

WIDENER



HN UH4Y \$

psappi
i (v)

THE
BIBLICAL CABINET;
OR
HERMENEUTICAL, EXEGETICAL,
AND
PHILOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

VOL. XXXVIII.

**THOLUCK'S COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE
HEBREWS.**

EDINBURGH:
THOMAS CLARK, 38. GEORGE STREET;
HAMILTON, ADAMS & CO. LONDON;
AND W. CURRY, JUN. & CO. DUBLIN.
MDCCCXLII.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

1868, Oct. 5

Wilson Bequest
2 vols.

A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS,

BY

Friedrich August Gottlieb

DR. A. THOLÜCK,

CONSISTORIAL COUNSELLOR, AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF HALLE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, BY

JAMES HAMILTON, M. A.,

PROFESSOR OF MODERN LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

WITH AN APPENDIX,

COMPRISING TWO DISSERTATIONS BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

TRANSLATED BY

J. E. RYLAND, Esq.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:

THOMAS CLARK, 38. GEORGE STREET.

MDCCCXLII.

C1048.32
18,59 JF

J. THOMSON, PRINTER, MILNE SQUARE.

TO DR. BUNSEN,

EMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY
OF HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF PRUSSIA TO THE
HELVETIC CONFEDERACY, &c.

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED,

WITH GRATEFUL RECOLLECTIONS,

BY THE AUTHOR.

Ofentimes, much honoured friend, have you urged upon me to return to my original studies, and to devote my powers to the Criticism and Exposition of the Old Testament; for it was your opinion that I should succeed in connecting human science, in a manner which you consider correct, with Christian and Ecclesiastical interests. Up to the present time I have not been able to look upon this as my vocation. Yet, since my studies have led me to that portion of the New Testament which, in a certain sense, occupies the boundary-territory between the New and Old Covenant, and from the understanding of which the Old Testament interpreter may certainly gain the clearest insight into his own office, I would take the

liberty of presenting you with this Work. There was once a time when the Scriptures found a place in the studies of statesmen. God be thanked, this time has not quite passed away! In the wide circle of your studies, which embraces the classical world and sacred literature, both of ancient and modern times, that Book of Scripture to whose exposition my present work is devoted, will also find a place, and should you meet in this with not a few things which you can from the heart approve, look, I pray you, on the book as only a longer Epistle which may recal to you the time of that delightful mental reciprocation, in which I received as much from you, as I, who occupy a more sacred office, could give in return.

Still stands the Capitol—still Frascati's and Albano's bright heights stand in unchangeable remembrance before my soul. Delightfully streamed the glories of nature, delightfully the glories of art; but how poor would all enjoyment be, had it not in the sanctuary of the family circle found its glorification, which connects earth with heaven.

What the outward and inward man experienced there, has borne manifold fruits, and the greatest share of gratitude I owe to you and to your house. Accept it then, from a distance, and let my name never be forgotten in your heart and in your house.

A. THOLUCK.

HALLE, 20th Jan. 1836.

P R E F A C E

T O T H E

S E C O N D E D I T I O N .

THIS Second Edition has, here and there, received improvements and several additions. In the sixth chapter of the Introduction, the Section on Inspiration has been recast; as far as Bleek's valuable work has appeared, I have consulted it, and perceive that we have, independently, arrived for the most part at similar conclusions. In the later sections, some parts have been retouched in Chapters VIII. and IX. The Appendices, published under the title of the Old Testament in the New,—or two Essays, 1. On the Citations from the Old Testament contained in the New. 2. On the Ideas of Sacrifice and Priest in the Old and New Testaments, which cannot be dispensed with in the study of the Commentary, were earlier out of print, and appeared last year in a new edition.

As the advertisements of my respected publisher speak of a second and third edition of this Commentary, I must mention, in order to prevent misunderstanding, that, soon after the appearance of the first edition, the printing of an additional number of copies was necessary, but this was not specified in the title

of the later printed copies, and hence this edition appears as the second.

May this work, the preparation of which has afforded me peculiar delight, meet in this new edition with sympathising friends and readers!

A. THOLUCK.

HALLE, *3d April* 1840.

CONTENTS

OF

VOLUME FIRST.

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| INTRODUCTION. | |
| CHAPTER I. The Author of the Epistle, | 1 |
| § 1. External Evidence for and against its composition, by Paul, | 1—19 |
| § 2. Internal Evidence, | 19 |
| A. Intimations respecting the author, drawn from single passages, | 19—24 |
| B. The Doctrinal Contents of the Epistle, | 24—29 |
| C. The Language and Style, | 29—46 |
| D. Single passages of the Epistle which seem to be reminiscences from the Pauline writings, | 47 |
| E. The form of the Quotations from the Old Testament in our Epistle, | 48—51 |
| F. The External arrangement of the Epistle, | 51—53 |
| § 3. Result of the Examination of the External and Internal Evidences, and survey of the critical enquiries respecting the Author, | 53—60 |
| § 4. If Paul be not—who is the Author? | 61—71 |

| | Page |
|--|---------|
| Chap. II. The Receivers of the Epistle, . . . | 72—75 |
| Chap. III. The Language of the Epistle, . . . | 75—80 |
| Chap. IV. Time and Place of the Composition of the Epistle, | 81 |
| Chap. V. Object, Contents, and Theological scope of the Epistle, | 82 |
| Chap. VI. On the Canonicalness and authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, | 83—110 |
| Chap. VII. The Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, | 110—424 |
| COMMENTARY,—Chap. I—VIII. | 125—297 |

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS.

Vol. I. p. 47, line 24, *for* like the \times for unknown magnitude,
read like the x for an unknown quantity.

— p. 60, line 24, *for* an inclination to make, where he cannot find a door.

read, an inclination to break through the walls, when he cannot find a door.

Vol. II. p. 2, line 2, *for* may *read* nay.

— p. 18, line 13, *for* shine *read* lustre.

— p. 24, line 19, *for* forbid *read* prohibitions.

— p. 207. “*Supports and adaptations.*” The German *Anlehnung* is a literal translation of what is called in the Talmud סְמִיכָה (*Smicah*)=

support—when a certain Rabbinical law is supported by some *hint* from the Scriptures, though taken in a different sense from the original meaning, and not even plainly told. Very often the *support* merely rests on an additional letter in a word, which by itself conveys no meaning whatever, but is interpreted as a sign, a mark for the existence of a certain law laid down by the Rabbies.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE.

THE Epistle to the Hebrews bears no superscription to inform us of its author. An inquiry respecting the author of this New Testament writing, must constitute, therefore, the main part of any introduction to it; and, since a great portion of the Christian church assumes it to be the work of the Apostle Paul, the inquiry must turn chiefly upon the question, whether *that* assumption be well founded. Yet, as the composition itself is not designated as proceeding from him, the discussion of the question cannot be regarded as an inquiry into its genuineness.

§ 1. External evidence for and against its composition by Paul.

No evidence can be adduced from the writings of the *first* century of the Christian era, that the Apostle Paul was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Some, indeed, have thought that the New Testament itself furnishes such evidence, namely, in the 14 and 15 ver. of 2 Peter ch. iii. In the admonition which the writer of that Epistle (whether Peter himself must be left undecided) gives to his readers to be diligent in well-doing, in expectation of a new heaven and a new earth, they conceive they discover an allusion to Heb. x. 25 (Comp. Heb. xii. 27, 28.). This opinion, though defended by Mynster (*Kleine theologische*

Schriften, s. 95.) and Dr. Paulus, has so little foundation that we need not dwell upon it (Comp. Bleek, § 21. Schott, Isagoge, § 80. Rem. 4.). The earliest evidence is found in what is called the first Epistle of *Clement of Rome* to the Corinthians. The author of that letter is not only acquainted with our Epistle, but more thoroughly conversant with it than with any other of St. Paul's Epistles. For, while the others are occasionally quoted by him, that to the Hebrews appears completely incorporated with his thoughts, he does not cite it under the usual forms of quotation, but appropriates from it many single words and phrases, and even many entire sentences (See the most complete collection of them in Lardner—"Principal Facts of the New Testament," Vol. I. p. 87, &c.). Now, could we show, with as much certainty as we can prove his intimate acquaintance with this Epistle, that Clement regarded Paul as its author, we should be placed, at once, above all further inquiry. For, as Clement was, not improbably, the friend and fellow-labourer of the Apostle (whom he mentions, Philipp. iv. 3.), his testimony would be conclusive. But, although the name of the Apostle is found in other parts of his work, *e. g.* in a quotation from 1 Cor. i. 12, yet that writer not quoting the Epistle, as we have remarked, with the usual forms of citation, affords the less ground to expect from him the name of its author.* The passages

* Stuart, indeed, C. 23 and 26, thinks he has discovered in Clement a formula of citation with passages from our Epistle, but without reason, as the apostolic Father introduces Old Testament quotations with these formulæ. These quotations, it is true, occur also in the Epistle to the Hebrews, though they cannot, on that account, be regarded as allegations from it, and so much the less as they are not quoted in it under a peculiar modification, but exactly according to the LXX. (I. 7, agrees with the Cod. Alex.). But Eichhorn is equally wrong, on the other side, when he would conclude from the want of the usual formulæ of citation, in quotations from our Epistle, that Clement held it in less esteem, since Clement and others of the Fathers likewise frequently interweave Biblical passages with their writings without any formula of citation.

quoted from it by him, furnish, therefore, no direct evidence of its composition by St. Paul. But, an indirect proof may be drawn from them. How did Clement, if it be not of Paul, make so liberal a use of it, while the Ecclesiastical writers, as we shall see in Tertullian, and in those of the Western Church in general, rarely or never quote the non-apostolical writings?*

Upon this fact, they who attribute the Epistle to St. Paul, are accustomed, and justly, to lay great stress. Yet no decisive argument can be drawn from it. For what if Clement, more intimately connected with the author of the Epistle, entertained a certain predilection for him (and a *predilection* for this very composition must certainly be presupposed); and, if the author, at the same time, were a disciple of St. Paul, and a distinguished person with the apostles? The situation of Clement, with regard to him, leads us to suppose such a person the writer.

Even if this be not readily granted, the quotations of Clement prove at least the antiquity of the Epistle, since that of Clement himself cannot be assigned to a later period than the year 96 after Christ; some critics, as Dodwell and Le Clerc, placing it even so early as the 70th year of the Christian era. To this point, as resulting from those quotations, great prominence has been given by Eusebius and Jerome.^b

We shall now pass from the *first* to the *second* and *third* centuries. In the Eastern, but especially in the Alexandrian church, we find, in the second century, a

* Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ii. 23. After saying of the Epistle of James: *ιστίον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μὲν*, "regard it as spurious," adds: *οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἠμνημόνευσαν*, "Few of the ancients have made mention of it."

^b Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iii. 38.: *ἐν ᾗ* (in the Epistle of Clement) *τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους πολλὰ νοήματα παραθεῖς, ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἀπολιξείη ῥητοῖς τισὶν ἐξ αὐτῆς χρῆσάμενος, σαφίστατα παρίστησιν, ὅτι μὴ νῖον ὑπέσχετο τὸ σύγγραμμα*. Hieron. Catal. vir. cel. c. 15. "In which, having inserted many thoughts taken from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and used even the very expressions, he shows most clearly that the work was *not of a recent date*."

generally prevailing opinion that the Epistle was written by St. Paul. As we are informed by Clement of Alexandria, and by Eusebius from him, Pantænus, the founder of the Alexandrian school (c. 150 after C.), believed Paul to be the author, as does also Clement of Alexandria himself, although he regards Luke as the translator of it into Greek. Both these Fathers remark, as something striking, the want of a superscription, and endeavour, by hypotheses, to explain the difficulties which might thence arise respecting its author. Comp. § 2. The passage of Eusebius relating to this point may be seen in Hist. Eccl. 6, 14. Origen, also (†254), regards the Epistle as the work of Paul. He frequently quotes from it under the name of that Apostle, mentions, too, in some passages (in Hom. vii. Jos., Hom. xiii. in Gen.), 14 Epistles of Paul, and says, if a Church retain the Epistle as written by him it is deserving of no blame on that account, for the ancients, not without reason, had handed it down as the composition of the Apostle. But, critically acquainted with language, and, struck with the difference between its diction and that of the Apostle, he assumes it as probable that only the *νοήματα* belonged to Paul, while the composition might be attributed to Clement of Rome, or Luke, or some person unknown.^a

^a The important passage of Origen relative to this point is found in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vi. 25. *Περὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς ἐν ταῖς εἰς αὐτὴν ὁμιλίαις ταῦτα διαλαμβάνει ὅτι ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογῆσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῆ ῥόγῃ τουτῆστι τῆ φράσει· ἀλλ' ἴσται ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθεῖσι τῆς λέξεως ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φράσειν διαφορὰς, ὁμολογήσει ἂν· πάλιν τε αὐτὸν ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσια ἴσται, καὶ οὐ δεύτερα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων, καὶ τοῦτο ἂν συμφῆσαι εἶναι ἀληθῆς, πᾶς ὁ προκίχων τῆ ἀναγνώσει τῆ ἀποστολικῆς. Τοῦτοις μὲν ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λίγων ἰγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος ἵπαιμι ἂν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἴσται, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπορημονιύσαντός τινος· τὰ ἀποστολικὰ, καὶ ὅσπερ ἐν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀποστολῶν τὰ ἐρημίνα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. Εἴ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὐτὴν εὐδοκίμειται καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἰπῆ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδιδάσκει· τίς δὲ ἡ γράψας*

Now. it is of great importance to know whether this view of the subject entertained by the Alexandrian Fathers rested upon historical grounds, that is, upon the tradition of the Church, or not; and also, the collateral evidence, whether, in those times, it found many opponents, or reigned alone without contradiction?

The more modern contenders against its composition by Paul, such as Schulz, and Eichhorn, and J. E. Ch. Schmidt, in their Introductions. assume a position of no inconsiderable advantage for their argument in considering the hypotheses advanced by Pantænus and Clement, regarding the want of a superscription, and by Origen, in respect of its diction, as *attempts at defending* the origination of the Epistle from Paul against those who impugn that opinion, and in ascribing the ef-

τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς Θεὸς εἶδεν· ἢ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ὑπὸ τινων μὲν λεγόντων, ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὑπὸ τινων δὲ, ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὡς ἰχίτω.

“ In his homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews, he expresses the following opinion of it; that the style of the Epistle which is inscribed to the Hebrews, has not the homeliness of language peculiar to the Apostle, as he acknowledged himself to be rude in speech, that is, in the arts of style; but that, with regard to the choice of the expression, this Epistle is written with great purity, as will be confessed by any one skilled in detecting the shades of words. And, besides, it contains some admirable thoughts not inferior to those which are found in the writings confessedly apostolic, which will be granted by any person who shall attentively peruse the writings of the Apostle. He says some other things, and adds: It is my opinion that the thoughts were the Apostle’s, but the choice of the language, and the disposition of the parts, were the work of some other person who wished to commemorate the sayings of the Apostle, and to arrange what he had heard from his master into a kind of commentary. . If any church, therefore, hold this Epistle for Pauline we must approve of their judgment, for the ancients have not been rash in handing down to us that it proceeded from Paul: at the same time, the real author, I think, is known only to God. But the writers whose works have come down to us ascribe it partly to Clement Bishop of the Romans, partly to Luke who wrote the Gospel and the Acts: so much for this subject.”

forts of those Fathers, in this defence, to a subjective predilection for the allegorical character of the Epistle. Thus, Eichhorn begins his examination of it in these words (Introd. iii. 2. p. 455.), "meanwhile the opponents of this hypothesis are as ancient as its defenders." This, however, must be pronounced a mere rhetorical stratagem.* For the impartiality of Bleek has sufficiently displayed the futility of these suppositions, by granting that we are not obliged to assume these hypotheses to have been first called into existence by the opponents of the authorship of Paul. Still, in another and essential respect, we find ourselves constrained to differ from Bleek. The estimate of the degree of generality enjoyed by the opinion that Paul was its author depends upon the right interpretation

* Even so early as the appearance of Storr's Comm., Eichhorn came forth, in his review of it (Allgem. Bibl. 3 B. s. 386), with the assertion, that "little is wanting to shew that the first mention of this Epistle was conjoined with a doubt whether it could be called a composition of Paul's." To any one who hesitates to believe how far the negative criticism of more modern times has indulged in the most glaring partiality,—and, in some degree, knowingly,—may find abundant proofs of it in the history of the recent criticism on our Epistle. Bertholdt, for instance, in his citation of the passage from Origen, quoted p. 4. note, appears,—we must make use of a strong expression,—as a downright intentional *falsarius*. The testimony of Origen, which occurs, certainly, in two different fragments, he has divided into two portions, and quoted in two different passages of his Introduction, Th. VI. s. 2944 and 2956, not, however, as might have reasonably been expected, each fragment complete for itself, but so, that, in the separation of the quotation, precisely that sentence has disappeared which lay in the way of the critic's argument, namely, that which contains the *historical basis* of Origen's opinion, *ἡ τις εἰς ἰσαλησίαν . . . παραδιδόκεται*; and not a single word indicates the omission of this important proposition. Schulz is likewise guilty of the same omission, an omission which Steudel has animadverted upon in his review of Schulz's work. His citation, however, in itself unjustifiable, is so far excusable, that, whatever industry he may have bestowed upon the internal, the external evidences have been treated by him very cursorily and very superficially, so that the omission is, probably, unintentional, which cannot be the case with Bertholdt.

of the sentence cited (p. 4.) from Origen,—*εἴ τις, κτλ.* Of that sentence Bleek, in p. 107 of his Introduction, says:—"This indeed, obviously sounds as if the opinion that the Epistle proceeded from Paul required a formal apology; from this it appears only as a *rare exception* to the usual practice, so that, in general, the Epistle did not enjoy, in the Church, the rank of one of Paul's." This, in our opinion, is clearly too sweeping a conclusion. *Ei*, with the *indic.*, throws a supposition into the idea, without any decision, *pro* or *contra*, whether the thing will or will not actually take place. In the remark of Gamaliel, *εἰ τὸ ἔργον ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐστίν κτλ.*, is there any affirmation that the work was not of God? When we say, "If a Prussian subject feel himself happy, he is right in doing so," who would thence conclude that this could be only a *rare exception*? Origen, indeed, might have so expressed himself, if all the churches had been of one mind in receiving the Epistle as from St. Paul. To the inquiry, why he adopted precisely this form of expression? we may answer, perhaps he wished to draw attention to the fact of the want of unanimity in the churches concerning it; only, in that case, it were not necessary, we conceive, that he had in view the dissenting *Eastern Churches*. Origen, who, as Storr remarks, was in Rome under that Zephyrinus in whose times Caius disputed against Proclus, and acknowledged only thirteen Epistles of Paul, might have in view the dissent of the *West*. Still, it appears to me more probable that Origen, in this passage, supposes the reception of it as the production of Paul to be general in the Church, and that he really means to say:—"I will not inquire how far the opinion of the churches, on this subject, is beyond doubt (thinking, at the same time, of the doubts in his own mind, and in that of others, from internal reasons), at any rate they have much reason on their side."

Bleek's opinion, that only a community here and there received the Epistle as of Paul, while the general tradition of its reception was in the highest degree unfavourable, is, as we conceive, completely prov-

ed to be erroneous by two other passages of Origen, in which he speaks of doubts entertained as to its composition by the Apostle. In *Matth. xxiii. 27.*, he makes use of this expression:—*pone aliquem abdicare Epistolam ad Hebræos quasi non Pauli*; and in the *Epistle, Ad. Afric. c. 9*, he says, ἀλλ' εἰκός τινα θλιβόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς εἰς ταῦτα ἀποδείξεως (by *Heb. xi. 37.* confirming the apocryphal fact of *Isaiah's* being sawn asunder) συγχρησασθαι τῷ βουλήματι τῶν ἀθετούντων τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς οὐ Παύλῳ γεγραμμένην, πρὸς ὃν ἄλλων λόγων κατ' ἰδίαν χρῆζομεν εἰς ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ εἶναι Παύλου τὴν ἐπιστολὴν.^a Can any one persuade himself that Origen would have so spoken concerning the doubts of Paul being its author had these doubts been founded on historical grounds, and spread through all the congregations? Do not these passages very distinctly indicate the doubts as those of individuals, springing, as they did in the mind of Origen himself, from internal difficulties which they were unable to explain?^b

We obtain the same conclusion from the sentence ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία κτλ. If some of the sceptics here mentioned regarded Luke, and others Clement of Rome, as the writer, their very hypotheses clearly shew that the character of its style induced the doubts entertained concerning its author.

In confirmation of our assertion, that no communities, and still less the majority of the communities, regarded the *Epistle* as not of Paul, we have the testimony of Eusebius, who (*Hist. Eccl. l. 3, c. 3.*) speaks only of individuals (and even then with an appeal to

^a But, it is probable that a person, being pressed by the proofs adduced on this point, will adopt the opinion of those who reject the *Epistle* as not written by Paul; in reply to such a one, it will be necessary to employ other and independent arguments in proof of the *Epistle* being the work of that Apostle.

^b The Introductions which have appeared since the time of Bleek have been more correctly expressed on this point; De Wette, Schott. The former only says, "Origen, although he quotes the *Epistle* as Pauline, yet is aware of doubts concerning it."

the Western Church) who had raised doubts *ὅτι γε μὴν τινες ἠθετήκασιν τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους, πρὸς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ὡς μὴ Παύλου οὖσαν αὐτὴν ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαντες, οὐ δίκαιον ἀγνοεῖν.*^a How could he, indeed, have spoken so confidently of its production by Paul, if, in the time of Origen, its authorship was questioned in the majority of the congregations?

In the evidence of Eusebius, we have still to estimate the value of the important words, *οὐ γὰρ εἰκῆ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασιν*, which Bertholdt and Schulz, as we have seen, most unjustifiably omit, and which Eichhorn and others have not deemed worthy of any closer examination. Bleek naturally weighs them with more minute attention. The question is, how far back the expression *ἀρχαῖοι*, in Origen, carries us? Bleek observes, he can easily conceive that Origen, in this expression, had only Clement (who died about thirty years before him), and Pantænus in view; and, indeed, it is in this way alone that the meaning attached by Bleek to *εἴ τις ἐκκλησία κτλ.* can be reconciled with the opinion of Origen. But can *ἀρχαῖοι* really refer to men of whom the one died twenty, perhaps only ten years before Origen wrote? Can he have introduced these two Alexandrian teachers with so general and indefinite a predicate? Must not the word *ἀρχαῖοι* be taken in the same sense in which Eusebius employs it in the formula, *ταῦτα μὲν ὡς ἐξ ἀρχαίων ἱστορίας εἰρησθῶ, and διὰ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων παραδίδεως* (Hist. Eccl. ii. 1; iii. 24)?^b Now, if we explain the phrase of Origen by that of Eusebius, we are carried back, to use the language of Hug, "to men who stand close upon the apostolic age;" and,^c in accordance with that expression, we lay it

^a It should be known, however, that *some* reject it as such (the work of Paul), and say that the Epistle was not regarded by the Roman Church as a certain and genuine Epistle of Paul.

^b But these things I have found in the muniments of the ancients, &c.

^c In Eusebius, indeed, Irenæus is designated as one *τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πρεσβυτέρων* (Hist. Eccl. v. 8.); still Irenæus preceded him by nearly a century and a half.

down as a fact, that, *not long after the apostolic times, our Epistle was regarded as written by Paul*, and that it enjoyed this distinction in the East, where the proximity of Palestine facilitated the spread of the earliest knowledge of its author.

From this unprejudiced examination of the historical evidence, throughout the whole of which we have endeavoured to avert our view from the result which we were desirous to obtain, it follows, that, in the time of Origen, some doubts certainly existed concerning its composition by Paul; but that the general opinion, supported by ancient tradition, was in its favour: and, even if Origen himself decide that only the *νοήματα* must be ascribed to Paul, but not its composition, we are so far from regarding this, with Eichhorn and others, as an expedient in favour of his subjective view, and, in opposition to tradition, to vindicate, by *whatever means, its origin from Paul*, that, on the contrary, we perceive in it, with Storr (Introd. § 4.), a means of reconciling *his subjective critical opinion with the force of the objective historical tradition.*^a And, to us the facts appear to speak so clearly in favour of this view of the passage, that, from so candid an inquirer as Bleek, when he shall reconsider the subject, we venture to hope for assent to it.

After the time of Origen, we find the Epistle generally acknowledged, in the Alexandrian Church, as proceeding from Paul; and, in the third century, by Dionysius the Bishop, by Peter the Bishop, and by Hierax the Heretic (See Bleek, p. 131. et seq.). This, certainly, can the less be attributed to the authority of that Father alone, as it happened, to a certain degree, in contradiction of it.

The question, therefore, now is, what was determined, at this period, in the remaining portion of the

^a So Hug, also:—"The remark was early made (in Alexandria,) that the style of the Epistle was strikingly distinguished from that of the Apostle. *Although the difference was perceived, and seemed to point directly to another author, still no one dared to deny it to be his.*"

Eastern Church, concerning the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews? a question of so much the greater importance as the decision of the Alexandrian Fathers in favour of its composition by Paul has been ascribed to their predilection for its allegorical character. The erroneousness of this supposition would immediately appear, could we affirm, with confidence, that the reception of the Epistle into the most ancient versions of the New Testament, the Peshito and the Latin (towards the close of the second, or beginning of the third, century), is a proof in favour of the acknowledgment of its apostolic origin (So Stuart, I. p. 97.). For, as the writings of those who were not of the number of the apostles are never, or but occasionally, quoted, so we should expect that no translations of them would be executed. This, however, we cannot with certainty affirm. For the contrary is proved by the circumstance, that, in the West, the Epistle was designated as not of Paul, during the period in which the ancient *Itala* was produced. But Bleek is inclined to grant, that, when the Peshito was composed, the same views prevailed in the Syrian Church, respecting the author of the Epistle, which the Syrian writers, collectively, entertained (Bleek, p. 439).

If we now inquire after more satisfactory evidence we find ourselves almost entirely deserted. There are extant, however, two works, from which, even in the absence of other testimony, the erroneousness of the hypotheses we have mentioned may be sufficiently shown. The one is that of Methodius, Bishop of Olympus in Lycia, and subsequently of Tyre (c. 290), the other an Epistle of the Synod of Antioch to Paul of Samosata (c. 264). In the writings of Methodius, Lardner (Principal Facts, vol. v. p. 258) has pointed out more than one testimony in favour of our Epistle, but, in particular, two passages which prove its composition by Paul. In the piece entitled *Convivium decem virg. orat.* 10. ap. Combef. p. 96, there occurs this passage, *εἰ ὁ νόμος ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον πνευματικὸς,*

τὰς εἰκόνας ἐμπεριέχων τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν,* and, in the same work, p. 116.: μυσίον γὰρ ἔξετε κλέος, ἐὰν ἀφέλητε νικήσασαι τοὺς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ στεφάνους ἑπτα, δι' οὓς ὁ ἄγων ἡμῖν πρόκειται καὶ ἡ πάλη κατὰ τὸν διδάσκαλον Παῦλον.^b The former passage Lardner conceives to be an allusion to Heb. x. 1., the latter to xii. 1. With Bleek, we feel constrained to admit this, as respects the latter, though the former, perhaps, is more questionable. Still, the assumption that the writer had in view the Epistle to the Hebrews is supported by the fact of that Father having, in other passages, undoubtedly made use of it, without formally adding the name of Paul.

The second testimony, from the writing of the synod, is equally unquestionable.^c And from it Bleek also draws this conclusion, "*This proves, certainly, that, in Antioch, the Epistle was then generally regarded as written by Paul, so much so, that even from its enemies contradiction had ceased to be apprehended.*"

Supported by these two testimonies, we may now affirm that, in the third century, not only in the communities of Egypt, but of Lesser Asia, this Epistle was acknowledged as written by the Apostle Paul,^d and that, if doubts concerning its origin existed they were

* If the law, according to the Apostle, be spiritual, containing the images of good things to come.

^b For ye shall obtain infinite glory, if, having gained the victory, ye take from her the seven crowns which she wears, the contest and struggle for which things are placed before us by our teacher Paul.

^c It is found in Mansi, Collect. concil. T. I. p. 1038.

^d We shall, intentionally, make no use here of the passage of Jerome, in Epistle twenty-nine, ad. Dard., illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam, non solum ab ecclesiis Orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis scriptoribus quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, as the addition, licet plerique eam vel Barnabæ vel Clementis arbitrentur. is obscure and, at any rate, the language of that writer cannot be taken strictly according to the letter. Comp. below, § 3, where this declaration is again mentioned.

probably the doubts of individuals. But, we may remark that, perhaps, Irenæus might be adduced as evidence that the recognition of it, in Lesser Asia, was not general.

The fate of the Epistle was very different in the West. There, from the earliest times of which we have any record, it was regarded, on all hands, as not of Paul. The most ancient evidence is that of Irenæus, towards the close of the second century. In his own writings, indeed, his testimony is only negative;—in his lengthened treatise, *Adv. haereses*, in which he makes such ample use of Paul's Epistles, there is not found a single quotation from the Epistle to the Hebrews. Hence, in mentioning one of his other works Βιβλίον διαλέξεων διαφόρων, Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 26, points out in it, as something remarkable, a quotation from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and another from the Wisdom of Solomon. This sparing use of the Epistle by Irenæus excites a suspicion that he was one of those who entertained doubts of its Pauline origin, especially, as being the bearer, for the Montanists, of the letter of recommendation to Eleutherius, in Rome, about the middle of the second century, he must have known the opinions of the community in that city. But we possess a positive testimony respecting him. Photius (in his *Biblioth. cod.* 232. ed. Bekker, p. 291.) adduces a declaration of Stephanus Gobaras, from the sixth century, which bears, that neither Irenæus, nor his disciple Hippolytus, in the beginning of the third century, held the Epistle to be of Paul. This testimony loses not a little of its credibility, indeed, from the fact that Eusebius, who, from the high esteem in which he held Irenæus, has a particular chap. ὅπως ὁ Εἰρηναῖος τῶν θείων μνημονεύει γραφῶν (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 8),* makes no mention whatever of this important circumstance. He intimates, however, that he had not read *all* the writings of that ancient Father. And,

* How Irenæus has recorded of the sacred writings.

Photius himself, in another passage (Cod. 121), confirms (a second important circumstance) the testimony of Gobaras respecting this Hippolytus the disciple of Irenæus. Now, it is known that Irenæus spent his youth in Lesser Asia. It were too much, however, to assert with Bleek that he is, therefore, "a representative of the opinions in that country." For, the spread of the anti-Pauline opinions in the West, but especially in Rome, had, no doubt, the chief influence in determining his opinion. But, it is probable that he had seen the contrary view opposed by many of his earlier acquaintance, otherwise he would not have so completely gone over to the opinions of the Western communities.

From the African church we are furnished with the evidence of Tertullian. He, it appears, was altogether ignorant that Paul had been assumed as the author of the Epistle, so that, without discussion, he quotes it as a work of Barnabas; and this he does, as we shall afterwards show more at length, when it was of the utmost moment for him to secure for it all possible authority. He has, besides, reproached Marcion with the intention of falsifying the *numerus epistolarum* by excluding the three Pastoral Epistles. But he does not charge him with culpability in rejecting the Epistle to the Hebrews, which he certainly must have done, had he himself considered it as the work of Paul (*Adv. Marc. v. 20.*).

In Cyprian, also, two passages are found, from which it appears that he excluded this Epistle from the number of Paul's. These are *Adv. Jud. lib. 1. c. 20.*, and, *De exhort. mart. c. ii.*, where he says that Paul, like John, in the Apocalypse, had written only to seven churches; a parallelism found also in Bishop Victorin (*†c. 303.*), and in the Muratorian canon, which we shall presently cite, and which supposes that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not reckoned among the Epistles of Paul. The evidence of Novatian, of the African church, in the third century, is particularly important. In his writings no use is ever made of the Epistle to the Hebrews, although, from the same cause as Tertullian, of

which we shall (On Heb. vi. 4—6.) speak more hereafter, he had the strongest motives to employ this Epistle, and to ascribe to it an especial authority.

In the Roman, as in the West African church, the Epistle was not considered as the work of Paul. Eusebius informs us (Hist. Eccl. vi. 20.) that the Roman Presbyter Caius, at the close of the second century, received only thirteen Epistles of that Apostle, and rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews. And, in like manner, what is called the Muratorian canon, executed towards the end of the second century, reckons only thirteen Pauline Epistles (Comp. Bleek, p. 122. et seq.).

On passing from the third to the fourth century we find a very different state of the question. All the teachers of the church, from the most opposite regions of the East, appear, in the fourth century, in favour of its Pauline origin; Bishop Alexander of Alexandria, the monk Antonius, Athanasius, Didymus, Theophilus of Alexandria, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Gregory Nazianzin, Basil, Epiphanius, the Syrian writers James of Nisibis and Ephraem Syrus, &c.

In preference to all the names here enumerated, the critical Eusebius deserves a more attentive consideration. Respecting this Epistle he has declared his opinion in several passages of his works. In the chief passage concerning the canon (Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.), he includes it among the Pauline Epistles as a Homologoumenon. In l. iii. 3. he gives the number of the authentic Epistles of Paul as fourteen, and in ii. 17. he quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews as the work of that Apostle. He mentions, however, the opposition to this view, which had, here and there, arisen in the church. In the passage we have quoted above (p. 4.), he says, that the Roman (Latin) church did not receive the Epistle, and that some Greeks, also, coincided with them in opinion; and, in speaking, l. iii. c. 38., of its adoption into the canon he endeavours to remove the objections to it. After the passage quoted p. 3. note, he adds, *ὁ δὲν εἰκότως ἔδοξεν, αὐτὸ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐγκραταλεχθῆναι γράμμασι*

τοῦ ἀποστόλου.* Lastly, he includes it among the ἀντιλέγομενοι (vi. 13.), and mentions it along with the Epistles of Barnabas, Clement, and Jude.

This apparent contradiction of a previous assertion, that the Epistle belonged to the Homologoumena, has been rightly explained, in the remark of Bleek, that Eusebius, in placing a work among the Homologoumena, did not mean to affirm that *no objection whatever*, but, merely, that no *valid* objection, had been raised against it.

Thus, while in the East, at this period, every scruple concerning its Pauline origin may be regarded as at rest, doubts continued to be entertained in the West, although these began gradually to disappear. Marius Victorinus, Zeno Phoebadius, Optatus, and other writers of the West, in whose works we might have expected quotations from the Epistle, make no use of it; and, in the commentary of Ambrosiaster on the Pauline Epistles, it is entirely omitted. Eusebius (l. vi. c. 20.) says, that, εἰς τὸ δεῦρο, some of the Latins still reject the Epistle. On the other hand, we find a distinct acknowledgment of it, as the work of Paul, in the following Latin authors of this century,—in Hilary (368), Lucifer Calaritanus (371), Ambrose, Philastrius, Gaudentius, and, even among the heads of the Western Church, Jerome and Augustine. In many passages of the two last, indeed, we still perceive their earlier scruples, partly, in their not permitting themselves to quote the Epistle as of Paul, and, partly, in their mentioning the widely spread suspicions concerning its author; and, even down into the seventh century we find, as in Isidore Hispalensis, the ancient doubts repeated in the West.

Constrained, from an unprejudiced inquiry, to acknowledge that the testimony of the Alexandrian doctors did not, as commonly has been affirmed, rest upon subjective private opinion, but upon the strength of historical tradition, the external evidence for

* Wherefore it has been ranked, not without reason, among the other writings of the Apostle.

the Pauline origin of our Epistle assumes to us, as it has done to others among the later, and even latest, critics, a much more favourable aspect. In accordance with this inquiry, we must pronounce, that the historical evidence in favour of the Pauline origin, especially as that evidence is drawn from the Eastern Church, decidedly preponderates. But, there remains the inquiry, if the testimony of this portion of the Church touching the author of the Epistle were unquestionable, how came the opposite opinion to be spread throughout the whole of the Western Church? Can we discover any accidental cause why, in it, Paul was not acknowledged as the author? Could such a cause, with any degree of probability, be assigned, we might be induced to admit it. This has been attempted to be done, both by the earlier and later defenders of the Pauline origin. Storr has advanced an hypothesis equally singular and improbable. According to him, Marcion caused the rejection of the Epistle in the West. It was peculiarly odious to the Western anti-Judaistic Gnostics; to every thing, therefore, which could be urged against its composition by Paul that writer gave its utmost force: ere the Roman Christians discovered his errors in doctrine, they had allowed themselves to be persuaded by his critical arguments; and, when he subsequently manifested heretical principles, it was no longer possible to eradicate the doubts which he had sown.

So highly improbable is this hypothesis that it scarcely deserves refutation; and it appears, indeed, to be confined to its author. But that formerly maintained by Spanheim, Wetstein, &c., and lately developed, with peculiar acuteness, by Hug, I think more plausible,—namely, that the opposition of the Western Church to the Montanists expelled the belief of its Pauline origin. As the Montanists, like the Novatians in later times, defended the stricter opinion of the first Christian communities, that the *lapsi* should not again be received into communion with the Church, no passage in the whole Scriptures appeared more strikingly to

support that opinion than Heb. vi. 4. et seq. ; and several writers mention that the Novatians did, in fact, urge the passage in their favour. Ambrosius, De Pœnit. l. 2, c. 3. ; Philastrius Haeres. 89. ; Theodoret and Chrysostom on Heb. vi. 4., &c. &c. The embarrassment felt by the Latins in meeting this scriptural authority induced them, it is supposed, to dispute, altogether, the apostolic origin of the Epistle ; whilst the Greeks, as Hug expresses himself, "like spectators less concerned in the struggle," were contented in depriving the heretics of that weapon in an exegetical way. But, from the outset, suspicion is awakened against the whole hypothesis, from the total absence of proof that it was the practice of the Church altogether to give up an acknowledged book of the New Testament, whenever that measure afforded a hope of wresting the weapons from the hands of heretical opponents. It rather appears that refuge was taken in the most forced interpretations, a course which was actually pursued in the exposition of Heb. vi. 4. But we may add a still more decisive argument. The passage adduced was, indeed, employed by the followers of Novatian in support of their doctrine, but neither Novatian himself, nor Tertullian, the head of the Montanist party, has done so ; nay, what is still more, as we have already (p. 4.), pointed out, Tertullian, in that very work whose object is to refute the more lax opinions on penitence advanced in his earlier treatise, De Pœnitentia, quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews as the production of Barnabas, namely, in his book De Pudicitia, c. 20. It was there his interest to give all possible importance to the Epistle ; and he does so, in fact, by advancing every thing that may place the authority of Barnabas in a striking point of view. Still, he never seeks to trace the Epistle to Paul, but brings his citation from it only as an appendix to the preceding proofs from the Apostolicum Instrumentum, drawn from the writings of Paul and John, and remarks, that he merely wished *ex redundantia* one *testimonium superinducere*. Now, had it been *known* to this Father

that the Epistle to the Hebrews had been ascribed to Paul, it is inconceivable that he should have left this fact wholly unnoticed. Still less can we assume, under these circumstances, that the Montanists and Novatians should have forced the Western Church to give up the opinions, until that time current, respecting the author of the Epistle. For, of Novatian we possess several pieces, in which occur numerous Biblical quotations. In none of these does he appeal to the Epistle to the Hebrews; but, as appears from the *Tractatus ad Novatianum haereticum*, in Galland III. p. 362—370 (a work whose author is unknown), his main support was Matth. x. 33. Hence, Stuart, a late and zealous defender of its production by the Apostle, has not ventured, decidedly, to adopt this hypothesis. In his first volume, p. 131., he says of it:—"as a matter of fact, this cannot be established by direct historical evidence;" and further on, "but, whatever might have been the cause, that the Epistle was pretty generally rejected by the Churches of the West the fact that it was so cannot reasonably be disputed."

Now, if neither this nor any other hypothesis impair the force of the evidence of the West, if we must admit it to possess a historical foundation as well as that of the East, the accumulated evidence of the latter can produce no decisive conviction, and we must grant the possibility that error was early introduced into the Eastern tradition concerning the author of the Epistle. Irenæus, *perhaps*, among the Fathers, may be regarded as the person on whom *the most ancient* opinion of the East retained its hold.

§. 2.—INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

A.—*Intimations respecting the Author drawn from single passages.*

In investigations respecting the author of works, the genuineness of which is disputed, all the evidence of one species commonly favours the suppos-

ed author, while that of another kind militates against him. But, in several parts of the series of evidence concerning the writer of our Epistle, proofs equally strong appear on either side. This is the case in the internal evidence, when we endeavour to glean, from detached passages, some indication of the person of its author. We find, in the last chapter (Heb. xiii. 18, 19 (x. 34.) 23, 24.), a number of passages, all of which appear to point out Paul as the writer. On the other hand, the declaration, ch. ii. 3., seems to testify most distinctly against him. That declaration, in which the writer refers his knowledge of the Gospel, not to our Lord himself, but, to those who had received it immediately from Him, particularly when contrasted with those declarations of St Paul, Gal. i. 1, 11, 16; ii. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 1—5, seems altogether inapplicable to that Apostle, who, at all times, strenuously insists upon his being a witness of the truth, in dignity not inferior even to those who had enjoyed immediate intercourse with the Redeemer. That single passage, indeed, was regarded by such men as Luther, Calvin, the Magdeburg Centuriators, and by many moderns, as a decisive proof against the Pauline origin of the Epistle. Nor is it easy to withhold assent from this opinion, when we consider to what description of communities the Epistle was written, namely, to Jewish Christians,—to the strictest Jewish Christians, by whom the apostolic authority of the writer would the most readily be questioned, and with whom it concerned him, in as high a degree as with the Galatians, to place in the strongest light his equality in authority with the other witnesses of the Gospel (Comp. the Exposit. of the passage).

While the force of that declaration will be readily admitted, it must still be acknowledged that the evidence to be found in ch. xiii., *in favour* of Paul, possesses no inconsiderable weight. It may be said, that those passages, taken together, place us in a historical position where every thing concurs in pointing out Paul as its author, and his imprisonment in Rome as

the period of its composition. The writer is a prisoner (the *ἵνα ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν* may indeed be referred to something else, such as liberation from imprisonment, the latter certainly is the more probable, and would be placed beyond doubt were *τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου*, c. x. 34., a genuine reading),^a he is in hope of being restored, in a short time, to the community, he mentions a person well known to them, Timothy, as his friend and companion, with whom he should then visit them, and, moreover, he sends a greeting from *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας*, which may be regarded as a designation of the Italians or Romans. How plainly does this point, it may be said, to the first imprisonment of the Apostle, nay even to the final period of it? At that time, he hoped, as is shown by Philipp. ii. 24. (i. 25.), and Philem. ver. 22., for a speedy release; Timothy had followed him thither from Ephesus, was then in his vicinity, and aided him in the communities. Col. i. 1.; Philem. 1.; Philipp. i. 12.; ii. 19, 20, 23. If, with Storr and Stuart, we take *ἀπολελυμένον* (xiii. 23.) in the sense of *ἀποπεμφθέντα*, we may hazard the conjecture, with the last mentioned divine, that Paul there speaks of the promised journey, Philipp. ii. 23., which Timothy made to the Philippians, to give them precise intelligence of the favourable turn of his affairs; he hoped to be completely freed by the time of Timothy's return, and then, with that faithful companion to set out on his journey to the receivers of the Epistle. Even if, with Hug, we understand *ἀπολελυμένον* as referring to liberation from imprisonment (certainly the only right meaning), it were easy to picture to the mind the historical position of the writer. The silence of the Acts of the Apostles respecting such an imprisonment of Timothy were no valid reason for denying it, as that faithful disciple might, certainly, in his endeavours to propagate the Gospel in Rome, be

^a Cramer, who adopts this reading, directs attention to the frequency with which Paul makes mention of his bonds. Eph. iii. 1.; iv. 1.; vi. 20. Philipp. i. 7, 13, 14, 16.; Col. iv. 18.; 2 Tim. ii. 9.

involved for a time in the face of his master. The complaint Philippi ii. 24, 25., that the other fellow-workers did not vigorously cooperate with Paul, but care for themselves, may have been occasioned by their not jeopardizing like Timothy (Comp. ii. 30.), both life and freedom in the cause. In Col. iv. 10., the Aristarchus who accompanied the Apostle on his journey to Rome is mentioned as a *former prisoner*, and Epaphras in the 23 ver. of Philemon. May not a similar fate have overtaken Timothy? This combination of circumstances, it must be allowed, possesses a high degree of probability, as indeed the opponents of the argument themselves admit, while they retreat upon the position, that it involves no absolute necessity.^b

But, it acquires additional force from the inquiry, what form the argument assumes if Paul be not the author? If we adopt the affirmative, various certain historical coincidences present themselves in the life of Timothy; but, assuming the negative, they instantly

* Only, in that case, the time of his imprisonment must have been subsequent to the composition of those Pauline Epistles which were written in captivity; for, otherwise, Paul would have mentioned Timothy, as he has done Aristarchus and Epaphras, as *condemned*: from Philippi ii. 19, 23., also, Timothy appears to have been at liberty. Hence Tillmont, although unnecessarily, advances the conjecture that he was detained after his journey to Macedonia: Mémoires pour servir, &c. Tom. ii. p. 144. and 542. We might, with greater propriety, appeal, against this combination, to the expression, Heb. xiii. 23., *ἐκ τῆς ἑτέρας πόλεως*, which seems to point to an arrival from another city, and, at the same time, is opposed to the supposition of an imprisonment in Rome. But what if this faithful helper had been arrested and detained in some distant part of the city, which, according to Pliny, embraced, in the time of Vespasian, a circuit of three (German) miles? What if, in the labours of his mission, he had been seized in some place in the neighbourhood of the city?

^b Eichhorn (Einleit. iii. S. 458.). "It is true that, when the author of the Epistle promises to visit his readers in company with Timothy, who does not, seeing Timothy was his companion for many years, immediately think of Paul as the chief traveller? But still, who could assume that he *must* be so?"

disappear. Nay, hitherto, it appears, the question has never been proposed, whether it be probable that Timothy, during the life of the Apostle, or even after his death, was ever connected as *συνεργός* with any other apostolic man. Eichhorn holds this to be impossible during the life of the Apostle, while Bleek thinks it may very easily be conceived. Its impossibility we will not affirm, though it is certainly far from probable. After the death of Paul, however, Timothy appears to have been permanent overseer of the community at Ephesus. Can he, at that time, have undertaken any new mission? If so, we should find ourselves, at last, driven to the hypothesis of Bertholdt, that this Timothy was a quite different person from him generally known by the name. But, disregarding the uncertain tradition of a Timothy the son of Prudens and Priscilla, no other Timothy is known to ecclesiastical antiquity. An assumption so gratuitous has, therefore, by Eichhorn, Bleek, and others been, with reason, rejected.

Now, while the argument for the composition of the Epistle by Paul, during his imprisonment in Rome, appears to have so much in its favour on this side, on another, from which, according to the older view, it derived one of its strongest supports, it becomes anew doubtful. The expression *ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας* was regarded, generally, by the older interpreters, as a periphrase of the *gentile οἱ Ἰταλοί*, as a designation of the Italian communities, including those of Rome. Respecting the linguistic proof, they appealed to *Raphel annot. ex Polyb. on Matth. xv. 1.* Stuart has, lately, although in an unsatisfactory manner, undertaken the defence of this opinion. Still, even defenders of the Pauline origin of the Epistle have now abandoned it, as opposed to the principles of the language; and they conceive the phrase to denote those members of the Italian communities who had come to Rome. And, while Schulz strenuously maintains that the phrase cannot possibly be regarded as a circumlo-

cution for *gentile*, Bleek looks upon this as decided, and says: "From τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας the writer could send a greeting *only if he were himself in another country, and not in Italy.*" Should this be granted, there would still remain, as Bleek admits, the way of escape taken by Storr and Hug. But we feel constrained to adopt another opinion. Οἱ ἀπὸ equally with οἱ ἐκ—as certainly ἐκ and ἀπὸ have, in so many respects, a like meaning—may be used as a circumlocution, and particularly for *gentile*. See the Expos. of xiii. 24. We must, therefore, regard that view of the phrase as admissible, avowing, at the same time, that the exposition general among the latest interpreters, namely, "persons come from Italy, fugitives from Italy,"^a has a far greater appearance of truth. See Expos. of xiii. 24.

At this stage of the inquiry, it appears, that the proofs derived from this department of the internal evidence *for and against* nearly balance one another. But, it must be confessed that, while the reasons last exhibited *for* the Pauline origin only render that view plausible, without depriving the opposite of probability, the proofs formerly advanced *against* it cut off even the possibility of Paul being the author.

B.—*The Doctrinal Contents of the Epistle.*

The opinion, that an essential difference exists between our Epistle and the Epistles of Paul, can hardly be entertained by any one versed in that Apostle's writings. Origen perceived in it the νοήματα of Paul; and, although, at the period of the Reformation, such men as Luther and Calvin conceived that some single passages, as ii. 3.; vi. 1, 2.; vi. 4—6.; xii. 17., contradicted the doctrinal views of the Apostle, as expressed in other places, they yet acknowledged, upon the whole,

^a More fully: οἱ παρόντες ἀπὸ, as Demosthenes, De rebus Chersonesi, p. 93, 11, εἰς φασιν οἱ παρόντες ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας.

that its contents were Pauline. We cannot, therefore, wonder, if later defenders of the Epistle have adduced the harmony of its doctrines with those of Paul as a fundamental argument for its Pauline origin. So Cramer (p. 68., &c.), Meyer (whom Schulz opposes), in the treatise: *Of some internal reasons for the composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews by Paul*, in the 3d Art. of the 2d vol. of the *Theol. Journal*, by Ammon and Bertholdt; Steudel, in his *Review of Schulz*; and particularly Hug, p. 461, &c.

In marked contrast to the opinion, until this period, generally prevalent respecting the doctrine of the Epistle, is that of some of the modern critics, as Bertholdt, Schulz, Seyffarth, in part *De Wette* (Introd. p. 299.), and Schott, *Isagoge*, p. 345., &c. Of these Schulz departs the farthest from the ancient opinion. He advances the peculiar notion, that the Epistle is the production of an author belonging to a mystical, Judæo-Christian sect, which had departed in many respects from the general Christian doctrines, and particularly from those of Paul. While the constant theme of that Apostle is the abrogation of the Old Law, our author is thought by him to remain altogether on Jewish soil, and, by mystical expositions, to endeavour to perpetuate Judaism. With him, the difference between Judaism and Christianity consists only in these two things—the first, that the dignity of high-priest was transferred from the tribe of Levi to Christ, who attained this dignity after the manner of Melchisedec;—the second, that Christianity supplies more certain knowledge of eternal life: but that, in the life after the present, there shall just be a sublimer temple-worship, a higher Judaism.

This peculiar view, however, is still confined to its author. It is opposed by *De Wette*, in his treatise on the Symbolico-typical scheme of doctrine of the Epistle, in which he observes (p. 5.), “I consider the writer’s views of Christianity to be, in the main, the same as those entertained by Paul.” And the author of this

opinion having himself withdrawn it, we need enter no further on its refutation.*

That no *essential* difference exists between the doctrines of our Epistle, and those of Paul, is now admitted even by the later opponents of its Pauline origin. Bleek declares (p. 303.), that, "in respect of the ideas, and the whole circle of thought, *our Epistle has an affinity with no other writings in the New Testament so great as with those of Paul.*" Besides the difference of doctrine, alleged by Schulz alone, some other diversities have been pointed out—for instance, that our author knows nothing of the calling of the heathen, one of the main topics of Paul—that he pays no regard to the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ, so important a subject in the doctrinal type of the Apostle—that he employs the *terminus πικρισ* with an essentially different meaning, &c. Bleek shows, with regard to these alleged differences, that, even if they do exist, they are not of so much importance as some imagine. Bleek, p. 303., &c. And as to the typical scheme of doctrine, it proves nothing; for, although that be more rare in the writings of Paul (Gal. iv. 21—31. Rom. v. 14. 1 Cor. x. 1—6.), we must at the same time take into account, that no other of his epistles is addressed exclusively to Judæo-Christians, and, that the whole tendency of this composition, the object of which is to point out the Christian ideas veiled in the Old Tes-

* Dr. Schulz, some years ago, gave the following explanation, with reference to his labours on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the "Studien und Kritiken, ii. 3. S. 618. "If the great object of these labours (to prove that Paul was not the author) be attained, the conjectures which the author advanced at the same time, and which now appear to himself untenable, may be set aside, as the reviewer (Schulz) sees not without satisfaction, that his production, defective in several points, may be looked upon as superfluous since the publication of the far more comprehensive and profound treatise of M. Bleek." It is so much the more striking, that Dr. Grossman (De Philos. Jud. sacræ vestigiis in ep. ad Hebr. 1833.) has come forward as the defender of the opinion, which Schulz himself has abandoned.

tament, gave especial occasion for the employment of type. But, in return, it is worthy of remark, that, with the exception of the passing allusion, 1 Pet. iii. 21., type is employed by no other apostolic writer, if reference to typical prophecies be not alleged, or the declaration of Christ, John iii. 14., which, however, in respect of *form*, is a *comparison*.

We proceed, therefore, upon the fact of its being generally admitted, that the doctrine of our Epistle is not *essentially* different from the Pauline doctrinal type, but rather that a very considerable number of declarations may be pointed out in which its author agrees, exclusively, with Paul. These accordant doctrinal points have not, hitherto, been satisfactorily collected, Bleek himself having cited them mingled with passages which agree with them only in the *expression*, p. 316. Leaving the more doubtful, let us direct our attention only to the following instances of agreement in doctrine. I. God the principle and the end of all beings, ii. 10, Comp. Rom. xi. 36.; 1 Cor. viii. 6.—II. The doctrine of Christ as *ἐκων* of God, and Mediator in the creation of the world (peculiar to Paul, and, in a modified form, to John), i. 1—3. Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4.; Col. i. 15, 16.—III. The doctrine of Christ's humiliation and His consequent exaltation, i. 4.; ii. 9. Comp. Philipp. ii. 8, 9.—IV. That Christ has deprived death of his power, ii. 14. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55, 57; 2 Tim. i. 10.—V. That Christ died, once for all, for sin, and is, therefore, now raised above all suffering, ix. 26, 28.; x. 12. Comp. Rom. vi. 9, 10.—VI. Christ is the Mediator, *μεσίτης*, betwixt God and men, also *ιερέυς* in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which, as we shall presently see, there is some difference from, but also an agreement with, the idea peculiar to Paul.—VII. The doctrine, that Christ having completed the work of redemption has exalted Himself above the heavens, vii. 26.; iv. 14. Comp. Ephes. iv. 10.—VIII. That He now intercedes for us with the Father (1 John ii. 2., in a modified form), vii. 25. Comp. Rom. viii. 34.—IX. That He shall reign at the right hand of the

Father, until he subdue all opposing hostile powers, x. 12, 13. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 25.—X. That He will reappear to judge mankind, but for the salvation of them that look for Him, ix. 27, 28. Comp. Titus ii. 13.; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8. Rom. viii. 24.; xiii. 11.—XI. That the Old Covenant was but a shadow of the good things of the New. viii. 5.; x. 1. Comp. Col. ii. 17.—XII. That the Old Covenant and the New stand towards each other in the relation of *σάργξ* and *πνεῦμα*, that the former purifies outwardly, but does not give life, that it is merely an educational institution, vii. 16, 18, 19.; ix. 9, 10, 13.; viii. 7.; x. 14, 16, 20. Comp. Rom. ii. 29.; 2 Cor. iii. 6, 7.; Gal. iii. 3, 24.; iv. 3, 9.—XIII. That free access to the Father was first obtained by Christ, x. 19. Comp. Eph. ii. 18. Rom. v. 2.—XIV. Accordance with the Pauline Triad, Faith, Love, Hope, vi. 10, 11.; x. 22, 23, 24. Comp. also the Exposition of vi. 4, 5. Bleek, in order to show that isolated agreements do not prove identity of author, appeals to the parallels which the 1st Epistle of Peter has with the Epistles of Paul, and that of James with the 1st of Peter. But, the affinities being incomparably less, the instance, in the present case, is inadmissible.

We have already remarked, that the doctrinal type of the Epistle to the Hebrews differs not *essentially* from the Pauline; but unessential differences, certain peculiarities of doctrine, that Epistle must be admitted to contain. The following three points we consider the most important:—1. That the Epistle, notwithstanding various occasions for the introduction of the subject, never once mentions the importance of Christ's resurrection. 2. That the idea of a mediator, which is certainly known to Paul, and differs not essentially from that of the *ιερεὺς* (comp. Heb. xii. 24.), is yet never brought forward, in the writings of the Apostle, in this latter form. It might be supposed that, when once the idea of the Messiah's priesthood was present to the Apostle's mind under the grand form in which we behold it in our Epistle, it would more frequently

have appeared in his doctrinal epistles. 3. That the πίστις, in this Epistle, is essentially different from the Pauline, may be shewn by proofs still more manifest than those adduced by Bleek: and, certainly, it may be admitted that the want of the contrast of νόμος and πίστις, ἔργα πίστεως καὶ νόμου in it, is somewhat striking. For, since the error of the receivers of the Epistle consisted wholly in a foolish clinging to the ἔργα νόμου, from which they might have been delivered through the δικαιοσύνη πίστεως, it must strike every one that Paul, if he be the author, never employs this form of polemics. Perhaps it might be added, that the employment of typical prophecy, and of type, in general, is carried further in this Epistle than can be expected from Paul, but — that is the question.

After all, there are still found in the doctrines of our Epistle, and the Epistles of Paul, incomparably more coincidences than discrepancies. Does this circumstance lend peculiar support to the assumption of its Pauline origin? No sure proof, certainly, can be drawn from it; for the supposition of an intimate disciple, a companion of the Apostle's being the author, would sufficiently explain the agreements, since, even in the gospel of Luke, treating of the history of Jesus, the dependance of doctrinal type cannot be mistaken, although the reasons for bringing it forward at all were very slight. And, the existence of peculiarities in a general coincidence of doctrine is a circumstance precisely of such a nature as to induce the conclusion, that a disciple of the great Apostle of the Gentiles was the author rather than that Apostle himself.

C.—*The Language and Style.*

We are now come to that property of the Epistle which gave rise to the first doubts respecting its Pauline origin. As we have seen above (p. 5.), the philologist Origen, who, in many places (for example, in his work Περὶ εὐχῆς), has shewn his critical acquaint-

tance with the linguistic characteristics of Greek, was induced, because the *ἐπιστολὴ συνδέσει τῆς λείξεως ἑλλη- νικώτερα*, to ascribe the embodying of these Pauline thoughts not to Paul himself but to another person. For the same reason, Clement of Alexandria supposed Luke to have translated the Epistle from the Hebrew; and others, even in the time of Origen, designate Luke as its author;—an opinion capable of being supported, inasmuch as a great portion of the *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* of the Epistle are only found in that Evangelist. Comp. Grotius in the Præloqu. to the Epistle to the Hebrews; Schott, *Isagoge*, p. 363., and particularly Stein, *Comm. zum Evang. des Lukas*, where the single words are given, as well as the constructions, in which Luke coincides with the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Let us now inquire how this Epistle stands to the epistles of Paul in respect of language.—I. In respect of single words and phrases.—II. In respect of the connection of sentences, or style. But, previous to this inquiry, we must institute another, neither attempted by Winer, who omits, in his Grammar, the essential point of an estimate of the Grecity of the various New Testament writers, nor by Bleek, who has not, in general, gone so largely, or profoundly, into the discussion of the language as could have been desired, the inquiry, namely, how near this Epistle actually approaches to that classical purity for which it has so often been admired; and whether, in this respect, it be essentially different from the other New Testament, but, particularly, the Pauline writings.

On this subject, dissent appears to have hitherto prevailed among exegetical writers on the New Testament. Some of these discover so great a difference between the degree of purity in the language of our Epistle, and that of the other epistles, that Böhme, p. 14., declares, “*stabit, ut opinamur, sententia, epistolam omnibus reliquis N. T. scriptis adeo præstare tum rebus tum arte et eloquentia atque grammatica orationis integritate, ut nemo omnium, qui ad sa-*

crum illum codicem aliquid operis contulerint, hujus auctor esse videatur." On the other hand, Henr. Planck, in his treatise, *De vera natura atque indole orationis Graecæ* N. T., says, "qui de Hellenismi sacri natura atque indole agere instituebant, mea sententia illud primum ponere debebant, quod non sermone culto perpolitique, quo scriptores eruditi usi reperiuntur, sed eo potius, qui in usu quotidiano vitaeque communis consuetudine obtinuit, exarati sunt libri N. T. Neque Paulum excipio de ceteris res ipsa loquitur, quibus praeter communem loquendi rationem, qua usi sunt, ne innotuit quidem melior oratio."

If, in pronouncing this opinion, the eminently learned author of that treatise had not altogether forgotten the Epistle to the Hebrews (which he really appears to have done), he either regarded it as Pauline, and placed it on an equality, in language, with the writings of Paul, or he has assigned to it a rank even inferior to theirs. At any rate, it is an impropriety in language to speak of the Classicity of the diction of the Apostle, since that epithet was applied to no authors later than the Alexandrian period. Were we to inquire, whether its language be pure Greek, we could only apply the *κοινοί* to it as a rule. Among these *κοινοί*, again, we should be obliged to distinguish between those who particularly cultivated a purer diction, as Arrian, Lucian, Aelian, and those who, like Artemidorus and Appian, were negligent of elegance. Now, certainly, the author of our Epistle can be classed only among the latter :^a and even from the style of these writers

^a Comp., for instance, *δικατόω*, Heb. vii. 6, 9, for which the genuine Greek has *δικατιύω*, Xenoph. Anab. v. 3, 9. Herod. vii. 132. ; *ιδυναμόω* ii. 34 (the verbs in *όω*, borrowed from the Doric, and hence frequent in Pindar, have a growing predominancy in the later Greek) ; *γνηθίς* instead of *γνόμνος*, vi. 4. ; the formation of the II. Aor. according to the termination of the I. Aor., Heb. ix. 12. ; *γύωθαι* vi. 5., like John ii. 9., and nowhere else in the New Testament, with the accusative instead of the genitive, &c.

his diction is disadvantageously distinguished by certain lexicographical and grammatical peculiarities which betray his descent from the Jewish nation.

Respecting these Hebraisms, indeed, the more recent critics have widely differed. Bleek has been able to find no other instances than the frequently recurring circumlocution of the adjective notion by the genitive of the substantive, iv. 2.; v. 13.; vi. 1.: while Stuart has reckoned up no less than *five* long pages of them, by which, as he conceives, he has completely demolished the opinion of Origen on the Grecity of the Epistle. But, in selecting his citations, the learned American has not been guided by sound canons of linguistic criticism. All those religious *termini* which have passed from the Old Testament into the Theological and Christian language of the European nations, as well as into the usage of the Greek, are cited by him as Hebraisms: ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, κληρονόμος, δόξα (among the Greeks *opinion, meaning*), οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα, ἀγιάζειν, σάξαι καὶ αἷμα, ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι, &c. But such *termini* are likewise found in portions of the New Testament of the purest diction, as in Acts xxvi., τὸ δωδεκάφυλον, τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ, οἱ ἅγιοι, κληρὸς ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις, &c. Where the lexicology is concerned, he should rather have shown that, in our Epistle, a *Hebraism is employed to express an idea for which the Greeks had a current term*. No instances of this kind can be pointed out, save the following: ch. i. 1.; ii. 2.; ix. 19., and others; λαλεῖν of Divine revelations, as ἸϚϚ; ii. 9., γεύεσθαι θανάτου; ἀπειθεῖν-ἀπιστεῖν (?) iii. 18.; iv. 11.; xi. 31.; vi. 5., ῥῆμα, in the meaning of *promise*; vii. 1., κοπή, *strages*, where, however, the author's reference is according to the LXX.; vii. 5., ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς ὁσφύος; xi. 5., ἰδεῖν θάνατον, and, in the same passage, according to the Hebrew text, οὐχ εὗρισκετο; xii. 11., καρπὸς εἰρημικός (?); xii. 19., as an Old Testament reminiscence, μὴ προσεῖθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον; xiii. 9., περιπατεῖν ἐν; reminiscence, xiii. 15., καρπὸς χειλέων; xiii. 21., ἐνώπιον.

Regarding the *grammatical* Hebraisms, much is questionable; still, in addition to the peculiarity re-

marked by Bleek, several passages may be adduced, *ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι*, iii. 12., the non-declension of foreign names, *Ἀαρῶν*, vii. 11. ix. 4., *Χερουβίμ*, ix. 5., *Ἰεριχῶ*, xi. 30., and, according to one reading, *τὸ Ἄβελ*, xii. 24. In Josephus, for instance, there is, instead of these forms, the Greek declension of the names, e. g. *Χερουβείς* (Paul likewise omits the declension generally; in one passage, the only one in the New Testament, he has—*Σαταῖν*, instead of *Σατανᾶς* or *Σατανᾶ* in the genitive, 2 Cor. xii. 7.) ; *εἰς καῦσιν* vi. 8., instead of *ἡ καῦσις* ; *λαμβάνειν εἰς κληρ.* xi. 8. ; xii. 9. the *καί* ; xii. 18., *ψηλαφώμενον* (?) .

It may, therefore, be affirmed that, of all the New Testament writings, perhaps only the second half of the Acts of the Apostles can vie with our Epistle in purity of diction. Even this general linguistic character, however, makes us infer that its author was not St. Paul ; while, in addition to it, there come certain distinct *isolated* diversities.

The proof from *words* and *phrases* has been so conducted by Schulz and Seyffarth, as to expose the latter to the charge of mechanism. It is only by such a method, indeed, that these writers have succeeded in collecting so great a mass of differences. Schulz fills *one-and-twenty* pages, and Seyffarth *eight-and-twenty* paragraphs, with this department of proof. Supported by a good Concordance, Stuart has, with commendable industry, followed these differences into every particular case. But, in bringing forward his counter-proof, he has laid himself open to a still heavier charge of mechanism. When Schulz cites *fifteen* examples in which the Epistle to the Hebrews differs in its mode of expression generally from the Epistles of Paul, Stuart adduces *five-and-a-half* pages of peculiarities in expression from 1 Cor. alone ; when Seyffarth cites 118 *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* from the Epistle to the Hebrews, Stuart opposes to them 230 *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* from 1 Cor., which contains only three chapters more than the Epistle to the Hebrews. Stuart values himself not a little on this “matter of fact” proof ;

which, indeed, among his own countrymen, accustomed to figures, and, even determining by figures how many revivals and how many half-revivals there are in a province, may have considerable weight. But, the remark of Cæcero, that the defenders of an opinion are not *numerandi* but *paunderandi*, is applicable to the citations brought forward by both parties. What does Schulz prove when he shows that Paul commonly employs *λίγιστος*, while the Epistle to the Hebrews, for this expression (in one place!), x. 24., has *ελαττωμένως*; or Seyffarth, when, as *ἄταξ λεγόμενα* from the xi. chap., he cites *τομτασιζέειν, μπιζοσί, ὄεμα*, where the author speaks of so many things never mentioned by Paul? Or when Stuart, in his *five-and-a-half* pages of peculiar phrases, from 1 Cor., includes the *γίωσαι; λαλεῖν*?^a The true path in conducting this proof has been pursued by Bleek. To the evidence for the non-Pauline origin of the Epistle, drawn from single words, he assigns a very subordinate importance, contenting himself with citing only *six* examples, from the great number of pretended peculiarities of language. He, very properly, draws attention to a circumstance which weakens, in a great degree, the proof from the different usages of words and phrases,—viz., that our Epistle belongs to a *genus dicendi* different from that of the Pauline Epistles; for, while, in these, with the exception of the private epistles, the *dialectic* character prevails, our Epistle is of the *RHETORICAL* *genus dicendi*; and, in this view of it he shows many things to be necessary which might otherwise appear remarkable. In the first place, the complete absence of those formulæ of the Rabbinical dialectics, with which the apostle of the heathen is so conversant: *τί δὲ ἐροῦμεν; ἐρεῖς οὖν, ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις, ἢ ἀγνοοῖτε; μὴ γίνοιτο, τί οὖν; τί γὰρ;* &c. And, again, the

^a Juhn is equally uncritical when, in his treatise (in other respects so meritorious), in Bengel's Journal, he reckons up, among the four hundred *ἄταξ λεγόμενα*, which he collected from the Pentateuch, the names of the unclean beasts, and the apparatus of the tabernacle. Where *ἄταξ νοούμενα* occur, there will *ἄταξ λεγόμενα* certainly be found.

employment of more sonorous, and poetical expressions, as *μεγαλωσύνη, μισθαποδοσία, ὀγκωμοσία, αἱματεκχυσία, πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, ἡ εὐπερίστατος ἁμαρτία, ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτὴς, ζῶν ἀκατάλυτος, &c.* Among these we may reckon the use of *παρά* with the accusative, joined with a comparative, in instituting a comparison, i. 4. ix. 23. xi. 4. xii. 24. Comp. iv. 12., *ὅσον*—*ὡσοῦτο* i. 4. vii. 20, 22. viii. 6. x. 25. And, to mention it once for all,—we may here add, the more perfect construction of the sentences, and the calm, solemn tone of the Epistle, which forms so strong a contrast with the vivacity of Paul.

It may appear as if, with this admission, the whole argument which the opponents of the Pauline origin have hitherto derived from the great dissimilarity in the style of the Epistle were given up. But, it is not so. On the contrary, it is precisely from the fact, that we nowhere find this oratorical character in the writings of Paul, that we may conclude he was not the author of it. Philastrius has already remarked this in speaking of our Epistle (Haer. 89.), “*et in ea quia rhetorice scripsit, sermone plausibili, inde non putant ejusdem apostoli.*” But we will enter more fully into the discussion of this point, when we come to treat of the construction of sentences.

The peculiarities of expression, from which Bleek conceives he is able to prove most satisfactorily that Paul is not the author, are the following:—

1.) “The frequent use of *πᾶς* in the Sing., ix. 19. ii. 9. Comp. with 2 Cor. v. 15. 1 Tim. ii. 6. He cites but these two instances; and, on the second only, as a peculiar usage, does he lay any stress. We must, therefore, suppose, that it was not his intention, like Schulz, to point out, in ii. 9., the *frequent* but the *peculiar* usage. And with good reason: for, as to the *frequent* use, Stuart has, in six chapters of the Epistle to the Ephesians, found *πᾶς* *three-and-twenty* times, in the singular, whereas, in our Epistle, with *thirteen* chapters, it occurs only *sixteen* times. However, that one unexpected instance of the use of the singular *every one*, for the

plural *all*, can decide nothing, and that so much the more as the same form occurs in other passages of the New Testament. See Comm. ii. 9.

2.) “Ὅθεν, in the signification of *wherefore*, ii. 17. iii. 1. vii. 25. viii. 3. ix. 18. xi. 19. This occurs in Luke *once*, but never in Paul, although his constant arguments gave so much occasion for the employment of particles.” In Paul we invariably find *διὰ τοῦτο*, *διό*, *διότι*.

3.) “Ἐάντε, *if indeed, provided*, iii. 6, 14. vi. 4., is never used by Paul, who, in the like combination, employs *εἴτε*, which is not found in our Epistle.” It is only in connection with other instances that any weight can be attached to this:—Paul has *εἴτε* *five* times.

4.) “Εἰς τὸ διηκεῖς, vii. 3. x. 1, 12, 14. Elsewhere it does not occur, either in the writings of Paul, or in any other part of the New Testament. Nor do we find in Paul *εἰς τὸ παντελές*, Heb. vii. 25, or *διαπαντός*, Heb. ix. 6. xiii. 15., except in Rom. xi. 10., in a citation from the Old Testament. He most frequently employs *πάντοτε*,” a usage of the declining period of Greek. See Sturz, *De dial. Maced.* p. 187. 59.

5.) “Καθίζεν, always with an intransitive meaning, *to sit*, i. 3. viii. 1. x. 12. xii. 2.: but, in Paul, with a transitive sense *to set*, as well as *συγκαθίζεν*.” Bleek has overlooked 2 Thess. ii. 4., where *καθίσαι* is intransitive—supposing that we do not read *αὐτόν*.

6.) “Παρά, with the acc., along with comparatives. See p. 35.

It is obvious that some of these positions are not yet established. At the same time, it is not requisite that every such voucher should contain complete proof in itself, the concurrence of many heightening their power: hence Bleek, in his copious Introduction, ought to have included all other instances possessing, according to his opinion, any force as evidence.—Our limits forbidding us to enlarge on this point, we will mention only a few more of these proofs of diversity in

the use of single words and phrases, which may, as we conceive, have some weight, even when individually taken. To these belongs the classical construction, hitherto unobserved, so far as we know, of *κοινωνέω* with the *gen. rei*, in our Epistle, ii. 14.; whereas Paul, as well as Peter and John, connect it with the *dat. rei*. Rom. xv. 27. 1 Tim. v. 22. 1 Peter iv. 13. 2 John 11. This construction occurs in no author before the time of Christ, although it is often employed by inferior writers under the declining Grecity, as in Achmet († 1080), Oneirocr. c. 118: *κοινωνήσει τῇ χαρᾷ αὐτοῦ*. Schulz has remarked, moreover, that the use of *μακροθυμία* and *μακροθυμεῖν*, vi. 12, 15., is quite peculiar, as it marks *patient waiting for, perseverance*. In Paul's writings, and elsewhere in the New Testament, this word frequently occurs; but, except, perhaps, in James, v. 10., Comp. 11., never with this meaning. We might, indeed, affirm, with Schulz, that Paul would have here employed *ὑπομονή*, a word of so frequent recurrence in his writings (Comp. Rom. viii. 25.). Besides, there is found, a circumstance never hitherto remarked, the word *σκότος* *eight-and-twenty* times in the other books of the New Testament, Paul using it *eleven* times, and always in the neuter form *τὸ σκότος*; but, in the only passage, in Hebrews, where it is met with, xii. 18., it has the more Attic masculine form. Comp. Porson on Eur. Hec. v. 821.

Respecting the appellations of Christ, Schulz has not been sufficiently cautious in conducting his proofs. He asserts, that the constant, and characteristic, formulæ with Paul are *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, *Χριστός Ἰησοῦς*, *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν*, and that the Epistle to the Hebrews has only *twice* (x. 10. xiii. 21.) *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, and only once *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς*. We must, first of all, remark, that *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* occurs likewise in xiii. 8., where it cannot be set aside as a quotation, and, that respectable authorities have it also in iii. 1. But then, Stuart reckons, that the whole number of those compound appellatives, pointed out by Schulz, as characteristic Pauline formulæ, amounts

but to *sixty-eight*, in the Pauline Epistles, while the simple $\delta\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ occurs 147, and $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ 198 times. To this proof also Bleek allows no importance,—and, apparently, for these two reasons: 1. That we might certainly expect more frequently the formulæ compounded with $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$: 2. That Paul employs disproportionately seldom the simple name $\delta\ \text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. In the Epistle to the Romans it occurs *twice*, iii. 26. viii. 11.; whereas the compound formulæ are found thirty-six times; in 1 Cor. $\text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ occurs once, xii. 3.; on the other hand, the compound formulæ appear twenty-six times, &c. But, in our Epistle, $\delta\ \text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ occurs *seven* times, ii. 9. vi. 20. vii. 22. x. 19. xii. 2, 24. xiii. 12. This is certainly remarkable, for, in the other New Testament Epistles, in those of Peter, John, and in the Epistle of Jude only, the compound formulæ are found. And, perhaps, we may regard another phraseological observation of Schulz, adopted by Winer into his Grammar (p. 273), as not to be relied on, viz. that Paul expressed the idea of *purpose, object, end*, by *εἰς*, and *πρός*, with the infinitive, while substantives are preferred in the Epistle to the Hebrews. *A priori*, perhaps, this might be expected, the infinitive construction being, in such a case, more Hebraic; but, at the same time, it is by no means *un-Grecian*; and, while 1 Cor. presents *five* instances of this construction, there are *seven* found in our Epistle, ii. 17. vii. 25. viii. 3. ix. 14, 28. xii. 10. xiii. 21. In the Epistle to the Romans, indeed, *εἰς τό* is found *fifteen* times, while in 2 Cor., which contains the same number of chapters as our Epistle, the phrase occurs only *four* times, and, therefore, three times seldomer than in Hebrews.

We have, hitherto, treated of words and phrases not of a dogmatic character; we come now to estimate the dogmatic terminology of the Epistle. We have seen that the ideas contained in it are Pauline, the question is, are these ideas expressed in the *termini technici* peculiar to the Apostle? In respect of the *most important* part of the inquiry we must answer—*No*: and this very cir-

cumstance awakens a strong suspicion of the composition of the Epistle by Paul. Here and there, we certainly find in it dogmatic *termini* which are peculiarly Pauline. The use of *καυχᾶσθαι, καύχησις, καύχημα* (Comp. on the other hand James iv. 16., but; ii. 13., the *comp.*), expressive of the exulting and triumphant joy of Christians (Comp. our Expos. of Heb. iii. 6.), is quite peculiar to the Apostle of the Gentiles; in this meaning the word occurs besides only in Heb. iii. 6.

Peculiar to Paul is *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως, διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει* &c.; and, quite analogous, our Epistle has xi. 7., *ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη*. Paul alone expresses the continuing activity of Christ for the salvation of His own by *ἐντυγχάνειν*, Rom. viii. 34., in like manner Heb. vii. 25. Christ is called by Paul only *εἶπων τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 2 Cor. iv. 4. Col. i. 15. Our Epistle has, i. 3., the corresponding, but, as becomes its oratorical style, more solemn expression, *ἀπαύγασμα, χαρακτήρ*. Of the various *χαρίσματα*, as *διαρέσεις πνεύματος*, 1 Cor. xii. 4., Comp. *μερισμοὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, Heb. ii. 4., Paul alone speaks. The predicate *ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης*, Rom. xv. 33. xvi. 20. 2 Cor. xiii. 11. Philipp. iv. 9. 1 Thess. v. 23., Comp. Heb. xiii. 20., is known only to Paul. The Christian's life of faith is by Paul alone represented as a contest, *ἀγών*, 1 Tim. vi. 12. 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8. Comp. Heb. xii. 1., &c. Still, while we occasionally meet with such Pauline *termini*, we find, precisely in the *leading ideas* of the Epistle, a terminology different from that of Paul. We have already remarked (p. 28.), that Paul nowhere, and our Epistle alone; denominates Christ a *Priest*. Paul may have understood the same thing by his expression *μεσίτης*, but we shall look in vain in his writings either for the term *ιερέυς*, or for the development of the idea expressed by it. Again, the designation of Christ as *ποιμὴν*, Heb. xiii. 20., as well as *ἀπόστολος*, Heb. iii. 1., and the use of *ὁμολογία*, which is confined to our Epistle, Heb. iii. 1. iv. 14. x. 23., and of *ἐγγίξειν τῷ Θεῷ*, Heb. vii. 19., &c. is foreign to the Apostle of the Gentiles. But the pecu-

liar *terminus τελειῶν*, with its derivatives, is particularly striking. Nowhere does Paul employ it in the sense there intended; Phil. iii. 12., strictly speaking, does not belong to this class of words. In John τελειῶν is likewise frequent, but, with another application. The whole work of redemption, subjective as well as objective, is denoted in our Epistle by this comprehensive *terminus*. See App. II. At the same time, the whole doctrinal scheme of the resurrection is here as intimately dependent on it, as the Pauline system on the Pauline expressions δικαιοσύνη ἐκ νόμου and ἐκ πίστεως, that of John on ἀγάπη, ζῶή, φῶς, and that of James on the opposition of πίστις and ἔργα. For this reason, we cannot assume that this expression was employed but once, accidentally, by Paul, and that, elsewhere, he adopted different terms. Had he ever contemplated redemption under this aspect, some traces of his thoughts, we cannot help believing, must infallibly have been found in other parts of his writings.

We come now to the consideration of the style. This is oratorical, and, of the *genus* denominated by the Romans *magnificum*, by the Greeks μεγαλοπρεπές, or σεμνόν. The quotation from Philastrius (p. 35.) shows, that this characteristic of its diction was remarked even by the ancients, and already raised in them a suspicion that the Epistle was not written by Paul. We formerly observed that this quality of style exercised an influence on the choice of single words and phrases. A style in which *numerus* is an essential requisite, selects, in order to attain its object, more sonorous, more poetical expressions, has, says Cicero, *etiam in oratione poeticum aliquod verbum dignitatem*, prefers antiquated and rarer words to more current terms,—as *reor*, *autumo*, in the Orations of Cicero,—and presents, in consequence, a more varied connection of sentences, and a greater variety in the use of particles, than the ordinary *stylus tenuis*. Having already (p. 35.) given proofs of the first of these points, we will here speak only of the particles in our Epistle.

Among the New Testament writers, John has made

the least use of the opulence of the Greek in Particles. His discourse goes on with the unvaried οὖν and δέ, here and there, only, appears a καίτοι γε, John iv. 1., or his more ready μέντοι, and once ὁμῶς μέντοι. This opulence of the Greek is most conspicuously displayed in the Acts of the Apostles, and in this Epistle. Between these two compositions and John stands Paul, whose dialectic method did not allow him to dispense with the Particles. With Paul and the Acts of the Apostles, our Epistle has, in common, the very frequent use of the adjunctive τε (in Hebrews nineteen times, in Matth. only twice, in John once), and that, too, the connective τε as well as τε—καί; besides, the conclusive and causal particles καί γάρ, τοίνυν (in James once), τοιγαροῦν (in our Epistle, and only once in Paul), δὴ (in Matth. once only, but oftener in Peter), &c. A singularity in our author's diction is the frequent use of γάρ, even in passages where other conjunctions might have been expected, ii. 5. iii. 3. v. 1. 13. vii. 12. 13. viii. 4. That the Epistle is distinguished by the peculiar use of the particles, and, at the same time, by a knowledge of the more elegant usages of the Greeks, is further shewn in respect of the following particles: 1.) ἀλλά, before a negative interrogative, ii. 16. 2.) εἶτα, in the animated progress of discourse, xii. 9. 3.) ὅπου, *by no means*, ii. 16. 4.) ὅθεν, used causally. See p. 36.

The rhetorical character of our Epistle, moreover, has induced a care in the collocation of words, and the structure of sentences, such as can be shewn in no other writings of the New Testament. On one side the object of the collocation of words is euphony, on the other, rhetorical effect. Schulz animadverts, with justice, on the little attention that has been paid to this quality of the Epistle by its interpreters. In the examination of the style, the Commentary of Böhme is of peculiar merit. Let any one desirous of knowing how solicitous our author has been of euphony, as well as oratorical effect, weigh the whole sentence vii. 4., but, particularly the post-position of the sono-

rous ἡ πατριάρχης: Σεισέσθη δὲ, κήρυξας ἄλλοι, ὃ καὶ ἀπαύτως Ἀβραὰμ ἐλάλει ἐκ τῆς ἀπειθείας. ἡ πατριάρχης; and so, likewise ver. 1—3. vi. 4—6. 17. v. 7—10. vii. 22. xii. 1., and others.^a Besides, no New Testament writer, Paul and Luke excepted, has made such ample use of participial constructions; whilst in our Epistle they never render the style confused or heavy, as is the case with Paul, 1 Thess. ii. 14., &c. 2 Tim. i. 9., &c. 2 Cor. iv. 8—10. Comp. with Heb. i. 1—4. ii. 2—4. xii. 1, 2., and others. In the ebullitions of his excited mind, the Apostle of the Gentiles heaps position upon position, and forces in parentheses, without any regard to the symmetry of his sentences, or the harmony of his periods. Hence, while every one of his longer parentheses becomes an Anakoluthon, we find, in the Epistle to the Hebrews,—a fundamental distinction between it and his writings,—not a single Anakoluthon, but, on the contrary, even in the longest periods, a rounding off which betrays a solicitude about the representation,—the garment of the thoughts, quite foreign to the Apostle Paul. Already Bleek pointed out xii. 18—28., as a particularly striking example of a considerable parenthesis containing a shorter one within it, οὕτω φοβεῖσθι ἢ τὸ φανταζόμενον, where yet the discourse flows on undisturbed. Comp. also, vii. 20—22. xii. 1. 2. v. 7—10. In the verses iii. 15. and ii. 9., the connecting of ὅπως with ἡλαττωμένον appears to be the only exception to this careful construction of sentences. But see the Exposition of the passage.

Now, is it credible that the ardent spirit of the

^a We are not entitled to appeal to the hexameter which occurs in Heb. xii. 13., in proof of the oratorical character of the Epistle, as the verse is no more intentional than the hexameter with which Livy begins his history, and Sallust the history of the Jugurthine War. Prose requires *numerum* but not *numeros*, and, therefore, the verses frequent in orators, as in Isocrates, have been justly blamed. Comp., also, the hexameter, perhaps an accidental one, in James i. 17. See below, chap. iii.

Apostle should, in this single composition, have become unlike itself, and fallen into a style so dissimilar to that which he generally writes? It may be replied: Why should not a mind with the powers of the Apostle's become, when he thought it necessary,—all things to all men, and, consequently, study diction where the receivers of the Epistle made pretensions to a purer Greek, and suit himself to his subject when that required to be calmly evolved. A man like Paul, it may be said, included many men and many characters in his single person. Does he not, for instance, appear very different in Athens and in Jerusalem? Is not his speech to the Athenians, and that before Festus and Agrippa, truly rhetorical? Are there not periods, such as Acts xxvi. 2, 3, 4, 5., equal, in every point of style, to any thing in the Epistle to the Hebrews? What *numerus* in the words τὴν μὲν οὖν βίωσίν μου, τὴν ἐκ νεότητος, τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένην ἐν τῷ ἔθνει μου ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, ἴσασι πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι προγινώσκοντές με ἄνωθεν, ἐὰν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβοστάτην ἀλήθειαν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος. To these instances a certain appearance of force will not be denied. Yet, with the exception, perhaps, of the remarks of Dr. Paulus, in his Introduction to our Epistle, pp. 16, 17.,* I know not whether the advocates of its genuineness had previously adduced them. The different tone of the Epistle Hug attributes, partly, to the circumstance that Paul was not the father and founder of this community, as he was of the others to which he wrote (is this true of the community of Rome?), and, therefore, precluded from that easy and familiar tone which we find in his other writings, partly to the loftiness of his theme, which, of itself, necessarily imparted a greater solemnity to the style. Perceiving, however, the scanty light afforded by this

* He there says also:—"A man of this intellectual character and power has not one species of phraseology only, and one mode of construction. Precisely because he did not, like a rhetorician, study in the schools, the form of his expression and composition quickly changes with the nature of his materials."

observation, he betakes himself for support to an influence of Luke upon the diction. In truth, two other points might be, with equal propriety, applied to the Epistle to the Romans: for nothing in the *subject matter* of the Epistle prevented its being treated rhetorically. What more fitting place for an oratorical style than a copious Epistle, which, like that to the Romans, gives a view of the whole scheme of the Christian doctrine of salvation? Steudel, in his review of Schulz, appears to assume, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was intended for the Alexandrian Jews, and that the Apostle of the Heathen, in addressing this cultivated class of Israelites, was obliged to adopt a higher tone, and study a purer diction. But where were these qualities of style more requisite than with the aesthetically-cultivated Corinthians, who attached undue value to an aesthetico-rhetorical culture? Yet it is precisely to these he boasts that his discourse is not *ἐν παιδοῖς ἀνδρωπίνης σοφίας λόγος*, and his style, in his two Epistles to that community, has all the peculiarities which generally characterise it. On the other hand, if the Epistle were addressed to Jewish converts in Palestine, then nowhere was elegance of diction less studied than among them. Dr. Paulus argues, that we have here a *λόγος παρακλήσεως*, an encouraging and exhortative (as Acts xiii. 15—41.), not a persuasive discourse, like the other Epistles. But, supposing this distinction correct, what has it to do with the more Hellenic idiom? The evidence derived from the character of the Apostle's speeches in the Acts of the Apostles has, certainly, a great appearance of force. But, here arises a doubt whether these exhibit the very words and form of sentences which Paul delivered, or those of Luke? Unhappily, we do not yet possess any critico-philological estimate of the various component parts of the Acts of the Apostles. The Dutch Monographs on this subject are not satisfactory. The critics acknowledge the diversity of the component parts, and of the diction, without entering into any more minute examination of them.

It has been remarked, indeed, that the speeches of Peter are more Hebraic than those of Paul; and this fact may be brought to prove the literal fidelity with which Paul's discourses have been recorded.* It may be added, that Luke himself accompanied Paul during the latter part of his life, and probably heard those discourses to which we have just alluded; and therefore, perhaps, committed them to writing immediately after they were pronounced.

But the supposition that Luke, from the period when he became an eye-and-ear-witness to Paul, recorded the speeches, as well as wrote the narrative in his own style, has unquestionably much more in its favour. It is precisely from about the sixteenth chapter to the end that the style becomes more symmetrical, and, indeed, proportionably purer; while, in the earlier sections, where Luke probably writes from the information of others, the diction is, in general, less pure. The difference is peculiarly striking, as regards purity of language, and the use of Hebraisms, between the discourse of Paul in ch. xiii., and his speech before the people in Jerusalem, ch. xxii. (which is translated from the Aramaic, and is not free from Hebraisms), but particularly those before Festus and Agrippa. Now, so long as it remains in the smallest degree uncertain,—to say no more—whether we have the very words of the Gentile Apostle, in those last-mentioned speeches, we cannot admit them as proofs of his ability to speak in a flowing style, and in pure Greek. Nay, even were we to admit such a mode of proof, the question would still remain:—*What could induce the Apostle, just in this Epistle—in an epistle, too, addressed to Judæo-Christians of Palestine—to adopt an oratorical manner and study a purer diction?* Finally, let us consider, that the calm, solemn style of our

* Seyler, in his paper on Peter's Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles (Studien und Kritiken 1832. I H. S. 53.), proceeds upon the supposition that these have been literally preserved even to $\alpha\alpha\iota$ and $\delta\iota$; but he has withheld the proof of his opinion.

Epistle cannot be explained merely from the design of the author to appear in *our* as an *Hebrew*. The writer has, no doubt, been naturally of a more tranquil character, in some degree, resembling James. Even if we might suppose that Paul had delivered the chief portion of the Epistle, the view of the composition between Judaism and Christianity, in a serene, calmly advancing style, would not his glowing spirit have shone through the last and exhortative portion of it? Would Paul, for example, have employed so languid a formula as (Heb. xi. 32.) *καὶ τὸ ἐν ἁγίοις ἐπιπέσει γὰρ ἡς ἄνευ ἡμῶν ὁ ἕως αὐτῶν;* Of *fire* our Epistle has not a single spark; but the fire blazes into flame itself in those discourses in the Acts of the Apostles, so beautiful in style, where through their foreign garb we recognise the well known soul of flame of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Our inquiry, then, into the language of this Epistle gives us the following result, viz. that, whatever doubts may exist on other points, the language and style, on the whole, speak against its composition by Paul. In single words and phrases, indeed, there are found coincidences with the Pauline Epistles, exceeding in number, even considerably, those which the learned and departed Kleinert collected in his work:—"On the Genuineness of all the Prophecies of Isaiah," in order to prove the identity of the authors of the first and last parts of that book. But, confessing, as we must do, that the undeniable coincidence of idiom in the first and last portions of that prophetic composition, as respects *single* words and phrases, when opposed by the complete diversity, in style, of the whole, has not brought us to acknowledge the identity of the author of both parts, we can still less recognise identity of author in the Pauline Epistles, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. The problem still remains unsolved, how the author of the latter portion of Isaiah came to appropriate thence few isolated phrases (*to be named*, for, to be, God as the *Holy One of Israel*, and some other things less striking) from the ancient prophecies; but, in the

Epistle to the Hebrews this is by no means surprising, the moment we suppose a follower or disciple of the Apostle to be its author.

D.—*Single Passages of the Epistle which seem to be reminiscences from the Pauline writings.*

Bleek, in particular, has drawn attention to a passage of this kind, Heb. x. 30. The text, there adduced, is from Deut. xxxii. 35.; and, in Hebrew, runs thus, לִי נִקְמָ וְשִׁלֵּם, in LXX. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδίκησεως ἀνταποδώσω, in our Epistle ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος, and exactly so, even with the addition λέγει Κύριος, in Rom. xii. 19. Now Paul is accustomed, even when the formula of a quotation has preceded, to add a λέγει Κύριος, as we see in Rom. xiv. 11. 1 Cor. xiv. 21. 2 Cor. vi. 17.; but, in Hebrews this does not again occur. Moreover, Heb. xii. 14. might be regarded as a reminiscence, εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων; Comp. Rom. xii. 18., εἰ δυνατόν, μετὰ πάντων ἀνδρῶπων εἰρηνεύοντες. Were we to adopt τοῦ κόπου, vi. 10., into the text, the passage would then appear a reminiscence of 1 Thess. i. 3.

Now, is this agreement accidental? It is certainly difficult to suppose it so; yet similar cases are met with in the province of criticism, where—were it only like the \times for unknown magnitude—accident is introduced as factor. Thus with regard to the above-mentioned question, why did the so-called Pseudo-Isaiah borrow no more than two phrases from the genuine, and make so frequent use of them; or, of the other, why the chapters which are not genuine have been attributed to Isaiah and to no others? Neither is it necessary, however, to suppose an accidental agreement of those quotations, nor does the nature of the author's quotations in other respects (See letter E) permit this to be done. If the quotation, after being once made by Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, could remain so long in his memory as to be a second time brought forward in the Epistle to the Hebrews, under the same form, why might it not be impressed,

in like manner, on that of one of his disciples who had heard it employed by Paul himself, or by some one of his disciples? But why is not rather a third, and common source, assumed? Few books, as is well known, had so many various readings as the Septuagint. But, if this solution be likewise rejected, may not the saying, as was the case with the declarations of the Mosaic law, have been current in the mouths of the people, in a form corresponding exactly with the Hebrew model?^a

E.—*The form of the quotations from the Old Testament in our Epistle.*

The result of a very careful and minute examination of the Old Testament quotations, occurring in the Pauline Epistles, instituted by Bleek, and for which the first Excursus of Koppe's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans had paved the way, is as follows: that Paul, in his quotations, follows the LXX. in general, but with more or less strictness, and never

^a Bleek has mentioned a case in which a citation of our Epistle, in like manner, agrees with no passage of the LXX., nor with the Hebrew text, but with Philo; and, upon this, he founds the conjecture that our author had read Philo's works. Comp. Heb. xiii. 5., *οὐ μή σε ἀνώ, οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἰγκαταλίω* with 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. *κύριος ὁ Θεός μου μετὰ σου οὐκ ἀήσει σε, οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἰγκαταλίω*, also Deuter. xxxi. 6. Isaiah i. 5. Philo, on the other hand (De Confus. Ling. p. 344.), has it, exactly as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the *first* person. But, as this constitutes the whole difference, we ought not, perhaps, to attach any importance to it, for how easily might the *oratio directa* pass, in a citation, into the *oratio indirecta*, or, from the *third* into the *first* person? We find, in fact, examples of this in the Rabbins, and in the New Testament. Compare, for instance, what has been said on the Old Testament citation in Heb. i. 6. Farther, in the citation Acts xiii. 22., Paul has turned the words which, in 1 Sam. xiii. 14., are read as the words of Samuel in the *third* person, from the *third* to the *first*, and interwoven them, directly, in the speech of God. A like case occurs, 1 Cor. i. 19., in a quotation from Isaiah xxix. 19., and Bleek himself (p. 353.) has acknowledged one of a similar character in 1 Cor. xiv. 21.

when the LXX. essentially differs from the Hebrew text. It is otherwise with the quotations in the Epistle to the Hebrews. *There the Old Testament declarations are universally cited from the LXX., without any consideration being had as to whether the Hebrew gives the same sense or not; the deviations from that translation are, even in the longer passages, of little importance, and never of a kind that implies, in the writer, a regard to the Hebrew text.* The only citation which approaches nearer to the Hebrew is that already mentioned under letter D., in chap. x. 30., where, as we saw, an influence of the Apostle Paul must be supposed. Comp. § 80. of Bleek.*

To this important circumstance, which contributes not a little to bring the Pauline origin of the Epistle into doubt, must be added two other circumstances not less worthy of consideration. The first of these is, that Paul, when he quotes according to the LXX.,

* With respect to this point, as well as that mentioned immediately after it, I have adopted the views of Bleek on the citations of Paul, notwithstanding that Schulz (in his review of Bleek's work, *Allgem. Litteraturzeit.* 1829. N. 104. 105.), has opposed them with no inconsiderable force. The reviewer conceives that the passages in which Paul agrees with the LXX. are far too few in number to warrant the conclusion that, in any instance, the Apostle had the Hebrew text in mind. But, the following circumstances seem to me to speak strongly enough for the contrary conclusion. 1. There can be no doubt that Paul was intimately acquainted with the Old Testament in the original. 2. It is undeniable that others of the New Testament writers, where the LXX. departed too far from the Hebrew text, translated the original more faithfully for themselves. Matthew and John adopt so literally the text of the LXX. that no doubt can be entertained as to their use of it. Still, there are other passages from which it is equally clear that, *on account of the object for which they quote it*, they gave a verbal translation of the Hebrew text. Comp. Matth. viii. 17.; ii. 15. (iv. 15.; xii. 18—21.); John xix. 37. Josephus, also, adheres almost invariably to the LXX. But he occasionally resorts, when necessary, to the Hebrew (*Michaelis in the Orient. Bibl.* V. S. 221. et seq. VII. S. 189. et seq.). Our limits forbid us to enter more minutely on the particular passages in Paul.

coincides particularly with the Cod. Vat., while the Epistle to the Hebrews agrees with the Cod. Alex. See Bleek, §. 82.

If but little stress must be laid on this circumstance, seeing we cannot securely rely on the text of the Cod. Vat. hitherto known, so much the more must be laid on another, namely, that of the formulæ of citation generally employed by Paul, καθὼς γέγραπται, ὡς γέγραπται, γέγραπται γὰρ, λέγει ἡ γραφή, and similar forms, not a *single one* occurs in our Epistle, nor yet of his rarer forms Δαυὶδ λέγει, Rom. iv. 6.; xi. 9. Μωϋσῆς λέγει, Rom. x. 19; Ἡσαΐας λέγει, Rom. x. 20, 21., &c. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, the declarations of the Old Testament are quoted, neither as declarations of Scripture, nor of the *person* or *author* from whom they proceeded, but, immediately, as the words of the Spirit, under whose guidance the work quoted was composed. From this observation chap. ii. 6. is the only exception. In proof of this affirmation, we cannot, of course, appeal to those passages in which God is introduced speaking in His own person, but to such as speak of Him in the third person, as i. 6, 7, 8.; iv. 4, 7.; vii. 21.; x. 30.; and, where the context incontestably shews that God is, at the same time, regarded as the locutory subject. With these coincide the formula λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, iii. 7.; x. 15. Accordingly, even if ὁ Θεός be not added to the formula of citation, it should be, in every instance, supplied, i. 5, 13.; iv. 3.; v. 5, 6.; vi. 13.; vii. 17.; viii. 8.; xii. 26.; xiii. 5. And, in several of these passages the context shews not that ἡ γραφή must be supplied but ὁ Θεός.

Now, in what way can the defenders of the Pauline composition get rid of these weighty examples? If we suppose the Epistle addressed to Alexandrian Jews, the first objection might speedily be removed; for it were little remarkable if Paul had kept more closely by a translation which they very well knew, and regarded as particularly sacred. But, if it were written to Judæo-Christians in *Palestine* (to whom

these defenders at present agree that it was addressed), the very close adherence of the author to the Greek text is quite inexplicable. To the doubts of Schulz, respecting the second circumstance, Stuart has been unable to give any other reply than that Paul himself varies very much in his use of forms of citation, and that passages may be found in his writings, also, in which God himself is introduced as speaking. Now, that Paul does not abide by the same formulæ in his quotations is acknowledged; but this does not lay to rest the suspicion awakened by the fact of the Epistle to the Hebrews wanting those various formulæ which are so frequent in his writings. The passages in which he introduces God as speaking, are the following, 2 Cor. vi. 16, 17. Rom. ix. 15, 25. 2 Cor. vi. 2. Gal. iii. 16.; but, in all these God is actually *the speaker*; nor is there a single passage in which it is otherwise.

Thus, in this department of the inquiry, also, there are weighty considerations against the opinion that the Epistle was written by Paul.

F.—*The external arrangement of the Epistle.*

One class, only, of the internal evidences remains for investigation, viz. that arising from the arrangement of the materials. All the Pauline Epistles have this characteristic,—they commence with a salutation to the community;—this is followed by what is called the dogmatical part of the Epistle;—then comes the practical or moral, which, again, is succeeded by the conclusion, consisting of notices respecting individuals (1 Cor. xvi. 2 Tim. iv. Titus iii. 12. Philipp. iv.), requests for intercession (Eph. vi. 19. Rom. xv. 30, 31.), greetings *from* individuals and *to* individuals,—and prayers for blessings. Our Epistle is likewise divided into a doctrinal and exhortative part, and concludes with the mention of personal circumstances, with a request for intercession, and a prayer for blessing. But, from the earliest times, the want of a superscription to it has always struck

its readers, as we have already seen from the efforts of Pantænus to remove the suspicion arising from that circumstance. Both he and Clement of Alexandria have attempted, although unsatisfactorily, to account for its absence. The former (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 14.) assigns, as the reason of it, that the preaching of the Gospel, among the Jews, was not, properly, the business of the Apostle, and that he, therefore, avoided prefixing to the Epistle his name and designation. The latter advances the opinion which has been adopted, down to the latest times, by the defenders of the Pauline origin of the Epistle,—that Paul was anxious not to deter the Hebrews, who were prejudiced against him, by the mention of his name, immediately at the head of the Epistle (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 14.). The acute Hug, who probably felt the unsatisfactory nature of both answers, in order to unite both, and to bring the third circumstance, also, into consideration (which Steudel, likewise, urges, in his review of Schulz), advertises his reader that this missive has scarcely the character of an Epistle, but goes on to the 12th ver. of ch. xiii. as a continuous treatise, and could not have fitly borne on its front that introductory greeting which, elsewhere, distinguishes the Epistles of Paul. Bleek, §. 71, has aptly illustrated these different views; and has, in so far, come over to the last-mentioned opinion, that he believes the oratorical character of the Epistle to have been the cause of the salutation being omitted, as unsuitable to the solemn commencement of the discourse. But he opposes, with justice, in the first place, the assertion, that the Epistle may be denominated a *treatise*, and, in the second place, he affirms that Paul, especially, would have been of all men the least inclined, particularly when writing to the Hebrews, to have made so few personal allusions, that he, especially, would have deemed it particularly requisite to advance, from the very outset, his claim to a divine calling and credibility. Compare, on this point, the Epistle to the Galatians. In this view we must coincide; and

we see, in the very omission, an important argument against the Pauline origin, of greater weight than the facts we have mentioned of the agreement of our Epistle with the Pauline Epistles, in regard to the external arrangement. For, from their very nature, all the New Testament Epistles have a certain resemblance, in this respect, to those of Paul; as indeed, all letters, those of the ancients (for instance Cicero's Epistles), and those of the moderns, are therein alike, they are always preceded by an introduction, the principal theme is handled in the body of the Epistle, and, at the close, follow personal notices, salutations from various parties to their friends, wishes for happiness, &c.

§. 3.—RESULT OF THE EXAMINATION OF THE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL EVIDENCES, AND SURVEY OF THE CRITICAL INQUIRIES RESPECTING THE AUTHOR.

We have endeavoured, with the greatest impartiality, to examine the *facts* which speak for and against the Pauline authorship. The external, as well as some of the internal arguments *for* it, have appeared in such force as might incline the reader to suppose that our Epistle should be ascribed to the Apostle. We must, nevertheless, declare ourselves against this supposition. The most important argument against it appears to be that derived from the language and the style. Even if the suspicions arising on this point stood alone they would have a considerable tendency to excite our doubts of its composition by Paul, just as the total difference of the last from the first portion of Isaiah, in respect of language, speaks against the composition of the former by that prophet. But, so far from these standing alone, there arise, on every side, other very serious suspicions of the Pauline origin. Now, if it be one of the most important critical principles that a concurrence of arguments, from the most opposite quarters, essentially heightens the validity of the isolated and less weighty proofs, so, in this case, the

doubt raised particularly by the diversity of the language must be greatly increased. We see, on more than one side, indeed, reasons in favour of Paul. Still, the arguments *for* him are very different from those *against* him. The argument from the testimony of the Eastern Church,—in our opinion very powerful,—is weakened, at least, in some degree, by that of the West; the evidence from the allusions to the personality of Paul in the last chapter of the Epistle, to which, in like manner, we were obliged to allow no inconsiderable weight, has a powerful counterpoise in ch. ii. 3.; from the contents of the Epistle, as we think, nothing definite on either side can be derived: on the other hand, the evidence from the language, from the citations, and, indeed, from the want of the salutation at the beginning, remains in its full force, for, we are constrained to deny that any thing on these points can be adduced in favour of St. Paul as the author of it. If it should be attempted to embarrass the opponents of the Pauline origin by the question: Whether it be really probable that the Eastern Church, which lay so much nearer than the distant West to Palestine, where the Epistle was particularly known, and was, therefore, likely to possess some accurate tradition concerning its author, should have had, so early as the second century, a false one, the difficulty may be met by a counter-question, namely, if the tradition of the Church respecting the author had, in fact, been unanimous,—how could the Western Church, from the very first, have entertained a different opinion? The impartial inquirer will find himself obliged to confess that it is easier to find an answer to the former than to the latter question. A reply, in any degree satisfactory, cannot be found to the latter; but, does not the supposition appear very plausible that the Epistle, diffused without a superscription, was held to be the composition of the Apostle, because of the relation of its contents to those of his acknowledged writings, and this especially if it proceeded from one in immediate intercourse with him?

Let us now trace out, shortly, the direction which the critical investigations, or views respecting the author of the Epistle, have taken since the time of the Fathers of the Church.

Although Augustine and Jerome frequently expressed their doubts respecting the author, yet, at other times, they spoke so much in favour of its Pauline composition, that the opinion of those two pillars of the Western Church essentially contributed to make this view more general also in the West. The Synods held in the north of Africa, towards the close of the fourth century, in the years 393, 397, quote the Epistle to the Hebrews as a work of Paul's, although in such a manner that the earlier doubts appear through their language. For, after having cited *Pauli Apostoli epistolæ tredecim*, it is added, *ejusdem ad Hebraeos una*. Hence this opinion was established as the doctrine of the Roman-Catholic Church; and the age of the Reformation re-awakened the doubts which had been formerly entertained. That theologian who, in those days,—like Semler, in later times, and under other circumstances,—sounded every depth and shoal with the line of criticism,—Erasmus, first expressed his doubts respecting the Pauline composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in his *Annot. in N. Test.* 1519, where he finally decides in favour of Clement of Rome as its author. Independently of Erasmus, Cardinal *Cajetan* appeared with the same doubts, and, influenced by the inquiring age in which he lived, expressed opinions which differed, in many respects, from the doctrine, and exposed him to the suspicion, of the Church. His reasons were of an offensive character to his contemporaries. He not only thinks that Heb. ix. 4. is in direct contradiction with 1 Kings viii. 9., but he regards the allegorical character of the Epistle as unworthy of an Apostle. It is not surprising, therefore, that Ambrose *Catharinus* (*Annot. in excerpta quaedam de comment. etc.* 1535.), along with other vulgar charges, accuses him of assailing the authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews with

the very same arguments with which the Emperor Julian had impugned the Gospel of Matthew. Luther and Calvin appear still more decisively against its composition by Paul (Comp. ii. 3.); Beza, at first of the same opinion, declares himself doubtful, in the last edition of his New Testament.^a Zuingle supposes the Apostle to be its author. Among the Socinians, Socinus himself speaks rather in favour of Paul, but Schlichting decidedly against him.

In the Roman-Catholic Church, these doubts were speedily ended by a decision of the Council of Trent placing our Epistle among the writings of Paul: a decision which Hug, and, very lately, Klee, have endeavoured to justify on scientific grounds; while Feilmoser, in his Introduction (2d Ed. 1830),—acknowledges the Epistle as Pauline only in so far as it was composed and despatched under the *authority* of the Apostle.—In the Evangelical Churches, also, both Lutheran and Reformed, the predominance which the taste for dogmatics obtained over the critico-historical soon produced the same result.^b In the Augsburg Confession, in the Apology,

^a Bleek has (p. 252.) brought forward Beza as coinciding altogether with his teacher Calvin. In the earlier editions of his New Testament this is certainly the case, and also in the edition of 1582, from which Bleek cites, and which is the third. But he declares himself for the very opposite view in the last edition, prepared during his life, the fifth, which was published in 1598. The title contains the following declaration:—*omnia nunc demum, ultima adhibita manu, quam accuratissime emendata et aucta, ut quodammodo novum opus videri possit.* He there endeavours to invalidate the objections he had once enforced, but adds, at the close:—*sed age libera sunt hominum judicia, modo in eo consentiamus omnes, vere dictatam hanc epistolam fuisse a Spiritu Sancto, etc.* It is remarkable that, of Zuingle Bleek has made no mention. The opinion of that reformer is known from the remarks of Kaspar Megalander, written after his death, and added to the edition, by Leo Jude, of the *Annotationes in plerosque N. T. libros.* Tiguri 1581.

^b It cannot be denied that, by this, our Church approximated to the Roman-Catholic. For, a historico-critical love of truth must always, among Protestants, go hand in hand with the dogmatical interest; and, if our modern Rationalism aimed only at *this*, we should be obliged to concede the point. Comp. Twisten's ex-

in Melancthon's *Loci Theologici*, in the Magdeburg Centuriators, we still find Luther's view; in like manner, in the reformed *Conf. Gallicana* we have the views of Calvin. On the other hand, in the seventeenth century, the opposite opinion is the current one, in both Churches, and continues so, with few exceptions (for instance the Lutherans Baldwin, Hunnius; the reformed divines Cameron and Beausobre; the Arminians Grotius, Clericus), up to the second half of the eighteenth century.

Semler—a second Erasmus,—was the first who, in this respect, also, awakened the spirit of inquiry, although (in his “*Beiträgen vor Baumgartens Erklärung des Hebräerbriefes, 1763.*”) he does not distinctly pronounce the negative opinion. In his footsteps followed J. D. Michaelis, who, in the earlier part of his life, every where proceeded upon the notion of its composition by Paul as an indubitable fact; but, in the last, being the 4th, Ed. of his Introduction to the New Testament, 1788, which appeared three years before his death, he represents this point as very doubtful. The first who endeavoured, in a lengthened disquisition, to give certainty to the doubts of these two scholars, was Ziegler, in his “*Einleitung in den Brief an die Hebräer. Gött. 1791.*” He opposes Storr, and,

cellent section (Dogm. particularly p. 282, 283. 2d Ed.), on the principle of Protestantism. Of this historico-critical love of truth the Reformers themselves were models, but it was too soon lost out of view. What was *established* historico-critically, Luther wished not to have withdrawn from the “noble” people; he knew what he *retained*, and therefore knew also what he could *give up*. From this noble striving after truth it arose, that he wished the Antilegomena to be distinguished as such, in the translation destined for the people, and hence the fact, that these four books, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, the book of Jude, and the Revelations, have no numbers in the German copies of the Bible, up to the middle of the seventeenth century (This should have been the case also with 2d Peter, and the 2d and 3d of John, but it did not appear proper to detach them from the Homologoumena which belonged to them). Thus he wished, at the same time, to point out which were “the right noble chief books” of Scripture.

upon the whole, conducts his argument with learning, judgment, and impartiality. Against him, on the other side, appeared Camerer, "Prüfung der Zieglerschen Einleitung," among his Theological and Critical Essays—Stuttg. 1794. Since the beginning of the present century, the negative opinion has gained a great ascendancy. The remarks of Eichhorn against Paul as the author, in his Introduction, are incomplete, and exceedingly partial, although it cannot be denied that his manner of bringing forward the proofs is acute. Berthold is a little more full, without, however, penetrating deeper into the subject. But, of the work of Schulz (*Der Brief an die Hebräer, Einleitung, Uebersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Breslau 1818), the inquiry concerning the author of our Epistle forms an essential portion. This production, it is true, affords manifold proofs of the passionate partiality by which its author has allowed himself to be governed, even in his scientific inquiries, so that evident facts—unknown to himself, as we may venture to hope—are perverted, the most important arguments opposed to his own views are evaded (see above, p. 6. note), and texts void of all force whatever are advanced in its favour (see above, p. 34.). Yet, it must be acknowledged that his treatise first drew attention, in matters of criticism, to many essential points, which must necessarily be discussed in every inquiry into the authorship by Paul, and that it greatly promoted more correct views respecting the internal evidences. With the work of Schulz may be classed that of Seyffarth, *De epistolæ, quæ dicitur ad Hebræos, indole maxime peculiari*, Lips. 1821., which evinces great industry, but, from a want of acuteness, has not essentially advanced the inquiry. Bleek has treated the subject in a very satisfactory manner, and more fully than any of his predecessors, in his book, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in den Brief an die Hebräer.*, Berlin, 1828. In this work conscientious industry is attractively combined with a sound and unprejudiced judgment. Yet the result of his investigation regarding the Pauline origin is only nega-

tive. The work, since its appearance, has been taken as the foundation of every other having the same object; and Schulz himself, in reference to his own work, has declared (See above, p. 26, note), that the more profound investigations of Bleek have rendered his own superfluous. We have made grateful use of Bleek's previous labours, and, although we must dispute several of his positions, we are obliged, for the most part, to coincide with his opinions. On a second examination of the subject, this industrious and conscientious critic will, no doubt, discover many things in his book to improve, and, particularly in the section on the linguistic peculiarities, much also to supply. Among the most recent introductory works, Schott's *Isagoge* must be mentioned as containing a good disposition of the most important points of inquiry.

In opposition to this numerous party, who impugn the Pauline origin of the Epistle, there have appeared defenders of it down even to the latest times. Of these the most considerable are certainly Hug, in his "Einleitung," and his review of De Groot's treatise in the "Freib. Zeitschr. I^o. H^t." and Professor Stuart, of the North-American Seminary, at Andover, "Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in two volumes. 1827" (2d Ed. 1833.). The first vol., of 288 pages, is occupied with the Introduction, and contains a copious refutation of the individual arguments of Bertholdt, Schulz, Seyffarth, which are reckoned up numerically. Among us, this work appears to be known only through the detailed review of it in the supplementary pages to the "Allgemeine Litteratur-Zeitung, Januar 1830. It is certainly liable to the charge of being a little heavy; but, the author's conscientious industry and exemplary love of truth merit every acknowledgment. I have not yet seen the second edition. In it, probably, the most particular attention will be bestowed on Bleek's inquiries, and his special objections to Stuart's arguments will undergo a minute examination. But, the manner in which Hug, with his well-known acuteness, has arranged the arguments

in favour of the Pauline origin gives them a greater power of conviction. Would we were not obliged to believe that this distinguished scholar is capable, when he pleases, of stating the reasons against Paul much more convincingly!—These two writers have been, very recently, joined by Dr. Paulus, in his work: *Des Apostels Paulus Ermahnungsschreiben an die Hebräerchristen*, Heidelberg, 1833. The investigation, as is usual with this writer, follows its *own* way. But we must bear this testimony to the work,—if it sometimes display opinions which must always remain peculiar to the author, it gives, at the same time, full force to whatever can be said in favour of the composition of the Epistle by Paul. On several points of the inquiry, our views have coincided with his, in opposition to those of Bleek.

Besides these three critics, who have entered the lists in favour of the Pauline Authorship, there remain to be particularly noticed, 1. Storr (*Pauli Brief an die Hebräer*, 1789.), who evinces, in his book, his wonted learning, and gift of combination, but, at the same time, an inclination to make, where he cannot find, a door. 2. Hofstede de Groot (*Disputatio, qua epistola ad Hebr. cum Paulinis epistolis comparatur*. Traj. ad Rhen. 1826.). This treatise aims at the linguistic argument in opposition to Schulz. But the author is deficient in philological tact, and in method. A single voice has been here and there raised among the Protestants in favour of the composition by Paul. So Steudel, in his review of Schulz, in "*Bengel's Archiv Bd. iv. St. 1.*," Scheibel in "*Köthes Zeitschrift fürs Christenthum, i. 1.*," and "*Rechtfertigung meines moralischen Characters u.s.w. Breslau, 1817.*" Stein, "*Kommentar zum Lukas, im Anhang über den Brief an die Laodiceische Gemeinde.*"^a

^a We may be allowed to notice, on this occasion, the hypothesis advanced by Baumgarten-Crusius in the Programme of 1829., "*De Origine epistolæ ad Hebræos conjecturæ*," and Stein, *passim*: that the Epistle to the Hebrews is the same with that known under the name of the Epistle to the Laodi-

§. 4. IF PAUL BE NOT, WHO IS THE AUTHOR ?

A wide field is here opened for hypothesis. So early as the time of Clement of Alexandria, and of Origen, opinions were (see above, p. 4.) expressed in favour of Luke either as composer or author; subsequently, Gro-tius regarded him as the author, and, latterly, Hug deemed him its *conscriptor*. In like manner, the earliest ecclesiastical antiquity names Clement of Rome partly as translator (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iii. 38.), partly as author (Ib. vi. 25.); in later times, this opinion was supported particularly by Erasmus. Again, Barnabas is pointed out by ancient ecclesiastical writers (see Tertullian above, p. 18.) as the author, in which they have been defended by Camerarius, J. E. Chr. Schmidt, Twesten (Dogmatik, 2 A. s. 105.), Ullmann (Studien und Kritiken Bd 1. Heft 2.).—Later writers have fallen upon other names. Böhmé, in his commentary, and Mynster (Kleine theol. Schriften, Kopenh. 1825, and, Studien und Kritiken, 2 B. 2 H.), assume Silvanus, or Silas, to be the writer. But, the notion that Apollos was the author has met with a far more general reception. Certain writers, as Eichhorn, Seyffarth, Schott, and others, think themselves obliged to adopt an Alexandrian, though they would decline fixing up-

ceans (yet, according to Baumgarten, the author was a disciple of Paul, and indeed an Alexandrian). To us it has always appeared a labour unworthy of thanks to vex the learned, who have enough on their hands with hypotheses which spring up of themselves, by manufactured ones, even though we look, as we must do in the case of Baumgarten-Crusius, with satisfaction on the play of subtilty. Schneckenburger has undertaken the refutation of Stein's Idiocrisy (Beiträgen u.s.w. S. 153.) See Lücke on Baumgarten's hypothesis (Studien und Kritiken, iii. 2. S. 450) and Schott, *Isagoge*, p. 386. It appears to have remained unknown to both Idiognomists that they had a precursor in the same path, namely, that master in Idiognomy and Idiocrisy, Dr. Schulthess.—Neue theologischen Annalen von 1818., September und October.

on a particular name. Luther first fell upon Apollos, in which he was followed by Clericus, Heumann, Semler, Ziegler, Dindorf, de Wetté; and, lastly, Bleek has undertaken a lengthened defence of this hypothesis.

We will now cast a glance upon the three most probable hypotheses, referring, for the sake of brevity, to Bleek for the remaining two. If Paul be not the writer of our Epistle, if, particularly, the purity of its language and the structure of its periods speak against him as such, the mind is naturally carried to Luke, who was, for several years, his companion, was conversant with the Greek idiom, and in his doctrinal type resembled Paul (the formula of the Lord's Supper in Luke, the parables of the Gospel, ch. xv.), especially as we can point out a considerable number of words and phrases which our Epistle has in common with no other of the New Testament writings except those of Luke (see above, p. 30.). Without, however, entering more minutely into the argument respecting language, the circumstance already noticed by Beza, that Luke was of Grecian descent, seems to be sufficient to draw off our attention from that Evangelist (Col. iv. 14. Comp. x. 11.). But the whole cast of our Epistle betrays its composition by a native Israelite, even were we unable to arrive at this conclusion from such expressions as *οι πατέρες (ἡμῶν)* i. 1., *οι πρεσβύτεροι*, xi. 2. Thus, therefore, if we should insist upon having a single name, our choice would lie between Barnabas and Apollos. With regard to the former, we must pay particular attention to what Ullmann has adduced (passim) in his favour—(Ullmann's treatise was published subsequently to the appearance of Bleek's Introduction): the advocate, of most consideration, for the other view, is Bleek. After carefully weighing the reasons on both sides, we feel obliged to confess, if we must at last fix upon a name, that those which speak for Apollos appear to us greatly to preponderate. The point from which Ullmann starts,

is the desire, certainly a very just one, that every critical hypothesis should have some historical connecting point. The hypothesis that Apollos is the author has no such connecting point, while that for Barnabas possesses one. We consider it as proved (see above, pp. 18, 19.), that Tertullian's testimony does not rest merely upon conjecture, but upon the firm foundation of historical tradition. Bleek, however, very properly remarks, that this tradition can never have been extensively diffused, for it is known neither to Origen nor Eusebius; nay, *with the exception of Tertullian*, there is not a single considerable ecclesiastical writer who has acceded to it. This opinion is mentioned by Jerome and Philastrius, as well as by Tertullian. Now, it is clear from the words of the former, Catal. c. 5... *Sed vel Barnabæ, juxta Tertullianum, vel Lucæ evangelistæ, juxta quosdam, vel Clementis, &c.*, that he knew either no assessor of that opinion, or, at least, none of note. True it is, that, in another place (Ep. ad Dard. 129.), he says, *licet plerique eam vel Barnabæ vel Clementis arbitrentur*; but, what his real meaning is in that passage is not very clear (See Bleek, p. 210, Rem. 280). Hence the conclusion which Ullmann draws from it, that many in the *Eastern Church* regarded Barnabas as the author, cannot, at least from these expressions, be with certainty derived.* Philastrius († c. 387.) gives a *hæresis* of those who considered Barnabas its author, from which it is evident that this opinion had spread; still we do not learn from him that it was maintained by any well-known writer.

Now, if, on the one hand, we cannot lay any great stress on the tradition of the Church, so, on the other, that tradition is much weakened by views of very slender foundation, and yet much more strenuously maintained, which make Clement of Rome, or Luke, the

* The reader will most probably, with Semler, supply *nos-trorum* to *plerique*, and make the expression apply to *Latin authors*.

author, and which bear so evidently upon them the marks of conjecture from less substantial points of agreement.^a Keeping out of view the weight which the historical foundation of that hypothesis imparts to it, there remains but little that speaks strongly in its favour. The strongest argument would certainly be suggested by the harmony of the character of our Epistle with that handed down to us under the name of Barnabas, could we admit the genuineness of the latter, and persuade ourselves, with Schmidt, that a kindred spirit reigns throughout both Epistles. To a mere superficial observer, the latter notion will appear very evident; still, even those theologians who have had the least relish for the doctrinal contents, as well as the doctrinal form of our Epistle, have not been able to conceal from themselves that there is an infinite difference between the *type* of it, and the allegories of the Epistle of Barnabas; and that, therefore, if the latter actually proceeded from the famous companion of Paul, the former could not have had Barnabas for its author. Thus, Eichhorn (Einleitung, iii. 2. s. 468.) says, "If we except the single passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. vii. 6., where Levi is said to have already in Abraham given tithes to Melchisedec, as too far fetched, which the author himself admits to be so, and excuses by a *ὡς ἔπος εἰπέν*, the Epistle is written with a manly seriousness, and has a sequence, roundness, fulness, vigour, and evenness in the representation, a clear, pleasing brevity of expression, a classical shape, one might almost say, for an allegorising composition, in which even the writings of Philo are inferior. In these qualities how far below it is the Epistle of Barnabas!—The

^a Were Stuart's opinion well founded, that Clement formally cites our Epistle, the hypothesis which supposes him to be the author of it would appear utterly ridiculous. But that opinion, as we have mentioned in the note to p. 3, has no foundation.

distance between them is so great that no comparison of them can be properly instituted. *From the latter writing there breathes a completely different spirit.*" Both Twisten (Dogmatik, I. s. 145. 2 A.) and Ullmann gave a similar opinion; but, both of them, and, along with Neander too, on this very ground contend, in the most decisive manner, that a composition so unworthy as that which is inscribed with the name of Barnabas cannot have proceeded from the friend and companion of the Apostle Paul.

With this admission, however, the strongest argument, in support of the composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews by Barnabas, is given up. Of the *six* internal reasons, which Ullmann urges, *two* apply with as much force to every other intimate friend and companion of the Apostle as they do to Barnabas;^a *one* of them rests on a pre-supposition, which will not easily be granted, that the receivers of the Epistle were *Cyprian Jewish Christians or Alexandrians*; the *fourth* is exceedingly precarious, namely, that the mention of Barnabas, by Clement of Alexandria, as one of the seventy disciples, and the frequent designation of Christ, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, by the simple ὁ Ἰησοῦς (see above, p. 38.), may indicate a personal connection with Jesus;^b the *fifth* reason is

^a Namely, No. 3., where it is observed, that, on the one hand, the Epistle contains much that is Pauline, and, on the other, differs in many respects from Paul: and No. 4., where it is said that the Epistle is entirely worthy of a disciple and friend of the Apostle, as also, that the writer presents himself as invested with Apostolical authority. Certainly! But, if what is here said holds equally good, with respect to the two men, who may be regarded as authors of the Epistle, and if, moreover, we learn nothing farther of Barnabas, than that he was ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ πλήρης Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ πίστεως (Acts xi. 24.), but, of Apollos, that he was Ἀλιξανδρεὺς τῶ γίνεαι, ἀνὴρ λόγιος — δυνατὸς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς — ὅστις ἐντόνως τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διαπατλᾷ γχετο δημοσίᾳ, ἐπιδικνύς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν (Acts xviii. 24, 28.), how decidedly, after reading these two passages of Scripture, does the scale turn in favour of Apollos!

^b But Paul also makes use of the simple Ἰησοῦς, proportion-

evident, if Apollos, but, uncertain if Barnabas, be considered the author, viz. that Barnabas, being a native of Cyprus, which was intimately connected with Alexandria, “ had, perhaps, been in Alexandria itself ;”—the Alexandrian descent and education of Apollos are undisputed. There remains, therefore, only the *sixth* reason, that Barnabas was a Levite, and, as such, intimately acquainted with the temple worship. But, the arrangements of the temple, mentioned in the Epistle, are, certainly, neither so detailed nor so recondite, that only a Levite could possess this minuter knowledge of them : on the contrary, as Bleek conceives,^a the author, ch. ix., has committed a mistake, in his description of the Sanctuary, which we should not have expected from one who had resided in Jerusalem. See Bleek, §. 94.

By a much more certain path Bleek attains to his result. He sets out from the following premises :—1. The author must have been of the Jewish nation. 2. According to ii. 3., he must have been a disciple of the Apostles. 3. He must have been intimately connected with Paul, as the contents and the language of the Epistle, or, indeed, the closer connection with Timothy, evince. 4. He does not shew himself altogether dependent on Paul, but maintains a decided originality. 5. The author, according to xiii. 19., must have been personally connected with the Jewish Christians, his readers. 6. He cannot have been an inhabitant of Palestine, nor have remained long in the neighbourhood of the temple at Jerusalem, since, from ix. 1—8., it appears that he was imperfectly acquainted with the temple arrangements. 7. He was, probably, an Alexandrian, which may be inferred from

ably with less frequency, indeed, than we find it employed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, yet, still not unfrequently—and, notwithstanding this, the conclusion, from this circumstance, to a personal acquaintance with Christ, does not hold good in his case.

^a The formularies of our churches, admitting no errors in writings received as inspired, repudiate all opinions of the kind advanced by Bleek.—*Tr.*

his skill in typical exposition, his congeniality with Philo in his form of doctrine, in his conceptions, and even in single expressions. The two last points alone may be questioned. Concerning the pretended antiquarian mistakes of the author, see the passages quoted, and Mynster (*Studien und Kritiken*, II. 2., S. 134, et seq.).

On the supposition of the Alexandrian origin and culture of the author, it must certainly be granted that the peculiar nature of the Epistle is most easily explained. Still, I should not be inclined to affirm this supposition necessary; and, I should even doubt whether, with Bleek, we ought to ascribe to it "the highest probability." That critic, eminently distinguished as his inquiries every where are by moderation and candour, does not himself lay, on many things, so much stress as might have been expected. He acknowledges that the exclusive use of the LXX. is no decisive proof that the writer was not of Palestine, that the typical form of the doctrine, in our Epistle, was prevalent among the Israelites of that country,^a and, that the correctness of the language does not necessarily imply an Alexandrian author.

^a Bleek should have expressed himself, on this point, somewhat more strongly. He merely says, that this manner of exposition was "by no means uncommon" among the Jews of Palestine. Olshausen's work on the deeper sense of Scripture, and Döpke's Hermeneutics, might have shewn, on the other hand, that it was just as well known and current in Palestine as in Alexandria. The manner, only, of the Palestinian Jews is different from that of the Alexandrians:—on this point, however, a more minute inquiry remains still a desideratum. As the opinion is still widely diffused, that the typical manner of expounding doctrine in the Epistle, necessarily obliges us to assume an Alexandrian author, we give the opinion of Cöln on the subject, in his review of Böhme's Commentary (*Hall. Litt. Zeit.* 1826, N. 131.). "On the other hand, M. B. is much to be commended for the expression of his opinion in opposition to those who, from the style and allegorical character of the Epistle, conclude that it was written by an Alexandrian Christian, or, at least, to Alexandrians." The reader may also compare Mynster (*Studien und Kritiken*, II. 2., S. 333.), who, agreeably to the marked distinction which he draws be-

Now, if all this be correct (of which we cannot doubt), there does not, as it appears to us, exist any thing especially compelling us to suppose the author an Alexandrian. The case were very different, indeed, could it be made probable that our author had read the writings of Philo, as was the opinion of Grotius, Clericus, Mangey; while the man most capable of pronouncing a decision on the question, Bened. Carpzov, was of a contrary opinion. We have already (p. 48. Rem.) discussed a point urged by Bleek, without finding it valid as a proof. In imitation of Schulz (p. 398, et seq.), he produces a catalogue of expressions and phrases which, it is conceived, give "*a great probability*" to this opinion. We are unwilling to deny that these are selected with care; at the same time, we are not inclined to admit that they give to the opinion "*a great probability.*" Some parallel passages are satisfactorily explained from an agreement in doctrine between the Jewish Christians of Palestine and Philo: thus, when with i. 2, a passage is compared in which Philo calls the Logos εἰκὼν Θεοῦ δι' ὃν σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο, which is, indeed, Pauline; when to v 3. φέρων τὰ πάντα, there is given, as a parallel, ὁ τὰ μὲν ὄντα φέρων καὶ τὰ πάντα γεννῶν,^a while yet Col. i. forms a parallel in matter, and φέρειν is a very common expression in the usage at that time general in that country, &c. (See Rem. on the Passage). Other parallels depend upon expressions which are just as

tween *type* and *allegory*, maintains that our author allegorises *but little*. But, the difference between *type* and *allegory*, such as this scholar has represented it, cannot strictly be maintained. On the other hand, we entirely agree with him in this, that Philo's allegories, and, still more, Philo's doctrine, have, for the most part, a character quite distinct from the typical manner of our Epistle, "the spirit of Philo is *toto coelo* different, and the direction and turn of the thought certainly do not indicate the same school." Yet, it remains incontrovertible, that the design and colouring of our Epistle approach more closely to the manner of Philo than does any other writing of the New Testament.

^a Who upholdeth all things, and produceth all things.

little peculiar to Philo as *φίρειν* in the sense of *maintain*, but belong to the Greek idiom, in general, or, at least, to the whole Grecity of that period; so *μετριοπαθεῖν* (See Rem. on v. 2.), *προσαγορευθεῖς* v. 10 (a quite common *terminus*), the collocation *δήσεις τε καὶ ἰκετηρίας* (See the passage from Isocrates, in Wetstein), *ἀμήτωρ* (a word certainly of very rare occurrence—but see Wetstein—which was suggested by the frequently recurring *ἀπάτωρ*), *ἰουδαίας ἀμαρτάνειν*, x. 26, (an expression so little peculiar to Philo that it may rather be considered the current one among the Greeks and Hellenists for the idea expressed by it, See Wetstein), *ὡς ἴπος εἶπεν* vii. 9. (quite a common formula), &c. Now, if we deduct these passages—and the same thing holds with regard to all the rest—there will remain of the list, which is not very long (there are, in all, 22 examples cited, and the more we consider the careful investigation which Bleek has instituted, the less expectation must we entertain of finding other and more striking proofs), almost nothing to give even a probability, much less any weight to the assertion that our author had read the works of Philo.^a—Finally, Grossmann, in the Programme (p. 14.) adduced p. 26., has cited some expressions of our Epistle intended to prove that its author was conversant with the language of the Alexandrian asceticks, as *οἱ καταφυγόντες*, vi. 18. But these furnish even less evidence than the passages brought forward by Bleek.

Still, we are ready to make the following admission, viz. could it be rendered probable that any distinguished person having intercourse with Paul, were an Alexandrian, and of Alexandrian culture, we might, with the

^a If such be the case with regard to the assertion, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was acquainted with the writings of Philo, how much less can this be maintained with any probability in respect of John the *Ἰδιώτης*. In fact, the works of this mystical Alexandrian Theologian must have made but little noise, and been far from widely spread, if Valckenaer be correct in what he thinks himself constrained to suppose, that Philo had never read the writings of Aristobulus! See Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, p. 95.

greatest appearance of truth, regard him as the author of the Epistle. Now, such a one is found in the person of Apollos. According to Acts xviii. 24, he was Ἰουδαῖος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει; and, there is added, moreover, a predicate in a high degree true of our author, he is called ἀνὴρ λόγιος (*facundus*) and δυνατὸς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς. We may infer precisely these qualities in Apollos from what Paul says of himself with regard to him, 1. Cor. i.—iv., especially iii. 6; ii. 4. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 5. 6. For, the great Apostle, who possessed, if not the elegance, yet the force of speech in so eminent a degree,^a in declaring that he alone had, by the weakness of preaching the crucified Jesus, planted the Gospel in the Corinthian Church, plainly points out Apollos, who, by his knowledge of the Scriptures, had always been able to overcome the Jews (Acts xviii. 28.), as the man who had *watered* the seed which was *sown* by himself (1 Cor. iii. 6.). Despising the πειθῶ, 1 Cor. ii. 4, in his own person, he admits it in his companion, to whom the Lord of the great building had assigned a different task from his own. 1 Cor. iii. 9. 10. Assuredly we know not of any other partner of the Apostle from whose gifts we might more readily expect such a composition, as our Epistle, than from this learned Alexandrian. Does not the Epistle

^a Would that our philologers, who so loftily pass by the writings of the Tentmaker, might feel the words of one of the most eminent brothers of the guild, Hemsterhusius, sounding in their ears, and penetrating their hearts! He closes with the following words his excellent discourse "*De Apostolo Paulo*," which Biers first communicated to us in the "*Symbola Luisburg. T. I.*" and which Valckensær had afterwards reprinted, in an improved state, in the *Orationes Tib. Hemsterh.*: haec igitur eloquentia, quæ non in flosculis verborum et orationis calamistratæ pigmentis, sed in indolis excelsæ notis, sed in pondere rerum gravissime pronuntiatarum est posita, si cuiquam, Paulo certe maximo merito assignabitur. Ergo, ut paucis dicam, haud vereor asseverare, non fuisse discretiorem Demosthenem in illa venustatis Atticæ copia, in isto virtutis oratoricæ regno, quam fuerit in his humilis et vulgaræ dictionis, si lubet, sordibus Paulus, verissimum Christianæ religionis fulmen.—Hear him!

point him out as the very same person, and employed in the same business, as he is described to be in Acts xviii. 28? And, to this must be added, that we might expect precisely in him an adoption, on the whole, of the doctrinal type of Paul, for he was instructed in Christianity by the Apostle's confidential friends Aquila and Priscilla, his activity, so far as our information extends, was chiefly displayed in those regions in which that Apostle had propagated the Gospel, and 1 Cor. xvi. 12., Titus iii. 13., prove that he stood in some more intimate connection with Paul. Finally (which is especially important), Apollos does not appear as altogether a subordinate preacher, nor must we consider him as dependent on the Apostle of the heathen in the same way as we look upon Timothy or Titus: on the contrary, he appears, 1 Cor. i. 4, along with Peter and Paul, as one of the chief propagators of the Gospel, in whom, as may reasonably be inferred from what is there said of him, and notwithstanding his dependence on the Pauline doctrinal type, we may suppose a peculiar view of it. If, to all these historical indications, we add the internal evidences, which certainly favour the supposition of the Epistle having had an Alexandrian origin, the hypothesis which assumes Apollos as the author of it will not only appear credible, not only the best supported of those hitherto set up, but, in itself, in the highest degree probable.

The following fact also deserves, perhaps, some attention. The close connection of Clement of Rome with the Corinthians indicates a more intimate acquaintance likewise with Apollos, and explains why *he* has made such frequent use of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Accordingly, we cannot, as we conceive, close this portion of our inquiry better than in the language of Bleek. "And thus we must confess that, as in other things, Luther in this conjecture, whether he first proposed, or only coincided with it, has shown equal freedom of opinion and true critical tact."

CHAPTER II.

THE RECEIVERS OF THE EPISTLE.

WHEN we speak of the receivers of this composition, we must justify the denomination of it as an Epistle. Commencing without the usual greeting, containing, in its progress, almost no personal allusion, and only a few allusions at its close, it might, perhaps, with more propriety, be denominated a *treatise*. But, since a very slight distinction obtains between a doctrinal epistle and a treatise, a distinction depending merely upon the special relation of the writer and the receivers, we are not, although the work approximate more to the form, entitled, on that account, to give it the appellation of a *treatise*, when, as is the case with the work under consideration, it bears characteristic marks of having been addressed and sent to particular readers as an Epistle. Now, such marks are not only found in the concluding chapter, but are sufficiently obvious in the Paraneses, ch. vi. and x.

The receivers of the Epistle are designated in the superscription by the few words *πρὸς Ἐβραίους*. Why it wants a complete salutation, which in the other Epistles, contains also the address, we have already (pp. 52, 53.) considered. If the superscription proceeded from the author himself, then, as the salutation is wanting, the former would be really an address,^a and, from its indistinctness, it would follow that we have before us an encyclical Epistle directed to no particular community. This has, in fact, been the opinion of several: Scholion in Matthäi, Braun, Lightfoot, and others. Stuart, also, makes it encyclical, in supposing that it was especially destined for the community at Caesarea, but that, from this community, it was to be spread among all the He-

* The Epistles of the ancients, rolled up in the manner of a scroll, and tied with a thread, were frequently without any address, in our sense of the word.

brews.^a That it was addressed to a particular community must necessarily be supposed, as it follows from the special Paraneses, the special greetings, the announcement of the author's arrival among them, &c. But, if it be so, the superscription would seem to be incorrect: and this might certainly be the case, as the superscriptions of the New Testament writings are not the composition of the author of the books. See the superscription: ἡ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολὴ πρώτη. But, it is not necessary to give up the propriety of this superscription, which is, on the contrary, completely justified by usage in the language of that period; so that no decisive argument can be brought against any one who may consider it as an address added by the author himself. The word 'Εβραῖος, in the time of Christ, was employed to denote, in addition to its original signification, the Jews of *Palestine*, in contradistinction to the 'Ελληνισταί. Comp. Acts vi. 1. This is the conclusion to which we are led, indeed, by its being contrasted with ἑλληνίζειν, to speak Greek, as characterising those who made use of the *Hebrew*, that is, of the *Aramaic tongue*, and who were precisely the *inhabitants of Palestine*. This signification is particularly obvious in the denomination εὐαγγέλιον κατ' 'Εβραίους, Comp. Irenæus, Adv. hæres. iii. 1., and Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iii. 24. In the latter passage it is said: Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ πρότερον 'Εβραίοις κηρύξας, ὡς ἔμελλε καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέροισι ἵναί, πατρίῳ γλώττῃ, γραφῆ παραδοῦς τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον.^{b c}

^a In this view of the matter, the idea of an encyclical writing is not indeed retained; for, in the sense, that the proper receivers of the Epistle gave it to others for their perusal, all the apostolical Epistles may be called encyclical.

^b Matthew having first preached to the Hebrews, as he saw himself obliged to go to others, presented to them his Gospel written in their native language.

^c When Eichhorn, who rejects the opinion here advanced, says (Einleit. iii. 2. S. 481.), "In no passage does the name 'Εβραῖος refer to the language, but always to the religion or the descent," he has Acts vi. 1. decidedly against him, but he leaves that passage wholly unnoticed. In the passages quoted from the Fathers of the Church, though 'Εβραῖος might certainly be

Now, the opinion that the 'Εβραῖοι, to whom our Epistle was addressed, were really those of Palestine, receives the strongest support from the character of the Epistle. That attachment to the Jewish worship which it supposes in those to whom it was addressed can be most easily conceived in those Jewish Christians who had been, or still were, eye-witnesses of the splendid temple-worship in Jerusalem. Another circumstance may be added: the absence of all allusion to Gentile Christians, both with regard to their election, and the relation of others to them. Against this, indeed, it may be alleged, that the Epistle of James was likewise written to Jewish Christians of the Diaspora, without touching upon their relation to the Gentile Christians. Still, there is this difference between the two cases: On the one hand, our author, as a disciple of Paul, might more readily be expected to discuss such matters, and, on the other, his subject might more naturally lead him to do so. Yet the expression in ch. ii. 16. would have been decidedly offensive had there been Gentile Christians, together with the Jewish, in that community.

The objections against this view, which respect the receivers of the Epistle, seem to us to have too slender a foundation to demand a particular examination. That which seems the most specious, viz. that an Epistle in Greek was little calculated for those Jewish Christians who spoke Aramaic, the reader will find refuted in the following chapter. A great number of hypotheses, concerning the regions for which it was destined, are pointed out and refuted by Bleek, § 13—15., and Schott, *Isagoge*, § 80. The latest critics have been unanimously of opinion, that the receivers were Chris-

referred to the *descent and religion*, yet a reference is made *at the same time*, nay, *especially*, to the language. The same remark holds good with respect to the passage in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6. 14.; whereas, in another passage, which Eichhorn might have alleged in his favour, 1. 5. c. 11., *ὁ δὲ ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ Ἑβραῖος ἀνίκων*, the reference to descent is decidedly the prominent one.

tians of Palestine, an opinion which prevailed, also, in the ancient church, as with Clement, Eusebius, Jerome, Theodoret, &c. Mynster, alone, has renewed the defense of Storr's notion, that the Epistle was intended for the Galatians. And Röth, in his thoroughly unsuccessful work: *Epistolam vulgo "ad Hebraeos" inscriptam non ad Hebraeos id est Christianos genere Judaeos sed ad Christianos genere gentiles et quidem ad Ephesios datam esse*, Francof. ad M. 1836., upon the supposition that the conjectured author Apollos stood in some more close relation to the Ephesians, and that the *Θεατριζόμενοι*, x. 33., refers to the uproar in Ephesus. Acts xix. 23., et seq., has set up the hypothesis, that the Ephesians were the receivers of the Epistle.

CHAPTER III.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE EPISTLE.

IF the readers for whom this Epistle was destined were Hebrews of Palestine, we should, as appears to us, be necessarily led, by this circumstance, to the conjecture, that it was originally written in the Aramaic language, and then translated. That it was so is distinctly affirmed by many ancient writers, by Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Jerome, Theodoret, Euthalius, &c., and also in the subscription of Cod. 31. Still, that this opinion rested upon no historical *tradition*, but upon a *conclusion* drawn partly from the difference between the diction of this Epistle and that of the Epistles of Paul, partly from the opinion that the Hebrews of Palestine could have been acquainted with no other language but the Grecian, may be proved from these two points, viz. that other writers, of equal antiquity, have endeavoured to remove the first difficulty in another manner, as, for instance, Origen, when he attributed the *thoughts* only to Paul, and, that the supposition of Clement of Rome, or Luke, being its translator, evidently shows an endeavour, by conjecture, to account for the

character of the Grecity of the Epistle. Comp. pp. 4. and 30. J. D. Michaelis, indeed, essayed, from internal reasons, namely, from presumed errors in translation, to show that the work must have originally been written in Hebrew. But his argument is equally destitute of solidity with that which Eichhorn and Bertholdt have attempted, on the same grounds, to set up, in the case of some others of the New Testament books.

From its style, it is incontestible that the Epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in Greek; for no composition, as a faithful translation from the Aramaic, could ever have come forth with the same perfection in the structure of its sentences. "Yet," says Bleek, with justice, "if it were written, by its author, in Aramaic, and its present Grecian form proceeded from another, the translator has handled it with so much freedom and address as to justify no longer the title of a translation, but of a free *rifacimento*." Its original composition, in Greek, may be shewn also (a remark which holds equally good with respect to the Epistles of Paul and to this Epistle), from the instances of Paronomasia (the chief of these are v. 8. xiii. 14.), as well as from the employment of such Greek words as could be expressed in Hebrew only by a circumlocution, as πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως (i. 1.) ἀπαύγασμα (i. 2.), ἐπιπερίστατος (xii. 1.), μετριοπαθεῖν (v. 2.). In the last there is also, perhaps, an allusion to συμπαθεῖν.^a There is still another important circum-

^a The appeal is not convincing which is made to the supposed play upon words in ix. 15. et seq., with respect to διαθήκη, where, according to the usual explanation, the author is conceived to make a transition from the signification *Covenant* to that of *Bequest by Will*. Bleek has correctly observed, that the Aramaic קִיְתִיָּה and סִיְתִיָּה should also have admitted of this play upon words. On the instances of Paronomasia, likewise, too much stress has been laid: they are not frequent, and sometimes they arise naturally in translation. Supposing, for instance, that the following words were to be translated into Greek:—*cum regibus aut minime aut suavissime loqui oportet*,

stance to be remarked: our author every where quotes strictly according to the LXX., and even finds his proof upon that text in cases where it differs widely from the Hebrew, for instance in x. 5—7. Even if we might suppose a translator to have adopted the text of the LXX. for his Hebrew citations, still, this is impossible in those cases where the whole argument sends us back to the LXX. alone.

But how shall we explain the reason why the Epistle should have been written in Greek to communities whose language was the Aramaic, and who derived their name from that very circumstance? Bleek has, very strangely, contented himself with a counter-question: "But what if the author were unacquainted with Aramaic? If, although of the Jewish nation, he were born and bred in some other country, for example, in Alexandria, we could not expect him to have an intimate acquaintance with the idiom of Palestine, at least not such an acquaintance as to enable him to compose, in that tongue, an Epistle of the extent and tenor of the one before us.^a We can very well imagine, however, that he composed and despatched his Epistle, in Greek, to the Palestinians, as, at that period, Greek was so generally known in Judea, particularly in Jerusalem, that he was not absolutely obliged to have an Aramaic translation prepared, and to send his Epistle to his readers in that dialect (p. 38)." It is remarkable that the author of so profound

every one, doubtless, would translate $\eta \eta \kappa \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \eta \eta \delta \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$; so, in 1 Cor. ix. 13., the Syriac version has a fine Paronomasia of ܩܠܘܣ and ܩܠܘܣ , where in Greek there is none. So, also, in Rev. i. 7.

^a Philo might have been adduced as a proof of the utter ignorance of the Hebrew language prevalent among the Alexandrian Jews. Highly educated as he was, and anxious to make it appear that he understood the sacred language of his people, Philo shews scarcely any acquaintance with it. The Hebrew text was read, indeed, in the Synagogues of Alexandria, along with the Greek translation, but just as little understood as the Latin is in the public service of the Romish Church.

and copious an Introduction has not entered more minutely into the investigation respecting the diffusion, at that time, of the Grecian language in Palestine. There appeared, two years prior to his, that model of a learned inquiry, the treatise of Hug on the use of the Greek in Palestine (in the second part of the Introduction), which combats, with so much success, the opinion, general since the time of de Rossi, that the Syro-Chaldaic was almost exclusively used. To examine, more closely, this interesting subject would lead us too far from our present purpose; we must, however, draw attention to the following remark: that, partly from the evidence brought forward by Paulus and Hug, partly from other proofs which may still be collected, we must suppose the Grecian tongue to have been, at that time, known to the mass of the Jewish people in Palestine, and even in the Capital itself. We shall pass over the direct proofs from the Talmud and Josephus, and the indirect from the historians of that period, and will only adduce what the New Testament presents in support of our assertion.

In the first place, it is in the highest degree probable that Christ spoke Greek.^a What language did He employ in the provinces inhabited by heathens, as in Tyre and Sidon (Mark vii. 24.), and in Decapolis, which consisted of Greek towns? What with the foreign Hellenists or Proselytes of the Gate from among the Greeks (John vii. 35. xii. 20., expositors are not agreed whether the Ἑλληνας there mentioned were the one or the other)? It can be proved that the Roman magistracy, in the provinces, made use, not of the Latin, but, of the Hellenic tongue. In what language then did He address Pilate? It may be replied, perhaps

^a The translator is aware that he has not, in this passage, exactly rendered the sense of his author, who means to say, that Christ must have, occasionally, spoken Greek when he found it necessary, and, of course, was able to speak that language. This ability to speak in different languages, it would be impossible, in the opinion of the translator, to conceive as not inherent in Christ, and must, therefore, be taken for granted.

He spoke by an interpreter? This cannot be believed, and still less that Pilate spoke Aramaic. It can be shewn to be equally probable, that the Apostles, even before they went out into the heathen world, were not ignorant of Greek. Considerable towns, and portions of country, in Palestine, were chiefly inhabited by Greeks; the rulers of the country, and the Roman garrisons spoke the Grecian tongue; the whole of the foreign Jews who attended at the feast,—and they did so by hundreds of thousands at once, there having assembled, according to the apparently incredible statement of Josephus, at the time of Easter, 2,700,000 souls in the capital,—spoke Greek; those Jews whose speech was the Grecian, had their own places of assembly in Jerusalem, the Alexandrians, Cyrenians, &c. Acts vi. 9.; ix. 29.; and the Christians also, of the earliest period, included a great number of Jews who spoke that language, Acts. vi. 1. Under these circumstances, to omit many other things which could have been produced, who would not expect a knowledge (even if an imperfect knowledge) of Greek in the disciples of Jesus? Now, that even some of those who, apparently, had never left Palestine, were acquainted with that tongue, nay, that their attainments in it were considerable, is proved, in the most striking manner, by the instance of James, a person of genuine Pharisaical education, and head of the community in *Jerusalem* (see Schneckenburger: Ueber den theologischen character des Briefes Jacobi, in his Beiträgen, and my Litterarischer Anzeiger, 1832. No. 50.), who, it would seem, when he died a martyr in that city, had never left Palestine.* We cannot but express our wonder that Hug has passed by this im-

* A certain elegance, and even some acquaintance with the Greek poets, cannot well be denied to James himself. It is not very improbable that the passage, i. 17., may have been borrowed from some poet. Independently of the perfect Hexameter which it contains, a second might be easily formed from the remaining words. As an instance of the elegancies of speech, we may refer, also, to the position of the Genitive in iii. 8.

portant source of proof unnoticed. The use of the LXX., too, by the Jews of Palestine, should not be forgotten. Could it have been in such general use there that Matthew and John usually follow it, if Greek had been as little known to the Jews of that country as Hebrew was to the Alexandrian Jews?

We might now examine how far Peter and John were acquainted with Greek, before they began their travels as missionaries, but we shall confine ourselves to the inquiry, whether, since the fact is, with respect to James, such as we have shewn it to be, we must not admit it to be probable that none of the Apostles was ignorant of Greek. In order to prove this, with regard to the mass of the population in Jerusalem, Hug makes an emphatic appeal to Acts xxi. 40. And, in truth, we must acknowledge the weight of its evidence. Paul is desirous, on the occasion of an uproar which had been raised against him, to address the people; they *expect from him* a harangue in Greek; but, on his commencing his speech in Aramaic, they become still more quiet, and listen with yet more attention. If, on the one side, it follows that the people generally preferred the language of the country to the Greek, it is proved, on the other, that they were acquainted with the latter language.

Hence it appears, that we are fairly entitled to the assumption, that our Epistle could be understood by the greater part of the receivers of it in Palestine, without an interpreter; and so these data may suffice to explain why an Epistle addressed to Christians of Palestine should have been composed in Greek. We will add this further observation, that the remarks we have made on the receivers, and the language of the Epistle, serve to fortify us in our opinion that Paul was not its author. If *he* who had, from the period of adolescence (and this, among the Jews, began at the age of 14), studied the literature of the Jews, and, as the text we have quoted, shews, could speak Aramaic fluently, if *he* had found it necessary to write to the Christians, of Jewish descent, living in Palestine,

would he not, in accordance with his principle of becoming all things to all men, have indulged the partiality of his nation for the language which they had inherited, and have written to them in Aramaic?

CHAPTER IV.

TIME AND PLACE OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE.

WHATEVER can be determined upon these points, is naturally dependent upon the opinion respecting the author. They who look upon Paul as the writer have a tolerably firm foundation for their opinion in those passages of the 13th chapter which touch upon the personal relations of the author, and may suppose the time of that Apostle's first imprisonment in Rome, and, indeed, shortly before the termination of it, as the period of the composition of the Epistle (Comp. above, chap. I. §. 2. A.) The usual subscription, also, favours this view: *ἠγράφη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας*, Cod. A. *ἀπὸ Ρώμης*. They who suppose other authors are almost unanimous in this, that the Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. But they differ respecting the place, or leave it altogether undetermined. In supposing Apollos the author, we are too little acquainted with the circumstances of that Apostolic man's life to be able to advance any thing more definite respecting the *place* of its composition. But, so far as the *time* is concerned, we may certainly conclude, from the Epistle, that the sanctuary and the Levitical service must have subsisted at the period when it was composed. Comp. particularly, chap. ix. 8., where sacrifice is spoken of as still practised. It cannot, however, have been written long before the destruction of that city, for the receivers of it appear to have, some considerable time before, embraced Christianity (v. 12), having, as Christians, had experience of many things, both good and evil (x. 32—34.), and many of those who had

first instructed them being already dead, (xiii. 7.), and probably, indeed, as martyrs.

CHAPTER V.

OBJECT, CONTENTS, AND THEOLOGICAL SCOPE OF THE EPISTLE.

THE object of the Epistle is parenetic. The receivers appear as wavering in their faith, and in danger of relapsing altogether into Judaism; ii. 1—4.; iii. 1. 7. 14.; iv. 1. 11—13. 14—16.; v. 11.; vi. 20.; x. 22—24. 25—39.; xii. 1—3, 4. 12. 13. 15. 25.; xiii. 9. Therefore, to confirm them in their faith, the author represents to them that, in the economy of the New Covenant, they had received much more than they had resigned with the Old; in the Old Covenant they had but the outline, in the New the completed picture, x. 1. This dogmatical argument serves as a support for the exhortation up to x. 18.; and that portion of the Epistle has, with reason, been especially called the dogmatical. For, although a comparison between the Old and New Covenants occurs, likewise, chap. xii. 19—24 (xiii. 10. 12.), still it is there treated in a more cursory manner. The single leading points of the comparison are the following: 1. The author of the New Covenant is exalted above all angels, the short period of His humiliation proving nothing to the contrary, seeing that, precisely by that humiliation, He wrought out our salvation, and became a High-priest of the New Covenant, chap. i.—ii. (xii. 25.) 2. This High-priesthood is infinitely more exalted than that of the Old Covenant. In it is fulfilled what the word of prophecy had announced of a High priest after the order of Melchisedec, chap. v. vii. 3. Hence, the covenant established by this High priest, the new relation between God and man, is much more exalted than the alliance maintained through the mediation of the priests of the Old Covenant—what was typical in

the latter came substantially to pass in the former, chap. viii., ix., x.

From this, then, arises the theological import of the Epistle. It is, 1. A complete illustration of the words of Augustine, which I have adopted as the motto of the present work: *NOVUM TESTAMENTUM IN VETERE latet, VETUS IN NOVO patet.* And, the study of it is important in proportion to the importance, at the present time, of imbuing with secure views of the divine import of the Old Covenant, those Theologians who believe in the revelation of the New. 2. The Epistle particularly leads us to the understanding of the Redeemer's High-priesthood; and, as, in the present age, especially, there is an endeavour after a more profound knowledge of the doctrine of the Atonement, so, in this respect, the Epistle is of great value to the Theologian.

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE CANONICALNESS AND AUTHORITY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

THOSE theologians who do not conjoin the ecclesiastical and critical interests have pronounced an inquiry, like the present, in an Introduction to this Epistle, superfluous. But, surely, the theological critic, who finds himself constrained to deny the directly Apostolic origin of a book adopted into the canon of Holy Writ, is bound to give an account why, and to what extent, it may belong to the canon, and—as this gives their significance to the canonical books—whether it may be used as a *norma fidei et vitæ Christianæ*. After the laudable example of Bleek, and Lücke on the Apocalypse, we will enter upon this inquiry, and proceed, as from a starting point, with some general remarks upon the Canon.

A consideration, which raises as much disquietude in the more superficial inquirer, as it yields comfort to the deeper observer, is this, that, in the history of the

Christian world, and, particularly, in the history of the book upon which the Christian world founds its faith, *accident* has had as free scope as in the general history of mankind. As no inward, positive, Divine influence, nor any outward Divine arrangement, put the historical writers of the New Testament in a condition to deliver to us, with the strictest fidelity to the letter, the words which the Redeemer spoke; Providence having neither by internal nor external means guarded against variations of the sacred text by transcribers, in like manner, no outward authority, nor any rule distinctly recognised in their consciousness, guarded the primitive Christian Church in the formation of the Canon of Holy Writ. But, as in the external world in which earthquakes and monstrosities interrupt not the eternal order and harmonious connection of the whole, and, in the moral history of a world in which a Nero and a Cataline cannot disturb, by the instrumentality of man, the sure procedure of the great Creator, and only lead us the more to the acknowledgment of a Supreme wisdom, so the deeper observer of the constitution of the Holy Scriptures must be struck with the greater admiration, when, with all the scope left to what we call accident, he sees attained the lofty end proposed to Himself by the Father of men. When, in spite of the 30,000 various readings which were reckoned up, even in the time of Mill, in the New Testament, a text has been formed from which, —as every reasonable man confesses,—we can draw, with the most perfect confidence, the doctrine of the Gospel, who will not acknowledge the hand into which all the unseen threads run together, from out of every contingency? “He rules,” says Haman, in the language of the Bible, “in the midst of his enemies.” Such contingencies must be regarded as the abortions of nature, by which her grand and silent march is never for a moment disturbed, nay, which—says a great theologian—prove the existence of a Providence *more* than the regularities of nature, as they prove that even the irregularity might become the rule.

In the construction of the Biblical Canon we perceive something similar. Some writings of the Apostles have been lost (1 Cor. v. 9.); spurious epistles were, even during their lives, ascribed to them (2 Thess. ii. 2.); writings, not spurious indeed, yet not the composition of the Apostles, are found in our Canon; others, again, as those acknowledged by us, have been regarded as canonical,—and still, who would affirm that the Canon of the New Testament, as it lies at present before us, does not supply a *certa regula fidei et vitæ Christianæ*?

That the writings of the men whom the Lord immediately selected to continue his work were worthy of a place in the Canon will be at once acknowledged. These the primitive Church specially adopted. She did not, however, limit herself to them, but received, likewise, some works written by *disciples* of the Apostles, as the Gospels of Luke and Mark, and the Acts of the Apostles. Whether James and Jude, from whom came our New Testament Epistles, belonged to the number of the Apostles, is, at least, a matter of dispute. Origen and Clement cite the writings of the pretended Hermas and Barnabas as canonical; the Epistle of Clement of Rome was read in most of the Christian Churches, like the sacred writings (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iv. 23.), and is found in one of the most ancient MSS., the Cod. Alex., along with the Biblical books. The Epistle to the Hebrews, too, is probably not the production of an Apostle. Now, what principles guided the Church in her reception of these writings into the Canon? It is agreed that there were no known rules on this subject. A sure historico-religious tact, of which they were unconscious, led the first Christians to admit, along with the Apostolic writings, those works, the authors of which had been placed in the closest connection with the Apostles, and, whose spirit is purely Christian; and this tact, whereby that Providence spoke which built up the Christian communities, has approved itself most remarkably in the fact, that not one of the many impure, apocryphal gospels, nay,

not even the *Ποιμὴν* of Hermas (impure, also, in spirit, and yet so highly prized by some individuals), nor yet the Epistle of Barnabas, was received into the Canon: on the other hand, the Epistle of Clement, enjoying a wider circle of readers, approaches in spirit the nearest to the Pauline Epistles, and must be considered unworthy of a place in the New Testament Canon only on account of its want of originality. The correctness of this tact, in the primitive Church, is evinced, also, beyond a doubt, in respect of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Let us suppose the case—that, instead of the Epistle before us, that preserved under the name of Barnabas had been admitted into the Canon. What a stain would it have been upon our collection of New Testament writings! Who could have read it without a smile at the dullness and narrow-mindedness of the author? and yet—let it not be forgotten—there was *no known rule* which made this be rejected and that retained; for the Epistle of Barnabas, so far as we can trace it in history, was ascribed to that distinguished fellow-labourer of the Apostles, and, therefore, in that respect, equal to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and highly valued by some Fathers of the Church who were deficient in the purer Christian spirit. If the Epistle to the Hebrews be the work of Apollos, a place, by that circumstance, is, on the historical side, secured to it in the Canon; and he that enters into its genius will join in the testimony borne to it by De Wette (see his *Einleit. ins. N. T. s.* 291.), and place it, in point of matter and spirit, on a level with the most admired productions of the apostolic literature.

We come now to the more difficult question, what normative importance we are to attach to the Epistle, if it must be referred, not to an Apostle, but, to the companion of an Apostle? Even the ancient Church supposed a less degree of authority in the disciples of the Apostles, founded upon a smaller measure of participation in the Divine Spirit. The manner in which Tertullian adduces the evidence of our Epistle, as an appendix to that drawn from the other New Testament writ-

ings, strikingly and instructively illustrates this subject (see p. 18.). It appears that a gradation of the operations of the Divine Spirit was supposed, similar to that which Origen supposes between the immediate declaration of God in "The Lord saith," and the mediate Divine doctrines (Comp. the remarkable passage *In Joan. tom iv. p. 5.*), or, as the Rabbins supposed in the Old Testament, when they ascribed to the נְבִיאִים

a smaller measure of the spirit than to Moses, and to the פְּתוּרִים an inferiority to the נְבִיאִים. Some principle must have been applied to those New Testament writings, of which the spirit was Christian, but the author doubtful, or unknown, similar to that which served as a guide in regard to the acknowledged writings of the disciples of the Apostles; the former having in their favour the presumption that, at least, they were composed by men in close correspondence with the Apostles. And thus it happened that the Antilegomena were regarded as a subordinate class of the New Testament writings, were seldomer read to the people, and quoted less frequently to establish Christian doctrine. In this way, also, arose a distinction of the New Testament Scriptures, like that obtaining among the books of the Old, between the Canonical, in the stricter sense, and the Apocryphal. Jerome employs this latter title in speaking of the Antilegomena, and characterises them as those *quæ ecclesia legit ad ædificationem plebis*, but does not employ *ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam*. This very division has been adopted by the Lutheran Church, which distinguishes the *libri proto-canonici* of the New Testament from the *deutero-canonici*, as the Roman Church does with respect to the scriptures of the Old Testament. The critico-historical love of truth in the Protestant Church endeavoured to introduce this distinction even to the knowledge of the laity. Those books which Luther had distinguished from "the right, certain, main books," as he calls them, the five Antilegomena, which

Eusebius reckoned, along with the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, of which Luther had called in question the apostolic origin, were, as we have remarked, p. 57. note, even in point of position, in the collection, separated from those main books. Hence the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, the book of Jude, and the Apocalypse, went together, and were placed after those certain books; in the older editions of the Bible, the first twenty-three books, only, are marked with a continuous number, while the remaining four follow undistinguished. This marked division of the New Testament continued to be general in the Luthern Church so late as the seventeenth century. But, as in other respects, after the middle of that century, the critico-historical avidity for truth which distinguished the Reformers lost its energy, so that, for instance, the doubt of the Pauline composition ceased henceforward to be heard, so this critical division of the Canon, too, disappeared.

Now, if a degree of authority is to be allowed to the compositions of the disciples of the Apostles inferior to that ascribed to those of the Apostles themselves, there arises the question, what is the difference in degree of illumination in both, and what, consequently, in their normative authority? We cannot, on this subject, refer to the manner in which it has been handled in any approved books of dogmatics; nay, the very questions to which we are led by our Epistle, have not even been discussed in treatises on the inspiration of the Apostles; and we, therefore, find ourselves compelled to attempt a dogmatical deduction, at least by way of indicating the path to be followed.

A radical investigation of this subject must proceed upon a definition of the manner in which the knowledge of truth existed in Christ himself. The dogmatics of Schleiermacher connect this question in a peculiar manner with the doctrine of the sinlessness of Christ. But, from the sinlessness of the Redeemer we can conclude to nothing more, in the first place, than a normal condition of a feeling of piety, leaving it still

uncertain by what extent of knowledge that feeling was accompanied. A strong and clear self-consciousness must, at any rate, be supposed in Him, as, otherwise, He would have been deficient in that clear expression of His pious emotions which is so requisite in a teacher. This, however, is not enough. Assuming this opinion, assuming that He could with facility express what He felt in adequate images and representations, still a twofold deficiency would always meet us: in the first place, this religious knowledge would refer only to the relation between God and man, and to no other element of faith; in the second place, it would be merely the knowledge of His own states of feeling, not that of objective truth. Ullmann, in his work on the Sinlessness of Christ, has omitted the consideration of this side of the inquiry; Schweizer, in his treatise "On the Dignity of the Founder of our Religion," claims for Christ the consciousness of His states of feeling, of the manner in which "He was affected (Ger. sein Afficirtseyn) by God," but thinks that a scientific, objective knowledge cannot be admitted to have been present in Him (Stud-u. Krit. 1834. s. 841. et seq.). Elwert, proceeding upon the views held by the school of Schleiermacher, consistently makes the possession of religious truth in the Apostles dependent upon the measure of their sinlessness (in the instructive treatise on Inspiration in Klaiber's Studien des evangel. Geistlichkeit Württembergs B. 2. H. 3.; against him is Steudel, in the treatise on the Inspiration of the Apostles, and the subjects connected with it, in the Tübinger theologischen Zeitschrift 1832, H. 2. u. 3.); while Twesten, in whom the views of Schleiermacher disappeared before the supranatural interest, proves the infallible inspiration of the Apostles from their destination for the Church.

The inquiry into the manner in which the perception of truth existed in Christ, has its proper place in the doctrinal discussion respecting the person of Christ, and the *status exinanitionis*. The doctrine of the incarnation of the λόγος is, in substance, that the self-

consciousness of the man Jesus, forming a continuity with that of the *λόγος*, was conscious also, of the infinitude of the actuality of the *λόγος*. But, regarded as a separated human existence, He had, at the same time, those bounds assigned to Him which are necessarily supposed in the individual man. To this point are to be referred progress in the different stages of life, with the gradations in development, the distinction of national peculiarity, of sex, of calling. Without these distinctions, the individual ceases to be discriminated from other individuals, and to occupy a place in the organism of mankind. Now, the essential point of our inquiry is, the *particular calling*. Christ was called to be a religious subject, to reveal the absolute religion of mankind. To this end a religious life is required, that is, the absolute combination (*Zusammenschluss*) of the consciousness of self with the consciousness of God, and that combination, too, considered as energetical, so that this unity shall be realized in all the utterances of life. Again, to this belongs the absolute knowledge of religion. We understand, by this expression, moreover, not merely a knowledge of the emotions of the subject, but a perception of objective truth. And, with this calling is also supposed the retirement of other spiritual tendencies and powers. Had these, in an equal degree, appeared in energy, they must have revealed themselves as action, and thus the Redeemer must have acted creatively in the sphere of politics,—of the fine arts,—of science. Still, as every sphere of life becomes perfect when man stands in a right relation towards God, so, along with the influence of Christ upon the religious sphere, He had communicated to Him, *implicité*, an influence upon every other sphere, as is shewn by the result in His Church. But here arises another question: are not the other limits, necessarily supposed with the individuality, boundaries, at the same time, to the absolute revelation of religion? This we may not, however, affirm. The human mind, fully developed, has, speaking generally, no barriers, it can pass out beyond itself, and

be in every other. Hence we see the more highly gifted man has no insurmountable barrier in his national consciousness, he enters into the spirit of other tribes of men, and his own national consciousness becomes, in proportion as he is the more perfect, the more a form in which to fulfil his vocation in the definite place in which he stands. In the Jewish people, besides, we must consider, particularly, the character of their peculiar calling. The whole nation may be regarded as a religious individual, every thing in it had a religious purpose. And thus the *purified* Jewish nationality forms the basis for the special labours of the Redeemer in His calling.

But a still greater difficulty meets us from another quarter. Religious knowledge is only then absolute when it discerns its relation to other knowledge, and contemplates, in the light of truth, not merely the religious ideas, but also the history connected with these, *in so far as that history is the bearer of religious ideas*. Christ connects the new religion with the old, and makes manifold references to its history. It is clear that not every conceivable historical error would be of importance for religious knowledge, but, it is not less true that there are historical errors which would essentially alter religious knowledge; if, for instance, Christ, upon the ground of the testimony of history, had regarded the sacrifice of Isaac, the so-called theft (for such it was not, see Litt. Anz. 1832. N. 63. s. 502.) of the vessels from the Egyptians, and the extermination of the Canaanites, as the commands of God, and yet these things had not been such. Shall we say, then, that Christ had all the positive knowledge which can be acquired by *learning* alone,—that he obtained his knowledge in this way only, and that, consequently, it was conditioned by the limitations of his people,—of his time, and of his teachers? Or shall we say, that, in those cases in which the province of religious knowledge touched upon any other department we may not deny to Him an intuitive insight into that other knowledge also? The former view, offensive as it may

appear, loses its offensiveness, in part, when we add, that the religious sense perceived, in an immediate way, the genuine religious purport under all the historical forms, but, that the knowledge respecting the historical, particularly, appears as something indifferent. Let us elucidate the subject by an example. The inward sense might perceive, in the words of Genesis, which present to us the institution of marriage, the genuine idea of that connection, but, whether the case was such as history relates of Adam and Eve is the unessential part of the subject. So the inward sense might perceive that what is written in Isaiah lxi. 1. expresses the idea to realise which Christ was come; but, whether, in that passage, the prophet spoke in his own name, or that of the Messiah, is the unessential matter. Some, indeed, may conceive that Old Testament facts, such as those mentioned, have no purely religious contents at all, but are the fictions of impure passion. With *this* view of the Old Testament, the supposition of an absolute religious knowledge in Christ can be reconciled only by ascribing to Him also an intuitive insight into other knowledge. But, from other circumstances, also, we are led to suppose in the Redeemer such an intuitive insight into other provinces. If, namely, the idea of an absolute religious knowledge equally demands a formal as a material perfection; if the conception of Redeemer imply that the members of His Church, in religious perception, are not capable of rising above the Head of it, there follows the conclusion to such an insight in Christ into the positive knowledge connected with religion as would make Him free from error. Were it otherwise, the scientific and more profound theologian of our own days would be constrained to regard the religious knowledge of the Redeemer as but an initial step. Let us form a clear conception of certain individual cases, and it will appear evident, besides, that the mere contemplation of religious ideas, without their concrete shape, must have brought with it, at least, a more obscure expression of these ideas themselves. Could Christ have been distinctly conscious res-

pecting eschatology,—could his consciousness have gone beyond a mere *conjecture* (Ger. *Ahnung*), if he had not had an intuition into all concrete relations? To the question, in what mode a historical knowledge, going beyond what historically surrounded Him, is possible?—the answer lies in the theory of prophetism. The prophets have foretold, not only general, but, also, single concrete events. It can be proved incontestably, that Christ, with absolute certainty, foretold events, which, irrespective of prophetic intuition, could have been announced only in the form of a threat, in the category of possibility and probability. An extreme scepticism has wished to render doubtful even such data as the prediction of the denial of Peter. Be it so. We will take a section of the discourses of Jesus, the authenticity of which even the very extremest scepticism has never impugned. That the parables of Jesus, in Matth. **xxi.** **xxii.**, are really declarations of Christ is admitted even by de Wette, and, in these, it is declared by Christ, in the plainest words, at a time when not a single heathen had been converted, that the *kingdom of God should be, in an especial manner, established in the heathen world.* “*Therefore say I unto you,*” so runs the passage, Matth. **xxi.** **43.**, “*The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.*” With the same undoubting distinctness, many declarations are uttered, and have never been contested, respecting the approaching destruction of the city, and the impending catastrophe of Israel. Matth. **xxii.** **7.** Luke **xix.** **42.**, et seq. Shall we suppose the intuition which brought future events before the eye of the Redeemer unable to clear up events that were past,—to open up the invisible world to His view?

Let us add to this, that the totality of the impression of Christ's personality, as well as many declarations of His regarding His knowledge, admit only such an idea of Him as obliges us to assume, that the future could bring no increment to His religious insight. On this subject, the first Gospels and John

agree, John iii. 11—13. Matth. xi. 27. We will mention another circumstance, which, although worthy of a full discussion, has not, as we believe, hitherto, received one. It might be shewn, that the manner in which Christ partly employs Old Testament declarations, partly applies current Jewish formulæ, in an ideal sense, indicates a mode of apprehending the religion of His nation altogether beyond the narrow views commonly taken by the Jews. Could Christ make the declaration, John i. 51., "Verily, verily, I say unto you, hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man;"—could He, we say, make this declaration, if he had not had a more ideal notion of the angels than that current in the Jewish theology? The same thing holds good with regard to the expressions, "*sitting on the throne of God,*" "*coming in the clouds,*" in the words of Matth. xxvi. 64., "*From this time shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.*" We draw the same conclusion from the declaration of our Lord, Luke xx. 37, 38., which it has been usual, indeed, to cite in a quite contrary way, as a proof of the dependence of Christ upon the Rabbinical exegesis. What is the point of Christ's proof? Is it not this, that when God places himself in so close a relation to any man as to call himself "*the God of that man,*" there is conveyed in the very words, the eternity of such a man! Certain highly intellectual philosophers have recently pointed out the correlative nature of faith in God and in immortality, and we shall not do wrong if we assume, that the Redeemer, in that declaration, intended to convey an equivalent notion. It is important that a great number of His declarations should be weighed with a distinct reference to this question. From an inquiry of this kind, we have come to the conclusion, that, in the declarations of our Lord, an accommodation, in form, may be proved to a much greater extent than is commonly supposed, a conclusion which has strengthened our conviction that, with

respect, also, to religious knowledge not immediate, we must not conceive Christ as in any way dependent on the degree of culture by which He was surrounded.

A distinction between the religious knowledge of the *Apostles* and that of our Lord, not merely in degree, but, *in specie*, is proved by the single declaration of Paul, 1 Cor. xiii. 12., "For now we see through a glass in a dark word; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known." Is it conceivable, that he who says, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him," Matth. xi. 27., that he who says, "Every man, therefore, that hath heard and hath learned of the Father (through the voice of God revealing itself in every man), cometh unto me; not that any man hath seen the Father, save he who is of God, he hath seen the Father," John vi. 45, 46,—is it conceivable that this person could make the declaration of Paul his own? That of Paul confesses, with a twofold reference, the imperfection of the Apostolic religious insight. The Apostle knows only *in part*: his insight, therefore, is imperfect, in respect of *extension*; he sees the truth only in an enigma: his knowledge, in respect of *intensity*, is imperfect. The imperfection, considered *extensivé*, is pronounced in the vii. chap. of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. There we learn that he had an undoubting insight only on certain points, but that, on other points again, he possessed a tolerably assured opinion, yet not so assured as to warrant him in founding upon it *laws* for the community. The imperfection, considered *intensivé*, would especially appear from the dependent relation in which the Apostolic doctrinal type stands to the individuality of the Apostle. Biblical theology admits that Paul, John, and James, follow a different *τρόπος παιδείας*, that there is in their doctrine a one-sidedness of apprehension, modified by their individuality, that their doctrinal

forms reciprocally supply one another. In Christ, on the contrary, we have that higher unity, in which are found the germs of their specializations. We recognise, again, the deficiency of formal perfection in the Apostolic religious knowledge, in the relative incapacity to rise to a thoroughly clear consciousness of the purport of the symbolic doctrinal form. When Christ says, He is come to give His life as a ransom for many, when He speaks of the feast of joy which the good are to enjoy with the Patriarchs, of the fire which is never quenched, and the worm which never dies, we conceive, that, in His consciousness, the scope of the thoughts, and the nature of the image, were clearly distinguished. When, on the contrary, Paul speaks of Christ as the propitiation for sinners, of the glorified Son of God at the right hand of the Father, of the evil spirits in the air, &c., the purport of the thoughts was so mingled with these images in his consciousness that he possessed that purport only *in* the images, or would have been unable, at least with certainty, to separate it from its figurative meaning. Finally, we find this deficiency of formal perfection, in the dependence of the Apostles upon the state of culture of the world by which they were surrounded, so that the measure of their historical, physical, astronomical insight, does not go beyond that state. As we intend making a special application of these two latter propositions to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we will enter a little more into detail. But, as we have to do with the writing of a coadjutor of the Apostles, we must previously enter upon the question, what relation the authority, and the nature of the religious knowledge, of these Apostolic *coadjutors* stood to that of the Apostles themselves.

The first question to be answered, is, whether we are bound to make a distinction *in specie*, or one in degree only, between the communication of the Divine Spirit to the Apostles, and that to the rest of the Christian world? This very important question has not been satisfactorily treated in recent times, and we

ourselves confess to have encountered no little difficulty in the elucidation of that relation. As we cannot go into detail in this place, we will only remark, that, although such men as Barnabas, and Timothy, appear acting along with the Apostles, although the promises of the communication of the Spirit, in John, nay, even the promises of the power of working miracles, cannot be limited to the twelve, nor, Paul being reckoned in the number, to the thirteen (1 Cor. xii. 9, 10. Mark xvi. 18. (in case this section is genuine), Acts viii. 6., yet it appears, as well from the Apostolic Epistles as from the testimony of the most remote ecclesiastical antiquity, that a specific authority belonged to the Apostles, superior to that of their coadjutors, and all other Christians. In the Apostolic decree, Acts xv. 22., the Apostles are not placed upon an equality with, but before, the Presbyters, while the latter, along with the community, are regarded as a whole. This, however, would carry us no further than to *primi inter pares*. But the case is different with the declaration in Heb. ii. 3., and Jude v 17. According to these passages, the *Apostles* appear as absolute authority; and Paul appears with an authority specifically different from that of Timothy—although it may be said, that this is modified by the youth of Timothy, and his dependence upon Paul. Whenever the Apostle is conscious of speaking from revelation, he imposes upon the community an absolute obedience to his word, 2 Thess. iii. 6. Gal. i. 8. 1 Cor. xiv. 37.—What the doctrine of the Church was on this subject at the close of the *third* century is shewn by the well-known words of Tertullian: *Spiritum quidem Dei etiam fideles habent, sed non omnes fideles apostoli etc. Exhort. cast. c. 4.* Let us turn, however, to more early times. The Epistle of Barnabas begins with a declaration of its author, respecting his character as a teacher, such as Paul certainly would not have prefixed to his Epistles: *Ego autem non tamquam doctor, sed unus ex vobis, demonstrabo pauca, per quæ in plurimis lætiores sitis.* He speaks of the

Apostles, ch. v., as of an independent class, whose calling was to spread the Gospel throughout the world. The Epistle of Clement of Rome, and that of Polycarp, as well as that of Ignatius, leave a strong impression on the mind, that these disciples of the Apostles would have regarded as audacious any pretension to an equality in position with the Apostles. The closer relation of the Apostles to Christ is expressed by Clement in these words, c. 42: *οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν εὐαγγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἐξεπέμφθη ὁ Χριστὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἐγένοντο οὖν ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐντάκτως ἐκ θελήματος Θεοῦ.*^a Their higher prophetic gifts, and their right of ruling in the church he thus acknowledges, c. 44: *καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἕρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόβρωσι εἰληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους.*^b And Polycarp, the disciple of John, says, in c. iii. of his Epistle to the Philippians, *οὔτε γὰρ ἐγὼ, οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολληθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου.*^c These passages sufficiently prove that even the disciples, the nearest to the Apostles, regarded the Apostles as belonging to another, and a higher order than themselves.

These data compel us to suppose that no disciple of the Apostles, and, generally, none of the first teachers of Christianity, pretended to that independent authority with which we see a Paul appear, and that they rather founded the obligatory force of their own doctrine simply upon the proof which they gave of its agreement with that which was originally delivered.

* The Apostles have preached to us from our Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ from God. Christ therefore was sent by God, the Apostles by Christ; so both were orderly sent, according to the will of God—*Archbishop of Canterbury's version.*

^b So likewise our Apostles knew, by our Lord Jesus Christ, that there should contentions arise upon account (or about the name of the bishopric) of the ministry. And, therefore, having a perfect foreknowledge of this, they appointed persons, as we have before said. *Id.*

^c For neither can I, nor any other such as I am, come up to the wisdom of the blessed and renowned Paul. *Id.*

That the Spirit of God operated in them with greater power, and greater clearness, than in the Christians of a later period of the Church, may the more readily be granted, as the external agents must at that time have contributed so much more powerfully in awakening them, and as, indeed, miraculous powers shewed themselves in the communities, which are not to be found in after times. Still, we make this admission only in the general, for doubtless there existed just such a diversity in the individuals, according to their different positions, as we find in the later periods of the Christian Church. Now, we shall be obliged to admit a more or less disturbing influence in them, on the part of earlier education, in proportion to the measure of the Spirit which they received.

It may be wished, perhaps, that we should assign a more definite boundary to the extent of these statements. But, it is probably impossible to give a general and ready rule, which, like an electrometer, applicable in every instance, could be employed to determine with certainty the degree of inspiration in all cases. Two scientific societies, so recently as the beginning of the present century, proposed, as the subject of a prize, the inquiry: whether there be actually a gradation in the kingdoms of nature? and yet no rational man can doubt of the existence of such a gradation. But, when the Physico-theologians, down to the pious de Luc, endeavoured to shew palpably, in the external *habitus*, the modes in the Ontological series where the higher and lower steps pass into one another, they were justly ridiculed by Blumenbach. In nothing is nature more mysterious than in her *transitions*, just because her transitions are *commencements*. The titles of the chapters, in the book of nature, are not drawn up by God but by *man*. This observation is equally applicable in the province of dogmatics and in that of nature. In dogmatics, indeed, they have distinguished *gratia* into *præveniens*, *operans*, *cooperans*; but, where shall we find the dogmatic land-surveyor who will presume, upon every occasion, to fix the mere-stone, for the living individual, where the one of these ceases and the other

begins ? The case is similar with respect to the various degrees of inspiration, which may be fixed, as to their grand features ; but, they have transitions where one degree imperceptibly loses itself in another. And we conceive it to be no more a reproach to the dogmatist, that he cannot bring them under his division of chapters, than it is to the naturalist that he cannot classify the transitions in the kingdom of nature.

When the Rationalists of modern times conceived, that they might rise above the apostolic degree of knowledge, they did so upon the ground of the supposed discovery, that the doctrine of the Apostles, literally taken, led to contradictions, and to sensuous representations of religious truth incompatible with reason. Paul speaks of a sacrificial death of Christ ; but, in the blood of a man, even were he a God-man, there is inherent as little atoning power as in the blood of an animal ; he speaks of a resurrection of the body ; but the scattered bones can never again be brought together ; according to him the faithful shall judge the angels ; but, if they be good angels—and the word *ἄγγελοι*, without any adjective, can be referred only to such—what is there in them to be judged ? He speaks of spirits *ἐν τοῖς ἰπουρανίοις*, Eph. ii. 2. vi. 12., but, if by this epithet we are to understand the lower stratum of the atmosphere, then no spirits are to be found there, &c. And, besides, the 2 Epistle of Peter, ii. 4., in contradiction with Paul, says, that the wicked spirits are in Tartarus, and it is said, 1 Peter v. 8., that the devil goeth about *upon the earth*.

Now, in the first place, Rationalism should have had the courage to confess, that the same, or similar, stones of offence occur in the discourses of the Redeemer himself. It ought also to have been acknowledged, that the purport of the thoughts which lie at the foundation of such expressions may be true, although not in the sensuous form in which these thoughts appear in the utterance of them. And, finally, it must also be kept in mind, that the Apostles cannot have been altogether wanting in insight into the inadequacy of the form in which they presented their doctrine. In

proof of this may be adduced *their change of images respecting the same thing*; when, for instance, the Apostle in one passage calls Christ the *Paschal lamb*, in another the *Mercy-seat*, in a third the *Ransom*, in a fourth the *Mediator*. We appeal on this point to Luther also. That thoroughly concrete spirit, who speaks of divine truths in the most uncouth images of common life, and lets boldly out against your gentle refiners (who have first to filter the milk of the Divine word through their own coal-sack, that they may render it more pure), does not think it wrong to write of the evil spirits in the above mentioned passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians, "above us in the air, they are floating like the clouds over us, and they flutter and fly every where about us like *humble bees*," &c. (Walch's Ed. Part 12. p. 471.), to say of the serpent in Paradise, that, before the fall, it went upright "*like a cock*," and of Christ's descent into hell, that "He beat in the gates of hell with his victorious banner." He certainly gave no account to himself, generally, of the relation of image and thought in such discourses, but that he, notwithstanding, had, we will not say in all, but, in several of his expressions of this kind a consciousness of the inadequate relation of thought and image, is seen from the following remarkable passage in a sermon on the descent into Hell: "If the matter were who should be the cunningest, I could be as cunning as they who so mock us, and scornfully ask and mock, how then was it? Was the banner made of paper or cloth? How happened it that it was not burned in hell? what kind of gates, doors, and bars were there in hell,—were they of iron or wood? Now, were I to endeavour to fathom, to feign forth, and to heighten these promises without images, and as they are in themselves, I could not express them, nor couldst thou understand. On this account, the outward tokens, images, and comparisons are good and useful to paint forth the thing, to comprehend it, and to retain it. Nay they serve to keep off from us the devil with his fiery darts, who seeks to seduce us from the word with high and

subtle thoughts, and we are, through such clear and easy images, which every man, even the most simple, can well conceive, kept in the right understanding of the word."

In this respect, the study of the immortal work of Dante, *La Divina Commedia*, yields many instructive notions. Throughout the whole of that work there runs a grand symbolism, in the use of which the author was certainly unconscious, in many cases, of the relation between the thought and its garb, but in some cases he has expressed distinctly that the material, local, concrete representation was only a vehicle for the thought. In one passage, indeed, he expressly directs attention to the circumstance, that the local form which he had selected for the expression of the thought, is in contradiction with the local reality of the relation subsisting between them. According to his doctrine, the blessed are in *one* heaven, and participate in similar happiness in proportion as they have rendered themselves susceptible of the influence of the upper light; they may be compared to smaller and larger vessels, which, indeed, are all full, but, yet with different quantities. Now, as they behold the eternal light in various degrees, it is said of them (Paradise, Canto iv. 37—48.):

“ Here were they shewn thee, not that fate assigns
This for their sphere, but for a sign to thee
(Of that celestial furthest from the height.
Thus needs, that ye may apprehend, we speak :
Since from things sensible alone we learn
That which, digested rightly, after turns
To intellectual. For no other cause
The Scripture, condescending graciously
To your perception, hands and feet to God
Attributes, nor so means : and holy church
Doth represent with human countenance
Gabriel and Michäel, and him who made
Tobias whole.”

Cary's Transl. v 37—49.

In those forms borrowed from locality, such as Paradise, Third Heaven, Tartarus, &c., there is sha-

dowed out, as the poet says, a subject of thought which can be brought near to, and impressed upon the general consciousness only in such a concrete form.

We have still a few observations to make on the relation which existed, in the Apostles, between error in mundane things and religious truth. It has already been remarked, that the religious sense, even with a defective and erroneous insight into historical data, can attain correctness through the guidance of an inward tact. By *tact* we understand here, as we do in the province of the fine arts, *a rule reposing in the feelings, but not coming distinctly and consciously forward.* To this tact, guided by the Divine Spirit, is brought back what we call inspiration in the *historians* of the New Testament. That they are not always rigorously exact, is seen by comparing them together, but, *that* a want of historical rigour, in particulars, may exist with historical truth, upon the whole, and *how* it may exist, I have endeavoured to shew in my "Credibility" (Glaubwürdigkeit), Sect. V. p. 429, et seq. 2d ed., to which section I beg earnestly to direct the reader's attention. The matter is precisely the same with regard to their narrative of the Redeemer's *discourses*. These narratives differ, all of them,—sometimes that of every Evangelist compared with any of the rest—and yet it would be impossible to find, in any passage, a *contradiction* in the sense of the discourse. Do we not, in this, perceive a higher hand? We find a similar relation in the manner in which the Old Testament is approached by the Apostles. They do not always go back to the Hebrew text, but frequently to the LXX.; and they may have occasionally failed in a right perception of the historico-critical constitution of the books which they employed. But, whoever will carefully compare their citations from the Old Testament, will be astonished, with all this imperfection in the form, at the correct religious tact with which they have employed the Old Testament passages. We have attempted to shew this, with respect to one of the passages most frequently attacked (Gal. iii. 16.),

in the first Supplement. It must be clear to every unprejudiced mind, that the new Christian consciousness of those views and traditions, which had reached a Paul from the Jewish theology, must have formed a kind of crisis in him. That many traditions, interpretations, and opinions of the Jewish schools still cleaved to Paul, the want of a foundation for which we now clearly perceive, must certainly be admitted, and still when, as 1 Cor., chap. vii., shews, he makes so exact a discrimination between his own opinion, and what was made certainly known to him by revelation, it is evident, that his delivery of the Evangelical doctrine could not be disturbed by any impure admixture from that side. And, if it must be admitted generally, that there reigns in the writings of Paul, Peter, and John, a much nobler and more rational spirit than in those of the Rabbins, we may with every reason assume, that what these Apostles retained of their previous culture was only the nobler, or, at least, not the mean and foolish notions. This will appear, in the most obvious light, when we consider the gross Jewish errors which the Apostles believed before their conversion, and imagine to ourselves what impression must have been made on the Christian reader, had they, after their conversion, represented such opinions, in their doctrinal writings, as undoubted truth;—for instance, as appears to result from John ix. 2., they believed that a man might sin in his mother's womb, and, from Matth. xvii. 10., expected a personal return of Elias. The book called *Ain Jakub* contains the whole *Agaddin* (*Legends*), collected from the Talmud, what impression would they not have produced had they passed into the writings of a Paul? Some, it is true, have thought they were able to shew something of the same kind in the Apostle, namely, at 1 Cor. x. 4. But, the interpretation which charges him, upon the strength of that passage, with belief in the Jewish legend, that the rock of Moses accompanied the Israelites during the whole of their march, can be proved to be false. The Apostle, certainly, did not mean, by the “pro-

fane and old wives' fables." of which he speaks, 1 Tim. iv. 7., the wild tales of the Rabbins; yet such a mind as his, we think, could not, on the whole, have passed any other judgment upon them.

With the exception, perhaps, of the Revelation of St. John, there is no New Testament book whose doctrinal manner, if we are forgetful to distinguish between the form and the thoughts, which would lead to such crude and material views as the Epistle to the Hebrews. In that Epistle, God is represented as dwelling in a tabernacle in the most interior portion of the heavens, of which Moses' tabernacle of the Covenant was a copy, close by the Holy of Holies. Passing through the heavens, Christ enters into this portion with His own blood, and, to complete the atonement, presents it there before the face of God, Heb. viii. 2, 3.; ix. 11, 24. He is, generally speaking, appointed Priest at this tabernacle, viii. 4, 6.; vii. 24., and, specially, for the business of intercession, vii. 25. Even in that region, in *heaven*, a heavenly Jerusalem is placed, in which all the spirits made perfect are enthroned, xii. 22. Christ is represented as High-priest and as a sacrifice, obliged to bring His own blood before God, if the human race was to be reconciled. Some more recent expositors, altogether destitute of the power of contemplating the New Testament doctrinal form as a whole, and of insight into the general human relation of the thought to the representation of it, have not blushed actually to take the greater part of what our author brings forward, in unconscious symbolism, in the proper sense of the expressions. In this respect he has received from none of his commentators so rude a handling as from Böhme. In the remarks on xi. 10., we read, *Erat namque Judaeorum, gentis incredibili se suaque omnia superstitione amanti, opinio, Hierosolyma quaedam, qua sua urbe nihil putarent in rerum universo vel praestantius, vel divinius, in ipso coelo esse aedificata, nimirum ea pro sede patria olim in aeternum beatorum futura.* And upon this follows, *Neque sane non credendum fuerit, nostrum quoque*

gente Judæum eadem opinione fuisse quantumcunque præditum et imbutum. On viii. 2., it is said that it is a *laudabile figmentum* of the author when he *coelesti templo a lectoribus dudum, sed ita, ut careret pontifice suo, credito* places Jesus at the head as High-priest, who will continue there eternally to exercise His office. Nay, according to xii. 22, the author not only believed in a heavenly Jerusalem, but also in a Mount Zion in heaven. This commentator is fully supported by the work of Rûth, mentioned p. 75., comp., for instance, p. 71. of that work. Now, in the first place, we might inquire of these theologians, in order to come to an understanding on this subject, whether they expound the discourses of Christ according to the same hermeneutical principles, and extract from Luke xvi. 9., that Christ thought there were many mansions in heaven, from Luke xix. 17., et seq., that, according to the doctrine of Jesus, each individual of the blessed will reign over a multitude of cities, and from Matth. viii. 11., that He, also, agreeing with the Rabbinical doctrine, conceived eternal happiness to consist in a feast with the Patriarchs, and for this feast Leviathan to have been laid in salt? See Jarchi, in his Comm. on Gen. i. 21. The older Rationalism, which still preserves some respect for the person of Christ, and in the school of which the commentator Böhme himself was trained, will, no doubt, entertain some scruples on this point. We read, at least, p. 577., where the declaration of Christ, John viii. 56., is cited as a superstition, *Caeterum de Abrahamo similia afferentem FECIT ipsum Jesum* JOANNES. From this it would appear, that the declarations of our Lord are likewise to be interpreted according to this gross system of hermeneutics, but then to be laid to the account of the Evangelists. Very good, but how stands the matter with the Revelations of John? That book is surely a real magazine of gross Jewish representations, and from it, particularly, is proved the superstition of the Jewish Jerusalem, which is to descend upon earth in the time of the Messiah, (Rev. xxi. 2.); and in it, too, there is

very distinct mention, not only of a temple of God in heaven, but even of an ark of the covenant, (Rev. xi. 19). But, on the other hand, how does it agree with this representation, when, of that city of God, the very stones of which are reckoned up, it is said, chap. xxi. 22., "And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine on it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof." Are such passages not calculated to draw the attention of interpreters to the fact, that the human mind, and especially the Oriental popular mind, in order to express what exceeds its powers, takes refuge, from internal necessity in imagery, without, however, expecting the reality exactly in this concrete covering. The Persian religio-philosopher Mahmud. (*Cod. M.S. Berol.*), himself an Oriental, has expressed his views on this subject so clearly and beautifully, that we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of presenting them to the reader.

" This world, the region of the things of sense,
Is but the shadow of yon spiritual world,
From which it draws its nourishment and life:
Our thoughts are captive monarchs, who are chained
And fettered in the prison of our words.
For, when sometime the sage's heart doth feel
The stirrings of the Being Infinite,
He straightway is constrained to vail his views
To the low level of his intellect,
Which must supply such shadowy images
As picture things unending.
Thus, never is his portraiture complete;
And, that alone which truly profits man
Is knowledge of himself. *Would'st thou hunt down
Each image to its consequents, thou must
On this side much remove, on that supply.*"

If we now turn our particular attention to the point under discussion, we do not venture, certainly, to affirm, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews would have been able to develope the purport of the

thoughts, with security, out of the symbolical signs and images which he has employed. But, we think we may venture to affirm, distinctly, that he was not deficient in the knowledge of moving in the province of symbol, and, that a proof of this may be obtained from his own words. This may be done, in the first place, with regard to the doctrine of the Atonement, as, indeed, has been shewn in de Wette's treatise on the Sybolicism of the Epistle to the Hebrews. For, while from some passages of the Epistle we might conceive that the author placed the properly atoning element in the physical act of the shedding of blood, other passages shew, on the contrary, that he regarded the spotlessness of Christ, and the entire yielding of His will in the sacrifice of Himself, as the essential point, Heb. ix. 14. ; x. 9. ; and, it also clearly appears from this, that Christ unites in one person the character of Sacrifice and Priest. It scarcely requires to be proved, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews did not believe in a material, heavenly city, and a real Mount Zion in heaven. His intention, in the passage under discussion, is to contrast the more excellent Christian possessions, in salvation, with those of the Old Testament ; if among the latter was a mount of God, and a sensible city of God, surely a fancy of but very moderate liveliness might light upon the thought of a heavenly city of God, and a heavenly mount of God, without the assistance of the tradition of the Rabbinical schools. And, in this contrast, those expressions will denote certainly nothing more than the perfected priestly living-together of the redeemed. Do not the same images of a heavenly Jerusalem prevail in our own spiritual lyric poetry, and through that poetry in the fancy of the Christian ? And yet it may boldly be asserted that, even among the most uncultivated members of the Church—supposing them to be truly pious—not one will be found who believes in a real, heavenly city. Other counter arguments will be found in the Commentary on xii. 22. The question may appear more doubtful as respects what the author says of the hea-

venly temple. It is said, viii. 5., that the earthly tabernacle of testimony was only the copy of a heavenly original; and it is not to be doubted, that our author considered heaven as the seat of God, and that, consequently, the entering of Christ into heaven has a pretty distinct local signification. But we must direct attention to the circumstance, that this very representation itself, according to which God is placed in heaven, can be proved to be only of a symbolical character. Comp. on this subject the Comm. on ii. 5., and on the Sermon on the Mount, Biblical Cabinet, Vol. XX. And, God having been conceived as indubitably spiritual and omnipresent, does it not follow, that the representation mentioned of the appearance of Christ before God must partake of the symbolical character? Nay, the symbol of the heaven itself proved insufficient for the loftiness of the idea. What was spiritually most exalted was transferred to the place which was, in respect of space, higher than heaven itself; just as our poetry, at one time, speaks of God as enthroned in heaven, at another, as *above* all heavens. Thus it is said, ix. 8., that the temple division of the holy place had quite disappeared in the Christian economy, and, that only a Holy of Holies remained, which, according to ix. 11., lies *beyond* the perfect tabernacle not made of the material of this world, so that Christ must pass *through* the heavens in order to reach it, as it is also said, iv. 14., with which vii. 26. agrees, that He is become higher than the heavens. Paul makes use of the same idea, to represent, in the most surpassing terms, the exaltation of the Saviour above all earthly bounds, when he says of him, Eph. iv. 10., that he ascended up *far above all heavens*, in order to fill all things. The manner in which these representations mutually exclude one another (which is always a proof that the writer is moving in the regions of imagery, since it is of the nature of the image to give a one-sided expression of the thought), we find, also, in respect of the functions which Christ is to perform as high-priest of the heavenly sanctuary. It is said, that

He offers His blood, and presents it before God, and that He makes intercession; but, in the same chapter, it is said at the very outset, what also the commencement of the Epistle declares, that this high-priest sits on the right hand of the throne of glory, in heaven, viii. 13. With the same reason for which the literal conception of the one representation is insisted on, we should be obliged to hold fast, likewise, the literal sense of the other. The sitting on the throne and ruling, taken in their proper sense, destroy the priestly functions, also taken in their proper sense.

CHAPTER VII.

THE EXPOSITORS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The Epistle to the Hebrews has been more commented upon in single treatises than any other Epistle of the New Testament. It is not our intention, at present, to give a complete account of the exegetical literature respecting it, but to mention only those productions which we deem most worthy of notice.

Of the Fathers of the Church, and collectors of *Catenae*, we have, 1. Chrysostom, whose homilies are to be found in the 11th vol. of Montfaucon's edition. The homilies of this Father, having been taken down by various tachygraphers, contain a great number of various readings, and also some obscure passages, Comp. particularly, the homilies on Matth., and on the Acts of the Apostles. The same remark holds good with respect to those on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Some manuscripts have many more than others; in several passages there are found contradictions, or a want of connection. See, in the Comm., the remark on Hebrews iv. 2. In respect of our Epistle, this is explained by the fact, that we possess these homilies only in an edition of the presbyter Constantinus,—according to Savilius and Tillemont, of that friend of the Bishop, the

presbyter Constantius, who repaired to him at Cucusus, and frequently corresponded with him—and that this edition, as we are told by the superscription itself, was formed *μετὰ τὴν κοίμησιν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ σημείων*, that is, from tachygraphical *notæ* or *sigla*. Notwithstanding these imperfections, this work, in point of matter, is not to be compared with the homilies on the Acts. Although Erasmus ventured to say of the latter: *nihil unquam legi indoctius*, EBRIUS AC STERTENS SCRIBEREM MELIORA, yet, in the commentary on our Epistle we find the usual exegetical excellencies of this Father. 2.) Theodoret. Even if the praise be just which has been bestowed by *Sixtus Senensis* on this expositor: *quantum fieri potest succincte, eleganter, ordinate et pie sensus Pauli explicantur, et sententiæ sententiis, quod in Paulo videtur difficillimum, miro artificio conjunguntur*, and which has been repeated, especially by the school of Ernesti, still we must regard Chrysostom as of more importance to the expositor of the New Testament Epistles than Theodoret, as he has certainly entered more profoundly into the sense of single passages. Theodoret's knowledge of languages, too, has not preserved him from errors in that respect, as in the explanation of Heb. ii. 16. The *Commentatio* of J. F. Ch. Richter, *De Theodoro epist. Paul. interprete*, Lips. 1822., we could have wished a little more profound. 3.) The *Catena*e of Theophylact and Œcumenius. The reason why the expositors of the New Testament, and, particularly those of the Epistles, employ, and much more frequently make extracts from the former than the latter, we must seek in the less extensive circulation of the works of Œcumenius; for, in copiousness, and in apt grammatical observations, the commentaries of Œcumenius, frequently used by Erasmus under the name of *Scholia Græca*, surpass those of Theophylact. This superiority is owing to the circumstance (whether the merit of this must be ascribed to the first collector, or to the later copyists), that they contain fragments and notes of many distinguished expositors, of

Origen, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Photius, &c. Hence no one will hesitate to subscribe to the opinion of Augustine, in p. 30. of the dissertation cited in the note^a : *Caeterum quisquis sit hujus catenæ confector, id candide profiteor, nihil præclarior a scriptoribus græcis in N.T. conscriptum extare præsertim in genere interpretationis grammatico.*

Of the Roman-Church the writers most worthy of attention are, 1.) Erasmus, in the *Adnotationes* (first published in 1516.), in the *Opp. ed. Lugd. B.T. VI.* and his *Paraphrasis* (1522.), in the *Opp. T. VII.* The first, which are also found in the *Crivici Sacri*, furnish much new matter for criticism, and grammatico-historical interpretation (which has been more fully expanded by succeeding writers), as well as valuable notices for the history of *patristic* exposition. The paraphrase is, at the same time, a commentary—as he says, *paraphrasis commentarii genus est*—and he has proposed to himself to approximate the *thoughts* of the Apostle to our manner of thinking, something of the same nature, though in a different way, as, in recent times, has been done by Stolz or Dr. Paulus. Melancthon considers these paraphrases so excellent, *ut sine pudore alias moliri non posset* (Hottinger *Hist. Eccl.* vi. p. 37.). With this eulogium we must agree so far as respects the elegance and perspicuity of his language, and the view of the connection of the thoughts in single passages, which is frequently very happy; but he has neither caught the leading ideas in

^a The critical character of the Scholia of Œcumenius has never been clearly displayed. Fronto Ducæus doubted that Œcumenius was the author of them. Augustine, also, in the Dissertation, *De catenis patrum græcis*, represents the authorship as doubtful. The latter is likewise of opinion that the explanations of Photius, in particular, have been added by a later hand. Still the authorship of Œcumenius might be very well defended, namely, from the writer's appeal to his *ἐπισημώσεις* in *Octateuchum*, in the Remark on Heb. ix. 1. : *εἰς τὴν ἐπισημωσάντων εἰς τὴν Ὀκτάτευχον συντάξας οὐδὲν ἄλλο.*

the Apostolic writings, nor the coherence of them on a grand scale, or as a whole. For this object the man who could pray: *sancte Socrates, ora pro nobis* was deficient in insight into the fundamental truths of Christianity. The reproach of Luther, in allusion to this (*Erasmi paraphrases PARAPHRONESES*), was well applied to him. The beautiful edition of them which last appeared by Augustine, 1778, 3 vol., contains also a history, by Nosselt, of the paraphrases of Erasmus. 2d. Zegerus, *Scholia in N. T. libros*, 1553., likewise comprised in the *Critici sacri*; this writer is a bigot to his creed, and without very extensive learning; yet in difficult passages he has commonly a definite opinion, and frequently refers to the *patres*. 3d. Benedict Justinianus, *Explanationes in omnes Pauli epp. Lugd.*, 1612. The merits of this commentary no one, with the exception of Richard Simon, *Hist. des comm. de N. T. c. 42.*, appears to have duly estimated. The writer's acquaintance with the Fathers induced me to make frequent use of his commentary while composing my own upon the Romans; but, in writing the present work I have not had access to his. 4th. Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentaria in omnes Pauli epp. Antw.*, 1614. The exegetical works of this Jesuit must be mentioned, not so much on account of their intrinsic merits as of the great importance they have acquired in the Roman Church. Of this commentary on the Epistles alone, there appeared—besides seven editions of the *Opera*—from 1614 till 1683—no less than *fourteen* editions, and hence the extensive circulation of the work. We shall not regard as partial the observations of Gisb. Voetius, in the *Bibl. stud. theol. l. 2. c. iv. : in pluribus locis difficilibus jejunus est, imo magis mutus quam piscis, in philologicis hospes est, in moralibus postillicas quisquillas obtrudit etc.*, when we consider that his fellow-believer Guy Patin, in the *Patiniani*, p. 60, pronounces this opinion of it: “le commentaire sur les épîtres est passable, le reste est peu de chose.” 5th. Calmet, *Commentaire littéral sur l'écriture sainte*, Paris 1707—1716. in 23 vol. 4to., afterwards 1724—

26., in 8 vol. fol. The work of this learned Benedictine remains still the chief exegetical work in the Roman Catholic Church. It merits this distinction, however, more as respects the Old Testament than the New, and, generally, more on account of its antiquarian dissertations. The writer has not entered very profoundly into the difficulties of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 6th. Klee, Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Mayence, 1833. Acknowledging, as we do, the estimable disposition of the author, we regret the necessity which compels us to avow, that this exegetical work in no respect satisfies the demands of learning, and has not advanced, on any single point, our understanding of the Epistle, not even in those cases where we should most naturally have expected it, namely, in the dogmatical questions.

Among the numerous expositions of the Evangelical Church we shall first mention the performances of the reformed Theologians, down to the beginning of the eighteenth century. Here, as elsewhere, Calvin and Beza are distinguished, the former for his knowledge of things, the latter for his knowledge of words. The estimable Piscator, too, who frequently expresses peculiar ideas on the Epistle to the Hebrews, is inclined to follow these commentators. Zwingle's short and unimportant *Annotationes* have been mentioned p. 56, note. The same may be said of the *Explann. ad Ep. ad Ebr.*, 1734., by Oecolampadius. The learned Pellicanus, *Comm. in omnes apostt. epp.*, 1539., is something more original. These heads of the Church were joined, at the beginning, and about the middle, of the seventeenth century, by those ornaments of the Dutch Academies Leyden and Franeker, and of that noble nursery of genuine Theology in France, Saumur,—which, alas ! fell too soon before the storms of persecution,—Drusius, Louis de Dieu, Dan. Heinsius, Cameron. and the two Cappells. Heinsius, in his *Exercitationes sacrae*, 1639, is generally at least, *new*, if not correct; comp., for example, Hebr. iv. 12. vii. 8. ii. 16. iii. 1.; Drusius, in his *Animadv.* draws his illustrations particularly from

the Old Testament and the Rabbins ; De Dieu, in his *Critica sacra*, gives valuable critical remarks with reference to the Oriental translations ; of the Cappells, the elder J. Cappell (a younger, and also celebrated J. Cappell, was the son of Louis Cappell), Professor in Sedan, published copious and well considered *Observv. in Ep. ad Ebr.* 1624., his brother, the renowned Louis Cappell, added *Spicilegium nott. in N. T.*, 1632, to the remarks of Cameron, and published this with the *Observv.* of his brother on the New Testament, Amsterdam, 1657. But the most deserving of distinction is John Cameron, by birth a Scotchman (†1625 in France), whose *Annott. in N. T.* were first published by his friend Louis Cappell in 1628, the later editions are of 1632, 1677. Of him R. Simon, a Roman Catholic, gives this testimony : “ il est vrai qu'il traite quelquefois en théologien les matières de controverse, mais cela n'empêche pas qu'il n'ait éclairci doctement le sens littéral et grammatical d'un grand nombre de passages, etc.” Cameron unites dogmatical profundity to a solid knowledge of language (in his 25th year he spoke Greek and Latin with equal fluency), and a certain *acumen* which makes him in several passages depart from views hitherto adopted, and correct errors which had received the sanction of prescription. See on Heb. ii. 16. His work may serve as a beautiful specimen of the spirit which animated the Academy of Saumur. He has done much, especially for the Epistle to the Hebrews. All these, with the exception of De Dieu and Heinsius, have been adopted into the *Critici sacri*.—An interest in the Epistle to the Hebrews increased in Holland from the time that the school of Coccejus began to shew so great a predilection for the study of Typology. The commentary of Coccejus himself, which is found in the 5th vol. of his works, contains a great deal of good dogmatical discussion (Comp., for example, ii. 10), and is not extravagantly Typological. This characteristic is still more observable in those expositions of the Epistle, which, after the Dutch fashion, were given in sermons.

We will now bring together the whole of this class of writers, which reached even into the beginning of the eighteenth century. To it belong: Groenewegen (1693), Ackersloot (1697), Hoeke (1693), Caspar Streso (1661), Clement Streso (1714), Hulsius (1725), and others, for the greater part very diffuse and wearisome productions, of which the most important is Braun, *Commentar. in ep. ad Ebraeos*, 1705, and d'Outreïn, *Zendbrief van Paulus aan de Ebreëen ontleided, uitgebreed en verklaard*, 1711, German, 1713. 2 vol. 4to. The former is the production of a Theologian versed in Hebrew antiquities, the latter is more of a prolix, dogmatical cast. The English commentaries, with the exception of Hammond and Whitby, are in character similar to the Dutch works of this period. At their head, and still considered by English Theologians as a master-piece, stands Owen, "Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews," 1668. fol., which folio illustrates the *two first* chapters; the two following folios carry the Exposition to the tenth chapter. The work certainly gives evidence of the learning and theological insight of the truly pious author, but it entombs the reader under a mass of exercitations, disputations and porismata of every kind.—It is discouraging to see how the stream of genuine theological learning, which still flowed so copiously in the Reformed Church at the beginning of the seventeenth century, afterwards disappears in the sand in this as well as in the sister Church.—With regard to Hammond and Whitby, the former in his *Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the books of the New Testament*, 1653 (there were afterwards seven editions in English), has sought to establish all the crotchets of which the book is full at least in a learned way. Even in the Epistle to the Hebrews he is haunted by his Gnostics, *ex. gr.*, x. 26; still, like his whimsical rival Whitby, in his "Paraphrase," 1770., he occasionally makes a useful remark. It is strange that the more learned of the English Theologians of that period are so much given to indulge either in ortho-

dox or heretical *whims*; yet their works are now studied and republished in their own country as the only learned expositions of the New Testament!

The Lutheran Church, in which, more early than in the Reformed, the exegetical interest was swallowed up by the dogmatical and polemical, offers, during the whole of this period, few contributions to the exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews truly promotive of that object. Of the Reformers, we possess no expository work on this Epistle. Strigel, Camerarius, Brentius, Flacius, Hunnius, are of no importance. The expositors of most merit are John Gerhard, *Comm. super ep. ad Ebr.* 1641., Er. Schmid, *Notae in N. T.* 1658., Seb. Schmid, *Comm. in ep. ad Hebr.* 1690., Dorschens, *Comm. in ep. ad Ebr.* 1717., Calov, in the *Bibl. illustr.* Er. Schmid, a Professor of Philology, did, for his time, good service in the cause of expounding the language of the New Testament. Like Winer, he combats, among other things, the Hebraisms, and, when Beza declares *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις*, Heb. i. 1., a Hebraism, he proves the contrary, and cries: *ita saepe Hebraismum oportet esse velum ignorantiae graecismi.* The three last commentators, indeed, make the dogmatical prevail too much over the exegetical cause, but they are of real value in respect of dogmatical exposition, and, at least, do not wish to leave their dogmatical positions until they have carefully established them. How learned and acute, for example, is Calov's explanation of that difficult chapter, the ixth of our Epistle? This is in a much lower degree the case with the commentary of the Danish bishop, Erasmus Brochmann (*Comm. in ep. ad Ebr.* 1706.), who was celebrated in his time as a dogmatist.

Before we continue the History of the Exegesis of our Epistle down into more recent times, we must mention the works of the Socinians and Arminians. Of the former we have only the work of Schlichting, of which he himself says that Crell had an essential share in it. The main object with him is the justifi-

cation of the Socinian view of the priesthood of Christ; his knowledge of language and history is deficient; where he requires these, he willingly seeks support from Grotius, yet he endeavours, with some care, to investigate the connection of the text, and, upon the whole, has a sound judgment. To this class properly belongs the work (Paraphrase and Notes upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, Lond. 1755.) of Sykes, known by his Essay on Sacrifices. Although a member of the Anglican church, the author has brought out all the Socinian views. He has, indeed, gone farther than the Socinians themselves; for, while they acknowledge a mystical sense in the passages of the Old Testament, which are cited in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Sykes disputes this, and sees in those quotations either accommodation, or a purely arbitrary application. Among the Arminians we must place Grotius, Clericus, Limborch, Wetstein. On the first and last of these names nothing farther need be said; Wetstein's "Collections" cannot be dispensed with by the interpreter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In Clericus' remarks on Hammond's works, some, though not many, valuable discussions will be found. Nowhere, perhaps, shall we find that opinion, respecting the character of the citations from the Old Testament in the New, which is current in recent times, so early and so boldly pronounced. On Heb. vi. 1. he says: *allegorici Scriptores Judaeorum, eo tempore, innumera loca Messiae aptabant, non grammatica interpretatione freti, sed consuetudine quadam vetusta ita explicandae Scripturae . . . ea disceptandi cum Judaeis via eo libentius hic usus est auctor* (therefore only Accommodation?), *quod ex ea interpretatione nihil sequeretur, quod contrarium esset iis, quae de Christo vera esse noverat, imo vero posset, pro consuetudine Judaica, Melchisedeko Christum conferre. Alioqui si res in se introspeceretur, firmum et grammaticum argumentum contra alios ex ea historia nullum duci posset.* Limborch's *Comm. in Acta Apostol., ep. ad Rom. et ad Ebraeos*, 1711, has been very much used, still a

high value cannot be ascribed to it, for philological investigation is not his calling, and he shews no depth in dogmatical exposition.

When we enter upon the eighteenth century, we tread on a new soil, and find ourselves placed in other relations. The difference of creeds retires, the exegetical method in all the three Churches is nearly the same, but, as a distinction is still found, the classification must be made more according to nations than confessions. The main features of this diversity are the growth of the Philologico-antiquarian interest, and the retirement of the Dogmatico-polemical. Hence, the theologians who adhere more strictly to the doctrinal idea follow a method similar to that of Calvin, Piscator, and Camerarius; while those who gradually depart from it follow the Arminian Exegesis of Grotius, Episcopius, and Clericus. And the philologico-antiquarian cause strengthens in proportion as the belief in the *contents* of the Epistle declines, until, in the nineteenth century, the New Testament writings in general, and our Epistle in particular, are commented upon only as records of ancient views and opinions, in which the expositor finds little or nothing of his own convictions.

This period is ushered in by some English paraphrases, a form of exposition which was introduced into Germany and Holland from England. The paraphrase of the worthy Doddridge (1738), translated by Rambach, is written in a fine spirit, and contains many sound views: that of Pierce (1733) is learned, but is not free from forced interpretations. Michaelis translated it (1747) into Latin, and added to it illustrations, sometimes good, but sometimes, also, either superfluous or forced, which he retracted, for the greater part, in his own work, *Erklärung* (Paraphrase with notes) *des Briefes au die Hebräer*, 1762: for instance, the direct reference of the viii. Psalm to the Messiah, and the explication of Heb. ii. 6, according to this view. This work formed an epoch in the exposition of our Epistle; many received views were abandoned,

new, although frequently forced, or even false, expositions were introduced, for example, when he regards $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu}$ as an expression adopted from the mysteries, in the learned notes on ii. 10., $\delta\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\alpha$ as a betrothal, on iii. 1., and others. There are several good antiquarian observations introduced; comp., for instance, the learned remarks on the sacrifice of the covenant at ix. 20., and the aid brought to the interpretation from the Jewish theology, as at i. 5., the *Son* of God an official name, ii. 5., on the dominion of the angels upon earth, ii. 14. the Devil lord of death. A similar rank may be assigned to Zachariä's Paraphrastic exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 1771; and to the work of Blasche (*Systematischer Kommentar über den Brief an die Hebräer*, 1782), a work as lofty in pretension as it is humble in talent. The object of that work was the illustration of the doctrinal idea of the Epistle, but, its well meaning author was unequal to the task, as he was to many other objects which he proposed to himself. The commentary of the respectable theologian Cramer, 1757, 2 vol. 4to., stands, upon the whole, in respect of dogmatics, upon the same level; he defends the most orthodox views with zeal, but in a very forced manner. Comp. on i. 10. ii. 10. ii. 13, &c. Still his Introduction is highly valuable. Storr opened up a new path in the same dogmatic field, however, in his illustration of our Epistle, 1789. He had to combat the insinuations and notions of the more modern theology; and here and there he endeavours to act as a mediator, and in other places to help himself by far-fetched interpretations. This very Commentary contains some of his most forced exegesis; as when he, ix. 14., translates $\delta\iota\alpha\ \pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\omega\ \nu\iota\omicron\upsilon$: "by virtue of his glorious state" (in heaven), or when $\kappa\alpha\theta'\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\upsilon$, x. 11, must mean, "on every day of reconciliation," &c.

We come now to the performances of the Ernestian school. Ernesti's *Lectiones academicae in ep. ad Hebr.* were published by Dindorf in 1795, with remarks. How extremely feeble were the academical

lectures of the man who is regarded as the restorer of grammatico-historical interpretation, in the very point of grammatico-historical interpretation itself, could never have been believed, were not the proof presented by the work before us. That it may not be supposed we err through any prejudice against this celebrated scholar, let us hear Eichhorn's opinion (in *Allg. Bibl.* VII. S. 125.): "Although we have read a great portion of Ernesti's verbal explanation, yet we have *not* been struck by a *single* remark which merits distinction." But the additions of Dindorf are of great value. If we may judge from the *Acroases* published by Dindorf, the case is somewhat better in the lectures of Morus, the almost equally renowned pupil of Ernesti, whose translation of the Hebrews (3d Ed. 1786) received unbounded applause; Hezel, in a separate work, gave a criticism of it (1795), in which he likewise extolled it to the skies, and improved it by several "emendations," which are unworthy of the name.

These works bearing a resemblance both in spirit and form,—translation or paraphrase constituting their subject matter,—we have mentioned them in their order. But we must notice, in addition, among the labours of the Germans belonging to this period, Christoph. Wolf, in his *Curæ*, T. IV.; Bengel, in the *Gnomon*; the profoundly learned Bened. Carpzov, in his *Exercitt. in ep. ad Hebr. ex Philone*, 1750; and Christ. Schmid, in his *Observationes in ep. ad Hebr.*, 1760. Of Wolf's work the literary information is the most acceptable portion; Bengel's great acuteness finds copious nourishment in our Epistle; Carpzov,—still standing on the ground of the old Lutheran theology,—displays a learning and profundity in historical exposition which excites astonishment, and, until his time, had been found, *in this way*, only among the theologians of the Reformed Church. Christ. Schmid, a learned and pious Christian, is distinguished in that age of prolixity and flat dogmatizing, even above his Ernestian opponents, by a severe brevity, and by a strict adherence to grammatical interpretation.

Of the foreign productions of that period, we must notice Beausobre's *Remarques sur le N. T.* 1742.; but, particularly, the labours of the two Dutchmen, Abresch and Valckenaer. The former, a son of the renowned editor of Æschylus, published, from 1786—1790., three *specimina* of a *Paraphrasis et annotationum in ep. ad Hebr.*, to which there was added, in 1817, a fourth *specimen*, by his pupil Heringa, which brings down the work to the end of the seventh chapter. In these we find, so far as the language is concerned, the profundity and erudition of the Dutch, although the author cannot so far get the mastery of himself as not occasionally to offer violence to the language in favour of his own views. The theological point of view is that of the milder orthodoxy of Venema. We look with interest on the struggle of this truth-loving author, as he sometimes steers his little bark between the probable meaning which is not orthodox, and the orthodox which is not probable. The Scholia of the celebrated philologist Valckenaer, published by his pupil Wassenberg (Amsterdam, 1815, 2 vols.), must not be taken up with too high expectations; the Dutch philologists, who were obliged to deliver lectures on the New Testament, were compelled, in these, to make a very great descent. A few sheets from the lectures of the great Hemsterhusius on the New Testament, which I have had an opportunity of perusing, go little beyond what would be given in our gymnasial instruction. Valckenaer's Scholia, certainly, stand higher; yet in them there is much that is deficient in precision, and much that is trivial.

We commence the last period of the exegesis of our Epistle by Heinrich's continuation of Koppe, first edition, 1792, second edition, 1823. That form of exegesis for which Michaelis, Zachariä, Morus, &c., had paved the way, we find here perfected. The exposition gives up all connection with the tradition of the Church,—the older interpreters are, at the most, employed to contribute a linguistic or antiquarian notice,—the expositor stands with his conviction quite clear

of the author to be explained, and has, therefore, only to inform us what, in ancient times, was the *opinion* of the biblical authors. But he does this with negligence, and want of linguistic and logical precision, as well as of historical knowledge, and what results as the sense of the expounded writing is so meagre and wearisome, that it might be thought the last hour had struck for the New Testament itself, as well as its interpretation. We may find some excuse for this production in the fact, that its author composed it while yet a *repentant* at Göttingen. The work, nevertheless, on its appearance, was received with applause, and remained the most in vogue up to the period of the publication of Schulz's translation, Breslau, 1818. Although, in Schulz, the discord between what is considered truth by the expositor, and what was regarded as such by the author, comes still more prominently into view (see above pp. 37, 38, 39.), yet, from this time forward, exegesis gained in scientific energy. Strongly as we are opposed to his dogmatical views, we still cheerfully acknowledge that his work has done essential service to the linguistic interpretation of the Epistle. The translation is excellent, renders, with care, even the shades of thought, and, though a few of the explanations are violent (*e. g.* ii. 16.), the notes, upon the whole, contain useful remarks. Böhme first gave us a complete commentary: *Epistola ad Hebraeos, vertit et commentario instruxit, Böhme, Lips.* 1825. This learned work, it appears, has not met with the reception it deserves. With respect to the dogmatical exposition, indeed, it ranks even lower, perhaps, than the work of Schulz, for the commentator does not scruple to ascribe to the author of the Epistle such gross superstition (see above, p. 105.) that, if the case really were as he affirms it to be, we should certainly be obliged to advise that the Epistle should be no longer placed in the hands of Christians, to say nothing of taking it as the foundation of public religious discourse. On the other hand, there is a closeness in his discussion of the progress of the thought in general, and the con-

nection of the single sentences, a logical precision, and a grammatical strictness (see, for instance, vii. 1, 11, 13, 16, 28. ; viii. 5. ; ix. 2, 11, 12, 15. ; xi. 7, 8, 14. ; xii. 2, 22, 25., &c.) which, we may certainly venture to say, is found in no expositor previous to his time. The latest commentaries are those of Stuart, 1827 ; Kuinoel, 1831 ; and Klee, 1833. We have already (p. 114.) mentioned the last of these ; Stuart may be ranked somewhere with Storr ; and Kuinoel is a diligent collector ; but, neither his explanation of the language nor his conception of the thought can give satisfaction to the reader ;—one great defect of the work is the accumulation of a mass of materials, which, allowing it to be useful, belongs to the Lexicon.

In conclusion, we must mention two works, the author of which is independent of his age, Menken's Exposition of the xi. chap. of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in fourteen Homilies, Bremen, 1821 ; and, Homilies on the ix. and x. chap., with an Appendix of a few homilies on passages of the xii. chap., Bremen, 1831. Although we cannot coincide with many of the opinions peculiar to this author, still these works may be ranked among the best and most beautiful that we possess on this Epistle.

Since the publication of the first Edition of this Commentary, there has appeared the first volume of Bleek's Commentary (1836), which handles c. i.—iv. 13. The work belongs to that class of expository writings which embraces the whole mass of the exegetical apparatus, like Harless' Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, and my own Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. Yet some of the more important older aids have not been at the author's command, and the want of these may probably be sensibly felt, for example, in respect of the later editions of Beza, and the work of Abresch. The exposition is careful and impartial ; but there is a want of liveliness and compression in the style.

CHAPTER I.

THE EXALTED REDEEMER IS RAISED ABOVE THE ANGELS.

VER. 1—5. *The highest of all revelations has been vouchsafed to us, namely, that in the SON; who, now, having completed the work of redemption, sits enthroned on the right hand of God.*

Ver. 1. The Pauline Epistles, at the very outset, throw the reader into an appropriate frame of mind, by the announcement, that they are the production of a *divinely-called* Apostle. An announcement of this kind is wanting in our Epistle, in consequence of its oratorical character; the want is compensated, however, by the solemn language with which the topics are introduced. Even in this circumstance the rhetorical talent of the author is shewn; the expressions are poetical (πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, ἀπαύγασμα, δεξιὰ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης, see p. 35); the antitheses are striking; the period, notwithstanding its length, is well constructed; the two participial propositions in ver. 3. are beautifully proportioned to the main proposition with the *verb. fin.* Ver. 1. begins with a retrospect of the manner in which God had formerly revealed himself—viz., only through *prophets*, who made manifest but fragments of the truth, while, in the Son, *the Spirit is without measure*, John iii. 34. Πάλαι, as many suppose, refers to the fact, that, with the exception of the Baptist, no messenger of God had appeared for the period of four hundred years, but, more correctly, it forms an antithesis to ἐπ' ἰσχύατος τ. ἡμ.—*since primeval times.* Λαλεῖν, agreeably to Old Tes-

tament usage, like קָרַן , is employed particularly in speaking of Divine Revelations, ii. 2. ix. 19. xi. 18. xii. 25. Comp. ii. Peter i. 21. James v. 10. Acts iii. 24.— Πολυμερῶς κ. πολυτρόπως have, since the time of Theodoret, been referred, the former to the various *periods* or *measures*, the latter to the different *kinds* of revelation; but, more recently, they have been considered merely a rhetorical amplification, as which they are frequently found in orators, *e. g.* Maximus Tyrius, *Diss.* 7. § 2., and 7. § 7. Now πολυμερῶς does not directly express *times*, but corresponds to our *manifold*, and πολυτρόπως is used in the same way; but, as πολυτρόπως , like πολυειδῶς , may undoubtedly express *kinds*, there can be no objection, on this ground, against taking it in the more definite sense. The antithesis will then stand thus, “formerly the revelation was by degrees, and with manifold modifications, but now it is absolute.” If the author, however, had this sense in view in employing the two adverbs, it is remarkable that the minor proposition should want a ἀπλῶς or ἐφάπαξ .— Ἐν τ. προφ. is, by Beza, taken argumentatively: *Magna vis est Hebraismi, quo significatur Deum quasi prophetis ipsis in se disside et animum et linguam eorum afflatu quodam peculiari fuisse moderatum*; so also Carpzov, and even Alberti; others understand it: “in the books of the prophets.” It can be taken only in an *instrumental* sense. This use of ἐν , indeed, is less Grecian; still the Greeks also employ ἐν in an acceptation very nearly approaching the *instrumental* (Bernhardy, *Syntax.* p. 210. 212.), particularly the Grammarians, as Moeris, *ed. Koch*, p. 268.; so that this phrase cannot be called a Hebraism. In chap. ii. 3., we find λαλεῖν διά .—Respecting the formula $\text{ἐπ' ἑσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων}$, we must remark that this reading, as Bengel perceived, must be preferred to the *rec.* ἐπ' ἑσχάτων . The sense of both, however, is the same, comp. the singular, 2 Peter iii. 3., the plural, 1 Peter i. 20., for the plural is *neutrius generis*, which, moreover, can-

not here be distinguished by the accent, for the feminine would be written, not *ἰσχατῶν*, but, *ἰσχάτων*, Buttmann, *Ausführl. Gramm. I. s. 143*. Thus, in the LXX, there occurs *ἐπ' ἰσχατῶν τῆς ὀργῆς—τῆς βασιλείας*, also *ἐπ' ἰσχάτων*, without any addition, "at last," Dan. viii. 19, 23. Prov. xxv. 8. With the more strictly defining genitive *τῶν ἡμερῶν* or *τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων*, it is a translation of **בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים**. This phrase became subse-

quently the fixed designation of the time when the Messiah's kingdom was to begin, so that here the sense is: "on the confines of the former period, and of the new everlasting epoch—not *within* the latter, and also not *within* the former." More recent translators have failed in giving the meaning of the expression. Schulz rendered it, as the Vulgate and Luther had done before him, "last of all at this time." This, however, is quite incorrect. If the idea that the *speaking* had taken place *for the last time* was intended to be the prominent one, the phrase must have run thus: *ἰσχατον ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἐλάλησεν*. But De Wette, also, translates it incorrectly: "in these last days," as the *Italic* had previously done: *in novissimis diebus his*. Christ appeared at the end of the time, Heb. ix. 26., 1 Cor. x. 11.; He is then taken up into heaven until the fulfilment of the prophecies respecting the spread and fate of God's kingdom, Acts iii. 20, 21. Heb. x. 13. Comp. x. 25, 37., and will appear again the second time, when the *αἰὼν μέλλων*, which, as to *δύναμις*, exists already in the redeemed (Heb. vi. 5.), will pass into *ἐνέργεια*, Col. iii. 4. *Υἱός* is not merely the Logos in *abstr* but the individual Jesus, who was one with the Logos through continuity of self-consciousness. See, on the predicate Son, my Comm. on the Sermon on the Mount, *Biblical Cabinet*, Vol. VI.

Ver. 2. 3. The idea here contained is evolved in a similar manner in Col. i. 15—22. The former proposition glances first at the completion of the Redeemer's power, then at its commencement—the latter, enter-

ing more into detail, describes the way to that completion, with reference to its commencement. "Ὁν ἐθήκεν—ἐποίησιν. The idea expressed by κληρονόμος is that of an *absolute representative* of the Godhead. Christ enters into this state when the work of redemption shall have produced in man, subjectively, its full fruit, Acts ii. 34—36., Ps. ii. 8. ; in which latter passage, the expression, when used of the *Messiah*, might find support ; and of this, His κληρονομία, the Redeemer imparts a portion to His own, Rom. viii. 37. ; Titus iii. 7. ; Rev. xxi. 7. But, that the dignity of this Redeemer may appear more pre-eminent, the writer, by means of the καί, connects a new thought with what precedes, namely, that the same Being, who, according to His divine-human nature, shall possess all things in the world which He has carried on to its consummation, is also, according to His divine nature, the *Author* of all things. Αἰῶνες, according to Grecian usage, signifies only *ages*, as עולם in Hebrew.

Hence Theodoret, and some more modern interpreters, whose minds were greatly swayed by dogmatical reasons, as Paulus, Bolton, Stolz, have rendered it, "by whom he caused new *epochs* to arise, the Mosaic and the Christian." In Chaldee, however, and in Rabbinic Hebrew (Comp. the Hebrew עולם, Ecclesiast. iii.

11.), עולם denotes, also, *that which is in time, world*, and this usage has, it appears, passed from the Rabbinic into the Arabic. Here αἰών must necessarily signify *world*. This is decisively shewn by the parallel passage Heb. xi. 3., and, likewise, by that in the Epistle to the Colossians, and φέρων τὰ πάντα in ver. 3. Comp. Griesbach, *De mundo a Deo Patre condito per Filium*, *Opusc.* T. ii., where, at p. 192, this passage is examined more at large.

The leading thought of the proposition in ver. 3. lies in the *verb. fin.* "The Son is *enthroned*," Comp. ver. 13. With this leading thought, a subordinate one is connected in the *part.*, namely, that He is first en-

throned after having humbled Himself for the expiation of our sins.^a This subordinate thought, again, is raised by a parenthetical participial proposition, which expresses the dignity of Him who is the Author of the Redemption. But, perhaps, we ought to prefer the supposition, that the parenthetical participial proposition has less logical relation to the second participial proposition than to the main one, and consider the thought to be this: "He is from everlasting an effulgence of God, and, therefore, His sitting on the throne might be expected," in which case the *part.* would be regarded as causal. The idea, that God in the *Λόγος* finds and reflects Himself as in His counterpart, is expressed by Paul, when, 2. Cor. iv. 4.; Col. i. 15., he calls the *Logos εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ*; which expression, as also the cognate one *ἐκμαγεῖν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, occurs in Philo. In the Rabbins, we have the synonymous *וְיִקְרָא*, and Wisd. vii. 25, 26., *ἔσοπτρον τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνεργείας*. With the expression "image" corresponds that which is here chosen, *χαρακτήρ*, and *ἀπαύγασμα* says the same thing; *δόξα* denotes the splendour which surrounds God, Luke ii. 9., Macrobius *Saturn.* i., 20.; *quae aëris gloria, nisi solis illuminatio*. — *ὑπόστασις* means, as the Greek interpreters have explained it, *Being, essence*; although many expositors, offended at the Son being called only the copy of the Being, took *ὑπόστασις* in the sense, adopted by the Church, of *Person*; so Hesychius, Thomas Aquinas, Salmeron, Beza, and Hutter. This signification Möller, in particular, undertook to defend against Calvin: *De genuina vocum χαρακτήρ et ὑπόστασις notione*, 1738. Others, as Gerhard, and Seb. Schmid, draw a distinction between *persona* and *personalitas*, and adopt the latter signification.

We have yet to discuss the question whether we have here *Philonic* doctrine and expressions? The

^a Bengel: *latet hic occupatio. Conversatio Christi in carne non videbatur tam augusta de eo ferre prædicata. Respondet apostolus, id factum esse a tempore, pro purgandis peccatis.* So also II. 9.

doctrine of Philo is certainly akin to this ; he calls the Logos not only : ἐκμαγεῖον τοῦ Θεοῦ, but also : ἀπαύγασμα, Grossmann, *Quaest. Philon.* ii. p. 432., sq. Lücke, Comm. on John, 2d. Edit., Pt. I., p. 246., thinks he has discovered between Philo and John, on the one hand, and between the Epistle to the Hebrews and Paul, on the other, an essential difference in the doctrine of the Logos. This difference we do not think can be well established. On the contrary, we hold the supposition of a connection of the doctrine of the Logos, as here introduced, with that of Philo, as in the highest degree doubtful, at least upon the ground assigned, namely, because it can be shewn that the Theology of Palestine teaches the same thing respecting the Logos. But the supposition, apparently entertained also by Lücke, *Ib.* p. 244., that the Alexandrian Gnosis first formed that of Palestine, is, in our opinion, quite erroneous. See above, p. 67, 68. Yet, if Apollos be the author of our Epistle, we are at liberty to suppose, on this very account, a connection, if not with Philo, at least with the Alexandrian form of the Jewish Gnosis. As Col. i. 15. mentions first His *origin*, and ver. 17. declares that all things subsist *through* Him, so is it here likewise ; and this φέρων, too, is not connected by a καί but by τέ, in as much as the idea of the All-upholding power is conditioned by that of the likeness in image of the being : hence both have a closer connection than would have been expressed by καί. Φέρειν, in the spiritual sense, unites the meanings *sustain* and *govern*, the former is found in Philo, *Quis rer. divin.* h. p. 486, c., *De nom. mut.* p. 1084., c., the latter in Plutarch, in *Lucullus*, c. 6. Being as common in the later as it was rare in the older Greek, it is here adopted by Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Theodoret.^a If our author have taken

^a Compare the use of *vehere* in Seneca, Ep. 31., Deus ille maximus potentissimusque ipse *vehit* omnia. Also אָנָשׁ, in

Hebrew, and סָבַל, in Rabb., have a kindred meaning. Still, it would be absurd in our author to go back to the signifi-

φέρειν in the derivative, intellectual sense, then we prefer the signification *uphold* (erhalten), as συνέστηκε, Col. i. 17.; and ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ σύγκειται τὰ πάντα, Wisd. xliii. 26.; and, considering the rhetorico-poetical character of the composition, we should prefer retaining the proper meaning of the word *to bear*, which Schulz and de Wette express in their translations. The reader may, probably, remember the Virgilian thought: *spiritus intus alit, totamque infra supraque mens agit molem*. Of Πῆμα τῆς δυνάμεως we may here regard the gen. as having an adjective force, that form of construction being frequent in our Author, (p. 32), and, indeed, a Hebraism, which even the more correct Jewish writers do not easily avoid. See James i. 25., ii. 1.

Respecting the dogmatical import of καθαρισμὸν ποιεῖν and its synonymes (see App. II.). Δι' ἑαυτοῦ is designedly made prominent, because, by this circumstance, He is distinguished from the Old Testament priest, at whose sacrifices the offering and the priest were *two different* objects, while here they are the same, Comp. vii. 27., x. 10. Griesbach, therefore, fell very far short of the meaning, when, conceiving δι' ἑαυτοῦ to be superfluous, he conjectured διότι.— On καθίζω, see p. 36. He who sits at the right hand of the king shares his power with him. As no Hebrew, although he might speak of a throne of God, actually believed it to exist *externally*, so no Christian, certainly, will think of an *external* sitting at the side of God. But, for the representation of the particular idea the image is indispensable and thoroughly *true*. Comp. for the image, as such, particularly Rev. iii. 21. After being perfected through suffering, Christ first ascended the throne, xii. 2., v. 9. Ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, as in the Old Testament, בְּמַרְוֹם יוֹשֵׁב, what distinguishes the throne of God from the throne of

tion of the Hebrew, where the same signification is presented by the Greek. Many of the Latin Fathers have *gerens omnia* (see the Note in Sabatier), while the Italic has *ferens*, and the Vulgate *portans*.

earthly kings, Eph. iv. 10., and, as a closer definition of μεγαλωσύνη, is best taken as connected with it, and not with καθίζειν. Μεγαλωσύνη, like all nouns in σύννη, came later into use than those in ὄτης, especially in the solemn style; viii. 1., Jude 25., Wisd. xxviii. 4. The *Abstr.* is here stronger than the *concr.*; as, in our own language the *majesty*, the abstract, is much more emphatic than the *majestic*.^a

Ver. 4. Γενόμενοι points out that this exaltation is true, not only of the Logos in *abstracto*, but of the whole divine-human subject. Comp. vii. 26. As the servant's form in which the humbled Messiah appeared had given offence, it was requisite to give prominence to this notion. Comp. ii. 9. It is not necessary to suppose that the readers of this Epistle belonged to a particular party, which, like the Judaizing false teachers at Colosse, occupied themselves much in speculations about the angelic powers, instead of cleaving, as Paul desired them, to the *Head*. Peter also gives prominence to the notion of the subordination of the whole spiritual world to the Messiah (1 Peter iii. 22., Comp. Eph. i. 21.), and Gal. iii. 19. brings out the contrast that the law, because it was given by angels only, and not by the Son, is inferior to the Gospel.

Τοσούτω—δσω, see above p. 35. The name is the name *Son*. At Phil. ii. 9., it has been doubted whether υἱός, or Ἰησοῦς, or κύριος be the ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα. We should be inclined to say, that Paul had not in that passage any particular name in view, but rather that, in its proper sense, *name* was subordinate, and the meaning of *dignity* the principal object, while here the contrary appears to be the case.

Ver. 5—14. *What the Scripture says of the SON, goes far beyond what can be said of the ANGELS. Angels are servants, nay, servants of His redeemed, while Christ is SON, and EVERLASTING KING.*

^a In Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. c. 16, Christ is called τὸ σκῆπτρον τῆς μεγαλωσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ, "the sceptre of the majesty of God."

Ver. 5.—*God declares Himself His Father, in the strictest sense of the word, in two passages, Ps. ii. 7., and 2 Sam. vii. 14.* We have here to consider the subject which we have treated of elsewhere (in App. I.), viz., the application of the Old Testament in our Epistle, especially with regard to the passages before us, as well as those to be hereafter cited. *Ποῦς* is not, *to whom then, tandem,* for, with that meaning, it would have been more nearly connected with *ῥίσι*, but it is joined with the verb, *ever, at any time,* as in ver. 13.

Ver. 6.—Our first object is to inquire whence this citation is derived, since the decision of that point must influence our conception of the meaning. The question is, namely, whether the Author cited from Ps. xcvi. 7., where the LXX. translate *προσκυήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ*, or from Deut. xxxii. 43., where the words are not found in the Hebrew, indeed, but in the LXX., and there, literally, as they appear in the quotation before us. As the writer prefaces the declaration by *καί*, which is of no importance for his object, it appears to us indubitable that he quoted Deut. xxxii. 43., from the LXX. And it appears to us equally beyond doubt, that he borrowed the words from thence precisely because their *form*, that is, the *ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ*, was more suited to his purpose; while, with respect to the *matter*, he had recourse to Ps. xcvi. That Psalm introduces God as the King of the world, and what it says of Him as such might be said of the Messiah, *through whom, and in whom,* God established the Theocracy. Comp. App. I. On the other hand, the words in Deut. xxxii. apparently furnish no reason for their application to the Messiah. And, another circumstance confirms the opinion that the Author referred to Ps. xcvi. The *Cod. Alex.*, namely, has in Deut. xxxii., not *ἄγγελοι*, but *ἰσὶ Θεοῦ*; and so, also, two ancient Scholia, Euseb. *Comm. in Psalm*, p. 416, ed. *Montf.*, Epiphanius, *Haeres*, lxx. Augustine also takes notice of this deviation.

In this form, our Author could not have employed the quotation, since he urges precisely the name *υἱὸς Θεοῦ*, as applicable to Christ. But the *Cod. Alex.*, in the parallel proposition, reads: *καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ*. Now, if this be the ancient reading, it would be clearly seen, that, in the Author's mind, a reminiscence of Ps. xcvi. was blended with that of the passage from Moses. If the quotation be taken from a Psalm descriptive of the majesty of the Messiah's kingdom, that circumstance alone would suggest the conjecture, that the bringing in refers to the time to which 1 Cor. xv. 28. also refers (Heb. x. 13.), when all things shall be subject to the Messiah-king (Phil. ii. 9.) To this exposition of the words a strict acceptance of them seems also to lead; it is supported, namely, by the position of *πάλιν*, which, from that position, appears to be joined with the verb. If we then take the Aorist, construed with *ἔταν*, in the signification of the *ful. ex.*, there will result the translation, *quando rursus introduxerit*. This translation has been defended by Cameron, Calmet, Dan. Heinse, and others. *Οἰκουμένη* may then be understood of the glorified world, into which the King of Spirits enters, and is in point of matter, the same as, at ii. 5., is expressed more definitely by *οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα*. On the other hand, the majority of interpreters have disputed the reference to the future appearance of Christ, and made the *εἰσάγειν* relate either to the *introductio praedictiva*, as they have expressed it, that is, the *announcement* of the birth of Christ in the world of Spirits, or simply, to the birth of Christ. See Chrysostom, Theodoret, Seb. Schmid, Cramer, Storr, Kuinoel, and Bleek. Chrysostom appealed to what is said of an heir: "*he is brought into his inheritance;*" more recent expositors appealed to Schöttgen and Lightfoot, who had shewn that, *to come into the world*, among the Rabbins, means nothing more than *to be born*. Comp. x. 4. Bleek appeals to the circumstance, that the Author would not, in homage to the Messiah, have limited the summons to a period at that

time future. To this we reply, the factum, however, stood fast in futurity. Against Bleek's supposition it may be urged, partly, that a bringing in of the First Born *before* the incarnation, and a summons to the Angels to worship Him, would require a definite moment, and if this were the moment shortly before the incarnation, it would have been unsuitable for such a summons, while another cannot be found, and, partly, that the exposition of *περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν*, ii. 5., which would then be necessary, might be thought less satisfactory than a reference of it to this passage. Still, on the other hand, we cannot approve of the construction of *πάλιν* with the verb. This construction could, with propriety, be admitted only if there had been a previous mention of a *first* bringing in, which some indeed conceive they have found, ver. 5., in *σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*. But that proposition has been affixed merely for the amplification of the idea of the Sonship. To this may be added, 1. That *πάλιν* is the usual formula by which citations are ranged in serie, ver. 5.; ii. 13.; x. 30.; Rom. xv. 10. 12. 2. That the supposition of a transposition of the adverb is exposed to no suspicion, since it is frequent both in Greek and Latin. Comp. Abresch on this passage, Winer, Gram. p. 456. We, therefore, assume a transposition,^a and conceive it, as respects the point of time to which the language is to be referred, to imply the whole period of the exaltation of Christ (1 Peter iii. 22., perhaps, also, *ἠφθη ἀγγέλοις*, 1 Tim. iii. 16., may be compared), but *especially* the manifestation of it, when He enters into the *regnum gloriæ* (2 Thes. i. 9, 10.). The *first born* is also, in point of *rank*, the first among the brethren. Hence David is called the *first born* among the *kings* of the earth, Ps. lxxxix. 28. That passage in the Rabba, the mystical commentary on Exodus, sect. 19. f. 118. 4., is referred to the Messiah; He is, also upon other occasions, called

^a In German also we could say: "*wann er abermals einführt*," instead of "*abermals wann er einführt*."

among the Rabbins, the first-born of God, and, with a more distinct allusion to the *fraternal* relation, in Rom. viii. 29. It is unnecessary to determine more closely whether *here*, in like manner, the relation to the *brethren* (ii. 12.) predominate, or that to the other rulers, as in ver. 9.^a

The formula λέγει, in this and other passages (iv. 4.), Bohme will not allow to be supplied by ὁ Θεός, because, in the citations, ἄγγελου Θεοῦ is again found, but by ἡ γραφή, as Paul is accustomed to write. See Introduction, p. 50.

Ver. 7.—*Angels are ministering elements of nature, the Son is everlasting King* (8—12.). Πρός, like ἔ, turned towards, i. e. in respect of. Our author quotes according to the LXX. ; and, in the sense which is given by that translation alone is the passage suited to his purpose : it is the lowest kind of servitude, if his angels must minister as *elements of nature*. But, on the contrary, how sublime are the declarations, ver. 8—12., concerning the Son ! Meanwhile, is the version of the LXX. correct ? and—at any rate—what is the sense of the passage according to the view conveyed by it ?

The text runs thus: עֲשֵׂה מִלְאָכָיו רוֹחוֹת מְשָׁרְתָיו
אֵשׁ לְהַט. The preceding context shews how water, clouds, winds, hence the elements of nature, must serve God. Following the same train of thought, we expect here, also, that wind and flame will be described as the *ministers of God*. So it was conceived by Calvin, Bucer, Beza, Cameron, Grotius, Bleek, and almost all the moderns.^b Some, indeed, have assumed this

^a By the τοὺς μισόχους, (answering to the Hebrew הַבְּרִיִּים) are meant associates in dignity, συνδέονους, i. e. *fellow Kings*, as Dr. French and Mr Skinner well render, aptly comparing Rev. xix. 16, "And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS." See Bloomfield, s. l.—Tr.

^b In Xenophon, *Memorab.* IV. 3, 14., the winds and lightnings are called ἀσπερίται τῶν θιῶν.

meaning in the passage before us, and Beza brings forward a grammatical reason for it, namely, that the words *ἀγγελοι* and *λειτουργοί* must be regarded as predicates, because they have the article, a proof that they are not used appellatively of ministers of God in general, but, *in specie*, of the (known) angels, so that the sense will be: "winds and flames take the place of the angels"—and, consequently, the conclusion, how low their station! An ingenious exposition certainly! In our opinion, however, that acceptance of the passage of the Psalm which makes the *angels* the *object* deserves the preference. In the first place, in Hebrew the natural order of the words, in ordinary discourse, is this: first the Verb, then the Object, and finally the Predicate. This rule is to be departed from only when an improper sense would arise from its observance. The apparent unsuitableness of the sense has been the cause of such a departure in this instance. But, how would the case stand if the angels were here to be taken as impersonal emanations of the powers of God, serving as a basis for natural phenomena? Primarily, indeed, מלאך, which, according to its form, means, not *legatus*, but, *legatio divina*, was a more general designation of every divine energy acting in the terrestrial system; in the New Testament such energies are called *δυνάμεις*, Rom. viii. 38., 1 Peter iii. 22., among the Rabbins כִּוְהוֹת *Forces, Powers*. According to the Jewish theology, they are the instrumental causes of every phenomenon in nature; and such, also, was the notion of the natural philosophers of the middle ages, down to the time of Keppler—including this great man himself ("every element has its celestial *Archeus*"). Even if we regard John v. 4. as spurious, it will still shew the popular notion of the first Christian age: an angel is the *principium movens* of the natural phenomenon. See Olshausen's "Komm. zum N. T. I. Th. I. A. S. 46."* If this be our author's view, and it has some

* According to Sack, Comment. Theol. p. 19. the מלאך¹¹

foundation in truth—for what we call *powers of nature* is but a X, instead of which we might use the expression *messengers of God*—then his quotation is quite appropriate, there arises the sense we have given above.^a

Ver. 8—12.—*Contrast of the Son.* Here *πρός* might signify *ad*, and (as in ver. 13. xi. 18) serve to mark the dative relation; but, since this verse forms too definite an antithesis to ver. 7., we prefer the signification: “*in respect of the Son, God says in the Scripture.*” The passages are quoted strictly from the LXX., Ps. xlv. 7., cii. 26—28. We will not here inquire whether the LXX. have rightly translated *ὁ Σπύρος σου, ὁ Θεός*. The matter most important to the author in the *first* citation is, that the Son is twice addressed as *ὁ Θεός*, and, that an everlasting throne is ascribed to Him; in the *second*, that He created the world, and will survive it, when, in its present form (1 Cor. vii. 31. 1 John ii. 17.), it shall perish. That *ὄψωνοί* here means *angels*, or, at least, includes the angels, as many think, does not seem easily reconcilable with the passage.

Ver. 13.—Here we take *πρός* in the signification *to*: nor will this change appear striking after the intervention of such long quotations. As the last *dictum probans*, that notion is adduced which was most known and most current, and to which the Redeemer himself appeals, Matth. xxii. 44., then the Apostles, Acts ii. 35. 1 Cor. xv. 25., to which perhaps, ver. 3. alluded, and which appears, x. 12, 13., in a distinct dogmatical

also is to be so regarded: “ita ut” מלאך non tam personam a Jehovah distinctam, sed naturalem illam apparitionem, qua Jehovah loqui et se manifestare voluit, indicare videatur. Persona, quae agnoscitur, in nuntio Jehovahae, semper Jehovah ipse est, ac nobis fortasse מלאך potius *Bothschaft* (Message) quam *Bothschafter* (Messenger) vertendum esset.

^a Venema, also, on Ps. 4., regards the *angels* as the object, but sees nothing more in the predicate of *Winds* and *Flames of fire* than a description, in the way of comparison, of the manner of their agency.

connection (Comp. also viii. 1.), and where we will treat more at large of the sense in which it is cited by the New Testament writers.

Ver. 14—The Son *rules*, the angels *serve*, nay, serve those who are subjects in His kingdom; the Son is *enthroned*, they are *sent* to and fro as messengers. It is even said πάντες, that is, the very *highest* among the many classes of higher spirits. And, to express this, the proposition is put in the interrogative form, which gives additional force to the emphatic character of the passage.

CHAPTER II.

WE MUST NOT BE LED ASTRAY BY THE CIRCUMSTANCE
THAT THE REDEEMER WAS HUMBLED FOR A TIME
BELOW THE ANGELS; THIS TOOK PLACE, BY DIVINE
NECESSITY, FOR OUR SALVATION.

*Ver. 1—4. How much the sublime character of the
New Testament revelation makes it our duty to lay
it earnestly to heart!*

Ver. 1.—Instead of the usual ὄθεν (p. 36.), we have here the more Pauline expression διὰ τοῦτο.—Περισσοτέρως, a word very frequent with Paul, being found in the second Epistle to the Corinthians seven times, in our Ep. at xiii. 19., and περισσότερον, vi. 17.; vii. 15. There is no necessity to take the compar., with Bohme, as a positive. It must be construed with δεῖ, and not with προέχειν.—In παραρῥυῶμεν we have first to consider the orthography. Lachmann has adopted παραρῥυῶμεν, without the reduplication of the ρ. This orthography is found, also, in Cod. A. D., likewise in two Cod. mentioned by Matthäi, Comp. also ix. 19, 21., and Cod. D., at x. 22., ἐραντισμένοι, in like manner, Prov. iii. 21., in Breitinger παραρῥῆς. This orthography, according to Eustathius, *Ad Odys.* Π. 610. 12. Φ. 761. 53., is peculiar to the later Grecity; Sturz, *De dial. Maced.*

§ 10., numbers it among the examples of Alexandrian orthography.

There is great uncertainty, however, with regard to those examples of Alexandrian orthography quoted by Sturz; and, this is by no means an unimportant point, since, from the orthography tests have been obtained to determine the native country of the New Testament *Codd.* Hug has two such tests, by which he regularly fixes the native country of the manuscript, viz. the α in the termination of the II. Aor., and the μ before the labials, particularly before ψ . When we come to discuss the first-mentioned form in $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, ix. 12., we will return to this subject, and shew what weighty consequences have been drawn from such doubtful premises, not only by Hug, who is generally so circumspect, but by all those who, after him, have given us Introductions to the New Testament. We must previously remark, that we can by no means permit ourselves to lay down any fixed rules respecting the Alexandrian orthography. This only may be affirmed, that the whole catalogue of the peculiarities of Alexandrian orthography, by Sturz, is very uncritical, more especially where he cites all those instances, in the LXX., of a single instead of a double ρ as Alexandrianisms. There are innumerable examples in which the translators, purely from oversight, have written a double instead of a single, and a single instead of a double, letter, as when, in John xix. 23., several *Codd.* read $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma$, and, *vice versa*, in the *Cod. Thuric.* III Maccab. vi. 6., $\epsilon\pi\acute{\rho}\upsilon\sigma\sigma\omega$, and Matth xxvi. 28., $\epsilon\kappa\chi\upsilon\nu\beta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$. It is otherwise, perhaps, with the case before us. The spelling with the single ρ is poetical (Buttmann, *Ausführl. Gramm.* I. 84.); and hence we might, perhaps, agree with Eustathius, in as much as poetical forms prevailed in the later usage. Accordingly, in the *Cod. Alex.*, Heb. x. 22., we have the *Homeric* form $\rho\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$. Comp. the uncontracted forms $\chi\iota\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ $\delta\sigma\acute{\tau}\epsilon\omega\nu$, xiii. 15.; xi. 22., which, however, occur also in Plato and Aristotle.

Moreover, the word is accented by all the editors as *Properispomenon*, and, consequently, is not consi-

dered to be the *conj. praes.* παραρρῶμεν,^a but either, as by Erasmus, Schmid, and Dindorf, the *conj. praes.* of παραρρῶναι, or the *aor. sec. pass.* of παραρρῶναι. Now, we have, certainly, some few examples of a *praes. παραρρῶναι*; but the *aor. sec. pass.* is far more frequently used, and is found everywhere, both in its proper and its figurative sense. We may, therefore, without hesitation, regard the word as in the *aor. sec. pass.* and employed with a neuter signification. To *flow* is = to be flowed past,—so Buttman. Now, “to flow by before something,” when used figuratively of persons, may certainly mean, “to let slip from the attention,” and, hence, doubtless, to forget, or, to fail of something, to lose something, and, used *absoluté*: “to go to ruin.” The meaning to forget it is equally difficult to shew, strictly speaking, either from usage or from the etymon. It cannot be done in the manner in which Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Cameron and Peirce (who take it to mean *persuere ut vas rimarum plenum*) wish to do it. Beza himself says, that, on account of μήποτε *ne quando*, he is inclined to prefer the other signification^b Now, in favour of that other signification, it may be said, 1. That the meaning *forget*, even could it be established, would introduce a tautology: “let us give good heed to the things we have heard, that we may not forget them. 2. That the second meaning is found also in similar *compp.* For example, παραπίπτειν τῆς ἀληθείας is found in Polybius, 12. 7. 2., τοῦ καθήκοντος 8. 13. 8.; παραπαίειν τῆς ἀληθείας in Polyb. 3. 12. 9.;

^a There is another passage in the New Testament where it may be considered doubtful whether the Act. or Pass. Aor. should be adopted, and in what manner, accordingly, the accent should be placed, viz. Luke xvi. 9.: ἵναν ἐκλίθητε *quando deficiatis*, or ἵναν ἐκλιπῆτε *quando deficiamini*, in case, namely, it should be thought proper to supply *auxilio* or *viribus*; in which explanation, moreover, we by no means agree.

^b This supposition has very probably arisen from two causes. 1. The passage, Prov. iii. 21., on which we shall afterwards make some observations, seems to require it. 2. *Praeterfluere aures*, used of things, frequently occurs in Latin and Greek.

παρασύρεσθαι τῆς ἀληθείας in Photius, vide *Biblioth. p. m.* 400: ἔοικε δὲ φιλοπονώτερον περὶ τὴν ἱερὰν ἡμῶν κ. Δείαν γραφὴν διατεθῆναι, εἰ καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς παρασύρεται τῆς ἀληθείας. 3. That this signification is not only exactly suited to the context, but has also a corresponding parallel, in matter, in iv. 1. 4. That it may be shown to predominate in the later style, and hence is adopted in this place by the Greek Fathers and Lexicographers generally, Chrysost. and Theoph.: μὴ ἀπολώμεθα, μὴ ἐκπέσωμεν, Theod.: ἵνα μὴ τινα ὄλισθον ὑπομείνωμεν. According to this, Hesych., Suidas, *Lex. Cyrilli, Gloss. Alb.*, see, in the last, the remark, p. 170., where παραγλυστρίσωμεν is adduced from the modern Greek translation of Maximus as an explanation of the proof; but, γλυστροῦν, according to Du Cange, is καταλισθαίνειν, ἐκπίπτειν. The vouchers for this, from the later usage, where it is so employed in speaking of persons, are the following: Clement of Alexandria, *Paedag.* III. 11, p. 288. ed. Potter: "the women must adorn themselves in a chaste manner, μὴ παραρῥυῶσι τῆς ἀληθείας διὰ χαυνότητα: Ephraim. Syr. T. I. Opp. p. 267. ed. Rom.: ἀπορῥίψωμεν ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν πάντα λογισμὸν κακίας, μὴ ποτε παραρῥυῶμεν γυμνὸς γὰρ ὁ ἄδης ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ περιβόλαιον τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ:"^a Ib. T. II. p. 243.: μὴδὲ παραρῥύητε ἀπ' αὐτῆς (πίστεως), ἐν τινὶ δισταγμῷ.^b We have also to consider the passage in the LXX., Prov. iii. 21., where it is said: οὐ μὴ παραρῥυῆς, τήρησον δὲ ἐμὴν βουλήν καὶ ἔνοιαν. There, it has been attempted to force the reading παραρῥυῆ into the text, and, then, to supply ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου, so Ludovic Cappell, and Lambertus Bos. The Arabic, and, somewhat similar to this, Symmachus translated μὴ παραρῥυησάτωσαν ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν σου. It is incontestable that the meaning to be adopted there is: "let not slip." But, if this be given by ἀμελεῖν, it shews that this is the same meaning which we adopt in the passage before us, only

^a Let us cast away from us every evil imagination, lest at any time we swerve: for Hades is open before his face, and there is no covering for perdition.

^b Neither swerve ye from it (i. e. the faith), by any wavering.

differently applied, namely, not to *blessing, delivery*, but, to *doctrine*. Now, since we have an allusion to *delivery*, a reminiscence of the passage in Proverbs cannot be supposed. In our opinion, the author, by παραρῆσθαι means exactly the same thing which he expresses, iv. 1., by ὑστερεῖν: "to lose salvation, and in so far to be lost." Thus Haymo (†853) unites both—*ne forte pereamus et a salute excidamus*. Respecting this difficult word, Luther very much wavered. In his translation of 1522, he followed the obscure and barbarous *perefluamus*^a of the Vulgate ("Damit wir nicht etwa verfließen"); in that of 1530 he has: That we may not be *destroyed* ("Damit wir nicht etwa verderben müssen"), which he subsequently displaced for "Damit wir nicht dahinfahren," and explained this in his Marginal Glosses, "as a ship, before its entering into port, plunges into destruction." But παραρῆσθαι cannot be said of *ships*, but of water only. With the exception of Storr, the moderns, for the greater part, as Böhme, Bretschneider, Wahl, Kuinöl, Schulz, and De Wette, in his 2d Ed., explain it as we do ("that we may not lose them"), the last, in his 1st Ed., "that it may not escape us."

Ver. 2.—Tradition affirmed that the law was given by the ministrations of angels. The first traces of this opinion are in Ps. lxxviii. 18., and in the LXX., Deut. xxxiii. 2.; in the New Testament, Gal. iii. 19., Acts vii. 53.; in Josephus, *Antiq.* 15. 5. 3.; Targum of the Song of Solomon, ii. 3. This mode of representation our author employs in order to illustrate the higher dignity of the New Testament; but, the more he points this proof by carrying it back exclusively to the angels, the more does he embarrass the older interpreters who urged the *mouth* and *finger* of God in the giving of the law. A similar climactic contrast between the Old and New Covenant may be seen at

^a Jerome, *Contr. Jovin.* has even: *ne forte superefluamus*, the translation prior to Jerome has: *ne casu labamur*. The *casu* is intended to express the *πρὸς* in *μῆκροσ*, which is more correctly rendered by *quando* than by *forte* or *casu*.

xii. 25. Hence, many have allowed themselves to be misled so far as to understand, by ἄγγελοι, *prophets*. Βέβαιος is used in the same sense as ἐβεβαιώθη subsequently is of the New Testament word of God. Every transgression of the law receiving its punishment was a proof that the law was βέβαιος. On μισθαποδοσία see *Introd.* p. 35.

Ver. 3.—A metonymy is here commonly assumed, as if σωτηρία = λόγος σωτηρίας in Acts xiii. 26. ; xvi. 17., *Comp Acts* xxviii. 28. : τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ. The relative ἣτις coming after τηλικαύτης instead of ὥστε, is explained by Matthiä, sect. 479., rem. i. ; the mark of interrogation, therefore, which is commonly put after σωτηρίας is inconvenient, as the proposition is not completed. Still, as the whole period does not terminate till we reach ver. 4, the point of interrogation could not be so long postponed. Ἀρχὴν λαμβάνειν for ἀρχεσθαι, is usual with writers at the time of Christ, and subsequently ; with the *Inf.*, it serves as a circumlocution of the adverb, somewhat like τυγχάνω with the participle. Ἐβεβαιώθη εἰς ἡμᾶς, a *significatio pregnans*, as Theophylact explains it : διεπορευμένη και εἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαίως και πιστῶς.

We have now reached that passage of the Epistle which appears to speak most strongly against its Pauline composition ; for, the Author, by this declaration, seems to place himself in the same dependent relation towards the Apostles as Luke does, with respect to himself, in his Gospel, i. 2. ; a passage compared with this by Chrysostom. So early as the fifth century, Euthalius pointed out this difficulty, without, however, removing it ; Theophylact and Oecumenius endeavour to remove it, but unsatisfactorily ; Luther and Calvin, from this passage, especially, decide against the Ep. being the work of Paul.^a Beza, in his *fifth* edition,

^a Luther (Walch's Edit. xiv. p. 146.): " It is clear from this, that he speaks of the Apostles as a disciple, to whom such doctrine had come from the Apostles, perhaps long afterwards." Calvin says : " Caeterum hic locus indicio est epistolam a Paulo non fuisse compositam. Neque enim tam humiliter loqui solet, ut se unum fateatur ex apostolorum discipulis, neque id

seems to prefer the supposition of an error of transcription, that is, of *ἡμᾶς* instead of *ὑμᾶς*, but afterwards he takes refuge, like most of the defenders of the Pauline origin of the Epistle, under the rhetorical figure *ἀνακοίνωσις*. If the Ep. is to be maintained as the composition of the Apostle, the assumption of this figure offers certainly the most admissible way of escape from the difficulty, and one which Hug. in his *Intro.* 3d. Ed. p. 467., has followed with the most security, although he has not brought to his proof all the means at his command. We may remark that the communicative^a manner, peculiar to all the New Testament epistolary writers, is found more than once in our Ep., vi. 1—3. ; x. 24—26. ; xii. 1. 2. To the observation of Bleek, that, while the fact cannot be denied, yet, that this manner of address occurs only in exhortative, reprehensive discourse, where the Author, conscious of the general sinfulness, may include himself along with his readers, it may be replied : We find it so in the passage before us : *δοῦν ἡμᾶς προσέχειν, πῶς ἐκφρευξόμεθα κτλ.*, and although the proposition *εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβιβαιώθη* does not directly belong to the exhortative, but declares a historical fact, yet it may, perhaps, be imagined, that Paul having commenced in the communicative style would continue in it, and so much the more, as, *in many respects, his knowledge also τῶν λαληθέντων διὰ τοῦ κυρίου was based upon the tradition of the Apostles.* From the instances mentioned by me in my *Miscellaneous Works*, Vol. II., p. 309., *et seq.*, it appears to me indeed decidedly probable, that 1 Cor. vii. 10. ; xi. 23. cannot be referred to oral

ambitione, sed quia improbi ejusmodi praetextu tantundem detrahere ejus doctrinae moliebantur. Apparet igitur, non esse Paulum, qui ex *auditu* se habere evangelium scribit, non autem ex revelatione.

^a The word *communicative* is employed in the Original to denote that manner of writing in which the Author considers himself in the same position as his readers, and in this sense it is also employed here, and in a few more passages of the translation.—*Tr.*

traditions derived from the Apostles, yet it cannot be but that Paul received many a saying of Christ, and many a fact of His history through the Apostles. Besides, does he not say that he received the λαληθέντα, not ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων, which certainly would speak more decisively against the Apostolic origin of the Epistle, but, only ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων, *from those that heard?* This declaration, then, might perhaps be reconciled with the Authorship by Paul; and we should be satisfied with this vindication of the point, could it be proved that the Epistle was written to persons *in whom no doubt could arise as to the apostolic dignity of Paul.* But what shall we say when we find the Apostle, where a doubt prevailed as to his parity with the other Apostles, so zealously defend his equality with them as he does in Gal. i. 1. 11. 16.; ii. 6., *et seq.*; 1 Cor. ix. 1. Now, this Epistle is addressed precisely to those communities in which Pseudo-Apostles, similar to those in Galatia, could not fail to be found, from which we should rather say the Galatian Pseudo-Apostles *arose* (Gal. ii. 12.). In writing to *these* communities, would he have given occasion for any misunderstanding touching his dignity? This cannot be believed.^a

Ver. 4. The leading thought previously was, that the New Testament word of God is βέβαιον, as being spoken by the *Lord*, and delivered by *those that heard*

^a Among the communicative passages, to which the defenders of the other view appeal, perhaps the most applicable is Jude ver. 17., μνήσθητι τῶν ἡμερῶν τῶν προσημειωμένων ὑπὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, but see Neander's History of the Apostolic Church. Another passage from the Pauline Epistles might be adduced, which has never yet been applied in this investigation, viz., 2 Tim. ii. 2., εἰ ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων. By these witnesses we might understand the Apostles, as several expositors have done. But, not to mention other reasons, 1 Tim. vi. 12. decidedly proves that these witnesses are baptismal witnesses. In the Armenian Ep. of Paul to the Cor. ver. 4., it is certainly said, ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐκτείνω ἰδίδια ὑμῶν, ἵνα αὐτοῖς παρέλαβον παρὰ τῶν προτίμων Ἀποστόλων κτλ., but that Epistle is decidedly not genuine.

him; but there was added the *βεβαιώσεις*, by the wonderful signs, and here, in particular, those of the primitive Church. The idea of miracle is rhetorically amplified; *σημεῖα*, the miracles, inasmuch as they are signs of the spiritually wonderful, point to this (Hugo a S^{co} Victore; *prodigia quasi porro digia*), *τέρατα*, as they cause astonishment, *δυνάμεις*, as they are evidences of superhuman power. The *μερισμοὶ πνεύματος* are the *διαίρεσεις χαρισμάτων καὶ ἐνεργημάτων*, 1 Cor. xii. 4. 6., of the One Spirit the various *φανερώσεις*, which, in the first age, being endued with unusual energy, passed into the supernatural. *Μερισμός*, which occurs, also, iv. 12., is, besides, like *ἀγιασμός*, and similar words, a nominal form of the later Greivity, found in Josephus, Plutarch, &c., the *classical word* being *ἀναδασμός*. The addition *κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν* is in the genuine style of Paul, Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 11., *πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, διαίρουν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται*. As the reason why one being receives *this*, and another *that*, quality at creation must be referred simply to the *θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, so the same reason holds with respect to the New Creation. Comp. Paul's use of *κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος*, Eph. i. 5., and of *διὰ τοῦ θελήματος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, where he speaks of his own calling to be an Apostle.

Ver. 5—9. *The Son alone is Lord in the kingdom of God, and although all things are not yet subject to Him, still we already see His exaltation in its commencement.*

Ver. 5. We would neither, with Heinrichs, refer *γάρ* to *σημεῖα*, nor, with Kuinöl, to *διὰ τοῦ κυρίου*, and still less, with Chr. Schmid, exchange it for *δέ*. It is based upon the whole connection of ideas from ver. 2—4., in which the greatness of the Christian scheme of salvation is declared. Its greatness is founded in this (such is the meaning), that the Son of Man is ruler in the *οἴκουμ. μελλ.*, and not angels. The glory of the Christian economy is then farther shewn, as in ch. i.,

from the dignity of the Son of God compared with the Angels, and that, too, with the special intention of removing any doubt which might arise in the minds of the readers in consequence of His ignominious death. *Περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν* can be properly explained, we think, only by looking back to i. 6. If a transposition of *πάλιν* be adopted there, as we have done, then the passage does not indeed distinctly declare that *ἡ οἰκουμένη ἢ μέλλουσα* is meant, but, as we have shewn, the idea lies in the subject itself, since God did not solemnly introduce His Son on His first appearance, for on this first appearance He was rather humbled, *βραχ' τι*, below the Angels. It may now be asked whether, by *οἰκουμένη*, we must understand the earth. This sense is not necessarily conveyed by the word itself, for, like *αἰών*, it may denote the new *system of the universe*, whether that shall be upon the earth or else-

where. The expression *אֲרָץ עוֹלָם* was employed equally by those Jewish Theologians who expected the new order of things upon earth, and by those who looked for it in another world. We must form our decision, therefore, by what is said on this subject in other passages of the New Testament, and, particularly, by what our Author teaches. The most distinct intimation that the consummation of the kingdom of Christ shall be upon the new earth is found in 2 Peter iii. 13. ; Rom. i. 19—21. It has lately been asserted (Usteri, Paulin. Lehrb. 4. A. s. 369.), that “the Ep. to the Hebrews contains generally the germs of that opinion which we call the *modern* one, namely, that our life upon earth is only a state of trial and preparation for Heaven. Paul, on the contrary, places the future, for the greater part, upon earth, and sees it in events which shall come to pass on it.” This is one of the many assertions which have been inconsiderately made concerning the Apostolic doctrines, among others by Rückert, without the smallest attempt at an illustration of Scripture by Scripture. Thus, Usteri gives no other proof of his assertion, as to

the views of Paul, than Phil. iii. 20. From that passage, however, no certain conclusion can be drawn; while the passage, 1 Thess. iv. 17., which appears to speak most decisively *against* it, is not even mentioned. That the Ep. to the Hebrews every where places future bliss in Heaven is certainly true (see Schulz, p. 92.). See especially ch. ix. 11.; xiii. 14.; vi. 20.; x. 34.; xii. 22. 23. Still it would have been nothing more than a duty to have noticed that, not to mention the other Apostolical writings, this "modern" opinion may be proved just as well from the discourses of *Christ himself*. Matth. v. 12.; vi. 20.; xix. 21.; Luke xvi. 9.; John xvii. 24. Comp. ver. 5. 13.; xiv. 2. Our opinion is this: God is designated in the Old and New Testament as *ἰσχυρότατος*, as enthroned *ἐν οὐρανῷ*, and still, in the Old and New Testament, it is declared, that the heavens do not contain Him, and that He is everywhere present (See my Comm. on the Sermon on the Mount, Bibl. Cab. Vol. xx.) Hence it follows, that, on the one hand, it is very natural that the abode of Christ and the blessed should be placed in Heaven, for they are in the immediate presence of God (Heb. ix. 24.), but, on the other, that this designation is to be understood not so much of *place* as of *state*, as it is expressed in the Lutheran dogmatics, not *τοπικῶς*, but *τροπικῶς*. Even the doctrine which adhered strictly to the letter distinguished *coelum gloriæ*, the world of the blessed, *coelum naturæ*, the Æther, *coelum gratiæ*, the Church upon earth, and defined *coelum*, when alone, not as the regions of air, but thus: *est certum τοῦ, in quo electi æternam lætitiām et gloriām participabunt*. Comp. the remarks in the Introd., p. 105, *et seq.* If the case be thus, there is no reason why the Apostles should not speak of a bliss in heaven, and yet understand by the expression a bliss which should be manifest upon earth. They might the more readily do this, as bliss commences at death, and, until the glorification of the earth, must be fixed, as to locality, somewhere else. Hence, in Acts iii. 21., it is said of

Christ himself, that He is received up into heaven, *pro tempore*, until every prophetic prediction be fulfilled, when He will again appear upon earth. That the expression of locality, *in heaven, from heaven*, is only the designation of what is *from and with God, from Him proceeding*, is particularly apparent when, Rev. xxi. 2., the prophet says he saw the new Jerusalem, adorned as a bride, descend upon earth, *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. In 1 Peter i. 4, it is said of the κληρονομία of the faithful that it is to be reserved, *ἐν οὐρανοῖς*, until the σωτηρία shall be revealed, *ἐν κυριῷ ἰσχύατι*. The Apostle says, Col. iii. 1., that Christ is enthroned above with God, wherefore the Christian must τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖν; and, ver. 3., it is declared that already the ζωὴ of the Christian is hidden *σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ*, until the appearance of Christ. In Phil. iii. 20. it is said our conversation is, *ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ἐξ οὗ καὶ σωτηρία ἀπεκδεχόμεθα*. While the same Apostle, 1 Cor. xv., so beautifully describes how the new σῶμα shall spring from the old like the blade from the grain of seed when it casts off its shell, it is said, 2 Cor. v. 2., that the new οἰκητήριον is *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, and will come *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, in order to absorb (καταπίνειν) what is mortal in the old σῶμα, and then to form a new covering. Is it not clear that: “*to be established in God’s omnipotence, destination,*” and: “*to be in heaven,*” are synonymous expressions? That two representations apparently destructive of each other, such as *in heaven is our country, &c., our country will be on the glorified earth*, may co-exist and mutually support each other, without the exclusion of either, might be proved from the manner in which, in the religious style, we speak of the dead: “He is gone to the joy of his Lord:” “God grant him a peaceful rest until the blessed day of the resurrection.” A heathen who should observe only the latter in our church, would consider himself fully entitled to conclude from it, that, according to our belief, a Psychopannychy commenced immediately after death; and whoever should remark the former only, that, immediately on the

death of the Christian, his completed state begins, after which nothing more is to be expected. With these observations, we return to the term *οίκουμένη μέλλουσα*. For the reasons we have stated, there is, in our opinion, nothing opposed to the notion, that the Author of the Ep. to the Heb. shared in the belief of his teacher Paul, that the earthly *οίκουμένη*, at the final consummation in the state of glorification, shall be the seat of the *βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ*; although, on the other hand, we do not affirm that such a conclusion may be drawn with perfect certainty from this expression. This conception of the passage has certainly much more in its favour than that adopted by Bleek, according to which *οίκ. μελλ.* is the Christian economy in general, the *σωτηρία*, spoken of (*περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν*) ver. 3.; this is not governed by Angels, inasmuch as the Angels nowhere exercise an essential influence in bringing in the kingdom of God.

Ver. 6. In a rhetorical *ἐξεργασία*, similar to that in Rom. x. 5., *et seq.*; Eph. iv. 8., *et seq.*, v. 32., the Author, on Ps. viii. 5—7., which he quotes literally, but with a slight abbreviation,^a from the LXX., develops what he himself wished to teach the community respecting the humiliation of Christ; that the Son of Man had indeed been humbled far below the angels, but only for a season; that He was thereafter crowned with glory; and, finally, that all things had been put under Him. It is true that we do not now see all things put under Him, although this subjection will at last take place (Heb. x. 12 13.) but the exaltation of the deeply-humbled Jesus has already begun. The indefinite way in which the citation is made must not be explained as Koppe and Schulz have explained it, by supposing the Author to have cited from memory, and to have forgotten the Scripture passage. The contrary might rather be inferred, from the words agreeing so nearly with the LXX., but with more certainty 1stly. From the consideration, that, if the words of the

^a The words *καὶ κατίσθησας κτλ.*, ver. 7., do not belong to the text, but are a complete gloss from the LXX.

Psalm were so well known to the Author, that he could quote them with such strictness from the LXX., it is very improbable that he was ignorant of the passage being a portion of the Psalms. If we assume this here, we certainly cannot do the same by iv. 4. 2dly. From this, that Philo quotes in a similar manner when he certainly knew the writers from whom he quoted (See Carpzov on the passage); in the same way, the Rabbins (see Schöttgen on the passage), and the Apostolic Fathers, as Clement of Rome, *Ep. i. Ad Corinthios, c. 15. 26. λέγει γάρ σου.* Therefore we say more correctly with Theodoret, *οὐ λέγει τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ εἰπόντος, ἅτε πρὸς ἐπιστήμονας τῶν γραφῶν διαλεγόμενος.*^a Perhaps, also, the indefiniteness of the quotation, in this instance, may be partly explained from its serving the Author as a connective, as a substratum for his own thoughts. Paul is equally indefinite in his quotations under similar circumstances, Eph. iv. 8.; v. 14; and Christ himself cites, at John vii. 38. (where in reality there is no distinct Old Testament passage), quite indefinitely, *καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή. — Διαμαρτύρεσθαι* we must not take, with Kuinöl, in the more lax signification of *canere*; the passage is cited as a Scripture testimony, although not in the strictest sense. Comp. *μαρτυρεῖν*, vii. 17.

In expounding the words of the citation, we have only to ask ourselves what signification they have in the mind of the Author, within the scope of his own application of them. And, first, it may be asked, whether the *τί* imply the *praestantia* or *miseria*? Böhme supposes our Author to have conceived it in the former sense; Kuinöl, that in Ps. viii. and cxliv. 3. it is likewise to be so taken. In our opinion, this is forbidden by the context in the passages from the Psalms; but, independently of that, does not the phrase, "God remembers any one," according to Old Testament usage, always imply that he is miserable? Comp., for instance, *רָץ* and *רָץ*, which are found

^a He does not give the name of the speaker, as he is discoursing to those who were conversant with the Scriptures.

together in Jer. xv. 15. We cannot believe, therefore, that the Author has departed from this acceptation, particularly as nothing compelled him so to do. When the writer used *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, had he in view the name which Christ commonly gives to himself? This is possible; but we cannot agree with Böhme, that the term gave him occasion to employ precisely this quotation. Such a circumstance might with more justice be affirmed of the *παρ' ἀγγέλους*.

Ver. 7. Interpreters have endeavoured to explain the departure of the LXX. from the Hebrew text, in this verse, by expounding the latter by the former. Calvin, Vitranga, Venema, and Döderlein, explain *βραχὺ τῷ* in the Psalm, temporally, and אֱלֹהִים of the *Angels*. The latter interpretation is adopted not only by the LXX., but the Targum, by Jarchi, Aben Esra, and Mendelsohn. In the Psalm, however, both expositions are inadmissible, 1. On account of the construction of the verb *חָסַר*; 2. Because the Psalm,

* In *וְתַחֲסְרֵהוּ מֵעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים*, we must not take *מ* as the greater number of modern interpreters of the Psalms have done, as a comparison. The *מִן*, construed with *חָסַר*, denotes the object of which one suffers want. So we find it clearly, Eccl. iv. 8. But, in *אֱלֹהִים* the original signification of this plural, the idea of the *abstract*, appears prominent, “he wants but little of the Divinity” (er ermangelt nur wenig der Gottheit). The ancient plural in the word *אֱלֹהִים* may be regarded as denoting the abstract idea, rather than as indicating the original Polytheism of the Hebrews, or, as a *pluralis majestatis*. “This manner of expressing the abstract by the plural appears to be even more ancient, and more immediately addressed to the senses, than the more frequent one, in which the *foem. sing.* is put for the *abstr.* Ewald, Hebrew Gramm. p. 326. The acute De Dieu first drew attention to that construction of *חָסַר*. Differing from all other expositors, he translated: *egentem fecisti eum*, and in the same way appealed to Eccl. iv. 8., but he, too, has translated *מֵאֱלֹהִים* by *supra angelos*.

as is shown by ver. 6. 7., alludes strictly to the history of the creation, where the likeness to *God* is declared.

Ver. 8. 9. Only a few have rightly perceived the application which is now made of the declaration in the Psalms. The Psalm says, that *all things* shall be subject to Him. This *πάντα* is here brought forward as it is in 1 Cor. xv. 27. To this extent, indeed, the word is not yet fulfilled in Him; still His exaltation is certain, as the glorified One He has poured out His spirit, Acts ii. 23., is already exalted above all Angels, Eph. i. 21, 22.; 1 Peter iii. 22, and is enthroned at the right hand of God, until He shall have put all his enemies under His feet, x. 13. As to its commencement, therefore, we see that *πάντα ὑπέραξας* already fulfilled. To this we must add, what is further developed in ver. 10—18, that it was precisely His temporary humiliation which made Him the *High Priest* of the New Covenant. It cannot, of course, have any thing in it offensive.

Ver. 8. Here is one of those cases where *γὰρ* appears to be used anomalously (see p. 41.), inasmuch as we should rather have expected a *μὲν* in opposition to the following *δέ*, on which account Schulz translates: *now*. If we had before us an animated dialogistic discourse, we might here suppose an elliptical use of the *γὰρ*: “but this saying agrees not, *for*.” See Viger, p. 496. So in Paul, Rom. iv. 2. Some may wish to apply to this passage the canon, which, since the time of Apollonius, has been applied to Homer, that the established proposition is placed by transposition before that to be established: “We see not yet, however, all things put under Him; if all things shall be put under Him, then nothing shall remain that shall not be put under Him.” But, besides the impropriety of applying this canon, taken strictly, to Homer (see Thiersch, Gramm. p. 478. Hartung, Griechische Partikeln. I. 467.), the relation of the propositions to one another is different, for the second with *δέ* appears to point out an objection to the first. If we must take *γὰρ* as ratiocinative, I see only this

way of getting quit of the difficulty; the citation, namely, is supposed to be brought to prove, that the *οίκουμένη μέλλουσα* is put under Him; but how is this found in it? The author urges *πάντα*—in pursuance of his purpose, he puts *τά πάντα*, not merely *all things possible*, but, *the totality*—this *πάντα* must also include the *οίκουμένη μέλλουσα*, and thus the *γάρ* refers back to ver. 5. But what are the *οὐπω ὑποτεταγμένα*? It is commonly said *the angels*, but according to Eph. i. 21. 22.; 1 Peter iii. 22., along with the exaltation of Christ, His exaltation over the angels is also given; and, indeed, necessarily given, for He sits on *the right hand of God*. What is not yet put under Him we may determine by 1 Cor. xv. 25. 26. Comp. the exposition of Heb. x. 13.

Ver. 9. The construction in this passage is accompanied by some difficulties. Certain expositors, as Beza and Jac. Cappell, think a double synchysis must be supposed, so that the real position of the words would be this: *βλέπομεν δὲ δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον τὸν βραχὺ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*. Valckenaer will have *διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου* construed with *ἠλαττωμένον* as well as with *ἐστεφανωμένον*. Others have even questioned the reading. Schulz, on account of its unsuitable position, would expunge *Ἰησοῦν* from the text; Matthäi, both here and at ver. 7., would expunge *δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον*, and Semler *ὅπως χάριτι Θεοῦ—θανάτου*. For all these assumptions I think there exists not any reason. Let us first come to an understanding on the position of *Ἰησοῦν*. That position, so far from being striking, is much rather *necessary*. The subject-matter, previously, had been Man, or the Son of Man in general (*αὐτός*). The Author now shows how this was fulfilled in the person of Jesus. It might in fact occur to us, as it did to Beza, Michaelis, and Storr, that he had by *ἄνθρωπος*, in the Psalm, understood man in general, to whom universal dominion was promised *in Christ*, and now wished to prove, that in Christ, the True Man, the fulfilment had in a preliminary manner begun. The

first *acc.*, τὸν δὲ βραχὺ τι κτλ., has for its predicate Ἰησοῦν, to which we may supply ὄντα or εἶναι, as at Acts xviii. 28. (Matthiä, Gramm. sect. 428.); and, if this be the correct view, then the position of Ἰησοῦν is the only appropriate one: “*Him who was humbled for a short time below the angels* (of whom the Psalm speaks, and who before was only denoted by αὐτός) we see *in the person of Jesus.*” This is precisely Luther’s view. Comp. the position given to Ἰησοῦς, vii. 22., not for the sake of euphony alone, but of emphasis. If, instead of ὄρᾶν, ver. 8., βλέπειν were intentionally put, we should be obliged to consider its proper signification here to be, *to descry*, to *behold* (Ger. *erblicken*), which is quite agreeable to the sense of the passage. Bengel gives *adspectus loquitur*. The phrase βραχὺ τι is, by many, referred only to the last period of the passion. But, according to ver. 14. 16. 17., v. 7., we think that the ἡμέραι τῆς σαρξὸς are meant by it. The σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα is that which places Him lower than the Angels.—Now, if the first half of the proposition be translated as we have rendered it then διὰ τὸ πάθημα cannot be joined with ἡλαττωμένον but with ἐστεφανωμένον, and dogmatical analogies will be found in v. 8. 9.; x. 12.; xii. 2. It may now be expected, perhaps, that the proposition, διὰ τὸ πάθημα κτλ., as a defining proposition, is more closely connected with Ἰησοῦν, by the article τὸν placed at the commencement. But it is more rightly regarded as parenthetic: “We behold Jesus, the humbled one, crowned with glory, and that on account of His having endured death.” The passage being so conceived, it can no longer strike us that we find ὅπως κτλ. connected with ἡλαττωμένον; as otherwise, indeed, it would have been a solecism.

Along with χάριτι Θεοῦ, there is found the reading χάρις Θεοῦ, which is interesting in a dogmatical point of view. According to the testimony of Origen, in his Comm. on John i. 1. it was, in his time, the most general, for he men-

* See my Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Bibl. Cab. Vol. vi.

was published by Henke (Helmstädt 1800). It consists of two leaves only, and contains the first and last chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews (The *Cod. Uffenbach I. ap. Welst.* contains the Acts, the Epistles, and the Revelation). This valuable fragment, which cannot be assigned to a later period than the tenth century, is the only *Cod.* known which reads $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, if we except *Cod.* 67., which, according to the statement of Alter, has the same reading as a Scholium of the second hand, on the margin, *Nov. Test. ed. Alter T. ii. p. 519.* This reading, although feebly supported externally, is defended by Bengel.

It appears that this excellent man would not have admitted the application of Schulz's Canon of Criticism, although sound in itself: *lectio prae aliis sensum pietatis praesertim monasticae alendae aptum fundens suspecta est (Proleg. in ed. N. T. p. lxi.)*, either here or to 1 John v. 7. If we are to take $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ into favour, in spite of its slender external foundation, it must be supported by very strong internal evidence. It must be, 1. The reading demanded by the context: and, 2. The substitution of $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\tau\iota\varsigma \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ must be easily explicable from dogmatical reasons. Now, so far as the former point is concerned, it is remarkable that Bengel himself wavers as to the right sense. In the first *Prodromus*, which he subjoined, 1725, to his edition of the work of Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio*, he gave this exposition: *filius hominis mortuus proinde ac si is non esset Deus*; in the *Prodromus* of 1731, and, in the *Gnonon*, he proposes this meaning: *ut praeter Deum sibi omnia vindicaret*, which has been adopted from him not only by the Crusian Chr. Schmid, but also by Henke. Again, the exposition of the Greek interpreters is quite different from this, they explain it according to 1 Cor. xv. 27.: "He died for all save God," and then the object of the addition, "save God," we must consider as being to give greater prominence

* Wetstein had already, in 1717, made that discovery; but, unknown to Bengel.

to the extent of the reconciling power of Christ: "for every thing that exists, God only excepted." But, there is a fourth view possible, that is, a reference of the words to the *ἐγκατάλειψις*, Matth. xxvii. 46. So Matthäi. Now, as so great a difference of opinion exists among interpreters respecting the sense of that reading, we cannot surely affirm that it is necessarily demanded by the context. Moreover, it cannot be made to appear probable that *χάριτι* has been substituted for *χωρίς* for dogmatical reasons. Such a substitution must have been made, if at all, for polemical purposes, against the Nestorians; but, the antiquity of the reading *χάριτι* extends far beyond the date of these disputes. Hence Bengel, in the *Gnomon*, after mentioning both readings, and deciding in favour of *χωρίς*, adds: *lectori tamen integrum est, rem amplius expendere.*

If we now inquire into the origin of the reading *χωρίς*, we must examine the charge advanced against the Nestorians, or those ecclesiastical teachers who entertained their sentiments, as having been the authors of it. Marius Mercator charges Theodoret with the substitution; a Scholium of a *Cod. Coisl.* 19., in Griesbach and Wetstein, accuses Theodore of Mopsuestia; Oecumenius and Theophylact blame the Nestorians in general. That they have sometimes corrupted the text of the New Testament, as they were accused of doing by the *Synodus Diamperensis*, is shewn by 1 Cor. v. 8., where the Nestorian manuscripts alone, instead of *ἐν ἀζύμοις*, express the sense of *ἐν ζύμῃ*, and, for this reason, because the Nestorians, with the other Eastern Christians, at the Sacrament of the Supper made use of leavened bread. The passage, according to the present Peshito text, must also have been decidedly displeasing to them, so that, in this way, we have it explained why those of Nestorian sentiments among the ancients, as well as the present Nestorians in the East, prefer the reading *χωρίς* Θεοῦ. From the high antiquity of that reading, however, we must renounce the idea of its origin in Nestorian views, and then the question presents itself, whether

χωρίς Θεοῦ arose, by a mere slip of the pen, from χάριτι Θεοῦ, or whether it have crept into the text as a Gloss. The substitution of an ω for an α, by transcribers, was easy, for α was expressed, for the sake of brevity, by a straight line drawn above the consonant, ω by a circumflex, and these two marks were readily interchangeable. It is not so easy to explain the change of τι into ς: yet there are examples of it; Comp. σχήμασι MSS. *Ba. et Vi.* instead of σχήματι, in Herodian 2, 12, 3. Henke conceives, that, originally, neither reading was found in the text, but, rather, that to ὑπὲρ παντός was added the gloss χωρίς Θεοῦ, and this exchanged by transcribers for the better known χάριτι Θεοῦ. The hypothesis of Griesbach is more probable, that, to the οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον the gloss χωρίς Θεοῦ, founded on 1 Cor. xv. 27. was added, and, that it afterwards crept into our verse.

Χάριτι Θεοῦ has several dogmatical parallels in the New Testament, *e. g.* Rom. v. 15. Titus iii. 7.—The use of the sing. παῖς, instead of the plur. πάντων, *quilibet omnes*, has been considered, although improperly, as an idiom of our author, see p. 35. Why should he not, with equal propriety, write: “that he might suffer death for *every one*,” or: “that he might suffer death for *all*?” Was it not here at the writer’s choice, as in Matth. xiii. 19., and Mark ix. 49., to use the singular instead of the plural? See, for example, Polybius I. 1. 4. παρορμηθεῖσαι πάντα καὶ νέον καὶ πρεσβύτερον, on which passage Schweighäuser remarks: *singularis usurpatur, ubi numerum pluralem expectasses*, Comp. πᾶς τις frequently = ἕκαστος, *e. g.* Herodotus 1, 50; 3, 79., and, simply, πᾶς in Herodot. 7, 197. is, by some, so explained. Origen and Theodoret urge this word for the universality of the work of redemption, the former drawing from it the conclusion, that it includes the souls of the stars and the angels. If, with these writers, we read χωρίς Θεοῦ this conclusion seems necessary.

Ver. 10.—18. And indeed, this short humiliation, until

death, was necessary, for, only through it could He overcome death and be a merciful high-priest.

In our opinion, ver. 10. contains the *Thesis*, which, in the next verse, is further developed, and in the following sequence of ideas: 1. If God was desirous of forming a community of many glorified sons, then that Son who paved the way for them must be glorified through suffering. Ver. 10. 2. Those whom Christ has sanctified are to be regarded as the Sons of God as well as Himself. Ver. 11—13. 3. The ἕκρεπε is proved from this, that the incarnation was necessary, *a*: in order that death might be overcome, ver. 14, 15., *b*: in order that Christ might have that full sympathy with humanity which must be supposed in a mediator, a priest, ver. 14—18.

Respecting the construction, two sets of questions fall to be considered. 1. To what subject does αὐτῷ relate? 2. Must the same subject be taken for ἀγαγόντα? All the moderns (with the single exception of Cramer), and almost all the ancients have made αὐτῷ refer to *God*. To Him the language necessarily refers, because the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας is mentioned as a different subject. Brachmann has very strangely made αὐτῷ refer decidedly to the Father; but, contrary to all the principles of grammar, he has from δι' ὃν κτλ. onwards referred every thing to the Son. It may appear more doubtful whether *God* be the subject with respect to ἀγαγόντα also, as many have supposed, first, the *Auct. quaest. ad Antiochum*, and last of all Klee, who translates: "it became Him, on account of whom are all things, Him who was leading many sons into glory, to make perfect the Prince of their salvation through suffering." But, it is remarkable, that, in his exposition, Klee follows another view of the passage. Against the reference of ἀγαγόντα to ἀρχηγόν it can hardly be argued, that, before πολλούς, the article τὸν would have been expected again, for we might assume—as Justinian proposes to do, and as Bengel approves—that we have here a proposition in apposition,

which, for the sake of emphasis, is placed before: "it became God—as one who should lead many sons into glory, the *leader* of them, &c." But the pron. *αὐτῶν* is certainly opposed to this construction of the words. Interpreters have been led to expound the passage in this manner from expecting the dative *ἀγαγόντι*, instead of the accusative, in the reference to God.^a In such cases, however, it depends equally upon the author, whether he will add the participial proposition in the same case as an apposition, or make it a predicate, as it does whether he will construe the predicates of the infinitive with the case of the subjects or not: See Bernhardy, *Syntax*, p. 367.; in the New Testament, Acts xi. 12. xxv. 27. Construed with the infinitive, it defines more closely not so much the nature of God, as He is in Himself, as His relation to the *τελειῶσαι*. We must by no means call this, as Kuinöl has done, an Anacoluthon.

Let us now examine the words individually. *Πρόπειν* does not denote an outward *ἀνάγκη*, but one in the existing constitution of the human race, resulting from *the nature of God*: so also *ῥπειλε*, ver. 17., and *δεῖ*, Luke xvii. 25. xxiv. 26. &c.—*Αὐτός*, as in Attic prose, = *ἐκάθως*. We were obliged to refer the relative proposition to this subject, but, we cannot help remarking that, in the predicate itself lies a reason for referring it not to the Father but to the Son, namely, in the *δι' οὗ*: if spoken of the Father as the source, *ἐξ οὗ* would have been necessary, according to Rom. xi. 36. and I Cor. viii. 6., where precisely this *δι' οὗ* distinguishes the Son from the Father. If, for this reason, the reader still wish to abide by the reference to the Son, I see no other means of vindicating the construction than the supposition, that *αὐτὸν τοῦτον* has dropt out from before the relative, a supposition, which, however, would charge this correct writer with an intolerable solecism.

^a According to Carpov and Michaelis: "grammar undoubtedly decides that it goes to Christ," because, otherwise, the dative must necessarily have been used.

We shall come nearer the truth by supposing that, in this place, the author (as is done at ver. 11) would have employed ἐξ ὧν had he not had in view the Paronomasia δι' ὧν. This highly significant predicate of God proves the descent of our author from the Pauline school. Of the Apostles, Paul, alone, is acquainted with that thought which embraces time and eternity: God is the *end* of all being. The Italic, instead of *propter quem*, has, with a like sense, *pro quo*. And why does the writer add this predicate in particular?—for the same reason that is found at Rom. xi. 36. There it points out God as the autonomic author of the whole development of the universe in its beginning, middle, and end. So here the predicate intimates, that He who is the prime cause and end of created being is also in a condition to form the wisest counsels for its welfare. The πολλοὶ υἱοὶ stand in contrast to the *one υἱός*, who was not *alone* to be conducted to the δόξα, similar to the declaration, Heb. xi. 40., that the elders were not alone to be conducted to God. The δόξα is that enjoyed in the *regnum gloriæ*, Rom. v. 2.; viii. 18. Col. i. 27. 2 Tim. ii. 10., which includes the becoming like to Christ, 1 John iii. 2.

It is necessary that we now enter upon a difficult inquiry, that, namely, respecting the *Part. Aor. ἀγαγόντα*. The translation: "who *was* to bring many," is widely spread among us—and to it we are led by the context. Nevertheless, grammatical accuracy demands particularly that the *past* idea should be expressed; for, among all the modes of the *Aor.* it is, next to the indicative, most peculiar to the participle. Hence the Italic: *multis filiis in gloriam adductis*, the Vulgate: *qui adduxerat*, in like manner the Peshito, the Arabic, Luther, and also de Wette: "as he — led," which, however, does not necessarily express the past. Now, the adoption of the complete past is accompanied with insuperable difficulties. We could not, if such were adopted, understand the New Testament υἱοὶ, but, as Este, Justir., and Braun have done, the Old Testament saints only. Now, these, certainly, are repre-

canon *De conatu* cannot be applied, perhaps the signification peculiar to the Aorist, that of marking what is *customary, habitual*, has more to recommend it. A very acceptable sense would be obtained if we might translate: *cujus est adducere*, as we might comprehend in the passage both the Old and New Testament sons of God. But, on the one hand, this version gives rise to the dogmatical difficulty, that there ought certainly to be a causal relation between the *υἱὸς ἀρχηγός* and those *υἱοὶ πολλοί*, and that, consequently, we cannot understand any save those of the New Testament: while, again, strictly taken, the Aorist does not express what we call (*pflügen*) *to be wont*, for we find in Greek rather *φιλεῖν, χαίρειν, ἐθέλειν*. Thus stands the matter: the Greek, from his vivacity, presentiates the past in which certain events frequently came to pass; hence, in Grecian proverbs, where we would use the present, the Aorist is employed, Comp. for example, 'Αρσενίου Ἰωνιά ed. Walz, 1832. p. 185. Similar to this is Iliad iii. 33—35 (the same is the case with Arabian proverbs, Comp. also Thiersch, Gramm. p. 291. 2.). According to this strict acceptation, the *ἄγειν εἰς δόξαν* would refer especially to a past. This being the case, nothing else seems to remain for us than, without further justification of the proceeding, to suppose a *permutatio temporum*, according to which *ἀγαγόντα* would stand in place of *ἄγοντα* or *ἄζοντα*. Thus, Beza contents himself with the remark: *ipsa sententia ostendit significari actum praesentem, non praeteritum*, Bleek, also, says no more, and Schlichting is so bold as to give *ἄγοντα* as a reading. The true state of the matter seems rather to be, that the *Part. Aorist.*, joined with the Aoristic *Verb. finit.*, loses the signification of the past, and expresses what takes place contemporaneously with it, from which, in the passage before us, we derive this sense: "as he *wished* to bring," *adducendo*. This is rendered very clear by a passage in Eurip. *Phoen.* v. 1519. *τᾶς ἀγρίας ὅτε δυσζύνετον ζυνετὸς μέλος ἔγνω σφιγγὸς, αἰδοῦ σῶμα φονεύσας*. Oedipus did not explain the riddle *after* he had killed the sphinx,

but *while* he killed her. So Eurip. *Medea*, v. 434. Hermann has illustrated this usage, *Ad Viger*. p. 774. New Testament examples are found in Acts xix. 29. Luke i. 9.; ix. 20. 1 Tim. i. 12.

Ἄρχηγός is here, and, in xii. 2., as also in Acts iii. 15. v. 31., equivalent to *author*, Joseph. *Antiq.* vii. 9, 4. πολλῶν ἀρχηγῶν κακῶν; Diodorus Sic. v. 64. μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν ἀρχηγούς.

On τελειοῦν See App. II, and, on the τελειώσεις through the παθήματα, the exposition of v. 8, 9. The Socinian and Arminian exegesis finds—in the genuine spirit of modern Rationalism—the *causal connection* of the τελειώσεις of Christ and of the πολλοὶ υἱοί in the example of *steadfastness*, to be given to Christians, since they, likewise, would be constrained to endure many sufferings. See Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, and also Episcopius in his Commentary on Revelation ii. 8., where he discusses our passage at length. In like manner, the restriction of τὰ πάντα to *quae ad salutem pertinent* is a Socinio-Arminian reduction of the comprehensive idea which cannot be justified by Eph. iii. 9., and still less by Rom. xi. 36., to which Grotius appeals.

Ver. 11. The γάρ refers back to υἱοί, the object being to shew wherefore the redeemed bear the same name as the Redeemer; but, it may appear doubtful whether this be proved by the Messiah participating in their *lowness*, or by their being sanctified and made Sons through Him, and participating in His *highness*. In the former case ἐνός must be referred to Adam, as Justinian, Hunnius, Carpzov and others have referred it; or, in consideration of ver. 16., to Abraham, as Bengel, Michaelis, and Chr. Schmid; or, ἐνός may be taken, with Calvin, as a neuter: *ex una massa*. In the other case, the expositor will, with the Grecian interpreters, refer it to God. Οὐκ ἐκαιοσχύνεται, in the same way, will be referred, in the first case, to the Messiah's taking part in the lowness of His brethren, in the other, to their having been raised by Him. The reasons advanced by Bengel and Michaelis for the former

view are less weighty, but not so that drawn from the first citation in ver. 13., which, however, seems to declare that the Messiah and the redeemed stood in a similar human filial relation to God. Still so many circumstances combine as to decide us in favour of the *second* view. Even the phrase *τίς—καί* seems to lead to it, for, in the strict use of that phrase the first word appears as the main idea, so that the formula runs thus: "not only this—but also that" So, in Latin, *amoque et laudo*, Terence, Hecyra, iii. 5, 38., *praeter aequumque et bonum*, Adolph. 1, 39. See Hartung, Partikellehre I s 98. Moreover, *οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται* is better explained by it, for, it implies that men have now obtained a dignity, so that the Son of God is not prejudiced by His brotherhood. Add to this, that, in ver. 14., the participation of the Redeemer in the meanness of humanity is first mentioned as a consequence of what precedes. Finally, it must be kept in mind, on the one hand, that the name *υἱοὶ Θεοῦ*, according to the usage in other parts of the New Testament, constantly denotes the dignity obtained through Christ, on the other, that, in the passages where Christ is called "the brother of the redeemed," the expression refers to *God being His and their Father*, John xx. 17 Matth. xii. 50. Rom. viii. 29. But, what shall we now say to the above-mentioned citation, ver. 13.? I can only suppose that it is not carefully selected, in as much as it properly belongs to that other series of ideas: but, even were it to be proved that the Messiah was truly a man, it may be said that Old Testament *dicta* more appropriate than this might have been adduced. The allegation of this passage was made, perhaps, in this way: the author's real intention was to cite the second passage from Isaiah viii. 18., which is here quite appropriate, and, as this from Isaiah viii. 17. would also, in some degree, bear to be applied, he cited it previously. It is remarkable, that the very writer who, ch. i., describes the superhuman dignity of the Redeemer in such lofty language, now brings prominently forward the equality of the redeemed with Him. For this,

however, he had the authority of Christ himself, John xx. 17. Matth. xii. 50. A sentiment of reverence has made the Church abstain from a frequent use of the title brother; it is most frequently employed by the United Brethren, in their Ascetic terminology, in consequence of the tendency of Zinzendorf to bring the Saviour as near as possible to His own. It is a highly remarkable trait in the Christian doctrine, and a source of its inexhaustible riches, that it unites in its dogmas such amazing contrasts as "our brother and our God." It is, also, remarkable that the Rationalists, in their dogmatics, have not often employed this expression. Baumgarten-Crusius has taken this significant word as the motto to his Introduction to Dogmatics.

On the term ἀγιάζω See App. II. The faithful have no claim to the name of brother on their own account, but only as ἀγιάζόμενοι, that being imparted to them, Rom. viii. 29, only in so far as they are σύμμορφοι τῆς εἰκόνης αὐτοῦ. — The εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ is, like other comprehensive expressions of Scripture, sometimes employed in a narrower, sometimes in a wider sense, all the senses, however, having one fundamental notion to which they relate, like concentric circles. This character of the language of Scripture, by virtue of which a single word traverses so wide a field, and has, at one time, a less, at another a greater opulence of meaning, according to its application, may be disagreeable to the formalist in dogmatics as well as to the linguist, these having more to do with the *distinction* than the *unity* of the idea; but, for religious contemplation, and a profound speculation, there is a great charm in beholding the unity of the *Idea* in the unity of the *Word*. Thus the soul and centre of the notion υἱὸς Θεοῦ is given in Christ, but His υἰότης is reflected in manifold gradations in His brethren. Paul designates, Acts xvii. 28., in the language of the poet, *all* men as the children of God; in the fuller sense the name belongs to those whom the Son has, κατ' ἕξοχην, made *Sons*, Gal. iv. 4—6. John i. 12. But John uses the same εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, and ἐκ τῆς

ἀληθείας, of those also, in whom—to speak in the terminology of the Schools—only the *gratia prae-parans* is active. He who has a sense for truth, before he comes to Christ, is becoming a child of God, in the deeper sense of the term (John iii. 21.); John viii. 47.; xviii. 37. 1 John iv. 6. Comp. on the notion *υἱὸς Θεοῦ*, my Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount (Bibl. Cab. Vol. VI.) and see also above p. 127.

Ver. 12. 13. The two first citations, with a very slight change, are made from Ps. xxii. 22., and Isaiah viii. 17 (the ancient commentators improperly regarded the latter as quoted from Psalm xviii. 4), the third from Isaiah viii. 18. On the relation of the Old Testament passages to the reference to Christ, see Appendix I. It is commonly supposed, in respect of the passage from Isaiah viii. 18., that the *nervus probandi* lies in this, that the *filial* relation, as well as the *fraternal*, evinces a unity of nature, and, of course, that the *παῖδια* are children of Christ. Much more must we look upon τὰ *παῖδια* as a designation of the *υἱὸι Θεοῦ*, who are assigned to Christ as to the First-born, and which He, consequently, mentions in close connexion with Himself.

Ver. 14. While in ver. 10. ἐπρεπε was advanced without further explanation, the motives are here first assigned. It may be said that these are twofold, the first, lying in the antecedent, in ἐπεὶ; the second in ἵνα, in the final proposition. The second, however, appears as the main question, the Incarnation alone making the endurance of death possible. Therefore, nearly the same relation obtains between this ἐπεὶ and ἵνα as between the two ἵνα, Rom. v. 20, 21., where, in our opinion, the first proposition with ἵνα, declares the condition under which alone the second with ἵνα could be realised. Still more correspondent is, in ver. 17, the relation of the ὅθεν ἠφείλεν to the final proposition ἵνα γένηται. It may excite our wonder, that, in 1 Tim. ii. 5., where Christ is mentioned as μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, He is called only ἄνθρωπος; the reason of

this, however, lies in the mention made immediately afterwards of His reconciling death. We must, therefore, agree with the Gloss of Grotius, that *σάρξ* and *αἷμα* here point out not *merely* the human nature, but, in particular, the *παθητὸν κ. φθαρτὸν*. This is demanded not only by the context. but, generally, by the usage of the term; *this* materiality, which consists in flesh and blood, is the perishable, Matth. xvi. 17. 1 Cor. xv. 50. Gal. i. 16.; Eph. v. 12. Christ has even now, in His glorification, a *σῶμα*, Phil. iii. 21., but the days of His *σάρξ* are past, Heb. v. 7. The perf. *κεκοινῶνηκε* must not be explained with Bengel: *respectu majoris partis, quae jam vixerat, tempore testimonii in Psalmo editi*, but rather, according to the proper import of the Perfect, as denoting the *state*, arising from the action of the *κοινωνεῖν*. On the construction with the *Gen. rei*, see p. 37. *Καταργεῖν* is a genuine Pauline expression, found, in the most various flexions, twenty-five times in the Pauline Epistles, but, with the exception of Luke xiii. 7., where it is applied to an object of sense, it is found nowhere else save in the passage before us. In Luke xiii. 7. it is used of an object of sense, but in every other instance, in the spiritual sense, to *deprive of activity* (*ἀεργὸν ποιεῖν*).

The developement of the thoughts upon which this declaration is founded, is equally difficult and important. Let us divide the subject, considering these three questions: 1. In how far has Christ, through His death, destroyed death? 2. In how far has He, through His death, destroyed the devil? 3. In how far has the devil the power of death?

1. *In how far has Christ, through His death, destroyed death?* Or, that we may express the thought in the harshest of all Oxymora. that in which Luther has clothed it in his Easter Hymn of 1524: "What means this wondrous rejoicing of Christians: The Scripture hath announced how *one death ate up the other*; death hath become a derision! Halleluiah! (Die Schrift hat verkündet das, wie *Ein Tod den andern frass*: ein Spott aus dem Tod ist worden! Hallelujah!)"

—When we inquire, amid the Theology of the last de-
 cennium of the past century, we receive an answer
 equally tenuous and distinct, the echo of which we
 find in Kuinöl: by the resurrection of Christ, it is
 most clearly proved that there is a future life;—this is
 given as the dogmatical contents of the passage, and
 the remainder of this declaration is regarded as a con-
 scious or unconscious Jewish dress for it. Grotius re-
 lates, at this place, the Jewish superstitious sayings of
 Sammael, the angel of death, and after him, Wetstein,
 Michaelis, and others. Bretschneider, on *θάνατος*, has
 endeavoured to propagate some peculiar ideas respecting
 the superstition which lies at the foundation of the dis-
 courses of Christ and of the Apostles, especially in the
 “*Zeitschrift für Christenthum und Gottesgelahrtheit*”
 in the “*Aufsätzen B. 7. H. 4., und B. 8. H. 3.*”, then in
 his *Lexicon*, and in his “*Dogmatik*”, B. 2. S. 301., &c.
 The Apostles, as it appears to him, looked upon the
 natural death as something good and agreeable to the
 laws of nature; and, by *θάνατος* they understood only
 that everlasting sleep of the soul, in Hades, which came
 over every soul in consequence of Adam’s transgres-
 sion, so that the merit of Christ and his Apostles lies
 in freeing men from this superstition, and in doing this
 —because of the incapability of the people at that
 time to understand the subject better—by means of
 another less hazardous superstition, namely, that the
 death of Christ upon the Cross frees the believer from
 Hades. The *Socinian* and *Arminian* Theology gives
 a more comprehensive import to the declaration than
 the modern. According to Schlichting, Christ through
 His death has conquered death and the devil; 1. In so
 far as His exaltation followed upon His death, and, in
 His exalted state, He is able fully to vanquish Satan.
 2. In so far as upon the death of Christ the resurrec-
 tion and glorification followed, and, by this highest
 proof of the truth of the Gospel, men were brought to
 devote themselves to Christ, and thus to withdraw
 themselves from Satan’s dominion. According to
 Limborch, that victory over death and the devil is ac-

complished, 1. Because the death of Christ, as the Covenant Sacrifice, strengthens faith generally; 2. Because the death of Christ does away with guilt; 3. Because upon the death of Christ follows His exaltation, through which He is able to cast down the kingdom of sin and death. The dogmatists of the Church reckon up various single points, for instance, Gerhard, *Loc. theol. T. xvii. p. 48. : liberavit nos a morte, 1) timorem mortis in nobis extinguendo, 2) mortem in aliquid melius commutando, 3) in media morte vivifica consolatione nos sustentando, 4) corpus nostrum suscitando.* Before we show *how*, in our opinion, Christ destroyed death, we will discuss the question, in what does the destruction of death through Christ consist? In doing this, we must refer especially to parallels in subject, or, at the same time, when we can find them, in words. The most remarkable of these is 2 Tim. 1. 10., καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον, φωτισαιτος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, then comes 1 Cor. xv. 55.; Rev. i. 18.; xx. 14.; xxi. 4., with these the passage from John must be connected, in which it is said, that, for believers, there is no more θάνατος, John v. 24.; viii. 51, 52.; xi. 25. Now, we must remark, on the one hand, that θάνατος, in the passage before us, can, from the context, denote only *bodily* death, but, on the other, that neither here nor in the passages from John, is the question at all of the abolition of the act of *physical dying*, for to this believers also remain subject. Hence also ver. 15. speaks only of the destruction of the *fear* of death, and of the *bondage* to death. Decisive proofs that, in the language of Christ, *to die*, does not mean *to escape physical death*, are partly John xi. 25. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, κὰν ἀποθάνῃ, ζήσεται, partly John xi. 4., where our Lord first says of the sickness of Lazarus it is οὐ πρὸς θάνατον, and, nevertheless, He declares shortly afterwards: Διάζαρος ἀπέθανεν. The expression employed also in 2 Tim. i. 10, καταργεῖν τὸν θάνατον, strictly interpreted, denotes only a *rendering inoperative* (ἀεργὸν ποιεῖν), and the φανέρωσις of the ζωὴ

and ἀφθαρσία is assigned as the positive act of Christ, which φανέρωσις is here something *effectuating*, and not merely a *teaching*. Ζωή and ἀφθαρσία, again, are here so related, that the one is *causa*, and hence placed before, the other *effectus*, *i. e.* the ζωή is the ὄντως ζωή, 1 Tim. vi. 19., which overcomes death. Observe the remarkable expression, 2 Tim. i. 1.: κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ, where ζωή means *specially* the spiritual life in Christ, but it probably comprehends also, as ἐπαγγελία permits us to conclude, eternal life. This ζωή is consequently the βασιλεύειν ἐν ζωῇ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rom. v. 21 (Comp. δικαίωσις ζωῆς, Rom. v. 18.), ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσει διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Hence, also, John v. 29., ἀνάστασις τῆς ζωῆς construed by apposition, contrasted with ἀνάστασις κρίσεως. With this agrees fully what is said John v. 24.—“the believer hath already passed into life,” and John iv. 14. “Christ hath placed a fountain in the inward man, the water whereof floweth unto everlasting life.” In like manner, it is said, John vi. 33. 40. 41. 44. 50. 51. of the bread of life which Christ gives,—that it is “food which remaineth unto everlasting life, and that whosoever eateth of it shall live for ever.” Hence we may give the following as the result: the καταργεῖν τὸν θάνατον, through Christ, consists in this, that He establishes in man a true life which overcometh death, and which will go on unto perfection in another world. But, since this true life is not established in man merely through the death of Christ, and the power which overcomes death cannot be ascribed exclusively but only pre-eminently to the death of Christ, our question stands thus: In the whole compass of Christ's agency in obtaining the ζωὴ αἰώνιος for men, how much efficacy is inherent in His death? Our answer is: by virtue of the fulness of God dwelling in Him, death has only so much power over Christ as He grants to it, but the principle which overcomes death, that principle the head imparted to His members. Οὐκ ἦν δυνατὸν κρατεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου, says Peter of Christ, Acts ii. 24. The Redeemer declares of Himself, that

He has power to lay down His life and to take it up again, John x. 17. 18., and the same thought is contained in John ii. 19. Therefore, we affirm, that He who was able, by His mere will, to recal the spirit into the lifeless body, and to overcome in it the principle of corruption, could have warded off death from Himself, provided He had so willed; but that having yielded Himself a prey to it, and freely laid down His life, He also freely resumed and glorified the holy temple of His body. This affirmation may, perhaps, appear a little startling to some. But, are we not convinced that the Christ who was able to overcome disease in the organisation of others, was also able to ward it off from His own? If this power, however, is in Him in an absolute degree, then, along with it, He has also given to Him the ability to suppress the power of death. Now, in our Epistle, this power in Christ to overcome death is mentioned in those significant expressions found in ch. vii. 16.; ix. 14. But that which the head has, the same passes also to the members.

These members, too, receive such a life, that, in virtue thereof, it will one day be said of them: οὔτε γὰρ ἀποθνεῖν ἐστὶ δύνανται, Luke xx. 36. In appearance, while they yet only receive the first fruits of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 23.), they are overcome by disease and death; still, even now, through the life of Christ in them, they overcome disease and death in their essence, so that, as the older theologians express themselves, their death is only the *larva mortis*, the transition to a more free unfolding of the life established in them, which finally overcoming also the material φθόρα, will glorify its cast off bodily covering. He who has raised up Christ, will, as Paul says, διὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν ἐν ἡμῖν, finally animate also our σῶμα θνητόν, Rom. viii. 11. "The end of God's work is the glorification of the body." The καταργεῖν τὸν θάνατον, in the Church, has, therefore, two degrees, the one in which death in its *essence* is overcome, but, in its *appearance* remains; the other, in which, in its appear-

ance also it is overcome. This last *καταγειν* is spoken of in 1 Cor. xv. 26. Then first, also, Hades is destroyed, which subsists so long as the material world is not glorified by the Spirit; and hence, also, at the final consummation, Hades, together with Death, shall be overcome, 1 Cor. xv. 55. Rev. xx. 14.

Now, although the main idea of the author, as is shewn by ver. 15., be, that Christ has destroyed death, yet he adopts the expressions, that Christ has destroyed the Devil, who has the power of Death, whereby the overcoming of Death is represented not as a physical but an *ethical* process. Accordingly we inquire:

2. *In how far has Christ's death destroyed the Devil?* That His death was a condemnation of the devil is declared by Christ Himself, John xii. 31. In how far is this the case? A general answer may be given: in so far as by His life and His death He has broken the power of the kingdom of evil, Luke x. 18. But, if we inquire in a more special manner, what did our author understand, in the passage under consideration, by the overcoming of the power of Satan? we may, with reference to ver. 15. express it thus: Christ, by His redeeming death, deprived Satan of the right to make men miserable after death—the want of *δικαιοσύνη* and *ζωή*, and unhappiness are correlative terms, so that where the one is the other must be also. But, Christ, by his death, has obtained for His own the *αἰώνιος κληρονομία*, ix. 15., is become, through the struggle which He rightly sustained against death, *αἴτιος τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν*, v. 7—9., has brought it to pass that believers, through the rent veil of His earthly life, pass into the Holy of Holies, x. 19. 20. Comp. App. II. With this agrees the boast of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 56. 57., that death is deprived of his sting, which is sin.

3. Let us again inquire: *In how far the power over death is attributed to the Devil?* For the elucidation of this question expositors are wont to adduce

passages from the Rabbins concerning the angel of death Sammael, who, riding upon the serpent, is said to have seduced Eve, &c. These passages are found at greatest length in Buxtorf, *Lex.* and in Eisenmenger, from whom Schöttgen has made extracts. With these may be compared what Hackspan brings forward in his learned treatise, *De angelorum daemonumque nominibus*, § 42. 43., on the Angel of Death, in his *Sylloge Dissertt.*, 1663. Still, what do these passages prove? According to some modifications of the Rabbinical story, they certainly talk of Sammael (and, in like manner, of Asasel and Asmodai) as if he were a particular angel; but, according to the most current representation, Sammael is only another name for Satan, as Maimonides has proved, *More Nebochim*, II. c. 30. Now, that Death came into the world through Satan, is already known from Wisdom ii. 24. We must not, however, regard the proposition: That Satan has power over Death, as merely an isolated notice, for it is intimately connected with the whole doctrine of that being. The author of evil upon earth is also the author of all its consequences. Descending still farther, Christ himself calls that which in nature diffuses Death, *δύναμις τοῦ ἐχθροῦ*, Luke x. 19. The same thought, that Death is dependent upon the Author of Evil, is given under a more corporeal image in *Evang. Nicod. ed. Thilo*, p. 736., where Hades, as a particular person, addresses Satan: *ὦ ἀρχιδιάβολε, ἡ τοῦ θανάτου ἀρχή, ἡ ῥίζα τῆς ἀμαρτίας, τὸ τέλος παντὸς κακοῦ.*^a The expression *κράτος ἔχων τοῦ θανάτου* indicates that Death itself is a power, which, although originally foreign to human nature, yet now *κυριεύει, βασιλεύει* (Rom. vi. 9.; v. 14.), reigns over it.

Ver. 15. The first thing which here attracts attention is the use of the demonstrative *τούτους*, since we should either expect *πάντες ὅσοι*, or *ὅσοι*, in the first proposition, and *τούτους* in the second. Hence Luther,

^a O Archfiend, the beginning of Death, the root of Sin, the end of all Evil.

Schulz, and de Wette have, without any remark, translated it: "those who," exactly corresponding to the Italic: "*hos, qui.*" No other course is permitted us than either to suppose that, construed *ad sensum*, it refers to the preceding τὰ παιδία, or—which I should prefer—to suppose a preadmission of the Demonstr., such as we find in Herodian, 4, 15, 11: ἐπειρῶντο δὲ οἱ μὲν βάρβαροι, πολὺ τι τῷ πλήθει τούτων ὑπερέχοντες, κυκλώσασθαι τοὺς Ῥωμαίους, instead of κυκλώσασθαι τοὺς Ῥωμαίους, πολὺ τι τῷ πλήθει ὑπερέχοντες αὐτῶν or τούτων. It is asserted, although incorrectly, by Abresch, that the infinitive ζῆν, when taken, as it is here, substantively, cannot be accompanied by an adjective. See, for instance, Ignatius: *Ad Trall.* c. 9., τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν. The connection of the Gen. δουλείας is questionable; that is, whether it is to be construed with ἐνοχοί, which is assumed by almost all interpreters, or with the verb ἀπαλλάξῃ, a construction which Abresch and Böhme defend, after the example of de Rhörs. The reason given by Abresch, namely, that ἐνοχοί is more usually construed with the dative, is of no weight. The argument, to which Böhme has given such prominence, that our author, for the sake of emphasis, is wont to place the main idea at the end of his periods, is based, at least, on precarious grounds. Schäfer goes so far as to affirm, against Hermann and Bremi, that the Greeks and Latins, in the collocation of words, paid no attention whatever to the emphasis of sense, and looked only to euphony, *Appar. ad Demosth.* I. 347. 400: *omnino falsissimum mihi videtur de vocum collocatione iudicium in liberrima linguae graecae latinaeque syntaxi, quae ad aurium sensum numerorumque suavitatem aut gravitatem fere exigeretur.* Even if this be not true to the extent maintained by him it is so in general, and more in Greek than in Latin, in which we certainly trace distinct rules for the emphatic collocation of words. At all events, the construction adopted by Böhme would make us sin equally against logical perspicuity and the laws of euphony: and, still, this commentator urges another

reason, namely, that ἀπαλλάξῃ cannot well stand without a genitive. This is correct, ἀπαλλάττειν is = ἀλλάττειν ἀπό τινος. Aid has been sought in an ellipsis of φόβου, indeed, but, Kuinöl's observations in defence of that are inapplicable. If ἀπαλλάξῃ stood at the close instead of the commencement of the proposition, the pronoun belonging to it, αὐτοῦ (φόβου), might be omitted with the utmost propriety: See Winer, p. 128., and the writers there quoted. Yet, in the present position of the words, an ellipsis is scarcely admissible. I do not venture to decide between the two constructions; whichever we adopt the sense remains the same. Φόβος and δούλος are correlative ideas, Rom. viii. 15., and stand opposed to the παρρησία, with which the υἱοὶ approach the θρόνος τῆς χάριτος, chap. iv. 16. x. 22. This Christian παρρησία refers also to that which lies beyond the earthly death. It might occur to an inquirer to compare with this the δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς, Rom. viii. 21. But, on a closer examination it is perceived that the parallel is only apparent.

Ver. 16. With *that* race—such is the author's thought—which was to be saved, it was necessary that the Divine Being should be incorporated, and this thought is declared in such a way as again to set aside the doubt as to His humiliation below the angels.

We have here an extraordinary case in the history of Exegesis, namely, of a proposition, without a single *testis veritatis*, having for centuries been understood and explained in the Church against every law of language. Of such a case it might have appeared difficult to find an example; yet such an example is presented by the verse before us. Without a dissentient voice, save that of Chrysostom,^a we find adopted from

* The passage in which Chrysostom explains this verse is one of those in which the hand of a stranger has interfered with the text. Comp. below, on chap. iv. 2. That Chrysostom distinguishes between the signification of ἱπικλαμβάνεσθαι and ἀναλαμβάνειν is clear from these words: ἱ

the first ages of the Church down into the sixteenth century, an exposition which, according to the laws of language, ought manifestly to be rejected. The Italic translates: *nec enim statim angelos adsumsit*, in the sense of: "He did not assume the nature of angels;" the Vulgate: *nusquam enim angelos apprehendit*; Ambrosius, Vigilius Taps.: *suscepit*. The Peshito: $\text{ܕܡܝܢ ܐܢܓܠܝܢ ܠܗ ܠܗܝܟܢ}$, "he has not taken (anything) from the angels," by which, probably, it was intended to express, that he took not on him their nature. The *Philox.* has ܕܡܝܢ , "he assumes." The Coptic version, also, has: *non induit*. The version of Luther, as well as the other Protestant translations, express the same sense; and so is it explained by all the interpreters from Theodoret to Castellio, the first, so far as we know, who gave an exposition agreeable to the usage of the language. He first rendered (I Ed. of his translation, 1551): *non enim angelis opitulatur*. Yet, after this correct translation was published to the world, neither Erasmus, nor Calvin, nor Beza, nor any other of the philologists of that age, undertook its defence. On the contrary, Beza hurls his thunders against what he calls this abominable innovation of Castellio, whom he very much hated. The new exposition found so much the more welcome a reception from the Socinians, first from the acute Enjeddin (not, as Maresius says, from Socinus himself), who undertook Castellio's defence, and made some severe animadversions on Beza, then from Crell, Schlichting;—subsequently from the Arminians, Grotius, and Limborch; and, finally, the theologians of the Roman Catholic and Evangelic churches appear in its favour. Among the Roman Catholics the first was the acute Ribera (1606, died 1614.). Both parties, however, still evinced an unwillingness to im-

$\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$ ($\tau.$ 'Ιουδαίων) ἴσταν ἡ σωτηρία, ὅτι ἰκείνων ἰσιλάσεται πρῶτον, ὅτι ἰκείνων ἀνίλασται σάρκα, but, upon these there follows some words from which no meaning can be drawn.

pugn the traditional exposition. Ribera says: *libentius fatebor non intelligere sensum Pauli, quam tot Patrum explicationi contradicere*. On the translators of Port Royal adopting the new version they found themselves exposed to the censure of R. Simon (see his *Hist. des commentt. du N.T.*, p. 922.). The praise of the most solid defence of this version is due to Cameron. Since the middle of the 17th century, the older exposition has been, in fact, the property of the stricter Anti-Socinian polemicists. See, among those of the Reformed Church, Maresius, *Hydra Socinianismi* II. p. 522.; among the Lutherans, Scherzer, *Colleg. Antisocin.* (1672), p. 396., Calov, *Synopsis controvers.* (1685) p. 77.; but see, also, the Comm. of Seb. Schmid and Chr. Wolf.

The proofs of the incorrectness of that older exposition, are the following: 1. Ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι, with the Gen., has the signification of: "to take hold of one by a part of the body, especially by the hand, in order to help him," Wisd. iv. 11. Jerem. li. 32., hence the Vulgate, more correctly than the Italic, has employed *apprehendit*. But, on the other hand, this verb cannot be understood of the assumption of human nature.* 2. Ἐπιλαμβάνεται is in the Pres.; upon which Kuinöl remarks: *praesens vim Aoristi habet*. The work of redemption is rather considered as a work begun by the incarnation of Christ, but still constantly advancing. However, if ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι were explained of

* Theophylact and Oecumenius have endeavoured, in a peculiar way, to unite the traditional dogmatical interpretation with that agreeable to the usage of the language. They take ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι in the sense of δράσασθαι, and Oecumenius observes accordingly: τὸ ἐπιλαμβάνεται δηλοῖ ὅτι ἡμεῖς μὲν αὐτὸν ἐφιύρομεν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἢ δὲ Χριστὸς ἰδίῳ κτ. διώκων ἴφθασι, κ. φθάσας ἐπιλάβετο. οὐκ ἀγγέλων φύσεως ἰδράξατο οὐδὲ ἀνίλαβεν, ἀλλ' ἀνθρωπίνης.^{aa} Daniel Heinsius, in his "Exercitt. Sacr. p. 556.," professes himself to be of this strange opinion, but inaccurately quotes it as the exposition of Chrysostom, and Justinian also.

^{aa} The ἐπιλαμβάνεται means, that we fled from him, but that Christ pursued, and, pursuing, overtook, and overtaking, laid hold of: he laid not hold of nor took up the nature of angels, but of men.

the assumption of the human nature, the Aorist or the Perfect must be employed. 3. "To become man" cannot be expressed by λαμβάνειν or ἀναλαμβάνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, nor even ἀνθρώπους γενέσθαι, such a phrase necessarily demanding τὴν φύσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀναλαμβάνειν (this word is frequently employed to denote the *putting on of clothes*), or ἄνθρωπος γενέσθαι—and much less can ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι, with the Gen., have that signification. 4. This proposition with γὰρ is intended to elucidate the proposition μετέσχε σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος, but that view of it would make it express an *idem per idem*. There is a peculiar notion expressed by Schulz, who takes θάνατος as the subject: "death indeed does not seize angels but the children of men, therefore the Redeemer was obliged to come to the help of men." Ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι denotes certainly a violent attack, for instance, of diseases (epilepsy), but, as the natural subject of the phrase is precisely that person whose redeeming efficacy is previously spoken of, recourse should have been had to such a reference only in the event of its being found impossible to bring out a proper sense in any other way.

We have yet to inquire, Whence had Luther the *nowhere* (*nirgend*) of his version? He has here—for generally in his first undertakings in the New Testament, no less than in his translation of the Psalter, he depended on the Vulgate—followed the Vulgate. Now, the *nusquam* of that version seems to have been thus introduced: δὴ που were read separately, που ing referred to a Biblical passage, Comp. δέ που, ver. ∴ "in no Biblical passage is it said that he, &c." And thus it is explained by Seb. Schmid and Coccejus.

But why have we σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ and not τῶν ἀνθρώπων, which might have been expected as the natural antithesis of ἀγγέλων? As Böhme supposes, σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ might be put in the spiritual sense, so that it would denote those *genuine* sons of Abraham who had truly the word of prophecy before their eyes (Rom. ix. 6, 7, 8.), and these are they who walk in the footsteps of his faith (Rom. iv. 12. Gal. iii. 8. 9.).

Such a spiritual acceptation of the expression can not have been far from the mind of our Author, since he transfers the predicates of the outward people of God in the deepest sense to Christians, Comp. λαός, ver. 17., iv. 9., xiii. 12., with 1 Peter ii. 9. Titus ii. 24. Gal. vi. 16. But, in our passage the leading idea is the *corporeity* of those to whose aid the Redeemer is come. Now, that the writer actually confined the Redemption to Israel may not be affirmed, because of the ὑπὲρ παντός, ver. 9. It seems, therefore, most proper to seek for the reason of this form of expression in our Author's having in view the *promises* fulfilled to the seed of Abraham. On this very account, too, expositors have been led to refer δῆπου to *Scripture passages*.

Ver. 17. Here ὁθεν and ἵνα appear in the same relation as ἐπει and ἵνα in ver. 14. The overcoming of Satan mentioned in ver. 14. already presupposed the redemption and the redeeming death. The verse is an explication of that presupposition. In order to overcome Satan our Redeemer must be High-priest, in order to be such He must be ἐλεήμων, and, that He might be this, it was necessary for Him to be like His brethren. On the realization of the order of Priest in Christ, See App. II. Ἐλεήμων may be construed with ἀρχιερεύς as an adjective, or, it may be taken by itself. The latter mode is preferable, because, otherwise, the ἐλεήμων as well as the πιστός would be placed in connection with τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν; ἐλεήμων refers to the relation of Christ to the brethren, πιστός to that to God, who perfects the atonement in and through Christ. Still, we must not take τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν as = πρὸς Θεόν, as Bengel appears to have done, Comp. v. 1. It belongs to the idea of a reconciler or mediator, that he unite the interests of both parties in himself, that he transpose himself in a lively manner into both. According to His divine nature, Christ bore in Himself the consciousness of the claim of God on men at the same time with that of His compassion towards them; He must, as man, feel the wants of men, and hence

stand in their stead. Schleiermacher, Dogmatik I. A. II. S. 290 : " Since Christ, in order to receive us into the communion of His life, was obliged *to begin* by entering into communion with us—" S. 291 : " So far as the whole of Christ's dealings and actions from the beginning was conditioned by His suffering, that is, by His *sympathy* with our guilt and punishableness." Should it be objected—If Christ could not have become compassionate by any other means than through a real participation in our nature, then is He more compassionate than God, it may be replied : " God was in Christ, and reconciled the world to Himself." It is said in the parable, that the Father fell on the neck of the lost Son, so, in like manner, has this taken place *in Christ*. We have still to inquire, whether the dignity of the High Priest be here conceived as one first beginning in heaven (see on viii. 1.). The contrary seems to be the case ; *ιλάσκεσθαι* certainly appears to refer to the Redemption completed upon earth. If, however, ver. 18. be urged, we may say with Bleek, that the *βοηθῆσαι*, which is mentioned as the consequence of the *πεπρονθέναι*, is parallel to the *ιλάσκεσθαι*, and, if this be so, then *ιλάσκεσθαι* refers to the *intercession by virtue* of the Atonement completed upon earth. On *λάβε*, see at ver. 16.

Ver. 18. The merciful sympathy of the New Testament High Priest had been mentioned, ver. 17., not without respect to the state of the community, their struggles, their sorrows, and their consequent temptation to apostacy. This notion appears still more prominently in the verse before us, wherein, from His temptation in tribulation, the Author deduces the consequence : " that He is able to succour them that are tempted." This is more distinctly shown in ch. iv. 14—16., which verses, let it be carefully remarked, exactly continue the thread broken off at this passage, for ch. iii. iv. must be regarded as an intervening Parenthesis. We think the sense of the verse cannot be more beautifully given than in the language of *Hutt. rediv.* 2 Ed. p. 273 : " In Christ God received a

form for us, in the Son we recognise the Father, we are able to love Him as a man, in our Brother God, who reigns at all times over us, and who will one day (even now) sit on His throne to judge the world, we confide in a heart which has experienced how the human heart feels amidst seductive pleasure, and how amid the cares and anxieties of life." 'Εν ᾧ is generally regarded as a relative including a demonstrative, ἐν ᾧ—ἐν τούτῳ δύναται, as the Vulg., Luther, and also philologists, such as Casaubon and Valckenaer. But Böhme, with great acuteness, has pointed out certain reasons which compel us to regard it here as a causal particle. Of these, the most worthy of remark are: 1. We expect, from the very commencement, that the discourse will not turn upon a single suffering, nor a single temptation, as if the βοήθεια were confined to a distinct class of the πειρασμοί; and against such a notion we have also iv. 15., πεπειρασμένον κατὰ πάντα. 2. As we should have, according to that view, a historical relation of the suffering, we should expect the Aorist ἔταθε, as in v. 8.; xiii. 12.; as the Perfect rather points out the result of the παθήματα, that Christ is one *who has endured suffering*, and the Part. of the Aor. connected with it, assigns the modification under which the παθήματα befel him. 'Εν ᾧ, therefore, will be best translated by: *in so far*; the examples of which from the Classics see in Bernhardt's Syntax, p. 211.—Αὐτός in other passages, when in the *casus rectus*, is always emphatic, so is it likewise here. Winer, p. 132.

We have now to elucidate the dogmatical purport of πειρασθῆναι, as employed with reference to Christ. In my Comm. on the Sermon on the Mount, Bib. Cab. Vol. XX, I have stated that the signification of πειρασμός = πειρατήριον implies, that a man is placed in a state of *choice*, and, hence, may easily be brought to fall. Castellio expresses this sense by *periclitando*. If the sinlessness of the Redeemer is still to be maintained, then, as Ullmann, finally, and Hase, also, in the 2d Ed. of his Life of Jesus, p. 67., has remarked,

we can ascribe to Him no *susceptibility of incitement* to evil, and this, as it would seem, negatives the notion of *choice*. How then can we speak of a *πειρασθῆναι* with respect to Him? It may be replied: in so far as, *in abstracto*, the *possibility* of sinning in the second Adam is no more to be excluded than it is in the first, and every thing took place in Him, which, if it had taken place in other children of Adam, would, in them, have stirred up sin—as Schleiermacher, in his Second Advent Sermon 1832, on Heb. iv. 15., expresses himself: “His human soul had in every thing the same susceptibility as our own; the opposition of liking and disliking, of joy and sorrow, as it is found in our soul was also in His, and, in such opposition it was obliged to try its strength—that is, be tempted. *Every thing, therefore, which moves us inwardly, and in such a manner that thereupon sin afterwards arises in us, moved Him also, but without any ensuing of sin in Him.*” But, in our opinion, the notion of temptation is still more closely applicable to the Redeemer, and we are not obliged to suppose Him free from the pain of choice also. Let us first inquire: of which *πειρασμοί* does our author speak? Not of those in the wilderness, but of the struggle with the sufferings of His last days and hours; this is shewn by v. 7, 8.; and the object of the writer was, from the *πειρασμοί* of the Redeemer, to draw consolation for Christians assailed by tribulation; hence, also, iv. 15., *συμπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν*. Now, in these struggles of the Redeemer, there was actually a pain of choice, not, indeed, between what was agreeable to God’s will, and what was opposed to it, but between what was agreeable and what was opposed to human nature, as capable of suffering. Were not this the case, how could the Redeemer here distinguish His will from that of His Father, and say: “Not *my* will but *thine* be done?” Suffering, in itself, without reference to the Divine Will, was not His will; and, as He chose it, He chose it only in so far as, therein, He chose the will of God, and this suf-

fering could not pass away without pains and struggles. But, in such struggles sin could have no place, because, 1. The dread of suffering in human nature is not, in itself, sinful; 2. Because, considered *under the form of the Divine will*, Christ straightway chose suffering. As he says in John iv. 34 : that it is His meat *to do* the will of His Father, so was it also His meat *to suffer* it. But, in our opinion, in the *πειρασμός* in the Wilderness, we must not think there was no pain of choice. If we keep by the intimation of Luke iv. 13., and John xiv. 30., these two passages, apparently, go to prove that Christ's struggles, in the last days of His sufferings, and those in the Wilderness, were of a kindred nature. We find that the conflict in the Wilderness, in general, is directed to the same object as that in Gethsemane and Golgotha, in particular. This is not the place for a full explanation of the history of the temptation; thus much, however, we may premise: The Redeemer, we conceive, declares, in the three acts of temptation, concentrated, the three tendencies wherein the Divine fulness of power imparted to Him might have been abused (So also, recently, Neander). Let us imagine another endowed with this fulness of power; in him the temptation might have arisen to seek, by means of it, *pleasure, honour, glory*, and, to these three things refer the three temptations. Had this taken place, Satan and not God would have been served. Now, when the dread of suffering in the human nature preferred, instead of slowly pressing forward by the path of the Thorns and the Cross to the *τελείωσις*, to the *δόξα* and *τιμὴ* (v. 9. ii. 9. xii. 2.), at once to become a partaker of glory, the preference shews nothing sinful; on the contrary, human nature *must* flee the evil, and seek the untroubled state. Sin would first have entered when the evil had been regarded as the *ἐντολή τοῦ πατρὸς*, and yet been avoided. But, He who feeds five thousand lives on alms, He who succoured all others permits that it should be cried out to Him while on the cross, that "He can not help himself;"

He who—to employ the language of Claudius—bears under the coat which was woven throughout the thunder and lightning of heaven, and says Himself, that twelve legions of angels are at His command, Matth. xxvi. 53., has not where to lay His head. This is what the Redeemer chose instead of that which Satan proffered Him; and, if it cost Him a struggle freely to embrace it, there was in that struggle just as little sin as in the exclamation of the Christian when, sighing under the burden of tribulation, he, at the same time, cries out: “Father, thy will be done,” and: “deliver us from all evil!”

CHAPTER III.

BY THE FAITHFULNESS AND EXALTATION OF OUR HIGH PRIEST LET US LAY FAST HOLD ON HIM, OTHERWISE, IN SPITE OF THE GIFTS OF GRACE WHICH WE HAVE ALREADY RECEIVED, THE SAME FATE OF REPROBATION MAY COME UPON US WHICH BEFEL THOSE IN THE WILDERNESS, WHO HAD PREVIOUSLY OBTAINED SO GREAT FAVOUR.

Ver. 1—6. *Behold Christ, who is as faithful to God as Moses was, and yet is exalted so high above Moses.*

VER. 1. In our opinion, the context is especially connected with the predicate πιστός in ii. 17. He remained πιστός in the πειρασμοί, therefore the community must look upon Him in order to become so likewise. Κλησίς expresses a Pauline idea. At ἐπουράνιος the question arises, whether it mean that which descends from heaven (vi. 4. xii. 26.), or, that which leads to heaven? The same question has been proposed at Philipp. iii. 14., on ἡ ἄνω κλησίς τοῦ Θεοῦ. As the object of the κλησίς there has been proposed

αἰώνιος ζώη, 1 Tim. vi. 12., and, in our Epistle ix. 15., the αἰώνιος κληρονομία. Compare ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως, Eph. i. 18. This reference, too, answers a paraenetic purpose, that is, to venture the earthly for the heavenly, comp. x. 34: τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὑπαρξίν ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ μένουσαν. This passage contains the only example of the predicate ὁ ἀπόστολος applied to Jesus, and has given rise to the puzzling question: "In what passage of the New Testament is Jesus numbered among the *Apostles*?" The opinion generally current justifies the expression by those passages in John wherein it is said, that the Father has sent the Son into the world (ἀπέστειλεν), John iii. 34. v. 36. vi. 29. x. 36. Comp. also John xx. 21. Theodoret compares, likewise, Gal. iv. 4. And, as, elsewhere, the Apostles call themselves διάκονοι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἁγίων, so Paul calls Christ διάκονος, Rom. xv. 8., comp. Gal. ii. 17. Supposing this view of the passage to be the true one, there arises another question: whether ἀπόστολος relate here to Moses, and ἀρχιερεὺς to Aaron, or, whether ἀρχιερεὺς must be regarded as involving the idea of ἀπόστολος? An attempt has been made, as by Jac. Cappell, to shew that the predicate ἀπόστολος is as applicable to Aaron as that of ἀρχιερεὺς to Moses. I must confess that the passages quoted do not appear to me sufficient to justify the use of the predicate ὁ ἀπόστολος τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν as applied to Christ. Ἀπόστολος, without any addition, is constantly employed to designate the ἀπόστολοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ; if it were intended to point out Christ, in contradistinction to them, as the immediate ἀπόστολος τοῦ Θεοῦ, it would have been necessary to intimate this, in some way or other; for instance by an adjective, such as θεῖος or οὐράνιος. And we may add, that, in this construction, where the Sacerdotal dignity alone of Christ is the matter in question, we do not expect such a predicate. But, if the expression were employed to compare Jesus with Moses, wherefore the addition of ἀρχιερεὺς, and why not the expression

ὁ προφήτης, which is more frequently used of Moses? These reasons oblige us to look around for some other explanation. The first writer, so far as we know, who pointed out a suitable explanation was Braun in his Commentary. The same view was subsequently defended by Deyling, in the *Observv. Sacr.* t. I., Sachlin, in a learned treatise in the *Thes. nov. phil. theol.* II. p. 964., Schöttgen, Wolf, Wetstein, and Stuart. According to the Talmud, the High Priest, on the Feast of Atonement, was sanctioned by a fixed formula to appear before God as the mediator of the people, and, as such, received the name of *ambassador*, *i. e. representative of the Synedrium*, שְׁלִיחַ בֵּית דִּי. Of this we are informed by the *Cod. Joma*, which describes the different rites of the feast of expiation. The supposition of an allusion to this rite would yield us in so far an advantage as it would enable us easily to explain the connection of ἀπόστολος and ἀρχιερεύς. But, it is requisite to determine the signification of ὁμολογία in order to obtain a complete insight into the sense of the expression. The Vulgate, Luther, Schulz, de Wette, and Wahl, have retained the signification *confession*, and taken it in the wider sense of *religion*; the Italic has *constitutio*, probably in the sense of *lex, statutum*; Chrysostom explains it by: τῆς πίστεως. On the other hand, Camerarius has referred to the sense of *league, covenant*; and the Dutch Federal Theology decided, after the example of Coccejus, universally, for the meaning *stipulatio*. The signification *covenant, promise*, has lately found a defender in Tittmann: "Remarks on the *Synonimes* of the New Testament." *Biblical Cabinet*, Vol. III. We, in like manner, think ourselves obliged to decide in its favour. In our opinion, it is much more convenient to refer ἀρχιερεύς, an expression of a kindred meaning with μεσίτης, to a covenant than to a confession; and, from iv. 14, as well as x. 23., this signification appears the most suitable. Ὁμολογία, like διαθήκη, denotes ἡτις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομόθε-

τηται viii. 6., hence, x. 23., ὁμολογία τῆς ἐλπίδος. The notion of διαθήκη and that of ἐπαγγελίαι are indeed closely connected, Wisdom xviii. 22. Eccus. xlv. 11. And, very remarkably, this same expression, ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας, is found in Philo l. I. *De somn.*, in Mangey t. I. p. 654. There, it is true, τῆς ὁμολογίας is wanting in *Cod. Med.*, and Mangey has, in his usual manner, and without one word of explanation, founded a conjecture upon this circumstance, that the word has been transplanted thither, by some copyist, from the Epistle to the Hebrews. Whether the reading be genuine or not, the signification of *covenant* alone must be adopted in that passage, as the word is unaccompanied by a pronoun. Now that קִלְשׁ signified delegate, *i. e.* deputy, representative of the community; just as we find in other combinations, also, the term קִלְשׁ decidedly with this signification. The sense of the passage would then be: Christ the *representative* and *High-priest* of the *covenant* concluded with God; and ἀπόστολος would not differ in sense from μισίτης and ἔγγυος, vii. 22. It has been objected to this exposition, that the term, in this sense, belongs to the usage of a later period, and that, in the rite alluded to, the ἀπόστολος was chosen by men, while here, ver. 2., God appears as the appointer. But, with respect to the latter remark, it may be replied: that *God* has chosen the representative of men from among themselves; and, as to the forms, a doubt may certainly be entertained with regard to the time at which the rites given in the *Cod. Joma* were recorded. At any rate, they belong to a period anterior to the destruction of the temple, consequently, if the rite be founded upon a genuine tradition, so is also the name. And, besides, the name, as we have shewn, was elsewhere in use with the signification of *representative*. We conceive, therefore, that this exposition has been sufficiently established.

Ver. 2. It appears that this comparison of Christ

with Moses occurred to our Author merely by the way, from a remembrance of the Old Testament passage, Numbers xii. 7., wherefore, in ver. 3—6., he immediately makes the reader remark, that the equality in faithfulness of these two does not involve their equality in respect of dignity. *Ποιεῖν*, according to the usage in Greek, as well as in Hebrew, *to appoint*, Comp. Keuchen on Acts ii. 36., Elsner on Mark iii. 14., Carpzov on the passage before us. Comp. namely, 1 Sam. xii. 6. *μάστρυς κυρίου ὁ ποιήσας τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ τὸν Ἀαρῶν*. Bleek, who doubts whether *ποιεῖν τινα* may ever stand absolutely for *appoint*, would take, in opposition to Gesenius, the *ΠΣΥ* of that passage in the sense of *create*.

The declaration respecting Moses is quoted in *that* form in which we find it in Numbers xii. 7. A question of great importance to the understanding of the passage, ver. 6., is, whether *αὐτοῦ* refer to God, to *ποιήσας*, or to Christ, to whom the preceding *αὐτόν* refers. In the Old Testament passage, certainly, the pronoun is used with reference to God; as our author, in like manner, at x. 21., speaks of the *οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ*; and, hence, all expositors have given it the same reference here. But, reasons of considerable weight might be adduced to shew that the writer wished, in this place, to denote the house as a *house of Christ*, in the same way as it is declared in ver. 3. 4. and 6. Böhme has given this as a conjecture. We should, if we adopted this view, be obliged to read, ver. 6., *τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ*, as we find it in the Plantinian and Erasman editions, and, to the external reasons for *αὐτοῦ* in ver. 6., there might be added some internal grounds also. But, as something may be urged against this supposition, and nothing compels us to it, we shall drop it, after the example of Böhme. We may remark, respecting *οἶκος*, that it means, in the Old Testament passage, and also in this application of it, *family, race*; hence, too, *πιστός*, in the Old Testament context, has a superlative signification, see Ewald, *Kritische Grammatik*, sec. 302. If prominence was given in ver. 3. and 4. to the proper meaning *House*,

the transition from the Metonymical to the proper sense was so much the more easy, as, in the Old Testament, the Metonymy is carried still further, and: "to build a house" is of the same import as: "to found a family." Ruth iv. 11.

Ver. 3. The reason of the call to *κατανοεῖν* already exists in the participial predicate *πιστὸν ὄντα*, yet, the *γὰρ* brings forward a new reason drawn from the dignity of Christ. As all Divine revelation belongs to the Logos, as the God manifest, so, the establishment of the Old Testament economy is referred to Him. In like manner, John xii. 41. 1 Cor. x. 4., rest upon the same view. Hence, while Christ, in whom the Logos became man, is the founder of the Old Testament economy, Moses belongs to it simply as an individual, and, consequently, stands far below Christ.

Ver. 4. *En locum*—thus does Abresch commence his exposition of this verse—*qui vix dici potest quantum torserit interpretes*. The declaration has appeared so singular and difficult to many, that some *Codd.*, mentioned by Matthäi, entirely omit *πᾶς γὰρ — τινός.*—First, let us remark, that the verse has been improperly included by Carpzov, Knapp, and Vater, in a parenthesis; the argument goes on to ver. 5.—According to the exposition current since the time of the Greek Fathers the declaration would be a *dictum probans* for the divinity of Christ, and belong indeed to those passages in which Christ is called (not *ὁ Θεός*) *Θεός*. But what, in that case, would be the argument of the Apostle? The answer depends upon this, whether we refer *τὰ πάντα* to the institutions for salvation spoken of before—taking *τὰ* in a demonstrative sense,—as the expositors of the *Reformed Church* do, or, to the universe, as Theodoret, Theophylact, and the *Lutheran* interpreters have taken it. Some conceive that there is here a syllogism, to which the *conclusio* must be supplied; according to others the *propositio minor* is wanting. Piscator gives the syllogism thus: *is, qui condidit domum Dei, est deus — atqui Christus condidit domum Dei, — ergo Christus est Deus, et per conse-*

quens major est Mose. It were better, if we adopt this view, to say: "Some one must be the founder of every house, now, he that builds up the whole Old and New Testament edifice is no other than God." According to the acceptation common among the Lutherans, which was known also to Theophylact, and, as it appears, to Theodoret, the conclusion is this: "A house—and Moses was designated as part of a house, and, of course can be here named a house—is made, but he who *is not* made, but himself makes all, and, consequently, created Moses also, he is God." In support of this exposition Jac. Cappell and Bengel come forward with a demonstrative acceptation of ὁ δὲ: "but this one—Christ, who made all things, is God," certainly against every principle of grammar, for, in that case, the article before τὰ πάντα could not have been wanting: ὁ τὰ πάντα κατασκευάσας. These two views scarcely deserve a particular confutation. Socinian, and Socinianising theologians, as Sykes and Peirce, have attempted, from polemical motives, to give other expositions equally violent. That explanation which has, in recent times, been most approved of we ourselves adopt, and will endeavour to establish in the following manner. As the בֵּית

יִשְׂרָאֵל in the Old Testament was always designated as בֵּית יְהוָה, the reader, even though acquainted with the idea which referred back the divine revelations in the Old Testament economy to the מִיִּמְרָא דִּי, might certainly have been struck by the circumstance, that Christ, without farther notice, should be pointed out as the founder of that community. As if in explanation, the Author adds: "Some one, as an instrument, must found a building, although God must ever be acknowledged as the highest founder of all things." Paul expresses himself in a manner very similar, 1 Cor. xi. 12., ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡ γυνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός, οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ διὰ τῆς γυναικός· τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, Comp. ver. 3. *ib.* Yet it still remains something singular, certainly, that τινός stands so isolated and indefinite.

Ver. 5.—Christ's exaltation above Moses is shewn from yet another side. According to Numbers xii. 7., the latter is θεράπων, and he is θεράπων with relation to the future institution for salvation. Christ is, by acknowledgment, Son,—this *material* contrast is formally expressed by the counter-position of the prepositions *ἐν* and *ἐπί*. Θεράπων, which is well rendered by the Vulgate: *famulus*, and employed also in Wisdom x. 16., and applied to Moses, corresponds more to the *ἱταῖρος*, while δούλος = *οἰκέτης*, see Ammonius, *ed. Valck.* p. 69. It is singular that most interpreters have improperly referred λαληθησόμενα to revelations which Moses was still to receive. The Peshito itself translates expressly: "what by his mediation (ⲥⲓⲙⲓⲛⲟⲩ) should be revealed;" Ambrosius, *De Josepho*, c. 6. 10., cites even: *quae dicta essent*, instead of: *quae dicenda erant*, according to which we should have been obliged so to conceive the matter as if that honorary predicate had been conferred upon Moses *before* the reception of his revelations, with reference to his future department. This, however, would be an assumption destitute of all foundation. When we remember what is said chap. viii. 5. ix. 8. 23. x. 1., we shall believe, no doubt, that the λαληθησόμενα are the *Christian* revelations (ii. 3.), which were indicated by the arrangements of the Mosaic worship.

Ver. 6.—The Copula may be merely supplied, or, what is better, πιστός ἐστι. Down to the most recent times, there has been a diversity of opinion among interpreters whether we should read αὐτοῦ, or αὐτοῦ. The Vulgate has: *in domo sua*, while the Italic: *in domo ejus*. When it is urged against the reflective, that it is precisely the term *υἱός* which brings out the principal point, namely, that of the dependance, it is replied, with a reference to Gal. iv. 1. 2. 7., that the notion *υἱός* includes the *κληρονομία*. Perhaps the following reason may be more striking. If, with these interpreters, we do not refer αὐτοῦ in ver. 5. and 2. to Christ, then the former αὐτοῦ and this αὐτοῦ, in ver. 6., would form an antithesis not less strong than the pre-

positions *ἐν* and *ἐπί*. But, in this case also, we should, in ver. 6., expect another word, such as *ἰδίον*. Instead of the *rec. οὐ*, we find in the Latin translations, and in the Latin *patres* *ὅς*, which Bengel, from his predilection for the authority of the Latin version, decidedly prefers, notwithstanding that neither *Cod. A.*,—the agreement of which with the Latin version he made a criterion in the *Gnomon*, 2. A., of the genuineness of a reading, nor any other auxiliary accords with this reading, except the *Cod. Clarom.*, from his partiality for which Beza, likewise, has adopted *ὅς*, and three *Codd. Minusc.*, although the first, from the second hand too, reads *οὐ*. The external reasons, of course, quite preponderate in favour of *οὐ*; for *Cod. D.*, from its adherence to the Latin version, and also from its adoption of glosses (See, immediately below, *ὄπιον* in ver. 9.), has no great weight. There exists a grammatical suspicion, indeed, against *οὐ*, namely, the want of the article before *ὄλιος*, which a grammatically instructed Copyist has added in only one *Cod.*, according to Matthäi. We do not intend to vindicate the want of the article from the fact, that it is equally wanting in passages of Luke and Paul, where the definite nature of the subject necessarily demands it, *e. g.* Luke x. 29., 36.; Eph. i. 10., when explained according to Rückert. But, we might inquire with Böhme, whether it must not necessarily be wanting here? Since precisely, according to the connection of our passage, *ὁ ὄλιος Θεοῦ* denotes the Old and New Testament economy as a whole, and it might, consequently, have caused some confusion, if, immediately following upon this, the N. T. Theocracy had been called directly *ὁ ὄλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, comp., accordingly, *Θεοῦ οἰκοδομὴ ἔστι*, 1 Cor. iii. 9. Should this reason be thought unsatisfactory, an appeal may be made to examples where it is wanting to the *Predicate* after a preceding relative. The passages, indeed, in which these are found, are not sufficiently convincing, xi. 10. *ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ Θεός*; Ps. cxliv. 15.: *οὐ κτίστης ὁ Θεὸς αὐτοῦ. Οἴκισ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* are employed in speaking of the

Christian community, 1 Tim. iii. 15. 1 Peter ii. 5.; iv. 17. Eph. ii. 21.; 2 Thess. ii. 4. Rev. iii. 12., comp. 1 Cor. iii., 16. 2 Cor. vi. 16. Now this house of *God* is here called a house of *Christ*, in the first place, because He is the foundation of it, and, secondly, because *in* Him the building is framed together and groweth, Eph. ii. 20. 21.; 1 Cor. iii. 11. As Paul, when he puts forward any elevated declarations to the Churches, is wont to connect his warning propositions with *εἶπερ* and *εἴγε*, Rom. viii. 9. 1 Peter ii. 3. Col. i. 23., so our author employs *εἶναι*, which Lachmann has adopted, or *εἰναιπερ* ver. 14.; vi. 3, and, in the wavering state of the community such was the more necessary. What he wishes them to hold fast is *faith* and *hope*, and, in the same way, *πίστις* and *ἐλπίς* are connected 1 Peter i. 21. Παύλησις as to matter = ὑπόστασις, ver. 14., πληροφωρία τῆς (sic.) πίστεως, x. 22. *Hope*, according to the Christian notion, is *Faith* with a particular direction, that is, while *faith* is the holding fast the reality of the present and future invisible world, *hope* is the joyful confidence which arises from that holding fast the future world, the certainty of participation in the βασιλεία τῆς δόξης, and hence *hope* and *joy* are correlative ideas, Rom. xii. 12.; 2 Cor. iii. 12. Here also *καύχημα* expresses joy, triumphant joy; a parallel passage is found Rom. v. 2.: *καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Wahl, by an accurate distinction of *sensus* and *significatus* has, for the most part with reason, diminished the number of meanings in the N. T. Lexicons; but, under *καύχημα* he has improperly omitted the signification *gaudium*, which Bretschneider has received into his Dictionary. That Luther's: "*Ruhm*" (glory, boasting), and: "*sich rühmen*" (to boast) are not quite suitable, we often feel in reading the Pauline Epistles, particularly the second Epistle to the Corinthians. The LXX. clearly shews that *καύχησις*, according to Hellenistic usage, was equivalent to *ἀγαλλίασις*, which latter, accordingly, in one Cod., 1 Thess ii. 19., stands instead of *καύχησις*. In the Aramaic, also, ܟܘܚܘܢ has not merely the signification *gloriatius*

est, but also *laetatus est*. Καύχημα, for which the Attic writers have καύχσεις, is here, as it is in 2 Cor. v. 12. Active, as φρόνημα is=φρόνησις, Buttmann, Ausführl. Gramm. ii. 315. In Pindar it so occurs, Isthm. v. 65 : καύχημα κατάξρειχς σιγῶ : “water glorying by silence,” that is, that it may spring up so much the more luxuriantly.—βέβαιος, not only here, but, throughout all the New Testament, occurs as an adjective of three terminations, ver. 14. ; vi. 19. ; ix. 17. ; Rom. iv. 16. ; 2 Cor. i. 7. From the predilection of the Attics for *communia* it is used more frequently by them as a *commune* : but still it is often found as an adjective of three endings. See the Rem. on *Thomas Mag. ed. Bern.* p. 149. In Heb. ix. 12. we find also αἰώνιον. Examples of the reference of the adjective, as in this passage, according to its genders, not to the substantive immediately preceding καύχημα, but, to ἐλπίς are found likewise in classical writers, although more frequently in the poets than the prose writers. Matthiä, §. 141. 2. c. There yet remains, the question, whether μέχρι τέλους refer to τέλος τῶν πάντων, the reappearance of Christ, or to the τέλος of every individual, a question which may likewise be asked respecting Matth. x. 22. ; xxiv. 13. 1 Cor. i. 8. Rev. ii. 26. The assertion propagated in more recent times, that Paul distinctly expected the reappearance of our Lord during his own life, has been lately modified by Usteri and others, who think that he looked for this when he wrote the Epistles to the Thessalonians, but that, subsequently, Phil. i. 21—24., he became doubtful respecting it, and, finally, 2 Tim. iv. 6. et seq., altogether resigned this expectation. Were this assertion correct, we should not, merely on that account, be entitled to assume that the disciples of Paul participated in his opinion. And, moreover, the assertion, not to mention other reasons against it, is weakened by the express declaration of the Apostle. 2 Thess. ii. 2. &c., that the day of the Lord was *not to be immediately* expected, various events were previously to take place ; and, if, with many, we understand by κατέχων, the Apostle himself, then it is expressly declared that he would not survive until the

day of the Lord. The communicative manner of address must be admitted in 1 Cor. xv. 51. (according to the *rec.*), and in 1 Thess. iv. 17., for, if it be not, we should be forced to adopt the absurd notion, that Paul knew with certainty, that, for some years, no Christian would die in Corinth or Thessalonica. But, according to Lachmann's text, and also the *text. rec.* explained by Rückert, or as Billroth, Olshausen, and Winer (p. 512.) explain it, Paul says directly, that some, or even all, would die. Compare the article on Hegel's doctrine of the resurrection in the *Evang. K. Z.*, 1834. No. 12. S. 94. As Christ, on the one hand, had admonished them to look every moment for His reappearance, and, on the other, declared that no one knew the hour of His coming, so the Apostles were convinced that He *might*, and desired that He *should* come very soon, without, however, fixing any thing respecting the *articulus temporis*. According to this we must expound x. 25, 37. of our Ep., comp. x. 25. We, therefore, explain *μέχρι τέλους* in this passage, quite indefinitely, of the *end of the season of conflict*; and we regard 1 Peter i. 9. 2 Tim. i. 12., as, in substance, saying the same thing. This termination of the season of conflict approaches, for some, at the *end of the individual*, for others, at the *end of the whole race*. Bleek remarks: "It is in general; until hope shall find its object, its complete fulfilment."

Ver. 7—19.—*Lay the threatening to heart, which is pronounced in Ps. xciv. 7. &c., that the unbeliever and the disobedient cannot see God's rest.*

Ver. 7.—Unbelief and apostacy were chiefly to be apprehended in the community (ver. 12; x. 22, 25), and, hence the exhortation is directed against these, comp. the mention of *ἀπιστία*, ver. 18. 19.; iv. 2. Already had the community received numerous blessings, but these had served only to render many among them secure, vi. 4—8. The author works against this pernicious security, by setting before them a terrible example. The Fathers, who had, during the Exodus

from Egypt, seen such manifold wonders of God's grace, and had ten times tempted Him, yet without obeying His voice, were, at last, excluded from the land of promise; so, notwithstanding numerous instances of God's grace, many of the community might lose the heavenly Canaan (c. iv.). The Old Testament fact is applied in a manner exactly corresponding by Paul, 1 Cor. x. 1—11. The Author might have pronounced this warning, in reference to the threatenings, Deut. i. 34., but, as a Psalmist had already held up these threatenings before *his* generation, the writer prefers introducing them in the words of that Psalmist, and refers them, not to David, indeed, who is said to be the Author of them by the tradition of the LXX. (comp. iv. 7.), but to the *auctor primarius Scripturae Sacrae*, the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, because the latter, as Calvin says: *longe plus efficiendis animis valet, quam si Davidem nomine citaret.*

Let us now consider the different views of expositors regarding the construction. According to Calvin, Piscator, Grotius, Carpzov, and Valckenaer, the words from *καθώς* to the end of the 11th verse should be included in brackets, so that *βλέπετε*, in ver. 12., would fall to be connected with *διό* in ver. 7.; a collocation for which Abresch, particularly adduces this reason, that we should expect *δέ*, or some other particle, to be employed along with *βλέπετε*. But, in opposition to this, it may be remarked, that, in xii. 25., *βλέπετε* is used by itself, to introduce an admonition. Böhme considers it as certain, that the proposition, ver. 12., is the concluding proposition to *καθώς*. Kuinöl, on the contrary, after the example of some older writers, supposes that the author appropriates the words of Scripture as his own: "Wherefore,—that I may let the Scripture speak,—harden, &c." To us it appears preferable to regard this proposition as one of those on which the Apodosis, as it can be supplied from the Antecedent, falls of itself. It would have run thus: *μὴ σκληρύνετε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν* (comp. ver. 13.). This view may the more readily be adopted, because of the

length of the citation introduced by καθώς, and, because, precisely after καθώς in shorter citations (Rom. xv. 3. 21. 1 Cor. i. 31. ; ii. 9.), as well as in other cases (Mark xv. 8. 1 John iii. 12. 2 Cor. iii. 13.), the Apodosis must be supplied from the preceding context. In such cases the Greeks and Latins combine the Apodosis and Prothesis into one proposition, a usage which has been placed by Matthiä, *De Anacoluthis*, under the Anacoluthia, but by Krüger, in his excellent treatise on Attraction, §. 31., it has been more correctly reckoned among the Attractions.

Ver. 8.—Comp. Exodus xvii. It has been contended by Michaelis, especially, that παραπειρασμός and πειρασμός, are, in the LXX., designations of places, as the Greeks also, on other occasions (as Philo Byblius, in the translation of Sanchoniathon), were used to translate the significant Eastern *nomina propria* into Greek. Still, not only has Rosenmüller, among the expositors of the Psalms, not acknowledged this in the Greek translators, but de Wette has rendered the Hebrew: “as on the day of the temptation.” There is no doubt that the Psalmist employed the words in the Hebrew text as *nomina propria*. The observation of Kuinöl, that the addition כִּי־וַיִּטְּוֹ shews the contrary, I do not understand, comp. כִּי־וַיִּטְּוֹ מִרְיִן Isa. ix. 3., כִּי־וַיִּטְּוֹ מִצְרַיִם, Ezek. xxx. 9. With respect to the LXX., on the other hand, we may entertain a doubt, although the opinion of Michaelis seems to be correct.

Ver. 9.—Οἶ referred back to ἔξημος=ὄπου, which is given by one Scholion, and adopted by the *Cod. Clarom.* Πειράξις, even when employed by men in reference to God, has the meaning assigned to it at ii. 18.; by means of mistrust and unbelief, men think they can place God in a situation in which His impotence will be made manifest. Δοκιμάξις, in like manner, is here selected in the bad and accessory sense, for the sake of the parallelism with πειράξις; still בְּרַח,

to which it corresponds, occurs Malachi iii. 10, 15., and, without the parallelism, = $\aleph\psi$, and so also $\deltaοκιμάζειν$, Wisdom i. 3., comp. Bauermeister on the passage. Knapp and Vater, pointing according to the Hebrew, have placed a colon before $\epsilon\deltaοκιμασαν$; but neither Breitinger, in the LXX., nor Griesbach, has adopted this punctuation. According to the Hebrew punctuation the adversative signification of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ comes more distinctly forward; $\kappa\alpha\iota$ corresponds, in this passage, to the Hebrew וְ *although*, and occurs with this import in classical writers, especially in parenthetical use. Wolf on Demosth. *Adv. Lep.* p. 238. Stallbaum on *Apol. Socr.* p. 53. Moreover, very weighty testimonies are in favour of the reading $\omega\delta\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\alphaσαν\ \omega\iota\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma\ \eta\mu\omega\omega\ \epsilon\nu\ \deltaοκιμασι\alpha$.

Ver. 10, 11.—The $\delta\epsilon$, in ver. 11., must not be taken in the disjunctive sense of $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ (which it indeed never bears), for, in this place, it has a conjunctive signification, and hence the LXX., following the Hebrew more closely, have given $\kappa\alpha\iota$. $\omega\varsigma$ here, and at iv. 3., with the *verb. fin.*, is employed in the sense *so that* (Mark iv. 27. does not belong to this class of meanings). Perhaps the rare occurrence of this meaning has occasioned the reading $\delta\iota\varsigma$ of the Vulgate. $\omega\varsigma$ and $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ = *as*, and *so as*, are both employed with the infinitive, and with the *verb. fin.* to denote the effect, result. See Passow, p. 1129. No. 3. Winer p. 277. 299. The Canon, that $\omega\varsigma$ alone, is employed to mark intention, $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ result, is incorrect as respects both Particles. See, in reference to $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$, Bremi, in the *Appar. ad Demosth.* I. p. 413.— $\epsilon\iota$ is the Hebrew formula of adjuration וְ

Ver. 12.—There is here stated, more especially, what was the cause of the destruction of that race, namely, unbelief. The genitive $\alpha\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$ is placed by the adjective $\pi\omega\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}$, elsewhere, particularly by participles and Adject. *verb.*, to denote the cause from which any thing proceeds, 2 Peter ii. 14., according to *Cod. AC.* 1 Cor. ii. 13. James i. 13., in which cases

the older Praxis talked of an ellipse of the ἀπό. See Bos, *Ellips. ed. Schaefer*, p. 749.—On μή with the future following it, in classical writers, see Matthiä, p. 998. In the New Testament, comp. Col. ii. 3.; and Winer, p. 445. Ἐν points out the expression in which the unbelief reveals itself. The predicate ζῶν, in opposition to the μή φύσει ὄντες θεοί, Gal. iv. 8., denotes the God who shows himself operative in life, and hence the real God, and is, therefore, of a kindred meaning with ἐνεργής, iv. 12., and with ἀληθινός, 1 Thes. i. 9. Here, perhaps, it was selected for the same reason as at x. 31., and iv. 12., in order to indicate that this real God will likewise realise His threatenings. The same allusion is contained in the predicate of God's being the living God in the usual formula of an oath, יהוה חי,

Jer. v. 2.

Ver. 13.—Christian watchfulness alone can preserve us from such a fall; and no man must, in this matter, consider himself alone, for then self-deception is near, but all must mutually regard one another, xii. 15.; x. 24. That this sin has an ensnaring power (φρεναπαρά), so that the understanding is led astray by it, Rom. vii. 11. Ephes. iv. 22. James i. 22. 26. And, indeed, this mutual admonition must take place while it is called *to-day*. Now this has either the meaning: "so long as that *to-day* of the Psalm is called to you" (so Böhme and Kuinöl understand it), or: "so long as the predicate *to-day* is called *i. e.* used" (so Luther, Beza, Bleek), *i. e.* so long as your earthly life endures (iv. 7.). And, as the danger is every day renewed, so must we give heed καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, and so much the more as the period at which this call ceases for the individual and for the whole race is at hand, x. 37.

Ver. 14.—This hardening would have for us effects so much the more pernicious as God has shewn so much grace as to send Christ to us, vi. 4.; x. 26. Μίτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, like vi. 4., μίτοχοι πνεύματος ἁγίου. Ὁ Χριστός the sum of all the Christian blessings, on

which account we do not find ὁ Ἰησοῦς, which is elsewhere employed by the Author, Gal. iii. 27.; Phil. iii. 8. Theoph.: οὕτω μετέχομεν αὐτοῦ ὡς σῶμα κεφαλῆς. Γεγόναμεν must be translated, not as a present, but, as a perfect, the intention being to give prominence to the value of that which we have received through Christ. In the other passages, also, where it occurs, it is most correctly translated by the perfect, v. 11.; vii. 16.; xi. 3.; xii. 8. The conditional proposition with εἰάνπερ is like ver. 6. On ὑπόστασις see at xi. 1., and compare παρῴησία, ver. 6. In ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς ὑποστάσεως there is as little of a Hypallage as there is in ix. 2.; ἀρχὴ must be taken as a concrete, it corresponds with πρώτη πίστις, 1 Tim. v. 12. Comp. Rev. ii. 4. The first faith of the community was a thoroughly self-denying devotion to Christ, vi. 10.; x. 32. Μέχρι τέλους forms a beautiful antithesis to ἀρχή, comp. on ver. 6., Bengel: *initium—usque ad finem*, xii. 2.; vi. 11. *Christianus quamdiu non est τετελειωμένος, habet se pro INCIPIENTE*; resembling this is τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως, 1 Peter i. 9., in so far as, in that passage, the signification *reward*, is not adopted, but *end*, which alone is the correct meaning. On the feminine termination of βέβαιος comp. at ver. 6.

Ver. 15.—There is a diversity of opinion respecting the grammatical construction of the words of this verse. Chrysostom remarks, καθ' ὑπερβατόν ἐστι τοῦτο, that is, he thinks ver. 16—19. are to be taken parenthetically, and the commencement of chap. iv., φοβηθῶμεν οὖν, to be joined with ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι,—and, in this, he is followed by Grotius and Valckenaer. Carpzov, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Kuinöl, and Winer (p. 496) regard σήμερον—ἀκούσητε as the words of the Psalmist, and, on the other hand, μὴ σκληρύνητε as the admonition of the writer. According to Bengel, Peirce, Chr. Schmid, Abresch, and Knapp ver. 14. should be inclosed in brackets, and ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι be connected with παρακαλεῖτε; while, by the Vulgate, Luther, Calvin, and Beza, ver. 15. is connected immediately with ver. 14., as Beza translates: *interim dum dicitur*, i. e. *quamdiu*

haec vox personat. Of the views we have mentioned, *this* seems to be the most worthy of adoption. It is true a particular emphasis would then be laid upon the idea: *so long as*, so that we might expect *ἕως ὅτου* or *ἄχρις οὗ*, whilst *ἐν* imports merely *by*, comp. viii. 13., *ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι*, 1. Cor. xv. 52. Still, we should have agreed to this connection of propositions, if a preferable one, first proposed by Böhme, did not present itself; according to it, ver. 16. is regarded as the concluding proposition of ver. 15., and *γάρ* as a particle in the interrogation, as it occurs particularly in interrogations of surprise. See Hermann on Viger, p. 829. Hartung, i. 478. "When it is said: to-day, &c.—what manner of persons were they who, after they had heard God's word, revolted?" This connection of propositions is strongly supported by the circumstance, that it gives a sense very appropriate to the context. The writer, in ver. 14., brought forward, as the ground of his warning against them hardening themselves, that Christians have received so great blessings. It might have been objected, that, for this very reason, a falling away was the less to be expected from them. He replies, "does not the language of the Psalmist, which I bring before you, refer precisely to such rebels against God as He had, with a mighty arm, conducted out of the land of bondage? and to whom do the anger and wrath of God apply? to the very same persons, when they had fallen into unbelief; *consequently*, we are not placed in security by the grace which we may have ourselves experienced." comp. Rem. on ver. 7.

Ver. 16.—The exposition here will be very different from ours, if we take, as Oecum. and Theophylact, as well as the Vulgate, and, after it, Luther have done, *τινίς* as *pron. indef.*, and *ἀλλά* as implying a limitation. *Τινίς* would then relate to the six hundred thousand who fell in the wilderness, *οὐ πάντες* to those who were, on the muster, found under twenty years of age, the Women and Levites, and especially to the two persons, Caleb and Joshua, to whom it was vouchsafed

to enter into Canaan, as Paul, also, 1 Cor. x. 5., for the sake of these two exceptions, says only: οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν αὐτῶν εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεός. But the strongest argument against this view of the passage is its complete opposition to the object of the Author, which is to shew the magnitude of the divine punishment. According to our exposition, τίτες must be written as an interrogative pronoun, and, likewise, without an initial capital. So Theod. understood it. Ἀκούσαντες with an allusion to the εἰὼν ἀκούσητε; the subject of this ἀκοή is the εὐαγγέλιον, that believers shall enter into the land of rest, comp. iv. 1. 2. Ἀλλά in the interrogation, like εἶτα xii. 9., is according to genuine classical usage, and corresponds to our *but, still, yet, indeed* (*doch.*): "it was *indeed* all those," and hence is especially employed in Antiphora. Matthiä, §. 613., Devarius *De Partic.* p. 19., resembling the Latin *at*, and *at enim*, Tursellinus *ed. Hand.* i. 438. 446. On πάντες οἱ ἐξεληθόντες, Bengel first made the acute remark that the signification: "altogether such as," would be more suitable, as Schulz also translates it; the object to be proved being, namely, that precisely those who had received the most grace should suffer the heaviest inflictions of the divine anger. But, can πάντες οἱ ἐξεληθόντες be so translated? It appears that Bengel had οἱ πάντες in mind; οἱ πάντες φίλοι means: "friends all together," and may, therefore, be rendered: "*nothing but,*" or, "*wholly friends,*" according to which usage, also, οἱ πάντες is placed with numerical words, when the phrase has the signification of, *in the whole, in all*, Acts xxvii. 37.; xix. 7.* On the other hand, πάντες οἱ φίλοι can only be rendered: "*the friends, all of them.*" Bengel, as well as Kuinöl, appeals to Raphael on James i. 17. The examples there adduced are either such as have the singular without the article, as

* Winer, p. 106., appears to have overlooked this use of οἱ πάντες, with numbers. He has also there quoted the position of the article in ὁ πᾶς νόμος, Gal. v. 14., as an anomaly, without observing that it is far from rare in the classics, *ex. gr.* Plato, *De Rep.* 10, 618. ὁ πᾶς κίνδυνος, Polyb. 1, 15, 6.

James i. 2., which certainly means: "all possible peace," and, hence, "pure peace;" or, the article stands before πάντες, as Arrian, 3, 8, 8. Παρθουαίους δὲ καὶ Ἰσχυαίους καὶ Ταπούρους, τοὺς πάντας ἰππέας (*wholly* horsemen, horsemen *altogether*) Φραταφέρνης ἦγεν. We get almost the same sense as that sought by Bengel, by translating: "was it not they altogether who went out of Egypt," in which these two exceptions, Caleb and Joshua, and those in their minority, remain unnoticed, and the following thought presents itself: "did not God's anger strike so many as had there experienced proofs of His grace?"

Ver. 17—19.—It is most convenient, with Beza and Matthäi, to place the mark of interrogation at the end of the verse, for, otherwise, the words have a dragging effect. The reason, also, of the punishment is now added, that is, unbelief, as in verse 19. δι' ἀπιστίαν is made prominent by the collocation of the words. With this ἀπιστεῖν, according to the usage of the New Testament, ἀπειθεῖν is synonymous (iv. 11.), in so far as all belief in an objective truth is a sub-ordinating of self to it, hence ὑπακοή πίστεως, Rom. i. 5. But, it is remarkable, that, in ver. 17., ἀμαρτάνειν appears to be used synonymously with ἀπειθεῖν. In the New Testament ἀμαρτάνειν is used in a similar way to our *fallen*, which partly denotes sinning in general, partly a deep fall and apostacy from the right path in particular; in this latter sense it is used here, and in x. 26; 2 Peter ii. 4; Titus iii. 11. So in Hebrew מַעַל, to sin, to fall into sin, joined with בִּיהוּה, to fall off, to apostatize, so also פָּשַׁע; and thus פָּשַׁע and מַרָּה, are connected in Lam. iii. 42. Κῶλα is put in some places by the LXX. for פְּנֵי רִים, Beza: *hoc vocabulo significatur, illos non tam sic ferente mortalitate vel quovis morbo, sed tabescentibus sensim corporibus in deserto veluti concidisse.*

CHAPTER IV.

THAT PROMISE OF GOD'S REST STILL CONCERNETH US ALSO, NAY, US PECULIARLY, THEREFORE, LET US STRIVE THAT WE MAY OBTAIN A PORTION IN IT.

Ver. 1—10. *That promise of God's rest still concerneth us also, nay, us peculiarly.*

Few interpreters have succeeded in giving a lucid view of the progress of the ideas in this section. As an insight into that is necessary in order to a right comprehension of detached portions of the section, we will premise a survey of it. The promise of the land of rest concerneth us also (iii. 13.). We who have been led out of the spiritual Egypt (Rev. xi. 8.) have, as well as they who were led out of the sensible Egypt, received the glad tidings of a rest of God, nay, to us, the faithful, it peculiarly belongs. That is, although that rest of God existed from the beginning of the world, yet the men of Moses' time, in consequence of their unbelief, did not enter into it. Now, since the compassion of God wills that there should be some to enjoy this rest, men are, after the lapse of five hundred years, again invited to it with a to-day, by which it is declared, that, even originally, the land of rest did not merely denote the earthly Canaan, as the latter, in the times of David, had long been possessed by the chosen people. In as much as the land of the true rest of God is now opened to us Christians, through Christ (vi. 19, 20.), that promise belongs, also, peculiarly to us. As tending to give a clearer perception of the contents of the following section, let us cast a glance upon the Hermeneutics of the author. He does not expound according to the grammatico-historical connection, but, what lies, *κατὰ διάνοιαν*, in the declarations of the Old Testament, he considers as contained in it *κατὰ ἔημα*, and derives it from the *words*. In what light we are to consider this mode of interpretation, see explained

in App. I. We will now shew, as respects the passage before us, on the one hand, where the author has departed from the grammatico-historical interpretation, on the other, wherein he has rightly apprehended, *κατὰ διάνοιαν*, those Old Testament declarations. 1. He has taken up the Old Testament declaration, ver. 3., without regard to the grammatico-historical connection, as, by including the declaration quoted in ver. 4., he has not explained the words *εἰς τὴν κατὰπαυσίν μου* according to their primary meaning: "into the land which *I* give you for rest (Deut. xii. 9.)," but: "into the rest which *I, God, myself* enjoy." 2. He has concluded, from the warning of the Psalmist against neglecting the voice of God now, as was done in the time of Moses, that even now a rest of God is offered, and that too the same as then, wherefore, the rest promised in those times cannot have been merely rest in the earthly Canaan. In how small a degree soever the Old Testament passages, *κατὰ ἔημα*, i. e. according to their historical connection, justify this exposition, and these conclusions, still, we must confess that, *κατὰ διάνοιαν*, they are rightly cited. The typical character of the Old Testament history being supposed, the earthly land of promise presents itself in the connection of the same Canaan as the type of that land of promise won by Christ; and, herein lies a justification of the affirmation, that the promise given to the believing Israelites that they should enter into the land of rest was not exhausted by its temporal fulfilment; in other words, that, according to its fullest import, it points to something higher. Moreover, if it be true, that we most significantly express the character of the Christian's rest in the land of promise prepared by Christ when we say, he will share in the rest of God himself, then it is also true that the promise of entering into God's rest, conceived *κατὰ διάνοιαν*, does not merely imply a rest prepared by God, but, also, one which God himself enjoys.

Ver. 1. An admonition founded upon sad examples, comp. ver. 11. 1 Cor. x. 8. 9. Rom xi. 20. 21.

Καταλειπομένης alludes to the circumstance that the sense of the promise was not exhausted by the possession of the earthly country. It is still uncertain, with regard to αὐτοῦ, whether it be the rest which God gives, or which He possesses. Δοκῆ we cannot, as Schulz and Wahl have rendered it, translate: "that no one may think he is come too late;" the Apostle is not desirous of warning against a false view, nor against faint-heartedness, but against actual exclusion. Ὑστέρειν means: *to come too late*, and is, no doubt, used with reference to σήμερον. In the Perfect it means: "*to be come too late*," i. e. to be excluded, and, in the sense of the declaration, Luke xiii. 25.; in a corresponding sense it is used Heb. xii. 15. Δοκεῖν, in accordance with this view, is used here paraphrastically, as, in other passages, φαίνεσθαι, to soften the admonition, comp. Josephus, *Antiqu.* II. 6, 10.: οὐδ' ὦν εἰς ἐμέ δοκεῖτε ἀμαρτεῖν, ἔτι μνημονεύω. In like manner the Latin *videri*, *Cic. De Off.* III. 2, 6: *ut tute tibi defuisse videare*. The use of δοκεῖ, 1 Cor. xi. 16., might certainly be explained in the same way, as Wahl supposes, but it is better to take it in the signification (as in 1 Cor. viii. 2.): "to assume, to arrogate, to presume." Luther, with correct feeling, has altogether passed by the words. With our conception of the meaning Bleek entirely coincides.

Ver. 2. The εὐαγγέλιον of Christians relates especially to the acquisition of eternal bliss; the εὐαγγέλιον of the contemporaries of Moses related to the earthly Canaan, but this, again, points to the land of everlasting bliss. Bengel has made a judicious remark on the εὐαγγελισθέντες, ver. 6. The exposition of the following words depends upon the reading, which is fluctuating, in the two words of the *rec.*, συγκεκραμένος and ἀκούσασι. The received reading is found, indeed, in the two most ancient versions, the Peshito (not in the *Philox.*), and the Latin, but not in a single copy of the *Uncial Codd.*, and only in a few of the *Minusc. Codd.*, from the 11th to the 14th century. The *Venetian Codd.*, also, which have lately received a more careful collation by

Rinck, read *συγκραμένους*; it is, therefore, by no means merely *plures boni codices*, as Böhme expresses himself, which speak for the *Acc. plur.*, but, with Matthäi, we ought rather to say: *συγκραμένος fortasse nullius codicis auctoritate confirmatur, nisi eorum qui e Latina Vulgata et Veteri Italica, ut vocant, interpolati sunt*, hence, also, the *Acc. plur.*—either *συγκερασμένους* or *συγκεκραμένους*—was adopted into the text by the *Complut.*, *Plantin.*, *Gcnev.*, and, subsequently, by Wetstein, Matthäi, and Lachmann, and considered by Griesbach as almost equal in claims to *συγκεκραμένος*. We will explain the passage according to this reading, as, from these circumstances, it would appear to be the only well founded one.

In the first place, we have to decide for one of the two passive forms, *κέκραμαι* or *κεκέρασμαι*. For the latter the external, as well as the grammatical, evidence preponderates. It is the *later* form (Buttmann, *Ausführl. Gramm.* ii. 154.), and is also found *Rev.* xiv. 10.; so likewise *πεπειρασμένος* is the ascertained reading iv. 15., while *Cod. C.*, and several *Codd. minusc.* have *πεπειρασμένος* in that passage. The signification of *συγκεράνυσθαι, c. dat. pers.* is: to *associate, to join with some one, c. dat. rei, to join with a thing*; for which numerous examples may be found in Wetstein, Kypke, and Abresch. Now, there are here two constructions possible: either we must connect the verb with the dative of the person, and regard *τῆ πίστει* as *dat. modi*: “as they did not in faith join themselves to those who heard,” or, we must connect the verb with the *dat. rei*, and make the *dat. pers.* dependent upon the *dat. rei*, as, for instance, *Matt. xxvii. 7., εἰς ταφὴν τοῖς ξένοις*. See Winer, p. 198., Wahl, *s. v. εἶναι, I. A. a.*, so that this sense results: “as they did not join in the belief of those hearing.” In both constructions the sense remains the same. *Ἀκούειν* designates, according to this conception of the passage, *hearing with faith, obeying (gehörchen)*, and, by the *ἀκούσαντες* none else can be understood save Caleb and Joshua. Thus it is explained by Theoph., *Œcum.*,

and likewise Chrysost. ; only the last, singularly enough, expresses himself as if, *vice versa*, it were said of these two believers, that they had not joined the number of the unbelievers. The passage runs thus : μη τóινυν νομίσητε, ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀκούειν τοῦ κηρύγματος ὠφελήθησθε· ἐπεὶ κἀκεῖνοι ἤκουσαν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἀπάναντα, ἐπειδὴ μὴ ἐπίστευσαν. οἱ οὖν περὶ Χάλεβ καὶ Ἰησοῦν, ἐπειδὴ μὴ συνεκράθησαν τοῖς ἀπιστήσασιν, τουτέστιν, οὐ συνεφώνησαν, διέφυγον τὴν κατ' ἐκείνων ἐξενεχθεῖσαν τιμωρίαν . . . οὐκ εἶπεν, οὐ συνεφώνησαν, ἀλλ', οὐ συνεκράθησαν, τουτέστιν, ἀστασιάστως διέστησαν; ἐκείνων πάντων μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν γιῶμην ἐσχηκότων. ἐσταῦθα μοι δοκεῖ καὶ στάσιν αἰνίττεσθαι.^a How he came to give this exposition has hitherto remained an enigma to the learned. Hammond, by writing στασιάστως, instead of ἀστασιάστως, does not, upon the whole, give us any assistance, while the change would certainly be incorrect. Even the ancient Theophylact, although he had, perhaps, in individual passages, a more correct reading of the text of Chrysostom than we now possess, says, full of ἀπορία and wonder : τοῦτό δε κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην αὐτοῦ καὶ βαθεῖαν σοφίαν ὁ ἅγιος οὗτος εἰπὼν ἐμοὶ γοῦν τῷ ἀναξίῳ οὐκ ἔδωκε νῆσαι πῶς αὐτὸ εἶπει.^b In fact it would be difficult to bring an appropriate sense out of the words. But this is one of the cases in which, as we have remarked, p. 110., and 178., note, the text seems to have been corrupted by foreign admixtures, and, in the same way, also, the exposition of viii. 2. ; ix. 28. It appears indeed, that this Father had the *lect. rec.* before him,

^a Do not, therefore, think that having merely heard the word preached it shall advantage you. For they also heard, yet, believing not, it profited them nothing. But Caleb and Joshua, not being of the same mind with those who believed not, escaped the punishment which befel them, . . . he does not say they did not agree with them, but they did not join themselves to them, that is, they separated from them without sedition, for, here it appears to me tacitly to imply sedition.

^b Thus, indeed, according to his great and profound wisdom, this holy man spoke; but to me, an unworthy person, he did not grant to comprehend how he said it.

for, some sentences preceding, he writes thus: *εἶτα ἐπάγει ἀλλ' οὐκ ᾤφελθεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνου, μὴ συγκεκραμένης τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν.*^a

The exposition of the passage commonly given is somewhat striking, inasmuch as of 600,000 people it affirms that they did not *join* the faith of two individuals. It appears to have been this consideration which induced those who read the *acc. plur.* to torture ἀκούσασιν in order to obtain from it a more agreeable sense. *Cod.* 71. has ἀκουσθεῖσι, as in ii. 1. ; this, or the synonymous ἀκούσμασιν, appears to have been read by the Vulgate and Theod., the latter of whom has the following commentary: οὐκ ἀπόχρη εἰς σωτηρίαν ἢ τῶν λόγων ἀκρόασις. προσήκει γὰρ τοῦτο μετὰ πίστεως δεῖξασθαι, καὶ βεβαίως φυλάττει. τί γὰρ ᾔνησεν ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπαγγελία τοὺς ταύτην δεξαμένους, μὴ πιστῶς δεξαμένους, καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμει τεθαυρηκότας καὶ οἶον τοῖς Θεοῦ λόγοις ἀνακραθέντας.^b The same sense is aimed at by another reading, τοὺς ἀκούσαντας, which is found in a *Cod.* of Chrysostom, mentioned by Matthäi. The sense elicited by these readings is certainly interesting, yet the readings themselves have too little authority to warrant us in entering more minutely into the subject. The main argument which militates against συγκεκρασμένους has been acutely stated by Beza, and, after him, by Clericus, namely, that ἀκούειν, throughout the whole of this section, and even in the λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς, denotes *mere hearing*, not an *obedient reception*. While, according to the exposition of Theoph. and Oecum., τοῖς ἀκούσασιν being directly made = τοῖς πιστεύσασιν, we rather expect, in contrast to the λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς, that some weight will be laid upon πίστις. We are led, also, to suppose this from ver. 3., where, at οἱ ἀκούσαν-

^a Then he says, but the word heard did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it.

^b The hearing of the word alone is not sufficient for salvation, it must be received with faith, and steadfastly retained: for what does the promise of God profit those who receive it, not receiving it in faith, nor confiding in the power of God, and, as it were, mingling with the words of God.

τες, the antithesis is formed by ἡμεῖς οἱ πιστεύσαντες. Now, this reason I consider so weighty, that I feel myself constrained to abide by the *recepta συγκεκραμένος* or *συγκεκρασμέως*.

It may, certainly, appear hazardous to prefer, in opposition to an acknowledged principle of criticism, the easy reading, which is not supported by a single older *Cod.*, to the more difficult, which is received by all the older *Codd.*, and by most of the Versions and Fathers. Here, however, Bentley's remark holds good, with regard to the principle, that the more difficult is to be preferred to the easier reading: *In Cic. Tusc. iii. 6., Tu . . . illud amplecteris, quia librarii vocabula trita pro reconditis supponere solent, non vice versa. Recte quidem, et hoc PLERUMQUE ita se habet. Sed ex generalibus illis artis, nescio cujus, criticae regulis non est de singulis locis sententia ferenda.* And, as to the authority of the *Codd.*, we must subscribe to the decision of Griesbach (*ed. Schulz, Proleg. LX.*): *usu venire potest, ut tot tamque manifestis suae bonitatis criteriis lectio aliqua praeferat, ut duobus testibus, dummodo ad diversas classes ac familias pertineant, IMMO UNICO satis sit suffulta.* So Lachmann, for instance, has not adopted (Luke xviii. 14.) ἡ γὰρ, but παρ' ἐκεῖνον, which is given only by B. L. But the reading which we have defended, is, in reality, by no means so destitute of authority as may at first sight appear. Let us but remember, that the Latin translation, and the Peshito, both of which versions are in favour of our reading, are older than any of the *Codd.* known to us. If, to what has been said, we add the evidence of Chrysostom for *συγκεκραμένος* we shall have three of the most respectable testimonies in its favour.

That, of the termination *ες*, the termination *ους* might be formed by the copyists, is easy to be imagined, as ἐκεῖνους goes before; and, besides, *ος* and *ους* would be readily confounded. See Bast, p. 772, 774.

If we now read *συγκεκρασμέως* we have again the double structure formerly noticed, with the *dat. pers.* or *rei*. The former appears to us preferable, and hence we translate: "as the word did not unite with

the hearers in faith, did not pass over into them." The λόγος ἀκοῆς will then be regarded as the food, which, like as Christ says of himself (John vi.), as the bread of life, must pass into flesh and blood, through man's appropriating it to himself in faith,—Beza observes: *at non profuit illis auditus sermo, ut qui fide contemporatus non fuerit apud eos, qui audierunt.* Hedinger gives this marginal remark: "A meat, in order to nourish, must go into the blood and feed the body. If the word is to profit, it must be changed by faith as a nourishing sap into the spirit, sense, and will of men, that the whole man may become, as the word is, and requires, holy, just, chaste, and pious. Hearing, alone, is of as little value as undigested food in a bad stomach."

The passage, in this view of it, is a parallel in sense to a passage of Paul, Rom. i. 16: δὲνάμις Θεοῦ ἐστὶ (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς) εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. Comp. Rom. x. 17.

Ver. 3, 4.—To the μόιον ἀκούσαντες the οἱ πιστεύσαντες—which word is placed in *pausa*—form a rigorous antithesis, comp. Rom. iv. 12.—But, in what sequence of thought the following words stand, what, particularly the proposition beginning with καίτοι is intended to convey, has been one of the most puzzling questions to the interpreter. Abresch says: *certainim interpretes in illis verbis eorumque nexu cum superioribus et consilio constituendo elaborarunt. Quorum vero sententias si sigillatim recensere foret animus, longum erat faciendum. Atque ego haud scio an ne opus sil quidem, quum universe appareat laborasse viros doctos NEC SIBI-MET IPSIS FECISSE SATIS.* And Kuinöl: *locus obscurus, partim ob nimiam scriptoris brevitatem qui pro ea, qua vigeat, cogitandi celeritate plura omittit, a lectoribus cogitando adjicienda, partim ob disputandi rationem convenientem ei, quæ illa ætate in scholis Judæorum obtinebat.* We must first explain our views respecting the signification of καίτοι. The Vulgate has translated καίτοι here and καίπερ. c. v. 8. by: *et quidem*; and, in this, it is joined by Luther. Now, *et quidem* might certainly be

taken in the sense of *quamquam*, and it would then be correct; but several expositors have taken it in the explicative sense of *nempe*, which quite obscures the sense. Hence Vatablus and Erasmus, and still more Beza, urge the sense *quamquam*, in this passage. But what is here the meaning of this limiting *proposition* with an *although*? The usual and most correct explanation,—although brought forward with various modifications—is that found in Chrysost., Theod., Clarius, Gerhard, Grotius, Calov, and Bengel. Either it is, “along with the rest in Canaan, of which Moses speaks, there is another rest mentioned in Scripture, the rest from creation—so, along with the rest of Canaan, a third may be mentioned, the heavenly,” or, “of the rest from creation, the Psalmist cannot speak, for that rest lies in the past, whereas this mentioned in the Psalm lies in the future.” We conceive that a close examination of ver. 6. will guide us to the real meaning of the author. From it there necessarily arises the following as the train of thought: When it is there said, “these shall not enter into God’s rest,” the reason cannot be that this rest of God was not itself in existence; it exists from the beginning of the world, and, as they who went before us did not enter into it because of unbelief, so God again and again invited to it.” Thus it appears, that, henceforward, the rest of God is conceived to be the same as the rest which God himself enjoys. The translation was given by the Sabbath being called, 2. Macc. xv. 1. ἡ τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέρα, and the comparison presented itself so much the more readily to the author, as the Rabbinical Theology describes the state of the Messiah’s kingdom as a σαββατισμός. See the Rem. on the passage by Ludov. Capell, and Schöttgen. On the indefinite citation in ver. 4., see on c ii. 6.

Ver. 5. Πάλιν here, as αὖ elsewhere, includes the antithesis in itself, as in English *again* and *against* (Ger. *wieder* and *wider*) are one word, in Latin *item* and *autem*. The antithesis lies in the circumstance, that the rest was long ago accessible, and, yet, it was

then declared that the Mosaic generation should not enter into it.

Ver. 6, 7.—The thought is as follows: God cannot have prepared such a rest without rendering it of use—in other words—the divine love cannot have enjoyed rest and bliss from the foundation of the world, without ever desiring that it should be shared by others. The evidence preponderates in favour of *προεΐρηται* instead of *ἔρηται*.

Ver. 8.—The imperf. with *ἄν*, in the minor proposition, must not be translated; “he would have spoken,” as Luther and even Beza have rendered it, for that meaning would have demanded *ἐλάλησεν ἄν* (Comp. x. 2. *ἐπαύσαντο ἄν*), but, “he would speak.”

Ver. 9.—*Λαὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* as in ii. 17.; this *λαὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* consists of the *πιστεύσαντες*, ver. 3. *Σαββατισμός*, which occurs neither in the New Testament, nor in the LXX., is found in Plutarch, *De Superst.* c. 3. It is here deliberately adopted instead of *σάββητον*, as the latter denotes the *day* only, but the former the *celebration* of the day. It is derived from *σαββατίζω*; and *ίζω* and *αζω* are the terminations of those verbs which denote the celebration of a festival, as *ιορτάζω*, *νομηνιάζω*, *θεσμοφοριάζω*. Luther has translated it *rest*, better than others who have *Sabbath*; but de Wette has still better rendered it, “*Sabbath rest*.”

Ver. 10. *Believers may participate in the rest which God himself enjoys.*

Ver. 10. This declaration overflows in its opulence of contents. According to more modern interpreters, as Valckenaer, Böhme, Koppe, *ἔργα* is = *κόποι*; as they compare and explain Rev. xiv. 13.: *aerumnae, quibus his in terris premuntur christiani*, with which we may also compare the declaration, Wisdom iv. 7.: *δίκαιος ἐὰν φθάσῃ τελευτῆσαι, ἐν ἀναπαύσει ἔσται*. “*ἔργα*, in *signification*, cannot, of course, be = *aerumnae*, it can only denote the *subjective struggle* against the *aerumnae*, as likewise Rev. xiv. 13., where *ἔργα* marks the Christian virtues made patent in the *κόποι*, and,

therefore, equivalent to *ἀγὼν πίστεως*, Heb. xii. 1. 1 Tim. vi. 12. It may be asked whether the author thought only of the external distresses of life? And, in answer to such an inquiry, an appeal may be made, with Bleek, to the circumstance, that toilsome labour was one of the consequences of the curse of the fall, which will then be abolished. Comp. Gen. v. 29., and the translation of the LXX. of Gen. iii. 17. The same expositor, also, reminds his readers that the *ἔργα* are the work of the six week-days, and the rest, therefore, from labour, the repose from every profane work. In endeavouring to ascertain the meaning, we start from another point, namely, of what nature is the rest of God according to the conviction of the author? It is certainly not mere inactivity, but as certainly the bliss which springs from the completion of the work of creation, that work of which it is said, "and God saw every thing that He had made, and, behold, it was very good." The rest of the blessed, therefore, must be a rest of completion, and, accordingly, we must comprehend under the *ἔργα* the struggle against sin. Hence Theoph. rightly remarks: *ἐνταῦθα μὲν γὰρ καὶ τοῖς δικαίοις πολὺς ὁ κόπος καὶ ὁ ἀγὼν γάρτε ἄλλα καὶ διὰ τοὺς τῆς ἀρετῆς ἰδρωτάς. ἐκεῖ δὲ οὐδὲ ἀρετῆς ἠθικῆς (namely, that connected with conflict) ἔστιν ἔργασία, ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ ἀπληστος ἀπόλαυσις.*^a On the question, whether with that struggling *ἐργάζεσθαι* every *ἐργάζεσθαι*, i. e. every activity, is to cease, the passage gives no information. But, the misunderstandings which have arisen concerning that point, make it necessary that we should devote a few words to the discussion of it. To this declaration there has, indeed, been here and there fastened a representation of eternity not very different from that which is combated by Plato: *De Republ.* ii. p. 363. D., as if the promised *κατάπαυσις* were a *dolce far niente*, a *μείθη αἰώνιος* such as is promised by the *οἱ περὶ Ὁρφέα*. On the other

^a Here, below, indeed, many toils and painful contests await the just, as in other things so in the struggles of virtue; above, however, are no labours of moral virtue, but the inexhaustible fruition of God.

hand, some that wish never to be satiated, but for ever to enjoy the pleasure of eating, have entered a solemn protest against the *Ingrediens* of everlasting repose in the bliss of a future life. "If the eternal Father"—says Lessing—"held in His right hand truth, in His left the pursuit of it, and I were required to choose—I would embrace His knees and say, Father give me the left!" And some dogmatists, to gratify the wishes of these lovers of restlessness, have considered it proper to mix, " manifold obscurities, wishes, unsatisfied longings, wants," in the cup of the blessed (Bretschneider, *Dogm.* ii. 488.). The following appears to us the correct view on this point.

Every being has its idea after which it strives. This is the spiritual impulse of gravitation ; so that the being, until it attains that idea, can no more find repose, than the stone which is hurled into the air. According to Aristotle, all *κίνησις* has no other object than to make the imperfect phenomenon, the *λόγος τῆς οὐσίας*, homogeneous with the *τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι*, which by him, as well as by Plato, is called the *εἶδος* and *παράδειγμα* (*Phys.* ii. 3.). But every thing in nature has attained its object, when, according to its indwelling power, it has become energy, and so satisfied its idea (*Metaphys.* v. 16.). Now, we say, that every one called to the kingdom of Christ has to realize the idea of becoming a distinct member of the *σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, in the *βασιλεία τῆς δόξης*. It is only when he has attained this point that disquiet, and the struggling, *ἐργάζεσθαι*, terminate. Being already good, he will no more grow better. With this, however, nothing is less supposed than an intellectual death. This only takes place where there is a state without distinction:—in this state the process ceases. But the perfected individual does not cease to be a particular being, as he continues to adjust himself to the divine qualities. Sin was a hindering of this adjustment ; and when this hinderance is removed, that process between the finite and the infinite mind first receives its full life and freedom. Some rays of a presentiment of this state fall into our souls at those mo-

ments of our lives, when perceiving, willing, and feeling with the totality of our spirit, we yield ourselves up to a divine truth, and repose in it. Such periods of devotion we call a *foretaste* of eternity; and with reason, for we then truly enjoy the *δυνάμεις τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*, Heb. vi. 5. The repose of God, likewise, on the Sabbath, does not include inactivity. It is, as we have said, the blessed contemplation of the completion of the world. But this does not exclude a *continued working* in what is already established. Comp. John v. 17.

Of the expositions which differ from this, we remark, firstly, it is inaccurate to explain the passage with Aretius, Piscator, and Hedinger, as if the subject were merely the *cessatio a peccatis*, while it is the *cessatio decertationis cum peccatis*. No more can there be, as Calvin will have it, any Anti-Pelagian polemics in the passage: *Nam hinc semper faciendum est exordium, quum de regula pie sancteque vivendi agitur, ut homo sibi quodammodo mortuus deum, patiatur vivere: ferietur ab operibus propriis, ut licet Deo agenti concedat*. Much less, finally, can ἔργα be exclusively referred to the Ritual Commandments, as Semler, D. Michaelis on Peirce (in his Commentary he subsequently withdrew this opinion), Cramer, and Griesbach, in the Dissertation on this passage, 1792, have assumed.

Ver. 11—13. *Let us earnestly endeavour to be not stubborn like those in the wilderness, for God's word takes severe vengeance.*

Ver. 11.—Schulz, and, after him, De Wette, translate very properly: "That not any one should fall as a like example of stubbornness;" that is, *ἐν* is instrumental for the dative merely (comp. the dative τῷ πλοιαρίῳ, John xxi. 8., with *ἐν* πλοίῳ, Matth. xiv. 13.), now the dative marks "*the mode and manner*" in which the totality of a fact appears, Bernhardt, Syntax, p. 100. Ὑπόδειγμα for παράδειγμα, in the later Grecity, Lobeck, *Ad Phryn.* p. 12.

Ver. 12, 13.—*Si quis alius*,—says Valckenaer,—*hic certe locus amabili pulchrarum figurarum conspiratione est elegantissimus*; but, when he continues: *illud plane mirandum, potuisse reperiri interpretes, qui per λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ CHRISTUM crediderunt designari*, and expresses his wonder that even a Clericus, *homo emunctae naris*, should have lighted upon this opinion, we cannot quite agree with him. Against this view of the Fathers, which has been defended, among the moderns, by Seb. Schmid, Spener, Heinsius, Cramer, Alting, Bertholdt, and, as we have mentioned, Clericus also, it was urged especially, that the passage so taken would not agree with the context. But to this it might be replied, that the author might certainly represent the punishment in the wilderness as executed by the Logos, who is, indeed, the organ of the manifestation in the Old Testament. Compare the striking parallel passage, Wisdom xviii. 15., which was probably known to our author: ὁ παντοδύναμος σου λόγος ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἐκ θρόνων βασιλειῶν ἀπότομος πολεμιστῆς εἰς μέσον τῆς ὀλεθρίας ἤλατο γῆς, ξίφος ὄξυ τὴν ἀνυπόκριτον ἐπιταγήν σου φέρων. Still, we are decidedly in favour of the opinion, that λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ denote here the Divine words, the promises and threatenings of God, particularly the latter; and on this account especially, that, on the one hand, there is no intimation, in what precedes, of the Logos having executed that punishment, on the other, the severity and certainty of the Divine declarations had been previously held up to them on several occasions, λέγει, c. iii. 7., ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, iii. 15., ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς, iv. 2., ἐλάλει, iv. 8. It may also be remembered, that the author would otherwise probably neither have used the predicate ἐνεργῆς nor κριτικός, but instead of the latter κριτής. As we think, moreover, that we must refer the αὐτοῦ in ver. 13., and πρὸς ὃν to the same λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, we suppose that the author here personifies the divine words, and designates them as the representative of God, similar to the manner in which Christ speaks, John xii. 48.: ὁ λόγος

ὅν ἐλάλησα, ἐκεῖνος κρινεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, comp. John v. 45., and also *Test. Judæ.* c. 22. In like manner, the Word of God is conceived as the representative of God himself, Wisdom xvi. 12. comp. with Exod. xv. 26., and Ecclus. xliii. 28. Hence Olshausen, in his treatise, *De λόγῳ, Opusc.* p. 134, places this passage, and not without reason, at the foundation of his development of the conception of the Logos, in as much as he endeavours to develop that conception from the idea of the divine speaking in general. On the predicate ζῶν, may be compared λόγια ζῶντα, Acts vii. 38. The vital power is here, also, the condition of the ἐνέργεια, see above on iii. 12. The predicates following upon τομώτερος prepare for the idea with which the whole sentence concludes, that man will be judged according to the word of God. They speak of the judicial power which the Word already exercises in the interior, which pre-supposes that It penetrates men, and, in as much as this penetration is necessary to the future judgment, the last thought is prepared for by these predicates. So Paul, Rom. ii. 15, 16, represents the internal act of judgment which now takes place as the prelude of the external. Many expositors improperly refer these words to the animating power of Gospel preaching—this reference lies beyond the scope of the context. The comparative of the adjective τομός is here construed with ὑπὲρ instead of μᾶλλον ἢ or πλεον, as is παρά, elsewhere, in our Epistle. The sword with double *mouth*, i.e. with double edge, (ἐσθίειν vorare, is said in Greek and Latin of a sword); in Rev. i. 16., ii. 12., also, it is an image for the word which judges the heart, comp. Is. xlix. 2., xi. 4. Ἀχρεῖς μου ὅτι μωροὶ ἐστέ ὡς τὸ μερῖζεῖν*. How deeply the word of God, which judges the inward man, penetrates, is made obvious by the mention of the most inward, most impenetrable spiritual and corporeal life, which yet this word

* Schleusner has here a remarkable confusion of *sensus* and *significatus*, for he gives, as the second signification of μερῖζμός; *intimum, intimi recessus*.

thoroughly pervades. The language of the text does not imply that soul and spirit, joints and marrow are *divided asunder*, but that they are *divided in themselves, i.e. penetrated*. This passage is an important one for Biblical Psychology, as, along with 1 Thess. v. 23., it establishes Trichotomy, as received in recent times by our Psychologists Fr. Schlegel, Schubert, Heinroth, and Eschenmayer. This is not the place to enter more minutely into that subject. In our opinion, $\psi\chi\eta$ here denotes the power which tends towards the sensual, $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ the power directed to the non-sensual, the divine spirit working in man.* On the word $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$, Calvin remarks: *quoniam vitia, quæ sub falsa virtutum specie latebant, cognosci incipiunt absterso fuco*. And, altogether, Calvin says many powerful and serious things on this passage.

To what does the double $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in ver. 13 refer? It may be said, the author refers it to the Genit. $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, as Bengel says: *facilis erat analysis dicti, si utraque ejus pars recto casu proferatur*. *DEUS est, coram quo nulla natura non apparet*. I am not prepared with any example to prove so incorrect a reference of the pronoun, nor have I found any in those expositors who have touched upon the topic, yet, such do occur in inaccurate writers. The reference of the pronoun, John viii. 44., is still more violent. And considering the

* This definition admits of being proved, particularly by the use of $\psi\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$, 1 Cor. ii. 14., xv. 44., 46. James iii. 15. Jude 19, as the use of $\psi\chi$ and $\nu\mu$ also, in Hebrew, corresponds with it, although that use is not constant. It might, perhaps, be alleged, too, in confirmation of this, that in the N. T., when the Redeemer's horror of death is spoken of (consequently an *affection* relating to the *sensuous* part), it is said His $\psi\chi\eta$ was troubled, John xii. 27. Matth. xxvi. 38.; but, where mention is made of the *spiritual pain* of inward sympathy, as John xi. 33., xiii. 21., then the $\pi\nu\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$ was perturbed. Still, this distinction, in the N. T. can, by no means, be invariably maintained. For instance, $\psi\chi\eta$ is also used of the soul of man in general, in opposition to the body, as in our Epistle xii. 3., xiii. 17.

general accuracy of our author, we must prefer some other way of obviating the difficulty, if any such present itself unconstrained. Such a way, we conceive, is the supposition, that the word of God, as we remarked above, is regarded as personified, &c., as the representative of God. The *ταῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ*, indeed, might excite a doubt of this exposition. Yet I cannot, on this ground alone, resolve to give it up; for, if a personification be once made, then eyes may as well be attributed to the word of God as *hands* are in Prov. iii. 16. If this conception of the passage, however, cannot be allowed, let us rather suppose that *αὐτός* stands instead of the demonstr. *αὗτος* or *ἐκεῖνος*, and, that the pronoun *πρὸς ὃν* relates to it (Matthiä Gramm. § 469. 8.): "all is open before Him with whom we have to do," comp. *αὐτός* at ii. 10.

The signification of *τραχηλίζω* is quite secure;* but its derivation is differently traced, most writers, since Perizonius, conceiving that it alludes to the criminals when exposed to view, whose sinking head was bent over that they might be plainly seen by all spectators. See Wolf's *Curæ*, Elsner and Alberti *Observ.* Others have derived the expression from the sacrificial ritual, as the Grecian interpreters have done, and that, by a different way, either from the cutting up of the sacrificial animal being begun by the division of the *τράχηλος*, or from the animal about to be sacrificed having had its neck bent over. With this is connected the opinion that *μάχαιρα* has been employed with an eye to the sacrificial knife. This special reference however, is arbitrary and unfounded. *Πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος* has been translated by Luther, Schulz, and

* Michaelis alone translates: "with bent-down forehead," and says that in this he follows Wetstein. Wetstein, however, has pronounced no opinion, but merely collects a great number of examples in which *ἐτραχηλίζεσθαι*, and a few times also *τραχηλίζεσθαι* occurs in the signification of *ὑποσκελισθαι*, and from thence, Michaelis has borrowed the general sense. Theoph. and Cecum., also, adduce that explanation, without, however, approving of it.

Vater, with an appeal to *περὶ οὗ πολλὸς ἡμῶν ὁ λόγος* ver. 11., "of whom we speak." But, why this addition here? Even if it be put only to define more strictly the subject of the *αὐτός*; it is not to the purpose, for God himself was not the subject of the preceding context. We do not wish to urge strongly that, in such circumstances, we should not expect the ambiguous *πρός*. although, in similar cases, ver. 11. and ii. 5., *περὶ* is found. If this view of the matter be not acceded to, then, as the Syriac has already done, we may either take *λόγος* in the signification of *reckoning*, as, at xiii. 17., Chrys., Theoph., Theod., Er. Schmid, and Michaelis have likewise done, or we may, with Beza, translate: *quicum nobis negotium*, coinciding with Calvin, Kuinöl and de Wette. This mode of interpretation would bring out the same sense as the first, and is to be preferred on this ground, that the formula *ἔστι μοι (ὁ) λόγος πρὸς τινά* is very frequent in the sense of: "I have to do with one" (see Wetstein, also 2 Kings ix. 5. in the LXX.); but, it is doubtful whether it occur in the sense of: "there is a reckoning to be given, *λόγος ἀποδοτέος ἔστι.*"

Ver. 14, 15.—Although the division of the Scriptures into chapters, the work of Hugo de St Clair, is, upon the whole, very happy, yet, in some passages, it is faulty, as 2 Cor. ii. 1.; Eph. v. 1.; Col. iv. 1.; and so, also, here, as has been remarked by R. Stephen, after Beza: *hinc potius oportuerat novam sectionem auspicari.*

Ver. 14—16.—*As Christ is our High Priest, we should at all times draw near to the Throne of God with confidence.*

Ver. 14.—The introduction of the subject of Christ's sacerdotal dignity by *οὗ* is not so incorrect as it may seem to be.* As the paranesis does not fit in with the

* Calvin (with many others) makes here the following erroneous and perplexing remark: *hactenus disseruit de Christi Apostolatu (but where?) nunc ad secundum ejus munus transit.*

progress of the treatise, and, as the subject here becomes again doctrinal, the οὖν is joined to the preceding doctrinal section, which closed with the proof of the Redeemer's sacerdotal dignity, ii. 17, 18., comp. iii. 1., nay His συμπάθεια was the particular topic of discourse, to which ver. 15., is here joined. All the intervening portion was parenetic. Οὖν is, therefore, epanaleptic. Μέγας does not, somewhat in the manner of x. 21., designate the *High Priest*, but, like xiii. 20., it serves to denote exaltation. The exaltation is shewn in the circumstance, that, while the other High Priests went through an earthly fore-court, and an earthly sanctuary, into the earthly Holy of Holies, to the symbol of the divinity, this High Priest passes through Heaven into the immediate presence of God, comp. ix. 11. ; vii. 26. Eph. iv. 10. Luther has improperly rendered it, "who has gone *towards* heaven." The linguistic vindication of διερχεσθαι here, and εἰσέρχεσθαι διὰ, ix. 11., as = εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς, has been in vain attempted by Amyraldus, Ernesti, Abresch, Dindorf, and Schleusner. The endeavour to defend this view arose from a dogmatical cause, namely, the impossibility of explaining *whither* Christ had gone, when He had passed through the heavens, since it is only said elsewhere that He was taken up into heaven. But, it is also said, vii. 26., and ix. 11., that He has gone higher than the Heavens into the Holy of Holies ; hence, in these passages, the Holy of Holies is regarded as something completely beyond the heavens, comp. with these remarks what has been said on c. ii. 5., and at the beginning of c. viii. on *heaven*, and especially the observations in the Introduction, p. 100. et seq., on the symbolical system of the Apostles.—Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, the apposition is here placed emphatically after διεληλυθότα. The admonition, κρατῶμεν κτλ., also alludes to the danger of the παραπίπτειν, in the community, vi. 6., comp. iii. 6, 14. x. 23. That κρατεῖν *must* be here rendered : *to lay hold of*, and not : *to hold fast*, is not proved by

Tittmann, *De Synon. N. T.* (Bibl. Cab. Vol. III.), comp. x. 23. κατέχειν.

Ver. 15.—He only, of whom it is known that he thoroughly adopted the whole extent of our misery, is a consoling mediator between God and man, as the close of c. ii. testified this of Christ, comp. the exposition of the passage. But, at the same time, he must be himself unspotted, otherwise he can not enter into immediate communion with God; this idea is here brought prominently forward by χωρίς ἁμαρτίας, comp. vii. 26, 27. 1 John ii. 1. Γάρ is consequently used here with great significance. Καθ' ὁμοίωτα wants the pronoun ἡμῶν, and so, also, in Eph. iii. 18., an αὐτῆς must be supplied at εἰ τὸ πλάτος κτλ; here, however, the omission, from ἡμῶν going immediately before, is less striking than in that other passage.

Ver. 16.—The more confidently the grace offered by Christ is appropriated, the less danger there is of lukewarmness and apostacy; and therefore the author, both here and at x. 22., exhorts particularly to such an appropriation. With a mediator like Christ, the sinner may approach God with more confidence, Christ having first established the free προσαγωγή πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Rom. iii. 21.; v. 1, 2. Eph. ii. 18., iii. 12. Heb. x. 19, 20, 22. But, according to our Epistle, this ἐγγίξειν or προσέρχεσθαι is completed in the other world. See on vii. 19, 25., and ix. 8. Compare also Harless on Eph. ii. 18. The Θεῖνος of God, as at viii. 1., xii. 2., is a circumlocution for the Divine majesty. The gen. *gen. qualitatis* and *effectus*. Several interpreters suppose an allusion to the ἰλαστήριον; with the symbol τῆς ἰλθω τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως upon earth,—as Philo calls the ark of the covenant,—the heavenly is contrasted. If we found any addition, such as τῇ ἐπουρανίῳ, we might suppose such to be the case, but not otherwise.—Εὐκαιρος *opportunus*, and hence: *ubi opus sit*.

CHAPTER V.

CHRIST IS OUR HIGH PRIEST AFTER THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDEK, UPON WHICH I SHOULD HAVE HAD MUCH TO SAY TO YOU, WERE YE NOT BECOME WEAK IN SPIRITUAL UNDERSTANDING.

Ver. 1—3. *Even the High Priests, chosen from among men, who offer for the sins of their brethren, have compassion on sinners, as they are themselves brethren in guilt.*

VER. 1.—If, misled by the division of chapters, we do not join ver. 1. closely to what goes before, and suppose, as is generally done, that the design of the author, from ver. 1., is to shew wherein the heavenly High Priest may be compared to the earthly, there will be found here a great want of proportion in the sequence of the thoughts. The points of comparison which are given in ver. 1—3. are not at all applied to Christ, and, at ver. 4. the discourse hurries forward to another disparate point of comparison, namely, that Christ also was chosen like these by God; and again, in ver. 1., γάρ appears altogether without an antecedent.^a We therefore suppose, on the contrary, that ver. 1—3. are joined with what precedes, and shew that even the earthly High Priest himself was not without συμπάθεια. It is not till we reach ver. 4. that something new appears. And, the author does not, in our opinion, lay any particular stress upon the thought brought forward in ver. 4—10., that Christ was chosen of God, that thought rather supplying him with a point of transition for the introduction of the declaration in which Christ is called

^a Beza observes: *Itaque γάρ non tam est causalis quam inchoativa, ut loquuntur grammatici. Sunt autem haec capita collationis.*

a *Priest after the order of Melchisedek*. This subject, after the conclusion of the Paraenesis, iv. 11. —vi. 20. (the last words of which intercalated paraenetic section again refer back to v. 10.), he prosecutes in ch. vii.

Ver. 1.—Γάρ is not joined to ver. 16., but to ver. 15. Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος contrasts the earthly High Priest with the heavenly, of whom it might likewise have been said, in a certain sense, that He was chosen from among men; but the author conceives of Him as a Priest after the pattern of Melchisedek, who has μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος, vii. 3. The writer here takes the idea of *sinfulness* as correlative with that of humanity. The Priest, being taken from among men and offering for men, is subject like them to ἀσθένεια.—Τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, as at ii. 17.—Προσφέρειν, the *term. techn.* of the offering, viii. 3, 4.; ix. 7, 14, &c.; δῶρα comprehends the θυσίαι, *sacrificia cruenta*; τί—καί, as at ii. 11.; the θυσίαι are here brought more prominently forward, because, as ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν shews, the subject-matter is *sin offerings*; both words are connected in the same manner by τί—καί in viii. 3.

Ver. 2.—The word μετριοπαθεῖν demands a particular examination. It appears to have had its origin in the Peripatetic school. Among the numerous examples adduced by Wetstein, Carpzov, Kypke, Krebs, and Abresch, I have not found one prior to the age of Alexander; nor is there one to be found in the London edition of Stephen.* It appears to me, there-

* Valckenaer, indeed, refers to a fragment of the Pythagorean Archytas in the *Sermones* of Stobaeus. This is to be found in Gaisford's Ed. Vol. I. p. 59., and in it the μετριοπάθεια is, undoubtedly, recommended, exactly in the Peripatetic sense; as Jamblichus, also, *Vita Pyth. ed. Küster*, p. 28., introduces Pythagoras warning against the ἁμικρία. But the fragments of Archytas are, for the most part, spurious: see "Ritter, über die Pythag. Phil. s. 64;" and although it is certain that Pythagoras recommended harmony, as the highest aim of morality, yet it may be questioned whether he understood this in the Peripatetic sense, and whether he employed the word (which is important to us), μετριοπάθεια.

fore, that the word was first formed by the Peripatetics in opposition to the ἀπάθεια of the Stoics. As Aristotle had every where recommended the μέτριον, the μεσότης, so his disciples, with respect to the πάθος, recommended the μετριοπαθεῖν, in opposition to the Stoical ἀπρῆθῃ εἶναι. Diog. Laert. L. V. § 31, says of Aristotle: ἔφη δὲ τὸν σοφὸν μὴ εἶναι μὲν ἀπαθῆ, μετριοπαθῆ δέ— which must, however, be referred to Aristotle, in respect of the matter only, not the words. The term passed afterwards, as it appears, from the schools of the philosophers into the language of common life; for, so early as the time of our Saviour we find it in general use among the writers of that period, expressing a suppressed affection,^b whether of sorrow or anger, or even haughtiness, so that μετριοπαθής denotes the *resolute man*, the *meek*, the *humble*, &c.; so in Appian, Dionys. Hal., Sext. Empir., and Josephus. It appears to have been particularly in use among the Alexandrians; it is found in very many passages of Philo; and Clement of Alexandria has it, *Strom. IV.* 516. *ed. Pott.*; he even quotes there a passage, from Clement of Rome, in which it likewise occurs. But Clement of Rome, as he appears to have been intimately acquainted with the Ep. to the Hebrews, may have borrowed it from that Epistle. Still, the term has not, in the Alexandrian writers, any more than in the above-mentioned historians, the original definite meaning of the Peripatetic school. Philo and Clement of Alexandria were attached to the Stoical doctrine of the ἀπάθεια of the σοφός (See Clement, *Strom.* vi. c. 9., where he teaches, that the apostles had suppressed even the allowable affections, as courage, joy, &c.). According to this later usage, therefore, μετριοπαθεῖν must here mean, “to moderate the affection of displeasure,” *i. e.*: “to shew indulgence.” The question

^a He says of the wise man that he is not (ἀπαθῆ) without passions, but that he moderates (μετριοπαθῆ) his passions.

^b The word *affection* is here employed to denote the *state of being mentally affected*, or moved by any cause.—*Tr.*

now is, whether the word is exactly equivalent to the *συπαθῶν*, iv. 15., ascribed to Christ. In a writer so exact in the selection of his language as our author, a reason must certainly be assigned for the interchange of the words. Böhme has proposed the acute conjecture, that the human High Priest is intended to be represented as less capable of that complete sympathy which dwelt in the Divine, and the *πάθος*, which he has *κατὰ μετρίτητα*, would be, according to this conjecture, not *displeasure* at sinners, but *compassion* with them. So Stephen also appears to have taken the word.^a But, this conception of it makes it deviate from the usage which lies displayed before us in numerous examples, in which *μετριοπαθεῖν* never denotes any thing defective, but always a virtue. If the interchange of the words was actually intentional, the reason of it might rather be sought in this, that, in the human mediator his own sinfulness has been made prominent, and hence his *συμπάθεια* is a *non-anger* (*nichtzürnen*), an indulgence founded upon a feeling of guilt in himself, while, in the *sinless* mediator it is compassion for the misery of the sinner.^b Translators have greatly differed in their views. The Ethiopian, into whose version Glosses have found their way, translates as if he had read *μη βουθεῖν*. The Syriac has given a circumlocution, "who can condescend and sympathise;" the Arabian (in the Polyglot), who translated from the

^a Stephen, in his *Thes.*, says: "*Plane existimo μετριοπαθεῖν hic NOVE ab apostolo usurpatum fuisse, et nova etiam constructione pro eo quod in fine praecedentis cap. dixerat συμπάθειαι; eadem de re loquens, VEL POTIUS συμπάθειαι κατὰ μετριοπαθειαι.*"

^b In the same manner, precisely, the acute Cameron gives a reason for the distinction: "*μετριοπαθεῖν duo in se complectitur, quorum prius significatur voce μετρίως, nempe ἰουίσιαι, unde oritur vel excusatio, vel, si res poscat, purgatio, quas virtus plerumque inde proficiscitur, quod meminimus et nos esse homines, unde fit, ut de aliis non durius quam de nobismetipsis statuamus. Alterum vero est συμπάθειαι, cum sensu alienae miseriae officimur. Ergo unico verbo ἰμπατριώματα causa et effectus significantur. . . . Ergo Christus quidem συμπάθειαι nobis, at non μετριοπαθεῖν.*"

Greek text, "he can forgive and be kind;" the Copt., literally, "he can bear suffering with moderation;" Ambrose has *affici*; and, among the moderns, Beza and Er. Schmid: *qui possit quantum satis est misereri*, &c.

Interpreters differ as to whether ἀγνοεῖν be here put, as in ix. 7., simply in the signification: *to sin*. Like our German *Fehltritt* (Angl. *slip*), and originally, also, *Vergehen* (to take a false step), it certainly signifies every kind of sin, although it primarily denoted only (Irrthumssünden) sins of ignorance or error. In the context, we must regard the selection of this *milder* expression as intentional, for the intention is seen in the addition *πλανωμένοις*. He who is *μετριοπαθής* to sin looks upon it on the side in which it appears in a less glaring light. For the same reason *ἀσθeneia* is chosen, as in iv. 15. *Περίκειται*, with the accusative of the thing, is employed in speaking of the dress, and is, therefore, a mark of the closest connection.

Ver. 3.—Comp. vii. 27.

Ver. 4—10.—*Like the founder of the Levitical order of Priests, our High Priest also, is chosen immediately by God, and that, too, after the manner of Melchisedek.*

Ver. 4, 5.—It might appear that *καί* has not here the *vim explicativam*, since a new and independent thought is introduced, on which account Schulz has translated: "further." But this is not the case. The apostle glances back to *λαμβάνόμενος*, ver. 1., and illustrates the thought on another side, so that we may always translate: "and indeed." It would, however, be more properly printed, as has been done by Griesbach, with the uncial letter. The author, as we have already remarked, has introduced this thought merely to lead the reader to the declaration in Ps. cx. The affirmation made of all high priests, that they are called of God, is so far true as all Aaronites received their appointment by God's command, comp. vii. 9. 10. In

proof of the divine installation of Christ into the office of Priest the passage from Ps. ii., already quoted, c. i. 4., is first mentioned. It was there proved, that, to the Messiah alone was given the lofty predicate of Son; here the author draws from the passage the investiture of the Messiah with the priestly office. It may be inquired with what reason? Our author no more refers the *γενένηκά σε* to the eternal generation of the Son, than Paul does in Acts xiii. 33.* Both these apostolic men refer the declaration to the period of glorification commencing at the resurrection. Now as Christ, from that time, makes His redemption efficacious in the heavenly sanctuary, *i. e.* makes everlasting intercession (see vii. 27.), so His resurrection and glorification is conceived as the moment in which He is declared priest. This conception is essentially contained, too, in the passage of the Psalm itself. For, the word of God, here cited, says the same thing as ver. 6. of the Psalm, so that, to “*beget,*” and, to “*constitute king,*” in point of matter, appear to be the same. Comp. Stier on the passage of the Psalm, and on Acts, Pt. i. p. 368. Thus, it is said, Rom. i. 4., that through the resurrection, the Messiah was proved to be the Son of God, and, in this chapter, ver. 10., His sacerdotal dignity is represented as the consequence of His *τελειώσις*.

Ver. 6.—We have here that very remarkable and important declaration from the Psalm, the opulence of whose stores is more fully displayed in c. vii. The Psalm is of peculiar importance for the Christian interpreter, in as much as Christ says in express terms: David spoke in it *ἐν πνεύματι* of the Messiah, Matth. xxii. 44. *Ἐν ἐσέρῳ*, without *τόπω*, occurs also in Acts xiii. 35.—*Ἱερέως*, in the sense of *ἀρχιερέως*, is explained at ver. 10. As the idea of this new priesthood is not merely concentrated in one, but also limited to one, so this One Priest is that which the High-priest was in the Levitical priesthood, Comp. vii. 23—25.—For

* See Macknight, &c. on the passage.—Tr.

τάξις, there is found in the Hebrew מַדְבָּר, *manner, way*.

Now τάξις may have this meaning also in Greek, implying first *position*, then *quality*; ἐν τάξει τινός in the *quality of some one*, Comp. 2 Macc. ix. 18. But, it may also denote the *order of the Priests*, and so it is taken by the Latin translator, and by Luther. It may be objected, that this signification is not suitable here, since Melchisedek had no series, or order of priests, like himself. But, the objection has no weight; for, as in Christ there appeared an antitype of his priesthood, it may be said, in a figurative sense, that Christ belonged to the order, or series of the priesthood of Melchisedek. Supported by this, Schulz has retained the older exposition, and translates, “in the series (Ger. Reihe) of Melchisedek.” Such an antithesis of a twofold τάξις is found at vii. 11. We cannot, therefore, reject this conception of the passage, yet, we confess ourselves more inclined to the former exposition, as, at vii. 15. (Comp. 17). the author himself seems to explain κατὰ τάξιν by κατ’ ομοίωτητα. The Syriac, also, has: “after the likeness;” the Ethiopic: “according to the office;” de Wette has retained Luther’s translation.—The explanation of εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα is found at ch. vii. Comp. the first sentence there, and likewise ver. 8, 16, 24.

Ver. 7. From ver. 7, 9., there is a cursory mention of the nature of the Messiah’s sacerdotal work, which is more fully displayed in ch. ix., and especially in ch. x. Let us bestow some attention on προσενέγκας (See Rem. on ver. 3.). His offerings, in external appearance, were His tears—elsewhere (ch. ix. x.) His blood—conceived according to the inward reason His ὑπακοή (ver. 8. Rom. v. 19.), Comp. App. II.—On σάργ see at ii. 14., Comp. 1 Peter iv. 2, τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χεῖρον, 2 Cor. x. 3., ἐν σαρκὶ περιπατοῦντες, instead of which there is ἐν τῷ σώματι, xiii. 3. 2 Cor. v. 6. The leading thought expressed by the *verb. fin.* is, that Christ has rendered ὑπακοή: the partic. singles out the chief fact of this ὑπακοή, it appears at its high-

est point in the last struggle ; hence, Phil. ii. 8., γειόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.—The participial proposition relates to the struggle upon the Mount of Olives. As an acquaintance with it is at once supposed by the author, it appears to follow, that what is related in the three first Gospels concerning it was spread throughout all the Christian church. The gospel narrative makes no mention of *tears* ; nor is the author here concerned with the historical details ; he reproduces the whole impression which that scene had left on his mind, and, for this purpose, makes use of several ἐπιτατικά.^a Since Christ, however,—a sign of His more delicate organization, which made Him feel pain more acutely—on some occasions shed tears, when such would not have been shed by men otherwise of deep sensibility (John xi. 35. Luke xix. 41.), we must not regard this detail as an inappropriate heightening of the picture. Manifold δεήσεις and ἰκετηρίαι, also,—the synonymes are here employed to enhance the notion, Comp. John xvi. 20. : κλαύσετε καὶ θρηνήσετε ὑμεῖς, See Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. xxi. *et seq.*—are not mentioned in that account, and yet Christ prayed several times on the same subject, John xii. 27.—The κραυγὴ ἰσχυρά is, of course, to be expected in an emotion so violent as to prevail over the Redeemer to pray, not merely kneeling (Luke xxii. 41.), which of itself supposes a strong affection, but, even πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (Matth. xxvi. 39.). If a more detailed testimony be desired, an appeal may be made to the προσήυχστο ἰκτενέστερον, Luke xxii. 44.—But, what was the subject-matter of these prayers ? Not to be compelled to die ? So, on the first glance at the passage, we should be led to believe. It is immediately added, however, that He was *heard*, there-

^a Since Luke has given the most detailed account of the passion in the garden, might we not venture to suppose, that this part presupposes in the writer a knowledge of the Gospel of Luke ? and so leading us on this side, likewise, to the supposition of a connection of our author with the School of Paul ?

fore, His prayers could not have had reference to any desire of avoiding death, but, perhaps referred only to His being freed from the anguish of dying, to His *endurance* in the last *πειρασμοί*. We must keep by this view, if, as the Syriac, the Italic (*exauditus a metu*), Calvin, Beza, Scaliger, Gerhard, Storr, Böhme, Kuinöl, de Wette, and Stuart do, we take *εὐλάβεια* in the sense of *fear*. On the other hand, another class of expositors and translators present us with a quite different conception of the words *ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας*. The Vulgate has: *pro sua reverentia*; in like manner the Coptic; the Æthiopic: "because of His righteousness;" Luther, coinciding with the Vulgate: "in that He had God in honour" and so Chrysost: *βούλεται αὐτοῦ δεῖξαι τὸ κατόρθωμα ὃν μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ* (that the great deed was more His own than proceeding from God's grace), *τοσαύτη, φησιν, ἣν αὐτοῦ ἢ εὐλάβεια, ὡς καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου αἰδεῖσθαι αὐτὸν τὸν Θεόν.*^a Among the moderns, Schulz, particularly, remarks, "How is it possible, with Storr and others, to find in this?" "delivered or freed from this fear or anguish?" *Εὐλάβεια* signifies neither more nor less than: '*reverentia*.' Now, wherein, according to this second view, consists His being heard? Here, too, we might say: "in being freed from the anguish," but, better: "in the carrying out the *πειρασμός* to *δόξα*," as, according to the representation of John, the time of death is also the time of the *δοξασμός*, John xii. 27. 28., xiii. 31., xvii. 1., Acts ii. 22. 33., 1 Peter ii. 21. *Σώζειν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου* is not, indeed, elsewhere different from *ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου* (Matthiä, Griech. Gramm. § 353. Anm.); but, here *ἐκ* might be urged, and it may be said, that the prayer does not relate to deliverance *from*, but *out of* death, Acts ii. 24. This explanation has, certainly, much to recommend it; yet Schulz should not have re-

^a He wishes to shew that the great deed was more His own than proceeding from the grace of God. so that He says, it was His (*εὐλάβεια*) reverence, that from *this* also He might reverence God.

jected nor even spoken so harshly of the first exposition. He should have read what Casaubon says on the passage: *qui negant εὐλάβειαν esse metum, parum sani sunt, si negant passim ita usurpári Græcis scriptoribus.* Εὐλάβεια has no doubt the meaning of *fear*, as is proved by Krebs, but, particularly, by the numerous examples in Wetstein. If this meaning be wanting in our Lexicons of Classical Greek, the deficiency ought to be supplied; for, although the word originally means, not *anguish*, but, *anxiety* (εὐλαβής, one who takes everything with consideration), yet, among the Stoics, there had arisen a usage according to which it corresponded, in some degree, to our *considerateness* (Bedächtigkeit), care, apprehension (Besorgniss); but in the age after Christ, it is quite usual in the sense of *fear*. Nay, in the passage before us, the word is peculiarly appropriate in this meaning, more so than φόβος, or ταραχή. It was a nobler term, designating a fear in which a man οὐ σαλεύεται ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦς αὐτοῦ (2 Thess. ii. 2.). Hence, even the Stoics permitted the εὐλάβεια, but not the φόβος. Diog. Laert., L.vii. 116, says of Zeno: τὴν δ' εὐλάβειαν ἐναντίαν φασὶν εἶναι τῷ φόβῳ, οὐσαν εὐλογον ἔκκλισιν.^a And Plutarch, *De virt. mor.* c. 9, says, the Stoics called joy and εὐλάβεια not ἀπαθείας, but εὐπαθείας, with perfect propriety: γίνεται γὰρ εὐπάθεια τοῦ λογισμοῦ τὸ πάθος οὐκ ἀναιροῦντος ἀλλὰ κοσμοῦντος καὶ τάττοντος ἐν τοῖς σωφρονοῦσιν.^b That our author, possessing so accurate a knowledge of words, selected this term by design may very readily be conceived; that he used the same word, xii. 28., and xi. 7., in its usual acceptation, is no valid objection against this opinion. But, there are several other circumstances which excite a doubt respecting the second exposition. In it, ἀπὸ is taken as designating the more remote motive. Now, this is quite admissible, al-

^a That εὐλάβεια was the expression opposed to fear, being a rational hesitation.

^b For the εὐπαθεία belongs to reason, which does not eradicate (τὸ πάθος) passion, but harmoniously arranges and commands in those who are prudent.

though we should rather expect *διά*. In the first exposition there is a *constructio pregnans*, as at x. 22. Comp. *Ps.* xxii. 22. מִקְרָנִי רַמִּים צְנִיתָנִי.

Moreover, in adopting the second view, we should not expect the pron. *αὐτοῦ* to be omitted after *εὐλαβεία*. It may be questioned, also, whether Christ have been called *εὐσεβής* or *εὐλαβής* by the New Testament writers; the predicate *pious* (Ger. *Fromm*) would sound somewhat strange if employed in the language of our church. But the following counter-arguments are of more weight:—1. The author has the garden of Gethsemane in view; now, there, the Redeemer's prayer related not to His glorification, as in the passages quoted from John, but to His *deliverance from the cup of suffering*. 2. That ver. 7. treats of it is presupposed also in ver. 8., in which we find that the *παθήματα* were indispensable. Accordingly, we say, the subject of His prayer was, that the cup of suffering might pass away from Him; but the hearing of it took place only in as much as the Redeemer drank that cup as a *Conqueror*. Let us here notice the remarkable circumstance, that the struggles of the Son of God passed in seclusion, and were witnessed only by the three confidential disciples:—how would it have been had His enemies watched Him in that hour! But, as the full moon comes forth from behind the thick cloud, He steps forward immediately with the power of a God incarnate over the rudest minds among the crowds that sought him, and, at His: "*I am He!*" they fall prostrate on the earth. This, and the manner in which, as one *εἰδώς ὅτι πάντα δέδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατήρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθε, καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπάγει* (*John* xiii. 3.), He supports every thing to the last *τετέλεισται*, with full consciousness, was the *εἰσακουσθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας*.—On the anguish of the fear of death, comp. Beza's long note on the passage, and the beautiful remarks of Ullmann, in his work on the Sinlessness of Christ. (*Students' Cabinet Library of Useful Tracts*, No. 41.)

Ver. 8.—The leading thought of this verse is, the High Priest of the New Testament has shewn obedience. But the dress is striking under which this thought is brought before us, namely, He has *learned* obedience, which seems to indicate that a period of disobedience had preceded. The most awkward explanation of this circumstance is that of Theodoret, who says the declaration was made: ὑπερβολικῶς. There is so little appearance of an hyperbole, however, that the expression might more properly be designated a μείωσις, for the fact appears to be *less* affirmed of Christ than is due to Him. We might rather say, that, for the sake of the Paronomasia, the thought was clumsily expressed. But any thing of this kind, in a writer guided by the Spirit of God, cannot easily be admitted. When the apostles, as it is said, 1 Cor. ii. 13., adapt pneumatic words to pneumatic truths the thought governs the word, and not the word the thought, especially when a false thought would directly spring from a different mode of expression. But, here, also, the thought is quite accurately expressed. We do not merely call that *to learn* when something new is implanted,—he who thinks learns to think. Calvin remarks: *Verum id factum est nostro respectu, ut experimentum specimenque ederet suae subjectionis ad mortem usque, QUANQUAM VERE HOC DICHI POTEST, Christum morte sua ad plenum didicisse, quid sit obedire Deo, quando tunc maxime ad sui abnegationem adductus est.*—The καίπερ ὡν υἱός points out what is striking in the circumstance, that the Son of God must *learn* obedience, and learn, indeed, through *suffering*. Wherein lay this necessity? *Firstly*, In the fact, that thus only could the ὑπακοή be ascertained. *Secondly*, In that the ὑπακοή becomes for us a foundation of salvation, as is expressed ver. 9. and ii. 10. Comp. ch. x. and App. II.—De Wette, in his New Testament, has not taken the trouble to express the Paronomasias; and in the New Testament these are, indeed, thrown so much into the back-ground, as a matter of secondary consideration,

that such a course must be approved of whenever the sense is in danger of suffering in the slightest degree. The far higher object of a close adherence to the text ought in no case to be sacrificed to any thing of less importance. Here, for instance, the imitation could hardly have been accomplished without giving up the word *learned*, which is essential. The phrase must have run something in this way: "Through that which he *endured* he has obedience *procured*" (Ger. er hat durch das, was er *gelitten*, sich den Gehorsam *erstritten*"), in Latin: *Quae nocuerunt docuerunt*.

Ver. 9. 10.—As we have shewn more fully in App. II., in the discussion respecting the meaning of *τελειοῦν*, there is, in these verses, a twofold subject of importance, that of an *internal*, and that of an *external* perfectness: the Son of God attained, through His well-endured *πειρασμοί*, the end or purpose of the full *χαρά*, xii. 1., and, along with it, the *sessio ad dextram Dei*, xii. 2. He is now become *αἴτιος σωτηρίας* (*αἴτιος* is used by the classic writers, also, as a substantive) for His brethren (ii. 10.), partly as His *ὑπακοή* is for their good, partly as He makes continual intercession for them, vii. 25.—This *representative*, and this *intercessory* efficiency constitute the *opus sacerdotale*: hence there follows, immediately, the thought, that He had been called *Priest*. As the author applied the declaration of Psalm ii. particularly to the glorification of Christ after His sufferings, he has in like manner applied that in Ps. cx.—*Τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν πᾶσιν* brings forward the necessity of the *appropriation* of the salvation by the *πίστις*: where *this* appropriation takes place the *salvation* is effectual for *all*, Comp. Rom. i. 16. *εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι*.

Ver. 11—14. *The great significance of the declaration, that the Lord is high-priest after the order of Melchisedek, gives rise to important doctrines, but, alas, ye have lost the spiritual understanding for such truths!*

Ver. 11. *Λόγος* with the art.: "the particular one which I have to propose." *Και*: "to explain preceding words, especially when it adds something stronger," Matthiä § 620. *d.*: with *πολύς* John, ch. xx. 30., has preserved the Grecism, although that usage is not constant in classical writers, Matthiä, § 444. 6. *Δυσερμήνευτος* with the Inf., having the power of the Lat. Supine. The addition of *λέγειν* was here necessary, in order to render it clear, that *ἑρμηνεία* denotes the *elocutio auctoris*, not the *interpretatio lectoris*, *ἑρμηνεία* being a technical expression also of the Grecian rhetoricians for the *elocutio* of the Latins.—*Γεγόνατε* should not have been translated by Schulz, de Wette, and Kuinöl, after Luther's example, *ye be*, (*Ger. seid*), for *non olim sic erat*; in ver. 12., also, we find *γεγόνατε*, Comp. x. 32.: *ἀναμιμνήσκουσθε τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας*. Besides, a passage will not easily be found in the New Testament where *γέγονα* stands for *εἰμί*, Comp., for instance, in John i. 3, 15, 27, 30. v. 14. vi. 25. xii. 29, 30. xiv. 22., and, in our Epistle iii. 14. vii. 16, 20. xi. 3. xii. 8. In classical language it properly denotes only: *to be*, when it is equivalent to: "have become physically." *Ἀκοαί* is naturally the spiritual hearing.

Ver. 12.—*Διὰ τὸν χρόνον* *in consideration* of the time, *by virtue of* the time, Comp. *διὰ τὴν ἔξιν* ver. 14.—*τίνα* may be taken interrogatively, and, then, it will receive a comma before it, and *διδάσκειν* will be translated passively (1 Thes. iv. 9. v. 1. Winer p. 315.), and, thus it usually is: but, *τινά*, taken as a *pron. indef.*, may be accented, and, then, the comma will come after it; and, it is so accented, after the example of Gronovius, by Böhme and Lachmann. In favour of this it might be urged, that it brings out a more definite antithesis to *διδάσκαλοι*.—But what is the meaning of *λόγια Θεοῦ*? Schulz is of opinion, that it can only denote the Old Testament prophecies, like Rom. iii. 2. At the first glance, this opinion, opposed to all the received views of the phrase, surprises us with as great an appearance of truth as Schleiermacher's view of

the *λόγια κυρίου* in Papias. On comparing, however, the *ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, vi. 1., which is connected by the *διό*, we cannot resolve to deviate from the current explanation, which, by *λόγια Θεοῦ*, understands the *Christian doctrine*. The division of the whole New Testament by Photius (See Suicer, *Theol.* ii. 248.) into *κυριακά λόγια* and *ἀποστολικά*, proves, in opposition to Schleiermacher, that *λόγια* could be said of the gospels *sec. partem potiore*, and against Schulz, that the Christian doctrine could be called *λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου*, or, *τοῦ Θεοῦ*.—The author does not say *simpliciter τὰ στοιχεῖα*, but, he defines the expression more closely by *τῆς ἀρχῆς*, because, otherwise, it might be believed that *στοιχεῖα* meant only *elements*. This Gen., as also *τῆς ἀρχῆς*, vi. 1., have been cited by Bleek as Hebraisms (see above, p. 32.), but scarcely with reason. The Greeks employed the genitive to express *nom. comp.*, as *beginning-elements*, the genitive generally serving to complete the idea, Thiersch, *Gramm.* § 251. The contrast of milk and firm meat to designate the various degrees of the truth is found, also, 1 Cor. iii. 2.; it is not so, however, in 1 Peter ii. 2. *Καὶ οὐ* is of classical usage instead of *ἀλλ' οὐ*, Matthiä, p. 1224.

Ver. 13.—This is a difficult passage. What is the *λόγος δικαιοσύνης*? If *δικαιοσύνη* be here employed in its usual signification, the phrase either means, generally, the doctrine of moral perfection, or, *in specie*, according to Pauline usage, the doctrine of the *δικαιοσύνη ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*. The former conception of the phrase, with a reference to Matth. v. 20., is found in Chrysost., Theoph., Oecum., and the Catholic expositors Zegerus, Justinian, and others; and, lately, in Bretschneider, in his *Lex.*, s. v. *δικαιοσύνη* (*Comp.* xii. 11.). The other has been taken by Beza, Stephen, Cappell, and Stuart. That the Pauline term *δικαιοσύνη ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, or, *κατὰ τὸν Θεόν*, is not unknown to our author, is shewn by xi. 7.: that he knew the opposition of a justification by *χάρις*, and one by the fulfilment of the law, is evinced by xiii. 9. The reader

may compare, in Paul, *διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, 2 Cor. iii. 9., and *ὁ λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς*, 2 Cor. v. 19. The mention of this doctrine in this passage, too, does not lie beyond the scope of the context, for the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ* contains, at the same time, that of *justification*. Yet, it will appear, that neither of these views can be here admitted. If, as the Greek Fathers prefer to take it, *δικαιοσύνη* signified, according to Matth. v. 20, the higher gospel holiness, then a more strict definition would certainly be required; but there is nowhere, in our Epistle, any mention of a more profound development of the moral law, of the higher gospel holiness. And it appears, likewise, requisite that we should have a closer definition, if the expression be referred to the *δικαιοσύνη ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, as the *terminus* does not again occur in the whole of the context. Besides, it must be confessed that, although in the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ, contained in chap. vii., the doctrine of justification is included it is still not made prominent. From the context, we expect, not a complaint from the author that his readers do not understand justification from the life of Christ, but, that they do not comprehend His higher sacerdotal dignity, into which the Old Testament priesthood had passed, as into the more perfect one. As he continues, moreover, vi. 1., *διὸ ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα*, Chrysost. conjectured that *δικαιοσύνη* might be equivalent in meaning to *τελειότης*, and that, perhaps, *λόγος τῆς δικαιοσύνης* marks the doctrine of the *higher sacerdotal dignity of Christ*; so also Theoph. particularly, and the Scholiast in Matthäi. This signification has been approved of by most of the moderns, who give the sense, however, with various modifications. Calvin says: *accipit apostolus hoc nomen pro integritate cognitionis, quae nos ad perfectionem ducit*; Dorscheus, who is joined by Calov: *sermo de mysteriis justitiam salvificam explicantibus sublimior, plenior, perfectior, solidior*. Grotius interprets it of the *τελειότης*, which is equivalent to the Alexandrian *γνώσις*,

διάνοιξις τῶν γραφῶν, and acutely adds: *vera cabala*. Accordingly, the most recent expositors give it: *perfectior doctrina*, i. e. *subtilior*; so Schulz, De Wette, Kuinöl, and Wahl. It is, however, remarkable that these expositors get so lightly over the difficulty of the author (who was completely master of all the stores of the Grecian tongue,) having employed the word *δικαιοσύνη*, which, in the meaning here assigned to it, neither occurs in classical Greek, nor is accordant with Hellenistic usage; for where *δικαιοσύνη* is = *τελειότης* it invariably means *sanctimonia*. An appeal is made, indeed, to the meaning of *δίκαιος*, which, like *justus*, in Latin, denotes the *rightly constituted*, τὸ ἀληθινόν, τὸ γνήσιον, and, to the circumstance, that the adjective has been exchanged for the substantive, for this reason alone, that the adjective would have been liable to be misunderstood. But why did not the author employ the very common adjective *τέλειος*, as Paul has done, 1 Cor. ii. 6.; xiv. 20., or *λόγος σοφίας*, 1 Cor. ii. 6.? Thus we see ourselves obliged to return to the sense of *λόγος δικαιοσύνης*, which is current in the New Testament, and to understand by it the doctrine of justification. That, then, the expression *must* have been more definite we cannot directly affirm. Paul, 2 Cor. iii. 9., calls the ministry of the Gospel, without any stricter definition, *διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, its ministers, *διακόνους δικαιοσύνης*, 2 Cor. xi. 15., and Rom. ix. 31.; the Gospel he calls *νόμος δικαιοσύνης*. Why should not the reader have understood the expression *λόγος δικαιοσύνης*? That our author does not subsequently, *disertis verbis*, handle the doctrine of justification, is true; but no one will deny that the doctrine of the priestly office of Christ might have been called, particularly, *λόγος δικαιοσύνης*. It is acknowledged that here he means the same thing which, at vi. 1., he reckons in the state of the *τελειότης*, which lies beyond the truths mentioned, vi. 1. 2., and which truth he calls τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς λόγον τοῦ Χριστοῦ: this, indeed, is the Christian *λόγος δικαιοσύνης*. If a doubt, however, be still felt respecting this view of the passage, perhaps the ingenious notion of Böhme, who supposes

here a play upon words, may be thought to merit a more accurate examination. *Λόγος δικαιοσύνης*, according to this notion, means, in its first sense, *sermo justus*, i. e. *loquela satis ad intelligendum composita*, but the phrase contains, through this meaning, an *allusion* to the *doctrine of righteousness*. The unusual expression becomes then less striking, as being selected for the sake of the allusion. In favour of this view, it may be urged, that the expositor will be in doubt whether, in ver. 14., he have imagery before him or merely metaphorical style. Both, occasionally, pass into one another, See on vi. 7, 8. To corroborate the notion that they are only metaphorical expressions, and, that then, also, *αἰσθητήρια* does not designate the organs of sensation, but the organs of spiritual trial,—Comp. *αἴσθησις*, of spiritual experience, Phil. i. 9,—it may be argued, that the hurtful and the useful are not distinguished by means of the organs of sensation. We should prefer saying, as at vi. 7, 8., that the discourse presents an image, but the expressions are selected with reference to the thing compared; and hence, also, there is an inconcinnity in *αἰσθητήρια*. If this be the case, we shall be tempted to make the figurative expression commence at ver. 13., and *νήπιος* itself will then be employed, with reference to its primary signification, in the sense of *in-fans, qui nondum fari queat*. As examples of such Amphibolic style may be mentioned, John iii. 20. 21.; ix. 5.; xi. 9. 10. Rom. xiii. 13. It might then be said, that, to express this peculiar sense, the author chose the unusual expression in order to enable him, at the same time, to make this allusion. Still, the following, among other considerations, may be considered as opposed to this supposition; the words *γάλα, νήπιος, τέλειος, στερεὰ τροφή*, in verses 13. and 14., are used, all of them, as it appears, not in their proper but their tropical sense.

Ver. 14.—The contrast of *νήπιος* and *τέλειος* with reference to Christian insight is very frequent in Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 1. xiii. 11. Rom. ii. 20. Eph. iv. 14. Paul, in like manner, frequently gives as a mark of

perfection, that τὰ διαφέροντα are perceived, Rom. ii. 18. xii. 2. Eph. v. 10. Phil. i. 10. Ἐξίς, in opposition to διάθεσις (πρᾶξις), designates, according to the philosophical usage of Aristotle, the inward quality or habitude cleaving to a thing, also with relation to age, Dion. Hal. De comp. verb. l. 5.: ἐν ᾗ ποτ' ἂν ἡλικία τε καὶ ἔξει;^a Comp. Schaefer on the passage.

CHAPTER VI.

LET US NOT RETROGRADE IN KNOWLEDGE, FOR RETROGRESSION EASILY LEADS TO APOSTACY.

Ver. 1—8. Let us strive after perfection in Christian insight, for, when a decided apostacy takes place, there is no return.

Ver. 1.—Διό: “as surely no one will wish to be considered a νήπιος.”—On the Gen. τῆς ἀρχῆς, see ver. 12.—The τελειότης is the state of the τελειοί mentioned ver. 14.; according to the context, it is the condition in which the λόγος δικαιοσύνης is known, which lies beyond the initial λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Φέρεσθαι, according to *de Wette*, “we will turn us,” which is too feeble; *Schulz*, “pursue” (hintreiben); but, better, “hasten.”—The author now mentions six doctrinal points, which do not constitute the essentials of the Christian Faith; and he intentionally selects, indeed, such articles as had been, in some degree, known to those of his readers who were of Jewish descent while they were yet Jews. He brings forward these points in pairs, and connects, by two and two, the doctrines which are more closely allied.^b If, on the one hand, it do not follow, because

^a In what age and condition.

^b Bengel very correctly remarks: “*Tria capitum paria, quae versu hoc et sequenti enumerantur, ejusmodi erant, ut Judaeus apud suos ex V. T. probe institutus ea ad Christianismum fere adferre debuerit.*” Directly the reverse of this was

he calls these *elementary doctrines*, that they are unimportant—he calls them also *foundations*—it is absurd, on the other, to conclude. as is done by an American sect, “The Six Article Christians,” that, because they are called *foundations*, they are alone sufficient to constitute a Christian. —“*Ἔργα νεκρά*, found ix. 14., must be explained according to the analogy of *πίστις νεκρά*, James ii. 17., *ἁμαρτία νεκρά*, Rom. vii. 8.; from which it would appear that they are works which want the living power of the love of God. So Epictetus, *Diss.* 3, 23, 29., calls a philosophical *λόγος, νεκρός* when it wants the inward convincing power. *Πίστις ἐπὶ Θεῷ* is not merely the belief that there *is* a God, but it includes, as it always does when *πίστις* is construed with *εἰς, ἐπί, πρὸς*, the notion of confidence in, tendency towards, God, Comp. on xi. 1. Hence, also, it is placed in a closer connection with *μετάνοια*.

Ver. 2.—The rite of reception into the community. Instead of the sing. *βάπτισμα*, the author employs the plur. of *βαπτισμός*, his intention being to point out, that, in their Jewish purifications, they already had an analogon of baptism, Heb. ix. 10. As the *ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν* is placed along with this in very close connection, it cannot be referred to the act of ordination, but, simply, to the imposition of hands connected with baptism, Acts ii. 38. viii. 14—19. xix. 1—6. Quite in accordance with this, *τί* is employed, not *καί*. This act, also, was known to the Jews, Numb. xxvii. 18. 23. Deut. xxxiv. 9. 2 Sam. xiii. 19.—With respect to the last proposition, the moderns incline to the supposition, that the *ἀνάστασις* refers only to the *δίκαιοι*, the resurrection *sensu eminentiori*, as John vi. 40, 54. ;

the opinion of the older Reformed and Lutheran divines, namely, that the writer enumerates only those articles which are *peculiar to Christianity*. This opinion was arrived at through the supposition, that the main articles of apostolical catechizing were here enumerated. The more ancient catechists actually believed themselves able to shew, that all Christian doctrines might be included under those six leading articles. Comp., in particular, Walch : *De apostol. instit. catechetica*.

the κρίμα relates to the non-believing, because, otherwise, in the last proposition, along with the κρίμα, we should expect the ζωή αιώνιος: so Gerhard, and, later, Schöttgen understood the passage. Besides, an appeal might be made to this circumstance, that, with the exception of John v. 29., a resurrection of the non-believing is nowhere taught in the New Testament. If we understand, indeed, by resurrection, a glorification of the body, such cannot be conceived in non-Christians. Is it not singular that Paul, in such passages as 1 Cor. xv., particularly ver. 55., takes no notice of the ἄδικοι? It may be added, that the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked is widely spread among the Rabbins. And we might almost believe that the judgment mentioned at ix. 27. of our Epistle is, for the wicked, annihilation. But, the doctrine of a resurrection of the unrighteous is pronounced in Dan. xii. 2.; and Acts xxiv. 15. unquestionably shews that, in the time of Paul, the pharisees taught an ἀνάστασις τῶν ἀδίκων, in which the Apostle testifies that he also believed. We may conclude, too, from some passages at least of the Talmud (See Corrodi, Geschichte des Chiliasmus, I. S. 351.) that, according to it, the wicked are not excluded from the resurrection. Our author, no doubt, taught no other doctrine on this point than was taught by Paul and the Old Testament, and ἀνάστασις ought certainly to be referred to both classes. But, whether κρίμα likewise extend to both, or only to the ἄδικοι, as κρίσις in John v. 24, and Mark iii. 29., denotes *damnation*, and whether, therefore, bliss must be considered as included in the resurrection of the just is more doubtful. From Heb. ix. 27. we might venture to decide, that κρίμα relates to both parties. Κρίμα αἰώνιον, the *consequences* of which endure eternally, like λύτρωσις, διαθήκη αἰώνιος, ix. 12. xiii. 20. In Mark iii. 29., according to the *rec.* and Fritzsche, we should read κρίσις αἰώνιος—still, we prefer ἀμάρτημα αἰώνιον.

Ver. 3.—Our first object here is to decide as to the reading. ACDE, a number of *Codd. minusc.*,

the Armenian and Ethiopic versions, Theodoret, and Eecumenius, have the conjunctive ποιήσωμεν. The external authorities in its favour, may therefore be considered as preponderating; at least, ποιήσωμεν, by the Eastern and Western sources, is justified equally with ποιήσομεν, on which account Lachmann gives both readings. Besides, it is known, that the *Codd.* frequently waver between the fut. and conj. aor. See Winer Gramm. p. 255. The demonstrative may refer to the immediately preceding καταβάλλεσθαι θεμέλιον, or, likewise, to the more remote φερώμεθα,—a construction, however, which is certainly a little awkward. The Greek interpreters have decided for the latter; and so, too, all the moderns, with the exception of Abresch and Storr. It might even be suspected that the conj. was a consequence of this acceptance; for, if ποιήσωμεν refer to the reiterated statement of the fundamental doctrines, the *future* only can be used. Still, we feel ourselves obliged to accede to the current opinion. Although it cannot be denied that the retrospective reference to φερώμεθα has something awkward in it, yet the proposition, “and that will we do,” namely, “again lay a foundation,” would be still more awkward; for we should much more naturally expect it to be connected by a καίτοι. Add to this, that it would not then be easy to assign a reason for the γάρ in ver. 4., while it now connects itself appropriately thus: “We must press on towards the centre of faith, for retrogression brings apostacy; and to them who have already participated in the Christian privileges of grace, and have fallen away, return is impossible.—Ἐπιτρέπειν, according to later usage, is: “to permit, vouchsafe (gestatten).” See 1 Cor. xvi. 7. James iv. 15.

Ver. 4—6.—Here we have a practically important passage,^a in expounding which we must keep steadily

^a Many theological doubts, the lot of those afflicted with temptations, as it is expressed, are to be referred to the passage. See *ex. gr.* Spener: Theol. Bedenken, iv. 634.; Letzte theol. Bedenken, ii. 398.

in view the exactly parallel section x. 26. *et seq.* The rigour of the declaration here made appeared to Luther so great as to make him dissatisfied with the author of the Epistle.^a In our opinion, an opinion which we will immediately endeavour to establish against those who dissent from us, the result of both passages is this: "He who outwardly is thoroughly instructed in Christianity, and has inwardly had all the experiences connected with a life of faith, and afterwards, not from weakness, but *ἐκουσίως* (x. 26.), falls away and, in such a manner, that the truth which he formerly possessed he now holds for a lie, and thereby profanes the Christ *without him* (ver. 6. x. 29. *ὁ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατήσας καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἠγησάμενος*), and blasphemes the Christ *within him* (x. 29. *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας*), for this man there is, subjectively, no renewal of a change of mind (ver. 6.), and, objectively, no new sacrifice for sins (x. 26. *οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία*). According to the established truth, that it is the curse of evil eternally to propagate evil, he has risen to such a height of wickedness, that a return from it is impossible."

As it is an indispensable duty in the theological interpreter to explain Scripture by Scripture, and, be-

^a "Besides," says he, "this Epistle gives us a hard knot to undo; for, in ch. vi. and x., it directly denies and rejects repentance for sins committed after baptism, and, in xii. 17., declares that Esau had sought repentance, and yet not found it, which, as the words sound, appears opposed to all the Gospels, and to St. Paul's Epistles. And although a gloss may be made out of the passage, yet the words sound so clearly, that I know not whether this would be sufficient." It may be observed, however, that Luther here understood the *παραπτώματα* and *ἁμαρτίαι*, as Chrys. and Theod. had done, of all *gross sins*, and not of the *pecc. contra Sp. Sanct*: but, in the passage xii. 17., he totally misunderstood the word *μετάνοια*. According to the explanations which, at a later period, were received in the Church which took his name, he would have found no stumbling-block in these passages.

sides, as the *believing* interpreter proceeds upon the conviction that, amidst all the diversity of *typus doctrinae* of the New Testament writers the basis of their Christian consciousness is the same, our first duty here is to collect together those declarations of which the substance appears to be the same with that of the passage before us, and to examine whether they lead to the same result, which, if they do, will confirm our exposition; but, on the other hand, to institute a strict search after those declarations which appear to contradict our text. Of the latter kind is 1 John ii. 19., of the former are Matth. xii. 31, 32. 1 John v. 16. 2 Peter ii. 20. Let us commence with 2 Peter ii. 20. Here the impossibility of return is not affirmed, the latter end is only, the case being supposed, worse than the beginning, *in case the end does not resume the beginning in a still more glorious way*. On the right understanding of Matth. xii. 31. 32. there have been recently promulgated various interesting views, differing very widely, however, from those formerly received. That difference, however, does not affect the subject of inquiry. The present question is simply,—whether an apostacy from the truth once perceived, and completely entered into the consciousness—let such apostacy be psychologically conceived as it may—*bring on a state of obduracy from which there is no redemption*. On this point the more modern interpreters of that passage are unanimous, and they,—namely, Grasshoff and Gurlitt,—agree in holding the spiritual condition designated in that text as parallel with the condition described in both passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is likewise agreed among recent expositors, that 1 John v. 16. cannot be regarded as a decided parallel. In whatever way we may define *πρὸς θάνατον*, John does not determine whether a *μετάνοια*, in such a case, be possible or not,—a circumstance remarked by Lücke,—but merely desires, in order to keep holy the consciousness of the Christian *ἀδελφότης*, that, for such a

one, the prayer of brotherly intercession should cease.* There remains for us, therefore, the consideration of 1 John ii. 19., which contains a declaration apparently at variance with the result of all these passages. According to that declaration, it is impossible for one who actually belongs to the Christian community, who is a genuine disciple, ever (ἐξέλθεσθαι) to fall off from it. As the above mentioned passages form the *praesidium* for the doctrine of the Lutheran church: *renatos labi posse*, so the last served the same end for the opposite opinion of the Reformed church; and, as the expositors of that church had recourse to subtleties, in order to weaken the probative power of the one passage, so the like subtleties were employed by the Lutherans respecting the other. The Arminian, and the more modern theologians, share, with

* The older expositors have usually taken ἀμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον as a generic idea, under which the *pecc. contra Sp. Sanct.* was comprehended. The ample explanation which Beza gives of 1 John v. 16. may particularly be compared. He there shews, according to the doctrinal idea of the Gospel, in the first place, that the distinction of *pecc. lethale* and *veniale*, in the Catholic sense, is inadmissible, that every sin of the unregenerate is *lethale*, and makes this astounding declaration, which evinces what a profound consciousness of guilt was habitually felt by the men of that period: "*hinc videntur crudeles, qui totam hominis non regenerati naturam jam inde a primo conceptu ream aeternae mortis peragunt, et qui pro minimis (ut vocant) peccatis commoventur, QUUM POTIUS MIRARI OPORTUERIT TANTAM ESSE DEI BONITATEM, UT VELOB UNUM UNIUS PECCATUM TOTUM ORBEM TERRARUM FUNDITUS MILLIES NON PERDIDERIT.*" He then determines that every regenerate person (according to him = *electus*) may fall into the same deadly sins as the unregenerate, with the exception of *one*, which is the *pecc. contra Spiritum Sanctum*, and that this sin is here, in John, to be understood κατ' ἔξοχήν under the name *peccatum lethale*. Consequently, in accordance with the doctrinal idea of the Reformed church, the possibility of the *pecc. contra S. S.* is supposed with regard to those alone in whom the Spirit of God has worked imperfectly. Comp. Calvin, *Instit.* L. 3. c. 2. § 11. Beza, *Coll. Mompelg.* p. 463. 465. 467., also his *Quaest. et respons.* p. 127.

those of the Reformed church, in the interest to remove the impossibility, not so much of apostacy as of renewal. But the theologians of the Romish church, too, were seduced into the employment of subtleties in interpreting our text; thus, *παραπίπτειν* was referred, by the Novatians, merely to mortal sins, such as murder, adultery; and, by them there was derived from the passage the doctrine: *lapsos in peccatum lethale non posse ad pœnitentiam restitui*. With respect to Heb. vi., some of the Fathers (Jerome *Ad Jovin* ii. 3.), and Roman Catholic expositors (Erasmus, Zegerus), in controversy with the Novatians, moreover Calvinists, modern Supranaturalists (Chr. Schmid, Storr), and Rationalists, and some, also, of the older Lutherans, as Flacius in the *Clavis*, rested their argument upon the *ἀδύνατον*. The word, however, is not taken so strictly in Matth. xix. 26. It declares only an impossibility on the part of man, and does not exclude an extraordinary efficacy on the part of God, by which the impossible is rendered possible. Calvin, and, after him, Beza, scorn this mode of escape from the difficulty. The former says, there is nothing to hinder: *quominus reprobos etiam gustu gratiæ suæ adspersgat (Deus), irradiet eorum mentes aliquibus lucis suæ scintillis, afficiat eos bonitatis sensu, verbumque suum utcunque eorum animis insculpat. Alioqui ubi esset illa TEMPORARIA FIDES, cujus meminit Marcus, c. iv. 17.?* Like Beza, in the Rem. upon the former passage, he supposes, that, in order to commit the sin against the Holy Ghost, it is not necessary that the sinner should be in a state of regeneration, properly so called, and full experience of all the gifts of grace. Some theologians, as Alberti, Braun, and Stuart, even attach importance to *γευσάμενους*, as if it only denoted a *GUSTARE extremis labris*. Other Calvinists have adopted much more violent expedients, either urging the partic. *παραπεσόντας*: "in case they should fall away (but which does not happen)," or, the inf. active *ἀναλαϊνίξειν*, namely, "a man

cannot renew them, but God can.”^a Several of the Lutheran expositors, again, as Seb. Schmid and Spener, in order to escape from the force of 1 John ii. 19., referred ἐξ ἡμῶν to the college of the Apostles, and the sense is given by Spener thus: “their wickedness must not be attributed to us, since they were, even when they went out from among us, not of us, neither sent by us, nor certainly partaking of our truth; for, had they been sent by us, and been still partakers of our doctrine (at the moment of departure), they would also have remained outwardly among us.” Recent interpreters, both the expositors of this Epistle, and those of the Epistles of St. John, have altogether omitted the consideration of the opposing passages. Lücke, on 1 John ii. 19., has not even made mention of the passages in Hebrews, far less attempted to shew the unity of their contents.

Our opinion, which we advance with deference, is the following:—John certainly says, that those belonging, in the full sense of the expression, to the number of His disciples, never leave him again, as He, the good Shepherd himself, said, no one shall pluck them out of His hand, John x. 28. But what is the meaning of, to belong to Jesus? It means to hear His voice, to follow Him, John x. 4. 27.; but what means, to belong to the number of his disciples, in the full sense? This means not merely to be participant in those *objective* privileges of grace, which are enumerated Heb. vi. 4. 5., but, *subjectively*, to fulfil all the conditions which the Saviour has laid down; above all, μένειν ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ, John viii. 31.; xv. 4. 5. 1 John ii. 24.; iii. 6. Comp. Col. i. 23. 1 Tim. ii. 15.; vi. 3. 2 Tim. iii. 14. Whoever abides *not* in Him is cast forth, John xv. 6.; whoever, on the contrary, abides in Him, becomes more and more

^a Thus, also, two of the Lutherans, Bengel and Schöttgen. The former immediately after ἀδύνατον remarks: *impossibile hominibus, quamlibet idoneis*. But he also declares that, according to his opinion, the condition here described is not necessarily to be connected with the *blasphemia in Spir. Sanctum*; sed, tamen, says he, *amara animae constitutio PROPE eadem est, cf. x. 29.*

free from the temptation of sin, John viii. 32., he keepeth himself from the wicked one, so that he cannot touch him, 1 John v. 18., he shall more and more taste how sweet the word of the Lord is, 1 Peter ii. 3., so that, when he has *once* drunk of the water, he will desire it ever more, Ecclus. xxiv. 28, 29., he will be inseparably one with his Lord. Accordingly, it is quite correct to say, that no one plucks His out of His hand, *in case they fulfil the conditions established by Him, in case they abide in Him*. Then is verified in them, that He who is in them is greater than he who is in the world; and, that faith overcometh the world, 1 John iv. 4.; v. 4. But in our passage, and in chap. x., the subject matter respects those who, having, *objectively*, had all the experiences of Grace which fall to the lot of the Christian, do not fulfil the *subjective* conditions, and, therefore, finally fall away. We, consequently, agree with the Lutheran Church in this, that he who is led into the whole compass of Christian experiences may yet cease to *abide in them*; but, we say also, that he who abides not in them was, at the very time when he had those objective experiences, not *subjectively* true to them, otherwise, there would have been fulfilled in him: ὅστις ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ καὶ περισσευθήσεται, so that he would have abided in them and not have fallen away; that, on this account, therefore, by the Reformed Church of Germany, such a one is, with reason, not reckoned in the *full* sense among the number of His disciples. Whence it follows, that *he who, in the full sense, belongs to His disciples can be known only EX EVENTU*, agreeably to the conclusion which John himself draws: εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν, μεμενηκέρισαν ἀν μὲθ' ἡμῶν. The Lutheran dogmatics, therefore, draw a distinction between *renati* and *electi*, bestowing the latter name only upon those *in fide, dilectione, et studio sanctitatis finaliter perseverantibus*. In conclusion, we must not pass unnoticed an attempt, proceeding upon the supposition of the Apocatastasis, to remove the presupposed possibility of eternal dam-

¹ See Macknight, Hak'ane, &c. — *Tr.*

nation contained in this declaration. It is found in Hasenkamp's Journal; Wahrheit zur Gottseligkeit Hft. III. s. 307. According to this view, the fire which burns down the field is merely a *purgatorial fire*.

Ver. 4.—As at ver. 1. 2., the first stage of Christian insight was denoted by three truths, which were known likewise to Judaism, so here the state of complete Christian experience is in the same way denoted by three articles, which may be compared with the Pauline Triad, *Faith, Hope, and Love*: 1. *Illumination and tasting of the bread of Life*. 2. *Participation in the Holy Ghost as the guiding principle of the Christian Life*. 3. *Tasting of the precious promises of the future, and of the powers even of the world to come*. The main points are connected by καί, the inferior by τε. The style is particularly elevated, and falls into rhythm; several Dochmian members of verses, especially, may be pointed out in the passage. Φωτίζειν, according to Pauline usage, Eph. i. 18. iii. 9., to *impart the light of true knowledge*, with relation to Christ as the true light of the world (Eph. v. 14. John i. 9.). According to the most ancient usage, in the language of the Christian Church, baptism was called, *per met. adjuncti*, φωτισμός, as Justin (*Apol. I. c. 80. ed. Grabe*) says: ὡς φωτίζον μὲν τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μαθητόντων.^a While this usage, and the high opinion of the value of baptism, prevailed during the first centuries of the Church, it is not to be wondered at if this signification was adopted, in the passage before us, by the ancient interpreters; thus the Syriac, Theodoret, Theophylact, and more recently, Ernesti and Michaelis. But, it is opposed by the usage of Paul, and likewise that of our Epistle; for, in ch. x. 32., where the word again occurs, it must be expounded according to ver. 26. of the same chapter, a passage parallel to that under consideration, and in which it runs thus: μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν

^a As enlightening the mind of all those who learn these things.

τὴν ἐκτίωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας. In our exposition, too, the amplifying proposition construes better with τέ. It represents the enlightenment as something perceptible by the whole man, as a consciousness. The δωρεά is just the Christian φῶς objectively taken (Comp. John iv. 10.); it is called ἐπουράνιος, inasmuch as it is not *invented* by man, but *given* by God, Comp. ἐν τοῖς ἐπουράνιοις; Eph. i. 3.—It may appear singular that the πνεῦμα ἅγιον is yet distinguished from this δωρεά, since to believe and to be enlightened presuppose the possession of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. xii. 3.), who is Himself, Acts viii. 19. 20., called a δωρεά of God. But, on the one hand, the Spirit of God may, as the bearer of the awakened Christian life, be distinguished from the truths of salvation of which the mind has become conscious; on the other hand, the communication of the Spirit, in the primitive church, came more visibly before men than it does at present: The δυνάμεις are connected with it, see Gal. i. 2. 5.—On the part, γενηθείς, and on the constr. of γέυεσθαι, c. acc. in ver. 5. Comp. above p. 31., note.

Ver. 5. The older interpreters referred καλὸν Θεοῦ ἔγγημα to the Gospel, *in specie* to the tidings of Grace, in contrast to the burden of the Law, Acts xv. 10. Matth. xi. 28. 29. In adopting this view, however, we see no cause wherefore this should form a particular member of the proposition, as it is already implied in γευσάμενους τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου; besides, the amplification connected by τέ would be less suitable. The moderns have, therefore, rendered ἔγγημα better by: *promise*, as frequently in טוֹב לְבָרֶךָ, Josh. xxi. 45. xxiii. 14. Jer. xxix. 10. xxxiii. 14. 1 Kings viii. 29. The promise of Canaan, especially, was a type of the promise of the everlasting land of rest (c. iv.), and, our author gives particular prominence to the notion, that, through Christ, access has been opened to a blessed futurity. The explanatory proposition suits itself excellently to this exposition. The perception, that this world and the world to come form no rigid

contrast, but, rather, that the Christian here below possesses eternal life, is not, as has been sometimes affirmed, peculiar to John, being common to him and Paul. The latter Apostle propounds it, however, under another form; he calls the Spirit of God, which the believer here receives, the *earnest*, the *first fruits* (Eph. i. 14. 2 Cor. i. 22. Rom. viii. 23.), upon which follows the *full sum*, the *harvest*. Our author, also, regards the powers of life prevailing in believers as having flowed from the other world.

Ver. 6. The inf. *act.* ἀνακαθίζεῖν is not different in sense from the inf. *pass.*, Comp. on v. 11. 'Ανακαθίζεῖν εἰς μετάνοιαν, that kind of renovation from which a change of mind proceeds. In the following words, which have received many very perverse interpretations, we must keep constantly in view the parallel passage x. 29. They give, in agreement with it, this simple sense: What the carnal Israel did outwardly those who harden themselves do inwardly; that is, while they renounce the Son of God, they place themselves in the position of the unbelieving Jews, they must approve of the crucifixion of Him who made Himself equal with God, count His blood as κοινόν, and, with that, repeat inwardly the wicked deed of the crucifixion. Bengel: *qui efficaciam crucis Christi pridem exantlatæ non credunt, vel jure cum a Judæis crucifixum putant, perinde faciunt, ac si Christum dicerent denuo esse crucifigendum; cf. Rom. x. 6, 7* (which passage in a certain respect may no doubt be compared). The ἀνα, in ἀνασταυροῦν, is, therefore, not to be taken *locally*: "to fasten *up upon* the cross," making the *comp.* synonomous with the *simpl.*, but *temporally*; the *part.* may be taken causally, and resolved by *quippe qui*. Τὸν Θεοῦ is intentionally used, similar to Acts iii. 15.: "Ye have *kill-ed* the Prince of *Life*." 'Εαυτοῦς has been very variously conceived; most commonly as *dat. incomm.* In *this* part of the context it is better taken thus: *for themselves*, in contrast to *coram omnibus*, and, therefore, denoting the inward character of the deed. It

would, consequently, be a dative of reference, or of direction, Matth. xiii. 14. might be compared, ἀναπληροῦνται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία, i. e. *with respect to them.*

Ver. 7, 8.—The same truth is here expressed figuratively. Divine increase rests upon the ground which brings forth fruit answerable to the divine blessing,—a curse upon that which deceives the hopes. Let us first remark, that, as is frequently the case in the Hebrew *parallelismus verb.*, the definition of the first proposition, ἡ πιούσα κτλ., is to be conceived as added to the second. Let us observe, also, that, as above, perhaps, v. 13, 14., and frequently in comparisons (Matth. v. 25. vii. 10. Luke xi. 39.), the words of the comparison are selected with reference to the thing compared, in which cases the comparison passes into metaphor. There is very nearly an exact correspondence in the parts of comparison. The rain from heaven falls upon both soils—a beautiful image for the divine gifts of grace (James i. 17. v. 7.); the one drinks it in and bears fruit, as the master of the soil wishes (John xv. 8, 16. Matth. xxi. 43.), the other produces weeds: God blesses the former, so that it grows green and blossoms (Gen. xxvii. 27.), and rejects the latter, nay, almost curses it (Gen. iii. 17.), so that, at last, it is burned down. The extension of the thought, in the last proposition, arises from the desire of the author to express himself with forbearance, keeping his readers in view, of whom he did not expect that any would proceed so far (Comp. ver. 9, 10). In consequence of this regard to *persons*, he selects an expression that marks, at the same time, the future punishment (Matth. iii. 10. vii. 19. xiii. 30. John xv. 6.).—Ver. 7. The part. *aor.* πιούσα stands first, then the *praes.* τίκτουςα, because the latter is related to the former as effect to cause. Δι οὓς is not used instead of δι ἑν; the writer does not mean the labourers of the ground (Matth. xxi. 33. 1 Cor. iii. 9.), but the possessors. Καί does not imply *in addition to*, i. e. so that the labour is added to the blessing of heaven,

but *even, just* (eben), as vii. 26., if we read there, with Lachmann, *καὶ ἔπρεπεν*, comp. Hermann on Viger, p. 831. Zell, *Ad Arist. Eth.* 1, 2. Luke frequently places it with the relative, just because the relative always brings forward something new, Luke vi. 13, 16. x. 39 (1 Peter ii. 8.). In some passages of that Evangelist it can scarcely be translated. The curse of God made the earth unfruitful, Gen. iii. 17.; the curse of Christ made the fig-tree, which had no fruit on it, for ever barren, Mark xi. 21.: unfruitfulness and the divine curse are therefore interchangeable ideas. Ἦς refers to γῆ, comp. ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια, Phil. iii. 19. Εἰς καὶ οὖσιν put instead of the nom. ἡ καὶ οὖσις, as it is a frequent formula from the Old Testament, comp. LXX. Isa. xl. 16. xliv. 15.

Ver. 9—12. *The worst, however, is not to be feared in the readers, but this earnest warning is rather to excite them to greater zeal.*

Ver. 9.—With the same gentle kindness with which Paul everywhere, but especially in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, moderates his chastening language, our author here, and at x. 32. *et seq.*, passes from the most cutting severity to terms of familiar confidence. As Paul, in such cases, immediately after the sharpest expressions, adds an ἀδελφοί, τέκνία (Gal. iv. 12, 19.), so the writer follows his admonition by ἀγαπητοί. Ἐχόμενον σωτηρίας is a Classical periphrasis of the adjective notion; hence Böhme has well remarked: *haud insalutaria*. So early as Herodotus we find a similar use, that of τὰ ἐχόμενά τινος, as the circumlocution of the genus of a thing: τὰ τῶν ὄνειράτων ἐχόμενα I. c. 120., *quae sunt de genere insomniorum*, and in Plato and Lucian as a circumlocution for the adjective. Our author has selected this mode of expression for the sake of the parallel with κατὰρας ἐγγύς, on which account the German translation must retain the *nahe* (near). Schulz has: “what has bliss as its consequence (was die Seligkeit zur Folge hat).”

Ver. 10, 11.—The more strongly faith and love have shewn themselves in the Christian the more has he conformed himself to a life in Christ, and the greater, therefore, is the inward improbability of apostacy. Now, since we must regard it as a Divine arrangement, that the more a man yields himself to the kingdom of light the more strongly he is attracted by it, the author founds his firm confidence in *God*, not upon Divine *grace*, but, on Divine *justice*, inasmuch as, in that relation, not merely the fact of the proof of God's love towards the unworthy is represented, but, at the same time, His *recompensing justice* (Rom. vi. 16). In other passages of Scripture, also, the salvation which shall be the portion of the good is represented as an effluence of recompensing justice, 2 Thess. i. 6, 7. 2 Tim. iv. 8. Upon this the Catholic dogmatics found the doctrine of the *meritum condigni*. The older Protestant dogmatists replied to this, that the subject-matter here is not a *justitia RETRIBUTIONIS*, but *PROMISSIONIS divinae*, as Ambrosiaster expressed himself, *In Rom. 3.: Justitia Dei dicitur, quae est misericordia, quia de promissione originem habet, et cum promissum Dei redditur, justitia Dei dicitur*. Thus *δικαιος* would be here equal to *πιστός*, comp. 1 John i. 9. 1 Cor. x. 13. 1 Peter iv. 19. The form of this requital is, perhaps, less satisfactory. It is said: God rewards the good man according to His *justice*, after he has in Christ placed himself in such a relation to Him as then subsists. This induced Calixtus to offer no opposition to the term *Merit*, taken in a *certain lax* sense (*Adrott. ad conc. Trid. sess. 6. n. 18.*). The Protestant dogmatists, also, feel obliged to adopt the term *Reward* (*Lohn*), as it is a Biblical one, and define it more closely by: *Reward of Grace* (*Gnaden-lohn*). Merit, however, in the Roman Catholic sense of the word, is not contained in the declarations cited; for, 1. If there be, on the side of God, a *DEBITUM praemiandi*, there is also, on the side of man, a *DEBITUM praestandi*, but the *servant has no merit*. 2. All human performances

bear no proportion to that which is left undone.
3. All strength comes from God.

Τοῦ κόπου, before τῆς ἀγάπης, should be decidedly removed from the text, there being a preponderance of authorities against the words. If regarded as genuine the phrase would be a reminiscence of 1 Thess. i. 3. (see above, p. 28.), but it was precisely the resemblance of the passage before us to that other—ver. 10. the ἀγάπη, ver. 11. the ἐλπίς, and, at the beginning, τὸ ἔργον also collectively taken, as at 1 Thess. i. 3. (likewise James i. 4.)—which gave occasion to the interpolation of τοῦ κόπου. If we omit it, the resemblance of the two passages is then too slight to entitle us to assume a reminiscence. Yet the manner in which the author continues, ver. 11: “may you approve yourselves with respect to the ἐλπίς also,” as we see, from other circumstances, that he is acquainted with the Pauline Triad (see above, p. 28.), allows us to suppose, that he wishes τὸ ἔργον to be considered as a designation of ἔργον πίστεως. Assuming this, we have the Pauline order in the exhibition of this Triad, from which Paul himself departs only in 1 Cor. xiii. 13., and then from an obvious cause.

On ver. 11. comp. the Rem. on iii. 14.

Ver. 12. The end must be obtained by a struggle; in the struggle he will not be slothful who always keeps the end in view; and this state of mind takes place through hope (ver. 19, 20. x. 23. xii. 1, 2, 4. et seq. Rom. viii. 25.). On μακροθυμία see vi. 15.

Ver. 13—20. *It verily becomes us to have an immoveable faith, like that which Abraham founded upon the promise, Gen. xxii., as God's faithfulness in itself, and His oath besides, is our surety for this promise.*

Ver. 13—15.—Although the author, ver. 12., in speaking of the κληρονομοῦντες, had in view several of the historical examples, which he enumerates ch. xi.—he employs the part. *praes.*, because he presentiates

the history to his own mind (comp. the wavering reading James v. 11.)—yet, certainly, the example of Abraham appeared to him conspicuous above the rest, as Abraham had particularly preserved the πίστις, and, with it, the ὑπομονή. In James v. 11. Job is cited as the most eminent example of the ὑπομεινάντες. Γάρ has no close connection; according to the sense it relates to ver. 14.: “for Abraham shewed such μακροθυμία, after God had given him such assured promises.” In Rom. iv. 13. *et seq.* we have a more minute developement of the ὑπομονή of the Patriarch. The Divine declaration is taken from Gen. xxii. 16, 17., and so changed according to the wants of the author, that, here, instead of πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου, we have σὲ employed—in point of fact, the increase of the Patriarch’s posterity is an increase of himself. Ἡ μὴν is a formula of an oath. Lachmann has, in accordance with the external authority of *Codd.* alone, adopted the senseless reading εἰ μὴν, which is certainly a mere slip of the pen. The manner in which the dignity of an oath is spoken of here, and at vii. 20., may serve as a proof that, at least, this apostolical writer, and, certainly, the Christians of the apostolical age in general, did not except against the use of an oath. Oaths are everywhere sworn by things that are sacred to man, *that are placed above him*; and the idea upon which the oath is based is, that he who swears will lose this higher object, if the object be a Divinity, that he will forfeit the protection of that being. Comp. *my Comm.* on the Sermon on the Mount, *Bibl. Cab.* Vol. VI. The construction of δυνάμει with κατὰ, *c. Gen.* (marking the direction, Bernhardt, *Syntax*, s. 238), which occurs also in *Matth.* xxvi. 63., is Classical.

Ver. 16—18.—It may appear strange, that the oath which God swore in making the promise to Abraham should be cited as a support for the faith and hope of Christians. Whoever has maturely considered how Paul, *Rom.* iv. 17, 18. and *Gal.* iii. 8, 16., expounds

the Old Testament promise will entertain no doubt that our author here follows the same view with that Apostle. That promise, in its more obvious sense, was referred by the Apostle to the great posterity of the Patriarch according to the flesh, but, in its deeper import, to the spiritual posterity, whose Father and *antesignanus* Abraham is in faith. Comp. the Dissertation on Gal. iii. 16., in *my* Literary Advert. 1833, No. 31—34., which I have added to the first Appendix as a Supp. Although our author conceived thus of the Divine declarations, it served as a consolation to the Christians, who had indeed already received, in its beginnings, the fulfilment of this *εὐλογία* in Christ, but expected the full *κληρονομία* in another world. Œcum. says: *ἡμεῖς γὰρ οἱ κληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, οἱ κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν σπέρμα ὄντες τῷ Ἀβραάμ—οὐδὲν γὰρ ἦν ἕτερον καὶ τὰ τότε μεθ' ὀρκῶν ἐπαγγελλόμενα, ἢ ἡ μέλλουσα ἐλπίς τῶν πιστῶν.*^a—*Ἐν ᾧ* must not be taken, with the Vulgate, Bengel, Böhme, and others, as *qua in re, whereby*; Luther rightly perceived, that ver. 17. is connected with ver. 16.; *ἐν ᾧ* is causal: “*wherefore,*” as Schulz and De Wette have rendered it. Hence, also, ver. 16. should not be terminated by a point. In accommodation—the author means to say—to the manner in which men confirm their covenants, God has, to the certainty which lies in every one of His words, superadded that of an asseveration by an oath—these are the *δύο πράγματα*. *Ἐν οἷς, whereby, quae cum adsint*. *Οἱ καταρυγόντες* are thus annotated by Calvin: *Hoc verbo significat, non aliter Deo vere nos fidere, quam dum praesidiis omnibus aliis destituti ad solidam ejus promissionem confugimus, et statuimus illic nobis unicum asylum.* Bengel wittily remarks: *Confugimus—velut a NAUFRAGIO, sequitur ἀγκυραν. Κρατῆσαι, inf. of intention,*

^a For we are heirs of the promise, being the seed of Abraham according to the promise—for those things which were promised with the oaths were nothing but the future hope of believers.

immediately joined with the part. *καταφυγόντες*. The *ἰλπίς* is represented as a *βωμὸς*, Eurip., *Iph. in Aul.* v. 911. *Προκειμένη* leads the mind to the image of the race-course and the goal (*τέγμα*), comp. xii. 1, 2., hence *ἰλπίς* must be taken objectively, comp. *ἰλπίς ἀποκειμένη ἐν οὐρανοῖς*, Col. i. 5.; Tit. ii. 13. The *ἦν*, in ver. 19., refers back, however, to the subjective signification of it; as the object hoped for by means of faith is a present one (xi. 1.), the objective and subjective significations are closely connected, and, in Rom. viii. 24. there is such a transition from the one to the other.

Ver. 19, 20.—A beautiful double image: 1. The world is the sea—the mind is the vessel—the bliss beyond this world the distant coast—the strong hope in Faith the anchor, which prevents the vessel from being driven to and fro by the waves. 2. The world is the Fore-court—the human mind the uninitiated—the bliss beyond this world the sanctuary—Christ the Priest, who gives the consecration, so that the uninitiated may enter through Him into the sanctuary. The former image is found also in xi. 13., the latter is based upon the noble idea of the general priesthood of Christians. The expression *ἑσώτερον τοῦ καταπέτασματος* directs us back to the LXX., where the Holy of Holies, lying behind the veil, is so called, Lev. xvi. 2, 12, 15. Comp. Numb. xviii. 7. In Philo, *De vita Mosis*, L. 3. p. 667., there is found a distinction between *κάλυμμα* and *καταπέτασμα*, the latter only being said to denote the veil of the *adytum*; but, the Alexandrian translators, Josephus, and even Philo himself, do not invariably abide by this distinction. Still, our author has no doubt in mind the entrance to the Holy of Holies; for, in other passages, he lays a stress upon the circumstance, that Christ opened an entrance to it, ix. 12. x. 19, 20. The latter passage explains also the *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*. Parallels in matter for the notion of the *πεδῆρομος* are ii. 10. Acts iii. 15., and, most probably, 1 Cor. xv. 23. On the whole representa-

tion of the Holy of Holies in heaven the reader may compare the exposition of viii. 1.

The author having, by the animadversions and exhortations which extend from ver. 11., awakened in his readers a feeling of intimate dependence upon the salvation offered to them in Christ, now passes on, at the close of the sixth chapter, to display the riches of the declaration, that Christ is a Priest after the order of Melchisedek.

CHAPTER VII.

Ver. 1—3.—*That which lies in the type of Melchisedek, in so far as he is the representative of an ever-during Priesthood.*^a

Ver. 1—3. The remarkable declaration of Psalm cx. 4. demanded an investigation into the resemblance obtaining between the priestly office of Christ and that of Melchisedek. This gives the author occasion to enter into a typical exposition of those few words in which the history of the enigmatical priest-king is recorded (Gen. xiv.). Strange and inexplicable this man stands before us in history—a priest of the true God, of that God whom Abraham worshipped, at a time when Paganism reigned on every side, and Abraham alone, of all his family,

^a Expositors have, in this chapter, given the connection very defectively. It has escaped their notice—Bengel alone draws attention to the point, although not sufficiently—that, properly speaking, the chap. contains an exposition of the words of the Psalm in vi. 20. Ver. 1—3. give us those words again. Ver. 4—10. are a parenthetical thought, founded upon the passage in Genesis, which claims for the new high-priest the highest prerogatives. Ver. 11—14. shew what is contained in the *κατὰ τὸν Μ.*, ver. 15—17. what in the *eis τὸν αἰῶνα*, ver. 20—22. what is spoken of in the words of the Psalm introductory to that declaration. In ver. 23—25., the signification of the *πίστευ* is brought prominently forward.

JOSHUA xxiv. 2., bent the knee to the One holy God of heaven and earth (Gen. xiv. 19.)—a priest who was, at the same time, a king, and that, too, on the same spot that subsequently became the centre of the Theocracy, who, as a king, reigned over subjects of the same faith no doubt as himself—a priest whose blessing Abraham receives with so great a feeling of subordination as to lay, as a subject, the tenth of the spoil at his feet! How came this man to Canaan? From what race was he sprung? Who instructed him in the true faith? Who gave him priestly consecration, and in what did that consist? All these are questions to which history furnishes no reply; so that Melchisedek appears before us like a being of a superior nature, and this is the *first* typical significance which the author brings out. The *other* lies in the fact, that, according to history, he appears high above Abraham; and, inasmuch as the tribe of Levi looks to Abraham as the father and head of the tribe, the dignity of Melchisedek appears greatly exalted above the Levitical. In a cursory manner, the writer draws attention to the significance of the names of Melchisedek and Jerusalem, for, in the proper sense, Christ is *King of righteousness and peace*. It was not his intention to illustrate all the typical points, but only those which are important for *this* object, otherwise he would undoubtedly not have omitted to refer the bread and wine which Melchisedek brought forth to the elements of the Lord's supper, as has been done by all expositors, from the Fathers of the Church down to Stolberg.

Considering the enigmatical character under which Melchisedek appears in Jewish history, it cannot excite our wonder, that the Jewish expositors believed something mysterious to have been hidden under that personage. According to the current of opinion among them, Melchisedek was the most pious of Noah's sons, Shem. This opinion Jerome received from his Jewish teachers; the passages of the Jewish writers respecting this point, (the Targum Jonathan belongs to these) have been col-

lected by Bochart, *Phaleg*. L. 2. c. 1. ; according to Epiphanius, this was the view of the Samaritans; and Christian expositors, with Luther of the number, have adopted it. In a passage of the Sohar (*Lech. Lecha*, f. 60. col. 237. ed. Sulzb.), he is treated as a type of the *King of true Peace*. Still more, in consequence of what is here said of him, must the person of Melchisedek have appeared mysterious to the Christians. The notions of the Melchisedeckians, who gave him out as the appearance of a Divine *δύναμις* (Acts viii. 10.), and those of the Hierakites, who hold him for an appearance of the *πνεῦμα ἄγιον*, are regarded as heretical; but, even in the Church there were those who, as Epiphanius (*Haer.* 55.) says: *νομίζουσι φύσει τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἰδέᾳ ἀνθρώπου τότε τῷ Ἀβραάμ πεφῆναι*;^a others, as Chrysostom informs us, considered him as more than Christ; Origen and Didymus regard him as an angel. It is singular, that the former opinion, namely, that Melchisedek was a temporary *ἐνσάρκωσις* of the Son of God, has found defenders even among the most learned Roman Catholic and Protestant expositors, Peter Molinaeus, Cunaeus, Outrein, Hottinger, Benj. Starke (in the *Annot. sel.*), and Petersen. Against this gross error Epiphanius appealed with reason to the *ἀφωμοιωμένος* in ver. 3. The majority of the Fathers, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustine, and Jerome entertained a sound and correct view, Comp. Jerome, *Ep. ad Evangelum*. In the most recent times, however, some have struck again into the older path. Schulz and Böhme conceive the author to have at least concluded, from the manner in which the Old Testament speaks of Melchisedek, that he *lives as a Priest for ever*. And, in fact, the *μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῆ* might appear to speak in favour of this view. Several writers, conscious of this difficulty, have assumed Christ as the subject of the *ζῆ*, so Cappell, Dan. Heinse, Peirce, Storr. Others, as Heinrichs, have here applied the

^a Think that, as to His nature, the Son of God appeared then to Abraham in the shape of man.

irrational canon of a Hypallage of the participle, set up by Giassius and Bæner (in his *Philol. Thucydideæ—Pædagog.* p. 105., where also he cites our passage), so that ἰσχυρομένως αἰεὶ is supposed by them to stand instead of ἰσχυρῶς αἰεὶ αἰετῶς. But, is the case such that this meaning may be imputed to the author? If he actually concludes, from the passage in Genesis, that Melchisedek is eternal *a parte post*, then he must also have concluded his eternity *a parte ante* from that passage, and been desirous of expressing it in the μήτε ἀσχηματιστῶς ἰσχυρῶς. Who can imagine, that a Christian Apostle could ascribe eternity to Melchisedek in the same sense as to the only-begotten Son of God? Farther, if Melchisedek be everlasting Priest *like* Christ, then he is also Priest *along* with Him, and Christ is no longer the *only* mediator between God and man (1 Tim. ii. 5.). An opinion, therefore, like that asserted would have been quite irreconcilable with the Christian Faith. But, the author's words themselves speak against such an imputation. The very manner in which αἰετῶς ἀσχηματιστῶς καὶ, ver. 3., is epexegetically placed after ἀσχηματιστῶς ἰσχυρῶς shows in *what sense alone* the author predicates eternity of Melchisedek; and this appears still more clearly from the contrast ἀσχηματισμένος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ: not that he is ὅμοιος to the Son of God, says the writer, but, that he is *made like* to Him (in the historical representation of him, Comp. the note on the passage). The positive proposition μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῆν must, therefore, be taken in the same sense as the negative one μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων. And, the author's reason for thus expressing himself is his wish subsequently to exalt Christ, in virtue of His δύναμις ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου, above the Levitical priests, ver. 16. Now, in order to bring out the typical parallel with more vigour, he does not say—what he properly meant—ὁ ἀσχηματισμένος τῷ ζῶντι εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, but, directly, μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῆν.

We will notice only the most important works of the very copious literature on this subject, comp. the writings cited by Wolf, in the *Curæ ad. h. l.*, and Liliën-

thal, bibl. Archivarius, s. 712. The historical views respecting Melchisedek are found in the learned, and still very useful, work of Heidegger, *Historia patriarcharum II. exerc. II.*, with which may be joined, *Historia critica Melchisedeci*, by Borges, Berne, 1706. A list of the various views concerning him is to be found in Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudep. V. T. II.* p. 329. seq., III. p. 72., Suicer's *Thes. s. h. v.*; on the dogmatico-historical side, comp. Pererius, *Comm. in Gen.* 14., the Dissert. of Körber and Rein. in the *Nov. Thes. Amstel. T. II.*, Deyling, *Obs. sacrae T. II.* p. 73. et seq., Stollberg on the individual worshippers of the true God, in his contemplations on Sacred Writ, *Hamburg 1819, II.* p. 248. et seq.

Ver. 1—3.—The first question is, how are we to arrange the propositions down to the close of ver. 3. ? Storr conceives the words βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ as far as Ἀβραάμ to be parenthetical, and the predicate to ὁ Μελχισεδέκ to be βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης (ἰστί). According to Luther, Calvin, Beza, and the majority of earlier expositors, whom Schulz also has joined, the verb ἦν is to be supplied to Μελχισεδέκ, so that with ὁ συναντήσας a new proposition would begin: "This Melchisedek was king of Salem,—he met Abraham." One cannot but be surprised that Schulz, who always endeavours to keep so closely by the structure of the periods in the Epistle, should here join the commatic system of Seiler, and, like that writer himself, neglect the γάρ. For this very γάρ, at so early a part of the text, may lead us to consider the verb μένει as belonging to the subject Μελχισεδέκ. The author is desirous of establishing the ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, and hence continues: οὗτος γάρ — — μένει ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές. The eternity of the priestly dignity of Melchisedek forms precisely the great theme of this chapter, comp. ver. 8, 16, 24. In favour of this construction of the proposition is the participle ὁ συναντήσας, connected by apposition.* In the Old Testament text,

* If, as Lachmann does, and as, in fact, it seems advisable to

Gen. xiv. 17, the *meeting* of the king of Sodom is mentioned; of Melchisedek it is only said that he brought out bread and wine; but, as the former is necessarily included in the latter, it is not surprising that it should be here said of Melchisedek. It is a little more singular that the author has not employed typically, in another way, the circumstance, that Melchisedek is priest of Salem. He had the choice of pointing out *either* that Melchisedek was *also* king of Jerusalem, *or* that *he* was king of the earthly as Christ is king of the heavenly city of God (xii. 22.). But he prefers employing it in an etymologico-typical manner, according to which Melchisedek was an image of the King of true righteousness (i. 9. Mal. iv. 2. Jer. xxxiii. 15, 16. I Cor. i. 30.), and true peace (Isa. ix. 6. Luke ii. 14. Col. i. 20. Rom. v. 1.). Ἀπάτωρ and ἀμήτωρ are explained in the subsequent ἀγενεαλόγητος, comp. ver. 6., and denote him whose genealogy is unknown; while a priest, in the Levitical sense, could not, by any means, dispense with the proof of his descent. As we must at: "having neither beginning of days, nor end of life," conceive added "in history," so here we must make the same addition. The author might have thus employed the words in the context, even though supported by no peculiar usage. These words, however, were so much the less liable to be misunderstood as in Greek ἀπάτωρ and ἀμήτωρ, were said of those whose fathers and mothers were unknown, or of mean extraction, σκότιστοι; this usage is still more common in Latin, and also in Arabic, Horace Serm. I. 6, 10.: *multos saepe viros, NULLIS MAJORIBUS ORTOS, et VIXISSE probos, amplis et honoribus auctos.* Livy IV. 3.: *Servium Tullium, captiva Corniculana natum, PATRE NULLO, matre serva* Comp. Wetstein on the passage. In the same sense, Philo calls Sarah, whose mother is not mentioned in Scripture, ἀμήτωρ, *De temul.* p. 248.,

do, we exclude the $\tau\epsilon\iota$ from the text in Acts x. 1., and in ver. 3. reject the aid of the $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ before $\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, we shall have just as long a parenthetical series of appositions as we find here.

Quis rer. div. haer. p. 489. And the term is also found among the Rabbins. So, in *Bereshith Rabba*, *sect.* 18. *f.* 18. 2., it is said of the heathen: "the heathen has no father (אין אב לגוי)," because he has no Jewish pedigree. As to the words *μήτε ἀρχὴν κτλ.*, it is questionable whether they refer to the person of Melchisedek, or, as Cameron, Limborch, Chr. Schmid, and Kuinöl have supposed, to the priestly office: that is, in so far as we are not informed when Melchisedek entered upon, or laid down, the office of Priest, he is a type of Christ, of whom the same thing is true. These interpreters, besides, appeal to this fact, that *ἡμέραι* is used, also, *de tempore, quo quis munere aliquo perfungitur*, Luke i. 5. Matth. xi. 12. Jer. i. 2. This remark, indeed, is not quite valid as proof, since, in the passages quoted, *ἡμέραι* denotes the period of the performance of a duty only in so far as that corresponds with the duration of life: on the other hand, however, some weight may be attached to the circumstance, that the Psalm chiefly speaks of the eternity of the *priestly office*. But let us here direct attention to what the author says of Christ. To Him he ascribes an everlasting priesthood, just because His *person* is everlasting, ver. 16. and ver. 25., πάντοτε ζῶν. To this must be added, 1. That τέλος ζωῆς cannot well denote simply the end of the Priest's life: and, 2. That μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῆ, ver. 8., cannot, in like manner, be referred merely to the continuing function as priest. We, therefore, agree with the common supposition, according to which these words designate Melchisedek as a type of the eternal existence of Christ. Chrysostom explains them very rationally, observing, among other things: πῶς μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν, μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων; πῶς; τῷ μὴ ἐμφέρεσθαι τῇ γραφῇ—ἰδοὺ τὸ ἀναρχον, ἰδοὺ τὸ ἀτελεύτητον ὡσπερ τοῦτου οὐκ ἴσμεν οὔτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν, οὔτε ζωῆς τέλος, διὰ τὸ μὴ γεγράφθαι οὕτως οὐκ ἴσμεν οὐδὲ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, οὐ διὰ τὸ μὴ γεγράφθαι, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι.^a Oecume-

^a How, having neither beginning of days nor end of

nus says on μένει εἰς τὸ διηκεῖς : τοῦτω τῷ τρόπῳ δέξαι τὸ διηκεῖς ᾧ και τὰ ἄλλα. ὅτι, φησὶν, ὅσον ἦκεν εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας πότε τελευτήσας ἀπέθετο τὴν ἱερωσύνην, εἰς τὸ διηκεῖς ἴστιν ἱερεὺς.^a The positive contrast, also, says the same thing—for δέ denotes this—comp. p. 267-8. Melchisedek is represented as like the Son of God. Calvin : *assimilatus, quoad ferebat significandi ratio . . . lineamenta Christi in eo conspicimus ; vivi hominis effigies in tabula cerni potest, et tamen procul distat homo a sua pictura.* An appeal may be made to the language of the Syrian Church, in which the substantives derived from the verb ܠܘܕ , denote *Type*, thus ܠܘܕܘܐ , ܠܘܕܘܬܐ , and the verb ܠܘܕ itself means : *typice repraesentare.* See Wisemann, *Horae Syriac. T. I.* p. 19. Our passage has been particularly had in view in a passage of Jacob of Edessa (Ephraim Syr. *Opp. T. I.* p. 173.), where Melchisedek is called ܠܘܕܘܐܘܬܐ ܠܘܕܘܐܘܬܐ , i. e. "Type and likeness of the Messiah." On μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Theodoret remarks : ὁ εἰς ἕτερον τοῦτον παραπέμπων τὸν κληρὸν, δοκεῖ πως ἀφαιρεῖσθαι τὴν ἀξίαν ἄλλου τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἔχοντος.^b

Ver. 4—10.—*How high, according to history, does Melchisedek stand above the Levitical priesthood. If the Laity gave tithe to the Levites, and here the Father of all the Levites gave tithe to the mysterious priest-king, then to him there is ascribed a priesthood in a more exalted sense.*

Ver. 4.—The reader will observe how carefully the

life? how? as it is not contained in Scripture— —this is the "having no beginning," this the "having no end:" and as we know not this of him, "having neither beginning of days nor end of life," because it is, not written, so we know not these things of Jesus, *not because they are not told in Scripture, but because He had them not.*

^a In this place the (τὸ διηκεῖς,) perpetuity is shown in the way in which he shows the other things; because, says he, inasmuch as he came to us who knew not when he died, and laid aside his priesthood, he is a priest for ever.

^b He who transmits this quality to another seems somehow to take away the dignity of that other who possesses this virtue.

words are placed for the purpose of enhancing the thought. The author, equally for the sake of euphony and sense, selects, instead of the usual ὁ πατήρ, the sonorous ὁ πατριάρχης. The orators most admired, at the close of their periods, the third Paeon, or the *Ionicus a minore*.

Ver. 5, 6.—The Levites receive tithe from their brethren, the descendants of Abraham; Melchisedek, without being a descendant of Abraham, receives tithe from Abraham himself, and blesses him who, through the promise received from God, appears exalted above all human blessing. The blessing is not to be understood here as an inefficient wish, but as, at the same time, working out its purport, like the blessing of the Patriarchs on their children.

Ver. 7, 8.—On the one side, the blessing shows the superior dignity of Melchisedek, on the other, of the tithe; but the last thought is so declared by the author as to give prominence to the typical fact in Melchisedek. See above, p. 267., *et seq.*

Ver. 9, 10.—We have now arrived at the declaration which later critics and interpreters have found it most difficult to pardon in the author, in which, as it is conceived, the *ingenium rabbinicum* displays itself the most strongly (see Eichhorn, above, p. 64). This notion is not obvious. The assertion might much more properly be made, we think, as respects ver. 1—3., and the argument in c. iv. Suppose that a descendant of Luther's, as is actually the case with a collateral branch in Bohemia, should return to the bosom of the Romish church, and kiss the Pope's slipper, would we not say that Luther, in his descendant, had been obliged to do homage to the Pope? Our passage differs from this example in form only, not in matter. If it be replied, that the form of expression is not literal, we rejoin, very good—the author lets us know this by the formula: ὡς ἔπος εἶπεν. But, if offence be taken at the sensuous representation of the propagation of the species which appears to lie in the εἰς τῆν ὄσφυν, it may be answered: what obliges us, on

this point, to follow the encasing system of Löwenhoek? According to the present usage of language, we would say, the human race lay potentially in Adam. Theodoret employs the expression: ἔτι τοίνυν ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἶχε τῆς παιδοποιίας τὰς ἀφορμὰς—does this essentially differ from ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ εἶναι? In using the latter formula, who ever connects Löwenhoek's system with it? To the Israelites that form of expression was brought closely home by the phrase ἐξέχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος. We can by no means conclude that the positive doctrine of Traducianism is contained in it; on the contrary, chap. xii. 9. seems to affirm the reverse. And it is known, that even Augustine, whose formula: *peccare in lumbis Adami*, would entitle us fully to draw this conclusion respecting him, has not confessed himself a believer in Traducianism. He sought a sensuous, and yet obvious, expression for the proposition elsewhere advanced by him: *omnes fuimus in illo uno*, QUANDO OMNES FUIMUS ILLE UNUS (*De civ. Dei*, l. 13, c. 14.), and *esse in lumbis Adami* presented itself.—Moreover, we must observe, that, while the modern views of the universe more and more isolate the individuals of a race and people,—the fundamental error of more recent systems,—the more ancient usually regard nations and races as *one person*. Thus, in Greek tragedy, Plutarch, *De sacra Num. vind.*, Wolf, *Ad Dem. adv. Lept.* p. 466., Heubner on Reinhard's Plan Jesu, S. 466. So also, particularly, in the Old Testament prophecy. Comp. what has been said on this subject in the first App., on 2 Sam. vii. Every individual, certainly, has his individual right, for, in every one a new creature enters the world, but not *merely* a new one, every individual having drawn from the fountain of his tribe and race.

It now only remains for us to give a more close definition to the formula ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, which we derive from the ancient rhetoricians. Quintilian, *Instit. or.* 8, 3: *si quid periculosius finxisse videmur, quibusdam remediis praemuniendum est: UT ITA DICAM, si licet*

* Still, therefore, he had in himself the source of generation.

dicere, quodammodo. Longinus, *De Sublim.* 32, 3.: διόπερ ὁ μὲν Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ ὁ Θεόφραστος μειλίγματα φασὶ τίνα τῶν Δρασειῶν εἶναι ταῦτα μεταφορῶν, τὰ ὡς περεὶ φάναι, καὶ οἶονεῖ, καὶ εἰ χρεὶ τοῦτον εἰπεῖν τὸν πρόπον, καὶ εἰ δεῖ παρακινδυνευτικώτερον λέξαι ἢ γὰρ ἀποτίμησις φασιν ἴαται τὰ τολμηρά.^a Examples may be seen in Wetstein, Kypke, Carpzon, Abresch.

Ver. 11—14. *Exposition of κατὰ τ. τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ.*

Ver 11. The commencement of the exposition, and application of the prophecy. The κατὰ τὴν-τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ is first examined. The imperfection of the Levitical priesthood is strikingly proved by the circumstance of the Messianic priest belonging to another τάξις.—⁷Ἦν must not be translated, as by the Vulgate, *erat*, but, as Luther rendered it, *fuisse*; the Imp., as in John xi. 21. 32., in the conditional proposition, instead of the Aorist. ⁷Ἦν and ἔφην, as originally the 2 Aor. and Imp. were identical, have frequently the force of an Aor., Hermann, *De emend. rat. gr.* p. 244. The Plusquamp., νεομοθέητο, shews that the author transported himself back into the past; according to Attic usage it is without the augment *ε*, and this is the usual form in the New Testament, Winer, p. 67. Ἰερωσύνη differs not from ἱερατεία, ver. 5. Except in our Epistle (ver. 12. 14. 24.). it is not found in the New Testament, although it is met with in the LXX.—Ἐπί, whereby, whereupon, used also of conditions, ix. 17. 1 Cor. ix. 10.—Ἀνίστασθαι is medial; the Vulgate gave *surgere*,—as it were against expectation, comp. παραγίνεσθαι, ix. 11.—Ἐτερος here, and at ver. 16., has been intentionally used, most probably, instead of ἄλλος,, as the latter signifies only

* Therefore Aristotle and Theophrastus say, that the following expressions are softenings of such bold metaphors, as *if to say*; and, as *if*; and, *if we may speak in this manner*; and, *if we must speak more boldly*; for this qualification takes away from the boldness.

alius, but the former, at the same time, has the force of *diversus*. The proposition *καὶ οὐ* is connected, by a Zeugma, arising from the brevity of the expression, with *τίς ἐστὶ χρεία* (Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 3.); as the sense of the proposition, in the *oratio directa*, floated before the mind of the author, he places *οὐ* where we should expect *μή*, which is also found in one Cod. mentioned by Matthäi.

Ver. 12. Every single *ἐπιτολή* (ver. 16.), especially this of the priesthood, is so essentially connected with the whole *νόμος*, that the abrogation of this single *ἐπιτολή* clearly points out that an entirely new and different *οἰκονομία* was to be introduced. Other prophetic declarations seemed to lead to the same conclusion, as when, according to Zech. vi., the royal and priestly crowns were to be united on the head of the man Zemach, and especially when, according to Isaiah lxvi. 21., the Lord, in the last time, will choose His Priests from among the heathen also, which latter passage has lately received a most forced interpretation from Hitzig, and for the very purpose, indeed, of banishing *this* idea from it.

Ver. 13, 14.—It is *universally known* (*προῶδηλον*—where the *πρό* is not to be taken temporally but locally) among Christians, that Christ is “the Lion of the tribe of Judah,” Rev. v. 5., as among the Jews also the Messiah was expected to spring from *that* tribe, partly from Gen. xlix. 10., partly as He was to be a scion of the house of David. The term *ἀνατέλλω* is designedly employed, both because it is a solemn one, and, because $\Gamma\Delta\text{Z}$, translated by the LXX. *ἀνατολή*, had become *terminus solennis* for the Messiah.

Ver. 15—17.—*Exposition of εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.*

Ver. 15—17.—The conclusion, that these words of prophecy point to an economy different in its very *constitution* from the preceding, comes more clearly before us when we see, that this priest is chosen, not

agreeably to a *s'atute*, but, according to *an inward living power*, and, consequently, not outwardly, and on account of a carnal privilege. The psalm appoints Him a priest *for ever*. We must therefore consider *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* in the citation, ver 17., as emphatic. *Κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα* seems here, where the words of the psalm are expounded, to express the *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν*: we have, therefore, preferred, at v. 6., taking *τάξις* not in the sense of *order of priests*. But, we admit, that this point may be disputed; it may be said, with Bengel, *similitudo* INCLUDIT *τάξιν*. — *Σαρκικός* combines here, as elsewhere (Rom. ii. 28. Gal. vi. 12., comp. also Usteri, Phil. iii. 3. Eph. ii. 11.), the idea of the *carnal* and *outward*, simply because the flesh is the outward, and the Spirit the inward man, comp. ix. 10, 13. That *ἐντολή* was carnal (the *only* ordinance respecting the descent of the priests), because it required a definite carnal descent. Instead of *σαρκικός*, Griesbach and Lachmann have adopted *σαρκινός*, a form which, according to the authorities on Rom. vii. 14. 1 Cor. iii. 1., ought to be adopted. There is here no difficulty in the word, as it respects the flesh in the *proper* sense; we must, however, in consequence of the other passages cited, suppose that *σαρκινός* was employed by the New Testament writers as synonymous with *σαρκικός*. This is the case with the Fathers: as in Clement of Alexandria, *Quis dives salvus*, c. 18. The case with regard to the forms in *ικος* and *ινος*, stood as, in German, with those in *ig* and *icht*, which, in part, correspond to them: many German writers, in spite of Adelung, use *milchig* (Angl. milken) and *milchicht* (milky), *kupfrig* (composed of copper) and *kupfericht* (coppery), synonymously. Comp., in Passow, *γαλακτινός* and *γαλακτικός*, *ἀνθρώπινος*, *ἀνθρώπιτικός*, &c. See the Exposition by Fritzsche of Rom. vii. 14.—The contrast to *σαρκικός* or *σαρκινός* is formed by *δύναμις*; so, for instance, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 5. 1.: *διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην, τὴν ἐν δυνάμει δεκνυμένην, καὶ μὴ ἐν εἴδει καυχωμένην.** Comp. the an-

* On account of the love which is shewn in *power*, and not boasted of in *appearance*.

tithesis of λόγος and δύναμις, 1 Cor. iv. 19., μέγροσις and δύναμις, 2 Tim. iii. 5. Christ has the power of overcoming death and living for ever. See on ii. 14. above, p. 173.; comp. πάριτε ζῶν. A mediation which might have been interrupted by death,—if, for example, the tribe of Aaron had become extinct by death,—could not be the essential one. The true mediator is He that lives for ever. It may be objected, that the mediatorial office ceases when the divine life has passed completely to the redeemed, when all enemies shall be overcome, x. 13. 1 Cor. xv. 25—28. To this it may be replied: The author here, and at ver. 25., has not pursued the thought to that final consummation, he looks only so far forward as the time when the Lord, according to 2 Tim. iv. 8., shall have freed them from all evil, and helped His own to His heavenly kingdom, that is σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελές, ver. 25. Still, it may be said again, the priesthood is, in so far, an eternal one, and the mediation for ever, as, even *after* the period marked out by Paul, the redeemed will *possess* their new life, as one obtained through the mediation of Christ. The term δύναμις ζωῆς ἀκατάλυτου, used of Christ, has a parallel in the πνεῦμα αἰώνιον, ix. 14.

Ver. 18, 19.—*The reason why the declaration in the Psalm annuls the Levitical Priesthood.*

Ver. 18, 19.—The reason why it was necessary to change that economy was, because it could not produce perfection. Wherein consists this perfection, of which we are to be made partakers through the new economy? It gives complete confidence (x. 2. 10. 14. 22.), and this confidence is here called, indeed, not πιστις, but, ἰλαρις, because the subject-matter is not merely the confidence with which the believer in this world approaches the throne of the Deity (iv. 16. x. 22. Rom. v. 2.), but, especially, that by virtue of which he shall in the *next world* come into communion with God (σκιάν ἔχων τ. μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν ὁ νόμος

Comp. viii. 6.); both are comprehended x. 19—22., Comp. App. II. on *τελειοῦν* and *ἐγγίξιν*. — *Ἐπιτολή* has been regarded by Luther, for instance, as *pars pro toto*, and translated: *Law* (Gesetz); and this view is conceived to be supported by the circumstance of *ὁ νόμος* being found in the parenthetical proposition. This assumption is not *necessary*. We may conceive the context to run thus: “That carnal order of Pries’s, as no man could truly approach God through it, is abrogated—the Law has in nothing brought perfection—and, on the other hand, a sacerdotal order is introduced through which we obtain the hope of approaching God in truth.”—On the position of the *adj. neutr. pro subst.* Comp. Winer, p. 210. This form of expression has been considered by many as a point of relationship in the usage of our author with that of Paul, but not with reason. Winer rightly observes, that these *neutr. adj.* were frequently used, particularly by the later prose writers.^a They are found, for instance, very often in Tatian, Theodoret, and others. Their occurrence only in our Epistle and in the writings of Paul is not to be ascribed to the idiosyncrasy of the authors, but, to be explained by their more comprehensive knowledge of the language. However, τὸ ἀρθαζον, 1 Peter iii. 4. (Comp. e. g. Beza, and de Wette), might be explained according to the same usage, and an example of it thus found in a composition confessedly not Pauline.—In Gal. iv. 9., ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχίῃα—which cannot be referred to the elements in the heathen world, for the Galatians wished not to return to heathenism—form a strict parallel in matter with the ἀσθενές and ἀνωφελές. Bengel makes the following excellent remark on that passage: *debi-*

^a Bernhardt, in his *Syntax*, p. 327., presents us with something more minute respecting the historical formation of this idiom. He carries back the usage only to Plato and Thucydides: a still more ancient example is found in the 136th fragment of Pindar, if, instead of the *lect. rec.*, *τιμαί*, we adopt that of Böckh: *τίμια*, which also occurs in Diodorus Siculus, *Hist.* 3, 9.

litas opposita parrhesiae filiali, egestas opulentiae haereditatis, Comp. Eph. i. 18. Col. ii. 3. We would not, as Theoph. does, explain οὐδέν by the *masc* οὐδένα, but: "in no respect has it brought perfection, it has not perfected confidence, neither hope."—To ἐπίσημαγωγῆ we must again supply γίνεσθαι from ver. 18., as the Vulgate has done; Erasmus and Zuingle improperly give: *verum erat (lex) introductio et paedagogus ad meliorem spem*. Beza acutely observes, that this is opposed by the *ἐπί* in the *Comp.*, which marks the attaining to something already existing. Comp. Abresch on the passage.

Ver. 20—22.—*Exposition of the words which introduce the declaration in the Psalm.*

Ver. 20—22.—The Author had expounded the words of the Psalm which formed his text, he recollects those by which that text was introduced, and, by virtue of the importance which the oath has in the mouth of God (See on vi. 15.), he draws an argument from them. The new economy is here, for the first time, called *διαθήκη*, See viii. 8—13. ix. 15—21. xii. 24. Thus it is called by the Redeemer himself, Matth. xxvi. 28., and by Paul, according to an Old Testament declaration, Rom. xi. 27., then in 1 Cor. xi. 25. 2 Cor. iii. 6. Gal. iv. 24. The general notion of a *covenant* is this: a mutual relation, in which, on both sides, promises are given. Under the first covenant, God promised life and death, according to the fulfilment, or non-fulfilment of the law, in the second, according to the appropriation of Christ through faith; in the first the people promised *obedience* through their solemn Amen! in the second the Ἰσραήλ τοῦ Θεοῦ promises *faith*, from which proceed, naturally, obedience and a right fulfilment of the Law (Rom. viii. 4).^a A covenant between parties that are afar off

^a The signification of *διαθήκη* in our Epistle has been disputed. While the majority of ancient expositors prefer, in gene-

requires a mediator, hence Christ is *μεσίτης*, ix. 16. xii. 24. ; but, as mediator, Christ is also *security* for the obtaining of that which He procured by His mediation. There is, perhaps, some foundation for the

ral, and also in the eighth chapter of our Epistle (Comp below on ix. 15.), the signification of *testament*, Schulz insists that the word, generally, has only the meaning of *institution*, establishment (Stiftung), inasmuch as wherever *διαθήκη* occurs God is invariably the *establisher*, the *declarer of His will*; a meaning evinced also by the construction, *διαθήκη πρὸς, ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραήλ*, ix. 17. x. 16. viii. 8. It is certainly true that, in Greek, *διαθήκη* is the generic idea for every species of *declaration of will, disposition*, just as *testamentum*, is, according to its etymology. *Συθήκη*, alone, which was used by Aquila, exclusively denotes, in the strictest sense, *covenant, bond*. The signification desired by Schulz is found also in several passages, as Isa. lix. 21. 1 Macc. ii. 54. Gal. iii. 15., where in the 17th ver. *ἰσαγγελία* is employed as synonymous with it. The word (Stiftung) *institution, establishment*, too, is admirably selected by Schulz to express the general idea. But this learned writer is wrong in denying the more limited signification of the word. It is undoubtedly found in the Hebrew, for even when, in that language, the *establishing, founding of a covenant* is spoken of, in which case בְּרִית

is construed with ל , and *διαθήκη*, in Greek, accordingly, with *ἐπί* and *πρὸς*, that circumstance does not do away with the idea of covenant, since the *engagements* on both sides still find place. When God makes a covenant with men, it is ever, as Philo expresses himself, a *σύμβολον χάριτος*. The Epistle to the Hebrews has, in a special manner, served as a support to the Federal Theology. We had a specimen of this above, p. 178. In this passage, where the subject-matter is the covenant of which Jesus is the *surety*, was contained a *sedes doctrinae*. On that, however, it may be remarked, that Coccejus firmly adheres to the general meaning *covenant*, in opposition to the special signification *testament*, which is not the case with all the later federalists : Comp., however, *ex. gr.* d'Outrin. *Ἐγγυος* was, in the juridical terminology, rendered *fidejussor* ; but, the expression more correspondent to the current dogma would have been *expromissor*, inasmuch as in the *fidejussio* the debtor still remains bound to make payment, and the surety takes upon him that payment only *eventually* ; but in the *expromissio* the obligation is *transferred to him immediately*. The master of that theological school, Coccejus himself, deserves commendation, moreover, for having, in the exposition of this passage, entirely avoided all juridical subtlety.

conjecture, that the writer selected this word, which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, for the sake of the Paronomasia with ἐγγίξιν; but the selection of the term may also be explained from the Author's object, which is to shew that the ἐγγίξιν τῷ Θεῷ was secured through Christ, and the ἐλπίς (ver. 19.), therefore, is firm. Ἰησοῦς, like ἡ πατριάρχης, ver. 4., and τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας, ix. 15., is placed behind for rhetorical and euphonic effect.

Ver. 23—25.—*The exposition of μένειν.*

Ver. 23—25.—The thought expressed in ver. 15—17, is pursued farther, and that by way of expounding μένειν, a word not used in the Old Testament text, but in the Author's exposition. No μένειν existed in the case of those Priests (High Priests); hence it was necessary that several should succeed to the office, but in this Priest the idea of High Priest is concentrated, and, therefore, with Him is the μένειν, and no succession. Instead of the *verb. fin.* we find the Part. with εἶναι, because the intention here is to express what is abiding. Ἀπαράβατος can be taken both actively and passively, what *does not pass over*, and *what may not be passed over, or changed*. There is no reason why, with the more recent interpreters, we should keep by the active signification (comp. Elsner on the passage, Lobeck, *Ad Phryn.* p. 313.), that of *pass over* (übertreten), see III. Esr. vi. 31.: ὅσοι ἀν παραβῶσιν ἢ καὶ ἀκνώσωσιν. The article, with ἰερωσύνη, is here used agreeably to the laws of language, "He has *the* Priesthood *as one* that does not pass away;" See Winer, p. 100, 119. The question is, how are we to conceive of the intercession of Christ, which, with the exception of this place, is denoted by the term ἐντυγχάνειν, Rom. viii. 34, in subject-matter like I John ii. 1., in apparent contradiction with John xvi. 26. Its Lexical signification is originally, "to meet with some one in favour of a third party," the Vulgate has: *interpellat*, the Italic, in Sabatier: *exorat*, Erasmus: *intercedit*. The

idea is borrowed from the office of the High Priest, who, according to the Talmudists, and Philo, *Leg. ad. Caj.*, when he carried the incense into the Holy of Holies, on the day of atonement, prayed for the people. This Christ does in the true Holy of Holies, *after* the offering is presented; of course, the term implies the benedictory effects which the Redeemer continually produces in His community, *in virtue* of the redemption once established. Schleiermacher, *Glaubensl.* II. §. 125, 5. says: "Christ remains, by virtue of His whole existence, the *representative* of the whole human race, and on His account, alone, that race is blessed by God." Contemplated from *this* side, therefore, the kingly efficiency cannot be separated from the intercessory, the ἐντυγχάνειν proves itself a βασιλεύειν, through which, at last, all enemies will be overcome, *x.* 12, 14. *1 Cor.* xv. 25. In the dispute concerning the nature of the *intercessio*, the Lutheran Church stood, relatively to the Reformed Church, in a position the reverse of that which she maintained in the dispute as to the *sessio ad dextram*. While the Reformed, on the latter point, pressed the literal acceptance of the passage, and of course, *localiter*, the supposition of a *σου* in heaven, the Lutherans, on the other hand, would have had the exaltation to heaven understood not literally, not *τοπικῶς* but *τροπικῶς*; again, the Reformed urged that the intercession was not to be conceived literally, but figuratively, while the Lutherans maintained, in opposition to them, the literal acceptance of the notion. Theodoret had made the remark that there is nothing in the ἐντυγχάνειν save ἡ τῆς κηδεμονίας ὑπερβολή, Chrys. on Rom. viii. 34. : τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν εἶρηκεν, ἵνα τὸ θεμιτὸν καὶ ἀκμάζον τῆς περὶ ἡμᾶς ἀγάπης ἐνδείξηται.^a According to the Lutheran dogmatics, this *intercessio* is an *intercessio* VERBALIS, to which Calov. adds: *apparet coram Deo proprio sanguinolento corpore, imo, ut probabile est, cruento etiam.*

^a He hath said τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν that he might shew the warmth and the intensity of the love for us.

The Roman Catholic dogmatists, who speak, besides, of an *intercessio verbalis* SPIRITUS SANCTI, mention, too, the shewing of the *stigmata*. The Reformed and Arminian doctrine, according to which the term is figurative, was expressly contested. By the Theologians of the Ernestian school, ἐντυγχάθειν is resolved into the *notio universa* of the σώζειν, See Morus, *De notionibus universis in theol.*, Diss. I. p. 208.

Ver. 26—28 —This *High Priest, who once for all made reconciliation for sin, and that truly, could alone satisfy the wants of mankind.*

Ver. 26.—The γάρ shews that such a High Priest was also required by our wants. Καί has been adopted by Lachmann. It is suitable to the passage, and should be translated *yea, even*. See on vi. 7. Comp. also 2 Cor. iii. 6. v. 5. The leading thought is, that Christ has established the reconciliation *once for all*. This he could do only inasmuch as He was *without spot*. In consequence of this He was raised above the heavens, and *reigns at the right hand of the Father* (ch. viii. 1).—The notion of the stainlessness receives an amplification; δσιος marks Him as one who had perfectly answered God's will (the perfected δίκαιος 1 John ii. 1.), ἀκακος as Him who, according to His nature, was able to fulfil it, ἀμίαντος as one in whom temptation left no evil trace behind it. The highest point of the amplification is conceived, by the majority of interpreters, to be κειχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν. But, can any passage be adduced in which the *sinlessness* is denoted by such an expression? Christ. Schmid very unaptly compares ἱερεῖον. Had expositors kept steadily in mind the notion, that the High Priest's office, in our Epistle, is represented as specially exercised in heaven, no hesitation would have been felt at the exaltation of Jesus in this place above the sinful community of men (xii. 3). The expression prepares the following : καὶ ὑψή-

λότερος κτλ. Comp. Introd. p. 82., and χωρίς ἀμαρτίας, ix. 28. Josephus, also, *Antiqu.* 3, 5, 7., says of Moses: αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἀνακεχωρηκέναι. Ὁν ὑψηλότερος κτλ. comp. on v. 14. viii. l. ix. 11.

Ver. 27.—Ἐφάπαξ is the chief idea: “at once, i. e. once for all,” Rom. vi. 10. Heb. ix. 12. x. 10. 1 Pet. iii. 18.; elsewhere, also, we find καθάπαξ, εἰς ἅπαξ, or, simply, ἅπαξ. Comp. Thomas M.; so ἅπαξ, ix. 26, 27, 28. x. 2., to which may be added Ælian, *Var. Hist.* xiii. 24. The One Sacrifice atones for all sins for ever. Ἀναφέρειν, according to Hellenistic usage, corresponding to הָלַעַן, the term. techn. for the act of offering sacrifice, as προσφέρειν corresponds to בָּרַךְ.

The sufficiency of this sacrifice was a consequence of its absolute stainlessness. Comp. ix. 14. and x. 1—14., where this doctrine is more fully developed, see also App. II. The expression καθ' ἡμέραν does not appear very apt in this place, as the subject-matter is not concerning the priests generally, and their daily offerings (ix. 6. x. 11.), but respecting the High Priest, whose duty it was to offer only ἅπαξ τοῦ ἱερατοῦ (ix. 7.). There remains for us nothing but the supposition, that daily is here put, in the more extended sense, for what is continually repeated. Comp. διαπαντός ix. 6., and εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, x. 1. The author might the more readily express himself thus, as he regarded the High-priest as at the same time the representative of the priests in general, Comp. on x. 11. A very unsatisfactory, but peculiar, view is taken by Lakemacher, in the VII. *Obs.* of his *Obs. Philol.* T. I. We may consider as a want of attention to minutiae, similar to that before us, the observations respecting the High-priest at v. 1., viii. 3., where it is said he was appointed in order to present δωρὰ τε καὶ θυσίας, while the proper business of the High-priest was only the offering of the sacrifice of atonement; and he took a part in the affairs of the other priests on festival days alone, and, on other occasions, when it was his pleasure to do so, Josephus, *De Bello, Jud.* 5. 5. 7.

Ver. 23.—Retrospect upon verses 18 and 20., and hence μετὰ τὸν νόμον, by which the abrogation of the νόμος is indicated, comp. Gal. iii. 23. As, according to a natural presupposition, the later annuls the earlier, so Paul, Gal. iii. 17., has proved the contrary for that one case of exception. Ἀσθένεια, as at iv. 15.; v. 2. The part. perf. τετελειωμένον is taken by many, e. g., by the Syriac, Vulgate, Luther, and the Greek interpreters, as an adjective. But this would detract from the thought. Translate *perfected*, in the same sense as at ii. 10.; v. 9.—Υἱός is opposed in the same manner to ἄνθρωπος as τετελειωμένον is to ἀσθένεια, comp. υἱός, in contrast to *men*, i. 1.; iii. 6.; v. 8.

CHAPTER VIII.

Ver. 1—7.—*Christ is High Priest in the true Sanctuary.*

In chap. iv. 14.; vii. 26. it was said, that Christ had risen above the heavens; in this and the following chapter more distinct mention is made of a Holy of Holies, into which He has risen, in order to execute the office of priest for us in the presence of God (viii. 2. 3.; ix. 24.); He has entered into that heavenly tabernacle the pattern of which Moses beheld in the vision (ver. 5.). We have seen (Introd. p. 105.), that some modern expositors, proceeding upon this passage, have ascribed to the author the superstitious notion of there being really, in heaven, a temple fashioned after the earthly one at Jerusalem, and of the Redeemer performing sacred functions in it according to the manner of the Jewish High-priest. Some carnal-minded Jews have, in fact, given room for such an opinion; but, among the Jews themselves, there are many who have been more spiritually-minded, who have spoken of such a temple only in a figurative sense (See on ix. 8.). To our author, therefore, the injustice would be so much the greater were we

to place him, without farther examination, among the rudest class of his nation. But that, in fact, the Heavens, the Temple, the Holy of Holies, are but symbols in his mind to enable him to convey to others the notion that Christ has entered into absolute bliss, into a completely realised unity with God (during His life upon earth His appearance was not adequate with His being, His idea), in which He continues to give effect to that reconciliation of mankind which He accomplished upon earth (x. 12, 14.), may be shewn from the contradictions which would appear in the author's representations were we to interpret the whole of the images as external realities. This we have shewn in the Introd. p. 105, et seq; comp. on ix. 8. A proof, indeed, may be supposed to exist in ix. 11., that he did not understand that tabernacle to be material; the expression οὐ χειροποίητος does not, however, afford such a proof; See on the passage. The majority of Lutherans explain the passage the most spiritually according to the spirituality of their views respecting the οὐρανός. See p. 283. Thus Seb. Schmid: *ubicunque thronus et dextra Dei sunt, ibi est tabernaculum ejus, imo non male possis dicere, ipsum thronum Dei esse hoc tabernaculum aut ad illud saltem pertinere.* Schleiermacher makes some beautiful remarks on this subject in his sermon on Heb. viii. 1, 2., in the 2d vol. of his Sermons, p. 504. There is a good treatise on the passage by Kiessling (who subsequently published a diffuse work on the connection of the Mosaic holy things with the exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews); *Diss. philol. qua Iesum sanctorum administrum, etc.* Lips. 1740. Compare, too, Deyling in the *Obs. sacrae*, in the treatise, *Christi ἐμφανισμὸς in conspectu Dei.*

We have here to consider and adjust the dispute which has arisen on these chapters of the Epistle, whether, namely, the sacerdotal office of the Redeemer consisted in the offering of His sacrifice upon earth, or whether He first became priest by the presentation of this sacrifice to God in heaven? The former view,

which lies at the foundation of the doctrinal type of the Roman Catholic and Protestant church, has been recently defended by Cramer in his *Comm.* Part II. p. 157, et seq., Gabler in the: *Diss. quo argumentandi genere usus sit auctor ep. ad Hebr.*, V. 5, 6., Winzer, in his treatise: *De sacerdotis officio, quod Christo tribuitur in ep. ad Hebr.* I, II, III. The latter took its rise among the Socinians (Socin.: *Inst. rel. chr. Opp.* I. 664. epp. p. 196, et seq.), was adopted by the Arminians, and, in recent times, has been defended by Michaelis in his *Commentary*, p. 218., Tittmann: *De notione sacerdotis in ep. ad Hebr.*, Storr in his *Comm.* p. 138., Griesbach: *De imaginibus Judaicis, etc.*, in the 2d vol. of his *Opusc.* p. 430, 436., and Kuinöl on the passage. The Socinian view set out from the antiquarian remark, that the *slaying* of the sacrifice took place in the fore-court, and can be regarded only as a *PRAEPARATIO ad sacrificium*; and hence Michaelis calls this an *antiquarian* dispute. According to this view, the act of sacrifice begins with the *presentation of it to God*. This is precisely the opinion of Storr. The proper course will be to acknowledge some truth in both views. Let us first of all keep in mind that there is this distinction between our author's notions and the Pauline passages, on the sacrifice of Christ (Eph. v. 2.), that, in the Epistle to the Heb. only, Christ is compared with the sacrifice on the *feast of atonement* (also v. 1—3. x. 1. xiii. 11.), and that, of course, it could only be said according to *this* Epistle, that the sacrifice consisted in the *ἐμφανισμός*, in the presentation in the Holy of Holies. Of Paul and Peter, on the contrary, it must be affirmed, either that they regarded the proper act of sacrifice as in the offering itself, or, in the *כִּבְיָדָה*, at the altar; or that, in accordance with their application of the notion of sacrifice to Christ, they would not have called Him *ἀρχιερεύς*. At the same time, it is not correct to say that the slaying of the sacrifice is not comprehended among the priestly functions. In

earlier times, indeed, that was done by others, as well as by priests; but, at a later period, it was exclusively performed by priests, Comp. the use of *ιερεύειν* in Homer. And, besides, the immolation itself still remains the *conditio sine qua non* of the presentation, being related to it as effect to cause. In c. i. 3. x. 12., it is said, that the New Testament High-priest was first exalted to the right hand of God when He had presented the *θυσία*,—of course upon earth—again, vii. 27., the *θυσία* is represented as offered upon earth, and, at x. 14., the earthly act of atonement alone can be understood by *προσφορά*. Accordingly it must be avowed, that our Author does, indeed, represent Christ as *ἀρχιερεύς* in the heavenly *adytum*, but, by virtue of the sacrifice performed upon earth. From ii. 17, it also appears, that he first represents Christ as High Priest in heaven. Wherein does he think this sacerdotal activity consisted? In *intercession*, in the sense developed at vii. 23—25. The Socinians, themselves, have at last perceived the one-sided character of their views, for, while the Catechism of Rakau originally limited the office of the High Priest to the *ἐμφανισμός ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, it is said, according to the revision of Crell and Schlichting: *erat quidem in terra agens, in cruce pendens, Christus sacerdos, &c.* And our Author, with great wisdom, especially compares the sacrificial act of the Redeemer with that of the High Priest on the day of atonement, and not with other sacrifices. For, while the other sacrifices had respect to single, and, indeed, for the greater part, to ceremonial transgressions, that yearly sacrifice referred to the collective guilt of the people, so that the *High Priest* alone was authorised to offer it. *In this sacrificial act, of course, the idea of sacrifice appears in its concentrated form.*

Let us now turn to particulars.—*κεφάλαιον*, like *κεφαλή*, generally denotes the *sum*, and—as the sum of a thing is the *chief thing*—also, the *main point*, the *substance* (Ger. *Hauptsache*). So early as Pindar, *Pyth.* iv. 206, *κεφάλαια λόγων* is explained by the

Scholias: τὰ μείζονα καὶ καιρία. Hombergk's dispute with Beza, who translates *summa*, and his demand that the translation should be *caput*, was, therefore, a mere abstraction; the Italic and Vulgate have *capitulum*. Kuinöl affirms, although incorrectly, that a new thought is here introduced. The thought is that discussed hitherto, with merely a new turn in point of *form*. Ἐπί, by some, has been rendered *without*, *besides* (Ger. Ausser), by others *after*, *according to* (Ger. Nach). It is here best taken in its usual acceptation *by*, in which it is a circumlocution of the genitive relation, and may be translated *in*, or *in respect of*, for these two significations coincide; for example, Herodotus, II. 170.: οὐκ ὄσιον ποιῆσαι ἐπὶ τοιοῦτω πρῆγματι (*in*, or, *in respect of*, such a thing) ἐξαγορεύει τοῦνομα. So Plato says, *Theat.* p. 185. c.: τὸ δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι κοινόν, instead of the Gen. πάντων.—Ὁν καθίζειν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου κτλ. see on I. 3. Τῶν ἁγίων is taken by Oecumenius as well as by the Peshito, ix. 8., as a *masc.*, a conception of it mentioned by Theophylact; Chrysostom is here defective, yet he appears not to have so understood the words; in more recent times, Schulz adopts this view. It does not, however, harmonize with the context. Luther, on account of ix. 2, regarding the phrase as *neutr.*, translates (“Die heiligen Güter”): “the sacred (goods) things.” The question comes to be, whether τὰ ἅγια denote the Temple in general, or the Holy of Holies? The latter meaning has ix. 8, 12. in its favour; still, even should the phrase denote the Temple, yet the *service* in the Holy of Holies would, *in specie*, be meant. Σκηνή ἀληθινή, which follow, are an extension of the notion.^a Ἄλη-

^a According to the *letter*, the Book of Wisdom also speaks of τὰ ἅγια in heaven, which Jacob saw, for instance, in that difficult passage, x. 10., where it is said of Wisdom: Ἰδὲν ἀντὶ βασιλείαν Θεοῦ καὶ ἰδὲν ἀντὶ γῶσιν ἁγίων. Baumgarten—Crusius (*Biblische Dogm.* S. 99.) explains it simply *heaven*. Βασιλεία Θεοῦ here denotes, as Bauermeister correctly interprets it the choirs of angels, and the manifestation of God which Jacob beheld in his dream: ἅγια may certainly, even *without*

θινός, as in ix. 24., and according to the usage of John, as well as of Paul, 1 Thes. i. 9., is said of that which answers to its idea, our *real*, comp. ἀλήθεια in contrast to the σκιά of the Old Testament, John i. 17. The addition ἦν ἑπαξῆν κτλ. = ἀχειροποιήτος, comp., the exposition of ix. 11, and also σκηνή, Rev. xxi. 3.

Ver. 3—6.—The syllogism of these three verses is as follows: “Christ must sacrifice, if He be High Priest; sacrifice in *the* manner in which it is done upon earth, in the earthly temple, He cannot, for He belongs not to the order of Priests established by the Law; therefore, if His name of Priest is to have any truth, He must present a sacrifice in the higher sense of the word, and in another temple.”—*What* Christ presents is declared (v. 7.) vii. 27; ix. 12; x. 10. Οὐδέ, in ver. 4., is taken in the sense of *not even*, which Schulz thus expresses: “were He now upon earth, He could not *every where* be priest.” The ὄντων which certainly may be taken as an imperfect, is, no doubt, to be understood in a present sense, and then points out that the worship existed in those times. Moreover, the κατὰ τὸν νόμον, ver. 4., must not be overlooked, — Christ could not have sacrificed κατὰ τὸν νόμον, seeing He was not of Levitical descent. On ver. 6., comp. vii. 18, 19.—The parenthetical ver. 5., alone, requires a more minute investigation. Λατρεύειν τινί, to do *some one* a service, τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύειν, xiii. 10.; ὑπόδειγμα (ix. 23.) and σκιά are, therefore, designations of the earthly temple itself, which is only a shadowy outline. Τὰ ἐπουράνια, indefinitely, the *heavenly*; Luther: “heavenly things” (himmlische Güter), as at ix. 23., but with a reference to the Temple. The passage is borrowed from Exodus xxv. 40. That this passage first suggested to the Author his whole doctrinal type of a heavenly tabernacle, is

an article, express the definite Sanctuary (see ἄγια, ix. 2., in this Epistle, and the remark on θυματήριον, ix. 4., respecting the position of the article), but it is better rendered as = τὰ ἱερωγεία in ver. 5. of this chapter.

not very probable, as he would, otherwise, have placed it at the head of his whole system, and, generally, would have given it a more ample developement. But he adduces it only parenthetically, and explains it no further. How the various *parts* of the earthly tabernacle are related to the heavenly is not declared. His intention, therefore, is merely to express the general thought, which was here, too, the only object, that those priests serve at a *shadow*. Now what did our author understand by that *archetype*, seeing he did not explain it of a sensuous sanctuary? We conceive that by it he understood absolute bliss in communion with God, as this lies in the symbolic import of the Mosaic tabernacle (See on ix. 8.). Can the idealising author of the book of Wisdom have thought any thing else, when, ix. 8., he says, with reference to Exod. xxv. 40., *εἶπας οἰκοδομηῆσαι ναὸν ἐν ἔρει ἀγίωσου, καὶ ἐν πόλει κατασκηνώσεώς σου θυσιαστήριον, μίμημα σκηνῆς ἀγίας, ἣν προητοίμασας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς?* It was the most holy image of the full nearness of God, the Sanctuary of the priestly Israel. If now the Holy of Holies alone have, according to our author, an *eternal* significance (ix. 8.), then he has seen in the eternal kingdom of God, composed of the perfected church, the last realization of that tabernacle of covenant. A comparison of Rev. xi. 19. with xxi. 2, 3. leads to the same view. It is evident, that here the tabernacle is only the symbol of the dwelling of God among His people.

Ver. 7—13.—The declarations of the prophet have already announced a New Covenant, and thus declared the Old obsolete; and we may, therefore, expect its complete destruction to be near at hand.

*Ver. 7.—*The following citation is already before the mind of the writer, and hence he selects, more in the way of a play upon words, the predicate *ἄμεμπτος*. In the prophetic declaration, the *Law* is not so much blamed as the *People* who had not observed it. Still it contains, certainly, an indirect *μομφή* of the *διαθήκη* itself; and this view of it is ingeniously brought out.

For, if the Law or Covenant were such as the people could not bear (Acts xv. 10. ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγόν, ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι), if the law from Sinai—to use the language of Tertullian—was a satire upon human powers, then there inhered in it a *μομφή*, in reference to the Law itself. — Beza, mistaking the Imperfect, has falsely rendered ἰζητεῖτο: *non FUISSET quaesitum*; but, the word is correctly given by the Vulgate, and, after it, by Luther: *non inquireretur*. Böhme even corrects by *fuisse*, instead of *esset*. Τόπος, known in the phrase διδόναι τόπον, Rom. xii. 19., Wisdom xii. 10., and also τόπον εὐρίσκειν, Hebr. xii. 17., τόπον λαμβάνειν, Acts xxv. 16. Schulz translates: “so it were not required that a second should come.”

Ver. 8—12.—Comp. x. 15. The quotation from Jeremiah xxxi. 31., *et seq.* is made almost literally according to the LXX. See Bleek p. 360.* No other passage of the Old Testament so clearly expresses the distinction between the Old and the New Covenant, διακονία γράμματος καὶ πνεύματος, 2 Cor. iii. 6—9. But Comp., as parallels, Ezek. xi. 19. xxxvi. 26. As the *Angel*, the mediator of this *new* Covenant (Comp. Is. xlii. 6. xlix. 8.), the *Messiah* is designated, Mal. iii. 1. In proof of the manner in which that prophetic declaration led intelligent Jews to understand the nature of their Law, we cannot forbear quoting at large a very interesting and remarkable passage from the *Ikkarim* (*Fundamenta legis*) of the estimable Rabbi Albo (†1430), which de Rossi justly styles: *una grandiosa ed interessante opera*. It is there said, Vol. III.

c. 13. : כשנתן חשי התורה ידע שהנהגה היא כשנתן חשי התורה ידע שהנהגה היא תספיק עד הזמן ששערה חכמתה שיספיק להכין המקבילים ולתקן טבעם על שיקבלו ההנהגה השנית א'ע'ף שלא יגלהו לאדם וכשיגיע הזמן יצוה בחנהגה השנית כמו שהרופא יתן הנהגה אל החולה וכשיגיע

* Bleek has ἀπειλαζομένου instead of ἰπειλαζομένου. This is, no doubt, an oversight, as neither the New nor the Old Testament text has this reading.

הזמן ההוא שנתחזק כבר החלה מחוליו שנה הרפא
 חנננתו ויתר מה שאסר ואסר מה שהתיר ואין
 לחולה להפלא מזה וכמו שיעשה המלמד עם התלמיד
 שירגילהו בתהלה בדבר קלה הבנה צד שיוכל בלמוד
 מעט ואחר יעתיק אותו למדרגה חזקה ועמוקה :
 “ When God, who is highly to be extolled, gave the
 Law, He knew, that this form of education was suffi-
 cient for a certain period, which His wisdom had
 fixed, that it was sufficient to prepare those who
 received it, and incline their minds to receive the
 second form, although God has revealed this to no
 man ; but, when the time shall come, God will
 reveal that second form to men. Like a Physician
 who prescribes a diet to his patient until a certain
 period which he knows, but which he does not tell
 to the patient ; when, however, the time is at hand
 in which the sick man is to recover, the physician
 changes his diet,—permits what he had forbidden, and
 forbids what he had permitted. The patient need
 not, then, wonder at this ; it resembles the manner
 in which the teacher deports himself towards the pupil,
 to whom at the beginning, he gives an easy and
 comprehensible lesson, until he has gradually accus-
 tomed him to instruction, when he leads him up to a
 higher and more difficult stage.” The fundamental
 thought of the Old Testament passage is this : “ That
 covenant could not be fulfilled, it worked wrath (*καὶ γὰρ
 ἡμέλησα αὐτῶν*, Comp. Rom. iv. 15.), in the time of
 the New Covenant I will, through the communication
 of the Spirit, change the commandments into an in-
 ward impulse, and that through a forgiveness of
 sins.” To this passage of Jeremiah we must join that
 remarkable one in chap. vii. 21, 22., which shews,
 that the prophet did not regard the ritual command-
 ment as founded in the original design of God, but
 as added for a paedagogical purpose. Comp., on that
 passage, Kimchi and Maimonides, in More Nevochim
 L. 2. c. 32. If the prophets of the Old Covenant it-
 self were conscious that they served only a transitory
 preparatory, institution, we see with how much more

reason Paul (2 Cor. iii. 13.) expounds the veil with which Moses covered his face as the symbol of timidity or bashfulness. *Αὐτοῖς* belongs to *λόγῳ*; Schulz says: "but blame lies in this address." *Ἐπιλαβόμενου μου* is ungrammatical; the Complut. has,—is it with authority? for Holmes gives no various reading,—*ἐν ᾗ ἐπελαβόμενῳ*. This has always been regarded as a mixture of two constructions; Winer, however, p. 496, in opposition to this opinion, remarks, that very probably the Hebrew *בְּיָמֵי הַחֲזִיקִי* gave rise to it. But, is it sufficient, in that case, to say, that the translator exchanged the Inf. with the Participle merely for the sake of perspicuity? The reading *διδούς νόμους* is found in the *Cod. Alex.*, the *Complutensian*, and a considerable number of manuscripts; in chap. x. 16., of our Epistle, also, the *verb fin.* *δώσω* is omitted, while it is the reading in the *Cod. Vat.* If *διδούς*, without the *verb fin.*, be the correct reading, it must be regarded as a *constr. variata*; as Winer, p. 498. The promise: *ἴσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς Θεὸν κτλ.* is, at different times, more or less truly fulfilled. The *first* degree is the outward kingdom of God, Levit. xxvi. 12. The *second* degree is the inward kingdom of God, 2 Cor. vi. 16. The *third* degree is the inward kingdom of God in its *φανέρωσις*, Rev. xxi. 3.: and so, after a similar manner, with other predicates of the people of God, as, for instance, the priestly dignity, comp. Exod. xix. 6. 1 Peter ii. 5. Rev. i. 6.; and Isaiah lxi. 6. This progressive advance of the significance of the Old Testament institutions, predicates, &c., shews the "*transparency*" of that economy, and, in it, the prophetic character which runs through the whole. The promise, ver. 11., is not put accidentally; for, if the law be an inward one, it no longer needs a conservator or expounder, every one forms his own rule from within. Comp. the application of synonymous prophecies, John vi. 45. Acts ii. 16. The last proposition, ver. 12., as we see from x. 15., is important to the author. *Forgiveness of sins* will be the *reason* (*ὅτι ἴλεως κτλ.*)

of this change. *Kai τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν* is wanting in *Cod. B.* 17. 23., and in versions; nor is it found in the Hebrew. Yet this addition occurs again x. 17., and without any deviation in the authority. Now, as the quotation is there more indefinite, it has been conjectured, with some probability, that the author, in the first instance, citing closely according to the LXX., did not write these words; but, in the second, quoting by memory, he added them. The citation in x. 8., also, is less close than in ver. 5.

Ver. 13. The full significance of this declaration has not been brought out by expositors. *Ἐν τῷ λέγειν*, as in iii. 15., ii. 8. The religious depth of the author here takes the form of a play upon words. We must set out from the *vis propria* of *καινός*. This word, it is known, is distinguished from *νέος* in Greek, as *novus* from *recens* in Latin, and *nouveau* from *neuf* in French. Comp. Vömel, *Synon. Gr. Wörterbuch*, S. 19. 189. Döderlein, *Lat. Synon.* IV. S. 96. In the New Testament this distinction may every where be maintained, as well as that of *ἀνακαινοῦν* and *ἀνανεοῦν*, 2 Cor. iv. 16. Eph. iv. 23., see Tittman, *Synonimes of the New Testament*, Biblical Cabinet, Vol. III. p. 108. That the New Covenant is constantly denominated *καινή* and not *νέα* is quite in rule, for the leading idea is that it takes the *place* of an earlier one which prepared the way for it. In Heb. xii. 24. we have the only instance of *νέα διαθήκη*, and, it may there be intentionally employed in the sense of *foedus re-centur ortum*. Now, opposed to *καινός*, is *παλαιῶν*, first of all in the sense of: "to declare *παλαιός*;" with the notion of *growing obsolete*, there was, even according to some passages of the Old Testament, closely combined that of *annihilation, abolition*, Ps. cii. 27. Isa. i. 9. *Ecclus.* xiv. 17. But *παλαιῶν*, in Greek, like *antiquare* in Latin, has also, *ex adjuncto*, the signification of *abrogare*. Hence, instead of the barbarous *veterare* of the Italic and Vulgate, Beza has introduced *antiquare* into his Latin translation. Thus the author, with an ingenious play upon words

abounding however in truth, deduces from the prophet's designation of the **NEW** Covenant the abrogation of the Old.—Now, the then point of vision of the Jews, which he has in view, is that which he observed in his own person. The consciousness in the prophets of the Old Covenant being merely the shadow, naturally gave rise in them to the expectation that this shadow would endure only until the coming of the complete form. Comp. *my* Comm. on the Sermon on the Mount, Biblical Cabinet, Vol. VI. The worship was *still* continued on the Holy Mountain; but, our author contemplated this period as its *old age*, which must soon be followed by complete dissolution. He, therefore, explains *παλαιούμενον*, which must be here rendered not *abrogated* but *antiquated*, by *γηράσκον*. This expectation was nourished, perhaps, by the prophecies of Christ respecting the destruction of Jerusalem. Paul, too, appears, Rom. ii. 4, 5., to intimate that the people, from the continuance of their national constitution, had become presumptuous, but, that a catastrophe was near at hand. Still, it is also possible, that this expectation had arisen solely from a consciousness of the Old Covenant having accomplished its purpose in the world. At present, Judaism must be regarded as fallen, for, according to the *Mosaic* precepts, the people transplanted from the Holy Land into a foreign soil, and without a temple and a priesthood, can no longer (Hos. iii. 4, 5.) worship God.

END OF VOL. I.

