portion of) **the grown up, to those who  
by virtue of their** (long) **habit have their  
organs of sense** (not, *their senses* themselves, but their eyes, ears, tongue, by which the senses act. Here again there  
manifestly is a mixture of the figure and  
the thing signified: on account of what  
follows, we must necessarily understand  
these **organs of sense** of the inner organs  
of the soul) **exercised with a view to  
distinction of good and evil** (this puts  
us in mind, as Bleek remarks, of the common Old Test. expression in describing childhood; e.g. Deut. i. 39; Isa. vii. 16. The reference here of good and is evil is manifestly not to *moral* qualities, but to  
excellence and inferiority, wholesomeness  
and corruptness in doctrine).  
  
**CHAP. VI. 1.] Therefore** (on the connexion, see below) **leaving** (as behind, and  
done with; in order to go on to another  
thing: not, *forgetting*, any more than the  
foundation is forgotten when we rear the  
house upon it) **the word of the beginning  
of Christ** (compare above, ch, vv. 12: that  
word, or discourse, which has respect to  
the fundamental and elementary things  
mentioned below), **let us press on to  
maturity** (a question of some difficulty has  
divided the Commentators here: whether  
this sentence be meant as expressing the  
resolution of the Writer, as we say, “let  
us now proceed” to this or that,—or as  
conveying an exhortation to the readers.  
Each view has a formidable array of supporters. Owen tries [and so Delitzsch] to comprehend both meanings: giving, however, the alternative very  
lucidly: “The Apostle either assumes the  
Hebrews unto himself, as to his work, or  
joins himself with them as to their duty.  
For if the words be taken the first way,  
they declare his resolution in teaching: if  
in the latter, their duty in learning.”  
Between these two, both equally legitimate, the context must decide. And in  
seeking for elements of decision, I own that the alternative seems to me to have been put too exclusively. What I mean  
will be plain, when we consider on the one  
hand that *“laying the foundation”* can  
hardly be properly said of any but a  
*teacher:* and on the other, that vv. 4 ff.  
must necessarily have a general reference  
of warning to the hearers. It seems to  
me that the fact may be best stated thus:  
The whole is a *“condescension”* of the  
Writer to his readers: he with his work  
of teaching comes down to their level of  
learning, and regards that teaching and  
learning as all one work, going on together: himself and them as bound up in  
one progress. Thus best may we explain  
the expressions, which seem to oscillate  
alternately between writer and readers.  
And thus will *therefore* retain all its  
proper meaning, which on the first hypothesis was obliged to be wrested. It will mean, ‘Wherefore, seeing that we [you  
and I, by communication] are in so low a state  
babes, instead of grown men, let us, &c.’); **not again laying the foundation**(the *subjects* to be supplied to the participle **laying** are the readers, with whom the Writer unites himself, as above explained) **of** (the genitives here indicate the materials of which the foundation consists. They are all matters belonging to the *“discourse concerning the beginning  
of Christ:”* extending indeed in their  
influence over the whole Christian life,  
just as the shape of the foundation is that  
of the building: but to be laid down once  
for all and not afterwards repeated) **repentance from dead works, and faith on  
God** (so in the opening of the Gospel,  
Mark i. 15: and in its progress, Acts xx.  
21. These were the common conditions  
on which all mankind were invited to  
embrace the Gospel. And as the readers  
here were Jews, so would these words  
especially remind them of the form in  
which they were first invited by Christ’s  
messengers. But we have to notice the