Christ, keeping **His Son** as the great subject of both clauses, and thus making  
them, not contrasts to one another, but correlative parts of the same great whole. And (2) the Apostle, dwelling here on *patent facts*,—the announcements of prophecy,—the history of the Lord’s Humanity, does not deal with the *essential subsistent Godhead of Christ*, but with *that manifestation of it* which the great fact of the Resurrection had made to men. Also (3) by amplifying the *Spirit* into **the Spirit of holiness**, he characterizes the  
Spirit of Christ as one of absolute holiness, i.e. as *divine*, and *partaking* of the God-*head* : see below.

**with power**] This qualifying clause belongs to **declared**,—not  
to the words “*the Son of God*,”—nor again is it a parallel clause to “*according to the Spirit of holiness*,” to “by the resurrection,” &c. (as St. Chrysostom, who interprets it “by means of the miracles which He did”), **manifested with power** (to be) **the Son of God**. The rendering then is, **which was with power declared** to be the **Son of God**.

**declared**] before men. It is not the objective *appointment* of Christ as the Son of God, that is spoken of, but the subjective manifestation in men’s minds that He is so: not of Christ’s *being* what He is, but of the  
*proof* of that fact by His Resurrection.

**according to the Spirit of holiness**] The Spirit of holiness is not  
equivalent to “the **Holy Spirit** :” this epithet would be inapplicable here, for it would point out the *Third Person in the Blessed Trinity, whereas it is the Spirit of Christ Himself*, in distinction from His Flesh, which is spoken of. And this Spirit is designated by the gen. of quality, **of holiness**, to shew that it is not a human, but a divine Spirit which is attributed *here* to  
Christ,—a Spirit to which holiness belongs as its essence. The other interpretations certainly miss the mark, by overlooking the terms, *according to the flesh* and *according to the Spirit*, the two sides of the Person of Christ here intended to be brought out. Such are that of Theodoret :  
“through the might wrought in Him by means of the Holy Spirit,”— Chrysostom :  
“from the Spirit, by whom He gave sanctification,” &c. Calvin and Olshausen also seem to wish to include the notion of *sanctifying* in the term **holiness**, which, how ever true, is more than strictly belongs to  
the words.

**by**] as indicating the source, out of which the demonstration  
proceeds.

**the resurrection of the dead**] not, “the resurrection *from* the dead,”’—which, besides that it is not the rendering of the words of the original,  
would be a weakening of the strong expression of the Apostle, who takes here  
summarily and by anticipation the Resurrection of Jesus as being, including,  
involving (“***I am*** *the Resurrection*,” John xi. 25) *the (whole) Resurrection of the dead.* So that we must not render as A. V. “the resurrection from the dead,” but **the resurrection of the dead**, regarded as accomplished in that of Christ. It was the full accomplishment of this, which more than any thing declared Him to be the Son of God: see John v. 25—29. Thus in these words lies wrapped up the argument of ch. vi. 4 ff.

**even Jesus Christ our Lord**] This is the place of these words in the original, and to this place they ought to be kept. For the Apostle having given this description of the Person and dignity of the Son of God, very Man and very God, now identifies this divine Person with JESUS CHRIST, the Lord and Master of Christians,—the historical object of their faith, and (see words following) the Appointer of himself to the apostolic office.

**5. through whom**] As in Gal. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 9, designating the Lord Himself as the Agent in conferring the grace and Apostleship.

**we received**] not ‘*all Christians*, —but *we*, the Apostle himself as he not unfrequently speaks. No others need be here included in the word. *Those  
to whom he is writing* cannot be thus included, for they are specially contrasted with the subject of the verb **received** by the following verse. Nor can this verb **received** (not, as A. V., “*have received*”) refer to any *general* bestowal of this kind, indicating, as it must, a definite past event,  
viz. the reception of the Apostleship by himself.

**grace**] It is hardly to be understood, as Augustine explains, that “the Apostle has grace in common with all the faithful, but *Apostleship* not in