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IT is ten years since this edition was first drafted. Various interruptions, of war and peace, have prevented me from finishing it till now, and I am bound to acknowledge the courtesy and patience of the editor and the publishers. During the ten years a number of valuable contributions to the subject have appeared. Of these as well as of their predecessors I have endeavoured to take account; if I have not referred to them often, this has been due to no lack of appreciation, but simply because, in order to be concise and readable, I have found it necessary to abstain from offering any catena of opinions in this edition. The one justification for issuing another edition of Πρὸς Ἐβραίους seemed to me to lie in a fresh point of view, expounded in the notes—fresh, that is, in an English edition. I am more convinced than ever that the criticism of this writing cannot hope to make any positive advance except from two negative conclusions. One is, that the identity of the author and of his readers must be left in the mist where they already lay at the beginning of the second century when the guess-work, which is honoured as "tradition," began. The other is, that the situation which called forth this remarkable piece of primitive Christian thought had nothing to do with any movement in contemporary Judaism. The writer of Πρὸς Ἐβραίους knew no Hebrew, and his readers were in no sense Ἐβραῖοι. These may sound paradoxes. I agree with those who think they are axioms. At any
rate such is the point of view from which the present edition has been written; it will explain why, for example, in the Introduction there is so comparatively small space devoted to the stock questions about authorship and date.

One special reason for the delay in issuing the book has been the need of working through the materials supplied for the criticism of the text by von Soden's *Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (1913) and by some subsequent discoveries, and also the need of making a first-hand study of the Wisdom literature of Hellenistic Judaism as well as of Philo. Further, I did not feel justified in annotating Προς Εβραίος without reading through the scattered ethical and philosophical tracts and treatises of the general period, like the *De Mundo* and the remains of Teles and Musonius Rufus.

"A commentary," as Dr. Johnson observed, "must arise from the fortuitous discoveries of many men in devious walks of literature." No one can leave the criticism of a work like Προς Εβραίος after twelve years spent upon it, without feeling deeply indebted to such writers as Chrysostom, Calvin, Bleek, Riehm, and Riggenbach, who have directly handled it. But I owe much to some eighteenth-century writings, like L. C. Valckenear's *Scholia* and G. D. Kypke's *Observationes Sacrae*, as well as to other scholars who have lit up special points of interpretation indirectly. Where the critical data had been already gathered in fairly complete form, I have tried to exercise an independent judgment; also I hope some fresh ground has been broken here and there in ascertaining and illustrating the text of this early Christian masterpiece.

JAMES MOFFATT.

GLASGOW, 15th February 1924.
## CONTENTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>xiii–lxxvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 1. Origin and Aim</td>
<td>xiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2. Religious Ideas</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 3. Style and Diction</td>
<td>lvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4. Text, Commentaries, etc.</td>
<td>lxiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>1–247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexes</td>
<td>248–264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Greek</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Subjects and Authors</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Quotations, etc., of the Old Testament</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§ 1. Origin and Aim.

During the last quarter of the first century A.D. a little masterpiece of religious thought began to circulate among some of the Christian communities. The earliest trace of it appears towards the end of the century, in a pastoral letter sent by the church of Rome to the church of Corinth. The authorship of this letter is traditionally assigned to a certain Clement, who probably composed it about the last decade of the century. Evidently he knew Πρός Ἑβραίους (as we may, for the sake of convenience, call our writing); there are several almost verbal reminiscences (cp. Dr. A. J. Carlyle in *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, pp. 44 f., where the evidence is sifted). This is beyond dispute, and proves that our writing was known at Rome during the last quarter of the first century. A fair specimen of the indebtedness of Clement to our epistle may be seen in a passage like the following, where I have underlined the allusions:

362-5 ἑν δὲν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ, τοσοῦτο μεῖζων ἔστιν ἄγγέλων, διότι διαφορώτερον ἄρτομα κεκληρονομηκέν· γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως:

οἱ ποιῶν τοὺς ἄγγελους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα
καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα.

ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ οὕτως ἔπειν ὁ δεσπότης:

ὑὸς μου ἐλ σύ,
ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκά σε.

ἀιτησαι παρ’ ἐμοῦ, καὶ δώσω σοι ἐθνη τῆν κληρονομίαν
σου καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσιν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς.
καὶ πάλιν λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν·

xiii
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κάθων ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,

τίνες οὖν οἱ ἐξήροι; οἱ φανίλου καὶ ἀντιτασσόμενοι τῷ

θελήματι αὐτοῦ.

To this we may add a sentence from what precedes:

361 Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἄρχιερᾶ

238 δύναται τοῖς περασομένοις βοη-

τῶν προσφορῶν ἡμῶν, τῶν προστάτη

καὶ βοηθῶν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν.

The same phrase occurs twice in later doxologies, δα τοῦ

ἀρχιερεύς καὶ προστάτῳ (τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν, 618) (ἡμῶν, 641) Ἰησοῦ

Χριστοῦ. There is no convincing proof that Ignatius or

Polykarp used Πρὸς Ἑβραίους, but the so-called Epistle of

Barnabas contains some traces of it (e.g. in 465. 58. 6 and 617-19).

Barnabas is a second-rate interpretation of the OT ceremonial

system, partly on allegorical lines, to warn Christians against

having anything to do with Judaism; its motto might be taken

from 36 ὧν μὴ προσηγοροῦμεθα ὁς προσήλυτοι (v.l. ἐπήλυτοι) τῷ

ἀκείνῳ νόμῳ. In the homily called 2 Clement our writing is

freely employed, e.g. in

116 δαμα, ἀδελφοὶ μου, μὴ διψυχῶ-

μέν, ἀλλὰ ἐξίζωσατε ὑπομείνας, ἵνα

καὶ τῶν μιθῶν κομισώμεθα. πιστῶς γὰρ

αὕτων ὁ ἐπαγγελμένος τὰς ἀντιμοσιάς

ἀποδίδωμι ἐκάστῳ ἔργῳ αὐτοῦ.

1ο ἀποθέμουν ἔκειν ὁ περικείμεθα

νέφος τῷ αὐτοῦ δελθεῖν.

164 προσευχῇ δὲ ἐκ καλῆς συνει-

ήσεως.

"It seems difficult, in view of the verbal coincidences, to

resist the conclusion that the language of 2 Clement is un-

consciously influenced by that of Hebrews" (Dr. A. J. Carlyle


2 Clement is, in all likelihood, a product either of the Roman

or of the Alexandrian church, where Πρὸς Ἑβραίους was early

appreciated, this becomes doubly probable.

There is no reason why Justin Martyr, who had lived at

Rome, should not have known it; but the evidence for his use

of it (see on 31 114 etc.) is barely beyond dispute. Hermas,

however, knew it; the Shepherd shows repeated traces of it (cf.

Zahn’s edition, pp. 439 f.). It was read in the North African

church, as Tertullian’s allusion proves (see p. xvii), and with

particular interest in the Alexandrian church, even before Clement
wrote (cp. p. xviii). Clement's use of it is unmistakable, though he does not show any sympathy with its ideas about sacrifice.\(^1\) Naturally a thinker like Marcion ignored it, though why it shared with First Peter the fate of exclusion from the Muratorian canon is inexplicable. However, the evidence of the second century upon the whole is sufficient to show that it was being widely circulated and appreciated as an edifying religious treatise, canonical or not.

(ii.)

By this time it had received the title of Πρὸς Ἔβραίους. Whatever doubts there were about the authorship, the writing never went under any title except this in the later church; which proves that, though not original, the title must be early. Ἐβραίουs\(^2\) was intended to mean Jewish Christians. Those who affixed this title had no idea of its original destination; otherwise they would have chosen a local term, for the writing is obviously intended for a special community. They were struck by the interest of the writing in the OT sacrifices and priests, however, and imagined in a superficial way that it must have been addressed to Jewish Christians. Ἐβραίουs was still an archaic equivalent for Ἰουδαῖοι; and those who called our writing Πρὸς Ἐβραίουs must have imagined that it had been originally meant for Jewish (i.e. Hebrew-speaking) Christians in Palestine, or, in a broader sense, for Christians who had been born in Judaism. The latter is more probable. Where the title originated we cannot say; the corresponding description of 1 Peter as ad gentes originated in the Western church, but Πρὸς Ἐβραίουs is common both to the Western and the Eastern churches. The very fact that so vague and misleading a title was added, proves that by the second century all traces of the original destination of the writing had been lost. It is, like the Ad Familiares of Cicero's correspondence, one of the erroneous titles in ancient literature, "hardly more than a reflection of the impression produced on an early copyist" (W. Robertson Smith). The reason why the original destination had been lost sight of, was probably the fact that it was a small household church—not one of the great churches, but a more limited circle, which may have become merged in the larger local church as time went on. Had it been sent, for example, to any large church like that at Rome or Alexandria, there would have been neither the need


\(^2\) It is quite impossible to regard it as original, in an allegorical sense, as though the writer, like Philo, regarded Ἐβραῖος as the typical believer who, a second Abraham, migrated or crossed from the sensuous to the spiritual world. The writer never alludes to Abraham in this connexion; indeed he never uses Ἐβραῖος at all.
nor the opportunity for changing the title to Ἡ προς Ἰβραίους. Our writing is not a manifesto to Jewish Christians in general, or to Palestinian Jewish Christians, as προς Ἰβραίους would imply; indeed it is not addressed to Jewish Christians at all. Whoever were its original readers, they belonged to a definite, local group or circle. That is the first inference from the writing itself; the second is, that they were not specifically Jewish Christians. The canonical title has had an unfortunate influence upon the interpretation of the writing (an influence which is still felt in some quarters). It has been responsible for the idea, expressed in a variety of forms, that the writer is addressing Jewish Christians in Palestine or elsewhere who were tempted, e.g., by the war of A.D. 66-70, to fall back into Judaism; and even those who cannot share this view sometimes regard the readers as swayed by some hereditary associations with their old faith, tempted by the fascinations of a ritual, outward system of religion, to give up the spiritual messianism of the church. All such interpretations are beside the point. The writer never mentions Jews or Christians. He views his readers without any distinction of this kind; to him they are in danger of relapsing, but there is not a suggestion that the relapse is into Judaism, or that he is trying to wean them from a preoccupation with Jewish religion. He never refers to the temple, any more than to circumcision. It is the tabernacle of the pentateuch which interests him, and all his knowledge of the Jewish ritual is gained from the LXX and later tradition. The LXX is for him and his readers the codex of their religion, the appeal to which was cogent, for Gentile Christians, in the early church. As Christians, his readers accepted the LXX as their bible. It was superfluous to argue for it; he could argue from it, as Paul had done, as a writer like Clement of Rome did afterwards. How much the LXX meant to Gentile Christians, may be seen in the case of a man like Tatian, for example, who explicitly declares that he owed to reading of the OT his conversion to Christianity (*Ad Graecos*, 29). It is true that our author, in arguing that Christ had to suffer, does not appeal to the LXX. But this is an idiosyncrasy, which does not affect the vital significance of the LXX prophecies. The Christians to whom he was writing had learned to appreciate their LXX as an authority, by their membership in the church. Their danger was not an undervaluing of the LXX as authoritative; it was a moral and mental danger, which the writer seeks to meet by showing how great their religion was intrinsically. This he could only do ultimately by assuming that they admitted the appeal to their bible, just as they admitted the divine Sonship of Jesus. There may have been Christians of Jewish birth among his readers; but he addresses
his circle, irrespective of their origin, as all members of the People of God, who accept the Book of God. The writing, in short, might have been called *ad gentes* as aptly as First Peter, which also describes Gentile Christians as ὁ λαὸς, the People (cp. on 217). The readers were not in doubt of their religion. Its basis was unquestioned. What the trouble was, in their case, was no theoretical doubt about the codex or the contents of Christianity, but a practical failure to be loyal to their principles, which the writer seeks to meet by recalling them to the full meaning and responsibility of their faith; naturally he takes them to the common ground of the sacred LXX.

We touch here the question of the writer’s aim. But, before discussing this, a word must be said about the authorship.

Had Πρὸς Ἐβραῖοις been addressed to Jews, the title would have been intelligible. Not only was there a [συναγωγὴ Ἐβραίων] at Corinth (cp. Deissmann’s *Light from the East*, pp. 13, 14), but a συναγωγὴ Ἀβρααμ at Rome (cp. Schürer’s *Geschichte des jüd. Völkes*, iii. 46). Among the Jewish συναγωγαί mentioned in the Roman epitaphs (cp. N. Müller’s *Die jüdische Katakombe am Monteverde zu Rom..., Leipzig, 1912*, pp. 110 ff.), there is one of Ἐβρεῶν, which Müller explains as in contrast to the synagogue of “vernaclorum” (Ἠβρακλῖσις, Ἑβρακλῆσις), i.e. resident Jews as opposed to immigrants; though it seems truer, with E. Bormann (*Wiener Studien, 1912*, pp. 383 ff.), to think of some Kultgemeinde which adhered to the use of Hebrew, or which, at any rate, was of Palestinian origin or connexion.

(iii.)

The knowledge of who the author was must have disappeared as soon as the knowledge of what the church was, for whom he wrote. Who wrote Πρὸς Ἐβραῖοις? We know as little of this as we do of the authorship of *The Whole Duty of Man*, that seventeenth-century classic of English piety. Conjectures sprang up, early in the second century, but by that time men were no wiser than we are. The mere fact that some said Barnabas, some Paul, proves that the writing had been circulating among the ἄδεσποτα. It was perhaps natural that our writing should be assigned to Barnabas, who, as a Levite, might be supposed to take a special interest in the ritual of the temple—the very reason which led to his association with the later Epistle of Barnabas. Also, he was called νῦς παρακλήσεως (*Ac 4* 38), which seemed to tally with Ἡε 13*22 (τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως), just as the allusion to “beloved” in *Ps 127* (= *2 S 12* 26) was made to justify the attribution of the psalm to king Solomon. The difficulty about applying *2* 8 to a man like Barnabas was overlooked, and in North Africa, at any rate, the (Roman?) tradition of his authorship prevailed, as Tertullian’s words in *de pudicitia* 20 show: “volo ex redundantia aliquius etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superinducere, idoneum
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confirmandii de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum. Extat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, adeo satis auctoritati viri, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore: ‘aut ego solus et Barnabas non habemus hoc operandi potestatem?’ (1 Co 96). Et utique receptor apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum. Monens itaque discipulos, omissis omnibus initiis, ad perfectionem magis tendere,” etc. (quoting He 64).

What appeals to Tertullian in Πρὸς Ἐβραῖοις is its uncompromising denial of any second repentance. His increasing sympathy with the Montanists had led him to take a much less favourable view of the Shepherd of Hermas than he had once entertained; he now contrasts its lax tone with the rigour of Πρὸς Ἐβραῖοις, and seeks to buttress his argument on this point by insisting as much as he can on the authority of Πρὸς Ἐβραῖοις as a production of the apostolic Barnabas. Where this tradition originated we cannot tell. Tertullian refers to it as a fact, not as an oral tradition; he may have known some MS of the writing with the title Βαρνάβα πρὸς Ἐβραῖοις (ἐπιστολή), and this may have come from Montanist circles in Asia Minor, as Zahn suggests. But all this is guessing in the dark about a guess in the dark.

Since Paul was the most considerable letter-writer of the primitive church, it was natural that in some quarters this anonymous writing should be assigned to him, as was done apparently in the Alexandrian church, although even there scholarly readers felt qualms at an early period, and endeavoured to explain the idiosyncrasies of style by supposing that some disciple of Paul, like Luke, translated it from Hebrew into Greek. This Alexandrian tradition of Paul’s authorship was evidently criticized in other quarters, and the controversy drew from Origen the one piece of enlightened literary criticism which the early discussions produced. Ὅστι ὁ χαρακτήρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἐβραῖοις ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς οὐκ ἤχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικόν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ (2 Co 110), τούτῳ τῇ φράσει, ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιστολή συνθέει τῆς λέξεως Ἐλληνικοτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνει φράσεων διαφορὰ ὁμολογήσει ἂν, πάλιν τε αὐτῷ ἢ τὰ νοηματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσται ἐστι, καὶ οὐ δεύτερα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων, καὶ τούτῳ ἄν συμφέρει εἶναι ἄλλης πάς τὰ ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ. ὅπως δὲ ἀποφαίνομεν οὕτως εἰπούμενον ἂν ἢ τὰ μὲν νοηματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντος τῶν τὰ ἀποστολικά, καὶ ἠσπερεῖ σχολογραφήσαντος τῶν τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. εἰ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἤχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὐτή εὐδοκιμεῖται καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ. ὁ γὰρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι. τὰς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὸ μὲν ἄλληθες
Origen is too good a scholar to notice the guess that it was a translation from Hebrew, but he adds, "ἡ δὲ εἷς ἡμῶς φθάσασα ἱστορία, ὧν τινοι μὲν λεγοῦντον, ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ζηγραφεῖ τήν ἐπιστολήν, ὥστε τινῶν δὲ ὅτι Δουκᾶς ὁ γράφας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς Πράξεις. The idea that Clement of Rome wrote it was, of course, an erroneous deduction from the echoes of it in his pages, almost as unfounded as the notion that Luke wrote it, either independently or as an amanuensis of Paul—a view probably due ultimately to the explanation of how his gospel came to be an apostolic, canonical work. Origen yields more to the "Pauline" interpretation of Πρὸς Ἐβραίους than is legitimate; but, like Erasmus at a later day, he was living in an environment where the "Pauline" tradition was almost a note of orthodoxy. Even his slight scruples failed to keep the question open. In the Eastern church, any hesitation soon passed away, and the scholarly scruples of men like Clement of Alexandria and Origen made no impression on the church at large. It is significant, for example, that when even Eusebius comes to give his own opinion (H.E. iii. 38. 2), he alters the hypothesis about Clement of Rome, and makes him merely the translator of a Pauline Hebrew original, not the author of a Greek original. As a rule, however, Πρὸς Ἐβραίους was accepted as fully Pauline, and passed into the NT canon of the Asiatic, the Egyptian, and the Syriac churches without question. In the Syriac canon of A.D. 400 (text as in Souter's Text and Canon of NT, p. 226), indeed, it stands next to Romans in the list of Paul's epistles (see below, § 4). Euthalius, it is true, about the middle of the fifth century, argues for it in a way that indicates a current of opposition still flowing in certain quarters, but ecclesiastically Πρὸς Ἐβραίους in the East as a Pauline document could defy doubts. The firm conviction of the Eastern church as a whole comes out in a remark like that of Apollinaris the bishop of Laodicea, towards the close of the fourth century: οὐδὲ γέγραπται ὅτι χαρακτηρέω ἐστι τῆς ὑποστάσεως ὁ νῦς; παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ Παῦλῳ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐβραίους. Οὐκ ἔκκλησιάζεται. Ὄφελος κατηγόρητο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Χριστοῦ, Παῦλου εἶναι πεπίστευται ἡ ἑπιστολή (Dial. de sancta Trin. 922).

It was otherwise in the Western church, where Πρὸς Ἐβραίους was for long either read simply as an edifying treatise, or, if regarded as canonical, assigned to some anonymous apostolic

---

1 There is a parallel to the last words in the scoffing close of an epigram in the Greek Anthology (ix. 135): γράψε τις; οἶδε θεὸς τίνος εἰςεῖν; οἶδε καὶ αὐτὸς.

2 "Ut a stilo Pauli, quod ad phrasin attinet, longe lateque discrepat, ita ad spiritum ac pectus Paulinum vehementer accedit."
writer rather than to Paul. Possibly the use made of Πρὸς Ἐβραίος by the Montanists and the Novatians, who welcomed its denial of a second repentance, compromised it in certain quarters. Besides, the Roman church had never accepted the Alexandrian tradition of Paul's authorship. Hence, even when, on its merits, it was admitted to the canon, there was a strong tendency to treat it as anonymous, as may be seen, for example, in Augustine's references. Once in the canon, however, it gradually acquired a Pauline prestige, and, as Greek scholarship faded, any scruples to the contrary became less and less intelligible. It was not till the study of Greek revived again, at the dawn of the Reformation, that the question was reopened.

The data in connexion with the early fortunes of Πρὸς Ἐβραίος in church history belong to text-books on the Canon, like Zahn's Geschichte d. NT Kanons, i. 283 f., 577 f.; ii. 160 f., 358 f.; Leipoldt's Geschichte d. NT Kanons, i. pp. 188 f., 219 f.; and Jacquier's Le Nouveau Testament dans L'Eglise Chrétienne, 1. (1911).

Few characters mentioned in the NT have escaped the attention of those who have desired in later days to identify the author of Πρὸς Ἐβραίος. Apollos, Peter, Philip, Silvanus, and even Prisca have been suggested, besides Aristion, the alleged author of Mk 16:9-20. I have summarized these views elsewhere (Introd. to Lit. of NT.8, pp. 438-442), and it is superfluous here to discuss hypotheses which are in the main due to an irrepressible desire to construct NT romances. Perhaps our modern pride resents being baffled by an ancient document, but it is better to admit that we are not yet wiser on this matter than Origen was, seventeen centuries ago. The author of Πρὸς Ἐβραίος cannot be identified with any figure known to us in the primitive Christian tradition. He left great prose to some little clan of early Christians, but who they were and who he was, ὁ μὲν ἀληθὸς θεὸς οἶδεν. To us he is a voice and no more.

The theory which alone explains the conflicting traditions is that for a time the writing was circulated as an anonymous tract. Only on this hypothesis can the simultaneous emergence of the Barnabas and the Paul traditions in different quarters be explained, as well as the persistent tradition in the Roman church that it was anonymous. As Zahn sensibly concludes, "those into whose hands Πρὸς Ἐβραίος came either looked upon it as an anonymous writing from ancient apostolic times, or else resorted to conjecture. If Paul did not write it, they thought, then it must have been composed by some other prominent teacher of the apostolic church. Barnabas was such a man." In one sense, it was fortunate that the Pauline hypothesis prevailed so early and so extensively, for apart from
this help it might have been difficult for Πρὸς Ἐβραίος to win or to retain its place in the canon. But even when it had been lodged securely inside the canon, some Western churchmen still clung for a while to the old tradition of its anonymity, although they could do no more than hold this as a pious opinion. The later church was right in assigning Πρὸς Ἐβραίος a canonical position. The original reasons might be erroneous or doubtful, but even in the Western church, where they continued to be questioned, there was an increasing indisposition to challenge their canonical result.

(iv.)

Thrown back, in the absence of any reliable tradition, upon the internal evidence, we can only conclude that the writer was one of those personalities in whom the primitive church was more rich than we sometimes realize. “Si l'on a pu comparer saint Paul à Luther,” says Ménégoz, “nous comparerions volontiers l'auteur de l'Épître aux Hébreux à Melanchthon.” He was a highly trained διδάσκαλος, perhaps a Jewish Christian, who had imbibed the philosophy of Alexandrian Judaism before his conversion, a man of literary culture and deep religious feeling. He writes to what is apparently a small community or circle of Christians, possibly one of the household-churches, to which he was attached. For some reason or another he was absent from them, and, although he hopes to rejoin them before long, he feels moved to send them this letter (13:24f.) to rally them. It is possible to infer from 13:24 (see note) that they belonged to Italy; in any case, Πρὸς Ἐβραίος was written either to or from some church in Italy. Beyond the fact that the writer and his readers had been evangelized by some of the disciples of Jesus (2:4), we know nothing more about them. The words in 2:4 do not mean that they belonged to the second generation, of course, in a chronological sense, for such words would have applied to the converts of any mission during the first thirty years or so after the crucifixion, and the only other inference to be drawn, as to the date, is from passages like 10:22f. and 13:7, viz. that the first readers of Πρὸς Ἐβραίος were not neophytes; they had lived through some rough experiences, and indeed their friend expects from them a maturity of experience and intelligence which he is disappointed to miss (5:11f.); also,

1 According to Professor Souter (Text and Canon of NT, p. 190) the epistle is ignored by the African Canon (c. 360), Optatus of Mileue in Numidia (370–385), the Acts of the Donatist Controversy, Zeno of Verona, an African by birth, and Foebadius of Agen (ob. post 392), while “Ambrosiaster” (fourth century?) “uses the work as canonical, but always as an anonymous work.”
their original leaders have died, probably as martyrs (cp. on 137). For these and other reasons, a certain sense of disillusionment had begun to creep over them. Πρὸς Ἔβραιοις is a λόγος παρακλήσεως, to steady and rally people who are πειραζόμενοι, their temptation being to renounce God, or at least to hesitate and retreat, to relax the fibre of loyal faith, as if God were too difficult to follow in the new, hard situation. Once, at the outset of their Christian career, they had been exposed to mob-rioting (10.82 ff.), when they had suffered losses of property, for the sake of the gospel, and also the loud jeers and sneers which pagans and Jews alike heaped sometimes upon the disciples. This they had borne manfully, in the first glow of their enthusiasm. Now, the more violent forms of persecution had apparently passed; what was left was the dragging experience of contempt at the hand of outsiders, the social ostracism and shame, which were threatening to take the heart out of them. Such was their rough, disconcerting environment. Unless an illegitimate amount of imagination is applied to the internal data, they cannot be identified with what is known of any community in the primitive church, so scanty is our information. Least of all is it feasible to connect them with the supposed effects of the Jewish rebellion which culminated in A.D. 70. Πρὸς Ἔβραιοις cannot be later than about A.D. 85, as the use of it in Clement of Rome’s epistle proves; how much earlier it is, we cannot say, but the controversy over the Law, which marked the Pauline phase, is evidently over.

It is perhaps not yet quite superfluous to point out that the use of the present tense (e.g. in 78. 20 38. 96. 13) is no clue to the date, as though this implied that the Jewish temple was still standing. The writer is simply using the historic present of actions described in scripture. It is a literary method which is common in writings long after A.D. 70, e.g. in Josephus, who observes (c. Ληστ., i. 7) that any priest who violates a Mosaic regulation απραγνωστάκεις μὴς τούς βωμοὺς παραστασεῖς μὴς μετέχεις τῆς ἄλλης ἄγνατες (so Ant. iii. 6, 7-12, xiv. 2. 2, etc.). Clement of Rome similarly writes as though the Mosaic ritual were still in existence (40-41, τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεῖ θαυματοργεῖ λειτουργεί λατρεύει εἰς... καὶ διετέλεσθα θαυματοργεῖ εἰς... προσφέρονται θυσίας ἐν Ἴερον συνθήμα μόνης), and the author of the Ἐπ. ad Diognet. 3 writes that οὐ δὲ γε θυσίας αὐτῷ δὲ αἵματος καὶ κλεισέν καὶ διόκατω μικρῶν ἐπιτελεῖ οἵμους καὶ θάνατος ταῖς τιμίαις αὕτην γενάσεως, οὗτος δὲ διαφεύγει τῶν εἰς τὰ κοφά τήν αὐτήν ἐνδεικμένων φιλοσυμίων. The idea that the situation of the readers was in any way connected with the crisis of A.D. 66-70 in Palestine is unfounded. Πρὸς Ἔβραιοις has nothing to do with the Jewish temple, nor with Palestinian Christians. There is not a syllable in the writing which suggests that either the author or his readers had any connexion with or interest in the contemporary temple and ritual of Judaism; their existence mattered as little to his idealist method of argument as their abolition. When he observes (818) that the old διαθήκη was ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ, all he means is that the old régime, superseded now by Jesus, was decaying even in Jeremiah’s age.
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The object of Πρὸς Ἐβραίους may be seen from a brief analysis of its contents. The writer opens with a stately paragraph, introducing the argument that Jesus Christ as the Son of God is superior (κρείττων) to angels, in the order of revelation (1:1-2:18), and this, not in spite of but because of his incarnation and sufferings. He is also superior (κρείττων) even to Moses (3:6-8), as a Son is superior to a servant. Instead of pursuing the argument further, the writer then gives an impressive bible reading on the 95th psalm, to prove that the People of God have still assured to them, if they will only have faith, the divine Rest in the world to come (3:6b-4:18). Resuming his argument, the writer now begins to show how Jesus as God's Son is superior to the Aaronic high priest (4:14-5:10). This is the heart of his subject, and he stops for a moment to rouse the attention of his readers (5:11-6:20) before entering upon the high theme. By a series of skilful transitions he has passed on from the Person of the Son, which is uppermost in chs. 1-4, to the Priesthood of the Son, which dominates chs. 7-8. Jesus as High Priest mediates a superior (κρείττων) order of religion or διαθήκη than that under which Aaron and his successors did their work for the People of God, and access to God, which is the supreme need of men, is now secured fully and finally by the relation of Jesus to God, in virtue of his sacrifice (6:20-8:13). The validity of this sacrifice is then proved (9:1-10:18); it is absolutely efficacious, as no earlier sacrifice of victims could be, in securing forgiveness and fellowship for man. The remainder of the writing (10:19-13:24) is a series of impressive appeals for constancy. The first (10:19-31) is a skilful blend of encouragement and warning. He then appeals to the fine record of his readers (10:32f), bidding them be worthy of their own past, and inciting them to faith in God by reciting a great roll-call of heroes and heroines belonging to God's People in the past, from Abel to the Maccabean martyrs (11:1-40). He further kindles their imagination and conscience by holding up Jesus as the Supreme Leader of all the faithful (12:1-8), even along the path of suffering; besides, he adds (12:4-11), suffering is God's discipline for those who belong to his household. To prefer the world (12:12-17) is to incur a fearful penalty; the one duty for us is to accept the position of fellowship with God, in a due spirit of awe and grateful confidence (12:18-29). A brief note of some ethical duties follows (13:1-7), with a sudden warning against some current tendencies to compromise their spiritual religion (13:8-16). A postscript (13:17-24), with some personalia, ends the epistle.

It is artificial to divide up a writing of this kind, which is not
a treatise on theology, and I have therefore deliberately abstained from introducing any formal divisions and subdivisions in the commentary. The flow of thought, with its turns and windings, is best followed from point to point. So far as the general plan goes, it is determined by the idea of the finality of the Christian revelation in Jesus the Son of God. This is brought out (A) by a proof that he is superior to angels (1:1-2:18) and Moses (3:1-6b), followed by the special exhortation of 3:6b-4:18. Thus far it is what may be termed the Personality of the Son which is discussed. Next (B) comes the Son as High Priest (4:14-7:28), including the parenthetical exhortation of 5:11-6:20. The (C) Sacrifice of this High Priest in his Sanctuary then (8:1-10:18) is discussed, each of the three arguments, which are vitally connected, laying stress from one side or another upon the absolute efficacy of the revelation. This is the dominant idea of the writing, and it explains the particular line which the writer strikes out. He takes a very serious view of the position of his friends and readers. They are disheartened and discouraged for various reasons, some of which are noted in the course of the epistle. There is the strain of hardship, the unpleasant experience of being scoffed at, and the ordinary temptations of immorality, which may bring them, if they are not careful, to the verge of actual apostasy. The writer appears to feel that the only way to save them from ruining themselves is to put before them the fearful and unsuspected consequences of their failure. Hence three times over the writer draws a moving picture of the fate which awaits apostates and renegades (6:4ff, 10:26ff, 12:15ff). But the special line of argument which he adopts in 5-10:18 must be connected somehow with the danger in which he felt his friends involved, and this is only to be explained if we assume that their relaxed interest in Christianity arose out of an imperfect conception of what Jesus meant for their faith. He offers no theoretical disquisition; it is to reinforce and deepen their conviction of the place of Jesus in religion, that he argues, pleads, and warns, dwelling on the privileges and responsibilities of the relationship in which Jesus had placed them. All the help they needed, all the hope they required, lay in the access to God mediated by Jesus, if they would only realize it.

This is what makes the writing of special interest. In the first place (a) the author is urged by a practical necessity to think out his faith, or rather to state the full content of his faith, for the benefit of his readers. Their need puts him on his mettle. "Une chose surtamt," says Anatole France, "donne le l'attrait à la pensée des hommes: c'est l'inquiétude. Un esprit qui n'est point anxieux m'irrite ou m'ennuie." In a sense all the NT writers are spurred by this anxiety, but the author
of Πρὸς Ὑβραίους pre-eminently. It is not anxiety about his personal faith, nor about the prospects of Christianity, but about the loyalty of those for whom he feels himself responsible; his very certainty of the absolute value of Christianity makes him anxious when he sees his friends ready to give it up, anxious on their behalf, and anxious to bring out as lucidly and persuasively as possible the full meaning of the revelation of God in Jesus. What he writes is not a theological treatise in cold blood, but a statement of the faith, alive with practical interest. The situation of his readers has stirred his own mind, and he bends all his powers of thought and emotion to rally them. There is a vital urgency behind what he writes for his circle. But (δ), more than this, the form into which he throws his appeal answers to the situation of his readers. He feels that the word for them is the absolute worth of Jesus as the Son of God; it is to bring this out that he argues, in the middle part of his epistle, so elaborately and anxiously about the priesthood and sacrifice of Jesus. The idealistic conception of the two spheres, the real and eternal, and the phenomenal (which is the mere σαμαί and ἑπόδειγμα, a παραβολή, an ἀντίτυπον of the former), is applied to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which inaugurates and realizes the eternal διαθήκη between God and man. In a series of contrasts, he brings out the superiority of this revelation to the OT διαθήκη with its cultus. But not because the contemporary form of the latter had any attractions for his readers. It is with the archaic σχημα described in the OT that he deals, in order to elucidate the final value of Jesus and his sacrifice under the new διαθήκη, which was indeed the real and eternal one. To readers like his friends, with an imperfect sense of all that was contained in their faith, he says, “Come back to your bible, and see how fully it suggests the positive value of Jesus.” Christians were finding Christ in the LXX, especially his sufferings in the prophetic scriptures, but our author falls back on the pentateuch and the psalter especially to illustrate the commanding position of Jesus as the Son of God in the eternal διαθήκη, and the duties as well as the privileges of living under such a final revelation, where the purpose and the promises of God for his People are realized as they could not be under the OT διαθήκη. Why the writer concentrates upon the priesthood and sacrifice of Jesus in this eternal order of things, is due in part to his general conception of religion (see pp. xliii f.). For him there could be no religion without a priest. But this idea is of direct service to his readers, as he believes. Hence the first mention of Jesus as ἄρχων occurs as a reason for loyalty and confidence (2:14f.). Nothing is more practical in religion than an idea, a relevant idea powerfully urged. When the writer concentrates for a while upon
this cardinal idea of Jesus as ἐσχατονήσιον, therefore, it is because nothing can be more vital, he thinks, for his friends than to show them the claims and resources of their faith, disclosing the rich and real nature of God's revelation to them in his Son. Access to God, confidence in God, pardon for sins of the past, and hope for the future—all this is bound up with the διαθήκη of Christ, and the writer reveals it between the lines of the LXX, to which as members of the People of God his friends naturally turned for instruction and revelation. This διαθήκη, he argues, is far superior to the earlier one, as the Son of God is superior to angels and to Moses himself; nay more, it is superior in efficacy, as the real is superior to its shadowy outline, for the sacrifice which underlies any διαθήκη is fulfilled in Christ as it could not be under the levitical cultus. The function of Christ as high priest is to mediate the direct access of the People to God, and all this has been done so fully and finally that Christians have simply to avail themselves of its provisions for their faith and need.

What the writer feels called upon to deal with, therefore, is not any sense of disappointment in his readers that they had not an impressive ritual or an outward priesthood, nor any hankering after such in contemporary Judaism; it is a failure to see that Christianity is the absolute religion, a failure which is really responsible for the unsatisfactory and even the critical situation of the readers. To meet this need, the writer argues as well as exhorts. He seeks to show from the LXX how the Christian faith alone fulfils the conditions of real religion, and as he knows no other religion than the earlier phase in Israel, he takes common ground with his readers on the LXX record of the first διαθήκη, in order to let them see even there the implications and anticipations of the higher.

But while the author never contemplates any fusion of Christianity with Jewish legalism, and while the argument betrays no trace of Jewish religion as a competing attraction for the readers, it might be argued that some speculative Judaism had affected the mind of the readers. No basis for this can be found in 139f. Yet if there were any proselytes among the readers, they may have felt the fascination of the Jewish system, as those did afterwards who are warned by Ignatius (ad Philad. 6, etc.), “Better listen to Christianity from a circumcised Christian than to Judaism from one uncircumcised.” “It is monstrous to talk of Jesus Christ and ἰουδαίους” (ad Magnes. 10). This interpretation was put forward by Häring (Studien und Kritiken, 1891, pp. 589f.), and it has been most ingeniously argued by Professor Purdy (Expositor, xix. pp. 123–139), who thinks that the emphasis upon “Jesus” means that the readers
were exposed to the seductions of a liberal Judaism which offered an escape from persecution and other difficulties by presenting a Christ who was spiritual, divorced from history; that this liberal, speculative Judaism came forward as "a more developed and perfected type of religion than Christianity"; and that, without being legalistic, it claimed to be a traditional, ritualistic faith, which was at once inward and ceremonial. The objection to such interpretations, however, is that they explain *ignotum per ignotius*. We know little or nothing of such liberal Judaism in the first century, any more than of a tendency on the part of Jewish Christians to abandon Christianity about A.D. 70 for their ancestral faith. Indeed any influence of Jewish propaganda, ritualistic or latitudinarian, must be regarded as secondary, at the most, in the situation of the readers as that is to be inferred from *Πρὸς Ἔβραους* itself. When we recognize the real method and aim of the writer, it becomes clear that he was dealing with a situation which did not require any such influence to account for it. The form taken by his argument is determined by the conception, or rather the misconception, of the faith entertained by his friends; and this in turn is due not to any political or racial factors, but to social and mental causes, such as are sufficiently indicated in *Πρὸς Ἔβραους* itself. Had the danger been a relapse into Judaism of any kind, it would have implied a repudiation of Jesus Christ as messiah and divine—the very truth which the writer can assume! What he needs to do is not to defend this, but to develop it.

The writing, therefore, for all its elaborate structure, has a spontaneous aim. It is not a homily written at large, to which by some afterthought, on the part of the writer or of some editor, a few *personalia* have been appended in ch. 13. The argumentative sections bear directly and definitely upon the situation of the readers, whom the writer has in view throughout, even when he seems to be far from their situation. Which brings us to the problem of the literary structure of *Πρὸς Ἔβραους*.

(vi.)

See especially W. Wrede's monograph, *Das literarische Rätsel d. Hebräerbriefs* (1906), with the essays of E. Burggaller and R. Perdelwitz in *Zeitschrift für Neutest. Wissenschaft* (1908, pp. 110 f.; 1910, pp. 59 f., 105 f.); V. Monod's *De titulo epistolae vulgo ad Hebraeos inscriptae* (1910); C. C. 1

1 Cp., further, Professor Dickie's article in *Expositor*, v. pp. 371 f. The notion that the writer is controverting an external view of Christ's person, which shrank, e.g., from admitting his humiliation and real humanity, had been urged by Julius Kögel in *Die Verborgenheit Jesu als des Messias* (Greifenswald, 1909) and in *Der Sohn und die Söhne, ein exegetische Studie zu Heb. 2:18* (1904).
The literary problem of Πρὸς Εβραῖος is raised by the absence of any address and the presence of personal matter in ch. 13. Why (a) has it no introductory greeting? And why (b) has it a postscript? As for the former point (a), there may have been, in the original, an introductory title. Πρὸς Εβραῖος opens with a great sentence (11f.), but Eph 1st is just such another, and there is no reason why the one should not have followed a title-address any more than the other.\(^1\) It may have been lost by accident, in the tear and wear of the manuscript, for such accidents are not unknown in ancient literature. This is, at any rate, more probable than the idea that it was suppressed because the author (Barnabas, Apollos?) was not of sufficiently apostolic rank for the canon. Had this interest been operative, it would have been perfectly easy to alter a word or two in the address itself. Besides, Πρὸς Εβραῖος was circulating long before it was admitted to the canon, and it circulated even afterwards as non-canonical; yet not a trace of any address, Pauline or non-Pauline, has ever survived. Which, in turn, tells against the hypothesis that such ever existed—at least, against the theory that it was deleted when the writing was canonized. If the elision of the address ever took place, it must have been very early, and rather as the result of accident than deliberately. Yet there is no decisive reason why the writing should not have begun originally as it does in its present form. Nor does this imply (b) that the personal data in ch. 13 are irrelevant. Πρὸς Εβραῖος has a certain originality in form as well as in content; it is neither an epistle nor a homily, pure and simple. True, down to 12\(^{29}\) (or 13\(^{17}\)) there is little or nothing that might not have been spoken by a preacher to his audience, and Valckenaer (on 4\(^{9}\)) is right, so far, in saying, “haec magnifica ad Hebraeos missa dissertatio oratio potius dicenda est quam epistola.” Yet the writer is not addressing an ideal public; he is not composing a treatise for Christendom at large. It is really unreal to explain away passages like 5\(^{11}\). 10\(^{22}\). 12\(^{14}\). and 13\(^{1-9}\) as rhetorical abstractions.

Πρὸς Εβραῖος was the work of a διδάσκαλος, who knew how to deliver a λόγος παρακλητικὸς. Parts of it probably represent what he had used in preaching already (e.g. 37). But, while it has sometimes the tone of sermon notes written out, it is not a

---

\(^1\) Ep. Barnabas begins with ἀδελφοὶ, οὗτος δὲ ἡμᾶς φρονεῖν περὶ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς περὶ θεοῦ, etc.; 2 Clement starts with a greeting, χαίρετε, νῦν καὶ δυνατέρες, ἐν ὑμῖν κυρίον τοῦ ἀγαπητῶν ἡμᾶς ἐν εἰρήνῃ.
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sermon in the air. To strike out 13.19, 22-24 or 13.1-7, 16-19, 22f. (Torrey) does not reduce it from a letter or epistle to a sermon like 2 Clement. Thus, e.g., a phrase like 11.33 (see note) is as intelligible in a written work as in a spoken address. It is only by emptying passages like 5.11f. and 10.26f. of their full meaning that anyone can speak of the writer as composing a sermon at large or for an ideal public. Part of the force of 5.11f., e.g., is due to the fact that the writer is dealing with a real situation, pleading that in what he is going to say he is not writing simply to display his own talent or to please himself, but for the serious, urgent need of his readers. They do not deserve what he is going to give them. But he will give it! A thoroughly pastoral touch, which is lost by being turned into a rhetorical excuse for deploying some favourite ideas of his own. According to Wrede, the author wrote in 13.18, 19 on the basis of (Philem 22) 2 Co 1.11-12 to make it appear as though Paul was the author, and then added 13.28 on the basis of Ph 2.12, 23, 24; but why he should mix up these reminiscences, which, according to Wrede, are contradictory, it is difficult to see. Had he wished to put a Pauline colour into the closing paragraphs, he would surely have done it in a lucid, coherent fashion, instead of leaving the supposed allusions to Paul's Roman imprisonment so enigmatic. But, though Wrede thinks that the hypothesis of a pseudonymous conclusion is the only way of explaining the phenomena of ch. 13, he agrees that to excise it entirely is out of the question. Neither the style nor the contents justify such a radical theory, except on the untenable hypothesis that 1-12 is a pure treatise. The analogies of a doxology being followed by personal matter (e.g. 2 Ti 4.18, 1 P 4.11 etc.) tell against the idea that Προς Ἐβραίος must have ended with 13.21, and much less could it have ended with 13.17. To assume that the writer suddenly bethought him, at the end, of giving a Pauline appearance to what he had written, and that he therefore added 13.22f., is to credit him with too little ability. Had he wished to convey this impression, he would certainly have gone further and made changes in the earlier part. Nor is it likely that anyone added the closing verses in order to facilitate its entrance into the NT canon by bringing it into line with the other epistles. The canon was drawn up for worship, and if Προς Ἐβραίος was originally a discourse, it seems very unlikely that anyone would have gone

1 To excise 13.1-7 as a "formless jumble of rather commonplace admonitions" is a singular misjudgment.

2 The linguistic proof is cogently led by C. R. Williams in the Journal of Biblical Literature (1911), pp. 129-136, who shows that the alleged special parallels between He 13 and Paul are neither so numerous nor so significant as is commonly supposed, and that the only fair explanation of He 13 as a whole is that it was written to accompany 1-12.
out of his way, on this occasion, to add some enigmatic personal references. In short, while Προς Ἐβραίους betrays here and there the interests and methods of an effective preacher, the epistolary form is not a piece of literary fiction; still less is it due (in ch. 13) to some later hand. It is hardly too much to say that the various theories about the retouching of the 13th chapter of Προς Ἐβραίους are as valuable, from the standpoint of literary criticism, as Macaulay's unhesitating belief that Dr. Johnson had revised and retouched Cecilia.

§ 2. THE RELIGIOUS IDEAS.

In addition to the text-books on NT theology, consult Riehm's Lehrbegriff des Hebäürbriefs (1867), W. Milligan's Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord (1891), Ménégès's La Théologie de l'Épître aux Hébreux (1894), A. Seeberg's Der Tod Christi (1895), A. B. Bruce's The Epistle to the Hebrews (1890), G. Milligan's The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews (1899), G. Vos on "The Priesthood of Christ in Hebrews" (Princeton Theological Review, 1907, pp. 423 f., 579 f.), Du Bose's Highpriesthood and Sacrifice (1908), A. Nairne's The Epistle of Priesthood (1913), H. L. MacNeill's Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews (1914), H. A. A. Kennedy's Theology of the Epistles (1919, pp. 182-221), and E. F. Scott's The Epistle to the Hebrews (1922).

Many readers who are not children will understand what Mr Edmund Gosse in Father and Son (pp. 89 f.) describes, in telling how his father read aloud to him the epistle. "The extraordinary beauty of the language—for instance, the matchless cadences and images of the first chapter—made a certain impression upon my imagination, and were (I think) my earliest initiation into the magic of literature. I was incapable of defining what I felt, but I certainly had a grip in the throat, which was in its essence a purely aesthetic emotion, when my father read, in his pure, large, ringing voice, such passages as 'The heavens are the work of Thy hands. They shall perish, but Thou remainest, and they shall all wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt Thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail.' But the dialectic parts of the epistle puzzled and confused me. Such metaphysical ideas as 'laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works' and 'crucifying the Son of God afresh' were not successfully brought down to the level of my understanding. . . . The melodious language, the divine forensic audacities, the magnificent ebb and flow of argument which make the Epistle to the Hebrews such a miracle, were far beyond my reach, and they only bewildered me." They become less bewildering when they are viewed in the right perspective. The clue to them lies in the
philosophical idea which dominates the outlook of the writer, and in the symbolism which, linked to this idea, embodied his characteristic conceptions of religion. We might almost say that, next to the deflecting influence of the tradition which identified our epistle with the Pauline scheme of thought and thereby missed its original and independent contribution to early Christianity, nothing has so handicapped its appeal as the later use of it in dogmatic theology. While the author of Προς Εβραίονς often turned the literal into the figurative, his theological interpreters have been as often engaged in turning the figurative expressions of the epistle into what was literal. A due appreciation of the symbolism has been the slow gain of the historical method as applied to the classics of primitive Christianity. There is no consistent symbolism, indeed, not even in the case of the ἄρχιερεως; in the nature of the case, there could not be. But symbolism there is, and symbolism of a unique kind.

(i.)

The author writes from a religious philosophy of his own—that is, of his own among the NT writers. The philosophical element in his view of the world and God is fundamentally Platonic. Like Philo and the author of Wisdom, he interprets the past and the present alike in terms of the old theory (cp. on 8:5 10) that the phenomenal is but an imperfect, shadowy transcript of what is eternal and real. He applies this principle to the past. What was all the Levitical cultus in bygone days but a faint copy of the celestial archetype, a copy that suggested by its very imperfections the future and final realization? In such arguments (chs. 7–10) he means to declare “that Christianity is eternal, just as it shall be everlasting, and that all else is only this, that the true heavenly things of which it consists thrust themselves forward on to this bank and shoal of time, and took cosmical embodiment, in order to suggest their coming everlasting manifestation.”¹ The idea that the seen and material is but a poor, provisional replica of the unseen and real order of things (τὰ ἐπιφάνεια, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οἰκρασί, τὰ μὴ σαλανύεια), pervades Προς Εβραίονς. Thus faith (11:1f.) means the conviction, the practical realization, of this world of realities, not only the belief that the universe does not arise out of mere φανάρωμα, but the conviction that life must be ordered, at all costs, by a vision of the unseen, or by obedience to a Voice unheard by any outward ear. Similarly the outward priest, sanctuary, and sacrifices of the ancient cultus were merely the shadowy copy of the real, as manifested in Jesus with his self-sacrifice, his death being, as

¹ A. B. Davidson, Biblical and Literary Essays (p. 317).
Sabatier says, “une fonction sacerdotale, un acte transcendant de purification rituelle, accompli hors de l’humanité” (La Doctrine de l’Expiation, p. 37). Such is the philosophical strain which permeates Πρὸς Ἐβραίους. The idea of heavenly counterparts is not, of course, confined to Platonism; it is Sumerian, in one of its roots (cp. on 85), and it had already entered apocalyptic. But our author derives it from his Alexandrian religious philosophy (transmuting the κόσμος νοητός into the more vivid and devotional figures of an οἶκος or πόλις θεοῦ, a πάτρις or even a σκηνή ἀληθινή), just as elsewhere he freely uses Aristotelian ideas like that of the τέλος or final end, with its τελείωσις or sequence of growth, and shows familiarity with the idea of the ἔτος (514). The τελείωσις (see on 59) idea is of special importance, as it denotes for men the work of Christ in putting them into their proper status towards God (see on 210). “By a single offering he has made the sanctified perfect for all time” (τετελείωκεν, 1014), the offering or προσφορά being himself, and the “perfecting” being the act of putting the People into their true and final relation towards God. This the Law, with its outward organization of priests and animal sacrifices, could never do; “as the Law has a mere shadow of the bliss that is to be, instead of representing the reality of that bliss (viz. the ‘perfect’ relationship between God and men), it can never perfect those who draw near” (101).

This gives us the focus for viewing the detailed comparison between the levitical sacrifices and priests on the one hand and the Κρείττων Jesus. “You see in your bible,” the writer argues, “the elaborate system of ritual which was once organized for the forgiveness of sins and the access of the people to God. All this was merely provisional and ineffective, a shadow of the Reality which already existed in the mind of God, and which is now ours in the sacrifice of Jesus.” Even the fanciful argument from the priesthood of Melchizedek (620–717)—fanciful to us, but forcible then—swings from this conception. What the author seeks to do is not to prove that there had been from the first a natural or real priesthood, superior to the levitical, a priesthood fulfilled in Christ. His aim primarily is to discredit the levitical priesthood of bygone days; it was anticipated in the divine order by that of Melchizedek, he shows, using a chronological argument resembling that of Paul in Gal 38f., on the principle that what is prior is superior. But what leads him to elaborate specially the Melchizedek priesthood is that it had already played an important rôle in Jewish speculation in connexion with the messianic hope. Philo had already identified Melchizedek outright with the Logos or possibly even with the messiah. Whether the author of Πρὸς Ἐβραίους intends to contradict Philo or not, he takes a different line, falling back upon his favourite psalm,
the 110th, which in the Greek version, the only one known to him, had put forward not only the belief that messiah was ἡσυχίας άλλων κατά τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ, but the Alexandrian belief in the pre-existence of messiah (v. 8 έκ γαστρός πρό ἐωσφόρου ἐξενένυσα νεο). Here then, by Alexandrian methods of exegesis, in the pentateuch text combined with the psalm, he found scripture proof of an original priesthood which was not levitical, not transferable, and permanent. This priesthood of Melchizedek was, of course, not quite a perfect type of Christ's, for it did not include any sacrifice, but, as resting on personality, not on heredity, 1 it did typify, he held, that eternal priesthood of the Christ which was to supersede the levitical, for all the ancient prestige of the latter. As this prestige was wholly biblical for the writer and his readers, so it was essential that the disproof of its validity should be biblical also. Though he never uses either the idea of Melchizedek offering bread and wine to typify the elements in the eucharist, in spite of the fact that Philo once allegorized this trait (de Leg. Alleg. iii. 25), or the idea of Melchizedek being uncircumcised (as he would have done, had he been seriously arguing with people who were in danger of relapsing into contemporary Judaism), he does seem to glance at the combination of the sacerdotal and the royal functions. Like Philo, though more fully, he notices the religious significance of the etymology "king of righteousness" and "king of peace," the reason being that throughout his argument he endeavours repeatedly to preserve something of the primitive view of Jesus as messianic king, particularly because the idea of the divine βασιλεία plays next to no part in his scheme of thought. Sometimes the combination of the sacerdotal and royal metaphors is incongruous enough, although it is not unimpressive (e.g. 10-12-13). Primarily it is a survival of the older militant messianic category which is relevant in the first chapter (see 18f.), but out of place in the argument from the priesthood; the reference is really due to the desire to reaffirm the absolute significance of Christ's work, and by way of anticipation he sounds this note even in 71-2. Later on, it opens up into an interesting instance of his relation to the primitive eschatology. To his mind, trained in the Alexandrian philosophy of religion, the present world of sense and time stands over against the world of reality, the former being merely the shadow and copy of the latter. There is an archetypal

1 The writer is trying to express an idea which, as Prof. E. F. Scott argues (pp. 207 f.), "underlies all our modern thought—social and political as well as religious," viz. that true authority is not prescriptive but personal; "the priesthood which can bring us nearer God must be one of inherent character and personality."
order of things, eternal and divine, to which the mundane order but dimly corresponds, and only within this higher order, eternal and invisible, is access to God possible for man. On such a view as this, which ultimately (see pp. xxxi–xxxii) goes back to Platonic idealism, and which had been worked out by Philo, the real world is the transcendent order of things, which is the pattern for the phenomenal universe, so that to attain God man must pass from the lower and outward world of the senses to the inner. But how? Philo employed the Logos or Reason as the medium. Our author similarly holds that men must attain this higher world, but for him it is a σκυψώ, a sanctuary, the real Presence of God, and it is entered not through ecstasy or mystic rapture, but through connexion with Jesus Christ, who has not only revealed that world but opened the way into it. The Presence of God is now attainable as it could not be under the outward cultus of the σκυψώ in the OT, for the complete sacrifice has been offered “in the realm of the spirit,” thus providing for the direct access of the people to their God. The full bliss of the fellowship is still in the future, indeed; it is not to be realized finally until Jesus returns for his people, for he is as yet only their πρόδρομος (6:20). The primitive eschatology required and received this admission from the writer, though it is hardly consonant with his deeper thought. And this is why he quotes for example the old words about Jesus waiting in heaven till his foes are crushed (10:12–18). He is still near enough to the primitive period to share the forward look (see, e.g., 2:9, 10:37), and unlike Philo, he does not allow his religious idealism to evaporate his eschatology. But while this note of expectation is sounded now and then, it is held that Christians already experience the powers of the world to come. The new and final order has dawned ever since the sacrifice of Jesus was made, and the position of believers is guaranteed. “You have come to mount Sion, the city of the living God.” The entrance of Jesus has made a fresh, living way for us, which is here and now open. “For all time he is able to save those who approach God through him, as he is always living to intercede on their behalf.” Christians enjoy the final status of relationship to God in the world of spirit and reality, in virtue of the final sacrifice offered by Jesus the Son.

(ii.)

What was this sacrifice? How did the writer understand it? (a) The first thing to be said is that in his interpretation of the sacrifice of Jesus, he takes the piacular view. Calvin (Instit. ii. 15. 6) maintains that, as for the priesthood of Christ, “finem et usum eius esse ut sit mediator purus omni macula, qui sanctitate
sua Deum nobis conciliet. Sed quia aditum occupat justa maledictio, et Deus pro judicis officio nobis infensus est, ut nobis favorem comparat sacerdos ad placandam iram ipsius Dei, piaculum intervenire necesse est. . . . Qua de re prolixe apostolus disputat in epistola ad Hebraeos a septimo capite fere ad finem usque decimi.” Matthew Arnold is not often found beside Calvin, but he shares this error. “Turn it which way we will, the notion of appeasement of an offended God by vicarious sacrifice, which the Epistle to the Hebrews apparently sanctions, will never truly speak to the religious sense, or bear fruit for true religion” (St. Paul and Protestantism, p. 72). Arnold saves himself by the word “apparently,” but the truth is that this idea is not sanctioned by Πρὸς Ἑβραίους at all. The interpretation of Calvin confuses Paul’s doctrine of expiation with the piacular view of our author. The entire group of ideas about the law, the curse, and the wrath of God is alien to Πρὸς Ἑβραίους. The conception of God is indeed charged with wholesome awe (cp. on 12:28-29); but although God is never called directly the Father of Christians, his attitude to men is one of grace, and the entire process of man’s approach is initiated by him (2:9 13:20). God’s wrath is reserved for the apostates (16:29-31); it does not brood over unregenerate men, to be removed by Christ. Such a notion could hardly have occurred to a man with predilections for the typical significance of the OT ritual, in which the sacrifices were not intended to avert the wrath of God so much as to reassure the people from time to time that their relations with their God had not been interrupted. The function of Christ, according to our author, is not to appease the divine wrath (see on 2:6f. 17), but to establish once and for all the direct fellowship of God with his people, and a picturesque archaic phrase like that in 12:24 about the αἷμα ῥαντιμούον cannot be pressed into the doctrine that Jesus by his sacrifice averted or averts the just anger of God. On the other hand, while the author knows the primitive Christian idea of God’s fatherhood, it is not in such terms that he expresses his own conception of God. Philo (De Exsecreationibus, 9) describes how the Jews in the diaspora will be encouraged to return to Israel and Israel’s God, particularly by his forgiving character (ἐνὶ μὲν εἰπεικά καὶ χρηστότητι τοῦ παρακαλούμενον συγγνώμην πρὸ τιμωρίας δει τιθέντος); the end of their approach to God, he adds, οὐδὲν ἄτερον ἢ εὐφρεστεῖν τῷ θεῷ καθίστασι νόιος πατρὶ. But the author of Πρὸς Ἑβραίους lays no stress upon the Fatherhood of God for men; except in connexion with the discipline of suffering, he never alludes to the goodness of God as paternal, even for Christians, and indeed it is only in OT quotations that God is called even the Father of the Son (1:5 5:6). He avoids, even more strictly
than Jesus, the use of love-language. The verb ἀγαπᾷ only occurs twice, both times in an OT citation; ἀγάπη is also used only twice, and never of man's attitude towards God. There is significance in such linguistic data; they corroborate the impression that the author takes a deep view (see on 12:28) of the homage and awe due to God. Godly reverence, εὐλαβεία (see on 5:7), characterized Jesus in his human life, and it is to characterize Christians towards God, i.e. an awe which is devoid of anything like nervous fear, an ennobling sense of the greatness of God, but still a reverential awe. This is not incompatible with humble confidence or with a serious joy, with παρρησία (cp. on 3:16). Indeed "all deep joy has something of the awful in it," as Carlyle says. Ἐξομένεις χάριν is the word of our author (12:28); the standing attitude of Christians towards their God is one of profound thankfulness for his goodness to them. Only, it is to be accompanied μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους. We are to feel absolutely secure under God's will, whatever crises or catastrophes befall the universe, and the security is at once to thrill (see on 2:12) and to subdue our minds. Hence, while God's graciousness overcomes any anxiety in man, his sublimity is intended to elevate and purify human life by purging it of easy emotion and thin sentimentalism. This is not the primitive awe of religion before the terrors of the unknown supernatural; the author believes in the gracious, kindly nature of God (see on 2:10, also 6:10 13:16 etc.), but he has an instinctive horror of anything like a shallow levity. The tone of Πρὸς Ἑβραίον resembles, indeed, that of 1 P 1:7 (εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστον ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τής παρουσίας ὦμον χρόνον ἀναπτάρχητε); there may be irreverence in religion, not only in formal religion but for other reasons in spiritual religion. Yet the special aspect of our epistle is reflected in what Jesus once said to men tempted to hesitate and draw back in fear of suffering: "I will show you whom to fear—fear Him who after He has killed has power to cast you into Gehenna. Yes, I tell you, fear Him" (Lk 12:5). This illustrates the spirit and situation of Πρὸς Ἑβραίον, where the writer warns his friends against apostasy by reminding them of δ θεὸς ζων and of the judgment. We might almost infer that in his mind the dominant conception is God regarded as transcendental, not with regard to creation but with regard to frail, faulty human nature. What engrosses the writer is the need not so much of a medium between God and the material universe, as of a medium between his holiness and human sin (see on 12:28).

(δ) As for the essence and idea of the sacrifice, while he refers to a number of OT sacrifices by way of illustration, his main analogy comes from the ritual of atonement-day in the
levitical code (Lv 16), where it was prescribed that once a year the highpriest was to enter the inner shrine by himself, the shrine within which stood the sacred box or ark symbolizing the divine Presence. The elaborate sacrifices of the day are only glanced at by our author. Thus he never alludes to the famous scapegoat, which bore away the sins of the people into the desert. All he mentions is the sacrifice of certain animals, as propitiation for the highpriest’s own sins and also for those of the nation. Carrying some blood of these animals, the priest was to smear the λαστήριον or cover of the ark. This had a twofold object. (i) Blood was used to reconsecrate the sanctuary (Lv 16:16). This was a relic of the archaic idea that the life-bond between the god and his worshippers required to be renewed by sacred blood; “the holiness of the altar is liable to be impaired, and requires to be refreshed by an application of holy blood.” ¹ Our author refers to this crude practice in 9:28. But his dominant interest is in (ii) the action of the highpriest as he enters the inner shrine; it is not the reconsecration of the sanctuary with its altar, but the general atonement there made for the sins of the People, which engrosses him. The application of the victim’s blood to the λαστήριον by the divinely appointed highpriest was believed to propitiate Yahweh by cleansing the People from the sins which might prevent him from dwelling any longer in the land or among the People. The annual ceremony was designed to ensure his Presence among them, “to enable the close relationship between Deity and man to continue undisturbed. The logical circle—that the atoning ceremonies were ordered by God to produce their effect upon himself—was necessarily unperceived by the priestly mind” (Montefiore, Hibbert Lectures, p. 337). What the rite, as laid down in the bible, was intended to accomplish was simply, for the author of Ἡπὸς Ἐβπαίων, to renew the life-bond between God and the People. This sacrifice offered by the highpriest on atonement-day was the supreme, piacular action of the levitical cultus. Once a year it availed to wipe out the guilt of all sins, whatever their nature, ritual or moral, which interrupted the relationship between God and his People.² For it was a sacrifice designed for the entire People as the community of God. The blood of the victims was carried into the inner shrine, on behalf of the People outside the sanctuary; this the highpriest did for them, as he passed inside the curtain which shrouded the inner shrine. Also, in contrast to the usual custom, the flesh of the victims, instead of any part being eaten as a meal, was carried out and burned up. In all this the writer finds a richly symbolic

¹ W. Robertson Smith, The Religion of the Semites (1907), pp. 408 f.
meaning (914). Jesus was both highpriest and victim, as he
died and passed inside the heavenly Presence of God to
establish the life-bond between God and his People. Jesus did
not need to sacrifice for himself. Jesus did not need to sacrifice
himself more than once for the People. Jesus secured a
forgiveness which the older animal sacrifices never won. And
Jesus did not leave his People outside; he opened the way for
them to enter God's own presence after him, and in virtue of his
self-sacrifice. So the author, from time to time, works out the
details of the symbolism. He even uses the treatment of the
victim's remains to prove that Christians must be unworlly
(1311f); but this is an after-thought, for his fundamental interest
lies in the sacrificial suggestiveness of the atonement-day which,
external and imperfect as its ritual was, adumbrated the reality
which had been manifested in the sacrifice and ascension of
Jesus.

Yet this figurative category had its obvious drawbacks, two
of which may be noted here. One (a) is, that it does not allow
him to show how the sacrificial death of Jesus is connected with
the inner renewal of the heart and the consequent access of
man to God. He uses phrases like ἀναστήσας (see on 211) and
καθαρίζων and τελειῶν (this term emphasizing more than the
others the idea of completeness), but we can only deduce from
occasional hints like 914 what he meant by the efficacy of the
sacrificial death. His ritualistic category assumed that such a
sacrifice availed to reinstate the People before God (cp. on 922),
and this axiom sufficed for his Christian conviction that every­
thing depended upon what Jesus is to God and to us—what he
is, he is in virtue of what he did, of the sacrificial offering of
himself. But the symbol or parable in the levitical cultus went
no further. And it even tended to confuse the conception of
what is symbolized, by its inadequacy; it necessarily separated
priest and victim, and it suggested by its series of actions a time­
element which is out of keeping with the eternal order. Hence
the literal tendency in the interpretation of the sacrifice has led
to confusion, as attempts have been made to express the con­
tinuous, timeless efficacy of the sacrifice. That the death was
a sacrifice, complete and final, is assumed (e.g. 727 914 1010, 12, 14).
Yet language is used which has suggested that in the heavenly
σκυπή this sacrifice is continually presented or offered (e.g. 726
and the vg. mistranslation of 1012 "hic autem unam pro peccatis
offerens hostiam in sempiternum sedit"). The other drawback
(b) is, that the idea of Jesus passing like the highpriest at once
from the sacrifice into the inner sanctuary (i.e. through the
heavens into the Presence, 414) has prevented him from making
use of the Resurrection (cp. also on 1312). The heavenly sphere
of Jesus is so closely linked with his previous existence on earth, under the category of the sacrifice, that the author could not suggest an experience like the resurrection, which would not have tallied with this idea of continuity.

On the other hand, the concentration of interest in the symbol on the sole personality of the priest and of the single sacrifice enabled him to voice what was his predominant belief about Jesus. How profoundly he was engrossed by the idea of Christ's adequacy as mediator may be judged from his avoidance of some current religious beliefs about intercession. Over and again he comes to a point where contemporary opinions (with which he was quite familiar) suggested, e.g., the intercession of angels in heaven, or of departed saints on behalf of men on earth, ideas like the merits of the fathers or the atoning efficacy of martyrdom in the past, to facilitate the approach of sinful men to God (cp. on 11:40 12:17. 23. 24 etc.). These he deliberately ignores. In view of the single, sufficient sacrifice of Jesus, in the light of his eternally valid intercession, no supplementary aid was required. It is not accidental that such beliefs are left out of our author's scheme of thought. It is a fresh proof of his genuinely primitive faith in Jesus as the one mediator. The ideas of the perfect Priest and the perfect Sacrifice are a theological expression, in symbolic language, of what was vital to the classical piety of the early church; and apart from Paul no one set this out so cogently and clearly as the writer of IIpo.

(iii.)

Our modern symbolism does no sort of justice to the ancient idea of priesthood. Matthew Arnold says of Wordsworth:

"He was a priest to us all,
Of the wonder and bloom of the world,
Which we saw with his eyes, and were glad."

That is, "priest" means interpreter, one who introduces us to a deeper vision, one who, as we might put it, opens up to us a new world of ideas. Such is not the ultimate function of Christ as ἵππεις in our epistle. Dogmatic theology would prefer to call this the prophetic function of Christ, but the priestly office means mediation, not interpretation. The function of the high-priest is to enter and to offer: εἰσέρχεσθαι and προσφέρειν forming the complete action, and no distinction being drawn between the two, any more than between the terms "priest" and "high-priest."

The fundamental importance of this may be illustrated from the recourse made by Paul and by our author respectively to the
Jeremianic oracle of the new covenant or διαθήκη. Paul's main interest in it lies in its prediction of the Spirit, as opposed to the Law. What appeals to Paul is the inward and direct intuition of God, which forms the burden of the oracle. But to our author (8:15-18) it is the last sentence of the oracle which is supreme, i.e. the remission of sins; "I will be merciful to their iniquities, and remember their sins no more." He seizes the name and fact of a "new" covenant, as implying that the old was inadequate. But he continues: "If the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkled on defiled persons, give them a holiness that bears on bodily purity, how much more will the blood of Christ, who in the spirit of the eternal offered himself as an unblemished sacrifice to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve a living God?" He mediates a new covenant for this reason, that those who have been called may obtain the eternal deliverance they have been promised, now that a death has occurred which redeems them from the transgressions involved in the first covenant" (9:18-15). That is, the conclusion of Jeremiah's oracle—that God will forgive and forget—is the real reason why our author quotes it. There can be no access without an amnesty for the past; the religious communion of the immediate future must be guaranteed by a sacrifice ratifying the pardon of God.

This difference between Paul and our author is, of course, owing to the fact that for the latter the covenant 1 or law is subordinated to the priesthood. Change the priesthood, says the writer, and ipso facto the law has to be changed too. The covenant is a relationship of God and men, arising out of grace, and inaugurated by some historic act; since its efficiency as an institution for forgiveness and fellowship depends on the personality and standing of the priesthood, the appearance of Jesus as the absolute Priest does away with the inferior law.

This brings us to the heart of the Christology, the sacrifice and priestly service of Christ as the mediator of this new covenant with its eternal fellowship.

Men are sons of God, and their relation of confidence and access is based upon the function of the Son κατ' Εξουσίαν. The author shares with Paul the view that the Son is the Son before and during his incarnate life, and yet perhaps Son in a special sense in consequence of the resurrection—or rather, as our author would have preferred to say, in consequence of the ascension. This may be the idea underneath the compressed clauses at the opening of the epistle (1:5). "God has spoken to us by

1 As Professor Kennedy points out, with real insight: "all the terms of the contrast which he works out are selected because of their relation to the covenant-conception" (p. 201).
a Son—a Son whom he appointed heir of the universe, as it
was by him that he had created the world. He, reflecting God's
bright glory and stamped with God's own character, sustains the
universe by his word of power; when he had secured our
purification from sins, he sat down at the right hand of the
Majesty on high; and thus he is superior to the angels, as he
has inherited a Name superior to theirs. For to what angel did
God ever say—

'Thou art my Son,
To-day have I become thy Father?'

(referring to the ancient notion that the king first became con-
scious of his latent divine sonship at his accession to the throne).
The name or dignity which Christ inherits, as the result of his
redemptive work, is probably that of Son; as the following
quotation from the OT psalm suggests, the resurrection or exaltation
may mark, as it does for Paul, the fully operative
sonship of Christ, the only way to inherit or possess the
universe being to endure the suffering and death which purified
human sin and led to the enthronement of Christ. Our author
holds that this divine being was sent into the world because he
was God's Son, and that he freely undertook his mission for
God's other sons on earth.

The mission was a will of God which involved sacrifice.
That is the point of the quotation (10:6f) from the 40th psalm
—not to prove that obedience to God was better than sacrifice,
but to bring out the truth that God's will required a higher kind
of sacrifice than the levitical, namely, the personal, free self-
sacrifice of Christ in the body. Even this is more than self-
sacrifice in our modern sense of the term. It is "by this will,"
the writer argues, that "we are consecrated, because Jesus Christ
once for all has offered up his body." No doubt the offering is
eternal, it is not confined to the historical act on Calvary. "He
has entered heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God
on our behalf" (9:24): "he is always living to make intercession
for us" (7:25). Still, the author is more realistic in expression than
the tradition of the Testament of Levi (3), which makes the
angel of the Presence in the third heaven offer a spiritual and
bloodless sacrifice to God in propitiation for the sins of ignorance
committed by the righteous. Our author assigns entirely to Christ
the intercessory functions which the piety of the later Judaism
had already begun to divide among angels and departed saints,
but he also makes the sacrifice of Jesus one of blood—a realism
which was essential to his scheme of argument from the
entrance of the OT high priest into the inner shrine.

The superior or rather the absolute efficacy of the blood of
Christ depends in turn on his absolute significance as the Son of God; it is his person and work which render his self-sacrifice valid and supreme. But this is asserted rather than explained. Indeed, it is asserted on the ground of a presupposition which was assumed as axiomatic, namely, the impossibility of communion with God apart from blood shed in sacrifice (9:22). For example, when the writer encourages his readers by reminding them of their position (12:24), that they “have come to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant and to the sprinkled blood whose message is nobler than Abel’s,” he does not mean to draw an antithesis between Abel’s blood as a cry for vengeance and Christ’s blood as a cry for intercession. The fundamental antithesis lies between exclusion and inclusion. Abel’s blood demanded the excommunication of the sinner, as an outcast from God’s presence; Christ’s blood draws the sinner near and ratifies the covenant. The author denies to the OT cultus of sacrifice any such atoning value, but at the same time he reaffirms its basal principle, that blood in sacrifice is essential to communion with the deity. Blood offered in sacrifice does possess a religious efficacy, to expiate and purify. Without shedding of blood there is no remission. We ask, why? But the ancient world never dreamt of asking, why? What puzzles a modern was an axiom to the ancient. The argument of our epistle is pivoted on this postulate, and no attempt is made to rationalize it.

In the Law of Holiness, incorporated in Leviticus, there is indeed one incidental allusion to the rationale of sacrifice or blood-expiation, when, in prohibiting the use of blood as a food, the taboo proceeds: “the life of the body is in the blood, and I have given it to you for the altar to make propitiation for yourselves, for the blood makes propitiation by means of the life” (i.e. the life inherent in it). This is reflection on the meaning of sacrifice, but it does not carry us very far, for it only explains the piacular efficacy of blood by its mysterious potency of life. Semitic scholars warn us against finding in these words (Lv 17:11) either the popular idea of the substitution of the victim for the sinner, or even the theory that the essential thing in sacrifice is the offering of a life to God. As far as the Hebrew text goes, this may be correct. But the former idea soon became attached to the verse, as we see from the LXX—τὸ γὰρ αἷμα αἵου ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐξάλλωσιν. This view does not seem to be common in later Jewish thought, though it was corroborated by the expiatory value attached to the death of the martyrs (e.g. 4 Mac 17:28). It is in this later world, however, rather than in the primitive world of Leviticus, that the atmosphere of the idea of Ἐβραῖος is to be sought, the idea that because Jesus was what he was, his death has such an atoning significance as
to inaugurate a new and final relation between God and men, the idea that his blood purifies the conscience because it is his blood, the blood of the sinless Christ, who is both the priest and the sacrifice. When the author writes that Christ “in the spirit of the eternal” (9:14) offered himself as an unblemished sacrifice to God, he has in mind the contrast between the annual sacrifice on the day of atonement and the sacrifice of Christ which never needed to be repeated, because it had been offered in the spirit and—as we might say—in the eternal order of things. It was a sacrifice bound up with his death in history, but it belonged essentially to the higher order of absolute reality. The writer breathed the Philonic atmosphere in which the eternal Now over-shadowed the things of space and time (see on 1:6), but he knew this sacrifice had taken place on the cross, and his problem was one which never confronted Philo, the problem which we moderns have to face in the question: How can a single historical fact possess a timeless significance? How can Christianity claim to be final, on the basis of a specific revelation in history? Our author answered this problem in his own way for his own day.

(iv.)

For him religion is specially fellowship with God on the basis of forgiveness. He never uses the ordinary term κοινωνία, however, in this sense. It is access to God on the part of worshippers that is central to his mind; that is, he conceives religion as worship, as the approach of the human soul to the divine Presence, and Christianity is the religion which is religion since it mediates this access and thereby secures the immediate consciousness of God for man. Or, as he would prefer to say, the revelation of God in Jesus has won this right for man as it could not be won before. For, from the first, there has been a People of God seeking, and to a certain extent enjoying, this access. God has ever been revealing himself to them, so far as was possible. But now in Jesus the final revelation has come which supersedes all that went before in Israel. The writer never contemplates any other line of revelation; outside Israel of old he never looks. It is enough for him that the worship of the OT implied a revelation which was meant to elicit faith, especially through the sacrificial cultus, and that the imperfections of that revelation have now been disclosed and superseded by the revelation in Jesus the Son. Faith in this revelation is in one aspect belief (4:26). Indeed he describes faith simply as the conviction of the unseen world, the assurance that God has spoken and that he will make his word good, if men rely upon
it; he who draws near to God must believe that he exists and that he does reward those who seek him (11:6). Faith of this noble kind, in spite of appearances to the contrary, has always characterized the People. Our author rejoices to trace it at work long before Jesus came, and he insists that it is the saving power still, a faith which in some aspects is indistinguishable from hope, since it inspires the soul to act and suffer in the conviction that God is real and sure to reward loyalty in the next world, if not in the present. Such faith characterized Jesus himself (2:18 12). It is belief in God as trustworthy, amid all the shows and changes of life, an inward conviction that, when he has spoken, the one thing for a man to do is to hold to that word and to obey it at all costs. This is the conception of faith in the early and the later sections of the writing (3:7. 10-12). The difference that Jesus has made—for the writer seems to realize that there is a difference between the primitive faith and the faith of those who are living after the revelation in Jesus—is this, that the assurance of faith has now become far more real than it was. Though even now believers have to await the full measure of their reward, though faith still is hope to some extent, yet the full realization of the fellowship with God which is the supreme object of faith has been now made through Jesus. In two ways. (i) For faith Jesus is the inspiring example; he is the great Believer who has shown in his own life on earth the possibilities of faith. In order to understand what faith is, we must look to Jesus above all, to see how faith begins and continues and ends. But (ii) Jesus has not only preceded us on the line of faith; he has by his sacrifice made our access to God direct and real, as it never could be before. Hence the writer can say, "let us draw near with a full assurance of faith and a true heart, in absolute assurance of faith" since "we have a great Priest over the house of God." "We have confidence to enter the holy Presence in virtue of the blood of Jesus." He does not make Jesus the object of faith as Paul does, but he argues that only the sacrifice of Jesus opens the way into the presence of God for sinful men.

This is the argument of the central part of the writing (chs. 7-10). Religion is worship, and worship implies sacrifice; there is no access for man to God without sacrifice, and no

1 "It was by no divine magic, no mere 'breath, turn of eye, wave of hand,' that he 'joined issue with death,' but by the power of that genuinely human faith which had inspired others in the past" (MacNeill, p. 26). Bousset's denial of this (Theol. Literaturzeitung, 1915, p. 43 f.: "man wird bei dem Jesus d. Hebräerbriefe so wenig wie bei dem paulinischen noch im strengen Sinne von einem subjectivem Glauben Jesu reden können") is as incomprehensible as his desperate effort to explain He 5:7-10 from the fixed ideas of the mystery-religions.
religion without a priest (see on 7\textsuperscript{11}). The relations between God and his People from the first\textsuperscript{1} have been on the basis of sacrifice, as the bible shows, and the new revelation in Jesus simply changes the old sacrificial order with its priesthood for another. The writer starts from a profound sense of sin, as an interruption of fellowship between God and man. He thoroughly sympathizes with the instinct which underlay the ancient practice of sacrifice, that fellowship with God is not a matter of course, that God is accessible and yet difficult of access, and that human nature cannot find its way unaided into his presence. Thus he quotes the 40th psalm (see p. xli), not to prove that God's will is fellowship, and that to do the will of God is enough for man, apart from any sacrifice, but to illustrate the truth that the will of God does require a sacrifice, not simply the ethical obedience of man, but the self-sacrifice with which Jesus offered himself freely, the perfect victim and the perfect priest. All men now have to do is to avail themselves of his sacrifice in order to enjoy access to God in the fullest sense of the term. "Having a great Highpriest who has passed through the heavens, let us draw near."

The conception of religion as devotion or worship covers a wide range in Προς Εβραίων. It helps to explain, for example (see above, p. xxxviii), why the writer represents Jesus after death not as being raised from the dead, but as passing through the heavens into the inner Presence or sanctuary of God with the sacrifice of his blood (4\textsuperscript{14} 9\textsuperscript{11f}). It accounts for the elaboration of a detail like that of 9\textsuperscript{28}, and, what is much more important, it explains the "sacrificial" delineation of the Christian life. In this ἀληθινὴ σκηνή (82), of God's own making, with its θυσιαστήμονον (13\textsuperscript{10}), Christians worship God (λατρεύων, 9\textsuperscript{14} 12\textsuperscript{28} 13\textsuperscript{10}); their devotion to him is expressed by the faith and loyalty which detach them from this world (13\textsuperscript{15-14}) and enable them to live and move under the inspiration of the upper world; indeed their ethical life of thanksgiving (see on 2\textsuperscript{12}) and beneficence is a sacrifice by which they honour and worship God (13\textsuperscript{15-16}), a sacrifice presented to God by their ἀρχηγος Jesus. The writer never suggests that the worship-regulations of the outworn cultus are to be reproduced in any rites of the church on earth; he never dreamed of this, any more than of the ἱγνούμενον being called "priests." The essence of priesthood, viz, the mediation of approach to God, had been absolutely fulfilled in Jesus, and in one sense all believers were enabled to follow him into the inner σκηνή, where they worshipped their God as the priests of old had done in their σκηνή, and as the People of old had never

\textsuperscript{1} i.e. from the inauguration of the διαθήκη at Sinai, though he notes that even earlier there was sacrifice offered (11\textsuperscript{5}).
been able to do except through the highpriest as their representative and proxy. But, while the worship-idea is drawn out to describe Christians, in \( \text{Προς} \ 'Εβραίον \) its primary element is that of the eternal function of Christ as \( \alphaπχερεύς \) in the heavenly \( \sigmaχηνή \).

(v.)

Symbolism alters as the ages pass. The picture-language in which one age expresses its mental or religious conceptions often ceases to be intelligible or attractive to later generations, because the civic, ritual, or economic conditions of life which had originally suggested it have disappeared or changed their form. This well-known principle applies especially to the language of religion, and it is one reason why some of the arguments in \( \text{Προς} \ 'Εβραίον \) are so difficult for the modern mind to follow. There are other reasons, no doubt. The exegetical methods which the author took over from the Alexandrian school are not ours. Besides, historical criticism has rendered it hard for us moderns to appreciate the naive use of the OT which prevails in some sections of \( \text{Προς} \ 'Εβραίον \). But, above all, the sacrificial analogies are a stumbling-block, for we have nothing to correspond to what an ancient understood by a “priest” and sacrifice. Dryden was not poetic when he translated Vergil’s “sacerdos” in the third Georgic (489) by “holy butcher,” but the phrase had its truth. The business of a priest was often that of a butcher; blood flowed, blood was splashed about. It was in terms of such beliefs and practices that the author of \( \text{Προς} \ 'Εβραίον \) argued, rising above them to the spiritual conception of the self-sacrifice of Jesus, but nevertheless starting from them as axiomatic. The duty of the modern mind is to understand, in the first place, how he came by these notions; and, in the second place, what he intended to convey by the use of such symbolic terms as “blood,” “highpriest,” and “sacrifice.”

The striking idea of Christ as the eternal \( \alphaπχερεύς \), by whom the access of man to God is finally and fully assured, may have been a flash of inspiration, one of the notes of originality and insight which mark the writer’s treatment and restatement of the faith. But originality is not depreciated by the effort to trace anticipations. What led him to this view? After all, the most brilliant flashes depend upon an atmosphere already prepared for them. They are struck out of something. In this case, it is not enough to say that the conception was merely the transference to Jesus of the Philonic predicates of the Logos, or the result of a bible-reading in the pentateuch. In the pentateuch the writer found proofs of what he brought to it, and the arguments in chs. 7–10 really buttress ideas built on other foundations.
Once the conception of a heavenly sanctuary became current, the notion of a heavenly ἅρπυστρέφως would not be far-fetched for a writer like this. Philo had, indeed, not only spoken of the Logos as a highpriest, in a metaphorical sense, i.e. as mediating metaphysically and psychologically the relations between the worlds of thought and sense, but in an allegorical fashion spoken of "two temples belonging to God, one being the world in which the highpriest is his own Son, the Logos, the other being the rational soul" (de Somniis, i. 37). Our writer is much less abstract. Like the author of the Apocalypse (see on 4:10), he thinks of heaven in royal and ritual imagery as well as in civic, but it is the ritual symbolism which is more prominent. During the second century B.C. the ideas of a heavenly sanctuary and a heavenly altar became current in apocalyptic piety, partly owing to the idealistic and yet realistic conception (see on 8:6) that in heaven the true originals were preserved, the material altar and sanctuary being, like the earthly Jerusalem, inferior representations of transcendent realities. From this it was a natural development to work out the idea of a heavenly highpriest. By "natural" I do not mean to undervalue the poetical and religious originality of the writer of Ἱπός Ἐβραίους. The author of the Apocalypse of John, for example, fails to reach this idea, and even in the enigmatic passage in the vision and confession of Levi (Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Test. Levi 5), where the seer tells us, "I saw the holy temple, and upon a throne of glory the Most High. And he said to me, Levi, I have given thee the blessings of priesthood until I come and sojourn in the midst of Israel" —even here, though the levitical priesthood, as in our epistle, is only a temporary substitute for the presence of God, the heavenly sanctuary has no highpriest. Nevertheless it was the idea of the heavenly sanctuary which held one germ of the idea of the heavenly highpriest for the author of Ἱπός Ἐβραίους, as he desired to express the fundamental significance of Jesus for his faith.

Another factor was the speculations of Philo about the Logos as highpriest (de Migrat. Abrah. 102, de Fug. 108 ff.), though the priestly mediation there is mainly between man and the upper world of ideas. The Logos or Reason is not only the means of creating the material cosmos after the pattern of the first and real world, but inherent in it, enabling human creatures to apprehend the invisible. This is Philo's primary use of the metaphor. It is philosophical rather than religious. Yet the increased prestige of the highpriest in the later Judaism prompted him to apply to the Logos functions which resemble intercession as well as interpretation. Vague as they are, they were familiar to the author of our epistle, and it is probable that they helped
to fashion his expression of the eternal significance of Jesus as the mediator between man and God. The Logos as highpriest, says Philo (de Somn. ii. 28), for example, is not only ἀμώμος, ἀλόκληρος, but μεθόριος τις θεοῦ <καὶ ἀνθρώπου> φύσις, τοῦ μὲν ἐλάττων, ἀνθρώπου δὲ κρείττων. Then he quotes the LXX of Lv 16:17. The original says that no man is to be with the highpriest when he enters the inner shrine, but the Greek version runs, ὅταν εἰσῆν ἐς τὰ ἁγιά τῶν ἁγίων ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, ἀνθρώπος οὐκ ἔσται, and Philo dwells on the literal, wrong sense of the last three words, as if they meant “the highpriest is not to be a man.” “What will he be, if he is not a man? God? I would not say that (οὐκ ἂν ἐίπομεν). . . . Nor yet is he man, but he touches both extremes (ἐκατέρων τῶν ἁκρῶν, ὃς ἂν βασιλεὺς καὶ κεφαλῆς, ἐφαπτόμενος).” Later (ibid. 34) he remarks, “if at that time he is not a man, it is clear he is not God either, but a minister (λειτουργὸς θεοῦ) of God, belonging to creation in his mortal nature and to the uncreated world in his immortal nature.” Similarly he pleads, in the de sacerdot. 12, that the function of the highpriest was to mediate between God and man, ίνα διὰ μέσου τινὸς ἀνθρώπου μὲν ἑλάκτων τὸ θεῖον, θεὸς δὲ τὰς χάριτας ἀνθρώπους ὑποδιάκονος τινὶ χρώμενος ὥργη καὶ χορηγὴ. Here we may feel vibrating a need of intercession, even although the idea is still somewhat theosophic.

(c) A third basis for the conception of Christ's priesthood lay in the combination of messianic and sacerdotal functions which is reflected in the 110th psalm (see above, p. xxxiii), which in the Testaments of the Patriarchs (Reuben 68) is actually applied to Hyrcanus the Maccabean priest-king, while in the Test. Levi (18) functions which are messianic in all but name are ascribed to a new priest, with more spiritual insight than in the psalm itself. The curious thing, however, is that this Priest discharges no sacerdotal functions. The hymn describes his divine attestation and consecration—“and in his priesthood shall sin come to an end, and he shall open the gates of paradise and shall remove the threatening sword against Adam.” That is all. Probably the passing phase of expectation, that a messiah would arise from the sacerdotal Maccabees, accounts for such a fusion of messiah and priest. In any case its influence was not wide. Still, the anticipation is not unimportant for the thought of Πρὸς Ἑβραίων, which rests so much upon the mystical significance of that psalm. Paul had seen the fulfilment of Ps 110 in the final triumph of Christ as messiah over his foes (1 Co 15:24. 25 διὰ γὰρ αὐτῶν βασιλεὺς ἄρχων οὗ θῇ πάντας τῶν ἔχρων υπὸ τῶν πόδας αὐτῶν). But meantime Christ was in living touch with his church on earth, and Paul can even speak, in a glowing outburst, of his effective intercession (Ro 8:24 δε καὶ ἅπαξ ἐνεργεῖ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν). This is at least the idea of the highpriesthood of Christ, in almost every-
thing except name, though Paul says as much of the Spirit (Ro 8:27 κατὰ θεόν ἐννυχάνει ὑπὲρ ἄγιων). Later, in the Fourth Gospel, a similar thought reappears; Christ is represented in priestly metaphor as interceding for his People (17:11), and the phrases (17:17-19) about Jesus consecrating himself (as priest and victim) that thereby his disciples may be "consecrated" εἰς τὴν ἁληθείαν (i.e. in the sphere of Reality), indicate a use of ἁγιάζειν which expresses one of the central ideas of Πρὸς Ἐβραίους. But in the latter writing the idea is explicit and elaborate, as it is nowhere else in the NT, and explicit on the basis of a later line in the 110th psalm, which Paul ignored. Our author also knew and used the earlier couplet (10:13), but he draws his cardinal argument from v. 4 ὥστε αἰώνια κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ.

(vi.)

There is a partial anticipation of all this in the Enochic conception of the Son of Man. No doubt, as Volz warns us (Jüdische Eschatologie, p. 90), we must not read too much into such apocalyptic phrases, since the Son of Man is an x quantity of personal value in the age of expected bliss and salvation. Still, the pre-existent messiah there is Son of Man as transcendent and in some sense as human; he must be human, "Man," in order to help men, and he must be transcendent in order to be a deliverer or redeemer. But the author of Πρὸς Ἐβραίους, like Paul, significantly avoids the term Son of Man, even in 28; and although he has these two ideas of human sympathy and of transcendency in close connexion, he derives them from his meditation upon the real Jesus ultimately, not from any apocalyptic speculations. What he meant by the term "Son of God" is not quite plain. Philo had regarded the Logos as pre-existent and as active in the history of the people, and so he regards Christ; but while it seems clear (see on 55) that Christ is priest for him because he was already Son, the further questions, when did he become priest? and how is the Sonship compatible with the earthly life?—these are problems which remain unsolved. The interpretation of the function of Jesus through the phrase in the 2nd psalm (see on 15) hardly clears up the matter any more than in the case of Justin Martyr (Dial. 88). Later on, Hippolytus, or whoever wrote the homily appended (chs. xi.—xii.) to the Επιστ. Diognet., faced the problem more boldly and beautifully by arguing that "the Word was from the very beginning, appeared new, was proved to be old, and is ever young as he is born in the hearts of the saints. He is the eternal One, who to-day was accounted Son" (δὴ σήμερον νῦν λογισθεὶς, 115). Here "to-day" refers to the Christian era;
evidently the problem left by the author of Πρὸς Ἕβραίους, with his mystical, timeless use of the 2nd psalm, was now being felt as a theological difficulty. But this is no clue to how he himself took the reference. There is a large section in his thought upon Christ as the eternal, transcendental Son which remains obscure to us, and which perhaps was indefinite to himself. He took over the idea of the divine Sonship from the primitive church, seized upon it to interpret the sufferings and sacrificial function of Jesus as well as his eternal value, and linked it to the notion of the highpriesthood; but he does not succeed in harmonizing its implications about the incarnate life with his special γνώσεως of the eternal Son within the higher sphere of divine realities.

At the same time there seems no hiatus between the metaphysical and the historical in the writer’s conception of Jesus, no unreconciled dualism between the speculative reconstruction and the historical tradition. In Πρὸς Ἕβραίους we have the ordinary primitive starting-point, how could a divine, reigning Christ ever have become man? The writer never hints that his readers would question this, for they were not tempted by any Jewish ideas. He uses the category of the Son quite frankly, in order to express the absolute value of the revelation in Jesus; it is his sheer sense of the reality of the incarnate life which prompts him to employ the transcendental ideas. He does not start from a modern humanist view of Jesus, but from a conviction of his eternal divine character and function as Son and as ἀρχηγός, and his argument is that this position was only possible upon the human experience, that Jesus became man because he was Son (τοῦτο), and is ἀρχηγός because once he was man.

(a) For our author Jesus is the Son, before ever he became man, but there is no definite suggestion (see on 12:29) that he made a sacrifice in order to become incarnate, no suggestion that he showed his χάρις by entering our human lot (ὅτι οὐκ ἐπτύχατον πλούσιος ὦν, ἕαντόν ἐκένωσεν ἐν ὑμοίματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος). Our author feels deeply the suffering of Jesus in the days of his flesh, but it is the final sacrifice at the end of his life which is emphasized. That he suffered as the eternal Son is understood: also, that it was voluntary (τοῦτο), also that it was his human experience which qualified him to offer the perfect sacrifice, by God’s χάρις. But, apart from the (τοῦτο) allusion to the temporary inferiority to angels, the writer does not touch the moving idea of the kenotic theories of the incarnation, viz. the “sense of sacrifice on the part of a pre-existent One.”

(b) Since he knew nothing of the sombre view of the σάρξ

---

1 As H. J. Holtzmann (Neutest. Theologie 2, ii. 337) and Pfleiderer (p. 287) imagine.
which pervaded the Pauline psychology, he found no difficulty in understanding how the sinless Jesus could share human flesh and blood. The sinlessness is assumed, not argued (cp. on 4:15 57). Yet the writer does not simply transfer it as a dogmatic predicate of messiahship to Jesus. One of the characteristics which set Πρός Ἔβραίοις apart in the early Christian literature is the idea that Jesus did not possess sinlessness simply as a prerogative of his divine Sonship or as a requisite for the validity of his priestly function. It was not a mere endowment. The idea rather is that he had to realize and maintain it by a prolonged moral conflict ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. This view goes back to direct historical tradition, with its deeply marked impression of the personality of Jesus, and no sort of justice is done to Πρός Ἔβραίοις if its conceptions of the human Son as sinless are referred to a theoretical interest or dogmatic prepossession. Such an interpretation is bound up with the view that Πρός Ἔβραίοις represents the more or less arbitrary fusion of an historical tradition about Jesus with a pre-Christian christology. But it is not enough to speak vaguely of materials for such a christology floating in pre-Christian Judaism and crystallizing round the person of Jesus, once Jesus was identified with the messiah. The crystallization was not fortuitous. What Πρός Ἔβραίοις contains is a christology which implies features and characteristics in Jesus too definite to be explained away as picturesque deductions from messianic postulates or Philonic speculations. These undoubtedly enter into the statement of the christology, but the motives and interests of that christology lie everywhere. The writer's starting-point is not to be sought in some semi-metaphysical idea like that of the eternal Son as a supernatural being who dipped into humanity for a brief interval in order to rise once more and resume his celestial glory; the mere fact that the eschatology is retained, though it does not always accord with the writer's characteristic view of Christ, shows that he was working from a primitive historical tradition about Jesus (see above, pp. xlv f.). To this may be added the fact that he avoids the Hellenistic term σοτηρ, a term which had been associated with the notion of the appearance of a deity hitherto hidden. The allusions to the historical Jesus are not numerous, but they are too detailed and direct to be explained away; he preached σοτηρία, the message of eschatological bliss; he belonged to the tribe of Judah; he was sorely tempted, badly

1 He does not use the technical language of the mystery-religions (cp. on 64), and they cannot be shown to have been present continuously to his mind. If the argument from silence holds here, he probably felt for them the same aversion as the devout Philo felt (de Sacrific. 12), though Philo on occasion would employ their terminology for his own purposes.
treated, and finally crucified outside Jerusalem. These are the main outward traits. But they are bound up with an interpretation of the meaning of Jesus which is not a mere deduction from messianic mythology or OT prophecies, and it is unreal, in view of a passage like 5ff., e.g., to imagine that the writer was doing little more than painting in a human face among the messianic speculations about a divine Son.

(c) Neither is the sinlessness of Jesus connected with the circumstances of his human origin. No explanation at all is offered of how this pre-existent Son entered the world of men. It is assumed that he did not come out of humanity but that he came into it; yet, like Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel (19ff.), our author is not interested in questions about the human birth. Even when he describes the prototype Melchizedek as “without father and mother” (7), he is not suggesting any parallel to the Christ; the phrase is no more than a fanciful deduction from the wording or rather the silence of the legend, just as the original priest-king Gudea says to the goddess in the Sumerian tale, “I have no mother, thou art my mother; I have no father, thou art my father.” It is impossible to place this allusion beside the happy misquotation in 10 “a body thou hast prepared for me,” and to argue, as Pfleiderer (p. 287) does, that the incarnation is conceived as purely supernatural. All we need to do is to recall the Alexandrian belief, voiced in a passage like Wisd 819 (“I was the child of fine parts: to my lot there fell a good soul, or rather being good I entered a body undefiled”); the good soul is what we call the personality, the thinking self, to which God allots a body, and birth, in the ordinary human way, is not incompatible with the pre-existence of the soul or self which, prior to birth, is in the keeping of God. The author of Προς Ἐβραίους could quite well think of the incarnation of Jesus along such lines, even although for him the pre-existent Christ meant much more than the pre-existent human soul.

The meaning of the incarnation is, in one aspect, to yield a perfect example of faith (12ff.) in action; in another and, for the writer, a deeper, to prepare Jesus, by sympathy and suffering, for his sacrificial function on behalf of the People. The rationale of his death is that it is inexplicable except upon the fact of his relationship to men as their representative and priest before God (21ff.). From some passages like 5ff. 7ff., it has been inferred that Jesus had to offer a sacrifice on his own behalf as well as on behalf of men (i.e. his tears and cries in Gethsemane), or that he only overcame his sinful nature when he was raised to heaven. But this is to read into the letter of the argument more than the writer ever intended it to convey. The point of
his daring argument is that the sufferings of Jesus were not incompatible with his sinlessness, and at the same time that they rendered his sacrifice of himself absolutely efficacious. The writer is evidently in line with the primitive synoptic tradition, though he never proves the necessity of the sufferings from OT prophecy, as even his contemporary Peter does, preferring, with a fine intuition in the form of a religious reflection, to employ the idea of moral congruity (2:10).

(vii.)

The symbolism of the highpriesthood and sacrifice of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary is therefore designed to convey the truth that the relations of men with God are based finally upon Jesus Christ. In the unseen world which is conceived in this naive idealistic way, Jesus is central; through him God is known and accessible to man, and through him man enjoys forgiveness and fellowship with God. When Paul once wrote, τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, if he had stopped there he would have been saying no more than Epictetus or Marcus Aurelius might have said and did say. But when he added, οὐ δὲ Ἡρακλέως ἐστιν (ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθώμενος), he defined the upper sphere in a new sense. So with the author of Ἡρακλέως. In the real world of higher things, “everything is dominated by the figure of the great High Priest at the right hand of the Majesty in the Heavens, clothed in our nature, compassionate to our infirmities, able to save to the uttermost, sending timely succour to those who are in peril, pleading our cause. It is this which faith sees, this to which faith clings as the divine reality behind and beyond all that passes, all that tries, daunts, or discourages the soul: it is this in which it finds the ens realissimum, the very truth of things, all that is meant by God.”

Yet while this is the central theme (chs. 7–10), which the writer feels it is essential for his friends to grasp if they are to maintain their position, it is one proof of the primitive character of Ἡρακλέως that it preserves traces of other and more popular ideas of Christianity. Thus (a) there is the primitive idea of the messiah as the heir, who at the resurrection inherits full power as the divine Son or Κληρονόμος. Strictly speaking, this does not harmonize with the conception of the Son as eternal, but it reappears now and then, thrown up from the eschatological tradition which the author retains (see above, pp. xxxiii f.). (b) The isolated reference to the overthrow of the devil is another allusion to ideas which were in the background of the writer’s mind (see on 2:14, 15). (c) The scanty

1 Denney, The Death of Christ, pp. 239, 240.
use made of the favourite conception of Jesus as the divine \textit{Kúρios} (see below, p. lxxiii) is also remarkable. This is not one of the writer's categories; the elements of divine authority and of a relation between the \textit{Kúρios} and the divine Community are expressed otherwise, in the idea of the Highpriest and the People.

Furthermore the category of the Highpriesthood itself was not large enough for the writer's full message. (\textit{a}) It could not be fitted in with his eschatology any more than the idea of the two worlds could be. The latter is dovetailed into his scheme by the idea of faith as practically equivalent to hope (in 10:35f.); the world to come actually enters our experience here and now, but the full realization is reserved for the end, and meantime Christians must wait, holding fast to the revelation of God in the present. The former could not be adjusted to the eschatology, and the result is that when the writer passes to speak in terms of the primitive expectation of the end (10:25-12:29), he allows the idea of the Highpriesthood to fall into the background. In any case the return of Jesus is connected only with the deliverance of his own People (9:28). He does not come to judge; that is a function reserved for God. The end is heralded by a cataclysm which is to shake the whole universe, heaven as well as earth (11:1f., 12:26f.), another conception which, however impressive, by no means harmonizes with the idea of the two spheres. But the writer's intense consciousness of living in the last days proved too strong for his speculative theory of the eternal and the material orders. (\textit{b}) Again, the Highpriesthood was inadequate to the ethical conceptions of the writer. It did involve ethical ideas—the cleansing of the conscience and the prompting of devotion and awe, moral consecration, and inward purity (these being the real "worship"); but when he desires to inspire his readers he instinctively turns to the vivid conception of Jesus as the \textit{dρχηγός}, as the pioneer and supreme example of faith on earth.

The latter aspect brings out the idea of a contemplation of Jesus Christ, a vision of his reality (cp. 3:1, 12:2), which, when correlated with the idea of a participation in the higher world of reality, as embodied in the Highpriest aspect, raises the question, how far is it legitimate to speak of the writer as mystical?

(viii.)

To claim or to deny that he was a mystic is, after all, a question of words. He is devoid of the faith-mysticism which characterizes Paul. Even when he speaks once of believers being \textit{μέτοχοι Χριστοῦ} (3:14), he means no more than their membership
in the household of God over which Christ presides; there is no hint of the personal trust in Christ which distinguishes "faith" in Paul. As important is the consideration that the writer does not take the sacrifices of the levitical cultus as merely symbolizing union with God. Such is the genuinely mystical interpretation. To him, on the other hand, sacrifice is an action which bears upon man’s relation to God, and it is from this point of view that he estimates and criticizes the levitical cultus. But while technically he is not a mystic, even in the sense in which that much-abused term may be applied to any NT writer, he has notes and qualities which might be called "mystical." To call him an "idealist" is the only alternative, and this is misleading, for idealism suggests a philosophical detachment which is not suitable to Πρὸς Ἐβραίους. On the other hand, his profound sense of the eternal realities, his view of religion as inspired by the unseen powers of God, his conception of fellowship with God as based on the eternal presence of Jesus in heaven—these and other elements in his mind mark him as a definitely unworldly spirit, impatient of any sensuous medium, even of a sacrificial meal, that would interpose between the human soul and God. Not that he uses any pantheistic language; he is more careful to avoid this than a writer like the author of First John. His deep moral nature conceives of God as a transcendent Majestic Being, before whom believers must feel awe and reverence, even as they rejoice and are thankful. He has a wholesome sense of God’s authority, and an instinctive aversion to anything like a sentimental, presumptuous piety (see above, pp. xxxv f.). Yet as he speaks of the Rest or the City of God, as he describes the eternal Sanctuary, or the unshaken order of things, or as he delineates the present position of God’s People here in their constant dependence on the unseen relation between Christ and God, he almost tempts us to call him "mystical," if "mysticism" could be restricted to the idea that the human soul may be united to Absolute Reality or God. He is certainly not mystical as Philo is;¹ there is no hint in Πρὸς Ἐβραίους, for example, of an individualistic, occasional rapture, in which the soul soars above sense and thought into the empyrean of the unconditioned. He remains in close touch with moral realities and the historical tradition. But the spirituality of his outlook, with its speculative reach and its steady openness to influences pouring from the unseen realities, hardly deserves to be denied the name of "mystical," simply because it is neither wistful nor emotional.

¹ The soundest account of Philo’s “mysticism” is by Professor H. A. A. Kennedy in Philo’s Contribution to Religion, p. 211 f.
§ 3. STYLE AND DICTION.

(i.)

Πρὸς Ἐβραῖος is distinguished, among the prose works of the primitive church, by its rhythmical cadences. The writer was acquainted with the oratorical rhythms which were popularized by Isokrates, and although he uses them freely, when he uses them at all, his periods show traces of this rhetorical method. According to Aristotle's rules upon the use of paeans in prose rhythm (Rhet. iii. 8. 6-7), the opening ought to be

\[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \]

while \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] should be reserved for the conclusion.

Our author, however, begins with πολύμερος, an introductory rhythm (cp. 1:6 3:12) which seems to be rather a favourite with

\[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \]

him, e.g. 3:1 οθεν ἀδελφ, 7:10 εἰς γὰρ ἐν τῷ, 12:25 βλέπετε μη, 15:20

ο δὲ θεός, though he varies it with an anapaest and an iambus

\[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \]

(e.g. 2:4 5 1:16 διὸ οὖν ἐπαίσχυ, 12:12 etc.), or \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] (as in 5:12 6:7, see below, 13:5 αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφηκ, etc.), or \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] (as in 3:3 5:6 πιστεύσαι γὰρ δὲ, 11:39 etc.), or even occasionally with three trochees

\[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \]

(e.g. 11:8), or \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] (11:11 13:3 etc.), or \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] (e.g. 11:13 4:12), or even two anaepasts (e.g. 1:6 5:11 13:10), or \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] (13:9). He also likes to carry on or even to begin a new sentence or paragraph with the same or a similar rhythm as in the end of the preceding, e.g., \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] in 4:11 and 4:12, or \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] in 7:21 and 7:22, or as in 8:13

\[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \]

(\[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \]) and 9:1

\[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \]

(\[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \]) or \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] as in 10:10 and 11:1, and to repeat a rhythm twice in succession, as, e.g.,

\[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \]

in 2:8 (τῆλακώντος δὲ ... ἡμεῖς τηλικοῦτ' ἑκοντες). The standard closing rhythm \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] does not clearly occur till 11:8 (γεγονόναι), 11:4 (ἐν λαλεῖ), 11:23 (Βασιλεῶς), and 12:24; it is not so frequent as, e.g., \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] (7:28 9:26 10:84 35 11:13 15 28 12:9 etc.). He also likes to close with a single or an echoing rhythm like \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] in 1:13 (σὺν ἐν ὑψηλοῖς), 2:10 (ἀτ ὦν τελειώσαι), 2:18 (πεπονθὲ πειρασθεὶς ... μένοις βοηθῆσαι), or \[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \] in 7:19 9:28 (δοθήσεται ... σωτηρίαν), 11:4 (κεῖν τῷ θεῷ ... αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ), 11:21 etc. A curious variety in almost parallel clauses occurs in 11:1

\[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \]

εἰςτιν δὲ πιστὸς εὐπηκομένων ὑποστάσεις

\[ \text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots} \]

πραγματον εὐεχοῦς αὐ βλεπομένων,
where the cross cadences are plain, as in Isokrates often. But at the end of sentences, as a rule, he prefers $\text{v v v}$ (para-
puwo, me, 21 89), or $\text{v v v}$ (75 lauloümen, 25 78 7 etc.) or $\text{v v v}$ (ovn teletwos, 210 218 314 38 11 11 etc.), sometimes the weighty $\text{v v v}$ (217 82 1089 119 1114 etc.), or $\text{v v v}$ (41 55 12 102 18 27 118) now and then, or one or even two (511) anapaests, often ending on a short syllable.

He is true to the ancient principle of Isokrates, however, that prose should be mingled with rhythms of all sorts, especially iambic and trochaic, and there even happen to be two trimeters in 12114, besides the similar rhythm in 1213 20. Also he secures smoothness often by avoiding the practice of making a word which begins with a vowel follow a word which ends with a vowel (Dei ta fawvneva mfi smupitpev). Parallelisms in sound, sense, and form are not infrequent. These sxmiata of Isokrates can be traced, e.g., in 1 2 8 where, by anviveis, ov ... pantow answers to ov ... upostaseis autou, as di ov ... epiotisexto vefwom ... dnemwes autou, or as in 111, which is, however, a case of parivoseis or parallelism in form. As in Wisdom, the accumulation of short syllables, a characteristic of the later prose, is frequent in Prodots Ebetaivos (e.g. in 21 2 vete parapv ... $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ logos eyeneto betaivos, 69 10 kai eixomeva ... ov yar adikos o seos), 1025 1112 19 128 9 134 etc.). At the same time, Prodots Ebetaivos is not written in parallel rhythm, like Wisdom (cp. Thackeray's study in Journal of Theological Studies, vi. pp. 232 f.); it is a prose work, and, besides, we do not expect the same opportunities for using even prose-rhythms in the theological centre of the writing, though in the opening chapters and towards the close, the writer has freer play. One or two samples may be cited, e.g., in the two parallel clauses of 12: $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ or in 18 where astwos autov answers to amewos autov. In 218 the two clauses begin with $\text{v v v}$ and end with epilambanetai, the verb being obviously repeated to bring out the anapaestic rhythm. The "cretic" ($\text{v v v}$), which is particularly frequent, is seen clearly in a carefully wrought passage like 48 10:

$\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$  
$\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$ $\text{v v v}$

ei yap autous Iseous katepaunven
There is a repeated attempt at balance, e.g. of clauses, like (11.39):

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{καὶ ἀντικεῖον ἰδίων} \\
\text{ἐπετυχόν ἐπαγγέλων,}
\end{array} \]

where both have the same number of syllables and end on the same rhythm; or, in the next verse, where δύναμιν πυρὸς is echoed in ἐφύγον στόμα, while there is a similar harmony of sound in the closing syllables of

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{υροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ} \\
\text{ἀν ἀλλοτριῶν,}
\end{array} \]

and in vv.37 and 38 the balancing is obvious in

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{ἐν φονῷ μαχαίρης} \\
\text{περιηλθῶν ἐν} \\
\text{υπερουμενοὶ θλίβ} \\
\text{ἐν ἐρημίαις}
\end{array} \]

or in the chiming of 38 and 39:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{καὶ σπηλαῖος καὶ τοὺς ὅπας τῆς γῆς} \\
\text{καὶ οὕτω παντες μαρτυρηθέντες δ.}
\end{array} \]
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As for the bearing of this rhythmical structure on the text, it does not affect the main passages in question (e.g. 2\textsuperscript{9} 6\textsuperscript{2}); it rather supports and indeed may explain the omission of τω before υιος in 1\textsuperscript{1}, and of δλω in 2\textsuperscript{2}, as well as the right of μελλόντων to stand in 9\textsuperscript{11} and in 10\textsuperscript{1}; it might favour, however, ἄγγελων γενώ-
μενος instead of γενώμενος των ἄγγελων in 1\textsuperscript{4}, and the insertion of ἦ στιάρα in 11\textsuperscript{11} and of ὅρει in 12\textsuperscript{18}, if it were pressed; while, on the
other hand, as employed by Blass, it buttresses the wrong insertion
of μέχρι τέλους βεβαίων in 3\textsuperscript{6}, and inferior readings like συγκεκρασ-
μένους and ἀκουσθέων in 4\textsuperscript{2}, ἐκδεχομένος (D\textsuperscript{9}) in 9\textsuperscript{28}, εὶ in 12\textsuperscript{7}, εὖ
χολή in 12\textsuperscript{10}, and ἀνέχεσθαι in 13\textsuperscript{22}. But the writer is not shackled
to στίχος, though his mind evidently was familiar with the rhythms
in question.

(ii.)

There are traces of vernacular Greek, but the language and
style are idiomatic on the whole. Thus the perfect is sometimes
employed for the sake of literary variety, to relieve a line of aorists
(e.g. 11\textsuperscript{17}, 28), and indeed is often used aoristically, without any
subtle intention (cp. on 7\textsuperscript{6} etc.); it is pedantic to press signifi-
cance into the tenses, without carefully watching the contemporary
Hellenistic usage. The definite article is sparingly employed.
Μᾶς . . . δὲ, on the other hand, is more common, as we might
expect from the antithetical predilections of the author in his
dialectic. As for the prepositions, the avoidance of σῶν is re-
markable (cp. on 12\textsuperscript{14}), all the more remarkable since our author
is fond of verbs compounded with σῶν. Oratorical imperatives
are used with effect (e.g. 3\textsuperscript{1-12} 7\textsuperscript{4} 10\textsuperscript{22} etc.), also double (15 18, 14
12\textsuperscript{5}-7) and even triple (3\textsuperscript{16-18}) dramatic questions, as well as single
ones (2\textsuperscript{8,4} 4\textsuperscript{11} 9\textsuperscript{13}, 14 10\textsuperscript{20} 11\textsuperscript{22} 12\textsuperscript{9}). The style is persuasive,
nor common, as we might
expect from the antithetical predilections of the author in his
dialectic. As for the prepositions, the avoidance of σῶν is re-
markable (cp. on 12\textsuperscript{14}), all the more remarkable since our author
is fond of verbs compounded with σῶν. Oratorical imperatives
are used with effect (e.g. 3\textsuperscript{1-12} 7\textsuperscript{4} 10\textsuperscript{22} etc.), also double (15 18, 14
12\textsuperscript{5}-7) and even triple (3\textsuperscript{16-18}) dramatic questions, as well as single
ones (2\textsuperscript{8,4} 4\textsuperscript{11} 9\textsuperscript{13}, 14 10\textsuperscript{20} 11\textsuperscript{22} 12\textsuperscript{9}). The style is persuasive,
nor common, as we might
expect from the antithetical predilections of the author in his
dialectic. As for the prepositions, the avoidance of σῶν is re-
markable (cp. on 12\textsuperscript{14}), all the more remarkable since our author
is fond of verbs compounded with σῶν. Oratorical imperatives
are used with effect (e.g. 3\textsuperscript{1-12} 7\textsuperscript{4} 10\textsuperscript{22} etc.), also double (15 18, 14
12\textsuperscript{5}-7) and even triple (3\textsuperscript{16-18}) dramatic questions, as well as single
ones (2\textsuperscript{8,4} 4\textsuperscript{11} 9\textsuperscript{13}, 14 10\textsuperscript{20} 11\textsuperscript{22} 12\textsuperscript{9}). The style is persuasive,
nor common, as we might
expect from the antithetical predilections of the author in his
dialectic. As for the prepositions, the avoidance of σῶν is re-
markable (cp. on 12\textsuperscript{14}), all the more remarkable since our author
is fond of verbs compounded with σῶν. Oratorical imperatives
are used with effect (e.g. 3\textsuperscript{1-12} 7\textsuperscript{4} 10\textsuperscript{22} etc.), also double (15 18, 14
12\textsuperscript{5}-7) and even triple (3\textsuperscript{16-18}) dramatic questions, as well as single
ones (2\textsuperscript{8,4} 4\textsuperscript{11} 9\textsuperscript{13}, 14 10\textsuperscript{20} 11\textsuperscript{22} 12\textsuperscript{9}). The style is persuasive,
nor common, as we might
expect from the antithetical predilections of the author in his
dialectic. As for the prepositions, the avoidance of σῶν is re-
markable (cp. on 12\textsuperscript{14}), all the more remarkable since our author
is fond of verbs compounded with σῶν. Oratorical imperatives
are used with effect (e.g. 3\textsuperscript{1-12} 7\textsuperscript{4} 10\textsuperscript{22} etc.), also double (15 18, 14
12\textsuperscript{5}-7) and even triple (3\textsuperscript{16-18}) dramatic questions, as well as single
ones (2\textsuperscript{8,4} 4\textsuperscript{11} 9\textsuperscript{13}, 14 10\textsuperscript{20} 11\textsuperscript{22} 12\textsuperscript{9}). The style is persuasive,
nor common, as we might
expect from the antithetical predilections of the author in his
dialectic. As for the prepositions, the avoidance of σῶν is re-
markable (cp. on 12\textsuperscript{14}), all the more remarkable since our author
is fond of verbs compounded with σῶν. Oratorical imperatives
are used with effect (e.g. 3\textsuperscript{1-12} 7\textsuperscript{4} 10\textsuperscript{22} etc.), also double (15 18, 14
12\textsuperscript{5}-7) and even triple (3\textsuperscript{16-18}) dramatic questions, as well as single
ones (2\textsuperscript{8,4} 4\textsuperscript{11} 9\textsuperscript{13}, 14 10\textsuperscript{20} 11\textsuperscript{22} 12\textsuperscript{9}). The style is persuasive,
Yet his short sentences are most effective, e.g. 2:18 4:8 10:18, and once at least (3:16-18) there is a touch of the rapid, staccato diatribe style, which lent itself to the needs of popular preaching. He loves a play on words or assonance, e.g. Καπάτα ροπά, δ.τ.τ. αύτός τά δύο τοις πολλάν ἀνεγεικέν ἀμαρτίας (9:28), τοσούτον ἑχοιτε περικείμενον ἦμών νέφος μαρτύρων . . . τρέχομεν τόν προκείμενον ἦμών ἄγωνα (1:2), ἐκλέπησε τῆς παρακλήσεως . . . μὴ δὲ ἐκλίνον (12:5), μένουσα πολὺς ἄλλα τήν μελλονταν (13:11).

Also he occasionally likes to use a term in two senses, e.g. τῷ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ . . . πρὸς ἐν ἦµῖν ὁ λόγος (4:12, 18), and διαβήκη in 9:15.

From first to last he is addicted to the gentle practice of alliteration, e.g. πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλῆσα τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις (1:1), πάνω παράβασις καὶ παρακοή (2:2), ἀφήκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον (28), τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἄρχερα (3:1), κατόι . . . ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (4:8), ἐνθυμήσων καὶ ἐννοοῦν (14:12), ἀπάτω, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενελόγητος (7:9), διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενεὶς καὶ ἀνωφέλει (7:15), εἰς τὸ παντελὲς . . . τοὺς προσερχόμενους . . . πάντως ζῶν (7:25), οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίων κληρονομιάς (9:16), εἰσήλθεν ἄγια Χριστός ἀντιτύπα τῶν ἀληθειῶν, ἄλλο εἰς αὐτόν (9:24), ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (9:26), ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελεῖᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς ἀμαρτίας (9:26), ἀποκεῖται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἄπαξ ἀποθανεῖν (9:27), ἐν αὐτῶς ἀνάμνησις ἀμαρτίων (10:3), ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἀμα ταιρίων καὶ τράγων ἄφαιρες ἀμαρτίας (10:4), θλίψεωι θεατρικόμενοι (10:35), εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης ἐμνημόνευσαν ἀφ' ἧς ἔξεβησαν (11:15), πᾶσα μὲν παιδεία πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρόν (12:1), περισσότερος δὲ παρακαλῶ τούτο ποιήσαι (13:19). On the other hand, he seems deliberately to avoid alliteration once by altering διεθέμενη into ἐπιτίθησα (8:9).

One or two other features of his style are remarkable. There is, for example, the predestination for sonorous compounds like μυστατοδοσία and εὐπερίστατος, and also the love of adjectives in a privative, which Aristotle noted as a mark of the elevated style (Rhet. iii. 6. 7); in Ἐπό δὲ Ἑβραίονα there are no fewer than twenty-four such, while even in the historical romance miscalled 3 Mac. there are no more than twenty. Other items are the fondness for nouns ending in -is (cp. on 2:4), the extensive use of periphrases (cp. on 4:11), and of the infinitive and the preposition (see on 3:12). The use of a word like τε is also noticeable. Apart from eleven occurrences of τε καί, and one doubtful case of τε . . . τε . . . καί (6:9), τε links (a) substantives without any preceding καί or δὲ; (b) principal clauses, as in 12:8; and (c) participial clauses, as in 18:6. Emphasis is generally brought out by throwing a word forward or to the very end of the sentence.
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The writer is also in the habit of interposing several words between the article or pronoun and the substantive; e.g.

1 4 διαφορώτερον παρ’ αὐτοῦς κεκληρονομηκεν ὄνομα.
4 8 οὐκ ἂν περὶ άλλης ἐλάλει μετ’ ταῦτα ἡμέρας.
10 11 τὰς αὐτὰς πολλάκις προσφέρων θυσίας.
10 12 μιᾶν ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίων προσενέγκας θυσίαν.
10 27 πυρὸς ξίλου ἑσθείες μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους.
12 2 τῶν τοιαύτην ὑπομενενηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀντιλογίαν.

Further, his use of the genitive absolute is to be noted, e.g., in—

2 4 συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ κτλ.
4 1 καταλειπομένης . . . αὐτοῦ (seven words between μὴ ποτὲ and δόκῃ τις).
4 8 καί τῶν ἔργων . . . γενηθέντων.
7 12 μετατιθεμένης γὰρ τῆς ἱερατικῆς.
8 4 ὀντων τῶν προσφέρωντων κατὰ νόμον τὰ δώρα.
9 6 τούτῳ δὲ οὕτω κατεσκευασμένων.
9 8 τούτῳ δηλοῦντος τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου . . . ἐτὶ τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐξουσίης στάσιν.
9 15 θανάτου γενομένου . . . παραβάσεων (ten words between ὃποι and τ. ἐλαβὼσιν).
9 19 λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἑντολῆς . . . Μωσεόπος.
10 26 ἐκοινώσως γὰρ ἀμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν.
11 4 μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοὺς δάφοις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Finally, there is an obvious endeavour to avoid harsh hiatus, sometimes by the choice of a term (e.g. διότι for δήτι, as in Polybius and Theophrastus, or ἄχρις for ἄχρι, or ὃς for ὅτι), and a distinct fondness for compound verbs; Moulton (ii. 11), reckoning by the pages of WH, finds that while Mark has 5.7 compound verbs per page, Acts 6.25, Hebrews has 8.0, and Paul only 3.8.

His vocabulary is drawn from a wide range of reading. Whether he was a Jew by birth or not, he goes far beyond the LXX. His Greek recalls that of authors like Musonius Rufus and the philosophical Greek writers, and he affects more or less technical philosophical terms like αἰσθητήριον, δυσμοιργός, θέλησις, μετριοπάθειν, τελείων, τέλος, τιμωρία, and ὑπόδειγμα. He was acquainted with the books of the Maccabees, Wisdom, Sirach, and perhaps even Philo. This last affinity is strongly marked. The more he differs from Philo in his speculative interpretation of religion, the more I feel, after a prolonged study of Philo, that our author had probably read some of his works; it is not easy
to avoid the conclusion that his acquaintance with the Hellenistic Judaism of Alexandria included an acquaintance with Philo’s writings. However this may be, the terminology of the Wisdom literature was as familiar to this early Christian διδάσκαλος as to the author of James.¹

As for the LXX, the text he used—and he uses it with some freedom in quotations—must have resembled that of A (cp. Buchel in Studien und Kritiken, 1906, pp. 508–591), upon the whole. It is to his acquaintance with the LXX that occasional “Semitisms” in his style may be referred, e.g. the ἐπ' ἐσχάτον of 11, the καρδία ἀπωτείς of 312, the ἐν τῷ λέγοντι of 315, the θρόνος τῆς χάριτος of 418, and the phrases in 57, 95 and 1215. But this is a minor point. We note rather that (a) he sometimes uses LXX terms (e.g. δεινομεῖς) in a special Hellenistic sense, or in a sense of his own. (b) Again, it is the use of the contents of the LXX which is really significant. The nearest approach to Πρὸς Ἐβραίοις, in its treatment of the OT, is the speech of Stephen, the Hellenistic Jewish Christian, in Ac 71–53, where we have a similar use of the typological method and a similar freedom in handling the OT story (cp. EB1. 4791, e.g. Ac 720 = He 1127), which proves how men like these writers, for all their reverence for the LXX, sat wonderfully free to the letter of the scripture and employed, without hesitation, later Jewish traditions in order to interpret it for their own purposes. But Stephen’s reading of the OT is not that of Πρὸς Ἐβραίοις. The latter never dwells on the crime of the Jews in putting Jesus to death (123 is merely a general, passing allusion), whereas Stephen makes that crime part and parcel of the age-long obstinacy and externalism which had characterized Israel. In Πρὸς Ἐβραίοις, again, the κληρονομία of Palestine is spiritualized (37f.), whereas Stephen merely argues that its local possession by Israel was not final. Stephen, again, argues that believers in Jesus are the true heirs of the OT spiritual revelation, not the Jews; while in Πρὸς Ἐβραίοις the continuity of the People is assumed, and Christians are regarded as ἵππος ἡμάτο the People of God, without any allusion to the Jews having forfeited their privileges. Here the author of Πρὸς Ἐβραίοις differs even from the parable of Jesus (cp. on 11); he conveys no censure of the historical Jews who had been responsible for the crucifixion. The occasional resemblances between Stephen’s speech and Πρὸς Ἐβραίοις are not so significant as the difference of tone and temper between them, e.g. in their conceptions of Moses and of the angels (cp. on He 22). For another thing, (c) the conception of God derives largely

¹ On the philosophical background of ideas as well as of words, see A. R. Edgar in Hermathena, xi. pp. 263–287; and H. T. Andrews in Expositor, xiv. pp. 348f.
from the element of awe and majesty in the OT (see on 1 3 418 10 486. 31 12 29). This has been already noted (see pp. xxxv f.). But linguistically there are characteristic elements in the various allusions to God. Apart altogether from a stately term like Μεγαλοποιή (18 81) or Δόξα (9 8), we get a singular number of indirect, descriptive phrases like δι' ἐν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα (2 10), τῷ ποιήσαιντι αἰτίον (3 2), πρὸς ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος (4 18), τῶν δυνάμεων σῶζειν αἰτίον ἐκ θανάτου (5 7), ὁ ἐπαγγελμένος (10 28 11 11), τῶν ἀδρατῶν (11 27), τῶν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν χρηματίζοντα (12 28). After 1, indeed, there is a slight tendency to avoid the use of ὁ θεός and to prefer such periphrases of a solemn and even liturgical tone. It is noticeable, e.g., that while ὁ θεός occurs about seventy-eight times in 2 Co (which is about the same length as Ἰησοῦς, 33. 104. 2127) and in the doxology with Ἰησοῦς (13 26). It is not a term to which the author attaches special significance (cp. on 7 24). Ἰησοῦς, as in (i) 5 (τὸν δὲ βραχίν τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἅλαστριον βλέψεων Ἰησοῦν), (ii) 3 (κατανόησά την ἄποστολον καὶ ἀρχιερεά τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν), (iii) 4 1 (ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερεία μεγάν διεληλυθότα τοὺς ὀφείλον, Ἰησοῦν), (iv) 6 20 (ὅπως πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς), (v) 7 22 (κατὰ τοσοῦτον καὶ κράτος ἀρχικής γέγονεν ἐγγύωσ Ἰησοῦς), (vi) 10 10 (ἐν τῷ αἰματὶ Ἰησοῦν), (vii) 12 2 (τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγόν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν), (viii) 12 24 (καὶ διαθήκης νέας μεσήτη Ἰησοῦ), (ix) 13 12 (διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς), (x) 13 20 (τὸν τειμένα τῶν προβατῶν τῶν μεγάν ἐν αἰματὶ διαθήκης αἰωνίου, τῶν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν), is generally the climax of an impressive phrase or phrases. The unique use of this name in such connexions soon led to liturgical or theological expansions, as, e.g., 3 1 (+ Χριστόν, C K L Ψ 104. 326. 1175 syr arm Orig. Chrys.), 6 20 (+ Χριστός, D), 10 10 (+ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1827 vg), 13 12 (+ ὅ, 5 [as Col 3 17]). 330 [as Col 3 17]. 440 [as Ro 8 11]. 623. 635. 1867. 204: + ὁ κύριος, 1836: Χριστός, 487); 13 20 (+ Χριστόν, D Ψ 5. 104. 177. 241. 323. 337. 436. 547. 623: 635. 1831. 1837. 1891 lat' toto syr' toto Chrys.). Χριστός (3 6 81, 24), or ὁ Χριστός (3 4 5 6 9 14, 28. 11 26), has also been altered; e.g., 3 14 (κύριος, 256. 2127: θεός, 635: om. τοῦ, 467), 5 (om. ὁ, 462), 6 (ὁ θεός, 38. 2005: om. 429), 9 24 (+ ὁ C D Ψ 104. 256. 263. 326. 467. 1739. 2127 arm: Ἰησοῦς, 823 vg Orig.), but less seriously. Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς only occurs thrice (10 10 13 8, 21).
So far as vocabulary and style go, there are certain affinities between Ἱππός Ἐβραῖος and (a) the Lucan writings, (b) 1 Peter, and, to a less degree, (c) the Pastoral Epistles; but an examination of the data indicates that the affinities are not sufficient to do more than indicate a common atmosphere of thought and expression at some points. I do not now feel it safe to go beyond this cautious verdict. The author of Ἱππός Ἐβραῖος has idiosyncrasies which are much more significant than any such affinities. His literary relations with the other NT writers, if he had any, remain obscure, with two exceptions. Whether he had read Paul's epistles or not, depends in part on the question whether the quotation in 10:36 was derived outright from Ro 12:19 or from some florilegium of messianic texts; but, apart from this, there are numerous cases of what seem to be reminiscences of Paul. As for 1 Peter, our author has some connexion, which remains unsolved, with what probably was an earlier document.

To sum up. He has a sense of literary nicety, which enters into his earnest religious argument without rendering it artificial or over-elaborate. He has an art of words, which is more than an unconscious sense of rhythm. He has the style of a trained speaker; it is style, yet style at the command of a devout genius. "Of Hellenistic writers he is the freest from the monotony that is the chief fault of Hellenistic compared with literary Greek; his words do not follow each other in a mechanically necessary order, but are arranged so as to emphasize their relative importance, and to make the sentences effective as well as intelligible. One may say that he deals with the biblical language (understanding by this the Hellenistic dialect founded on the LXX, not merely his actual quotations from it) . . . as a preacher, whose first duty is to be faithful, but his second to be eloquent" (W. H. Simcox, The Writers of the NT, p. 43).

§ 4. Text, Commentaries, etc.

(i.)

The textual criticism of Ἱππός Ἐβραῖος is bound up with the general criticism of the Pauline text (cp. Romans in the present series, pp. lxiii ff.), but it has one or two special features of its own, which are due in part (a) to the fact of its exclusion from the NT Canon in some quarters of the early church, and (b) also to the fact that the Pauline F (Greek text) and G are wholly, while B C H M N W p18 and 048 are partially, missing. It is accidental that the Philoxenian Syriac version has not survived, but the former phenomenon (a) accounts for the absence of Ἱππός Ἐβραῖος not simply from the Gothic version, but also from the old Latin African bible-text for which Tertullian and Cyprian, the pseudo-Augustinian Speculum and "Ambrosiaster," furnish such valuable evidence in the case of
the Pauline epistles. The (b) defectiveness of B, etc., on the other hand, is to some extent made up by the discovery of the two early papyrus-fragments.

The following is a list of the MSS and the main cursives, the notations of Gregory and von Soden being added in brackets, for the sake of convenience in reference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codicum Index.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n saec. iv. (v.)</td>
<td>[01 : δ 2].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ,, v.</td>
<td>[02 : δ 4].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ,, iv.</td>
<td>[03 : δ 1] cont. 11-918: for remainder cp. cursive 203.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C ,, v.</td>
<td>[04 : δ 3] cont. 24-728 915-1C24 1216-1326.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ,, (vi.)</td>
<td>[06 : α 1026] cont. 11-1320. Codex Claromontanus is a Graeco-Latin MS, whose Greek text is poorly1 reproduced in the later (saec. ix.-x.) E = codex Sangermanensis. The Greek text of the latter (11-128) is therefore of no independent value (cp. Hort in WH, §§ 335-337); for its Latin text, as well as for that of_Format Augiensis (saec. ix.), whose Greek text of Ἠρώδους has not been preserved, see below, p. lxix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K ,, ix.</td>
<td>[018 : P].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18 ,, iv.</td>
<td>[a 1034] cont. 214-58 108-1118 1128-1217: Oxyrhynchus Papyri, iv. (1904) 36-48. The tendency, in 214-58, to agree with B &quot;in the omission of unessential words and phrases . . . gives the papyrus peculiar value in the later chapters, where B is deficient&quot;; thus p18 partially makes up for the loss of B after 914. Otherwise the text of the papyrus is closest to that of D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 An instance may be found in 1038, where a corrector of D obelized the first and last letters of ἢενδιόμενοι and wrote over it λεπτίδομενον. In E we get the absurd νεκτομενοθετατοζομενον (cp. Gregory's Textkritik des NT, 1. 109).
The Epistle to the Hebrews

Three specimens of how the MSS group themselves may be printed. (a) shows the relation between M and the papyrus p:\textsuperscript{13}:

M agrees with p:\textsuperscript{13} in eight places:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l|l}
31 & 'Iησου\\
38 & δύναι \\
39 & ὑμῶν ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ \\
310 & τοίχη \\
313 & τις εἰς ὑμῶν \\
42 & συνεκ(
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

It opposes p:\textsuperscript{13} (+ B) in:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l|l}
32 & ἄν\\
36 & δις\\
39 & μέχρι τέλους βεβαιαν\\
39 & με\\
40 & αὐξ.
40 & τῆν before κατάπαυσιν
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

M has some remarkable affinities with the text of Origen (e.g. 18 19 21).

(b) exhibits the relations of ι and D*, showing how A and B agree with them on the whole, and how p:\textsuperscript{13} again falls into this group:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l|l|l}
κ and D* agree in & & \\
18 & position of ἔποιήσεν & A B M \\
18 & + καὶ before ἡ πάλαι & A B M p:\textsuperscript{13} & \\
21 & παραρώμεν & A B & \\
21 & + καὶ κατάπαυσις ... οὐ & A & \\
215 & διολλας & \\
31 & om. Χριστὸν & A B M p:\textsuperscript{13} & \\
34 & πάντα & A B M p:\textsuperscript{13} & \\
310 & τοίχη & A B M p:\textsuperscript{13} & \\
319 & δι' (so 79) & A B M p:\textsuperscript{13} & \\
41 & καταλιπμένης (alone), except for p:\textsuperscript{13} & A B & \\
41 & προσέληναι & A (B) & p:\textsuperscript{13} & \\
418 & συνεκάθησαι & A B* & \\
418 & ἔλεος & A & \\
51 & δι' αὐθὴν & A B & \\
55 & μερὶ ἀμαρτίων & A & \\
610 & om. τοῦ κόσμου & A B & \\
616 & om. μὲν & A B & \\
71 & Δεῦ & A B & \\
73 & om. τὸν before Ἀβραάμ & B & \\
710 & ὁ , Μελχισεdek & & \\
711 & αὐθῆ & A B & \\
717 & εἰρήκη & A B & \\
717 & ματροπέται & A B & \\
82 & om. καὶ before ὦκ ἄνθρωπος & B & \\
84 & οὖν & A B & \\
84 & om. τῶν ἱερῶν & A B & \\
811 & om. αὐτῶν after μικρῷ & A B & \\
93 & χερουσίων (alone of un- & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
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(c) exhibits characteristic readings of H, with some of its main allies:

| 13 | καθαρισμὸν | A B | D | H* | P | vg | arm |
| 26 | δουλίας | A | D* | H | P |
| 28 | τε ἐξ ὑμῶν | A | C | H | M | P | vg | pesh | arm | boh |
| 34 | τοῦ Ἑρατοῦ γεγ. | A | B | C | D | W | H | M | P | vg |
| 17 | τίνω δὲ | B | C | D | H | P | K | L | sah |
| 12 | ἐνεργής | A | C | D | H | P | K | L | vg |
| 15 | ἄντιθέται | A | B | C | D* | H |
| 10 | θυσίας (—from) | A | C | D | H | K | L | vg |
| 10 | dia | D* | H | L |
| 10 | om. | H* | (vg) | pesh |
| 10 | καθαρισμένους | D | H | P | K |
| 16 | ἕθεκακερας | A | C | D* | W | H | P |
| 15 | τοις δεκακοις | p | A | D* | H | vg | pesh | boh |
| 14 | λαοῦσ | A | | H | vg | pesh | boh |
| 14 | ὑπάρχων | p | A | D* | H* | vg | pesh | boh |
| 14 | μεγάλην μαθ. | A | D | W | H | P |
| 14 | χρονε | A | D* | W | H | P | K | L |
| 14 | μου ἐκ πιστεως | A | H* | vg | arm |
| 12 | πάνα δέ | p | A | D* | H | K | L | vg | pesh | boh |
| 12 | ποιηθα | A | D | H | K | L |
| 12 | αὐτῆς | (p) | A | H | P |
| 12 | αὐτοῦ | A | D* | H | P | K | L |
| 13 | om. τῶν αἵων | C | D | H | arm |
| 13 | ἡμῶν | A | C | D* | W | H | M | vg | pesh | arm | boh | sah |
| 13 | ἀκόη | A | C | D | H | P | M | K | vg | pesh | (arm) | boh |

Cursives.

| 1 saec. | x. | [δ 254] | 189 saec. | xiii. | [θ 80] |
| 2 | xii. | [a 253] | 203 | xii. | [a 203] |
| 3 | xiv. | [δ 453] | 206 | xii. | [a 356] |
| 6 | xiii. | [δ 356] | 209 | xiv. | [δ 457] |
| 10 | xiv. | cont. 1st-93 | 216 | xiv. | [a 469] |
| 31 | xi. | [a 103] | 217 | xi. | [a 106]) cont. 1st-6th |
| 33 | ix.-x. | [δ 48] | Hort's 17 | 218 | xiii. | [δ 300] |
| 35 | xiii. | [δ 309] | 222 | x. | [a 69] |
| 38 | xiii. | [δ 355] | 226 | xi. | [δ 156] |
| 47 | xi. | [θ 103] | 227 | xii. | [a 258] |
| 69 | xv. | [δ 505] | 241 | xi. | [δ 507] |
| 88 | xii. | [a 200] | 242 | xii. | [δ 206] |
| 90 | xvi. | [δ 652] | 253 | xi. | [δ 152] |
| 93 | x. | [a 51] | 255 | x. | [a 174] |
| 103 | xi. | [θ 28] | 256 | xii. | [a 216] |
| 104 | xi. | [a 103] | 257 | xiv. | [a 466] |
| 112 | xi. | [E 100] | 263 | xiii.-xv. | [δ 372] |
| 177 | xi. | [a 106] | 291 | xv. | [a 157] cont. 914-1365 |
| 181 | xii. | [a 101] | 296 | xvi. | [δ 603] |
| 188 | xii. | [a 200] | 323 | xi.-xii. | [a 157] |
Of these some like 5 and 33 and 442 and 999 and 1908, are of the first rank; von Soden pronounces 1288 "a very good representative" of his H text. Yet even the best cursive, like the uncial, may stray (see on 4 16). As a specimen of how one good cursive goes, I append this note of some characteristic readings in 424**:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>om. αὐτῷ after διονύσιον</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Orig</td>
<td>d e f v g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>om. ἡμῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A B D*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x, a 152</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>x, a 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x, a 71</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>x, a 367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>x, a 51</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>x, a 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>x, a 364</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>x, a 396</td>
<td>cont. 11-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>x, a 261</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>x, a 486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>x, a 173</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>x, a 367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>x, a 161</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>x, a 472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>x, a 169</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>x, a 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>x, a 359</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>x, a 192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>x, a 502</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>x, a 175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>x, a 171</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>x, a 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>x, a 396</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>x, a 114</td>
<td>cont. 11-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>x, a 173</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>x, a 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>x, a 161</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>x, a 209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>x, a 169</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>x, a 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>x, a 169</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>x, a 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>x, a 173</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>x, a 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>x, a 161</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>x, a 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>x, a 169</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>x, a 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>x, a 152</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>x, a 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>x, a 171</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>x, a 367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>x, a 364</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>x, a 396</td>
<td>cont. 11-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>x, a 261</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>x, a 486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Latin Versions.

A. Old Latin (vt), saec. ii. (?)–iv.

Hebrews is omitted in the pseudo-Augustinian Speculum (= m) and in codex Boernerianus (= g), but included in—

\[d\] (Latin version of D)
\[e\] (,, ,, ,, E)
\[f\] (,, ,, ,, F)
\[r\] (codex Frisingensis: saec. vi., cont. 6\textsuperscript{a}–7\textsuperscript{a} 7\textsuperscript{a}–8\textsuperscript{a} 9\textsuperscript{a}–11\textsuperscript{a})
\[x^2\] (,, Bodleianus: ,, ix., cont. 1\textsuperscript{a}–11\textsuperscript{a})

Of these, \(r\) (corresponding to the text used by Augustine), with the few quotations by Priscillian, represents the African, \(d\) (in the main)\(^1\) and \(x^2\) the European, type of the Old Latin text; but \(f\) is predominantly vulgate, and it is doubtful whether \(x^2\) is really Old Latin. On the other hand, some evidence for the Old Latin text is to be found occasionally in the following MSS of—

B. Vulgate (vg), saec. iv.

\[am\] (Codex Amiatinus: saec. vii.–viii.)
\[fuld\] (,, Fuldensis: ,, vi.)
\[cav\] (,, Cavensis: ,, ix.) \{Spanish\}
\[tol\] (,, Toletanus: ,, viii.)
\[harl\] (,, Harleianus: ,, viii.)
\[c\] (,, Colbertinus: ,, xii.)

Though \(c\) is an Old Latin text for the gospels, Hebrews and the rest of the NT are vulgate; but He 10–11 in \(harl\) (which elsewhere has affinities with \(am\) and \(fuld\)) is Old Latin, according to E. S. Buchanan (The Epistles and Apocalypse from the codex Harleianus [z = Wordsworth’s Z\textsubscript{2}], numbered Harl. 1772 in the British Museum Library, 1913). Both in \(harl\) and in \(e\), 11\textsuperscript{a}–23 has a special capitulation; \(harl\), which adds after “the prophets” in

\(^1\) The text of \(d\) corresponds to that of Lucifer of Cagliari (saec. iv.), who quotes 2\textsuperscript{a}–4\textsuperscript{a} and 4\textsuperscript{a}–18 in his treatise De non conveniendo cum haereticis, xi. (CSEL., vol. xiv.). According to Harnack (Studien zur Vulgata des Hebräerbüch, 1920) it is \(d\), not \(r\), which underlies the vulgate (cp. J. Belser on “die Vulgata u. der Griech. Text im Hebräerbrief,” in Theolog. Quartalschrift, 1906, pp. 337–369).
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11\textsuperscript{32}—“Ananias azarias misahel daniel helias helisaus”—apparently points to \textsuperscript{11b,32} having been at one time added to the original text which ran (\textsuperscript{11a,33}) : “in hac enim testimonium habuerunt seniores qui per fidem uicerunt regna,” etc. Of these MSS, \textit{fuld} represents an Italian text, \textit{cav} and \textit{tol} a Spanish (the former with some admixture of Old Latin); \textit{am} (whose text is akin to \textit{fuld}) is an Italian text, written in Great Britain. At an early date the Latin versions were glossed, however (cp. on 7\textsuperscript{1} \textsuperscript{11\textsuperscript{28}}).

\textbf{EGYPTIAN VERSIONS.}


In \textit{IIpos 'Eβραλόvs} comes very early in the Pauline canon, immediately after Romans and Corinthians, even earlier than in the first (A.D. 400) Syriac canon, whereas in boh it comes between the Pauline church letters and the Pastoral. The latter seems to have been an early (i.e. a fourth century) position in the Eastern or Alexandrian canon, to judge from Athanasius (\textit{Fest. Ep. xxxix.}); it reappears in the uncials \textit{A B1 W}. Not long afterwards, at the Synod of Carthage (can. 39), in A.D. 397, it is put between the Pauline and the Catholic epistles, which seems to have been the African and even the (or, a) Roman order. This reflects at least a doubt about its right to stand under Paul's name, whereas the order in sah and the primitive Syriac canon reflects a deliberate assertion of its Pauline authorship. The Alexandrian position is intermediate.

The data of the Egyptian versions are of special interest, as several of the uncials have Egyptian affinities or an Egyptian origin, and as \textit{IIpos 'Eβραλόvs} was early studied at Alexandria. Thus, to cite only one or two, boh is right, as against sah, e.g. in the rendering of πρὸς in 1\textsuperscript{1}, in omitting δήω (3\textsuperscript{5}), in rendering υποστάσεως as “confidence” in 3\textsuperscript{14}, in rendering ἐν θεάδι (4\textsuperscript{4}) “in David,” in reading παθεῖν in 9\textsuperscript{3}, in rendering ὑπόστασις by “assurance” (so syr arm) in 11\textsuperscript{1}, in taking καλόμενον by itself (11\textsuperscript{9}), in keeping ἑλθάσθησαν before ἐπιλέξασθαν (11\textsuperscript{8}), though ἑπειράσθησαν, =were tempted, is inferior to sah's omission of any such term, in reading ἑπαγγελλαν (11\textsuperscript{180}, where sah agrees with W in reading the plural), etc. On the other hand, and in a large number of cases, sah is superior, e.g. at 2\textsuperscript{17} (“a merciful and faithful high-priest”), at 3\textsuperscript{6} (omitting μέχρι τέλους βεβαλαν), at 4\textsuperscript{2} (συγκεκραμένοι), in rendering κρατόμεν (4\textsuperscript{16}) “let us hold on to,” in maintaining θέσ in 6\textsuperscript{2} (for “Lord” in boh), in omitting τοῦ κόσμου in 6\textsuperscript{16}, in reading λειπεῖ (with W) in 7\textsuperscript{28}, in reading ὄμων in 9\textsuperscript{14}, in rendering the last words of 9\textsuperscript{6}, in rendering ἀμ. . . ἀντιλογίαν in 12\textsuperscript{3} etc. Note also that sah agrees with arm in inserting ἄγαν before ἑπαγγελλας in 4\textsuperscript{3}, ἄπετρον λέγει in 10\textsuperscript{6,17}, and γὰρ in 12\textsuperscript{4}, while boh agrees with arm in adding ἐντεύ in 1\textsuperscript{6} and ἀλώνως at 5\textsuperscript{16}, and both agree with arm in omitting καὶ in 1\textsuperscript{4}. Both translate ἐσερχόμεθα (4\textsuperscript{9}) as a future, read ἀπίστιαν in 4\textsuperscript{8} (with vg and arm), omit κατὰ τὴν τ. M. in 7\textsuperscript{21}, take ἰδίων as an adjective in 9\textsuperscript{1}, read μελλόντων in 9\textsuperscript{1}, take ἤς in 11\textsuperscript{2} to mean the ark, read ἥ στειρα in 11\textsuperscript{3}, render δύκον by “pride” in 12\textsuperscript{1}, take ὑπομένετε as imperative in 12\textsuperscript{1}, and refer αὐτὴν to τόπον μεταφοράς in 12\textsuperscript{2}. Sah has

\begin{footnotesize}
1 Yet in the archetype of the capitulation system in B \textit{IIpos 'Eβραλόvs} must have stood between Galatians and Ephesians, which “is the order given in the Sahidic version of the ‘Festal letter’ of Athanasius” (Kirsopp Lake, \textit{The Text of the NT}, p. 53).
\end{footnotesize}
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some curious renderings, e.g. "hewed out" for ἐνκαυλίσαν (10\textsuperscript{20}), "the place of the blood" for ἀμαρός in 12\textsuperscript{4}, and actually "hanging for them another time" (ἀναστραμμένας ἐκεῖνοι, 6\textsuperscript{8}); in general it is rather more vivid and less literal, though boh reads "through the sea of Shari" [slaughter] in 11\textsuperscript{40} (sah is defective here), which is singular enough. On the other hand, sah is more idiomatic. Thus it is in sah, not in boh, that ὅμηροι ἔρθοντο (6\textsuperscript{16}) is rendered by "become daunted." The differences in a passage like 12\textsuperscript{22}-24 are specially instructive. Sah takes παραστέριοι with what follows, boh with ἀγγέλου ("myriads of angels keeping festival"); on the other hand, sah is right as against boh's reading of πνευματι (v.22), while both render "God the judge of all." In v.98 both render ἐπιγέγελται literally by "he promised," but boh translates παραλαμβάνοντες in v.29 as a future and χάριν as "grace," whereas sah renders correctly in both cases. In ch. 13, sah seems to read πεθέρεσθε in v.9 ("be not tossed about"), inserts ἑργάζεσθαι (as against boh), and reads ἕμπνευσεν in v.21; in v.25 it reads ἀνέκαθεσθε; in v.26, while boh renders ἀποδελμαφένεν by "released," sah renders "our brother Timotheos whom I sent" (which confuses the sense of the passage altogether), and, unlike boh, omits the final ἐμπνευσα. It is significant that sah often tallies with ρ as against d, e.g. in 6\textsuperscript{40} (ἰσχυρός), 7\textsuperscript{21} (ἄρχοντες), though with d now and then against ρ, as in 11\textsuperscript{8} (δὲ). It agrees with d and eth in reading πνευματι in 1\textsuperscript{7}, ὡς ἐκδίκησιν in 1\textsuperscript{18} (as well as ἐλεήμονες), and καὶ τῶν τράγων in 9\textsuperscript{18}, but differs from d almost as often, and from eth in reading ταραγη in 3\textsuperscript{10}, in omitting κατὰ τ. τ. Μ. in 7\textsuperscript{21}, etc. Unexpectedly a collation of sah and of eth yields no material for a clear decision upon the relation of the texts they imply.

SYRIAC VERSIONS.

For the Old Syriac, i.e. for the Syriac text of Hebrews prior to the vulgate revision (Peshitta) of the fifth century, we possess even less material than in the case of the Old Latin version. Hebrews belonged to the old Syrian canon, but the primitive text can only be recovered approximately from (i) the Armenian version, which rests in part upon an Old Syriac basis—"readings of the Armenian vulgate which differ from the ordinary Greek text, especially if they are supported by the Peshitta, may be considered with some confidence to have been derived from the lost Old Syriac" (F. C. Burkitt, EBi. 5004); from (ii) the homilies of Aphraates (saec. iv), and from (iii) the Armenian translation of Ephraem Syrus (saec. iv.), Commentarii in Ep. Pauli nunc primum ex armenio in latinum sermonem a patribus Mekitharistis translati (Venice, 1893, pp. 200-242).

Hebrews is not extant in the Philoxenian version of A.D. 508, but the Harklean revision of that text (A.D. 616-617) is now accessible in complete form, thanks to R. L. Bensly's edition (The Harklean Version of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 11\textsuperscript{38}-13\textsuperscript{20}, now edited for the first time with Introduction and Notes, Cambridge, 1889). The Peshitta version is now conveniently accessible in the British and Foreign Bible Society's edition of The New Testament in Syriac (1920).

1 It rarely goes its own way, but the omission of any adjective at all with πνευματος in 9\textsuperscript{14} is most remarkable; so is the reading of ὁμός for ἡμῶς in 13\textsuperscript{5} (where M Orig have one of their characteristic agreements in omitting any pronoun).

2 Mr. F. C. Conybeare kindly supplied me with a fresh collation.
The early evidence for the use of Πρὸς Ἐβραίους may be chronologically tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSS.</th>
<th>Versions.</th>
<th>Writers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100–200</td>
<td>(Old Syriac)</td>
<td>Clem. Rom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200–300</td>
<td>(Old Latin)</td>
<td>Clem. Alex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300–400</td>
<td>p18 p18</td>
<td>Origen (~248)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300–400</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Eusebius (~340)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300–400</td>
<td>N (?)</td>
<td>Basil (~379)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400–500</td>
<td>W (?)</td>
<td>Cyril of Jerusalem (~386)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400–500</td>
<td>peshitta (370–383)</td>
<td>Cyril of Alex. (~444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400–500</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>Theodoret (~458)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500–600</td>
<td>D d</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600–700</td>
<td>H r</td>
<td>Sahidic (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700–800</td>
<td>AM 048</td>
<td>Vulgate (370–383)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800–900</td>
<td>TM N f</td>
<td>Chrysostom (~407)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900–1000</td>
<td>P e (?)</td>
<td>Theodore of Mopsuestia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S A B C H M Ψ W (with p13) would represent von Soden’s H text (approximating to WH’s Neutral), his I text (corresponding to WH’s Western) being represented by K L P among the uncials. But the difference between these in the Pauline corpus are, he admits, less than in the case of the gospels. Boussset (in Texte und Untersuchungen, xi. 4, pp. 45 f.) has shown that Νο H (which tend to agree with Origen’s text) have affinities with Euthalius; they carry with them a number of cursive (including 33. 69. 88. 104. 424. 436 and 1908), and enable us to reconstruct the archetype of codex Pamphili, i.e. the third century recension of Origen’s text. This group would therefore stand midway between B N A C and the later K L (with majority of cursive). But no exact grouping of the MSS is feasible. The text has suffered early corruption at several places, e.g. 26 42 71 10 44 11 11 120 12 121 and 13 21, though only the first of these passages is of real, religious importance. But, apart from this, the earliest MSS betray serious errors (cp. on 71 11 25), as though the text had not been well preserved. Thus B, for all its services (e.g. in 62), goes wrong repeatedly (e.g. 15 71 12), as does N* (e.g. 12 om. αὐτῷ, 49 69 97 τότε, 10 62 δομανίας), and even p13 in 43 (ἐλευθερίαν), 10 18 (δομανίας), 11 1 (ἀπόστασις), etc. The errors of W are mainly linguistic, but it reads ἐλευθερίαν in 42, πίστεως in 61, etc. A test passage like 214, where “blood and flesh” naturally passed into the conventional “flesh and blood,”
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shows the inferior reading supported not only by $K$ and $L$, as we might expect, but by $f$ and $tol$, the peshitta and eth. Similarly the wrong reading $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\varepsilon\varphi\epsilon\tau\iota\iota$ in 717 brings out not only $K$ and $L$ again but $C$ $D$ syr and a group of cursive, 256. 326. 436. 1175. 1837. 2127. In 928 only arm inserts $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\iota$, after $\alpha\pi\epsilon\kappa\delta\varepsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\nu$, but the similar homiletic gloss of $\delta\iota\alpha\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\nu\omega\sigma\iota\sigma\omega$ before or after $\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\sigma\omega\tau\eta\iota\alpha\nu$ turns up in $A$ $P$ syr$^{\text{hkl}}$, and in 38. 69. 218. 256. 263. 330. 436. 440. 462. 823. 1245. 1288. 1611. 1837. 1898. 2005. In 914 the gloss $\kappa\iota\iota\ \alpha\lambda\iota\theta\iota\iota\iota$ is supported also by $A$ $P$ as well as by $b$ and one or two cursive like 104. To take another instance, the gloss $\kappa\iota\iota\ \alpha\lambda\iota\theta\iota\iota\iota$ (in 1028) has only $D^\star$ among the uncials, but it is an Old Latin reading, though $r$ does not support it, and it was read in the original text of the harklean Syriac. Again, in 1112, what B. Weiss calls the “obvious emendation” $\varepsilon\gamma\nu\nu\nu\iota\theta\varsigma\sigma\sigma\varsigma\sigma\sigma$ is supported by $N$ $L$ $P^{18}$ $\Psi$ and 1739, while in the same verse $\kappa\iota\iota\ \alpha\lambda\iota\theta\iota\iota\iota$ ($\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\sigma$, $D$) carries with it $N$ $A$ $D$ $K$ $L$ $P$ $P^{18}$, and $D$ $\Psi$ omit $\eta\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\tau$ $\chi\iota\lambda\sigma\sigma$. When $M$ resumes at 1220 it is generally in the company of $N$ $A$ $D$ $P$ (as, e.g., 1228. 24. 25 1325. 9. 20), once (1227 om. $\tau\gamma\nu$) with $D^\star$ arm, once with $D^\star$ (om. $\varepsilon\gamma\nu\nu\nu\iota\theta\varsigma\sigma\sigma$), once with $K$ $L$ $P$ ($\kappa\kappa\kappa\chi$, 1329) against $N$ $A$ $D^\star$. Such phenomena render the problem of ascertaining any traditional text of $\Pi\rho\delta\,\varepsilon\beta\varphi\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ unusually difficult. Even the data yielded by Clement of Alexandria$^1$ and the Latin and Egyptian versions do not as yet facilitate a genealogical grouping of the extant MSS or a working hypothesis as to the authorities in which a text free from Western readings may be preserved.

(ii.)

The eighteen homilies by Origen (†253) are lost, though Eusebius (cp. above, pp. xviii–xix) quotes two fragments on the style and authorship. The ‘$\Upsilon\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\omega\varsigma\nu\sigma\nu\varsigma\omega\varsigma$ of Pamphilus (partially extant in the Latin version of Rufinus) implies that he also wrote a commentary on the epistle, but this is lost, and the Syriac commentary of Ephraem Syrus (†373) is only extant in the Latin version of an Armenian version (cp. above, p. lxxi). We are fortunate, however, in possessing the first important exposition of $\Pi\rho\delta\,\varepsilon\beta\varphi\alpha\iota\omega\nu$, viz. the homilies of Chrysostom (†407), extant in the form of notes, posthumously published, which the presbyter Constantine had taken down. Chrysostom’s comments are drawn upon by most of the subsequent expositors. The foremost of these Greek exegetes is Theodore of Mopsuestia (†428), who is the first to show any appreciation of historical

$^1$ The original text in one place at least (cp. on 114) can be restored by the help of $P^{18}$ and Clement,
criticism (*Theodori Mopsuesteni in NT Commentaria quae reperiri potuerunt*, collegit O. F. Fritzsche, 1847, pp. 160-172). The exposition by his contemporary Theodoret of Cyrrhus (†458) is based almost entirely upon Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Theod. Comm. in omnes Pauli epistolae*, ed. E. B. Pusey, 1870, ii. 132-219). Similarly, the work of Oecumenius of Tricca in Thrace (tenth century) contains large excerpts from previous writers, including Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Photius (cp. Migne, *PG.* cxviii-cxix). Theophylact, archbishop of Bulgaria (end of eleventh century), also draws upon his predecessors (cp. Migne, *PG.* cxxiv), like Euthymius Ziganus (beginning of twelfth century), a monk near Constantinople. The latter’s commentary on Hebrews is in the second volume (pp. 341 f.) of his *Commentarii* (ed. N. Calogeras, Athens, 1887). In a happy hour, about the middle of the sixth century, Cassiodorus (Migne’s *PL.* lxx. p. 1120) employed a scholar called Mutianus to translate Chrysostom’s homilies into Latin. This version started the homilies on a fresh career in the Western church, and subsequent Latin expositions, e.g. by Sedulius Scotus, W. Strabo, Alcuin, and Thomas of Aquinum, build on this version and on the vulgate. An excellent account of these commentaries is now published by Riggenbach in Zahn’s *Forschungen zur Gesch. des NTlichen Kanons*, vol. viii. (1907).

Since F. Bleek’s great edition (1828-1840) there has been a continuous stream of commentaries; special mention may be made of those by Delitzsch (Eng. tr. 1867), Lüneemann (1867, 1882), Moses Stuart⁴ (1860), Alford⁵ (1862), Reuss (1860, 1878), Kurtz (1869), Hofmann (1873), A. B. Davidson (1882), F. Rendall (1888), C. J. Vaughan (1890), B. Weiss (in Meyer, 1897), von Soden (1899), Westcott⁶ (1903), Hollmann⁷ (1907), E. J. Goodspeed (1908), A. S. Peake (Century Bible, n.d.), M. Dods (1910), E. C. Wickham (1910), A. Seeberg (1912), Riggenbach (1913, 1922), Windisch (1913), and Nairne (1918).

Other works referred to, in this edition,¹ are as follows:—

Bengel (Bgl.). *J. A. Bengelii Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (1742).

BGU. • Aegyptische Urkunden (Griechisch Urkunden), ed. Wilcken (1895).
BM. • Greek Papyri in the British Museum (1893 f.).
Diat. • E. A. Abbott, Diatessarica.
EBi. • The Encyclopaedia Biblica (1899–1903, ed. J. S. Black and T. K. Cheyne).
Erasmus • Adnotationes (1516), In epist. Pauli apostoli ad Hebraeos paraphrasis (1521).
ERE. • Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (ed. J. Hastings).
Expositor • The Expositor. Small superior numbers indicate the series.
GCP. • Grundsätze und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde, von L. Mitteis und U. Wilcken (1912), I. Band.
Helbing • Grammatik der Septuaginta, Laut- und Wortlehre, von R. Helbing (1907).
IMA. • Inscriptiones Graecae Insul. Maris Aegaei (1895 f.).
Josephus • Flavii Josephi Opera Omnia post Immanuelem Bekkerum, recognovit S. A. Naber.
LXX • The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint Version (ed. H. B. Swete).
Magn. • Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander (ed. Kern, 1900).
Michel • Recueil d’Inscriptions Grecques (ed. C. Michel, 1900).
Mitteis-Wilcken • Grundzüge u. Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde (1912).
OGIS. • Dittenberger’s Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (1903–1905).
OP. • The Oxyrhynchus Papyri (ed. B. P. Grenfell and A. Hunt).
Philo • Philonis Alexandriai Opera Quae Supersunt (recognoverunt L. Cohn et P. Wendland).
Radermacher • Neutestamentliche Grammatik (1911), in Lietzmann’s Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (vol. i.).
Syll. • Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum² (ed. W. Dittenberger).
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Zahn . . Theodor Zahn’s Einleitung in das NT, §§ 45–47.
COMMENTARY.

The final disclosure of God's mind and purpose has been made in his Son, who is far superior to the angels; beware then of taking it casually and carelessly (1:1-24).

The epistle opens with a long sentence (vv.1-4), the subject being first (vv.1-2) God, then (vv.3-4) the Son of God; rhetorically and logically the sentence might have ended with εν (+ τοῦ ἄρμ) υἱὸν, but the author proceeds to elaborate in a series of dependent clauses the pre-eminence of the Son within the order of creation and providence. The main thread on which these clauses about the Son's relation to God and the world are strung is ὅτι ... ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλουσίνης. It is in this (including the purging of men from their sins by His sacrifice) that the final disclosure of God's mind and purpose is made; ὁ θεὸς ἐδάλμησεν ἥμιν ἐν υἱὸν ... ὅτι ... ἐκάθισεν κτλ. But the cosmic significance of the Son is first mentioned (v.2); he is not created but creative, under God. Here as in 2:10 the writer explicitly stresses the vital connexion between redemption and creation; the Son who deals with the sins of men is the Son who is over the universe. This is again the point in the insertion of φέρων τε τὰ πάντα κτλ., before καθαρισμὸν ἀμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος. The object of insisting that the Son is also the exact counterpart of God (ὅτι ὁν κτλ. 2:1), is to bring out the truth that he is not only God's organ in creation, but essentially divine as a Son. In short, since the object of the divine revelation (λαλεῖν) is fellowship between God and men, it must culminate in One who can deal with sin, as no prophet or succession of prophets could do; the line of revelation ἐν προφήταις has its climax ἐν υἱῷ, in a Son whose redeeming sacrifice was the real and effective manifestation of God's mind for communion.

As it is necessary to break up this elaborate sentence for the purpose of exposition, I print it not only in Greek but in the stately Vulgate version, in order to exhibit at the very outset the style and spirit of Πρὸς Ἑβραίους.
Polymeros καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεός λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων εὐλάβης ἦν ἐν ὑμῖν, διὸ ἔθηκε κληρονόμοις πάντως, δι’ αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐποίησε τοσάδιαν· ἵνα ἀπαίσιμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, φέρων τῇ πᾶντα τῷ ἁμαρτάνῃ τῆς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ, καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενον ἕκαθιστὸν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλώσυνης ἐν ψυχής, τοσοῦτοι κρείττοις γενόμενος τῶν ἁγίων διώκοντον διαφορώτερον παρ’ αὐτοῖς κεκληρονομημένην ἄνωμα.

Multifariam et multis modis olim Deus loquens patribus in prophetis novissime diebus istis locutus est nobis in filio, quem constituit heredem universorum, per quem fectit et saecula, qui cum sit splendor gloriae et figura substantiae eius, portans quoque omnia verbo virtutis suae, purgationem peccatorum faciens, sedit ad dextram majestatis in excelsis, tanto melior angelis effectus quanto differentius prae illis nomen hereditavit.

1 Many were the forms and fashions in which God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets, 2 but in these days at the end he has spoken to us by a Son—a Son whom he has appointed heir of the universe, as it was by him that he created the world.

Greek prefaces and introductions of a rhetorical type were fond of opening with πολίς in some form or other (e.g. Sirach prol. πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων κτλ.; Dion. Halic. de oratoribus antiquis, πολλὴν χάριν κτλ., an early instance being the third Philippic of Demosthenes, πολλῶν, ὡς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναίοι, λόγων γεγομένων κτλ.). Here πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως is a sonorous hendiadys for "variously," as Chrysostom was the first to point out (τὸ γὰρ πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως τούτοις διαφόρως). A similar turn of expression occurs in 2 2 παραβάσεις καὶ παρακή. The writer does not mean to exclude variety from the Christian revelation; he expressly mentions how rich and manysided it was, in 2 4. Nor does he suggest that the revelation ἐν προφήταις was inferior because it was piecemeal and varied. There is a slight suggestion of the unity and finality of the revelation ἐν υἱῷ, as compared with the prolonged revelations made through the prophets, the Son being far more than a prophet; but there is a deeper suggestion of the unity and continuity of revelation then and now. Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως really "signalises the variety and fullness of the Old Testament word of God" (A. B. Davidson). On the other hand, Christ is God's last word to the world; revelation in him is complete, final and homogeneous.

Compare the comment of Eustathius on Odyssey, 11: πολυτρόπως ἀνεγνωρισθή πάλιν οἱ ἡλίθεν εἰς γνώσιν, μηδὲν ἀναγνωρισμοῖς συμπεδόντος ἐτέρῳ ἀναγκαρισμῷ τό εὐθὸν. Ἦλθως γὰρ τῷ Τελεμάχῳ, ἐτέρως δὲ Θερμηκείᾳ, ἐτέρως τοῖς δύολοις, Ἦλθων δὲ τρόπων τῷ Λαέρτῃ, καὶ ὅλως ἀνομοὶς ἀπέα. Πολυμερῶς, according to Hesychius (= πολυχεῖσως), differs from πολυτρόπως (διαφόρως, ποικίλως), and, strictly speaking, is the adverb of πολυμερῆς=manifold (Wis 9:28, where Wisdom is called πρεσβύα μονογενῆς, πολυμερῆς). But no such distinction is intended here.

In πάλαι (as opposed to ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων) θεὸς λαλήσας, λαλεῖν, here as throughout the epistle, is prac-
I. 1, 2.) THE FATHERS AND THE PROPHETS

A technically an equivalent for λέγεω (see Anz's Subsidia, pp. 309–310), with a special reference to inspired and oracular utterances of God or of divinely gifted men. This sense is as old as Menander (ὁ νοῦς γάρ ἐστιν δέ λαλήσων θεός, Kock's Comic. Attic. Fragm. 70). Οἱ πατέρες in contrast to ἡμεῖς means OT believers in general (cp. Jn 6:59 7:22), whereas the more usual NT sense of the term is "the patriarchs" (cp. Diat. 1949–1950, 2553e), i.e. Abraham, etc., though the term (3:5 8:9) covers the ancients down to Samuel or later (Mt 23:30). Our fathers or ancestors (Wis 18:6) means the Hebrew worthies of the far past to whom Christians as God's People, whether they had been born Jews or not (1 Co 10:1 οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν), look back, as the earlier Sirach did in his πατέρων ύμων (Sir 44:1–50:28), or the prophet in Zec 1:6 (οἱ πατέρες ύμων . . . καὶ οἱ προφῆται). For οἱ πατέρες = our fathers, cp. Prayer of Manasseh 1 (θεός τῶν πατέρων) and Wessely's Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde, i. 64, where boys are reckoned in a list σύν τοῖς πατράσι. The insertion of τοῖς ψυχαῖς (p12 999. 1836 boh sah Clem. Alex., Chrys. Prissillian) is a correct but superfluous gloss. As for ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, προφῆται is used here in a broader sense than in 11:32; it denotes the entire succession of those who spoke for God to the People of old, both before and after Moses (Ac 3:22 7:37), who is the supreme prophet, according to Philo (de ebrīt. 21, de decalogo 33). Joshua is a prophet (Sir 46:1), so is David (Philo, de agric. 12). In Ps 105:15 the patriarchs, to whom revelations are made, are both God's προφῆται and χριστοὶ. Later on, the term was extended, as in Lk 13:28 (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, καὶ πάντας τοῖς προφήτας, cp. He 11:32), and still more in Mt 5:12 (τοῖς προφήταις τοῖς πρὸ ψυχῶν). The reason why there is no contrast between the Son and the prophets is probably because the writer felt there was no danger of rivalry; prophecy had ceased by the time that the Son came; the "prophet" belonged to a bygone order of things, so that there was no need to argue against any misconception of their function in relation to that of the Son (Bar 85:1–3 "in former times our fathers had helpers, righteous men and holy prophets . . . but now the righteous have been gathered and the prophets have fallen asleep").

As no further use is made of the contrast between Jesus and the prophets (who are only again mentioned incidentally in 11:32), it was natural that ἀγγέλους should be conjectured (S. Crellius, Initium Ioannis Evangelii restitutum, p. 238, independently by Spitta in Stud. u. Kritiken, 1913, pp. 106–109) to have been the original reading, instead of προφῆται. But "the word spoken by angels" (2:2) does not refer to divine communications made to the patriarchs; nor can οἱ πατέρες be identified with the patriarchs, as Spitta contends (cf. U. Holzmeister in Zeitschrift
Für Kathol. Theologie, 1913, pp. 805–830), and, even if it could, προφήταις would be quite opposite (cf. Philo, de Abrah. 22). Why the writer selects προφήταις is not clear. But ἄνθρωποι would have been an imperfect antithesis, since the Son was human. Philo (de Monarch. 9 : ἐκμνεῖς γάρ εἶσαι οἱ προφήταις θεοῦ καταχρομένου τοῖς ἐκείνους ὁργάνοις πρὸς δῆλωσιν ὃν ἐν ἐθελήσει) views the prophets as interpreters of God in a sense that might correspond to the strict meaning of εἶναι, and even (Quaest. in Exod. 23:22 τοῦ γὰρ λέγοντος ὁ προφήτης ἀγγελὸς κυρίου ἑστίν) applies ἄγγελος to the prophet. But εἶναι here is a synonym for διά (Chrys. δρᾶσ 5τά καὶ τὸ εἶναι ἑστῖν), as in I S 28:6 (ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ κυρίος εν τοῖς ἐνυπνίοις καὶ εν τοῖς δηλοῖς καὶ εν τοῖς προφηταῖς).

In Test. Dan 11 [acc. to the tenth cent. Paris MS 938] and in LXX of Nu 24:14, Jer 23:20 [B: ἐσχάτων, A Q*], 25:19 (49:50) [B: ἐσχάτων, A Q], 37:30 (30:36) [A Q: ἐσχάτων, B], Ezk 38:13εἰς ἐσχάτον ἑτῶν], Dn 10:14 [ἐσχάτων], Hos 5:31, ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, appears, instead of the more common ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, as a rendering of the phrase ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμέρας τῶν ἡμέρων. A similar variety of reading occurs here; Origen, e.g., reads ἐσχάτων without τούτων (on La 4:20) and ἐσχάτων (fragm. on John 3:21), while ἐσχάτων is read by 44, a few minor cursive, d and the Syriac version. The same idea is expressed in 1 P 1:20 by ἐπὶ ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων, but the τούτων here is unique. The messianic mission of Jesus falls at the close of these days, or, as the writer says later (9:26), ἐπὶ συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων. These days correspond to the present age (ὁ νῦν αἰών); the age (or world) to come (ὁ μέλλων αἰών, ἐπὶ τῶν τούτων) is to dawn at the second coming of Christ (9:28 10:27). Meantime, the revelation of God ἐν νῦν has been made to the Christian church as God’s People (ἐκλάθησαν ἡμῖν); the ἡμῖν does not mean simply the hearers of Jesus on earth, for this would exclude the writer and his readers (2:8), and ἐκλάθησαν covers more than the earthly mission of Jesus. There is no special reference in ἐκλάθησαν to the teaching of Jesus; the writer is thinking of the revelation of God’s redeeming purpose in Christ as manifested (v v. 8-4) by the (resurrection and) intercession in heaven which completed the sacrifice on the cross. This is the final revelation, now experienced by Christians.

The saying of Jesus quoted by Epiphanius (Haer. xxiii. 5, xlii. 3, lxvi. 42), ὁ λαλῶν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, ἰδοὺ πάρειμαι, was an anti-gnostic logion based partly on this passage and partly on Is 55:6 ἐκὼ εἰμι αὐτὸς ὁ λαλῶν, πάρειμαι. The author of Hebrews is not conscious of any polemic against the OT revelation as inferior to and unworthy of the Christian God. He assumes that it was the same God who spoke in both Testaments: “Sed in hac diversitate unum tamen Deus nobis proponit: nequis putet Legem cum Evangelio pugnare, vel alium esse huius quam illius authorem” (Calvin).

1 The Armenian reading τούτων after ἡμερῶν, instead of αὐτῶν, is incorrect, and may even be a reminiscence of Ἔχει 1.
In δὲ ἐθηκέν κληρονόμον πάντων there is a parallel, perhaps even an allusion, to the Synoptic parable: finally he sent his son (Mt 21:27), or, as Mark (12:6) and Luke (20:13) explicitly declare, his beloved son, though our author does not work out the sombre thought of the parable. There, the son is the heir (ὀιτὸς ἐστιν δ’ κληρονόμος), though not of the universe. Here, the meaning of δὲ ἐθηκέν κληρονόμον πάντων is the same: he was “appointed” heir, he was heir by God’s appointment. It is the fact of this position, not the time, that the writer has in mind, and we cannot be sure that this “appointment” corresponds to the elevation of ν.3 (ἐκάθισεν). Probably, in our modern phrase, it describes a pre-temporal act, or rather a relationship which belongs to the eternal order. The force of the aorist ἐθηκέν is best rendered by the English perfect, “has appointed”; no definite time is necessarily intended.

“Nam ideo ille haeres, ut nos suis opibus ditet. Quin hoc elogio nunc eum ornat Apostolus ut sciamus nos sine ipso bonorum omnium esse inopes” (Calvin). The reflection of Sedulius Scotus (alii post patrem haeredes sunt, hic autem vivente Patre haeres est) is pious but irrelevant, for κληρονομεῖν in Hellenistic Greek had come to mean, like its equivalent “inherit” in Elizabethan English, no more than “possess” or “obtain”; a κληρονόμος was a “possessor,” with the double nuance of certainty and anticipation. “Haeres” in Latin acquired the same sense; “pro haerede gerere est pro domino gerere, veteres enim ‘haeredes’ pro ‘dominis’ appellabant” (Justinian, Instit. ii. 19. 7).

In δι’ οὗ (Griesbach conj. δι’ οὗ) καὶ ἐποίησε τοὺς αἰῶνας the καὶ especially1 suggests a correspondence between this and the preceding statement; what the Son was to possess was what he had been instrumental in making. Τοὺς αἰῶνας here, though never in Paul, is equivalent (EBi. 1147) to τὰ πάντα in ν.3 (implied in πάντων above), i.e. the universe or world (118). The functions assigned by Jewish speculation to media like the Logos at creation are here claimed as the prerogative of the Son. This passing allusion to the function of Christ in relation to the universe probably originated, as in the case of Paul, in the religious conception of redemption. From the redeeming function of Christ which extended to all men, it was natural to infer His agency in relation to creation as part of his pre-existence. The notion is that “the whole course of nature and grace must find its explanation in God, not merely in an abstract divine arbitrium, but in that which befits the divine nature” (W. Robertson Smith), i.e. the thought behind 2θεός is connected with the thought behind 1θεός. This may be due to a theological reflection, but the tendency to emphasize the moral rather than the metaphysical aspect, which is noticeable in Πρὸς Ἐβραίους as

1 An emphasis blurred by the τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν of D B K L P harkl Chrys. Theod. (Blass, von Sod.).
in the Fourth Gospel, and even in Paul, is consonant with Philo’s tendency to show the function of the Logos and the other intermediate powers as religious rather than cosmical (cp. Bréhier’s Les Idées Philos. et Religieuses de Philon d’Alexandrie, pp. 65 f., 111 f., 152, “il ne s’agit plus chez Philon d’un explication du monde mais du culte divin”; 174 f., “la thèse de Philon, qui explique et produit la doctrine des intermédiaires, n’est pas l’impossibilité pour Dieu de produire le monde mais l’impossibilité pour l’âme d’atteindre Dieu directement”). Yet Philo had repeatedly claimed for his Logos, that it was the organ of creation (e.g. de sacerdot. 5, λόγος δ’ ἐστὶν εἰκὼν θεοῦ, δ’ οὗ σύμμετον κόσμος ἐνδημογενέτο), and this is what is here, as by Paul, claimed for Christ. Only, it is a religious, not a cosmological, instinct that prompts the thought. The early Christian, who believed in the lordship of Christ over the world, felt, as a modern would put it, that the end must be implicit in the beginning, that the aim and principle of the world must be essentially Christian. This is not elaborated in “Hebrews” any more than in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 18); the author elsewhere prefers the simple monotheistic expression (210 118). But the idea is consonant with his conception of the Son. “If pre-existence is a legitimate way of expressing the absolute significance of Jesus, then the mediation of creation through Christ is a legitimate way of putting the conviction that in the last resort, and in spite of appearances, the world in which we live is a Christian world, our ally, not our adversary” (Denney in ERE. viii. 516 f.).

3 He (ὅς ὁ λείος) reflecting God’s bright glory and stamped with God’s own character, sustains the universe with his word of power; when he had secured our purification from sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high; 4 and thus he is superior to (κρίτων) the angels, as he has inherited a Name superior (διαφορώτερον, 3θ) to theirs.

The unique relation of Christ to God is one of the unborrowed truths of Christianity, but it is stated here in borrowed terms. The writer is using metaphors which had been already applied in Alexandrian theology to Wisdom and the Logos. Thus Wisdom is an unalloyed emanation τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης, ἀπαίγασμα ... φωτὸς αἰδίου (Wis 725. 26), and ἀπαίγασμα in the same sense of “reflection” occurs in Philo, who describes the universe as ὁν ἀγίων ἀπαίγασμα, μίμημα ἀρχετύπου (de plant. 12), the human spirit as τύπον τυλίκα και χαρακτήρα βέιας δυνάμεως (quod deter. pot. ins. sol. 83), and similarly the Logos. χαρακτήρ is “the exact reproduction,” as a statue of a person (OGIS. 36360 χαρακτήρα μορφῆς ἐμῆς); literally, the stamp or clear-cut impression made by a seal, the very facsimile of the original. The two terms ἀπαίγασμα and χαρακτήρ are therefore intended to bring out the same idea.
I. 3.) THE FATHER AND THE SON

ὁ πόστασις = the being or essence of God, which corresponds to his ὁ χαρακτήρ (= character or nature); it is a philosophical rather than a religious term, in this connexion, but enters the religious world in Wis 16:21 (ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὁ πόστασις σου κτῆσι). Its physical sense emerges in the contemporary de Mundi, 4, τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ φαντασμάτων τὰ μὲν ἐστὶ κατ᾽ ἐμφασιν τὰ δὲ καθ᾽ ὁπόστασιν. The use of it as a term for the essence or substance of a human being is not uncommon in the LXX (e.g. Ps 39:13 139:18); cp. Schletter’s Der Glaube im NT 3 (1905), pp. 615 ff, where the linguistic data are arranged.

χαρακτήρ had already acquired a meaning corresponding to the modern “character” (e.g. in Menander’s proverb, ἀνδρὸς χαρακτήρ ἐκ λόγου γεωργίζεται, Heauton Timoroumenos, 11). The idea of χαρακτήρ as replica is further illustrated by the Bereschith rabba, 52. 3 (on Gn 21): “hence we learn that he (Isaac) was the splendour of his (father’s) face, as like as possible to him.”

An early explanation of this conception is given by Lactantius (diuin. instit. iv. 29), viz. that “the Father is as it were an overflowing fountain, the Son like a stream flowing from it; the Father like the sun, the Son as it were a ray extended from the sun (radius ex sole porrectus). Since he is faithful (cp. He 3:2) and dear to the most High Father, he is not separated from him, any more than the stream is from the fountain or the ray from the sun; for the water of the fountain is in the stream, and the sun’s light in the ray.” But our author is content to throw out his figurative expressions. How the Son could express the character of God, is a problem which he does not discuss; it is felt by the author of the Fourth Gospel, who suggests the moral and spiritual affinities that lie behind such a function of Jesus Christ, by hinting that the Son on earth taught what he had heard from the Father and lived out the life he had himself experienced and witnessed with the unseen Father. This latter thought is present to the mind of Seneca in Epp. 65. 6, where he observes that “Cleanthes could never have exactly reproduced Zeno, if he had simply listened to him; he shared the life of Zeno, he saw into his secret purposes” (vitae eius interfuit, secreta perspexit). The author of Hebrews, like Paul in Col 1:15-17, contents himself with asserting the vital community of nature between the Son and God, in virtue of which (φέρεται τε) the Son holds his position in the universe.

In the next clause, φέρεται 1 τα πάντα is not used in the sense in which Sappho (fragm. 95, πάντα φέρει) speaks of the evening star “bringing all things home,” the sheep to their fold and children to their mother. The phrase means “upholding the universe as it moves,” bearing it and bearing it on. “Thou bearest things on high and things below,” Cain tells God in Bereschith rabba, 23. 2, “but thou dost not bear my sins.” “Deus ille maximus potentissimus ipse vehit omnia,” (Seneca, Epist. 31). The idea had been already applied by Philo to the Logos (e.g. de migrat. Abrah. 6, ὁ λόγος . . . ὁ ὅλων κυβερνήτης πνεύματος ἐκ σύμπαντα: de spec. legibus, i. 81, λόγος ὃ εὐτίν εἰκόνα θεοῦ, ὃς ὁ σύμπαν τὸ κόσμος ἐνδομοιοργεῖτο: de plant. 8, λόγος δὲ ὁ αἰωνιός θεοῦ τοῦ αἰωνίου τὸ χρυσότατον και βεβαιώτατον ἑρεμεμα τῶν ὅλων ἐστίν. So Chrysostom takes it: φέρειν . . . τοτέστι, κυβερνών, τὰ διαπίπτοντα συγκρατών. It would certainly carry on the thought of διʼ οὗ . . . αἰώνας, however, if φέρεων here could be taken in its regular Philonic sense of “bring into existence” (e.g. quis rer. div. her. 7, ὃ τὰ μὴ ὄντα φέρον καὶ τὰ πάντα γεννῶν:

1 φέρεων is, like ἀπὸλειται in 49, an error of B*.
de mutat. nom. 44, πάντα φέρων ἑτοῖμα ὁ θεὸς; this was the interpretation of Gregory of Nyssa (MPG. xlvi. 265), and it would give a better sense to "word of power" as the fiat of creative authority. But the ordinary interpretation is not untenable.

In τῷ ἰστι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, the αὐτοῦ (αὐτοῦ ?) refers to the Son, not as in the preceding clause and in 113 to God. Hence perhaps its omission by M 424** 1739 Origen.

With καθαρισμὸν ... ὑψηλὸς the writer at last touches what is for him the central truth about the Son; it is not the teaching of Jesus that interests him, but what Jesus did for sin by his sacrifice and exaltation. From this conception the main argument of the epistle flows. Καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν is a Septuagint expression (e.g. Job 721 ποίησω ... καθαρισμὸν (τῆς ἁμαρτίας μου)), though this application of κ. to sins is much more rare than that either to persons (Lv 1513) or places (1 Ch 2326, 2 Mac 105). In 2 P 19 (τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν) it is filled out with the possessive pronoun, which is supplied here by some (e.g. ήμῶν D K L harkl sah arm Athan. Chrys., ήμῶν Ν). Grammatically it = (a) purgation of sins, as καθαρίζω may be used of the "removal" of a disease (Mt 84), or = (b) our cleansing from sins (O14 καθαρίζει τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἐργῶν). Before καθαρισμὸν the words δι' ἐαυτοῦ (αὐτοῦ) are inserted by D H K L M 256 d harkl sah boh eth Orig. Athan. Aug. etc. Δι' ἐαυτοῦ = ipse, as ἐαυτὸ = sua sponte. Ἑκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ is a reminiscence of a favourite psalm (1101) of the writer, though he avoids its οὐκ ἔκείστων. It denotes entrance into a position of divine authority. "Sedere ad Patris dexteram nihil aliud est quam gubernare vice Patris" (Calvin). Ἐν ὑψηλῷ, a phrase used by no other NT writer, is a reminiscence of the Greek psalter and equivalent to ἐν ψάλτου: grammatically it goes with ἐκάθισεν. (The divine attribute of μεγαλωσύνη is for the first time employed as a periphrasis for the divine Majesty.) This enthronement exhibits (v.4) the superiority of the Son to the angels. Ὀνόμα is emphatic by its position at the close of the sentence; it carries the general Oriental sense of "rank" or "dignity." The precise nature of this dignity is described as that of sonship (v.5), but the conception widens in the following passage (vv.6f.), and it is needless to identify ὄνομα outright with υἱός, though υἱός brings out its primary meaning. In τοσοῦτοι κρέπτων γενόμενος (going closely with ἐκάθισεν) τῶν (accidentally omitted by B and Clem. Rom.) ἀγγελῶν (emphatic by position) παρ' ἀυτῶς κεκληρονομηκέν ὄνομα, the relative use of ὄνομα in NT Greek is confined to Mk 726, but τοσοῦτοι ... ὄνομα is a common Philonic expression. Κρεπτῶν (for which Clement of Rome in 362 substitutes the synonymous μείζων) is an indefinite term = "superior."
Unlike Paul, the writer here and elsewhere is fond of using παρά after a comparative.

Κρείττων in this sense occurs in the contemporary (?) Aristotelian treatise de Mundo, 391a (διὰ τὸ ἄδεστον τῶν κρείττων εἶναι), where τὰ κρείττων means the nobler Universe.

The sudden transition to a comparison between the Son and the angels implies that something is before the writer's mind. Were his readers, like the Colossians to whom Paul wrote, in danger of an undue deference to angels in their religion, a deference which threatened to impair their estimate of Christ? Or is he developing his argument in the light of some contemporay belief about angels and revelation? Probably the latter, though this does not emerge till 22. Meanwhile, seven Biblical proofs (cp. W. Robertson Smith, Expositor 2, i. pp. 5 f.) of v. 4 are adduced; the two in v. 5 specially explain the διαφωστερον ὄνομα, while the five in vv. 6-14 describe the meaning and force of κρείττων τῶν ἀγγέλων. The first two are:

* For to what angel did God ever say,  
  "Thou art my son,  
  to-day have I become thy father"?  
  Or again,  
  "I will be a father to him,  
  and he shall be a son to me"?

The first quotation is from the 2nd Psalm (v. 7), read as a messianic prediction—which may have been its original meaning, and certainly was the meaning attached to it by the early Christians, if not already by some circles of Judaism: 1

υἱός μου εἶ σὺ,  
ἐγώ σήμερον γεγέννηκα σε.

Did the author take σήμερον here, as perhaps in 37, though not in 13, in (a) a mystical sense, or (b) with a reference to some special phase in the history of Christ? (a) tallies with Philo's usage: σήμερον δ' ἐστὶν δ' ἀπέρατος καὶ ἀδιέξετης αἰών...τὸ ἄφενδες ὄνομα αἰώνοι (de fuga, 11, on Dt 41), ἦσσ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας, τούτους δὲ δ' γὰρ αἰών ἄπας τῷ σήμερον παραμετρεῖται (leg. alleg. iii. 8 on Gn 354). (b) might allude either to the baptism or to the resurrection of Christ in primitive Christian usage; the latter would be more congenial to our author, if it were assumed that he had any special incident in mind. But he simply quotes the text for the purpose of bringing out the title of Son as applied to Christ. When we ask what he meant by σήμερον, we are asking a question which was not present to his mind, unless, indeed, "the idea of a bright radiance streaming forth from God's glory" (v. 8) pointed in the direction of (a), as 1 See G. H. Box, The Ezra-Apocalypse, pp. lvi, lvii.
Robertson Smith thought. But the second line of the verse is merely quoted to fill out the first, which is the pivot of the proof: 

viōs μου εἶ σον. Sons of God is not unknown as a title for angels in the Hebrew Old Testament (see EBi. 4691). “Sometimes Moses calls the angels sons of God,” Philo observes (Quaest. in Gen. 6)—as being bodiless spirits. But the LXX is careful to translate: “sons of Elohim” by ἄγγελοι θεοῦ (e.g. in Gn 62-4, Job 16 21 38), except in Ps 294 and 897, where sons of God are intended by the translator to denote human beings; and no individual angel is ever called viōs. As the author of Πρὸς Ἐβραίους and his readers knew only the Greek Bible, the proof holds good.

The second quotation is from 2 S 714:

'Εγὼ ἐσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα,
καὶ αὐτὸς ἐσται μοι εἰς νιόν,

a promise cited more exactly than in 2 Co 618 and Rev 217, but with equal indifference to its original setting. Paul and the prophet John apply it to the relationship between God and Christians; our author prefers to treat it as messianic. Indeed he only alludes twice, in OT quotations, to God as the Father of Christians (see Introd. p. xxxv).

The third quotation (v.6) clinches this proof of Christ’s unique authority and opens up the sense in which he is κρεῖττων τῶν ἀνάγκαιων:

and further, when introducing the Firstborn into the world, he says,

“Let all God’s angels worship him.”

In ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ the term πάλιν, rhetorically transferred, answers to the πάλιν of v.5; it is not to be taken with εἰσαγάγῃ = “reintroduce,” as if the first “introduction” of the Son had been referred to in v.25. A good parallel for this usage occurs in Philo (leg. alleg. iii. 9: δὲ πάλιν ἀποδιδάσκων θείων τὸν μὲν οἰδενός αἰτίον φησιν εἶναι, where πάλιν goes with φησιν). Εἰσαγάγῃ might refer to birth, as, e.g., in Epictetus (iv. 1. 104, οὐχὶ ἐκεῖνος σε εἰσάγαγεν) and pseudo-Musonius, ep. 90 (Hercher’s Epist. Graeci, 401 f.: οὐ τέκνα μόνον εἰς τὸ γένος ἄλλα καὶ τοιάδε τέκνα εἰσάγαγες), or simply to “introduction” (cp. Mitteis-Wilcken, i. 2. 141 (110 B.C.), εἰσάξω τὸν ἐμαυτοῦ νιόν εἰς τὴν σύνοδον). Linguistically either the incarnation or the second advent might be intended; but neither the tense of εἰσαγάγῃ (unless it be taken strictly as futuristic—ubi introduxerit) nor the proximity of

1 It is only Theodotion who ventures in Dan 328(92) to retain the literal son, since from his christological point of view it could not be misunderstood in this connexion.

πᾶλν is decisive in favour of the latter (ὅταν εἰσαγάγη might, by a well-known Greek idiom, be equivalent to "when he speaks of introducing, or, describes the introduction of"—Valckenaer, etc.). Πρωτότοκος is Firstborn in the sense of superior. The suggestion of Christ being higher than angels is also present in the context of the term as used by Paul (Col 1:15, 16), but it is nowhere else used absolutely in the NT, and the writer here ignores any inference that might be drawn from it to an inferior sonship of angels. Its equivalent (cp. the v. ll. in Sir 36:17) πρωτόγονος is applied by Philo to the Logos. Here it means that Christ was Son in a pre-eminent sense; the idea of priority passes into that of superiority. A πρωτότοκος υἱός had a relationship of likeness and nearness to God which was unrivalled. As the context indicates, the term brings out the pre-eminent honour and the unique relationship to God enjoyed by the Son among the heavenly host.

The notion of worship being due only to a senior reappears in the Vita Adae et Evae (14), where the devil declines to worship Adam: "I have no need to worship Adam ... I will not worship an inferior being who is my junior. I am his senior in the Creation; before he was made, I was already made; it is his duty to worship me." In the Ascensio Isaiae (11:25) the angels humbly worship Christ as he ascends through the heavens where they live; here the adoration is claimed for him as he enters ἡ οἰκουμένη.

The line καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ comes from a LXX addition to the Hebrew text of the Song of Moses in Dt 32:43, calling upon all angels to pay homage to Yahweh. But the LXX text 1 actually reads υἱοὶ θεοῦ, not ἄγγελοι θεοῦ (into which F corrects it)! Our author probably changed it into ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, recollecting the similar phrase in Ps 97:7 (προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ),2 unless, indeed, the change had been already made. The fact that Justin Martyr (Dial. 130) quotes the LXX gloss with ἄγγελοι, is an indication that this may have been the text current among the primitive Christians.

The last four (vv. 7-14) quotations carry on the idea of the Son's superiority to the angels:

7 While he says of angels (ὡς ὡς = with reference to),
   "Who makes his angels into winds,
   his servants into flames of fire,"

8 he says of the Son,
   "God is thy throne for ever and ever,
   and thy royal sceptre is the sceptre of equity:
   thou hast loved justice and hated lawlessness,
   therefore God, thy God, has consecrated thee
   with the oil of rejoicing beyond thy comrades—"

10 and,
   "Thou didst found the earth at the beginning, O Lord,

---

1 As the song appears in A, at the close of the psalter, the reading is ἄγγελοι (vīoī, R).
2 Which acquired a messianic application (see Diat. 3134).
and the heavens are the work of thy hands:

they will perish, but thou remainest,
thou wilt roll them up like a mantle, and they will be changed,
and thy years never fail."

In v.7 the quotation (ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἄγγελους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα) only differs from the LXX by the substitution of πυρὸς φλόγα for πῦρ φλέγων (B: πυρὸς φλέγων A). The singular in φλόγα and perhaps the recollection that πνεῦμα elsewhere in NT = "wind" only in the singular, led to the change of πνεῦμα into πνεύμα (D 326, 424**, 1912, 1245, 2005 d sah eth Orig.). The author is taking the LXX translation or mistranslation of Ps 104:4 (ὁ ποιῶν κτίλιν, a nominative without a verb, as in 1 Co 3:19) to mean that God can reduce angels to the elemental forces of wind and fire, so unstable is their nature, whereas the person and authority of the Son are above all change and decay. The meaning might also be that God makes angels out of wind and fire; 2 but this is less apt. Our author takes the same view as the author of 4 Esdras, who (821) writes:

"Before whom the heavenly host stands in terror,
and at thy word change to wind and fire."

Rabbinic traditions corroborate this interpretation; e.g. "every day ministering angels are created from the fiery stream, and they utter a song and perish" (Chagiga, ed. Streane, p. 76), and the confession of the angel to Manoah in Yalkut Shimeoni, ii. 11. 3: "God changes us every hour ... sometimes he makes us fire, at other times wind."

The interest of rabbinic mysticism in the nature of angels is illustrated by the second century dialogue between Hadrian, that "curiositatum omnium explorator," and R. Joshua ben Chananja (cp. W. Bacher, Agada der Tannaiten, i. 171-172). The emperor asks the rabbi what becomes of the angels whom God creates daily to sing His praise; the rabbi answers that they return to the stream of fire which flows eternally from the sweat shed by the Beasts supporting the divine throne or chariot (referring to the vision of Ezekiel and the "fiery stream" of Dn 7:10). From this stream of fire the angels issue, and to it they return. Λειτουργοὺς of angels as in Ps 103:21 (λειτουργοὶ αὐτοῦ, ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ).

The fifth (vv.8-9) quotation is from Ps 45:8-9—a Hebrew epithalamium for some royal personage or national hero, which our author characteristically regards as messianic.

1 Aquila has πῦρ λάβὲν, Symm. πυρὶνην φλόγα.
2 As in Apoc. Bar. 218 ("the holy creatures which thou didst make from the beginning out of flame and fire") and 488 ("Thou givest commandment to the flames and they change into spirits").
The quotation inserts τῆς before εἰσὶν τὴν αἰώνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, follows A in preferring τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος (τοῦ αἰῶνος om. B 33) to αἰῶνα αἰῶνος (B), but prefers B’s ανομίαν (cp. 2 Co 6:14) to A’s ἀδικίαν, and agrees with both in prefixing ἡ to the second (D K L P Cyr. Cosm. Dam.) instead of to the first (N A B M, etc.) ἀβάδος. The psalm is not quoted elsewhere in NT (apart from a possible reminiscence of 45:6 in Rev 6:9), and rarely cited in primitive Christian literature, although the messianic reference reappears in Irenaeus (iv. 34. 11, quoting v.2). "Ο θεός (sc. ἐστίν rather than ἦσε) may be (a) nominative (subject or predicate). This interpretation ("God is thy throne," or, "thy throne is God"), which was probably responsible for the change of σοῦ after βασιλείας into αἰτοῦ (N B), has been advocated, e.g., by Grotius, Ewald ("thy throne is divine"), WH ("founded on God, the immovable Rock"), and Wickham ("represents God"). Tyndale's rendering is, "God thy seat shall be." Those who find this interpretation harsh prefer to (b) take δ θεός as a vocative, which grammatically is possible (= δ θεί, cp. 10:7 and Ps 3:8 138:17 etc.); "Thy throne, O God (or, O divine One), is for ever and ever." This (so sah vg, etc.) yields an excellent sense, and may well explain the attractiveness of the text for a writer who wished to bring out the divine significance of Christ; δ θεός appealed to him like κύριος in the first line of the next quotation. The sense would be clear if δ θεός were omitted altogether, as its Hebrew equivalent ought to be in the original; but the LXX text as it stands was the text before our author, and the problem is to decide which interpretation he followed. (b) involves the direct application of δ θεός to the Son, which, in a poetical quotation, is not perhaps improbable (see Jn 1:18 20:28); in v.9 it may involve the repetition of δ θεός (om. by Irenaeus, Apost. Preaching, 47—accidentally?) as vocative, and does involve the rendering of δ θεός σου as the God of the God already mentioned. The point of the citation lies in its opening and closing words: (i) the Son has a royal and lasting authority (as δ θεός?), in contrast

---

1 The addition of this καὶ is not to mark a fresh quotation (as in v.10), but simply to introduce the parallel line (as in v.10 καὶ ἔργα κτλ.).
2 Cr. Ps 110:2 ἀβάδον δυνάμεως σου (om. N) ἐξαποστελεί κύριος.
3 For παρὰ with accus. in this sense, cp. above, v.3, and 1ς 53:3 ἄτομον καὶ ἐκλεῖσεν παρὰ τοῦ οὐδὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
to the angels, and (ii) he is anointed (ἐχρυσέως = ὁ Χριστός) more highly than his companions—an Oriental metaphor referring here, as in Is 61:3 etc., not to coronation but to bliss. If the writer of Hebrews has anything specially in mind, it is angels (12:23) rather than human beings (3:14) as μέτοχοι of the royal Prince, whose superior and supreme position is one of intense joy, based on a moral activity (as in 12:2, where the passive side of the moral effort is emphasized).

The sixth (vv. 10-12) quotation is from Ps 102:25-28 which in A runs thus:

καὶ ἀρχάς ἑνεκῶν τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρανοί
καὶ πάντες ὡς ὑμάτιον παλαιώθησονται,
καὶ ὁσεὶ περιβάλλων ἱλίξεις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλλαγήσονται
σοὶ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἰ, καὶ τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ ἔκλειψον.

The author, for purposes of emphasis (as in 2:13), has thrown σοι to the beginning of the sentence, and in the last line he has reverted to the more natural σοι (B). In the text of the epistle there are only two uncertain readings, for the proposed change of διαμένεις into the future διαμένεις (vg. permanebis) does not really affect the sense, and D*'s ὡς for ὠσεί is a merely stylistic alteration. In 128 two small points of textual uncertainty emerge. (a) ἱλίξεις (A B D* K L P M ὑ π Syr arm sah boh eth Orig. Chrys.) has been altered into ἀλλάξεις (N* D* 327. 919 τν Tert. Ath.). The same variant occurs in LXX, where ἀλλάξεις is read by N for ἱλίξεις, which may have crept into the text from Is 34:4, but is more likely to have been altered into ἀλλάξεις in view of ἀλλαγήσονται (ἀλλαγήσονται, arm). (b) ὡς ὑμάτιον (N A B D* 1739 τν arm eth) after αὐτοὺς is omitted by D* M vg syr sah boh Chrys. Ath. Cyril Alex. Probably the words are due to homoiooteleuton. If retained, a comma needs to be placed after them (so Zimmer.); they thus go with the preceding phrase, although one early rendering (D d) runs: “(and) like a garment they will be changed.”

The psalm is taken as a messianic oracle (see Bacon in Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wissenschaft, 1902, 280-285), which the Greek version implied, or at any rate suggested; it contained welcome indications of the Son in his creative function and also of his destined triumph. The poetical suggestion of the sky as a mantle of the deity occurs in Philo, who writes (de fuga, 20)

1 Ἰχθεις, in contrast to ἱλίξεις, is exclusively metaphorical in NT (cp. Gray in EBi. 173), although neither Latin nor English is able to preserve the distinction.
2 A classical and Philonic equivalent for ἐν ἀρχά (LXX again in Ps 119:102).
3 This title, which attracted our author, is an addition of the LXX.
4 Including ἑ γῆ, but with special reference to οι οὐρανοί.
that the Logos ἐνοῦκεται ὡς ἐσθήτα τῶν κόσμων· γῆν γὰρ καὶ ὄψιν καὶ ἀέρα καὶ πῦρ καὶ τὰ ἐκ τούτων ἐπημπορεύτηκε. But the quotation is meant to bring out generally (i) the superiority of the Son as creative (so v.2) to the creation, and (ii) his permanence amid the decay of nature; 1 the world wears out, 2 even the sky (1226) is cast aside, and with it the heavenly lights, but the Son remains ("thou art thou," boh); nature is at his mercy, not he at nature’s. The close connexion of angels with the forces of nature (v.7) may have involved the thought that this transiency affects angels as well, but our author does not suggest this.

The final biblical proof (v.18) is taken from Ps 1101, a psalm in which later on the writer is to find rich messianic suggestion. The quotation clinches the argument for the superiority of the Son by recalling (v.3) his unique divine commission and authority:

13 To what angel did he ever say, "Sit at my right hand, till I make your enemies a footstool for your feet"?

14 Are not all angels merely spirits in the divine service, commissioned for the benefit of those who are to inherit salvation?

The Greek couplet—

καθὼς εἶ δικαίων μου,
ἐστιν ὡς τός ἐκθρόνος σου ἐπιστόλων τῶν ποιῶν σου,

corresponds exactly to the LXX; D* omits ἄν as in Ac 286. The martial metaphor is (cp. Introd. pp. xxxiii f.) one of the primitive Christian expressions which survive in the writer’s vocabulary (cp. 1012).

The subordinate position of angels is now (v.14) summed up; πάντες—all without distinction—are simply λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα (without any power of ruling) εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα (commissioned, not acting on their own initiative). 8 According to the Mechilta on Ex 1418, the Israelites, when crossing the Red Sea, were shown "squadrons upon squadrons of ministering angels" (רברוחה תחת בהם נמשכים; cp. Heb. of Sir 4326, and Dieterich’s Mithrasliturgie, p. 6, line 14, ᾧ ἀρχῇ τοῦ λειτουργοῦντος ἄνέμων (see above, v.7). Philo speaks of ἄγγελοι λειτουργοί (de virtutibus, 74), of τοὺς ἐπιδιακόνους αὐτοῦ τῶν δυνάμεως ἄγγελον (de templo, 1), and in de plantatione, 4: Μωσῆς δὲ ἄνοματι εὐθυβλήτω χρώμενος ἄγγέλους προσαγορεύει, πρεσβευομένας καὶ διαγγέλλοντας

1 A pre-Christian Upanishad (Sacred Books of East, xv. 266) cries: “Only when men shall roll up the sky like a hide, will there be an end of misery, unless God has first been known.”

2 παλαιούσθαι is a common word with ἱμάτιον, and the wearing-out of clothes is a favourite metaphor for men (Is 59, Sir 1417) as well as for nature (Is 5115). Πέριβολαῖον is any covering for the body; not simply a veil (1 Co 1118), but a generic term (cp. Ps 1045 ἄβυσσος ὡς ἱμάτιον τὸ περιβάλλον αὐτοῦ).

3 Is reads διακονίας, as in 87 ἡμέρας for ἡμέρα.
"Angels of the (divine) ministry" was a common rabbinic term, and the writer concludes here that the angels serve God, not, as Philo loved to argue, in the order of nature, but in promoting the interests of God’s people; this is the main object of their existence. He ignores the Jewish doctrine voiced in Test. Levi 3, that in (the sixth?) heaven the angels of the Presence (οἱ λειτουργοῦντες και ἡγεμόμενοι πρὸς κύριον ἐπὶ πάσας ταῖς ἄγνοιαῖς τῶν δικαίων) sacrifice and intercede for the saints, just as in 11:40-12:1 he ignores the companion doctrine that the departed saints interceded for the living. Later Christian speculation revived the Jewish doctrine of angels interceding for men and mediating their prayers, but our author stands deliberately apart from this. Heaven has its myriads of angels (12:23), but the entire relation of men to God depends upon Christ. Angels are simply servants (λειτουργοὶ, v.7) of God’s saving purpose for mankind; how these “angels and ministers of grace” further it, the writer never explains. He would not have gone as far as Philo, at any rate (ἀγγελία καὶ θεία φύσεις, ὑποδίκων καὶ ὑπαρχον τῷ πρώτῳ θεῷ, δι’ ὅν οία προσβεβληθῶν δόσα ἀν θελήσῃ τῷ γενέσι ἡμῶν προσθέστικα διαγγέλλει, de Abrahamo, 23).

In διὰ τοῦτο μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν (κλ. σωτ. only here in NT), it is remarkable that σωτηρία is mentioned for the first time without any adjective or explanation. Evidently it had already acquired a specific Christian meaning for the readers as well as for the writer; no definition was required to differentiate the Christian significance of the term from the current usage. As σωτηρία involves the sacrificial work of Christ (who is never called σωτήρ), it cannot be applied to the pre-Christian period of revelation. Indeed in our epistle σωτηρία is invariably eschatological. The outlook in the messianic oracles already quoted is one of expectation; some future deliverance at the hands of God or his messianic representative is anticipated. Μέλλοντας implies a divine purpose, as in 8:6 II:8.

The phrase about τοῦτο μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν marks a skilful transition to the deeper theme of the next passage, viz. the relation of the Son to this σωτηρία (on 21-9 cp. W. Robertson Smith in Expositor2, i. pp. 138 f.). But the transition is worked out in a practical warning (21-4) to the readers, which not only explains the underlying interest of the preceding biblical proofs, but leads up effectively to the next aspect of truth which he has in mind:

1 We must therefore (διὰ τοῦτο, in view of this pre-eminent authority of the Son) pay closer attention to what we have heard, in case we drift away.
2 For if the divine word spoken by angels held good (εὐθείαν δεῖξας, proved valid), if transgression and disobedience met with due (δικαίως = adequate, not arbitrary) punishment in every case, 3 how shall we (ἡμεῖς, emphatic) escape
the penalty\(^1\) for neglecting (ἀμελήσαντες, if we ignore: Mt 22\(^6\)) a salvation which (ἡς, inasmuch as it) was originally proclaimed by the Lord himself (not by mere angels) and guaranteed to us by those who heard him, \(^4\) while God corroborated their testimony with signs and wonders and a variety of miraculous powers, distributing the holy Spirit as it pleased him (ἀφοῦ emphatic as in Ro 3\(^2\)\(^5\)).

Apart from the accidental omission of v.\(^1\) by M 1739, Origen, and of ς (M P) in v.\(^4\), with the variant παραρρησίας (B\(^6\) D\(^6\)) for παραρρέων,\(^2\) the only textual item of any moment, and it is a minor one, is the substitution of ἅμα for διά in v.\(^3\) by some cursives (69, 623, 1066, 1845), due either to the following ἅμα, or to the dogmatic desire of emphasizing the initiative of ὁ κόσμος. But διά here as in διὰ ἀγγέλων, meaning "by," is used to preserve the idea that in λαλεῖν the subject is God (\(^1\)). The order of words (v.\(^1\)) δεῖ περισσοτέρως προσέχειν ἃμας has been spoiled in ης νεγ (περισσοτέρως δεῖ) and K L P (ἡμᾶς προσέχειν).

As elsewhere in Hellenistic Greek (e.g. Jos. *Apol. i. 1, ἐπεὶ δὲ συνήχεις ὅρῳ ταῖς ὑπὸ δυσμενεῖα ὑπὸ τινῶν εἰρήμενας προσέγγιστας βλασφημίας καὶ τοῖς περὶ τὴν Ἀρχαιολογίαν ὑπὸ ἑμῶν γεγραμμένους ἀποστολισμάς κτλ.; Strabo, ii. 1, τοῖς μὲν ἀποστέην . . . ἐκεῖνη δὲ προσέχειν (σ. τὸν νόμον) is the opposite of ἀποστέην: to "attend" is to believe and act upon what is heard. This is implied even in Ac 8\(^6\) and 16\(^14\) (προσέχειν τοὺς λαλομένους ὑπὸ Παῦλου) where it is the attention of one who hears the gospel for the first time; here it is attention to a familiar message. Περισσοτέρως is almost in its elative sense of "with extreme care"; "all the more" would bring out its force here as in 13\(^9\). Certainly there is no idea of demanding a closer attention to the gospel than to the Law. ἃμας = we Christians (ἡμῖν, \(^1\)), you and I, as in v.\(^3\). The τὰ ἀκοοθέντα (in τοῖς ἀκουσθέντις) is the revelation of the εἰαγγέλιον (a term never used by our author), i.e. what ὁ θεὸς ἔλαλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν νῷ, \(^1\) and this is further defined (in vv.\(^3\)\(^4\)) as consisting in the initial revelation made by Jesus on earth and the transmission of this by divinely accredited envoys to the writer and his readers (εἰς ἡμᾶς ἑβεβαιωθῆ). In the *Ep. Aristeas*, 127, oral teaching is preferred to reading (τὸ γὰρ καλὸς ζῆν ἐν τῷ τὰ νόμιμα συνήχειν εἶναι' τούτῳ δὲ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι διὰ τῆς ἀκροάσεως πολλῶν μᾶλλον ἡ διὰ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως), and the evangelists of v.\(^4\) include οἴτινες ἔλαλησαν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (13\(^5\)); but while the news was oral, there is no particular emphasis as that here. The author simply appeals for attentive obedience, μὴ ποτὲ παραρρύμεν (2 aor. subj.), i.e. drift away from (literally, "be carried past" and so lose) the σωτηρία which we have heard. Παραρέω in this sense goes back to Pr 3\(^2\) \(\nuέ\), μὴ παραρύψας, τήρησον δὲ ἐμὴν βουλήν καὶ ἐννοοῦν (see Clem. *Paed.* 111).

---

\(^1\) ἐκφθεγμένη, without an object (κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ, Ro 2\(^3\)) as 12\(^5\), Sir 16\(^1\), 1 Th 5\(^3\).

\(^2\) Arm apparently read ὁστιρθόμεν, and P. Junius needlessly conjectured παρασύρωμεν ("pervert them").
xi. 58, διὸ καὶ συνέλευσαν χρῆ τὸς γυναικὸς κοσμίως καὶ περισφύγευς αἰδοῖς σώφρονι, μή παρερρυσσόμεν τῆς ἀληθείας; indeed the writer may have had the line of Proverbs in mind, as Chrys. suggested.

The verb may have lost its figurative meaning, and may have been simply an equivalent for “going wrong,” like “labi” in Latin (cp. Cicero, De Officiis, i. 6, “labi autem, errare . . . malum et turpe ducimus”). Anyhow προσέχειν must not be taken in a nautical sense (=moor), in order to round off the “drift away” of παραρέω, a term which carries a sombre significance here (=παραπτώσεως, 63); μήποτε παραρώμεθα, τούτουτι μή ἀπολύωμεθα, μὴ ἐκπέσωμεν (Chrysostom).

In vv. 2f. we have a characteristic (e.g. το 38-81) argument a minore ad maius; if, as we know from our bible (the bible being the Greek OT), every infringement of the Sinaitic legislation was strictly punished—a legislation enacted by means of angels—how much more serious will be the consequences of disregarding such a (great, τῆλικαυτή) σωτηρία as that originally proclaimed by the Lord himself! The τῆλικαυτή is defined as (a) “directly inaugurated by the Κύριος himself,” and (θ) transmitted to us unimpaired by witnesses who had a rich, supernatural endowment; it is as if the writer said, “Do not imagine that the revelation has been weakened, or that your distance from the life of Jesus puts you in any inferior position; the full power of God’s Spirit has been at work in the apostolic preaching to which we owe our faith.”

The reference in λόγος is to the Mosaic code, not, as Schoettgen thought, to such specific orders of angels as the admonitions to Lot and his wife.

Λόγος is used, not νόμος, in keeping with the emphasis upon the divine λαλεῖν in the context, and, instead of νόμος Μοσείως (το 28), δι’ ἀγγέλων λαληθείς λόγος is chosen for argumentative reasons. Here as in Gal 3:19 and Ac 7:88 (ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγάς ἄγγελων) the function of angels in the revelation of the Law at Sinai is assumed, but without any disparaging tone such as is overheard in Paul’s reference. The writer and his readers shared the belief, which first appeared in Hellenistic Judaism, that God employed angels at Sinai. Josephus (Ant. xv. 136, ἡμῶν δὲ τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τὰ δυσώτατα τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις δι’ ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων)1 repeats this tradition, but it went back to the LXX which altered Dt 33:2 into a definite proof of angelic co-operation (ἐκ δεξίων αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ’ αὐτοῦ) and brought this out in Ps 68:18. Rabbinic tradition elaborated the idea. The writer, however, would not have claimed, like Philo (de vita Mosis, 23), that the Mosaic legislation was βέβαια, ἀσάλευτα, valid and supreme as long as the world endured.

1 This is from a speech of Herod inciting the Jews to fight bravely. “In such a speech,” as Robertson Smith observed, “one does not introduce doubtful points of theology.” The tenet was firmly held.
II. 2, 3. THE COMING OF CHRISTIANITY

Παράβασις καὶ παρακοή form one idea (see on 11); as παρακοή (which is not a LXX term) denotes a disregard of orders or of appeals (cp. Clem. Ἡμι. x. 13, εἰ εἴτε παρακοή λόγων κρίσεις γίνεται, and the use of the verb in Mt 1317 ἐὰν δὲ παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν κτλ., or in LXX of Is 6512 ἐλάλησε καὶ παρηκούσατε), it represents the negative aspect, παράβασις the positive. Μισθαποδοσία is a sonorous synonym (rare in this sombre sense of κόλασις) for μισθος or for the classical μισθοδοσία. Some of the facts which the writer has in mind are mentioned in 317 and 1028. The Law proved no dead letter in the history of God's people; it enforced pains and penalties for disobedience.

In v.3 ἄρχην λαβοῦσα is a familiar Hellenistic phrase; cp. e.g. Philo in Quaest. in Ἑσ. 12 (ὅταν οἱ τῶν σπαρτῶν καρποὶ τελειωθῶσιν, οἱ τῶν δένδρων γενετέως ἄρχην λαμβάνοντον), and de νιτα Μωσίς, 114 (τὴν ἄρχην τοῦ γενέσθαι λάβον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ). The writer felt, as Plutarch did about Rome, τὰ Ῥωμαίων πράγματα οὐκ ἄν υπάρχοντο προὔβη δυνάμεως, μὴ θειαν τινὰ ἄρχην λαβόντα καὶ μηδὲν μέγα μὴ διε παράδοξον ἔχουσαν. The modern mind wonders how the writer could assume that the σωτηρία, as he conceives it, was actually preached by Jesus on earth. But he was unconscious of any such difference. The Christian revelation was made through the Jesus who had lived and suffered and ascended, and the reference is not specifically to his teaching, but to his personality and career, in which God's saving purpose came to full expression. Οἱ ἀκούσαντες means those who heard Jesus himself, the αὐτόται of Lk 114 (cp. the shorter conclusion to Mark's gospel: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸσ ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . ἔξαπεσευσελέν δι ὑπάτω τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτω κύριμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας). If the Sinaitic Law ἔγενετο βέβαιος, the Christian revelation was also confirmed or guaranteed to us—εἰς ἡμᾶς (1 P 125 τὸ δῆμα τὸ εἰαγγελισθὲν εἰς υἱόν: Ac 229 Ἰησοῦν . . ἀνδρα ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποδεξηγμένον εἰς υἱόν) ἐβεβαιώθη. It reached us, accurate and trustworthy. No wonder, when we realize the channel along which it flowed. It was authenticated by the double testimony of men1 who had actually heard Jesus, and of God who attested and inspired them in their mission. Συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν means “assent” in Ep. Aristeas, 191, and “corroborate” in the de Mundo, 400a (συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ δ ὁτιο ἀπασ), as usual, but is here a sonorous religious term for συμμαρτυρεῖν (Ro 816). “Coniunctio σίν . . . hunc habet sensum, nos in fide evanellii confirmari symphonia quadam Dei et hominum” (Calvin).

1 In ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκούσαντων, ὑπὸ is used, as invariably throughout Πρὸς 'Εβραίους, of persons, which is a proof of good Greek. “There is no more certain test of the accuracy of individual Greek writers than their use of the passives (or equivalent forms) with ὑπὸ and a genitive. In the best writers this genitive almost invariably denotes personal, or at least living objects” (W. J. Hickie, on Andocides, De Mysteriis, § 14).
σημ., τερ., δου. in the reverse order describe the miracles of Jesus in Ac 22; here they denote the miracles of the primitive evangelists as in 2 Co 12:2.

Philo, speaking of the wonderful feats of Moses before the Pharaoh, declares that signs and wonders are a plainer proof of what God commands than any verbal injunction (περὶ δη τοῦ θεοῦ πρανοτέραις χρησιμών ἀποδείξει ταῖς διὰ σημεῖων καὶ τεράτων τὸ βοήθημα δεδηλωκότος, v. 8. Mos. i. 16).

As "God" (θεοῦ) is the subject of the clause, αὐτοῦ (for which D actually reads θεοῦ) refers to him, and πνεύματος ἀγίου is the genitive of the object after μερισμοῖς (cp. 6:4). What is distributed is the Spirit, in a variety of endowments. To take αὐτοῦ with πνεύματος and make the latter the genitive of the subject, would tally with Paul's description of the Spirit διαφορῶν ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται (1 Co 12:11), but would fail to explain what was distributed and would naturally require τοῦ μερισμοῦ.

As "signs and wonders" are a plainer proof of what God commands than any verbal injunction (περὶ δη τοῦ θεοῦ πρανοτέραις χρησιμών ἀποδείξει ταῖς διὰ σημεῖων καὶ τεράτων τὸ βοήθημα δεδηλωκότος, v. 8. Mos. i. 16).

As "God" (θεοῦ) is the subject of the clause, αὐτοῦ (for which D actually reads θεοῦ) refers to him, and πνεύματος ἀγίου is the genitive of the object after μερισμοῖς (cp. 6:4). What is distributed is the Spirit, in a variety of endowments. To take αὐτοῦ with πνεύματος and make the latter the genitive of the subject, would tally with Paul's description of the Spirit διαφορῶν ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται (1 Co 12:11), but would fail to explain what was distributed and would naturally require τοῦ μερισμοῦ.

A fair parallel lies in Gal 3:6 ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν ὕμνῳ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν, where δυνάμεις also means "miraculous powers" or "mighty deeds" (a Hellenistic sense, differing from that of the LXX = "forces"). In κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θελήσαν, as perhaps even in 17:8 (cp. Blass, 284. 3; Abbott's Johannine Grammar, 2558), the possessive αὐτοῦ is emphatic. θελησιν is read by καὶ R for δέσιν in Ps 21:8 (cp. Ezk 28:23 μὴ θελήσει θελήσω). It is not merely a vulgarism for θελησις, volonte; θελησις désigne le vouloir concentré sur un moment, sur un acte, l'ordre, le commandement" (Psichari, Essai sur le grec de la Septante, 1908, p. 171 n.). The writer is fond of such forms (e.g. ἀθέτησις, ἀθλησις, αἵνεις, μετάθεσις, πρόσκυνης). Naturally the phrase has a very different meaning from the similar remark in Lucian, who makes Hesiod (Dis-putatio cum Hesiode, 4) apologize for certain omissions in his poetry, by pleading that the Muses who inspired him gave their gifts as they pleased—αὐτοὶ δὲ τὰς ευντιών δωρεὰς οἰς τέ εἰν ἑθέλωσι. The vital significance of the Son as the ἀρχηγός of this "salvation" 1 by means of his sufferings on earth, is now developed (vv. 5-18). This unique element in the Son has been already hinted (v.3), but the writer now proceeds to explain it as the core of Christ's pre-eminence. The argument starts from the antithesis between the Son and angels (v.6); presently it passes beyond this, and angels are merely mentioned casually in a parenthesis (v.16). The writer is now coming to the heart of his theme, how and why the Son or Lord, of whom he has been speaking, suffered, died, and rose. Vv.6-9 are the prelude to vv.10-18. The idea underlying the whole passage is this: Λαλεῖοθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου meant much more than λαλεῖοθαι δι' ἀγγέλου, for the Christian revelation of σωτηρία had involved a tragic and painful experience for the Son on earth as he purged sins away. His present superiority to angels had been preceded by a period of mortal

1 In A καὶ of Is 9:6 the messiah is called πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰώνος.
experience on earth ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. But this sojourn was only for a time; it was the vital presupposition of his triumph; it enabled him to die a death which invested him with supreme power on behalf of his fellow-men; and it taught him sympathy (cp. Zimmer, in Studien und Kritiken, 1882, pp. 413 f., and in NTlichen Studien, i. pp. 20–129, on 2:6–18).

5 For the world to come, of which I (ἡμεῖς of authorship) am speaking, was not put under the control of angels (whatever may be the case with the present world). 6 One writer, as we know, has affirmed,

"What is man, that thou art mindful of him?
or the son of man, that thou cares for him?
7 For a little while thou hast put him lower than the angels,
crowning him with glory and honour,
8 putting all things under his feet."

Now by "putting all things under him" the writer meant to leave nothing out of his control. But, as it is, we do not yet see "all things controlled" by man; what we do see is Jesus "who was put lower than the angels for a little while" to suffer death, and who has been "crowned with glory and honour," that by God's grace he might taste death for everyone.

Οὗ γὰρ ἄγγελος (γὰρ, as in Greek idiom, opening a new question; almost equivalent to "now"); oὐ γὰρ—non certe, Valckenaer) ὑπέταξε (i.e. ὁ θεός, as C vg add)—the writer is already thinking of ὑπέταξας in the quotation which he is about to make. In the light of subsequent allusions to μέλλοντα ἀγαθά (9:11 10:1) and ᾗ μέλλονσα πόλις (1:14), we see that τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν means the new order of things in which the σωτηρία of 1:14 2:2 is to be realized (see 9:28), and from which already influences are pouring down into the life of Christians. The latter allusion is the pivot of the transition. The powers and spiritual experiences just mentioned (in v.4) imply this higher, future order of things (cp. 6:4 especially δύναμες τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος), from which rays stream down into the present. How the ministry of angels is connected with them, we do not learn. But the author had already urged that this service of angels was rendered to the divine authority, and that it served to benefit Christians (1:14). This idea starts him afresh. Who reigns in the new order? Not angels but the Son, and the Son who has come down for a time into human nature and suffered death. He begins by quoting a stanza from a psalm which seems irrelevant, because it compares men and angels. In reality this is not what occupies his mind; otherwise he might have put his argument differently and used, for example, the belief that Christians would hold sway over angels in the next world (1 Co 6:3).

1 ἐν τῷ (sc. λέγειν, as 8:11).
2 The omission of this αὐτῷ by B d e arm does not alter the sense.
Philo (de orāfice, 29, oū par’ ὅσον ὤσσατον γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, διὰ τὴν τάξιν ἡλάττωσα) argues that man is not inferior in position because he was created last in order; but this refers to man in relation to other creatures, not in relation to angels, as here.

The quotation (vv.6–8a) from the 8th psalm runs:

τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὃτι μιμνήσκη
ci.ai

ὅδε ἄνθρωπον ὃτι ἐπισκέπτη ἄτον;

ἡλάττωσας αὐτῶν βραχύ τι παρ ἄγγελους,

dόξη καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτῶν.

πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποιῶν αὐτοῦ.

The LXX tr. ἄγγέλους not incorrectly by αὐγέλους, since the elohim of the original probably included angels. This was the point of the quotation, for the author of Hebrews. The text of the quotation offers only a couple of items. (a) τί is changed into τίς (LXX A) by C* P 104. 917. 1288. 1319. 1891. 2127 vt boh, either in conformity to the preceding τίς or owing to the feeling that the more common τίς (in questions, e.g. 127, Jn 1234) suited the reference to Christ better (Bleek, Zimmer). (b) The quotation omits καὶ κατέστησας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὰ ἐργα τῶν χειρῶν σου before πάντα: it is inserted by Ν A C D* M P syr lat boh arm eth Euth. Theodt. Sedul. to complete the quotation. It is the one line in the sentence on which the writer does not comment; probably he left it out as incompatible with 110 (ἐργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσιν ὁι ὑφαναολ), although he frequently quotes more of an OT passage than is absolutely required for his particular purpose.

In διεμαρτύρατο δὲ ποῦ τίς (v.6), even if the δὲ is adversative, it need not be expressed in English idiom. διεμαρτύρεσθαι in Greek inscriptions "means primarily to address an assembly or a king" (Hicks, in Classical Review, i. 45). Here, the only place where it introduces an OT quotation, it = attest or affirm. Ποῦ τίς in such a formula is a literary mannerism familiar in Philo (De Ebriet. 14: εἰπε γάρ ποῦ τίς), and ποῦ later on (44) recurs in a similar formula, as often in Philo. The τίς implies no modification of the Alexandrian theory of inspiration; his words are God’s words (v.8). The psalm intends no contrast between ἡλάττωσας κτλ. and δόξη . . . ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτῶν. The proof that this wonderful being has been created in a position only slightly inferior to that of the divine host lies in the fact that he is crowned king of nature, invested with a divine authority over creation. The psalm is a panegyric on man, like Hamlet’s ("What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel!" etc.), but with a religious note of wonder and gratitude to God. In applying the psalm, however, our writer takes βραχύ τι

1 μιμνήσκη means mindfulness shown in act, and ἐπισκέπτη, as always in the NT, denotes personal care.
II. 7, 8.

in the sense of “temporarily” rather than “slightly,” and so has to make the “inferiority” and “exaltation” two successive phases, in applying the description to the career of Jesus. He does not take this verse as part of a messianic ode; neither here nor elsewhere does he use the term “Son of Man.” He points out, first of all (v. 8) that, as things are (νῦν δὲ οὖν: οὐ πῶς = οὐ πῶς might be read, i.e. “in no wise,” and νῦν taken logically instead of temporally; but this is less natural and pointed), the last words are still unfulfilled; οὖν ὁ ἄρωμεν ἄντω (i.e. man) τὰ “πάντα” (i.e. ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα) ὑποτεταγμένα. Human nature is not “crowned with glory and honour” at present. How can it be, when the terror of death and the devil (v. 15) enslaves it? What is to be said, then? This, that although we do not see man triumphant, there is something that we do see: βλέπωμεν ἦσοῦ dealing triumphantly with death on man’s behalf (v. 9). The ἦσοῦ comes in with emphasis, as in 3 and 12, at the end of a preliminary definition τὸν . . . ἡλπιτωμένον.

It is less natural to take the messianic interpretation which involves the reference of ἄντω already to him. On this view, the writer frankly allows that the closing part of the prophecy is still unfulfilled. “We do not yet see τὰ πάντα under the sway of Jesus Christ, for the world to come has not yet come; it has only been inaugurated by the sacrifice of Christ (ἐκ θαρσωμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν παντᾶς ἐκάθεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλοπρίνης ἐν φυγλοίσι). Though the Son is crowned (ἐκ οὖν ἐκ δεξιῶν μον) and enthroned (καθοῦν ἐκ δεξιῶν μον), his foes are still to be subdued (ἐν τοῖς χειροῖς σου ὑποτόθεν τῶν πολλῶν σου), and we must be content to wait for our full σωτηρία (οὐδὲς) at his second coming; under the ὁπῶς ὁ ἄρωμεν κτλ. of experience there is a deeper experience of faith.” The writer rather turns back in v. 9 to the language of v. 7; this at least has been fulfilled. Jesus has been put lower than the angels and he has been crowned. How and why? The writer answers the second question first. Or rather, in answering the second he suggests the answer to the first. At this point, and not till then, the messianic interpretation becomes quite natural and indeed inevitable. It is the earlier introduction of it which is unlikely. The application to the messiah of words like those quoted in v. 6 is forced, and “Hebrews” has no room for the notion of Christ as the ideal or representative Man, as is implied in the messianic interpretation of ἄντω in v. 8. That interpretation yields a true idea—the thought expressed, e.g., in T. E. Brown’s poem, “Sad! Sad!”—

“One thing appears to me—
The work is not complete;
One world I know, and see
It is not at His feet—
Not, not! Is this the sum?”
No, our author hastens to add, it is not the sum; our outlook is not one of mere pathos; we do see Jesus enthroned, with the full prospect of ultimate triumph. But the idea of the issues of Christ's triumph being still incomplete is not true here. What is relevant, and what is alone relevant, is the decisive character of his sacrifice. The argument of v.8-9, therefore, is that, however inapplicable to man the rhapsody of the psalm is, at present, the words of the psalm are true, notwithstanding. For we see the Jesus who was "put lower than the angels for a little while" to suffer death (διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου must refer to the death of Jesus himself,1 not to the general experience of death as the occasion for his incarnation), now "crowned with glory and honour." When διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου is connected with what follows (δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον), it gives the reason for the exaltation, not the object of the incarnation (= εἰς τὸ πάσχαν). But διὰ . . . θανάτου is elucidated in a moment by ὅπως . . . θανάτου. V.9 answers the question why Jesus was lowered and exalted—it was for the sake of mankind. In v.10 the writer proceeds to explain how he was "lowered"—it was by suffering that culminated in death. Then he recurs naturally to the "why." The mixture of quotation and comment in v.9 leaves the meaning open to some dubiety, although the drift is plain. "But one Being referred to in the psalm (ἀν . . . ἡλπτωμένον) we do see—it is Jesus, and Jesus as ἡλπτωμένον for the purpose of suffering death, and δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον. Why did he die? Why was he thus humiliated and honoured? For the sake of every man; his death was ὑπὲρ παντὸς, part of the divine purpose of redemption." Thus ὅπως . . . θανάτου explains and expounds the idea of διὰ τὸ πάθημα (which consists in) τοῦ θανάτου, gathering up the full object and purpose of the experience which has just been predicated of Jesus. This implies a pause after ἐστεφανωμένον, or, as Bleek suggests, the supplying of an idea like ὅ ἐσταθεν before ὅπως κτλ., if γενέσθαι is to be taken, as it must be, as = "he might taste." How a ὅπως clause follows and elucidates διὰ κτλ. may be seen in Ep. Arist. 106 (διὰ τοῦς ἐν ταῖς ἁγνείαις ὀντας, ὅπως μηδενὸς θεγγάνωσιν).

As for v.8b, Paul makes a similar comment (1 Co 15:27), but excludes God from the τὰ πάντα. The curiously explicit language here is intended to reiterate what is possibly hinted at in v.8, viz., that the next world has no room for the angelic control which characterizes the present. (The τὰ πάντα includes even angels!) This belief was familiar to readers of the Greek bible, where Dt 32:8 voices a conception of guardian-angels over the non-Jewish nations which became current in some circles of the later Judaism. Non-Jewish Christians, like the readers of our epistle, would be likely to appreciate the point of an argument which dealt with this. Note that ἐνυπιστάκτων occurs in a similar antithesis in Epictetus, ii. 10. 1, τὰς τὰ
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Δλλα ἵπτοταγμένα, αὐτὴν ἡ ἀδωνιεύτων καὶ ἀντίθετων. Our author's language reads almost like a tacit repudiation of Philo's remark on Gn 1:28 in de opificio mundi (28), that God put man over all things with the exception of the heavenly beings—δει γὰρ θυμια ἐν τοῖς τραχί στοιχείοις γέ υδάτι ἄρη πάντα ὑπότατοι αὐτῷ, τά κατ' οὐράνιον ὑπεξελθόμενο διε αὐτήτως μοῖρας ἐπιλαχώνα.

The closing clause of v.9 (ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεωσηται θανάτω), therefore, resumes and completes the idea of διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου. Each follows a phrase from the psalm; but ὅπως . . . θανάτω does not follow ἐστεφανωμένων logically. The only possible method of thus taking ὅπως κτλ. would be by applying δοξὴ καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφανωμένων to Christ's life prior to death, either (a) to his pre-incarnate existence, when "in the counsels of heaven" he was, as it were, "crowned for death" (so Rendall, who makes γεώσαθαι θανάτω cover the "inward dying" of daily self-denial and suffering which led up to Calvary), or (b) to his incarnate life (so, e.g., Holmán, Milligan, Bruce), as if his readiness to sacrifice himself already threw a halo round him, or (c) specifically to God's recognition and approval of him at the baptism and transfiguration (Dods). But the use of δοξὴ in v.10 tells against such theories; it is from another angle altogether that Jesus is said in 2 P 1:17 to have received τιμὴ καὶ δοξὰ from God at the transfiguration. The most natural interpretation, therefore, is to regard δοξὴ . . . ἐστεφανωμένων as almost parenthetical, rounding off the quotation from the psalm. It is unnecessary to fall back on such suggestions as (i) to assume a break in the text after ἐστεφανωμένων, some words lost which led up to ὅπως . . . θανάτω (Windisch), or (ii) to translate ὅπως by "how," as in Lk 24:20, i.e. "we see how Jesus tasted death" (so Blass, boldly reading ἐγεύσατο), or by "after that" or "when" (Moses Stuart), as in Soph. Oed. Col. 1638 (where, however, it takes the indicative as usual), etc.

In ὑπὲρ παντὸς, παντὸς was at an early stage taken as neuter, practically—the universe. This was a popular idea in Egyptian Christianity. "You know," says the risen Christ to his disciples, in a Bohairic narrative of the death of Joseph (Texts and Studies, iv. 2. 130), "that many times now I have told you that I must needs be crucified and taste death for the universe." The interpretation occurs first in Origen, who (in Joan. i. 35) writes: "He is a 'great highpriest' [referring to Heb 4:15], having offered himself up in sacrifice once (διὰ) not for human beings alone, but for the rest of rational creatures as well (ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν λοιπῶν λογικῶν). 'For without God he tasted death for everyone' (χωρὶς γὰρ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς ἐγεύσατο θανάτω). In some copies of the epistle to the Hebrews this passage runs: 'for by the grace of God' (χάριτι γὰρ θεοῦ). Well, if 'without God he tasted death for everyone,' he did not die simply for human beings, but for the rest of rational creatures as well; and if 'by the grace of God he tasted the death for everyone,' he died for all except for God (χωρὶς θεοῦ)—for 'by the grace of God he tasted death for everyone.' It would indeed be

1 Reading τοῦ before ὑπὲρ.
preposterous (ἀτόσων) to say that he tasted death for human sins and not also for any other being besides man who has fallen into sin—e.g., for the stars. Even the stars are by no means pure before God, as we read in the book of Job: ‘The stars are not pure before him,’ unless this is said hyperbolically. For this reason he is a ‘great highpriest,’ because he restores (ἀποκαθιστάτης) all things to his Father’s kingdom, ordering it so that what is lacking in any part of creation is completed for the fulness of the Father’s glory (πρὸς τὸ χωρήσαν δόξαν πατρικήν).’ The Greek fathers adhered steadily to this interpretation of παντῶς as equivalent to the entire universe, including especially angels. But the neuter is always expressed in ‘Hebrews’ by the plural, with or without the article, and, as v. 18 shows, the entire interest is in human beings.

Γεύσαι after ὑπὲρ παντῶς has also been misinterpreted. Γεύειν in LXX, as a rendering of εὑρίσκειν, takes either genitive (1 S 14:24, cp. 2 Mac 6:30) or accusative (1 S 14:20, Job 34:3), but γεύεσθαι θανάτου never occurs; it is the counterpart of the rabbinic phrase παντί εὑρίσκειν, and elsewhere in the NT (Mk 9:4=Mt 16:28=Lk 9:27, Jn 3:14) is used not of Jesus but of men. It means to experience (ἴδειν θανάτου, II:1). Here it is a bitter experience, not a rapid sip, as if Jesus simply “tasted” death (Chrysostom, Theophyl., Oecumenius: οὐ γὰρ ἐνέμεινεν τῷ θανάτῳ ἄλλα μονὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον τινά ἀγεγεννησας) quickly, or merely sipped it like a doctor sipping a drug to encourage a patient. The truer comment would be: “When I think of our Lord as tasting death it seems to me as if He alone ever truly tasted death” (M’Leod Campbell, The Nature of the Atonement, p. 259); γεύσαι does not echo βραχύ τι, as though all that Jesus experienced of death was slight or short.

The hardest knot of the hard passage lies in χάριτι θεοῦ. In the second century two forms of the text were current, χορικός θεωτικός and χαριτικός θεωτικός. This is plain from Origen’s comment (see above); he himself is unwilling to rule out the latter reading, but prefers the former, which he apparently found to be the ordinary text. Theodoret assumed it to be original, as Ambrose did in the West. Jerome knew both (on Gal 3:10), and the eighth century Anastasius Abbas read χωρικός (“absque deo: sola enim divina natura non egebat”), i.e., in the sense already suggested by Fulgentius and Vigilius, that Christ’s divine nature did not die. On the other hand, writers like Eusebius, Athanasius, and Chrysostom never mention any other reading than χάριτι. Of all the supporters of χωρικός, the most emphatic is Theodore of Mopsuestia, who protests that it is most absurd (γελοιοτάτον) to substitute χαριτικός θεοῦ for χωρικός θεοῦ, arguing from passages like 1 Co 1:9 and Eph 2:8 that Paul’s custom is not to use the former phrase ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ πάντως ἀπό τινος ἀκολουθίας λόγου. The reading suited the Nestorian view of the person of Christ, and probably the fact of its popularity among the Nestorians tended to compromise χωρίς in the eyes of the later church; it survives only in M 424**, though there is a trace of it (a Nestorian gloss?) in three codices of the Peshitto. But Oecumenius and Theophylact are wrong in holding that it originated among the Nestorians. This is dogmatic prejudice;
χωρίς was read in good manuscripts, if not in the best, by Origen's time, and the problem is to determine whether it or χάριτι was original. The one may be a transcriptional error for the other. In this case, the textual canon “potior lectio difficillima” would favour χωρίς. But the canon does not apply rigidly to every such case, and the final decision depends upon the internal probabilities. Long associations render it difficult for a modern to do justice to χωρίς θεοῦ. Yet χωρίς is elsewhere used by our author in a remarkable way, e.g. in 9:8 χωρίς ἀμαρτίας ὄφθησεν, and the question is whether χωρίς θεοῦ here cannot be understood in an apt, although daring, sense. It may be (i) “forsaken by God,” an allusion to the “dereliction” of Mk 15:24 (B. Weiss, Zimmer), though this would rather be put as ἀπέρ θεοῦ. (ii) “Apart from his divinity” (see above), i.e. when Christ died, his divine nature survived. But this would require a term like τῆς θεότητος. (iii) Taken with παντὸς, “die for everyone (everything?) except God” (Origen’s view, adopted recently by moderns like Ewald and Ebrard). Of these (i) and (iii) are alone tenable. Even if (iii) be rejected, it furnishes a clue to the problem of the origin of the reading. Thus Bengel and others modify it by taking ἐπερ παντὸς = to master everything, χωρίς θεοῦ being added to explain that “everything” does not include God. It is possible, of course, that in the Latin rendering (ut gratia Dei pro omnibus gustaret mortem) gratia is an original nominative, not an ablative, and represents χωρίς (Christ = the Grace of God), which came to be altered into χωρίς and χάριτι. But, if χωρίς θεοῦ is regarded as secondary, its origin probably lies in the dogmatic scruple of some primitive scribe who wrote the words on the margin as a gloss upon παντὸς, or even on the margin of ν.8 opposite ἀφήκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον, whence it slipped lower down into the text. Upon the whole, it seems fairest to assume that at some very early stage there must have been a corruption of the text, which cannot be explained upon the available data. But at any rate χάριτι fits in well with ἐπερεπεμε, which immediately follows, and this is one point in its favour. It was χάριτι θεοῦ that Jesus died for everyone, and this was consonant with God’s character (ἐπερεπεμε γὰρ αὐτῷ, i.e. θεῷ). The nearest Latin equivalent for πρέπον, as Cicero (de Officiis, i. 26) said, was “decorum” (dulce et decorum est pro patria mori), and in this high sense the divine χάρις (4:16), shown in the wide range and object of the death of Jesus, comes out in the process and method.

1 It was so taken by some Latin fathers like Primasius and by later theologians of the Western church like Thomas of Aquinum and Sedulius Scotus, who depended on the Vulgate version.
The writer now explains (vv. 10-18) why Jesus had to suffer and to die. Only thus could he save his brother men who lay (whether by nature or as a punishment, we are not told) under the tyranny of death. To die for everyone meant that Jesus had to enter human life and identify himself with men; suffering is the badge and lot of the race, and a Saviour must be a sufferer, if he is to carry out God's saving purpose. The sufferings of Jesus were neither an arbitrary nor a degrading experience, but natural, in view of what he was to God and men alike. For the first time, the conception of suffering occurs, and the situation which gave rise to the author's handling of the subject arose out of what he felt to be his readers' attitude. "We are suffering hardships on account of our religion." But so did Jesus, the writer replies. "Well, but was it necessary for him any more than for us? And if so, how does that consideration help us in our plight?" To this there is a twofold answer. (a) Suffering made Jesus a real Saviour; it enabled him to offer his perfect sacrifice, on which fellowship with God depends. (b) He suffered not only for you but like you, undergoing the same temptations to faith and loyalty as you have to meet. The threefold inference is: (i) do not give way, but realize all you have in his sacrifice, and what a perfect help and sympathy you can enjoy. (ii) Remember, this is a warning as well as an encouragement; it will be a fearful thing to disparage a religious tie of such privilege. (iii) Also, let his example nerve you.

10 In bringing many sons to glory, it was befitting that He for whom and by whom the universe exists, should perfect the Pioneer of their salvation by suffering (διὰ παθημάτων, echoing διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου). 11 For sanctifier and sanctified have all one origin (ἐξ ἐνός, sc. γενόσω: neuter as Ac 17:26). That is why he (ὁ ἀγιάζων) is not ashamed to call them brothers, saying,

"I will proclaim thy name to my brothers,
in the midst of the church I will sing of thee";

and again,

"I will put my trust in him";

12 and again,

"Here am I and the children God has given me."

14 Since the children then (οὕτως, resuming the thought of v. 11b) share blood and flesh, he himself participated in their nature, so that by dying he might crush him who wields the power of death (that is to say, the devil), and release from thraldom those who lay under a life-long fear of death. (For of course it is not angels that "he succours," it is "the offspring of Abraham"). He had to resemble his brothers in every respect, in order to prove a merciful and faithful high priest in things divine, to expiate the sins of the

---

1 αἵματος καὶ σαρκός (Eph 6:12) is altered into the more conventional σαρκός καὶ αἵματος by, e.g., K L f vg syr pesh eth boh Theodoret, Aug. Jerome.
2 αὕτως, i.e. αἵματος καὶ σαρκός, not παθημάτων, which is wrongly added by D* d syr saus Eus. Jerome, Theodoret.
II. 10.] THE PURPOSE OF GOD

People. 18 It is as he suffered by his temptations that he is able to help the tempted.

It is remarkable (cp. Introd. p. xvi) that the writer does not connect the sufferings of Jesus with OT prophecy, either generally (as, e.g., Lk 24:26 ὠψὶ τῶν Χριστὸν κτλ.), or with a specific reference to Is 53. He explains them on the ground of moral congruity. Here they are viewed from God’s standpoint, as in 12:2 from that of Jesus himself. God’s purpose of grace made it befitting and indeed inevitable that Jesus should suffer and die in fulfilling his function as a Saviour (v.10); then (vv.11f.) it is shown how he made common cause with those whom he was to rescue.

"Επρέπεν γὰρ κτλ. (v. 10). Πρέπειν ορ πρέπον, in the sense of "seemly," is not applied to God in the LXX, but is not uncommon in later Greek, e.g. Lucian’s Prometheus, 8 (οὐτε θεοὶ πρέπον οὔτε ἄλλοι βασιλείαν), and the de Mundo, 397δ, 398α (δ καὶ πρέπον ἔστι καὶ θεοὶ μάλιστα ἀρμόζον—of a theory about the universe, however). The writer was familiar with it in Philo, who has several things to say about what it behoved God to do, though never this thing; Philo has the phrase, not the idea. According to Aristotle (Nεt. Ethic. iv. 2. 2, τὸ πρέπον δὴ πρὸς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐν φὶ καὶ περὶ δὴ), what is "befitting" relates to the person himself, to the particular occasion, and to the object. Here, we might say, the idea is that it would not have done for God to save men by a method which stopped short of suffering and actual death. "Quand il est question des actes de Dieu, ce qui est convenable est toujours nécessaire au point de vue métaphysique" (Reuss). In the description of God (for αὐτὸ cannot be applied to Jesus in any natural sense) δὲ δν τὰ πάντα καὶ δὲ οὐ τὰ πάντα, the writer differs sharply from Philo. The Alexandrian Jew objects to Eve (Gn 4:1) and Joseph (Gn 40:18) using the phrase διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (Cherubim, 35), on the ground that it makes God merely instrumental; whereas, ὁ θεὸς αἰτιών, οὐκ ὁργανόν. On the contrary, we call God the creative cause (αἰτίων) of the universe, ὁργανόν δὲ λόγον θεοῦ δὲ οὗ κατεσκευάσθη. He then quotes Ex 14:13 to prove, by the use of παρὰ, that οὐ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ παρ ’αὐτοῦ ὁς αἰτίων τὸ σώζεσθαι. But our author has no such scruples about διὰ, any more than Aeschylus had (Agamemnon, 1486, διὰ Δίως παναθέου πανέργετα). Like Paul (Ro 11:36) he can say δὲ οὐ τὰ πάντα of God, adding, for the sake of paronomasia, δὲ οὐν to cover what Paul meant by εἴξ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτῶν. Or rather, starting with δὲ οὖν τὰ πάντα he

1 The φησιν of v. 17 is not the same as this ἐδει.
2 Thus: πρέπει τῷ θεῷ φοτείνως καὶ οἰκοδομεῖν ἐν ζωῆς τῶν ἁρετῶς (Leg. alleg. i. 15).
3 When he does use διὰ (de orphicidio, 24) it is δὶ αὐτοῦ μόνον, of creation.
prefers another διά with a genitive, for the sake of assonance, to the more usual equivalent εἴς ὅν or ὑπ' ὅν. To preserve the assonance, Zimmer proposes to render: "um dessentwillen das All, und durch dessen Willen das All."

The ultimate origin of the phrase probably lies in the mystery-cults; Aristides (лат тов Σάρατν, 51: ed. Dindorf, i. p. 87), in an invocation of Serapis, writes to this effect, πάντα γὰρ πανταχόν διὰ σοῦ τε καὶ διὰ σε ἡμῖν γέρνεται. But Greek thought in Stoicism had long ago played upon the use of διὰ in this connexion. Possibly διὰ with the accusative was the primitive and regular expression, as Norden contends.1 We call Zeus "Ζῶνα καὶ Δία" ὅσ ἐν εἰ λέγουμεν δι' ὄν ἥμεν, says the author of de Mundo (401α), like the older Stoics (see Arnim's Stoicorum veterum Fragmenta, ii. pp. 305, 312), and διὰ with the accusative might have the same causal sense here,2 i.e. "through," in which case the two phrases δι' ὄν and δι' ὁδ would practically be a poetical reduplication of the same idea, or at least—"by whom and through whom." But the dominant, though not exclusive, idea of δι' ὄν here is final, "for whom"; the end of the universe, of all history and creation, lies with Him by whom it came into being and exists; He who redeems is He who has all creation at His command and under His control.

The point in adding δι' ὄν . . . τὰ πάντα to αὐτῷ is that the sufferings and death of Jesus are not accidental; they form part of the eternal world-purpose of God. Philo had explained that Moses was called up to Mount Sinai on the seventh day, because God wished to make the choice of Israel parallel to the creation of the world (Quaest. in Exod. 2416 βουλόμενος ἐπιθεῖται ὅτι αὐτός καὶ τὸν κόσμον ἐδημούργησε καὶ τὸ γένος ἐλετο. Ἡ δὲ ἀνάκλησις τοῦ προφήτου δεύτερα γένεσις ἐστὶ τῆς προτέρας ἁμείνοι). But our author goes deeper; redemption, he reiterates (for this had been hinted at in 114), is not outside the order of creation. The distinction between the redeeming grace of God and the created universe was drawn afterwards by gnosticism. There is no conscious repudiation of such a view here, only a definite assertion that behind the redeeming purpose lay the full force of God the creator, that God's providence included the mysterious sufferings of Jesus His Son, and that these were in line with His will.

In πολλοὺς υἱόσ τοις the πολλοί is in antithesis to the one and only ἄρχηγος, as in Ro 829, Mk 1424. For the first time the writer calls Christians God's sons. His confidence towards the Father is in sharp contrast to Philo's touch of hesitation in De Confus. Ling. 28 (καὶ μηδέποτε μέντοι τυγχάνῃ τις ἄξιόχρεως ὃν υἱός θεοῦ προσαγορεύεσθαι . . . καὶ γὰρ εἰ μήπω ἰκανοὶ θεοῦ πατέρες νομίζεσθαι γεγάναμεν). Ἀγαγόντα is devoid of any reference to

1 Agnostos Theos, 347 f. ("Das ist die applikation der logisch-grammatischen Theorie über den Kasus, der in ältester Terminologie, ἐτέρα ἀκτιαν πτώσις, heisst, auf die Physik : die Welt ist das Objekt der durch die höchste αἰτία ausgeübten Tätigkeit ").

2 As in Apoc. 41 and Epist. Aristencs, 16: δι' ὄν ἥμοιοοῦνται τὰ πάντα καὶ γίνεται (quoting Ζῶνα καὶ Δία).
past time. The aorist participle is used adverbially, as often, to denote "an action evidently in a general way coincident in time with the action of the verb, yet not identical with it. The choice of the aorist participle rather than the present in such cases is due to the fact that the action is thought of, not as in progress, but as a simple event or fact" (Burton, Moods and Tenses, 149). It is accusative instead of dative, agreeing with an implied aitw in stead of avtw, by a common Greek assimilation (cp. e.g. Ac 11:12 15:22 22:17 25:27). The accusative and infinitive construction prompted ayagwta instead of ayagwnt. Had ayagwnta been intended to qualify ayxqoxv, palloc would have been preceded by tów. The thought is: thus do men attain the doxa which had been their destiny (v. 7), but only through a Jesus who had won it for them by suffering.

The mistaken idea that ayagwnta must refer to some action previous to FdELwos, which gave rise to the Latin rendering "qui adduxerat" (vg) or "multis filiis adductis" (vt), is responsible for the ingenious suggestion of Zimmer that doxa denotes an intermediate state of bliss, where the dikaios of the older age await the full inheritance of the messianic bliss. It is possible (see below on 11:40 12:52) to reconstruct such an idea in the mind of the writer, but not to introduce it here.

The general idea in ayxxyon is that of originator or personal source; toutéoti, tôn aitw ton tís swtptías (Chrysostom). It is doubtful how far the writer was determined, in choosing the term, by its varied associations, but the context, like that of 12:2, suggests that the "pioneer" meaning was present to his mind; Jesus was ayxxyos tís swtptías aitw in the sense that he led the way, broke open the road for those who followed him. This meaning, common in the LXX, recurs in Ac 5:31 (ayxxyon kai swtptía), and suits ayagwnta better than the alternative sense of the head or progenitor—as of a Greek clan or colony. In this sense ayxxyos is applied to heroes, and is even a divine title of Apollo as the head of the Seleucidae (OGIS. 212:18, 219:20), as well as a term for the founder (= conditor) or head of a philosophical school (Athenaeus, xiii. 563 Ε, τὸν Δραγμόν ὅμων τῆς σοφίας Ζήρωνα). But the other rendering is more relevant. Compare the confession (in the Acts of Maximilianus) of the soldier who was put to death in 295 A.D. (Ruinart, Acta Martyrum, pp. 346 f.): "huic omnes Christiani servimus, hunc sequimur vitae principem, salutis auctorem." The sufferings of Jesus as ayxxyos swtptías had, of course, a specific value in the eyes of the writer. He did not die simply in order to show mortals how to die; he experienced death ὑπὲρ τοῦτος, and by this unique suffering made it possible for "many sons" of God to enter the bliss which he had first won for them. Hence, to "perfect" (telleioi) the ayxxyos swtptías is to make him adequate,
completely effective. What this involved for him we are not yet told; later on (59 728) the writer touches the relation between the perfect ability of Christ and his ethical development through suffering (see below, v.14), but meantime he uses this general term. God had to “perfect” Jesus by means of suffering, that he might be equal to his task as ἀρχηγός or ἀρχιερεὺς (v.17); the addition of αὐτῶν to σωτηρίας implies (see 728) that he himself had not to be saved from sin as they had. The underlying idea of the whole sentence is that by thus “perfecting” Jesus through suffering, God carries out his purpose of bringing “many sons” to bliss.

The verb had already acquired a tragic significance in connexion with martyrdom; in 4 Mac 710 (ἐν πιστῇ θανάτου σφαγίας ἐγείρεσθαι) it is used of Eleazar’s heroic death, and this reappeared in the Christian vocabulary, as, e.g., in the title of the Passio S. Perpetuae (μαρτυριῶν τῆς ἁγίας Περπετουᾶς καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῇ τελειωθέντων ἐν Ἀφρικῇ). But, although Philo had popularized the idea of τελειωται =τελείσθαι, this is not present to our writer’s mind; he is thinking of God’s purpose to realize a complete experience of forgiveness and fellowship (σωτηρία) through the Son, and this includes and involves (as we shall see) a process of moral development for the Son.

The writer now (v.11) works out the idea suggested by πολλοὺς υἱοὺς. Since Jesus and Christians have the same spiritual origin, since they too in their own way are “sons” of God, he is proud to call them brothers and to share their lot (vv.11-13). The leader and his company are a unit, members of the one family of God. It is implied, though the writer does not explain the matter further, that Christ’s common tie with mankind goes back to the pre-incarnate period; there was a close bond between them, even before he was born into the world; indeed the incarnation was the consequence of this solidarity or vital tie (ἐν ἑνός, cp. Pindar, Ἀθη. vi. 1, ἐν ἀνδρῶν, ἐν θεῶν γένος). Ὁ ἁγιάζων and οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι are participles used as substantives, devoid of reference to time. Here, as at 1312, Jesus is assigned the divine prerogative of ἁγιάζειν (cp. Ezk 2012 ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ ἁγιάζων αὐτῶν, 2 Mac 125, etc.), i.e. of making God’s People His very own, by bringing them into vital relationship with Himself. It is another sacerdotal metaphor; the thought of 13 (καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτών ποιησάμενος) is touched again, but the full meaning of ἁγιάζεως is not developed till 913, where we see that to be “sanctified” is to be brought into the presence of God through the self-sacrifice of Christ; in other words, ἁγιάζονται =προτερχόμενοι οἱ ἁγιάζειν τῷ θεῷ, as in Nu 165 where the ἁγιοὶ are those whom God προστατεύσαι πρὸς ἑαυτόν.

According to (Akiba?) Mechilta, 716 (on Ex 2018), God said to the angels at Sinai, “Go down and help your brothers” (בָּרֵךְ לָעֲשׂוּ דָּעֲשׂוּ); yet it was not merely the angels, but God himself, who helped them (the proof-text being Ca 21).
Δι' ἂν αἰτίαν—a phrase only used elsewhere in the NT by the author of the Pastoral epistles—διὰ ἐπαισχύνηται κτλ. ’Ἐπαισχύνησθαι implies that he was of higher rank, being somehow οὐς θεού as they were not. The verb only occurs three times in LXX, twice of human shame (Ps 119:6, Is 1:29), and once perhaps of God (= ἡμᾶς) in Job 34:19. In Test. Jos. 2 it is used passively (οὐ γὰρ ὃς ἀνθρώπως ἐπαισχύνεται ὁ θεός). In the gospels, besides Mk 3:8ff. and Mt 25:40, there are slight traditions of the risen Jesus calling the disciples his ἀδελφοί (Mt 28:10, Jn 20:17); but the writer either did not know of them or preferred, as usual, to lead biblical proofs. He quotes three passages (vv.12, 13), the first from the 22nd psalm (v.23) taken as a messianic cry, the only change made in the LXX text being the alteration of οἵτινες θεοῦ into ἡμῶν. The Son associates himself with his ἀδελφοί in the praise of God offered by their community (a thought which is echoed in 12:28 13:15).

According to Justin Martyr (Dial. 106), Ps 22:22, 23 foretells how the risen Jesus stood ἐν μεσός τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ, τῶν ἄποστόλων . . . καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν διάγων διήμετο τῷ θεῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἄποστόλων γέλοιται γεγονόμενον, and in the Acta Ioannis (11) Jesus, before going out to Gethsemane, says, Let us sing a hymn to the Father (ἐν μέσῳ δὲ αὐτῶν γενόμενος). The couplet is quoted here for the sake of the first line; the second fills it out. Our author only uses ἐκκλησία (12:28) of the heavenly host, never in its ordinary sense of the "church."

The second quotation (v.13a) is from Is 8:17 ἔσομαι πεποίθως (a periphrastic future) ἐτέραν, but the writer prefixes ἔγω to ἔσομαι for emphasis. The insertion of ἔγω by the LXX at the beginning of Is 8:17 helped to suggest that the words were not spoken by the prophet himself. The fact that Jesus required to put faith in God proves that he was a human being like ourselves (see 12:2).

In Philo trustful hope towards God is the essential mark of humanity; e.g. quad. dej. pot. 38 (on Gn 4:26), τοῦ δὲ κατὰ Μωυσῆν ἀνθρώπου διάθεσις ζωῆς ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμῶν δύνανθε θεὸν ἐλπίζοντας.

The third quotation (v.13b) is from the words which immediately follow in Is 8:18, where the LXX breaks the Hebrew sentence into two, the first of which is quoted for his own purposes by the writer. The παιδία are God's children, the fellow νοοί of Christ. It is too subtle to treat, with Zimmer, the three quotations as (a) a resolve to proclaim God, as a man to men; (b) a resolve to trust God amid the sufferings incurred in his mission, and (c) an anticipation of the reward of that mission. On the other hand, to omit the second καὶ πάλιν as a scribal gloss (Bentley) would certainly improve the sense and avoid the necessity of splitting up an Isaianic quotation into two, the first of which is not strictly apposite. But καὶ πάλιν is similarly.

1 It is a literary device of Philo in making quotations (cp. quis rer. div. 1).
used in το; it is more easy to understand why such words should be omitted than inserted; and the deliberate addition of ἐγὼ in the first points to an intentional use of the sentence as indirectly a confession of fellow-feeling with men on the part of the Son.

The same words of the 22nd psalm are played upon by the Od. Sol 31:4: "and he (i.e. messiah or Truth) lifted up his voice to the most High, and offered to Him the sons that were with him (or, in his hands)."

In v.14 κεκοιμώνηκεν (here alone in the NT) takes the classical genitive, as in the LXX. An apt classical parallel occurs in the military writer Polyaenus (Strateg. iii. 11. 1), where Chabrias tells his troops to think of their foes merely as ἀνθρώπως ἄμα καὶ σάρκα έχουσι, καί τής αὐτῆς φύσεως ἕμιν κεκοιμώνηκοσίν. The following phrase παραπλησίως (="similarly," i.e. almost "equally" or "also," as, e.g., in Mar. Tyt. vii. 2, καί ἑστιν καί δ' ἄρχων πόλεως μέρος καί οἱ ἀρχόμενοι παραπλησίως) μετέχετεν... ινα κτλ. answers to the thought of ἐλατομένον... διὰ τὸ πάθημα κτλ. above. The verb is simply a synonym for κοιμώνειν; in the papyri and the inscriptions μετέχετεν is rather more common, but there is no distinction of meaning between the two.

This idea (ινα κτλ.) of crushing the devil as the wielder of death is not worked out by the writer. He alludes to it in passing as a belief current in his circle, and it must have had some context in his mind; but what this scheme of thought was, we can only guess. Evidently the devil was regarded as having a hold upon men somehow, a claim and control which meant death for them. One clue to the meaning is to be found in the religious ideas popularized by the Wisdom of Solomon, in which it is pretty clear that man was regarded as originally immortal (13. 14), that death did not form part of God's scheme at the beginning, and that the devil was responsible for the introduction of death into the world (22. 24); those who side with the devil encounter death (πειράζονσι δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ τῆς ἐκείνης μερός δυντες), which they bring upon themselves as a result of their sins. Robertson Smith (Expositor 2, iii. pp. 76 f.) suggests another explanation, viz., that Jesus removes the fear of death by acting as our Highpriest, since (cp. Nu 18) the OT priests were responsible for averting death from the people, "the fear of death" being "specially connected with the approach of an impure worshipper before God." This certainly paves the way for v.17, but it does not explain the allusion to the devil, for the illustration of Zech 3 is too remote.

Corroboration of this idea are to be found in more quarters than one. (a) There is the rabbinic notion that the angel of death has the power of inflicting death, according to Pes. Kahana, 32. 1396; Mechilta, 72a on Ex 20 (where Ps 82 is applied to Israel at Sinai, since obedience to the Torah would have exempted them from the power of the angel of death), the angel of death being identified with the devil. (b) There is also the apocalyptic hope that
messiah at the end would crush the power of the devil, a hope expressed in the second-century conclusion (Freer-Codex) to Mark, where the risen Christ declares that "the limit (or term, ὁ δρός) of years for Satan's power has now expired." (c) Possibly the author assumed and expanded Paul's view of death as the divine punishment for sin executed by the devil, and of Christ's death as a satisfaction which, by removing this curse of the law, did away with the devil's hold on sinful mortals. Theodoret's explanation ( Dial. iii.) is that the sinlessness of Christ's human nature freed human nature from sin, which the devil had employed to enslave men: επειδή γὰρ τιμωρία τῶν ἁμαρτήτων ὁ θάνατος ἦν, τὸ δὲ σώμα τὸ Κυριακὸν οὐκ ἔχει ἀμαρτίας κηλίδα δ' ἀπαρά τῶν θεῶν νόμον δ' θάνατος ἀδίκως εξηγήθησεν, ἀνέστησε μὲν πρῶτον τὸ παρανόμως κατασχέθην. Επειτὰ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐνδικοὺς καθιερμένους ὑπέσχετο τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν.

The force of the paradox in διὰ τοῦ θανάτου (to which the Armenian version needlessly adds αὐτοῦ) is explained by Chrysostom: δι' οὗ ἐκράτησεν ὁ διάβολος, διὰ τούτου ἠττηθή. As the essence of σωτηρία is life, its negative aspect naturally involves emancipation from death. Ἐχειν τὸ κράτος τοῦ θανάτου means to wield the power of death, i.e. to have control of death. Ἐχειν τὸ κράτος with the genitive in Greek denoting lordship in a certain sphere, e.g. Eurip. Helena, 68 (τίς τῶν ἐρωμένων δομάτων ἔχει κράτος). Ἀπαλλάξει goes with δουλείας (as in Joseph. Ant. 13. 13 (363), τῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐξαρθροῦσας αὐτοῦ δουλείας ... ἀπαλλαττεῖν, etc.), which is thrown to the end of the sentence for emphasis, after ὅσοι ... ἦσαν which qualifies τούτους. Ἐνοχοι is a passive adjective, equivalent to ἐνεχώμενοι, "bound by," (as in Demosthenes, 1229), and goes with φῶς θανάτου, which is not a causal dative. Ὄσοι in Hellenistic Greek is no more than the ordinary relative οἷς. Διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζήν, not simply in old age, as Musonius (ed. Hense, xvii.) thinks: καὶ τὸ γε ἀθλήσατον ποιοῦν τὸν βίον τοὺς γέρουσιν αὐτὸ ἐστὶν, ὁ τοῦ θανάτου φόβος. Aristaeas (130, 141, 168) uses διὰ ἐλεύθερος τοῦ ζῆν, but διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν is an unparalleled (in NT Greek) instance of an attribute in the same case being added to the infinitive with a preposition. There is a classical parallel in the Platonic διὰ παντὸς τοῦ έταίναι (Parmenides, 152 E); but τὸ ζῆν had already come to be equivalent to ὁ βίος.

The enslaving power of fear in general is described by Xenophon in the Cyræedia, iii. 1. 23 f.: οἶς οὖν τι μᾶλλον καταδουλώθηκεν ἀνθρώπων τοῦ λόγχρου φόβου; ... οἷς πάνω τῶν δεινῶν ὁ φόβος μάλιστα καταπλήττει τῆς ψυχᾶς. Here it is the fear of death, or rather of what comes after death, which is described. The Greek protest against the fear of death (cp. Epict. iii. 36. 28), as unworthy of the wise and good, is echoed by Philo (quod omnis probus liber, 3, ἔπαινεται παρὰ τινος ὁ τρίμετρον ἐκεῖνο τοῦμας: "τίς εὖτε δοῦλος, τοῦθεν ἁμώτερος ὃν;" ὥς μᾶλλον συνυδώ τὸ ἀκόλουθον. Ὑπέλαβε γὰρ, ὅτι οὐδὲν οὐτως δουλώνθηται πέρικε διάνοιαν, ὡς τὸ ἐπὶ θανάτῳ δέος, ἐνεκα τοῦ πρός τὸ ζῆν ἴμερον). But the fear persisted; as we see from writers
like Seneca ("optanda mors est sine metu mortis mori," *Troades*, 869) and Cicero; the latter deals with the fear of death in *De Finibus*, v. 11, as an almost universal emotion ("fere sic afficiuntur omnes"). Lucretius as a rationalist had denounced it magnificently in the *De Rerum Natura*, which "is from end to end a passionate argument against the fear of death and the superstition of which it was the basis. The fear which he combated was not the fear of annihilation, but one with which the writer of this Epistle could sympathize, the fear of what might come after death; 'aeternas quoniam poenas in morte timendum est' (i. 111)" (Wickham). The fear of death as death (cp. Harnack's *History of Dogma*, iii. 180) has been felt even by strong Christians like Dr. Johnson. But our author has more in view. Seneca's epistles, for example, are thickly strewn with counsels against the fear of death; he remonstrates with Lucilius on the absurdity of it, discusses the legitimacy of suicide, if things come to the worst, points out that children and lunatics have no such fear (*Ep.* xxxvi. 12), and anticipates most of the modern arguments against this terror. Nevertheless, he admits that it controls human life to a remarkable extent, even though it is the thought of death, not death itself, that we dread (*Ep.* xxx. 17); he confesses that if you take anyone, young, middle-aged, or elderly, "you will find them equally afraid of death" (xxii. 14). And his deepest consolation is that death cannot be a very serious evil, because it is the last evil of all ("quod extremum est," *Ep.* iv. 3). Now the author of *Πρὸς Ἐβραίους* sees more beyond death than Seneca. "After death, the judgment." The terror which he notes in men is inspired by the fact that death is not the final crisis (927). "Ultra (i.e. post mortem) neque curae neque gaudio locum esse," said Sallust. It was because a primitive Christian did see something "ultra mortem," that he was in fear, till his hope reassured him (928).

It is noteworthy that here (vv. 14–15) and elsewhere our author, not unlike the other διδάσκαλος who wrote the epistle of James, ignores entirely the idea of the devil as the source of temptation; he does not even imply the conception of the devil, as 1 Peter does, as the instigator of persecution.

In one of his terse parentheses the writer now (v. 16) adds, οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοῦ παθήλει ἐπιλαμβάνεται. Δὴ τοῦ is the classical term for "it need hardly be said" or "of course," and ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι means "t to succour" (Sir 4:11 ἡ σοφία νιὸν ἄντη ἄννυσεν, καὶ ἐπιλαμβάνεται τῶν ἐγούτοιν αὐτῇ). If it meant "seize" or "grip," θάνατος (i.e. either death, or the angel of death, cp. v. 14) might be taken as the nominative, the verse being still a parenthesis. This idea, favoured by some moderns, seems to lie behind the Syriac version (cp. A. Bonus, *Expository Times*, xxxiii. pp. 234–236); but ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι here corresponds to
II. 16, 17.] THE AID OF JESUS

βοήθησαι in v. 18, and is used in the same good sense as in the other quotation in 50. The words ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπλαμβάνεται may be a reminiscence of Is 41:8,9 where God reassures Israel: σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ . . . ὀδικελαβόμην. The archaic phrase was perhaps chosen, instead of a term like ἀνθρώπων,1 on account of Abraham's position as the father of the faithful (see 11ff.). Paul had already claimed it as a title for all Christians, irrespective of their birth: οὐκ εἰν 'Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἔλλην . . . εἰ δὲ υἱεὶς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἑστέ (Gal 3:28, 29), and our author likes these archaic, biblical periphrases. He repeats ἐπλαμβάνεται after Ἀβραὰμ to make a rhetorical antistrophe (see Introd. p. lvii).

It is a warning against the habit of taking the Greek fathers as absolute authorities for the Greek of Πόρι Ἐβραίους, that they never suspected the real sense of ἐπλαμβάνεται here. To them it meant “appropriates” (the nature of). When Castellio (Chatillon), the sixteenth century scholar, first pointed out the true meaning, Beza pleasantly called his opinion a piece of cursed impudence (“execranda Castellionis audacia qui ἐπλαμβάνεται convertit ‘opitulatur,’ non modo falsa sed etiam inepta interpretatione”). The mere fact that the Greek fathers and the versions missed the point of the word is a consideration which bears, e.g., upon the interpretation of a word like ὑπόστασις in 3:14 and 11.

The thought of vv. 14-15 is now resumed in v. 17; δὲν (a particle never used by Paul) ἀφεῖλεν (answering to ἔπρεπεν) κατὰ πάντα (emphatic by position) τοῖς ἄδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι—resembling them in reality, as one brother resembles another (so Test. Naphtali 18 ὁμοίως μου ἦν κατὰ πάντα Ἰωσήφ). In what follows, ἔλεήμων2 is put first for emphasis (as the writer is about to speak of this first), and goes like πιστὸς with ἀρχιερεύς. “Quae verba sic interpretor: ut misericors esset, ideoque fidelis,” Calvin argues. But this sequence of thought is not natural; loyalty to God's purpose no doubt involved compassion for men, but Christ was πιστὸς as he endured steadfastly the temptations incurred in his τελείωσις as ἀρχιερέας. He suffered, but he never swerved in his vocation. Nor can πιστὸς here mean “reliable” (Seeberg, Der Tod Christi, 17), i.e. reliable because merciful; the idea of his sympathy as an encouragement to faith is otherwise put (cp. 4:14f. 12ff.). The idea of τελείωσις in v. 10 is being explicitly stated; the sufferings of Christ on earth had a reflex influence upon himself as Saviour, fitting him for the proper discharge of his vocation. But the vocation is described from a new angle of vision; instead of ἀρχιερεύς or ὁ ἀγιάζων, Jesus is suddenly (see Introd. p. xcv) called ἀρχιερεύς.

1 Cosmas Indicopleustes correctly interpreted the phrase: τούτοις σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς λογικῆς (372 B).
2 The seer in Enoch 40-10 has a vision of the four angels who intercede for Israel before God; the first is “Michael, the merciful and long-suffering.”
evidently a term familiar to the readers (ἀρχιερεία τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, 3). The prestige of the highpriest in the later Judaism is plain in rabbinic (e.g. Berachoth, Joma) tradition and also in apocalyptic. The Maccabean highpriests assumed the title of ἵερεις τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ύψιστον (Ass. Mosis, 61; Jubilees, 32), and the ritual of the day of atonement, when he officiated on behalf of the people, was invested with a special halo. This is the point of the allusion here, to the ἀρχιερείας expiating the sins of the people. Philo had already used the metaphor to exalt the functions of his Logos as a mediator: ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἵκετης μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος αἰ ρός τὸ ἀφθαρτον, προσβευτὴς δὲ τοῦ ἱγμόνος πρὸς τὸ υπῆκον (quis rerum div. heres, 42). But, while the term ἵκετης does imply some idea of intercession, this is not prominent in Philo's cosmological and metaphysical scheme, as it is in our epistle, which carefully avoids the Philonic idea that men can propitiate God (βούλεται γὰρ αὐτὸν δ νόμος μείζονος μεμοιράσθαι φύσεως ἢ κατ ἀνθρώπων, ἐγγυτέρω προσσίαν τῆς θείας, μεθόρουν, εἰ δεί τάληθες λέγειν, ἀμφότερον ἦν διὰ μέσου τῶν ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἡλασκόντας θεῶν, θεῶς δὲ τὰς χάριτας ἀνθρώπων ὑποδιακόνω τινὶ χρώμενος ὀρέγη καὶ χορηγῆ, De Spec. Leg. i. 12). Again, Philo explains (de sacerdot. 12) that the highpriest was forbidden to mourn, when a relative died, ἵνα . . . κρείτων οἴκτον γενόμενος, ἄνυστος εἰς αἱ διασελγη. This freedom from the ordinary affections of humanity was part of his nearer apportionment to the life of God (ἐγγυτέρω προσσίαν τῆς θείας [φύσεως]). But our author looks at the function of Christ as ἀρχιερεία differentially; the first word to be used about him in this connexion is ἔλεημων, and, before passing on to develop the idea of πιστός, the writer adds (v.18) another word upon the practical sympathy of Christ. In resembling his ἀπελθὼν κατὰ παντὰ Christ πέπονθεν πειρασθείς, His death had achieved for them an emancipation from the dread of death (v.14); by entering into glory he had expiated the sins of God's People, thereby securing for them a free and intimate access to God. But the process by means of which he had thus triumphed was also of value to men; it gave him the experience which enabled him by sympathy to enter into the position of those who are tempted as he was, and to furnish them with effective help. The connexion between v.18 (with its γὰρ) and v.17 does not rest upon the idea of Christ as ἔλεημων καὶ πιστός ἄρχιερεῖς, as though the effective help received from Christ were a constant proof that he expiates sins, i.e. maintains us in the favour and fellowship of God (Seeberg). It rests on the special idea suggested by ἔλεημων. "His compassion is not mere pity for men racked . . . by pain in itself, however arising; it is compassion for men tempted by sufferings towards sin or unbelief" (A. B.
II. 17, 18. — THE TEMPTATIONS OF JESUS

Davidson). What the writer has specially in mind is the agony in Gethsemane (cp. 57) as the culminating experience of sorrow caused by the temptation to avoid the fear of death or the cross.

The adverbial accusative τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν here, as in 51, is a fairly common LXX phrase (e.g. Ex 416 (of Moses), εὐ δὲ αὐτῷ ἔσῃ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν). ᾿ιλάσκεσθαι τὰς ᾿ἀμαρτίας is also a LXX phrase, an expression for pardon or expiation, as in Ps 654 (τὰς ᾿ἀσεβείας ἡμῶν σὺ ᾿ιλάσῃ), which never occurs again in the NT. When the verb (middle voice) is used of God's dealings with men, it generally takes the person of the sinner as its object in the dative (as Lk 1813, the only other NT instance of ᾿ιλάσκεσθαι) or else sins in the dative (ταῖς ᾿ἀμαρτίαις is actually read here by A 5. 33. 623. 913, Athan. Chrys. Bentley, etc.). This removal of sins as an obstacle to fellowship with God comes under the function of ᾿ὁ ἁγιάζων. The thought reappears in 725 and in 1 Jn 22 (καὶ αὐτὸς ὕλασμός ἐστίν).

ὁ λαός (τοῦ θεοῦ) is the writer's favourite biblical expression for the church, from the beginning to the end; he never distinguishes Jews and Gentiles.

The introduction of the πειρασμοὶ of Jesus (v.18) is as abrupt as the introduction of the ᾿ἀρχετέρες idea, but is thrown out by way of anticipation. Ἐν ὧν γὰρ = ἐν τούτῳ ἐν ὧ (causal) or ἀπό, explaining not the sphere, but the reason of his "help," πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθείς—the participle defining the πᾶσχειν (a term never applied to Jesus by Paul): he suffered by his temptations, the temptations specially in view being temptations to avoid the suffering that led to the cross. This is the situation of the readers. They are in danger of slipping into apostasy, of giving up their faith on account of the hardships which it involved. Οἱ πειρασθηκαί are people tempted to flinch and falter under the pressure of suffering. Life is hard for them, and faith as hard if not harder. Courage, the writer cries, Jesus understands; he has been through it all, he knows how hard it is to bear suffering without being deflected from the will of God. Grammatically, the words might also read: "For he himself, having been tempted by what he suffered, is able to help those who are tempted." The sense is really not very different, for the particular temptations in view are those which arise out of the painful experience of having God's will cross the natural inclination to avoid pain. But the πειρασμοὶ of Jesus were not simply due to what he suffered. He was strongly tempted by experiences which were not painful at all—e.g. by the remonstrance of Simon Peter at Caesarea Philippi. As Ritschl puts it, "Christ was exposed to temptation simply because a temptation is always bound up with an inclination which is at the outset morally legitimate or permissible. It was the impulse,
in itself lawful, of self-preservation which led to Christ's desire to be spared the suffering of death. And this gave rise to a temptation to sin, because the wish collided with his duty in his vocation. Christ, however, did not consent to this temptation. He renounced his self-preservation, because he assented to the Divine disposal of the end of his life as a consequence of his vocation (Rechtfertigung u. Versöhnung, iii. 507; Eng. tr. p. 573).

On the suffering that such temptation involved, see below on 58.

Bothein and ιυλάκεσθαι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις occur side by side in the prayer of Ps 799 (LXX). Are they synonymous here? Is the meaning of τὸ ιυλάκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ θεοῦ that Christ constantly enables us to overcome the temptations that would keep us at a distance from God or hinder us from being at peace with God? (so, e.g., Kurtz and M'Leod Campbell, The Nature of the Atonement, pp. 172-174). The meaning is deeper. The help conveyed by the sympathy of Jesus reaches back to a sacrificial relationship, upon which everything turns. Hence the ideas of ἀλείψων and πιστὸς are now developed, the latter in 31-06a, the former in 414f, 36b-418 being a practical application of what is urged in 31-06. But the writer does not work out the thought of Christ as πιστὸς in connexion with his function as ἀρξεφεις, even though he mentions the latter term at the outset of his appeal, in which the stress falls on the expiatory work of Christ.

1 Holy brothers (ἄγιοι = ἄγνωστοι, 211), you who participate in a heavenly calling, look at Jesus then (ὅθεν in the light of what has just been said), at the apostle and highpriest of our confession; 2 he is "faithful" to Him who appointed him. For while "Moses" also was "faithful in every department of God's house," 3 Jesus (οὗτος, as in 1012) has been adjudged greater glory (παρά, as in 14) Moses, inasmuch as the founder of a house enjoys greater honour (τιμίω, a literary synonym for δόξα) than the house itself. 4 (Every house is founded by some one, but God is the founder of all.) Besides, while "Moses" was "faithful in every department of God's house" as an attendant—by way of witness to the coming revelation—5 Christ is faithful as a son over God's house.

In v. 1 διά (om. p13 B sah boh Cyr. Amb.) may be a gloss from v. 4. In v. 4 the emphasis on παλαιοὶ is better maintained by οὗτος δόξας (καὶ B C D P v Chrys.) than by δόξας οὗτος (p13 K L M 6. 33. 104. 326. 1175. 1288 vg) or by the omission of οὗτος altogether (467 arm Basil). In v. 4 πᾶντα has been harmonized artificially with 18 210 by the addition of τὰ (C 0 L P Ψ 104. 326. 1175. 1128 Athan.).

For the first time the writer addresses his readers, and as ἀδελφοὶ ἄγιοι (only here in NT, for ἄγιοι in i Th 527 is a later insertion), κληρονόμοι ἐποιεῖσθαι μετοχοῖς (6 etc., cp. Ps 11938 μέτοχοι ἐγὼ ἐμί πάντως τῶν φασομένων σε, Ἐπ. Arist. 207; de Mundo, 401b). In Ph 314 the ἀνώ κληρος is the prize conferred at the end upon Christian faith and faithfulness. Here there may be a side allusion to 21 (ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ καλεῖν). ἐκατανοήσατε (a verb) used in this general sense by Ἐπ. Aristieas, 3, πρὸς ἰδ
the writer summons his readers to consider Jesus as πιστός; but, instead of explaining why or how Jesus was loyal to God, he uses this quality to bring out two respects (the first in vv. 2a-4, the second in vv. 5-6a) in which Jesus outshone Moses, the divinely-commissioned leader and lawgiver of the People in far-off days, although there is no tone of disparagement in the comparison with Moses, as in the comparison with the angels.

In the description of Jesus as τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, ὁμολογία is almost an equivalent for "our religion," as in 4:14 (cp. 10:28). Through the sense of a vow (LXX) or of a legal agreement (papyri and inscriptions), it had naturally passed into the Christian vocabulary as a term for the common and solemn confession or creed of faith. ἡμῶν is emphatic. In "our religion" it is Jesus who is ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεύς, not Moses. This suits the context better than to make the antithesis one between the law and the gospel (Theophyl. ὃς γὰρ τῆς κατὰ νόμον λατρείας ἀρχιερεύς ἐστιν, ἄλλα τῆς ἡμετέρας πίστεως). Possibly the writer had in mind the Jewish veneration for Moses which found expression during the second century in a remark of rabbi Jose ben Chalafta upon this very phrase from Numbers (Sifre, § 110): "God calls Moses ‘faithful in all His house,’ and thereby he ranked higher than the ministering angels themselves." The use of ἀπόστολος as an epithet for Jesus shows "the fresh creative genius of the writer and the unconventional nature of his style." (Bruce). Over half a century later, Justin (in Ἀρσ. 1:12) called Jesus Christ τοῦ πατρὸς πάντων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ νόσι καὶ ἀπόστολος ὅν, and in Ἀρσ. 1:68 described him as ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπόστολος' αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἀπαγγέλλει δοσα δεὶ γνωσθῆναι, καὶ ἀποστέλλεται, μηνύων δοσα ἀγγέλλεται (the connexion of thought here possibly explains the alteration of διηγήσωμαι into ἀπαγγέλλω in He 2:18). Naturally Jesus was rarely called ἄγγελος; but it was all the easier for our author to call Jesus ἀπόστολος, as he avoids the term in its ecclesiastical sense (cp. 2:4). For him it carries the usual associations of authority; ἀπόστολος is Ionic for πρεσβεύτης, not a mere envoy, but an ambassador or representative sent with powers, authorized to speak in the name of the person who has dispatched him. Here the allusion is to 2:5, where the parallel is with the Sinaitic legislation, just as the allusion to Jesus as ἀρχιερεύς recalls the δ ἄγια ὶν of 2:11-17. On the other hand, it is not so clear that any explicit antithesis to Moses is implied in ἀρχιερεύς, for, although Philo had invested Moses with...
highpriestly honour (praem. et proen. 9, γυγκάνει...ἀρχιερευόνης, de vita Mosis, ii. 1, ἕγενετο γὰρ προνοίᾳ θεοῦ...ἀρχιερεῖς), this is never prominent, and it is never worked out in "Hebrews."

The reason why they are to look at Jesus is (vv. 2) his faithfulness τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτῷ, where ποιεῖν means "to appoint" to an office (as 1 S 126 κύρος ὁ ποιήσας τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ τὸν Ααρόν, Mk 30 καὶ ἐσοφίσεν δώδεκα). This faithfulness puts him above Moses for two reasons. First (vv.2-4), because he is the founder of the House or Householder of God, whereas Moses is part of the House. The text the writer has in mind is Nu 127 (οὐχ οὕτως ὁ θεράπων μου Μωυσῆς: ἐν δόξῃ τῷ οἶκῳ μου πιστὸς ἐστίν), and the argument of v.8, where οἶκος, like our "house," includes the sense of household or family,1 turns on the assumption that Moses belonged to the οἶκος in which he served so faithfully. How Jesus "founded" God's household, we are not told. But there was an οἶκος θεοῦ before Moses, as is noted later in II2.26, a line of πρεσβύτεροι who lived by faith; and their existence is naturally referred to the eternal Son. The founding of the Household is part and parcel of the creation of the τὰ πάντα (12.8). Κατασκευάζειν includes, of course (see 92.6), the arrangement of the οἶκος (cp. Epict. i. 6. 7-10, where κατασκευάζω is similarly used in the argument from design). The author then adds an edifying aside, in v.4, to explain how the οἶκος was God's (v.2 αὐτοῖ), though Jesus had specially founded it. It would ease the connexion of thought if θεός meant (as in 187) "divine" as applied to Christ (so, e.g., Cramer, M. Stuart), or if οὕτως could be read for θεός, as Blass actually proposes. But this is to rewrite the passage. Nor can we take αὐτοῖ in v.8a as "Christ's"; there are not two Households, and πᾶς (v.4) does not mean "each" (so, e.g., Reuss). Αὐτοῖ in vv.2.5 and 8a must mean "God's." He as creator is ultimately responsible for the House which, under him, Jesus founded and supervises.

This was a commonplace of ancient thought. Justin, e.g., observes: Μεγάλωρ τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τοῖς ταύτα φθάσαι ταύτα φράξομεν' μείζονα γὰρ τῶν δημιουργῶν τοῦ σκευασμένου ἀστέφματο (Apol. 129). It had been remarked by Philo (De I'ant. 16): δοξή γὰρ ὁ κτησάμενος τὸ κτήμα τοῦ κτήσαντος ἄμεινον καὶ τὸ πεποιημένον τοῦ γεγονότος, τοσούτου βασιλεύοντος ἀκέμνοι, and in Legum Allegor. iii. 32 he argues that just as no one would ever suppose that a furnished mansion had been completed ἄνευ τέχνης καὶ δημιουργῶν, so anyone entering and studying the universe ὄστρεος εἷς μεγάλην οἰκίαν ἡ πτέλει would naturally conclude that ἐν καὶ ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦτος δημιουργὸς ὁ θεός.

The usual way of combining the thought of v. 4 with the context is indicated by Lactantius in proving the unity of the Father and the Son (diuin. insti. iv. 29): "When anyone has a son of whom he is specially fond (quem unice dilegit), a son who is still in the house and under his father's authority (in manu patris)—he may grant him the name and power of lord (nomen

1 Our author avoids (see on 212) ἐκκλησία, unlike the author of 1 Ti 316 who writes ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ, ἡτίς ἐστίν ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ.
domini potestatemque), yet by civil law (civili iure) the house is one, and one is called lord. So this world is one house of God, and the Son and the Father, who in harmony (unanimos) dwell in the world, are one God.”

The second (5-6) proof of the superiority of Jesus to Moses is now introduced by *καθ.* It rests on the term *θεράπων* used of Moses in the context (as well as in Nu 11:11 12:7 etc.; of Moses and Aaron in Wis 10:16 18:21); *θεράπων* is not the same as *δοῦλος*, but for our author it is less than *πιστός*, and he contrasts Moses as the *θεράπων* ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ with Jesus as the Λογίον ἐπὶ τῶν ὀικών, *ἐπί* used as in 10:21 (ἐρέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀικῶν τοῦ θεοῦ) and Mt 25:21, 23 (ἐπὶ δύνα ἡ πιστότερος). Moses is “egregius domesticus fidei tuae” (Aug. Conf. xii. 23). The difficult phrase *εἰς τὸ μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων* means, like 9, that the position of Moses was one which pointed beyond itself to a future and higher revelation; the tabernacle was a *σκήνη τοῦ μαρτύριον* (Nu 12:5) in a deep sense. This is much more likely than the idea that the faithfulness of Moses guaranteed the trustworthiness of anything he said, or even that Moses merely served to bear testimony of what God revealed from time to time (as if the writer was thinking of the words στάμα κατὰ στάμα λαλήσω αὐτῷ which follow the above-quoted text in Numbers).

The writer now passes into a long appeal for loyalty, which has three movements (3:6-19 4:1-10 4:11-18). The first two are connected with a homily on Ps 95:7-11 as a divine warning against the peril of apostasy, the story of Israel after the exodus from Egypt being chosen as a solemn instance of how easy and fatal it is to forfeit privilege by practical unbelief. It is a variant upon the theme of 2:8, suggested by the comparison between Moses and Jesus, but there is no comparison between Jesus and Joshua; for although the former opens up the Rest for the People of to-day, the stress of the exhortation falls upon the unbelief and disobedience of the People in the past.

6 *Now we are this house of God* (οδ., from the preceding *ἐν τῷ*), if we will only keep confident and proud of our hope. 7 *Therefore, as the holy Spirit says:* "Today, when (ἐὰν, as in 1 Jn 2:28) you hear his voice, harden not (ἡ σκληρύνετε, aor. subj. of negative entreaty) your hearts as at the Provoation, on the day of the Temptation in the desert,

9 where (οδ. = *ἐν τῷ* as Dt 8:2) your fathers put me to the proof,

10 and for forty years felt what I could do."

Therefore "I grew exasperated with that generation, I said, 'They are always astray in their heart'; they would not learn my ways;"

11 so (ὡς consecutive) I swore in my anger "they shall never (ἐὶς the emphatic negative ἐκ in oaths) enter my Rest.""

12 *Brothers, take care in case there is a wicked, unbelieving heart in any of you, moving you to apostatize from the living God.* 13 Rather admonish one another (ἐναντίον = ἀλλήλου) daily, so long as this word "Today" is uttered, that none of you may be deceived by sin and "hardened." 14 For we only
participate in Christ provided that we keep firm to the very end the confidence with which we started, 16 this word ever sounding in our ears:

"Today, when you hear his voice, harden not your hearts as at the Provocation."

16 Who heard and yet "provoked" him? Was it not all who left Egypt under the leadership of Moses? 17 And with whom was he exasperated for forty years? Was it not with those who sinned, whose "corpses 1 fell in the desert"? 18 And to whom "did he swear that they (sc. aiōnoi) would never enter his Rest"? To whom but those who disobeyed (ἀπειθήσαν, cp. Ac 19) 19 Thus (καὶ consecutive) we see it was owing to unbelief that they could not enter.

In v. 6 (a) ois is altered into δσ by D* M 6. 424 Lat. Lucifer, Ambr. Priscillian, probably owing to the erroneous idea that the definite article (supplied by 440. 2005) would have been necessary between ois and deos. (b) év is assimilated to the text of v. 14 by a change to ἀνπερ in n° A C D° K L W syṛḳl Lucifer, Chrys. etc. (von Soden). (c) After ἐπίσδος the words μέχρι τέλους βεβαιαν are inserted from v. 14 by a number of MSS; the shorter, correct text is preserved in p° B 1739 sah eth Lucifer, Ambrose.

V. 6b introduces the appeal, by a transition from 6a. When Philo claims that παρρησία is the mark of intelligent religion (quis erer. div. haeres, 4, τοὺς μὲν οὖν ἀμαθεῖς συμφέρον ἡσυχία, τοὺς δὲ ἐπιστήμονας ἐφημέρους καὶ ἀμα φιλοδοσιτῶς ἀνακαθήσατον ἡ παρρησία κτήμα), he means by παρρησία the confidence which is not afraid to pray aloud: cp. ib. 5 (παρρησία δὲ φιλίας συγγενεῖς, ἐπεὶ πρὸς τινὰ ἄν τις ἤ πρὸς τὸν ἀνατούς φίλον παρρησιάσαστο;), where the prayers and remonstrances of Moses are explained as a proof that he was God's friend. But here as elsewhere in the NT παρρησία has the broader meaning of "confidence" which already appears in the LXX (e.g. in Job 27 μὴ ἔχει τινὰ παρρησίαν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ). This confidence is the outcome of the Christian ἐλπίς (for τῆς ἐλπίδος goes with τὴν παρρησίαν as well as with τὸ καύχημα); here as in 416 and 1019.35 it denotes the believing man's attitude to a God whom he knows to be trustworthy. The idea of τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος is exactly that of Ro 54 (καυχόμεθα ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ), and of a saying like Ps 512 (καὶ ἐφφανθήσωσαν ἐπὶ σοι πάντες οἱ ἐλπιζόμενες ἐπί σέ).

Διὸ in v. 7 goes most naturally with μὴ σκληρύνῃσε (v. 5), the thought of which recurs in v. 18 as the central thread. The alternative, to take it with βλέπετε in v. 12, which turns the whole quotation into a parenthesis, seems to blunt the direct force of the admonition; it makes the parenthesis far too long, and empties the second διό of its meaning. βλέπετε is no more abrupt in v. 12 than in 1228; it introduces a sharp, sudden warning, without any particle like oin or δε, and requires no previous term like διό. The quotation is introduced as in 1018 by "the holy Spirit," as the Speaker, a rabbinic idea of inspiration. The quotation itself is from Ps 957-11 which in A runs as follows:

1 καὶ in this sense is from Nu 1429,82, a passage which the writer has in mind.
III. 9.] A WARNING

σήμερον εἰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε,
μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ
katά τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ" 
οὐ ἐπείρασαν 1 οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν,
ἐδοκίμασαν με καὶ Ἰδὼν τὰ ἔργα μου.
τεσσεράκοντα ἐτη προσώπῳ τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ, 2
καὶ ἐπέν. 3 ἤε� 4 πλανώνται τῇ καρδίᾳ,
αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὀδοὺς μου.
ὡς ἀμοῶσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου,
εἰ ἐσελεύνωται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν μου.

In vv.9.10, though he knew (v.17) the correct connexion of the LXX (cp. v.17a), he alters it here for his own purpose, taking τεσσεράκοντα ἐτη with what precedes instead of with what follows, inserting διό (which crept into the text of R in the psalm) before προσώπῳ for emphasis, and altering ἐδοκίμασαν με into ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ. 3 The LXX always renders the place-names “Meriba” and “Massa” by generalizing moral terms, here by παραπικρασμός and πειρασμός, the former only here in the LXX (Aquila, 1 Sam 1583; Theodotion, Prov 1711). The displacement of τεσσεράκοντα ἐτη was all the more feasible as εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου meant for him the experience of God’s punishing indignation. (Τεσσεράκοντα is better attested than τεσσεράκοντα (Moulton, ii. 66) for the first century.) There is no hint that the writer was conscious of the rabbinic tradition, deduced from this psalm, that the period of messiah would last for forty years, still less that he had any idea of comparing this term with the period between the crucifixion and 70 A.D. What he really does is to manipulate the LXX text in order to bring out his idea that the entire forty years in the desert were a “day of temptation,” 6 during which the People exasperated God. Hence (in v.9) he transfers the “forty years” to εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου, in order to emphasize the truth that the stay in the People in the desert was one long provocation of God; for εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου is not an aggravation of their offence

1 κε ἀποστολεῖ ποιός (so T), which has crept (needlessly, for περάτευν may be used absolutely as in 1 Co 109) into the text of Hebrews through κε D8 M vg pesh harkl boh arm Apollin.
2 In some texts of Hebrews (p18 κ A B D* M 33· 424* vg Clem. Apollin.) this becomes (under the influence of the literal view of forty years?) ταύτη ἐκείνη in C D8 K L P syr sah boh arm eth Eus. Cyril. Chrys.).
3 The Ionic form εἶπα (B) has slipped into some texts of Hebrews (A D 33· 206· 489· 1288. 1518. 1836).
4 The LXX is stronger than the Hebrew; it appears to translate not the of the MT, but εὖ (cp. Flashar in Zeits für alt. Wiss., 1912, 84–85).
5 ἐδοκίμασαν (με) is read in the text of Hebrews, by assimilation, in κε D8 K L vg syr arm eth Apollin. Lucifer, Ambr. Chrys. etc. i.e. ἔδωκιμασα ἀλλαγαὶ was altered into ἔδωκιμασα.
6 The κατὰ in κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν (v.8) is temporal as in 10 727, not “after the manner of” (“ secundum,” vg).
("though they felt what I could do for them"), but a reminder that all along God let them feel how he could punish them for their disobedience. Finally, their long-continued obstinacy led him to exclude them from the land of Rest. This "finally" does not mean that the divine oath of exclusion was pronounced at the end of the forty years in the desert, but that as the result of God's experience he gradually killed off (v.17) all those who had left Egypt. This retribution was forced upon him by the conviction οὖν εξενωσαν τὰς ὀδοὺς μου (i.e. would not learn my laws for life, cared not to take my road).

The rabbinic interpretation of Ps 95 as messianic appears in the legend (T.B. Sanhedrim, 98a) of R. Joshua ben Levi and Elijah. When the rabbi was sent by Elijah to messiah at the gates of Rome, he asked, "Lord, when comest thou?" He answered, "To-day." Joshua returned to Elijah, who inquired of him: "What said He to thee?" Joshua: "Peace be with thee, son of Levi." Elijah: "Therewith He has assured to thee and thy father a prospect of attaining the world to come." Joshua: "But He has deceived me, by telling me He would come to-day." Elijah: "Not so, what He meant was, To-day, if you will hear His voice." The severe view of the fate of the wilderness-generation also appears in Sanh. 110b, where it is proved that the generation of the wilderness have no part in the world to come, from Nu 14:35 and also from Ps 95 (as I swore in my anger that they should not enter into my Rest). This was rabbi Akiba's stern reading of the text. But rabbinic opinion, as reflected in the Mishna (cp. W. Bacher, Agada der Tannaiten, i. 135 f.), varied on the question of the fate assigned to the generation of Israelites during the forty years of wandering in the desert. While some authorities took Ps 95 strictly, as if the "rest" meant the rest after death, and these Israelites were by the divine oath excluded from the world to come, others endeavoured to minimize the text; God's oath only referred to the incredulous spies, they argued, or it was uttered in the haste of anger and recalled. In defence of the latter milder view Ps 50:16 was quoted, and Isa 35:10. Our author takes the stern view, reproduced later by Dante (Purgatorio, xviii. 133-135), for example, who makes the Israelites an example of sloth; "the folk for whom the sea opened were dead ere Jordan saw the heirs of promise." He never speaks of men "tempting God," apart from this quotation, and indeed, except in II 17, God's ἐν πρωσῳμῷ or probation of men is confined to the human life of Jesus.

For διὸ in v.10 Clem. Alex. (Protrept. 9) reads δὲ δ. προσωξθίζειν is a LXX term for the indignant loathing excited by some defiance of God's will, here by a discontented, critical attitude towards him. In v.11 κατάπαυσις is used of Canaan as the promised land of settled peace, as only in Dt 12:9 (οὐ γὰρ ἔκτενε... εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν) and 1 K 8:56 (εὐλογηθὸς Κύριος σήμερον, δεὶ ἐδώκης κατάπαυσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ). The mystical sense is developed in 4:3f. The application (vv.12f.) opens with βλέπετε (for the classical ὄρατε) μη... ἔσται (as in Col 2:7 (βλέπετε μη... ἔσται)), the reason for the future being probably "because the verb εἶμι has no aorist, which is the tense required," Field, Notes on Translation of N.T., p. 38) ἐν τιν ὄρῳ—the same concern for individuals
as in 4:11 10:25 12:15—καρδία ἀπιστίας (genitive of quality—a Semitism here). Ἀπιστία must mean more than "incredulity"; the assonance with ἀποστῆναι was all the more apt as ἀπιστία denoted the unbelief which issues in action, ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι—the idea as in Ezk 20:8 καὶ ἀπέστησαν ἄπ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἥθελσαν εἰσακούσαι μοι, though the preposition ἄπ' was not needed, as may be seen, e.g., in Wis 3:10 (οὐ . . . τοῦ κυρίου ἀποστάτες).

Our author is fond of this construction, the infinitive with a preposition. "The living God" suggests what they lose by their apostasy, and what they bring upon themselves by way of retribution (10:31), especially the latter (cp. 4:12). There is no real distinction between θεός ζώντος and τοῦ θεοῦ ζώντος, for the article could be dropped, as in the case of θεός πατήρ and κύριος Ἰσσοῦς, once the expression became stamped and current.

In v.13 παρακαλεῖτε . . . καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν (cp. Test. Levi 9:8 ἣν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν συνετίξων με) emphasizes the keen, constant care of the community for its members, which is one feature of the epistle. In ἀρχής οὐ (elsewhere in NT with aorist or future), which is not a common phrase among Attic historians and orators, ἀρχής is a Hellenistic form of ἀρχή (p13 M) used sometimes when a vowel followed. Σήμερον is "God's instant men call years" (Browning), and the paronomasia in καλεῖται 1 . . . παρακαλεῖτε led the writer to prefer καλεῖται to a term like κηρύσσεται. The period (see 4:7) is that during which God's call and opportunity still hold out, and the same idea is expressed in ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι Σήμερον κτλ. (v.15). ἐξ ὠμῶν is sufficiently emphatic as it stands, without being shifted forward before τις (B D K L d e etc. harkl Theodt. Dam.) in order to contrast ὠμεῖς with οἱ πατέρες ὠμῶν (v.9).

As for ἡ ἀμαρτία, it is the sin of apostasy (12:4), which like all sin deceives men (Ko 7:11), in this case by persuading them that they will be better off if they allow themselves to abandon the exacting demands of God. The responsibility of their position is expressed in ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ, a passive with a middle meaning; men can harden themselves or let lower considerations harden them against the call of God. As Clement of Alexandria (Protrept. ix.) explains: ὅταν τὴν ἀπελήνη ὅταν τὴν προτροπὴν ὅταν τὴν τιμην, τῇ ὑπὸ ἑπὶ τὴν χάριν εἰς δργήν μεταλλάσσωμεν . . . μεγάλη γὰρ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ ἡ χάρις, "ἐὰν σήμερον τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκοουσῶμεν" . . . ἐκάκορα . . . τῆς ἀμαρτίας τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀδέιτα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἐτού ᾧ ἦν σήμερον ὑμωμᾶς.

In v.14 μετοχοὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (which is not an equivalent for the Pauline ἐν Χριστῷ, but rather means to have a personal interest in him) answers to μετοχοὶ κλησίσως ἐπουρανίου in v.1 and to μετόχοις πνεύματος ἁγίου in 6:4; γεγόναμεν betrays the predilection of the writer for γέγονα rather than its equivalent εἶναι. 1Εάνπερ

1 The common confusion between αι and ει led to the variant καλεῖτε (A C).
an intensive particle (for εὰν, v.9) τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως (genitive of apposition)—i.e. "our initial confidence" (the idea of 10:32)—κατάσχωμεν (echoing v.6). The misinterpretation of ὑποστάσεως as (Christ's) "substance"1 led to the addition of αὐτοῦ (A 588. 623. 1827. 1912 vg). But ὑπόστασις here as in 11 denotes a firm, confident conviction or resolute hope (in LXX, e.g., Ῥ 112 ἔστιν μοι ὑπόστασις τοῦ γεννηθῆναι με ἀνδρί, rendering πάνι, which is translated by ἐλπίς in Pr 117), with the associations of steadfast patience under trying discouragements. This psychological meaning was already current (cp. 2 Co 9:4 μη...κατασχυνθῶμεν ἡμεῖς ἐν τῇ ὑπόστασις ταύτῃ), alongside of the physical or metaphysical. What a man bases himself on, as he confronts the future, is his ὑπόστασις, which here in sound and even (by contrast) in thought answers to ἀποστήναι.

It is possible to regard v.14 as a parenthesis, and connect ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι (v.15) closely with παρακαλείτε or ἵνα μη...ἀμαρτίας (v.13), but this is less natural; ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι ("while it is said," as in Ps 42:4 ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι) connects easily and aptly with κατάσχωμεν, and vv.14-15 thus carry on positively the thought of v.15, viz. that the writer and his readers are still within the sound of God's call to his οἶκος to be ἀπόστειαν.

The pointed questions which now follow (vv.16-18) are a favourite device of the diatribe style. Παραπικραίνειν (Hesych. παροργίζειν)2 in v.16 seems to have been coined by the LXX to express "rebellious" with a further sense of provoking or angering God; e.g. Dt 31:27 παραπικραίνοντες ἔτε τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν (translating πρᾶξις), and Dt 32:10 ἐν βδελύγμασιν αὐτῶν παρεπικραναῖς μὲ (translating ἄϕις). The sense of "disobey" recurs occasionally in the LXX psalter (e.g. 104:28, 106:11); indeed the term involves a disobedience which stirs up the divine anger against rebels, the flagrant disobedience (cp. παραβαίνειν for ἄκαθος in Dt 94; Nu 27:14) which rouses exasperation in God. 'Αλλ', one rhetorical question being answered by another (as Lk 17:8), logically presupposes τινες, but τινες must be read in the previous question. By writing πάντες the writer does not stop to allow for the faithful minority, as Paul does (1 Co 10:7; τινες αὐτῶν). In the grave conclusion (v.19) δὴ ἀποστίαν (from v.12) is thrown to the end for the sake of emphasis.

But, the author continues (4:16), the promised rest is still available; it is open to faith, though only to faith (1-8). No matter how certainly all has been done upon God's part (3-5), and no matter how sure some human beings are to share his

1 Another early error was to regard it as "our substance," so that κατὰσχαμεν meant faith as "the beginning of our true nature" (a view already current in Chrysostom).

2 In Dt 32:10 it is parallel to παροργίζειν; cp. Flashar's discussion in Zeitschrift für alt. Wiss., 1912, 185 f. It does not always require an object (God).
Rest (v. 6), it does not follow that we shall, unless we take warning by this failure of our fathers in the past and have faith in God. Such is the urgent general idea of this paragraph. But the argument is compressed; the writer complicates it by defining the divine Rest as the sabbath-rest of eternity, and also by introducing an allusion to Joshua. That is, he (a) explains God's 

κατάπαυσις in Ps 95 by the σαββατισμός of Gn 2, and then (b) draws an inference from the fact that the psalm-promise is long subsequent to the announcement of the σαββατισμός.

He assumes that there is only one Rest mentioned, the κατάπαυσις into which God entered when he finished the work of creation, to which 

οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν were called under Moses, and to which Christians are now called. They must never lose faith in it, whatever be appearances to the contrary.

1 Well then, as the promise of entrance into his Rest is still left to us, let us be afraid of anyone being judged to have missed it. 2 For (καὶ γὰρ = etenim) we have had the good news as well as they (εἰκεῖνοι = 3\textsuperscript{10}) ; only, the message they heard was of no use to them, because it did not meet with faith in the hearers. 8 For we do "enter the Rest" by our faith: according to his word, "As I swore in my anger, they shall never enter my Rest"—although "his works" were all over by the foundation of the world. 4 For he says somewhere about the seventh (sc. ἡμέρας) day: "And God rested from all his works on the seventh day." 5 And again in this (ἐν τούτῳ, sc. τόπῳ) passage, "they shall never enter my Rest." 6 Since then it is reserved (ἀπολείπεται, a variant for καταλείπτω) for some "to enter it," and since those who formerly got the good news failed to "enter" owing to their disobedience, 7 he again fixes a day; "today"—as he says in "David" after so long an interval, and as has been already quoted: "Today, when you hear his voice, harden not your hearts." 8 Thus if Joshua had given them Rest, God would not speak later about another day. There is a sabbath-Rest, then, reserved (ἀπολείπεται, as in 6) still for the People of God (for once "a man enters his (ἄνθρωπος, i.e. God's) rest," he "rests from work" just as God did).

Ἐπαγγελία (v. 1) is not common in the LXX, though it mis-translates ἡ ἁμαρτία in Ps 56\textsuperscript{8}, and is occasionally the term for a human promise. In the Prayer of Manasseh (6) it is the divine promise (τὰ ἔλεος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας σου), and recurs in the plural, of the divine promises, in Test. Jos. 20\textsuperscript{1} (ὁ θεὸς ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπάξει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν) and Ps. Sol 12\textsuperscript{8} (δοσιν κυρίῳ κληρονομήσων ἐπαγγελίας κυρίου—the first occurrence of this phrase κλ. ἐπ., cp. below on 61\textsuperscript{2}). Καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας ( + τῆς D* 255, from 61\textsuperscript{15} 11\textsuperscript{11}) is a genitive absolute. Ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν (like ὁρμῇ . . . ἐβρίζετο in Ac 14\textsuperscript{8}) κτλ.: the basis of the appeal is (a) that the divine promise of Rest has been neither fulfilled nor withdrawn (still τὸ "σήμερον" καλεῖται); and (b) that the punishment which befalls

1 Ἀπειλθεῖαν, altered into ἀπιστίαν by \textsuperscript{15} vg sah boh arm Cyr.
others is a warning to ourselves (cp. Philo, ad Gaium, 1: αἱ γὰρ ἐτέρων τιμωρεῖ ἑλπίζωσι τοῖς πολλοῖς, φόβῳ τοῦ μὴ παραπλησία ταθείων). By a well-known literary device μὴ ποτὲ, like μὴ in 1215, takes a present (δοκῇ), instead of the more usual aorist, subjunctive. Δοκῇ means "judged" or "adjudged," as in Josephus, Ant. viii. 32, καὶ ἀλλότριον δοκῇ. This is common in the LXX, e.g. in Pr 1728 ένεών δὲ τις οὕτων πνεύμας δοξεῖ φρονίμοις εἶναι (where δόξει is paralleled by λογισθῆσεται), 2714 (καταραμένου οὐδὲν διαφέρειν δόξει); indeed it is an ordinary Attic use which goes back to Plato (e.g. Phaedo, 113 D, of the souls in the underworld, οὐ μὲν ἂν δοξωσι μέσως βεβιωκέναι) and Demosthenes (629. 17, οἱ δὲδογμένοι ἀδροφόνοι = the convicted murderers). The searching scrutiny which passes this verdict upon lack of faith is the work of the divine Logos (in v.12).

In v.2 εὐγγελισμένοι is remarkable. Our author, who never uses εἰαγγέλων (preferring ἐπαγγελλα here as an equivalent), employs the passive of εἰαγγελιζέων 1 (as in v.6) in the broad sense of "having good news brought to one." The passive occurs in LXX of 2 S 1831 (εἰαγγελισθήσω δ ὁ κύριος μον δ ὁ βασιλεύς) and in Mt 118 (πτωχοί εἰαγγελίζονται). The καὶ after καθάπερ emphasizes as usual the idea of correspondence. The reason for the failure of the past generation was that they merely heard what God said, and did not believe him; ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς (ἀκοῆς, passive = "sermo auditus," vg), which is another (see 312) instance of the Semitic genitive of quality, is defined as μὴ (causal particle as in 1227 μὴ φοβηθεῖσις) συγκέκριμενος τῇ πίστει τοὺς ἄκουσαν, since it did not get blended with faith in (the case of) those who heard it. Or τῇ πίστει may be an instrumental dative: "since it did not enter vitally into the hearers by means of the faith which it normally awakens in men." The fault lies, as in the parable of the Sower, not with the message but with the hearers. The phrase λόγος . . . συγκεκρασμένοι may be illustrated from Menander (Stob. Serm. 42, p. 302), τὴν τοῦ λόγου μὲν δύναμιν οὐκ ἐπίφθανον ἦθεν δὲ χρηστῶ συγκεκραμένην ἔχειν, and Plutarch, non posse suauiter vivi secundum Epicurum, 11οι, βέλτιον γὰρ ἐνυπάρχειν τι καὶ συγκεκράσθαι τῇ περὶ θεῶν δόξῃ κοινών αἰῶνων καὶ φόβου πάθος κτλ. The use of λόγος with such verbs is illustrated by Plutarch, Vit. Cleom. 2 (ὁ δὲ Στωικὸς λόγος . . . βάθει δὲ καὶ πράω κεραυνύμενος ἦθεν μάλιστα εἰς τὸ οἰκεῖον ἄγαθον ἐπιδίδωσιν). Κράτις occurs in Philo's definition of φιλία (Quaest. in Gen. 218) as consisting [οὐκ] εἰν τῷ χρειῶδει μᾶλλον ἡ κράσει καὶ συμφωνίᾳ βεβαιώ τῶν ἴδιων, and συγκεκράσθαι in his description of the union of spirit and blood in the human body (Quaest. in Gen. 94 πνεύμα . . . ἐμφέρεσθαι καὶ συγκεκρασθαι αἰματί).
The original reading συγκεκριμένος was soon assimilated (after κατάλαβειν) into the accusative -ous (p.18 A B C D K L M P vg boh syrh etc. Chrys. Theod.-Mops. Aug.), and this led to the alteration of τοῖς ἀκούσαντως into τῶν ἀκούσαντων (D* 104. 1611. 2005 d syr* ms Lucif.), or τοῖς ἀκούσαντως or τοῖς ἀκούσαντιν (1912 vg Theod.-Mops.), or τοῖς ἀκούσαντιν (1891). The absence of any allusion elsewhere to the faithful minority (Caleb, Joshua) tells decisively against συγκεκριμένοις ("since they did not mix with the believing hearers"); for the writer (see above) never takes them into account, and, to make any sense, this reading implies them. How could the majority be blamed for not associating with believing hearers when ex hypothesi there were none such?

The writer now (vv.8-10) lays emphasis upon the reality of the Rest. "We have had this good news too as well as they," for (γάρ) we believers do enter into God's Rest; it is prepared and open, it has been ready ever since the world began—ἀπολείπεται συνβατικός τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ. Εἰσερχόμεθα is the emphatic word in v.8: "we do (we are sure to) enter," the futuristic present ("ingrediemur," vg). When God excluded that unbelieving generation from his Rest, he was already himself in his Rest. The κατάπαυσις was already in existence; the reason why these men did not gain entrance was their own unbelief, not any failure on God's part to have the Rest ready. Long ago it had been brought into being (this is the force of ἐκτιθείμενος in v.8), for what prevents it from being realized is not that any ἐργα of God require still to be done. Κατάπαυσις is the sequel to ἐργά. The creative ἐργα leading up to this κατάπαυσις have been completed centuries ago; God enjoys his κατάπαυσις, and if his People do not, the fault lies with themselves, with man's disbelief.

Here, as in Ro 3:28, there is a choice of reading between ὅν (n A C M 1908 boh) and γάρ (p.18 B D K L P Ψ 6. 33 lat syr* arm eth Chrys. Lucif. etc.); the colourless δέ (syr* pesh arm) may be neglected. The context is decisive in favour of γάρ. Probably the misinterpretation which produced ὅν led to the change of ἐξωραίμεθα into ἐισερχόμεθα (A C 33. 69: future in vg sah boh Lucif.). The insertion of τῷ (the first) may be due to the same interpretation, but not necessarily; p.18 B D* om., but B omits the article sometimes without cause (e.g. 7:15). The omission of εἰ (p.18 D* 2. 330. 440. 623. 642. 1288. 1319. 1912) was due to the following εἰ in ἐκσελεθρώσαται.

Καίτω (with gen. absol., as OP. 898:28) is equivalent here to καίτωσεν for which it is a v.l. in Ac 17:27 (A E, with ptc). "Καίτω, ut antiquiores καίσερ, passim cum participio iungunt scriptores aetatis hellenisticae" (Herwerden, Appendix Lexici Graci, 249). Κατασκευὴ is not a LXX term, but appears in Ep. Aristaeus, 29 and 2 Mac 2:29 (τὴς ἀδικίας κατασκευὴς = the entire edifice); in the NT always, except He 11:11, in the phrase ἀπό or πρὸ κατασκευής κόσμου.

The writer then (v.4) quotes Gn 2:2, inserting δ θεὸς ἐν (exactly as Philo had done, de poster. Caini, 18), as a proof that the κατά-
---
1 A similar error of A C in 62.
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πανείς had originated immediately after the six days of creation. In εἴρη α ου the ου is another literary mannerism (as in Philo); instead of quoting definitely he makes a vague allusion (cp. 26). The psalm-threat is then (v.5) combined with it, and (v.6) the deduction drawn, that the threat (v.7) implies a promise (though not as if v.1 meant, “lest anyone imagine he has come too late for it”—an interpretation as old as Schöttgen, and still advocated, e.g., by Dods).

The title of the 92nd psalm, “for the sabbath-day,” was discussed about the middle of the 2nd century by R. Jehuda and R. Nehemia; the former interpreted it to mean the great Day of the world to come, which was to be one perfect sabbath, but R. Nehemia’s rabbinical tradition preferred to make it the seventh day of creation on which God rested (see W. Bacher’s Agada der Tannaiten, i. pp. 328-329). The author of the Epistle of Barnabas (15) sees the fulfilment of Gn 22 in the millennium: “he rested on the seventh day” means that “when his Son arrives he will destroy the time of the lawless one, and condemn the impious, and alter sun and moon and stars; then he will really rest on the seventh day,” and Christians cannot enjoy their rest till then. Our author’s line is different—different even from the Jewish interpretation in the Vita Adae et Evae (li. 1), which makes the seventh day symbolize “the resurrection and the rest of the age to come; on the seventh day the Lord rested from all his works.”

In v.7 μετὰ τοσούτων χρόνων, like μετὰ ταῦτα (v.5), denotes the interval of centuries between the desert and the psalm of David, for εν Δαυιδ means “in the psalter” (like εν Ηλια, Ro 11:2); the 95th psalm is headed αὐς εἰς τῷ Δαυιδ in the Greek bible, but the writer throughout (37) treats it as a direct, divine word. Προείρηται (the author alluding to his previous quotation) is the original text (p13 A C D* P 6. 33. 1611. 2004. 2005 lat syr Chrys. Cyr. Lucif.); προείρητεν (B 256. 263. 436. 442. 999. 1739. 1837 arm sah boh Orig.) suggests that God or David spoke these words before the oath (v.7 comes before v.11!), while εἰρηται (D* K L eth etc. Theophyl.) is simply a formula of quotation. From the combination of Ps 95:8 with Ps 9511 and Gn 22 (vv.8-7) the practical inference is now drawn (v.8f.). Like Sirach (46:2 κρατᾶς εν πολέμως Ἰσραής Νανή . . . δὲ γένετο κατὰ τὸ δόμωμα αὐτοῦ μέγας ἐπὶ σωτηρία ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ), Philo (de mutatione nominum, 21, Ἰσραής δὲ [ἐμφανεύεται] σωτηρία κυρίου, έξεως δόμωμα τῆς ἀρίστης) had commented on the religious significance of the name Joshua; but our author ignores this, and even uses the name Ἰσραής freely, since Ἰσραής is never applied by him to Christ before the incarnation (Aquila naturally avoids Ἰσραής and prefers Ἰσραύλ). The author of Ep. Barnabas plays on the fact that “Joshua” and “Jesus” are the same names: ἐκποίατε ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν σαρκὶ μέλλοντα φανεροῦσας ὡμίν Ἰσραής (68), i.e. not on the “Jesus” who led Israel into the land of rest, but on the true, divine “Joshua.” Such, he declares, is the inner
meaning of Is 28:16 (δὲ ἐξήνευε ἐπ' αὐτὸν ζῆσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα).

But the author of Προεραίων takes his own line, starting from the transitive use of κατάπαυσεν (Jos 1:18 κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν κατάπαυσεν ὑμᾶς καὶ ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν τὴν γῆν ταύτην, etc.); not that he reads subtle meanings into the transitive and intransitive usages of κατάπαυσεν, like Philo. Nor does he philosophize upon the relevance of κατάπαυσις to God. Philo, in De Cherubim (26), explains why Moses calls the sabbath (ἔμμενε τες ἀνάπαυσις) the "sabbath of God" in Ex 20:10 etc.; the only thing which really rests is God—"rest (ἀνάπαυλαν) meaning not inactivity in good (ἀπραξίαν καλῶν)—for the cause of all things which is active by nature never ceases doing what is best, but—an energy devoid of laboriousness, devoid of suffering, and moving with absolute ease." The movement and changes of creation point to labour, but "what is free from weakness, even though it moves all things, will never cease to rest: ὡστε οἰκειοτάτον μόνῳ θεῷ τὸ ἀνάπαυσθαι." So in De Sacrif. Abelis et Caiini, 8, τὸν τοσοῦτον κόσμον ἀνεῖ τῶν πάνω πάλαι μὲν ἐργάζετο, νῦν δὲ καὶ ἐλπιζει συνέχων οὐδέποτε λήγει [cp. He 1:3 φέρων τι τά πάντα], θεῷ γὰρ τὸ ἀκάματον ἀρμοδιώτατον. All such speculations are remote from our author. He simply assumes (a) that God's promise of κατάπαυσις is spiritual; it was not fulfilled, it was never meant to be fulfilled, in the peaceful settlement of the Hebrew clans in Canaan; (b) as a corollary of this, he assumes that it is eschatological.

In v.9 ἄρα, as in 12:8, Lk 11:48, Ac 11:18, Ro 10:17, is thrown to the beginning by an unclassical turn ("müsstes dem gebildeten Hellenen hochgradig anstößig erscheinen," Radermacher, 20). Σαββατισμός, apparently 1 a word coined by the writer, is a Semitic-Greek compound. The use of σαββατισμός for κατάπαυσις is then (v.10) justified in language to which the closest parallel is Apoc 14:13. "Rest" throughout all this passage—and the writer never refers to it again—is the blissful existence of God's faithful in the next world. As a contemporary apocalyptist put it, in 4 Es 8:2: "for you paradise is opened, the tree of life planted, the future age prepared, abundance made ready, a City built, a Rest appointed" (κατέσταθη;). In ἀπὸ τῶν ἱδίων, as in διὰ τοῦ ἱδίου αἰῶνας (13:19), ἱδίος is slightly emphatic with the context; it is not quite equivalent to the possessive pronoun.

When Maximus of Tyre speaks of life as a long, arduous path to the goal of bliss and perfection, he describes in semi-mystical language how tired souls, longing for the land to which this straight and narrow and little-frequented way leads, at length reach it and "rest from their labour" (Dissert. xxiii.).

---

1 The only classical instance is uncertain; Bernadakis suspects it in the text of Plutarch, de superstit. 166 A.
The lesson thus drawn from the reading of the OT passages is pressed home (vv. 11-13) with a skilful blend of encouragement and warning.

11 Let us be eager then to "enter that Rest," in case anyone falls into the same sort of disobedience. 12 For the Logos of God is a living thing, active and more cutting than any sword with double edge, penetrating to the very division of soul and spirit, joints and marrow—scrutinizing the very thoughts and conceptions of the heart. 13 And no created thing is hidden from him; all things lie open and exposed before the eyes of him with whom we have to reckon (ὁ λόγος).

In v. 11 the position of τις, as, e.g., in Lk 18, is due to "the tendency which is to be noted early in Greek as well as in cognate languages, to bring unemphasized (enclitic) pronouns as near to the beginning of the sentence as possible" (Blass, § 473. 1). For πέπτειν ἐν, cp. Epict. iii. 22. 48, πότε ὑμῶν εἰδέν με τις . . . ἐν ἐκκλίσει περιπτώσεως. This Hellenistic equivalent for πέπτειν εἰς goes back to earlier usage, e.g. Eurip. Hec. 109.1, 1092. ἐν κλίσεω καὶ φρενῶν ταράγματι πέπτωσα δεινός. In Hellenistic Greek ὑπόθεσιμα came to have the sense of παράδειγμα, and is used here loosely for "king" or "sort"; take care of falling into disobedience like that of which these πατέρες ὑμῶν yield such a tragic example. The writer, with his fondness for periphrases of this kind, writes ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ὑποθείματι τῆς ἁπείθειας, where ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἁπείθειᾳ would have served. In passing away from the text about Rest, he drops this last warning reference to the classical example of ἁπείθεια in the far past of the People.

The connexion of thought in vv. 11f. is suggested by what has been already hinted in v. 1, where the writer pled for anxiety, μὴ ποτὲ δοκῇ τις εξ ὑμῶν ὑπερηφανεία. He repeats ἵνα μηθ . . . τις . . . πέσῃ, and enlarges upon what lies behind the term δοκῇ. Then, after the passage on the relentless scrutiny of the divine Logos, he effects a transition to the direct thought of God (v. 13), with which the paragraph closes. Σπουδάσωμεν—we have to put heart and soul into our religion, for we are in touch with a God whom nothing escapes; ζῶν γάρ κτλ. (v. 12). The term ζῶν echoes θεὸς ζῶν in 3.12 (men do not disobey God with impunity), just as καρδίας echoes καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας. God is swift to mark any departure from his will in human thought—the thought that issues in action.

The personifying of the divine λόγος, in a passage which described God in action, had already been attempted. In Wis 18, for example, the plagues of Egypt are described as the effect of God's λόγος coming into play: ὁ παντοδύναμος σου λόγος ἀπ' οἴρανων . . . ξέφως ἐξή τὴν ἀνυπόκριτον ἐπιταγήν σου φέρων. In Wis 16, again, the φιλάνθρωπον τυπίμα σοφία, which cannot tolerate blasphemy, reacts against it: ὃτι τῶν νεφρῶν αὐτοῦ (the blasphemer) μάρτυς ὁ θεὸς, καὶ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐπίσκοπος ἀληθής,
so that no muttering of rebellion is unmarked. Here the writer poetically personifies the revelation of God for a moment. ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ is God speaking, and speaking in words which are charged with doom and promise (37f.). The revelation, however, is broader than the scripture; it includes the revelation of God’s purpose in Jesus (1f.). The free application of δ λόγος (τοῦ θεοῦ) in primitive Christianity is seen in 1 P 23f., 118f., quite apart from the specific application of the term to the person of Christ (Jn 1:18). Here it denotes the Christian gospel declared authoritatively by men like the writer, an inspired message which carries on the OT revelation of God’s promises and threats, and which is vitally effective. No dead letter, this λόγος! The rhetorical outburst in vv.12f. is a preacher’s equivalent for the common idea that the sense of God’s all-seeing scrutiny should deter men from evil-doing, as, e.g., in Plautus (Captivi, ii. 2. 63, “est profecto deu’, qui quae nos gerimus auditque et uidet”). This had been deepened by ethical writers like Seneca (Ep. lxxxiii. 1, “nihil deo clusum est, interest animis nostris et cogitationibus mediis intervenit”), Epictetus (ii. 14. 11, οὐκ ἔστι λαθεῖν αὐτόν οὐ μόνον ποιοῦντα ἄλλ’ οὐδὲ διανοούμενον ἢ ἐνθυμούμενον), and the author of the Epistle of Aristeas (132–133: Moses teaches ὅτι μόνον ὁ θεός ἔστι... καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτὸν λανθανεί τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς γινομένων ὑπ’ ἀνθρώπων κρυφῶς... κἀκεῖνη τις κακίαν ἐπιτελεῖν, οὐκ ἀν λάθοι, μη ὅτι καὶ πράξεις, and 210: the characteristic note of piety is τὸ διαλαμβάνειν ὅπι πάντα διαπαντός ὁ θεός ἐνεργεῖ καὶ γινώσκει, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἄν λάθοι ἄδικον ποιήσας ἢ κακόν ἐργασάμενος ἀνθρώπος), as well as by apocalypticists like the author of Baruch (835; He will assuredly examine the secret thoughts and that which is laid up in the secret chambers of all the members of man). But our author has one particular affinity. Take Philo’s interpretation of διεῖλεν αὐτὰ μέσα in Gn 1510. Scripture means, he explains (quis rer. div. haeres, 26) that it was God who divided them, τὸ τομεῖ τῷ συμπάντων ἐναντίον λόγῳ, δὲ εἰς τὴν ἀυτήν ἀκονθησίας ἀκρίμην διαρίφει σκότου. τὰ γὰρ ἀσθητὰ πάντα ἐπέδιδον μέχρι τῶν ἄτομων καὶ λεγομένων ἄμερον διεξέλθα, πάλιν ἀπὸ τοῦτον τὸ λόγῳ θεωρητὰ εἰς άμυθήτους καὶ ἀπεργάφους μόρος ἀρχεῖ τις διαρίφει σκότους τομεῖς. He returns (in 48) to this analytic function of the Logos in God and man, and in De mutatione nominum (18) speaks of ἡκονημένων καὶ δικίαν λόγον, μαστείναι καὶ ἀναπέταυ τικά ἰκανον. Still, the Logos is to meas as the principle of differentiation in the universe, rather than as an ethical force; and when Philo connects the latter with δ λόγος, as he does in quod deter. pot. 29, Cherub. 9, etc., δ λόγος is the human faculty of reason. Obviously, our author is using Philonic language rather than Philonic ideas.
Chrysostom (αὐτῷ μέλλωμεν δοῦναι εὐθύνας τῶν πεπραγμένων) onwards, and the papyri support the origin of the phrase as a commercial metaphor; e.g. ὁΡ. 1188 (A.D. 13) ὦς πρὸς σὲ τοῦ περὶ τῶν ἀγγείων[θέμτων] ἐν[τίματος] ἐσο[μένου] (sc. λόγου), and Hibel Papyri, 53 4 (246 B.C.) περὶ ὧν ἁγόλοκα ὦς πρὸς σὲ τοῦ λόγου ἐσομάνου. (δ) The alternative rendering, “with whom we have to do,” has equal support in Gk. usage; e.g. in the LXX phrase λόγος μοί πρὸς σὲ (1 Ρ. 214, 2 Ρ. 96) and in Ἰγ. 177 (μακράν εἰσιν Σιδωνίων, καὶ λόγον ὦν ἔχουσιν πρὸς ἄνθρωπον). The former idea is predominant, however, as the context suggests (cp. Ignat. ad Magn. 3, τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον ὦ πρὸς σάρκα ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ πρὸς θεὸν τὸν τὰ κρύφια εἰδότα), and includes the latter. It is plainly the view of the early anti-Marcionite treatise, which has been preserved among the works of Ephraem Syrus (cp. Preuschen, Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wissenschaft, 1911, pp. 243–269), where the passage is quoted from a text like this: ὦς καὶ ὁ Παύλος λέγει, ζῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πασῶν μάχαιραν διστομοῦν, διδόκινομεν μέχρι μερισμοῦ πνεύματος καὶ σαρκός, μέχρι ἁμρῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν, καὶ κριτικὸς ἐστιν ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιών καρδιάς· καὶ ὦν ἐστὶν κτίσις ἰδρυμῆς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ πάντα χρησαμὴ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, δι' ἡμῶν καὶ τετραχρησίμου ἔσμεν ἐν τοῖς ὁμοθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐκαστος ἡμῶν λόγον αὐτῷ ἀποδοῦμαι. The rendering, “who is our subject, of whom we are speaking” (πρὸς = with reference to, and ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος as in 511), is impossibly flat.

At this point the writer effects a transition to the main theme, which is to occupy him till 1018, i.e. Christ as ἄρχιερειος. He begins, however, by a practical appeal (vv.14–18) which catches up the ideas of 217. 18 3.

14 As we have a great highpriest, then, who has passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast to our confession; 18 for ours is no high priest who is incapable (μὴ διώκοντι ἡμᾶς, yet without sinning. 16 So let us approach the throne of grace with confidence (μετὰ παραρτισιών, 3), that we may receive mercy and find grace to help us in the hour of need.

Μέγας is a favourite adjective for ἄρχιερειος in Philo,1 but when the writer adds, ἔχοντες οὖν ἄρχιερεῖα μέγαν διελήνιθσα τοῦς οὕρανοὺς, he is developing a thought of his own. The greatness of Jesus as ἄρχιερειος consists in his access to God not through any material veil, but through the upper heavens; he has penetrated to the very throne of God, in virtue of his perfect self-sacrifice. This idea is not elaborated till later (cp. 618f. 924f.), in the sacerdotal sense. But it has been already mentioned in 29. 10, where Jesus the Son of God saves men by his entrance into the full divine glory. Κρατῶμεν here as in 618 with the genitive

1 ὃ μὲν δὴ μεγᾶς ἄρχιερειος (de Somn. i. 38), even of the Logos.
(δομολογίας, see 31); in Paul it takes the accusative. The writer now (v. 15) reiterates the truth of 2:11f; the exalted Jesus is well able to sympathize with weak men on earth, since he has shared their experience of temptation. It is put negatively, then positively. Συμπάθησις is used of Jesus as in Acta Pauli et Theclae, 17 (δε μόνος συνεπάθηνεν πλανομένω κόσμῳ); see below, on 10:34. Origen (in Matt. xiii. 2) quotes a saying of Jesus: διὰ τούτων ἀσθενόντας ἔσθενον καὶ διὰ τούτων πεινώντας ἐπένειν καὶ διὰ τούτων δυσφόντας ἐδίψων, the first part of which may go back to Mt 8:17 (αὐτὸς τάς ἀσθενείας ἐλάβεν); cp. also Mt 25:35. Philo uses the term even of the Mosaic law (de spec. leg. ii. 13, τὸ δὲ ἀπόρως ἔχοντι συνε­πάθησε), but here it is more than “to be considerate.” The aid afforded by Jesus as ἀρχιερεύς is far more than official; it is inspired by fellow-feeling ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν. “Verius sentiunt qui simul cum externis aerumnis comprehendunt animi affectus, quales sunt metus, tristitia, horror mortis, et similes” (Calvin). These ἀσθένειαι are the sources of temptation. Ἡ ὑπέρ ἀσθενών, as Jesus had said to his disciples, warning them against temptation. Jesus was tempted κατὰ πάντα (2:17.18) καθ’ ὄμοιότητα (a psychological Stoic term; the phrase occurs in OP. ix. 1202-24 and BGU. 1028:15, in second-century inscriptions) χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, without yielding to sin. Which is a real ground for encouragement, for the best help is that afforded by those who have stood where we slip and faced the onset of temptation without yielding to it. The special reference is to temptations leading to apostasy or disobedience to the will of God. It is true that χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας does exclude some temptations. Strictly speaking, κατὰ πάντα is modified by this restriction, since a number of our worst temptations arise out of sin previously committed. But this is not in the writer’s mind at all. He is too eager, to enter into any psychological analysis.

Philo deduces from Lv 4:3 (μόνον οὐκ ἄντικρυς ἀπαθιδάκρυς, διότι ὁ πρὸς ἀληθείας ἀρχιερεύς καὶ μὴ ψευδώνυμος ἀμέτοχος ἁμαρτημάτων ἐτέν) that the ideal highpriest is practically sinless (de Victimis, 10); but this is a thought with which he wistfully toys, and the idea of the Logos as unstained by contact with the material universe is very different from this conception of Jesus as actually tempted and scatheless. Nor would the transference of the idea of messiah as sinless account for our writer’s view. To him and his readers Jesus is sinless, not in virtue of a divine prerogative, but as the result of a real human experience which proved successful in the field of temptation.

Hence (v. 16) προσερχόμεθα οὖν μετὰ παρρησίας. Philo (quis rer. div. haeres, 2) makes παρρησία the reward of a good conscience, which enables a loyal servant of God to approach him frankly.

1 Of God in 4 Mac 5:25 κατὰ φύσιν ἡμῖν συμπαθεῖ νομοθετῶν ὁ τοῦ κτίσματι, but in the weaker sense of consideration. It is curious that 4 Mac., like Hebrews, uses the word twice, once of God and once of men (cp. 4 Mac 13:28 οὖτως δὴ τοίνυν καθεστηκώς τῆς φιλαδελφίας συμπαθοῦσης).
But here (cp. *ERE.* ii. 786) παρρησία is not freedom of utterance so much as resolute confidence (cp. on 36). Our writer certainly includes prayer in this conception of approaching God, but it is prayer as the outcome of faith and hope. Seneca bids Lucilius pray boldly to God, if his prayers are for soundness of soul and body, not for any selfish and material end: "audacter deum roga; nihil illum de alieno rogaturus es" (*Ep.* x. 4). But even this is not the meaning of παρρησία here. The Roman argues that a man can only pray aloud and confidently if his desires are such as he is not ashamed to have others hear, whereas the majority of people "whisper basest of prayers to God." Our author does not mean "palam" by παρρησία.

Our approach (προσερχόμεθα: the verb in the sense of applying to a court or authority, e.g. in *OP.* i 119 προσήλθομεν τῷ κρατίστῳ βούλῃ, *BGU.* 1022) is τῷ θεραπό τῆς χάριτος, for grace is now enthroned (see 26F). For the phrase see Is 16 διορθοθήσεται μετ' ἐλέους θρόνος. Our author (cp. Introd. p. xlvi), like those who shared the faith of apocalyptic as well as of rabbinic piety, regarded heaven as God's royal presence and also as the σκηνή where he was worshipped, an idea which dated from Is 6F and Ps 29 (cp. Mechilta on Ex 1517), though he only alludes incidentally (1222) to the worship of God by the host of angels in the upper sanctuary. He is far from the pathetic cry of Azariah (*Dn* 338): Δὲ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ καίρῳ τούτῳ . . . οὐδὲ τόπος τοῦ κατώτατον ισότος υἱὸς καὶ ἐφρεῖν ἔλεος. He rather shares Philo's feeling (*de Exsecrat.* 9) that οἱ ἀνασφολομένοι can rely upon the compassionate character of God (ἐνί μὲν ἐπιείκειά καὶ χρηστότητι τοῦ παρακαλομένου συγγνώμην πρὸ τιμωρίας ἢ τιμήτου), though he regards this mercy as conditioned by the sacrifice of Jesus. The twofold object of the approach is (a) λαμβάνειν ἔλεος, which is used for the passive of ἔλεος (which is rare), and (b) χάριν εὐφρίσκειν κτλ., an echo of the LXX phrase (e.g. Gn 6 εὔφρισκες χάριν ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ). In the writer's text (A) of the LXX, Prov 317 ran οἱ δὲ ἐμὲ ζητοῦντες εὐώνυμους χάριν.1 Εἰς εὐκαίρων βοήθειαν recalls τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθήσαται in 218; it signifies "for assistance in the hour of need." Ἐκκαίρως means literally "seasonable," as in Ps 10427 (δόθην τὰν τρόφην αὐτοῖς εὐκαίρων, "fitting," or "opportune" (*Ep.* Aristæas, 203, 236). The "sympathy" of Jesus is shown by practical aid to the tempted, which is suitable to their situation, suitable above all because it is timely (ἐκκαίρων being almost equivalent to εὖ καίρῳ

---

1 Aristotle argues that χάρις or benevolence must be spontaneous and disinterested; also, that its value is enhanced by necessitous circumstances (ἔστα δὴ χάρις, καθ' ἂν δὲ εὐκαίρων λέγεται χάριν ὑπογρεῖν δεομένῳ μη ἀντί τινος, μηδ' ἵνα τι αὐτῷ τῷ ὑπογρηγοῦντι ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκείνῳ τι μεγάλη ἢ δὲ ἢ σφόδρα δεομένῳ, ἢ μεγάλων καὶ χαλεπῶν, ἢ ἐν καιροῖς τοιούτοις, ἢ μόνος ἢ πρῶτος ἢ μάλιστα, *Rhel.* ii. 7. 2).
JESUS AS PRIEST

IV. 16–V. 1. JESUS AS PRIEST

Philos (de sacrificantibus, 10) shows how God, for all his greatness, cherishes compassion (ελέος καὶ οἴκτων λαμβάνει τῶν ἐν ἐνδείασι ἀπορωτάτων) for needy folk, especially for poor proselytes, who, in their devotion to him, are rewarded by his help (καρπὸν εὐφάνειον τῆς ἐπι τῶν θεοῦ καταφυγῆς τὴν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ βοήθειαν). But the best illustration of the phrase is in Aristides, Eἰς τὸν Σάραπιν 50: σὺ γὰρ δὴ πᾶς τις ἐν παιτὶ καιρῷ βοήθων καλεῖ, Σάραπι.

How widely even good cursives may be found supporting a wrong reading is shown by the evidence for προσερχόμεθα: Ⅳ. 38, 88, 104, 177, 206*, 241, 255, 263, 337, 378, 383, 440, 462, 467, 487, 489, 623, 635, 639, 642, 915, 919, 920, 927, 1245, 1288, 1518, 1836, 1852, 1872, 1891, 2004. For θεος (the Hellenistic neuter, cp. Cronert’s θεοθεία Graeca Herculanensis, 176), the Attic θεος (θεος, masc.) is substituted by L and a few minuscules (Chrys. Theodoret). B om. εὐρομεν.

He now (51–10) for the first time begins to explain the qualifications of the true ἀρχιερεύς.

(a) First, he must be humane as well as human:

1 Every highpriest who is selected from men and appointed to act on behalf of men in things divine, offering gifts and sacrifices for sin, 2 can deal gently with those who err through ignorance, since he himself is beset with weakness—3 which obliges him to present offerings for his own sins as well as for those of the People.

(b) Second, he must not be self-appointed.

4 Also, it is an office which no one elects to take for himself; he is called to it by God, just as Aaron was.

The writer now proceeds to apply these two conditions to Jesus, but he takes them in reverse order, beginning with (b).

5 Similarly Christ was not raised to the glory of the priesthood by himself, but by Him who declared to him,

“Thou art my son, to-day have I become thy father.”

6 Just as elsewhere (ἐν έτέρῳ, sc. τούτῳ) he says,

“Thou art a priest for ever, with the rank of Melchizedek.”

He then goes back to (a):

7 In the days of his flesh, with bitter cries and tears, he offered prayers and supplications to Him who was able to save him from death; and he was heard, because of his godly fear. 8 Thus, Son though he was, he learned by (ἀπ’ ὅν = ἀπὸ τοῦτων ὅ) all he suffered how to obey, 9 and by being thus perfected he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him, 10 being designated by God highpriest “with the rank of Melchizedek.”

Πάς γὰρ ἀρχιερεύς (dealing only with Hebrew highpriests, and only with what is said of them in the LXX) ἐς ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος (Νυ 86 λάβε τοὺς Δευτέρας ἐκ μέσου νῦν Ἰσραήλ) καθίσταται—passive, in the light of 728 (ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπων καθίστροφον ἀρχιερείς ἔχοντας ἀσθενεῖαν) and of the Philonic usage (e.g. de vit. Mosis, ii. 11, τῷ μέλλοντι ἀρχιερείς καθίσταται). The middle may indeed be used transitively, as, e.g., in Eurip. Suppl. 522 (πόλεμον δὲ τοῦτον ὦν ἐγὼ καθίσταμαι), and is so taken here by some (e.g. Calvin, Kypke). But τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν is an adverbial accusative as in 217, not the object of καθίσταται in an active sense. In διώρα τε καὶ θυσίας, here as in 83 and 9, the
The writer goes back to the LXX (A) rendering of 1 K 8:4 (καὶ τὸ δῶρον καὶ τὰς θυσίας). The phrase recurs in Ἑρ. Aristaeas, 234 (ὁ δῶρος ὀδὴ θυσίας), and is a generic term for sacrifices or offerings, without any distinction. The early omission of τε (B D B̅ K Lat boh pesh) was due to the idea that ἰδίας should be closely connected with ἀμαρτίῶν ("ut offerat dona, et sacrificia pro peccatis," vg). Instead of writing εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν, our author departs from his favourite construction of εἰς with the infinitive and writes ἐν προσφέρῃ, in order to introduce μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος. This, although a participial clause, contains the leading idea of the sentence. The ἀφειρεῖς is able to deal gently with the erring People whom he represents, since he shares their δοθένεια, their common infirmity or liability to temptation.

Μετριοπαθεῖν in v.2 is a term coined by ethical philosophy. It is used by Philo to describe the mean between extravagant grief and stoic apathy, in the case of Abraham’s sorrow for the death of his wife (τὸ δὲ μέσον πρὸ τῶν ἀκρων ἑλόμενον μετριοπαθεῖν, De Abrah. 44); so Plutarch (Consol. ad Apoll. 22) speaks of τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐν τοιοῦτοι μετριοπαθείας. But here it denotes gentleness and forbearance, the moderation of anger in a person who is provoked and indignant—as in Plut. de Cohib. ιτα, 10, ἀναστήσας δὲ καὶ σωφαί, καὶ φεύγανθαί καὶ καρπήσας, πραότητος ἐστι καὶ συγγιόμεις καὶ μετριοπαθείς. Josephus (Ant. xii. 3. 2) praises this quality in Vespasian and Titus (μετριοπαθησάντων), who acted magnanimously and generously towards the unruly Jews; Dionysius Halicarnassus accuses Marcius (Ant. 8. 529) of lacking τὸ εὐδιάλλακτον καὶ μετριοπαθές, ὅποτε δὲ ὅργης τῷ γένει. And so on. The term is allied to πράοτης. The sins of others are apt to irritate us, either because they are repeated or because they are flagrant; they excite emotions of disgust, impatience, and exasperation, and tempt us to be hard and harsh (Gal 6:1). The thought of excess here is excessive severity rather than excessive leniency. The objects of this μετριοπαθεῖν are τοῖς ἀνοικοῦντι καὶ πλανομένοις, i.e., people who sin through yielding to the weaknesses of human nature. For such offenders alone the πιάκαλα of atonement-day (which the writer has in mind) availed. Those who sinned ἐκούσιοις (10:26), not ἀκούσιοι, were without the pale; for such presumptuous sins, which our writer regards specially under the category of deliberate apostasy (3:12 10:26), there is no pardon possible. The phrase here is practically a hendiadys, for τοῖς εἰς ἄγνοιας πλανομένοις: the People err through their ἄγνοια. Thus ἄγνοια becomes an equivalent for ἀμαρτάνειν (Sir 23:2 etc.), just as the noun ἄγνοια comes to imply sin (cp. 9:7 and Jth 5:20 ἐ μὲν ἐστιν ἄγνοια ἐ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἀμαρτάνοντει εἰς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν, with Tebt. Pap. 124:3 (118 B.C.) and 5:3—a proclamation by king Euergetes and queen Cleopatra.
declaring “an amnesty to all their subjects for all errors, crimes,” etc., except wilful murder and sacrilege). In the Martyr. Pauli, 4, the apostle addresses his pagan audience as ἀνδρεῖς οἱ ὄτες ἐν τῇ ἀγνωσίᾳ καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ ταύτη.

(a) Strictly speaking, only such sins could be pardoned (Lv 4:25, 21, Nu 15:22-31, Dt 17:19) as were unintentional. Wilful sins were not covered by the ordinary ritual of sacrifice (10:26, cp. Nu 12:11).

(b) The term περίκεισθαι only occurs in the LXX in Ep. Jer. 23:57 and in 4 Mac 13 (τὰ δεσμὰ περικειμένον), and in both places in its literal sense (Symm. Is 61:10), as in Ac 28:20. But Seneca says of the body, “hoc quoque natura ut quendam vestem animo circumdedit” (Epist. 92), and the metaphorical sense is as old as Theocritus (23:14 ἀπὸ χρῶς ὑβρίν τὰς ὀργὰς περικείμενον).

The ἀρχιερεῖς, therefore (v.3), requires to offer sacrifice for his own sins as well as for those of the People, καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ οὗτῳ καὶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ. This twofold sacrifice is recognized by Philo (de vit. Mosis, ii. 1), who notes that the holder of the ἱερωσύνη must ἐπὶ τελείως ἱερὸς beseech God for blessing αὐτῷ τε καὶ τῆς ἀρχιερείας. The regulations for atonement-day (Lv 16:6-17) provided that the ἀρχιερεῖς sacrificed for himself and his household as well as for the People (καὶ προσάσει Ἀραών τὸν μόσχον τὸν περὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξελάστει περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ περὶ τάσης συναγωγῆς υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ). But our author now turns from the idea of the solidarity between priest and People to the idea of the priest’s commission from God. ἡν τιμὴν (in v.4) means position or office, as often, e.g. ἐπίτροπος λαμβάνει ταύτην τὴν τιμήν (i.e. of supervising the household slaves), Arist. Pol. i. 7. ῥιμᾶς γὰρ λέγομεν εἶναι τὰς ἀρχὰς, ib. iii. 10. περὶ τῶν ἀρχιερεών πῶς τῇ ἡρασίῳ καὶ τίσιν ἔξεστι τῆς τιμῆς ταύτης μεταλαμβάνειν, Joseph. Ant. xx. 10. 1. ἄλλα (sc. λαμβάνει) καλοῦμενος, but takes it when (or, as) he is called. The terseness of the phrase led to the alteration (C L) of αὐτῷ into ἄλλῳ ὅ (as in v.5). Καθὼς περὶ καὶ Ἀραών. In Josephus (Ant. iii. 8. 1), Moses tells the Israelites, νῦν ὁ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς Ἀραώνα τῆς τιμῆς ταύτης ἡκένω καὶ τούτων ἱρυταί ἱερεῖα.

περὶ (before ἀμαρτιῶν in v.3) has been changed to ὑπὲρ in C D K L etc. (conformingly to 5). There is no difference in meaning (cp. περὶ, Mt 26:28 = ὑπέρ, Mk. and Lk.), for περὶ (see 10:6, 8, 18, 26 13) has taken over the sense of ὑπέρ.

For καθὼς περὶ (κ* A B D* 33) in v.4, κ* D K L P Ψ 6. 1288. 1739 read the more obvious καθάπερ (C * syrhkl Chrys. Cyr. Alex. Procopius : καθὼς).

In v.5 ὅχι ἐαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν, while the term δόξα was specially applicable to the highpriestly office (cf. 2 Mac 14:7 ὅθεν ἀκολούθωσαν τὴν προγονικὴν δόξαν, λέγω δὴ τὴν ἀρχιεροσύνην), the phrase is quite general, as in the parallel Jn 8:44. The following γενήσιμαι is an exephegetic infinitive, which recurs in the Lucan writings (Lk 15:4, 72, Ac 15:10) and in the earlier Psalter of Solo-
mon (28, etc.). After ἀλλὰ we must supply some words like αὐτὸν ἑδόσασεν.

The argument runs thus: We have a great ἀρχιερεύς, Jesus the Son of God (414), and it is as he is Son that he carries out the vocation of ἀρχιερεύς. There is something vital, for the writer's mind, in the connexion of ἀρχιερεύς and Υἱός. Hence he quotes (v.5) his favourite text from Ps 2 7 before the more apposite one (in v.6) from Ps 1104, implying that the position of divine Son carried with it, in some sense, the rôle of ἀρχιερεύς. This had been already suggested in 12.8 where the activities of the Son include the purification of men from their sins. Here the second quotation only mentions ἔρευς, it is true; but the writer drew no sharp distinction between ἔρευς and ἀρχιερεύς. In κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεβίκ, τάξις for the writer, as 715 proves (κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεβίκ), has a general meaning; 1 Jesus has the rank of a Melchizedek, he is a priest of the Melchizedek sort or order, though in the strict sense of the term there was no τάξις or succession of Melchizedek priests.

Τάξιν in the papyri is often a list or register; in O.P. 12664 (A.D. 98) ἐν τάξιν means "in the class" (of people). It had acquired a sacerdotal nuance, e.g. Michel 7351231. (the regulations of Antiochus I.), ὅσιος ἐν ὑστέρω χρόνῳ τάξιν λάβῃ τάχην, and occasionally denoted a post or office (e.g. Tebt. P 2975, A.D. 123).

οὐς κτλ. Some editors (e.g. A. B. Davidson, Lünemann, Peake, Hollmann) take vv.7-10 as a further proof of (δ). But the writer is here casting back to (α), not hinting that the trying experiences of Jesus on earth proved that his vocation was not self-sought, but using these to illustrate the thoroughness with which he had identified himself with men. He does this, although the parallel naturally broke down at one point. Indeed his conception of Christ was too large for the categories he had been employing, and this accounts for the tone and language of the passage. (α) Jesus being χωρίς ἀμαρτίας did not require to offer any sacrifices on his own behalf; and (δ) the case of Melchizedek offered no suggestion of suffering as a vital element in the vocation of an ἀρχιερεύς. As for the former point, while the writer uses προσενέγκαι in speaking of the prayers of Jesus, this is at most a subconscious echo of προσφέρειν in vv.1-3; there is no equivalent in Jesus to the sacrifice offered by the OT ἀρχιερεύς, περὶ ἑαυτοῦ . . . περὶ ἀμαρτίων. The writer starts with his parallel, for ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκός αὐτοῦ corresponds to περικεῖται ἁθένειαν (v.2); but instead of developing the idea of sympathy in an official (μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμειν κτλ.), he passes to the deeper idea that Jesus qualified himself by a moral discipline.

1 As in 2 Mac 918 ἐπιστολὴν ἔχουσαν ἱκετηρίας τάξιν, Ἐρ. Ἀγριτ. 69, κρυπτίδος ἔχουσα τάξιν.
to be ἄρχερευς in a pre-eminent sense. He mentions the prayers and tears of Jesus here, as the faith of Jesus in 2126, for the express purpose of showing how truly he shared the lot of man on earth, using δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας, a phrase which the writer may have found in his text (A) of Ἰb 4022 (27) δεήσεις καὶ ἱκετηρίας, but which was classical (e.g. Isokrates, de Pace, 46, πολλὰς ἱκετηρίας καὶ δεήσεις πουγκομένω). Ἦκετηρία had become an equivalent for ἱκετεία, which is actually the reading here in 1 (δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετείας). The phrase recurs in a Ptolemaic papyrus (Brunet de Presle et E. Egger's Papyrus Grecs du Musée du Louvre, 2728), χάρειν σὲ ἄξιω μετὰ δεήσεως καὶ ἱκετείας, though in a weakened sense. The addition of μετὰ κραυγῆς (here a cry of anguish) ἴσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρῶν may be a touch of pathos, due to his own imagination, or suggested by the phraseology of the 22nd psalm, which was a messianic prediction for him (cp. above, 2129) as for the early church; the words of v.8 in that psalm would hardly suit (κεκράζομαι ἡμέρας πρὸς σὲ καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούσῃ), but phrases like that of v.6 (πρὸς σὲ ἐκκέραζαν καὶ ἐσώθησαν) and v.25 (ἐν τῷ κεκραγέναι με πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐτήκουσὲν μου) might have been in his mind. Tears were added before long to the Lucan account of the passion, at 2244 (Epiph. Ancor. 31, ἀλλὰ "καὶ ἐκλαυσθεν" κεῖται ἐν τῷ κατὰ Δουκᾶν εὐαγγελίῳ ἐν τοῖς ἀδιορθῶσιν ἀντιγράφοις). It is one of the passages which prove how deeply the writer was impressed by the historical Jesus; the intense faith and courage and pitifulness of Jesus must have deeply moved his mind. He seeks to bring out the full significance of this for the saving work of Jesus as Son. His methods of proof may be remote and artificial, to our taste, but the religious interest which prompted them is fundamental. No theoretical reflection on the qualification of priests or upon the dogma of messiah's sinlessness could have produced such passages as this.

Later Rabbinic piety laid stress on tears, e.g. in Sohar Exod. fol. 5, 19, “Rabbi Jehuda said, all things of this world depend on penitence and prayers, which men offer to God (Blessed be He!), especially if one sheds tears along with his prayers”; and in Synopsis Sohar, p. 33, n. 2, “There are three kinds of prayers, entreaty, crying, and tears. Entreaty is offered in a quiet voice, crying with a raised voice, but tears are higher than all.”

In ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, the sense of εὐλαβεία in 1228 and of εὐλαβείσθαι in 117 shows that ἀπὸ here means “on account of” (as is common in Hellenistic Greek), and that ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας must be taken, as the Greek fathers took it, “on account of his reverent fear of God,” pro sua reverentia (vg), “because he had

1 Like that of Hos 12, where tears are added to the primitive story (Gn 3226) of Jacob's prayer (ἐνισχύσεις μετὰ ἄγγελον καὶ ἰδιωσθή ἐκλαυσθεν καὶ ἐδεήσησθαν μου). In 2 Mac 118 the Maccabean army μετὰ ἰδιωμῶν καὶ δακρῶν ἱκέτευον τῶν κόρων.
God in reverence” (Tyndale; “in honoure,” Coverdale). The writer is thinking of the moving tradition about Jesus in Gethsemane, which is now preserved in the synoptic gospels, where Jesus entreats God to be spared death: ‘Αββά ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σοι παρέστηκε τὸ ποτήριον ἀν’ ἐμοῦ τούτο (Mk 14:36). This repeated supplication corresponds to the “bitter tears and cries.” Then Jesus adds, ἀλλ’ οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τί σοῦ. This is his εἰλάβεια, the godly fear which leaves everything to the will of God. Such is the discipline which issues in ὑπακοή. Compare Ps. Sol 6:8 καὶ κύριος εἰσηκουσε προσευχὴν παντὸς ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ.

(a) The alternative sense of “fear” appears as early as the Old Latin version (d = exauditus a metu). This meaning of εἰλάβεια (Beza: “liberatus ex metu”) occurs in Joseph. Ant. xi. 6. 9, εἰλάβειας οὖν ἔτην (Esther) ἔπολεων. Indeed εἰλάβεια (cp. Anz, 359) and its verb εἰλάβεισθαι are common in this sense; cp. e.g. 2 Mac 8:6 ἐμε καταγάμησαι τοὺς δεσμοὺς τῇ . . . πολιτίσθεναι. Sir 4:2 ἐμε εἰλαβὼν κρίμα δανδόν: Wis 17:1 ὁ θεὸς καταγέλασε εἰλαβείων ἔφοσον. But here the deeper, religious sense is more relevant to the context. “In any case the answer consisted . . . in courage given to face death. . . . The point to be emphasized is, not so much that the prayer of Jesus was heard, as that it needed to be heard” (A. B. Bruce, p. 186).

(b) Some (e.g. Linden in Studien und Kritiken, 1860, 753 f., and Blass, § 211) take ἀπὸ τῆς εἰλαβείας with what follows; this was the interpretation of the Peshito (“and, although he was a son, he learned obedience from fear and the sufferings which he bore”). But the separation of ἀπὸ τῆς εἰλαβείας from ἀπὸ ᾧ and the necessity of introducing a καὶ before the latter phrase point to the artificiality of this construction.

In v. 8 καὶ περ ὦν υἱὸς (καὶ περ being used with a participle as in 7:5 12:17) means, “Son though he was,” not “son though he was.” The writer knows that painful discipline is to be expected by all who are sons of God the Father; he points out, in 12:5, that every son, because he is a son, has to suffer. Here the remarkable thing is that Jesus had to suffer, not because but although he was υἱός, which shows that Jesus is Son in a unique sense; as applied to Jesus υἱός means something special. As divine υἱός in the sense of 11:1, it might have been expected that he would be exempt from such a discipline. ὡς . . . ἐμαθεν . . . ὑπακοῆ is the main thread of the sentence, but καὶ περ ὦν υἱὸς attaches itself to ἐμαθεν κτλ. rather than to the preceding participles προσευχήκας and εἰσακουσθεῖς (Chrys. Theophyl.). With a daring stroke the author adds, ἐμαθεν ἄφ’ ὦν ἐπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν. The paronomasia goes back to a common Greek phrase which is as old as Aeschylus (Agam. 177 f.), who describes Zeus as τὸν πάθει μάθος θέντα κυρίος ἔχειν, and tells how (W. Headlam)—

“The heart in time of sleep renews
Aching remembrance of her bruise,
And chastening wisdom enters wills that most refuse”—
which, the poet adds, is a sort of χάρις βίωσις from the gods. This moral doctrine, that πάθος brings μάθος, is echoed by Pindar (Isthm. i. 40, δ πανήγυρις δε νόμο καὶ προμάθειον φέρει) and other writers, notably by Philo (de vit. Mos. iii. 38, τούτοις οὖν λόγος ἀλλ’ ἔργα παθοῦσι παθόντες εἰσονται τὸ ἐμὸν ἀφειδεῖ, ἐπεὶ μαθόντες οὐκ ἐγνωσαν: de spec. leg. iii. 6, ἵν’ ἐκ τοῦ παθείν μάθη κτλ. : de somn. ii. 15, δ παθῶν ἀκριβῶς ἔμαθεν, ὅτι τοῦ θεοῦ (Gn 50:19) ἐστιν). But in the Greek authors and in Philo it is almost invariably applied to “the thoughtless or stupid, and to open and deliberate offenders” (Abbott, Diat. 3203a), to people who can only be taught by suffering. Our writer ventures, therefore, to apply to the sinless Jesus an idea which mainly referred to young or wilful or undisciplined natures. The term ὑπακοή only occurs once in the LXX, at 2 S 22:8 (καὶ ὑπακοή σου ἔπληθυνεν με, Α), where it translates πίστις. The general idea corresponds to that of 10:5-9 below, where Jesus enters the world submissively to do the will of God, a vocation which involved suffering and self-sacrifice. But the closest parallel is the argument of Paul in Ph 2:6-8, that Jesus, born in human form, ἔταπεν ὕπακος ἐαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος (sc. τῷ θεῷ) μέχρι θανάτου, and the conception of the ὑπακοή of Jesus (Ro 5:18) in contrast to the ὑπακοή of Adam. What our writer means to bring out here, as in 2:10f, is the practical initiation of Jesus into his vocation for God and men. “Wherever there is a vocation, growth and process are inevitable. . . . Personal relations are of necessity relations into which one grows; the relation can be fully and practically constituted only in the practical exercise of the calling in which it is involved. So it was with Christ. He had, so to speak, to work Himself into His place in the plan of salvation, to go down among the brethren whom He was to lead to glory and fully to identify Himself with them, not of course by sharing their individual vocation, but in the practice of obedience in the far harder vocation given to Him. That obedience had to be learned, not because His will was not at every moment perfect . . . but simply because it was a concrete, many-sided obedience” (W. Robertson Smith, Expositor2, ii. pp. 425, 426). Τελειωθεὶς in v.9 recalls and expands the remark of 2:10, that God “perfected” Jesus by suffering as τὸν ἄρχεγον τῆς σωτηρίας αἰτῶν, and the argument of 2:17. The writer avoids the technical Stoic terms προκόπτειν and προκοπῆ. He prefers τελείοια and τελείωσις, not on account of their associations with the sacerdotal consecration of the OT ritual, but in order to suggest the moral ripening which enabled Jesus to offer a perfect self-sacrifice, and also perhaps with a side-allusion here to the death-association of these terms.
Philo (de Abrah. 11) observes that nature, instruction, and practice are the three things essential πρὸς τελειώτητα τοῦ βιοῦ, οὗτε γὰρ διδασκαλίαν ἰδεῖν φύσεως ἢ ἀνκήθεσις τελειώθην δυνατόν ὥστε φύσις ἐπὶ πέρας ἐστὶν ἐλθεῖν ἰκανῆ δίκα τοῦ μαθητῶν.

Ἄπιος σωτηρίας was a common Greek phrase. Thus Philo speaks of the brazen serpent as ἄπιος σωτηρίας γενόμενος παντελῶς τοῖς θεασαμένοις (de Agric. 22). Aeschines (in Cleisiph. 57) has τῆς μὲν σωτηρίας τῇ πόλει τοὺς θεοὺς ἀπίοις γεγενήμενοι, and in the de Mundo, 398d, the writer declares that it is fitting for God ἄπιον τε γίνεσθαι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς σωτηρίας. Σωτηρία ἀιωνίος is a LXX phrase (Is 45:17), but not in the sense intended here (cp. 28). The collocation of Jesus learning how to obey God and of thus proving a saviour τοῖς ὑπακοοῦσιν αὐτῷ is remarkable. At first sight there is a clue to the sense in Philo, who declares that “the man who is morally earnest,” receiving God’s kingdom, “does not prove a source of evil to anyone (ἄπιος γίνεται), but proves a source of the acquisition and use of good things for all who obey him” (πάιει τοῖς ὑπηκοοῖς, de Abrah. 45). This refers to Abraham, but to the incident of Gn 23, not to that of Melchizedek; Philo is spiritualizing the idea of the good man as king, and the ὑπηκοοί are the members of his household under his authority. The parallel is merely verbal. Here by πάειν τοῖς ὑπακοοῦσιν αὐτῷ the writer means οἱ πατεύσαντες (4), but with a special reference to their loyalty to Christ. Disobedience to Christ or to God (318 46 11) is the practical expression of disbelief. It is a refusal to take Christ for what he is, as God’s appointed ἀρχιερεύς. The writer then adds (v.10) προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιερεύς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, in order to explain how, thus commissioned, he brought the σωτηρία αἰωνίος. The paragraph is thus rounded off, like that of vv.5-6, with a reference to the Melchizedek priesthood, which the writer regards as of profound importance, and to which he now proposes to advance. Though προσαγορευθεῖν is not used in this sense (“hail,” “designate”) in the LXX, the usage is common in Hellenistic writings like 2 Maccabees (186-47 109) and Josephus (e.g. c. Ant. i. 311). But the Melchizedek type of priesthood is not discussed till 620 71. The interlude between 510 and 620 is devoted to a stirring exhortation; for this interpretation of the Son as priest is a piece of γνώσις which can only be imparted to those who have mastered the elementary truths of the Christian religion, and the writer feels and fears that his readers are still so immature that they may be unable or unwilling to grasp the higher and fuller teaching about Christ. The admonition has three movements of thought, 511-14, 61-8, and 69-19.

11 On this point ἐν ὑμῖν, plural of authorship, as 21 have a great deal to say, which it is hard to make intelligible to you. For (καὶ γὰρ = etenim) you have
v. 11, 12. BACKWARDNESS

grown dull of hearing. Though by this time you should be teaching other people, you still need someone to teach you once more the rudimentary principles of the divine revelation. You are in need of milk, not of solid food. (For anyone who is fed on milk is unskilled in moral truth; he is a mere babe. Whereas solid food is for the mature, for those who have their faculties trained by exercise to distinguish good and evil.) Let us pass on then to what is mature, leaving elementary Christian doctrine behind, instead of laying the foundation over again with repentance from dead works, with faith in God, with instruction about ablations and the laying on of hands, about the resurrection of the dead and eternal punishment. With God's permission we will take this step.

The entire paragraph (vv. 11-14) is full of ideas and terms current in the ethical and especially the Stoic philosophy of the day. Thus, to begin with, πολύς (sc. ἐστι) ὁ λόγος is a common literary phrase for "there is much to say"; e.g. Dion. Hal. ad Amm. i. 3, πολύς γὰρ ὁ περὶ αὐτῶν λόγος, and Lysias in Panderenem, 11, ὅσα μὲν οὖν αὐτόθι ἐρήμη, πολὺς ἂν εἰ οὐκο λόγος δεγειζθαί. Πολύς and δυσερμηνεύως are separated, as elsewhere adjectives are (e.g. 2:17). For the general sense of δυσερμηνεύως λέγειν, see Philo, de migrat. Abrah. 18, ἢς τά μὲν ἀλλὰ μακροτέρων ἢ κατὰ τόν παρόντα καιρὸν δεῖται λόγων καὶ υπερθέτειν, and Dion. Halic. de Comp. viii. περὶ δὲ καὶ πολύς ὁ λόγος καὶ βαθεία ἢ θεωρία. Δυσερμηνεύως occurs in an obscure and interpolated passage of Philo's de Somniiis (i. 32, ἀλέκτῳ τινι καὶ δυσερμηνεύτῳ θλα), and Artemidorus (Oneirocr. iii. 67, οἱ δὲνεφαοι ... ποικίλοι καὶ πολλοῖς δυσερμηνεύονται) uses it of dreams. ἔπει κτλ. (explaining δυσερμηνεύως) for the fault lies with you, not with the subject. Νωθρός only occurs once in the LXX, and not in this sense (Pr 22:20 ἀνθράσι νωθροῖς, tr. Ὑψί); even in Sir 4:29 11:12 it means no more than slack or backward (as below in 6:12). It is a common Greek ethical term for sluggishness, used with the accusative or the (locative) dative. With ἁκοφ it denotes dulness. The literal sense occurs in Heliodorus (v. 10: ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἔσοβομ... τάχα μὲν που καὶ δι᾽ ἡλικίαν νοθρότατος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁκοφ' νόσος γὰρ ἄλλων τε καὶ ὧτων τὸ γήρας), and the metaphorical sense of ἁκοφ is illustrated by Philo's remark in quis rer. div. haer. 3: ἐν ἁφοῖς ἁνθράσιν, ὡς ὦτα μὲν ἑστὶν, ἁκοφ δὲ οὖς ἔνεσιν.

Why (καὶ γὰρ, v.19), the writer continues, instead of being teachers you still need a teacher. For χρεία with the article and infinitive (τοῦ διδάσκειν 2 κτλ.), cp. the similar use of χρέων in OP. 1488:25. In what follows, τινά, the masculine singular, gives a better sense than τινα, the neuter plural. "Ye again have need of (one) to teach you what are the elements" (sah boh); but it

1 De inserts ἁκοφ (Mt 15:26) between γὰρ and ἐστιν: "he is still a mere babe." Blass adopts this, for reasons of rhythm.
2 19:12 and Origen read (with 462) διδάσκειθαι, and omit ἐμαυ.
is the elementary truths themselves, not what they are, that need to be taught. *Τὰ στοιχεῖα* here means the ABC or elementary principles (see Burton's *Galatians*, pp. 510f.), such as he mentions in 6:1-2. He defines them further as *τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων θεοῦ*, where *τὰ λογία θεοῦ* means not the OT but the divine revelation in general, so that *τὰ σ. τ. ἀρχῆς* corresponds to the Latin phrase "prima elementa." The words *διδάσκαλοι* simply charge the readers with backwardness. "The expression, 'to be teachers,' affirms no more than that the readers ought to be ripe in Christian knowledge. Once a man is ripe or mature, the qualification for teaching is present" (Wrede, p. 32). The use of the phrase in Greek proves that it is a general expression for stirring people up to acquaint themselves with what should be familiar. See Epict. *Enchir.* 5:1, ποιον οὖν ἐτι διδάσκαλον προσδοκᾷ; ... οὐκ ἐτι εἰ μειράκιον, ἀλλὰ ἰσήρ ἡδή τέλειος. It was quite a favourite ethical maxim in antiquity. Thus Cyrus tells the Persian chiefs that he would be ashamed to give them advice on the eve of battle: ὅθα γὰρ υμᾶς ταύτα ἐπισταμένους καὶ μεμελετηκότας καὶ ἀσκοῦντας διὰ τέλους οἵημερ ἐγώ, ὡστε καὶ ἄλλους εἰκότως ἄν διδάσκοιτε (Cyrop. iii. 3. 35). Similarly we have the remark of Aristophanes in Plato, *Sympos.* 189d, ἐγὼ οὖν πειράσομαι υμᾶς εἰσηγήσοσθαι τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ, υμεὶς δὲ τὸν ἄλλων διδάσκαλον ἐσποθε, and the reply given by Apollonius of Tyana to a person who asked why he never put questions to anybody: ὅτι μειράκιον ἄν ἔζησα, νῦν δὲ οὕτω χρὴ ἔρθειν ἀλλὰ διδάσκαλοι ἐσποθε, and the reference given by Seneca tells Lucilius the same truth: "quousque discès? iam et praecipe (Ep. 33*). The same phrase here offers no support whatever to any theories about the readers of *Πρὸς Ἐβραίους* being a group of teachers, or a small, specially cultured community. The author, himself a διδάσκαλος, as he is in possession of this mature γνώσις, is trying to shame his friends out of their imperfect grasp of their religion. That is all. *Γεγονότες χρείαν ἐκχοντες* is a rhetorical variant for *χρείαν ἔχετε,* due to the writer's fondness for *γεγονός.* If there is any special meaning in the larger phrase, it is that detected by Chrysostom, who argues that the writer chose it deliberately: τουτότιν, ὑμεῖς ἕθελήσατε, ὑμεῖς ἐαυτοῖς εἰς τούτο κατεστήσατε, εἰς ταύτην τὴν χρείαν. They are responsible for this second childhood of theirs. The comparison of milk and solid food is one of the most common in Greek

---

1 Origen (*Philocalia, xviii. 23*) uses this passage neatly to answer Celsus, who had declared that Christians were afraid to appeal to an educated and intelligent audience. He quotes 5:1-2, as well as 1 Co 3:1-2, arguing that in the light of them it must be admitted *ὑμεῖς, δὴν δύναμις, πάντα πράττομεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ φρονίμως ἀνθρώπων γενέσθαι τὸν σύλλογον ἡμῶν· καὶ τὰ ἐν ἡμῖν μάλιστα καλὰ καὶ θεία τότε τολμήμεν ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν διαλόγιας φέρειν εἰς μέσον, δι᾽ εὐποροῦμεν σωζόμεν ἄκροατῶν.*
ethical philosophy, as in Epictetus, e.g. ii. 16. 39, οὐθελείς ἡ ποιήσασθαι καὶ ἀπετάθαι τροφῆς στερεωτέρας, and iii. 24. 9, οὐκ ἀπογαλακτίσομεν ἡπὸ τοῦ ἐαυτοῦ, and particularly in Philo. A characteristic passage from the latter writer is the sentence in de agric. 2: ἐπεὶ δὲ νηπίως μὲν ἠστι γάλα τροφῆς, τελειόι δὲ τὰ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα, καὶ ψυχής γαλακτώδεις μὲν ἄν ἔλευ τροφαὶ κατὰ τὴν παιδικὴν ἡλικίαν τὰ τῆς ἐγκυκλίων μονοσικής προπαιδεύματα, τέλεια δὲ καὶ ἄνδραίς ἑμπρεπεῖς αἱ διὰ φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀπάθεις ἀρετῆς ψυχής. Our writer adopts the metaphor, as Paul had done (1 Co 3:1-2), and adds a general aside (vv. 13·14) in order to enforce his remonstrance. He does not use the term νηπίως, and the plight of his friends is not due to the same causes as operated in the Corinthian church, but he evidently regards his interpretation of the priesthood of Christ as mature instruction, στερεὰ τροφῆ. 'Ο μετέχων γάλακτος is one whose only food (μετέχειν as in i Co 10:17 etc.) is milk; ἀπειρός is "inexperienced," and therefore "unskilled," in λόγῳ δικαιοσύνης—an ethical phrase for what moderns would call "moral truth," almost as in Xen. Cyrop. i. 6. 31, ἀνήρ διδάσκαλος τῶν παιδῶν, δο διδασκαλεῖ ἁρὰ τοὺς παιδῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην κτλ., or in M. Aurelius xi. 10, xii. 1. Thus, while δικαιοσύνη here is not a religious term, the phrase means more than (a) "incapable of talking correctly" (Delitzsch, B. Weiss, von Soden), which is, no doubt, the mark of a νηπίος, but irrelevant in this connexion; or (b) "incapable of understanding normal speech," such as grown-up people use (Riggenbach). Τελείων δὲ κτλ. (v.14). The clearest statement of what contemporary ethical teachers meant by τελείως as mature, is (cp. p. 70) in Epict. Enchirid. 51, "how long (εἰς ποιὸν ἐτὶ χρόνον) will you defer thinking of yourself as worthy of the very best ...? You have received the precepts you ought to accept, and have accepted them. Why then do you still wait for a teacher (διδάσκαλον προσδοκᾶς), that you may put off amending yourself till he comes? You are a lad no longer, you are a full-grown man now (οὐκ ἐτὶ εἰ μεμάκιον, ἀλλὰ ἂν ἔχῃ τέλειος). ... Make up your mind, ere it is too late, to live ως τέλειος καὶ προκόπτοςτα." Then he adds, in words that recall He 12ff.: "and when you meet anything stiff or sweet, glorious or inglorious, remember that ὁ ἄγων καὶ ἡπὸ πάρεστι τὰ Ὀλύμπια." As Pythagoras divided his pupils into νηπίως and τελείως, so our author distinguishes between the immature and the mature (cp. i Co 2:6 ἐν τοῖς τελείοις, 3:1 νηπίωσ). In διὰ τὴν ἐξίω (vg. "pro consuetudine") he uses ἐξίς much as does the writer of the prologue to Sirach (iagn διὰ τὴν περιποιησάμνος), for facility or practice. It is not an equivalent for mental faculties here,

\[Firma quaedam facilitas quae apud Graecos \dot{\varepsilon}ξίς nominatur\] (Quint. Instit. Orat. 10. 1).
but for the exercise of our powers. These powers or faculties are called τὰ αἰσθήτηρια. Αἰσθήτηρια was a Stoic term for an organ of the senses, and, like its English equivalent "sense," easily acquired an ethical significance, as in Jer 4:19 τὰ αἰσθήτηρια τῆς καρδίας μου. The phrase γεγυμνασμένα αἰσθήτηρια may be illustrated from Galen (de dign. puls. iii. 2, ὅπερ γὰρ ἐν εὐαισθητότοταν φύσιν τε καὶ τὸ αἰσθητήριον ἔχει γεγυμνασμένον ἰκανός . . . οὕτως ἄν άριστος εἴη γνώμον τῶν ἐντός ὑποκειμένων, and ἐν κομψε, ii.: λελογισμένον μὲν ἐστὶν ἀνδρὸς τῶν λογισμῶν οὗς εἰρήκα καὶ γεγυμνασμένα τὴν αἰσθήσιν ἐν πολλῇ τῇ κατὰ μέρος ἐμπειρίᾳ κτλ.), γεγυμνασμένα being a perfect participle used predicatively, like πεφυτευμένην in Lk 136, and γεγυμασμένων above. Compare what Marcus Aurelius (iii. i) says about old age; it may come upon us, bringing not physical failure, but a premature decay of the mental and moral faculties, e.g., of self-control, of the sense of duty, καὶ δὼσα τοιαύτα λογισμοῦ συνγεγυμνασμένον πάνιν χρῆκε. Elsewhere (ii. 13) he declares that ignorance of moral distinctions (ἀγνωσία ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν) is a blindness as serious as any inability to distinguish black and white. The power of moral discrimination (πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ) is the mark of maturity, in contrast to childhood (cp. e.g. Dt 1:99 πᾶν χαίδων γένος ὅσις οὖν οἴδειν σήμερον ἀγάθου ἢ κακοῦ). Compare the definition of τὸ ἡθικὸν in Sextus Empiricus (Hyp. Pyrrh. iii. 168): ὅπερ δοκεῖ περὶ τὴν διάκρισιν τῶν τε καλῶν καὶ κακῶν καὶ ἀδιαφόρων κατα-γένεσθαι.

In spite of Resch's arguments (Texte u. Untersuchungen, xxx. 3. 112 ff.), there is no reason to hear any echo of the well-known saying attributed to Jesus: ἱνασθε δὲ δόκιμοι τραπεζίται, τὰ μὲν ἀποδοκιμάζοντες, τὸ δὲ καλῶν κατέχοντες.

Διὰ—well then (as in 1:12. 28)—ἐπὶ τὸν τελειώτητα φερώμεθα (61). It is a moral duty to grow up, and the duty involves an effort. The τελειώτης in question is the mature mental grasp of the truth about Christ as ἀρχιερεῖς, a truth which the writer is disappointed that his friends still find it difficult to understand. However, διὰ τὸν χρόνον they ought to understand it. He has every reason to expect an effort from them, and therefore he follows up his remonstrance with a word of encouragement. Instead of the sharp, severe tone of vv.11f., he now speaks more hopefully. The connexion is not easy. We expect "however" instead of "well then." But the connexion is not made more easy by regarding 61 as a resolve of the writer: "since you are so immature, I am going on myself to develop the higher teaching." It would be senseless for a teacher to take this line, and it is not facilitated by reading φερόμεθα. The plural is not the literary plural as in 511. The writer wishes to carry his readers along with him. "If you want anyone to instruct you over again in
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rudimentary Christianity, I am not the man; I propose to carry you forward into a higher course of lessons. Come, let us advance, you and I together." The underlying thought, which explains the transition, is revealed in the next paragraph (vv. 4f.), where the writer practically tells his readers that they must either advance or lose their present position of faith, in which latter case there is no second chance for them. In spite of his unqualified censure in 512, he shows, in 69f., that they are really capable of doing what he summons them to try in 61f., i.e. to think out the full significance of Jesus in relation to faith and forgiveness. Only thus, he argues, can quicken the faint pulse of your religious life. "Religion is something different from mere strenuous thinking on the great religious questions. Yet it still remains true that faith and knowledge are inseparable, and that both grow stronger as they react on one another. More often than we know, the failure of religion, as a moral power, is due to no other cause than intellectual sloth" (E. F. Scott, p. 44). After the parenthesis of 518.14, the writer resumes the thought with which he started in 511a "you must make an effort to enter into this larger appreciation of what Christ means." *Aφεντες* . . . *φερομέθα* is a phrase illustrated by Eurip. *Androm.* 392–393, τήν ἀρχήν ἀφείς | πρὸς τὴν τελευτὴν ύστεραν οὖναν φέρη; by *ἀφέντες* the writer means "leaving behind," and by *φερομέθα* "let us advance." *Ἀφίημι* might even mean "to omit" ("not mentioning"); it is so used with λόγον (= to pass over without mentioning), e.g. in Plutarch's *an seni respublica gerenda sit*, 18, ἀλλ' ἀφέντες, εἰ βούλει, τὸν ἀποστόλα τῆς πολιτείας λόγον ἐκεῖνο σκοτώμεν ἡδή κτλ., and even independently (cf. Epict. iv. 1. 15, τὸν μὲν Καίσαρα πρὸς τὸ παρόν ἀφώμεν, and Theophrastus, *prooem.* ἀφείς τὸ προοιμίαζεθαι καὶ πολλά περὶ τοῦ πράγματος λέγειν). In what follows, τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον is a variant for τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ (512). Τοῦ Χριστοῦ is an objective genitive; the writer is not thinking of injunctions issued by Christ (so Harnack, *Constitution and Law of the Church*, p. 344). Blass follows L in reading λοιπῶν after λόγων—needlessly.

The use of the *θεμέλιοι* metaphor after τῆς ἀρχῆς was natural; it occurs in Epictetus (ii. 15. 8, οὐ θέλεις τὴν ἀρχήν στῆσαι καὶ τῶν *θεμέλιων*) and in Philo (de *spec. leg.* ii. 13, ἀρχὴν ταῦταν βαλλαμένος ὁσπέρ θεμέλιον τινα). Indeed the *θεμέλιοι* metaphor is particularly common in Philo, as, e.g., in the *de vita contempl.* 476 (ἐγκατέστη δὲ ὁσπέρ τιναν θεμέλιον προκαταβαλλόμενον ψυχής). This basis (θεμέλιοι) of Christian instruction is now described; the contents are arranged in three pairs, but, as the middle pair are not distinctively Christian ideas (v. 4), the writer puts in

1 Compare the motto which Cromwell is said to have written on his pocket-bible, "qui cessat esse melior cessat esse bonus."
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διδαχήν or διδαχής. The θεμέλιον of instruction consists of μετανοιάς ... και πίστεως (genitives of quality), while διδαχήν, which is in apposition to it ("I mean, instruction about"), controls the other four genitives. Μετάνοια and πίστες, βαπτισμοί and επιθέσις χειρῶν, ἀνάστασις and κρίμα αἰώνον, are the fundamental truths. Μετάνοιαύς ἀπό is like μετανοεῖν ἀπό (Ac 8:22), and πίστες ἐπὶ Θεόν like πίστειν ἐπὶ (e.g. Wis 12:2 ἵνα ἀπαλαγέτες τῆς κακίας πιστεύσωμεν ἐπὶ σέ, κύριε). These two requirements were foremost in the programme of the Christian mission. The other side of repentance is described in 9:14 πόσῳ μάλλον τὸ ἄμα του Χριστοῦ ... καθαρίει τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν Θεῷ ἔως, where the last word indicates that νεκρὰ ἔργα mean the conduct of those who are outside the real life and service of God. Practically, therefore, νεκρὰ ἔργα are sins, as the Greek fathers assumed; the man who wrote 11:25 (θεός ... ἀμαρτίας) would hardly have hesitated to call them such. He has coined this phrase to suggest that such ἔργα have no principle of life in them,2 or that they lead to death. The origin of the phrase has not been explained, though Chrysostom and Oecumenius were right in suggesting that the metaphor of 9:14 was derived from the contamination incurred by touching a corpse (see Nu 19:11 ff. 31:19). Its exact meaning is less clear. The one thing that is clear about it is that these ἔργα νεκρά were not habitual sins of Christians; they were moral offences from which a man had to break away, in order to become a Christian at all. They denote not the lifeless, formal ceremonies of Judaism, but occupations, interests, and pleasures, which lay within the sphere of moral death, where, as a contemporary Christian writer put it ( Eph 2:1), pagans lay νεκροὶ τοὺς παραπτωμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις. The phrase might cover Jewish Christians, if there were any such in the community to which this homily is addressed, but it is a general phrase. Whatever is evil is νεκρόν, for our author, and ἔργα νεκρά render any Christian πίστις or λατρεία impossible (cp. Expositor, Jan. 1918, pp. 1–18), because they belong to the profane, contaminating sphere of the world.

In v.2 διδαχήν is read, instead of διδαχής, by B syr harki and the Old Latin, a very small group—yet the reading is probably

1 According to Philo (de Abrak. 2, 3), next to hope, which is the ἄρχη μετουσίας ἄγαθων, comes ἡ ἐπὶ ἀμαρτανομένως μετάνοια καὶ βελτίωσις. Only, he adds (ibid. 4), repentance is second to τελείωσις, ὑστερο παντοτ οὖν σῶμα τούτο οἱ πρὸς ὑγιείαν ἐξ ἀνθρώπους μεταβολῆ ... ἦ ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων βελτίωσις ἰδίων ἀγαθῶν ὕφευγον ψυχής ἔστι μὴ τοῖς πατικοῖς ἐπιμενοῦσας ἀλλ' ἀδροτεροὶ καὶ ἀνώτα ὡς φρονήσας ἐπανέγνωσε εὐθύς κατάστασιν [ψυχής] καὶ τῆς ἀντίθεσις τῶν καλῶν ἐπιτροπήσατο.

2 Cp. the use of νεκρός in Epict. iii. 23, 28, καὶ μὴ ἐν μὴ ταῦτα ἐμποτι ο τοῦ φιλοσόφου λόγος, νεκρός ἐστι καὶ αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ λέγων. This passage indicates how νεκρός could pass from the vivid application to persons (Mt 8:22, Lk 15:20, cp. Col 2:20), into a secondary application to their sphere and conduct.
original; the surrounding genitives led to its alteration into διδαχή. However, it makes no difference to the sense, which reading is chosen. Even διδαχή depends on θεμέλιον as a qualifying genitive. But the change of διδαχή into διδαχή is much more likely than the reverse process. Διδαχή follows βαπτισμόν like κόσμος in 1 P 3:3 (ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος).

Βαπτισμόῖ by itself does not mean specifically Christian baptism either in this epistle (9:10) or elsewhere (Mk 7:4), but ablutions or immersions such as the mystery religions and the Jewish cultus required for initiates, proselytes, and worshippers in general. The singular might mean Christian baptism (as in Col 2:12), but why does the writer employ the plural here? Not because in some primitive Christian circles the catechumen was thrice sprinkled or immersed in the name of the Trinity (Didache 7:1-3), but because ancient religions, such as those familiar to the readers, had all manner of purification rites connected with water (see on 10:22). The distinctively Christian uses of water had to be grasped by new adherents. That is, at baptism, e.g., the catechumen would be specially instructed about the difference between this Christian rite, with its symbolic purification from sins of which one repented, and (a) the similar rites in connexion with Jewish proselytes on their reception into the synagogue or with adherents who were initiated into various cults, and (b) the ablutions which were required from Christians in subsequent worship. The latter practice may be alluded to in 10:22 (λευκοφρένοι τὸ σῶμα ἡτατι καθαρῷ). Justin (Apol. i. 62) regards these lustrations of the cults as devilish caricatures of real baptism: καὶ τὸ λουτρὸν δὴ τούτο ἀκούσαντες οἱ δαίμονες . . . ἐνήργησαν καὶ ῥαντίζειν ἑαυτοὺς τοὺς εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ αὐτῶν ἐπιβαίνοντας καὶ προσέναι αὐτῶν μέλλοντας, λουθάς καὶ κύνας ἀποφυτοῦται τέλον δὲ καὶ λοισθαί ἐπίσταντα πρὶν ἠθείν ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερά, ἐνδα ἱδρύνεται, ἐνεργοῦσι. The ἐπιθέσεως χειρῶν which often followed baptism in primitive days (e.g. Ac 8:17a. 19b), though it is ignored by the Didache and Justin, was supposed to confer the holy Spirit (see v.4). Tertullian witnesses to the custom (de baptismo, 18, de carnis resurrectione, 8), and Cyprian corroborates it (Ep. lxxiv. 5, “manus baptizato imponitur ad accipiendum spiritum sanctum”). The rite was employed in blessing, in exorcising, and at “ordination,” afterwards at the reception of penitents and heretics; here it is mentioned in connexion with baptism particularly (ΕΡΕ. vi. 494b).

The subject is discussed in monographs like A. J. Mason’s The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism (1891), and J. Behm’s Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum (1911).

The final pair of doctrines is ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν καὶ κρίματος (2:14. 15 9:27) αἰωνίου (as in Ac 24:15. 28). Τε is added after ἀνασ-
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tάσεως mechanically (to conform with the preceding τε) by Ν A C K L Lat arm syr hki pesh, just as it is added after βαπτισμῶν by harkl. In the rather elliptical style and loose construction of the whole sentence, "notwithstanding its graceful rhythmical structure," it is possible to see, with Bruce (p. 203), "an oratorical device to express a feeling of impatience" with people who need to have such principia mentioned. At any rate the writer hastens forward. V. 3 is not a parenthesis ("I will do this," i.e. go over such elementary truths with you, "if God permits," when I reach you, 1322); the τούτο refers to the advance proposed in v. 1, and after ποιήσωμεν the author adds reverently, "if God permits," ἐάντερ ἐπιτρέπῃ θεὸς, almost as a contemporary rhetorician might say in a pious aside: ἔὰν δὲ σωφρονίζῃ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἡμᾶς (Dion. Halicarn. De Admir. VI dicendi in Dem. 58), or θεών ἡμᾶς φυλασσόντων ἀνευκεῖ τε καὶ ἀνόψους (De Composit. Verborum, 1).

The papyri show that similar phrases were current in the correspondence of the day (cp. Deissmann's Bible Studies, p. 80), and Josephus (Ant. xx. 11. 2) uses κἂν τὸ θεῖον ἐπιτρέπῃ.

ποιήσωμεν (Ν B K L N 1. 2. 5. 6. 33. 69. 88. 216. 218. 221. 226. 242. 255. 337. 429. 489. 919. 920. 1149. 1518. 1739. 1758. 1827. 1867. 2127. 2143. Lat sah boh Chrys.) has been changed into ποιήσωμεν by A C D P arm, etc., though the latter may have been originally, like φερόμενα in v. 1, an orthographic variant, o and w being frequently confused.

4 For in the case of people who have been once enlightened, who tasted the heavenly Gift, who participated in the holy Spirit, who tasted the goodness of God's word and the powers of the world to come, and then fell away—it is impossible to make them repent afresh, since they crucify the Son of God in their own persons and hold him up to obloquy. 8 For "land" which absorbs the rain that often falls on it, and bears "plants" that are useful to those far whom it is tilled, receives a blessing from God; whereas, if it (sc. ἡ γῆ) "produces thorns and thistles," it is reprobate and on the verge of being cursed—its fate is to be burned.

Vv. 4-6 put the reason for τούτο ποιήσωμεν (v. 3), and vv. 7-8 give the reason for ἀδύνατον . . . ἀνακατιζεῖν εἰς μετάνοιαν (vv. 4-6).

Vv. 4-6 put the reason for τούτο ποιήσωμεν (v. 3), and vv. 7-8 give the reason for ἀδύνατον . . . ἀνακατιζεῖν εἰς μετάνοιαν (vv. 4-6).

Logically πάλιν ἀνακατιζεῖν εἰς μετάνοιαν ought to come immediately after ἀδύνατον γάρ, but the writer delayed the phrase in order to break up the sequence of participles. The passage is charged with an austerity which shows how seriously the writer took life. Seneca quotes (Ep. xxiii. 9-11) to Lucilius the saying of Epicurus, that "it is irksome always to be starting life over again," and that "they live badly who are always beginning to live." The reason is: "quia
semper illis imperfecta vita est." But our writer takes a much more sombre view of the position of his friends. He urges them to develop their ideas of Christianity. "You need some one to teach you the rudimentary lessons of the faith all over again," he had said. "Yes," he now adds, "and in some cases that is impossible. Relaying a foundation of repentance, etc ! That cannot be done for deliberate apostates." The implication is that his readers are in danger of this sin, as indeed he has hinted already (in 37-414), and that one of the things that is weakening them is their religious inability to realize the supreme significance of Jesus. To remain as they are is fatal; it means the possibility of a relapse altogether. "Come on," the writer bids them, "for if you do not you will fall back, and to fall back is to be ruined." The connexion between this passage and the foregoing, therefore, is that to rest content with their present elementary hold upon Christian truth is to have an inadequate grasp of it; the force of temptation is so strong that this rudimentary acquaintance with it will not prevent them from falling away altogether, and the one thing to ensure their religious position is to see the full meaning of what Jesus is and does. This meaning he is anxious to impart, not as an extra but as an essential. The situation is so serious, he implies, that only those who fully realize what Jesus means for forgiveness and fellowship will be able to hold out. And once you relapse, he argues, once you let go your faith, it is fatal; people who deliberately abandon their Christian confession of faith are beyond recovery. Such a view of apostasy as a heinous offence, which destroyed all hope of recovery, is characteristic of Πρᾶς Ἐβραῖους. It was not confined to this writer. That certain persons could not repent of their sins was, e.g., an idea admitted in rabbinic Judaism. "Over and over again we have the saying: 'For him who sins and causes others to sin no repentance is allowed or possible' (Aboth v. 26; Sanhedrin, 107b). 'He who is wholly given up to sin is unable to repent, and there is no forgiveness to him for ever' (Midrash Tehillim on Ps 1 ad fin.)." There is a partial parallel to this passage in the idea thrown out by Philo in de agricultura, 28, as he comments upon Gn 926: "Noah began to till the earth." Evidently, says Philo, this means that he was merely working at the Agriculture of the subject. ΄Αρχῇ δ', δ τῶν παλαιῶν λόγων, ήμυς τοῦ πάντος, ὃς ἄν ἡμισί πρός τό τέλος ἁφετηκία, ὃς μὴ προσγενομένου καὶ τό ἄρξανθαι πολλάκις μεγάλα πολλοὺς ἐβλάπτει. His point is that it is dangerous to stop short in any moral endeavour. But our author is more rigorous in his outlook. His warning is modified, however. (a) It is put in the form of a general statement.

(b) It contains a note of encouragement in v. 7; and (c) it is at once followed up by an eager hope that the readers will disappoint their friend and teacher's fear (v. 9). In the later church this feature of Προς Ἐβραίοις entered into the ecclesiastical question of penance (cp. ERE, ix. 716, and Journal of Theological Studies, iv. 321 f.), and seriously affected the vogue of the epistle (cp. Introd. p. xx).

The fourfold description of believers (4-5a) begins with ἀπαξ φωτισθέντας, where φωτισθέντας corresponds to λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας (1026), in the general sense of LXX (e.g. Ps 118210 ἡ δήλωσις τῶν λόγων σου φωτεί, καὶ συνετε νηπίους), i.e. "enlightened" in the sense of having their eyes opened (Eph 118) to the Christian God. Subsequently, earlier even than Justin Martyr, the verb, with its noun φωτισμός, came to be used of baptism specifically (cp. ERE. viii. 54, 55). "Ἀπαξ is prefixed, in contrast to πάλιν (v. 6); once for all men enter Christianity, it is an experience which, like their own death (927) and the death of Jesus (928), can never be repeated. In καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ἡμᾶς ("experienced how good the gospel is") the construction resembles that of Herod. vii. 46, where the active voice is used with the accusative (ὁ δὲ θεὸς γλυκὸν γεύσας τὸν αὐτοῦ, φθονερός ἐν αὐτῷ εἰρύσκεται εών), and the adj. is put first: "the deity, who let us taste the sweetness of life (or, that life is sweet), is found to be spiteful in so doing." The similar use of the middle here as in Pr 2926 and Jn 2 probably points to the same meaning (cp., however, Diait. 2016-2018), i.e., practically as if it were ὅτι κτλ. (cp. Ps 348 γεύσασθε καὶ ἰδέτε ὅτι χρηστός ὁ κύριος, I P 23), in contrast to the more common construction with the genitive (v. 429). The writer uses genitive and accusative indifferently, for the sake of literary variety; and καλὸν here is the same as καλὸ in 514. Γευσαμένους κτλ. recalls the partiality of Philo for this metaphor (e.g. de Abrah. 19; de Somn. i. 26), but indeed it is common (cp. e.g. Jos. Ant. iv. 6. 9, ἄπαξ τὸ νέον γευσαμένον ἑξισκόν ἔθισμοι ἀπλήστω ψυχῶν ἐνεφορεῖ τοῖς ἑλεγκταῖς καὶ τοῖς ἁγιοίς). The heavenly Gift (τῆς δοθεῖσας τῆς ἐπουρανίου) may be the Christian salvation in general, which is then viewed as the impartation of the holy Spirit, and finally as the revelation of the higher world which even already is partly realized in the experience of faith. Note that φωτισθέντας is followed by γευσαμένους κτλ., as the light-metaphor is followed by the food-metaphor in Philo's (de fuga et invent. 25) remarks upon the manna (Ex 1615, 18): ὥστε σύνταξις αὕτη τὴν ὀρατικὴν ψυχὴν φωτίζει τε
VI. 5, 6.] NO SECOND REPENTANCE

καὶ ὁμοί καὶ γλυκαίνει... τοὺς διψῶντας καὶ πεινῶντας καλο-
κάγαθιας ἐφηδύνωσα. Also, that δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος 1 in-
cludes the thrilling experiences mentioned in 26. The dramatic
turn comes in (v. 6) καὶ παραπεσόντας. Παραπτώτευν is here used
in its most sinister sense; it corresponds to ἀποστήναι (3 12), and
indeed both verbs are used in the LXX to translate the same
term γένος. The usage in Wis 6 8 (μὴ παραπεσήγητε) 12 2 (τοὺς
παραπτώσαντας) paves the way for this sense of a deliberate
renunciation of the Christian God, which is equivalent to ἐκουσίως
ἀμαρτάνειν in 10 26. The sin against the holy Spirit, which Jesus
regarded as unpardonable, the mysterious ἀμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον
of 1 Jn 5 16, and this sin of apostasy, are on the same level. The
writer never hints at what his friends might relapse into.

Anything that ignored Christ was to him hopeless.

'ἄδυνατον (sc. ἔστιν) is now (v. 6) taken up in ἄνακανίζειν (for
which Paul prefers the form ἄνακανιζέν), a LXX term (e.g. Ps
51 12) which is actually used for the Christian start in life by
Barnabas (6 11 ἄνακανίζως ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν),
and naturally of the divine action. Πάλιν is prefixed for emphasis,
as in Isokr. Areopag. 3, τῆς ἔχθρας τῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλεία πάλιν
ἄνακανιζομένης.

There have been various, vain efforts to explain the apparent harshness
of the statement. Erasmus took ἄδυνατον (like ἐν = difficult) as "difficult";
Grotius said it was impossible "per legem Mosis"; others take ἄνακανίζειν
to mean "keep on renewing," while some, like Schoettgen, Bengel, and
Wickham, fall back on the old view that while men could not, God might
effect it. But even the last-named idea is out of the question. If the writer
thought of any subject to ἄνακανίζειν, it was probably a Christian διδόσκαλος
like himself; but the efforts of such a Christian are assumed to be the channel
of the divine power, and no renewal could take place without God. There
is not the faintest suggestion that a second repentance might be produced by
God when human effort failed. The tenor of passages like 10 28, and 12 4
 tells finally against this modification of the language. A similarly ominous
tone is heard in Philo's comment on Nu 30 10 in quod deter. pot. insid. 40:
φήσωμεν διάνοιαν... ἐκβεβληθήμεν καὶ χάριν θεοῦ, ἤτις ἢ γονᾶς θείας ὧν
παρεδέξατο ἡ παραδεξαμένη ἐκουσίων αὐθεὶς ἐξημβλώσε... ἡ δ' ἐπαξ διαθέχο-
θεῖα καὶ διοικηθεῖσα ὡς ἀπουκόλιος μέχρι τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος ἐκτετάξεται, εἰς τὸν
ἀρχαῖον οἴκον ἐπανεθεοῦν ἄδυνατον.

The reason why a second repentance is impossible is given
in ἀνασταυρώντας... παραδειγματίζοντας, where ἀνασταυρώντας
is used instead of σταυρώντας, for the sake of assonance (after ἄνακανίζειν), but with the same meaning. Ἀνασταύρων simply
means "to crucify," as, e.g., in Plato's Gorgias, 28 (τοὺς αὐτῶν ἐπιδεῖν

1 Tertullian's translation, "occidente iam aevō" (de Pudicitia, 20) shows
that his Greek text had omitted a line by accident:

ΝΟΥΣΘΥΡΗΜΑΔΥΝ
ΛΜΕΙΣΤΕΜΕΛΑ
ΟΝΤΟΣΑΙΛΝΟϹΚΑΙ,

i.e. δινάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.
So THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS [VI. 6.

The meaning of the vivid phrase is that they put Jesus out of their life, they break off all connexion with him; he is dead to them. This is the decisive force of σταυρωθῆς in Gal 6:14. The writer adds an equally vivid touch in καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας (=τῶν μόνω θεοίς καταπατήτας κτλ., 10:29)—as if he is not worth their loyalty! Their repudiation of him proclaims to the world that they consider him useless, and that the best thing they can do for themselves is to put him out of their life. Παραδειγματίζειν is used in its Hellenistic sense, which is represented by τιθέναι εἰς παράδειγμα in the LXX (Nah 3:8). Possibly the term was already associated with impaling (cp. Nu 25:4 παραδειγμάτων αὐτοῦ Κυρίου),1 but our author does not use it in the LXX sense of “make an example of” (by punishing); the idea is of exposing to contemptuous ignominy, in public (as in Mt 19).

The Bithynians who had renounced Christianity proved to Pliny their desertion by maligning Christ—one of the things which, as he observed, no real Christian would do (“quorum nihil posse cogi dicuntur qui sunt re vera Christiani”). “Omnes . . . Christi male dixerunt.” When the proconsul urges Polykarp to abandon Christianity, he tells the bishop, λειτουργοί τῶν Χριστόν (Mart. Polyc. ix. 3). The language of Πρὸς Ἐφραῖος is echoed in the saying of Jesus quoted in Apost. Const. vi. 18: οὐ τοις εἰσὶν περὶ τῆς κυρίας πικρῶς καὶ ἀπόστολον ἀπεφάντασε τῶν Χριστίων (Mart. Polyc. ix. 3). The parallel is verbal rather than real. But there is a true parallel in Mongolian Buddhism, which ranks five sins as certain “to be followed by a hell of intense sufferings, and that without cessation . . . patricide, matricide, killing a Doctor of Divinity (i.e. a lama), bleeding Buddha, sowing hatred among priests. . . . Drawing blood from the body of Buddha is a figurative expression, after the manner of He 6” (J. Gilmour, Among the Mongols, pp. 233, 234).

1 In alluding to the gibbeting law of Dt 21:22ff.; Josephus (Bell. Jud. iv. 5. 2) speaks of ἀνασταυροῦν.
VI. 6-8.]

A PARABLE FROM NATURE

In the little illustration (vv. 7-8), which corresponds to what Jesus might have put in the form of a parable, there are reminiscences of the language about God's curse upon the ground (Gn 3:17, 18): πεπτωκατάρατος ὡς γη... ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους ἀνατελεῖ, and also of the words in Gn 12 καὶ ἐξῆγεν· γῆ ὁ στάνταν χορτόν, though the writer uses ἐκφέρειν for ἀνατελεῖν, and prefers τίκτων to ἐκφέρειν (in v. 7). The image of a plot or field is mentioned by Quintilian (Instit. Orat. v. 11. 24) as a common instance of the ἀποβολή: "ut, si animum dicas excolendum, similitudine utaris terrae quae neglecta spinas ac dumos, culta fructus creat." The best Greek instance is in Euripides (Hecuba, 592 f.: οὐκον δεινον, εἰ γῆ μὲν κακὴ, τυχόντα καιροῦ θεόθεν εἰς στάχθον φέρει, χρυσῆ δ' ἀμαρτόσων ὄν χρεον αὐτήν τυγχαίν | κακὸν διδωσαι καρπὸν κτλ.). Ποιῶσα of land, as, e.g., in Dt 11 γῆ... ἐκ τοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίεται ὑδωρ: Is 55:10f. etc. As εὐθέτος generally takes εἰς with the accusative, it is possible that τίκτουσα was meant to go with ἐκεῖνοι. Γεωργεῖται, of land being worked or cultivated, is a common term in the papyri (e.g. Syll. 429 τά τε χωρία εἰ γεωργεῖται) as well as in the LXX.

(a) Origen's homiletical comment (Philocalia, xxii. 9) is, τὰ γνώμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεράστια οἰονεῖς ὑπὸ ἐκείνου· αἱ δὲ προαραθέναι αἱ διδαφοῖς οἰονεῖ ἡ ἡγεμονία· μὲν γῆ ἡ ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ ἡμικηλίμη, μη τῇ φύσει ὡς γῆ τυχανόσα—ἀν ἡ σιχανόσα—το Ἰερώμη (Ierome, tractatus de psalmo xcvii., Anecdota Maredsolan.a, iii. 3. 90: "apostolorum epistolae nostrae pluviae sunt spiritales. Quid enim dicit Paulus in epistola ad Hebraeos? Terra enim saepe venientem super se bibens imbrem, et reliqua") (b) The Mishna directs that at the repetition of the second of the Eighteen Blessings the worshipper should think of the heavy rain and pray for it at the ninth Blessing (Berachoth, 5:1), evidently because the second declares, "Blessed art thou, O Lord, who restorest the dead" (rain quickening the earth), and the ninth runs, "Bless to us, O Lord our God, this year and grant us a rich harvest and bring a blessing on our land." Also, "on the occasion of the rains and good news, one says, Blessed be He who is good and does good" (Berachoth, 9:2). Cp. Marcus Aurelius, v. 7, εὐρηκὴ ἀνθρωπον οὖν, ὅσον, ὃς φιλε Ζεῦ, κατὰ τὴν ἄρωπα τῆς Ἀθηναῖον καὶ τῶν πεδίων.

Metαλαμβάνει (= participate in) is not a LXX term, but occurs in this sense in Wis 18:9 etc.; εὐλογίασ occurs again in 12:17 (of Esau the apostate missing his εὐλογία, and there is a subtle suggestion here, that those alone who make use of their divine privileges are rewarded. What the writer has in mind is brought out in v. 10; that he was thinking of the Esau-story here is shown by the reminiscence of ἀγρον ὄν ἡπλούσθην Κύριος (Gn 27:27).

The reverse side of the picture is now shown (v. 8).

Commenting on Gn 3:18 Philo fancifully plays on the derivation of the word τριβόλος (like "trefoil"): ἐκατον δὲ τῶν παθῶν τριβόλια εἴρηκεν, ἐπειδὴ τριτά ἐστιν, αὐτὸ τε καὶ τὸ τοιχίκον καὶ τὸ ἐκ τούτων ἀπόστελεμα (leg. alleg. 3:9). He also compares the eradication of evil desires in the soul to a gardener or farmer burning down weeds (de Agric. 4, πάντ' ἐκκόψα, ἐκτέμω... καὶ ἐπικαύει καὶ τάς ρίζας αὐτῶν ἐφεξοῦς ἄχρι τῶν ὑστάτων τῆς γῆς φλογὸς μινήν); but in our epistle, as in Jn 15:6, the burning is a final doom, not a process of severe discipline.
'Aδόκιμος is used as in 1 Co 9:27; the moral sense breaks through, as in the next clause, where the meaning of εἰς καῦσιν may be illustrated by Dt 29:22 and by Philo's more elaborate description of the thunderstorm which destroyed Sodom (de Abrah. 27); God, he says, showered a blast ὀψ ἄδατος ἀλλὰ πυρός upon the city and its fields, by way of punishment, and everything was consumed, ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ ἐν φανερῷ καὶ ὑπὲρ γῆς ἄπαντα κατανάλωσεν ἢ φλὸς, ἤδη καί τὴν γῆν αὐτῆν ἔκακε ... ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδ' αὐθίνος τοτε καρπὸν ἐνεγκείν ἢ χλοηφόρησαι τὸ παράπαν δονήθηναι. The metaphor otherwise is inexact, for the reference cannot be to the burning of a field in order to eradicate weeds; our author is thinking of final punishment (= κρίματος αἰωνίου, 62), which he associates as usual with fire (10:26, 27 12:29). The moral application thus impinges on the figurative sketch. The words κατάρας ἐγγύς actually occur in Aristides (Orat. in Kom. 370: τὸ μὲν προχωρεῖν αὐτῶν ἐ ἔβουλοντο, ἀμήχανον καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς).1 There is no thought of mildness in the term ἐγγύς, it being used, as in 8:15, of imminent doom, which is only a matter of time. Meanwhile there is the ἐκδοχή (10:27).

Later on, this conception of unpardonable sins led to the whole system of penance, which really starts from the discussion by Hermas in the second century. But for our author the unpardonable sin is apostasy, and his view is that of a missionary. Modern analogies are not wanting. Thus, in Dr. G. Warneck's book, The Living Forces of the Gospel (p. 248), we read that "the Battak Christians would have even serious transgressions forgiven; but if a Christian should again sacrifice to ancestors or have anything to do with magic, no earnest Christian will speak in his favour; he is regarded as one who has fallen back into heathenism, and therefore as lost."

9 Though I say this, beloved, I feel sure you will take the better 2 course that means salvation. 10 God is not unfair; he will not forget what you have done, or the love you have shown for his sake in ministering, as you still do, to the saints. 11 It is my heart's desire that each of you would prove equally keen upon realising your full (πληροφόρησα, 10:29) hope to the very end, 12 so that instead of being slack you may imitate those who inherit the promises by their steadfast faith.

The ground for his confident hope about his "dear friends" (Tyndale, v.9) lies in the fact that they are really fruitful (v.7) in what is the saving quality of a Christian community, viz. brotherly love (v.10). The God who blesses a faithful life (v.7) will be sure to reward them for that; stern though he may be, in punishing the disloyal, he never overlooks good service. Only (v.v.11, 12),

2 For some reason the softer linguistic form κρείσσων is used here, as at 10:24, in preference to κρείσσων.
the writer adds, put as much heart and soul into your realization of what Christianity means as you are putting into your brotherly love; by thus taking the better course, you are sure of God’s blessing. As ἀγαπητὸς indicates (the only time he uses it), the writer’s affection leads him to hope for the best; he is deeply concerned about the condition of his friends, but he does not believe their case is desperate (v.4). He has good hopes of them, and he wishes to encourage them by assuring them that he still believes in them. We may compare the remarks of Seneca to Lucilius, Ep. xxix. 3, about a mutual friend, Marcellinus, about whom both of them were anxious. Seneca says he has not yet lost hope of Marcellinus. For wisdom or philosophy “is an art; let it aim at some definite object, choosing those who will make progress (profecturos) and withdrawing from those of whom it despairs—yet not abandoning them quickly, rather trying drastic remedies when everything seems hopeless.” Elsewhere, he encourages Lucilius himself by assuring him of his friend’s confidence and hope (Ep. xxxii. 2: “habeo quidem fiduciam non posse te detorqueri mansurumque in proposito”), and, in connexion with another case, observes that he will not be deterred from attempting to reform certain people (Ep. xxv. 2): “I would rather lack success than lack faith.”

In καὶ (epexegetic) ἐχόμενα (sc. πράγματα) σωτηρίας, ἐχόμενα, thus employed, is a common Greek phrase (cp. e.g. Marc. Aurel. i. 6, ὅσα τοιαῦτα τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀγωγῆς ἐχόμενα: Musonius (ed. Hense), xi., ζητεῖν παιδείας ἐχόμενα (v.l. ἐχόμενον): Philo, de Agric. 22, τὰ δὲ καρπεῖς καὶ σωφροσύνης . . . ἐχόμενα) for what has a bearing upon, or is connected with; here, for what pertains to and therefore promotes σωτηρία (the opposite of κατάρα and καύσις). The reason for this confidence, with which he seeks to hearten his readers, lies in their good record of practical service (τοῦ ἐργαν ὑμῶν κτλ.) which God is far too just to ignore. After all, they had some fruits as well as roots of Christianity (v.10). Ἐπιλαθέσθαι is an infinitive of conceived result (Burton’s Moods and Tenses, 371c; Blass, § 391. 4), instead of ἐνα c. subj., as, e.g., in Ἰν 19, οἱ δῷκες κ. c. infinitive; cp. Xen. Cyrop. iv. 1. 20, δίκαιος ἐκ ἀντικαρῆςθαι.1 The text of τοῦ ἐργον ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης was soon harmonized with that of Ἰ Θ 18 by the insertion of τοῦ κόσμου after καὶ (so D° K L 69*. 256. 263. 1611*. 2005. 2127 boh Theodoret, etc.). The relative ἡν after ἀγάπης has been attracted into the genitive ἡς (as in 920). One practical form of this διακονεῖν is mentioned in Ἱ 38. 94. Here εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ goes closely with διακονήσαντες κτλ., as well as with ἐνεδείξασθε, in the sense of “for his sake.” In Pirke Aboth,

1 See Dolon’s remark in the Rhesus of Euripides (161, 162): οὐκόω πονεῖν μὲν χρῆ, πονοῦντα δ’ ἄξιον μοθὸν φερεῖσθαι.
216. R. Jose’s saying is quoted, “Let all thy works be done for the sake of heaven” (literally ἐπὶ τῷ οἴνωμα, as here and in Ign. Rom. 9:6 ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν δεκαμένων με εἰς οἴνωμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Τούς ἄγαλμα, the only place (except 13:21) where the writer uses this common term for “fellow-Christians”; God will never be so unjust as to overlook kindness shown to “his own.”

The personal affection of the writer comes out not only in the ἀγαπητοί of v.9, but again (v.11) in the deep ἐπιθυμομακεν, a term charged with intense yearning (as Chrysostom says, πατρικῆς φιλοστοργίας), and in the individualizing ἐκαστὸν (cp. 3:12, 18). He is urgent that they should display τὴν ἀδικίαν σπουδὴν with regard to their Christian ἐλπὶς as they display in the sphere of their Christian ἀγάπη. This does not mean that he wishes them to be more concerned about saving their own souls or about heaven than about their duties of brotherly love; his point is that the higher knowledge which he presses upon their minds is the one security for a Christian life at all. Just as Paul cannot assume that the warm mutual affection of the Thessalonian Christians implied a strict social morality (see below on 13:4), or that the same quality in the Philippian Christians implied moral discrimination (Ph 1:6), so our author pleads with his friends to complete their brotherly love by a mature grasp of what their faith implied. He reiterates later on the need of φιλαδελφία (13:1), and he is careful to show how it is inspired by the very devotion to Christ for which he pleads (10:19-24). Πληροφορία (not a LXX term) here is less subjective than in 10:22, where it denotes the complete assurance which comes from a realization of all that is involved in some object. Here it is the latter sense of fullness, scope and depth in their—ἐλπίς.1 This is part and parcel of the τελειωτὴς to which he is summoning them to advance (6:1). The result of this grasp of what is involved in their faith will be (v.19) a vigorous constancy, without which even a kindly, unselfish spirit is inadequate. For ἐνεκτίσαται σπουδὴν compare Herodian’s remark that the soldiers of Severus in A.D. 193 πᾶσαν ἐνεκτίκνυσκατο προθυμίαν καὶ σπουδὴν (ii. 10. 19), Magn. 5361 (iii. b.c.), ἀπόδειξιν πουόμενος τῆς περὶ τὰ μέγιστα σπουδὴς, and Syll. 34241 (i. b.c.) τὴν μεγίστην ἐνεκτίκνυσκατο σπουδὴν εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος σωτηρίαν. The Greeks used the verb as we use “display,” in speaking of some inward quality. This arduor has to be kept up ἄχρι τέλους (cp. pseudo-Musionius, Ἑρρ. 1, in Hercher’s Ἑπιστολ. Graeci, 401 f.: τηροῦται δὲ ἦν ἐχοννίν πρόθεσιν ἄχρι τέλους φιλοσοφήσας); it is the sustained interest in essential Christian truth which issues practically in μακροθυμία (v.12), or in the confident attitude of hope (3:6, 14).

1 For ἐλπίδος, πίστεως is read in W 1867.
VI. 11, 12. EXAMPLES OF FAITH

Aristotle, in *Rhet.* ii. 19. 5, argues that ὅτα ἐὰν ἀρχὴ δύναται γενέσθαι, καὶ τὸ τέλος ἀδύνατα γένεται ὅτα ἄρχεται γενέσθαι τῶν ἀδύνατων, a paradox which really means that "if you want to know whether the end of any course of action, plan, scheme, or indeed of anything—is possible, you must look to the beginning: beginning implies end: if it can be begun, it can also be brought to an end" (Cope).

In v. 12 the appeal is rounded off with ἵνα μὴ νοθροὶ γένησθε, that you may not prove remiss (repeating νοθροὶ from 511, but in a slightly different sense: they are to be alert not simply to understand, but to act upon the solid truths of their faith), μημυστὶ δὲ κτλ. Hitherto he has only mentioned people who were a warning; now he encourages them by pointing out that they had predecessors in the line of loyalty. This incentive is left over for the time being; the writer returns to it in his panegyric upon faith in chapter 11. Meanwhile he is content to emphasize the steadfast faith (πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας, a hendiadys) that characterizes this loyalty. Μακροθυμία means here (as in Ja 517) the tenacity with which faith holds out. Compare Menander's couplet (Kock's *Com. Attic. Fragm.* 549), ἄνθρωπος ὃν μηδέποτε τὴν ἄλπιαν | αἰτοῦ παρὰ θεῶν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μακροθυμίαν, and *Test. Jos.* 27 μεγά φάρμακόν ἐστιν ἡ μακροθυμία | καὶ πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ διδόσων ἡ ὑπομονή. But this aspect of πίστεως is not brought forward till 1096, after the discussion of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. In κληρονομούντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας the writer implies that hope is invariably sustained by a promise or promises. He has already mentioned ἡ ἐπαγγελία (41). Κληρονομούν τὰς ἐπαγγελίας can hardly mean "get a promise of something"; as the appended διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας suggests, it denotes "coming into possession of what is promised." This is proved by the equivalent ἐπέτυχε τῆς ἐπαγγελίας in v. 15.

Taking Abraham as the first or as a typical instance of steadfast faith in God's promises, the writer now (vv. 13 - 19) lays stress not upon the human quality, but upon the divine basis for this undaunted reliance. Constancy means an effort. But it is evoked by a divine revelation; what stirs and sustains it is a word of God. From the first the supreme Promise of God has been guaranteed by him to men so securely that there need be no uncertainty or hesitation in committing oneself to this Hope. The paragraph carries on the thought of vv. 11. 12; at the end, by a dexterous turn, the writer regains the line of argument which he had dropped when he turned aside to incite and reprove his readers (511f).

13 For in making a promise to Abraham God "swore by himself" (since he could swear by none greater). 14 i.e. I will indeed bless you and multiply you. 15 Thus it was (i.e. thanks to the divine Oath) that Abraham by his steadfastness obtained (so 1123) what he had promised. 16 For as men swear by μεν.
a greater than themselves, and as an oath means to them a guarantee that ends any dispute, so that by these two solid facts (the Promise and the Oath), where it is impossible for God to be false, we refugees might have strong encouragement (παράδεκταν, see on 12) to seize the hope set before us, anchoring the soul to it safe and sure, as it “enters the veil.”

As usual, he likes to give a biblical proof or illustration (vv. 18-14), God’s famous promise to Abraham, but the main point in it is that God ratified the promise with an oath.

Our author takes the OT references to God’s oath quite naively. Others had felt a difficulty, as is shown by Philo’s treatise de Abrahamo (46): “God, enamoured of this man [i.e. Abraham], for his faith (πίστις) in him, gives him in return a pledge (πίστις), guaranteeing by an oath (τὴν δὲ δόγμαν βεβαιοσάντων) the gifts he had promised... for he says, “I swear by myself” (Gn 22:16)—and with him a word is an oath—for the sake of confirming his mind more steadfastly and immovably than ever before.” But the references to God’s oaths were a perplexity to Philo; his mystical mind was embarrassed by their realism. In de sacrif. Abeli et Caini (28, 29) he returns to the subject. Hosts of people, he admits, regard the literal sense of these OT words as inconsistent with God’s character, since an oath implies (παραδειγματος ἁμαρτησμουμενον) God giving evidence in a disputed matter; whereas θεῷ οὐδὲν δοθηλον οὐδὲ ἁμαρτησμουμενον, God’s mere word ought to be enough: ο δὲ θεὸς καὶ λέγων πιστὸς ἐστιν, ὡστε καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ βεβαιοτύπτῳ ἑνεκε μηδὲν δρόμων διαφερέν. He inclines to regard the OT references to God’s oaths as a condescension of the sacred writer to dull minds rather than as a condescension upon God’s part. In Leg. Allegor. iii. 72 he quotes this very passage (Gn 22:16-17), adding: ἐάν καὶ τὸ δόγμα βεβαιοσάτω τὴν ἐπιστήμην καὶ δρόμων ἑπερεπτεῖ· ὡς γὰρ ὅτι οὐ καθ’ ἑτέρου ὄμνις θεὸς, οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ κρείττων, ἀλλὰ καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ, δὲ ἐστὶν πάντων δραστος. But he feels bound to explain it. Some of his contemporaries had begun to take exception to such representations of God, on the ground that God’s word required no formal confirmation—it confirmed itself by being fulfilled—and that it was absurd (διασκεδάζω) to speak of God swearing by himself, in order to bear testimony to himself. Philo (ibid. 73) attempts to meet this objection by urging that only God can bear testimony to himself, since no one else knows the divine nature truly; consequently it is appropriate for him to add confirmation to his word, although the latter by itself is amply deserving of belief. In Berachoth, 32. 1 (on Ex 32:12), it is asked, “What means γάρ;” R. Eleazar answered: ‘Thus saith Moses to God (Blessed be He!);’ ‘Lord of all the world, hast thou sworn by heaven and earth, I would say, even as heaven and earth shall perish, so too thine oath shall perish. But now thou hast sworn by thy Great Name, which lives and lasts for ever and ever; so shall thine oath also last for ever and ever.’”

Εἴγε (v. 18) with infin. = ἐδώνατο as usual. Ἀμονεν... ἐν μήν... ἐν δολογήσω. Both the LXX (Thackeray, pp. 83, 84) and the papyri (Deissmann, Bible Studies, 205 f.) show that ἐν μήν after ἀμονεν in oaths is common as an asseveration; in some cases, as here, the classical form ἦ μήν, from which ἐν μήν arose by itacism, is textually possible. The quotation (v. 14) is from the promise made to Abraham after the sacrifice of Isaac (Gn 22:16-17): κατ’ ἐμαυτὸν ἄμοσα... ἐν μῆν ἐν δολογήσω σε, καὶ πλη-
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The practical religious value of God's promise being thus (v.15) confirmed is now brought out for the present generation (vv.16f.—another long sentence). Katá toú meîkronos, i.e. by God. Which, Philo argues, is irreverent: ἀσεβεῖς ἄν νομισθείειν οἱ φάσκοντες δυνάναι katá θεοῦ (Leg. Allegor. iii. 73), since only swearing by the Name of God is permissible (cp. Dt 6'18). But our author has no such scruples (see above). And he is quite unconscious of any objection to oaths, such as some early Christian teachers felt (e.g. Ja 5'12); he speaks of the practice of taking oaths without any scruples. "Hic locus . . . docet aliquem inter Christianos jurisjurandi usum esse legitimum . . . potro non dicit olim fuisse in usu, sed adhuc vigere pronuntiat" (Calvin). Ἀντιλογίας, dispute or quarrel (the derived sense in 77 χωρίς πάσης ἀντιλογίας, there is no disputing). Εἰς βεβαιώσων only occurs once in the LXX (Lv 25'23), but is a current phrase in the papyri (cp. Deissmann's Bible Studies, 163 f.) for "by way of guarantee"; it is opposed to eis ἀδέηγον, and used here as in Wis 6'10 προσοχῇ δὲ νόμων βεβαιώσις ἀφαιρεσίας. In Philo (see on v.18) it is the oath which is guaranteed; here the oath guarantees. The general idea of v.17 is that of OGIS. (ii. b.c.), ὅπως ἄν εἰς τὸν ἀπαντα χρόνον ἀκύνητα καὶ ἀμετάθετα μένη τά τε πρὸς τὸν θεοῦ τίμια καὶ τά πρὸς τὸν Ἀθήνανον φιλάνθρωπα. Ἐν θ = διό, Theophylact), such being the case. Πειρασότερον, which goes with ἐπιδείξα, is illustrated by what Philo says in de Abrahamo, 46 (see above): "abundantius quam sine juramento factum videretur" (Bengel). It is an equivalent for πειρασότερος, which, indeed, B reads here. Ἐπιδείξα (cp. Elephantine-Papyri [1907] 17 (iv. b.c.) ἐπιδείξετο δὲ Ἡρακλείος ἃτ ἀν ἐγκαλη Ἀμυτήρια ἐναντίον ἀνδρῶν τρώων): the verb, which is only once used of God in the LXX (Is 37'28 νῦν δὲ ἐπιδείξα ἐξερμνώσατα ἐθνη κτλ.), means here "to afford proof of." The writer uses the general plural, τοὺς κληρονόμους τῆς ἐπαγγελίας,1 instead of the singular "Abraham," since the Promise in its mystical sense applied to the entire People, who had faith like that of Abraham. The reference is not specifically to Isaac and Jacob, although these are called his συγκληρονόμοι in 119. In τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς our author evidently chooses βουλῆς for the sake of the assonance with βουλόμενος. Ἀμετάθετος is a synonym for ἀκύνητος (cp. above on v.17 and Schol. on Soph. Antig. 1027), and, as the papyri show, had a frequent connexion with wills in the sense of "irrevocable." Here, in connexion with βουλῆς, it implies final determination (cp. 3 Mac 5'11. 12); the purpose had a fixed

1 Eusebius once (Dem. iv. 15. 40) omits τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, and once (ibid. v. 3. 21) reads τῆς βασιλείας, either accidentally or with a recollection of Ja 2'.

θύμων πληθυνὺ τὸ σπέρμα σου. The practical religious value of God's promise being thus (v.15) confirmed is now brought out for the present generation (vv.16f.—another long sentence). Katá toú meîkronos, i.e. by God. Which, Philo argues, is irreverent: ἀσεβεῖς ἄν νομισθείειν οἱ φάσκοντες δυνάναι katá θεοῦ (Leg. Allegor. iii. 73), since only swearing by the Name of God is permissible (cp. Dt 6'18). But our author has no such scruples (see above). And he is quite unconscious of any objection to oaths, such as some early Christian teachers felt (e.g. Ja 5'12); he speaks of the practice of taking oaths without any scruples. "Hic locus . . . docet aliquem inter Christianos jurisjurandi usum esse legitimum . . . potro non dicit olim fuisse in usu, sed adhuc vigere pronuntiat" (Calvin). Ἀντιλογίας, dispute or quarrel (the derived sense in 77 χωρίς πάσης ἀντιλογίας, there is no disputing). Εἰς βεβαιώσων only occurs once in the LXX (Lv 25'23), but is a current phrase in the papyri (cp. Deissmann's Bible Studies, 163 f.) for "by way of guarantee"; it is opposed to eis ἀδέηγον, and used here as in Wis 6'10 προσοχῇ δὲ νόμων βεβαιώσις ἀφαιρεσίας. In Philo (see on v.18) it is the oath which is guaranteed; here the oath guarantees. The general idea of v.17 is that of OGIS. (ii. b.c.), ὅπως ἄν εἰς τὸν ἀπαντα χρόνον ἀκύνητα καὶ ἀμετάθετα μένη τά τε πρὸς τὸν θεοῦ τίμια καὶ τά πρὸς τὸν Ἀθήνανον φιλάνθρωπα. Ἐν θ = διό, Theophylact), such being the case. Πειρασότερον, which goes with ἐπιδείξα, is illustrated by what Philo says in de Abrahamo, 46 (see above): "abundantius quam sine juramento factum videretur" (Bengel). It is an equivalent for πειρασότερος, which, indeed, B reads here. Ἐπιδείξα (cp. Elephantine-Papyri [1907] 17 (iv. b.c.) ἐπιδείξετο δὲ Ἡρακλείος ἃτ ἀν ἐγκαλη Ἀμυτήρια ἐναντίον ἀνδρῶν τρώων): the verb, which is only once used of God in the LXX (Is 37'28 νῦν δὲ ἐπιδείξα ἐξερμνώσατα ἐθνη κτλ.), means here "to afford proof of." The writer uses the general plural, τοὺς κληρονόμους τῆς ἐπαγγελίας,1 instead of the singular "Abraham," since the Promise in its mystical sense applied to the entire People, who had faith like that of Abraham. The reference is not specifically to Isaac and Jacob, although these are called his συγκληρονόμοι in 119. In τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς our author evidently chooses βουλῆς for the sake of the assonance with βουλόμενος. Ἀμετάθετος is a synonym for ἀκύνητος (cp. above on v.17 and Schol. on Soph. Antig. 1027), and, as the papyri show, had a frequent connexion with wills in the sense of "irrevocable." Here, in connexion with βουλῆς, it implies final determination (cp. 3 Mac 5'11. 12); the purpose had a fixed
character or solidity about it. The verb ἡμεσίτευσεν ("intervened") does not occur in the LXX, and is here used intransitively, instead of, as usual (cp. e.g. Dion. Halic. Ant. ix. 59. 5; OGIS. 437 etc.), with some accusative like συνβήκας. In Jos. Ant. vii. 8. 5 it is used intransitively, but in the sense of "interceding" (πιστεῖς ὁ Ἰώαβος καὶ τὴν ἀνάγκην αὐτοῦ κατοικτείρας ἡμεσίτευσε πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα). The oath is almost certainly that just mentioned. Less probable is the interpretation (Delitzsch, Hofmann, M. Stuart, von Soden, Peake, Seeberg, Wickham) which regards the oath referred to in vv. 16, 17, as the oath in the writer's favourite psalm, 110 4:

ομοσεν Κύριος καὶ οὗ μεταμελήθησεται
Σὺ εἰ θερέως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδεκ.

This oath does refer to the priesthood of Jesus, which the writer is about to re-introduce (in v. 20); but it is not a thought which is brought forward till 7 20. 21. 28; and the second line of the couplet has been already quoted (5) without any allusion to the first.

In v. 18 καταφέυγεν and ἐλπίς are connected, but not as in Wis 14 (Noah = ἡ ἐλπὶς τοῦ κόσμου ἐπὶ σχεδίας, καταφυγόσα). Here, as ἐλπίς means what is hoped for, i.e. the object of expectation, "the only thought is that we are moored to an immovable object" (A. B. Davidson). The details of the anchor-metaphor are not to be pressed (v. 19); the writer simply argues that we are meant to fix ourselves to what has been fixed for us by God and in God. To change the metaphor, our hope roots itself in the eternal order. What we hope for is unseen, being out of sight, but it is secure and real, and we can grasp it by faith.

(a) Philo (Quaest. in Exod. 22) ascribes the survival and success of the Israelites in Egypt διὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν σωτήρα θεόν καταφυγήν, διὰ εἰς ἀπόρους καὶ αἱμηχάνους ἐπιτέμψας τὴν ἐσφαλτην δύναιν έρρύσατο τῶν ἱκέτας. (b) τὸν is inserted in v. 18 before θεόν (by ACP 33. 1245. 1739. 1827. 2005 Ath. Chrys.), probably to harmonize with ὁ θεός in v. 17 (where 1912 omits ὁ). But θεόν ("one who is God") is quite apposite.

Παράκλησις goes with κρατήσαι (aor. = "seize," rather than "hold fast to," like κρατέω in 414), and οἱ καταφυγόντες stands by itself, though there is no need to conjecture οἱ κατὰ φυγήν ὄντες = in our flight (so J. J. Reiske, etc.). Is not eternal life, Philo asks, ὁ πρὸς τὸν καταφυγῆ (de fuga, 15)? In τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος, προκειμένης must have the same sense as in I2; the colloquial sense of "aforesaid," which is common in the papyri (e.g. OP. 1275 εἰς τὴν προκειμένην κόμην), would be flat. Ἀσφαλή τέ καὶ βεβαιὰν reflects one of the ordinary phrases in Greek ethics which the writer is so fond of employing. Cp.
VI. 19.]  THE ANCHOR OF HOPE

Plutarch, *de comm. not.* i.61.c, καί του πᾶσα κατάληψις ἐν τῷ σοφῷ καὶ κυρίῃ τοῦ ἀσφαλεῖς ἔχουσα καὶ βέβαιων κτλ.: Sextus Empir. adv. log. ii. 374, ἐς τῷ ὑποτεθέμενον ἦν ὑποτίθενται βέβαιων ἐστὶ καὶ ἀσφαλεῖς: and Philo, *quis rer. div.* 62, κατάληψις ἀσφαλής καὶ βεβαία. The ἄγκυρα of hope is safe and sure, as it is fixed in eternity. All hope for the Christian rests in what Jesus has done in the eternal order by his sacrifice.

Chrysostom's comment on the "anchor" metaphor is all that is needed:

οὐ μὴν γὰρ ἡ ἄγκυρα ἐξαργυθεῖσα τοῦ πλοίου, ὥσ πάροικοι αὐτῷ περιφέρεσθαι, κὰν μυρίων παρασκελεσίων ἄνεμοι, ἀλλὰ ἐξαργυθεῖσα ἐδραίων ποιεῖν, οὐκ ἂν καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς. The anchor of hope was a fairly common metaphor in the later Greek ethic (e.g. Heliod. vii. 25, πᾶσα ἐκλίδος ἄγκυρα παντολεῶς ἀνθίσσεται, and Epictr. Fragm. (30) 89, οὐτε ναῦν εἰς ἐνόπτισμα ἁγκυρίου οὐσίων ἐκ μᾶς ἐκλίδος ἐρμίστων), but our author may have taken the religious application from Philo, who writes (*de Somniis,* i. 39), ὅτι χρη καταπτηχεῖν τὸν ἐλπίδα θείας συμμαχίας εἰρομοιοίται (lies moored to). He does not use it as a metaphor for stability, however, like most of the Greeks from Euripides (e.g. *Helena,* 277, ἄγκυρα δ' ἡ μου τὰς τῆς θέας ἄγκυρης) and Aristophanes (e.g. *Knights,* 1244, κεπτή τις ἐλπίς ἐστ' ἐφ' ἣν ἄγκυρα) onwards, as, e.g., in the most famous use of the anchor-metaphor,¹ that by Pythagoras (*Stob. Elog.* 3: πλοίων ἀναχθής ἄγκυρα, δόξα ἐτὶ ἀνθενεστέρα . . . τινες οὖν ἄγκυραι δυναται; φρονεῖς, μεγαλοψυχία, ἀνδρία ταῖται οὐθεὶς χειμῶν σαλεβεί).

Suddenly he breaks the metaphor,² in order to regain the idea of the priesthood of Jesus in the invisible world. Hope enters the unseen world; the Christian hope, as he conceives it, is bound up with the sacrifice and intercession of Jesus in the Presence of God, and so he uses language from the ritual of Lev 16:² about Aaron "passing inside the veil," or curtain that screened the innermost shrine. To this conception he returns in 9:³ after he has described the vital functions of Jesus as ἵππος (6:²). For at last he has reached what he regards as the cardinal theme of his homily. The first paragraph (7:¹-³), which is one long sentence in Greek, applies and expands ἑις τῶν αἰῶνα, the first note of Melchizedek's priesthood being that it is perpetual, thus typifying the priesthood of Jesus. The next is (7:⁴-¹⁰), that it is prior and superior to the levitical priesthood; this is

¹ The comparison between hope and a voyage in *de Abrahamo,* 9, is different: ὁ δὲ ἐξεπίστυκ, ὃς δὲ σεβομαι τὸν καλὸν, μὴν ἂν ἐξετέθησα τοὺς δεδυναμένος, ἀλλὰ ἐκάκως τοῖς πλέονοις, οὓς προεντος εἰς λιμένας καταριζεῖ θαλαττευονυν ἐνρυμάζεται μη δυνάμενον. This is the thought of Ro 8:²-⁵.
² For the anchor as a symbol on tombs, pagan and Christian, see Le Blant's *Inscr. Chrét.* de Gaule, i. 158, 312. Contrast with He 6:⁸-¹⁰ the bitter melancholy of the epitaph in the Greek Anthology (ix. 49): ἐλπίς καὶ σοῦ, Τύχη, μέγα ζήρετε θ' τῶν λιμένι εἰρον | οὐδὲν ἐμοὶ χ' ἄμψη παίξτε τοὺς μετ' ἐμε. Ὅρα ἡμείς οὖν τοῦσ στος αὐτὸς εἰς τοὺς ἑαυτοὺς εἰρον (cf. *Lycophron,* ix. 271-276).
³ A similar mixture of metaphor in *Ep. Aristeas,* 230 (οὐ δὲ οὖν δυνατὸν ἔτσι πταίσαι, τάς ἀγαθὰς ἐπιτρέπεται αἱ βλαστάνων εἰρον, ή τὰ μέγατα τῶν ὄρων καταγείρον ς, ἀνδρεία τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦτον ἐπιτρέπει τῇ καταγείρει), and Philo, *de praen. 2* (τοῖς δὲ τοῦτος σπόρος ἔτσι εἰς ἐλπίς, η ποτιά τῶν βιων).
There (δια for the classical διό) Jesus entered for us in advance, when he became highpriest "for ever with the rank of Melchizedek." 1 For "Melchizedek, the king of Salem, a priest of the Most High God," who "met Abraham on his return from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him"— who had "a tenth part (βελτίων, sc. μοιρα) of everything" assigned him by Abraham—this Melchizedek is (sc. 他是) primarily a "king of righteousness" (that is the meaning of his name); then, besides that, "king of Salem" (which means, king of peace). 3 He has neither father nor mother nor genealogy, neither a beginning to his days nor an end to his life, but, resembling the Son of God, continues to be "priest" permanently.

This paragraph and that which follows (vv. 4-10) are another little sermon, this time on the story of Gn 14:18-20. In 6:20-7:3 the writer starts from the idea that Jesus is ἀρχιερεύς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, and shows how the Melchizedek priesthood was εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, i.e. explaining Ps 110:4 from Gn 14:18-20. Εἰσῆλθεν in 6:20 is explained later, in 9:26. Πρόδρομος recalls ἄρχηγος (2:10), with its suggestion of pioneering. The term is only used in the LXX of the days ἐφορος, πρόδρομοι σταφυλῆς (Nu 13:22), or of early fruit (ὡς πρόδρομος σοῦ, Is 28:4); the present sense occurs, however, in Wis 12:8, where wasps or hornets are called the πρόδρομοι of God's avenging host. The thought here is of Christ entering heaven as we are destined to do, after him, once like him (5:9) we are "perfected." Vv. 1-3 in ch. 7 are another of the writer's long sentences: οὗτος ὁ Μελ­χισεδέκ... μένει ἱερεύς εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς is the central thought, but the subject is overloaded with quotations and comments, including a long μεν... δε clause. The length of the sentence and the difficulty of applying μένει ἱερεύς εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς to Melchizedek have led some editors to make Jesus the subject of the sentence: οὗτος (Jesus) γὰρ (ὁ Μελχισεδέκ... τῷ νῦν θεοῦ) μένει ἱερεύς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. But the οὗτος, as v. 4 shows, is Melchizedek, and the theory is wrecked upon v. 8, for it is quite impossible to take ἐκεῖ κτλ. as "in the upper sanctuary (sc. ἐστων) there is One of whom the record is that He lives." There is a slight but characteristic freedom at the very outset in the use of the story, e.g. in ὁ συναντήσας κτλ. The story implies this, but does not say it. It was the king of Sodom who ἐκήλθεν εἰς συναντήσιν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ὑποστρέψας αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς, but as Melchizedek is immediately said to have brought the conquering hero bread and wine, our writer assumed that he also met Abraham.

An interesting example of the original reading being preserved in an inferior group of MSS is afforded by ὁ συναντήσας (C* L P). The variant ὡς συναντήσας (A B C¹ D K W 33. 436. 794. 1831. 1837. 1912), which makes a pointless anacolouthon, was due to the accidental reduplication of C
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(OCCYN for OCYN), though attempts have been made to justify this reading by assuming an anacolouthon in the sentence, or a parenthesis in δι... τον Ἀβραὰμ, or carelessness on the part of the writer who began with a relative and forgot to carry on the proper construction. Some curious homiletic expansions have crept into the text of vv. 1-2. After βασιλῶν two late minuscules (456, 460) read δὴ εἶδωζ τοὺς ἄλλοις καὶ ἐξειδικεύετο Λῶτ μετὰ πάσης αὐτῶν, and after αὐτῶν, D* vi 330. 440. 823 put καὶ (ὁ Ἀβραὰμ) ἐυλογηθεὶς ἐν αὐτῷ. The latter is another (cp. 1120) of the glosses which were thrown up by the Latin versions.

In v.2 έρέσεων is substituted for the ἔδωκεν of the LXX (which reappears in v.4), in order to make it clear that Abraham's gift was a sort of tithe. Tithes were not paid by the Hebrews from spoils of war; this was a pagan custom. But such is the interpretation of the story in Philo, e.g. in his fragment on Gn 1418 (Fragments of Philo, ed. J. Rendel Harris, p. 72): τὰ γὰρ τοῦ πολέμου ἀριστεῖα δίδωσιν τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ τὰς τῆς νίκης ἀπαρχὰς. ἀριστεροποιήσατα δὲ καὶ ἐγιωτάτη πασῶν ἀπαρχῶν ἡ δικαία διὰ τὸ παντέλεως εἶναι τῶν ἀριστῶν, ἢ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῖς καὶ νεωκοροῖς αἱ δικάται προστάται νόμον καρπῶν καὶ θρεμμάτων ἀποδίδονται, ἀριστοῖς τῆς ἀπαρχῆς Ἀβραὰμ, δό καὶ τὸν γένος ἀρχηγῆς ἐστίν. Ορ again in de congressu, 17, where he describes the same incident as Abraham offering God τὰς δικάτας χαριστηρία τῆς νίκης.

The fantastic interpretation of the Melchizedek episode is all the writer's own. What use, if any, was made of Melchizedek in pre-Christian Judaism, is no longer to be ascertained. Apparently the book of Jubilees contained a reference to this episode in Abraham's career, but it has been excised for some reason (see R. H. Charles' note on Jub 1325). Josephus makes little of the story (Ant. i. 10. 2). He simply recounts how, when Abraham returned from the rout of the Assyrians, αὐτῷ ὃς τῶν ὁσιωμάτων βασιλεύσει εἰς τόσον τινα δυνάμει περὶ βασιλεὺς· ἔνθα δὲ τῇ Σολομῶν πόλεως ὑποδέχεται βασιλεὺς αὐτὸς Μελχισεδέκης. σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο βασιλεῖς δίκαιος· καὶ ἦ δὲ τοιοῦτος ὁμολογομένως, ὡς δὲ ταυτὰ τῶν τῆς αἰτίας καὶ ἱερά Γνωσθῆθαι τῷ θεῷ. τὴν μέντοι Σολομῶν ἐστερὼν ἐκάλεσε Ἰεροσόλυμα, ἔχορηγες δὲ ὡς ὁ Μελχισεδέκς τῷ Ἀβράμον στρατῷ ξένω καὶ τοῦτον ἄρσον στρατιῶν τῶν ἑπταδεκατῶν παραχέχει, καὶ παρὰ τῆς εὐφχαλίας αὐτῶν τῆς ἐπαινεῖ σταυρὸν καὶ τὸν θεὸν εὐλογεῖ αἰτίου ποιήσατα τοῦ ἐχθροῖς. Ἀβραὰμον δὲ διδάσκεται καὶ τὴν δικαία τῆς λείας αὐτῷ, προσδέχεται τὴν δόσιν κτλ. In the later Judaism, however, more interest was taken in Melchizedek (cp. M. Friedländer in Revue des Études Juives, v. pp. 1 f.). Thus some applied the 110th psalm to Abraham (Mechilla on Ex 15†, r. Gen. 55. 6), who was ranked as the priest after the order of Melchizedek, while Melchizedek was supposed to have been degraded because he (Gn 1426) mentioned the name of Abraham before that of God! This, as Bacher conjectures, represented a protest against the Christian view of Melchizedek (Agada der Tannaiten, i. p. 259). It denotes the influence of Πρὸς Ἐξαπαλοῦς. Philo, as we might expect, had already made more of the episode than Josephus, and it is Philo's method of interpretation which gives the clue to our writer's use of the story. Thus in Leg. Alleg. iii. 25, 26 he points out (a) that Μελχισεδέκ βασιλεύ ζ τῇ εἰρήνῃ—Σαλμὺ τοῦτο γὰρ ἐφιμηκύνεται—καὶ ἱερά ἐκαύων πεποίηκεν ἡ θεός (in Gn 1425), and allegorizes the reference into a panegyric upon the peaceful, persuasive influence of the really royal mind. He then (b) does the same with the sacerdotal reference. 'Αλλ'
In vv. 1-2 the only points in the original tale which are specially noted are (a) that his name means βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης; (b) that Σαλήμ, his capital, means εἰρήνη; and (c) inferentially that this primitive ideal priest was also a king. Yet none of these is developed. Thus, the writer has no interest in identifying Σαλήμ. All that matters is its meaning. He quotes ἵερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ψυχατοῦ, but it is ἵερεὺς alone that interests him. The fact about the tithes (ὃ καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισεν ἀβρααμ) is certainly significant, but it is held over until v. 4. What strikes him as far more vital is the silence of the record about the birth and death of Melchizedek (v. 8). Δικαιοσύνη as a royal characteristic (see Introd. pp. xxxii f.) had been already noted in connexion with Christ (18f.); but he does not connect it with,eιρήνη, as Philo does, though the traditional association of δικαιοσύνη with the messianic reign may have been in his mind. In the alliteration (v. 8) of ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος, the third term is apparently coined by himself; it does not mean "of no pedigree," nor "without successors," but simply (cp. v. 6) "devoid of any genealogy." Having no beginning (since none is mentioned), M. has no end. ἀπάτωρ and ἀμήτωρ are boldly lifted from their pagan associations. In the brief episode of Gn 14:18-20, this mysterious Melchizedek appears only as a priest of God; his birth is never mentioned, neither is his death; unlike the Aaronic priests, with whom a pure family descent was vital, this priest has no progenitors. Reading the record in the light of Ps 110:4, and on the Alexandrian principle that the very silence of scripture is charged with meaning, the writer divines in Melchizedek a priest who is permanent. This method of interpretation had been popularized by Philo. In quod det. pot. 48, e.g., he calls attention to the fact that Moses does not explain in Gn 4:15 what was the mark put by God upon Cain. Why? Because the mark was to prevent him from being killed. Now Moses never mentions the death of Cain διὰ πάντης τῆς νομοθεσίας, suggesting that ὡσπερ ἡ μεμυθεμένη Σκύλλα, κακὰν ἄλαθαντον ἐστίν ἄφροσύνη. Again (de Ἐβρ. 14) εἶπε γὰρ τοῦ τις "καὶ γὰρ ἄλλοθι ἀδελφὴ μοῦ ἐστιν ἐκ πατρός, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ μητρός." (Gn 20:12)—
Abraham's evasive description of Sarah—is most significant; she had no mother, *i.e.* she had no connexion with the material world of the senses.

'Απάτωρ and ἀμήτωρ were applied to (a) waifs, whose parents were unknown; or (b) to illegitimate children; or (c) to people of low origin; or (d) to deities who were supposed to have been born, like Athené and Hephaestus, from only one sex. Lactantius (*deinn. instit.* i. 7) quotes the Delphic oracle, which described Apollo as ἀμήτωρ, and insists that such terms refer only to God (ibid. iv. 13). "As God the Father, the origin and source of things, is without parentage, he is most accurately called ἀπάτωρ and ἀμήτωρ by Trismegistus, since he was not begotten by anyone. Hence it was fitting that the Son also should be twice born, that he too should become ἀπάτωρ and ἀμήτωρ." His argument apparently 1 is that the pre-existent Son was ἀμήτωρ and that He became ἀπάτωρ by the Virgin-birth (so Theodore of Mopsuestia). Lactantius proves the priesthood of Christ from Ps 110 4 among other passages, but he ignores the deduction from the Melchizedek of Gn 14; indeed he gives a rival derivation of Jerusalem as if from λέπος ὁμωμένων. Theodoret, who (*Dial.* ii.) explains that the incarnate Son was ἀμήτωρ, with respect to his divine nature, and ἀνεγείρακατοσ in fulfilment of Is 538, faces the difficulty of Melchizedek with characteristic frankness. Melchizedek, he explains, is described as ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, simply because scripture does not record his parentage or lineage. Εἰ ἀληθῶς ἀπάτωρ ἦν καὶ ἀμήτωρ, οὐκ ἂν ἦν εἰκὼν, ἀλλὰ ἀληθείᾳ. 'Επειδὴ δὲ οὐ φυσε ταῦτα ἔχει, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τῆς θεᾶς Γραφῆς οἰκονομίαν, δεῖκνυ θεᾶς τῶν τῶν. In his commentary he explains that μενεὶ λεφθεὶς εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς means τὴν ἑρμοτύπων οὐ παρέπεμψε εἰς παῖδας, καθὼπερ Λεβοὺ καὶ Ἐλεάζαρ καὶ Φυέες.

Ἀφομοιωτός in v. 3 means "resembling," as, *e.g.*, in *Ερ. Jerem.* 70 νεκρῶ ἐρρεμένων ἐν σκότει ἀφομοιώτατος οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν, though it might even be taken as a strict passive, "made to resemble" (*i.e.* in scripture), the Son of God being understood to be eternal. Εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς is a classical equivalent for εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, a phrase which is always to be understood in the light of its context. Here it could not be simply "ad vitam"; the foregoing phrases and the fact that even the levitical priests were appointed for life, rule out such an interpretation.

The writer now (vv. 4–10) moralizes upon the statement that Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek and received his blessing, which proves the supreme dignity of the Melchizedek priesthood, and, inferentially, its superiority to the levitical.

4 Now mark the dignity of this man. The patriarch "Abraham paid" him "a tenth" of the spoils. 6 Those sons of Levi, who receive the priestly office, are indeed ordered by law to tithe the people (that is, their brothers), although the latter are descended from Abraham; 6 but he who had no levitical (ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐκ τῶν δὲ νὰς) genealogy actually tithed Abraham and "blessed" the possessor of the promises! 7 (And there is no question that it is the inferior who is blessed by the superior.) 8 Again, it is mortal men in the one case who receive tithes, while in the other it is one of whom the witness is that "he lives." 9 In fact, we might almost say that even Levi the receiver of tithes paid tithes through Abraham; 10 for he was still in the loins of his father when Melchizedek met him.

1 In iv. 25 he says that "as God was the Father of his spirit without a mother, so a virgin was the mother of his body without a father."
**THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS [VII. 4-8.**

**Θεωρεῖτε (v. 4)** is an oratorical imperative as in 4 Mac 14:13 (θεωρεῖτε δὲ πῶς πολύπλοκος ἐστιν ἡ τῆς φιλοτεχνίας στοργή); πυλίκος is a rare word, often used for ἡλίκος after vowels, though not in Zec 2:6 (τού Ἕλιου πυλίκον τὸ πλάτος αὐτῆς ἐστιν), where alone it occurs in the LXX. The οἴστος (om. D* 67**, 1739 Blass) repeats the οἴστος of v.1. We have now a triple proof of the inferiority of the levitical priesthood to Melchizedek. (a) Melchizedek, though not in levitical orders, took tithes from and gave a blessing to Abraham himself (vv.4-7); (b) he is never recorded to have lost his priesthood by death (v.8); and (c) indeed, in his ancestor Abraham, Levi yet unborn did homage to Melchizedek (9.10). Τὰ ἀκροβίνια (v.4), which this alone of NT writers has occasion to use, explains the πάντα of v.2; it is one of the classical terms for which he went outside the LXX. Οἱ πατριάρχης is thrown to the end of the sentence for emphasis. In v.5 ἱερατεία is chosen instead of ἱερωσύνη for the sake of assonance with λεωεί. The LXX does not distinguish them sharply. The general statement about tithing, κατὰ τὸν νόμον (the ἔντολή of Nu 18:19-21), is intended to throw the spontaneous action of Abraham into relief; ἀποδεκατοῦν of “tithing” persons occurs in 1 S 8:19, but usually means “to pay tithes,” like the more common δεκατοῦν (v.6), the classical form being δεκατείνειν. In v.6 the perfect ἐνοικηκέ is like the Philonic perfect (see above). In describing the incident (de Abrahamo, 40), Philo lays stress upon the fact that δ μέγας ἱερεύς τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ offered ἐπινίκια and feasted the conquerors; he omits both the blessing and the offering of tithes, though he soon allegorizes the latter (41).

Moulton calls attention to “the beautiful parallel in Plato's Ἀπολ. 28c, for the characteristic perfect in Hebrews, describing what stands written in Scripture,” holding that “δος ἐν Τρόμῳ τετελευθήκας (as is written in the Athenians’ Bible) is exactly like He 7:9 11:17. 28.” But these perfects are simply aoristic (see above, p. 91, note).

**V.7** is a parenthetical comment on what blessing and being blessed imply; the neuter (ἐλαττων) is used, as usual in Greek (cp. Blass, § 138. 1), in a general statement, especially in a collective sense, about persons. Then the writer rapidly summarizes, from vv.1-4, the contrast between the levitical priests who die off and Melchizedek whose record (μαρτυροῦμενος in scripture, cp. 113) is “he lives” (μήτε ζωῆς τέλος . . . μένει ἐis ὁ διηνεκές). Finally (vv.9-10), he ventures (ὡς ἔτος ἐπιείκη, a literary phrase, much affected by Philo) on what he seems to feel may be regarded as a forced and fanciful remark, that Levi was committed δι' Ἀβραὰμ (genitive) to a position of respectful deference towards the prince-priest of Salem. In v.6 καὶ περ ἐλημοθιας ἐκ τῆς ὀφύου Ἀβραὰμ (the Semitic expression for descendants, chosen here in view of what he was going to say in
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v.10 ἐν τῇ δόσει τοῦ πατρὸς is another imaginative touch added in order to signalize the pre-eminent honour of the levitical priests over their fellow-countrymen. Such is their high authority. And yet Melchizedek's is higher still!

(a) In v.4 “forte legendum, δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος αὐτῶν δεδεκάτοκε τῶν Ἀβραὰμ, ipsum Abrahamam” (Bentley). But ἐξ αὐτῶν explains itself, and the stress which αὐτῶν would convey is already brought out by the emphatic position of Ἀβραὰμ, and by the comment καὶ τὸν ἐξοντα κτλ. (b) In v.4 καὶ is inserted after ἔξοντα, in conformity with v.2, by A C Dc K L P syr hàng arm, etc. For ἀποδεκατοῦν in v.5 the termination (cp. Thackeray, 244) ἀποδεκατοῦν is read by B D (as κατασκεπων in Mt 132). In v.6 the more common (1129) aorist, εὐλόγησε, is read by A C P 6. 104. 242. 263. 326. 383. 1288. 1739. 2004. 2143, Chrys. for εὐλόγησε.

He now (vv.114) turns to prove his point further, by glancing at the text from the 110th psalm. “It is no use to plead that Melchizedek was succeeded by the imposing Aaronic priesthood; this priesthood belonged to an order of religion which had to be superseded by the Melchizedek-order of priesthood.” He argues here, as already, from the fact that the psalter is later than the pentateuch; the point of 7 11 is exactly that of 411.

11 Further, if the levitical priesthood had been the means of reaching perfection (for it was on the basis of that priesthood that the Law was enacted for the People), why was it still necessary for another sort of priest to emerge “with the rank of Melchizedek,” instead of simply with the rank of Aaron (12 for when the priesthood is changed, a change of law necessarily follows)? 13 He who is thus (i.e. “with the rank of M.”) described belongs to another tribe, no member of which ever devoted himself to the altar; 14 for it is evident that our Lord sprang from Judah, and Moses never mentioned priesthood in connexion with that tribe. 15 This becomes all the more plain when (ἐλ = ἐξελ) another priest emerges “resembling Melchizedek,” 16 one who has become a priest by the power of an indissoluble (ἀκατάληπτον, i.e. by death) Life and not by the Law of an external command; 17 for the witness to him is, “Thou art priest for ever, with the rank of Melchizedek.” 18 A previous command is set aside on account of its weakness and uselessness 19 (for the Law made nothing perfect), and there is introduced a better Hope, by means of which we can draw near to God.

Εἰ μὲν οὖν (without any δέ to follow, as in 84) τελείώσις (“perfection” in the sense of a perfectly adequate relation to God; see v.19) διὰ τῆς Δευτερικῆς ἱερατην κτλ. Δευτερικῆς is a rare word, found in Philo (de fuga, ἡ Δευτερικὴ μόνη), but never in the LXX except in the title of Leviticus; ίερατην does occur in the LXX, and is not distinguishable from ἱερατεία (v.9). In the parenthesis remark ὁ λαός γὰρ ἐπὶ αὐτῆς νεκρομόθεται, αὐτῆς was changed into αὐτῆς(6. 242. 330. 378. 383. 440. 462. 467. 489. 491. 999. 1610. 1836 Theophyl.), or αὐτῆς (K L 326. 1288, etc. Chrys.) after 8ε (where again we have this curious passive), and νεκρομόθεται altered into the pluperfect ἐνεκρομόθησα (K L, etc.). The less obvious genitive (cp. Ex. 3427 ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν λόγων τούτων τέθημαι σοὶ διαθήκην καὶ τῷ Ἰσραήλ) ἐπὶ αὐτῆς
is not "in the time of," for the levitical priesthood was not in
existence prior to the Law; it might mean "in connexion with,"
since ἐν and πρὶς have a similar force with this genitive, but the
incorrect dative correctly explains the genitive. The Mosaic νομος could not be worked for the λαός without a priesthood, to
deal with the offences incurred. The idea of the writer always
is that a νομος or διαθήκη depends for its validity and effective-
ness upon the ιερεύς or ιερεῖς by whom it is administered. Their
personal character and position are the essential thing. Every con-
sideration is subordinated to that of the priesthood. As a change
in that involves a change in the νομος (v.12), the meaning of the
parenthesis in v.11 must be that the priesthood was the basis for the
νομος, though, no doubt, the writer has put his points in vv.11.12
somewhat intricately; this parenthetical remark would have been
better placed after the other in v.12, as indeed van d. Sande
Bakhuyzen proposes. Three times over (cp. v.19) he puts in
deprecatory remarks about the Law, the reason being that the
Law and the priesthood went together. It is as if he meant
here: "the levitical priesthood (which, of course, implies the
Law, for the Law rested on the priesthood)." The inference
that the νομος is antiquated for Christians reaches the same end
as Paul does by his dialectic, but by a very different route.
Ἀνιστασθαι (=appear on the scene, as v.15) and λέγονται refer to
Ps 110:4, which is regarded as marking a new departure, with
far-reaching effects, involving (v.12) an alteration of the νομος as
well as of the ἱερωσύνη. In καὶ οὗ... λέγονται the οὗ negatives
the infinitive as μη usually does; Ἀραβ, like Καὶ (Jn 21:2), has
become indeclinable, though Josephus still employs the ordinary
genitive Ἀραβόνος. In v.12 μετάθεσις, which is not a LXX term,
though it occurs in 2 Mac 2:24, is practically equivalent here
(cp. ταυτ.) to ἄλλης in v.18. A close parallel occurs in de
Mundo, 6, νομος μὲν γὰρ ήμιν ἱσοκλίνης ὁ θεὸς, οὐδεμιᾶς ἐπιθέση-
μενος διόρθωσιν ἡ μετάθεσις, and a similar phrase is employed by
Josephus to describe the arbitrary transference of the highpriest-
hood (Ant. xii. 9. 7, ὕπὸ Δυστον πεισθεῖς, μεταβείναι τὴν τιμὴν ἀπὸ
tαύτης τῆς οἰκίας εἰς ἔτερον).

We now (vv.18f.) get an account of what was meant by οὗ
kατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀραβῶν οὔ ἢ ἔτερον ("another," in the sense of "a
different") ἱερεῖς in v.11; Jesus, this ἱερεῖς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισ-
δέκος came from the non-sacerdotal tribe of Judah, not from that
of Levi. Ἐφ' ὅν is another instance of the extension of this
metaphorical use of ἐν from the Attic dative to the accusative.
The perfect μετέσχηκεν may be used in an aoristic sense, like
ἐσχάτα, or simply for the sake of assonance with προσέσχηκεν,
and it means no more than μετέσχηκεν in 214; indeed μετέσχηκεν is
read here by P 489. 623*. 1912 arm, as προσέσχηκεν is (by A C
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33. 1288) for ἐπιστροφὴν. The conjecture of Erasmus, ἐπιστροφὴν, is ingenious, but ἐπιστροφὴν in the sense of “attend” is quite classical. The rule referred to in ἐστὶν τῷ ὑπὲρ τῆς αἰμάτος τοῦ Ἀριστοκράτους. No tribe except Levi supplied priests. (Πρῶτολος in v. 14 is not a LXX term, but occurs in this sense in 2 Mac 3:17 (δὲ ἤν πρῶτολον ἐγώντε) and 14:39, as well as in Judith 8:20.) In Test. Levi 8:14 it is predicted (cp. Introd. p. xlviii) that βασιλεύς ἐκ τοῦ 'Ἰουδα ἀναστήσεται καὶ τοῖς ἰερατεῖαν νέαν: but this is a purely verbal parallel, the βασιλεύς is Hyrcanus and the reference is to the Maccabean priest-kings who succeed the Aaronic priesthood. Ἀναστάληκας is a synonym for ἀνεσταθείς (v.15), as in Nu 24:17, though it is just possible that ἀναστάληκας is a subtle allusion to the messianic title of Ἀναστάτος in Zec 6:12: in commenting on that verse Philo observes (de confus. ling. 14): τούτον μὲν γὰρ πρεσβύτατον ὑὸν ὁ τῶν δια 

οἱ ἐντελεῖ πατὴρ. (For ἐπηρεάω the abstract equivalent ἐπηροῦσα, from v.12, is substituted by Dc K L.) The title ὁ κύριος ἥμων is one of the links between the vocabulary of this epistle and that of the pastorals (1 Ti 1:14, 2 Ti 1:8). As the result of all this, what is it that becomes (v.15) ἐπιστροφὴν (for ἐπιστροφῆς is substituted by C D K Ψ 104. 326. 1175. etc.) hints at the contrast which is to be worked out later (in 9:14) between the external and the inward or spiritual, the sacerdotal ἐντολή being dismissed as merely σαρκίζη, since it laid down physical descent as a requisite for office. Hereditary succession is opposed to the inherent personality of the Son (=9:14). The distinction between σαρκικὸς (=fleshly, with the nature and qualities of σάρξ) and σάρκινος (fleshy, composed of σάρξ) is blurred in Hellenistic Greek of the period, where adjectives in -ίνος tend to take over the sense of those in -ικός, and vice versa. In v.17 μαρτυρεῖται (cp. μαρτυροῦμενος, v.8) is altered to the active (10:15) μαρτυρεῖ by C D K L 256. 326. 436. 1175. 1837. 2127 syrsvski vg arm Chrys.

The μετάθεσις of v.12 is now explained negatively (ἀδέτησις) and positively (ἐπιστροφή) in vv.18-19. Ἀδέτησις (one of his juristic metaphors, cp. 9:28) γίνεται (i.e. by the promulgation of Ps 110:1) προαγωγή (cp. ἸΜΑ. iii. 247, τὰ προφήτα προφήτα: προάγων is

1 Κατάδηλος is the classical intensive form of δῆλον, used here for the sake of assonance with the following κατά.
not used by the LXX in this sense of "fore-going") ἐντολής (v.16) διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς (unemphatic) ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἀνωφελεῖς (alliteration). ἀνωφελεῖς is a word common in such connexions, e.g. Ep. Arist. 253, ὑπὸ ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ ἀλγείνων ἐστίν: Polyb. xii. 25 ᾦς ἀγγλίων καὶ ἀνωφελεῖς. The uselessness of the Law lay in its failure to secure an adequate forgiveness of sins, without which a real access or fellowship (ἐγγίζειν τῷ θεῷ) was impossible; οὐδὲν ἐτελείωσε, it led to no absolute order of communion between men and God, no τελείωσις. The positive contrast (v.19) is introduced by the striking compound ἐπισταγωγή (with γένεσι), a term used by Josephus for the replacing of Vashti by Esther (Ant. xi. 6. 2, σβέννυσθαί γὰρ τὸ πρὸς τὴν προτέραν φιλοστοργον ἐτέρας ἐπισταγωγῆ, καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἐκείνην εἰςών ἀποσπώμενον κατὰ μικρὸν γίγνεσθαί τῆς συνούσης); there is no force here in the ἐκεί, as if it meant “fresh” or “further.” The new ἐλπίς is κρείττων by its effectiveness (618); it accomplishes what the νόμος and its ἐρωστική had failed to realize for men, viz. a direct and lasting access to God. In what follows the writer ceases to use the term ἐλπίς, and concentrates upon the ἐγκατεστάσεις, since the essence of the ἐλπίς lies in the priesthood and sacrifice of Jesus the Son. With this allusion to the κρείττων ἐλπίς, he really resumes the thought of 618.19; but he has another word to say upon the superiority of the Melchizedek priest, and in this connexion he recalls another oath of God, viz. at the inauguration or consecration mentioned in Ps 110, a solemn divine oath, which was absent from the ritual of the levitical priesthood, and which ratifies the new priesthood of Jesus as permanent (vv.20–22), enabling him to do for men what the levitical priests one after another failed to accomplish (vv.23–25).

20 A better Hope, because it was not promised apart from an oath. Previous priests (οἱ μὲν = levitical priests) became priests apart from any oath, 21 but he has an oath from Him who said to him, "The Lord has sworn, and he will not change his mind, thou art a priest for ever."

22 And this makes Jesus surety for a superior covenant. 23 Also, while they (οἱ μὲν) became priests in large numbers, since death prevents them from continuing to serve, 24 he holds his priesthood without any successor, since he continues for ever. 25 Hence for all time he is able to save those who approach God through him, as he is always living to intercede on their behalf.

The long sentence (vv.20–22) closes with ἤσοις in an emphatic position. After καὶ καθ᾽ ὅσον οἱ χωρὶς ὀρκυμοσίας, which connect (sc. τοῦτο γένεσι) with ἐπισταγωγὴν κρείττων ἐλπίδος, there is a long explanatory parenthesis οἱ μὲν γὰρ ... ἐις τὸν αἰῶνα, exactly in the literary style of Philo (e.g. quis rer. div. 17, ἐφ᾽ ὅσον γὰρ ὀμαί κτλ.—νοῦς μὲν γὰρ ... αἰσθησις—ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον κτλ.). In v.20 ὀρκυμοσία (oath-taking) is a neuter plural (cp. Syll. 593 OGIS. 229) which, like ἀντωμοσία, has become a feminine singular of the first declension, and ἐστὶν γεγονότες is simply an analytic form
of the perfect tense, adopted as more sonorous than ἔγεγοναί. As we have already seen (on 613), Philo (de sacrif. 28–29) discusses such references to God swearing. Thousands of people, he observes, regard an oath as inconsistent with the character of God, who requires no witness to his character. “Men who are disbelieved have recourse to an oath in order to win credence, but God’s mere word must be believed (ὅ δὲ θεὸς καὶ λέγων πιστὸς ἐστιν); hence, his words are in no sense different from oaths, as far as assurance goes.” He concludes that the idea of God swearing an oath is simply an anthropomorphism which is necessary on account of human weakness. Our author takes the OT language in Ps 1104 more naively, detecting a profound significance in the line δυοονεν κύριος καὶ οὐ μεταμεληθησται (in the Hellenistic sense of “regret” = change his mind). The allusion is, of course, to the levitical priests. But Roman readers could understand from their former religion how oaths were needful in such a matter. Claudius, says Suetonius (Vit. Claud. 22), “in co-optandis per collegia sacerdotibus neminem nisi juratus (i.e. that they were suitable) nominavit.”

The superfluous addition of κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδεκ was soon made, after έλις τὸν αἰῶνα, by n6 A D K L P vt S y r P h h δ ὑ b e t E u s (D e m. iv. 15. 40), etc.

Παραμένειν means to remain in office or serve (a common euphemism in the papyri). The priestly office could last in a family (cp. Jos. Ant. xi. 8. 2, τῆς ἰερατικῆς τιμῆς μεγίστης οὔσης καὶ ἐν τῷ γένει παραμένοντης), but mortal men (Ἀποθνήσκοντες, v.8) could not paramein as priests, whereas (v.24) Jesus remains a perpetual ἵερος, διὰ τὸ μένειν (= πάντοτε Ἰῶν, v.25) αὐτῶν (superfluous as in Lk 2 διὰ το αὐτὸν εἶναι). Ἀπαράβατον, a legal adjective for “inviolable,” is here used in the uncommon sense of non-transferable (boh Chrys. οὸκ ἔχει διάδοχον, Oecumenius, etc. ἀδιάδοχον), as an equivalent for μὴ παραβιανοῦσαν εἰς ἄλλον, and contrasts Jesus with the long succession of the levitical priests (πλειονέσ). The passive sense of “not to be infringed” (cp. Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 43, εἰμαρμένην φαμέν ἀπαράβατον ταύτην εἶναι, where the adjective = ineluctable) or “unbroken” does not suit the context, for Jesus had no rivals and the word can hardly refer to the invasion of death. Like γεγυμνασμένα in 514, also after ἔξειν, it has a predicative force, marked by the absence of the article. Philo (quīs rer. div. heres, 6) finds a similar significance in the etymology of κύριος as a divine title: κύριος μὲν γὰρ παρὰ τὸ κύριος, ὃ δὴ βεβαιῶν ἐστιν, εἰρηταί, καὶ ἕναντίωντα ἀβεβαιοῦ καὶ ἀκύρων. But our author does not discover any basis for the perpetuity of ὁ κύριος ημῶν in the etymology of κύριος, and is content (in vv.22–24) to stress the line of the psalm, in order to prove that Jesus guaranteed a superior διαθήκη (i.e. order of religious fellowship). Ἠγγυὸς is one of the
jurisdictional terms (vg, sponsor) which he uses in a general sense; here it is "surety" or "pledge." Διαθήκη is discussed by him later on; it is a term put in here as often to excite interest and anticipation. How readily ἔγγυος could be associated with a term like σώζειν (v. 25) may be understood from Sir 29:15:

χάριτας ἔγγυον μὴ ἐπιλάθη,
ἐδωκεν γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ σου.
ἀγαθὰ ἔγγυον ἀνατρέψει ἀμαρτωλός,
καὶ ἀχριστός ἐν διανοίᾳ ἐγκαταλείψει ὑποσάμενον.

Our author might have written μεσίτης here as well as in 88; he prefers ἔγγυος probably for the sake of assonance with γέγονεν or even ἐγγίζομεν. As μεσίτευν means to vouch for the truth of a promise or statement (cp. 617), so ἔγγυος means one who vouches for the fulfilment of a promise, and therefore is a synonym for μεσίτης here. The conclusion (v. 25) is put in simple and effective language. 

Εἰς τὸ παντελές is to be taken in the temporal sense of the phrase, as in B.M. iii. 161:11 (A.D. 212) ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὸ παντελές, being simply a literary variant for πάντως. The alternative rendering "utterly" suits Lk 13:11 better than this passage. This full and final ἱερωσύνη of Jesus is the κρείττων ἔλπις (v.19), the τελείωσις which the levitical priesthood failed to supply, a perfect access to God's Presence. His intercession (ἐντυγχάνειν, sc. θεόν as in Ro 8:34 δια καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν) has red blood in it, unlike Philo's conception, e.g. in Vit. Mos. iii. 14, ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἣν τὸν ἱερωμένον (the highpriest) τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρὶ παρακλήτῳ χρηθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἁρμήνιν νῦν (i.e. the Logos) πρὸς τε ἀμαρτητῶν ἀμαρτητῶν καὶ χρηματίων ἀφθονιτάτων ἀγαθῶν, and in quid rer. div. 42, where the Logos is ἱερεύς τοῦ θεντοῦ κηρύγγοντος διὰ πρὸς τὸ ἀθωρατον παρὰ διὰ τοῦ φύσεως ἰδιωθεὶς τοῦ διδωθεὶς τὸ διόν θεοῦ περιδείν τὸ ιδιόν ἐργον. The function of intercession in heaven for the People, which originally (see p. 37) was the prerogative of Michael the angelic guardian of Israel, or generally of angels (see on 114), is thus transferred to Jesus, to One who is no mere angel but who has sacrificed himself for the People. The author deliberately excludes any other mediator or semi-mediator in the heavenly sphere (see p. xxxix).

A triumphant little summary (vv.26-28) now rounds off the argument of 619f.-7:25:

Such was the highpriest for us, saintly, innocent, unstained, far from all contact with the sinful, lifted high above the heavens, 27 one who has no need, like yonder highpriests, day by day to offer sacrifices first for their own sins and then for (the preposition is omitted as in Ac 26:18) those of the People— he did that once for all in offering up himself. 28 For the Law appoints human beings in their weakness to the priesthood; but the word of the Oath (which came after the Law) appoints a Son who is made perfect for ever.
The text of this paragraph has only a few variants, none of any importance. After ἡμῖν in v. 21 καὶ is added by A B D 1739 sypresh Ἥκι Eusebius ("was exactly the one for us"). In v. 27 it makes no difference to the sense whether προσενεγκας (N A W 33. 256. 436. 442. 1837. 2004. 2127 arm Cyr.) or ἀνενέγκας (B C D K L P etc. Chrys.) is read; the latter may have been suggested by ἀναφέρειν, or προσενεγκας may have appealed to later scribes as the more usual and technical term in the epistle. The technical distinction between ἀναφέρειν (action of people) and προσεφέρειν (action of the priest) had long been blurred; both verbs mean what we mean by "offer up" or "sacrifice." In v. 28 the original ἱερεῖς (D* Δ r vg) was soon changed (to conform with ἱερομέτρεις in v. 27) into ἱερομέτρεις. The reason why ἱερομέτρεις and ἱερεῖς have been used in 7:16 is that Melchizedek was called ἱερεῖς, not ἱερομέτρεις. Once the category is levitical, the interchange of ἱερομέτρεις and ἱερεῖς becomes natural.

The words τοιούτος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐπέπεμψεν (another daring use of ἐπέπεμσεν, cp. 2:10) ἱερομέτρεις (v. 26) might be bracketed as one of the author's parentheses, in which case ὅσιος κτλ. would carry on πάντοτε ξύω ... αὐτῶν. But ὅσΘ in Greek often follows τοιούτος, and the usual construction is quite satisfactory. Γὰρ is intensive, as often. It is generally misleading to parse a rhapsody, but there is a certain sequence of thought in ὅσιος κτλ., where the positive adjective ὅσιος is followed by two negative terms in alliteration (ἀκάκος, ἀμιαντός), and κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν is further defined by ὑψιλότερος τῶν ὁμορραγίων γενόμενος (the same idea as in 4:14 διεληλυθότα τῶν ὁμορραγίων). He is ὅσιος, pious or saintly (cp. ERE. vi. 743), in virtue of qualities like his reverence, obedience, faith, loyalty, and humility, already noted. ᾧ ἀκακὸς is innocent (as in Job 8:20, Jer 11:19), one of the LXX equivalents for ἡσυχασμόν, ἁπλον, not simply = devoid of evil feeling towards men; like ἀμιαντός, it denotes a character χωρίς ἁμαρτίας. ἀμιαντός is used of the untainted Isis in OP. 138o (ἐν Πάντω ἀμιαντός). The language may be intended to suggest a contrast between the deep ethical purity of Jesus and the ritual purity of the levitical highpriest, who had to take extreme precautions against outward defilement (cp. Lv 21:10-15 for the regulations, and the details in Josephus, Ant. iii. 12. 2, μὴ μόνον δὲ περὶ τὸς ἱερονύμως καθαρός εἶναι, σπουδαζεῖν δὲ καὶ περὶ τὴν αὐτῶν δίαιταν, ὡς αὐτῆς ἁμεμπτὸν εἶναι καὶ διὰ ταῖτην τὴν αἰτίαν, οἱ τὴν ἱερατικὴν στολὴν φοροῦντες ἁμοιοὶ τε εἰς καὶ περὶ πάντα καθαροὶ καὶ νηφάλιοι), and had to avoid human contact for seven days before the ceremony of atonement-day. The next two phrases go together. Κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν is intelligible in the light of 9:28; Jesus has ἀπαξ sacrificed himself for the sins of men, and in that sense his connexion with ἁμαρτωλοί is done. He is no levitical highpriest who is in daily contact with them, and therefore obliged to sacrifice repeatedly. Hence the writer at once adds (v. 27) a word to explain and expand this pregnant thought; the sphere in which Jesus now lives (ὑψιλότερος κτλ.) is not one in which,
as on earth, he had to suffer the contagion or the hostility of 
\[\text{ἄμαρτωλοι} (12^2)\] and to die for human sins.

"He has outsoared the shadow of our night;
Envy and calumny and hate and pain . . .
Can touch him not and torture not again;
From the contagion of the world's slow stain
He is secure."

This is vital \(^1\) to the sympathy and intercession of Jesus; it is in virtue of this position before God that he aids his people, as \textit{τετελεσμένος}, and therefore able to do all for them. His priesthood is, in modern phrase, absolute. As eternal \textit{ἀρχιερεύς} in the supreme sense, and as no longer in daily contact with sinners, Jesus is far above the routine ministry of the levitical \textit{ἀρχιερεύς}. The writer blends loosely in his description (v. 27) the annual sacrifice of the highpriest on atonement-day (to which he has already referred in 5\(^3\)) and the daily sacrifices offered by priests. Strictly speaking the \textit{ἀρχιερεύς} did not require to offer sacrifices \textit{καθ' ἡμέραν}, and the accurate phrase would have been \textit{κατ' έναυτόν.} According to Lv 6\(^{10-23}\) the highpriest had indeed to offer a cereal offering morning and evening; but the text is uncertain, for it is to be offered both on the day of his consecration and also \textit{διὰ πάντος}. Besides, this section was not in the LXX text of A, so that the writer of Hebrews did not know of it. Neither had he any knowledge of the later Jewish ritual, according to which the highpriest did offer this offering twice a day. Possibly, however, his expression here was suggested by Philo's statement about this offering, viz. that the highpriest did offer a daily sacrifice \textit{quis rer. div. 36: τὰς εὐθέλεχες θυσίας . . . ἦν τε ὑπὲρ έαυτῶν οἱ λειψίαι προσφέρονται τῆς σεμιδάλεως καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἱδίου τῶν δυνάμων, de spec. leg. iii. 23, ὁ ἀρχιερεύς . . . εἰσχάς δὲ καὶ θυσίας τελῶν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν}. It is true that this offering \textit{ὑπὲρ έαυτῶν} was not a sin-offering, only an offering of cereals; still it was reckoned a \textit{θυσία}, and in Sir 45\(^{14}\) it is counted as such. \textit{Τούτῳ γὰρ ἐποίησεν} refers then to his sacrifice for sins (9\(^{28}\)), not, of course, including any sins of his own (see on 5\(^3\); it means \textit{ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτίων τοῦ λαοῦ}, and the writer could afford to be technically inexact in his parallelism without fear of being misunderstood. "Jesus offered his sacrifice," "Jesus did all that a highpriest has to do,"—this was what he intended. The Greek fathers rightly referred \textit{τούτῳ} to \textit{ἐπείτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ}, as if the writer meant "\textit{this}, not that \textit{πρότερον.}" It is doubtful if he had such a sharp distinction in his mind, but when he wrote \textit{τούτῳ}

\(^1\) Thus Philo quotes (\textit{de Fug.} 12) with enthusiasm what Plato says in the \textit{Theatetus}: \textit{οὐΤ' ἀπολείπεται τὰ κακὰ δυνάμων—ὑπεναντίων γὰρ τι τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀλλ' εἶναι ἀνάγκη—οὔτε ἐν θείοις αὐτὰ ἰδρύσθαι.}
he was thinking of τῶν τοῦ λαός, and of that alone. An effort is sometimes made to evade this interpretation by confining καθ’ ἡμέραν to ὅς οὖν ἔχει and understanding “yearly” after οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, as if the idea were that Christ’s daily intercession required no daily sacrifice like the annual sacrifice on atonement-day. But, as the text stands, ἀνάγκη is knit to καθ’ ἡμέραν, and these words must all be taken along with ἀστέρι οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς (ἐξουσί). 

Compare the common assurance of the votaries of Serapis, e.g. BGU. ii. 385 (ii/iii A.D.), τὸ προσκύνημα σου ποιώ κατ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ Σαράπιδι καὶ τοῖς συνεργοῖς θεοῖς.

A deep impression is made by the words ἐαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας, "pro nobis tibi uictor et uictima, et ideo uictor, quia uictima, pro nobis tibi sacerdos et sacrificium, et ideo sacerdos, quia sacrificium" (Aug. Conf. x. 43). What is meant by this the writer holds over till he reaches the question of the sacrifice of Jesus as ἀρχιερεῖς (916). As usual, he prepares the way for a further idea by dropping an enigmatic allusion to it. Meantime (v.28) a general statement sums up the argument. Καθιστάνων is used as in 1 Mac 10·20 (καθεστάκαμεν σε σήμερον ἀρχιερεῖ τοῦ ἐθνοῦς σου), and ἀσθένειαν recalls 5·2 (περίκειται ἀσθένειαν), in the special sense that such weakness involved a sacrifice for one’s personal sins (ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἀμαρτιών). Whereas Jesus the Son of God (as opposed to ἀνθρώπους ἀσθενεῖς) was appointed by a divine order which superseded the Law (μετὰ τῶν νόμων = vv.11-19), and appointed as one who was τετελειωμένος (in the sense of 2·16) εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. It is implied that he was appointed ἀρχιερεῖς, between which and ἰερεῖς there is no difference.

The writer now picks up the thought (7·22) of the superior διαθήκη which Jesus as ἀρχιερεῖς in the eternal σκήνη or sanctuary mediates for the People. This forms the transition between the discussion of the priesthood (5-8) and the sacrifice of Jesus (9-10·17). The absolute sacrifice offered by Jesus as the absolute priest (vv.1·6) ratifies the new διαθήκη which has superseded the old (vv.7-13) with its imperfect sacrifices.

1 The point of all this is, we do have such a highpriest, one who is "seated at the right hand" of the throne of Majesty (see 1) in the heavens,
2 and who officiates in the sanctuary or "true tabernacle set up by the Lord" and not by man. 3 Now, as every highpriest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices, he too must have something to offer. 4 Were he on earth, he would not be a priest at all, for there are priests already to offer the gifts prescribed by Law (6 men who serve a mere outline and shadow of the heavenly—as Moses was instructed when he was about to execute the building of the tabernacle: “see,” God said, “that (sc. δῶς) you make everything on the pattern shown you upon the mountain”). 6 As it is, however, the divine service he has obtained is superior, owing to the fact that he mediates a superior covenant, enacted with superior promises.

The terseness of the clause ἂν ἐπηζεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἀνθρώπως (v.1) is
spoiled by the insertion of καί before οὐκ (A K L P vg boh syr armt eth Cosm.). In v. 4 οὖν becomes γὰρ in D K L syr arm Chrys. Theod., and a similar group of authorities add λειτουργός after ὑπάρχων. Τὸν is prefixed needlessly to νῦν by κέ D K L P Chrys. Dam. to conform to the usage in 7 a 22; but the sense is really unaffected, for the only legal regulation conceivable is that of the Law. In v. 6 τῶν and τῶν (650) are both attested; the former is more common in the papyri. The Hellenistic (from Aristotle onwards) form τέστιχοι (κέ B D K L 5 226. 246. 672. 920. 927. 1311. 1827. 1836. 1873. 2004. 2143, etc.; or πέτυχεν, κέ A D K L) has been corrected in P Ψ 6. 33. 1908 Orig. to the Attic τέστιχοι. Before κρίσιττονός, καί is omitted by D* 69. 436. 462 arm Thdt.

Κεφάλαιον ("the pith," Coverdale), which is nominative absolute, is used as in Cic. ad Attic. v. 18: "et multa, immo omnia, quorum κεφάλαιον," etc., Dem. xiii. 36: ἐστὶ δ', ὁ ἄνδρας Ἀθηναίοι, κεφάλαιον ἀπάντων τῶν εἰρήμενων (at the close of a speech); Musonius (ed. Hense, 67 f.) βίον καὶ γενέσεως παῖδων κοινονίαν κεφάλαιον εἶναι γάμου, etc. The word in this sense is common throughout literature and the more colloquial papyri, here with ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις (concerning what has been said). In passing from the intricate argument about the Melchizedek priesthood, which is now dropped, the writer disentangles the salient and central truth of the discussion, in order to continue his exposition of Jesus as highpriest. "Such, I have said, was the ἀρχιερεύς for us, and such is the ἀρχιερεύς we have—One who is enthroned, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, next to God himself." While Philo spiritualizes the highpriesthood, not unlike Paul (Ro 12f.), by arguing that devotion to God is the real highpriesthood (τὸ γὰρ θεραπευτικὸν γένος ἀνάθημα ἐστὶ θεοῦ, ιερωμένον τὴν μεγάλην ἀρχιερωματικὴν αὐτῷ μόνῳ, de Fug. 7), our author sees its essential functions transcended by Jesus in the spiritual order.

The phrase in v. 2 τῶν ἀγίων λειτουργός, offers two points of interest. First, the linguistic form λειτουργός. The ei form stands between the older η or η, which waned apparently from the third cent. b.c., and the later i form; "λειτουργός sim. socios habet omnium temporum papyros praeter perpaucas recentiores quae sacrīs fere cum libris conspirantes λειτουργός λειτουργία scribunt." (Cröner, Memoria Graecæ Hercul. 39). Then, the meaning of τῶν ἀγίων. Philo has the phrase, in Leg. Alcæ. iii. 46, τοιοῦτος ἐν θεραπευτῇ καὶ λειτουργῷ τῶν ἁγίων, where τῶν ἀγίων means "sacred things," as in de Fug. 17, where the Levites are described as priests οἰς ή τῶν ἁγίων ανακείται λειτουργία. This might be the meaning here. But the writer uses τὰ ἁγία elsewhere (9 8 10 1 3 11) of "the sanctuary," a rendering favoured by the context. By τὰ ἁγία he means, as often in the LXX, the sanctuary in general, without any reference to the distinction (cp. 9 24) between the outer and the inner shrine. The LXX avoids the pagan term ἱερῶν in this connexion, though τὰ ἁγία itself was already in use among ethnic writers (e.g. the edict of
Ptolemy III., καὶ καθιδρίσας ἐν τῶν ἀγγ.: "in sacrario templi," Dittenberger, *OGIS* 56. It is here defined (καὶ επεξεγετικό) as the true or real σχηματικοῦ ἐπηθεὶν ὁ κύριος (a reminiscence of Nu 24 ἑκατέρας ἐπηθεὶς Κύριος, and of Ex 33 καὶ λαβῶν Μωυσῆς τὴν σχηματίζαι αὐτοῦ ἐπηθεὶς). The reality and authenticity of the writer's faith come out in a term like ἀληθινός. What he means by it he will explain in a moment (v. 5). Meanwhile he turns to the λειτουργία of Jesus in this ideal sanctuary. This ἀρχιερεία of ours, in his vocation (v. 3, cp. 5 ἐν), must have (ἀναγκαῖον, sc. ἐστὶν) some sacrifice to present before God, though what this offering is, the writer does not definitely say, even later in 9. The analogy of a highpriest carrying the blood of an animal inside the sacred shrine had its obvious limitations, for Jesus was both ἀρχιερεία and offering, by his self-sacrifice. Προσενέγχηκα is the Hellenistic aorist subjunctive, where classical Greek would have employed a future indicative (Radermacher, 138). The writer proceeds to argue that this λειτουργία is far superior to the levitical cultus (vv. 4 f.). Even in the heavenly sanctuary there must be sacrifice of some kind—for sacrifice is essential to communion, in his view. It is not a sacrifice according to the levitical ritual; indeed Jesus on this level would not be in levitical orders at all. But so far from that being any drawback or disqualification to our ἀρχιερεία, it is a proof of his superiority, for the bible itself indicates that the levitical cultus is only an inferior copy of the heavenly order to which Jesus belongs.

Instead of contrasting at this point (v. 4) τὰ δῶρα (sacrifices, as in 11 ἐν) of the levitical priests with the spiritual sacrifice of Jesus, he hints that the mere fact of these sacrifices being made ἐν γίς is a proof of their inferiority. This is put into a parenthesis (v. 5); but, though a grammatical aside, it contains one of the writer's fundamental ideas about religion (Eusebius, in *Praep. Evang.* xii. 19, after quoting He 8, refers to the similar Platonic view in the sixth book of the *Republic*). Such priests (οἰκτει) the simple relative as in 9 ἐν ὑποτασία τῶν ἐπουρανίων (cp. 9 ὑποτασία) ἔντοιχοι, is not assimilated, though ἔντοιχοι might have been written; the practice varied (cp. e.g. Dt 5 ἐν τῇ γῇ ἔγραψεν διδοθήμεν, 12 ὑποτασία τοῦ θεοῦ). ¹ ἄνω is not assimilated, though ἄνω might have been written; the practice varied (cp. e.g. Dt 5 ἐν τῇ γῇ ἔγραψεν διδοθήμεν, 12 ὑποτασία τοῦ θεοῦ).

1 Passively in the NT in Ac 10:25, but the exact parallel is in Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 8. 8, Μωυσῆς ἡ δεύτερη ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἐκρημασθεὶς, ² as often in the LXX and the papyri, of divine
revelations as well as of royal instructions—μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνήν. The subject of the φησι is God, understood from κεχρημάτισται, and the γὰρ 1 introduces the quotation, in which, the writer, following Philo (Leg. Alleg. iii. 33), as probably codex Ambrosianus (F) of the LXX followed him, adds πάντα. He also substitutes δειγμάτα for δειγμένον, which Philo keeps (κατὰ τὸ παραδείγμα τὸ δειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει πάντα ποιήσεις), and retains the LXX τῦπον (like Stephen in Ac 7:44). The idea was current in Alexandrian Judaism, under the influence of Platonism, that this σκηνή on earth had been but a reproduction of the pre-existent heavenly sanctuary. Thus the author of Wisdom makes Solomon remind God that he had been told to build the temple (ναὸν . . . καὶ θυναστήριον) as μίμημα σκηνῆς ἀγίας ἐκ προτοίμασας ἀπὸ ἄρχουσιν (98), where σκηνὴ ἁγία is plainly the heavenly sanctuary as the eternal archetype. This idealism determines the thought of our writer (see Introd. pp. xxxi f.). Above the shows and shadows of material things he sees the real order of being, and it is most real to him on account of Jesus being there, for the entire relationship between God and man depends upon this function and vocation of Jesus in the eternal sanctuary.

Such ideas were not unknown in other circles. Seneca (Ep. lviii. 18–19) had just explained to Lucilius that the Platonic ideas were “what all visible things were created from, and what formed the pattern for all things,” quoting the Parmenides, 132 D, to prove that the Platonic idea was the everlasting pattern of all things in nature. The metaphor is more than once used by Cicero, e.g. Tusc. iii. 2. 3, and in de Officiis, iii. 17, where he writes: "We have no real and life-like (solidam et expressam effigiem) likeness of real law and genuine justice; all we enjoy is shadow and sketch (umbra et imaginibus). Would that we were true even to these! For they are taken from the excellent patterns provided by nature and truth.” But our author’s thought is deeper. In the contemporary Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch the idea of Ex 25:40 is developed into the thought that the heavenly Jerusalem was also revealed to Moses along with the patterns of the σκηνή and its utensils (44); God also showed Moses “the pattern of Zion and its measures, in the pattern of which the sanctuary of the present time was to be made” (Charles’ tr.). The origin of this notion is very ancient; it goes back to Sumerian sources, for Gudea the prince-priest of Lagash (c. 3000 B.C.) receives in a vision the plan of the temple which he is commanded to build (cp. A. Jeremias, Babylonisches im NT, pp. 62 f.). It is to this fundamental conception that the author of Ἱερός Ἑβραίου recurs, only to elaborate it in an altogether new form, which went far beyond Philo. Philo’s argument (Leg. Alleg. iii. 33), on this very verse of Exodus, is that Bezaleel only constructed an imitation (μιμήματα) of τὰ ἀρχέτυπα given to Moses; the latter was called up to the mountain to receive the direct idea of God, whereas the former worked simply ἀπὸ σκιᾶς τῶν γενομένων. In de Plant. 6 he observes that the very name of Bezaleel (βζαλέλ) means “one who works in shadows” (ἐν σκιάς ποιῶν); in De Somniiis, i. 35, he defines it as “in the shadow of God,” and again contrasts Bezaleel with Moses: ὁ μὲν οἶα σκιᾶς ὑπεγράφη, ὁ δ’ οὖ σκιᾶς,

1 Put before φησι, because the point is not that the oracle was given, but what the oracle contained.
VIII. 6.]

THE SUPERIOR COVENANT

6. THE SUPERIOR COVENANT

He then continues (v. 6), logical as in 2:8-9 (answering to "me" in v. 4) the thought of Christ’s superior leitourgia by describing him again (cp. 7:22) in connexion with the superior diaethêka, and using now not έγγυοι but μεσήτης. Μεσήτης (see on Gal 3:18) commonly means an arbitrator (e.g. Job 9:38, Κείν. P. 4:4 [A.D. 104]) or κατασταθείς κριτὴς μεσήτης) or intermediary in some civil transaction (ΟΡ. 1:29:19); but this writer’s use of it, always in connexion with διαθήκη (9:12) and always as a description of Jesus (as in 1 Ti 2:5), implies that it is practically (see on 7:22) a synonym for έγγυοι. Indeed, linguistically, it is a Hellenistic equivalent for the Attic διαθήκης, and in Diod. Siculus, iv. 54 (τοῦτον γὰρ μεσίτην γεγονότα τῶν διολογίων ἐν Κόλχαις ἐπηγγέλθαι διαθήκης αὐτῇ παραστομονήματι), its meaning corresponds to that of έγγυοι. The sense is plain, even before the writer develops his ideas about the new διαθήκη, for, whenever the idea of reconciliation emerges, terms like μεσήτης and μεσητεύει are natural. Μεσήτης καὶ διαλακτής is Philo’s phrase2 for Moses (Vit. Mos. iii. 19). And as a διαθήκη was a gracious order of religious fellowship, inaugurated upon some historical occasion by sacrifice, it was natural to speak of Jesus as the One who mediated this new διαθήκη of Christianity. He gave it (Theophyl. μεσήτης καὶ δότης); he it was who realized it for men and who maintains it for men. All that the writer has to say meantime about the διαθήκη is that it has been enacted (v. 6) ἐπὶ κρεῖττονεν ἐπαγγέλλω. This passive use of νομοθετεῖν is not unexampled; cf. e.g. OGIS. 49:3 (ii A.D.) καὶ τάῦτα μὲν ὑμῖν δόθω καὶ καλῶς ... νενομοθετήθω. It is implied, of course, that God is ὅ νομοθετῶν (as in LXX Ps 83:7). What the “better promises” are, he now proceeds to explain, by a contrast between their διαθήκη and its predecessor. The superiority of the new διαθήκη is shown by the fact that God thereby superseded the διαθήκη with which the levitical cultus was bound up; the writer quotes an oracle from Jeremiah, again laying stress on the fact that it came after the older διαθήκη (vv. 7-15), and enumerating its promises as contained in a newδιαθήκη.

1 In these two latter passages, at least, there may be an allusion to the contemporary description of Moses as “mediator of the covenant” (“arbiter testamenti,” Ass. Mosis, i. 14). The writer does not contrast Jesus with Michael, who was the great angelic mediator in some circles of Jewish piety (cp. Jub 1:20, Test. Dan 6).

2 Josephus (Ant. xvi. 2. 2) says that Herod τῶν παρ’ Ἀγρίππα τῶν ἐπισημνημένων μεσίτης ἦν, and that his influence moved πρὸς τὰς εὐεργείας οὐ βραδύνοντα τῶν Ἀγρίππαν. Πλεῖον μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἰδίαλλαξεν ὄρθισεν.
7 For if that first covenant had been faultless, there would have been no occasion for a second. 8 Whereas God does find fault with the people of that covenant, when he says:

"The day is coming, saith the Lord, when I will conclude a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah.

9 It will not be on the lines of the covenant I made with their fathers, on the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt's Land;

for they would not hold to my covenant, so I left them alone, saith the Lord.

10 This is the covenant I will make with the house of Israel when that ("the day" of v. 8) day comes, saith the Lord;

I will set my laws within their mind, inscribing them upon their hearts;

I will be a God (eis theon, i.e. all that men can expect a God to be) to them,

and they shall be a People to me;

one citizen will no longer teach his fellow, one man will no longer teach his brother (τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, i.e. one another, Ex 10:22), saying, "Know the Lord," for all shall know me, low and high together.

11 I will be merciful to their iniquities, and remember their sins no more.

12 By saying "a new covenant," he antiquates the first. And whatever is antiquated and aged is on the verge of vanishing.

The contents of the prediction of a κατάδιαθήκη by God, and the very fact that such was necessary, prove the defectiveness of the first διαθήκη. The writer is struck by the mention of a new διαθήκη even in the OT itself, and he now explains the significance of this. As for ἡ πρώτη (sc. διαθήκη) ἐκείνη, εἰ ... ἄμειπτος (if no fault could have been found with it), οὐκ ἂν δειτέρας ἐξητείτο τόπος. Δειτέρας is replaced by ἔτερος in B* (so B. Weiss, Blass); but, while ἔτερος could follow πρῶτος (Mt 21:30), δειτέρας is the term chosen in 10:9, and B* is far too slender evidence by itself. Ζητεῖν τόπον is one of those idiomatic phrases, like εὑρεῖν τόπον and λαβεῖν τόπον, of which the writer was fond. The force of the γὰρ after μεμφόμενος is: "and there was occasion for a second διαθήκη, the first was not ἄμειπτος, since," etc. It need make little or no difference to the sense whether we read αὐτοῖς (ℵ B D e L 6. 38. 88. 104. 256. 436. 467. 999. 1311. 1319. 1739. 1837. 1845. 1912. 2004. 2127 Origen) or ἀυτοῖς (ℵ* A D* K P W 33 vg arm), for μεμφόμενος can take a dative as well as an accusative (cf. Arist. Ῥητ. 1. 6. 24, Κορωβίοις δ' οὐ μέμφεται τὸ Ἰλων: Aesch. Ἑρμ. 63, οὐδεὶς ἐνδικός μέμφαιτο μοι) in the sense of "censuring" or "finding fault with," and μεμφόμενος naturally goes with ἀυτοῖς or αὐτοῖς. The objection to taking αὐτοῖς with λέγει 1

1 μεμφόμενος is then "by way of censure," and some think the writer purposely avoided adding αὐτήν. Which, in view of what he says in v. 18, is doubtful; besides, he has just said that the former διαθήκη was not ἄμειπτος.
is that the quotation is not addressed directly to the people, but spoken at large. Thus the parallel from 2 Mac 27 (μεμψάμενος αὐτοῖς εἶπεν) is not decisive, and the vg is probably correct in rendering “vituperans enim eos dicit.” The context explains here as in 48 and 1128 who are meant by αὐτοῖς. The real interest of the writer in this Jeremianic oracle is shown when he returns to it in 1016-18; what arrests him is the promise of a free, full pardon at the close. But he quotes it at length, partly because it did imply the supersession of the older διαθήκη and partly because it contained high promises (vv.10-12), higher than had yet been given to the People. No doubt it also contains a warning (v.9), like the text from the 95th psalm (37f.), but this is not why he recites it (see p. xl).

The text of Jer 3831-34 (3131-34) as he read it in his bible (i.e. in A) ran thus:

Idou ἡμέρα ἔρχονται, λέγει Κύριος,
καὶ διαθήσομαι τῷ οίκῳ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ιουδα διαθήκην
καὶνήν,
οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην ἐὰν διεθέμην τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν
ἐν ἡμέρα ἐπιλαβαμένων μοι τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν ἐξαγαγεὶν αὐτοὺς ἐκ
γῆς Αἰγύπτου,
ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἔνεμεναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου,
κἂν ἡμέλεσα αὐτῶν, φησίν Κύριος.
ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἐν διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ
μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, φησίν Κύριος,
διδοῦν τὸνος μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν
καὶ ἐπιγράψω αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν,
καὶ ὄψομαι αὐτοὺς
καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θόν.
καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μου εἰς λαόν.
καὶ όὐ μὴ 1 διδάσων ἐκαστὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐκαστὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ λέγων· γνώθι τὸν Κύριον,
ὅτι πάντες ἴδησονται με
ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἑώς μεγάλου αὐτῶν,
ὅτι ἰδεις ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν
καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν ὁ μὴ μνησθῇ ἐτὶ.

Our author follows as usual the text of A upon the whole (e.g. λέγει τὸν φθοῖν in v.31, κάτω in v.32, the omission of μοι after διαθήκη and of δώσω after διδοὺς in v.32, ό μὴ διδάσων for ό διδάσωσιν in v.34 and the omission of αὐτῶν after μικρός), but substitutes συνελέσω ἐπὶ τῶν οἴκων (bis) for διαθήσομαι τῷ οίκῳ in v.31, reads λέγει for φησίν in v.32 and v.33, alters διεθέμην into ἐστίναι (Q*), and follows B in reading ἐπὶ κ. αὐτῶν before the verb (v.34), and πολιτήν...ἀδελφὸν in v.34, as well as in omitting καὶ δ. αὐτοῖς (Α Ν) in the former verse; in v.34 he reads εἰδόθωσιν (Q) instead of

1 όυ μὴ only occurs in Hebrews in quotations (here, 1017 135); out of about ninety-six occurrences in the NT, only eight are with the future.
iōnous, the forms of ωδιν and εδων being repeatedly confused (cp. Thackeray, 278). These minor changes may be partly due to the fact that he is quoting from memory. In some cases his own text has been conformed to other versions of the LXX; e.g. A D Ψ boh restore μου in v. 10, N* K vg Clem. Chrys. read καρδίαν (with N in LXX), though the singular1 is plainly a con-
formation to διαθήκην ("Für den Plural sprechen ausser A D L noch B, wo nur das C in e verschrieben und daraus ετι καρδία εαυτών geworden ist, und P, wo der Dat. in den Acc. verwandelt," B. Weiss in Texte u. Untersuchungen, xiv. 3. 16, 55); B Ψ arm revive the LXX (B) variant γράφω: the LXX (Q) variant πλησίον is substituted for πολίτην by P vg syr εικ. jed. 38. 206. 218. 226. 257. 547. 642. 1288. 1311. 1912, etc. Cyril, and the LXX (B Q κ) αὐτῶν restored after μικρόθεν by D* Ψ syr boh eth, etc. On the other hand, a trait like the reading ἑστήκας in the LXX text of Q* may be due to the influence of Hebrews itself. The addition of καὶ τῶν ἀνωμιῶν αὐτῶν after or before καὶ τῶν ἀμαρηίων αὐτῶν in v. 12 is a homiletic gloss from 1012, though strongly entrenched in N° A C D K L Ψ 6. 104. 326, etc. vg pesh arm Clem.

Συντελέσω διαθήκην, a literary LXX variant for τούτων διαθήκην, recalls the phrase συντελέσω διαθήκην (Jer 418 (348)), and, as 12
(νέας διαθήκης) shows, the writer draws no distinction between καινός and νέος (v. 8). In v. 9 the genitive absolute (ἐπιλαβομένου μου) after ἡμέρα, instead of εν ἠ ἐπιλαβομένην (as Justin correctly puts it, Dial. xi.), is a Hellenistic innovation, due here to translation, but paralleled in Bar 228 ἐν ἡμέρα ἐπιλαβομένου σου αὐτῶ); in δὴ (causal only here and in v. 10). . . ἐνεμένα, the latter is our "abide by," in the sense of obey or practise, exactly as in Isokrates, κατὰ τῶν Σοφιστῶν, 20: οὐς εἰ τίς ἐπὶ τῶν πράξεων ἐμμεμεινεν. Bengel has a crisp comment on αὖτοι . . . κάγα here and on ἐσομαι . . . καὶ αὐτοί ("correlata . . . sed ratione inverse; populus fecerat initium tollendi foederis prius, in novo omnibus incipit et perfect Deus"); and, as it happens, there is a dramatic contrast between ἡμέρα here and the only other use of the verb in this epistle (23). In v. 10 δίδους, by the omission of δῶσω, is left hanging in the air; but (cp. Moulton, 222) such participles could be taken as finite verbs in popular Greek of the period (cp. e.g. χειροτονθείσις in 2 Co 810). The καὶνή διαθήκη is to be on entirely fresh lines, not a mere revival of the past; it is to realize a knowledge of God which is inward and intuitive (vv. 10.11). There is significance in the promise, καὶ ἐσομαι αὖτοις . . . εἰς λαὸν. A διαθήκη was always between God and his people, and this had been the object even of the former διαθήκη (Ex. 67); now it is to be realized at last. Philo's sentence ("even if we are sluggish, however, He is not sluggish about taking to Himself those who are fit for His service; for He says, 'I will take you to be a people for myself, and I will be your God,'" De Sacrific. Abelis et Caini, 26) is an apt comment; but our author, who sees the new διαθήκη fulfilled in Christianity, has

1 That eti takes the accusative here is shown by 1018; καρδίς cannot be the genitive singular alongside of an accusative.
his own views about how such a promise and purpose was attainable, for while the oracle ignores the sacrificial ritual altogether, he cannot conceive any pardon apart from sacrifice, nor any διαθήκη apart from a basal sacrifice. These ideas he is to develop in his next paragraphs, for it is the closing promise of pardon 1 which is to him the supreme boon. Meanwhile, before passing on to explain how this had been mediated by Jesus, he (v.13) drives home the truth of the contrast between old and new (see Introd., p. xxxix). 'Ἐν τῷ λέγειν (same construction as in 28)—when the word καινήν (sc. διαθήκην) was pronounced, it sealed the doom of the old διαθήκη. Παλαιός (πεπαλαιώκε) in this transitive sense ("he hath abrogated," Tyndale) is known to the LXX (Job 95, La 3, both times of God in action); γνάφακειν is practically equivalent to μαραίνεσθαι, and implies decay (see Wilamowitz on Eur. Herakles, 1223). The two words ἐγγὺς (as in 68 ἀφανισμός, at the end of the paragraph, sound like the notes of a knell, though they have no contemporary reference; the writer simply means that the end of the old διαθήκη was at hand (p. xxii). The new would soon follow, as it had done ἐν τῷ (1). The verb ἀφανίζειν (-εσθαι) is applied to legislation (e.g., Lysias, 868, τὴν ἑπέτεραν νομοθεσίαν ἀφανίζοντας) in the sense of abolition, lapsing or falling into desuetude, Dion. Hal. Ant. iii. 178, ἂς (i.e. Numa's laws) ἀφανισθήμενος συνήβη τῷ χρόνῳ, the opposite of ἀφανίζειν being γράφειν (ibid. ix. 608, κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, οὐς οὐ νεωτί δεσπέζει γράφειν πάλαι γὰρ ἐγράφησαν, καὶ εὐθείας αὐτοῖς ἡφανίζει χρόνος), and the sense of disappearance in ἀφανισμός appears already in the LXX (e.g. Jer 2837 καὶ ἔτων Βαβυλῶν ἐς ἀφανισμόν).

But the new διαθήκη is also superior to the old by its sacrifice (91f.), sacrifice being essential to any forgiveness such as has been promised. The older διαθήκη had its sanctuary and ritual (vv.1-5), but even these (vv.6f.) indicated a defect.

1 The first covenant had indeed its regulations for worship and a material sanctuary. 2 A tent was set up (κατασκευάσου as in 3), the outer tent, containing the lampstand, the table, and the loaves of the Presence; this is called the Holy place. 3 But behind (μετὰ only here in NT of place) the second veil was the tent called the Holy of Holies, containing the golden altar of incense, and also the ark of the covenant covered all over with gold, which held the golden pot of manna, the rod of Aaron that once blossomed, and the tablets of the covenant; 4 above this were the cherubim of the Glory overshadowing the mercy-seat—matters which (i.e. all in 2-5) it is impossible for me to discuss at present in detail.

1 Wit: τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν ὡς μη μεταβώ εἰς compare the parable of R. Jochanan and R. Eliezer on God's readiness to forget the sinful nature of his servants: "There is a parable concerning a king of flesh and blood, who said to his servants, Build me a great palace on the dunghill. They went and built it for him. It was not thenceforward the king's pleasure to remember the dunghill which had been there." (Chagiga, 10 a. i. 27).
The καινὴ διαθήκη of 87-13 had been realized by the arrival of Christ (911); hence the older διαθήκη was superseded, and the writer speaks of it in the past tense, εἶχε. As for ἡ πρώτη (sc. διαθήκη) of which he has been just speaking (813), the antithesis of the entire passage is between ἡ πρώτη διαθήκη (vv.1-10) and ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη (vv.11-22), as is explicitly stated in v.15. The καὶ (om. B 38. 206*, 216*, 489. 547. 1739. 1827 boh pesh Origen) before ἡ πρώτη emphasizes the fact that the old had this in common with the new, viz. worship and a sanctuary. This is, of course, out of keeping with the Jeremianic oracle of the new διαθήκη, which does not contemplate any such provision, but the writer takes a special view of διαθήκη which involves a celestial counterpart to the ritual provisions of the old order.

The former διαθήκη, then, embraced δικαιώματα, i.e. regulations, as in Lk 16 and 1 Mac 21. 32 (Ἄλεως ἡμῖν καταλαίπησαν νόμον καὶ δικαιώματα τῶν νόμων τοῦ βασιλέως οὐκ ἄκουσιμεθα, παρελθεῖν την λατρείαν ἡμῶν), rather than rights or privileges (as, e.g., O.P. 111915 τῶν ἐκαρέτων τής ἡμετέρας πατρίδος δικαώματων), arrangements for the cultus. Λατρείας grammatically might be accusative plural (as in v.8), but is probably the genitive, after δικαιώματα, which it defines. Λατρεία or (as spelt in W) λατρεία (cp. Thackeray, 87) is the cultus (Ro 9), or any specific part of it (Ex 12). The close connexion between worship and a sanctuary (already in 82-8) leads to the addition of τὸ τε (as in 18 65) ἀγιον κοσμικῶν. By τὸ ἄγιον the author means the entire sanctuary (so, e.g., Ex 36, Nū 3), not the innermost sacred shrine or ἄγιον ἀγιῶν. This is clear. What is not so clear is the meaning of κοσμικῶν, and the meaning of its position after the noun without an article. Primarily κοσμικός here as in Ti 212 (τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας) is an equivalent for ἐπὶ γῆς (83), i.e. mundane or material, as opposed to ἐπουράνιον or οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως (v.11). A fair parallel to this occurs in Test. Jos. 17, διὰ τὴν κοσμικὴν μονὰ δοξάν. But did our author use it with a further suggestion? It would have been quite irrelevant to his purpose to suggest the “public” aspect of the sanctuary, although Jews like Philo and Josephus might speak of the temple as κοσμικός in this sense, i.e. in contrast to synagogues and προσευχαι, which were of local importance (Philo, ad Caium. 1019), or simply as a place of public worship (e.g. Jos. Bell. iv. 5. 2, τῆς κοσμικῆς θρησκείας κατάρχοντας, προσκυνομένους τε τοὺς ἐκ τῆς οἰκουμενῆς παραβάλλονσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν). Neither would our author have called the sanctuary κοσμικός as symbolic of the κόσμος, though Philo (Vit. Mosis, iii. 3-10) and Josephus (Ant. iii. 6. 4, iii. 7. 7, ἐκατό τὰ ὄντα εἰς ἀπομιμήσιν καὶ διατύπωσιν τῶν ὅλων) also play with this fancy. He views the sanctuary as a dim representation of the divine sanctuary, not
of the universe. Yet he might have employed κοσμικόν in a similar sense, if we interpret the obscure phrase μυστήριον κοσμικόν ἐκκλησίας in Did. 111 (see the notes of Dr. C. Taylor and Dr. Rendel Harris in their editions) as a spiritual or heavenly idea, “depicted in the world of sense by emblematic actions or material objects,” “a symbol or action wrought upon the stage of this world to illustrate what was doing or to be done on a higher plane.” Thus, in the context of the Didache, marriage would be a μυστήριον κοσμικόν (cp. Eph 5:22) of the spiritual relation between Christ and his church. This early Christian usage may have determined the choice of κοσμικόν here, the sanctuary being κοσμικόν because it is the material representation or parabolic outward expression of the true, heavenly sanctuary. But at best it is a secondary suggestion; unless κοσμικόν could be taken as “ornamented,” the controlling idea is that the sanctuary and its ritual were external and material (δικαιώματα σαρκός, χειροποιητόν, χειροποιήτα). The very position of κοσμικόν denotes, as often in Greek, a stress such as might be conveyed in English by “a sanctuary, material indeed.”

The άγιον is now described (v.2f.), after Ex 25–26. It consisted of two parts, each called a σκηνή. The large outer tent, the first (ἡ πρώτη) to be entered, was called "Αγια (neut. plur., not fem. sing.). The phrase, ἢ τις λέγεται άγια 1 would have been in a better position immediately after ἡ πρώτη, where, indeed, Chrysostom (followed by Blass) reads it, instead of after the list of the furniture. The lampstand stood in front (to the south) of the sacred table on which twelve loaves or cakes of wheaten flour were piled (ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἅρτων = οἱ ἅρτοι τῆς πρόθεσιος), the Hebrew counterpart of the well-known lectisternia: ἡ τράπεζα ... ἅρτων is a hendiadys for “the table with its loaves of the Presence.” Such was the furniture of the outer σκηνή. Then (vv.3–5) follows a larger catalogue (cp. Joma 24) of what lay inside the inner shrine (άγια άγιων) behind the curtain (Ex 27:18) which screened this from the outer tent, and which is called δεύτερον καταπέτασμα, δεύτερον, because the first was a curtain hung at the entrance to the larger tent, and καταπέτασμα, either because that is the term used in Ex 26:8f. (the particular passage the writer has in mind here), the term elsewhere being usually κάλυμμα or ἑπισταστρον (Ex 26:8f. etc.), or because Philo had expressly distinguished the outer curtain as κάλυμμα, the inner as καταπέτασμα (de vita Mosis, iii. 9). This inner shrine contained (v.4) χρυσοὺν θυμίαμα, i.e. a wooden box, overlaid with gold, on which incense (θυμίαμα) was offered twice daily by the priests. The LXX calls this θυσιαστήριον τοῦ θυμίαματος (Ex 30:1–10), but our writer follows the usage of Philo, which is also,

1 Τὰ Ἁγία (B arm) is an attempt to reproduce exactly the LXX phrase.
on the whole, that of Josephus, in calling it θυματήριον (so Symm. Theodotion, Ex 30:1 31:8); θυματήριον, in the non-biblical papyri, denotes articles like censers in a sanctuary, but is never used in the LXX of levitical censers, though Josephus occasionally describes them thus, like the author of 4 Mac 7:11. The ordinary view was that this θυματήριον stood beside the λυχνία and the sacred τράπεζα in the outer sanctuary. Both Philo (e.g. quis rer. div. 46, τριῶν δότων ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις σκευέων, λυχνίας, τραπέζης, θυματηρίου: de vita Mos. iii. 9 f., in the outer tent, τὰ λουτὰ τριά σκευή... μέσον μὲν τὸ θυματήριον... τὴν δὲ λυχνίαν... ἡ δὲ τράπεζα) and Josephus (Ant. iii. 6. 4 f.; cp. viii. 4. 1 for the reproduction in Solomon’s temple) are quite explicit on this. Indeed no other position was possible for an altar which required daily service from the priests; inside the ἁγία τῶν ἁγίων it would have been useless. But another tradition, which appears in the contemporary (Syriac) apocalypse of Baruch (67), placed the altar of incense1 inside the ἁγία ἁγίων, a view reflected as early as the Samaritan text of the pentateuch, which put Ex 30:1-10 (the description of the altar of incense) after 26:85, where logically it ought to stand, inserting a τιμήτωρ in Ex 40:27 (where the altar of incense is placed “before the veil”). The earliest hint of this tradition seems to be given in the Hebrew text of 1 K 6:22, where Solomon is said to have overlaid with gold “the altar that is by the oracle” (i.e. the ἁγία ἁγίων). But our author could not have been influenced by this, for it is absent from the LXX text. His inaccuracy was rendered possible by the vague language of the pentateuch about the position of the altar of incense, ἀπειναντί τοῦ καταπετάσματος τοῦ ὄντος ἐπὶ τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῶν μαρτυρίων (Ex 30:6), where ἀπειναντί may mean “opposite” or “close in front of” the curtain—but on which side of it? In Ex 37 the τράπεζα, the λυχνία, and the altar of incense are described successively after the items in the ἁγία ἁγίων; but then the LXX did not contain the section on the altar of incense, so that this passage offered no clue to our writer. In Ex 40:6 it is merely put ἐναντίον τῆς κιβωτοῦ. This vagueness is due to the fact that in the original source the sketch of the σκηνή had no altar of incense at all; the latter is a later accretion, hence the curious position of Ex 30:1-10 in a sort of appendix, and the ambiguity about its site.

After all it is only an antiquarian detail for our author. It has been suggested that he regarded the ἁγία τῶν ἁγίων, irrespective of the veil, as symbolizing the heavenly sanctuary, and that he therefore thought it must include the altar of incense as symbolizing the prayers of the saints. But there is no trace of such a symbolism elsewhere in the epistle; it is confined to the author of the Apocalypse (530). The suggestion that he meant ἐχουσα

1 Whether the language means this or a censer is disputed.
to express only a close or ideal connexion between the inner shrine and the altar of incense, is popular (e.g. Delitzsch, Zahn, Peake, Seeberg) but quite unacceptable; θυματήριον as applied to the other items could not mean this, and what applies to them applies to the θυματήριον. Besides, the point of the whole passage is to distinguish between the contents of the two compartments. Still less tenable is the idea that θυματήριον really means “censer” or “incense pan.” This way out of the difficulty was started very early (in the peshitta, the vulgate), but a censer is far too minor a utensil to be included in this inventory; even the censer afterwards used on atonement-day did not belong to the ἄγια τῶν ἄγιων, neither was it golden. What the σκηνή had was merely a brazier (πυρεῖον, Lv 16:12). Since it is not possible that so important an object as the altar of incense could have been left out, we may assume without much hesitation that the writer did mean to describe it by θυματήριον, and that the irregularity of placing it on the wrong side of the curtain is simply another of his inaccuracies in describing what he only knew from the text of the LXX. In B the slip is boldly corrected by the transference of (καί) χρυσόσων θυματήριον to v. immediately after ἄρτων (so Blass).

The second item is τὸν κιβώτον τῆς διαθήκης covered with gold all over (πάντοθεν: Philo’s phrase is οἴνοδον καὶ ξύλωδεν, de Ebriet. 21), a chest or box about 4 feet long and 2½ feet broad and high (Ex 25:10f.), which held three sacred treasures, (a) the golden pot (στάμνος, Attic feminine) of manna (Ex 16:32-34); (b) Aaron’s rod ή βλαστήσασα (in the story of Nu 17:1-11, which attested the sacerdotal monopoly of the clan of Levi); and (c) αἱ πλάκας τῆς διαθήκης (Ex 25:16f. 31:18), i.e. the two stone tablets on which the decalogue was written (πλάκας διαθήκης, Dt 9:9; εὐβαλον τὰς πλάκας εἰς τὸν κιβώτον, 10:5), the decalogue summarizing the terms of the διαθήκη for the People. In adding χρυσὴ to στάμνος the writer follows the later tradition of the LXX and of Philo (de congressu, 18); the pot is not golden in the Hebrew original. He also infers, as later Jewish tradition did, that the ark contained this pot, although, like Aaron’s rod, it simply lay in front of the ark (Ex 16:33. 34, Nu 17:10). He would gather from 1 K 8:9 that the ark contained the tablets of the covenant. He then (v.5) mentions the χερουβείν (Aramaic form) or χερουβείμ (Hebrew form) δόξης, two small winged figures (Ex 25:18-20), whose pinions extended over a rectangular gold slab, called τὸ ιλαστήριον, laid on the top of the ark, which it fitted exactly. They are called cherubim Δόξης, which is like Μεγαλωσύνης (1:8) a divine title, applied to Jesus in Ja 21, but here used as in Ro 9:4. The cherubim on the ιλαστήριον represented the divine Presence as accessible in mercy; the mystery of this is suggested by the couplet in Sir 49:10:

"Iēzekiyl, ὃς εἶδεν ὄρασιν Δόξης ἦν ὑπεδείξειν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ ἄρματος χερουβείμ." 

1 The change from ἐν ἢ to ἥχοσα is purely stylistic, and ἥχοσα in both instances means “containing.”
2 χρυσόσων θυματήριον lacks the article, like στάμνος χρυσῆ.
Philo's account of ἱλαστήριον is given in de vita Mosis, iii. 8, ἡ δὲ κιβωτός . . . κεχυσμενή πολυτέλως ἐνδοθέν τε καὶ ἐξωθεν, ἡς ἐπίθεμα ὡσανεὶ πόμα τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἱλαστήριον . . . ὅπερ ἐσκεῖν ἐναι σύμβολον φυσικότερον μὲν τῆς ἱερ. τοῦ θεοῦ διάνομεως. Lower down, in the same paragraph, he speaks of τὸ ἐπίθημα τὸ προσαγορευόμενον ἱλαστήριον, and τὸ ἱλαστήριον is similarly used in De Cherub. 8 (on the basis of Ex 25:19). The ἐπίθημα or covering of the ark was splashed with blood on atonement-day; perhaps, even apart from that, its Hebrew original meant "means of propitiation," and was not incorrectly named ἱλαστήριον (cp. Deissmann in EBi. 3027-3035), but our author simply uses it in its LXX sense of "mercy-seat." He does not enter into any details about its significance; in his scheme of sacrificial thought such a conception had no place. Philo also allegorizes the overshadowing wings of the cherubim as a symbol of God's creative and royal powers protecting the cosmos, and explains Ex 25:22 as follows (Quaest. in Exod. 25:22): τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὴν κιβωτόν κατὰ μέρος ἐρήτησα, δε ὡς συνιδήσαν ἀνοικήτως ἀνάλαβετο τοῦ γνώμησαι χάριν τίνων ταύτα ἐστι ιδίον δυσέλθετεν δὲ ταύτα συμβολικά· κιβωτός καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ θησαυριζόμενα νόμιμα καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτης τὸ ἱλαστήριον καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱλαστήριου Χαλδαίων γλώσσης λεγόμενα χρεωμέν, ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων κατὰ τὸ μέσον φωνῆ καὶ λόγου καὶ ὑπεράνων ὁ λόγος κτλ. But our author does not enter into any such details. He has no time for further discussion of the furniture, he observes; whether he would have allegorized these items of antiquarian ritual, if or when he had leisure, we cannot tell. The only one he does employ mystically is the καταπέτασμα (10:20), and his use of it is not particularly happy. He now breaks off, almost as Philo does (quae rer. div. 45, πολίν δ' ὄντα τὸν περὶ ἱκάστου λόγον ὑπερθέτειν εἰσόδιος) on the same subject. Κατὰ μέρος is the ordinary literary phrase in this connexion (e.g. 2 Mac 2:30; Polybius, i. 67. 11, περὶ ὧν οὐχ ὄντων τέ διὰ τῆς γραφῆς τὸν κατὰ μέρος ἀποδοθοῦν οἱ λόγον, and Poimandres [ed. Reitzenstein, p. 84] περὶ ὧν κατὰ μέρος λόγος ἐστι πολύς). Οὐκ ἐστιν as in 1 Co 11:20. Worship in a sanctuary like this shows that access to God was defective (vv.6-8), as was inevitable when the sacrifices were external (vv.8-10). Having first shown this, the writer gets back to the main line of his argument (8:2), viz. the sacrifice of Jesus as pre-eminent and final (v.11f.).

6 Such were the arrangements for worship. The priests constantly enter the first tent (v.4) in the discharge of their ritual duties, 7 but the second tent is entered only once a year by the highpriest alone—and it must not be without blood, which he presents on behalf of (cp. 5:1) himself and the errors of the People. 8 By this the holy Spirit means that the way into the Holiest Presence was not yet disclosed so long as the first tent (which foreshadowed the present age) was still standing, with its offerings of gifts and sacrifices which cannot (μή as in 4) possibly make the conscience of the worshipper
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perfect, since they relate (sc. ὁδοὺς) merely to food and drink and a variety of ablutions—outward regulations for the body, that only hold till the period of the New Order.

In v. 6 διὰ πάντως = continually, as in Β.Μ. i. 426 (ii B.C.) οἱ ἐν ὀίκῳ πάντες συν διαπάντως μείειν ποιοῦμενοι. Ἐπιτελοῦν (which might even be the present with a futuristic sense, the writer placing himself and his readers back at the inauguration of the sanctuary: "Now, this being all ready, the priests will enter," etc.) ἐπιτελοῦντες (a regular sacerdotal or ritual term in Philo) λατρείας (morning and evening, to trim the lamps and offer incense on the golden altar, Ex 27 21 30 7 , etc.; weekly, to change the bread of the Presence, Lv 24 8 f , Jos. Ant. iii. 6. 6). The ritual of the inner shrine (v. 8) is now described (v. 7, cp. Joma 5 3 ); the place is entered by the highpriest ἀπάξ τοῦ ἑνωμυτοῦ, on the annual day of atonement (Lv 16 29 34 , Ex 30 10 ); only once, and he must be alone (μόνος, Lv 16 17 ), this one individual out of all the priests. Even he dare not enter χώρις ἀματος (Lv 16 14 f ), i.e. without carrying in blood from the sacrifice offered for his own and the nation’s ἀναγνώματων. In Gn 43 12 ἀνόημα is "an oversight," but in Ἰέ 5 20 Ἰόβ 3 8 , Ι Μακ 13 30 , Σίρ 23 2 ἀνοίγματα and "sins" are bracketed together (see above on 5 2 ), and the word occurs alone in Polyb. xxxviii. i. 5 as an equivalent for "offences" or "errors" in the moral sense. There is no hint that people were not responsible for them, or that they were not serious; on the contrary, they had to be atoned for. Ὑπέρ κτλ.; for a similarly loose construction cp. 1 Ἰην 2 2 (οὐ περὶ ἡμετέρων [ἀμαρτίων] δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου).

Rabbi Ismael b. Elischa, the distinguished exegete of i-ii A.D., classified sins as follows (Tos. Joma 5 3 ): Transgressions of positive enactments were atoned for by repentance, involving a purpose of new obedience, according to Jer 22 28 ("Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings"). The day of atonement, however, was necessary for the full pardon of offences against divine prohibitions: according to Lv 16 20 ("On that day shall the priest make atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins"). An offender whose wrongdoing deserved severe or capital punishment could only be restored by means of sufferings: according to Ps 86 2 ("Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes"). But desecration of the divine Name could not be atoned for by any of these three methods; death alone wiped out this sin (Jer 24 6 ).

The author now (v. 8) proceeds to find a spiritual significance in this ceremonial. Δηλοῦντος is used of a divine meaning as in 12 27 , here conveyed by outward facts. In Π 11 the verb is again used of the Spirit, and this is the idea here; Josephus (Ant. iii. 7. 7, δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην τῶν σαρδουκίων ἐκάτεροι) uses the same verb for the mystic significance of the jewels worn by the highpriest, but our author’s interpretation of the significance of the σκηνή is naturally very different from that.
of Josephus, who regards the unapproachable character of the ἀδυνατον or inner shrine as symbolizing heaven itself (Ant. iii. 6. 4 and 7. 7, ὅ τοῖς ἵερεσιν ἦν ἄβατον, ὃς οὐφανδὼς ἄνετο τῷ θεῷ . . . διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν οὐφανᾶν ἁνεπίβατον εἶναι ἀνθρώποις). For ὄνομα with gen. in sense of "way to," cp. Gn 3:24 (τὴν ὀδόν τοῦ ἕλιου τῆς ἔως), Jg 5:14 (ἐλι οὗν τοῦ Σινᾶ). Τῶν ἃγίων here (like τὰ ἃγια in vv.12, 25, cp. 13:11) as in 10:19 means the very Presence of God, an archaic liturgical phrase suggested by the context. The word φανεροῦσαι was not found by the writer in his text of the LXX; it only occurs in the LXX in Jer 40 (33:6), and the Latin phrase "iter patefieri" (e.g. Caesar, de Bello Gall. iii. 1) is merely a verbal parallel. In τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἔχων ἑαυτόν στάσιν (v.9), the writer has chosen στάσιν for the sake of assonance with ἐνεστηκότα, but ἔχειν στάσιν is a good Greek phrase for "to be in existence." The parenthesis ἦτε 1 παραβολή (here = τῦπος, as Chrysostom saw) εἰς τῶν καιρῶν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα means that the first σκηνή was merely provisional, as it did no more than adumbrate the heavenly reality, and provisional εἰς (as in Ac 4:5 εἰς τὴν αἰρόν) τῶν καιρῶν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, i.e. the period in which the writer and his readers lived, the period inaugurated by the advent of Jesus with his new διαθήκη. This had meant the supersession of the older διαθήκη with its sanctuary and διακάθαρμα, which only lasted μέχρι καιροῦ διαρθόων. But, so long as they lasted, they were intended by God to foreshadow the permanent order of religion; they were, as the writer says later (v.23), ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐφαναῖς, mere copies but still copies. This is why he calls the fore-tent a παραβολή. For now, as he adds triumphantly, in a daring, imaginative expression, our ἀρχιερεύς has passed through his heavenly fore-tent (v.11), and his heavenly sanctuary corresponds to a heavenly (i.e. a full and final) sacrifice. In the levitical ritual the highpriest on atonement-day took the blood of the victim through the fore-tent into the inner shrine. Little that accomplished! It was but a dim emblem of what our highpriest was to do and has done, in the New Order of things.

When readers failed to see that ἦτε . . . ἐνεστηκότα was a parenthesis, it was natural that καθ' ἦν should be changed into καθ' ἐν (De K L P, so Blass).

The failure of animal sacrifices (9b-10) lies κατὰ συνείδησιν. As the inner consciousness here is a consciousness of sin, "conscience" fairly represents the Greek term συνείδησις. Now, the levitical sacrifices were ineffective as regards the conscience of worshippers; they were merely ἐπὶ θεῶν καὶ σώματι καὶ διαφόρους βαπτισμοῖς, a striking phrase (cp. 13:9) of scorn for the mass of things.

1 Sc. ἦν. The construction was explained by the addition of καθέστηκεν after ἐνεστηκότα (so 69. 104. 330. 436. 440. 462. 491. 823. 1319. 1836. 1837. 1898. 2005. 2127, etc.).
minute regulations about what might or might not be eaten or drunk, and about baths, etc. Food and ablutions are intelligible; a book like Leviticus is full of regulations about them. But πόρμαν;? Well, the writer adds this as naturally as the author of Ep. Aristeas does, in describing the levitical code. “I suppose most people feel some curiosity about the enactments of our law περὶ τῶν βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν” (128); it was to safeguard us from pagan defilement that παντὸθν ἡμᾶς περιέφραξεν ἡγείαις καὶ διὰ βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν (142), ἐπὶ τῶν βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν ἀπαρξαμένους εὐθέως τότε συγχρησθαι κελεύει (158). It is curious that this defence of the levitical code contains an allusion which is a verbal parallel to our writer’s disparaging remark here; the author asserts that intelligent Egyptian priests call the Jews “men of God,” a title only applicable to one who σέβεται τὸν κατὰ ἄληθειαν θεόν, since all others are ἄθρωποι βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν καὶ σκέπτης, ἢ γὰρ πάσα διάθεσις αὐτῶν ἐπὶ ταῦτα καταφεύγει. τοὺς δὲ παρ’ ἡμῶν ἐν οὐδενί ταῦτα λελόγισται (140. 141). Libations of wine accompanied certain levitical sacrifices (e.g. Nu 5:15 6:15.17 28f.), but no ritual regulations were laid down for them, and they were never offered independently (cp. EBii. 4193, 4209). It is because the whole question of sacrifice is now to be restated that he throws in these disparaging comments upon the δῶρα τοῦ καὶ θυσίας and their accompaniments in the older ἁγιη. Such sacrifices were part and parcel of a system connected with (v. 10) external ritual, and in concluding the discussion he catches up the term with which he had opened it: all such rites are δικαιώματα σαρκός, connected with the sensuous side of life and therefore provisional, μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα. Here ἐπικείμενα is “prescribed,” as in the description of workmen on strike, in Tebt. P. 267f. (114 B.C.) ἐγκαταλείπωσας τὴν ἐπικείμενην ἀσχολίαν. Διορθώσεις means a “reconstruction” of religion, such as the new διαθήκη (818) involved; the use of the term in Polybius, iii. 118. 12 (πρὸς τῶν πολιτευμάτων διορθώσεις) indicates how our author could seize on it for his own purposes.

The comma might be omitted after βαπτισμοῦς, and δικαιώματα taken closely with μόνον: “gifts and sacrifices, which (μόνον καλ. in apposition) are merely (the subject of) outward regulations for the body,” ἐπὶ being taken as cumulative (Lk 3:28)—“besides,” etc. This gets over the difficulty that the levitical offerings had a wider scope than food, drink, and ablutions; but ἐπὶ is not natural in this sense here, and ἐπὶ . . . βαπτισμοῦς is not a parenthetical clause. The insertion of καὶ before δικαιώματα (by καὶ Β Δ etc. vg hkl Chrys.), = “even” or “in particular” (which is the only natural sense), is pointless. Δικαιώματον (D K L vg hkl) was an easy conformation to the previous dative, which would logically involve ἐπικείμενοι (as the vg implies: “et justitiis carnis usque ad tempus correctionis impositis”), otherwise ἐπικείμενα would be extremely awkward, after δυνάμεια, in apposition to δῶρα τε καὶ θυσίας.

Now for the better sanctuary and especially the better sacrifice of Christ as our ἀρχιερεύς (vv.11-28)!
11 But when Christ arrived as the highpriest of the bliss that was to be, he passed through the greater and more perfect tent which no hands had made (no part, that is to say, of the present order), 12 not (οὐδὲ = nor yet) taking any blood of goats and calves but his own blood, and entered once for all into the Holy place. He secured an eternal redemption. 13 For if the blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkled on defiled persons, give them a holiness that bears on bodily purity, 14 how much more shall (καθότερον, logical future) the blood of Christ, who in the spirit of the eternal offered himself as an unblemished sacrifice to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve a living God."

This paragraph consists of two long sentences (vv.11, 12, 13, 14). The second is an explanation of αὐτῶν λύτρων εὑρόμενος at the close of the first. In the first, the sphere, the action, and the object of the sacrifice are noted, as a parallel to vv.6, 7; but in vv.13, 14 the sphere is no longer mentioned, the stress falling upon the other two elements. The writer does not return to the question of the sphere till vv.21ff.

Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος (v.11). But Christ came on the scene, 1 and all was changed. He arrived as ἅρματος, and the author carries on the thought by an imaginative description of him passing through the upper heavens (no hand-made, mundane fore-court this!) into the innermost Presence. It is a more detailed account of what he had meant by ἐξοντες ἅρματα μέγαν διελθόντα τοὺς ὁδρανοὺς (4, 14). Χειροποίητον, like χειροποίητη (v.24), means "manufactured," not "fictitious" (as applied to idols or idol-temples by the LXX and Philo). Τοῦτο έστιν οὐ θατής τῆς κτίσεως reads like the gloss of a scribe, but the writer is fond of this phrase τοῦτο έστιν, and, though it adds nothing to οὐ χειροποίητον, it may stand. Κτίσις, in this sense of creation or created order, was familiar to him (e.g. Wis 5:17 19:6). Μελλόντων, before ἄγαθῶν, was soon altered into γενομένων (by B D* 1611. 1739. 2005 vet syr Orig. Chrys.), either owing to a scribe being misled by παραγενόμενως or owing to a pious feeling that μελλόντων here (though not in 10:1) was too eschatological. The ἄγαθα were μέλλοντα in a sense even for Christians, but already they had begun to be realized; e.g. in the λύτρωσις. This full range was still to be disclosed (2:5 13:14), but they were realities of which Christians had here and now some vital experience (see on 65).

Some editors (e.g. Rendall, Nairne) take τῶν γενομένων ἄγαθῶν with what follows, as if the writer meant to say that "Christ appeared as highpriest of the good things which came by the greater and more perfect tabernacle (not made with hands—that is, not of this creation)." This involves, (a) the interpretation of οὐδὲ as = "not by the blood of goats and calves either," the term carrying on παραγενόμενος; and (b) διά in a double sense. There is no objection to (b), but (a) is weak; the bliss and benefit are mediated not through the sphere but through what Jesus does in the sphere of the eternal σκηνή. Others (e.g. Westcott, von Soden, Dods, Seeberg) take διὰ τῆς

---

1 Παραγενόμενος (as Lk 12:61, Mt 3:1 suggest) is more active than the πεφανέρωται of v.28.
IX. 11-13. ] THE NEW AND TRUE SACRIFICE

σκηνής with Χριστός, "Christ by means of the ... sanctuary." This sense of διὰ is better than that of (a) above, and it keeps διὰ the same for vv. 11 and 12. But the context (παραγεγράμμενοι ... εἰσήλθεν) points to the local use of διὰ in διὰ τῆς ... σκηνῆς, rather than to the instrumental; and it is no objection that the writer immediately uses διὰ in another sense (διὰ αἵματος), for this is one of his literary methods (cp. διὰ with gen. and accus. in 21: 2 28. 107 18. 19. 23. 24. 25).

Continuing the description of Christ's sacrifice, he adds (v. 12) ὁδὸς δι' αἵματος τράγων (for the People) καὶ μόσχων (for himself), which according to the programme in Lv 16 the priest smeared on the east side of the ἱλαστήριον. The later Jewish procedure is described in the Mishna tractate Joma, but our author simply draws upon the LXX text, though (like Aquila and Symmachus) he uses μόσχων instead of χίμαρων. Διὰ is graphically used in διὰ τοῦ ἱδίου αἵματος, as in διὰ αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων, but the idea is the self-sacrifice, the surrender of his own life, in virtue of which he redeemed his People, the αἷμα or sacrifice being redemptive as it was his. The single sacrifice had eternal value, owing to his personality. The term ἐφάπαξ, a stronger form of ἀπαξεῖς, which is unknown to the LXX, is reserved by our author for the sacrifice of Jesus, which he now describes as issuing in a λύτρωσις—an archaic religious term which he never uses elsewhere; it is practically the same as ἀπολύτρωσις (v. 15), but he puts it into a much deeper meaning than the LXX or than Luke (1: 68 2: 28), the only other NT writer who employs the term. Though he avoids the verb, his meaning is really that of 1 P 1: 18 (ἐλυτρώθη τιμῶν αἵματι ὁ πάντων τόμον καὶ αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ) or of Ti 2: 14 (δι' ἑαυτῶν έκκόμην ἐπέρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λύτρωσίηται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον).

In this compressed phrase, ἀλωνίαν λύτρωσιν εἰρήμενος, (a) alowian offers the only instance of ἀλῶνιος being modified in this epistle. (b) Εὐρήμενος, in the sense of Dion. Hal. Ant. v. 293 (ὀθέν διαλλαγάς εὑράτω τοῖς ἀνδρῶν καὶ κάθοδον), and Jos. Ant. i. 19. 1 (πάππου δόξαν ἀριεῖς μεγάλης εἰρήμενου), is a participle (for its form, cp. Moulton, i. p. 51), which, though middle, is not meant to suggest any personal effort like "by himself," much less "for himself"; the middle in Hellenistic Greek had come to mean what the active meant. What he secured, he secured for us (cp. Aelian, Var. Hist. iii. 17, καὶ αὐτῶν σωτηριαν εὑράτω). The aorist has not a past sense; it either means "to secure" (like εὑρήμενοι in 4 Mac 3: 16 and ἐπισκεψάμενοι in 2 Mac 11: 29), after a verb of motion (cp. Ac 25: 28), or "securing" (by what grammarians call "coincident action").

The last three words of v. 12 are now (vv. 18. 14) explained by an a fortiori argument. Why was Christ's redemption eternal? What gave it this absolute character and final force? In v. 13

1 The διὰ here as in διὰ παύειματος alowlou suggest the state in which a certain thing is done, and inferentially the use becomes instrumental, as we say, "he came in power."
2 The Attic form εὐρήμενος is preferred by D* 226. 436. 920.
Greek text:

τράγων καὶ ταύρων reverses the order in 10; and ταύρων is now substituted for μόσχων. The former led to ταύρων καὶ τράγων being read (by the K L P group, Athanasius, Cyril, etc.), but “the blood of goats and bulls” was a biblical generalization (Ps 50, Is 111), chosen here as a literary variation, perhaps for the sake of the alliteration, though some editors see in ταύρων a subtle, deliberate antithesis to the feminine δακτύλις. According to the directions of Nu 19:6, a red cow was slaughtered and then burned; the ashes (ἡ σπόδος τῆς δακτυλίας) were mixed with fresh water and sprinkled upon any worshipper who had touched a dead body and thus incurred ceremonial impurity, contact with the dead being regarded as a disqualification for intercourse with men or God (see above on 6). This mixture was called νάρτιζον. The rite supplies the metaphors of the argument in vv.14-15; it was one of the ablutions (v.10) which restored the contaminated person (τοὺς κεκοιμημένους) to the worshipping community of the Lord. The cow is described as ἀμωμος, the purified person as καθαρός; but our author goes outside the LXX for κεκοιμημένους, and even παντίζειν is rare in the LXX. “The red colour of the cow and the scarlet cloth burnt on the pyre with the aromatic woods, suggest the colour of blood; the aromatic woods are also probably connected with primitive ideas of the cathartic value of odours such as they produce” (R. A. S. Macalister in ERE. xi. 36a). The lustration had no connexion whatever with atonement-day, and it was only in later rabbinic tradition that it was associated with the functions of the high-priest. According to Pesikta 40a, a pagan inquirer once pointed out to Rabbi Jochanan ben Zakkai the superstitious character of such rites. His disciples considered his reply unsatisfactory, and afterwards pressed him to explain to them the meaning of the ashes and the sprinkling, but all he could say was that it had been appointed by the Holy One, and that men must not inquire into His reasons (cp. Bacher’s Agada d. Pal. Amoräer, i. 556; Agada der Tannaiten, i. 37, 38). Our author does not go into details, like the author of Ep. Barnabas (8), who allegorizes the ritual freely in the light of the Jewish tradition; he merely points out that, according to the bible, the rite, like the similar rite of blood on atonement-day, restored the worshipper to outward communion with God. Αγιαίζει means this and no more.

The removal of the religious tabu upon persons contaminated by contact with the dead was familiar to non-Jews. The writer goes back to the OT for his illustration, but it would be quite intelligible to his Gentile Christian readers (cp. Marett’s The Evolution of Religion, pp. 115 f.; ERE. iv. 434, x. 456, 483, 485, 501), in a world where physical contact with the dead was a μακρια. Philo’s exposition (de spec. legibis, i. ΠΕΡΙ ΘΟΥΝΤΩΝ, 1 f.) of the rite is that the primary concern is for the purity of the soul; the attention needed for securing that the victim is ἀμωμος, or, as he says, παντελως
IX. 13, 14.] THE BLOOD OF CHRIST

The bodily cleansing is only secondary, and even this he ingeniously allegorizes into a demand for self-knowledge, since the water and ashes should remind us how worthless our natures are, and knowledge of this kind is a wholesome purge for conceit! Thus, according to Philo, the rite did purge soul as well as body: ἀναγκαιῶν τόσο μέλλοντας φοντάν εἰς τὸ λέρος ἐπὶ μετώποις θυσίας τὸ τε σῶμα φαρδύνεσθαι καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν πρὸ τοῦ σῶματος. Our author does not share this favourable view (cp. Seeberg's Der Tod Christi, pp. 53 f.; O. Schmitz's Die Opferanschauung des späteren Judentums, pp. 281 f.). He would not have denied that the levitical cultus aimed at spiritual good; what he did deny was that it attained its end. Till a perfect sacrifice was offered, such an end was unattainable. The levitical cultus “provided a ritual cleansing for the community, a cleansing which, for devout minds that could penetrate beneath the letter to the spirit, must have often meant a sense of restoration to God's community. But at best the machinery was cumbrous: at best the pathway into God’s presence was dimly lighted” (H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 213).

Our author does not explain how the blood of goats and bulls could free the worshiper from ceremonial impurity; the cathartic efficacy of blood is assumed. From the comparative study of religion we know now that this belief was due to the notion that “the animal that has been consecrated by contact with the altar becomes charged with a divine potency, and its sacred blood, poured over the impure man, absorbs and disperses his impurity” (Marett, The Evolution of Religion, p. 121). But in Προς Ἐβραίους, (a) though the blood of goats and bulls is applied to the people as well as to the altar, and is regarded as atoning (see below), the writer offers no rationale of sacrifice. Χωρὶς αἰματερκυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἁφετις. He does not argue, he takes for granted, that access to God involves sacrifice, i.e. blood shed. (b) He uses the rite of Nu 19 to suggest the cathartic process, the point of this lustration being the use of “water made holy by being mingled with the ashes of the heifer that had been burnt.” “The final point is reached,” no doubt (Marett, op. cit. 123), “when it is realized that the blood of bulls and goats cannot wash away sin, that nothing external can defile the heart or soul, but only evil thoughts and evil will.” Yet our writer insists that even this inward defilement requires a sacrifice, the sacrifice of Christ's blood. This is now (v. 14) urged in the phrase ἐαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν, where we at last see what was intended by προσφέρεν τι in 3:8. We are not to think of the risen or ascended Christ presenting himself to God, but of his giving himself up to die as a sacrifice. The blood of Christ means his life given up for the sake of men. He did die, but it was a voluntary death—not the slaughter of an unconscious, reluctant victim; and he who died lives. More than that, he lives with the power of that death or sacrifice. This profound thought is further
developed by (a) the term ἄμωμον, which is in apposition to ἐκατόν; and (b) by διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου, which goes with προσήνεγκεν. (a) Paul calls Christians, or calls them to be, ἄμωμον; but our writer, like the author of 1 P (119), calls Christ ἄμωμος as a victim. It is a poetic synonym for ἄμωμος, taken over as the technical term (LXX) for the unblemished (σώμα) animals which alone could be employed in sacrifice; here it denotes the stainless personality, the sinless nature which rendered the self-sacrifice of Jesus eternally valid. Then (b) the pregnant phrase διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου, which qualifies ἐκατόν προσήνεγκεν, means that this sacrifice was offered in the realm or order of the inward spirit, not of the outward and material; it was no δικαίωμα σαρκός, but carried out διὰ πνεύματος, i.e. in, or in virtue of, his spiritual nature. What the author had called ζωὴ ἀκατάλληλος (716) he now calls πνεύμα αἰώνιον. The sacrificial blood had a mystical efficacy; it resulted in an eternal λύτρωσις because it operated in an eternal order of spirit, the sacrifice of Jesus purifying the inner personality (τὴν συνειδησίαν) because it was the action of a personality, and of a sinless personality which belonged by nature to the order of spirit or eternity. Christ was both priest and victim; as Son of God he was eternal and spiritual, unlike mortal highpriests (719), and, on the other side, unlike a mortal victim. The implication (which underlies all the epistle) is that even in his earthly life Jesus possessed eternal life. Hence what took place in time upon the cross, the writer means, took place really in the eternal, absolute order. Christ sacrificed himself ἐφάπαξ, and the single sacrifice needed no repetition, since it possessed absolute, eternal value as the action of One who belonged to the eternal order. He died—he had to die—but only once (915–1018), for his sacrifice, by its eternal significance, accomplished at a stroke what no amount of animal sacrifices could have secured, viz. the forgiveness of sins. It is as trivial to exhaust the meaning of πνεύμα αἰώνιον in a contrast with the animal sacrifices of the levitical cultus as it is irrelevant to drag in the dogma of the trinity. Αἰωνίου closely describes πνεύματος (hence it has no article). What is in the writer's mind is the truth that what Jesus did by dying can never be exhausted or transcended. His sacrifice, like his διαθήκη, like the λύτρωσις or σωτηρία which he secures, is αἰώνιος or lasting, because it is at the heart of things. It was because Jesus was what he was by nature that his sacrifice had such final value; its atoning significance lay in his vital connexion with the realm of absolute realities; it embodied all that his divine personality meant for men in relation to God. In short, his self-sacrifice "was something beyond which nothing could be, or could be conceived to be, as a response to God's mind and requirement
in relation to sin... an intelligent and loving response to the holy and gracious will of God, and to the terrible situation of man” (Denney, *The Death of Christ*, p. 228).

A later parallel from rabbinic religion occurs in the Midrash Tehillim on Ps 31: “formerly you were redeemed with flesh and blood, which to-day is and to-morrow is buried; wherefore your redemption was temporal (ניֶשׁ מְלָכִים). But now I will redeem you by myself, who live and remain for ever; wherefore your redemption will be eternal redemption (דַּוְּעַ יִרְדָּנָא, cp. Is 45:17).”

One or two minor textual items may be noted in v.14.

καθαρισθεί is a form which is rare (Mt 3:12, Ja 4:8?) in the NT, so rare that καθαρίσθεν is read here by 206, 221, 1831 Did. Ath. It is a Hellenistic verb, used in the inscriptions (with ἀπό) exactly in the ceremonial sense underlying the metaphor of this passage (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 216 f.). The cleansing of the conscience (cp. v.9) is ἀπό νεκρῶν ἐγραυν, from far more serious flaws and stains than ceremonial pollution by contact with a corpse (see above, and in 6:1). As Dods puts it, “a pause might be made before ἐγραυν, from dead—not bodies but) works.” The object is εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν τῷ ήσυχί. The writer uses the sacerdotal term (8:5) here as in 10:2 and 12:28, probably like Paul in a general sense; if he thought of Christians as priests, i.e. as possessing the right of access to God, he never says so. Religion for him is access to God, and ritual metaphors are freely used to express the thought. When others would say “fellowship,” he says “worship.” It is fundamental for him that forgiveness is essential to such fellowship, and forgiveness is what is meant by “purifying the conscience.” As absolute forgiveness was the boon of the new διαθήκη (8:12), our author now proceeds (vv.16ff.) to show how Christ’s sacrifice was necessary and efficacious under that διαθήκη. A sacrifice, involving death, is essential to any διαθήκη: this principle, which applies to the new διαθήκη (v.19), is illustrated first generally (vv.16-17) and then specifically, with reference to the former διαθήκη (vv.18-22).

---

14 He mediates a new covenant for this reason, that those who have been called may obtain the eternal inheritances they have been promised, now that a death has occurred which redeems them from the transgressions involved in the first covenant. 16 Thus in the case of a will, the death of the testator must be announced. 17 A will only holds in cases of death, it is never valid so long as the testator is alive. 18 Hence even the first (ἡ πρώτη, sc. διαθήκη as in 9) covenant of God’s will was not inaugurated apart from blood; 19 for after Moses had announced every command in the Law to all the people, he took the
blood of calves and goats, together with water, scarlet wool and hyssop, sprinkling the book and all the people, and saying, 20 "This is the blood of that covenant which is God's command for you." 21 He even (kai . . . òl, only here in Heb.) sprinkled with blood the tent and all the utensils of worship in the same way. 22 In fact, one might almost say that by Law everything is cleansed with blood. No blood shed no remission of sins!

The writer thus weaves together the idea of the new διαθήκη (9:15 echoes 8:6) and the idea of sacrifice which he has just been developing. In v.15 διὰ τοῦτο carries a forward reference ("now this is why Christ mediates a new διαθήκη, δόξα κτλ."); as, e.g., in Xen. Cyrop. ii. 1. 21, οὐκ ἀκούσαν ὅτι ἐν ἀλλο τρέφονται ἢ δόξας μακοῦνται ὑπὲρ τῶν τρεφόντων. As the climax of the promises in the new διαθήκη is pardon (8:12), so here its purpose is described as ἀπολύτρωσις, which obviously is equivalent to full forgiveness (Eph 1:7 τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ ἀμαρτού αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἁφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων). Ἀπολύτρωσις τῶν ... παραβάσεως is like καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἀμαρτίων in 1:3. But pardon is only the means to fellowship, and the full scope of what has been promised is still to be realized. Yet it is now certain; the "bliss to be," is an eternal κληρονομία, assured by Christ. Note that the ἐπὶ in ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ is not exactly temporal = "under," i.e. during the period of (cp. ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰωνῶν in v.26), but causal. The transgressions, which had arisen "in connexion with" the first διαθήκη, like unbelief and disobedience, are conceived as having taken their place among men; they are the standing temptations of life towards God. The writer does not say, with Paul, that sin became guilt in view of the law, but this is near to his meaning; with the first διαθήκη sins started, the sins that haunt the People. They are removed, for the atoning death of Jesus, so that the People are now unencumbered. There is a similar thought in Ac 13:38. 39, where Paul tells some Jews that through Jesus Christ ὑμῖν ἁφεσιν ἀμαρτίων καταγγέλλεται, καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων ἐν ὑμῖν ἡδονήθη ἐν νόμῳ Μωσήως δικαίωται, ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιώταται. For the sake of emphasis, τὴν ἐπαγγέλιαν is thrown forward, away from κληρονομίας, like ἀπολύτρωσις in the next verse.

Ἀπολύτρωσις, which in 11:30 is used in its non-technical sense of "release" from death (at the cost of some unworthy compliance), is used here in its LXX religious sense of a redemption which costs much, which can only be had at the cost of sacrifice. The primitive idea of "ransom" had already begun to fade out of it (cp. Dn 4:28; Philo, quod omnis probus, 17), leaving "liberation" at some cost as the predominant idea (so in Clem. Alex. Strom vii. 56). Here it is a synonym for λύτρωσις (v.19), or as Theophylact put it, for deliverance. But its reference is not eschatological; the retrospective reference is uppermost.

For the first and only time he employs οἱ κεκλημένοι to describe those whom he had already hailed as κληρονόμοι.
μέτοχοι (31). To be "called" was indispensable to receiving God's boon (118), so that κεκλημένοι here is an appropriate term for those who are no longer hampered by any obstacles of an inadequate pardon. The κεκλημένοι are the faithful People; "the objects of redemption are united in one category, for the One and Only Sacrifice is not of the sphere of time" (Wickham). It is not an aoristic perfect (= κλήθεντες), as if the κεκλημένοι were simply those under the old διαθήκη, though these are included, for the sacrificial death of Jesus has a retrospective value; it clears off the accumulated offences of the past. The writer does not work out this, any more than Paul does in Ro 3:25f.; but it may be implied in 1140 12:23 (see below), where the "perfecting" of the older believers is connected with the atonement. However, the special point here of θανάτου . . . παραβάσεως is that the death which inaugurates the new διαθήκη deals effectively with the hindrances left by the former διαθήκη. Not that this is its exclusive function. That the death inaugurates an order of grace in which forgiveness is still required and bestowed, is taken for granted (e.g. 4:16); but the κληρονομία, which from the beginning has been held out to the People of God, has only become attainable since the sacrifice of Jesus, and therefore (a) his death avails even for those who in the past hoped for it, yet could not obtain it, and also (b) deals with the παράβασεις set up by the older διαθήκη among men.

But how was a death necessary to a διαθήκη? The answer is given in v.16f. through a characteristic play on the term. In ὅπου γὰρ (sc. ἐντὸ) διαθήκη κτλ. he uses διαθήκη as equivalent to "will" or testamentary disposition, playing effectively upon the double sense of the term, as Paul had already done in Gal 3:16f. The point of his illustration (vv.16-17) depends upon this; βεβαία and ἱσχύει are purposely used in a juristic sense, applicable to wills as well as to laws, and δ διαθέμενος is the technical term for "testator." The illustration has its defects, but only when it is pressed beyond what the writer means to imply. A will does not come into force during the lifetime of the testator, and yet Jesus was living! True, but he had died, and died inaugurating a διαθήκη in words which the writer has in mind (v.20); indeed, according to one tradition he had spoken of himself figuratively as assigning rights to his disciples (κάγω διαιτήμαι ὑμῖν, Lk 22:28). The slight incongruity in this illustration is not more than that involved in making Jesus both priest and victim. It is a curious equivocue, this double use of διαθήκη, the common idea of both meanings being that benefits are "disponed," and that the διαθήκη only takes effect after a death. The continuity of argument is less obvious in English, where no single word conveys the different nuances which διαθήκη bore for Greek readers.
Hence in v.\textsuperscript{18} some periphrasis like "the first covenant of God's will" is desirable.

That διαθήκη in vv.\textsuperscript{18},\textsuperscript{17} is equivalent to "testamentary disposition," is essential to the argument. No natural interpretation of vv.\textsuperscript{18},\textsuperscript{20} is possible, when διαθήκη is understood rigidly either as "covenant" or as "will." The classical juristic sense is richly illustrated in the papyri and contemporary Hellenistic Greek, while the "covenant" meaning prevails throughout the LXX; but Philo had already used it in both senses, and here the juristic sense of κληρονομία (v.\textsuperscript{15}) paved the way for the juristic sense which v.\textsuperscript{17} demands. The linguistic materials are collected, with a variety of interpretations, by Norton in \textit{A Lexicographical and Historical Study of Διαθήκη} (Chicago, 1908), Behm (\textit{Der Begriff Διαθήκη im Neuen Testament}, Naumburg, 1912), Lohmeyer (\textit{Διαθήκη: ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des Neutestamentlichen Begriffs}, Leipzig, 1913), and G. Vos in \textit{Princeton Theological Review} (1915, pp. 587 f.; 1916, pp. 1–61).

In v.\textsuperscript{16} φέρεσθαι is "announced," almost in the sense of "proved" (as often in Greek); in v.\textsuperscript{17} μὴ ποτε (cp. on οὐπω in 2\textsuperscript{8}) is not equivalent to μὴ τω (nondum, vg) but simply means "never" (non unquam), as, e.g., in Eurip. \textit{Hipp.} 823, ὅστε μὴ ποτε ἐκπνεύσαι πάλιν, μὴ here following the causal particle ἐπεί, like ὅτι in Jn 5\textsuperscript{18}; it had begun to displace ὅθε in later Greek. Moulton quotes \textit{BGU.} 530 (i A.D.), μέμφεται σε ἐπ(ε)τί μὴ ἀντί- γραφας αὐτῷ, and Radermacher (171) suggests that the change was sometimes due to a desire of avoiding the hiatus. "ἰσχύει has the same force as in Gal 5\textsuperscript{6}, cp. \textit{Tebt. P.} 2867 (ii A.D.) νομή ἀδικος [οὐ]ἐν ἑἰσχύει. Some needless difficulties have been felt with regard to the construction of the whole sentence. Thus (a) ἐπεί... διαθήκην might be a question, it is urged: "For is it ever valid so long as the testator is alive?" In Jn 7\textsuperscript{28} μὴ ποτε is so used interrogatively, but there it opens the sentence. This construction goes back to the Greek fathers Oecumenius and Theophylact; possibly it was due to the feeling that μὴ ποτε could not be used in a statement like this. (6) Isidore of Pelusium (\textit{Ep.} iv. 113) declares that ποτὲ is a corruption of τὸτε (π from τ, a stroke being added by accident), and that he found τὸτε "ἐν παλαιοῖς ἀντίγραφοι." Two old MSS (κ* D*) do happen to preserve this reading, which is in reality a corruption of τὸτε. Why, it may be asked, finally, does not the writer refer outright to the new διαθήκη as inaugurated at the last supper? The reason is plain. Here as throughout the epistle he ignores the passover or eucharist. As a non-sacerdotal feast, the passover would not have suited his argument. Every Israelite was his own priest then, as Philo remarks (\textit{De Decalogo}, 30, πάσχα... ἐν ᾧ δύνατι πανδημεῖν αὐτῶν ἐκαστός τοὺς ἰερεῖς αὐτῶν ὧν ἀναμέναντες, ἱεροσύνη τοῦ νόμου χαρισμένον τῷ ἔθνει παντὶ κατὰ μίαν ἡμέραν κτλ.). Hence the absence of a passover ritual from the entire
argument of the epistle, and also perhaps his failure to employ
it here, where it would have been extremely apt.

Reverting now to the other and biblical sense of διαθήκη, the
writer (vv.18f.) recalls how the διαθήκη at Sinai was inaugurated
with blood. οὖν—since διαθήκη and θάνατος are correlative—
οδική ἡ πρώτη (sc. διαθήκη) χωρίς αἵματος ἐνκακίωστα (the verb
here and in 10 being used in its ordinary LXX sense, e.g., 1 K
17:14 ἐγκακίσθη μεν ἔκει τὴν βασιλείαν, 1 Mac 4:26 ἀναβώμεν καθαρίσαι
τὰ ἀγα καὶ ἐνκακίστα). This fresh illustration of death or blood
being required in order to inaugurate a διαθήκη, is taken from the
story in Ex 24:8f., but he treats it with characteristic freedom.

Five points may be noted. (i) He inserts τὸ αἷμα . . . τῶν
τράγων, a slip which was conscientiously corrected by a number
of MSS which omitted καὶ τῶν τράγων (N° K L Ψ 5. 181. 203.
1845. 1898. 2143) as well as by syr Origen and Chrysostom.
Moses merely had μοσχάρια slaughtered; our author adds goats,
perhaps because the full phrase had become common for OT
sacrifices (see on v.18). (ii) He inserts μετὰ δίατος καὶ ἐρίου
κόκκινου καὶ ὁμόθυου, as these were associated in his mind with
the general ritual of sprinkling; water, hyssop, and scarlet
thread (κόκκινον), for example, he remembered from the de­
scription of another part of the ritual in Nu 19. The water was
used to dilute the blood; and stems of a small wall plant called
“hyssop” were tied with scarlet wool (κεκλωμένον κόκκινον) to
form a sprinkler in the rite of cleansing a leper (Lv 14:6f.), or for
sprinkling blood (Ex 12:22). But of this wisp or bunch there is
not a word in Ex 24:8f. (iii) Nor is it said in the OT that
Moses sprinkled 2 αὕτο τὸ βιβλίον. He simply splashed half of
the blood πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, καὶ λαβὼν τὸ βιβλίον (i.e.
the scroll containing the primitive code) θης διαθήκης, read it aloud to
the people, who promised obedience; whereupon λαβὼν δὲ Μωυσῆς
τὸ αἷμα κατεσκέδασεν τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐπένευ κτλ. An ingenious but
impracticable attempt to correct this error is to take αὕτο τε τὸ
βιβλίον with λαβὼν, but the τε goes with the next καὶ πάντα τὸν
λαὸν. The βιβλίον may have been included, since as a human
product, for all its divine contents, it was considered to require
cleansing; in which case the mention of it would lead up to v.21,
and αὕτο τε τὸ βιβλίον might be rendered “the book itself.”
This intensive use of αὐτός occurs just below in αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπομένα.
But αὐτός may be, according to the usage of Hellenistic Greek,

1 In τάσης ἐντολῆς κατὰ τὸν (om. K P) νόμον (“lecto omni mandato
legis,” vg) the κατά means “throughout” rather than “by.”
2 For κατασκέδασεν he substitutes ἄρραντισεν, from ἄρραντω, which is com­
paratively rare in the LXX (Lv 6:27, 2 K 9:8, Ps 51:7, Aquila and Symm. in
Is 63:3, Aquila and Theodotion in Is 52:18).
unemphatic, as, e.g., in 1111 καὶ αὐτὴν Ἑλλαβα, Ἰην 24 αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰσαί. (iv) In quoting the LXX ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ὑπὲρ διάθετο Κύριος πρὸς ὤμας (= ὄμα), he changes ἰδοὺ into τοῦτο (possibly a reminiscence of the synoptic tradition in Mk 1422), διάθετο into ἐνετειλάτο (after ἐντολής in v.19; but the phrase occurs elsewhere, though with the dative, e.g. Jos 2318), and κύριος πρὸς ὤμας into πρὸς ὤμας ὁ θεός. This is a minor alteration. It is more significant that, (v) following a later Jewish tradition, which reappears in Josephus (Ant. iii. 8. 6 [Moses cleansed Aaron and his sons] τήν τε σκηνὴν καὶ τὰ περὶ αὐτὴν σκέψας ἐλαύνε τε προβεβημένῳ καθὼς εἶπον, καὶ τῷ αἵματι τῶν ταύρων καὶ κριῶν σφαγέτουν κτλ.), he makes Moses use blood to sprinkle the σκηνή and all τὰ σκέπας τῆς λειτουργίας (a phrase from 1 Ch 928). The account of Ex 40.10 mentions oil only; Josephus adds blood, because the tradition he followed fused the oil-dedication of the σκηνή in Ex 40.10 with the (oil) sprinkling at the consecration of the priests (Lv 810f.), which was followed by a blood-sprinkling of the altar alone. Philo had previously combined the oil-dedication of the σκηνή with the consecration of the priests (vii. Mos. iii. 17); but he, too, is careful to confine any blood-sprinkling to the altar. Our author, with his predilection for blood as a cathartic, omits the oil altogether, and extends the blood to everything.

This second illustration (vv.18f.) is not quite parallel to the first; the death in the one case is of a human being in the course of nature, in the other case of animals slaughtered. But αἷμα and θάνατος were correlative terms for the writer. The vital necessity of αἷμα in this connexion is reiterated in the summary of v.22. Σχέδον, he begins—for there were exceptions to the rule that atonement for sins needed an animal sacrifice (e.g. Lv 511-13, where a poverty-stricken offender could get remission by presenting a handful of flour, and Nu 3122, where certain articles, spoils of war, are purified by fire or water). But the general rule was that πάντα, i.e. everything connected with the ritual and every worshipper, priest, or layman, had to be ceremonially purified by means of blood (καθαρίζεται as the result of ἐρράντισεν). The Greek readers of the epistle would be familiar with the similar rite of αἰμάσσειν τοὺς βεβούς (Theokr. Ἐπιγρ. i. 5, etc.). Finally, he sums up the position under the first διαθήκη by coining a term αἰματεκχυσία (from ἐκχυσίς αἵματος, 1 K 1828 etc.) for the shedding of an animal victim's blood in sacrifice; χωρὶς αἰματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις, i.e. even the limited pardon, in the shape of "cleansing," which was possible under the old order. Ἁφεσις here as in Mk 39 has no genitive following, but the sense is indubitable, in view of 1018 δύνῃ δὲ ἄφεσις τοῦτων (i.e. of sins). The latter passage voices a feeling which seems to contradict the
possibility of any forgiveness prior to the sacrifice of Christ (cp. 9:16 10:14f.), but the writer knew from his bible that there had been an ἄφεσις under the old régime as the result of animal sacrifice; καὶ ἐξελάστηκεν περὶ (or περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας) αὐτοῦ ὁ ἵερες ... καὶ ἄφεθησεν αὐτῷ was the formula (cp. Lv 5:10.16.18 etc.). The underlying principle of the argument is practically (cp. Introd., p. xlii) that laid down in the Jewish tract Joma v. 1 ("there is no expiation except by blood"), which quotes Lv 17:11, a text known to the writer of Hebrews in this form: ἢ γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ τίσης σαρκὸς αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν, καὶ ἐγὼ δέδωκα αὐτῷ ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ ἐξελάσκομαι περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν υἱῶν τοῦ γὰρ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐξελάστηκα. Blood as food is prohibited, since blood contains the vital principle; as there is a mysterious potency in it, which is to be reserved for rites of purification and expiation, by virtue of the life in it, this fluid is efficacious as an atonement. The Greek version would readily suggest to a reader like our author that the piacular efficacy of αἷμα was valid universally, and that the αἷμα or sacrificial death of Christ was required in order that human sin might be removed. Why such a sacrifice, why sacrifice at all, was essential, he did not ask. It was commanded by God in the bible; that was sufficient for him. The vital point for him was that, under this category of sacrifice, the αἷμα of Christ superseded all previous arrangements for securing pardon.

After the swift aside of v.22, the writer now pictures the appearance of Christ in the perfect sanctuary of heaven with the perfect sacrifice (v.28f.) which, being perfect or absolute, needs no repetition.

28 Now, while the copies of the heavenly things had (ἀνάγκη, sc. ἡν or ἡστὶν) to be cleansed with sacrifices like these, the heavenly things themselves required nobler sacrifices. 24 For Christ has not entered a holy place which human hands have made (a mere type of the reality!); he has entered heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf. 25 Nor was it (sc. εἰσῆλθεν) to offer himself repeatedly, like the highpriest entering the holy place every year with blood that was not his own: 26 for in that case he would have had to suffer repeatedly ever since the world was founded. Nay, once for all, at the end of the world, he has appeared with his self-sacrifice to abolish sin. 27 And just as it is appointed for men to die once and after that to be judged, 28 so Christ, after being once sacrificed to bear the sins of many, will appear again, not to deal with sin, but for the saving of those who look out for him.

The higher σκηνή requires a nobler kind of sacrifice than its material copy on earth (v.28). 1 This would be intelligible enough;

1 For ἀνάγκη ... καθαρίσθηται an early variant was ἀνάγκη ... καθαρίσθηται (D* 424* Origen), which Blass adopts. But our author prefers the nominative (v.16) to the dative, and καθαρίσθηται is no more than a conformation to the καθαρίσθηται of v.24. The τη, which some cursives (33. 1245. 2005) substitute for ἰ δε between ἀκρά and τὰ ἐνυπάνα, is due to alliteration.
but when the writer pushes the analogy so far as to suggest that the sacrifice of Christ had, among other effects, to purify heaven itself, the idea becomes almost fantastic. The nearest parallel to this notion occurs in Col 1:20; but the idea here is really unique, as though the constant work of forgiving sinners in the upper σκηνή rendered even that in some sense defiled. The slight touch of disparagement in τοῦτος (=τοίς ἄλογοις, Theodoret) may be conveyed by “like these” or “such,” and θυσίαις is the plural of category (like νεκροίς in v.17). After this passing lapse into the prosaic, the writer quickly recovers himself in a passage of high insight (vv.24f.) upon the nobler sacrifice of Jesus. Indeed, even as he compares it with the levitical sacrifices, its incomparable power becomes more and more evident. In v.24 (=vv.11-12) by αὐτήπα τῶν ἁληθινῶν he means a counterpart (αὐτήπα in reverse sense in 1 P 3:21) of reality (cp. 8:2), αὐτήπα being a synonym here for ἐποδείγματα, literally = “answering to the τύπος” which was shown to Moses (cp. 2 Clem. 14οὐδεὶς οὖν τὸ αὐτήπαν φθείρας τὸ ἀβδεντικὸν μεταλήφηται). Christ has entered the heavenly sphere νῦν (emphatic, “now at last” = ἐκ) ἐμφανισθήναι κτλ. In ἐμφανισθήναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ (cp. Ps 42:5 δόθησομαι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ) we have ἐμφανίζεων used in its Johannine sense (1:21,22), though passively as in Wis 1:2 (ἐμφανίζεται τοῖς μη πιστεύουσιν αὐτῷ). But the appearance is before God on behalf of men, and the meaning is brought out in 7:26 οικείοις ἐμφανίσαται. Christ’s sacrifice, it is held, provides men with a close and continuous access to God such as no cultus could effect; it is of absolute value, and therefore need not be repeated (vv.25-26), as the levitical sacrifices had to be. Οὐδὲ ὅλη πολλάκις προσφέρῃ ἑαυτῶν] What is meant precisely by προσφέρεσιν ἑαυτῶν here (as in v.14) is shown by παρέχει in v.26. “There is no difference between entering in and offering. The act of entering in and offering is one highpriestly act” (A. B. Davidson), and προσφέρεσιν ἑαυτῶν is inseparably connected with the suffering of death upon the cross. The contrast between his self-sacrifice and the highpriest entering with αἵματὶ ἀλλοτρίω (as opposed to ἰδίω, v.12) is thrown in, as a reminiscence of vv.17, but the writer does not dwell on this; it is the αὐτὰς (cp. v.12 and 1 P 3:18 Χριστὸς ἀπαξ περὶ ἀμαρτίων ἀπέθανεν) which engrosses his mind in v.26, ἐπεὶ (“alioquin,” vg) ἐδει (the ἅν being omitted as, e.g., in 1 Co 5:10 ἐπεὶ ὄφειλετε ... ἐξελθεῖν) κτλ. According to his outlook, there would be no time to repeat Christ’s incarnation and sacrifice before the end of the world, for that was imminent; hence he uses the past, not the future, for his reductio ad absurdum argument. If Christ’s sacrifice had not been of absolute, final value, i.e. if it had merely availed for a brief time, as a temporary provision, it would have had to be done over and over again in
previous ages, since from the first sinful man has needed sacrifice; whereas the only time he was seen on earth was once, late in the evening of the world. It is implied that Christ as the Son of God was eternal and pre-existent; also that when his sacrifice did take place, it covered sins of the past (see v. 15), the single sacrifice of Christ in our day availing for all sin, past as well as present and future. Had it not been so, God could not have left it till so late in the world’s history; it would have had to be done over and over again to meet the needs of men from the outset of history. 

_IX. 26, 27._ THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST

The object of the incarnation is, as in 29, the atonement. The thought of the first “appearance” of Christ naturally suggests that of the second, and the thought of Jesus dying ἀπαξ also suggests that men have to die ἀπαξ as well. Hence the parenthesis of vv. 27–28, for 101 carries on the argument from 926. It is a parenthesis, yet a parenthesis of central importance for the primitive religious eschatology which formed part of the writer’s inheritance, however inconsistent with his deeper views of faith and fellowship. “As surely as men have once to die and then to face the judgment, so Christ, once sacrificed for the sins of men, will reappear to complete the salvation of his own.”

`Ἀπόκειται (cp. Longinus, _de sublim._ 97 ἀλλ’ ἦμιν μὲν δυναμονούσιν ἀπόκειται λιμὺν κακῶν δ ἄθαναστος, and 4 Mac 811 οὖδὲν ἦμιν ἀπείθησασιν πλὴν τοῦ μετὰ στρεβλῶν ἀποθανεῖν ἀποκείται) τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀπαξ ἀποθανεῖν. The ἀπαξ here is not by way of relief, although the Greeks consoled themselves by reflecting that they had not to die twice; as they could only live once, they drew from this the conclusion that life must be “all the sweeter, as an experience that never can be repeated” (A. C. Pearson on Sophocles’ _Fragments_, n. 67). But our author (see on 214) sees that death is not the last thing to be faced by men; μετὰ δὲ τούτῳ κρίσις. This was what added seriousness to the prospect of death for early Christians. The Greek mind was exempt from such a dread; for them death ended the anxieties of life, and if there was one thing of which the Greek was sure, it was that “dead men rise up never.”
Aeschylus, for example, makes Apollo declare (Eumenides, 647, 648):

\[
\text{ánthros} \, \delta' \, \text{épeidhán} \, \text{al}’ \, \text{ánastasía} \, \kòn
\]

\[
\text{áppex} \, \text{thanontos}, \, \text{óutis} \, \text{èst}' \, \text{ánastasís}.
\]

Even in the sense of a return to life, there is no ánástasís (Eurip. Heracles, 297; Alcestis, 1076; Supplices, 775). Κρίσεis in En 17ε (kai kriónis èstai katà pántwn), as the context shows, is the eschatological catastrophe which spares the elect on earth, just as in En 56, which parallels He 928, sinners are threatened thus: pásw úmí tòis ánartoloi óûc ìpárrxei sówtria álla èpi pántas úmès katalúsis, katóra. In 1027 below krísis means the doom of the rebellious, but that is due to the context; here it is judgment in general, to which all ántrwpos alike are liable (1228 krióni thèi pántwn). Only, some have the happy experience of Christ’s return (v. 28), in the saving power of his sacrifice. There is (as in 1 P 226) an echo of Is 5312 (kai àytos àmartyías pollōn ántrveykei) in èis tò pollòn (cp. above on 210) ántrveykei àmartyías. Προσένεψεiz may be chosen to parallel men’s passive experience of death. At any rate his suffering of death was vicarious suffering; he took upon himself the consequences and responsibilities of our sins. Such is the Christ who èk deuterou phōsètai. In 1 P 54 fánéroùthai is used of the second appearance as well as of the first, but our author prefers a variety (see on v. 26) of expression. The striking phrase χωρίς àmartyías rests on the idea that the one atonement had been final (èis àðèthgwn tìs àmartyías), and that Christ was now kekwaroménoùs àpò tòw ánartoléw (726). He is not coming back to die, and without death sin could not be dealt with. The homiletic (from 2 Ti 315) addition of biad (79s, 1611. 2005) πístew, either after àpekdekouménoùs (by 38. 68. 218. 256. 263. 330. 436. 440. 462. 823. 1837 arm. etc.) or after sówtrian (by A P 1245. 1898 syrshl), is connected with the mistaken idea that èis sówtrian goes with àpekdekouménoùs (cp. Phil 320) instead of with phósètai. There is a very different kind of èkdoxh (1027) for some ántrwposi, even for some who once belonged to the People!

He now resumes the idea of 925. 26, expanding it by showing how the personal sacrifice of Jesus was final. This is done by quoting a passage from the 40th psalm which predicted the supersession of animal sacrifices (vv.5-10). The latter are inadequate, as is seen from the fact of their annual repetition; and they are annual because they are animal sacrifices.

1 For as the Law has a mere shadow of the bliss that is to be, instead of representing the reality of that bliss, it never can perfect those who draw near with the same annual sacrifices that are perpetually offered. 2 Otherwise, they would have surely ceased to be offered; for the worshippers, once cleansed, would no longer be conscious of sins! 3 As it is, they are an annual reminder
of sins 6 (for the blood of bulls and goats cannot possibly remove sins!).

Hence, on entering the world he says,

"Thou hast no desire for sacrifice or offering;
it is a body thou hast prepared for me—
in holocausts and sin-offerings (πεπὶ δαμαρίας as 1311) thou takest no delight.

So (τὸν) I said, "Here I come—in the roll of the book this is written of me—
I come to do thy will, O God."

He begins by saying, "Thou hast no desire for, thou takest no delight in,
sacrifices and offerings and holocausts and sin-offerings" (and those are what are offered in terms of the Law); 9 he then (τὸν) adds, "Here I come to do thy will." He does away with the first in order to establish the second.

And it is by this "will" that we are consecrated, because Jesus Christ once for all has "offered" up his "body."

This is the author's final verdict on the levitical cultus, "rapid in utterance, lofty in tone, rising from the didactic style of the theological doctor to the oracular speech of the Hebrew prophet, as in that peremptory sentence: 'It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.' The notable thing in it is, not any new line of argument, though that element is not wanting, but the series of spiritual intuitions it contains, stated or hinted, in brief, pithy phrases" (A. B. Bruce, pp. 373, 374). In σκιάν ... οὖκ εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων (v.1) the writer uses a Platonic phrase (Cratylus, 306 E, εἰκόνας τῶν πραγ-μάτων); εἰκών (= ἀλήθεια, Chrysostom) is contrasted with σκιά as the real expression or representation of substance is opposed to the faint shadow. The addition of τῶν πραγμάτων (= τῶν μέλλοντων ἀγαθῶν) emphasizes this sense; what represents solid realities is itself real, as compared to a mere σκιά. The μέλλοντα ἀγαθά (911) are the boons and blessings still to be realized in their fulness for Christians, being thought of from the standpoint of the new διαθήκη, not of the Law. The Law is for the writer no more than the regulations which provided for the cultus; the centre of gravity in the Law lies in the priesthood (711) and its sacrifices, not in what were the real provisions of the Law historically. The writer rarely speaks of the Law by itself. When he does so, as here, it is in this special ritual aspect, and what really bulks in his view is the contrast between the old and the new διαθήκη, i.e. the inadequate and the adequate forms of relationship to God. Once the former was superseded, the Law collapsed, and under the new διαθήκη there is no new Law. Even while the Law lasted, it was shadowy and ineffective, i.e. as a means of securing due access to God. And this is the point here made against the Law, not as Paul conceived it, but as the system of atoning animal sacrifices.

The text of v.1 has been tampered with at an early stage, though the variants affect the grammar rather than the general sense. Unless σύναι
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(D H K L ψ 2. 5. 35. 88. 181. 206. 226. 241. 242. 255. 326. 383. 429. 431. 547. 623. 794. 915. 977. 1311. 1518. 1739. 1827. 1836. 1845. 1867. 1873. 1898. 2143) at both Orig. Chrys. Thdt. Óec.) is read for ὅτι αὐταὶ τὰ αὐτὰς θυσίαι προσφέρεσιν, δὲ εἰσὶ τὸ διήνεκες οὖσατο δύναται τὸν προσερχόμενον τελειώσαι. As in 9, καθ’ ἦν (dropped out by a scribe accidentally, owing to the resemblance between καθὼς and καθέν) would connect with a previous noun (here σκιάν), or similarly fell out before εἰς (εἰςc), and ἀν was changed into ἀν in the three consecutive words after ἐπαναί. This still leaves ὅ νόμος without a verb, however, and is no improvement upon the sense gained either (a) by treating ὅ νόμος as a nominative absolute, and δύναται as an irregular plural depending on ἐν understood1 from θυσίας; or (b) by simply reading δύναται (so Delitzsch, Weiss, Westcott, Peake, Riggenbach, Blass), which clears up everything. A desire to smooth out the grammar or to bring out some private interpretation may be underneath changes like the addition of αὐτῶν after θυσίας (κ P), or the substitution of αὐτῶν for αὐτάς (69. 1319), or the omission of αὐτὰς altogether (2. 177. 206. 642. 920. 1518. 1872), as well as the omission of ἂς (A 33. 1611. 2005) or ἂς altogether, like the Syriac and Armenian versions, and the change of τελειώσαι (τελειώσαι, Blass) into καθάρσαι (D vt).

Προσφέρουσιν is an idiomatic use of the plural (Mt 20 τεθνηκασιν, Lk 12 αἰτοσώνυ), “where there is such a suppression of the subject in bringing emphasis upon the action, that we get the effect of a passive, or of French on, German man” (Moulton, i. 58). The allusion is to the yearly sacrifice on atonement-day, for προσφέρουσιν goes with κατ’ ἐπαναί, the latter phrase being thrown forward for the sake of emphasis, and also in order to avoid bringing εἰς τὸ διήνεκες too near it. Εἰς τὸ διήνεκες also goes with προσφέρουσιν, not (as in v.14) with τελειών. Οὖσατο here as in v.11 before δύνα(ν)ται (never elsewhere in the epistle) is doubly emphatic from its position. The constant repetition of these sacrifices proves that their effect is only temporary; they cannot possibly bring about a lasting, adequate relationship to God. So our author denies the belief of Judaism that atonement-day availed for the pardon of the People, a belief explicitly put forward, e.g., in Jub 517.18 (“If they turn to Him in righteousness, He will forgive all their transgressions, and pardon all their sins. It is written and ordained that He will show mercy to all who turn from their guilt once a year”). He reiterates this in v.2, where εἰς (as in 9 = alioquin) is followed by ὅ, which implies a question. “Would they not, otherwise, have ceased to be offered?” When this was not seen, either ὅ was omitted (H* vg? syr 206. 1245. 1518 Primasius, etc.), leaving ἄου out of its proper place, or it was suggested— as would never have occurred to the author—that the OT sacrifices ceased to be valid

1 It is inserted by A** 31. 366. 472. 1319 syrhkl arm. If the relative pronoun were assimilated, i.e. if ἂς (D* H L 5. 88. 257. 547, etc.) were read for ἂς, the accidental omission of ἂ would be more intelligible.
when the Christian sacrifice took place. In ὁδὸν ἐπάυσαντο
προσφέρομεναι (for construction see Gn 118 ἐπάυσαντο οἰκοδο-
μοῦντες) the ἀν is retained (see on 926). Κεκαθαρισμένους has
been altered into κεκαθαρίσμενος (L), but καθαρίζω, not the Attic
καθαίρω, is the general NT form. If our author spelt like his
LXX codex, however, κεκαθαρισμένους would be original (cp.
Thackeray, 74). Συνειδήσεις is again used (99) in connexion with
"the worshipper(s)," but the writer adds ἀμαρτίων (i.e. sins still
needing to be pardoned). For the genitive, compare Philo's
fine remark in quod det. pot. 40, ικετεύομεν οὖν τὸν θεόν οἱ
συνειδήσαι τῶν οἴκελών ἀδικημάτων ἐλεγχόμενοι, κολάσαι μᾶλλον
ήμας ἦ παρέων. In v.8 ἀνάμνησις means that public notice had
to be taken of such sins ("commemoratio," vg).

There is possibly an echo here of a passage like Nu 515 (θυσία μηνοσύνων
ἀναμμυρσκοῦσα ἀμαρτίαν), quoted by Philo in de Planit. 25 to illustrate his
statement that the sacrifices of the wicked simply serve to recall their misdeeds
(συμμυρφθεῖσιν τὰς ἐκάστων ἀγνολας τε καὶ διαμαρτίας). In vita Mois. iii.
10, he repeats this; if the sacrificer was ignorant and wicked, the sacrifices
were no sacrifices (... οὐ μὴν ἀμαρτημάτων, ἀλλ' ὑπάνησιν ἔφευσαται).
What Philo declares is the result of sacrifices offered by the wicked, the
author of Hebrews declares was the result of all sacrifices; they only served
to bring sin to mind. So in de Vicimis, 7, ἐφθησε γὰρ τὰς θυσίας ὑπάμνησιν
ἀμαρτημάτων ἀλλὰ μη λῃθην αὐτῶν κατασκεύασεν—what Philo declares absurd,
our author pronounces inevitable.

The ringing assertion of v.4 voices a sentiment which would
appeal strongly to readers who had been familiar with the
classical and contemporary protests (cp. ERE. iii. 770a), against
ritual and external sacrifice as a means of moral purification
(see above on 918). Ἀφαίρειν, a LXX verb in this connexion
(e.g. Num 1418 ἀφαιρων ἀνομίας καὶ ἀδυκίας καὶ ἀμαρτίας), becomes
ἀφελάν in L (so Blass), the aoristic and commoner form; the
verb is never used elsewhere in the NT, though Paul once
quotes Is 279 ὅταν ἀφελώμαι ἀμαρτίας (Ro 1127). All this inherent
defectiveness of animal sacrifices necessitated a new sacrifice
altogether (v.5 διό), the self-sacrifice of Jesus. So the writer
quotes Ps 407-8, which in A runs as follows:

θυσίαν καὶ προσφοράν οὐκ ἡθέλησας,
σῶμα δὲ κατηρτιῶ μοι·
ἀλκατωμάτα καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας οὐκ ἔζησας.
τότε ἤπον· ἵδον ἡκὼ,
(ἐν κεφαλῇ βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ)
τοῦ ποιήσαι τὸ θέλημά σου, ὁ θεὸς μου, ἡβουλήθην.

Our author reads ἐδοκίησας for ἐζητήσας, shifts ὁ θεὸς (omitting μου) to

1 Which is replaced in the text of Hebrews by Ψ (ἐζητήσεις) 623*. 1836.
The augment spelling ἐδοκίησας reappears here as occasionally at v.8 in a
small group (A C D* W, etc.), and the singular θυσίαν κ. προσφοράν is kept
at v.8 by w D* K L W, etc.
a position after ποιήσας, in order to emphasize τὸ θελήμα σου, and by omitting ἐβουλήθην (replaced by W in v.7), connects τὸν ποιήσας closely with ἡκε. A recollection of Ps 51:18 ἐλ ἡθέλσας θυσιάν ... ὑδακαυτόματα ὑπὲρ εἰδοκύρασεν may have suggested εἰδόκυρασεν, which takes the accusative as often in LXX. Κεφάλις is the roll or scroll, literally the knob or tip of the stick round which the papyrus sheet was rolled (cp. Ezek 2:4 kephalís biblion).

This is taken as an avowal of Christ on entering the world, and the LXX mistranslation in σῶμα is the pivot of the argument. The more correct translation would be ὅτι ἔδε, for the psalmist declared that God had given him ears for the purpose of attending to the divine monition to do the will of God, instead of relying upon sacrifices. Whether ὅτι was corrupted into σῶμα, or whether the latter was an independent translation, is of no moment; the evidence of the LXX text is indecisive. Our author found σῶμα in his LXX text and seized upon it; Jesus came with his body to do God's will, i.e. to die for the sins of men. The parenthetical phrase ἑν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ, which originally referred to the Deuteronomic code prescribing obedience to God's will, now becomes a general reference to the OT as a prediction of Christ's higher sacrifice; that is, if the writer really meant anything by it (he does not transcribe it, when he comes to the interpretation, vv.8-10). Though the LXX mistranslated the psalm, however, it did not alter its general sense. The Greek text meant practically what the original had meant, and it made this interpretation or application possible, namely, that there was a sacrifice which answered to the will of God as no animal sacrifice could. Only, our author takes the will of God as requiring some sacrifice. The point of his argument is not a contrast between animal sacrifices and moral obedience to the will of God; it is a contrast between the death of an animal which cannot enter into the meaning of what is being done, and the death of Jesus which means the free acceptance by him of all that God requires for the expiation of human sin. To do the will of God is, for our author, a sacrificial action, which involved for Jesus an atoning death, and this is the thought underlying his exposition and application of the psalm (vv.8-10). In v.8 ἀνωτέρον is "above" or "higher up" in the quotation (v.8). The interpretation of the oracle which follows is plain; there are no textual variants worth notice,1 and the language is clear. Thus εἰρήκεν in v.9 is the perfect of a completed action, =the saying stands on record, and ἀναπέλ has its common juristic sense of "abrogate," the opposite of ἐτησμ. The general idea is: Jesus entered the world fully conscious that the various sacrifices of the Law were unavailing as means of atonement, and ready to sacrifice himself in order

1 The vocative δ θεός is sometimes repeated after ποιήσας by n L 104. 1288. 1739 vg syrbd and pesh etc., or after σου (e.g. 1 1311 harl, arm).
to carry out the redeeming will of God. God’s will was to bring his People into close fellowship with himself (2:10); this necessitated a sacrifice such as that which the σώμα of Christ could alone provide. The triumphant conclusion is that this divine will, which had no interest in ordinary sacrifices, has been fulfilled in the προσφορά of Christ; what the Law could not do (v.1) has been achieved by the single self-sacrifice of Christ; it is by what he suffered in his body, not by any animal sacrifices, that we are ἡγιασμένοι (v.10). Jesus chose to obey God’s will; but, while the Psalmist simply ranked moral obedience higher than any animal sacrifice, our writer ranks the moral obedience of Jesus as redeemer above all such sacrifices. “Christ did not come into the world to be a good man: it was not for this that a body was prepared for him. He came to be a great High Priest, and the body was prepared for him, that by the offering of it he might put sinful men for ever into the perfect religious relation to God” (Denney, The Death of Christ, p. 234).

In conclusion (11-18) the writer interprets (11-14) a phrase which he has not yet noticed expressly, namely, that Christ sat down at the right hand of God (13.18); this proves afresh that his sacrifice was final. Then, having quoted from the pentateuch and the psalter, he reverts to the prophets (15-18), citing again the oracle about the new διαθήκη with its prediction, now fulfilled, of a final pardon.

11 Again, while every priest stands daily at his service, offering the same sacrifices repeatedly, sacrifices which never can take sins away—12 He offered a single sacrifice for sins and then “sat down at the right hand of God,” to wait “until his enemies are made a footstool for his feet.” For by a single offering he has made the sanctified perfect for all time. 13 Besides, we have the testimony of the holy Spirit; for after saying, “This is the covenant I will make with them that day comes, saith the Lord,” I will set my laws upon their hearts, inscribing them upon their minds,”

he adds,

17 “And their sins and breaches of the law I will remember no more.”

18 Now where these are remitted (ἀφενός, as ἡττον), an offering for sin exists (σέρα), no longer.

One or two textual difficulties emerge in this passage. In v.11 ἵππεος was altered (after 5:18) into ἄρπας (A C P 5. 69. 88. 206. 241. 256. 263. 436. 452. 467. 489. 623. 642. 794. 917. 920. 927. 999. 1836. 1837. 1898 syr). In v.12 ἄρπα (KL 104. 326 boh Theod. Oec. Theophyl.) is no improvement upon ἀρπα. A curious variant (boh Ephr.) in the following words is ἐαυτῶν μιᾶν ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίων προσφέρειν ἄξαλλαν. In v.14 boh (“for one offering will complete them, who will be sanctified, for ever”) appears to have read ματ γὰρ προσφέρα (so Bgl.) τελειωσε ἑαυτός. In v.16 τῶν διάνοιῶν is read by K L Ψ d syr sah boh arm.

The decisive consideration in favour of ἵππεος (v.11) is not that
the ἀρχιερεύς did not sacrifice daily (for the writer believed this, see on 7:27), but the adjective πᾶς. Περιελεύν is a literary synonym for ἀφαρεύν (v.1); there is no special emphasis in the verb here any more than, e.g., in 2 Co 3:16, for the (Zeph 3:16, περιελεύν kύριος τὰ ἀδικήματά σου) metaphorical idea of stripping no longer attached to the term, and the περί had ceased to mean “entirely” or “altogether.” The contrast between this repeated and ineffective ritual of the priests and the solitary, valid sacrifice of Jesus is now drawn in v.12, where εἰς τὸ διηνέκες goes more effectively with ἐκάθισεν than with προσευχόμενος θυσίαν, since the idea in the latter collocation is at once expressed in v.14. At the opening of the writer’s favourite psalm (110:1) lay a promise of God to his Son, which further proved that this sacrifice of Christ was final:

ἐπευ δ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου

Κάθου—a unique privilege; so Christ’s priestly sacrifice must be done and over, all that remains for him being to await the submission and homage of his foes. As for the obedient (5:9), they are perfected “finally,” i.e. brought into the closest relation to God, by what he has done for them; no need for him to stand at any priestly service on their behalf, like the levitical drudges! The contrast is between ἐκάθισεν and ζητήκεν (the attitude of a priest who has to be always ready for some sacrifice). Who the foes of Christ are, the writer never says.1 This militant metaphor was not quite congruous with the sacerdotal metaphor, although he found the two side by side in the 110th psalm. If he interpreted the prediction as Paul did in 1 Co 15:25ff., we might think of the devil (2:14) and such supernatural powers of evil; but this is not an idea which is worked out in Πρὸς Ἐβραίους. The conception belonged to the primitive messianic faith of the church, and the writer takes it up for a special purpose of his own, but he cannot interpret it, as Paul does, of an active reign of Christ during the brief interval before the end. Christ must reign actively, Paul argues. Christ must sit, says our writer.

The usual variation between the LXX ἐκ δεξιῶν and ἐν δεξιᾷ is reproduced in Πρὸς Ἐβραίους: the author prefers the latter, when he is not definitely quoting from the LXX as in 11. As this is a reminiscence rather than a citation, ἐν δεξιᾷ is the true reading, though ἐκ δεξιῶν is introduced by A 104 Athanasius. The theological significance of the idea is discussed in Dr. A. J. Tait’s monograph on The Heavenly Session of our Lord (1912), in which he points out the misleading influence of the Vulgate’s mistranslation of 10:2 (“hic autem unam pro peccatis offerens hostiam in sempiternum sedit”) upon the notion that Christ pleading his passion in heaven.

1 In Clem. Rom. 36:6 they are οἱ φαῦλοι καὶ ἀντιστασίμους τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ.
After reiterating the single sacrifice in v.14 (where τοὺς ἀνιμάζο-
μένους is "the sanctified," precisely as in 2.11), he adds (v.16) an
additional proof from scripture. Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα
tὸ ἁγιον, a biblical proof as usual clinching the argument. "Ἡμῖν
is "you and me," "us Christians," not the literary plural, as if he
meant "what I say is attested or confirmed by the inspired
book." Μαρτυρεῖν is a common Philonic term in this connexion,
e.g. Leg. Alleg. iii. 2, μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ ἐν ἑτέρων λέγων κτλ. (intro-
ducing Dt 4:30 and Ex 17:6); similarly in Xen. Mem. i. 2. 20,
μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν ὁ λέγων. The quotation, which is
obviously from memory, is part of the oracle already quoted
upon the new διαθήκη (38-13); the salient sentence is the closing
promise of pardon in v.17, but he leads up to it by citing some
of the introductory lines. The opening, μέτα γὰρ τὸ εἰρηκέναι,
implies that some verb follows or was meant to follow, but the
only one in the extant text is λέγει κύριος (v.16). Hence, before
v.17 we must understand something like μαρτυρεῖν καὶ λέγειν
προσέθηκεν καὶ φησιν (Oecumenius) or τότε εἰρηκέναι, although the
evidence for any such phrase, e.g. for ὡς εἰρήκει λέγει (31. 37. 55.
67. 71. 73. 80. 161) is highly precarious. In v.17 μηθυσθομοῦ
has been corrected into μηθῶθα by δο ΔΚ Λ Π, etc., since μηθῶ
was the LXX reading and also better grammar, the future after
οὐ μὴ being rare (cp. Diat. 2255, and above on 8.11). The oracle,
even in the LXX version, contemplates no sacrifice whatever
as a condition of pardon; but our author (see above, p. 131)
assumes that such an absolute forgiveness was conditioned by
some sacrifice.

The writer now (10:19-12:29) proceeds to apply his arguments
practically to the situation of his readers, urging their privileges
and their responsibilities under the new order of religion which
he has just outlined. In 10:19-31, which is the first paragraph,
encouragement (vv.19-25) passes into warning (26-31).

19 Brothers (ἅδελφοι, not since 3:12), since we have confidence to enter the
holy Presence in virtue of the blood of Jesus, by the fresh, living way which
he has inaugurated for us through the veil (that is, through his flesh), and
since we have "a great Priest over the house of God," let us draw near with
a true heart, in absolute assurance of faith, our hearts sprinkled clean from
a bad conscience, and our bodies washed in pure water; let us hold the hope
we avow without wavering (for we can rely on him who gave us the Promise);
and let us consider how to stir one another up to love and good deeds—not
ceasing to meet together, as is the habit of some, but admonishing one another
(sc. ἡμεῖς, as 3:18), all the more so, as you see the Day coming near.

The writer (ἐξοντες οὖν) presses the weighty arguments of
6:20-10:18, but he returns with them to reinforce the appeal of
3:1-4:16; after 10:19-21 the conception of Jesus as the ἵππος falls
more into the background. The passage is one long sentence,
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ἔσοντες . . . παρεσχόμεθα . . . κατέχωμεν . . . καὶ κατανωμέν . . . ἦς ἔσοντες οὖν (as in 4:14) since the way is now open (9:8) through the sacrifice of Jesus, whose atoning blood is for us the means of entering God's presence; παρρησία, "a sure intrauce" (Coverdale), echoing 4:16. But the writer fills out the appeal of 4:14-16 with the idea of the sanctuary and the sacrifice which he had broken off, in 5:1f, to develop. Though the appeal still is παρεσχόμεθα (23 = 4:16), the special motives are twofold: (a) παρρησία for access in virtue of the sacrifice of Jesus (vv.10, 20), and (b) the possession of Jesus as the supreme ἱερεύς (v.21). (a) The religious sense of παρρησία emerges in the early gloss inserted after Sir 18:29:

κρείσαν παρρησία ἐν δεσπότῃ μόνῃ

ἡ νεκρὰ καρδία νεκρῶν ἀντέχεσθαι.

Here παρρησία means confident trust, the unhesitating adherence of a human soul to God as its only Master, but our author specially defines it as παρρησία εἰς (cp. 2 P 1:11 ἡ εἰσόδος εἰς τὴν αὐτόνοι βασιλείαν) εἰσόδον (with gen. as ὁδόν in 9:5, but not a synonym for ὁδόν), i.e. for access to (τῶν ἄγιων) the holy Presence, ἐν τῷ αἴματι Ἰησοῦ (qualifying εἰσόδον).1 This resumes the thought of 9:10-12 (ἐν αἴματι as in 9:25). Compare for the phrase and general idea the words on the self-sacrifice of Decius Mus in Florus, i. 15. 3: "quasi monitu deorum, capite uelato, primam ante aciem dis manibus se devoverit, ut in confertissima se hostium tela iaculatus nouum ad uictoriam iter sanguinis sui semita aperiret." This εἰσόδος τῶν ἄγιων ἐν τῷ αἴματι Ἰησοῦ is further described in v.20; we enter by (ὡς, with ὁδόν . . . ζωαν in apposition) a way which Jesus has inaugurated by his sacrifice (9:18, 24, 25). This way is called recent or fresh and also living.

In πρόσφατος, as in the case of other compounds (e.g. κελαινεφής), the literal sense of the second element had been long forgotten (cp. Holden's note on Plutarch's Themistocles, 24); πρόσφατος simply means "fresh," without any sacrificial allusion ("freshly-killed"). Galen (de Hipp. et Plat, plac. iv. 7) quotes the well-known saying that λύτη ἐστὶ δόξα πρόσφατος κακοῦ παρουσίας, and the word (i.e. τὸ ἀρτίον γενόμενον, νέον, νεαρόν, Hesychius), as is plain from other passages like Arist. Magna Moralia, 1203β ὧ ἐκ τῆς προσφάτου φαντασίας ἀκρατῆς κτλ.), and Eccles 1:9 (οὐκ ἐστιν πᾶν πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τῶν ἥλιων), had no longer any of the specific sacrificial sense suggested etymologically by its second part. It is the thought of ἔξοθες in 13:6, though the writer means

1 Hence the idea is not put in quite the same way as in Eph 3:12 (ἐν ὄ έχουμεν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὴν προσεγωγὴν). In Sir 25:28 μοὶ (ὁς) γνωσί πονηρὴ ἐξουσία, Χ.Δ read παρρησίαν for Β's ἐξουσίαν, which proves how deeply the idea of liberty was rooted in παρρησία.
particularly (as in 1:2 9:8-11) to suggest that a long period had elapsed before the perfect fellowship was inaugurated finally; it is πρόσφατος, not ἀρχαῖος. Ζώσων means, in the light of 7:25 (cp. Jn 14:6), that access to God is mediated by the living Christ in virtue of his sacrificial intercession; the contrast is not so much with what is transient, as though ζώσων were equivalent to μένονσαν (Chrysostom, Cosm. 4:15a), as with the dead victims of the OT cultus or “the lifeless pavement trodden by the highpriest” (Delitzsch). He entered God’s presence thus διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος (6:10 9:8), τούτ’ ἐστιν τοῦ σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ—a ritual expression for the idea of 6:10. Διὰ is local, and, whether a verb like εἰσελθὼν is supplied or not, διὰ τ. κ. goes with ἐνεκαίνισεν, the idea being that Jesus had to die, in order to bring us into a living fellowship with God; the shedding of his blood meant that he had a body (10:5-10) to offer in sacrifice (cp. 9:14). The writer, however, elaborates his argument with a fresh detail of symbolism, suggested by the ritual of the tabernacle which he has already described in 9:20. There, the very existence of a veil hanging between the outer and the inner sanctuary was interpreted as a proof that access to God’s presence was as yet imperfectly realized. The highpriest carried once a year inside the veil the blood of victims slain outside it; that was all. Jesus, on the other hand, sheds his own blood as a perfect sacrifice, and thus wins entrance for us into the presence of God. Only, instead of saying that his sacrificial death meant the rending of the veil (like the author of Mk 15:88), i.e. the supersession of the OT barriers between God and man, he allegorizes the veil here as the flesh of Christ; this had to be rent before the blood could be shed, which enabled him to enter and open God’s presence for the people. It is a daring, poetical touch, and the parallelism is not to be prosaically pressed into any suggestion that the human nature in Jesus hid God from men λύοντας τὴν ἁμαρσάμενον, or that he ceased to be truly human when he sacrificed himself.

The idea already suggested in ζώσων is now (6) developed (in v.21) by (ἐχοντες) καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ, another echo of the earlier passage (cp. 3:1-6 4:14), ἱερεὺς μέγας being a sonorous LXX equivalent for ἀρχιερεὺς. Then comes the triple appeal, προσερχώμεθα . . . κατέχομεν . . . καὶ κατανοοῦμεν . . . The metaphor of προσερχώμεθα κτλ. (v.22), breaks down upon the fact that the Israelites never entered the innermost shrine, except as represented by their highpriest who entered once a year ἐν αἵματι ἄλλοτρῳ (9:25), which he took with him in order to atone for the sins that interrupted the communion of God and the people. In πρὸς Ἐβραίους the point is that, in virtue of the blood of Christ, Christians enjoy continuous fellowship with
God; the sacrifice of Christ enables them to approach God's presence, since their sins have been once and for all removed. The entrance of the OT highpriest therefore corresponds both to the sacrifice of Christ and to that access of Christians which the blood of Christ secures. On the one hand, Christ is our high-priest (v. 21); through his self-sacrifice in death the presence of God has been thrown open to us (vv. 19-20). This is the primary thought. But in order to express our use of this privilege, the writer has also to fall back upon language which suggests the entrance of the OT highpriest (cp. v. 19). He does not mean that Christians are priests, with the right of entry in virtue of a sacrifice which they present, but, as to approach God was a priestly prerogative under the older order, he describes the Christian access to God in sacerdotal metaphors. Προσερχόμεθα is one of these. It is amplified first by a μετά clause, and then by two participial clauses. The approach to God must be whole-hearted, μετά ἀληθινῆς καρδίας, without any hesitation or doubt, ἐν πληροφορίᾳ. This thought of πίστις as man's genuine answer to the realities of divine revelation, is presently to be developed at length (10:8ff.). Meantime the writer throws in the double participial clause, βεβαιωμένοι . . . καθαρῷ. The metaphors are sacerdotal; as priests were sprinkled with blood and bathed in water, to qualify them for their sacred service, so Christians may approach God with all confidence, on the basis of Christ's sacrifice, since they have been βεβαιωμένοι (i.e. sprinkled and so purified from—a frequent use of the verb) ἀπὸ συνείδησεως πονηρᾶς (= συνείδησεως ἀμαρτίων, 10:2) in their hearts (τὰς καρδίας—no external cleansing). Then the writer adds, καὶ λευκουμένοι τὸ σώμα ὅσιοτε καθαρῷ, suggesting that baptism corresponded to the bathing of priests (e.g. in Lev 16:4). Once and for all, at baptism (cp. 1 P 3:21), Christians have been thus purified from guilty stains by the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice. What room then can there be in their minds for anything but faith, a confident faith that draws near to God, sure that there is no longer anything between Him and them?

The distinctive feature which marked off the Christian βαπτισμός from all similar ablutions (6:9-10) was that it meant something more than a cleansing of the body; it was part and parcel of an inward cleansing of the καρδία, effected by τὸ αἵμα

1 The phrase ἐν ἀληθινῇ καρδίᾳ occurs in Test. Dan 5:3 (v.1, καθαρῷ) and in Is 38:2 (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ).
2 There is a verbal parallel in the account of Isis-worship given by Apuleius (Metamorph. xi. 28: “ergo igitur cunctis adfatim praeparatis . . . principalis dei nocturnis orgiis illustrius, plena iam fiducia germanae religionis obsequium diuinum frequentabam”).
3 More specifically, by the αἵμα βαπτισμοῦ of 12:24.
Hence this as the vital element is put first, though the body had also its place and part in the cleansing experience. The καρδία and the σώμα are a full, plastic expression for the entire personality, as an ancient conceived it. Ancient religious literature is full of orders for the penitent to approach the gods only after moral contrition and bodily cleansing, with a clean heart and a clean body, in clean clothes even. But, apart from other things, such ablutions had to be repeated, while the Christian ἡ ἐξάλειψις was a single ceremony, lying at the source and start of the religious experience. And what our author is thinking of particularly is not this or that pagan rite, but the OT ritual for priests as described in Ex 29:20f., Lv 8:28f. 14:5f. etc. (cp. Joma 3).

Three specimens of the anxious care for bodily purity in ancient religious ritual may be given. First (i) the ritual directions for worship in Syll. 567 (ii a.D.): πρύσων μὲν καὶ τὸ μέγαστον, χείρα καὶ γνώμην καθάροις καὶ ὑγείας ἡπάρχοντας καὶ μηδὲν αὐτοῖς δεώνυν συνειδήσας. Second (ii) the stress laid on it by a writer like Philo, who (quod deus sit immutabilis, 2), after pleading that we should honour God by purifying ourselves from evil deeds and washing off the stains of life, adds: καὶ γὰρ εὐθείας εἰς μὲν τὰ λεπτα μὴ ἕξειν βαδίζειν, διὰ τὸ μὴ πρόσερεν λουσμένον σφαδρύνητα τὸ σῶμα, εὔχεσθαι δὲ καὶ θείων ἐνεχειρεῖν ἐπὶ κηλιδομένη καὶ πεφυρμένη διανοῦ. His argument is that if the body requires ablutions (περιπραντηρίοι καὶ καθαρσίας ἀγαντικώς) before touching an external shrine, how can anyone who is morally impure draw near (προσελθεῖν τῷ θεῷ) the most pure God, unless he means to repent? 'Ο μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τὸ μηδὲν ἐπεξεργάσασθαι κακῶν καὶ τὰ παλαιὰ ἐκκώσαι ταῖς δικαίωσις γεγονθαίς προστίθεται [cp. He 4:12f. 13]. οδ' ἀνεύ τοῦτων δυσκάθαρτον διὰ ἁμαρτάνον φθέγγοντας τὸν τὰ ἐν μνήμης τῆς διανοίας ὀργῆνα [cp. He 4:13] καὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτούντας αὐτὴς ἐμπεριστατοῦντον. Or again in de Plant. 39: οὐκ αὐτὰς καὶ ψυχὰς καθηραμένους, τὰ μὲν λουτρῶν, τὰ δὲ νόμων καὶ πανδελεὶς ὀρθῆς μείωσις. In de Cherub. 28 he denounces the ostentatious religion of the worldly, who in addition to their other faults, τὰ μὲν σώματα λουτρῶν καὶ καθαρσίας ἀπορρίπτοντας, τὰ δὲ ψυχῶν ἐκκώσαι πάθη, οὕτω καταρρευαίνειν οἱ φίλοι, οὕτω βαλατορίζει οὕτω ἐκπλησσόμενοι, are very particular about their outward religious practices but careless about a clean soul. Finally, (iii) there is the saying of Epictetus (iv. 10. 3): Καὶ γὰρ ἐκκοῦν (i.e. the gods) φύσει καθαροῦ καὶ ἀκυροῦ, εἴπ' ἄραν ἡγιασμένοι αὐτοῖς οἱ ἁπατοῦνται κατὰ τὸν λόγον, ἐπὶ τοῦτον καὶ τοῦ καθαροῦ καὶ τοῦ καθαρῶν εἰσὶν ἀνθεκτικοὶ.

For the exceptional ἐφαρμισμένου (k* A C D*), K* D* etc. have substituted ἐφαρμισμένου (so Theodoret). The λεπομενοῖ of K B D P is the more common κοινή form of the Attic λεπομένου (A C D* etc.).

The next appeal (v. 28), κατέχωμεν τὴν διαλογιαν τῆς ἐπίδοσ (to which k* vg pesh eth add the gloss of ἡμῶν), echoes 4:14

---

1 Τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαλογιας ἐν φ' ἡγιάσθη, as 1 Co 6:11 ἀλλὰ ἀπελώσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθη.
3 According to a recently discovered (first century) inscription on a Palestinian synagogue (cp. Revue Biblique, 1921, pp. 247 f.), the synagogue was furnished with τῶν ἐξούσων (for hospitality, cp. below, 13) καὶ τὰ χρησιμοποιοῦντα τῶν ἔθνων (baths for ritual ablutions).
This hope for the future was first confessed at baptism, and rests upon God’s promise (as already explained in διατάγματα). It is to be held υπό τοῦ λόγου, αἰτίας, ἀδύνατον, ἀναφερόμενον ἀλτίνης, de Spec. Leg. ii. 1); in Irenaeus it recurs in a similar connexion (i. 88, ed. Harvey: ὁ τῶν κανόνων τῆς ἀληθείας ἀναφέρει ἐν θάντῳ κατέχων, διὰ τοῦ βαπτισμός εἰληφε). The old Wycliffite version translates finely: “hold we the confession of our hope bowynge to no side.” The close connexion between ἀναφέρομεν κτλ. and λεουσμένοι κτλ. makes it inadvisable to begin the second appeal with καὶ λεουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὑματι καθάρο (Erasmus, Beza, Bengel, Lachmann, Lünemann, von Soden, B. Weiss, etc.). A more plausible suggestion, first offered by Theodoret and adopted recently by Hofmann and Seeberg, is to begin the second appeal after πίστεως, making κατεχόμεν carry ἀναφέρομεν ... καθάρο. This yields a good sense, for it brings together the allusions to the baptismal confession. But the ordinary view is more probable; the asyndeton in κατεχόμεν is impressive, and if it is objected that the κατεχόμεν clause is left with less content than the other two, the answer is that its eschatological outlook is reiterated in the third clause, and that by itself its brevity has a telling force. Besides, ἔχοντες κτλ. (19–21) introduce κατεχόμεν as well as προσερχόμεθα.

The third appeal (24–25) turns on love (cp. 6:10), as the first on faith, and the second on hope. The members of the circle or community are to stir up one another to the practice of Christian love. Since this is only possible when common worship and fellowship are maintained, the writer warns them against following the bad example of abandoning such gatherings; καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους, for, if we are to κατανοῶν Christ (3:1), we are also bound to keep an eye on one another εἰς παραδείσομον ἀγαπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων (i.e. an active, attractive moral life, inspired by Christian love). This good sense of παραδείσομος as stimulus seems to be an original touch; in Greek elsewhere it bears the bad sense of provocation or exasperation (cp. Ac 15:39), although the verb παραδείσει had already acquired a good sense (e.g. in Josephus, Ant. xvi. 125, παραδείσει τὰς εἴναις: in Pr 6:8 ἵσθι μὴ ἐκλυόμενος, παράξευε δὲ καὶ τὸν φίλον σου διὰ ἐνεγκόμως: and in Xen. Cyrop. vi. 2. 5, καὶ τούτους ἐπαίνον τε παράξειν). Pliny’s words at the close of his letter to Caninius Rufus (iii. 7) illustrate what is meant by παραδείσει in this sense: “Scio te stimulis non egere; me tamen tui caritas evocat ut currentem

1 An instance of this is quoted in 11.1.
quoque instigem, sicut tu soles me. 'Αγαθή δ' ἔρις, cum invicem se mutuis exhortationibus amici ad amorem immortalitatis exacuunt.' How the παροξυμός is to be carried out, the writer does not say. By setting a good example? By definite exhortations (παρακαλοῦντες, v. 26, like 131)? Μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες—do not do to one another what God never does to you (136), do not leave your fellow-members in the lurch (the force of ἐγκαταλείποντες, especially in the κοινὴ)—τὴν ἐπίσυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν (reflexive pronoun in the genitive = ἑαυτῶν). 'Επίσυναγωγή in the κοινὴ (cp. Deissmann’s Light from the East, 102 f.) means a collection (of money), but had already in Jewish Greek (e.g. 2 Mac 27 ἐως ἄν συνάγῃ δ’ θεὸς ἐπίσυναγωγὴν τοῦ λαοῦ) begun to acquire the present sense of a popular “gathering.” Καθὼς ἔδος (ἐκ ἐστιν) ταῦτα. But who are these? What does this abandonment of common fellowship mean? (a) Perhaps that some were growing ashamed of their faith; it was so insignificant and unpopular, even dangerous to anyone who identified himself with it openly. They may have begun to grow tired of the sacrifices and hardships involved in membership of the local church. This is certainly the thought of 1038, and it is better than to suppose (b) the leaders were a small group of teachers or more intelligent Christians, who felt able, in a false superiority, to do without common worship; they did not require to mix with the ordinary members! The author in any case is warning people against the dangers of individualism, a warning on the lines of the best Greek and Jewish ethics, e.g. Isokrates, ad Demon. 13, τιμᾶ τὸ δαμόνιον ἄει μίν, μάλιστα δὲ μετὰ τῆς πόλεως, and the rabbinic counsel in Taanith, 11. 1 (“whenever the Israelites suffer distress, and one of them withdraws from the rest, two angels come to him and, laying their hands upon his head, say, this man who separates himself from the assembly shall not see the consolation which is to visit the congregation”), or in Hillel’s saying (Pirke Aboth 25): “Separate not thyself from the congregation, and trust not in thyself until the day of thy death.” The loyal Jews are described in Ps.-Sol 1718 as οἱ ἄγαπῶντες συναγωγάς δούλων, and a similar thought occurs also (if “his” and not “my” is the correct reading) in Od. Sol 32: “His members are with Him, and on them do I hang.” Any early Christian who attempted to live like a pious particle without the support of the community ran serious risks in an age when there was no public opinion to support him. His isolation, whatever its motive—fear, fastidiousness, self-conceit, or anything else—exposed him to the danger of losing his faith altogether. These are possible explanations of the writer’s grave tone in the passage before us. Some critics, like Zahn (§ 46), even think that (c) such unsatisfactory Christians left their own little congregation for another, in a spirit of lawless pique, or to gratify their
own tastes selfishly; but έαυτών is not emphatic, and in any congregation of Christians the duties of love would be pressed. Separatist tendencies were not absent from the early church; thus some members considered themselves too good to require common worship, as several warnings prove, e.g. in Barn 4:10 μὴ καθ' έαυτών ἐνυδύνοντες μονάζετε ὡς ἡ δεδικαιωμένοι, ἀλλ' ἔπει το αὕτο συνερχόμενοι συνζητεῖτε περὶ τοῦ κοινῆ συμφέροντος) and Ign. Eph. 5:6 (ὁ οὖν μη ἐρχόμενος ἔπει το αὐτὸ οὖσς ἡ δηον ὑπερηφανεί καὶ έαυτών διέκρινεν). But in our epistle (d) the warning is directed specially against people who combined Christianity with a number of mystery-cults, patronizing them in turn, or who withdrew from Christian fellowship, feeling that they had exhausted the Christian faith and that it required to be supplemented by some other cult. "At first and indeed always there were naturally some people who imagined that one could secure the sacred contents and blessings of Christianity as one did those of Isis or the Magna Mater, and then withdraw" (Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, bk. iii. c. 4; cp. Reitzenstein's Hellen. Mysterienreligionen, 94). This was serious, for, as the writer realized, it implied that they did not regard Christianity as the final and full revelation; their action proved that the Christian faith ranked no higher with them than one of the numerous Oriental cults which one by one might interest the mind, but which were not necessarily in any case the last word on life. The argument of the epistle has been directed against this misconception of Christianity, and the writer here notes a practical illustration of it in the conduct of adherents who were holding aloof, or who were in danger of holding aloof, from the common worship. Hence the austere warning which follows. Such a practice, or indeed any failure to "draw near" by the way of Jesus, is an insult to God, which spells hopeless ruin for the offender. And evidently this retribution is near. Christians are to be specially on their guard against conduct that means apostasy, for θείη (how, he does not say) πεταλοῦσαν (as in Ro 13:12) τὴν ἡμέραν (here, as in 1 Co 3:18, without ἐκείνη or τοῦ κυρίου). This eschatological setting distinguishes the next warning (vv.26-31) from the earlier in 6:4.
Apostasy like withdrawal from the church on the ground already mentioned, is treated as one of the deliberate (έκονοι ως) sins which (cp. on 54), under the OT order of religion, were beyond any atonement. Wilful offences, like rebellion and blasphemy against God, were reckoned unpardonable. "In the case of one who, by his sin, intentionally disowns the covenant itself, there can be no question of sacrifice. He has himself cut away the ground on which it would have been possible for him to obtain reconciliation" (Schultz, OT Theology, ii. 88). There is an equivalent to this, under the new διαθήκη, our author declares. To abandon Christianity is to avow that it is inadequate, and this denial of God's perfect revelation in Jesus Christ is fatal to the apostate. In έκονοι ως διοικοτήνων ἡμῶν (28), έκονοι ως is put first for the sake of emphasis, and διοικοτήνων means the sin of ἀποστήμα επὶ θεοῦ ζύντος (312) or of παρατίττευν (68), the present tense implying that such people persist in this attitude. 'Έκονοι ως is the keynote to the warning. Its force may be felt in a passage like Thuc. iv. 98, where the Athenians remind the Boeotians that God pardons what is done under the stress of war and peril, καὶ γὰρ τῶν ἄκονοι ἀμαρτήματον καταφεγγὴν εἶναι τοὺς βωμούς, and that it is wanton and presumptuous crimes alone which are heinous. Philo (vit. Mos. i. 49) describes Balaam praying for forgiveness from God on the ground that he had sinned ἐπὶ ἀνοίας ἀλλ' οὖ καθ' ἐκονομών γνώμην. The adverb occurs in 2 Mac 14 (Ἀλκιμός . . . έκονοις δὲ μεμολοσμένοις). The general idea of the entire warning is that the moral order punishes all who wantonly and wilfully flout it; as Menander once put it (Kock's Com. Attic. Fragm. 700):

νόμος φιλαξθεὶς οἴδεν ἔστιν ἢ νόμος
ο ὦ στι φιλαξθεὶς καὶ νόμος καὶ δήμος.

Our author expresses this law of retribution in personal terms drawn from the OT, which prove how deeply moral and reverent his religious faith was, and how he dreaded anything like presuming upon God's kindness and mercy. The easy-going man thinks God easy going; he is not very serious about his religious duties, and he cannot imagine how God can take them very seriously either. "We know" better, says the author of Πρὸς Εβραίους!

Christianity is described (in v. 26) as τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπιγνώσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, a semi-technical phrase of the day, which recurs in the Pastoral Epistles (though with ἔλθεῖν εἰς instead of λαβεῖν). It is not one of our author's favourite expressions, but the phrase

1 Here it is an equivalent for the phrases used in 64; there is no distinction between ἐπιγνώσις and γνώσις (θεοῦ) any more than in the LXX, and
is partly used by Epictetus in its most general sense (λαβών τις παρὰ τῆς φύσεως μέτρα καὶ κανόνας εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας κτλ., ii. 20. 21), when upbraiding the wretched academic philosophers (ὁ ἀκαδημιώτερος Ἀκαδημιώτερος) for discrediting the senses as organs of knowledge, instead of using and improving them. All that renegades can expect (v. 27) is φοβερά τις (=quidam, deepening the idea with its touch of vagueness) ἐκδοχή (a sense coined by the writer for this term, after his use of ἐκδέχεσθαι in 10:18) κρίσεως, for they have thrown over the only sacrifice that saves men from κρίσεις (9:27). This is expanded in a loose reminiscence of Is 26:11 (γῆς λαμψεται λαὸν ἀπαθετον, καὶ νῦν τῶν ὑπεντάντων ἔσται), though the phrase πυρὸς γῆς recalls Zeph 1:19 (3:8) ἐν πυρὶ γῆς αὐτοῦ καταναλωθήσεται πάσα ἡ γῆ. The contemporary Jewish Apocalypse of Baruch (48:89-90) contains a similar threat to wilful sinners:

"Therefore shall a fire consume their thoughts, and in flame shall the meditations of their reins be tried; for the Judge shall come and will not tarry—because each of earth's inhabitant knew when he was transgressing."

The penalty for the willful rejection (ἀδετήσας) of the Mosaic law was severe (Dt 17:2-17), but not more severe than the penalty to be inflicted on renegades from Christianity (vv.28-31). The former penalty was merciless, χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν (to which, at an early period, καὶ δακρύων was added by D, most old Latin texts, and syriac). It is described in a reminiscence of Dt 17:6 ἐπὶ δυνιν μάρτυρον ἦ ἐπὶ τρεῖν μάρτυρον ἀποθανεῖται ὁ ἀποθνήσκων (i.e. the apostate who has yielded to idolatry). The witnesses executed the punishment for the sin of which they had given evidence (Dt 17:7, Ac 7:57, Jn 8:49, Sanhedrin 6:4), but this is not before the writer's mind; ἐπὶ with the dative simply means "on the ground of (the evidence given by)." In πόσῳ δοκεῖτε κτλ. (v.29), δοκεῖτε is intercalated as in Aristoph. Acharn. 12 (πῶς τοῦτ' ἐσοώε μοι δοκεῖς τὴν καρδίαν;), and Herm. Sim. ix. 28. 8 (εἰ τὰ ζῆνη τοὺς δουλοὺς αὐτῶν κολάζουσιν, ἐὰν τὰς ἀρνητήτας τὸν κύριον ἑαυτοῦ, τι δοκεῖτε ποιῆσει ὁ κύριος ὑμῖν;). Πόσῳ (cp. 9:14) introduces an 

ἀλήθεια had been already stamped by Philo (e.g. de Justitia, 6, where the proselyte is said μεταναστάς ἐλάληθειαν) as a term for the true religion, which moulds the life of those who become members of the People. Compare the study of the phrase by M. Dibelius in NT Studien für G. Heinrichs (1914), pp. 176-189.

1 Probably it was the awkwardness of γῆς, coming after πυρός, which led to its omission in W. Sah reads simply "the flame of the fire."

2 According to the later rabbinic theory of inspiration, even to assert that Moses uttered one word of the Torah on his own authority was to despise the Torah (Sifre 112, on Nu 15:35).
argument from the less to the greater, which was the first of Hillel's seven rules for exegesis, and which is similarly used by Philo in *de Fuga*, 16, where, after quoting Ex 2115, he adds that Moses here practically denies that there is any pardon for those who blaspheme God (εἰ γὰρ οἱ τοὺς θνητοὺς κακογορήσαντες γονεῖς ἀπάγονται τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ, τίνος ἄξιον χρὴ νομίζειν τιμωρίας τοὺς τῶν ὀλων πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν βλασφημεῖν εὐπορεύοντας). There is also a passage in *de Spec. Legibus* (ii. 254, 255) where Philo asks, "If a man μὴ προσηκόντως δὲννε is guilty, πόσης ἄξιος τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν ὄντος ὁντα θεον ἀρνοῦμενος;"


tιμωρία originally meant vengeance. Διασφέρει δὲ τιμωρία καὶ κόλασις ἡ μὲν γὰρ κόλασις τοῦ πάσχοντος ἐνεκα ἐστιν, ἡ δὲ τιμωρία τοῦ ποιοῦντος, ἵνα ἀποσπασθῇ (Arist. Rhetoric, i. 10. 11; see Cope's *Introduction*, p. 232). But it became broadened into the general sense of punishment, and this obtained in Hellenistic Greek.

The threefold description of what is involved in the sin of apostasy begins: ὁ τῶν ύλῶν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας, another expression for the thought of 68, which recalls Zec 128 (Λῆθος καταπατούμενον πᾶσιν τὸς ἑθνερον' πᾶς ὁ καταπάτων αὐτὴν ἐμπαίζων ἐμπαίζεται). Καταπατεῖν ὄρκια was the phrase for breaking oaths (*Ilīad*, 4157); with a personal object, the verb denotes contempt of the most flagrant kind. Another aspect of the sin is that a man has thereby κοινὸν 1 ἡγησάμενος the sacrifice of Jesus; his action means that it is no more to him than an ordinary death ("communem," d), instead of a divine sacrifice which makes him a partaker of the divine fellowship (see p. 145). Where Christ is rejected, he is first despised; outward abandonment of him springs from some inward depreciation or disparagement. The third aspect, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος (not τὸν νόμον Μουσέως) ἐνύβρισας, suggests that the writer had in mind the language of Zec 11210 (EDURE ... πνεῦμα χάριτος καὶ οἰκτιρμοῦ), but πνεῦμα χάριτος (contrasted here, as in Jn 17, with the νόμος Μουσέως) is a periphrasis for πνεῦμα ἄγιον (64), χάρις being chosen (416 1115) to bring out the personal, gracious nature of the power so wantonly insulted.2 ἔνυβρισάν is not a LXX term, and it generally takes the dative. (Ἐν ὡς ἡγιασθη after ἡγησάμενος is omitted by A and some MSS of Chrysostom.)

The sombre close (vv.30. 31) of the warning is a reminder that the living God punishes renegades. Φοβηρὸν (v.31) re-echoes the φοβερά of v.27, and the awful nature of the doom is brought out by two quotations adapted from the OT. Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις,

1 Once in the LXX (Pr 1523) in this sense.
2 In *Test. jud.* 182 the πνεῦμα χάριτος poured out upon men is the Spirit as a gracious gift of God. But in He 1029, as in Eph 420, it is the divine Spirit wounded or outraged, the active retribution, however, being ascribed not to the Spirit itself but to God.
gō χαίρας Θεοῦ is the same form of Dt 32:36 as is quoted in Ro 12:19; it reproduces the Hebrew original more closely than the LXX (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδίκησεν δικαίωσις), perhaps from some current Greek version, unless the author of Hebrews borrowed it from Paul. Some of the same authorities as in 8:12 indeed add, from Ro 12:19, λέγει κύριος (N² A D° K L arm Theodoret, Damasus, etc.). Κρινεῖ Κύριος τῶν λαοῦ αὐτοῦ is from Dt 32:36. The thought of the original, in both passages, is God avenging his people on their foes and championing them, not punishing them; but here this fate is assigned to all who put themselves outside the range of God’s mercy in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ; they fall under God’s retribution. Τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χείρας Θεοῦ is a phrase used in a very different sense in 2 S 24:14, Sir 2:18; here it means, to fall into the grasp of the God who punishes the disloyal or rebels against his authority. Thus the tyrant Antiochus is threatened, in 2 Mac 7:81, οὐ μὴ διαφύγῃς τὰς χειρὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ. As in 3:12, ζῶντος is added to Θεοῦ to suggest that he is quick and alive to inflict retribution. The writer is impressively reticent on the nature of God’s τιμωρία, even more reticent than Plato, in one of the gravest warnings in Greek literature, the famous passage in the Leges (904, 905) about the divine δίκη: Ταῦτας τῆς δίκης οὐτε ἐν μὴ πότε οὐτε εἰ ἄλλος ἄτιχος γενόμενος ἐπείξεται περιγενέσαθαι Θεῶν ἢ πασῶν δικῶν διαφερόντως ἔταξεν τε οἱ τάξαντες χρεών τε ἐξευλαβεῖσθαι τὸ παράπτωμα. οὐ γάρ ἀμεληθήσῃ ποτὲ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς· οὐχ οὔτω συμκρόνω δεδύσῃ κατὰ τὸ τῆς γῆς βάθος, οὔτε ὑψηλός γενόμενος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναπτθῆσαι, τείσας δὲ αὐτῶν τῆν προσήκουσαν τιμωρίαν εἰτ’ ἐνθάδε μένων εἴτε καὶ ἐν Αἰδών διαπορειθέσις. Plato altered the Homeric term δίκη Θεῶν to suit his purpose; what meant “way,” or “habit,” he turned into a weighty word for “justice.” The alteration is justified from his “preaching” point of view, and the solemn note of the Greek sage’s warning is that of He 10:26; you cannot play fast and loose with God.

Yet, as at 6:9, so here, the writer swiftly turns from warning to encouragement, appealing to his readers to do better than he feared, and appealing to all that was best in them. “Why throw away the gains of your fine record in the past? You have not long to wait for your reward. Hold on for a little longer.” This is the theme of vv.22-29:

1 Paul cites the saying to prove that private Christians need not and must not take revenge into their own hands, since God is sure to avenge his people on their adversaries. Which is close to the idea of the original. Our author uses the text to clinch a warning that God will punish (κρινεῖ = “punibit,” not “judicabit”) his people for defying and deserting him.

2 So the martyr Eleazar protests in 2 Mac 6:24, as he refuses to save his life by unworthy compromise: εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος ἐξελοῦμαι τὴν εἰ ἀνθρώπων τιμωρίαν, ἀλλὰ τὰς τοῦ παντοκράτορος χεῖρας οὕτε εὖν οὔτε ἀποθανόν ἐκφέβομαι.
Recall the former days when, after you were enlightened, you endured a hard struggle of suffering; partly by being held up yourselves to obloquy and anguish, partly by making common cause with those who fared in this way; for you did sympathise with the prisoners, and you took the confiscation of your own belongings cheerfully, conscious that elsewhere you had higher, you had lasting possessions. Now do not drop that confidence of yours; it carries with it a rich hope of reward. Steady patience is what you need, so that after doing the will of God you may (like Abraham) get what you have been promised. For "in a little, a very little" now, "The Coming One (9) will arrive without delay.

Meantime my just man shall live on by his faith; if he shrinks back, my soul takes no delight in him."

We are not the men to shrink back and be lost, but to have faith and so to win our souls.

The excellent record of these Christians in the past consisted in their common brotherliness, which is now viewed in the light of the hardships they had had to endure, soon after they became Christians. The storm burst on them early; they weathered it nobly; why give up the voyage, when it is nearly done? It is implied that any trouble at present is nothing to what they once passed through. "Justgment is the faith that tested their powers (21); came to denote a martyr's death in the early church; but no such red significance attaches to it here. Apparently the persecution was not pushed to the last extreme; all survived it.

Hence there can be no allusion to the "ludibria" of Nero's outburst against the Roman Christians, which is used in a purely figurative sense (so "theatron" in 1 Co 4), like "theatrizen" in Polybius (e.g. iii. 91. 10, διόπερ ήμελλον... εκθεατριζεν δε τοις πολεμιους φυγομαχοντας). The meaning is that they had been held up to public derision, scoffed and sneered at, accused of crime and vice, unjustly suspected and denounced. All this had been, the writer knew, a real ordeal, particularly because the stinging contempt and insults had had to be borne in the open. "Over men yap τις δνειδίητα καθ' έαυτόν, λυπηρόν μεν, πολλῷ δε πλέον, δοταν επι πάντων (Chrysostom)." They had been exposed to ινεοιαις τε και θλίψει, taunts and scorn that tempted one to feel shame (an experience which our author evidently felt keenly), as well as to wider hardships, both insults and injuries. All this they had stood manfully. Better still,
their personal troubles had not rendered them indisposed to care for their fellow-sufferers, τῶν οὕτως (i.e. in the παθήματα) ἀναστρεφομένων (13:33). They exhibited the virtue of practical sympathy, urged in 13:3, at any risk or cost to themselves (κοινωνοι . . . γεννήθητες with the genitive, as in LXX of Pr 28:14, Is 1:28).

The ideas of v.33 are now (v.34) taken up in the reverse order (as in 5:1-7).

Kal y.a.p Toi:s Seu'toLs uuvnrnuoTA, imprisonment being for some a form of their παθήματα. Christians in prison had to be visited and fed by their fellow-members. For συμπαθεῖν (cp. 4:15) as between man and man, see Test. Sym. 36 καὶ λοιπόν συμπαθεῖ τῷ φθονομένῳ: Test. Benj. 4 τῷ ἀσθενοῦντι συμπάθεσι: Ign. Rom. 64 συμπαθείτω μοι: and the saying which is quoted in Meineke’s Frag. Comic. Graec. iv. 52, ἐκ τοῦ παθεῖν γίγνοντε καὶ τὸ συμπαθεῖν καὶ σοὶ γὰρ ἄλλος συμπαθήσεται πάθων. They had also borne their own losses with more than equanimity, with actual gladness (παθεῖν χαράς, the same thought as in Ro 5:3, though differently worked out), γινώσκοντες (with accus. and infinitive) ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς (= δμᾶς, which is actually read here by Cosmas Indicopleustes, 348a; ἑαυτοῖς is not emphatic any more than ἑαυτῶν in v.25) κρείσσονα (a favourite term of the author) υπαρξεῖν (Ac 2:25) καὶ μένουσαν (1:14, the thought of Mt 6:20). Τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν υπαρχόντων ὑμῶν (cp. Polybius, iv. 17. 4, ἀρπαγάς υπαρχόντων) implies that their own property had been either confiscated by the authorities or plundered in some mob-riot. Note the paronomasia of υπαρχόντων and υπαρξεῖν, and the place of this loss in the list of human evils as described in the Laches, 195 E (ἐίτε τῷ βάνατος ἐίτε νόσος ἐίτε ἀποτολὴ χρημάτων ἐσται).

There is no question of retaliation; the primitive Christians whom the author has in view had no means of returning injuries for injuries, or even of claiming redress. Thus the problem raised and solved by contemporary moralists does not present itself to the writer; he does not argue, as, e.g., Maximus of Tyre did in the next century (Dissert. ii.), that the good man should treat the loss of property as a trifle, and despise the futile attempts of his enemies to injure him thus, the soul or real self being beyond the reach of such evil-doers. The tone is rather that of Tob 4:21 (μὴ φοβάθω, παυτίν, ὅτι ἐπιτεχνικάμεν· υπάρχει σοι τολλα, εἰάν φοβηθής τῶν θεῶν κτλ.), except that our author notes the glow (μετὰ χαρᾶς) of an enthusiastic unworldliness, which was more than any Stoic resignation or even any quiet acquiescence in providence; he suggests in ἑαυτοῖς that, while others might seize and hold their property, they themselves had a possession of which no one could rob them. Seneca (Ep. ix. 18-19) quotes the famous reply of the philosophic Stilpo to Demetrius Poliorctes, who asked him, after the siege and sack of Megara, if he had lost anything in the widespread ruin, Stilpo answered that he had suffered no loss; “omnia bona mecum sunt.” That is, Seneca explains, he did not consider anything as “good” which could be taken from him. This helps to illustrate what the author of Ἰππὸν Ἐθραίον means. As Epictetus put it, there are more losses than the loss of property (ii. 10. 14.

1 This is not conveyed in προσέδεξαοθε, which here, as in 11:26, simply means “accepted,” not “welcomed.”
No persecution known to us in the primitive church answers to the data of this passage. But some sidelights are thrown upon it by Philo's vivid account of the earlier anti-Semitic riots in Alexandria. He notes that even those who sympathized with the persecuted were punished: τῶν δὲ ὃς ἀλῆθες πεπονθῶν φίλοι καὶ συγγενεῖς, ὃι μόνον ταίς τῶν προσηκόντων συμβραίνοντας συνήγγαγαν, ἀπέγνωσεν, ἐμαυθικόντο, ἐποδημάτωσεν, καὶ μετὰ πάσας τὰς αἰκίας, ὡς ἀδύνατο χωρῆσαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν, ἢ τελευταία καὶ ἐφεδρὸς τιμωρία σταυρὸς ἦν (ἐν Flaccus, ἡ: π. β. neither here nor in 1 Πτδ* does the author of Πρὸς Ἑβραίους mention the cross as a punishment for sufferers). Philo (ibid. 9) continues: πενία χαλεπῶν μὲν, καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν κατασκευάζεται πρὸς ἑξῆρων, ἔπειτα δὲ τῆς εἰς τὰ σώματα ἔβρωσε, κἂν ἢ βαρακτάτη. He repeats this (10), telling how Flaccus maltreated Jews who had been already stripped of their property, ᾧν οἱ μὲν ὑπομενόντων διότι συμβραίνας, πενίαν ὁμοίαν καὶ τὴν ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν ἔβρων, καὶ οἱ μὲν δρώντες, ὅσπερ ἐν τοῖς θεατρίκοις μέμως καθυπερκρίνοντο τοὺς πάλχοντας.

Three items of textual corruption occur in v. 84. (a) δεσμοίς (p. 13 A D* H 33. 104. 241. 424**. 635. 1245. 1288. 1739. 1908. 1912. 2005 r vg syrarm boh arm Chrys.) was eventually corrupted into δεσμοῖς (μοί) in K D* Ψ 256. 1288* etc. vt eth Clem. Orig.), a misspelling (i.e. δεσμοίς) which, with μοί added to make sense, contributed to the impression that Paul had written the epistle (Ph 1 Thess. 18). Compare the text implied in the (Pelagian ?) prologue to Paul's epp. in vg: "nam et vincit compasti estis, et rapinam bonorum vestrorum cum gudio suscepsitis."

(b) ἐαντοὺς (p. 13 Λ H lat boh Clem. Orig. etc.) suffered in the course of transmission; it was either omitted (by C) or altered into ἐαντοὺς (D K L Ψ, etc., Clem.) or ἐν ἑαντοὺς (1. 467. 489. 642. 920. 937. 1867. 1873), the dative being an attempt to bring out the idea that they had in their own religious personalities a possession beyond the reach of harm and loss, an idea pushed by some editors even into ἐαντοὺς, but too subtle for the context.

(c) ἐταρξαίον was eventually defined by the addition of ἐν (τοῖς) σφαναῖοι (from Ph 3:27?) in K D* H** Ψ 6. 203. 326. 506. 1288. 1739 syr arm Chrys. etc.

The reminder of vv. 82-84 is now (35-39) pressed home. Μὴ ἀποβάλλητε οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν ὑμῶν, as evinced in μετὰ χαρᾶς . . . γυνώσκωντες κτλ. The phrase occurs in Dio Chrys. Orat. 34 (δέδοικα μὴ τελῶς ἀποβάλλητε τὴν παρρησίαν) and elsewhere in the
sense of losing courage, but παρρησία retains its special force (3rd) here, and ἀποβάλλειν is the opposite of κατέχειν ("nolite itaque amittere," vg). The παρρησία is to be maintained, ἡττισ ἐκεί μεγάλην μισθαποδοσίαν (as 11:26), it is so sure of bringing its reward in the bliss promised by God to cheerful loyalty. Compare the saying of the contemporary rabbi Tarphon: "faithful is the Master of thy work, who will pay thee the reward of thy work, and know thou that the recompense of the reward of the righteous is for the time to come" (Pirke Aboth 2:19).

Epictetus makes a similar appeal, in iv. 3. 3 f., not to throw away all that one has gained in character by failing to maintain one's philosophical principles when one has suffered some loss of property. When you lose any outward possession, recollect what you gain instead of it (τι ἄντι αἵτων περιποιηθῇ); otherwise, you imperil the results of all your past conscientiousness (ὅσον προσέχεις σεαυτῷ, μέλλεις ἐκείνην ἄπαστα ταῦτα καὶ ἀναπέφευγεν). And it takes so little to do this; a mere swerve from reasonable principle (μετὰ ἀποτροπῆς τοῦ λόγου), a slight drowsiness, and all is lost (ἀπεθάνειν πάντα τὰ μέχρι τῶν σωφροσύνης). No outward possession is worth having. Epictetus continues, if it means that one ceases to be free, to be God's friend, to serve God willingly. I must not set my heart on anything else; God does not allow that, for if He had chosen, He would have made such outward goods good for me (ἀγαθὰ περισσεῖς αὐτὰ ἄν ἔμοι). Maximus of Tyre again argued that while, for example, men might be willing to endure pain and discomfort for the sake and hope of regaining health, "if you take away the hope of good to come, you also take away the power of enduring present ills" (εἰ ἀδέλφοι τινὰ ἀπιθανὰ τῶν ἀκακιῶν, ἀφαιρήσεις καὶ τινὰ ἀδέσποτα τῶν παρόντων κακῶν, Diss. xxxiii).

To retain the Christian παρρησία means still ὑπομένειν, no longer perhaps in the earlier sense (ὑπομείνατε, v. 68), and yet sometimes what has to be borne is harder, for sensitive people, than any actual loss. Such obedience to the will of God assumes many phases, from endurance of suffering to sheer waiting, and the latter is now urged (v. 86). Ὑπομονής γὰρ ἐκείνη χρείαν (5:12) ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ποιήσαντες (suggested by 10:7-9) κοιμήσομεθα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν (6:12 10:28). "Though the purpose of ὑπομονή is contained in the clause ἵνα . . . ἐπαγγελίαν, yet the function of this clause in the sentence is not telic. Its office is not to express the purpose of the principal clause, but to set forth a result (conceived, not actual) of which the posession of ὑπομονή is the necessary condition" (Burton, NT Mood and Tenses, p. 93). Ὑπομονή and ὑπομένειν echo through this passage and 12:1-2, the idea of tenacity being expressed in 10:38-11:40 by πίστεις. Ὑπομονή here as in the LXX (cp. Diat. 3548a-c) implies the conviction of "hope that the evil endured will be either remedied or proved to be no evil." Κοιμήσομεθα does not mean to get back or recover, nor to gather in, but simply as in the κοινή to receive, to get what has been promised (ἡ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν) rather than to get it as our due (which is the idea of μισθαποδοσία), though
what is promised is in one sense our due, since the promise can only be fulfilled for those who carry out its conditions \((6^{10})\). And it will soon be fulfilled. “Have patience; it is not long now.” Again he clinches his appeal with an OT word, this time from the prophets \((\text{vv.}^{37-38})\). “Ετι γὰρ (om. \(\text{p}^{13}\)) μικρὸν (sc. ἑστιν) δοσον δόσον. In de mutat. nomin. 44, Philo comments upon the aptness and significance of the word ναὶ in the promise of Gn 17\(^{19}\) (τι γὰρ εὐπρεπέτερον ἢ τάγαλα ἐπινείειν θεό καὶ ταχέως διμολογεῖν). Our author has a similar idea in mind, though he is eschatological, as Philo is not. *Οσον δοσον is a variant in D (on Lk 5\(^8\)) for ὅλγον. The phrase occurs in Aristoph. Wasp 213 (τι οὐκ ἀπεκοιμηθῆσαι δοσον δόσον στόλην), and elsewhere, but here it is a reminiscence of the LXX of Is 26\(^{20}\) (μικρὸν δοσον δόσον). Hence, although μικρὸν δοσον is also used, as by Philo, the omission of the second δοσον in the text of Hebrews by some cursives (e.g. 6. 181. 326. 1836) and Eusebius is unjustified. The words serve to introduce the real citation, apparently suggested by the term ὑπομονής \((<5^{86})\), from Hab 2\(^5-4\) ἐὰν υποτήρησα ὑπόμενον αὐτόν, δεὶ ἐρχόμενος ἤσει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ ἐὰν υποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἢ ψυχῇ μου ἐν αὐτῷ: δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως μου ἥσσεται, especially as the LXX makes the object of patient hope not the fulfilment of the vision, i.e. the speedy downfall of the foreign power, but either messiah or God. (a) The author of Hebrews further adds δ ἐρχόμενος, applying the words to Christ; (b) changes οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ into οὐ χρονεῖ: \(^{1}\) (c) reverses the order of the last two clauses, and (d) shifts μου in front of ἐκ πίστεως; as in the A text of the LXX. In the MSS of Hebrews, μου is entirely omitted by \(\text{p}^{13}\) D H K L P W cop eth Chrys. etc., to conform the text to the Pauline quotation (Ro 1 \(^{17}\), Gal 3\(^{11}\)), while the original LXX text, with μου after πίστεως, is preserved in D\(^*\) d syr\(^pesh\) bhi etc. This text, or at any rate its Hebrew original, meant that the just man \(i.e\) the Israelite) lived by God being faithful to his covenant with the nation. In Πρὸς Ἐβραίους the idea is that the just man of God is to live by his own πίστις or loyalty, as he holds on and holds out till the end, timidity meaning ἀπώλεια \((<5^{89})\), while the ζωή promised by God as the reward of human loyalty is the outcome of πίστις \((ἐκ πίστεως\)). But our author is interested in πίστις rather than in ζωῇ. The latter is not one of his categories, in the sense of eternal life; this idea he prefers to express otherwise. What he quotes the verse for is its combination of God’s speedy recompense and of the stress on human πίστις, which he proceeds to develop at length. The note struck in δ ὅσον also echoes on and on through the following passage (11\(^4\) Ἀβελ . . . ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος, 11\(^7\) Νόε . . .

\(^{1}\) This second future, or χρονεῖτε, \(\text{p}^{13} \text{κ}^{*}\) D\(^*\), is read by some editors (e.g. Tregelles, W-H, B. Weiss).
The aim of (c) was to make it clear, as it is not clear in the LXX, that the subject of ὑποστειλθαι was ὁ δίκαιος, and also to make the warning against apostasy the climax. Καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστειλθαι— not simply in fear (as, e.g., Dem. adv. Pant. 6:30, μοῦδὲν ὑποστειλ- λόμενον μὴδ’ αἰχμονόμενον), but in the fear which makes men (cp. Gal 2:12) withdraw from their duty or abandon their convictions— οὐκ εὐθοκεῖ ἢ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ. It is a fresh proof of the freedom which the writer uses, that he refers these last seven words to God as the speaker; in Habakkuk the words are uttered by the prophet himself. Then, with a ringing, rallying note, he expresses himself confident about the issue. Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμέν ὑποστολής (predicate genitive, as in 12:11, unless ἄνθρωπος or ἕκ is supplied) εἰς ἀπόλειαν, ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς (ἱστορεῖ, ν. 88). Περιποίησις occurs three times in the LXX (2 Ch 14:18, Hag 2:9, Mal 3:17) and several times in the NT, but never with ψυχῆς, though the exact phrase was known to classical Greek as an equivalent for saving one's own life. ὑποστολή, its antithesis, which in Jos. B.J. ii. 277 means dissimulation, has this new sense stamped on it, after ὑποστειλθαι.

The exhortation is renewed in 12:14, but only after a long paean on πίστις, with historical illustrations, to prove that πίστις has always meant hope and patience for loyal members of the People (11:1-40). The historical résumé (11:9-40), by which the writer seeks to kindle the imagination and conscience of his readers, is prefaced by a brief introduction (11:1-8):

1 Now faith means we are confident of what we hope for, convinced of what we do not see. 2 It was for this that the men of old won their record. 3 It is by faith we understand that the world was fashioned by the word of God, and thus the visible was made out of the invisible.

Calvin rightly protested against any division here, as an interruption to the thought: “quisquis hic fecit initium capitis undecimi, perperam contextum abrupit.” The following argument of 11:1-40 flows directly out of 10:35-39: ἡμομοιότητι is justified and sustained by πίστις, and we have now a λόγος παρακλήσεως on μιμηταί τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομοῦντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας (6:12). Hitherto the only historical characters who have been mentioned have been Abraham, Melchizedek, Moses, Aaron, and Joshua; and Abraham alone has been mentioned for his πίστις; now a long list of heroes and heroines of πίστει is put forward, from Abel to the Maccabean martyrs. But first (vv.1-3) a general word on faith. Ἑστίν δὲ πίστις κτλ. (v.1). It is needless to put a comma after πίστις, i.e., “there is such a thing as faith, faith really exists.” Εἰμί at the beginning of a
sentence does not necessarily carry this meaning; cp. e.g. Wis 7:1 εἰμὶ μὲν κἀγὼ θυγτός, Lk 8:11 ἔστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή (Jn 21:25 and 1 Jn 5:17 etc.). "Εστιν here is simply the copula, πίστις being the subject, and ἐλπισμένων ὑπόστασις the predicate. This turn of phrase is common in Philo, who puts ἔστι first in descriptions or definitions (e.g. Leg. Allegor. iii. 75, ἔστι δὲ στεναγμὸς σφοδρὰ καὶ ἐπισταμένη λύη: γινώ δεις ἵμμμ. 19, ἔστι δὲ εὐχῆ μὲν αἰτήσεις ἀγαθῶν παρὰ θεοῦ κτλ.). Needless difficulties have been raised about what follows. "Ὑπόστασις is to be understood in the sense of 3:14 "une assurance certaine" (Ménégoz); "faith is a sure confidence of thynges which are hoped for, and a certaynetie of thynges which are not seyne" (Tyndale), the opposite of ὑποστάλη. In the parallel clause, πράγματος ἐλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων (which in Attic Greek would have been ὁν ἀν τις μὴ ὁρᾷ), grammatically πράγματον might go with ἐλπισμένων instead of with βλεπομένων, for the sake of emphasis (so Chrysostom, Oecumenius, von Soden, etc.); the sense would be unaffected, but the balance of the rhythm would be upset. "ἐλεγχος is used in a fresh sense, as the subjective "conviction" (the English word has acquired the same double sense as the Greek); as Euthymius said, it is an equivalent for πραγμάτων ἀδρατῶν πληροφορία (so syr arm eth). The writer could find no Greek term for the idea, and therefore struck out a fresh application for ἐλεγχος. As for ἐλπισμένων . . . οὐ βλεπομένων (ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί ἐλπίζει; εἴ δὲ οὐ βλέπομεν ἐλπίζομεν δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα, Ro 8:24. 25), the unseen realities of which faith is confident are almost entirely in the future as promised by God, though, as the sequel shows, τὰ οὐ βλεπόμενα (e.g. vv. 3. 7. 8. 27) are not precisely the same as τὰ ἐλπισμένα. It cannot be too emphatically pointed out that the writer did not mean to say: (a) that faith gave substance or reality to unseen hopes, though this is the interpretation of the Greek fathers (Chrysostom, for example, argues: ἐπειδὴ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίδι ἀνυπόστατα εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἡ πίστις ὑπόστασιν αὕτως χαράζεται: μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ χαράζεται ἄλλ' αὐτῷ ἔστιν οὐσία αὑτῶν). When the writer declares that it is by faith we understand that the world was created, he does not mean that faith imparts reality to the creation; nor, when he says, e.g., the patriarchs lived in the expectation of a celestial Fatherland, that they thereby made this more real to themselves. No doubt this was true in a sense; but the author's point is that just because these objects of hope were real, because, e.g., God had prepared for them a City, therefore they were justified in having faith. It is faith as the reflex of eternal realities or rewards promised by God which is fundamental in this chapter, the faith by which a good man lives. (b) Similarly, faith is not the ἐλεγχος of things unseen in the sense of "proof," which could only mean
that it tests, or rather attests, their reality. The existence of human faith no doubt proves that there is some unseen object which calls it out, but the writer wishes to show, not the reality of these unseen ends of God—he assumes these—but the fact and force of believing in them with absolute confidence. Such erroneous interpretations arise out of the notion that the writer is giving an abstract definition of πίστις, whereas he is describing it, in view of what follows, as an active conviction which moves and moulds human conduct. The happiest description of it is, "seeing Him who is invisible" (v.27); and this idea is applied widely; sometimes it is belief in God as against the world and its forces, particularly the forces of human injustice or of death, sometimes belief in the spirit as against the senses, sometimes again (and this is prominent in 11:6f.) belief in the future as against the present.

In the papyri (e.g. in OP. ii. pp. 153, 176, where in the plural it = "the whole body of documents bearing on the ownership of a person's property . . . deposited in the archives, and forming the evidence of ownership") ὑπόστασις means occasionally the entire collection of title-deeds by which a man establishes his right to some property (cp. Moulton in Manchester Theological Essays, i. 174; Expositor, Dec. 1903, pp. 438 f.); but while this might suggest the metaphor, the metaphor means "confident assurance." The original sense of substance or reality, as in the de Mundo, 4 (συλλήψεις δὲ τῶν ἐν ἄληθεν φαντάσματων τὰ μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ ἐμφασιν τὰ δὲ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν), survives in Dante's interpretation (Paradiso, xxiv. 61 f.). He quotes the words as a definition of faith:

"Fede è sustanza di cose sperate, ed argomento delle non parventi,"

adding that he understands this to be its "quidity" or essence. But the notion that faith imparts a real existence to its object is read into the text. Faith as ὑπόστασις is "realization" of the unseen, but "realization" only in our popular, psychological sense of the term. The legal or logical sense of ἔλεγχος, as proof (in classical Greek and elsewhere, e.g. Jos. B. ii. 5. 4, ἵππος ἐστὶν ἔλεγχος τίς τῶν καθηγορικῶν, ὡστε τεκμηρίου) is out of place here. The existence of human faith is in one sense a proof that an invisible order exists, which can alone explain men acting as they do ἐν πίστει. But the writer assumes that, and declares that πίστις lives and moves in the steady light of the unseen realities. The sense of "test," as in Epictetus, iii. i. 10. If (ἐνδῆ ὃ ἔλεγχος τοῦ πράγματος, ἡ δοκιμασία τοῦ φιλοσοφοῦντος), is as impossible here as that of "rebuke"; the force of πίστις in 11:40 rests on its subjective sense as an inner conviction, which forms a motive for human life, and this determines the meaning of ὑπόστασις and ἔλεγχος as applied to it in the introductory description.

This connexion of faith with the future is emphasized by Philo in de Migratione Abrahami, 9, commenting on Gn 12:1 καὶ σοι δέλεα. It is δέλεα, not δείκνυμι, he points out—εἰς μαρτυρίαν πίστεως ἡ ἐπίστευσεν ἡ ψυχὴ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων ἐπιδεικνυμένη τῷ εὐχάριστῳ, ἀλλ’ ἐκ προσδοκίας τῶν μελλόντων . . . νομίσασα ἢ δὴ παρέῖναι τὰ μὴ παρόντα διὰ τὴν τοῦ ὑποσχο-
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μένον βεβαιώτητα πίστιν [cp. He ro28], ἀγαθὸν τέλειον, ἄθλον εὑρίσκει. Faith thus relies upon God's promise and eagerly expects what is to come; indeed it lives for and in the future. So our writer uses πίστις, almost as Paul used εἰπίς (psychologically the two being often indistinguishable). Nor is this πίστις a novelty in our religion (v.5), he adds, εν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν (78) οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. 'Εν δὲ διὰ ταύτης as in 46 616 922 1010; δι' ἦσ ἐμαρτυρήθη (v.4), μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως (v.30). Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι (= ὁ πατέρας, τ1) never bears this exact sense elsewhere in the NT, the nearest1 parallel being Mt 152 = Mk 78 6 (ἐν τοῖς παραδοσιν τῶν πρεσβύτερων). Philo (de Abrahamo 46), indeed, noting that Abraham the man of faith is the first man called πρεσβύτερος in scripture (Gn 241), reflects that this is significant; ὁ γὰρ ἀληθεία πρεσβύτερος οὐκ ἐν μήκει χρόνων ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἐπαινετὶ καὶ τελείῳ βίῳ θεωρεῖτα. Aged worldly people can only be called longlived children, τῶν δὲ φρονήσεως καὶ σοφίας καὶ τῆς πρὸς θεόν πίστεως ἐρασθενὰ λέγον τις ἀν ἐνδίκως εἶναι πρεσβύτερον. But our author weaves no such fancies round the word, though he probably understood the term in an honorific sense (cp. Philo, de Sobrietate, 4, πρεσβύτερον . . . τῶν γέρων καὶ τιμῆς ἄξον ὄνομάζει). For ἐμαρτυρήθησαν in this sense of getting a good report, cp. B. Latyschev's Inscript. Antiquae Orae Septent. i. 2126f. ἐμαρτυρήθη τοῖς ὑπὲρ φιλίας κυνίσουν . . . παραβολευσαμένον: Syll. 366 28 (i a.d.) ἀρχιτέκτονας μαρτυρηθέντας ὑπὸ τῆς σεμνοτάτης [βουλῆς], and the instances quoted in Deissmann's Bible Studies (265).

Before describing the scriptural record of the πρεσβύτεροι, however, the writer pauses to point out the supreme proof of πίστεως as πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος ὁδ βλεπομένων. The very world within which they showed their faith and within which we are to show our faith, was the outcome of what is invisible (v.8), and this conviction itself is an act of faith. Πίστει νοοῦμεν (cp. Ro 120: "νοεῖν is in Hellenistic Greek the current word for the apprehension of the divine in nature," A. T. Goodrick on Wis 134) κατηρτίσθαι (of creation, Ps 7316 σὺ κατηρτίσω ἢλιον καὶ σελήνην) τοῦτο αἰώνας (12) ἰδίατι θεοῦ (the divine fiat here), εἰς (with consecutive infinitive) τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι (perfect of permanence). The μὴ goes with φαινομένου, but is thrown before the preposition as, e.g., in Ac 15 oὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας (according to a familiar classical construction, Blass, § 433. 3). Faith always answers to revelation,

1 W. Brandt (Jüdische Reinheitslehre und ihre Beschreibung in den Evangelien, 1910, pp. 2, 3) thinks that this expression might apply to the more recent teachers as well as to the ancient authorities.
2 In 2 Mac 728 oὐκ ἔτην ἐποιήσαν αὐτὰ ὁ θεὸς (Α), the οὐκ goes with the verb.
and creation is the first revelation of God to man. Creation by
the fiat of God was the orthodox doctrine of Judaism, and
anyone who read the OT would accept it as the one theory
about the origin of the world (cp. e.g. the description of God in
the Mechilta, 33b, on Ex 14:31 etc. as “He who spoke and the
world was,” and Apoc. Bar. 14:17: “when of old there was no world with its inhabitants, Thou didst devise and speak with a word, and forthwith the works of creation stood before Thee”). But the explicitness of this sentence about creation out of what is invisible, suggests that the writer had other views in mind, which he desired to repudiate. Possibly Greek theories like those hinted at in Wis 10:17 about the world being created 


or the statement in the de aeternitate mundi, 2, where Philo declares εκ του όντος υδέων γίνεται, quoting Empedocles to this effect, though elsewhere Philo does agree that the world was made out of nothing, as, e.g., in the de Somnitis, i. 13 (ο θεὸς τα πάντα γεννήσας ου μόνον εις τοῦμαν ἔγαγεν ἄλλα και ἄ πρότερον οὐκ ἦν ἐποίησεν, οὐ δημιουργός μόνον ἄλλα και κτίστης αὐτὸς ὅν, cp. also Apoc. Bar. 21:4: “O Thou . . . that hast called from the beginning of the world that which did not yet exist,” and Slav. En. 24:5: “I will tell thee now what things I created from the non-existent, and what visible things from the invisible”). What the μὴ φανόμενα were, our author does not suggest. R. Akiba is said to have applied the words of Ps 101:7 to anyone who rashly speculated on the original material of the world. Our author does not speculate; it is very doubtful if he intends (Windisch, M’Neill) to agree with Philo’s idea (in the de opificio Mundi, 16, de confus. ling, 34) of the φανόμενοι οὕτως κόσμος being modelled on the ἀσώματος και νοητῶς or archetypal ideas, for the language of 8:6 is insufficient to bear the weight of this inference.

To take εἰς τὸ . . . γεγονότα as final, is a forced construction. The phrase does not describe the motive of κατηργώθαι, and if the writer had meant, “so that we might know the seen came from the unseen,” he would have written this, instead of allowing the vital words might know to be supplied.

The roll-call of the πρεσβυτέρων (vv.4f) opens with Abel and Enoch, two men who showed their πίστις before the deluge (vv.4f). One was murdered, the other, as the story went, never died; and the writer uses both tales to illustrate his point about πίστις.
XI. 4.)
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4 It was by faith (πίστεως, the rhetorical anaphora repeated throughout the section) that Abel offered God a richer sacrifice than Cain did, and thus (δι' Ἡς, sc. πίστεως) won from God the record of being "just," on the score of what he gave; he died, but by his faith he is speaking to us still. 5 It was by faith that Enoch was taken to heaven, so that he never died ("he was not overtaken by death, for God had taken him away"). For before he was taken to heaven, his record was that "he had satisfied God}; 6 and apart from faith it is impossible (διὰ πίστεως, sc. έπι της) "to satisfy him," for the man who draws near to God must believe that he exists, and that he does reward those who seek him.

The faith of Abel and of Enoch is not πίστεως ἐλπιδομένων, which is not introduced till v. 7. In 4 Mac 16ff. the illustrations of steadfast faith are (a) Abraham sacrificing Isaac, (b) Daniel in the den of lions, and (c) the three men in the fiery furnace; but in 18ff. the list of noble sufferers includes (a) Abel, (b) Isaac, (c) Joseph in prison, (d) Phinehas, (e) the three men in the fiery furnace, and (f) Daniel. Sirach's eulogy of famous men in Israel (44-50) has a wider sweep: Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, the judges, Samuel, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Hezekiah, Isaiah, Josiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Job, the twelve prophets, Zerubbabel, Joshua the son of Josedek, Nehemiah, and the highpriest Simon (i.e. down to the second century B.C.).

The first illustration (v. 4) is much less natural than most of those that follow. In the story of Gn 4:4-8, ἐπίδεικνυεν ὁ θεός ἐπὶ Ἄβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δώρους αὐτοῦ. But why God disregarded Cain's sacrifice and preferred Abel's, our author does not explain. Josephus (Ant. i. 54) thought that an offering of milk and animals was more acceptable to God as being natural (τοὺς αὐτόματος καὶ κατὰ φύσιν γεγονόστι) than Cain's cereal offering, which was wrung out of the ground by a covetous man; our author simply argues that the πλείων θυσία of Abel at the very dawn of history was prompted by faith. He does not enter into the nature of this πλείων (in sense of Mt 6:25 or Mk 12:48 ἡ χύρα αὐτή ἡ πτωχὴ πλείων πάντων βέβληκεν) θυσίαν παρὰ (as in 1:4 Ἰάκω) offered at the first act of worship recorded in scripture. What seems to be implied is that faith must inspire any worship that is to be acceptable to God from anyone who is to be God's δίκαιος (1038). Josephus held that Abel δικαιοσύνης ἐπιμελείτο, the blood of Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαίου is noted in Mt 23:35, and the Genesis-words ἐπίδεικνυεν ὁ θεός are here expanded by our author into ἐμπροσθείη εἶναι δίκαιος. Note the practical equivalence of δόωρα and θυσία, as already in 5 etc. There is nothing in Πρὸς Ἐβραίους like Philo's effort (Quaest. in Gen. 4) to distinguish between δόωρα and θυσία as follows: ὃ μὲν θύων ἐπιδιώκει, τὸ μὲν αἷμα τῷ βοώμῳ προξεῖν, τὰ δὲ κρέα ὀφελεῖ κομίζειν: ὃ δὲ δωροφέρουσας ἀλόν τούτο παραχωρεῖν τῷ λαμβάνοντι: ὃ μὲν οὖν φίλαυτος διαιμονεῖ οἰος ὁ Κάιω: ὃ δὲ φιλόθεος δώρηται οἶον ὁ Ἀβελ.
In what follows, (a) the original text (μαρτυροῦντος . . . αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ) is preserved in p13 Clem. (om. τῷ θεῷ). (b) αὐτῷ then became αὐτῷ under the influence of the LXX, and τῷ θεῷ was inserted after προσήνεγκε to complete the sense (N* D* K L P r vg syr boh arm Orig. Chrys. etc.). Finally, (c) τοῦ θεοῦ became assimilated to the preceding τῷ θεῷ, and μαρτυροῦντος . . . αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ (N* A D* 33. 104. 326. 1311. 1836. eth) became current, as though Abel witnessed to God, instead of God witnessing to Abel. Thus after προσήνεγκε the Greek originally ran: δι' ἥς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἰναι δίκαιος, μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δόρωις αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ. Then another application of the LXX was added. The phrase in Gn 410 (φωνὴ αἰματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρὸς με) had already suggested to Philo that Abel was in a sense still living (quod det. potiori insid. soleat, 14: ὃ Ἀβελ, τὸ παραδοθέατον, ἀγηρητὰ τε καὶ ζῇ· αὐχεῖται μὲν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ἀδέρφου διανομῆς, ζῇ δὲ τῆν ἐν θεῷ ζωῆν εἰδαίμονα· μαρτυρήθη δὲ τὸ χρησθὲν λόγιον, ἐν ὃ "φωνῇ" χρώμενος καὶ "βοᾷν" (Gen 410) ἀ πεπονθὲν ὑπὸ κακοῦ συνθέτου τιμαγών εὑρίσκεται· τῶν γὰρ ὅ μηκετ ὅν διαλέγεσθαι ὑπατῶς ὁτι. Our author takes a similar line here: καὶ δι' αὐτῆς (ἰ.πίστεως) ἀποθανὼν ἔνες οὐκορία: Εἰς ἅλατι. Even after death, Abel's cry is represented as reaching God, so Philo puts it (ibid. 20), ζῇ μὲν γὰρ, ὅς καὶ πρῶτερον ἔφην, ὃ τεθνάνα δοκοῦ, εἰ γε καὶ ἱκέτης ἐν θεῷ τοῦ δοκοῦ ταυτὰς εὐρίσκεται. Only, it is not the fact that the cry was one for retribution (1224) which is stressed here, not the fact that his blood cried to God after he died; but, as οὐκορία is never used of speaking to God, what the writer means to suggest (as in 315) is that Abel's faith still speaks to us (οὐκορία, not the historic present, but = in the record). Not even in 1224 does he adopt the idea of a divine nemesis for the sufferings of the pious in past generations. He does not represent the blood of martyrs like Abel as crying from the ground for personal vengeance; he has nothing of the spirit which prompted the weird vision of the wronged souls under the altar crying out for retribution (Rev 610). "Ἐν οὐκορίᾳ means, in a general sense, that he is an eloquent, living witness to all ages (so recently Seeberg). Primasius ("qui enim alios suo exemplo admonet ut justi sint, quomodo non loquitur?") and Chrysostom (τούτῳ καὶ τοῦ ζῆν σημεῖον ἔστι, καὶ τοῦ παρὰ πάντων ἄδεσθαι, θαυμάζεσθαι καὶ μακαριζέσθαι· ὃ γὰρ παρανικῶν τοῖς ἄλλοις δικαίοις εἶναι οὐκορίᾳ) put this well. The witness is that πίστει may
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have to face the last extreme of death (124), and that it is not abandoned by God; ἀποθανόν is never the last word upon a δίκαιος. Compare Tertullian’s argument from Abel, in De Scorpiace, 8: “a primordio enim justitia vim patitur. Statim ut colit Deus coeptit, invidiam religio sortita est: qui Deo placuerat, occidit, et quidem a fratre; quo proclivius impietas alienum sanguinem sectaretur, a suo ausplicata est. Denique non modo justorum, verum etiam et prophetarum.”

The difficulty of λαλεῖ led to the same correction λαλεῖται in D K L d eth, etc. Λαλεῖται as passive (=λέγεται) is nearly as impossible as middle; to say that Abel, even after death, is still spoken of, is a tepid idea. The writer of Hebrews meant more than an immortal memory, more even than Epicurus when he declared that by dying δικ αἰ ταὶ καὶ ὀδί τις ὑπόκειτο, διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός. The writer takes the two clauses in reverse order. Enoch μετετέθη τοῦ (with infinitive of result) μὴ ἤδειν θάνατον (Lk 2:6) καὶ ("indeed," introducing the quotation) οὖν ὑπόκειτο (on this Attic augmented form, which became rare in the Koinè, see Thackeray, 200) διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός, πρὸ γὰρ (resuming πίστει μετετέθη) τῆς μεταβάσεως μεμαρτύρηται (in the scripture record; hence the perfect, which here is practically aoristic) εὑρίσκεσθαι τῷ θεῷ (εὑρεστεῖται in its ordinary Hellenistic sense of a servant giving satisfaction to his master). For εὑρίσκεσθαι = die (be overtaken or surprised by death),1 cp. Epict. iii. 5. 5 f., ὅπως οἴδας ὅτι καὶ νόσος καὶ θάνατος καταλαβεῖν ἤμας ὑφελλοῦσιν τί ποτε ποιοῦντας; . . . ἐμοὶ μεν γὰρ καταληφθήσαται γένοσιν μηδένοι ἄλλοι ἐπιμελουμένης ἢ τῆς προαιρέσεως τῆς ἔμοι . . . ταῦτα ἐπιτεθείσων θέλω εὑρεθήσαι: iv. 10. 12, ἀγαθός ὃν ἀποθηκήγη γενναίαν πράξειν ἐπετελεῖν. ἔπει γὰρ δει πάντως ἀποθάνειν, ἀνάγκη τί ποτε ποιήσατα εὑρεθήσαι . . . τί οὖν θέλεις ποιών εὑρεθήσαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου; Here εὑρεθήσαι (with or without τοῦ θανάτου) is a synonym for καταληφθήσαται or ἀποθάνειν, as in Ph 3:9 (εὑρεθὼ ἐν αὐτῷ).

Both Clem. Rom. (92) and Origen, like Tertullian, appear to have read οὖν εὑρεθῇ αὐτὸι θάνατος in Gn 5:24; and Blass therefore reads here οὖν ὑπόκειτο(ο) αὐτὸι θάνατος, especially as it suits his scheme of rhythm. This is linguistically possible, as εὑρίσκεσθαι = be (cp. Fr. se trouver), e.g. in Lk 17:18, Ph 2:2. Μετέθηκεν was turned into the pluperfect μετετέθηκεν by κ* De L 5. 203. 256. 257. 326. 337. 378. 383. 491. 506. 623. 1611, etc.

Traditions varied upon Enoch (EBi. 1295a), and even Alexandrian Judaism did not always canonize him in this way. (a)

1 In Sifre Deut. 304, the angel of death sought Moses, but found him not (ἵππη κηρ).
The author of Wis 4:10f, without mentioning his name, quotes Gn 5:24 as if it meant that God removed Enoch from life early (καὶ ἔπαυεν ἀμαρτιῶν μετετέθη) in order to prevent him from sharing the sin of his age (ἡμᾶς, μὴ κακία ἀλλὰ καὶ σώσειν αὐτοῦ, ἐὰν δόλος ἀπαιτήσῃ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ); he departed young, but his removal was a boon mercifully granted by God to his youthful piety. (b) Philo views him in *de Abraamo*, 3 (cp. *de praem.* 3–4), as a type of μετάνοια. Quoting Gn 5:24 he points out that μετάθεσις means a change for the better, and that οὐχ ἡμίσκετο is therefore appropriate, τῷ τὸν ἄρχαίον καὶ ἐπιληπτὸν ἀπαληλφθαί βλον καὶ ἰδανίζοντι καὶ μηκέθν εὑρίσκεσθαι, καθάπερ εἰ μηδὲ τὴν ἄρχην ἔγινε τὸ ἀρχαίον πλήρες. The Greek version of Sir 44:16 echoes the same tradition (*Εὐνῶς εὐρήστησεν Κυρίῳ καὶ μετετέθη, ὑπόπτευμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς*), viz. that μετατήκης implies the effacement of Enoch’s blameworthy past, or at any rate that he was enrolled in better company. Our author does not share this view. His general deduction in v. 6 expands the description of πίστις in v. 1. To say that a man has satisfied God is to pronounce the highest possible eulogy upon him, says Philo 1 (*de Abraamo*, 6, "τῷ θεῷ εὐρήστησεν" οὐ τί γένος ἤν ἐν τῇ ψυσε κρείττων; τίς καλοκάγαθας ἑναργέστερος ἐλέγχος;), though he is referring to Noah, not to Enoch. Our author explains that to satisfy God necessarily implies πίστις (v. 6) in the sense of 10:26. Πιστεύεις γὰρ δὲ τὸν προσερχόμενον τῷ θεῷ (4:16 etc.) ὅτι ἐστίν (so *Epist.* iii. 26. 15, ὅτι καὶ ἐστὶ καὶ καλῶς διδοκεῖ τὰ ὅλα) καὶ τοῖς ἐκτιθοῦσιν αὐτῶν μεθαποδάνης (cf. v. 26 10:26) γίνεται. As for the first element of belief, in the existence of God (ὅτι ἐστίν), the early commentators, from Chrysostom (ὅτι ἐστιν’ οὗ τὸ τί ἐστιν: cp. Tert. adv. Marc. i. 17, "primo enim quaceritur an sit, et ita qualis sit") and Jerome (on Is 6:1–7, in *Anecdota Maredsolana*, iii. 3. 110: "cunque idem apostolus Paulus scribit in alio loco, Credere oportet accedentem ad Deum quia est, non posuit quis et qualis sit debere cognosci, sed tantum quod sit. Scimus enim esse Deum, scimusque quid non sit; quid autem et qualis sit, scire non possumus") onwards, emphasize the fact that it is God’s existence, not his nature, which is the primary element of faith. Philo does declare that the two main problems of enquiry are into God’s existence and into his essence (*de Monarch.* i. 4–6), but our author takes the more practical, religious line, and he does not suggest how faith in

1 Philo fancifully allegorizes the phrase in the *de mutat.* nomin. 4: φθειρέται οὐν εἰκότως τὸ γεωδες καὶ καταλάβεται, ὅταν δόλος δὲ δέμων δὲ νοῦς εὐφροσυνῆς προσελθῇ θεῷ ὁπώς ὁ τὸ γέως καὶ μᾶλλον εὐφροσύνῃ, πλὴν ὁ τὸ ἀδύνατων γενόται· δηλαδὴ δὲ τὸ χρησθὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ἑνῷ λόγῳ τόδε εὐφροσύνῃ διὸ ἑνώς τῷ θεῷ καὶ οὐκ εὐφροσύνῃ τοῦ γὰρ <ἀν> σκευάσματος τις εὐράμενος τὸ γέως τάγαθος τὸνάτο; . . . οὐχ εὐφράκτῳ ὁ εὐφροσύνης τρόπος τῷ θεῷ, ὅτι δὲν δήπων ἔπαιρκός μὲν δὲν ἄποκριτόμενος δὲ καὶ τὸ εἰς ταῦτα σύνοδον ἡμῶν ἀνωδιδόμων, ἑκείκῃ καὶ μετατεθῆναι λέγεται.
God’s existence is to be won or kept. When objectors asked him why he believed in the existence of the gods, Marcus Aurelius used to reply: \( \text{πρῶσον μὲν καὶ δύσει δρατού εἰσιν} \) \( \text{ἐπειτα} \) \( \text{μάντιοι οὐδὲ τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν ἐμαυτῷ ἐώρακα καὶ ὅρας τιμῶν οὕτως οἶν καὶ τοὺς θεούς, ἐξ ὦν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτῶν ἔκαστοτε πειρῶμαι, ἐκ τούτων ὃτι τε ἐισὶ καταλαμβάνω καὶ αἰδοῦμαι (xii. 28). \)

We have no such argument against atheism here; only the reminder that faith does imply a belief in the existence of God—a reminder which would appeal specially to those of the readers who had been born outside Judaism. Belief in the existence of God is for our author, however, one of the elementary principles of the Christian religion \((61)\); the stress here falls on the second element, \( \text{kai ... μυθαποθής γίνεται.} \)

When the Stoics spoke about belief in the divine existence, they generally associated it with belief in providence; both Seneca \((\text{Ep. xcv. 50,} \text{ "primus est deorum cultus deos credere . . . scire illos esse qui praesident mundo, quia universa vi sua temperant, qui humili generis tutelam gerunt interdum curious singulorum") and Epictetus \((\text{e.g. ii. 14. 11, λέγουσιν οἱ φιλόσοφοι ὅτι μαθεῖν δεί πρῶσον τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐστι θεὸς καὶ προνοεῖ τῶν ὅλων: Enchir. xxxi. 1, τῆς περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβείας ἵσθω ὅτι τὸ κυριώτατον ἐκείνῳ ἔστων ὅρθως ὑπολήφης περὶ αὐτῶν ἔχειν ὡς ὄντων καὶ διοικώντων τὰ δλα καλὸς καὶ δικαίως) are contemporary witnesses to this connexion of ideas, which, indeed, is as old as Plato \((\text{Leges, 905d,} \text{ "ὅτι μὲν γὰρ θεοὶ τ’ εἰσίν καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπιμελοῦνται.} \)

\( \text{Τοῖς εὐξητοῦσιν αὐτὸν} \) \((\text{for which p18 P read the simple ξητοῦσιν})\) denotes, not philosophic enquiry, but the practical religious quest, as in the OT \((\text{e.g. Ac 1517, Ro 321})\). This is not Philo’s view, \( \text{e.g., in the Leg. Alleg. 315} \) \( \text{εἰ δὲ ξητοῦσα εὐφρύσεις θεῳ ἀδήλῳ, πολλοὶς γὰρ οὐκ ἐξανεργοὶς ἔστων, ἀλλ’ ἀτελῇ τὴν στουβῆν ἀχρι παντὸς ἐσχῶν ἐξαρκεί μέντοι πρὸς μετουσίαι ἄγαθον καὶ ψεύδο τὸ ξητάιν μόνον, ἀεὶ γὰρ οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ καλὰ ὅρμαι κἂν τοῦ τέλους ἄτυχόως τοὺς χρωμένους προεφραίνουσι.} \)

But our author has a simpler belief; he is sure that the quest of faith is always successful. By God’s reward he means that the faith of man reaching out to God is never left to itself, but met by a real satisfaction; God proves its rewarder. Such faith is a conviction which illustrates 111, for the being of God is an unseen reality and his full reward is at present to be hoped for.

A still more apt illustration of πίστις as the ἐλεγχος πράγματων οὗ βλεπομένων which becomes a motive in human life, now occurs in \((\text{v.7})\) the faith which Noah showed at the deluge when he believed, against all appearances to the contrary, that he must obey God’s order and build an ark, although it is true that in this case the unseen was revealed and realized within the lifetime of the δικαίος. Like Philo, our author passes from Enoch to
Noah, although for a different reason. Philo ranks Noah as the lover of God and virtue, next to Enoch the typical penitent (de Abrah. 3, 5, εἰκότως τῷ μετανοηκότι τάττει κατὰ τὸ ἔξος τοῦ θεοφιλῆ καὶ φιλάρετον); here both are grouped as examples of πίστει. Sirach (44:17) also passes at once from Enoch to Noah the δίκαιος.

It was by faith (πίστει) that Noah, after being told by God (χρηματισθεὶς, 86, sc. παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ) of what was still unseen (τῶν μηδὲνα βλέπομένων, i.e. the deluge), reverently (εὐλαβθεὶς, cp. 5:1) constructed (κατεσκεύασεν, as 1 P 3:20) an ark to save his household; thus he condemned the world and became heir of the righteousness that follows faith.

The writer recalls, though he does not quote from, the story of Gn 6:18t. Πίστει goes closely with εὐλαβθεὶς κατεσκεύασεν, and περὶ τ. µ. βλέπομένων goes with χρηματισθεὶς (as Jos. Ant. iv. 102, εχρηματίζετο περὶ ον δὲ εἴδειτο), not with εὐλαβθεὶς, which is not a synonym for φοβθεὶς—the writer is at pains always to exclude fear or dread from faith (cp. vv. 23-27). Εἰς σωτηρίαν is to be taken as “to save alive” (Ac 2:20 πάσα ἐλπὶς τοῦ σωζομον ἡμᾶς, 27:84 τούτῳ γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ὑπερείας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει). Δι' ἡς (i.e. by the faith he thus exhibited; as both of the following clauses depend on this, it cannot refer to the ark, which would suit only the first) κατέκρινε τὸν κόσμον, where κατέκρινεν corresponds to what is probably the meaning of Wis 4:16 κατακριμεὶ δὲ δίκαιος καµῶν τὸν ζωντας δοσεβεῖς, though καµῶν (= ζανῶν) is not the point of Hebrews, which regards Noah's action as shaming the world, throwing its dark scepticism into relief against his own shining faith in God (Josephus, in Ant. i. 75, puts it less pointedly: δε θεὸς τούτων μὲν τῆς δικαιοσύνης γνάτης, κατεδίκαζε δ' ἐκείνους); κόσμος here (as in v.38) means sinful humanity, almost in the sense so common in the Johannine vocabulary, the κόσμος δοσεβῶν of 2 P 2:4. Philo (de congressu erudit. 17) notes that Noah was the first man in the OT to be specially called (Gn 6:9) δίκαιος; but our author, who has already called Abel and Noah δίκαιοι, does not use this fact; he contents himself with saying that τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κηρόνοµος, i.e. he became entitled to, came into possession of, the δικαιοσύνη which is the outcome or property (κατὰ κτλ., as in Hellenistic Greek, cp. Eph 1:15, a periphrasis for the possessive genitive) of such faith as he showed. Δικαιοσύνη here is the state of one who is God's δίκαιος (δ δίκαιος µου, 10:38). A vivid description of Noah's faith is given in Mark Rutherford's novel, The Deliverance, pp. 162, 163.

The faith of Abraham, as might be expected, receives more attention than that of any other (cp. Ac 7:2). It is described in three phases (8:9-10, 17-19); the faith of his wife Sara is attached to his (11-19), and a general statement about his immediate descend-
ants is interpolated (18-16) before the writer passes from the second to the third phase. As in Sirach and Philo, Abraham follows Noah. “Ten generations were there from Noah to Abraham, to show how great was His longsuffering; for all the generations were provoking Him, till Abraham our father came and received the reward of them all” (Pirke Aboth 5).

8 It was by faith that Abraham obeyed his call to go forth to a place which he would receive as an inheritance; he went forth, although he did not know where he was to go. 9 It was by faith that he “sojourned” in the promised land, as in a foreign country, residing in tents, as did Isaac and Jacob, who were co-heirs with him of the same promise; 10 he was waiting for the City with its fixed foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

The first phase (v.8) is the call to leave Mesopotamia and travel West, which is described in Gn 12:1ff. The writer does not dwell, like Philo (de Abrahamo, 14), on the wrench of tearing oneself from one’s home. But, as Philo says that Abraham started ἀμα τῷ κελευθήραῳ, our author begins with καλοῦμενος. When the call came, he obeyed it—ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν (epexegetic infinitive), a reminiscence of Gn 12:4 καὶ ἐπέσαν κύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰ, “Ἐξελθε... καὶ ἐπορεύθη Ἀβραὰ καθότερ ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ κύριος. He went out from Mesopotamia, μὴ ἐπιστάμενος ποῦ ἔχεται, his faith being tested by this uncertainty. So Philo (de Migr. Abrah. 9) notes the point of the future διέξεω in Gn 12:1; it is εἰς μαρτυρίαν πίστεως ἢ ἐπίστευσεν ἡ ψυχὴ θεοῦ.

The insertion of ὅ before καλοῦμενος (Α D 33. 256. 467. 1739. 2127 sah boh arm Thdt.) turns the phrase into an allusion to Abraham’s change of name in Gn 17:5, which is irrelevant to his earlier call to leave the far East.

The second phase (vv.9-10) is the trial of patience. He did not lose heart or hope, even when he did reach the country appointed to him, although he had to wander up and down it as a mere foreigner, εἰς (=ἐν, Mk 13:16, Ac 8:40) ἀλλοτριάν. He found the land he had been promised still in the hands of aliens, and yet he lived there, lived as an alien in his own country! Παρόκησεν is the opposite of κατούκησεν (as in Gn 37:1), and with a fine touch of paradox the writer therefore goes on to describe Abraham as ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας, contented patiently to lead a wandering, unsettled life. Such was all the “residence” he ever had! What sustained him was his πίστεως (v.10), his eager outlook for the City, ἡς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργός ὁ θεός. Compare the scholion on Lucian’s Jov. Ἱστ. 38: ὅν δὴ θεόν καὶ δημιουργὸν ὁ εὐσεβὴς ἀνευρηκὼς λογισμὸς ἐφοροῦν καὶ τεχνίτην τοῦ παντὸς προευρέτησεν. Τεχνίτης is not a LXX term, and only began to be used of God in Alexandrian Judaism (e.g. in Wis 13:1). This is the one place in the NT where it is applied to God; afterwards (e.g. Did. 12; Diog. 72) it became more common. Ηδημιουργός is equally unique as a NT term for God, but it occurs
in 2 Mac 41, and was used in classical literature frequently for a subordinate deity (cp. Schermann, Texte u. Untersuchungen, xxxiv. ad. 23). In Apoc. Esdræ (ed. Tisch. 32) the phrase occurs, ὁ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως δημιουργός. Our author simply writes τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργός as a rhetorical expression for maker or creator (82), without differentiating the one term from the other, as “designer” and “constructor” (cp. Philo, quis rer. div. 27, ὁ τεχνίτης . . . ἤνικα τὸν κόσμον εὐθυμοῦργα: de mut. nom. 4, οὕτη τά πάντα ὁ γεννήσας καὶ τεχνευόντας πατήρ, ὡστε τὸ “ἐγὼ εἰμὶ θεὸς σός” ἵσον ἐστὶ τῷ “ἐγώ εἰμι πατήρ καὶ δημιουργός”).

In the writer adds a new touch (as if to suggest that Abraham propagated his πίστις) in μετὰ ἵσαλκ καὶ ἰακώβ—who shared the same outlook—τῶν συγκληρονόμων (a kouνή, though not a LXX, term for co-heir) τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς. Their individual faith is noted later (vv. 20-21). In sketching his fine mystical interpretation of Abraham’s hope, the author ignores the fact that Jacob, according to Gn 3317 (ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ἐκεῖ οἰκία), did erect a permanent settlement for himself at Sukkoth. His immediate interest is not in Isaac and Jacob but in Abraham, and in the contrast of the tent-life with the stable, settled existence in a city—the idea which recurs in 1229-13. It is a Philonic thought in germ, for Philo (Leg. Alleg. 327) declares that the land promised by God to Abraham is a πόλις ἀγαθῆ καὶ πολλῆ καὶ σφαῖρα εἰδαίμων, typifying the higher contemplation of divine truth in which alone the soul is at home, or that the soul lives for a while in the body as in a foreign land (de Sommis, 181), till God in pity conducts it safe to μητρόπολις or immortality. The historical Abraham never dreamed of a πόλις, but our author imaginatively allegorizes the promised land once more (cp. 436), this time as (1222) a celestial πόλις or Jerusalem, like Paul and the apocalyptists. According to later tradition in Judaism, the celestial Jerusalem was shown in a vision to Abraham at the scene of Gn 159-21 (Apoc. Bar. 44), or to Jacob at Bethel (Beresh. rabba on Gn 2817). Ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ—and this showed the steady patience (1056) and inward expectation (111) of his faith—τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους (τοὺς, because it was such foundations that the tents lacked) ἔχουσαν πόλιν. No doubt there was something promised by God which Abraham expected and did get, in this life; the writer admits that (618-15). But, in a deeper sense, Abraham had yearnings for a higher, spiritual bliss, for heaven as his true home. The fulfilment of the promise about his family was not everything; indeed, his real faith was in an unseen future order of being (111). However, the realization of the one promise about Isaac (618-15) suggests a passing word upon the faith of Sara (vv. 11-12).

1 According to Jubilees 1916, Abraham lived to see Jacob’s manhood.
XI. 11.

It was by faith that even (καὶ) Sara got strength to conceive, bearing a son when she was past the age for it—because she considered she could rely on Him who gave the promise. Thus a single man, though (καὶ τὰῦτα) he was physically impotent, had issue in number “like the stars in heaven, countless as the sand on the seashore.”

This is the first instance of a woman's faith recorded, and she is a married woman. Paul (Ro 4:19f) ignores any faith on her part. Philo again praises Sarah, but not for her faith; it is her loyalty and affection for her husband which he singles out for commendation, particularly her magnanimity in the incident of Gn 16 (de Abrahamo, 42-44). Our author declares that even in spite of her physical condition (καὶ αὐτὴ Ἱδρα), she believed God when he promised her a child. The allusion is to the tale of Gn 17:15-21, which the readers are assumed to know, with its stress on the renewal of sexual functions in a woman of her age. This is the point of καὶ αὐτῇ, not “mere woman that she was” (Chrysostom, Oec., Bengel), nor “in spite of her incredulity” (Bleek), nor “Sara likewise,” i.e. as well as Abraham (Delitzsch, Hofmann, von Soden, Vaughan), owing to her close connexion with Abraham (Westcott, Seeberg), though the notion of “like-wise” is not excluded from the author's meaning, since the husband also was an old man. A gloss (στείρα, ἡ στείρα, ἡ στείρα ὅσα) was soon inserted by D* P, nearly all the versions, and Origen. This is superfluous, however, and probably arose from dittography (ΣΑΡΡΑΣΤΕΙΡΑ). The general idea is plain, though there is a difficulty in δύναμιν ἔλαβεν (i.e. from God) εἰς καταβολὴν στέρματος = εἰς τὸ καταβάλλονσαν στέρμα, i.e. for Abraham the male to do the work of generation upon her. This is how the text was understood in the versions, e.g. the Latin (“in conceptionem seminis”). Probably it was what the writer meant, though the expression is rather awkward, for καταβολὴ στέρματος means the act of the male; εἰς ὑποδοχὴν στέρματος would have been the correct words. This has been overcome (a) by omitting καὶ αὐτῇ Ἱδρα as a gloss, or (b) by reading αὐτῇ Ἱδρα. (a) certainly clears up the verse, leaving Abraham as the subject of both verses (so Field in Notes on Transl. of NT, p. 232, and Windisch); (b) is read by Michaelis, Storr, Rendall, Hort, and Riggenbach, the latter interpreting it not as “dativus commodi,” but = “along with.” If the ordinary text is retained, the idea suggested in καὶ αὐτῇ Ἱδρα is made explicit in παρὰ καρδὸν ἡλικίας. What rendered such faith hard for her was her physical condition. Philo (de Abraham. 22) applies this to both parents (ἤδη γὰρ ὑπερήφανες γεγονότες διὰ μακρὸν γῆς ἀπέγνωσαν πατίδος σποράν), and a woman in the period of life described in Gn 18:11-12 is called by Josephus γόναιν τὴν ἡλικίαν ἤδη προβεβληκός (Ant. vii. 8. 4).
Eis τὸ τεκνοσάρι (D* P 69. 436. 462. 1245. 1288. 2005 syrhkl) after ἕλαβεν is a harmless gloss. The addition of ἔτεκεν (ψ K L P lat arm) after ἥλικας was made when the force of καὶ (=even) before παρὰ καυδὸν was missed.

Πιστῶν ἡγήσατο τὸν ἐπαγγελμένον (1028) is an assertion which shows that the author ignores her sceptical laughter in Gn 1812; he does not hesitate (cp. v.27) to deal freely with the ancient story in order to make his point, and indeed ignores the equally sceptical attitude of Abraham himself (Gn 1717). To be πιστὸς in this connexion is to be true to one's word, as Cicero observes in the de Officiis (i. 7: "fundamentum autem justitiae fides, id est dictorum conventorumque constantia et veritas"). The promise was fulfilled in this life, so that Sara's faith resembles that of Noah (v.7). The fulfilment is described in v.12, where, after διὸ καὶ ἀφ' ἔνδος (i.e. Abraham),1 ἐγεννήθησαν (P13 Ν L Ψ 1739, etc.) is read by some authorities for ἐγεννήθησαν (A D K P etc.), though the latter suits the ἀπὸ in ἀφ' ἔνδος rather better. In either case something like τέκνα must be understood. 'Αφ' ἔνδος is resumed in καὶ ταῦτα (a v.l. in 1 Co 68 for the less common καὶ τοῦτο) νενεκρομένου (in the sense of Ro 419). Gen. r. on Gn 251 applies Job 147-9 to Abraham, but the plain sense is given in Augustine's comment (Civil. Dei, xvi. 28): "sicut aiant, qui scripsent interpretationes nominum Hebraeorum, quae his sacris literis continentur, Sara interpretatur princeps mea, Sarra autem virtus. Unde scriptum est in epistula ad Hebraeos: Fide et ipsa Sarra uirtutem accepit ad emissionem seminis. Ambo enim seniores erant, sicut scriptura testatur; sed illa etiam sterilis et cruore menstruo iam destituta, propter quod iam parere non posset, etiam si sterillis non fuisset. Porro si femina sit prouectoria aetatis, ut ei solita mulierum adhuc fluant, de iuuee parere potest, de seniore non potest; quamuis adhuc possit ille senior, sed de adulescentula gignere, sicut Abraham post mortem Sarrae de Cettura potuit [Gn 251], quia uiiuidam eius inuenit aetatem. Hoc ergo est, quod mirum commendat apostolus, et ad hoc dicit Abrahae iam fuisse corpus mortuum, quoniam non ex omni femina, cui adhuc esset aliquod pariendi tempus extremum, generare ipse in illa actate adhuc posset." This elucidates He 1111-19a. In what follows, the author is quoting from the divine promise in Gn 2217, a passage much used in later Jewish literature,2 though this is the only full allusion to it in the NT (cf. Ro 927).

Before passing to the third phase of Abraham's faith, the writer adds (vv.18-16) a general reflection on the faith of the patriarchs, an application of vv.8-10. There were promises which

1 Is 512 ἐμβδέψατε εἷς Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα υἱῶν . . . ὡτι εἷς ηῳ.
2 The comparison of a vast number to stars and sands is common in Greek and Latin literature; cp. e.g. Pindar's Olymp. 286, and Catullus, 61202.
could not be fulfilled in the present life, and this aspect of faith is now presented.

13 (These all died in faith without obtaining the promises; they only saw them far away and hailed them, owning they were “strangers and exiles” upon earth. 14 Now people who speak in this way plainly show they are in search of a fatherland. 15 If they thought of the land they have left behind, they would have time to go back, 16 but they really aspire to the better land in heaven. That is why God is not ashamed to be called their God; he has prepared a City for them.)

Οἱ πάντες (those first mentioned in 9-12, particularly the three patriarchs) died as well as lived κατὰ πίστιν, which is substituted here for πίστει either as a literary variety of expression, or in order to suggest πίστις as the sphere and standard of their characters. The writer argues that the patriarchs already possessed a πίστις in eternal life beyond the grave; their very language proves that. Μὴ κομισάμενοι explains the πίστις in which they died; this is the force of μὴ. All they had was a far-off vision of what had been promised them, but a vision which produced in them a glad belief—ιδόντες καὶ ἀσπαζόμενοι, the latter ptc. meaning that they hailed the prospect with delight, sure that it was no mirage. The verb here is less metaphorical than, e.g., in Musonius (ed. Hense), vi.: τὴν δὲ ζωὴν ὡς τῶν ἀγαθῶν μέγιστον ἀσπαζόμεθα, or Philo (ἀγάπησον αὐν ἀρετὰς καὶ ἀσπασόμεθα ψυχῇ τῇ σεαινοῦ, quis rer. div. heres, 8). Two interesting classical parallels may be cited, from Euripides (Ion, 585–587):

οὐ ταῦταν εἶδος φαίνεται τῶν πραγμάτων
πρόσωθεν ὄντων ἐγγύθευ· θ' ὀρομένων.

ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν μὲν συμφορὰν ἀσπαζόμει

and Vergil (Aen. 3.564 “Italian laeto socii clamore salutant”). Chrysostom prettily but needlessly urges that the whole metaphor is nautical (τῶν πλείων καὶ πορρῶθεν δρόμων τὰς πόλεις τὰς πολυμένας, ἂς πρὶν ἦ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτὰς τῇ προσρήσει λαβόντες αὐτὰς οἰκειοῦνται).

Κομισάμενοι (p³§ ν* Π W 33, etc.) is more likely to be original than a conformation to το³λταιρ; 11tg²¹; the sense is unaffected if we read the more common λαβόντες (n* D K L Ψ 6. 104. 1739, Orig.). The reading of A arm (προσδέξάμενοι) makes no sense.

Καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες, for to reside abroad carried with it a certain stigma, according to ancient opinion (cp. e.g. Ἑρ. Aristaeae, 249, καλῶς ἐν ἰδίᾳ καὶ ζήν καὶ τελευτάν. ἦ δὲ ἐξείς τοὺς μὲν πένθησεν καταφρόνησον ἑργάζεσαι, τοὺς δὲ πλουσίους δύνασθος, ὥς διὰ κακῶν ἐκπιπτόκοσιν: Sir 29°⁹²⁹⁻²⁸ etc.). The admission, ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπιδημοῦσαν ἐστίν ἐπὶ γῆς, is a generalization from the Oriental depreciation of Jacob in Gn 47° (ἐξείς ἰακώβ τῷ Φαραώ, ἀλ ἡμέρας τῶν ῥτῶν τῆς ζωῆς μου ὡς παροικῶ κτλ.), and the similar confession of Abraham in Gn 23° to the sons of Heth, πάροικος
The Epistle to the Hebrews

LXI. 13.

The epistle is a homiletic touch, as in Ps 119 (πάροικος εἰμι ἐν τῷ γῇ).

In both cases this ὁμολογία τῆς ἐλπίδος (10:23) is made before outsiders, and the words ἐν τῷ γῇ start the inference (vv. 14-16a) that the true home of these confessors was in heaven. Such a mystical significance of ἐνοι καὶ παρεπιδήμου, which had already been voiced in the psalter, is richly and romantically developed by Philo, but it never became prominent in primitive Christianity. Paul's nearest approach to it is worded differently (Phil 3, where τὸ πολιτέμα corresponds to πατρίς here). In Eph 2, indeed, Christians are no longer ἐνοι καὶ παρόικοι, for these terms are applied literally to pagans out of connexion with the chosen People of God. The only parallel to the thought of Hebrews is in 1 P, where Christians are παρεπιδήμου (11) and παροίκοι καὶ παρεπιδήμου (211). The term ἐνοι is used here as a synonym for παρόικοι, which (cp. Eph 2, 19) would be specially intelligible to Gentile Christians. Παρεπί-

δήμος only occurs in the LXX in Gn 23, Ps 39; in the Egyptian papyri παρεπιδήμοι (consistentes) denotes foreigners who settled and acquired a domicile in townships or cities like Alexandria (GCP. i. 40, 55; cp. A. Peyron's Papyri graeci R. Taur. Musei Aegyptii, 818 τῶν παρεπιδήμων καὶ [κα]τουκοιντῶν [ν] [υ]τᾶς), and for ἐνοι = peregrini, Ep. Arist. 109 f. The use of such metaphorical terms became fairly common in the moral vocabulary of the age, quite apart from the OT, e.g. Marcus Aurelius, ii. 17 (ὡς βίος πόλεμος καὶ ἐνοι ἐπιθυμία). A similar symbolism recurs in the argument of Epictetus (ii. 2, 36 f.) against the prevalent idea that logic, style, and eloquence are the end of philosophy: ὁδὲ τῶν ἀπίων εἰς τὴν πατρίδα τὴν ἐαυτοῦ καὶ διοικέων πανδοκείον καλὸν ἀρέσκαντος αὐτῷ τὸ πανδοκείον κατα-

μένον ἐν τῷ πανδοκεί. ἀνθρώποι επελάθουσι σῷ τῆς προθέσεως· οὐκ εἰς τούτο ἀδέσεις, ἀλλὰ διὰ τούτον ... τὸ δὲ προκείμενον ἐκεῖνον εἰς τὴν πατρίδα έπανελθεῖν. In a more specifically religious sense, it is expressed in the saying of Anaxagoras quoted by Diogenes Laertius (ii. 3. 7, πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα, "οὐδὲν σοι μέλει τῆς πατρίδος," "εὐφήμει" ἐφη, "ἐμοί γὰρ καὶ σφόδρα μέλει τῆς πατρίδος," δείξας τὸν οὐρανόν). According to Philo, the confession that they were strangers and pilgrims meant that the soul in this world longed to return to its pre-existent state in the eternal order, and could never feel at home among things material. So, e.g., de confus. līng. 17, διὰ τούτῳ οἱ κατὰ Μωυσῆν σοφοὶ πάντες εἰσάγονται "παρακούστες" αἱ γὰρ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν παρέκοψαν μὲν ἀποκτάνων ὀδύστερον τὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, εἰσώθησι δὲ τοῦ φιλοθεάμονος καὶ φιλομαθοῦς εἰς τὴν περίγειον φύσιν ἀποδημεῖν ... ἐπανερχόμεναι ἐκεῖνε πάλιν, ὃ ἐν ὑμής ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ, πατρίδα μὲν τὸν οὐράνον ἁρων ἐν θ' πολιτεύονται, ἐνὶ δὲ τὸν περίγειον ἐν θ' παράκατον νομίζονται κτλ. In Cherub. 33, 34, commenting on παρόικοι in Lx 25, he argues
that this is the real position of all wise souls towards God, since each of us is a stranger and sojourner in the foreign city of the world where God has for a time placed us till we return to Him.

The metaphor had been applied, in a derogatory sense, by Sallust to the lazy and sensual men who never know what real life means, but who pass through it heedlessly: "many human beings, given over to sensuality and sloth (ventri atque somno), uneducated, and uncultured, have gone through life like travellers" ("vitam sicuti peregrinantes transiere," Catil. 2).

Such a confession proves (v.14) that the men in question are not satisfied with the present outward order of things; ἐμφανίζεσθαι (Esth 22) and αὐτή ἐνεφάνισθη τῷ βασιλεῖ τὰ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς: Ac 23, OGIS. (iii a.D.) 42, Syll. 226 πὴν τε παρουσίαν ἐμφανίσῳ τοῦ βασιλέως, they thus avow or affirm, δι' πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσιν (Valckenar’s conjecture, ἕτι ξηποῦσιν, is ingenious but needless, cp. 13). For πάτρις in a mystical sense, compare Philo, de Agric. 14, commenting on Gn 47: τὸ γὰρ ὄντι πᾶσα ψυχή σοφοῦ πατρίδα μὲν ὑφανόν, ξένην δὲ γῆν ἐλαχί, καὶ νομίζει τὸν μὲν σοφίας ὁλοκ ἰδιὸν, τὸν δὲ σώματος ὅθενον, ὥς καὶ παρεπιδημεῖν φησαι. Here it is "heaven, the heart’s true home." The creditable feature in this kind of life was that these men had deliberately chosen it.1 Had they liked, they might have taken another and a less exacting line (v.15). Εἴ μὲν (as in 81) ἐμπνεοῦσαν (referring to the continuous past) κτλ. The μνημονεύων of N D* was due to the influence of the preceding presents, just as ἐμμηνοικασαν (33. 104. 216 Cosm.) to the influence of ἔξηβησαν, which in turn was smoothed out into the usual NT term ἔξηλθον (N D K L Ψ 436. 919. 1288. 1739). Μνημονεύων here has the sense of "giving a thought to," as in Jos. Ant. vi. 37, οὕτε προφήθη ἐμμηνοικασαν οὐδ’ ὄντου, and below in v.22. Time (as Ac 24:26), as elsewhere in Hebrews, rather than opportunity (1 Mac 15:26 ἡμεῖς δὲ καιρὸν ἔχοντες ἀντεχόμεθα τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν), is the idea of εἴχον δι’ καιρόν, καιρός taking an infinitive ἀνακάμψα (so Codex A in Jg 11 and ἀνακάμψαν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα αὐτῆς, for the ἀπέστρεψαν of B), as in Eurip. Rhesus, 10 (καιρὸς γὰρ ἀκούσα). Philo remarks of Abraham: τίς δ’ οὐκ ἐν μεταπατήθησαν παλαιόθησαν οἰκεῖοι, βραχέα μὲν φρονοι τῶν μελισσῶν ἡελίου, τὴν δὲ παρουσίαν ἀποριαν απεδώκαν ἐκφυεῖν (de Abrahamo, 18).

"Sometimes he wished his aims had been To gather gain like other men; Then thanked his God he'd traced his track Too far for wish to drag him back."

(THOMAS HARDY, The Two Men.)

On the contrary (v.16), so far from that, they held on, the writer

adds; νῦν δὲ (logical, as in 86, not temporal) κρείττονος ὑπέργονται,
τοῦτο εἶτιν ἐπουρανίον (so God is described in 2 Mac 38 as ὁ τῶν
κατοικιῶν ἐπουράνιων ἔχων). ἄδιδ σὰ ἐπαισχύνεται (compare 211)
αὐτοῦ τὸ θέος ἐπικαλεῖται (epexegetic infinitive) "αὑτῶν,"
referring to Ex 36, Ἐγώ εἰμι ... θεός Ὄμβραμ καὶ θεός Ἰσαὰκ καὶ
θεός Ἰακώβ, which the writer 1 interprets (cp. Mk 1226, 27) as an
assurance of immortality. Their hope of a πατρὶς or heavenly
home was no illusion; it was because God had such a πολὺς
(v.10) all ready for them that he could call himself their God.
He might have been ashamed to call himself such, had he not
made this provision for their needs and prepared this reward for
their faith (ὄροιμασεν, cp. Mt 2386).

The third phase of the faith of Abraham (vv.17-19) is now
chronicled, followed by three instances of faith at the end of
life, in Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph (vv.20-22).

17 It was by faith (πίστευ) "when Abraham was put to the test, that he
sacrificed Isaac"; he was ready to sacrifice "his only son," although he had
received the promises, 18 and had been told (πρὸς ὑπεργόν, as 55) that (ὑπεργόν
revit) "it is through Isaac (not Ishmael) that your offspring shall be reckoned"—
for he considered God was able even to raise men from the dead. Hence
(ὑπεργόν, causal) he did get him back, by what was a parable of the resurrection.
20 It was by faith that Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau in connection with the
future. 21 It was by faith that, when Jacob was dying (ὑπεργόν, as 5)
καὶ (epexegetic) ἐπίριπατα τὸν Ἰακώβ, he blessed each of the sons of Joseph, "bending in prayer over the head of his
staff." 22 It was by faith that Joseph at his end (ὑπεργόν, here) thought
about the exodus of the sons of Israel, and gave orders about his own bones.

The supreme test of Abraham’s πίστευ is found in the story
of Gn 221-18, which Jewish tradition always reckoned as the last
and sorest of his ten trials (Πίρκε Ἀβότ 54). It is cited in
4 Mac 1618-20 as a classical example of ὑπουρανόν (ἦφαίλευ τῶν ὑπομενόν
διὰ τὸν θεόν, δὲ ὅτι καὶ δ θανη ἡμῶν Ὄμβραμ ἐσπένθευ τὸν ἑδονότατον ὑόν ἐφαγίζασα Ἰσαὰκ κτλ.). In v.17 the
perfect tense προεσέχισεμι may mean "the ideally accomplished
sacrifice, as permanently recorded in scripture" (Moulton, so
Dict. 2751); but it is more likely to be aoristic (cp. Simcox,
Lang. of NT, pp. 104, 126). Περαξάμενος echoes Gn 221 (ὁ
θεὸς ἐπείριπα τὸν Ἰακώβ). Καὶ (epexegetic) τὸν μονογενή (a
Lucan use of the term in the NT) 9 προσέχειμεν (conative imper-
flect of interrupted action, like ἑκάλουν in Lk 159) τὸ ὑπεργο-
λίας ἀναδεξάμενος, i.e. the promises of a son, of a numerous line
of descendants (v.12), and of a blessing thus coming to all nations.

1 Origen (Ἰο.bar. ii. 17): μεγάλη γὰρ δοξα τῶν πατριάρχων τὸν θεόν ἀντὶ
ὁμολουσὶ προσέχαμεν τοὺς ἑκάλους ὑπομενάν τῇ >θεὸς < ἠδὲ αὐτὸ ὑπορεάρια.
2 The LXX of Gn 222 reads τὸν ἀγαπηθέντος τοῦ ἱπεργόν, but perhaps the writer of Πρὸς
Ἰθαράλους read a text like that underlying Aquila (τὸν μονογενῆ), Josephus
(τὸν μονογένης, Ant. i. 3. 1), and Symmachus (τὸν μονόν). Μονογένης
and ἀγαπηθός, as applied to a son, tended to shade into one another. Philo reads
ἀγαπηθός καὶ μόνος (ὑμὸν δειν ἠμμίμτο. 4, etc.).
This is made explicit in v. 18, with its quotation from Gn 21:12. For ἀναθέματι in the sense of “secure,” see the line from Sophocles’ “Ichneutae,” in Oxyrh. Papyri, vii. 25 (ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν εἶπε καὶ ἀνεδέκατο).

In v. 19 λογισμόν (as Ro 8:18 etc.) explains why he had the courage to sacrifice Isaac, although the action seemed certain to wreck the fulfilment of what God had promised him. He held ὧδε τὸ δικαίωμα, (Weakened into ἔγειραι by A P, etc.) δυνατός (Dan 3:17 ὅστις δυνάτος ἐξελέηθαι ἡμᾶς κτλ., and Ro 4:21) sc. ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς. Abraham, says Philo (de Abrahamo, 22), πάντα ὧδε δικαίωμα σχέδιον ἐστὶ σαρκαγῶν τουτὲ ὑδόμα προμαθουσα. Later (32) he speaks of this sacrifice as the most outstanding action in Abraham’s life—ὁ λόγος ἢ δὲ ὅπως πάντα ὤσαν ἰεροφιλεῖς ὑπερβάλλει. It was “a complicated and brilliant act of faith” (A. B. Davidson), for God seemed to contradict God, and the command ran counter to the highest human affection (Wisd 10:8 σοφία... ἐπὶ τέκνον σπλάγχνου ἵνα τῷ ἐφιλάξεσθαι. As Chrysostom put it, this was the special trial, τα γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀδικεῖ τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ μάχεσθαι, καὶ πίστει ἐκάθετο πίστει, καὶ πρόφαται ἐπαγγελία. Hence (ὥστε, in return for this superb faith) ἐκκομίσατο, he did recover him (κομίσομαι, as in Gn 38:20 etc., of getting back what belongs to you), 1 in a way that prefigured the resurrection (κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως, v. 85). Such is the meaning of ἐν παραβολῇ (cp. 9:1). Isaac’s restoration was to Abraham a sort 2 of resurrection (v. 85a “quaedam resurrectionis fuit species, quod subito liberatus fuit ex media morte,” Calvin). ‘Ἐν παραβολῇ has been taken sometimes in two other ways. (a) = παραβολοῖς, i.e. beyond all expectation, almost παραδόχεις, παρ’ ἐπιθαῦμα(σ), or in a desperate peril, as Polybius says of Hannibal (i. 23. 7, ἀνελπίστως καὶ παραβόλως αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ σκάφη δίδυμῳ). This is at any rate less far-fetched than—(b) “whence he had originally got him, figuratively-speaking,” as if the allusion was to νικρωμένου (in v. 12)! Against (a) is the fact that παραβολή never occurs in this sense.

Augustine’s comment is ( Civ. Del., xvi. 32): “non haesitavit, quod sibi reddi poterat immodicus, qui dari potuit non speratus. Sic intellectum est et in epistula ad Hebraeos, et sic expositum [He 11:17-19]... cuius similitudinem, nisi illius unde dicit apostolus: Qui proprio filio non pepercit, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit eum?” He makes Isaac carrying the wood a type of Christ carrying his cross, and the ram caught in the thicket typical of Christ crowned with thorns. According to the later Jewish tradition ( Pirke R. Eliezer, 31), Isaac’s soul, which had left his body as his father’s sword

1. Josephus (Ant. i. 13. 4) describes the father and son as παρ’ ἔκπειδος οἰκομενῶν κεκομενῶν. Philo (de Josepho, 35, τὸ κομίσασθαι τῶν ἀδελφῶν) has the same usage.

2. Aelian (Var. Hist. iii. 33) speaks of Satyrus the flautist, τρότων τινὰ τὴν τέχνην ἐκφαντιζόν παραβολή τῇ πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν.
was falling, returned at the words, “Lay not thy hand on the lad”; thus Abraham and Isaac “learned that God would raise the dead.”

The next three instances are of πίστις as ἐπόστασις ἐλπιζομένων, the hope being one to be realized in the destiny of the race (vv. 20-22).

The solitary instance of πίστις in Isaac (v. 20) is that mentioned in Gn 27:28.29,39,40, a faith which (111) anticipated a future for his two sons. Εὐλόγησεν, of one man blessing another, as in γ. In καὶ περὶ μελλόντων (sc. πραγμάτων), where μέλλειν refers to a future in this world, the καὶ simply1 emphasizes περὶ μελλόντων εὐλόγησεν, and the whole phrase goes with εὐλόγησεν, not with πίστευ. The very fact that he blessed his two sons proved that he believed the divine promises to them would be realized in the future. The next two instances of faith are taken from death-beds; it is faith, not in personal immortality, but in the continuance of the chosen race. In v. 21 the writer quotes from Gn 47:91 καὶ προσεκόνθησεν Ἰσραήλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἁκρον τῆς βασίλειος αὐτοῦ, where the LXX by mistake has read παρατίθηναι (staff) instead of παρατίθηναι (bed), and the incident is loosely transferred to the later situation (Gn 48:17), when Jacob blessed the two sons of Joseph. Supporting himself on his staff, he bowed reverently before God, as he blessed the lads. (In the Ep. Barnabas 13:4-6, the writer interprets Jacob’s preference for the younger son as a proof that Christians, not Jews, were the real heirs of God’s blessing!) In v. 22 the argument draws upon Gn 50:24.25 (Ex 13:19, Jos 24:32), where Joseph makes the Israelites swear to remove his remains from Egypt to the promised land, so confident was he that God’s promise to the people would one day be fulfilled. Τελευτῶν (Gn 50:26 καὶ Τελευτηθηκέναι Ἰωσήφ) περὶ τῆς ἐξόντων (only here in this sense in NT) τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ ἐμπαιδεύσει (called to mind, as v.16) καὶ περὶ τῶν ὅστις ὁστιῶν (uncontracted form as in LXX and Mt 23:27, Lk 24:39; cp. Cröner, Mem. Graeca Hercul. 1664) αὐτοῦ ἐνετέλεσεν. Joseph’s faith also was shown in his conviction of the future promised by God to Israel, but it found a practical expression in the instructions about conveying, his mummy out of Egypt (Sir 49:18 καὶ τὰ ὅστα αὐτοῦ ἐπεσκέπτησαν).

The ninth example of πίστις is Moses, of whom almost as much is made as of Abraham. Five instances of faith are mentioned in connexion with his career (vv. 23-29).

22 It was by faith that Moses was “hidden for three months” (τριμήνον, sc. χρόνον) after birth by his parents, because “they saw the child was

1 To suggest that it means “even” is flat for a blessing, ex hypothesi, referred to the future. Its omission (by K L P, the eastern versions, etc.) is more easily explained than its insertion.

2 1 K 1:47 προσεκόνθησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην, ἐπὶ has the same local sense.
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"beautiful" (Ac 7:20), and had no fear of the royal decree. 24 It was by faith that Moses refused, "when he had grown up," to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; 25 ill-treatment with God's people he preferred to the passing pleasures of sin, 26 considering obloquy with the Messiah to be richer wealth than all Egypt's treasures—for he had an eye to the Reward. 27 It was by faith that he left Egypt, not from any fear of the king's wrath; like one who saw the King invisible, he never flinched. 28 It was by faith that he celebrated "the passover" and performed the sprinkling by blood, so that "the destroying angel" (cf. 1 Co 10:15) might not touch Israel's firstborn. 29 It was by faith that they crossed the Red Sea (Ac 7:86) like dry land—and when the Egyptians attempted it, they were drowned.

Moses (v. 23) owed the preservation of his life as an infant to the courageous πίστις of his parents (πατέρων = γονέως, parentes, like πατres in Ovid's Metam. 4, and Plato's Leges, vi. 772 E, ἀγαθὸν πατέρων φιών). The writer quotes from Ex 2:2, adding that, as the result of their faith, they had no fear of the royal edict (διάταγμα as in Jos. Ant. xvi. 16. 5; Wis 11:7 etc.). This is the main point of their πίστις. On ἀφείνων see Philo's vit. Mos. i. 3: γεννθεὶς οὖν ὁ παις ἐθύμ ὧν ἐνέφανεν ἀστειοφέραν ἡ κατ' ἰδίωτην, ὡς καὶ τῶν τυμάνων κηρυκµάτων, ἐδ' ὅσον οἴλα τῇ ἤ, τοῦ γονέως ἀλογῆσαι. The Hebrew text makes the mother act alone, but the LXX gives the credit to both parents; and this tradition is followed by Philo and Josephus (Ant. ii. 9. 4), as by our author.

The parents of Moses are the first anonymous people in the roll-call of faith's representatives. Calvin rather severely ranks their faith on a lower level, because the parents of Moses were moved by the external appearance of their child, and because they ought to have brought him up themselves ("notandum est fidem quae hie laudatur valde esse imbecillam. Nam quum posthabito mortis suae mortuus Mosen deberent educare, eum exponunt. Patet igitur illorum fidem breui non tantum accelesse sed esse impiedisse"). Still, he reflects that this is after all an encouragement, since it proves that even weak faith is not despised by God. Chrysostom's comment is kinder; the writer, he thinks, means to afford additional encouragement to his readers by adducing not only heroes, but commonplace people as examples of faith (ἀσήµµων, ἀνωνύµων).

Another (72) gloss has been inserted here, after v. 23, by D* 1827 and nearly all the MSS of the Latin versions, viz. πατετοί µέγας γενόµενος Μωυσῆς ἀνέλει τῶν Ἀθροίων κατανοῶν τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν, a homiletical application of Ex 2:11.12 (used in Ac 7:23.12).

The second item of faith (v. 24) is the first individual proof by Moses himself. Josephus (Ant. ii. 9. 7) makes Moses refuse the Pharaoh's crown when a baby. The Pharaoh's daughter placed the child in her father's arms; he took it, pressed it to his bosom, and to please his daughter graciously put the crown upon its head. But the child threw it to the ground and stamped on it. Which seemed ominous to the king! The writer of Hebrews avoids such fancies, and simply summarizes Ex 2:11, where Moses µέγας γενόµενος (from Ex 2:11; i.e., as Calvin points out, when his refusal could not be set down to childish ignorance
of the world, nor to youthful impetuosity) ἡρμήσατο (with infinitive as in Wis 12:27 16:16 17:10) λέγεσθαι υἱὸς θυγατρὸς Φαραώ. His religious motive in declining the title and position of son to an Egyptian princess (Jub 47:9) is now given (v. 25); μάλλον ἐλάμπετο (for the construction and idea, cp. OGIS. 669:15 μάλλον τήν τῶν προςφέρων ἐπάρχων αἰώνιον συνήθειαν φιλάσσειν ἢ <τῇ τὴν πρόσκαιρον τυφοῦ αἰδικᾶν μεμυσάμενος) συγκακουχείσατα (a new compound, unknown to the LXX) τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ πρόσκαιρον (a non-LXX term 1 which first occurs in 4 Mac 15:8 26, and passed into the early Christian vocabulary as an antithesis to αἰώνιον) ἔχειν ἀμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσιν. The ἀμαρτία is the sin which he would have committed in proving disloyal to the People of God; that might have been pleasant for the time being, but πίστις looks to higher and lasting issues (10:34 11:1). It would have been “sin” for him to choose a high political career at court, the “sin” of apostasy; he did what others in their own way had done afterwards (10:35 cp. 13:20).

For ἀπόλαυσις see Antipater of Tarsus (Stob. Florileg. lxvii. 25): τὸν δ’ ἱδεῖν <τίνιν>, ἔχουσαν διδόστα πρὸς ἀκολουθίαν καὶ ποικίλων ἠδόνων ἀπόλαυσιν ἀγενῶν καὶ μικροχαρίων, ισόθεν νομίζοντας, and 4 Mac 5:6, where the tyrant taunts the conscientious Jews, καὶ γὰρ ἀνήστη πουτὸ τὸ μὴ ἀπόλαυσιν τῶν χωρίς ἀνείδους ἠδόνων. Philo (vit. Mos. i. 6: γενόμενος τε διαφέροντος ἀσκήσεως ἀληθείας καὶ τὸν ἄρρηταν βίον ὥς οὐδεὶς ἄτερος χλεωνάτας—ψυχὴ γὰρ ἐπώθει μόνη ζών, οὐ σώματι) praises the asceticism of Moses in the palace of the Pharaoh, but gives an interpretation of his reward which is lower than that of our author; he declares (i. 27) that as Moses renounced the high position of authority which he might have enjoyed in Egypt (ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὴν Ἀλυπώνα κατέληπτεν ἡγεμονίαν, θυγατρίδος τοῦ τότε βασιλείους ὄν), because he disapproved of the local injustice, God rewarded him with authority over a greater nation.

In v. 20 the reason for this renunciation of the world is explained. Μείζονα πλούτου ἡγησάμενος (cp. v. 11 and λογισάμενος in v. 19) τῶν Ἀλυπτῶν θησαυρῶν τῶν ἀνείδουμ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (as involved in συγκακουχείσατα τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ). This is one of the writer’s dinting phrases. There is a special obloquy in being connected with Christ. It is one of the things which Christians have to face to-day (13:18), and, the writer argues, it has always been so; Moses himself, the leader of God’s people at the first, showed his πίστις by deliberately meeting it. The obloquy was part of the human experience of Jesus himself (12:2 13:12), but the point here in τῶν ἀνείδουμ τοῦ Χριστοῦ is that, by identifying himself with God’s people in Egypt, Moses encountered the same ἀνείδομος as their very messiah afterwards was to endure. He thus faced what the writer, from his own standpoint, does not hesitate to call τῶν ἀνείδουμ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Whether he had in mind anything further, e.g. the idea that ὁ Χριστός here

1 It recurs in an edict of Caracalla (215 A.D.), quoted by Mitteis-Wileken, i. 2. 39.
means the pre-incarnate Logos, as though a mystical sense like that of 1 Co 10⁴ underlay the words, is uncertain and rather unlikely, though the idea that Christ was suffering in the person of the Israelites, or that they represented him, might be regarded as justified by the language, e.g., of Ps 89⁵¹ (τὸν ὄνειδισμὸν τῶν δούλων σου... οὐ ὄνειδισαν τὸ ἀντάλλαγμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου). The experiences of ingratitude and insulting treatment which Moses suffered at the hands of Israel illustrate Chrysostom’s definition of τὸν ὄνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ: τὸ μέχρι τέλους καὶ ἐσχάτης ἀναπνοῆς πάντωσιν κἀκεῖνοι... τοῦτο ἐστὶν ὄνειδισμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅταν τις παρ’ ὅν εὐθυγετῇ ὄνειδισθαι (citing Mt 27⁴⁰). The basis of this estimate of life is now given: ἀπεβλέπεν γὰρ εἰς τὴν μισθοδοσίαν, as the writer desired his readers to do (10⁸⁵ 11⁶). Ἀποβλέπειν εἰς is a common phrase for keeping one’s eye upon, having regard to, e.g. Theophrastus, ii. 10, καὶ εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἀποβλέπειν: Ιουσέφος, Bell. Jud. ii. 15. 1, ὁ μὲν... ἐς μόνον τὸ λυσιτέλες τὸ ἐκ τῶν ἀρπαγῶν ἀποβλέπειν, παρῆκουσεν. Mr. Starkie, in his note on Arist. Acharn. 32, suggests that ἀποβλέπειν, which is common in the comic poets and is also a philosophical term (e.g. Plato’s Phaedo, 115 C; Phaedrus, 234 D), “was used like ‘to prescind’ in English,” i.e. to fix one’s gaze on a single object by withdrawing it from everything else.

The third act of faith in his life (v. 27) is his withdrawal from Egypt to Midian (Ex 214f. = Ac 729). Μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως the author ignores the statement of the OT that Moses did fly from Egypt, in terror of being punished by the king for having murdered the Egyptian (δρῦν ἄμελεικτον βασιλέως ἀποδιδράσκον, Philo, de vit. Mos. i. 9). Josephus in his own way also (Ant. ii. 10. 1) eliminates the motive of fear. Our author declares that if Moses did retreat from Egypt, it was from no fear of Pharaoh, but in the faith that God had a future and a mission for him still; he had as little fear of Pharaoh as his parents had had, τὸν γὰρ ἄφρατον (sc. βασιλέα) ὡς ἄρων ἐκαρτέρησεν (cp. Sir 2 εὕθυνον τὴν καρδίαν σου καὶ καρτέρησον). “The courage to abandon work on which one’s heart is set, and accept inaction cheerfully as the will of God, is of the rarest and highest kind, and can be created and sustained only by the clearest spiritual vision” (Peake). The language and thought are illustrated by Epict. ii. 16. 45-46: ἐκ τῆς διανοίας ἐκβάλε... λύπην, φῶς, ἐπιθυμία, φόβον, ἐπιχαρεκακίαν, μαλακίαν, ἀκραίαν. Ταύτα δ’ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ ἐκβάλειν, εἰ μὴ πρὸς μόνον τὸν θεόν ἀποβλέπουσα, ἐκεῖνοι μοίχοι προπετευόμεντα, τοῖς εἰκόνες προστάγματος καθωσιμένοι. The phrase ὡς ὄρων means the inward vision where, as Marcus Aurelius observes (x. 26), ὄρῳς, οὕτος οὐκ ἔττον ἐναργῶς. In the de Mundo, 359a, God is described as ἄφρατος ὄν ἀλλὸς πλήν λογισμός. Philo had
already singled out this trait in Moses, e.g. de mutat. nomin. 2: 
Mωσῆς δὲ τῆς ἁδείας φύσεως θεατὴς καὶ τικτής—eis γὰρ τὸν 
γνώσιν φασίν αὐτῶν οἱ θεοὶ χρησμοὶ εἰσελθεῖν (Ex 2021), τὴν 
ἄραμαν καὶ ἄσωματον οὐσίαν αἰνετῶμεν. In vii. Mos. i. 15 he 
declares that the Pharaoh had no notion of any invisible God 
(μηδένα τὸ παράπαν νοητὸν θεὸν ἔξω τῶν ὁρατῶν νομίζων), and later 
on, commenting on Ex 2021 (i. 28), he adds that Moses entered 
the darkness, τούτων εἰς τὴν ἁδείαν καὶ ἄραμαν καὶ ἄσωματον τῶν 
ἄνων παράδειγματικῆς οὐσίας, τὰ ἀθέατα φύσει θνητὴ κατανόον.

Οἱ φοβηθεὶσ τῶν θυμῶν τοῦ βασιλέως, it may be noted that 
the Stoics took the prudential line of arguing that one ought not 
needlessly to provoke a tyrant: "sapiens nunquam potentium 
iras provocabit, immo declinabit, non alter quanm in navigando 
procellam" (Seneca, Ep. xiv. 7). Various attempts have been 
made to explain away the contradiction between this statement 
and that of Ex 214. (a) Some think they are not irreconcilable; 
"so far as his life was concerned, he feared, but in a higher 
region he had no fear" (A. B. Davidson), i.e. he was certain 
God would ultimately intervene to thwart Pharaoh, and so took 
precautions to save his own life in the interest of the cause. This 
is rather artificial, however, though maintained by some good 
critics like Lünemann. (b) Or, the θυμὸς may be not anger at 
the murder of the Egyptian, but the resentment of Moses' action 
in refusing a court position and withdrawing from Egypt 
(Vaughan, Dods, Delitzsch, etc.). (c) A more favourite method 
is to deny that the writer is alluding to Ex 214.15 at all, and to 
refer the passage to the real Exodus later (so Calvin, Bleek, 
Westcott, Seeberg, and many other edd.); but this is to antici­
pate v.28, and the Israelites were ordered out of Egypt by 
Pharaoh, not exposed to any anger of his.

The fourth act of faith (v.28) is his obedience to the divine 
orders of Ex 1212-48 (cp. Wis 185-9), which proved that he 
believed, in spite of appearances, that God had protection and a 
future for the People. Πεποίηκεν is another aoristic perfect; πρόσ-
χωσις is not a LXX term, and θέγαγω (θίγη) only occurs in LXX 
in Ex 1918 (=Heb 1220). As θέγαγω may take a genitive (1220) 
as well as an accusative, δισθερέων might go with πρωτότοκα (i.e. 
of the Egyptians) and θίγη with αὐτῶν (the Israelites). Note the 
alliteration in πιστεὶ πεπ. πᾶσα . . . πρόσχωσιν. The ἵνα μὴ 
iclause explains τὴν πρόσχωσιν τοῦ αἴματος.

By one Old Latin, or at any rate a non-Vulgate, text of this passage, in Codex 
Harleianus (ed. E. S. Buchanan, Sacred Latin Texts, i., 1912), a gloss is 
inserted at this point: "fide praedaverunt Aegyptios exunctes" (Ex 1285.26), 
which was evidently known to Sedulius Scotus (Migne, ciii. 268 C), who 
quotes it as "fide praedaverunt Aegyptios, quia crediderunt se iterum in 
Aegyptum non reversuros."
XI. 29-31. ] THE FAITH OF ISRAEL

The fifth act of faith (v. 29) is the crossing of the Red Sea (Ex 14:16). Strictly speaking, this is an act of faith on the part of the Israelites; the διέβησαν depends on, for its subject, the αὐτῶν of v. 28. But those who crossed were οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωϋσέως (3:16), and the action is the direct sequel to that of v. 28, though Moses is now included in the People. διὰ ξηράς γῆς is from Ex 14:29; διαβάλειν goes with the genitive as well as with the accusative. The Israelites took a risk, in obedience to God's order, and so proved their πίστις. But there are some things which are possible only to faith. Ἡς (i.e. ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα) πείραν λαβόντες οἱ Ἀιγυπτιῶν κατεπόθησαν (from Ex 15:4 κατεπόθησαν ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ, B), i.e. the Egyptians tried it and were swallowed up in the sea. Here πείραν λαμβάνειν is a classical phrase for (a) making an attempt, almost in the sense of testing or risking. They "ventured on" (cp. Dt 28:66 ἢ τρυφερὰ, ἢς οὐχι πείραν ἔλαβαν δ' ποὺς αὐτὴς βαίνειν εἰπὶ τῆς γῆς), or tried it (cp. Jos. Ant. 8. 6. 5, σοφίας βουλομένη λαβέιν πείραν, etc.). The other meaning is that (b) of getting experience (so in v. 30), which is often the sad result of (a); so, e.g., Demosth. in Aristocratem, 131, λαβὼν ἔργῳ τῆς ἱκείνος φιλίας πείραν. The writer ignores the legendary embroidery of Philo (vii. Mos. iii. 34, ὡς ἐπὶ ξηρᾶς ἀρταποῦ καὶ λιθῶν ὑπὸ ἐδάφους—ἐκραυγώθη γὰρ ἡ ψάμμος καὶ ἡ σπορᾶς αὐτῆς οὐσία συμφύσα ἡνώθη). Two more instances of faith are specially cited, both in connexion with the fall of Jericho (vv. 30, 31). During the interval between the Exodus and the entrance into Canaan the writer, we are not surprised to find (3:16f.), notes not a single example of πίστις, but it is remarkable that neither here nor below (v. 92ff.) is there any allusion to Joshua.

30 It was by faith that the walls of Jericho collapsed, after being surrounded for only seven days. 31 It was by faith that Rahab the harlot did not perish along with those who were disobedient, as she had welcomed the scouts peaceably.

The faith that had enabled Israel to cross the Red Sea in safety enabled them years later to bring the walls of a city crashing to the ground (v. 50). There was no siege of Jericho; Israel simply marched round it for a week, and that act of faith in God's promise, against all probabilities, brought about the marvel. So the writer summarizes Jos 6:1-20. Judas Maccabaeus and his men also appealed, in besieging a town, to τὸν μέγαν τοῦ κόσμου δυνάστην, τὸν ἄτερ κριῶν καὶ μηχανῶν ὄργανων κατακρημνίσαντα τὴν Ιερουσαλήμ κατὰ τοὺς Ἰσραήλ χρόνους (2 Mac 12:15), and one Egyptian fanatic (for whom Paul was once mistaken, Acts 21:38) promised his adherents, in rebelling against the Romans, that the walls of Jerusalem would collapse at his word of command (Josephus, Ant. xx. 8. 6).
The faith of a community is now followed by the faith of an individual. The last name on the special list is that of a foreigner, an unmarried woman, and a woman of loose morals (v. 31), in striking contrast to Sara and the mother of Moses. The story is told in Jos 2:1-25. For ἡ πόρνη ("Ratio haec cur R. solita sit peregrinos excipere," Bengel) see below on 1:3². A tendency to whitewash her character appears in the addition of ἐπιλεγομένη (Ν syrhkk Ephr.), which is also inserted by some codices in the text of Clem. Rom. 12.2. Her practical faith (Ja 2:25; Clem. Rom. 1 12 ἀπαντάς καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐσώθηγα), shown by her friendly (μετ' εἰρήνης) welcome to the spies, which sprang from her conviction that the God of Israel was to be feared, saved (σωσάμενον, cp. Sir 8:15) her from the fate of her fellow-citizens (τοὺς ἀπεθάνατους) who declined to submit to the claims of Israel’s God. They are described by the same word as are the recalcitrant Israelites themselves (3:18). Even Jewish priests were proud to trace their descent from Rahab; her reputation stood high in later tradition, owing to the life which followed this initial act of faith (cp. Mt 1:5).

For lack of space and time the writer now passes to a mere summary of subsequent examples of faith (vv. 32f.). Roughly speaking, we may say that vv. 32-34 describe what the folk of old did by faith, vv. 35-36 what they did for faith.

32 And what more shall I say? Time would fail me to tell of Gideon, of Barak and Samson and Jephthah, of David and Samuel and the prophets—men who by faith (διὰ πίστεως) conquered kingdoms, administered justice, obtained promises, shut the mouth of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, from weakness won to strength, proved valiant in warfare, and routed hosts of foreigners.

Καὶ τι ἐτι (om. D*) λέγω (deliberative conjunctive) does not necessarily imply that Πρὸς Ἐβραίους was originally a sermon or address; it was a literary as well as an oratorical phrase. Thus Josephus uses a similar phrase in Ant. xx. 11. 1 (καὶ τι δὲι πλεῖον λέγειν). Faith did not die out, at the entry into Palestine. On the contrary, the proofs of faith are so rich in the later story of the People that the writer has no time for anything except a glowing abstract. ἐπιλείψεις γάρ με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος is one form of a common rhetorical phrase, though ἡ ἡμέρα is generally used instead of ὁ χρόνος. Three instances may be cited: Dion. Hal. De Compositione Verb. 4 (after running over the names of a number of authors) καὶ ἄλλους μνήμους, ὥς ἀπάγων τὰ ὀνόματα εἰ βουλομένων λέγειν, ἐπιλείψεις μὲ τῆς ἡμέρας χρόνων: Demosth. de Corona, 324, ἐπιλείψεις με λέγονθ' ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν προδότων ὀνόματα, and (out of several instances) Philo, de Sacrif. Abelis et Caini, 5, ἐπιλείψεις μὲ ἡ ἡμέρα λέγοντα τά τῶν κατ' εἴδος ἀρετῶν ὀνόματα.
Heroes of Faith

XI. 32, 33.

In Plato's *Euth.* 6 C, *πολλά* πέρι τῶν θεών διηγήσαιμαι, and Philo's *de Abrah.* 44, *ῶν ὀλίγων πρότερον ἐνα διεξάλθον* (= "gone over"). For ψεύδο (*N. A. D.* 33. 547), ψεύδο is rightly read by ψεύδο *KLPC W Clem. Chrys. etc.* (cp. Blass, § 475. 2), though ψεύδο is omitted altogether by *Ψ 216*. Six names are specially mentioned, to begin with. Gideon's crushing victory over the Ammonites echoes down later history (e.g. *Is 9* 31, 10 26, *Ps 83* 11). The singing out of Barak is in line with the later Jewish tradition, which declined to think of him as a mere ally of Deborah; he was the real hero of the exploit. For example, some rabbis (cp. Targ. on *Jg 5* 20, Yalkut on *Jg 4* 2) gave him the high name of Michael, and praised this brave leader for his modesty in allowing Deborah to occupy so prominent a place. Later tradition also magnified Samson's piety and divine characteristics (e.g. *Sotah* 9b, 10a). Of all the four "judges" selected, Jephthah has the poorest reputation in Jewish tradition; he is censured for rashness, and his rank is comparatively insignificant. Augustine, however (*Quaest.* vii. xlix.), points out that the "spirit" came both on Jephthah (*Jg 11* 29, 30) and on Gideon (*8* 27). Why these four names are put in this unchronological order (instead of Barak, Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson), it is impossible to guess; in *1 S* 12 11 it is Gideon, Barak, Jephthah, and Samson, followed by Samuel. David here (*Δαυίδ τε*) belongs to the foregoing group, the only one of Israel's kings mentioned in the list. In Jewish tradition (e.g. Josephus, *Ant.* vi. 2, 2–3) Samuel's career was interpreted with quite martial fervour; he was credited with several victories over the Philistines. Hence he forms a transition between the previous heroes and the prophets, of which he was commonly regarded as the great leader (cp. *Ac 3* 24). "Ἀλλὰν (+ τῶν;) is superfluously inserted before προφητῶν by *sykhkl pesh arm eth sah boh 69. 1288 Theod. Dam. In σὶ διὰ πίστεως (v. 33) the σὶ covers vv. 33, 34, but διὰ πίστεως includes vv. 35–38 as well, and is reiterated in v. 39. The following nine terse clauses, devoid of a single καί, begin by noting military and civil achievements. In *κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλεία*, καταγωνιζόμενοι (not a LXX term) is the verb applied by Josephus to David's conquests (in *Ant.* vii. 2. 2, ἀνέστη καταγωνιζόμενοι Παλαιστινών δεδωκεν δοθέος); its later metaphorical use may be illustrated from *Mart.* Pol. 19 (διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καταγωνισάμενος τῶν ἄδικων ἀρχοντα). Ἱργασάντο δικαιοσύνην in the sense of *2 S* 8:15 (καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν Δαυίδ ἐπὶ 'Ισραήλ' καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ πάντα τῶν λαῶν αὐτοῦ) etc., the writer applying to this specific activity, for which πίστις was essential, a phrase elsewhere (cp. *Ac 10* 38) used for a general moral life. Such was their faith, too, that they had promises of God's help realized in their experience; this (cp. *6* 15) is
the force of ἐπέτυχων ἐπαγγελμάτων, as in the case of Daniel (Dn 6:8-23) or theōs mon ἐνεφραξεν τὰ στόματά τῶν λεόντων, Theod.), ἔσβασαν δύομιν πυρὸς, as in the case of Daniel's three friends (Dn 3:19-28, 1 Mac 2:59, 3 Mac 6:9). In ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαίρις, the unusual plural of στόμα (cp. Lk 21:24 πεσοῦνται στόματι μαχαίρις) may be due to the preceding στόματα rhetorically; it means repeated cases of escape from imminent peril of murder rather than double-edged swords (4:12), escapes, e.g., like those of Elijah (1 K 19:17) and Elisha (2 K 6:14ff.). In ἐδυναμώθησαν (p.15 N* A D* 1831; the v.l. ἐνεδυναμώθησαν was probably due to the influence of Ro 4:20) ἀπὸ αἰθενείας, the reference is quite general; Hezekiah's recovery from illness is too narrow an instance.1 The last three clauses are best illustrated by the story of the Maccabean struggle, where ἀλλότριοι is the term used for the persecutors (1 Mac 2:7 etc.), and παρεμβολή for their hosts (1 Mac 3:16 etc.). In παρεμβολὴ, ἐκλίναν ἀλλοτριῶν, παρεμβολή, a word which Phrynichus calls δεινός Μακεδονίκον, means a host in array (so often in 1 Mac and Polybius); κλίσω (cp. Jos. Ant. xiv. 15. 4, κλίνεται τὸ . . . κέρας τῆς φάλαγγος) is never used in this sense in the LXX.

What the heroes and heroines of πίστις had to endure is now summarized (vv.55-58): the passive rather than the active aspect of faith is emphasized.

36 Some were given back to their womankind, raised from the very dead; others were broken on the wheel, refusing to accept release, that they might obtain a better resurrection; 37 others, again, had to experience scoffs and scourging, aye, chains and imprisonment—38 they were stoned . . . sawn in two, and cut to pieces; they had to roam about in sheepskins and goatskins, forlorn, oppressed, ill-treated 39 (men of whom the world was not worthy), wanderers in the desert and among hills, in caves and gullies.

1 A more apt example is the nerving of Judith for her act of religious patriotism (cp. Rendel Harris, Sidelights on NT Research, 170f.), though there is a verbal parallel in the case of Samson (Jg 16:8 ἀπόστησεν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἢ ἰδίες μου καὶ σθενήσατο). 2 The odd v.l. γυναῖκας (p.19 N* A D* 33. 1912) may be another case (cp. Thackeray, 149, for LXX parallels) of -as for -es as a nominative form; as an accusative, it could only have the senseless meaning of "marrying" (λυμβάνειν γυναίκας). Strong, early groups of textual authorities now and then preserve errors.
convictions, and therefore chose to suffer. This is a plain reference to the Maccabean martyrs. "ἔτυμπανίδοθσαν (Blass prefers the more classical form in D* ὄπετυμπανίδοθσαν), a punishment probably corresponding to the mediaeval penalty of being broken on the wheel. "This dreadful punishment consists," says Scott in a note to the thirtieth chapter of The Betrothed, "in the executioner, with a bar of iron, breaking the shoulder-bones, arms, thigh-bones and legs of the criminal, taking his alternate sides. The punishment is concluded by a blow across the breast, called the coup de grâce, because it removes the sufferer from his agony." The victim was first stretched on a frame or block, the τύμπανον1 (so schol. on Aristoph. Plut. 476, τύμπανα ξύλα ἐφ᾽ οὐσ ἔτυμπανίζον· ἔχρωντο γὰρ ταῦτα τῇ τιμωρίᾳ), and beaten to death, for which the verb was ἄποτυμπανίζεσθαι (e.g. Josephus, c. Apionem, i. 148, quoting Berossus, Λαβδοροσοφόδος . . . ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων ἄπετυμπανίζοντας: Arist. Rhet. ii. 5. 14, ὡσπερ οἱ ἄποτυμπανιζόμενοι, etc.). So Eleazar was put to death, because he refused to save his life by eating swine's flesh (2 Mac 619 ὅ δὲ τοῦ μετ' εὐκλείας βαίνατον μᾶλλον ἢ τῶν μετὰ μισοῦν βιῶν ἀναδεξάμενοι αἰθωριέτως ἐπὶ τὸ τύμπανον προσήγησαν). It is this punishment of the Maccabean martyrs which the writer has in mind, as Theodoret already saw. The sufferers were "distracti quemadmodum corium in tympano distenditur" (Calvin); but the essence of the punishment was beating to death, as both Hesychius (πλήσσεται, ἐκδέρεται, λοχυρῶς τύπτεται) and Suidas (ξύλῳ πλήσσεται, ἐκδέρεται, καὶ κρέμαται) recognize in their definition of τυμπανίζεται. The hope of the resurrection, which sustained such martyrs oὐ προσδεξάμενοι (cp. 10ετός) τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, is illustrated by the tales of Maccabean martyrs, e.g. of Eleazar the scribe (2 Mac 611ε), urged to eat some pork ἴνα τούτῳ πράξῃς ἀπολύθη τοῦ βαΐνατον, and declining in a fine stubbornness; but specially of the heroic mother and her seven sons (ibid. 711ε), who perished confessing αἰρέτων μεταλάσσοντας ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ προσδοκαί ἐλπίδας πάλιν ἀναστήσεθαι ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ . . . οἱ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἡμέτεροι ἄδελφοι βραχὺν ἐπενέγκαντες πόνον ἀδιάνοι ζωῆς ὑπὸ διαβήκην θεοῦ πεπτόκασιν.

In v.36 ἔτερον δὲ (after οἱ μὲν . . . ἄλλοι δὲ in Matt 1614) πείραν ἐλαβον (see on v.29) ἐμπαιγμῶν (cp. Sir 2728 ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ ὑνειδισμός) καὶ μαστίγων—a hendiadys; the writer has in mind shameful tortures like those inflicted on the seven Maccabean brothers, as described in 2 Mac 71 (μάστιξιν καὶ νεφρᾶς αἰκιζο-

1 Another word for the frame was τρογός, as in 4 Mac 920, where the eldest of the seven famous Jewish brothers is beaten to death. Hence the verb used by Philo (in Flaccum, 10) to describe the punishment inflicted on the Alexandrian Jews (Ἰοουδαῖοι μαστιγοῦμενοι, κρεμάμενοι, τροχιζόμενοι, κατακιζόμενοι).
Although in this case the beating is not at once fatal, as the next words prove (ἐτεῖ δὲ δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακής). The passage would be more clear and consecutive, however, if ἐπερευοῖ δὲ preceded περιήλθον (in v. 37), introducing the case of those who had not to suffer the martyrs' death. This would leave ἐμπαιγμῶν κτλ. as a reiteration or expansion of ἐμπαιγισθησαν. Before δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακής, ἐτεῖ δὲ probably (cp. Lk 14:26) heightens the tone—not merely passing blows, but long durance vile: though the sense might be simply, "and further." In v. 37 ἑλθάθησαν (as in the case of Zechariah, 2 Ch 24:20-22, Mt 23:35) was the traditional punishment which ended Jeremiah's life in Egypt (Tertull. Scorp. 8); possibly the writer also had in mind the fate of Stephen (Acts 7:58).

Ἐπρίσθησαν (Am 1:9 ἐπρίζων πρῶσσιν σιδηροῖς κτλ.) alludes to the tradition of Isaiah having being sawn in two with a wooden saw during the reign of Manasseh, a tradition echoed in the contemporary Ascensio Isaiæ 5:1-14 (Justin's Dial. cxx.; Tertull. de Patientia, xiv. etc.); cp. R. H. Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah (1900), pp. xiv–xlix.

After ἑλθάθησαν there is a primitive corruption in the text. Four readings are to be noted.

ἐπειράθησαν, ἐπεράθησαν: W L P 33, 326 syr[hkl].
ἐπεράθησαν, ἐπειράθησαν: p13 A D Ψ 6. 104. 1611. 1739 lat boh arm.
ἐπειράθησαν: fuld, Clem. Thdt.
ἐπειράθησαν: 2. 327 syr[te] Eus. etc.

Origen apparently did not read ἑπειράθησαν, if we were to judge from Hom. Jerem. xv. 2 (Δόλου ἐλιθσάθησαν, Δόλου ἐπράθησαν, Δόλου ἄκειται μετά τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσίαστριου), but shortly before (xiv. 12) he quotes the passage verbally as follows: ἑλθάθησαν, ἐπειράθησαν, ἐπειράθησαν, ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον, though ἑπειράθησαν is omitted here by H. In c. Celis. vii. 7 it is doubtful whether ἑπειράθησαν or ἐπειράθησαν was the original reading. Eusebius omits the word in Prep. Evang. xii. 10 (583d), reading ἑλθάθησαν, ἐπειράθησαν, ἐν φόνῳ κτλ., and sah reads "they were sawn, they were stoned, they died under the sword." It is evident that ἑπειράθησαν (written in some MSS as ἑπρ.) as "were tempted" is impossible here; the word either was due to dittography with ἐπειράθησαν or represents a corruption of some term for torture. Various suggestions have been made, e.g. ἐπηρώθησαν (mutilated) by Tanaquil Faber, ἐπράθησαν (sold for slaves) by D. Heinsius, ἐπειράθησαν (strangled) by J. Alberti, or ἐπεράθησαν (impaled) by Knatchbull. But some word like ἐπηρώθησαν (Beza, F. Junius, etc.) or ἐπεράθησαν (Gataker)1 is more likely, since one of the seven Maccabeans brothers was fried to death (2 Mac 7), and burning was a punishment otherwise for the Maccabeans (2 Mac 6:12). It is at any rate probable that the writer put three aorists ending in -άθησαν together.

Death ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρης (a LXX phrase) was not an uncommon fate for unpopular prophets (I K 19:10, Jer 26:23); but the writer now passes, in περιήλθον κτλ. (57th, 38), to the sufferings

1 Or ἐνεπρήθησαν, which is used by Philo in describing the woes of the Alexandrian Jews (in Flaccum, 20, ἱώτες οἱ μὲν ἐνεπρήθησαν).
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of the living, harried and hunted over the country. Not all the loyal were killed, yet the survivors had a miserable life of it, like Mattathias and his sons (1 Mac 2:28 ἔφυγον . . . εἰς ήδή ὅψιν), or Judas Maccabaeus and his men, who had to take to the hills (2 Mac 5:27 ἐν τοῖς θρησκίας τρόποις διέζην στὸν κόσμον, καὶ τὴν χορτώδη τροφὴν συνόμευσαν διετέλον), or others during the persecution (2 Mac 6:11 ἔτεροι δὲ πλησίον συνωρμότες εἰς τὰ σπήλαια). When the storm blew over, the Maccabeans recollected ὡς τὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ἑρμηνευτὴν ἐν τοῖς θρησκίας καὶ τῶν σπηλαίων θηρίων τρόπων ἅγαν νεμόμενοι (2 Mac 10:8). They roamed, the writer adds, dressed ἐν μηλωταῖς (the rough garb of prophets, like Elijah, 1 K 19:13-19), ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμαισιν (still rougher pelts). According to the Ascensio Isaiae (27f.) the pious Jews who adhered to Isaiah when he withdrew from Manasseh's idolatry in Jerusalem and sought the hills, were “all clothed in garments of hair, and were all prophets.” Clement (17f.) extends the reference too widely: οὖν ἐν δέρμαισιν αἰγείοις καὶ μηλωταίς περιπάτησαν κηρύσσοντες τὴν ἐλευσίν τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγομεν δὲ Ἡλείαν καὶ Ἐλισάμη, ἐτὶ δὲ καὶ Ἰεζεκιήλ, τοὺς προφήτας· πρὸς τούτους καὶ τοὺς μεμαρτυρήμενους.

A vivid modern description of people clad in goatskins occurs in Balzac's Les Chouans (ch. i.): “Ayant pour tout vêtement une grande peau de chèvre qui les couvrait depuis le col jusqu'aux genoux . . . Les mèches plates de leurs longs cheveux s'unissaient si habituellement aux poils de la peau de chèvre et cachetaient si complètement leurs visages baissés vers la terre, qu'on pouvait facilement prendre cette peau pour la leur, et confondre, à la première vue, les malheureux avec ces animaux dont les dépouillements leur servaient de vêtement. Mais à travers les cheveux l'on voyait bientôt briller les yeux comme des gouttes de rosée dans une épaisse verdure ; et leurs regards, tout en annonçant l'intelligence humaine, causaient certainement plus de terreur que de plaisir.”

Their general plight is described in three participles, ὀστεροῦμενοι, θηλβόμενοι (2 Co 4:9), κακουχούμενοι (cp. 1:3), and Plut. Consol. ad Apoll. 26, ὅστε πρὸς ἀπώσασθαι τὰ πένθος κακουχομένους τελευτήσατο τὸν βίον. Κακοῦχειν only occurs twice in the LXX (1 K 2:20 11:39 A), but is common in the papyri (e.g. Tebt. Pap. 10422, b.c. 92). This ill-treatment at the hands of men, as if they were not considered fit to live (cp. Ac 22:22), elicits a splendid aside—ὡν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος. Compare Mehilta, 5a (on Ex 12:9): “Israel possessed four commandments, of which the whole world was not worthy,” and the story of the bath qol in Sanhedr. 11. 1, which said, “One is here present who is worthy to have the Shekinah dwelling in him, but the world is not worthy of such.” Κόσμος as in v.7; Philo's list of the various meanings of κόσμος (in de aetern. mundi, 2) does not include this semi-religious sense. Of the righteous, Wis 3:5 remarks: ὁ θεός ἐπειρασεν αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰρεν αὐτοῖς ἄξιος ἑκατον.
There is a class of whom the world is always worthy and more than worthy: it is worthy of those who watch for, reproduce, exaggerate its foibles, who make themselves the very embodiment of its ruling passions, who shriek its catchwords, encourage its illusions, and flatter its fanaticisms. But it is a poor rôle to play, and it never has been played by the men whose names stand for epochs in the march of history" (H. L. Stewart, _Questions of the Day in Philosophy and Psychology_, 1912, p. 133).

In 38b it was the not infrequent (cf. Mk 1:45) confusion of εν and ἔπι in ancient texts which probably accounted for ἐν being replaced by ἔπι (ἔφ') in p13 Α P 33. 88, etc.; ἔπι does not suit σπηλαίως . . . ὅπως, and the writer would have avoided the hiatus in ἔπι ἐρμίαις. Still, πλανώμενοι suits only ἐρμίαις καὶ ὀρέσιν, and ἔπι may have been the original word, used loosely like πλανώμενοι with σπηλαίως κτλ. In Ps.-Sol 17:19 the pious ἐπλανοῦτο ἐν ἐρμίαις, σωθήναι ψυχᾶς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ κακοῦ. For ὅπως, cp. Ob 8 ἐν ταῖς ὅπωσ τῶν πετρῶν. Σπηλαίως, like the Latin spelunca or speus, eventually became equivalent to a "temple," perhaps on account of the prominence of caves or grottoes in the worship of some cults.

Now for an estimate of this πίστις and its heroic representatives (vv.39-40)! The epilogue seems to justify God by arguing that the apparent denial of any adequate reward to them is part of a larger divine purpose, which could only satisfy them after death.

39 _They all won their record (μαρτυρηθέντες = ἐμαρτυρήθησαν in v.2) for faith, but the Promise they did not obtain._ 40 _God had something better in store for us (ἡμῶν emphatic); he would not have them perfected apart from us._

Some of these heroes and heroines of faith had had God's special promises fulfilled even in this life (e.g. vv.11-38), but the Promise, in the sense of the messianic bliss with its eternal life (10.86.87, cf. 6:17f.), they could not win. Why? Not owing to any defect in their faith, nor to any fault in God, but on account of his far-reaching purpose in history; οὗτοι πάντες (again as in v.18, but this time summing up the whole list, vv.4-38) οὐκ ἐκαμίαντο (in the sense of v.13 μὴ κομισάμενοι; not a voluntary renunciation, as Wetstein proposes to interpret it—"non acceperunt felicitatem promissam huius vitae, imo deliberato consilio huic beneficio renunciaverunt et maluerunt affigiri morique propter deum") τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν (in v.18 the Promise was loosely called αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, and the plural τὰς ἐπαγγελίας is therefore read here by A W 436. 1611). The reason for this is now given (v.40) in a genitive absolute clause, τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν κρατήτων τι προβλεψαμόνου (the middle for the active). Προβλέπειν only occurs once in the LXX (Ps 37:18 δὲ κύριος . . . προβλέπει ὅτι ἔστιν ἡ ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ), and only here in the NT, where the religious idea makes it practically a Greek equivalent for _providere_.

XI. 40.]

THEY AND WE

_The text is a translation of a passage from the New Testament, specifically 1 Corinthians 15:28-40._

*Kei'ttoν τι is explained by ἵνα μὴ χωρίς ἠμῶν τελειωθῶσιν, which does not mean that "our experience was necessary to complete their reward," but that God in his good providence reserved the messianic τελειωσις of Jesus Christ until we could share it. This τελειωσις is now theirs (9:25 12:23), as it is ours—if only we will show a like strenuous faith during the brief interval before the end. This is the thought of 12:17, catching up that of 10:36f. God deferred the coming of Christ, in order to let us share it (cp. 1 P 10:20), his plan being to make room for us as well. The τελειωσις has been realized in Jesus; till he reappears (9:28 10:12 19:87) to complete the purpose of God for us, we must hold on in faith, heartened by the example of these earlier saints. Their faith was only granted a far-off vision of the hoped-for end. We have seen that end realized in Jesus; therefore, with so many more resources and with so short a time of strain, we ought to be nerved for our endurance by the sense of our noble predecessors. It is not that we experience _κειττόν τι_ by our immediate experience of Christ (10:14), who fulfils to us what these former folk could not receive before his coming. This is true, but it is not exactly the point here. The _κειττόν τι_ is our inclusion in this People of God for whom the τελειωσις of Christ was destined, the privilege of the _κειττών διαθήκη_. The writer does not go the length of saying that Christ suffered in the persons of these saints and heroes (as, _e.g._, Paulinus of Nola, _Epist._ xxxviii. 3: "ab initio saeculorum Christus in omnibus suis patitur . . . in Abel occisus a fratre, in Noe irrisus a filio, in Abraham peregrinatus, in Isaac oblatus, in Jacob famulatus, in Joseph venditus, in Moyse expositus et fugatus, in prophetis iactatus et sectus, in apostolis terra marique iactatus, et multis ac uariis beatorum martyrum crucibus frequenter occisus").

The conclusion of the whole matter rather is (vv. 89-40) that the reward of their faith had to be deferred till Christ arrived in our day. The τελειωσις is entirely wrought out through Christ, and wrought out for all. It covers all God’s People (cp. 12:28), for now the Promise has been fulfilled to these earlier saints. But the writer significantly ignores any idea of their co-operation in our faith; we neither pray to them, nor they for us. Josephus interpreted the sacrifice of Isaac, as if Abraham reconciled himself to it by reflecting that his son would be a heavenly support to him (Ant. i. 13. 3, ἐκείνου, _i.e._ τοῦ θεοῦ, τῆν ψυχὴν τῆν σήν προδεχομένου καὶ παρ’ αὐτῷ καθέχοντος· ἔσει τε μοι εἰς κηδεμόνα καὶ γηροκόμον . . . τον θεόν ἀντὶ σαντού παρεσχημένος). Such ideas lie outside the range of our epistle, and there is significance in the fact that the writer never touches them.
In Clement of Alexandria's comment (Strom. iv. 16) on this passage, he quotes (reading lirfrµo'is mov: fovrous: -x,povL£'i: OtKatros mov), then hurries on to I 186 -12 2 ("reading {X,J0d.rr0rJ<Tav, hwpd.rrOrJrraP, EP <j,OP'I) µ.a.11"<·

0aPoP: ,v <prJµla,r: T1JP E'11"a;-;-eXlaP rou Oeou), 0.7r0Ae/7rera, PoiiP ro Kara. 7raparr,w'11"rJ<T<P elprJµtvoP µ6vo,. E'11"<<j,<pet ;-ouP' 7repl nµwv Kpe'irr6v r,

The collocation of T1JV E'11"aneXlav with rou Oeou is a mistake.

From the ,jp.w" • • • ,jp.w" of the epilogue the writer now passes into a moving appeal to his readers (12lf·).

Therefore (To,;-apo11v, as in I Th 4 8 ), with all this host of witnesses encircling us, we (kai ἡμῖν, emphatic) must strip off sin with its clinging folds, to run our appointed course steadily (~, V7roµovfis), our eyes fixed upon Jesus as the pioneer and the perfection of faith—upon Jesus who, in order to reach his own appointed joy, steadily endured (v7rlµetvev) the cross, thinking nothing of its shame, and is now "seated at the right hand" of the throne of God.

The writer now returns to the duty of (nroµ.ov~ as the immediate exercise of 110s (1o86f.), the supreme inspiration being the example of Jesus (121·8) as the great Believer, who shows us what true 110Tis means, from beginning to end, in its heroic course (τοῦ προκειμένου ἡμῖν ἁγώνα).

The general phraseology and idea of life as a strenuous ἁγών, in the Hellenic sense (see on 514), may be seen in many passages, e.g. Eurip. Orest. 846 f. :

πρὸς δ' Ἀργεῖον οἰχεῖται λεόν, ψυχῆς ἁγώνα τῶν προκειμένων πέρι δώσων, ἐν αἷς ἢθεν τοιάσας χρείαν,

Herod. viii. 102 (πολλὰς πολλὰς ἁγόνας δραμέονται αἱ Ἑλληνες) and ix. 60 (ἁγῶνος μεγίστου προκειμένου ἑλευθέρην εἶναι ἡ δεδουλωμένη τὴν Ἑλλάδα), and especially in 4 Mac 14² πάντες (the seven martyrs), ὥστε εἰς ἅλασσας δόντες πρέξαντες, ἐπὶ τῶν διὰ τῶν βασιλέων βάπτισαν ἑστηκόν, and Philo's de migra. Ἀδραν. 24, καὶ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ πιστεύας "ἔγνιξεν θεόν" (Gn 18 28, cp. He 11 6) λέγεται, έαν μένων πορεύομενοι μήτε κάμυ (cp. He 12 3) μήτε μαθηματίζω, ὡς παρ' ἐκάτερα ἐκτραπόμενοι (cp. He 12 8) πλανάσθαι τῆς μέσης καὶ εὐθυτετοῦ διαμαρτύρων ὀδῶι, μιμήσαμεσ ἃ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ δρομεὶς τὸ στάδιον ἀπαίτητο ἁγνύς τοῦ βίου, στεφάνως καὶ ἄθλων ἐπαξίων τείνεται πρὸς τὸ τέλος εὐθύν. The figure is elaborately worked out in 4 Mac 1711-14 (ἄλλος γὰρ ἢν ἁγῶν θείος ὁ δὲ αὐτῶν γεγενέμενος, ἡθλοθέτει γὰρ τότε ἅρχη δὲ ὑπομονὴς δοκιμάζουσα: τὸ νῖκος ἐν ἀρθραγίᾳ ἐν ζωῇ πολιτείᾳ. Ἑλεαζὰρ δὲ προηγώνιστο ὁ δὲ μὴτή τῶν ἑπτά πάντων ἐνχέλθη ὁ δὲ αἰσθητῶν ἀνηγώνιστο ὁ δὲ κόμως καὶ ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος θεωρεῖ), where the Maccabean martyrs are athletes of the true Law; but the imagery is more rhetorical and detailed than in Ἐν Πρός Ἐβραίων, where the author, with a passing touch of metaphor, suggests more simply and suggestively the same idea.

*Εχοντες ... ἀποθέμενοι ... ἀφορώτες, three participlest with the verb after the second, as in Jude 20. 21; but here the first, not the second, denotes the motive. Τοσοῦτον1 (thrown forward, for emphasis) ἔχοντες περικειμένοι ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων. Μαρτύρες here, in the light of 112. 4. 5. 39, denotes those who have borne

1 Τηλικοῦτον, N° W.
personal testimony to the faith. Heaven is now crowded with these (11) still; we are, or ought to be, conscious of their record, which is an encouragement to us (καὶ ήμεῖς ἐπ' εὐχατόν τῶν ήμερῶν τούτων (12)). It is what we see in them, not what they see in us, that is the writer’s main point; περικείμενον suggests that the idea of them as witnesses of our struggle (see the quot. from 4 Mac, above) is not to be excluded, but this is merely suggested, not developed. Μάρτυς is already, as in Rev 213 etc., beginning to shade off into the red sense of “martyr” (cp. Kattenbusch in Zeitsch. für neutest. Wissenschaft, 1903, pp. 111 f.; G. Krüger, ibid., 1916, pp. 264 f.; Reitzenstein in Hermes, 1917, pp. 442 f., and H. Delehaye in Analecta Bollandiana, 1921, pp. 20 f.), though the writer uses the word with a special application here, not as usually of the Christian apostles nor of the prophets, but of the heroes and heroines of the People in pre-Christian ages. He does not even call Jesus Christ μάρτυς (as does the author of the Johannine apocalypse).

The meaning of “witnesses of our ordeal” (i.e. spectators) is supported by passages like Epict. iv. 4. 31, οὖν δείξει ἄγνων δίκαια βαρύδου γίνεται; πολλοὺς δὲ προγομματιστὰς εἶναι, πολλοὺς τοὺς ἐπικηραγαζόντας, πολλοὺς ἐπιστάτας, πολλοὺς θεάτας, and particularly Longinus, de sublim. xiv. 2, who, in arguing that many people catch their inspiration from others, notes: τῷ γὰρ δυναῖ ἀμαθῶς ἐμφάνισα τῶν ἡμῶν λόγων δικαστήριον καὶ θεάτρον, καὶ ἐν τῇ κοινότητι ἢμοις κριταί τε καὶ μάρτυρις ὑπέχειν τῶν γραφομένων εὐθύνας πεπαίχθη. In Educational Aims and Methods (p. 28), Sir Joshua Fitch writes: “There is a remarkable chapter in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the writer unfolds to his countrymen what is in fact a National Portrait Gallery, as he enumerates, one by one, the heroes and saints of the Jewish history, and adds to his catalogue these inspiring words . . . [He 11:32-34]. And, finally, he draws this conclusion from his long retrospect . . . [He 12]. How much of the philosophy of history is condensed into that single sentence! It is suggestive to us of the ethical purpose which should dominate all our historical teaching. To what end do we live in a country whose annals are enriched by the story of great talents, high endeavours and noble sacrifices, if we do not become more conscious of the possibilities of our own life, and more anxious to live worthily of the inheritance which has come down to us?”

Νέφος (never in this sense in LXX) has its usual Greek meaning of “host” (Latin nimbus or nubes), as, e.g., in Herod. viii. 109, νέφος τοσοῦτο ἄνθρώπων. In ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάυτα καὶ τὴν εὐπεριστάταν ἀμαρτίαν, ὄγκον is thrown first for the sake of emphasis: “any encumbrance that handicaps us.” The conjec-

1 The broader conception of the moral life as an athletic contest recurs in Epict. iii. 25. 1-3, σκέψαι, ἧν προέθεσιν ἀρχόμενοι, τίνων μὲν έκεράτσας, τίνων δ’ οὐ . . . οὐ γὰρ ἀποκνυτήν τὸν ἁγίων τῶν μέγατον ἀγώνισμον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πληγὰς ληπτένων οὐ γὰρ ἐπέρ πάλης καὶ παγκρατίου δ’ ἁγίων πρόκειται . . . ἀλλ’ ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς εὐνοίας καὶ εὐδαιμονίας.
ture δοκον (P. Junius) is relevant, but superfluous; sloth is a hindrance, but the general sense of δοκος in this connexion is quite suitable. Compare Apul. Apologia, 19 (“et enim in omnibus ad vitae munia utendi quicquid aptam moderationem supergreditur, oneri potius quam usui exuberat”), and the evening prayer of the Therapeutae (Philo. vit. Contempl. 3) to have their souls lightened from τον των αἰσθητων καὶ αἰσθητων δοκον. "δοκος had acquired in Greek literature the sense of pride, both bad and good, and it has been taken here (so sah = “having forsaken all pride”) as an equivalent for pride in the sense of conceit (fastus), as, e.g., by Bengel and Seeberg. But what the readers seem to have been in danger of was not arrogance so much as a tendency to grow disheartened. The metaphor is not "reducing our weight," though δοκος had sometimes this association with fleshiness; it refers to the weight of superfluous things, like clothes, which would hinder and handicap the runner. Let us strip for the race, says the writer. Put unmetaphorically, the thought is that no high end like πίστις is possible apart from a steady, unflinching resolve to do without certain things. What these encumbrances are the writer does not say (cp. 11:18, 25, 26); he implies that if people will set themselves to the course of faith in this difficult world, they will soon discover what hampers them. In καὶ την εὑρεσιστατον ἀμαρτιαν, the article does not imply any specific sin like that of apostasy (v. 25); it is ἀμαρτια in general, any sin that might lead to apostasy (e.g. v. 16). The sense of εὑρεσιστατος can only be inferred from the context and from the analogy of similar compounds, for it appears to have been a verbal adjective coined by the writer; at any rate no instance of its use in earlier writers or in the papyri has been as yet discovered. As the phrase goes with ἀποθέμενοι, the introductory καί linking την ... ἀμαρτιαν with δοκον, εὑρεσιστατος probably denotes something like "circumstans nos" (vg), from περιστάτων (= cingere). The εὖ is in any case intensive. Theophylact suggested "endangering" (δι' ἐν εὔκολος τις εἰς περιστάσεις ἐμπίπτει' οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτω κινδύνωδες ὡς ἀμαρτία), as though it were formed from περιστάς (distress or misery). Taken passively, it might mean (a) "popular," or (b) "easily avoided," or (c) "easily contracted." (a) περιστάτωος may mean what people gather round (περιστάτωο) to admire, as, e.g., in Isokrates, de Permut. 135 Ε, βαμματοποιήσαι τας ... ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνοητῶν περιστάτων γενομένας, and εὑρεσιστατον would then = "right popular." This is at any rate more relevant and pointed than (b), from περιστάμμω, which Chrysostom once suggested (την εὔκολος περιστάμμενην ἡμᾶς ἢ την εὔκολος περιστάτων δυναμένην παθεῖν: μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦτο, φάδιον γὰρ εὰν ἠδομέν περιγενέσθαί τῆς ἀμαρτίας), though περιστάτωος does mean "admired," and ἀπερί
στάτος is sometimes, by way of contrast, “unsupported.” On the other hand, ἀπερίστατος may mean “unencumbered,” as in the contrast drawn by Maximus of Tyre (Diss. xx.) between the simple life (ἄπλοιν βίον καὶ ἀπερίστατον καὶ ἑλευθερίας ἐπήβολον) and a life τοῦ ὅνυ ἄπλο ἀλλ' ἀναγκαῖο καὶ περιστάσεων γέμωντι. The former life he declares was that of the golden age, before men worried themselves with the encumbrances of civilization. In the light of this, εὐπερίστατος might mean “which sorely hinders” (i.e. active), a sense not very different from (vg) “circumstans nos,” or “which at all times is prepared for us” (syr). (e) is suggested by Theodoret, who rightly takes ἥ ἁμαρτία as generic, and defines εὐπερίστατον as εὐκόλως συνισταμένη τε καὶ γυμνώμην. καὶ γὰρ ὀφθαλμὸς δελεάζεται, ἀκοὴ καταβλέγεται, ἀφὴ γαργαρίζεται, καὶ γλώσσα βάστα διολοσθαίνει, καὶ ὁ λογισμὸς περὶ τὸ χείρον ὀξύρροπος. But “easily caught” is hardly tense enough for the context. Wetstein, harking back to περίστατος and περί­στασις, connects the adjective with the idea of the heroic on­lookers. “Peccatum uestrum seu defectio a doctrina Christi non in occulto potest committi et latere; non magis quam lapsus cursoris, quo animo uidebant lapsum uestrum? qua fronte ante oculos ipsorum audebis tale facinus committere?” But “open” or “conspicuous” is, again, too slight and light a sense. If any conjecture had to be accepted, εὐπερίστατον would be the best. Cp. the schol. on Iliad, ii. 183 (ἀπὸ δὲ χλαίνων βάλε), χλάινα τετράγωνος χλαμίδος ἢ εἰς ἀξίων λήγονσα· ἀπέβαλε δὲ αὐτὴν διὰ τὸ εὐπερίστατον. Hence Bentley’s note: “Lego τὴν ὑπὲρ ἴκανον ἀπαρτίαν . . . immo potius εὐπερίστατον ἀπαρτίαν.” In Soph. Ajax, 821, the hero says of the sword on which he is about to fall, “I have fixed it in the ground, εὖ περιστελλα, right care­fully.” The verbal adjective would therefore mean, in this connexion, “close-clinging,” while ἀπαρτίαν (= burden) would be practically a synonym for ὅγκον.

Τρέχωμεν . . . ἀφορώντες, for the motive-power in life comes from inward convictions. What inspires Christians to hold out and to endure is their vision of the unseen (cp. Herodian, ν. 6. 7, ὅ δ’ Ἀντωνύνος ἐθεε . . . ἐς τὸν θεόν ἀποβλέπων καὶ τοὺς χαλινοὺς ἀντέχον τῶν ῥεπων’ πάσαν τε τῆν ὄδον ἣνυ τρέχων ἐμπαλίν ἐκείνῳ ἀφορῶν τε εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ), as the writer has already shown (11. 11). Τὸν προκειμένον ἢμιν ἄγωνα is built on the regular (p. 193) phrase for a course being set or assigned; e.g. Lucian in de Mercede Conduct. 11, σοι δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς ἄγων καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄπαντος τοῦ βίου τότε προκειόμεθα δοκεῖ: Plato’s Laches, 182α, ὃ γὰρ ἄγωνος ἄθληται ἐσμέν καὶ ἐν οἷς ἢμιν ὃ ἄγων πρόκειται κτλ., and Josephus, Ant. viii. 12. 3, ὃ προκειμένον αὐτοῖς
The Epistle to the Hebrews [XII. 1, 2.

For áforóntes eis (v. 2), see Epictetus, ii. 19, where the philosopher says he wishes to make his disciples free and happy, eis tôn theon áforóntas en panti kai mikrò kai megalò. An almost exact parallel occurs in the epitaph proposed by the author of 4 Mac (17) for the Maccabean martyrs, oì kai éxedíkousan to òðnos eis theon áforóntes kai mékri thanátov tòs basávou ópomeívántes. 'Aforóntes implies the same concentrated1 attention as ápoblétein (see on 1130): "with no eyes for any one or anything except Jesus." 'Iepoúν comes at the end of the phrase, as in 20, and especially 31; the terms tôn tòs písteos àrchiqon kai telleiothn describe him as the perfect exemplar of pístis in his earthly life (cp. 213), as the supreme pioneer (àrchiqos as in 210, though here as the pioneer of personal faith, not as the author of our faith) and the perfect embodiment of faith (telleiothn, a term apparently coined by the writer). He has realized faith to the full, from start to finish. Telleiothn does not refer to telleiothsw in 1140; it does not imply that Jesus "perfects" our faith by fulfilling the divine promises.

In 5s ánti tôn prokeimenvn autò òcharás, the òchará is the unselfish joy implied in 28-9, "that fruit of his self-sacrifice which must be presupposed in order that the self-sacrifice should be a reasonable transaction. Self-sacrificing love does not sacrifice itself but for an end of gain to its object; otherwise it would be folly. Does its esteeming as a reward that gain to those for whom it suffers, destroy its claim to being self-sacrifice? Nay, that which seals its character as self-sacrificing love is, that this to it is a satisfying reward" (M'Leod Campbell, The Nature of the Atonement, p. 23). As Epictetus bluntly put it, ἐάν μὴ ἐν τῷ αὑτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐνεβῆσθαι καὶ συμφέρον, οὐ δύναται σωθῆναι τὸ ἐνεβῆσθαι ἐν τῷ (i. 27. 14). So, in the Odes of Solomon 38-12, Christ says:

"They condemned me when I stood up . . .
But I endured and held my peace,
that I might not be moved by them.
But I stood unshaken like a firm rock,
that is beaten by the waves and endures.
And I bore their bitterness for humility's sake;
that I might redeem my people and inherit it."

Hence ánti (as in v. 16 ánti bróswos: cp. Plato's Menex. 237 Α, ἀνδρας ἄγαθας ἐπανύωντες, oí . . . τὴν τελειωτὴν ánti τῆς τῶν ζώντων σωτηρίας ἡλάξαντο) means, "to secure." The sense of

1 Epictetus, in his praise of Herakles (iii. 24), declares that his hero lived and worked with a firm faith in Zeus the Father. "He considered that Zeus was his own father; he called Zeus father, and did everything with his eyes fixed on Zeus (πρὸς ἑκείνουν ἄφορον ἐπραττεν ἐπραττεν)."
joy and shame

προκειμένης (cp. v. 1) tells against the rendering of ἀντὶ ..., χαρᾶς as "instead of the joy which had been set before him," as though the idea were that of I 25-26, either the renunciation of his pre-incarnate bliss (so Wetstein, von Soden, Windisch, Goodspeed, etc., recently), or the renunciation of joy in the incarnate life (so Chrysostom, Calvin), i.e. the natural pleasure of avoiding the way of the cross. This is a Pauline idea (2 Co 89, Phil 267), which the writer might have entertained; but (p. 1) he never hints at it elsewhere, and the other interpretation tallies with the idea of 289. Inspired by this, Jesus ὑπεμείνει (+ τῶν, p18 D*) σταυρῷ— as we might say in English "a cross." Aristotle (Nik. Eth. ix. 1, 2) declares that courage is praiseworthy just because it involves pain, χαλεπώτερον γὰρ τὰ λυπηρὰ ὑπομένειν ἢ τὰ ἤδειαν ἀπέχεσθαι: no doubt the end in view is pleasant (τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἀνδρείαν τέλος ἢδος, cp. He 1211), but the end is not always visible. In αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας it is not the horrible torture of the crucifixion, but its stinging indignity (cp. Gal 318 for an even darker view), which is noted as a hard thing; it was a punishment for slaves and criminals, for men of whom the world felt it was well rid (cp. 11389). But Jesus did not allow either the dread or the experience of this to daunt him. He rose above "indignity and contumely, that is to say, all that would most touch that life which man has in the favour of man, and which strikes more deeply than physical infliction, because it goes deeper than the body—wounding the spirit" (M'Lead Campbell, The Nature of the Atonement, pp. 229, 230). Musonius (ed. Hense, x.) defined ἔβρις or αἰσχύνη as ὁ λοιπόν ὁδορθῆσαι ἢ πληγῆσαι ἢ ἐμπυροθῆσαι, δὲν τὸ χαλεπώτατον πληγαῖ. But the special αἰσχύνη here is that of crucifixion. This, says the writer, Jesus did not allow to stand between him and loyalty to the will of God. It is one thing to be sensitive to disgrace and disarrangement, another thing to let these hinder us from doing our duty. Jesus was sensitive to such emotions; he felt disgrace keenly. But instead of allowing these feelings to cling to his mind, he rose above them. This is the force of κατα-φρονήσας here, as in the last clause of St. Philip of Neri's well-known maxim, "Spernere mundum, spernere te ipsum, spernere te sperni." It is the only place in the NT where καταφρονεῖν is used in a good sense (true and false shame are noted in Sir 420-21 περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς σου μὴ αἰσχυνθῆς ἐστὶν γὰρ αἰσχύνη ἐπά-γονσα ἀμαρτίαν, καὶ ἐστιν αἰσχύνη δοξᾶ καὶ χάρις). The climax is put in one of the writer's favourite quotations from the psalter; only this time he uses κεκάθικεν (perfect here alone for the more usual aorist, 181 1012) = and so has entered on his χάρα.

Jesus thus had to suffer worse than anything you have had to bear; this is the thought of vv.3-4, which round off the first movement of the appeal in 1216:—
Compare him who steadily endured (ὑπομεμενηκότα) all that hostility from sinful men, so as to keep your own hearts from fainting and failing. You have not had to shed blood yet in the struggle against sin.

The writer assumes, as in 5, a close knowledge of the Passion story. Before proceeding to argue that suffering is a fruitful discipline, with which God honours them (v.6), he reminds them that as yet they have not had to face the worst (v.4). The metaphor of the race-course dies away into the general military metaphor of v.4, where ἀμαρτία is half-personified as in 3. 'Ἀναλογίσασθε 1 (the γάρ is corroborative: "yes, ἀναλογίσασθε" κτλ.) is more than κατανοήσατε (3): "consider him and compare his treatment at the hands of these sinners (ἀμαρτωλῶν as in Mk 14) with what you are called to suffer." Τοιαύτην echoes σταυρον and αἰχμῆνη, and is explained by μέχρις αἰματος in the next verse, while ὑπομεμενηκότα is another aoristic perfect like κεκάθικεν.

'Ἀντιλογίαν is used here of active opposition, as in Ps 17 (ὁσαί με ἐξ ἀντιλογίων λαοῦ), where Ν* R read ἀντιλογίας, and in the papyri (e.g. Tebt. P. 138 [ii b.c.] ἀντιλογίας μάχην). Like the verb (cp. Jn 19, Ro 10), the noun covers more than verbal opposition, as in Nu 20 and Jude 11 η ἀντιλογία τοῦ Κορέ. The words εἰς αὐτῶν (or ἑαυτῶν, A P syrskl etc.: in semetipsum, vg.) have no special emphasis; all the writer means to say is that Jesus himself, Jesus in his own person, had to encounter malevolent opposition.

This is one of the places at which textual corruption began early. The curious v.l. ἅρτων finds early support in κ* D* (αἴμος, p13 κ* 33. 256. 1288. 1319*. 1739. 2127 Lat syrg boh Orig.; p18 κ* and D* go wrong here as in 11 κ* D* and Lat as at 11 (insertion). It is extremely unlikely that the reading arose from a recollection of passages like Nu 16 (Korah, Dathan, and Abiram) γύλασαν τὰ πυρεία τῶν ἀμαρτώλων τούτων ἐν (i.e. at the cost of) τὰς ψυγκαῖς αὐτῶν, or Pr 88 αὐτοὶ ἐμὲ ἀμαρτάνοντες ἀδεξοθόν εἰς τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυγκαῖς. The notion that an evil-doer really injured himself was a commonplace (e.g. M. Aurel. 9 οἱ ἀμαρτάνων ἑαυτῷ ἀμαρτάνει ὁ ἀδικῶν ἑαυτὸν ἀδίκει, the remark of Chrysippus quoted by Plutarch in de Stoic. repurg. xvi., ἀδίκειος ὁ εὖ ἑαυτῷ τῶν ἀδικουσάντων καὶ ἀδυντὸς ἀδικεῖ, ἱστ. ἀλλον ἀδικεῖ, Aristotle in Magn. Morai. 1196a, οἱ ἀρα ταῦτα μὴ πράττων ἀδικεῖ αὐτὸν, and Xen. Hellen. i. 7. 19, ἡμαρτήκοτα τὰ μέγιστα εἰς θεοῦ τε καὶ ἑαυτῶν αἰματοσ; Philo works it out in quod deter. 15. 16. But there is no point in suggesting here, as this reading does, that the ἅρτων were acting against their better selves, unconsciously injuring their own souls, as they maltreated Jesus. The writer deals with sin in a more straightforward and direct way, and, in spite of all arguments to the contrary (e.g. by Westcott, von Soden, Seeberg, Peake, Wickham), this seems a far-fetched idea here. It is like the similar interpretation of ἑαυτῶν in to4, a piece of irrelevant embroidery; it "looks like the conceit which some reader wrote upon his margin" (A. B. Davidson). Theodoret took εἰς ἑαυτῶν with ἀναλογίασθε = "think to yourselves." Which is not natural, though the Ethiopic version follows this interpretation. In some early versions (e.g. sah arm) neither εἰς ἑαυτῶν nor εἰς ἑαυτῶσ seems to be implied.

1 Ἀναλογίσομαι, though not a LXX term, begins to be used in Hellenistic Judaism (e.g. 1Ps. Sol 87 ἀναλογίσομαι τὰ κρίματα τῶν θεῶν) in a religious sense.
In ἐνα...ἐκλούμενοι, ἐκλούμενοι (ἐκλελυμένοι p18 D*) might go with ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὄμων (cp. Polybius, xx. 4. 7, οὗ μόνον τοῖς σώμασιν ἔκλειθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς), as readily as κάρμη (cp. Job 10: καρμω δὲ τῇ ψυχῇ μου). Both verbs connect with it, to express the general sense of inward exhaustion and faint-heartedness; indeed, Aristotle uses both to describe runners relaxing and collapsing, once the goal has been passed: ἐν τοῖς καμπτόροις (at the goal of the race, not till then) ἐκπνέουσι καὶ ἐκλύονται προορόντες γὰρ τὸ πέρας οὐ κάμνουσι πρότερον (Rhet. iii. 9. 2). In v. 4 οὐπω (γὰρ is superfluously added by D L 440. 491. 823 arm sah boh) κτλ. does not necessarily imply that they would be called upon to shed their blood in loyalty to their faith, as if martyrdom was the inevitable result of tenacity. Nor is the writer blaming them; he does not mean to suggest that if they had been truly decided for God against the world, they would by this time have suffered μέχρις αἱμάτως. He is shaming them, not blaming them. "Your sufferings have been serious and sharp (10:82), but nothing to what others before you, and especially Jesus, have had to bear. Will you give way under a lesser strain than theirs?" The coming of the messiah was to be heralded by birth-pangs of trouble for his adherents on earth, and it might be supposed that the writer implies here: "The Coming One (10:87) is near (12:28), as is evident from your woes; do not fail, but be ready for him." But this line of thought is not worked out elsewhere by the writer, and is not necessary to his argument at this point. To fight μέχρις αἵματος is to resist to the death; cp. the cry of Judas Maccabaeus to his troops (2 Mac 13:14), ἀγνώσιασθαί μέχρι θανάτου. Μέχρις αἵματος has the same meaning of a mortal combat, e.g. in Heliod. vii. 8, τῆς μέχρις αἵματος στάσεως.

Note another case of rhetorical alliteration in αἱμ. ἀντικ. ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι (cp. Clem. Hom. iv. 5, πρὸς τοσάποτρ ὄναμι ἀνταγωνι­σάσθαι), and the use of ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι above (v. 1) in the quot. from 4 Mac.

The connexion of thought in vv. 5f. is: God has not yet asked from you the supreme sacrifice (v. 4), and, besides (vv. 5f.), any demand he makes upon your courage is in your highest interests.

6 And have you forgotten the word of appeal that reasons with you as sons?

7 It is for discipline that you have to endure. God is treating you as sons; for where is the son who is not disciplined by his father? 6 Discipline is the portion (μέρος γεγόνα, as 3:19) of all; if you get no discipline, then you are not sons, but bastards. 7 Why, we had fathers of our flesh to discipline us,
and we yielded to them! Shall we not far more submit to the Father of our spirits, and so live? 10 For while their discipline was only for a time, and inflicted at their pleasure, he disciplines us for our good, that we may share in his own holiness. 11 Discipline always seems for the time to be a thing of pain, not of joy; but those who are trained by it reap the fruit of it afterwards in the peace of an upright life.

With the interrogative καὶ ἐκλήσῳ κτλ. (v.5) the writer opens his next argument and appeal. All such ὑπομονῇ means a divine παιδεία or moral training, which we have the honour of receiving from God. Instead of adducing the example of Jesus, however (see on 5·7·8), he quotes from the book of Proverbs (vv.5·6), and then applies the general idea (vv.7·11). Ἐκλανθάνεσθαι (not a LXX term) in v.5 is slightly stronger than the more common ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι, though it may be rhetorically chosen for the sake of assonance after ἐκλυόμενον. The παράκλησις is personified rhetorically; Ἡτίς (28) ὁμίν (for the scripture applies to all believers) ὡς υἱὸς διαλέγεται. It is the παράκλησις of God, who speaks as a father to his son (ὑιὸς μου), though in the original “son” is merely the pupil of the sage (personifying the divine wisdom). Παράκλησις in Alexandrian Judaism “is the regular term for ‘an appeal’ to an individual to rise to the higher life of philosophy” (Conybeare’s ed. of Philo’s de vit. Contempl., p. 201). The quotation is from Pr 3·11·12 (A):

 ula, μὴ ὄλυγῳρεῖ παιδείας Κυρίου,
 μηδὲ ἐκλύνοι ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενον,
 διὶ γὰρ ἄγαπα Κύριος παιδεῖε (ἐλέγχει, B)
 μαστυγοὶ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν δὲ παραδέχεται.

After ὑιὸς, μου is added (except by D* 31 Old Latin, Clem.), but otherwise the citation is word for word. Philo (De Congressu. Erud. 31) quotes the same passage to prove that discipline and hardship are profitable for the soul (οὕτως ἄρα ἡ ἐπιλεξίς καὶ νοθεσία καλὸν νενόμοσται, ὡστε δ’ αὐτὸς ἡ πρὸς θεον ὁμολογία συγγένεια γίνεται. τί γὰρ οἰκείωτερον νῦν πατρός ἡ νῦν πατρί;). The LXX contains a double mistranslation. (a) It is at least doubtful if the Hebrew text of the second line means “be not weary of”; the alternative is a parallel to the first line, “scorn not.” (b) It is certain that the second line of v.6 originally ran, “he afflicts the man in whom he delights,” or “and delights in him as a father in his son.” Our writer, following the free LXX version, notes the twofold attitude of men under hardship. They may determine to get through it and get over it, as if it had no relation to God, seeing nothing of him in it. Stronger natures take this line; they summon up a stoical courage, which dares the world to do its worst to them. This is ὄλυγῳρεῖ παιδείας Κυρίου. It ignores any divine meaning in the rough experience. Other natures collapse weakly (ἐκλύειν); they see God in the
trial, but he seems too hard upon them, and they break down in self-pity, as if they were victims of an unkind providence. Ελεγχόμενος ... παιδεύει is used, as in Rev 3:19 (οδονς εν αυτο και παιδευω), of pointing out and correcting faults; μαστιγοι, as in Judith 8:27 (εις νοσθησιν μαστιγοι Κυριος τοις έγγιζονται αυτο) and often elsewhere; παραδείγματι, in the sense of Ps.-Sol 16:16, where the writer prays:

γογγυσμων και διλογισμιων εν θλιψει μακρυνων απ’ εμοι, ειν αμαρτισων εν τω σε παιδευειν εις επιστροφην ... εν τω ελεγχοσθαι ψυχην εν χειρι σατριας αυτης ... εν τω υπομειναι δοκαιν υν τουτους ελεηθησεται υπο κυριον.

In εις παιδειαν υπομεινετε (v.7), with which the writer begins his application of the text, the vigour is lost by the change of εις into ει (in a group of late cursives, including 5.35.203.226c. 241.242.257.337.378.383.487.506.547.623.794.917.1319.1831.1891.1898.2127.2143 + Theophyl.), and υπομεινετε is indicative, not imperative. To endure rightly, one must endure intelligently; there is a reason for it in God’s relations with us (ὁς υιος υμιν προσφερεται). Προσφέρεται (cp. Syll. 371:18; i A.D.) is a non-biblical Greek term for “treating” or “handling” (“tractare, agere cum”); cp. Syll. 371:18; i A.D., and Latyschev’s Inscript. Antiqu. Orae Septentrionalis, i. 2228 τοις μεν ἡλικιωταις προσφερόμενος ὁς ἀδελφὸς ... τοῖς δὲ παισίν ὡς πατήρ; τις γoes with υιος, as in Mt 7:9 (τις ἔστων ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀνθρωπος) etc., and ἕστων after υιος is rightly omitted by AE A P W 104.256 vg sah Origen.

A mood of bitter scepticism about the discipline of providence recurs in some contemporary Roman writers; both Lucan (Pharsalia, iv. 807 f., “Felix Roma quidem, civesque habitura beatos, | si libertatis superis tam cura placeret | quam uindicta placet”) and Tacitus (Hist. i. 3, “neque enim umquam atroci-oribus populi Romani cladibus magisve iustis indicii adprobatum est non esse curae deiis securitatem nostram, esse ultionem”) speak as if the gods showed an unpaternal vindictiveness. But the idea of a fatherly providence was far-spread, both within and without Judaism. When our author argues: “You think that if God were fatherly, he would spare you these hardships? On the contrary, they are the proof of his wise affection”—he is not far from Seneca’s position (in the de Providentia, iv. 7): “hos itaque deus quos probat, quos amat, indurat recognoscit, exercet.” And in 2 Mac 6:12 the author bids his readers re-

1 D takes εις παιδειαν with the foregoing παραδείγματι, as Hofmann does with μαστιγοι. This leaves υπομεινετε (ὑπομεινάτε D) in quite an effective opening position for the next sentence; but it is not the writer’s habit to end a quotation with some outside phrase.
member τὰς τιμωρίας μὴ πρὸς ὀλεθρον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς παιδιὰν τοῦ γένους ἤμων εἶναι. According to Sanhedr. 101a (cp. Sifre, Deut. 32), Rabbi Akiba comforted R. Eliezer on his sick-bed by explaining to him that "chastisements are precious," whereas the other three rabbis who accompanied him had only praised the sick man for his piety. There is a fine passage in Philo's quod deter. potiori insid. so/eat, 39-40, where he argues that discipline at God's hands is better than being left to oneself in sin and folly; εὐνούχωτεροι δὲ καὶ κρείττονς τῶν ἀνεπερατευτῶν νέων οἱ μάλιστα μὲν ἐπιστασίας καὶ ἀρχὴς ἀξιωθέντες φυσικῆς, ἢν οἱ γεννησάντες ἐπὶ τέκνοις κεκληρώνατα . . . ἱκετεύμεν οὖν τὸν θεόν οἱ συνειδήσει τῶν ὀλενείων ἀδικημάτων ἐλεγχόμενοι, κολάσας ἡμᾶς μᾶλλον ἡ παρείαν. Similarly, in de sacrificandibus, 11, he writes of parental care, human and divine, apropos of Deut 141 (ὑοὶ ἐστε κυρίω τιθεοῦ ὑμῶν) ὑπολογίζεται προνοίας καὶ κρυφομοίρας ἀξιωθέντοις τῷ ὑπὲρ ἐκ πατρός: ἢ δὲ ἐπιμέλεια τοσοῦτον διωκεῖ τῆς ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων δοσολογίας, οἶμαι, καὶ ὁ ἐπιμελούμενος διαφέρει. Compare M. Aur. i. 17, τὸ ἄρχοντα καὶ πατρὶ ὑποσχήται, δὲ ἐμελεῖ πάντα τὸν τύφον ἀδαιρήσεις μου (cp. v. 31). When the king asks, in the Epist. Arist. 248, what is the supreme instance of neglect (ἀμελεία), the Jew answers, εἰ τέκνων ἀφρονίς τις εἰς, καὶ μὴ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἀγαθῶν στειδοὶ . . . τὸ δὲ ἐπιδείσαι παιδεῖαν σωφροσύνης μεταχείν, θεοῦ δυνάμει τοῦτο γίνεται.

Jerome writes in his letter (Epist. xxii. 39) to Eustochium: "haec est sola retributio, cum sanguis sanguine compensatur et redempti cruore Christi pro redemptore libenter occumbimus, quis sanctorum sine certamine corona­tus est? Abel justus occiditur; Abraham uxorem periclitatur amittere, et, ne in inmensum volumen extendam, quære et invenies singulos diversa per­pessos. solus in deliciis Salomon fuit et forsitan idea corrupt. quem enim diliget dominus, corripit; castigat autem omnem filium, quem recipit." He often quotes this verse (6) in his letters of counsel and warning. Thus in lxviii. 1 he prefixes it with the remark, "magna ira est, quando peccantibus non irascitur deus." The modern parallel would be Browning's hero in Christmas-Eve and Easter-Day (pt. 2, xxxiii.), who is

"happy that I can
Be crossed and thwarted as a man,
Not left in God's contempt apart,
With ghastly smooth life."

In v.8 πάντες (sc. υἱοὶ γυνήσεως) recalls πάντα υἱόν (v.6). Νόθοι are children born out of wedlock, who are left to themselves; the father is not sufficiently interested in them to inflict on them the discipline that fits his legitimate children for their place in the home. Νόθος (not a LXX term) seems to mean born of mixed marriages, in Wis 48 (cp. Aristoph. Birds, 1650-1652, νόθος γὰρ ἐὰν γυνήσιος . . . ὦν γε ξένης γυναικός). So Philo compares polytheists and lovers of material pleasure to τῶν ἐκ πόρνης ἀποκληθέντων (de Confus. līng. 28), as distinguished from
the sons of God. The double ἐστε (not ὡς) makes the sentence more vivid; the writer supposes an actual case. In vv. 9-10 the writer simply develops this idea of παιδεία, comparing the human and the divine methods. Hence ἐστα cannot mean here “further” (deinde); it is “besides,” in the sense that it brings out another element in the conception.

Ἐστά might be taken interrogatively (=itane or siccine), to introduce an animated question (as often in Plato, e.g. Leges, 964β, Theæt. 207δ, Sophist. 222β), though we should expect a δὲ in the second clause here or a καὶ before οὖς πολὺ μᾶλλον. Kypke suggests that ἐστα = et 6 (quodsi) as, e.g., in Jos. B. J. iii. 8. 5, εἰ δὲ μὲν ἀφανῆς τις ἄνθρωπον παρακαταθήκην, ἥ διάθεσιν κακῶς.

Παιδεuitys only occurs once in the LXX, and there as a description of God (Hos 5:2 ἐγὼ δὲ παιδεύτης ὑμῶν); in 4 Mac 9:6 (ὁ παιδεύτης γέρων) it is applied to a man, as in Ro 2:20. Καὶ ἐνετρεπόμεθα (“reverebamur,” vg), we submitted respectfully to them (the object of the verb being πατέρας), as in Mt 21:37, not, we amended our ways (as in LXX, e.g. 2 Ch 7:14 and Philo's quaest. in Gen. 4:9 τὸ μὴ ἀμαρτάνειν μηδὲν τὸ παραμέγιστον ἀγαθὸν. τὸ ἀμαρτάνοντα ἐνταπήναι συγγένες ἑκείνων). Οὐ ό πολὺ μᾶλλον, the more common πολὺ is read by D K L, and after πολὺ a few authorities (p13 n8 D8 1739 Origen) supply the δὲ which is strictly required after the preceding μὲν. The description of God as τὸ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων is unexpected. In the vocabulary of Hellenistic Judaism God is called ὁ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης (2 Mac 3:24), and “Lord of spirits” is a favourite Enochic title; but “spirits” here cannot mean angels (cp. Nu 16:29). The contrast between τῶς τῆς σαρκὸς πατέρας and τὸ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων denotes God as the author of man’s spiritual being; the expression is quite intelligible as a statement of practical religion, and is only rendered ambiguous when we read into it later ideas about traducianism and creationism, which were not in the writer’s mind. Shall we not submit to Him, the writer asks, καὶ ξύσομεν (cp. 10:28 ξύσται)? “Monemur hoc verbo nihil esse nobis magis exitiale quam si nos in Dei obsequium tradere recusemus” (Calvin). In v. 10 the assumption that the readers were mature men (εἰς ομοιον, v.9) is made explicit by πρὸς ὁλίγας ἠμέρας (till we became men). Πρὸς here, as in Wis 16:6 (εἰς νοθεσίαν δὲ πρὸς ὁλίγον ἑπαράχθησαν) etc., means duration; it is not final, as if the parental discipline were with a view to the short, earthly life alone. Κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς (as they chose) refers to the arbitrariness of the patria potestas. “Parents may err, but he is wise,” as the Scottish metrical paraphrase puts it.

The writer has in mind the familiar patria potestas of the Romans, as in Terence’s Heauton Timoroumenos (100: “vi et via pervolgata patrum”);
204--207: "parentum iniuriae unius modi sunt ferme . . . atque haec sunt tamen ad virtutem omnia"), where one father is confessing to another how he had mishandled his boy (99 f.: "ubi rem rescivi, coepi non humanius neque ut animum decuit aegrotum adulsetentuli tractare"). Compare the remark of the Persian officer in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (ii. 2. 14), who argued that a man who set himself to make people laugh did less for them than a man who made them weep, and instanced fathers—κλαίμασι μὲν γε καὶ πατέρες νόιοι σωφροσύνην μηχανώνται. This is wholesome correction. But it was not always so. "Qur postremo filio suscenseam, patres ut faciunt ceteri?" old Demaenetus asks, in the *Asinaria* (49) of Plautus. Ovid's "durus pater" (*Amores*, i. 15. 17) was more than a tradition of literature. Pliny tells us, for example, that he had once to remonstrate with a man who was thrashing his son for wasting money on horses and dogs (*Epp*, ix. 12): "haec tibi admonitus immodicae seueritatis exemplo pro amore mutuo scripsi, ne quando tu quoque filium tuum acerbius duriusque tractares." There is also the story told by Aelian (*Var. Hist.* ix. 33) about the youth who, when asked by his father what he had learned from Zeno, was thrashed for failing to show anything definite, and then calmly replied that he had studied stoically to put up with a father's bad temper (φήμη μεμαθηκέναι φέρειν ὤργην πατέρων καὶ μὴ ἄγανακτεῖν). Sons, says Dio Chrysostom (xv. 240 M), τρέφονται πάντες ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων καὶ παλαιοὶ τόλμακι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. The general point of view is put by Epictetus (*Enchiridion*, 30, ἀνέκεσθαι λοιπάροιτος, παλαιοῦ), and the connexion of "life" with παιδεία in *Pr* 4:18 ἐπιλαβοῦ εἰμὶ παιδείας, μὴ φήμης, ἀλλὰ φιλαθεὶν αὐτὴν σεαυτῷ εἰς ζωὴν σου: *Pr* 6:2 ὅπως ἐντολὴ νόμον καὶ φῶς, καὶ οὐδὲς ἰσης καὶ ἔλεγχος καὶ παιδεία, and Sir 4:17.

Now for the contrast. ὅ δὲ (God; sc. παιδείαι ἡμᾶς) ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον (cp. I Co 12:7; *Ep. Arist.* 125, συμβουλευόντων πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον τῶν φιλων), which is explained in εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν (cp. 6:7) τῆς ἀγίωτητος αὐτοῦ. Ἀγίωτης is a rare term, which begins to appear late in Hellenistic Judaism (e.g. 2 Mac 15:2 τοῦ παντὰ ἕφοροντο μὲθ' ἀγίωτητος: *Test. Levi* 3:1 ὑπεράνω πάνης ἀγίωτητος), and, except as a v.l. in 2 Co 1:12, occurs nowhere else in the NT. Here it denotes the divine life, to share in which is the outcome of ὁ ἀγνασμὸς ὁδ' χωρίς οὐδεὶς ὅφειτα (i.e. have a direct experience of) τὸν κύριον (v.1). The writer, in this contrast, is simply arguing that the divine education, which involves some suffering, as all παιδεία does, is more worthy of obedience from mature people than even the parental discipline to which, for all its faults of temper, they submitted during childhood. The sayings of Isokrates, that while the roots of παιδεία were bitter, its fruits were sweet, was a commonplace of ancient morals; the writer is going to develop it in a moment. Meantime he alludes to the equally well-known truth that παιδεία might involve severe physical treatment.

Two examples may be added of this doctrine that education involves a discipline which sometimes requires the infliction of pain. Maximus of Tyre (*Disic. iv. 7*), in arguing that the desire to give pleasure is by no means an invariable proof of true affection, asks: φιλίας δὲ που καὶ παιδεὶς πατήσει, καὶ διδάσκαλος μαθητάς· καὶ τὸ δὲ καὶ ἀναφέρετον ἡ παιδὶ πατήρ καὶ μαθήτη διδάσκαλος; so Philo argues in *de Migrat. Abrah.* 20, σωφροσύνην ὡς ἐνυκτοῦτο
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In v. 11 the writer sums up what he has been saying since v. 5. Discipline or παιδεία πρὸς τὸ παρόν (a classical Greek phrase = for the moment, e.g. Thuc. ii. 22, ὅρων αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν χαλεπαίνοντας) οὐ (πᾶς ... οὐ = absolute negative, not any) δοκεῖ (to human feelings and judgment) χαρᾶς εἶναι ἄλλα λύπης (to be a matter of, εἶναι with gen. as in 1039).

The other readings, πᾶσα γὰρ (Cosm. (221 C) Jer. Aug.) and πᾶσα (D* 104, 460, 917 arm eth Orig. Cosm. (376 D)) are obviously inferior attempts to clear up the passage.

"ὤστερον δὲ (cp. Pr 58, 4 (of the harlot) ἦ πρὸς καρδίαν λαταῖνει σοι φάρογγα: ὤστερον μέντοι πικρότερον χολᾶς εἰρήνεις), but later on discipline yields fruit; it is not a stone flung down arbitrarily on human life, but a seed. Ἐκ παρὰν εἰρηνικὸν δικαιοσύνης the writer means fruit (καρπὸς as often = result or outcome), which consists in (genit. of apposition) δικαιοσύνῃ (as in 117 a generic term for the good life as a religious relationship to God). But why εἰρηνικός? Possibly in contrast to the restiveness and pain (λύπης) of the period of discipline, when people are being trained (γεγυμνασμένοις); when the discipline does its perfect work, there is no friction between the soul and God. But there is also the suggestion of "saving" or "blissful." Philo quotes Pr 311, 19 (see above on v. 8) as a saying of Solomon the peaceful (εἰρηνικός); the significance of this he finds in the thought that subjection and obedience are really a wholesome state for people who are inclined to be self-assertive, uncontrolled, and quarrelsome. He thinks that Noah is rightly called by a name denoting rest, since μετά τῶν ἡρεμίαν δὲ καὶ ἡσυχάζοντα καὶ σταθαρὸν ἔτι δὲ καὶ εἰρηνικόν βλαν οἱ καλοκάγαθαι τετημήκτεν (Abrah. 5). To take εἰρηνικόν in some such sense (salutaris) would yield a good interpretation; and this is confirmed by the similar use of εἰρήνη in v. 14 and of the adjective in 3 Mac 6, where the Jews, in the ecstasy of their relief, χορῷς συνιστάντο εἰφροσύνης εἰρηνικής σημεῖον. Those who stand their training reap a safe, sound life at last. In its social aspect, εἰρηνικόν could only refer to the brotherly love of the community; the writer might be throwing out a hint to his readers, that suffering was apt to render people irritable, impatient with one another's faults. The later record even of the martyrs, for example, shows that the very prospect of
death did not always prevent Christians from quarrelling in prison. This may be the meaning of έφερνικόν in Ja 3:18, but it is out of keeping with the present context.

A close parallel to v. 11 is the saying of Aristotle (see above, for the similar remark of Isokrates), quoted by Diog. Laertius (v. i. 18): τῆς παιδείας έφη τάς µεν βίας εἶναι πικράς, γλυκεῖς δὲ τοὺς καρπούς. In Epist. Arist. 232, τοῦτο γὰρ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς (i.e. δικαιοσύνης) ἀληθῶς κατασκευάζεται, though the αληθία here is freedom from misfortune. Clem. Alex. (Strom. vii. 10. 56), after speaking of the time when we are delivered from the chastisements and punishments δὲ έκ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων εἰς παιδελαν ὑπομένων σωτήριον [He 12?], adds: μεθ’ ἥν ἀπολύτρωσιν τὸ γέρας καὶ τιμαὶ τελευθείσιν ἀποδίδονται . . . καὶ θεοὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν κέκληται οἱ σώθροι τῶν ἰλλων θεῶν, τῶν ὑπὸ τῷ σωτήρ πρῶτων τετάγμενων, γενησόμενοι.

The writer now resumes the imperative tone (vv. 12f.), with a blend of counsel and warning. The discipline of trouble is viewed under an active aspect; men must co-operate with God, exerting themselves to avoid sin (v. 1) by the exercise of personal zeal and church-discipline. Otherwise, the results may be fatal. The exhortation broadens out here, resuming the tone and range of 10:26f.

12 So (διὸ as in 6) “up with your listless hands! Strengthen your weak knees!” 13 And “make straight paths for your feet” to walk in. You must not let the lame get dislocated, but rather make them whole. 14 Aim at peace with all—at that consecration without which no one will ever see the Lord; 15 see to it that no one misses the grace of God, “that no root of bitterness grows up to be a trouble” by contaminating all the rest of you; 16 that no one turns to sexual vice or to a profane life as Esau did—Esau who for a single meal “parted with his birthright.” 17 You know how later on, when he wanted to obtain his inheritance of blessing, he was set aside; he got no chance to repent, though he tried for it with tears.

For the first time, since the hints in 3:12 4:1 and 6:11, the writer alludes to differences of attainment in the little community. Hitherto he has treated them as a solid whole. But the possibility of individual members giving way has been voiced in 10:29, and now the writer (10b) widens his appeal; his readers are to maintain their faith not only for their own sakes but for the sake of those who at their side are in special danger of collapsing. The courage of their ὑπομονή is more than a personal duty; they are responsible for their fellow-members, and this involves the duty of inspiring others by their own unswerving, unflagging faith. The admonition, as in 13:14, is addressed to the whole community, not to their leaders. The general aim of vv. 12. 13 is to produce the character praised by Matthew Arnold in his lines on Rugby Chapel:

“Ye move through the ranks, recall
The stragglers, refresh the out-worn . . .
Ye fill up the gaps in our files,
Strengthen the wavering line,
Stablish, continue our march, 
On, to the bound of the waste, 
On, to the City of God.”

He begins in v. 12 by using scriptural language borrowed freely from Is 35:8 (luxvuan, χείρες ανειμέναι καὶ γονάτα παραλεγμένα), but in a form already current in Sir 25:32 (χείρες παρειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλεγμένα), and also from Pr 4:26 (ὁρθάς τροχίας ποσὶν τοῖς ποσίν). This metaphorical language for collapsing in listless despair is common, e.g., in Sir 2:12 where χείρες παρειμέναι is bracketed with “cowardly hearts,” in Philo’s description of the Israelites who longed to return to Egypt, οἱ μὲν γὰρ προκαμόντες ἀνέπεσον, βαρών, άντίσαλον ἄγγελόμενοι τὸν πόνον, καὶ τὰς χείρας ἐπ’ αὐθεντείας ὡσπερ ἀπειρηκότες ἀδητητι καθήκαν (de Congressu Erud. 29, cp. He ii 11), and especially in the description of moral encouragement in Job 4:4 εἰ γὰρ σὺν ἐνοῦνθησας πολλοὺς, καὶ χειρὰς ἀσθενοὺς παρεκάλεσας, ἀσθενοῦντάς τε ἐξανέστησάς ῥήμασιν, γόνατι τε ἀνάνυσίσθαν θάρσος περιέθηκας. In Dt 32:36 παραλεγμένοις is parallel to παρειμένοις, and in Zeph 3:16 the appeal is θάρσει ... μὴ παρελθὼσαν αἱ χεῖρες σου.1 Αὐρθώσατε (literally = straighten, renew) goes with γόνατα better than with χειρας, but the sense is plain. In v. 13, if ποησάτε is read in the first clause, καὶ τροχίας ὡρθὰς ποησάτε τοῖς ποσίν ὑμῶν is a hexameter (p. lvii). By τὸ χωλόν the writer means “those who are lame,” these crippled souls in your company.

Probably the ποιητε of Ν* Ρ 33. 1871. 1831 (Orig.) has been conformed, in ποησάτε (ἡ Α Δ Η Κ Λ, etc., Chrys.), to the preceding ἄνορθώσατε (so, e.g., B. Weiss, in Texte u. Untersuch. xiv. 3. 4, 9, who declares that the older codices never yield any case of an original aor. being changed into a present), though some edd. (e.g. von Soden) regard ποησάτε as the original text and ποιητε as having been conformed to LXX (cp. Mt 3:8).

As ἱαθὴ δὲ μάλλον shows, ἐκτρατη here has its medical sense (e.g. Hippol. de offic. med. 14, ὥς μήτε ἀνακλάται μήτε ἐκτρέπται), not the common sense of being “turned aside” (as, e.g., in Philo, Quaest. in Exod. 23:20 οἱ ἄφυλάκτως διδοποιούτες διαμαρτάνοντες τῆς ὀρθῆς καὶ λεωφόρου ὅς πολλάκις εἰς ἀνοδίας καὶ δυσβάτους καὶ ἑαυτεῖας ἀπαποῦσ οἱ ἐκτρέπεσθαι: τὸ παραπλήσιον ἐστίν ὅτε καὶ αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν νεὼν παιδείας ἀμοιροῦσιν, and in M. Aurel. i. 7, καὶ τὸ μὴ ἐκτρατηθαι εἰς ξύλον σοφίστικον), In Od. Sol 6:14 the ministers of the divine grace are praised in similar terms for their service to weaker Christians:

“They have assuaged the dry lips,  
And the will that had fainted they have raised up; ...  
And limbs that had fallen  
They have straightened and set up.”

1 Clem. Hom. xii, 18, αἱ χεῖρες ὑπὸ δημαρτην παρελθοσαν.
But here it is the members as a whole who are addressed, and ἐδραῖος π. τ. ποσίν ὑμῶν means "keep straight" (ποσίν, dative = "for your feet")—it is the only way to help your fellow-members who have weakened themselves. Keep up the tone of your community, move in the right direction, to prevent any of your number from wavering and wandering. The straight path is the smooth path, it is implied; if any limping soul is allowed to stray from the straight course, under the influence of a bad example, he will be made worse instead of better. The admonition in Test. Sim. 5:2 is interesting, as it suggests the train of thought here between vv. 12f. and 13f.:

ἀγαθῶντες τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ἐνώπιον Κυρίου
καὶ εὐθυνόντες τὰς ὀδοὺς ὑμῶν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων
καὶ ἑσεθοῦσε εὐρίσκοντες χάριν ἐνώπιον Κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων.

The author of Πρὸς Ἐβραίους knows that the difficulties in the way of faith are more than mere despair. In 12:11 he has been dealing with the need of cheerful courage under the strain of life; this leads to the appeal of v.12. But while there is nothing so infectious as cowardice or despair, he rapidly passes on, in vv.13f. (καὶ κτλ.), to warn his readers against some specific temptations in the moral life. He continues, in a third imperative (v.14), εἰρήνην διώκετε (an OT phrase, Ἰερ. 31:11) μετὰ πάντων. Here μετὰ goes with διώκετε in the sense of "along with" (as in ΙΙ:9 13:28, for our author avoids σὺν), and πάντων means "all the (other) ἄγιοι," (as in 13:24). The call is to make common cause with all the rest of the Christians in the quest for God’s εἰρήνη, i.e. (see above on v.11) the bliss and security of a life under God’s control. It is εἰρήνη in a sense corresponding to the older sense of felicity and prosperity on the ground of some (messianic) victory of God, practically as in Luke 1:79 19:38 the Christian salvation; only this comprehensive sense does justice to the term here and in 13:20. Hence the following καὶ is almost = "even."

Εἰρήνη in a similar sense occurs repeatedly in the context of the passage already quoted from Proverbs: e.g. 3:1, 2 υἱῶν, ἡμῶν νομίμων μη ἐπιλαθῶν, ἵνα δὲ ῥήματα μου τηρεῖν σοι καρδία μηκός γὰρ βίου καὶ ἔτη ᾠδῆς καὶ εἰρήνης προσθήσουσι σοι... 3:8 ἀπαρχήν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ σῶν καρπῶν δικαιοσύνης... 3:16, 17 ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῆς ἐκπορεύεται δικαιοσύνη καὶ πάντων ὁ τρίβοι αὐτῆς ἐν εἰρήνῃ... 3:28 ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης πεποίθησιν ἐν εἰρήνῃ πάσας τὰς ὀδοὺς σου. After Pr 4:28 (as quoted above) there follows the promise, ἀπὸ δὲ τὰς ὅρθας ποιήσει τὰς προχίλας σου, τὰς δὲ πορείας σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ προάξει.

The conventional interpretation takes εἰρήνην with μετὰ πάντων (i.e. all
A WARNING

your members). This yields a fair sense, for a quarrelsome church is a real hindrance to effective faith; the quarrelsomeness here would be due to the presence of faulty persons, whose lapses were apt to be irritating, and what would break εἰρήνη (i.e. mutual harmony) in such cases is the spirit of harshness in dealing with faults, censoriousness, or aloofness, just as what makes for εἰρήνη is a concern for purity and goodness inspired by forbearance and patience. But all this is read into the text. There is no hint of such dangers elsewhere in Πρὸς Ἐβραίους as there is in 1 P 3:20 and Ro 12:18. Our author is characteristically putting a new edge on an old phrase like διώκετε εἰρήνη.

What εἰρήνη specially involved is shown in καὶ τὸν ἄγιασμὸν κτλ. Here ἄγιασμὸς is not to be identified with σωφροσύνη in the special sense of 13; it is the larger “consecration” to God which all ἄγιοι must maintain. In fact, διώκετε τὸν ἄγιασμὸν κτλ. is simply another description of the experience called “sharing in God’s ἀγάπης” (v.10) Χωρίς generally precedes, here it follows, the word it governs (οὐ), either for the sake of the rhythm or to avoid a hiatus (οὐς ὁδεῖς). “To see the Lord,” is an expression common in Philo for that vision of the Divine being which is the rare reward of those who can purify themselves from the sensuous (cp. H. A. A. Kennedy’s Philo’s Contribution to Religion, pp. 192 f.). Κύριος is God in νν. 5 and 6; here, in view of ὄσο, it might be Jesus (as 28), though “to see God” (v. “deum”) as a term for intimate personal fellowship is more adequate to the context. People must be on the alert against tendencies to infringe this ἄγιασμὸν (v.15); ἐπισκοπούντες, one form and function of παρακαλοῦντες (10:25), introduces three clauses, beginning each with μὴ τις, though it is not clear whether the third (v.16) is intended as an example of μανθῶν or as a further definition of the second μὴ τις (μία κτλ.). The first clause, μὴ τις ὑστερῶν (ἐν ἡμῖν) ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ, shows ὑστερεῖν (41) with ἀπὸ as in Eccles 6:2 ὑστερῶν . . . ἀπὸ πάντων οὐ ἐπιθυμήσει (Sir 7:24 μὴ νυστέρα ἀπὸ κλάμων has a different sense). In writing ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ the writer may have had already in mind the words of Dt 29:18 (μὴ τίς ἐστίν ἐν ὑμῖν . . . τίνος ἢ διάνοια εξεκλινεν ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν), which he is about to quote in the next clause.

The rhetorical tone comes out in the two iambic trimeters ὠς χωρίς ὁδεῖς ὑψέται τὸν κύριον and ἐπισκοπούντες μὴ τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ.

The next clause, μὴ τις μία πικρίας ἀνω φώσας ἐνοχλη, is a reminiscence of the warning against idolatry and apostasy in Dt 29:18, which A (as well as F*) preserves in this form, μὴ τίς ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν μία πικρίας ἀνω φώσας ἐνοχλη (so B*: ἐν χολῇ B) καὶ πικρία (B*: καὶ πικρία B). The form is ungrammatical, for ἐστιν is superfluous, as is καὶ πικρία. On the other hand, the text of B yields no good sense, for a root can hardly be said to grow up ἐν χολῇ, and καὶ πικρία is left stranded; the alteration of πικρία in B* does not help matters, for it is not preceded by ἐν χολῇ,
Plainly the writer found something like the words of A in his text of the LXX; he may have omitted ἐστιν and καὶ πυρία. The confusion between ὁχλη and χολη is intelligible, as δχλος and χόλος are confused elsewhere (Blass reads ἐν χολη here, which requires ἤ or ἐστιν to be supplied). ἐνοχλη is the present subjunctive of ἐνοχλεῖν, which is used in 1 Es 2:19 (ἐνοχλάοσα) and 2:24 (ἐνοχλησαί) of rebellion disturbing and troubling the realm. As a general term for "troubling" or "vexing," it is common both in classical Greek and in the papyri, either absolutely or with an accusative, as, e.g., Polystr. Ἐρικαυ. (ed. C. Wilke) 8b. 4, ὅπως ὧν ἐνοχλησαμένους ἦμᾶς, the edict of M. Sempronius Liberalis (Aug. 29, 154 a.d.): ἐν τῇ ὁλείᾳ τῇ γεωργίᾳ προσκαμπηροῦσι μῆ ἐνοχλεῖν (BGU. ii. 372), and Aristoph. Πρός. 709 f., οὐ πολιν οὐδ' ὃ πῦθηκοι οὔτε ὃ νῦν ἐνοχλῶν. As for βίβα (of a person, as, e.g., in 1 Mac 10 καὶ ἐξήλθεν ἐξ αὐτῶν μὴ ἀμαρτολός 'Ἀντίοχος Ἐπιφανής) πυρία (genitive of quality), the meaning is a poisonous character and influence (cp. Ac 8:25). The warning in Deuteronomy is against any pernicious creature in the community, who by cool insolence and infidelity draws down the divine sentence of extermination upon himself and his fellows. Here the writer thinks of people who consider that immediate gratification of their wishes is worth more than any higher end in life; they value their spiritual position as sons (vv. 5-6) so little, that they let it go in order to relapse on some material relief at the moment. Such a nature is essentially βέβηλος, devoid of any appreciation of God's privileges, and regarding these as of no more importance than sensuous pleasures of the hour. Under the bad influence of this (διὰ ταύτης, & D K L Ψ 326, etc., as in 13:2: διὰ αὐτῆς, Λ ᾿Η Ρ 33. 424* sy. 2b. Clem. etc., as in 11:1 12:11), all the rest (οἱ πολλοὶ, after one has been mentioned, as in Ro 5:15 etc.) may be tainted (μιμῶθαι), and so (cp. on 10:22) rendered incapable of ὑστεραί τῶν Κύριων.

The third clause (v.16) is μή τις (sc. ἡ) πόρνος ἢ βέβηλος (for the collocation see Philo, de Sacerdot. 8. πόρνη καὶ βεβηλῶ σώμα καὶ ψυχήν, and for this transferred sense of β. (=Lat. profanus) see Jebb-Pearson's Fragments of Soph. ii. 208); βέβηλος is only once applied to a person in the LXX, viz. in Ezk 21:25 σὺ βεβηλε ἰνομε (ἢ ἐνοχλείν), then to people like Antiochus (3 Mac 2:14) or (3 Mac 7:15 τοὺς βεβηλοὺς χειρωσάμενοι) recreant Jews. In adding ὃς 'Ἰσραήλ κτάλ. the writer chooses the story of Esau, in Gn 25:28-34 27:1-29, to illustrate the disastrous results of yielding to the ἀμαρτία of which he had spoken in v.1. There can be no ὑπομνημή, he implies, without a resolute determination to resist the immediate pleasures and passions of the hour. As Cicero puts it in the De Finibus, i. 14, "plerique, quod tenere atque
servare id quod ipsi statuerunt non possunt, victi et debilitati objecta specie voluptatis tradunt se libidinibus constringendos nec quid eventurum sit provident, ob eamque causam propter voluptatem et parvam et non necessarium et quae vel aliter pararetur et qua etiam carere possent sine dolore, tum in morbos graves, tum in damna, tum in dedecora incurrunt." But why choose Esau? Probably owing to rabbinic tradition, in which Esau is the typical instance of the godless who grow up among good people (Isaac and Rebekah) and yet do not follow their deeds, as Obadiah is of the good who grow up among the wicked (Ahab and Jezebel) and do not follow their deeds (Sifre 133 on Nu 27:1). The rabbinic tradition that Esau was sensual, is voiced as early as Philo, in the de Nobilitate, 4 (δὲ μὲν ἄπειθής ἐκ τῶν γαστρῶν καὶ τῶν μετὰ γαστέρα ἡδονῶν ἄκρατός ἔχων, ὥστε ἄνεπιστήθη καὶ πρεσβείων ἐξίσοσθαι τῷ μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ μετανοεῖν εὐθὺς ἐφ' ὦτι ἐξήτησί καὶ φονᾶν κατ' αὐτόν ἀδέλφον καὶ μηδὲν ἐπιρον ἢ δ' ὑπόστησε τοὺς γονέας πραγματεύοντας), where Philo interprets the μετάνοια of Esau as simply regret for a bad bargain. Our author may have considered Esau a πάρνος literally—and in any case the word is to be taken literally (as in 134), not in its OT metaphorical sense of "unfaithful"—but the weight of the warning falls on βέβηλος, as is clear from the phrase ἀντὶ βρῶσεως μᾶς (cp. Gn 25:28 ἢ θήρα αὐτῶν βρῶσις αὐτῶ). T. H. Green (Prolegomena to Ethics, § 96) points out that hunger was not the motive. "If the action were determined directly by the hunger, it would have no moral character, any more than have actions done in sleep, or strictly under compulsion, or from accident, or (so far as we know) the action of animals. Since, however, it is not the hunger as a natural force, but his own conception of himself, as finding for the time his greatest good in the satisfaction of hunger, that determines the act, Esau recognizes himself as the author of the act. . . . If evil follows from it, whether in the shape of punishment inflicted by a superior, or of calamity ensuing in the course of nature to himself or those in whom he is interested, he is aware that he himself has brought it on himself." The μᾶς is emphatic: "id culpam auget, non misericordiam mercetur" (Bengel).

In the quotation from Gn 25:34 (ἀπέθραυσαν δὲ Ἰσαὰκ τὰ προτοστοκεία τῷ ἱκώβ), ἀπέδοτο (A C 623), as if from a form ἀποδώσω (cp. Helbing, 105), is preferred by Lachmann, B. Weiss, WH.

The warning is now (v.17) driven home. "Iota, indicative here (a literary Atticism, though Blass insists that it is chosen for the

1 Jub 25:4-8 (Esau tempting Jacob to take one of his own two sensual wives).

2 Ἴτωθεν has this sense, and so has the verb (e.g. Ps 73:2, ἐξωλθήθηκας πάντα τὸν παρθένοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ).
sake of the rhythm, to assimilate τοῦ γὰρ ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα to the closing words of the preceding sentence), recalls to the readers the scripture story with which they were so familiar. τοῦ γὰρ ὅτι καὶ (another item in his story) μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομήσαι (1 P 3:9) τὴν εὐλογίαν (= πρωτοτοκία as in 1 Ch 5:2) ἀπεδοκιμάσθη (Jer 6:30 ἀπεδοκίμασεν αὐτὸς Κύριος; Ign. Rom. 8:3 εἶν ἀποδοκιμασθὼ). Ἀποδοκιμάζεσθαι is common in the Greek orators for officials being disqualified, but the rejection here is an act of God; Esau is a tragic instance of those who cannot get a second chance of μετάνοια (6:5). The writer has again the sombre, serious outlook which characterizes a passage like 6:4-8. The very metaphor of plant-growth occurs here as there, and ἀπεδοκιμάσθη recalls ἀδόκιμος. Μετάνοια is impossible for certain willful sins; certain acts of deliberate choice are irrevocable and fatal. Why this was so, in Esau's case, is now explained; μετανοιάς γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὑρε (εὕρηκα = obtain, with ἐκάθεν as often in LXX, e.g. Dt 4:20), καὶ περ ἐμὰ δακρύων (emphatic by position) ἐκζητήσας αὐτὴν (i.e. μετανοιαίν. "Μετανοιάς τόπος is, in fact, μετάνοια. . . When μετ. τόπον is taken up again, the mere secondary τόπος disappears, and it is αὐτὴν, not αὐτὸν, agreeing with the great thing really sought," Alford). If the writer used his usual A text of the LXX, he would not have found any allusion to the tears of Esau in Gn 27:88, but the tears were retained, from the Hebrew, in Jub 26:83, in other texts of the LXX, and in Josephus (Ant. 1:18.7, πένθος ἤγεν ἐπὶ τῇ διαμαρτμ. Καὶ αὐτῶν τοῖς δακρυσιν ἄχρομον ὅ πατὴρ κτλ.). "Those tears of Esau, the sensuous, wild, impulsive man, almost like the cry of some 'trapped creature,' are among the most pathetic in the Bible" (A. B. Davidson). Αὐτὴν refers to μετανοιάς, not to εὐλογίας (which would require μετανοιάς . . εὑρεν to be taken as a parenthesis, a construction which is wrecked on the antithesis between εὑρεν and ἐκζητήσας). The μετάνοια is not a change in the mind of Isaac, which would require some additional words like τοῦ πατρός. Besides, Esau does not beseech Isaac to alter his mind. Nor can it refer to a change in God's mind. It is "a change of mind" on Esau's part, "undoing the effects of a former state of mind" (A. B. Davidson). Bitterly as Esau regretted his hasty action, he was denied any chance of having its consequences reversed by a subsequent μετάνοια; this is the writer's meaning. Ἀδώνατον πάλιν ἀνακαμίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν is the law of God for such willful offenders, and to try for a second μετάνοια is vain. Such is the warning that our author deduces from the tale of Esau.

1 There is a striking parallel in De Mercede Conductis, 42, where Lucian describes an old man being met by ἡ μετάνοια δακρύουσα ἐς οὐδὲν ἄφελος.
This inexorable view agrees with Philo’s idea (Leg. Alleg. iii. 75, τολαίς γάρ γνωσίσ μετανοία χαμάθαυμα βουλθεθάναι οὐκ επέτρεψεν ο ἔθεος) that some, like Cain (quod deter. pot. 26, τῷ δὲ μὴ δεξαμεν μετανοιαν Καλὸν δὲ ὑπερβολὴ ἄγους), are too bad to repent, though Philo illustrates it here not from Esau, but from Lot’s wife. In de Spee. Leg. ii. 5 he declares that luxurious spendthrifts are διουκάδαριοι καὶ διοϋσταί, οὐ μὴδε θεία τῷ τῶν φῶν ἄρεως εὐγγυμονίας εξουθεναί. In Jub 35 Ἰσαάκ says Rebekah that “neither Esau nor his seed is to be saved.” But the idea of Πρὸς Ἐβδαλοῦς is made still more clear by the use of μετανοίας τόπον as an expression for opportunity or chance to repent. This is a contemporary Jewish phrase; cp. Apoc. Bar 83 ("For when the Most High will bring to pass all these things, there will not then be an opportunity for returning . . . nor place of repentance"), 4 Es 9 ("while a place of repentance was still open to them, they paid no heed "), which goes back to Wis 12 κρίνων δὲ κατὰ βραχὺ ἔθιδον τόπον μετανοίας (of God punishing the Canaanites). It is linguistically a Latinism, which recurs in Clem. Rom. 7 (ἐν γενεὰ καὶ γενεὰ μετανοίας τόπον εὐθέων ἀ ποστρέφειν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν) and Tatian (Orat. ad Graecos, 15, διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τῶν δαμαδῶν ἀ νάστασιν οὐκ ἔχει μετανοίας τόπον). But a special significance attaches to it in 4 Esdras, for example, where the writer (e.g. in 7137) rules out any intercession of the saints for the ungodly after death, in his desire to show that “the eternal destiny of the soul is fixed by the course of the earthly life" (G. H. Box, The Ezra-Apocalypse, pp. 154, 155). Here, as in the Slavonic Enoch (53), which also repudiates such intercession, “we may detect the influence of Alexandrine theology, which tended to lay all stress upon the present life as determining the eternal fate of every man." The author of Ἐπόδε Ἐβδαλοῦς shared this belief (cp. 97); for him the present life of man contains possibilities which are tragic and decisive. He ignores deliberately any intercession of saints or angels for the living or for the dead. But he goes still further, with Philo and others, in holding that, for some, certain actions fix their fate beyond any remedy. He regards their case as hopeless; characters like Esau, by an act of profane contempt for God, are rejected for ever, a second μετανοεῖν being beyond their reach.

The connexion (γάρ) between the finale (vv. 18-99) and what precedes lies in the thought that the higher the privilege, the higher the responsibility. In Leg. Alleg. iii. 1, Philo quotes Gn 25 to prove that virtue’s divine city is not meant for human passions; οὐ γάρ πέφυκεν ἡ τῶν παθῶν θνησεοτικῇ κακίᾳ τὴν ἀρετῆς πόλιν, wickedness banishing men from the presence and sight of God. But this line of thought is not in the writer’s mind. It is more relevant to recall that Esau typifies exclusion from God in Jub 15 ("Ishmael and his sons and his brothers and Esau, the Lord did not cause to approach Him "); yet even this is not needful to explain the turn of thought. The writer is continuing his grave warning. As vv. 14-17 recall the first warning of 64-8, so he now proceeds to reiterate the second warning of 10-17, reminding his readers that they stand in a critical position,

1 Philo read μετανοεῖν ἡ αἰτία μου τοῦ ἀφεθήκαι in Gn 49.
2 Livy, xiv. 10, “poenitentiae relinquens locum” (cp. xxiv. 26, “locus poenitendi s”); cp. Pliny’s Epp. x. 97, “ex quo facile est opinari, quae turba hominum emendari possit, si sit poenitentiæ locus,” where the phrase is used in quite a different sense, of a chance to give up Christianity.
in which any indifferences or disobedience to God will prove fatal. This is the note of vv. 25-29 in particular. But he leads up to the appeal by describing in a vivid passage the actual position of his readers before God (vv. 18-24); their new status and environment appeals even more powerfully and searchingly for an unworldly obedience to God than the old status of the People.

18 You have not come (προσελθησατε) to what you can touch, to "flames of fire," to "mist" and "gloom" and "stormy blasts," to the blare of a trumpet and to a Voice whose words made those who heard it refuse to hear another syllable (for they could not hear the command, "If even a beast touches the mountain, it must be stoned")—indeed, so awful was the sight that Moses said, "I am terrified and aghast." 20 You have come (προσελθησατε) to mount Sion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to myriads of angels in festal gathering, to the assembly of the first-born registered in heaven, to the God of all as judge, to the spirits of just men made perfect, to Jesus who mediates (8-9) the new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood whose message is nobler than Abel's.

The passage moves through two phases (vv. 18-21 and 22-24), contrasting the revelation at mount Sinai (22-28) with the new διαθήκη, the one sensuous, the other spiritual; the one striking terror with its outward circumstances of physical horror, the other charged with grace and welcome as well as with awe. The meditation and appeal are woven on material drawn from the LXX descriptions of the plague of darkness on Egypt (Ex 10:14, 20) and the theophany at Sinai (Dt 4:11 προσέλθησατε καὶ ἔστη ἐντὸ ὁ δῶρον ὡς τοῦ ὀρέων, σκότος, γνώφοι, θύελλα, φωνὴ μεγάλη, and Ex 19:23 προσέχετε ἑαυτοὺς τὸ ἀναβήσηται εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ θλείει το ἀυτοῦ πᾶς ὁ ἀμώμην τοῦ ὄρους θανάτῳ τελευτήσῃ...). In v. 18 the text is difficult and perhaps corrupt. ψηλαφομένων ὅρει would be equivalent to ψηλαφητοῦ ὅρει, a tangible, material mountain; but as ὅρει is a gloss (added, from v. 22, by D K L 255 syr. arm Athan. Cosm. etc., either before or after ψηλ.), though a correct gloss, ψ. may be taken (a) either with πυρὶ, (b) or independently. In the former case, (a) two constructions are possible. (i) One, as in vg ("ad tractabilem et accessibilem ignem"), renders "to a fire that was material (or palpable) and ablaze"; (ii) "to what was palpable and ablaze with fire" (πυρὶ in an ablative sense). (i) is a daring expression, and the implied contrast (with v. 29) is too remote. The objection to (ii) is that πυρὶ here, as in the OT, goes with the following datives. It is on the whole preferable (b) to take ψηλαφομένως by itself
The mountain could not be touched indeed (v. 20), but it was a tangible object which appealed to the senses. This is the point of contrast between it and the Σινών ὄρος, the present participle being equivalent to the verbal adjective ψηλαφητός. Kypke connects ψηλαφητός with πυρ in the sense of “touched by lightning” (“igne tactum et adustum”), comparing the Latin phrase “fulmine tactum.” But the Greek term is θύγατερ, and in any case this interpretation really requires ὄρος, the mountain “sundering” under the lightning touch of God (Ps 144:5 etc.).

Two conjectures have been proposed, ἔσεi νενεφωμένος by G. N. Bennett (Classical Review, vi. 263), who argues that this “would fit in exactly with the OT accounts, which represent the summit of the mountain as burnt with fire, while lower down it was enveloped in a dense cloud”; and περεναλωμένος (ὀρεί) by E. C. Selwyn (Journal of Theological Studies, ix. 133, 134) = “calcined” (a calcined volcano). Others (e.g. P. Junius) less aptly insert ὀδ or μή before ψηλαφητός, to harmonize the phrase with v. 20.

In the rest of the description, ἔριχω is a poetical word (cp. de Mundo, 403a, heaven πάντος ζόφου καὶ ἀτάκτων κυνήματος κεφωριμαένον), which the writer prefers to οὐκότος. Καὶ θύελλα—θύελλη, a hurricane, is defined by Hesychius as ἀνέμου συντροφὴ καὶ ὀρμή, ἡ καταγίς (cp. Hom. Od. 5. 317), and in de Mundo, 393a, as πνεῦμα βίαιον καὶ ἄφνῳ προσαλλόμενον. In v. 19 ἔριχω (ἔριχω Ἀστικοῦ ἔριχος Ἑλλήνης, Moeris) is a synonym for the LXX φωνῆ, which the writer intends to use immediately. Philo had already used ἔριχος in de Decalogo, 11: πάντα δ' ὅσ ἐκδότα περὶ τὸν τότον έθανατοργείτο, κύττοις βροντῶν μεζόνον ἡ ὡστε χωρεῖν ἀκοάς, ἀστραπῶν λαμφώσει αὐγειδεστάταις, ἀφόρτῳ σάλπιγγος ἔριχω πρὸς μήκιστον ἀποστειοῦσθα... πυρὸς σωραθείς καὶ σφινν βαθεῖ τὰ ἐν κύκλῳ συσκίαζοντος. In de Spec. Leg. ii. 22 he explains that the φωνῆ σάλπιγγος announced to all the world the significance of the event. Finally, καὶ φωνῆ ὑμάτων (the decalogue in Dt 4:12), ἔς (i.e. the φωνῆ) οἱ ἀκούσαντες παρατήσαντο μὴ (pleonastic negative as in Gal 5:1; hence omitted by κτ. P 407) προστεθήμαι (the active προσθείμαι, in A, is less apt) αὐτοῖς (i.e. the hearers) λόγον (accus. and infinitive construction after μή, cp. Blass, § 429). The reference in v. 20 is to the scene described in Dt 5:28ff, where it is the leaders of the nation who appeal in terror to Moses to take God’s messages and orders for them: καὶ νῦν μὴ ἀποθανάωμεν, ὅτι ἐξαναλώσει ἡμᾶς τὸ πῦρ τὸ μέγα τούτο, ἢν προσθόμεθα ἡμῖν ἀκούσαι τὴν φωνήν Κυρίου τού θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἡτί, καὶ ἀποθανοῦμεθα. But in Ex 20:19 it is the people, as here, who appeal to Moses, μὴ λαλείτω πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς, μὴ ἀποθανάωμεν. Τὸ διαστελλόμενον (in Ex 19:18, see above) is passive. Διαστελλόμαι is said by Anz (Subsidia, 326 f.) not to occur earlier than Plato; here, as in Jth 11:2 (ὅσα διεστέλλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς), of a divine injunction. In v. 21 φανταζόμενον is not a LXX term (for the sense, cp. Zec 10:1).
κύριος ἐποίησεν φαντασίας, of natural phenomena like rain); it is used here for the sake of alliteration (φοβ. φαντ.). To prove that even Moses was affected by the terrors of Sinai, the writer quotes from Dt 9:19 ἐκφοβὸς εἶμι, adding rhetorically καὶ ἐντρομος. He forgets that Moses uttered this cry of horror, not over the fearful spectacle of Sinai but at a later stage, over the worship of the golden calf. For ἐντρομος, cp. 1 Mac 13:2 ἐντρομος καὶ ἐκφοβὸς (v.l. ἐμφοβος). The phrase ἐντρομος γενόμενος is applied by Luke to the terror of Moses at the φωνὴ Κυρίου out of the burning bush (Ac 7:92).

Assonance led to ἐκτρομος (w.D*) or ἐμφοβος (M 241. 255. 489. 547. 1739 Thdt.). Ἐντρομος was read by Clem. Alex. (Protrept. ix. 2).

The true position of Christians is now sketched (vv. 22–23). Ἀλλὰ προσελθήθατε Σιὼν ὅρει καὶ πόλει (11:10) θεοῦ ἔχων, the author adding ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπουράνιος (11:18) in apposition to πόλει, and using thus the archaic metaphors of Is 18:7, Am 1:9, Mic 4ff. etc., in his picture of the true fellowship. Paul had contrasted mount Sinai (= the present Jerusalem) with ἡ ἁπαθός ἱερουσαλήμ. Our author's contrast is between mount Sion (= ἱερουσαλήμ ἐπουράνιος) and mount Sinai, though he does not name the latter. From the πόλις he now passes to the πολιτια.

In Chagiga, 12a, i. 33, Resh Lakish deduces from 1 K 8:13 and Is 63:15 that zebul, the fourth of the seven heavens, contains “the heavenly Jerusalem and the temple,” i.e. as the residence of deity; while Ma'on, the fifth heaven, holds the “companies of ministering angels.”

The second object of προσελθήθατε is καὶ μυριάς (so En 40:1: “I saw thousands of thousands and ten thousand times ten thousand before the Lord of spirits”) ἄγγελον, with which πάννυξις must be taken, leaving the following καὶ to introduce the third object (v. 26). The conception of the angels as μυριάς goes back to traditions like those voiced in Ps 68:17 (τὸ ἄρμα τοῦ θεοῦ μυριοπλάσιον, χιλιάδες εὐθηνοῦντον) κύριος ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐν Σαίν] and Dan 7:10 (μύρια μυριάδες). Πανήγυρις was a term charged with Greek religious associations (cp. R. van der Loeff, De Ludis Eleusiniis, pp. 85 f.), but it had already been adopted by Greek Jews like the translators of the LXX and Josephus for religious festivals. Πανήγυρις describes the angelic hosts thronging with glad worship round the living God. Their relation to God is noted here, as in 1:14 their relation to human beings. Ἐνθα πανήγυρις ἐκεῖ χαρά, as Theophylact observes (Ἰλαρᾶς εὐθυμίας, ἣν πανήγυρις ἐπιζήτητι, Philo, in Flacc. 14); but the joy of Lk 15:10 is not specially mentioned. Chrysostom's suggestion is that the writer ἐντεῦθεν τὴν χαρὰν δείκνυσι καὶ τὴν εὐφροσύνην ἀντὶ τοῦ γνόφου καὶ τοῦ σκότους καὶ τῆς θυέλλης. Augustine (Quaest. i. 168: “accessistis ad montem Sion et ad ciuitatem dei Hier-
usalem et ad milia angelorum exultantium”) seems to imply not only that παντηγύρει goes with ἄγγελων, but that he knew a text with some word like παντηγυρίζοντων (Blass), as is further proved by boh (“keeping festival”), Origlat (laetantium, collaudantium), and Ambrose. There is a hint of this in Clem. Alex. Protrept. ix. 6, 7: αὕτη γὰρ ἡ πρωτότοκος ἐκκλησία ἡ ἐκ πολλῶν ἄγαθῶν συγκεκριμένη παιδίων ἡ ταύτη ἐστὶ τὰ πρωτότοκα τὰ ἐναπογεγραμμένα ἐν οὐρανοις καὶ τοσαίτως μυρίσιν ἄγγελων συμπανηγυρίζοντα.

The human πολίται are next (v. 28) described as ἐκκλησίας πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς. (For the collocation of angels and men, see En 395 “Mine eyes saw their [i.e. the saints’] dwellings with His righteous angels, and their resting-places with the holy”; the Enoch apocalypse proceeding to the intercession of the angels (“and they petitioned, and interceded, and prayed for the children of men”) which the Christian writer deliberately omits.) The phrase describes what the author elsewhere calls ὁ λαὸς (τοῦ θεοῦ), but in two archaic expressions, chosen to emphasize what Paul would have called their election. They are πρωτότοκοι (as Israel had been πρωτότοκος, Ex 422 etc.), with a title to God’s blessing (v. 16 πρωτοτόκια). The choice of the plural instead of the collective singular was due to the previous plural in μυρίασιν ἄγγελοιν. In ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς there is a passing allusion to the idea of the celestial archives or register—a favourite poetical figure in which the Oriental expressed his assurance of salvation. As in Lk 1020 so here, the phrase refers to men on earth, to the church militant, not to the church triumphant; otherwise ἐν οὐρανοῖς would be meaningless.

This interpretation, which groups παντηγύρει with what precedes, is current in nearly all the early versions and Greek fathers, who generally assume it without question. The real alternative is to take μυρίασιν as further defined by ἄγγελοι παντηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησία πρωτότοκον ἀπογεγραμμένον ἐν οὐρανοῖς. This introduces and leaves μυρίασιν rather abruptly, and implies that angels alone are referred to (so recently Dods, von Soden, Peake, Seeberg), called πρωτότοκοι as created before men. But, while a later writer like Hermas (Vis. iii. 4) could speak of angels as οἱ πρῶτοι κτισθεῖτε, ἀπογεγραμμένον cannot naturally be applied to them. Hermas himself (Vis. i. 3) applies that term to men (ἐγγραφήσονται εἰς τὰς βιβλίους τῆς ζωῆς μετὰ τῶν ἄγγλων).

A fresh sweep of thought now begins (284-24). The writer is composing a lyrical sketch, not a law-paper; he reiterates the idea of the fellowship by speaking of God, men, and him by whom this tie between God and men has been welded, the allusion to Jesus being thrown to the end, as it is to form the starting-point for his next appeal (v. 25f.). In καὶ κρίτῃ θεῷ πάντων it is not possible, in view of 927 (μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις) and of the punitive sense of κρίνω in 1030, to understand κρίτης as defender

1 Clem. Hom. ix. 22, τὰ ἑσμάτα ἐν οὐρανῷ ως δεὶ ξύνων ἀναγραφήται.
or vindicator (so, e.g., Hofmann, Delitzsch, Riggenbach). The words mean “to the God of all (angels and men, the living and the dead, Ac 10:42), and to him as κριτής, to whom you must account for your life.” It is implied that he is no easy-going God. The contrast is not between the mere terrors of Sinai and the gracious relationship of Sion, but between the outward, sensuous terror of the former and the inward intimacy of the latter—an intimacy which still involves awe. In the next phrase, πνεύματα δικαίων means the departed who have in this life been δίκαιοι in the sense of 10:38f.; τετελειωμένων is added, not in the mere sense of “departed” (τελετάν = τελειόωθα, τελειῶν), but to suggest the work of Christ which includes the δίκαιοι, who had to await the sacrifice of Christ before they were “perfected” (11:40). If this involves the idea of a descent of Christ to the under-world, as Loofs (e.g. in ERE. iv. 662) argues, it implies the group of ideas mentioned in 21:4, which may have lain in the background of the writer’s thought. At any rate the “perfecting” of these δίκαιοι, their τελειώσεις, was due to Jesus; hence (v.24) the writer adds, καὶ διαθήκης νέας μεσίτης ἵνα (again at the end, for emphasis), where νέας is simply a synonym for καίνης (8: etc.). The classical distinction between the two terms was being dropped in the κοινή. Τῆς νέας Ἱερουσαλήμ occurs in Test. Dan 5:12, and the two words are synonymous, e.g., in Test. Levi 8:14 (ἐπικληθήσεται αὐτῷ ὄνομα καλῶν, ὅτι βασιλεὺς . . . ποιήσει ἱερατελαν νέαν). Indeed Blass thinks that the unexampled διαθήκης νέας was due to a sense of rhythm; the author felt a desire to reproduce the — ὅ — of the preceding ων τετελειωμένων.

In Cambodia (cp. ERE. iii. 164) those who are present at a death-bed all “repeat in a loud voice, the patient joining in as long as he has the strength, ‘Arahan! Arahan!’ ‘the saint! the just one!’” (Pāli araham = ‘the saint,’ ‘one who has attained final sanctification.’) Bleek is so perplexed by καὶ πνεῦμα, δικ. τελ. coming between θεῷ and ἱερῷ that he wonders whether the author did not originally write the phrase on the margin, intending it to go with παραγγέλει οἱ ἐκκλησίαι. The curious misreading of ὑς, τετελειωμένων, underlies Hilary’s quotation (tract. in Ps. 124: “ecclesia angelorum multitudinis frequentium—ecclesia primitivorum, ecclesia spirituum in domino fundatorum”). Another odd error, πνεύματι for πνεύμασι, appears in ὑς (both? d and some Latin fathers (e.g. Primasius)—a trinitarian emendation (= 10:39).

In διαθήκης νέας, as in 13:18, the writer recalls the conception with which he had been working in the middle part of his argument (chs. 7-10); now he proceeds to expand and explain the allusion in καὶ αἵματι δαυδισμοῦ (9:16f.) κρείττον (adverbial as in 1 Co 7:8) λαλοῦντι παρά (as in 14 etc.) τὸν Ἀβέλ (τὸν Ἀβέλ, cp. Jn 5:38). Reconciliation, not exclusion, is the note of the νέα διαθήκη. The blood of the murdered Abel (11:4) called out to 1 τοῦ Ἀβέλ (genitive) was actually read by L and is still preferred by Blass.
God in En 226f. (where the seer has a vision of Abel's spirit appealing to God) for the extinction of Cain and his descendants. The κρέατον in Jesus here is that, instead of being vindictive and seeking to exclude the guilty, he draws men into fellowship with God (see p. xlii). The contrast is therefore not between the Voice of the blood of Jesus (λαλούντι) and the Voice of the decalogue (v.19), but between Jesus and Abel; the former opens up the way to the presence of God, the latter sought to shut it against evil men. The blood of martyrs was assigned an atoning efficacy in 4 Mac 628f. 1721f.; but Abel's blood is never viewed in this light, and the attempt to explain this passage as though the blood of Jesus were superior in redeeming value to that of Abel as the first martyr (so, e.g., Seeberg), breaks down upon the fact that the writer never takes Abel's blood as in any sense typical of Christ's.

The application of vv.16-24 now follows. Though we have a far better relationship to God, the faults of the older generation may still be committed by us, and committed to our undoing (vv.25-29).

25 See (βλέπετε as 312) that you do not refuse to listen to his voice. For if they failed to escape, who refused to listen to their instructor upon earth, much less shall we, if we discard him who speaks from heaven. 26 Then his voice shook the earth, but now the assurance is, "once again I will make heaven as well as earth to quake." 27 That phrase (το δὲ as Eph 48), "once again," denotes (ὁδοι, as in 98) the removal of what is shaken (as no more than created), to leave only what stands unshaken. 28 Therefore let us render thanks that we get an unshaken realm; and in this way let us worship God acceptably—29 but with godly fear and awe, for our God is indeed "a consuming fire."

The divine revelation in the sacrifice of Jesus (λαλούντι) suggests the start of the next appeal and warning. From the celestial order, just sketched, the divine revelation (τὸν λαλούντα ... τὸν άπ' οδρανῶν) is made to us; instead of rejecting it, which would be tragic, let us hold to it. The argument is: God's revelation (v.25) implies a lasting relationship to himself (v.28); and although the present order of things in the universe is doomed to a speedy fall (v.26), this catastrophe will only bring out the unchanging realm in which God and we stand together (v.27). The abruptness of the asyndeton in (v.25) βλέπετε μὴ κτλ. adds to its force. Παρατίθητον ... παρατίθεμεν are only a verbal echo of παρατίθεμεν κτλ. in v.19; for the refusal of the people to hear God except through Moses is not blamed but praised by God (Dt 528). The writer, of course, may have ignored this, and read an ominous significance into the instinctive terror of the people, as if their refusal meant a radical rejection of God. But this is unlikely. By παρατίθεμεν τὸν χρηματίζοντα he means any obstinate rejection of what Moses laid down for
them as the will of God. Εἰ ... οὐκ (as was the fact) ἐξέφυγον (referring to the doom mentioned in 2:37; 10:29). As in 2:3 (πῶς ἦμεις ἐκφευγόμεθα), ἐκφεῦγον is used absolutely; the weaker ἐφυγόν is read only by N* D K L M ψ 104, etc. In the following words there are three possible readings. The original text ran: (a) ἐπὶ γῆς παρατησάμενοι τὸν χρηματίζοντα (N* A C D M d boh Cyr.), ἐπὶ γῆς being as often thrown to the front for the sake of emphasis. But the hyperbaton seemed awkward. Hence (b) τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς παρατησάμενοι χ. (N* K L P Chrys. Thdt. etc.) and (c) παρατησάμενοι τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς χ. (69. 256. 263. 436. 462. 467. 1837. 2005 vg) are attempts to make it clear that ἐπὶ γῆς goes with τὸν χρηματίζοντα, not with παρατησάμενοι. The latter interpretation misses the point of the contrast, which is not between a rejection on earth and a rejection in heaven (!), but between a human oracle of God and the divine Voice ἀπ' οὐρανῶν to us. The allusion in τὸν χρηματίζοντα is to Moses, as Chrysostom was the first to see. To refuse to listen to him is what has been already called ἀβετείν νόμον Μωϋσέως (10:28). As the Sinai-revelation is carefully described in 2:3 as δ ἀγγέλων λαλθεῖσιν λόγοις, so here Moses is ἁρματίζων, or, as Luke puts it, δι' ἐδεικτο λόγῳ ζωτα δούναι (Ac 7:38); he was the divine instructor of the λαός on earth. It is repeatedly said (Ex 20:22, Dt 4:30) that God spoke to the people at Sinai ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, so that to take τὸν χρηματίζοντα here as God, would be out of keeping with ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. The writer uses the verb in a wider sense than in that of 8:6 and 11:7; it means "the man who had divine authority to issue orders," just as in Jer 26:2 (τοῖς λόγοις οὐς συνέταξε συν αὐτοῖς χρηματίσαι), etc. He deliberately writes τὸν χρηματίζοντα of Moses, keeping τὸν λαλοῦντα as usual for God. Then, he concludes, πολύ (altered, as in ν, to πολλῷ by Dο K L M P ψ 226, or to πόσῳ, as in 9:14, by 255) μάλλον (sc. οὐκ ἐκφευγόμεθα) ἦμεις οἱ τὸν (sc. χρηματίζοντα) ἀπ' οὐρανών ἀποστρέφομεν (with accus. as 3 Mac 3:28 ἀποστέφασαν τὴν ἀτίμητον πολιτείαν, and 2 Ti 1:16 ἀπεστράφησαν μὲ πάντες).

It is surprising that οὐρανῷ (N M 216. 424**. 489. 547. 623. 642. 920. 1518. 1872 Chrys.) has not wider support, though, as 9:23, 24 shows, there is no difference in sense.

In ν.26 οὖ ἡ φωνὴ τῆς γῆς ἐσάλευσε τότε is another (cp. νν.13, 14) unintentional rhythm, this time a pentameter. Τότε, i.e. at Sinai. But in the LXX of Ex 19:18, which the writer used, the shaking of the hill is altered into the quaking of the people, and Jg 5:4¢ does not refer to the Sinai episode. Probably the writer inferred an earthquake from the poetical allusions in Ps 114:

1 Cp. Jos. Ant. iii. 8. 8, Μωϋσης ... ἐχρηματίζετο περὶ δὲν ἔδειτο παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.
(ἐσαλείψῃ ἢ γῆ), Ps 68ff, 77, when these were associated with the special theophany at Sinai. Νῦν δὲ ἐπήγερται (passive in middle sense, as Ro 421) λέγων, introducing a loose reminiscence and adaptation of Hag 26 (ἐτὶ ἀπεξ ἐγὼ σείει τὸν οὐρανόν καὶ τὴν γῆν κτλ.), where the prediction of a speedy convulsion of nature and the nations has been altered in the LXX, by the introduction of ἔτι, into a mere prediction of some ultimate crisis, with reference to some preceding σείσεις, i.e. for our writer the Sinai-revelation. The second and final σείσις is to be at the return of Jesus (928).

The anticipation of such a cosmic collapse entered apocalyptic. Thus the author of Apoc. Baruch tells his readers, "if you prepare your hearts, so as to sow in them the fruits of the law, it shall protect you when the Mighty One is to shake the whole creation" (321).

In v. 27 the Haggai prediction is made to mean the removal (μετάθεσιν, stronger sense than even in 712) τῶν σαλευμένων (by the σείσις). There is a divine purpose in the cosmic catastrophe, however; it is ἵνα μείη τὰ μὴ σαλευμένα, i.e. the βασιλεία ἀσαλευτος of the Christian order. For ἀσαλευτος, compare Philo, de vit. Mosis, ii. 3; τὰ δὲ τούτον μόνον βέβαια, ἀσαλευτα, ἀκράδαντα . . . μένει παγίως ἄφι ἡ ἡμέρας ἐγράφη μέχρι νῦν καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἐπείτα πάντα διαμενεῖ ἐπίπτη αἰώνα ὡσπερ ἄδανατα. Σείω and σαλεύω are cognate terms (cp. e.g. Sir 1618.19 ὁ οὐρανὸς . . . καὶ γῆ σαλευθήσονται . . . ἀμα τὰ ὅρη καὶ τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς συσσείονται). Here σείσις is changed into σείω by D K L P d arm and some cursive, probably to conform with the form of the promise in Hag 221 (ἐγὼ σείω τὸν οὐρ. καὶ τὴν γῆν). The hint is more reticent, and therefore more impressive than the elaborate prediction of the Jewish apocalyptist in Apoc. Bar 59ff.: "but also the heavens were shaken at that time from their place, and those who were under the throne of the Mighty One were perturbed, when He was taking Moses unto Himself. For He showed him . . . the pattern of Zion and its measures, in the pattern of which was to be made the sanctuary of the present time" (cp. He 85). There is a premonition of the last judgment in En 601, as a convulsion which shook not only heaven, but the nerves of the myriads of angels.

"There have been two notable transitions of life," says Gregory of Nazianzus (Orat. v, 25), in the history of the world, i.e. the two covenants, "which are also called earthquakes on account of their arresting character" (διὰ τὸ τοῦ πρόγνωσις περιβάλλων); the first from idols to the Law, the second from the Law to the gospel. We bring the good news of yet a third earthquake, the transition from the present order to the future (τὴν ἐντεύθεν ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκεῖσε μετάστασιν, τὰ μυκτεν κυνωμένα, μηδὲ σαλευμένα).2

1 i.e. while Haggai predicts "it will be very soon," the LXX says "once again."
2 Probably a reference to He 1226.
Changes and crises may only serve to render a state or an individual more stable. Thus Plutarch says of Rome, in the disturbed days of Numa, καθ’ αυτω τα κατατηρημένα το νεόεσθαι μᾶλλον ἐδράζεται, ρώμηνθαι δοκοῦσα διὰ τῶν κινήσεων (Vit. Num. 8). But the writer’s point in v. 27 is that there is an ἀσάλευτος βασιλεία already present, in the fellowship of the new διάθηκη, and that the result of the cosmic catastrophe will simply be to leave this unimpaired, to let it stand out in its supreme reality and permanence. The passage is a counterpart to 110-12, where skies and earth vanish, though they are God’s own ἔργα. So here, the writer puts in, by way of parenthesis, ὡς πεποιημένων. Kypke took πεποιημένων, “pro πεποιημένην, sc. μετάθεσιν,” comparing Mt 5:19 where he regarded ἀλαχίστων as similarly equivalent to ἀλαχίστην. The word would then be a genitive absolute, connecting with what follows: “all this being done so that,” etc. Even when πεποιημένων is taken in its ordinary sense, it is sometimes connected with τῶν κτλ. (so, e.g., Bengel and Delitzsch); the aim of creation was to replace the provisional by the permanent, the temporal by the eternal. A far-fetched interpretation. Even the conjecture (Valckenaer) πεποιημένων (labouring with decay) is needless, though ingenious. In vv. 28, 29 the final word upon this prospect and its responsibilities is said. Διό (as in v. 12), in view of this outlook (in v. 27), βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον (metaphorical, as, e.g., Diod. Sic. xii. 29, σπονδαί ἀσάλευται) παραλαμβάνοντες (cp. 2 Mac 10:11 and Eριστ. Α’'. 36, καὶ ἥμεις δὲ παραλαβόντες τὴν βασιλείαν κτλ., for this common phrase) ἔχομεν χάριν (διό with pres. subjunctive as in 6:1). The unique and sudden reference to the primitive idea of βασιλεία (see Introd., p. xxxiii) may be a reminiscence of the scripture from which he has just quoted; the prediction about the shaking of heaven and earth is followed, in Hag 2:6, by the further assertion, καὶ καταστρέψω θρόνους βασιλείων, καὶ ἔξοδον, δύναμιν βασιλείων τῶν θεών. Possibly our author regarded the prediction in Dn 7:18 (καὶ παραλήψωνται τὴν βασιλείαν ἄγιοι ψυστών καὶ καθέξουν αὐτὴν ἐως αἰώνοι τῶν αἰώνων) as fulfilled already in the Christian church, though he does not mean by βασιλείαι παραλαμβάνοντες that Christians enter on their reign.

Why thankfulness (for this common phrase, see Epict. i. 2. 23, ἔχω χάριν, δι’ μον φείδη, and O.F. 138178 (2nd century) διὰ θυσίων τῷ σώσαντι ἀπεθανόντος χάριτας) should be the standing order for them, the writer explains in δι’ ἥς κτλ.; it is the one acceptable λατρεία (9:14), or, as he puts it afterwards (13:15), the real sacrifice of Christians. Δι’ ἥς λατρεύων (subj. cohortative in relative clause, like ὁστρα τοῦ Ι. 5:12) εὐαρεστῶς (not in LXX;

1 Cp. Wis 5:18 ὀλίκαι δὲ εἰς τῶν αἰώνα ᾧσιν . . . λαμπρὰ διὸ τὸ βασιλείαν τῇ εὐπρεπελασ . . . ἐκ χειρὸς Κυρίου, δι’ τῆς δεξιός σκεπάσει αὐτῶν.
an adverb from the verb in the sense of 11°. The v.t. ἔσχομεν (K P Lat syr arm.) is the usual (see Ro 5) phonetic blunder, though λατρεύομεν (M P syr arm.) would yield as fair a sense as λατρεύομεν (A C D L 33. 104 Lat sah etc.). In μετά . . . δέος he puts in a characteristic warning against presumption. There are three readings. (a) εὐλαβείας καὶ δέος, A* A C D 256. 263. 436. 1912 sah boh syr arm. (b) εὐλαβείας καὶ αἰδούς, M P Ψ 6. 104. 326. 1739 lat Orig. (c) αἰδούς καὶ εὐλαβείας, K L 462 syr arm. Chrys. Thdt. The accidental doubling of αι (from καὶ) led to (b), especially as αἰδούς and εὐλαβεία were often bracketed together, and as δέος was a rare word (first popularized in Hellenistic Judaism by 2 Macca-bees). Εὐλαβεία here as in 5° (cp. 117) of reverent awe. Καὶ γάρ ὁ θεὸς Ἰμών πῦρ καταναλίσκον (v. 29). Not “for our God too is a πῦρ ἄν.” for the writer believed that the same God was God of the old διαθήκη and of the new; besides, this rendering would require καὶ γάρ Ἰμών ὁ θεὸς. The phrase is from Dt 4:24 (Moses at Sinai to the Israelites) ὅτι Κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἐστίν, θεὸς γῆς τῆς (cp. 93), referring to his intense resentment of anything like idolatry, which meant a neglect of the διαθήκη. There is no allusion to fire as purifying; the author of Wisdom (16:18) describes the Egyptians as πῦρ καταναλισκόμενοι, and it is this punitive aspect of God which is emphasized here, the divine ζῆλος (see p. xxxvi).

This is one of Tertullian’s points (adv. Marc. i. 26–27) against the Marcionite conception of a God who is good-natured and nothing more: “tacite permissum est, quod sine utione prohibetur . . . nihil Deo tam indignum quam non exsequi quod noluit et prohibuit admitti . . . malo parere Deum indignum sit quam animadvertere . . . Placze nec pater tuus est, in quern competat et amor propter pietatem, et timor propter disciplinam.” In Ἰπσωσ ἔσσαλος there is no softening of the conception, as in Philo’s argument (de Sacrificantibus, 8) that God’s requirement is simply ἀγατάν αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν, εἰ δὲ μὴ φοβεῖται γόνον ὧν ἰδέα καὶ κύριον, καὶ ἀνὴρ πατῶν λέναι τῶν εἰς ἄρσειν ὅδοι καὶ λατρεύειν αὐτῷ μὴ παρέργοι ἀλλὰ δῆλη τῇ πυρὶ πεπληρωμένη γνώμης φιλοκερνηκεὶ καὶ τῶν ἑσταλὼν αὐτοῦ περιέχεσθαι καὶ τὰ δίκαια τιμᾶν. In de Decalogo, 11, he spiritualizes the fire at Sinai thus: τὸν πυρὸς τὸ μὲν ψυχεῖν τὸ δὲ καλῶς πέφυκεν (those who obey the divine laws being inwardly enlightened, those who disobey being inflamed and consumed by their vices), and closes the treatise (33) by enunciating his favourite doctrine that God never punishes directly but only indirectly (here by Δεικ., whose appropriate task is to punish those who disobey her liege Lord). Indeed he allegorizes the OT comparison of God to a flame (Quaest. in Exod. 24:27 ὥσπερ δὲ ἡ φλές πάσαν τὴν παραβληθέσαν δῆλη ἀνάληκτη, οὕτως ὅταν ἐνυποκατηγορημένη τῶν θεοῦ ἐκκοιτος τῇ πυρὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐτέρωδους ἀκέραιος λογοφοροὺς διάφορες, καθοδοικείον τῇ δηλ. διάνοιας). The closest parallel to our passage lies in Ps.–Sol 15:24 where the author declares that praise to God is the one security for man. Ψαλμῷ καὶ αὐνόν μετ' ψυχῆς εὐθυρροσούσι καρδίας, καρπὸν χειλῶν ... ἀπαρχήν χειλῶν ἀπὸ καρδίας οὐσίας καὶ δικαίας, ὅ τιων ταῖνα οὐ σαλευθήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀπό (i.e. ὑπὸ) κακοῦ, φλές πυρὸς καὶ
With this impressive sentence ἂντι εὐπραίων really closes. But the writer appends (see Introd., pp. xxviii f.) a more or less informal postscript, with some personal messages to the community. A handful of moral counsels (vv. 1–7) is followed by a longer paragraph (vv. 8–16), and the closing personal messages are interrupted by a farewell benediction (v. 20).

1 Let your brotherly love continue. 2 Never forget to be hospitable, for by hospitality (διὰ τοῦτον, as 12:18) some have entertained angels unawares. 3 Remember prisoners as if you were in prison yourselves; remember those who are being ill-treated (11:7), since you too are in the body.

Neither φιλαδελφία nor φιλοξενία is a LXX term, though the broader sense of the former begins in 1 Mac 13:22–25 14:1. Μενέτω (cp. 6:10 10:24. 32f.), though its demands might be severe at times (cp. Ro 12:10, 1 P 1:22; Clem. Ro 1; Herm. Mand. 8:16); the duty is laid as usual on members of the church, not specially on officials. In v. 2 a particular expression of this φιλαδελφία is called for. Φιλοξενία was practically an article of religion in the ancient world. The primary reference here in πνεῦς is to Abraham and Sara (Gn 18:1f.), possibly to Manoah (Jg 13:2), and even to Tobit (Tob 1:2); but the point of the counsel would be caught readily by readers familiar with the Greek and Roman legends of divine visitants being entertained unawares by hospitable people, e.g. Hom. Odysse. xvii. 485 f. (καὶ τε θεοὶ ξεινοισίν ἐνκόστες ἀλλοδαποίοι).
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deiôs de pandokeina kai pornothekias ktl.; there is significance in the Jewish tradition preserved by Josephus (Ant. v. 1. 1) that Rahab ἡ πόρνη (1181) kept an inn. For a Christian to frequent such inns might be to endanger his character, and this consideration favoured the practice of hospitality on the part of the local church, apart altogether from the discomforts of an inn. ("In the better parts of the empire and in the larger places of resort there were houses corresponding in some measure to the old coaching inns of the eighteenth century; in the East there were the well-known caravanserais; but for the most part the ancient hostelries must have afforded but undesirable quarters. They were neither select nor clean," T. G. Tucker, *Life in the Roman World*, p. 20.) Some of these travellers would be itinerant evangelists (cp. 3 Jn 5-8).

According to Philo the three wayfarers seen by Abraham did not at first appear divine (αἱ δὲ θεωτέρας ὄντες φύσιν ἐλαίβησαν), though later on he suspected they were either prophets or angels when they had promised him the birth of a son in return for his splendid hospitality (Abrah. 22-23). "In a wise man's house," Philo observes, "no one is slow to practise hospitality: women and men, slaves and freedmen alike, are most eager to do service to strangers"; at the same time such hospitality was only an incident (πάρεργον) and instance (εἰκόνιστα) of Abraham's larger virtue, i.e. of his piety. Josephus also (Ant. i. 11. 2) makes Abraham suppose the three visitors were human strangers, until at last they revealed themselves as divine angels (θεωσάμενος τρεῖς ἄγγελοι καὶ νομίσας εἶναί ξένους ἔσπασα τῇ ἀναστᾷ καὶ παρ’ αὐτῷ καταχθέντας παρεκάλει ξενιῶν μεταλαβεῖν). It was ignorance of the classical idiom (cp. Herod. i. 44, ὑποδεξάμονοι τὸν ξέινον φονεὰ τοῦ παιδός ἡλώαν νόμισαν) in ἔλαβον ἔναντησε, which led to the corruptions of ἔλαβον in some Latin versions into "latuerunt," "didicerunt," and "placuerunt." Note the paronomasia ἐπιλανθάνεσθε ... ἔλαβον, and the emphatic position of ἄγγελος. "You never know whom you may be entertaining," the writer means. "Some humble visitor may turn out to be for you a very ἄγγελος θεοῦ" (cp. Gal 414).

Μιμησόσκοπε (bear in mind, and act on your thought of) τῶν δεσμῶν. Strangers come within sight; prisoners (v.8) have to be sought out or—if at a distance—borne in mind. Christian kindness to the latter, i.e. to fellow-Christians arrested for some reason or other, took the form either of personally visiting them to alleviate their sufferings by sympathy and gifts (cp. Mt 2536, 2 Ti 110), or of subscribing money (to pay their debts or, in the case of prisoners of war, to purchase their release), or of praying for them (Col 418 and 48). All this formed a prominent feature
of early Christian social ethics. The literature is full of tales about the general practice: e.g. Aristid. Apol. 15; Tertull. ad Mart. 1 f. and Apol. 39, with the vivid account of Lucian in the de Morte Peregr. 12, 13. This subject is discussed by Harnack in the Expansion of Early Christianity (bk. ii. ch. 3, section 5).

Our author urges, "remember the imprisoned" ως συνδεδεμένοι. If ως is taken in the same sense as the following ως, the meaning is: (a) "as prisoners yourselves," i.e. in the literal sense, "since you know what it means to be in prison"; or (b) "as imprisoned," in the metaphorical sense of Diognet. 6, Χριστιανοὶ κατέχονται ως εν φρουρᾷ της κόσμως. A third alternative sense is suggested by LXX of ις 181 (ὅς ψυχήν συνεδέθη τῇ ψυχῇ Δαυΐδ), but the absence of a dative after συνδεδεμένως and the parallel phrase ως εν σώματι rule it out. Probably ως is no more than an equivalent for were{. Christians are to regard themselves as one with their imprisoned fellows, in the sense of 1 Co 12:26 εἴτε τάσσεις εν μέλος, συμπάσσεις πάντα τὰ μέλη. This interpretation tallies with 10:34 above (cp. Neh 1:8-4). It does not, however, imply that εν σώματι, in the next clause, means "in the Body (of which you and your suffering fellows are alike members)"; for εν σώματι refers to the physical condition of liability to similar ill-usage. See Orig. c. Cels. ii. 23, τῶν τοίς εν σώματι (Bouhèreau conj. σώματι) συμβαίνοντων, and especially Philo's words describing some spectators of the cruelties inflicted by a revenue officer on his victims, as suffering acute pain, ως εν τοῖς ἐτέρων σώμασιν αὐτοὶ κακούμενοι (de Spec. Leg. iii. 30). So in de Confus. Ling. 35, καὶ τῷ συμβορῷ ἄγνωστων τῶν κακούμενων (i.e. by exile, famine, and plague; cp. He 11:37) οὐκ ἐνθεσάσαι χωρῶς, σώματι.

Seneca (Ep. ix. 8) illustrates the disinterestedness of friendship by observing that the wise man does not make friends for the reason suggested by Epicurus, viz., to "have someone who will sit beside him when he is ill, someone to assist him when he is thrown into chains or in poverty," but "that he may have someone beside whom, in sickness, he may himself sit, someone whom he may set free from captivity in the hands of the enemy." The former kind of friendship he dismisses as inadequate: "a man has made a friend who is to assist him in the event of bondage (adversum vincula'), but such a friend will forsake him as soon as the chains rattle ('cum primum crepuerit catena')." In Ep. Arist. 241, 242, when the king asks what is the use of kinship, the Jew replies, ἐὰν τοὺς συμβαίνοντας νομίζομεν ἁπλοὺς, μὴ ἀποστειθαί καὶ κακοπαθοῦν τὶς αὐτοὶ, φανεται τὸ συγγενὲς ὑσον λεγόντων ἄστη. Cicero specially praises generosity to prisoners, and charity in general, as being serviceable not only to individuals but to the State (de Offic. ii. 18, "haec benignitas etiam rei publicae est utilis, redimi e servitute captos, locupletari tenuiores").

Let marriage be held in honour by all, and keep the marriage-bed unstained. God will punish the vicious and adulterous.

Keep your life free from the love of money; be content with what you have, for He (αὐτός) has said,

"Never will I fail you, never will I forsake you."
So that we can say confidently,

"The Lord is my helper (βοηθός, cp. 2:18 4:16), I will not be afraid. What can men do to me?"

As vv. 1-2 echo 10:24-25, v. 4 drives home the πόρνος of 12:16, and vv. 5-6 echo the reminder of 10:34. Evidently (v. 4), as among the Macedonian Christians (1 Th 4:3-8), filadelfia could be taken for granted more readily than sexual purity. Τίμως (sc. εστώ as in v. 5, Ro 12:9, the asyndeton being forcible) δ' γάμος εν πάσει, i.e. primarily by all who are married, as the following clause explains. There may be an inclusive reference to others who are warned against lax views of sexual morality, but there is no clear evidence that the writer means to protest against an ascetic disparagement of marriage. Κοίτη is, like the classical λέχος, a euphemistic term for sexual intercourse, here between the married; ἄμιαντος is used of incest, specially in Test. Reub. i. 6, ἐμάνα κοίτην τοῦ πατρός μου: Plutarch, de Fluvii, 18, μὴ θέλων μαίνειν τὴν κοίτην τοῦ γανύχαντος, etc.; but here in a general sense, as, e.g., in Wisdom:

μακαρία ἡ στείρα ἡ ἄμιαντος,

ἡτις οὐκ ἔγνω κοίτην ἐν παραπτώματι,

ἐξει καρπὸν ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ ψυχῶν (3:18),

and οὔτε βίοις οὔτε γάμωσι καθαροῖς ἐκ φυλάσσουσιν,

ἐτερος δ' ἐτέρων ἡ λοξῶν ἀναρέι ἡ νοθεύων ὀδυνῇ (14:24).

In πόρνως γὰρ καὶ μοιχοὺς κτλ., the writer distinguishes between μοιχοῖς, i.e. married persons who have illicit relations with other married persons, and πόρνοι of the sexually vicious in general, i.e. married persons guilty of incest or sodomy as well as of fornication. In the former case the main reference is to the breach of another person's marriage; in the latter, the predominating idea is treachery to one's own marriage vows. The possibility of πορνεία in marriage is admitted in Tob 8:7 (οὐ διὰ πορνείαν ἐγὼ λαμβάνω τὴν ἀδελφήν μου ταύτην), i.e. of mere sexual gratification ¹ as distinct from the desire and duty of having children, which Jewish and strict Greek ethics held to be the paramount aim of marriage (along with mutual fellowship); but this is only one form of πορνεία. In the threat κρυεῖ (as in 10:80) δ' θεοῦ, the emphasis is on δ' θεοῦ. "Longe plurima pars scortatorum et adulterorum est sine dubio, quae effugit notitiam iudicum mortalium . . . magna pars, etiamsi innotescat, tamen poenam civilem et disciplinam ecclesiasticam vel effugit vel leuissime persertiscit" (Bengel).

This is another social duty (cp. Philo, de Decalogo, 24). In view of the Epicurean rejection of marriage (e.g. Ἐπικτ. iii. 7. 19), which is finely

---

¹ μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας, as Paul would say (1 Th 4:5).
answered by Antipater of Tarsus (Stob. Florileg. Ixvii. 25; ὁ εὐγενής καὶ ἐθύμων νέος... θεωρῶν διότι τέλειος οἶκος καὶ βίος οὐκ ἄλλος δύναται γενέσθαι, ἦ μετὰ. γυναικὸς καὶ τέκνων κτλ.), as well as of current ascetic tendencies (e.g., I Ti 4:8), there may have been a need of vindicating marriage, but the words here simply maintain the duty of keeping marriage vows unbroken. The writer is urging chastity, not the right and duty of any Christian to marry. Prejudices born of the later passion for celibacy led to the suppression of the inconvenient ἐν πάσι (om. 35. 406. 623. 1835. 1912* Didymus, Cyril Jerus., Eus., Athan., Epiphanius, Thdt.). The sense is hardly affected, whether ἀλλὰ (ὁ ΑΔ* Μ Π lat sah boh) or δὲ (C D Ψ 6 syr arm eth Clem., Eus., Didymus, Chrys.) is read, although the latter would give better support to the interpretation of the previous clause as an anti-ascetic maxim.

A warning against greed of gain (vv. 5-6) follows the warning against sexual impurity. There may be a link of thought between them. For the collocation of sensuality and the love of money, see Eptic. iii. 7. 21, σοὶ καλὴν γυναῖκα φανέσθαι μηδεμίαν ἦ τὴν σῆν, καλὸν παῖδα μηδένα, καλὸν ἀργύρωμα μηθέν, χρύσῳμα μηθέν: Test. Jud. 18, φυλάξασθε ἀπὸ τῆς πορείας καὶ τῆς φιλαργυρίας... ὅτι ταῦτα... οὐκ ἂφει ἄνδρα ἔλεγος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, and Philo’s (de Post. Caini, 34) remark, that all the worst quarrels, public and private, are due to greedy craving for ἡ ἔφορφιας γυναῖκος ἡ χρημάτων κτλ. In de Abrah. 26, he attributes the sensuality of Sodom to its material prosperity. Lucian notes the same connexion in Nigrin. 16 (συνεσυρχέται γὰρ μοιχεία καὶ φιλαργυρία κτλ., the love of money having been already set as the source of such vices). In I Co 5:10f. Paul brackets οἱ πόροι with οἱ πλεονεκταὶ, and πλεονεξία (cp. I Th 4:9) as selfishness covers adultery as well as grasping covetousness. But the deeper tie between the two sins is that the love of luxury and the desire for wealth open up opportunities of sensual indulgence. In injuries to other people, Cicero observes (de Offic. i. 7. 24), "latissime patet avaritia." When Longinus describes the deteriorating effects of this passion or vice in character (de Sublim. 44), he begins by distinguishing it from mere love of pleasure; φιλαργυρία μὲν νόσημα μικροποιῶν, φιλοθεία δ’ ἀγενεστάτων. Then he proceeds to analyse the working of φιλαργυρία in life, its issue in ἱβρίς, παρανομία, and ἀναστυνία.

'Ἀφιλάργυρος (the rebel Appianus tells Marcus Aurelius, in Op. xxviii. 10, 11, that his father τὸ μὲν τρίτον ήν φιλόσοφος, τὸ δεύτερον ἄφιλάργυρος, τὸ τρίτον φιλάγαθος) ὁ τρόπος (in sense of "mores," as often, e.g., M. Aurelius, i. 16, καὶ πᾶς ὁ τοιοῦτος τρόπος). Ἀρκοῦμενοι is the plur. ptc. after a noun (as in 2 Co 1, Ro 129), and with τῶν παρούσων reproduces a common Greek phrase for contentment, e.g. Teles, vii. 7, ἀλλ’ ἥμεις οὐ δυνάμεθα ἀρκεῖσθαι τοῖς παρούσοις, ὅταν καὶ τριφὴ τοῦ διώκετε, and xxviii. 31, καὶ μὴ ἔχων οὐκ ἐπιποθήσεις ἀλλὰ βίωσι ἄρκομενος τοῖς παρούσις. The feature here is the religious motive adduced in αὐτὸς γὰρ
CONFIDENCE IN GOD

The quotation of God as usual, e.g., 158), a phrase which (cp. Ac 20 aυτός εἶπεν) recalls the Pythagorean aυτός ἐφα (“thus said the Master”). The quotation oὐ μή σε ἄνω οὔδε oὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω is a popular paraphrase of Jos 15 or Gn 28 (cp. Dt 31, 1 Ch 28) which the writer owes to Philo (de Confus. Ling. 32), who quotes it exactly in this form as a λόγων τοῦ ἵλεω θεοῦ μεστῶν ἡμερῶν, but simply as a promise that God will never leave the human soul to its own unrestrained passions. The combination of the aor. subj. with the first oὐ μή and the reduplication of the negative (for oὐ oὐ μή, cp. Mt 24) amount to a strong asseveration. Note that the writer does not appeal, as Josephus does, to the merits of the fathers (Antiq. xi. 5. 7, τὸν μὲν θεὸν ἵστε μνήμη τῶν πατέρων Ἀβράμοι καὶ Ἰσάκου καὶ Ἰακώβου παραμένοιτα καὶ διὰ τὴς ἱκανίας δικαιοσύνης οὐκ ἐγκαταλείποντα τὴν ὑπὲρ ἧμῶν πρόνοιαν) in assuring his readers that they will not be left forlorn by God.

εἰρήκεν (so all the uncial except D) may be simply an orthographical variant of the true reading ἐγκαταλείπω (aorist subj.). In Dt 31 the A text runs oὐ μή σε ἄνω οὔδε oὐ σε ἐγκαταλείπη, in Jos 15 οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπω σε οὔδε ἔπεροφομαλ σε, and in Gn 28 oὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλείπω. The promise originally was of a martial character. But, as Keble puts it (Christian Year, “The Accession”):

“Not upon kings or priests alone
the power of that dear word is spent;
it chants to all in softest tone
the lowly lesson of content.”

οὖτε (v. 6) θαρροῦντας (on the evidence for this form, which Plutarch prefers to the Ionic variant θαρρεῖν, cp. Cröner’s Memoria Graeca Herculanensis, 133) ἡμᾶς (om. M, accidentally) λέγειν. What God says to us moves us to say something to ourselves. This quotation from Ps 116 is exact, except that the writer, for the sake of terseness, omits the καί (=so) before oὐ φοβηθήσομαι, which is reinserted by oὐ A D K L M syr1 etc. For the phrase θαρροῦντας λέγειν, see Pr 121 (Wisdom) ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν μὲν πόλεως θαρροῦσα λέγει: and for βοήθος and θαρρεῖν in conjunction, see Xen. Cyr. v. i. 25, 26, ἐπειδὴ δ' έκ Περσῶν βοήθος ήμίν ὀμηρείη . . . νῦν δ' αὖ οὕτους ἔχομεν ὡς σὺν μὲν σοι ὅμως καὶ ἐν τῇ πολεμίᾳ ἄντε θαρροῦμεν. Epictetus tells a man who is tempted (ii. 18. 29), τοῦ θεοῦ μέμην, ἐκείνον ἐπικαλοῦ βοήθων καὶ παραστάτην. This is the idea of the psalm-quotation here. Courage is described in Galen (de H. et Plat. decr. vii. 2) as the knowledge δόν χρή θαρρεῖν ἡ μή θαρρεῖν, a genuinely Stoic definition; and Alkibiades tells, in the Symposium (221 A), how he came upon Sokrates and Laches retreating during the Athenian defeat at Delium καὶ ἔδοξοι εἴθες παρακελεύοματε αὖθιν θαρρεῖν, καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι οὐκ ἀπολείφων αὐτῷ. In the touching prayer preserved in the Acta Pauli (xliii.), Thekla cries, δ θεὸς μον καὶ τοῦ
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According to Pliny (Epp. ix. 30: "primum est autem suo esse contentum, deinde, quos praecipue scias indigere sustentantem fouentemque orbe quodam societatis ambire") a man's first duty is to be content with what he has; his second, to go round and help all in his circle who are most in need. Epictetus quotes a saying of Musonius Rufus: οὐ χείλει μελέταν ἀρχαίας τῷ δεδομένῳ; (i. 1. 27); but this refers to life in general, not to money or property in particular. The argument of our author is that instead of clinging to their possessions and setting their hearts on goods (1034), which might still be taken from them by rapacious pagans, they must realize that having God they have enough. He will never allow them to be utterly stripped of the necessaries of life. Instead of trying to refund themselves for what they had lost, let them be content with what is left to them and rely on God to preserve their modest all; he will neither drop nor desert them.

Hitherto the community has been mainly (see on 1214f.) addressed as a whole. Now the writer reminds them of the example of their founders, dead and gone, adding this to the previous list of memories (1211f.).

7 Remember your leaders, the men who spoke the word of God to you; look back upon the close of their career, and copy their faith.

Μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγούμενων ὡμῶν οἰκίας (since they were the men who) ἔλαλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ. The special function of these primitive apostles and prophets was to preach the gospel (cp. 1 Co 117) with the supernatural powers of the Spirit. Then the writer adds a further title to remembrance, their consistent and heroic life; they had sealed their testimony with their (ὡν κτλ.) blood. Ἡγούμενοι, like ἀρχαῖοι, was a substantival formation which had a wide range of meaning; here it is equivalent to "president" or "leader" (cp. Epp. Apollon. ii. 69, ἄνδρας τοὺς ἡγούμενους ὑμῶν = your leading citizens, or prominent men, and Ac 1522). It was they who had founded the church by their authoritative preaching; ἔλαλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ recalls the allusion to the σωτηρία which ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκοσμάντων (i.e. Jesus) ἦσα εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη (28). The phrase denotes, in primitive Christianity (e.g. Did. 41 where the church-member is bidden remember with honour τοῦ λαλοῦντος σου τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ), the central function of the apostolic ministry as the declaration and interpretation of the divine λόγος. These men had died for their faith; ἐκβάσεως here, as in Wis 217 (τὰ ἐν ἐκβάσει αὐτῶν), is, like ἐξοδός, a metaphor for death as the close of life, evidently a death remarkable for its witness to faith. They had laid down their lives as martyrs. This proves that the allusion in 124 does not exclude some martyrdoms in the past history of the community, unless the reference here is supposed to mean

1 In Ep. Arist. 310, of the headmen of the Jewish community at Alexandria.
no more than that they died as they had lived κατὰ πίστιν (11:18), without giving up their faith.

In Egypt, during the Roman period, “a liturgical college of πρεσβύτεροι or ἱγμόμενοι was at the head of each temple” (GCPr. i. 127), the latter term being probably taken from its military sense of “officers” (e.g. ἱγμόμενοι τῶν ἐξω τάξεων).

Ἀναθεωροῦντες is “scanning closely, looking back (ἀνα-) on”; and ἀναστροφή is used in this sense even prior to Polybius; e.g. Magn. 46, 44 (iii B.C.) and Magn. 165 (i A.D.) διὰ τὴν τῶν ἓδους κόσμων ἀναστροφήν. As for μιμεῖσθαι, the verb never occurs in the LXX except as a v.l. (B*) for ἑμίστημα in Ps 31, and there in a bad sense. The good sense begins in Wis 2 (παροῦσιν τε μιμοῦνται αὐτήν), so far as Hellenistic Judaism goes, and in 4 Mac 9 (μιμησόμεθα τοὺς τρεῖς τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς Συρίας νεανίσκους) it is used of imitating a personal example, as here. In the de Congressu Erud. 13, Philo argues that the learner listens to what his teacher says, whereas a man who acquires true wisdom by practice and meditation (ὁ δὲ ἀκριβεῖ τὸ καλὸν ἀλλὰ μὴ διδασκαλία κτῶμεν) attends οὐ τοῖς λεγομένοις ἀλλὰ τοῖς λέγοντι, μιμούμενος τῶν ἐκείνων βιῶν ἐν ταῖς κατὰ μέρος ἀνεπιλάπτους πράξεις. He is referring to living examples of goodness, but, as in de Vita Mos. i. 28, he points out that Moses made his personal character a παράδειγμα τοῖς ἐθέλουσι μιμεῖσθαι. This stimulus of heroic memories belonging to one’s own group is noted by Quintilian (Instit. Orat. xii. 2. 31) as essential to the true orator: “quae sunt antiquitus dicta ac facta praecclare et nosse et animo semper agitare conveniet. Quae profecto nusquam plura maioraque quam in nostrae civitatis monumentis reperientur. . . . Quantum enim Graeci praecetis valent, tantum Romani, quod est maius, exemplis.” Marcus Aurelius recollects the same counsel: ἐν τοῖς τῶν Ἐπικουρείων γράμμασι παράγγελμα ἕκατο συνεχώς ὑπομιμησκεσθαι τῶν παλαιῶν τινος τῶν ἅρτετη χρησματῶν (xi. 26).

Human leaders may pass away, but Jesus Christ, the supreme object and subject of their faithful preaching, remains, and remains the same; no novel additions to his truth are required, least of all innovations which mix up his spiritual religion with what is sensuous and material.

8 Jesus Christ is always the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever. 9 Never let yourselves be carried away with a variety of novel doctrines; for the right thing is to have one’s heart strengthened by grace, not by the eating of food—that has never been any use to those who have had recourse to it. 10 Our (ἐκμεν as 4:10) altar is one of which the worshippers have no right to eat. 11 For the bodies of the animals whose “blood is taken into the holy Place” by the highpriest as a “sin-offering, are burned outside the camp”; 12 and so Jesus also suffered outside the gate, in order to sanctify the people (cp. 10:29) by his own blood (9:12). 13 Let us go to him “outside the camp,” then, bearing
his obloquy (for we have no lasting city here below, we seek the City to come). And by him "let us" constantly "offer praise to God" as our "sacrifice," that is, "the fruit of lips" that celebrate his Name. Do not forget (μη ἐμπιστεύσασθε, as in v.2) benevolence and charity either; these are the kind of sacrifices that are acceptable to God.

V.8 connects with what precedes and introduces what follows. "Εξῆς refers to his life on earth (23 57) and includes the service of the original ἥγουμενοι; it does not necessarily imply a long retrospect. Σήμερον as in 315, and δ αὐτός as in r12. The finality of the revelation in Jesus, sounded at the opening of the homily (1lf), resounds again here. He is never to be superseded; he never needs to be supplemented. Hence (v.9) the warning against some new theology about the media of forgiveness and fellowship, which, it is implied, infringes the all-sufficient efficacy of Jesus Christ. Διδάχαις (62) ποικίλαις (24 in good sense) καὶ ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε. Παραφέρεσθαι (cp. Jude 12) is never used in this metaphorical sense (swayed, swerved) in the LXX, where it is always literal, and the best illustration of ξένος in the sense of "foreign to" (the apostolic faith) is furnished by the author of the epistle to Diognetus (111), who protests, ὃ ἕνα ὀμιλῶ . . . αλλὰ αποστάλων γενόμενος μαθητής γίνομαι διδάσκαλος εὐνοῦ. Such notions he curtly pronounces useless, ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὄφελησθαν οἱ περιπατήσατε, where ἐν οἷς goes with περιπατήσατε; they have never been of any use in mediating fellowship with God for those who have had recourse to them. It is exactly the tone of Jesus in Mk 718.

Παραφέρεσθε was altered (under the influence of Eph 414) into περιφέρεσθε (K L Ψ 2. 5. 88. 330. 378. 440. 491. 547. 642. 919. 920. 1867. 1872. 1908. arm sah). Περιπατήσατες (καὶ C D K L M P syri) K X T A M Orig. Chrys. etc.) and περιπατήσατε (καὶ A D* 1912 lat) are variants which are substantially the same in meaning, περιπατέω ἐν being used in its common sense = living in the sphere of (Eph 210 etc.), having recourse to.

The positive position is affirmed in καλὸν κτλ. (καλὸν, as in 1 Co 71, Ro 1421 etc.). "Καλὸς . . . denotes that kind of good­ness which is at once seen to be good" (Hort on 1 P 212), i.e. by those who have a right instinct. The really right and good course is χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν, i.e. either to have one's heart strengthened, or to be strengthened in heart (καρδίαν, accus. of reference). Bread sustains our physical life (ἄρτος καρδίαν ἀνθρώπων στηρίζει, Ps 10415), but καρδία here means more than vitality; it is the inner life of the human soul, which God's χάρις alone can sustain, and God's χάρις in Jesus Christ is everything (29 etc.). But what does this contrast mean? The explanation is suggested in the next passage (vv.10-16), which flows out of

1 The forms vary; but this, the Attic spelling, has the best repue upon the whole (see W. G. Rutherford's New Phrynichus, pp. 370f.), and strong support here in κ A C* D* M.
what has just been said. The various novel doctrines were connected in some way with \( \beta \rho \omicron \mu \alpha \tau \). So much is clear. The difficulty is to infer what the \( \beta \rho \omicron \mu \alpha \tau \) were. There is a touch of scorn for such a motley, unheard of, set of \( \delta \delta \alpha \chi \alpha i \). The writer does not trouble to characterize them, but his words imply that they were many-sided, and that their main characteristic was a preoccupation with \( \beta \rho \omicron \mu \alpha \tau \). There is no reference to the ancient regulations of the Hebrew ritual mentioned in 9\(^{10}\); this would only be tenable on the hypothesis, for which there is no evidence, that the readers were Jewish Christians apt to be fascinated by the ritual of their ancestral faith, and, in any case, such notions could not naturally be described as \( \pi \omicron \kappa \iota \lambda \iota \kappa \kappa \iota \) \( \xi \varepsilon \nu a i \). We must look in other directions for the meaning of this enigmatic reference. (a) The new \( \delta \delta \alpha \chi \alpha i \) may have included ascetic regulations about diet as aids to the higher life, like the \( \delta \nu \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \tau a kai \delta \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda \iota \alpha i t \tau o n \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omicron \tau \omicron o n \) which disturbed the Christians at Colossè. Partly owing to Gnostic syncretism, prohibitions of certain foods (\( \alpha \pi \tau \varepsilon \chi \varepsilon \sigma \theta a i \beta \rho \omega \omicron \mu a t o n \), 1 Ti 4\(^{8}\)) were becoming common in some circles, in the supposed interests of spiritual religion. “We may assume,” says Pfleiderer, one of the representatives of this view (pp. 278 f.), “a similar Gnostic spiritualism, which placed the historical Saviour in an inferior position as compared with angels or spiritual powers who do not take upon them flesh and blood, and whose service consists in mystical purifications and ascetic abstinences.” (b) They may also have included such religious sacraments as were popularized in some of the mystery-cults, where worshippers ate the flesh of a sacrificial victim or consecrated elements which represented the deity. Participation in these festivals was not unknown among some ultra-liberal Christians of the age. It is denounced by Paul in 1 Co 10, and may underlie what the writer has already said in 10\(^{28}\). Why our author did not speak outright of \( \epsilon \iota \delta \omega \lambda \omicron \lambda \omicron \nu a a \), we cannot tell; but some such reference is more suitable to the context than (a), since it is sacrificial meals which are in question. He is primarily drawing a contrast between the various cult-feasts of paganism, which the readers feel they might indulge in, not only with immunity, but even with spiritual profit, and the Christian religion, which dispensed with any such participation. (c) Is there also a reference to the Lord’s supper, or to the realistic sense in which it was being interpreted, as though participation in it implied an actual eating of the sacrificial body of the Lord? This reference is urged by some critics, especially by F. Spitta (Zur Geschichte u. Litteratur des Urchristentums, i. pp. 325 f.) and O. Holtzmann (in Zeitschrift für die neueste Wissenschaft, x. pp. 251–260). Spitta goes wrong by misinterpreting v.\(^{10}\) as though the \( \sigma \omicron \omega \mu a \) of Christ implied a sacrificial meal
from which Jewish priests were excluded. Holtzmann rightly sees that the contrast between χάρις and βρώματα implies, for the latter, the only βρώμα possible for Christians, viz. the Lord's body as a food. What the writer protests against is the rising conception of the Lord's supper as a φαγεῖν τὸ σώμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. On the day of Atonement in the OT ritual, to which he refers, there was no participation in the flesh of the sacrificial victim; there could not be, in the nature of the case (v.11). So, he argues, the σώμα Χριστοῦ of our sacrifice cannot be literally eaten, as these neo-sacramentarians allege; any such notion is, to him, a relapse upon the sensuous, which as a spiritual idealist he despises as "a vain thing, fondly invented." A true insight into the significance of Jesus, such as he has been trying to bring out in what he has written, such as their earlier leaders themselves had conveyed in their own way, would reveal the superfluousness and irrelevance of these διδαχαί. As the writer is alluding to what is familiar, he does not enter into details, so that we have to guess at his references. But the trend of thought in vv.10f. is plain. In real Christian worship there is no sacrificial meal; the Christian sacrifice is not one of which the worshippers partake by eating. This is the point of v.10. The writer characteristically illustrates it from the OT ritual of atonement-day, by showing how the very death of Jesus outside the city of Jerusalem fulfilled the proviso in that ritual (vv.11-12) that the sacrifice must not be eaten. Then he finds in this fact about the death of Jesus a further illustration of the need for unworl-iness (vv.13-14). Finally, in reply to the question, "Then have Christians no sacrifices to offer at all?" he mentions the two standing sacrifices of thanksgiving and charity (vv.15-16), both owing their efficacy to Christ. Inwardness is the dominating thought of the entire paragraph. God's grace in Jesus Christ works upon the soul; no external medium like food is required to bring us into fellowship with him; it is vain to imagine that by eating anything one can enjoy communion with God. Our Lord stands wholly outside the material world of sense, outside things touched and tasted; in relationship to him and him alone, we can worship God. The writer has a mystical or idealistic bent, to which the sacramental idea is foreign. He never alludes to the eucharist; the one sacrament he notices is baptism. A ritual meal as the means of strengthening communion with God through Christ does not appeal to him in the slightest degree. It is not thus that God's χάρις is experienced.

The clue to v.10 lies in the obvious fact that the θυσιαστήριον and the σκηνή belong to the same figurative order. In our spiritual or heavenly σκηνή, the real σκηνή of the soul, there is indeed a θυσιαστήριον ἐξ οὗ (partitive; cp. τὰ εἰς τοῦ ιεροῦ ἐσθίου-
It makes no difference to the sense whether οἱ ... λατρεύοντες means worshippers (90 ἐκ θεῶν) or priests (86), and the writer does not allegorize θυσιαστήριον as Philo does (e.g. in de Leg. Alleg. i. 15, ἡς καθαράς καὶ ἀμαντὸν φύσεως ἡς ἀναφερόσθης τὰ ἀμώμα τῷ θεῷ, αὐτὴ δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον). His point is simply this, that the Christian sacrifice, on which all our relationship to God depends, is not one that involves or allows any connexion with a meal. To prove how impossible such a notion is, he (v.11) cites the ritual regulation in Lv 16.27 for the disposal of the carcases of the two animals sacrificed περὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας (ὅν τὸ αἶμα ἐσπεύδη ἐξιλάσασθαι ἐν τῷ ἅγιῳ ἐξοίσοντοι αὐτὰ ἕξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς καὶ κατακαύσωσιν αὐτὰ ἐν πυρί). For a moment the writer recalls his main argument in chs. 7-10; in v.10 Christ is regarded as the victim or sacrifice (cp. προσενεχθεὶς in 9.88), but here the necessities of the case involve the activity of the Victim. Διὰ καὶ ἡσύχους κτλ. (v.12). The parallel breaks down at one point, of course; his body was not burned up. But the real comparison lies in ἔξω τῆς πύλης (sc. τῆς παρεμβολῆς, as Ex 32.26.27). The Peshitto and 436 make the reference explicit by reading τόλεως, which seems to have been known to Tertullian (adv. jud. 1.4, “extra civitatem”). The fact that Jesus was crucified outside Jerusalem influenced the synoptic transcripts of the parable in Mk 12.8 = Mt 21.89 = Lk 20.10. Mark’s version, ἀπέκτειναν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξέβαλαν αὐτὸν ἐξω τοῦ ἀμπελώνου, was altered into (ἐξέβαλον) ἐκβαλόντες αὐτὸν ἐξω τοῦ ἀμπελώνος (καὶ) ἀπέκτειναν. Crucifixion, like other capital punishments, in the ancient world was inflicted outside a city. To the writer this fact seems intensely significant, rich in symbolism. So much so that his mind hurries on to use it, no longer as a mere confirmation of the negative in v.10, but as a positive, fresh call to unworldliness. All such sensuous ideas as those implied in sacrificial meals mix up our religion with the very world from which we ought, after Jesus, to be withdrawing. We meet Jesus outside all this, not inside it. In highly figurative language (v.18), he therefore makes a broad appeal for an unworldly religious fellowship, such as is alone in keeping with the χάρις of God in Jesus our Lord.

Τόινυν (beginning a sentence as in Lk 20.28 τόινυν ἀπόδοτε κτλ., instead of coming second in its classical position), let us join Jesus ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, for he is living. The thought of the

1 The omission of ἔξουσιαν by D* M and the Old Latin does not affect the sense; ἔξουσιν then has the same meaning as in 61.
2 The blood, not the body, of the victim mattered in the atonement ritual. Hence, in our writer’s scheme of thought, as Peake observes, “while he fully recognises the fact of the Resurrection of Christ, he can assign it no place in his argument or attach to it any theological significance.”
metaphor is that of Paul's admonition μὴ συναχείματεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ (Ro 12:2), and the words τοῦ ὄνειδισμον αὐτοῦ φέροντες recall the warnings against false shame (11:26 12:2), just as the following (v.14) reason, οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν δεδ (in the present outward order of things) μένουσαν 1 πόλιν ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιηθοῦμεν recalls the ideas of 11:10-14. The appeal echoes that of 4:11 ὁποιδάσωμεν οὖν εἴσελθεν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν κατάπασιν. It is through the experiences of an unsettled and insulted life that Christians must pass, if they are to be loyal to their Lord. That is, the writer interprets ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς figuratively (“Egrediamur et nos a commercio mundi huius,” Erasmus). Philo had already done so (cp. specially quod. det. pot. 44), in a mystical sense: μακρὶν διοικέσαι τοῦ σωματικοῦ στρατόπεδου, μόνως ἂν οίτως ἐξπίσας ἰκέτης καὶ θεραπεύης ἔστεθαι τέλειος θεῶ. Similarly in de Ebrietate, 25, commenting on Ex 33:7, he explains that by ἐν τῷ στρατόπεδῳ (= ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ) Moses meant allegorically ἐν τῷ μετὰ σώματος βίῳ, the material interests of the worldly life which must be forsaken if the soul is to enjoy the inward vision of God. Such is the renunciation which the writer here has in view. It is the thought in 2 Clem. 51 (ὅθεν, ἀδελφοί, καταλείπεστε τὴν παροικίαν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ποιήσωμεν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς, καὶ μὴ φοβηθῶμεν ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) and 65 (οὐ δυνάμεθα τῶν δύο φίλων εἶναι: δεὶ δὲ ἡμᾶς τούτῳ ἀποταξαμένους ἐκεῖνοι χράσθαι). Only, our author weaves in the characteristic idea of the shame which has to be endured in such an unworldly renunciation.

The next exhortation in v.15 (ἀναφέρομεν) catches up ἐξερχόμεθα, as δι' αὐτοῦ carries on πρὸς αὐτὸν. For once applying sacrificial language to the Christian life, he reminds his readers again of the sacrifice of thanksgiving. The phrase καρπὸν χειλέως explains (τοῦτο ἐστιν) the sense in which θυσία αἰνέσεως is to be taken; it is from the LXX mistranslation (καρπὸν χειλέως) of Hos 14:3 where the true text has סְיָם (bullocks) instead of סְיָם (fruit). In ὁμολογοῦντων τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ, ὁμολογεῖν is used in the sense of ἔξωμολογεῖσθαι by an unusual 2 turn of expression. The ὄνομα means, as usual, the revealed personality. Probably there is an unconscious recollection of Ps 54:8 (ἔξωμολογήσομαι τῷ ὄνοματι σου); θυσία αἰνέσεως 8 is also from the psalter (e.g. 50:14 28). Ἀναφέρειν elsewhere in the NT is only used of spiritual sacrifices in the parallel passage 1 P 2:5 ἀνενέχθαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εἰπροσδέκτους θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. We have no sacri-

---

1 In the sense of Aeneas (Verg. Aen. iii. 85, 86, “da moenia fessis | et genus et mansuram urbem”). Note the assonance μένουσαν ... μέλλουσαν.
2 But ὁμολογεῖν τῷ occurs in 3 Es 4:26 5:8 (A).
3 In the LXX ἔξωμολογησία is generally preferred to αἰνέσεις as an equivalent for סְיָם.
ficial meals, the writer implies; we do not need them. Nor have
we any sacrifices—except spiritual ones. (The оив after δι' αὐτοῦ,
which Νο Α C Dο M vg syrkl boh arm eth Orig. Chrys. etc. re-
tain, is omitted by Νο D* P Ψ vt syr*; but Νο D* om. оив also
1 Co 6\(^7\), as D in Ro 7\(^{26}\)). The thought of 12\(^{28}\) is thus expanded,
with the additional touch that thankfulness to God is inspired
by our experience of Jesus (δι' αὐτοῦ, as Col 3\(^{17}\) εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ
θεῷ πατρί δι' αὐτοῦ); the phrase is a counterpart of διὰ τοῦ
ἀρχερᾶν in v. 11. This thank-offering is to be made διὰ παντός
(sc. χρόνου), instead of at stated times, for, whatever befalls us, we
owe God thanks and praise (cp. 1 Th 5\(^{10}\)). The Mishna (cp.
Berachoth 5\(^{4}\)) declares that he must be silenced who only calls
upon God's name with thankfulness in the enjoyment of good
(Berachoth 5\(^{8}\) οὐ προς παρά τὸ καλὸν μοιχός μικρῶς χάρις...
άναμελήσει).

The religious idea of thanksgiving was prominent in several quarters. According to Fronto (Loeb ed. i. p. 22) thank-offerings were more acceptable
to the gods than sin-offerings, as being more disinterested: Μάντινων δὲ παίδες
φαν καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς ἰδίους εἶναι θυσίων τάς χαριστηρίας ἡ τάς μειλιγίους.
Philo had taught (de Plant. 30) that εὐχαριστία is exceptionally sacred, and
that towards God it must be an inward sacrifice: θεῷ δὲ οὐκ ἔνσει γνησίως
eὐχαριστῆσαι δι' ἐν πολλοῖς κατασκευαῖς ἀναιθημάτων θυσίον—αὐτὸ
γὰρ εἴμαστα ὁ κόσμος λεροῦ ἐξώφυρων ἄν γένοιτο πρὸς τὴν τοῦτον τιμῆν—ἀλλὰ δὲ
ἐπαίνῳ καὶ ἱμανών, οὐχ οὖς ἡ γεγονὸς ἢ ζητάται φωνή, ἀλλὰ οὗ ὁ ἄνειδος καὶ
καθαρώτατος νοῦς ἐγνήσεις καὶ ἀναμελῆσαι. He proceeds (ibid. 33) to dwell
on the meaning of the name Judah, δὶ εἰρημενεῖται κυρίω εὐχομελήσις. Judah
was the last (Gn 29\(^{36}\)) son of Leah, for nothing could be added to praise of
God, nothing excels ὁ εὐλογῶν τῶν θεῶν νοῦς. This tallies with the well-known
rabbinic saying, quoted in Tanchuma, 55. 2: "in the time of messiah all
sacrifices will cease, but the sacrifice of thanksgiving will not cease; all
prayers will cease, but praises will not cease" (on basis of Jer 33\(^4\) and Ps
56\(^{14}\)). The praise of God as the real sacrifice of the pious is frequently noted
in the later Judaism (e.g. 2 Mac 10\(^{7}\)).

In v. 16 the writer notes the second Christian sacrifice of
charity. Εἰδοποια, though not a LXX term, is common in
Hellenistic Greek, especially in Epictetus, e.g. Fragm. 15 (ed.
Schenk), ἐπὶ χρηστότητι καὶ εἰδοποιά; Fragm. 45, οἶδαι κρέισον
. . . εἰδοποιας (where the context suggests "beneficence").
Κοινωνία in the sense of charity or contributions had been
already used by Paul (2 Co 9\(^{18}\) etc.). To share with others,
to impart to them what we possess, is one way of worshipping
God. The three great definitions of worship or religious service
in the NT (here, Ro 12\(^{1-2}\) and Ja 1\(^{27}\)) are all inward and
ethical; what lies behind this one is the fact that part of the
food used in ancient OT sacrifices went to the support of the
priests, and part was used to provide meals for the poor.
Charitable relief was bound up with the sacrificial system, for such
parts of the animals as were not burnt were devoted to these
beneficent purposes. An equivalent must be provided in our
spiritual religion, the writer suggests; if we have no longer any animal sacrifices, we must carry on at any rate the charitable element in that ritual. This is the force of εὐσεβεία καὶ κοινωνία (perhaps including the sacrifice of praise as well as εὐποία καὶ κοινωνία) θυσίας εὐάρεστεῖται (cp. II 6, 12). This counsel agrees with some rabbinic opinions (e.g. T. B. Sukkah, 59b: “he who offers alms is greater than all sacrifices”). The special duty of supporting the priesthood is urged in Sir 7, but our author shows no trace of the theory that almsgiving in general was not only superior to sacrifices but possessed atoning merit before God (Sir 314 ἐλεημονών γὰρ πατρὸς οὐκ ἐπλυσθήσεται, καὶ ἀντὶ ἀμαρτιῶν προσανακοδομηθήσεται σοι). In the later rabbinic theology, prayer, penitence, the study of the Torah, hospitality, charity, and the like were regarded as sacrifices equivalent to those which had been offered when the temple was standing. Thus Rabbi Jochanan b. Zakkai (cp. Schlatter’s Jochanan ben Zakkai, pp. 39 f.) consoled himself and his friends with the thought, derived from Hos 6, that in the practice of charity they still possessed a valid sacrifice for sins; he voiced the conviction also (e.g. b. baba bathra 10b) that charity (ἵλιτυίς) won forgiveness for pagans as the sin-offering did for Israel. In the Ep. Barnabas (27 f.) the writer quotes Jer 722, 23 (Zec 817) as a warning to Christians against Jewish sacrifices (αἰσθάνεσθαι αὐν ὁφείλομεν τὴν γνώμην τῆς ἀγαθωσύνης τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἵνα ἡμῶν λέγη, θέλων ἡμᾶς μὴ ὁμοίων πλανωμένου εἰκείου ποῦ προσάγωμεν αὐτῷ), but he quotes Ps 5119 as the description of the ideal sacrifice.

The tendency in some circles of the later Judaism to spiritualize sacrifice in general and to insist on its motive and spirit is voiced in a passage like Jth 16:

Also in a number of statements from various sources, of which that in Ep. Arist. 234 (τὰ μεγάλα ἔστι δόξας; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν τὸ τιμᾶ τὸν θεὸν τούτῳ δὲ ἐστιν οἱ δώροι οὐδὲ θυσίαι, ἀλλὰ ψυχής καθαρώτερα καὶ διαλύμενη διὰ τὰς) may be cited as a fair specimen. The congruous idea of bloodless sacrifices was common in subsequent Christianity. Thus the martyr Apollonius (Acta Apollonii, 44; Conybeare’s Monuments of Early Christianity, pp. 47-48) tells the magistrate, “I expected . . . that thy heart would bear fruit, and
XIII. 16, 17.]
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that thou wouldst worship God, the Creator of all, and unto Him continually offer thy prayers by means of compassion; for compassion shown to men by men is a bloodless sacrifice and holy unto God." So Jerome's comment runs on Ps 15:6 oυ μη συναγάγη τάς συναγωγάς αυτών έκ αλμάτων. Συνάγων, φρονίν, συναγώγας έκ τῶν ἐθνῶν, oυ δι' αλμάτων ταπεινα συνάγων τουτέστιν, oυ παρασκευάζω διὰ τῆς νομικῆς μοι προσέρχεσθαι λατρεῖα, δι' αἰνεθεως δε μάλλον καὶ τῆς ἀναμάκτου θυσίας (Aeneidota Maredsolana, iii. 123). Both in the Didache (14 κλάσατε ἄρτον καί εὐχαριστήσατε προσεξομολογησάμενοι τά παραπτώματα υμῶν, δῶς καθαρά ἡ θυσία υμῶν y) and in Justin Martyr (Dial. 117, πάντας ὅσο διὰ τοῦ ἀνάμωτος τούτων θυσίας, δι' παρέδοκεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός γίνεσθαι, τοιτέστιν ἐπί τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, τάς ἐρ τόπω τῆς γῆς γινομέναι ὑπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, προδαφών ὁ θεός μαρτυρεὶ εὐαρέστους ὑπάρχειν αὕτω), the very prayers at the eucharist are called θυσία, but this belongs to a later stage, when the eucharist or love-feast became the rite round which collections for the poor, the sick, prisoners, and travelling visitors (vv.15) gathered, and into which sacrificial language began to be poured (cp. Justin's Apol. i. 66, 67). In Ἱούδα Ἐφραίου we find a simpler and different line of practical Christianity.

Now for a word on the living ἡγούμενοι of the community (v.17), including himself (vv.18, 19).

17 Obey your leaders, submit to them; for they (αὕτης) are alive to the interests of your souls, as men who will have to account for their trust. Let their work be a joy to them and not a grief—which would be a loss to yourselves.

18 Pray for me, for I am sure I have a clean conscience; my desire is in every way to lead an honest life. 19 I urge you to this (i.e. to prayer) all the more, that I may get back to you the sooner.

The connexion of vv.17f. is not only with v.7, but with vv.8-16. It would be indeed a grief to your true leaders if you gave way to these ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι doctrines, instead of following men who are really (this is the force of αὕτης) concerned for your highest interests. Πείθωσε (cp. Epict. Fragm. 27, τῶν προσεμολυντα ... διασκοποῦ ... εἰ μὲν ἀμέλεινα, ἀκόειν χρὴ καὶ πείθωσαι αὕτω) καὶ ὑπείκετε (ὑπείκω is not a LXX term); strong words but justified, for the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ which Christian leaders preached meant authoritative standards of life for the community (cp. 1 Co 4.17. 21 14.87 etc.), inspired by the Spirit. Insubordination was the temptation at one pole, an overbearing temper (1 P 58) the temptation at the other. Our author knows that, in the case of his friends, the former alone is to be feared. He does not threaten penalties for disobedience, however, as Josephus does (c. Αριωνημ, ii. 194) for insubordination on the part of the Jewish laity towards a priest: ὁ δὲ γε τούτῳ μὴ πειθόμενος υφεξε δίκην ώς εἰς τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν ἀσέβων. Rather, he singles out the highminded devotion of these leaders as an inducement to the rank and file to be submissive. Αὕτης γὰρ ἄγρυπνοστὶν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὄμω, almost as Epictetus says of the true Cynic who zealously concerns himself with the moral welfare of men, ὑπερήτηροστὶν ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπων (iii. 22. 95; he uses the verb once in its literal sense of a soldier having to keep watch through the night, iii. 24. 32).
The force of the phrase is flattened by the transference of ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν to a position after ὅς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες (as A vg). The latter expression, ὅς (conscious that) λόγον ἀποδώσοντες (ὥς with fut. ptc. here only in NT), is used by Chrysostom, de Sacerdotio, iii. 18 (cp. vi. 1), to enforce a sense of ministerial responsibility (εἰ γὰρ τῶν οἰκείων πλημμελημάτων εὐθύνας ὑπέχοντες φημίτομεν, ὥς οὐ δυνητόμενον τὸ πῦρ ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκεῖνο, τί χρὴ πείσονθαι προσδοκάν τὸν ὑπὲρ τοσοῦτον ἀπολογείσθαι μέλλοντα;), but in Πρὸς Ἐβραίους the writer assumes that the ἤγοιμενοι are doing and will do their duty. Any sadness which they may feel is due, not to a sense of their own shortcomings, but to their experience of wilfulness and error among their charges. Λόγον ἀποδώσοντες is more common in the NT than the equivalent λόγον διδόναι, which recurs often in Greek literature, e.g. in Plato's Sympos. 189δ, πρόσεχε τῶν νοτιο καὶ οὕτως λέγε ὅς δώσων λόγον, or in the complaint of the Fayyum peasants (A.D. 207), who petition the local centurion that the disturbers of their work may be called to account: ἐξείδοντες, εάν σοι δοθῇ, κελεύσαι αὐτούς ἄχθηναι εἰπε σε λόγον ἀποδώσοντας περὶ τούτον (GCP. i. 35425.26). In Clem. Alex. Quis dīv. salv. 42, John says to the captain of the robbers, ἐγὼ Χριστῷ λόγον δόσω ὑπὲρ σοῦ.

The εἰνα clause (ἐνα μετὰ χαράς τούτο ποιῶν καὶ μὴ στενάξοντες) goes back to πείθασθε . . . ἤπεικετε. The members have it in their power to thwart and disappoint their ἤγοιμενοι. Τοῦτο π. refers to ἀγραπνοῦσιν, and the best comment on καὶ μὴ στενάξοντες is in Denny’s hymn:

“O give us hearts to love like Thee,  
Like Thee, O Lord, to grieve  
Far more for others’ sins than all  
The wrongs that we receive.”

The last four words, ἀλυσιτελές γὰρ ὑμῶν τοῦτο, form a rhetorical litotes, as when Pindar (Olym. i. 53) remarks, ἀκέρδεια λέογχεν θαμανα κακαγόρος. It would be a “sore loss” to them if their lives failed to answer the hopes and efforts of their ἤγοιμενοι, hopes like those implied in 6 and 10. Ἀλυσιτελές (“no profit”) is probably used after λόγον ἀποδώσοντες with its sense of “reckoning.” Compare the use of the adverb in Theophrastus, viii. ιι (οὐ γὰρ μόνον ψεύδονται ἄλλα καὶ ἀλυσιτελῶς ἀπαλλάττοντοι), and the dry remark of Philo (in Flaccum, 6), speaking about the attempt of the Alexandrian anti-Semites to erect images in Jewish places of worship, when he says that Flaccus might have known ὅσο ὁ λυσιτελές ἔνθα πάτρα κωμεῖν! The term lent itself to such effective under-statements, as in Philo’s aphorism (Fragments of Philo, ed. J. Rendel Harris, p. 70) τὸ ἐπιορκεῖν ἄνοίγουν καὶ ἀλυσιτελέστατον.
The next word (v.18) is about himself. Προσεύχεσθε (continue praying) περὶ (cp. 2 Mac 1 ἐκ νῦν δίδε ἡγεμὸν προσευχόμενοι περὶ ὑμῶν) ἡμῶν (plural of authorship), πειθόμεθα (a modest confidence: “whatever some of you may think, I believe”) γὰρ ὅτι καλὴν συνείδησιν ἔχομεν. He is conscious of a keen desire (θέλοντες as in Ῥομ.12) to act in a straightforward, honest way; hence he can ask their prayers. Hence also they may feel confident and eager about praying for him. The writer chooses καλὴν (cp. on v.9) instead of ἀγαθὴν as his adjective for συνείδησιν, probably for the sake of assonance with the following καλῶς, perhaps also to avoid the hiatus after ἦμων. When he adds, ἐν πᾶσιν (here neuter) καλῶς θέλοντες ἀναστρέφεσθαι (a phrase which occurs in the Pergamos inscript. 459 καλῶς καὶ ἐνδοξῶς ἀναστράφησι, in the 1st century B.C. inscription (Priene, I 1 ἔκτος ἀναστρέφομεν ἐν πᾶσιν φίλανθρωπῶν), and in Epict. iv. 46, ἐστή σας ἂν εἴναι δύνασαι καθ’ ἡμέραν, ὅτι καλῶς ἀναστράφησι ἐν τῶι τῷ ἐργῷ, etc.), the language recalls that of 2 Co 1 ἐν πᾶσιν (here neuter) καὶ ἐνδοξῶς ἀναστράφησι, in the 1st century B.C. inscription (Priene, I 1 ἔκτος ἀναστρέφομεν ἐν πᾶσιν φίλανθρωπῶν), and in Epict. iv. 46, ἐστή σας ἂν εἴναι δύνασαι καθ’ ἡμέραν, ὅτι καλῶς ἀναστράφησι ἐν τῶι τῷ ἐργῷ, etc.), the language recalls that of 2 Co 1 where Paul appeals for the help of his readers’ prayers and pleads his honesty of conscience (τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνείδησιν ἡμῶν, ἐν πᾶσιν ἀναστράφημεν κτλ.). Perhaps the writer is conscious that his readers have been blaming him, attributing (say) his absence from them to unworthy motives, as in the case of Paul (e.g. 1 Th 2, 2 Co 117). This may be the feeling which prompts the protest here and the assurances in vv.19–23. “I am still deeply interested in you; my absence is involuntary; believe that.”

Καὶ is inserted before περὶ by D vt Chrys. (possibly as a reminiscence of 1 Th 5), i.e. pray as well as obey (“et orate pro nobis,” d); this would emphasize the fact that the writer belonged to the ἡγούμενοι. But the plural in v.18 is not used to show that the writer is one of the ἡγούμενοι mentioned in v.17, for whom the prayers of the community are asked. He was one of them; ἡμῶν here is the literal plural already used in 5 ὅτι ἄναστράφημεν κτλ.). There are apt parallels in Cicero’s de Officiis, ii. 24 (“Quem nos . . . e Graeco in Latinum convertimus. Sed tore hoc de genere, de quaerenda, de collocaanda pecunia vellens etiam de utenda”), and OP. x. 1296 (the letter of a boy to his father, ποιῶ . . . φιλοσοφόμεν καὶ ἀναφύγομεν. Πειθόμενα (πειθόμαι 256. 1319. 2127) has been changed into πεπολύθαμεν by ὑπὸ C D Ψ W 6. 104. 326 (Blass), probably because the latter (“we are confident”) is stronger than πειθόμενα, which (cp. Ac 26) only amounts to “we believe” (though implying “we are sure”). Retaining πειθόμενα, A. Bischoff (Zeits. für die neut. Wiss. ix. 171 f.) evades the difficulty by altering the order of the words: προσεύξῃ, περὶ ὑμῶν καλὴν γὰρ εἰς ἐχθεῖς, ὅτι πειθόμενα ἐν πᾶσιν κ. ὅτι ἀναστρέφεσθαι, i.e. taking ὅτι as “because.”

As in Philem 22, the writer’s return is dependent on his friends’ prayers (v.19); specially (see p. 17) let them intercede with God for his speedy restoration to them, ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῇ ὑμῖν (cp. OP. διὰ τὰ μεγαλεῖς ἀποκαταστάθη μοι δ ὑλός). Τάχιον may mean “the sooner” (i.e. than if you did not pray) or simply “soon” (as in v.23, where, as in Hellenistic Greek, it has lost
its comparative meaning). What detained the writer, we cannot tell. Apparently (v. 23) it was not imprisonment.

A closing prayer and doxology, such as was not uncommon in epistles of the primitive church (e.g. 1 Th 5:23, 1 P 5:11), now follows. Having asked his readers to pray for him, he now prays for them.

20 May the God of peace "who brought up" from the dead our Lord (φθορίζεις) Jesus (see p. lixiii), "the" great "Shepherd of the sheep, with the blood of the eternal covenant," 21 furnish you with everything that is good for the doing of his will, creating in your lives by Jesus Christ what is acceptable in his own sight! To him (i.e. God) be (sc. εὐθν) glory for ever and ever. Amen.

"Ο θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης means the God of saving bliss (see on 1:11), εἰρήνη being taken in a sense like the full OT sense of the secure prosperity won by the messianic triumph over the hostile powers of evil (cp. 2:14, 7:9). There is no special allusion here, as in Paul's use of the phrase (Ro 15:8, 2 Co 13:11 etc.), to friction in the community; the conflict is one in which God secures εἰρήνη for his People, a conflict with evil, not strife between members of the church. The method of this triumph is described in some OT phrases, which the writer uses quite apart from their original setting. The first quotation is from Is 63:11 τοῦ ὅ ἀναβάλασας ἐκ τῆς γῆς τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων, which the writer applies to Jesus—his only reference to the resurrection (cp. on vv. 11, 12). But there is no need (with Blass) to follow Chrysostom in reading τῆς γῆς here for νεκρῶν. With ἀναγάλιν in this sense, ἐκ νεκρῶν (so Ro 10:7) or some equivalent (ἐκ ἀδόν, Ps 30:4, Wis 16:13, Joseph. Ant. vi. 14. 2) is much more natural. In τῶν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τῶν μέγαν, ὁ μέγας is applied to him as in 4:14, 10:21. The figure of the ποιμήν, which never occurs in Paul, plays no rôle in our author's argument as it does in 1 Peter (2:25, 5:4); he prefers τερευς or ἄρχωνος, and even here he at once passes to the more congenial idea of the διαβήκη. Jesus is the great Shepherd, as he has made himself responsible for the People, identifying himself with them at all costs, and sacrificing his life in order to save them for God. But as death never occurs in the OT description of the divine shepherd, not even in the 23rd Psalm, the writer blends with his quotation from Isaiah another—ἐν αἵματι διαβήκης αἰωνίου, a LXX phrase from Zech 9:11 (ἐν αἵματι διαβήκης σου ἑσακαίτεσθαι δεσμούς σου), Is 55:3 (διαβήκουμεν ἐν διαβήκης αἰωνίων), etc. Ἐν αἵματι διαβήκης αἰωνίου goes with ἀναγάλιν, not with τὸν ποιμένα, in which case τῶν would need to be prefixed to the phrase. Jesus was raised to present his blood as the atoning sacrifice which mediated the διαβήκη (9:11, 24f.). To the resurrection (cp. on v. 12) is thus ascribed what elsewhere in the epistle is ascribed to the εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὰ ἅγια. But as the stress falls on αἰωνίου, then more is
implied than that apart from the αἰμα no διαθήκη could have been instituted. In reality the thought resembles that of 9:14 (διὰ διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίαν ἑαυτῶν προσήγεικεν ... καθαρεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ... εἰς τὸ λατρείαν θεῷ ἐστίν), where εἰς τὸ λατρείαν θεῷ corresponds to εἰς τὸ ποιήσαι τὸ θελήμα αὐτοῦ below; ἐν κτλ. is "equipped with," not "in virtue of." This interpretation is in line with the author's argument in chs. 7-10. "Videtur mihi apostolus hoc belle, Christum ita resurrexisse a mortuis, ut mors tamen eius non sit aboluta, sed aeternum vigorem retineat, ac si dixisset: Deus filium suum excitavit, sed ita ut sanguis, quern semel in morte fudit, ad sanctionem foederis aeterni post resurrectionem viget fructumque suum proferat perinde ac si semper fueret" (Calvin). In καταρτίσαι (the aor. optative) 1 κτλ., there is a parallel to the thought of Ph 2:15. "Εἰς τὸ ποιήσαι τὸ θελήμα αὐτοῦ recalls the language of 10:56, and διὰ 'ησοῦ Χριστοῦ goes with ποιῶν: the power of God in our lives as for our lives (v. 20) works through the person of Jesus Christ. To take διὰ Ἰ. Χ. with τὸ εὐδρεστὸν ἐνώπιον αὑτοῦ yields an unobjectionable sense, corresponding to the thought of v. 15. But τὸ ... αὑτοῦ stands quite well by itself (cf. 1 Jn 3:22).

The writer makes no such use of the shepherd and flock metaphor as, e.g., Philo had done. The Jewish thinker (Vit. Mos. i. 11) argues that the calling of a shepherd is the best preparation for anyone who is to rule over men; hence "kings are called shepherds of their people" as a title of honour. He also interprets the sheep as the symbol of a nature which is capable of improvement (de sacrif. Abel. 34, προκόπης δὲ πρόβατον, ὥς καὶ αὐτὸ δηλοὶ τούτονα, σομβολον). The classical habit of describing kings as shepherds of their people would help to make the metaphor quite intelligible to readers of non-Jewish origin. Compare, e.g., the saying of Cyrus (Xenophon, Cyropæedia, viii. 2. 14), that a good shepherd resembled a good king, τὸν τὰ γὰρ νομέα χρῆαι ἐφ Εὐδαιμονα τὰ κτήνη ποιήσαντα χρῆσαι αὐτοῦ, ὅ δὲ πρόβαταν εὐδαιμονα, τὸν τὰ βασιλέα οἰκονομῶν εὐδαιμονας πᾶλις καὶ ἀνθρώπους ποιοῦντα χρῆσαι αὐτοῦ.

Παρτί was soon furnished with the homiletic addition of ἐργῷ (C K M P syr sah arm eth Chrys. Thdt. etc.), or even ἐργῷ καὶ λόγῳ (A, from 2 Th 2:17). Ποιῶν has either αὐτῶ (καὶ A C* 33 1 1288 boh) or εὔνω (Greg. Nyss.) or αὐτὸς (d 1912) prefixed. Hort, admitting that "it is impossible to make sense of αὐτῶ" (B. Weiss, Blass═εὐνω), maintains that αὐτῶς is original. It is a homiletic insertion, out of which αὐτῶ arose by corruption. Ἡμῶν (καὶ D M Ψ 33. 104. 181. 326. 917. 927. 1288. 1739. 1912, etc. syr vs sah boh arm) is merely an error for ὑμῖν, due to the preceding ἡμῶν.

A personal postscript (vv. 22-24) is now added, as 1 P 5:12-14 after 5:10-11.

22 I appeal to you, brothers (3:1-12 10:19), to bear with this appeal of mine. It is but a short letter.

1 This lonely occurrence of the optative points to its tendency after the LXX to disappear; thus, apart from μὴ γενοῖτο, it only occurs once in a writer like Epictetus (iii. 5. 11).
22 You must understand that our brother Timotheus is now free. If he comes soon, he and I will see you together.

23 Salute all your leaders and all the saints. The Italians salute you.

24 Grace be with you all. Amen.

The Timotheus referred to (in v. 28) is probably the Timotheus who had been a colleague of Paul. The other allusions have nothing to correspond with them in the data of the NT. But there is no ground for supposing that vv. 22-25 were added, either by the writer himself (Wrede) or by those who drew up the canon, in order to give a Pauline appearance to the document (see Introd., pp. xxviii f.). Seeberg's reasons for regarding vv. 22-25 as a fragment of some other note by the same writer are that implies not a church but a small group of Christians, and that vv. 18-28 presuppose different situations; neither reason is valid. The style and contents are equally unfavourable to Perdelwitz's theory, that vv. 22-25 were added by some one who wrote out a copy of the original λόγος παρακλήσεως and forwarded it to an Italian church.

In v. 22 ἀνέχεσθαι, for which ἀνέχεσθε (J. Pricaeus apud Tit 19) is a needless conjecture, takes a genitive (as in 2 Ti 4:7 τῆς γνωστικικὰς διδασκαλίας ὅπως ἄνεχονται, and in Philo, quod omnis ὅρθος, 6, καὶ πῶς πατρὸς μὴν ἢ μητρὸς ἑπιταγμάτων παίδες ἄνεχονται, γνώριμοι δὲ δὲν ἄν υφήγηται διακελεύονται). It has been flattened into ἄνεχθαι (infinitive as in 1 P 2:11) by D* Ψ vg arm 181. 436. 1288. 1311. 1873, etc. (Blass). A written homily may be like a speech (Ac 13:16), a λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως (cp. on 12:5); παρακλητὸς echoes παρακάλεω. He is not the only early Christian writer who mildly suggested that he had not written at undue length (cp. e.g. 1 P 5:19 διὰ ἑλάγιων ἔγραψα, παρακάλων κτλ.; Barn 15:8) καὶ γὰρ ("etenim" as 42) διὰ βραχέων (αὐτ. λόγων) ἐπέστειλα 1 (epistolary aorist) ὕμι. Διὰ βραχέων was a common phrase in this connexion; e.g. Lucian's Toxaris, 56 (πειστών καὶ ταύτα σοι νομοθετοῦντι καὶ διὰ βραχέων λεκτέων, μὴ καὶ κάμηρς ἡμῖν τῇ ἄκοη συμπερινοτῶν). Πρὸς Ὁβραίους may be read aloud easily in one hour. The writer has had a good deal to say (πολὺς, 511), and he has now said it. Not I hope, he adds pleasantly, at too great length! As for the δυσερμήνευτος λέγει, that is another question which he does not raise here. He is not pleading for a patient reading, because he has had to compress his argument into a short space, which makes it hard to follow, owing to its highly condensed character. What he does appear to anticipate is the possibility of his readers resenting the length at which he has

1 For ἐπέστειλα (here as in Ac 15:20 21; Theophr. 24:28 ἐπιστέλλων μὴ γράψων κτλ. = "write," "send a letter"), see Laqueur's Quaest. Epigraph. et Papyr. Selectae, 16 f. (ἐπιστέλλων = "communicare aliquid cum alioque sive per hominem sive per epistolam ").
When the younger Pliny returned a book to Tacitus, with some criticisms upon its style and matter, he said he was not afraid to do so, since it was those most deserving praise who accepted criticism patiently ("neque enim ulli patientius reprehunduntur quam qui maxime laudari merentur," Epp. vii. 20). The author of Πρὸς Ἑβραίους might have taken this line, for he has done justice to the good qualities of his friends (e.g. 6th. 10 13ff.), even in reproving them for backwardness and slowness. But he prefers to plead that his words have not been long; his readers surely cannot complain of being wearied by the length of his remarks. Not long before, Seneca had made the, same kind of observation to Lucilius (Ep. xxxviii. 1) about short letters being more effective than lengthy discussions. "Merito exigis ut hoc inter nos epistularum commercium frequentemus, plurimum proficit sermo, quia minutatim inrepet animo... aliquid utendum est et illis, ut īta dicam, concionibus, ubi qui dubitat impellendas est: ubi vero non hoc agendum est ut velit discere sed ut discat, ad haec submissiona uestra usiendum est. facilius intrant et haerent: nec enim multis opus est, sed efficacia.

The literary critic Demetrius considered that the length of a letter should be carefully regulated (τὸ δὲ μέγεθος συνεστάλθω τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, De Elocut. 228); letters that were too long and stilted in expression became mere treatises, συγγράμματα, as in the case of many of Plato’s, whereas the true ἐπιστολή, according to Demetrius (ibid. 231), should be φιλοσοφόνισις in a brief compass (σύντομος). Which would apply to Πρὸς Ἑβραίους. Erasmus comments: “Scripsi paucis, ut ipse vos brevi visurus.” He may have, but he does not say so.

In v. 28 γινώσκετε is imperative; he is conveying a piece of information. See, e.g., Tebt. P. 37 2 (73 B.C.) γινώσκε κεφαλάν... προσεληνυθέναι Δημητρίῳ: ibid. 12 2 (118 B.C.) 36 2 56 5. The construction with the participle is common (e.g. Lk 8 46); you must understand τὸν ἀδελφόν ἤμων (omitted by Νο. Β, Κ Ψ 6 Chrys. etc.) ἡμῶν ἀπολευμένον, i.e. “is (set) free,” not necessarily from prison. The general sense, ranging from “is free” to “has started,” may be illustrated, e.g., from the application of a woman to leave Alexandria via Pharos (O.P. 1271 5, iii 3. D.: ἀξίω γράψας σε τῷ ἐπιστρῆς τῆς Φάρου ἀπολύσαι εἰς κατὰ τὸ ἑδος), or from B.G. I. 27 12-18 (καθ’ ἥμεραν προσδεχόμενα διμισσώρια ἦστε ἐως σήμερον μηδένα ἀπολευμένα τῶν μετὰ σῖτου),
where δ. = “has set out,” as in Ac 28:22 (ἐπέλυσεν). The interpretation of the next words μεθ’ αὐτοῦ ἔλαβε τάχιον ἔρχεται δύσωμι ὑμᾶς depends upon whether Timotheus is supposed to join the writer or to journey straight to the community addressed. In the latter case, the writer, who hopes to be coming soon (v. 19) himself, looks forward to meeting him there. In the former case, they will travel together. It is natural to assume that when the writer sent this message, Timotheus was somewhere else, and that he was expected ere long to reach the writer. For δύσωμι = visit, see 3 Jn 14 ἐπιτίθει δὲ συνεχῶς ἵλειν σε, etc. Ἐλαβε τάχιον ἔρχεται may mean either, “as soon as he comes,” or “if he comes soon.” The latter suits the situation implied in v. 19 better. The writer (in v. 19) asks the prayers of his readers, that some obstacle to his speedy return may be removed. If this obstacle were the hindrance that kept Timotheus from joining him on a journey which they had already planned to the church (Riggenbach), he would have said, “Pray for Timotheus, I cannot leave for you till he rejoins me.” But the idea is: as the writer is rejoining his friends soon (he hopes), he will be accompanied by Timotheus, should the latter arrive before he has to start. Written advice is all very well, but he hopes soon to follow up this λόγος παρακλήσεως with personal intercourse, like Seneca in Ep. vi. 5 (“plus tamen tibi et uiua vox et convictus quam oratio proderit. in rem praesentem uenias oportet, primum quia homines amplius oculis quam auribus credunt, deinde quia longum iter est per praecepta, breue et efficax per exempla”).

The greeting comes as usual last (v. 24). Αὐσπιστάσθη καλά is an unusual turn, however; the homily was evidently sent to the community, who are told to greet all their ἱγουμενοι. This finds its nearest parallel in Paul’s similar injunction (Ro 16:23) to the Ephesian Christians to salute this and that eminent member of their circle. Still, no other NT church is bidden to salute its leaders; and though the writer plainly wishes to reinforce his counsel in v. 17, the πάντας suggests that the persons addressed were “part of the whole church of a large city . . . a congregation attached to some household” (Zahn); they are to convey the writer’s greetings to all the leaders of the larger local church—and to all their fellow-members (καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἄγιοὺς being more intelligible, in the light of a passage like Ph 4:21 ἀπασπάσασθε πάντα ἄγιον). To his personal greetings he now adds greetings from some Italians. In οί ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, ἀπό may have its usual sense of “domiciled at,” (practically = ἐν), as, e.g., in O.P. i. 81 (A.D. 49-50), where τῶν ἀπ’, ὄξω μύχων means “the inhabitants of Oxyrhynchus,” or in Πληγμα . . . ἀπὸ Φίλαι, i.e. at Phmau (ostracon of A.D. 192, quoted in Deissmann’s Light from the East, p. 186). If it thus means residents in Italy, the writer is in Italy.
himself. But οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, on the analogy of Ac 21:27 (οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἁγιᾶς Ἰουδαίων), might equally well mean Italians resident for the time being outside Italy; in this case the writer, who is also abroad, is addressing some Italian community, to which their countrymen forward greetings. Grammatically, either rendering is possible, and there is no tradition to decide the question. Perhaps οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας is more natural, however, as a description of some Italian Christians abroad who chanced to be in the same locality as the writer and who take this opportunity of sending their greetings by him to an Italian community. If the writer was in Italy, we should have expected πάντες οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, considering the size of Italy and the scattered Christian communities there at this period.

The final benediction, ἡ χάρις (sc. ἐστὶν ο记者表示 eἰ) μετὰ πάντων ἄμην (Tit 3:15, 2 Ti 4:22) has a liturgical ἄμην, which is omitted by κἂν W fuld sah 33; the homily was, of course, intended to be read aloud at worship.
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Green, T. H., 211.
Gregory of Nazianzus, 221.
Gregory of Nyssa, 8.
Grotius, 79.
Grouping of MSS, lxxii.
Growth, 72 f.
Habakkuk, 157 f.
Haggai, 221.
Hards, Laying on of, 75.
Hardy, Thomas, 175.
Harnack, 73, 148, 226.
Heaven, 60.
"Hebrews," meaning of the title, xv.
"Heirship," liii, 5.
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Hermas, xviii, 217, etc.
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Hickie, W. J., 19.
Hicks, 22.
Holtzmann, O., 233.
Holzmeister, 3.
Hope, 154.
Hospitality, 224 f.
Household of God, 42.
Image of God, the, 6.
Impossible things, the four, 76.
Individualism, 147.
Infinitive, the epechegetic, 63; for other uses of the infinitive, see 35, 47, 83, 96.
Inns, 224 f.
Inpiration, 22, 44, 150.
Insubordination, 239.
Intercession of saints and angels, xxxix, xli, 16, 100, 213.
Isaac, 178.
Isaiah, martyrdom of, 188, 189.
Isidore, 128.
Isokrates, lvi, lvii, 194, 204.
Italy, xxi, 246 f.
Jacob, 178.
Jebb, R. C., 224.
Jephthah, 185.
Jeremiah, xl, 107 f., 139 f., 188.
Jerome, 26, 81, 166, 202, 239.
Jesus, birth of, lii; death of, xxxiv f., xxxix, 27 f.; human characteristics of, xxxvi, xliii f., 65, 101, 192 f.; names of, lxiii; prayers of, 66; priesthood of, xxxv f., 98 f.; teaching of, 19; as Son, xxiii f., xl f., 11, 66 f., 164, etc.
Joseph, 178.
Josephus, xxii, 139, 163, etc.
Joshua, 43, 52, 182.
Joy, 154; of Jesus, 14, 196.
Judaism, xxvi f.
Judith, 186.
Juristic terms, 87, 97, 111, 127 f., 138.
Justin Martyr, xiv, xlix, 11, 33, 41, 75, 99, 164, 239.
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Keble, 229.
Kennedy, H. A. A., xl, lv, 123, 209.
Kingdom of God, xxxiii.
Kögel, Julius, xxvii.
Kypke, x, 61, 203, 215, 222.
Lactantius, 7, 42, 93.
Lake, Kirsopp, lxx.
Latin Versions, lxix, 91, 155, 171, 182, 225.
Law, the, 96 f.
Levitical priesthood, 94, 96.
Libations, 119.
Living God, the, 47, 54, 152.
Logos, the, xxxiv, xlvii, xlix, 6, 54 f.
Loofs, 218.
"Lord," liv, lxiii.
Love, xxxv, xxxvi, 82, 146 f.
Lucian, 20, 56, 212, etc.
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Maccabean martyrs, 152, 183 f., 186 f., 189, 192, 196.
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Marett, R. R., 123.
Marriage, 226 f.
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Melchizedek, xxxii f., 90 f.
Menander, 3, 7, 85.
Ménégaz, xxi, 159.
Merits of the fathers, xxxix, 229.
Michael, 37, 100, 107, 185.
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Montefiore, C. G., xxxvii, 77.
Moses, 40 f., 107, 216 f.
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Novatians, xx.

Oath of God, 86 f., 99.
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Odes of Solomon, 34, 147, 196, 207.
Oecumenius, lxxiv, 74, 99, 128.
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Old Testament, use of, xvi, lxxiv, 25, 129, 215 f., etc.; argument from silence of, 92.
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Origen, on authorship of “Hebrews,” xviii f.; on interpretation of, 25, 70, 80, 81, 129, 131, 165, 176, 188.

Parables of Jesus, 5, 30; Jewish, 111.
Paronomasia, 29, 66, 154, etc.
Participles, use of, 32, 293.
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Paul, and the authorship of “Hebrews,” xviii, xxix: and author of “Hebrews,” xxxix f., xlvii, 10, 18, 34, 126, 155, 197, 216, etc.
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Peace, 205 f., 242.

People of God, the, xxxviii, 39, etc.
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Perfect tense, lix, 91, 94, etc.
Persecution, 36, 153 f.
Peter, First Epistle of, xv, xvii, xxxvi, lxiv, 36, 124, 175, etc.
Pfleiderer, lii, 233.
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Prisoners, 154, 225.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temptation, 36, 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temptation of Jesus, the, 38 f., 59.</td>
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<td>Wisdom, the Book of, xxxi, lii, lvii, 7, 34, 90, 106, 160, etc.</td>
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<tr>
<td>Women, 184.</td>
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<tr>
<td>World, creation of the, 5 f., 30 159 f.; end of the, 15, 52, 221.</td>
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<tr>
<td>“World,” The, 168.</td>
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<tr>
<td>Worship, lxxxiii f., 11, 125, 237.</td>
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<tr>
<td>Wrath of God, xxxv, 48.</td>
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<td>Wrede, W., xxix, 70, 244.</td>
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### III. QUOTATIONS OR REMINISCENCES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENESIS</th>
<th>NUMBERS</th>
<th>PROVERBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>31:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:9</td>
<td>51 f.</td>
<td>31:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:17, 18</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:3</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:24</td>
<td>165 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:11</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:1</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:18-20</td>
<td>90 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:2</td>
<td>224 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:12</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:16 f.</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:1</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:38</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:9</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:31</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:26</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:21</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:12</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:18</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:6</td>
<td>129 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:26</td>
<td>113 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:10</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:10</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:7</td>
<td>105, 230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>89 f., 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:37</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>14:2</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>9, 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:4</td>
<td>64, 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deuteronomy:**
- 1:11
- 11:24
- 223
- 26:11
- 150
- 157
- 37
- 134
- 242

**Isaiah:**
- 8:17
- 33
- 3:12
- 2:12
- 2:12

**Jeremiah:**
- 31:16
- 109 f., 141

**Hosea:**
- 14:2
- 236

**Haggai:**
- 2:6
- 221
- 2:21
- 221

**Zechariah:**
- 242