altogether, and slowness of ear to receive  
divine knowledge: and they wanted *some one* to begin again with them and learn them the very first elements. And so far from *“some one"* being, as Delitzsch most absurdly says, *flat and unmeaning,* it carries with it the fine keen edge of reproach: as if it were said, “to teach you what all know and any can teach”) **the rudiments** (or, ‘elements,’ or, ‘first principles:’ see  
Gal. iv. 3 and note; the simple parts out  
of which a body is compounded) **of the  
beginning** (the genitive specifies the elements, that they are not only such, but also belong to the *very beginning* of divine  
knowledge) **of the oracles** (that Christian  
doctrine [ch. vi. 1] which rests entirely on  
revelations from God) **of God; and ye have  
become** (‘not only, *‘ye have need,’* **but ye  
have become such as have need:** indicating  
that it was of their own will, that they had  
brought themselves into this state of need.”  
Chrysoston) (**persons**) **having need of milk,  
and not of solid food** (see 1 Cor. iii. 2.  
The similitude is very common with Philo.  
What is the milk in the Writer’s meaning,  
is plain from ch. vi. 1, where he enumerates  
several portions of Christian doctrine as  
parts of the discourse concerning the beginning of Christ).

**13.]** renders a reason for vv. 11, 12, and especially for  
the assertion that the discourse would be  
difficulty of interpretation. Having before  
stated that what he had to say would be  
hard for him to explain to them, and then  
that they were become persons needing  
milk and not solid food, he now proceeds  
to join these two positions together: **For  
every one who partakes of** (in the sense of  
*has for his share*, in ordinary feeding: not,  
partakes of in common with other things,  
for that adults do: see 1 Cor. x. 21) **milk  
is unskilled in** (not, unskil*ful* in, which  
would be so, but is a different thing) **the  
word of righteousness: for he is an infant**(that is, for every partaker of milk, in the metaphorical sense in which I just now used the word, i.e. every one who requires  
yet to be taught the first principles &c., is  
devoid of understanding in the word of  
righteousness, in, that is, the positions and  
arguments which treat of God’s salvation  
by Christ: for he is an infant: takes the  
same rank in spiritual understanding, that  
an infant does in worldly” Thus taken, I  
can see no difficulty in the contextual connexion. There is of course a mingling of the figure and the thing represented, which  
however is easy enough to any reader to  
whom both figure and thing are already  
familiar. But it is necessary to fix more  
satisfactorily the meaning of the somewhat  
obscure expression, **the word of righteous-  
ness.** Chrysostom interprets it of the  
doctrine of a pure and holy life: others,  
of that relating to Christ, the Author of  
righteousness: others again, of the higher  
doctrines: others, of the doctrine of justification by faith: others, of the doctrine of perfection, of which he by and by speaks:  
some, of the doctrine respecting Melchisedec, who is *King of Righteousness*. I incline more to Lünemann’s view of the meaning,  
based as it is on the requirements of the  
passage, in which the stress is not on  
*“the word of righteousness,”* but on *“unskilled,”* and *“the word of righteousness”* follows as something of course and generally understood. Feeling this, he interprets it. of the gospel in general: that  
*word* of which the central point is, the righteousness which is of God. And he  
refers to 2 Cor. iii. 9, *“the ministration of  
righteousness,”* and xi. 15, *“ministers of  
righteousness.”* This acceptation would not  
altogether preclude *“the king of righteousness”* falling under the same general head, and thus would bring the two expressions into union, though without any distinct reference from one to another).

**14.] But** (continuation of and contrast to  
ver. 13) **solid food belongs to** (is the