

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1855.

No. I.

J. W. Alexander

ART. I.—*Remarks on the Studies and Discipline of the Preacher.*

THE habits of a young minister, in respect to mental culture, are very early formed, and hence no one can begin too soon to regulate his closet-practice by maxims derived from the true philosophy of mind, and the experience of successful scholars. Early introduction to active labour, in an extended field, partaking of a missionary and itinerant character, may, amidst much usefulness, spoil a man for life, in all that regards progress of erudition, and productiveness of the reasoning powers. Such a person may accomplish much in the way of direct and proximate good; but his fruit often dies with him, and he does little in stimulating, forming, and enriching the minds of others. On the other hand, a zealous young scholar, captivated with the intellectual or literary side of ministerial work, may addict himself to books in such a manner as to sink the preacher in the man of learning, and spend his days without any real sympathy with the affectionate duties of the working clergy. The due admixture of the contemplative with the active, of learning with labour, of private cultivation with public spirit, is a *juste milieu* which few attain, but which cannot be too earnestly recommended.

is certainly no less intrinsically credible—that Moses wrote this book, by divine direction, to prepare the people for his legislation, and to guard against the errors into which they were perpetually falling afterwards—and all is clear; the parts succeed each other in a natural, intelligible order; the selection of materials explains itself; and the reader becomes conscious of that undefinable but not unreal sense of intellectual ease, which ever accompanies a clear perception of an author's general drift, as well as of his meaning in particular expressions.

Nidor Loversal

ART. III.—*Exegesis of Heb. vi. 4-8.*

THE exegetical importance and interest of this passage are not so great as the historical and doctrinal. It is this passage, a rigid interpretation of which is said to have induced the Montanists, the Novatians, and afterwards the Donatists, to refuse admission to the church to the *lapsed*, that is, to those who had in any way become guilty of idolatry, adultery, or murder. Since Spanheim and Wetstein, and latterly mainly through the influence of Hug, the opinion has gained currency that the Latin Church, whose treatment of the *lapsed* was a more lenient one, as the opposing schismatics quoted this to them irrefragable scriptural authority in support of their own manner of proceeding, was led by this interpretation, which was so much at variance with the other teachings of Paul, to deny first the Pauline authorship, then the apostolicity, and consequently the canonicity of this Epistle, whilst (say the advocates of this opinion) the Greek Church not being involved in the controversy of this practical question, and hence more moderate, because not blinded by the heat of the contest, adopted a different exegesis of the passage from that current in the West. When the Latin Church receded afterwards from this strict interpretation, which made the passage refer to true Christians, they also received this Epistle as canonical. This theory, however, confessedly got up to account for the

doubt that overhangs the authorship of this Epistle, is opposed by most modern writers of note, (Tholuck, Bleek,) and by Davidson in his Introduction, vol. iii. Still there is less of mere hypothesis, and more of verisimilitude about this assumption than in that of Storr, whose supposition was that Marcion having been excommunicated in Pontus and gone to Rome, in the hope of being admitted to church membership there, when he found that the Church of Rome was also very strict against the lapsed, mainly appealing to this passage, denied that this was Paul's doctrine, because the epistle had been written (said he) by Barnabas, who was of a Judaizing tendency. (Gal. ii. 13.) Thus, Storr says, the report arose in the Western Church that Barnabas, and not Paul, was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Luther also, as he interpreted this passage as treating of true Christians, or rather because he understood the writer to maintain that repentance was impossible to those who sin after baptism, doubted the canonicity of this Epistle. Among modern theologians, those who acknowledge a canon at all, have mostly interpreted this passage in such a manner as to make it agree with their general system.

As to this *interpretation* itself, among the ancients who rendered *φωτίζεν* by "baptize," many were led to delay baptism until a late period of life, as they understood *παραπίπτειν* to include *any* grievous sin. The Romanists who follow the traditional interpretation, maintain that sin after baptism forfeits grace, which, however, can be restored by the sacrament of penance. Those Anglicans who, with any logical consistency, hold to baptismal regeneration, but not to the doctrine that penance is a sacrament by which forgiveness can be secured, maintain that should baptized persons fall into any grievous sin, especially a second time, there is no certainty of forgiveness. All that remains, in this case, is the baptism of tears, and the galling chain of doubt; the fallen cannot appropriate again what was given plenary in baptism. Among Protestants, there can really be but two interpretations, (as far as relates to the scope and doctrine of the passage as a whole,) that of the Calvinists, and that of their opponents; of those who hold to the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, and those

who deny it. Lutherans and Arminians teach that the terms used apply to regenerate persons only, and that these are pronounced liable to fall. Calvinists maintain that the "analogy of faith" teaches plainly the saints' perseverance, and that this passage cannot contradict that doctrine; hence the language, strong as it is, cannot apply to the elect, none of whom, being all given to Christ, can be lost. There is, however, a class of Calvinistic theologians who feel constrained, by the force of the terms used, to apply them to true Christians, and to avoid the unscriptural and illogical doctrine, "*renatos labi posse*," which is moreover false in psychology and reason, they adopt various expedients. Some lay special stress on the fact that *παραπεσόντας* implies a *condition*; this, they say, can never happen in reality. Others endeavour to weaken the force of *ἀδύνατον*; still others prop their theory by the fact that *ἀνακαινίζειν* is in the active voice. The last two, being a matter of pure exegesis, will be spoken of in their proper place. Those who maintain that the sacred writer makes a statement involving an hypothesis of what is impossible, generally refer for a parallel to the case of Paul's shipwreck, where he knows that the ship's company will be saved, and yet he tells the soldiers that unless the crew remain in the vessel, they cannot be saved. But

1. This passage furnishes neither parallel nor explanation. God had revealed his purpose that all should be saved; this purpose the inspired apostle had announced; but knowing that in the divine mind end and means are purposed together, he was, as all men are, bound to use all lawful means to preserve life, the revealed will of God, and not his purpose, being the rule of human action. Such a distinction, however, cannot be applied in an inspired epistle, without express intimation to that purpose.

2. The doubt and inconsistency, and the wavering application of those who adopt this theory, at once suggest suspicion in regard to its tenability. For such men as Owen, Doddridge, Dwight, Gray, and others, whilst they suggest this expedient, yet feel its weakness so much that they will at the same time endeavour to weaken the force of *ἀδύνατον*, or try to lean

against ἀνακαλιζέειν, or even here and there imply that it is not true Christians that are described.

3. The writer's subsequent illustration is taken from a reality, and the strong presumption is, that the thing illustrated is real, and not merely hypothetical.

4. There would be no force in the passage on this assumption. The writer had told the Hebrews that he would not be detained with the elements of Christian doctrine, and exhorts them to go on to perfection, adding, "if (ἐάνπερ) God permit." Why? is the question that arises in the reader's mind—is there any danger of his not permitting?—Yes, answers the Apostle, standing still in religious attainments is just as impossible as in other things; if you do not advance, you slide back, and are in danger of entire apostasy, and this is the worst that can befall you; for (γάρ) persons with such and such experience and privileges, yet falling away, have forfeited their salvation. This is plain reality, not an imaginary case. Should he show so much concern to prevent what he knew could not occur?

5. As for the illustrations and analogies which such writers as Stuart and Barnes *e. g.* adduce, they are all inept; they all imply the possibility, and not the impossibility, of the thing dreaded. It were preposterous to offer motives in order to dissuade persons from falling over a precipice, who were in a condition which made such a fall impossible.

The whole passage is doubtless parallel with that in chapter x., where the writer speaks of men who have forfeited the only sacrifice for sin because they sin *wilfully* after having received the knowledge of the truth; they have trodden under foot the Son of God, and have counted the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and have done despite unto the Spirit of grace. The difficulty of this passage is due to the imperfection of human language, which is so poor in expressions to designate inward and spiritual things. Picturing them by images taken from the things of sense, it remains at the surface, and Christians, both in common life and in Scripture, are addressed and spoken of according to their outward character and profession, and not according to their inward state. We need hardly urge with Owen, that if truly regenerate persons had been meant,

much stronger, definite, and decisive terms might have been used; but we say that if the Scriptures were teaching the doctrine of "falling from grace," these terms doubtless might designate true Christians; but as they, in numerous and plain passages, teach the opposite doctrine, these terms apply to such as are true Christians only in appearance. They refer to that class of persons who have a real knowledge of the gospel plan of salvation, perceive the goodness and grace of God in pardoning sinners, make splendid professions, have gifts almost like apostles, have doubtless large experiences, and that sometimes for a considerable length of time. All the means of salvation they have made use of—objectively, not subjectively; but in the last, great, decisive conflict they have succumbed, chosen self instead of God; they never have truly experienced the regenerating, converting, and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit; they make finally utter shipwreck of their faith, blaspheme the Holy Ghost, and thus become guilty of the unpardonable sin.

This view is favoured

1. By the fact that every expression in the passage, taken by itself, or in its connection, easily admits of this interpretation, as will be seen below.

2. This assumption best suits the context which requires the possibility of the falling away.

3. By the testimony of observation; the history of the Church abundantly testifies to the truth of this interpretation, as well as to the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints.

The charge of perverting the sense of this passage comes with a very bad grace from those who apply the rack and the wheel to those numerous and most unequivocal passages in the writings of John, and other parts of Scripture, in order to torture them out of the plain asseveration of the doctrine of final perseverance.

As to the language and the style of this passage, they partake of all the peculiarities of this epistle generally; in addition to this, however, the diction of these verses is elevated, sonorous, and rhythmical. Tholuck says that parts of dochmiac verses can be pointed out, which, however, is not saying much. Complete and perfect dochmiacs are: τὲ τῆς δωρεᾶς, (ἀ-) γίον

καὶ καλόν, τὸ μέλλοντος αἰ (-ῶνος), ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱ (-όν), ἐκείνους δι' οὗ, θεοῦ ἐκφέρου (-σα), (κατ-) ἄρας ἐγγὺς ἦς.

Literally translated, the passage reads as follows:

“For again to renew to repentance those once enlightened, and having tasted of the gift, the heavenly (one), and having become partakers of the Holy Spirit, and having relished as good God’s word and the powers of the future age, and having fallen away, recrucifying to themselves and pillorying the Son of God, is impossible. For land that has drunk the frequent rain coming down upon it, and bearing proper vegetation for those on whose account it is also tilled, partakes of blessing from God; but producing thorns and briars, it is reprobate and near to a curse, whose end is burning.”

In the exegesis, the order of the original will be followed.

V. 4. Ἀδύνατον is the predicate of the sentence of which ἀνακαίνιζεν is the subject. For emphasis it is placed first. The Itala, Cardinal Hugo, Clarius, Jeremy Taylor, (On the Effect of Repentance,) Heinrichs, Ernesti, Dindorf, Storr, Kuinöl, Bloomfield, and others, render it “*difficult* ;” they refer to Mark x. 27; Acts xiv. 8; Rom. viii. 3, xv. 1. It is difficult to see how the passage in Mark and the parallel passages support this interpretation, for Christ, in the plainest terms, says, “What is *impossible* with men, is *possible* with God;” *difficult* is not the opposite of *possible*! In Acts xiv. 8, the *impotent* man in Lystra is spoken of, ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσίν; this does not mean, he could only walk with *difficulty*; on the contrary, it says plainly, οὐδὲποτε περιεπάτησεν. The use of the word in Rom. xv. 1, is parallel to this. In Rom. viii. 3, the *impossibility* of salvation by the law is spoken of: τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου; this is not the *difficulty* of salvation by the law! The only other passages where the word occurs in the New Testament are Heb. vi. 18, x. 4, xi. 6, in all of which it is undeniably “*impossible* ;” and this is its only usage in the classical writers. Another mode of evading the force of the word is to supply “for men,” “for us, Christian teachers,” “for me the Apostle,” so implying that with God it was not impossible. This mode is adopted by Ambrose, (De pœnitentia,) the Schmids, Le Clerc, Limborch, Schöttgen, Baumgarten, Bengel, and others, and for a purely exegetical reason also by De Wette. But this is entirely gra-

tuitous; and besides, if the writer is made to say that it was impossible for him to renew men of *such* a character, the implication would be that he *could* renew men of different character, which is entirely unscriptural. The notion that the use of this word is due to a rhetorical exaggeration, needs no special refutation. There can be no doctrinal objection to the rendering "*impossible*;" for the impossibility of restoration is not due to any want of efficacy in Christ's atonement, nor to any want of power on the part of the Holy Spirit, nor to any want of benevolence in God, but merely to God's eternal purpose; it is *impossible* according to that; it is impossible in the ordinary condition of the divine arrangement in the Gospel scheme.

γάρο, of course, constitutes the connexion with what precedes, introducing what follows as its reason. What that preceding conclusion is, has been disputed. Owen, Stuart, Turner, and the large majority of interpreters, refer it to the first clause of v. 3, "And this will we do;" the desperate condition of apostates is the reason for the necessity of progress in Christian attainments. There seems to be something wanting in this view of the connection of the clauses, and the second clause with its weighty ἐάνπερ, where ἐάν would seem to have been sufficient, is a mere expletive. Ernesti's view is peculiar; he takes the whole passage, iv. 15-vi. 3, to be an explanation of the first part of iv. 14, and here at vi. 4 is given the reason for the last clause of that verse, κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας. This is exceedingly unnatural, and the idea contained in that clause occurs with far more force in the immediately preceding context; he has not been followed by many. The objection just made lies equally strong against the connection proposed by Cameron with iv. 1. Kuinöl refers γάρο to no passage at all, but to the writer's unexpressed apprehension that the Hebrews might apostatize. This is too difficult of discovery to be right. Whitby, Newcomb, De Wette, and others connect it with μῆ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι: if that were necessary, it would imply that you were near apostatizing, and apostates cannot be renewed again. This, however, is not as natural as the connection pointed out by Abresch and Ebrard, namely with the clause immediately preceding, for the reason given above. We must leave the first principles, and endeavour to make higher attainments; we must

do this at once, ἐάνπερ, if indeed it be not already too late; it depends altogether on the long-suffering of God, for &c.

τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας. The accusatives in the sentence are the objects of ἀνακαινίζεν. Of the various divisions possible of the different characteristics given here of the persons intended, *that* seems to be the most natural which is pointed out by the discriminating use of the Greek connectives καὶ and τε. The former connects and separates the broader features, to which the minor, subordinate or co-ordinate traits are appended or attached by the latter, so that the persons alluded to are designated by three characteristics, in which Bengel finds respectively the gift of the Son, the gift of the Spirit, and a gift from the Father; Tholuck a parallel to Paul's triad of faith, charity, hope: 1, illumination and reception by faith of the bread of life, the heavenly gift; 2, participation of the Holy Spirit, the principle of the Christian life; 3, experience of the precious promises for the future, and the influences exerted by the sure expectation of a joyful eternity.—ἅπαξ in opposition to πάλιν, v. 6, *once*; once ought to have been sufficient. The same use of the word is observed in the other passages where it occurs in this epistle, eight times, more than in the rest of the New Testament altogether, (Bleek.) Owen takes this ἅπαξ together with the other participles in verses 4, 5. φωτίζεν is a word of the later Greek; there would be no difference of opinion in regard to its meaning, but for the fact that the word was employed at an early period to denote baptism; hence the Peshito renders the phrase, ܘܡܢ ܐܘܪܘܫܠܝܡ ܘܡܢ ܫܘܪܝܝܢ ܘܡܢ ܥܘܪܝܢ ܘܡܢ ܥܘܪܝܢ ܘܡܢ ܥܘܪܝܢ “who have once come to baptism,” and this interpretation is followed by the Fathers, and all the Romish interpreters, and even by Ernesti, Michaelis, Burton, and others. But it cannot be shown that this was the meaning of the word at the time of the apostles, still less that this is its meaning in this passage. Drusius maintains that it means *non tantum baptizare, sed etiam docere*. The LXX. and Aquila sometimes render הורה (to instruct) by φωτίζεν. Hence the vast majority of interpreters since the Reformation, (for instance, Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, Schlichting, Limborch, Owen, Bengel, Dindorf, Stuart, Tholuck, Scott, Bleek, Barnes, Schaff, [Sünde wider den Heiligen Geist,] McKeen, [Biblical Repository, 1842,] Bloomfield, De Wette, Ebrard, Turner, and others,)

render it "enlightened," properly instructed in the true nature of the Gospel. It may even mean spiritual illumination; for there are various degrees of it, short of the full beaming forth of the light from God's reconciled countenance.—Closely connected with this, as its consequence or an attending circumstance, is the following clause,

γευμαίνουσ τε· This does not merely mean *to taste*, in the sense of sipping, touching with the lips, in opposition to enjoying. When the Greek writers wish to express that idea, they generally add *χίλεισιν ἄχρους*; but it means *to experience*; as the previous clause employs the figure of *one* of the organs of sensation, so this employs another. Such expressions as, ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious; taste and see that the Lord is good; to taste death,—abundantly illustrate the usage of this verb.

τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου· Interpreters differ as to what is meant by this *heavenly gift*. Calmet, Owen, (referring to Acts ii. 33,) Lardner, (Letter on the Logos,) and Scott, make the following clause expegetical of this. Ernesti refers to Acts viii. 20, where the Holy Ghost is called *the gift of God*. Turner refers to Christ's conversation with the Samaritan woman, where he speaks of the living water which he would *give*, and understands 'the heavenly gift' to mean the ordinary and extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. Bishop Hopkins, McLean, Doddridge, and others, maintain that it means the extraordinary gifts alone, which unregenerate men might receive. Dindorf, Döderlein, Kuinöl, Stuart—the professed blessings or privileges of the gospel. Schmid, Bengel, McKeen—Christ. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, and others—forgiveness of sins. Grotius, Schlichting, and others—peace of conscience. Primasius, Estius, Michaelis—the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Pareus—faith. Klee—regeneration. Schaff—salvation generally. De Wette refers to the 'free gift' spoken of by Paul, *the gift of grace*. Le Clerc, Abresch, Dindorf make τῆς = ταύτης, the gift being the same as the φωτισμός of the previous clause. This is needless; and we may, (with Bleek, Tholuck, and others,) on account of the close connection by means of τε, understand by it *the knowledge of the truth*, as

depending and consequent on illumination. It is *ἐπουράνιος* because given by God, and not found out by man.

καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας. *μετόχους* is one of the words which critics adduce who deny the Pauline authorship of this epistle; it occurs five times in this epistle, but never in the other epistles of Paul. *γενηθέντας* is a Hellenism for *γενομένους*.

πνεύματος ἁγίου. Le Clerc, Grotius, Lardner, Whitby, Stuart, and others, would limit this to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; but there is nothing in the context to warrant this. This attempt, as well as the inference of Anti-Calvinists, that regenerate persons alone can here be alluded to, as they are said to be partakers of the Holy Spirit, arises from a false view of the Spirit's influences. Just as the influence of evil spirits is not confined to the children of darkness, but makes itself felt constantly in the bosom of the children of God as long as they are in the flesh, just so the Holy Spirit's influences are not confined to the elect alone, but in a certain measure are common to all men; in a higher measure they are common to most men; in a still higher to many men; and in a yet more powerful degree, still short of regeneration and sanctification, to subjects such as are here spoken of. It must be remembered that every thought and emotion that is good in any way, in whose heart soever it arise, is due to the almighty Spirit of God. That there is such a difference of degree in the participation of the Holy Spirit, is plain from the fact that, although Christ had breathed on his disciples, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," yet this was followed by that signal pouring out of the same Spirit on the day of Pentecost; whilst in Christ doubtless the Spirit dwelt without measure, in unlimited fulness. (See John iii. 34.)

V. 5. *καὶ καλὸν γευσσάμενους θεοῦ ῥῆμα*. The first question that arises is, why the accusative is here connected with *γευσσάμενους*; the classical writers always use the genitive with this verb. The fact that later writers connected it with the accusative also, accounts for this, that the accusative *could* be used here, but not why it *was* used, seeing that in the previous verse the genitive was used. Most interpreters pass this over in silence. Bengel and Vater endeavour to account for it in this way—the genitive is partitive; for the heavenly gift, which,

according to their interpretation, is Christ, is not entirely exhausted in this life, for we shall enjoy Christ's presence in heaven; whilst the preached word of God belongs entirely to this life. A less fanciful and simpler reason is suggested by Böhme and Bleek: the construction with the genitive would cause some inelegance, if not obscurity, in this clause, as all the nouns would be in the genitive, and of *καλοῦ* e. g. it might be doubtful whether it belonged to *θεοῦ* or to *ῥήματος*. By "the good word of God," most interpreters (Theodoret, Grotius, Schlichting, Limborch, Kuinöl, Stuart, De Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Turner, and others) understand the fulfilment in some degree of the gracious promises made by God in the Gospel; they refer for equivalent expressions in the Old Testament to Josh. xxi. 45, xxiii. 14, 15. In Jer. xxix. 10, the Lord says: "I will perform *my good word* toward you:" comp. xxxiii. 14. Michaelis understands specifically the promise of the Holy Ghost; Calvin and Braun, the gospel, (*καλόν*) as distinguished from the law in its severity; Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, the doctrine of God generally; Bleek, curiously, a personified attribute of God. If *ῥῆμα* is to be taken in the sense of "promise," then it is an instance of the peculiarity of this epistle, to use hebraizing terms whilst there are more expressive ones in Greek. But in all these interpretations the strangely prominent and emphatic position of *καλόν* is entirely overlooked; this seems to forbid the idea that *καλόν* should be merely an attribute; the rendering of Cappellus (*quàm bonum sit et salutare evangelium*) and of Ernesti (*suavitatem evangelii*) suggests the true rendering above given: the word of God by which his children are fed (Matt. iv. 4) has been tasted by them, and found to be good; they have experienced the fulfilment to be all that the promise had led them to expect.

δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. This again is closely joined to the preceding phrase by *τέ*, the accusative still depending on *γευσασμένους*. There is great confusion and great diversity of opinion among interpreters as to the meaning of this phrase, although primarily they seem to diverge in but two directions, some taking *μέλλων αἰών* literally as "the future world," others as a translation of the Rabbinical *מָשְׁכֵּן עֲתִידָא*, the Messianic age, and hence *the Christian dispensation*. Rhenferd has written

a large treatise to show that it does not mean the Christian dispensation, (*De phrasi Graeca ó αἰὼν ó μέλλον* in Meuschen's *Novum Testamentum ex Talmude illustratum*;) but neither he nor Witsius (in his *Dissertatio de seculo hoc et futuro*) has settled the matter. Davidson (Introd. iii. p. 246) contents himself with the naked dictum, It means *the future world*. Henry, Scott, and others, vaguely—desires of heaven and dread of hell. Böhme confines it to the second advent. But the majority of interpreters understand by it the Christian dispensation, and by the whole phrase either its energetic influences and appliances, (Barnes, Turner, and others,) or the spiritual powers belonging to the new dispensation, which as to its perfect development is future, but begins in the kingdom of God upon earth, (Bleek and others); or the miracles wrought by the Apostles and other believers, and which believers tasted by being their objects, or merely witnesses, (Photius, Wittich, Braun, Sykes, Owen, De Wette, and others.) Stuart distinguishes this phrase from the previous one, *μετόχους πνεύματος ἁγίου*, by making the former refer to the special gifts and influences of the Spirit bestowed in general upon the primitive disciples, the latter particularly to miracles of the highest order. McKeen—whatever in that world is powerful, either in reality, or in influence. The view of this passage, however, will be clearer, if we hold fast the distinction pointed out above between the use of *καί* and *τέ*; if this is founded in truth, then the two clauses of this verse stand in the same relation to one another as the first two clauses of v. 4. In using the expression *καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα*, the *דְּבַר יְהוָה אֱמָרָה לְעַמּוּדָה* of the Old Testament prophets, the promise of deliverance from the enemy, the oppressor, and typically from sin, the writer has placed himself on Old Testament ground, and can with propriety denominate the Christian dispensation *μέλλον αἰών*; in this age the *ῥῆμα* has become *δυνάμεις*, (in its peculiar New Testament usage,) the *wonders* of Redemption, not merely objectively, as Cameron explains it—the wonderful mysteries of Christ's Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, and Union with the Church—but these truths appropriated subjectively, and producing their several appropriate effects upon the soul and in the heart; and thus Grotius seems to be very near the truth when he takes

this clause to be the exegesis of the previous one. The strange rendering of Tertullian, *occidente jam aevo*, has been accounted for by the assumption of a false lection in his MS.

V. 6. *Καὶ παραπεσόντας*. With a striking and startling simplicity of style, this participle is made to close the enumeration, connected with it by a mere *καί*, which some versions have not been able to improve by the addition of some adversative particle. The suddenness with which this solemn, weighty word is made to wind up a delineation which might have been justly expected to terminate in a totally opposite manner, has the effect, upon the mind of the reader, of a flash of lightning from a serene sky. The verb occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The LXX. sometimes render ἔβη (to act treacherously), by it. The force of the preposition *παρά* in verbs with a figurative acceptation, is more easily exemplified than explained; it corresponds with the English *for-* (the German prefix *ver-*) in such words as *forlorn*, *forsaken*, *forsworn* (which might be *παρόμνημι*, if there were such a verb; but there is not, Liddell and Scott to the contrary notwithstanding), *forbidden*, *forgiven*, *forgotten*, etc.; so *παρομολογέω* to grant, i. e. treacherously; *παράγω* to seduce (the German *verleiten*), similarly *παρακρούω*; *παροράω* *versehen*; *παρακούω* to hear wrong; *παραγινώσκω* to decide wrong; *παραγλύφω* to counterfeit; *παραγρᾶσκω* to interpolate; Epictetus calls a spurious Christian a *παραβαπτιστής*; so that the force of this word is not exhausted by the simple notion of *sinning grievously*, (Montanists, Novatians, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Luther, Bellarmine, all Catholic interpreters, and many others), nor does it mean specifically a *relapse* (Stuart and others), but an utter, final, irretrievable lapse, whether this be to Judaism, Paganism, any system of anti-christian or unchristian philosophy, scepticism, or that state so much akin to that of demons, when a man with cool deliberation says, with the poet's Richard III.:

"I am determined to prove a villain!"

The expression doubtless finds its exegesis in ch. x. 26: "we sin *wilfully*," especially in v. 29, and also in iii. 12, where the "evil heart of unbelief" is said to consist "in *departing* from the living God."

πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν. The Peshito, Erasmus, Michaelis, and others, connect πάλιν with παραπεσόντας, which, however, is grammatically inadmissible, since, if such a connection were intended, πάλιν would have preceded the participle. The motive for this connection is doubtless the apparent pleonasm which it forms with ἀνακαινίζειν, which Grotius and many others assume to exist, although they do not connect thus; but there are so many examples of verbs compounded with ἀνά taking πάλιν, (see Stephanus' Thesaurus, Abresch, Dindorf, Bleek, and others),—Isocrates e. g. has the very expression πάλιν ἀνακαινισμένης—that with Beza, Bengel, De Wette, and others, the renovation, in a wide sense, comprehending the predicates of the previous verses, must be assumed to have taken place, and that the writer means that it cannot take place “a second time,” as the Syriac version renders the preposition alone. This verb also has afforded material to the impugnors of the Pauline authorship of the epistle, since it occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and Paul always uses ἀνακαινώω, itself neither used by the classical writers, nor by the LXX. According to the strict rules of rhetoric, the word ἀνακαινίζειν destroys the image suggested by παραπεσόντας; ἀνάγειν, ἀναστρέφειν, or some such word might have been expected; but the language designating the internal processes of spiritual life and religious truths generally, being *all* figurative, the outward form of the inward truth, the husk, the shell, composed of a material that is material, may and must be perishable, and hence it is of the least possible importance, provided it has served to convey the inner kernel, the substance, which must germinate and live.—There are many, as has been noticed above, who would lay stress on the use of the active voice of this verb, to modify the meaning of the whole passage. Some go so far as to make the preceding accusatives the subject, and supply ἑαυτούς as the object of this verb. It is sufficient to observe that this violence done to the grammar by no means helps to establish their doctrine as in conformity with truth: to suppose that men of such a character cannot renew themselves, implies that men of a different character could, which is entirely unscriptural.—The answer to those who would supply a subject to ἀνακαινίζειν, such as “Christian teachers,” “I

the writer," "men," etc., has already been suggested: If men cannot renew *these*, the implication is that they can renew others, which again is entirely contrary to Scripture. The attempt of Cardinal Hugo to heighten the significancy of this verb, has of course the effect of lowering the sense of the whole passage; he understands it of the impossibility to be restored again, so as to become like virgins, after a fall. Even in respect of the language there is no difficulty here; the present active infinitive expresses the notion of the verb simply, without any reference whatever to the agent or the object of the action. Nearly all modern languages afford innumerable instances of the use of the infinitive after adjectives or verbs where nobody asks whether it be active or passive, since the notion expressed is really passive, or rather neuter; nor need one seek far in Greek for such instances. When the writer of this epistle says, (v. 11): ὁ λόγος δυσσερμηνευτος λέγειν, who asks whether λέγειν be active or passive? or what matters it whether it be active or passive?—It must be noticed also that the Fathers and the Romish interpreters understand ἀνακαινίζειν of baptismal regeneration (διὰ λούτρου πάλιν ἀνακαινισμός, Chrysostom) and eventually of baptism, which, of course, is entirely gratuitous.

εἰς μετάνοιαν, so as to result in a change of mind.—Chrysostom says εἰς is in place of ἐν, and ἐν would be a Hebraism for διὰ by; and he is followed by many in all ages, even by Stuart, mainly because they all render μετάνοια by *repentance*, and understand this in their narrow dogmatical sense; this, in their systems, always precedes renovation. But the Scriptures use μετάνοια in a wider sense, as including that sorrow for sin, for instance, which is the Christian's daily companion.

ἀνασταυροῦντας. Some take the two remaining participles as giving the explanation wherein the apostasy consists, others (A Lape, Schlichting, Grotius, Limborch, Cramer, and all modern expositors) as the reason of the impossibility. It is the reason, doubtless, (as some paraphrase it, *quippe qui*), and, at the same time, they express that wherein the apostasy, not consists, but results, as the significant change of tense most clearly shows. Cappellus well limits the meaning of παραπέσοντας by these two participles; *haec est descriptio casus*, says

he; it is only such an entire lapse which is meant, which consists in the person's crucifying and disgracing the Son of God, or consenting to it.—As this is the only passage in the whole Scriptures where this word occurs, there has been a dispute in regard to its meaning, viz., as to whether the preposition has the force of “again,” or is merely a graphic adjunct to the verb, and hence is not translated at all; whether ἀνα here means *rursum*, or *sursum*. It is left untranslated by Carpzov, Fisher, Raphel, Abresch, Wetstein, Munthe, Bos, Alberti, Krebs, Ernesti, Dindorf, Mai, Schleussner, Bretschneider, Wahl, Böhme, Barnes, and others. It is rendered by “again” in the Peshito, the Vulgate, by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Photius, Theophylact, Tertullian, Jerome, (*recrucifigentes*), Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Valckenaer, Schulz, Heumann, Heinrichs, Kuinöl, Klee, Tholuck, Schaff, De Wette, Turner, etc. It is true, as Bleek observes, a verb compounded with ἀνά may have two meanings of the nature here contended for on different sides, e. g. ἀναβαίνω, which means both *to go up*, and *to go back*, and many others. Now the one class of interpreters endeavour to support their opinion by the fact that ἀνασταυρόω never occurs in profane writers in the sense of *crucifying again*; but this may be simply because they had no occasion for using a word to express such an idea; whilst the opposite opinion is much favoured by the ancient Greek exegetes, to whom the Greek was still a living language, taking it in that sense. Besides, wherever in the New Testament the idea of crucifying is to be expressed, the simple verb, without a preposition, is always used. The meaning is that such persons are actuated by the same temper and feelings that demanded Christ's cruel and disgraceful death; they consent to his death; they, by their conduct or by their words, show that they approve of Christ's crucifixion; they will not have this man to rule over them.—Those who refer all that precedes to rebaptism, make this clause expegetical of ἀνακαθίζειν. Referring to Rom. vi. 6, they say, as by baptism they were crucified with Jesus, so rebaptism would be a recrucifixion. In a merely spiritual sense, without reference to baptism, Calvin and Beza understand it in the same way.

ἐαυτοῖς is variously explained. Many consider it a Hebraism,

like $\eta\tilde{\nu}\ \eta\tilde{\nu}$, and hence pleonastic, or little better: "so far as they are concerned," (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Limborch, Michaelis, Ernesti, Böhme, Stuart, and others): Calvin—*quantum in se est*. A very general acceptance is that of a dative of disadvantage, (Storr, Turner, and many others,) or *in semet-ipsos*, (Tertullian, Vatblé, Braun, Kuinöl, etc.,) by which is meant that they do it to their own disadvantage, as they lose Christ thereby, having possessed him before, (Bleek.) Less likely is the acceptance of a dative of advantage: "for their gratification," (Klee and others); nor is that of Grotius, Schulz, Barnes, and others, more pleasing, who take it to mean—through themselves, as making the act their own, because it really adds nothing to the import of the preceding word. Bengel regards it as the antithesis to *παραδειγματίζοντας*, which has reference to others. Better, perhaps, is the interpretation of Tholuck, who understands it to imply that as the first crucifixion was an outward, public act, so this second is one which they commit by themselves, privately; it is an inward act solely.

$\tauὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ$ sets forth the dignity of the person thus treated.

καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας, a word belonging to the later Greek, occurring only once more in the New Testament, where it is rendered in the authorized version, "making a public example." "The disgrace attendant on the punishment of crucifixion seems to have suggested the word; the public contempt thrown upon religion by apostates is the idea," (Turner.) This solemn and awe-inspiring declaration is rendered still weightier by a familiar but impressive illustration:

V. 7. $\eta\tilde{\nu}\ \gammaάρ$. The writer wishes to show his readers how great the danger and how awful the consequences of apostasy are, which apostasy would be apparent, if they were destitute of good fruits, which are legitimately produced from a heart which has experienced the blessings of God's word and Spirit. As land, properly watered, but *also tilled*, (*καὶ γεωργεῖται*,) which brings forth fruits such as are profitable to its possessors, partakes of the divine blessing, so that which teems with thorns and briars is subject to the curse and destruction. *Γάρ* being a combination of $\gammaέ$ and $\alpha\tilde{\rho}\alpha$, and $\gammaέ$ denoting a reason, $\alpha\tilde{\rho}\alpha$ an explanation, it has a causal and an expegetical force. Here

the latter is the prominent notion; but it is unnecessary to render it with Stuart by "now." Γῆ is improperly rendered in the English version "*the earth*," probably owing to the use which the translators seem to have made of some Latin version, their dependence on which is easily traceable in very numerous instances. The Latin, of course, having *terra*, may be thus translated; the Greek simply says, *land*.

ἡ πιόουσα, *such as has drunk in, imbibed*; it is again the aorist, whilst the following participles, τικτουσα and ἐκφόρουσα are in the present; the absorption of the moisture being considered the principal cause of the production. The earth *drinking* is a very common image, both with sacred and profane writers; everybody remembers Anacreon's ἡ γῆ μέλαινα πίνει, Virgil's *sat prata biberunt*, and numerous other instances. The earth thus saturated represents the state of those previously described as so highly favoured. The word itself is not without significancy; the rain does not merely come down upon the land in copious showers, but the land has actually received and appropriated it; it is not stony ground, from which the water runs off without penetrating.

τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλὰκις ὑετόν· αὐτῆς is by far the best established reading, although the Vatican and some other MSS. have αὐτῶν, others αὐτῇ. The Recepta has πολλὰκις before ἐρχόμενον, and so have the editions of Stephen, the Elzevir edition, Griesbach's and Scholz's, all of which follow the Alexandrian MS., the Cod. Rescr., a MS. of the ninth century in the library of the castle of St. Angelo, one at Moscow, and others. But the Vat. MS., the Cod. Claromontanus, the MS. from the convent of St. Germain in Paris, and other uncial MSS., the Itala, both Syriac, the Coptic, and other versions, and Chrysostom, place it after; and these are followed by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Bleek, and other modern critics. The difference is, after all, not great; the one reading speaks of *copious rain falling*, the other of *copiously falling rain*. So it is with the other variation; the genitive (Bengel thinks) denotes more of continuance, whilst the accusative would simply indicate the direction; ἐρχόμενον suggests the word of Jesus, John xv. 22: "If I had not *come* and spoken unto them, they had not had sin."

καὶ τίκτουσα, and bearing, bringing forth; a very natural figure, frequently applied to the earth; perhaps in antithesis to ἐκφέρειουσα, in the following verse, as implying the accord with natural law and order.

βοτάνην. The word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The assertion of Stuart that it is a Hebraism for כֶּשֶׂבֶת, inasmuch as the Greek word in classical usage means herbage or vegetation, without including corn, does not appear well founded. The word does include all productions of the ground, with the subordinate idea of their still being unripe or un-gathered.

εὐθετον ἐξείνους. εὐθετος is a very general term, that may here refer either to seasonableness as to time, or to fitness and usefulness as to kind and quality. It is construed with πρὸς, or εἰς, (so in the two other passages where it occurs in the New Testament,) although some (Limborch, Barnes, De Wette, and others) connect it here with ἐξείνους. By far the majority of interpreters make ἐξείνους dependent on τίκτουσα; it makes no difference, however, as to the sense.

ὁὶ οὗς. The Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, the English version, E. Schmid, Heinrichs, Ernesti, Dindorf, and others, render this "by whom;" but this is contrary to grammar. Owen somehow unites the two interpretations. The correct rendering is, "on whose account," viz. the proprietors of the soil, (Tertullian, Occumenius, Limborch, Wetstein, Bengel, Stuart, Bleek, De Wette, Turner, Ebrard, and others.)

καὶ γεωργεῖται. The Cod. Claromont., a cursive MS., and many versions, also the English, omit this καί. It is variously explained. Some conceive that it intensifies the present tense in γεωργεῖται—it is *constantly* tilled. This is not very obvious, and hence rather arbitrary. Tholuck, Bleek, De Wette, perhaps also Erasmus, (*fructum reddendum, non quibuslibet, sed iis quorum operâ culta est terra,*) and Ernesti, (*quidem,*) think it is to correspond with εὐθετον—as the land yields its fruit to the proprietors, so it is *likewise* cultivated for them. But this is very flat. The opinion of Schlichting, Hezel, Böhme, Kuinöl, and others, seems better, who think it means that in addition to the ground's being watered, it is *also* (*etiam, auch noch*) tilled. The truth is, this γεωργεῖται is an important *addition*,

and on that account the writer seems to have added this *καί*. It is a very material ground of difference,—this *καί γεωργεῖται*,—between this and the other soil; this *καί*, therefore, serves to draw the attention of the reader to it, and to make it emphatic, as if the writer had said, The land brings forth fruit for its proprietors, that is for those, I must not omit to add, for whom it is *also tilled*. The heavenly gift must be cultivated, in other words. This appears also to be the view of Trench: “The *untended* soil, which yields thorns and briars as its natural harvest, is a permanent type and enduring parable of man’s heart, which has been submitted to the same curse, and without a *watchful spiritual husbandry* will as surely put forth *its* briars and *its* thorns.” (Notes on the Parables, p. 20.)

μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. The difficulty of accounting for the fact that land which is already blessed in being fruitful, should for this fruitfulness receive blessing, and of telling what this blessing would consist in, has perplexed many interpreters. Some, therefore, (Cappellus, Sykes, Peirce, Michaelis, Semler, Zacharia, Ernesti, and others,) flatten the expression down as meaning, It *appears* to be blessed, its fertility shows it to be blessed, &c. This is very frigid, and corresponds neither with the antithesis in the next verse, nor with the thing symbolized. Some (A Lapede, Estius, Baumgarten, C. F. Schmid,) say, it is blessed in being rendered still more fruitful by the divine beneficence. But this is hardly verified by the facts in nature. To say, as many do, “it is regarded with the divine approbation,” is affirming something to be the apostle’s meaning which it would be as difficult to verify as to deny; and after all, it would be saying but little, in a solemn manner. Tholuck mysteriously refers to the mutual relation subsisting in Scripture between blessing and fertility, and the curse and sterility. God curses the ground, and it becomes barren, it no longer yields its good fruits spontaneously: the fig-tree does not yield the expected fruit, and it is cursed. But this does not relieve the difficulty. Limborch, Bleek, and others refer to John xv. 2: “Every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit.” But this interpretation takes it for granted that the *εὐλογία* consists in increased fertility. Still, this last reference, together with the exigencies of the passage,

may lead us to the true interpretation. The same difficulty, the same lack of strict applicability to the subject used for illustration, meets us also in the next verse—*blessing, reprobation, the curse, ultimately burning*. All these are doubtless far less applicable to the figure, the earth, than to the object designed to be illustrated, *man*. We must assume, therefore, as is necessary in so many passages of Scripture, and, in fact, in all earnest, impressive writing, where the substance, and not the form, is the thing uppermost in the writer's mind, that the apostle ceases strictly to adhere to the simile, and uses such expressions as are, indeed, in some degree, applicable to both the figure and the thing signified, yet with a decided and pointed allusion to the latter mainly. Christian experience then amply verifies the doctrine that when the soil of the human heart, amply supplied with showers of refreshing from on high, and cultivated by the deeply-cutting plough of self-examination, carefully weeded from the rank growth shooting up from the remaining seeds of corruption, and diligently guarded against those birds of prey, evil spirits, and those destructive creeping things, darling vices and besetting sins, brings forth the fruits of the Spirit, meet for the Master's use—it “*receiveth blessing from God*.”—It is indifferent whether we connect ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ with ἐλλογίας or with μεταλαμβάνει.—The Cod. Claromont., the MS. of St. Germain, and other uncial MSS., John of Damascus and Theophylact, omit τοῦ.

V. 8. ἐκφέρουσα δέ. The subject of this second clause is not merely γῆ, nor γῆ (μὴ) πιῶσα &c., as some strangely supply, but γῆ ἢ πιῶσα τὸν ἐπὶ αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλὰκις ὕετόν. There is no outward, visible difference either in the nature of the soil, or in the watering received. There is no outward, visible difference between true and false members of the Church; they have the same faculties, reason, conscience, and will, they receive the same instructions, and are subject to the same common influences of the Spirit.—Bengel and others insist upon it that ἐκφέρουσα, especially as relieved by δέ, is chosen to form in itself an antithesis to τίπτουσα. This opinion is worthy of consideration, as the Greek interpreters, and also Greek scholars of later times seem to incline to it, (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, A Lapide, Grotius, Wittich, Valckenaer,

Klee, and others).—The copula is wanting in v. 8, the construction, however, is plain enough: as *γῆ τίκτουσα βοτάνην* in v. 7 is the subject and *μεταλαμβάνει* the predicate, so in v. 8 *γῆ ἐκφέρουσα ἀνάνθας* is the subject and *ἀδόκιμος* sc. *ἐστίν* is the predicate. Yet some there are who make *ἀδόκιμος* κ.λ. the subject, and supply *ἐστίν* with *ἐκφέρουσα* to make it equivalent to *ἐκφέρει*; that this, however, is as contrary to the rhetoric as to the design of the passage, needs no demonstration.

ἀνάνθας καὶ τριβόλους, the spontaneous, useless, and hurtful productions of the ground, frequently mentioned together in Scripture; so in the curse pronounced upon the ground, Gen. iii. 18 (LXX).

ἀδόκιμος, sc. *ἐστίν*, which may have been omitted here as well as in the next clause for the sake of the rhythm (Bleek). All the Latin versions render this word by *reproba*; it denotes that which has been tried, and found to be useless. The close allusion to the object symbolized has been pointed out above. This word occurs only in Paul's Epistles.

καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς. The divine curse is obviously meant; *βαβαί*, exclaims Chrysostom, *κόσην ἔχει παραμυθίαν ὁ λόγος!* how much consolation there is even in this severity; he might have said "is cursed," but the Hebrews were to make the application to themselves as far as suitable; therefore the apostle introduces this form of expression to soften the apparent harshness.

ἣς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῶσιν. *ἣς* is referred to *γῆ* by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Primasius, Luther, Carpzov, S. Schmid, Bengel, Kuinöl, Tholuck, and others; but it is evidently more natural to connect it with the nearest antecedent, *κατάρας*; so Erasmus, Calvin, Camerarius, Cramer, C. F. Schmid, Stuart, Bleek, De Wette, and others—the result or effect of the curse is final and utter destruction. Hence *εἰς καῶσιν* is unnecessarily called a Hebraism=*καῶσις*. The sentence is elliptical, and some supply *ἄξει τὴν γῆν*, others *βλέπει*, others *ἔρχεται*; but, as Winer (Grammatik, p. 657) observes, *ἐστί* is entirely sufficient.—The interpreters of this clause have quoted Virgil and Pliny to show that it was a practice in ancient husbandry, and Voss to show that it is still done in Italy and in the South of France, viz., to burn over the stubble on grain-fields to make them

more fertile, and hence Grotius calls this clause a metonymy, as the burning applies only to what is *on* the earth. But here a process of punishment is evidently intended, not one of purgation or improvement. Expositors, therefore, have wandered into all sorts of fancies to throw light on the meaning of this clause. Michaelis thinks a punishment is intended designed to improve; some think, the final burning and purifying of the earth is meant; Baumgarten and Bleek suggest the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrha, (this interpretation already departs from the strict rhetorical requirements of the unity of the figure): Braun, Bengel and others—the destruction of Jerusalem, which was ἐγγύς: Storr, M'Knight, Burton, and others find a drought here. This perplexity, however, is at once removed, as has been intimated above, by observing that the writer does not consider himself bound by the rules of rhetoric, that the sign and the thing signified commingle into one, as it were, and that reprobation, malediction, and final destruction by the consuming element have a much nearer reference to men resembling such barren, ungrateful, disappointing soil, than to the soil itself.

The whole passage teaches—1. That no amount of outward privileges, or inward experiences supersedes the necessity of labouring and watching, lest, after all, we should be cast away.

2. That the best evidence of our calling and election is good fruits, the fruits of the Spirit, inward graces, and outward acts, such as to make the saint, and thus collectively the Church, visible.

3. The necessity of the divine influence in order to salvation. Illumination, the good word of God, the Holy Spirit, all are the gifts of God's grace; these are taken for granted where a man has even the appearance of life.

4. If apostasy causes the irretrievable loss of the soul (“it is *impossible* to renew them again to repentance”), then the soul can be lost for ever, and there is such a thing as everlasting punishment.

5. Repentance may not always be possible.