feels, seems to me fatal to his view,  
indeed to all views except that which  
makes *sin* to *lie about us, as a garment,  
or beset us, as an inward propensity*. Of  
both these **laying aside** may be said; of  
the former literally, of the lntter figuratively.   
And in choosing between these  
two, I have no hesitation in preferring  
the former. The Writer is speaking of  
our *race:* and having expected us to lay  
aside all superfluous weight of body, which  
the athletes did, he passes to their other  
lightening for the race, viz., *stripping  
naked*, and exhorts us to put off sin, which  
Ties so easily about us. Most likely perhaps  
the word **sin** alludes especially, though it  
need not exclusively, to apostasy. There  
does not seem to be any allusion to the  
different sins which may, in the sense now  
so common, and originally derived from  
this passage in A.V., “*beset*” various  
persons: though, of course, such an *application*   
of the passage is quite admissible),   
**let us through** (not merely ‘*with,*”  
although we must so express ourselves in  
am English *version*, but as *the state in, by  
means of which*) **endurance run the race  
set before us,**

**2.**] **looking unto** (so  
A.V. very exactly. There does not appear  
to be in the word here used any intimation   
of looking *off from every thing else  
unto*, as sometimes asserted) **the Leader**(one who precedes others by his example,  
they following him. But see note on  
ch. ii, 10. *Author* seems the best English  
word here, as there) **and Perfecter** (this  
is variously interpreted. The most likely  
meaning is that H*e perfected the faith*,  
inasmuch as He perfected faith in his own  
person and example: *but He perfected the  
faith* also, inasmuch as He became the  
Author of perfect salvation to them that  
obey Him. His going before us in faith  
has made faith possible for us: His perfecting   
faith in his own person and example,   
has made faith effectual tor us)  
**of the faith** (viz. that faith of which we  
have been speaking through ch. xi.: and  
thus rather “*the faith*” than “*our faith,*”  
which latter is liable to the mistake so  
often made in English, viz. to being taken  
us if it meant *faith in us*, so that Jesus  
should be said to be “author and finisher”  
of each individual Christian’s faith which  
he has within him. The word here may  
be rendered merely “faith” without the  
article; but it would seem most probable  
that the article here used in the original,  
whereas it was not throughout ch. xi., is  
intended to have a definite force. Besides  
which, the ascription of faith to our Lord  
is so plain in our Epistle, compare ch. ii.  
13; iii. 2, that we must not seem to  
exclude this sense in our rendering, which  
we certainly do by “*our faith:*” whereas  
“*the faith*” includes both, and satisfies  
that which follows, in which His own  
example of endurance in prospect of  
triumph is set before us), [**even**] **Jesus,  
who for** (literally, **instead of**: see below)  
**the joy set before Him** (the words of the  
original thus rendered have been otherwise   
interpreted both by ancients and  
moderns, The ancient Syriac version,  
Beza, and others, take it to mean, “*instead  
of the joy which He had before His incarnation.*”   
But this, though not an  
incorrect *rendering*, seems to me doubly  
objectionable. First, which many have  
noticed, *joy* which He already had could  
not well be designated as *set before Him*:  
and then, which I have not seen noticed,  
the term **joy** can hardly be used of a state  
of bliss in which one already is, a quiescent  
or pre-existent joy, but more naturally  
applies to joy prompted by some cause of  
active rejoicing. Then another modification   
of this same view is found in Chrysostom,   
viz., that the preferable alternative  
of escaping the cross was before Him, and  
He might have taken it, if He would. And  
so Luther, Calvin, and others. But this  
again, though it might satisfy the “*set before  
Him,*” falls short of the above sense maintained   
for *joy*. Erasmus and others explain it,  
that He *despised the joys of this life*. This  
makes **joy** identical with *pleasure*, besides  
giving a low and unworthy sense to the  
joy *set before Him*, in making it to mean  
the pleasures of this life. The sense given  
above, “for the joy set before Him,” i.e.  
as in comparison with, as in exchange for,  
the joy which was to come after in the day  
of His triumph, is adopted by most Commentators,