

A  
SUPPLEMENT

To Dr. HAMMOND's

Paraphrase and Annotations

ON THE

New Testament.

IN WHICH

His Interpretation of many important Passages  
is freely and impartially examin'd:

And the SACRED TEXT further explain'd by new  
Remarks upon every Chapter.

By Monsieur LE CLERC.

---

*To which is prefix'd,*

A LETTER from the Author to a Friend in *England*,  
occasion'd by this Translation.

Likewise his Paraphrase, with Notes on the beginning of *St. John's*  
Gospel, which is not in the Latin *Hammond*, is inserted  
in its proper place.

---

LONDON: Printed for *Sam. Buckley*, and Sold by *Jeffery Wale* at  
the *Angel* in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, 1704.

506.14

L4626H

1924

600 Cal. 5

Wm. H. Bennett

SEP 9 1898

(624)

*A Letter from Mr. Le Clerc to a Friend in England, occasion'd by the English Translation of his Additions to Dr. Hammond on the New Testament; with something relating to his Ars Critica.*

HAVING perus'd several Sheets of an English Version of my Additions to Dr. Hammond on the New Testament, which were sent me over, I was well satisfied with the care and faithfulness of the Translator, not doubting of his exactness in the other Sheets, which I have not yet look'd over; but considering how unfit Judges of such kind of Writings, those who can read them only in their mother Tongue often are, I could not tell whether I had any occasion to rejoice. For hereby those things are submitted to the Censure of the Vulgar, which are in part above a vulgar Capacity; for there are several things in this Volume, which, tho' render'd into English, cannot be understood but by those who have some skill in the Greek Language, and in Heathen and Ecclesiastical Antiquities. No others can safely enough judge of them, because the force of Arguments many times entirely depends upon knowing the use of the Greek Tongue, or Ecclesiastical or Profane History. Yet no Men determine more confidently of these things than those who want that knowledg; because they think themselves competent Judges of every thing that is written in their own Language. And therefore I have often wonder'd that the learned Man, whose Annotations I have translated into Latin, did not chuse rather to write in Latin, than in English; when he very well knew that a great many, nay all the best things he had written in them, were such as could not be understood by mere English Readers. Besides, I did not know whether some learned Men of your Church-Clergy might think well of a Translation of my Additions; not because I have any where oppos'd the Doctrins of the Church of *England*, but because many, I can't tell why, are displeas'd that the Books of Strangers should be read by their Countrymen. I have found this by experience, both before

and not long since, when one that was a perfect Stranger to me, without my Knowledg and Consent, turned into English the Lives of some Fathers that I had written in French a considerable time before, in the *Bibliothèque Universelle*. For those English Lives, which I have not yet seen, stirred up against me the learned Dr. *Cave*, who perhaps would have said nothing about the French Lives; at least he was till that time silent, when in truth he had no reason to reflect upon me for any thing I had said in them, as I shall some time or other, and perhaps soon, shew. And yet there is no man it may be in the Continent, that has a greater value for the English Clergy, and other learned Men of that Nation, than I, or that speaks or writes oftner in their praise; and this not out of Flattery (for what Advantages have I, or can have from thence, who have long since settled my self in *Holland*?) but because I am really of that mind. And this I have testified also by my Actions, having translated several of their Writings into more known Languages than English, that every one might have the benefit of the Learning of the English Nation. What therefore can be the reason, why some English Gentlemen are unwilling to have my Writings read in English? I do not know, nor do I think my self concerned to be very inquisitive into it.

But as I am a lover of Peace, and utterly averse to all Contention, it would perhaps have been more for my satisfaction if I had continued *under the shelter*, if I may so speak, of the Latin Tongue, and so neither feared the rash Censures of the ignorant, nor provoked the displeasure of those learned Men, who would have no body heard but themselves. Yet since I am forced to take my Chance, and the Bookseller has thought fit to make me appear to his Countrymen in English, I shall say a few things to you, as my Friend, by which I may perhaps remove the prejudices and misapprehensions of some People.

Since my Latin Version of Dr. *Hammond* was published, I find he is become very famous, by that multitude of Copies which have been dispersed into all parts of *Europe*, and are much used by all that study the Scriptures. But notwithstanding the eagerness of Buyers and Readers, there have been divers Censures passed upon this my Undertaking. And some of them are come to my knowledg, to which I shall briefly reply.

There are some who would not have had me taken up so much time and pains in translating Dr. *Hammond*; but rather my self have written a new Paraphrase on the New Testament, adding those things which I thought were omitted by other Interpreters. These think too  
favourably



favourably of me, and not honourably enough of the learned *Doctor*. But I who know my self and him better, and understand what it is to keep within compass, count it an honour to have my fragments added to his completer Labours; if I may but do it with the leave of those who are of a contrary opinion. And that I speak herein sincerely, and not out of any feigned Modesty, sufficiently appears by the great trouble I have taken upon self, more for *Dr. Hammond's* sake than my own; for if I had not had a great esteem for his Writings, I should never have translated such a large Volume; nor would I have added any thing to idle Fictions, or spent time in confuting things, the weakness of which every one might see. And indeed as there are three things requisite in an Interpreter, without which nothing extraordinary can be expected from him, and which, if any one has, he does ill except he employs them for the publick good; those, in my judgment, were all found in *Dr. Hammond*. To wit, a knowledg of the Tongue wherein the Author writes whom we undertake to interpret, and the Subject of which he treats; a continual and careful reading of that Writer, so as to become perfect Masters of his Stile and Method; and lastly a sort of Critical or Grammatical Habit, acquired by long Custom, and confirmed by reading the best Interpreters, so as to be able to apply what we know of the Language and Things, skilfully and pertinently, whenever there is occasion.

*Dr. Hammond* was not only a very skilful Divine, but an excellent Grecian and likewise Hebrician, the Idioms of which Language are often mixed by the Writers of the New Testament with Greek Expressions. They that understand only speculative Divinity, often stumble in particular Passages, and many times look for Doctrins, true indeed in themselves, but nothing at all to their purpose, in places where they are not; and know not how to make a right use of those places whence they may really be deduced. They are contented not to oppose the received Doctrins, and think they cannot do amiss in seeking them any where, provided the words do not too plainly oppose it. By which means we see the Antient Interpreters of Scripture, both Greek and Latin, because they had no regard to Words or Grammar, but minded only truth of Doctrine, have strangely mistaken the genuin sense of Scripture. Hence, in part, came innumerable vain Allegories; which I do not call vain, because they contain false Doctrins, but because they are grounded upon no certain reason. Hence proceeded the violent Interpretations, and pitiful Subtilties, with which the Writings of those Interpreters abound. We need but read *St. Austin's* Commentaries on the *Psalms*, where we shall scarce

meet with a page, that has not some examples of this kind. Which if it were a true way of interpreting, any thing almost might be proved or disproved out of any place whatsoever. This Dr. *Hammond* carefully avoided, and would have avoided more, if some particular things had not a little too often occurred to his thoughts; as *the Heresy of the Gnosticks, the Destruction of Jerusalem, and Church-Discipline*; which three things he frequently sought for, where no body acquainted with the Apostles stile, had ever before look'd for them, and few again ever will. Yet, as I said before, Dr. *Hammond* does not near so often dash upon this Rock, as the Antient, or most late Interpreters, especially those who have written in the last Age. I might add this also, which is no small commendation of his Annotations, that he follows mostly that scheme of Divinity which is more agreable to Scripture, than the Opinions of many Interpreters, keeping a middle way between those who deduce a sort of fatal Necessity from all eternity, of which necessity the Mind of Man is a mere Instrument; and those, who like the Heathens, are said to deny that Vertue is at all owing to God.

No Man that reads his Annotations can doubt, whether he had that other faculty of an excellent Interpreter, which I said lay in an exact knowledg of the stile of Scripture, and cannot be acquired but by a constant reading of it. We shall find but few Interpreters so well acquainted with the Sacred Writings: That frequent and exact comparing of the words and expressions of Scripture with one another, which the Reader, upon the first opening of the Book, may observe, puts this matter beyond all doubt.

The third Qualification, which I said was a Critical Habit of judging concerning the meaning of places, tho it was not so great in him as the two former, was however considerable. And this I doubt not he attained by a diligent reading of the best Writers, especially *Grotius*; and he would have acquired it in a much greater degree, if the constant trouble of defending the Church of *England*, against several sorts of Adversaries, had not diverted him. But if we compare him with the Antient Interpreters, or with the greatest part of those who have written in the foregoing Age, we shall find *none* among the Antients, and but *few* among those of late, that can be thought his Equals. For the Antients tho they understood Greek, trusted more to their skill in Rhetorick than Language; and took more pleasure in running out into common places, or Allegories, than in seriously interpreting words and expressions. *Origen* and *St. Jerom*, who besides understood Hebrew, did also much more seldom  
see



use their knowledg in that kind, than a sort of Eloquence which took much in their Age. And later Interpreters have been more industrious to fill up their Commentaries with their own Divinity, and Controversies with other Sects of Christians, than with strict enquiries into the signification of Words and Phrases. But Dr. *Hammond*, considering what is expected from an Interpreter, and knowing the difference between a Preacher or a Divine, and an Expositor of Scripture, sets himself to perform the part of an Interpreter, and seldom concerns himself about any thing else.

Which being so, it cannot reasonably be said that I have spent my time ill in translating Dr. *Hammond*'s Annotations, or in illustrating, correcting, and enlarging them. But as mens Judgments commonly are, proceeding not from love to Truth, but from Passion, I find there are others, who whether really or seemingly, affirm that I am not indeed to be blamed for translating Dr. *Hammond*; but for annexing those things to his Annotations, wherein I often charge him with Error, or do otherwise contradict his Opinion; as if I were bound to assent to all that he says, or ought to have so great a reverence for him, as to be afraid of professing that I think he was mistaken in his interpretation of some Passages.

But to give these Men satisfaction, if they are willing to be satisfied, I would fain know which of the two ought to be most valued, Dr. *Hammond*'s Honour, or Truth? The Reputation of a Man long since dead, and whose Opinions no Law divine or humane obliges us to follow; or the defence of immortal Truth, which we cannot forsake without offending both God and Men? If they are of that humour, that they had rather maintain the Honour of a learned Divine, as I before said, but subject to error, than Truth, they are not fit to be spoken with. I will have no contest with such Men as profess themselves enemies to Truth; but shall leave them, without any reply, to the Mercy of their own perverse Temper. But the Errors, they say, of great Men, ought to be conceal'd, rather than aggravated. I answer, I have no where aggravated any thing, but confuted him in the softest terms, whenever I supposed him in a mistake. However, I don't think the greatest Mens Faults ought to be conceal'd, who the greater they are thought to be, the more liable unwary men are to be deceived by them, and therefore whenever they are out of the way, they ought above all others to be set right again. It is just we should forgive their Mistakes, and bear with their Defects, in consideration of their greater Vertues, and the notable Service they have done the learned World; but we ought not to let Errors

pass under the disguise of Truths. It becomes all Candidates of Learning, especially those that study the Scriptures, to endeavour all they can, and contend earnestly, that Truth upon all occasions may appear; not that it may be concealed, out of respect to any man, or Error receiv'd instead of Truth. The only thing justly blamable, in those who take upon them to correct the Mistakes of great Men, is, if they charge them falsely, passionately, or maliciously, not for the manifestation of Truth, but to lessen their Reputation; or if they endeavour to obscure their great Excellencies, and severely inveigh against small Offences as unpardonable Crimes.

But when Mistakes in men, that have otherwise done great service to the World by their Learning, are modestly censured, only with this design, that others may not follow them in an Error; the Admirers of great Men are so far from having any reason to complain, that if those great Men themselves were to live again, they could not, without the greatest ingratitude, and being chargeable with intolerable Pride, but thank those that had civilly shewn them their Error, and set them in the right way. Men are not so perfect in this World as to be liable to no Mistakes; and those to whom we give the highest Commendations are not such as have never erred, but whose Mistakes are but few, or only in things of little moment. Let us not therefore extol Men so, as if the greatness of their Judgment, or Learning, had exempted them from the common danger of erring; nor on the contrary, think them excluded out of the number of great Men, because they are convinced of some Error. I have so high an opinion of Dr. *Hammond*, upon reading over his Works, that I think there have been few Interpreters ever in the World comparable to him; tho I have often differ'd from him, and shewn sometimes that he was mistaken. So no man has a greater value for *H. Grotius*, or is more forward to commend him, or does it more frequently than I; yet I have sometimes confuted him, both in these Additions and elsewhere, without any abatement of my esteem or veneration for him. I am none of those, who are always upon the extreams both in applauding men and reviling them. I am for commending, without envy, what is praise-worthy; and rejecting, without malice, what is opposite to Truth.

But you ought not, they say, to have mixed things of another kind with Dr. *Hammond's* Annotations. Why not? for it's true he ought not to have any thing attributed to him that he did not say; but in a Work published so long after his death, and that in another language, I don't see why I might not add what I thought wanting in him,  
tho



tho perhaps he himself would not have approved of my Additions, if he had been alive. For I did not publish this work for his use, but of them who are now living, or for posterity, who may reasonably have a greater regard to Truth than to Dr. *Hammond*. They who do not like my Additions, may refuse to buy them. They may get Dr. *Hammond's* Annotations in English by themselves. But are there not great Volumes published both in *England* and *Holland*, in which the Commentaries of learned men both Papists and Protestantes, greatly differing in their opinions from one another, are printed together? And who even among the Papists, was ever displeas'd upon that account, or did not rather highly commend the design, because by that means what is wanting in some is supplied by others? But tho I am not always of Dr. *Hammond's* judgment, yet the differences between us are much fewer, than between the Critical Interpreters of the Old and New Testament; and if they had not, I would certainly never have undertaken to translate any thing of his. But because I agreed with him as to the chief points of Religion and the manner of Interpreting, therefore I translated his Annotations, tho I differ'd from him in some things. As I would have others bear with me whenever I disagree with them, so I cannot only bear with, but also love and respect others when they disagree with me. I count it an honour, as I said before, to have my short Remarks published with his accurate Labours; but if I may speak a little boldly without offence, I do not think so meanly of my own performances as that their value, if it be any, can seem e're the less by their being joined with Dr. *Hammond's*. If I had thought so, I would never have published them either together or alone. I might be mistaken indeed, as all men are commonly dim-sighted in that which concerns themselves; which whether it be true of me, let learned and impartial Readers only judg: but I could not but do what I thought fit to be done.

There is fallen lately into my hands an English Pamphlet intitl'd *A Free but Modest Censure* of some Controversial Books written in English, and among the rest of my *Ars Critica*, tho a Latin Treatise, and quite of another nature from those Controversies. To which there is also added the Authors judgment concerning my design in translating Dr. *Hammond*, of which I shall here subjoin a few things. That *Modest, but Free* Writer, whosoever he be, will not take it amiss, or at least cannot in reason, if I *modestly and freely* vindicate my intention. He

says, it is a harmful project to publish Dr. Hammond's *Annotations on the New Testament*, and at the same time to mix my own *Additional Notes* with them. This, says he, is a politick way to promote the Cause, especially in England, where the *Works* of that learned and pious Annotator are in so great esteem: When his Criticisms and Interpretations are blended with the Socinian ones, how easily will they be both imbibed together? I thought fit to caution my Countrymen about this hazard, that they may not be betrayed into Error, even the worst of Errors, whilst they are intent upon studying the Truth.

The Cause I have undertaken to defend, both in all my other printed Works, and my Additions to Dr. Hammond, is no other than the Cause of Christ and his Apostles; whose Authority alone (in matters of Religion), all Protestants think is to be regarded and followed, if we may judg of their Opinion by the Confessions they subscribe; of which mind I always was and ever shall be. I value the Authority of Socinus, or any other uninspired persons whatever, destitute of reason, no more than Dr. Hammond's or the Council of Trent's. When I think they agree with Christ and his Apostles, I assent to them; and if not, I differ from them. I never read all Socinus' Works, nor like his peculiar Opinions, so far as I know them, any more than other mens, whom I judg to be in an Error. Nay, I have sometimes confuted them, and as I see occasion shall confute more of them; not with a design to make his Followers odious, or to gain the favour of any Mortal, but to vindicate Truth. However, I am not of their mind who because men err in some things, that are otherwise obedient to the Precepts of the Gospel, and look for the coming of Christ to judg the quick and the dead, after the resurrection, by the rule of the Gospel, and reward the Good and punish the Wicked; and think not that they can attain Salvation by any other means, than the Faith they have in Christ, as one sent from God, which Faith alone they hope by the mercy of God, to have imputed to them for righteousness; I am not, I say, of their mind that sentence such men to everlasting Flames, into which they would, if they were able, immediately hurry them, without the least mercy; and in the mean time decree in a cruel manner to persecute them with Execrations, and Ecclesiastical and Civil Punishments. I have not so learned Christ, I do not find the Apostles ever acted in that manner; and whilst they are silent, and do not lead the way by their Example, I had rather incur the danger of being too merciful, than expose my self to the Charge of the least Cruelty and Barbarity. God will much sooner forgive them



them that heartily love him, that is, who keep his Commandments, and especially that great and so often repeated one of loving our Neighbour, their excessive Charity, if any Charity can be excessive towards men fearing God and Christ, tho in some things erroneous; than that horrible inhumanity, with which they are frequently defamed, and persecuted, and forced to endure all manner of Punishments, only because they profess themselves not to believe, what they think Christ or his Apostles never revealed. I had infinitely rather stand in the number of the merciful, before the tribunal of the great Judg, than in the company of Persecutors, whatever their Riches or Honours are in this World. I had rather be in the mean while evil spoken of and suspected of Errors, which I am as far from as can be, than appear by any means to countenance such Barbarity.

Nor am I of their mind, who oppose those that differ from them with any kind of Arguments, after the example of bad Lawyers, who deny all that their Adversaries affirm, and affirm all they deny. Truth, in my judgment, can never be well defended but by Truth. Let others contend with Passion, and affirm what it is the interest of their party should seem true, or deny, not that which they are sure is false, but which they think it necessary should appear so, that their side may prevail; as for me I will always say what I think true, and shall never fear any danger to the Christian Religion from Truth. This was heretofore the mind of a great man, for whom Dr. *Hammond* had always a very high value, whom he often transcribed, whom he defended against the Calumnies of his Adversaries, and in whose praise he every where speaks. All know very well that I describe *Hugo Grotius*, who whenever he thought *Socinus*, or *Crellius*, truly interpreted any place of Scripture, made no scruple to follow them; tho he knew at the same time that some ill minded men reviled him for it. Wherefore Dr. *Hammond* has justly more than once pleaded his Cause, as every one, that has read over the second Volume of his Works, knows.

I am not at all for diminishing Dr. *Hammond's* Reputation, as I have already sufficiently declared; I do not deny but he was a *pious and learned* man; nay if I had not those thoughts of him, I would never have undertaken to translate one line of his Writings. But my Animadversions neither need his Piety nor Learning to make them be read, if they are valuable; and if they are not, *the Learning and Piety* of Dr. *Hammond* will not procure me the Reader's favour; on the contrary,

contrary, if I am any where mistaken, the comparing them with Dr. Hammond will but render my Mistakes the more visible. ¶ But Socinian Doctrins, says my Censurer, will be imbibed with the true. I answer, I have before denyed, that I follow Socinus as my Guide; but I don't understand why this Censurer should be so much afraid lest the true Doctrins asserted by Dr. Hammond should not be effectual to prevent the ill impressions, that false and Socinian Interpretations may make upon Readers minds. If I were to reason after his manner, I should say that this Censurer is a close Socinian; who by secret methods endeavours to advance the credit of Socinus his Opinions. For it must needs be a very powerful Doctrine in his apprehension, which if any, tho never so little, of it be mixed with the Writings of Orthodox Divines, it so obscures all their Reasons, that whether they will or no, it is easily imbibed. This way of arguing tends more to magnify and promote, than to depress and extinguish Socinianism, against which the most learned Annotations on the New Testament are not, it seems, a sufficient Preservative. ¶ Besides this, there is another thing which gives ground for suspicion, and it is what my Censurer, and other such as he generally stand by. To wit, If a person be any thing ingenious, or more learned than ordinary, and writes out of the common road, he is presently a Socinian; as if all men of sense must needs turn Socinians. We have lately had a remarkable instance of this in the worthy and ingenious Mr. Lock, who, because he reasons more accurately about many things, than any before him had done, in his Excellent Treatise of *Humane Understanding*, is immediately cried down as a Socinian, by this Censurer and others. This is in earnest to favour the Socinians, to make all good wits of their number. Just such reports were formerly spread of *Hugo Grotius*, and *Ren. Cartesius*; which were no disgrace at all to those men, but an honour to the Socinians. So *Erasmus* was before charged with *Arianism*, by the Monks of those times, and others no better than they; as if it had been impossible for a man of his capacity to be Orthodox. ¶ I am conscious to my self how far I come short of those great men in learning and natural abilities; but if my Censurer was in earnest in the commendations he bestows upon me, he must needs own, that those endowments of mind which he attributes to me, were also the occasion of my falling into those Opinions, which he calls *the worst of errors*. But if he only flatter'd me, that he might speak the more spitefully of me afterwards, let me tell him, that feigned Respect is an argument of very little candour, to say no worse of it.



If he will say that *Socinus* was mistaken in a great many things, I fully agree with him; but I can reckon up a great many worse Errors than his, whereof I shall mention but one out of respect to my Censurer; that is, of those who think men deserve eternal Torments whom Christ never condemned; who by all means persecute those that differ from them, tho they own themselves to be as liable to Error as the very men whom they persecute; who, in a word, think they may upon very slight suspicions traduce men that are heartily devoted to Christianity, and sober in their lives, as a kind of Plagues to be carefully shunned. He that does not ascribe to Christ, what he thinks Christ never assumed to himself, if otherwise he perform constant obedience to all his Precepts which he fully understands, may obtain the forgiveness of his Ignorance from a most favourable and compassionate Judg; but he that breaks the Command of loving his Neighbour, which is as clear as the Sun at noon-day, by Slandering, and Bitterness, and Cruelty, and dies in those Vices, shall never, unless a new Gospel be made for him, be admitted into the Kingdom of Heaven.

Here I might take leave of my Censurer; but because he has thought fit to set such another mark of Infamy upon my *Ars Critica*, I shall briefly shew, that he is mightily mistaken, and did not diligently read what he was resolved to condemn. He says in the first place, that my Design in that Treatise was, by a new and cunning way to propagate *Socinianism*. But I who know my own mind and purpose a great deal better, utterly deny it: and there is nothing in the thing it self, which argues that I did so undesignedly. My intent was to shew how Students might arrive to a solid and useful sort of Learning. And therefore I intermixed a great many Examples, taken from things of the greatest moment, to prove that *Criticism* was no contemptible Art.

But my Censurer produces some Passages by which he endeavours to shew that my Design was to clear the way for *Socinianism*; which places I shall briefly consider, that every one may see with what Integrity and Modesty he descants upon them.

I said in *Part 1. Chap. 1. §. 3.* That many things in the Writings of the Antients had a respect to the Opinions of their Times; which must therefore be known, that we may understand what they mean. *Ita cum Judæorum præcipua in divino cultu ceremonia in sacrificio essent sita; ideo in Novo Testamento omnia fere pietatis officia sacrificii nomine interdum indigitari.* So because the chief Ceremony of the Jews in divine  
Worship

## Mr. Le Clerc's Letter

*Worship was Sacrificing, therefore in the New Testament almost all religious duties are sometimes expressed by the name of Sacrifices.* Then I add, *Mortem Christi sacrificium quoque vocari, quod fuerit præcipua ejus pietatis pars, & quædam habeat sacrificiis similia: That the death of Christ is called also a Sacrifice, because it was the chief part of his Obedience, and had some things in it resembling Sacrifices.* Here my Censurer translated my words so negligently, that he renders the Phrase *ejus pietatis, of that Religion,* as if I had a respect to the Jewish Religion; whereas I manifestly speak of Christ's Piety towards his Father. Then hence he infers, that I suppose the Sacrifice of Christ was only a *metaphorical and improper* Sacrifice, to side with those that reject Christ's Satisfaction. But what kind of Logick is this? That action of Christ, by which he principally redeemed men, is called a Sacrifice, by a Phrase taken from the Custom of the Jews, tho it did not in all things resemble a Sacrifice: therefore Christ did not redeem us. By what revelation came my Censurer to know, that to the end Christ might redeem men, it was requisite he should be slain just like a Victim, without any manner of difference? And how will he prove that there was every thing in the death of Christ which was observable in a Sacrifice? It's certain the Priest and the Sacrifice was not the same; the Sacrifice was slain in a consecrated place, the Blood of it was poured out at the foot of an Altar; and many other Rites were used, none of which, properly speaking, were observed in Christ's Crucifixion. Notwithstanding which, the Death of Christ might have all the efficacy of a Sacrifice. It is fit, for my Censurer's information, to observe that we are not to seek for all the circumstances of a Sacrifice in the death of Christ; because in so doing men often mix their own rotten Inventions with divine Revelation: as for instance, some inconsiderately say, that the Cross was an Altar; whereas there neither was, nor could be, any Altar in this Oblation, upon which the Sacrifice was to be consecrated; as it was in the Levitical Sacrifices. But this every one knows, and I would not have mention'd it, but that my Censurer speaks as if he was ignorant of it. As for his saying that what I affirm of the word Sacrifice being attributed to the Death of Christ, is nothing to the business of which I undertook to treat in that place of my *Ars Critica*, I leave that to the examination of the Reader. I have not so much time to spare, that I should always be teaching the Elements of Logick or Grammar.



In Part II. §. 1. c. 3. I have put it beyond all doubt, that *tho the most high God is stiled by the Jews Elohim, yet that word signifies God, as he is the object of Worship, εὐλασκω, not his most perfect Nature.* I have shewn also that the word *θεός* was used by the Jews that spake Greek, by the Gentiles and the Christians themselves in the same sense; which is of no small use to the understanding of innumerable Passages in antient Writers, both sacred and profane, which would otherwise be very obscure. Nothing can be more evident; and the design of the whole Chapter, to those who are not wilfully blind, is very plain. The thing it self is not opposed by my unknown Censurer, because it is undeniable, and is confirmed by the Consent of the most learned men; but he suspects that my design in writing it was, *to intimate that tho our Saviour might be the object of divine Worship, yet that he is not God.* Whether he speaks as he thinks I cannot tell, be that to himself; but I beseech him never to treat any other man at the same rate as he has done me. For to pretend to know the secret designs of Men, is not only *immodest*, but *sensless*; and in this matter I assure him he is utterly mistaken. I never thought Christ might be *the object of divine Worship*, tho he was not God: that would be mere Idolatry. Nay, the *Socinians* themselves do not say that Christ ought to be worshipped as the most high God, while they do not think him to be the most high God; but only with such a Worship as is due to an Ambassador from the supreme Majesty. I would have my Censurer read their Books before he undertakes to oppose them; and not attribute to me what neither I nor any man else ever imagin'd. It is not the part of a *modest* Man to cavil at what he does not understand, nor of a man of Candor, to misrepresent other mens Principles.

In the following Chap. IV. I said I did not think there was any Emphasis in this Phrase, *thou shalt die the death*, Gen. ii. 16. but that it signified simply, Death; and I rejected both the Opinion of *S. Austin*, who looks here for I know not how many kinds of Death, and those who interpret it of Mortality, which Interpretation I affirmed *to be contrary* to the constant use of the Hebrew Language. What says my Censurer to this? Does he shew that Use is against me? Does he prove that I was mistaken? By no means; but he contends that I side with a Party, *viz.* of *Socinians*; as if there were not learned Interpreters of all Parties that reject that Interpretation; which can be defended by no Example, but only by weak Arguments. Besides, for my Censurer's satisfaction, tho I do not think Mortality is there meant,

yet I doubt not but *Adam* was immortal before he sinned, and that he really became mortal by Sin, which he might have understood from my Commentary on *Gen.* iii. 19.

In the same Chapter I proved by manifest Examples, not only out of Heathen Writers, but out of *S. Paul* and *Josephus*, that the Phrase *to write laws in the heart*, in *Jeremiah*, is not to make them necessarily be obeyed, but only remembered without a Monitor. My Censurer says, that the Prophet speaks of the New Covenant, which I never denied; then he adds, that this Phrase signifies that *by virtue of the holy Spirit the understandings of the faithful are so enlightned, and their wills and consciences so effectually wrought upon, that they are enabled to observe the Law*. But by what undoubted Example does he prove this? None at all. Nor could it any more than that irresistible efficacy, be demonstrated by any Theological Arguments. But I have proved by examples out of *St. Paul* *Rom.* ii. 15. and *Josephus*, that that Phrase is not to be strained too far. And as to *St. Paul's* words, my Censurer says nothing, only he denies that examples taken out of Heathen Writers are any proofs; as if I had produced none but them. Then he says that in the passages of *Josephus*, the *Writing of the Law in Mens Minds, and the preserving it in their Memories*, seem to him to be two distinct things. But let the Reader consult those places, and he will wonder at the shrewdness of this free Censurer.

I said that by this Phrase of *St. Luke* in *Acts* xvi. 14. *The Lord opened her Heart, that she attended to those things which were spoken of Paul*, was meant no more than that, by *divine Providence* it came to pass, (*quibuscunque tandem machinis usus sit Deus*) whatever engines God made use of that *Lydia attentively gave ear to St. Paul*: As sufficiently appears by the foregoing Examples. My Censurer thinks this to be a strange expression, *quibuscunque tandem machinis usus sit Deus*; as if any that understood Latin did not know it to be a metaphorical Phrase taken from Cities, are batter'd with *Engines*. And my using such a Metaphor cannot seem strange to those, who have read in *St. Paul* *2 Cor.* x. 4. that *the Weapons of the Apostles warfare were not Carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strongholds*. For why may not I use such another Metaphor, and say *Engines*? Who, besides, that has any thing of Learning does not know that the best Latin Writers use that word in this Metaphorical sense? Let my Censurer read but this Passage of *Cicero* in *Epist.* xviii. to *Brutus*: *ad reliquos his quoque labor mihi accessit, ut omnes adhibeam machinas, ad tenendum adolescentem*. But would you know, good Sir, what those *machines* were, which God

made



made use of to open the Heart of Lydia, seeing I have not expressed my Mind more clearly in my *Ars Critica*? Why they were those *spiritual Weapons* of St. Paul, by which he pulled down strong holds; namely, the Gospel, which opens the Hearts of its Hearers, unless they are wilfully shut against God's call. So the Jews ordinarily said that *the Law opened their Hearts*, as you may be informed by *Lud. Cappellus* on Luke xxiv. 25. A sort of Inspiration whereby God works upon all the hearers of the Gospel, to enable them to receive it as they ought, if it be not their own fault, or upon some only, whom he irresistibly works upon, is no where intimated in Scripture, as some of the most learned Men have long since shewn, whom my Censurer may read. Whereas he says that I insist upon the ambiguity of the words *to redeem*, and *Spirit*, on purpose to patronize *Socinianism*, that is but the repetition of a Calumny which he brings over so often as to make it nauseous. He can't deny that what I said is true, but to lessen my Reputation, he pretends I wrote it with an ill design. I must undoubtedly, to please him, not only have reviled the *Socinians*, but made my self also a Liar, or concealed the Truth, that they might be the more easily refuted, or rather seem to be so. Then the commendableness of my design would have made all my dissimulations and falsehoods praise-worthy: But these are the tricks of a Man whose own Conscience condemns him, and who is a great favourer of the *Socinian* cause, whilst to undiscerning Persons he seems to oppose it. Which if it was not my Censurer's design, as I will not affirm; at least he manages things so, that it is as easy to see he is as unfit a Man to put an end to that Controversy, as he is good at detracting and calumniating.

In *Cap. vii.* I shewed that *ὁ θεὸς θεός* are properly Gods, by the institution of Men, or such as are accounted Gods. *And yet*, says my Censurer, *such was our Saviour*, say the *Socinian Masters*, *he is a God by divine Institution.* Therefore hence he ought to have inferred, if he would be consistent with himself, that it was not my design to gratify the *Socinians*, whom yet he unfitly compares to the Heathens.

In the *viii<sup>th</sup>* Chapter I said that irresistible *Grace*, which is asserted by *S. Austin*, did not seem to me to be agreeable to Scripture; and that the word *Grace* had no evident meaning in it. My Censurer does not prove the contrary, but endeavours to make me odious, for saying that *St. Austin was a popular Speaker, but no Critick.* As if that were not a thing very well known to all that have read his Works, or as if any doubted of it. I easily believe my Censurer never read *St. Austin's* works, in which I deal more fairly with him, than he does with me. Otherwise I

should say that either he had no knowledg at all of the Holy Scriptures, or a great deal of impudence, who should attribute to St. *Austin* a critical Skill, and that in the Scriptures (for here the Discourse is about the interpretation of Scripture) and endeavour to make me ill thought of for denying it. He calls him a *pious and learned Father*, which titles he gives to Dr. *Hammond*, whom he knew to be of a contrary opinion. But in this matter St. *Austin* neither thought *piously*, nor wrote *learnedly* of God. And as little *piety* or learning does he shew in his Epistles to *Boniface* and *Vincentius*; where he zealously defends Persecution on the account of Religion, and that with very absurd Arguments. He was one of the very first that promoted some two Doctrins, which take away all Goodness and Justice, both from God and Men. For by the one God is represented as creating the greatest part of Mankind to damn them, and sentence them to eternal Torments, for Sins committed by another, or which they themselves could not avoid; and by the other, Magistrates, and all that have the Administration of publick Affairs, are stirred up to persecute those that differ from them in matters of Religion. However that first Doctrin might be born with, because if any Man rashly shuts others out of Heaven, and erroneously reflects upon the Goodness and Justice of God, provided he does not persecute those that differ from him, and force them to profess themselves of his Opinion; he does more hurt to himself than to others, because God is nevertheless Gracious and Merciful. But he that is for being cruel to those that differ from him, does mischief both to others, and to the Truth. He makes himself a Beast, and forfeits eternal Happiness, which is promised to reasonable Creatures, not to Savages; he persecutes the innocent, and exposes them to innumerable Calamities; in fine, he disparages Truth, if he defends it by such Methods; and if he opposes it, he profanes the most Sacred thing in the World, and fights against God who is its Author. And this is no vain fear about what perhaps will never be; we have reason to be afraid lest St. *Austin's* Authority should move Christians to persecute one another for differences in Religion. The thing is actually come to pass already; for a certain great and powerful Monarch, in whose Kingdom many thousands of Protestants lately lived, was chiefly by that Father's Authority moved to attempt and execute those things; for which all *Europe* has justly rung with the loud Complaints of poor wretches that have been forc'd to fly their Country. It's certain the French King, who is otherwise no Tyrant, could not by any means have been induced to cancel all his past Edicts in favour



of the Reformed; and make use of the barbarity of Souldiers, to extort from them a confession which none of the Clergy of that Kingdom could by all their false reasonings bring them to, unless it were after the foremention'd Letters of St. *Austin* had been read to him, whose Authority, being imposed upon by Flatterers, he thought he might safely follow. Let my Censurer go now and resent my being so hardy as to say the truth of St. *Austin*. I speak in that manner, who do not use, like many others, to calumniate the Living, and speak untruths in favour of the Dead.

My Censurer pretends, that in *Chap. ix.* where I said that Philosophers and Divines often use words that have no meaning in them, and which if any one desire them to interpret, they can give no solid answer, for which I instanc'd in the words *Transubstantiation* and *Consubstantiation*. My Censurer, I say, pretends that I have a respect also to the *Trinity*, and other particular points belonging to the same matter. This forsooth is that *modest* Censurer, otherwise called *searcher of Hearts*, who can divine what other Men think, tho they are never so profoundly silent. Were I to make a Conjecture from what he has written, I should say that he did not only exterminate Charity, but even Justice and Truth out of the number of Christian Vertues. But I had rather think he erred through I know not what Passion, that hurried him to the violation of those Duties of Religion, which he himself accounted the most sacred.

My Interpretation of the words *Righteousness of God*, in *Chap. xii. 17.* for God's righteous Precepts, has no affinity with the peculiar Doctrins of the *Socinians*, unless it be in the brains of a Man that sees things where they are not, and has conceived such a dreadful Notion of the *Socinians*, that upon the least noise he presently imagins a whole Army of them to be coming upon him. I am sure *Crellius* and *Schlictingius*, their chief Leaders, give us a quite different interpretation of this place.

In *Chap. xiv.* I did not say that St. *John* had the same thoughts of the eternal *Reason*, as *Plato*; but only called the Divinity which dwelt in Christ, *Logos*, in a *Platonical* manner; and added, that it remained to be enquir'd whether S. *John* understood that word in a *Platonical* sense, plainly intimating that I thought the same word might be taken in different notions. I said also that if that word were to be understood in a *Platonical* sense in St. *John*, we should be forced to go over to the *Arians*; which, according to the opinion my Censurer represents me to be of, no Man in his wits would say it were necessary to do.

But this searcher into Heresies forgot that *Platonism* or *Arianism* was very different from *Socinianism*. And he knows not, or makes as if he did not know, that I have in a particular Dissertation, explained the beginning of St. *John's* Gospel, in a sense contrary to *Platonism*. Whereas I said that all Christians do at this day very much differ from the Opinion of the *Nicene* Council, he knows that can be manifestly proved from English Books, not to mention Latin. He knows very well that the learned Dr. *Cudworth* has proved that the *Nicene* Fathers, and others, thought the three Hypostases to be three equal Gods, as we should now express it. Let him read also the Life of *Gregory Nazianzen*, which I have written, and has been translated into English, if he does not understand French; and he will find that *Gregory* was undoubtedly of that Opinion. The thing is so clear, that it cannot be question'd by those who have consider'd it. But of this elsewhere.

In *Chap. xvi.* I rejected the mystical and high flown interpretations, and *ἐντελέαι* of the Antients which are destitute of reason; and I still reject them, with all the best Interpreters of Scripture. I value Rhetorical Arguments, which depend only upon the Speakers fancy, and are not to be tried by the rule of right Reason, no more than my Censurer's Calumnies, which are the products of his own fruitful brain. Such is his saying that I rejected the Rhetorical Discourses of the Fathers, because I think all things to be clear and plain in Christianity, and that no Mystery is to be admitted. Of which there is not so much as one word in that Chapter, where I speak of vain Rhetorick, and not of the obscurity or perspicuity of Religion. I never thought we had a clear and perfect Notion of all things revealed, as I have sufficiently shewn in the 2d Part of my *Ars Critica*, where I treat of *clear and adequate Notions*. My Censurer, who knows the secret Thoughts of mens Hearts, ought to have known what I had written in a Treatise he took upon him to censure. But he read it only to find matter of Calumny, not to do himself any good by it.

What I said about *Concrete* and *Abstract* Notions in *Part. ii. c. 5.* let my Censurer read over again a little more sedately; and he will find I had great reason to say that the names of Synods were names of abstract Ideas; because many attributed to them things which rather should have been in them, than which really were so, to heighten their Authority to the prejudice of Religion. The *Council of Trent* is alone enough to shew the necessity of this Observation. But these Lessons were written for the sake of such as love Truth; not such



such as are ready to defend or oppose any thing for Reward.

In the *viiiith Chap.* of the same Part, I said that all Men had not the same Notion of God, but some a larger and more noble one, and others a meaner and more contracted one, of which I alledged very plain examples, which I thought were almost useles, because no Man that had the least knowledg of Mankind could have any doubt of it. But this Censurer neither understood what I said, nor himself, while he affirms that these are *no very reverent thoughts of God.* They only think irreverently of God, who either worship Idols, or after they have endeavour'd, without any regard to Truth, Justice or Charity, to defame Men that fear God, think they have deserved well of Religion and their Country, and that therefore those Revenues are due to them, which the Piety of the Antient Christians instituted only in favour of good and learned Men, not of Slanderers.

Afterwards my Censurer upbraids me for reciting in *Part iii.* several places of the New Testament, wherein the Discourse is of Christ, corrupted by bad Men in the antient Copies, whether they thought well or ill of Christ; which I did not enquire into, nor did I deduce any Consectary, relating to any Theological Doctrin, from thence. He does not shew that there was no alteration made in those Copies, because he could not; but he interprets all these things in a bad sense according to his custom. What he himself thinks of these things, I cannot tell, nor am I concern'd to know; but I must needs say he defends the Cause which he affirms to be the best, both here and elsewhere, just as the most desperate Causes use to be defended; that is, by concealing Truth, and endeavouring to make those who declare it, as odious as is possible. Which whether it be for the honour of a Party, I leave him to consider, and those whose province that is.

At last he concludes his unjust Accusations with an Observation, which effectually confutes almost all he had said before: to wit, that I have alledged nothing new in favour of the *Socinians* about those places, nor endeavour'd to confute Bishop *Pearson*, and Bishop *Stillingfleet*. For thence he ought to have inferred, that I had another design, which I should not have executed otherwise than I have done, if there had never been any *Socinians* in the World. My intention having been only to shew the use of Criticks in things of the greatest moment, and if I am not mistaken, I have reached my end. The rest of what my Censurer says, has either been already confuted, or does not deserve consideration.

This,

*Mr. Le Clerc's Letter, &c.*

This, worthy Sir, is what I thought fit to say of Dr. *Hammond* and my *Ars Critica*, which I had a mind should be published, that the World might have this Testimonial of my Intentions, not to engage my self in a Quarrel with my Censurer; who if he be not brought to righter Apprehensions by what I have here said, no Arguments would ever convince him. Let him now call himself to an account for his Accusations, and not hope that God should be propitious to him, unless he repent of his unchristian Behaviour; which I speak with so hearty a good will to him, that I earnestly pray God not to lay this thing to his charge, but rather reduce him to a better Mind.

YOURS,

*Amsterdam,*  
Jan. 25. 169<sup>3</sup>.

J. LE CLERC.

## Errata.

P. 3. lin. 8. r. *their bold.* P. 48. l. 8. r. *deep rooting, or like weeds.* P. 95. l. 16. r. *Vers.* 51. P. 214. l. 13. f. *has not* r. *had.* P. 234. l. 14. f. *Ibid.* r. *Vers.* 28. Note h. P. 473<sub>2</sub> and 475. run Tit. r. *COLOSSIANS.* P. 545. l. 18. r. *compared with former, yet they.*

ADDI

# ADDITIONS

TO

Dr. HAMMOND'S

# ANNOTATIONS

ON THE

# New Testament.

Addition to the Annotation on the Title of the whole Book.

**T**O this which Dr. Hammond has observed of the word *διαθήκη*, if we add what is said of the same word by Grotius, there will remain but this one thing further to be noted, whereby many places of Scripture, yea the whole Christian Doctrin may be illustrated: Namely, that the word *διαθήκη*, in whatever sense it be taken, is metaphorical, and borrowed from the Customs of Men; for Covenants and Testaments properly so called, are only made amongst Men. Now Metaphorical Terms are seldom grounded upon a perfect Similitude between those things, to which they are indifferently applied; and therefore they cannot always be scrued up to the whole Latitude of their natural signification. It is sufficient if there be any Agreement, tho but small, between:



tween the thing, of which any word is used in a metaphorical sense, and that which it properly signifies. So that all that can be inferred from the bare word, is, that the several things expressed by it, have some affinity with one another. And in order to determin wherein that similitude lies, we must carefully consider both things themselves: Which being done, we may argue from the thing to the signification of the word, but not from the word to the thing.

So that from the sacred Writers calling the Laws of God διαθήκη a Covenant or Testament, this only in the first place can be concluded, that there is some likeness between the Laws of God and Covenants or Testaments. But that we may distinctly know wherein that likeness consists, we must first consider in what manner God deals with Men, setting aside all metaphorical Notions, and looking as narrowly as possible into things themselves; then we must enquire what Men do when they enter into Covenants, or make Testaments; and lastly, by a comparison of both, we may gather the true sense of the metaphorical Word or Phrase. So that they labour in vain, who whilst things themselves remain obscure, deduce as many Similitudes as they can from words.

Now if we consider the way in which God deals with Men under the Gospel, and then think what is ordinarily done in Testaments, we shall find that there is only this similitude between the Gospel and a Testament, that in both there is something given, and in both Death intervenes. So that wherever the Gospel is called a Testament, provided the Speaker can be thought to have a clear knowledg of things themselves, only one or other of these will be signified. For this is also to be carefully observed, that the mind of the Speaker must be known before any thing be affirmed of it; for tho' two things agree in many particulars, yet we often think but of one, or a few of them, and would not always have them all urged. To illustrate this by an example, It appears from the place in Heb ix. 16, 17. which Dr. Hammond here interprets, that the Sacred Writer only compares the Gospel and a Testament so far, as there is a Death and Gift in both. And therefore the signification of the word διαθήκη ought not, as to those words, to be extended any farther. In like manner,

## on the Title of the whole Book.

*manner where it is taken for a Covenant, it is not to be inferred that all those things are to be sought for in God's Oeconomy, either Old or New, that are observable in Covenants, and that every thing must be interpreted according to the Notion of a Covenant. From a steady consideration of the thing it self, it appears that God's Dispensations are nothing but Laws: And therefore whatever is said about fæderal Signs, by which God and Men do more closely bind themselves to one another, being besides Scripture, and not to be certainly concluded from the word Covenant, is perhaps to be reckon'd among those things, which Divines have more subtilly invented than solidly proved. God has no where declared that it was his design to deal with Men so as that all his Dispensations should perfectly resemble Covenants, even in the smallest Circumstances.*

*But perhaps some may reply that sometimes neither the mind of the Speaker, nor things themselves are sufficiently known to us, and ask what we are to think then of the signification of words: I do not see what else can be done in such a case, than to determine nothing rashly as if it were certain. It is undoubtedly the part of a wise Man to refrain from judging of what is doubtful, and I confess I do not know, in this dark state of Mortality, what can be safer than laying such a restraint upon our selves. But this Doctrin will please but few, because most Men love to conceal their Ignorance, and had rather seem learned than really be so. This may suffice to have been said once for all about an over subtil interpretation of metaphorical words, that I may have no occasion to inculcate it.*

*Addit. to the Remark on the words  $\epsilon\gamma\tau\epsilon\ \mu\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  in the Title of the first Gospel, after these words, still remaining to us.] Barnabas who wrote in the same Age with St. Matthew, Ep. Cath. c. iii. cites this Gospel in these words: Attendamus ergo, ne forte, sicut scriptum est, multi vocati, pauci electi, inveniamur. Let us take heed therefore, lest we should be found as it is written, many are called, but few are chosen. These words are twice found in St. Matthew Chap. xx. 16. and xxii. 14. and in no other place of Scripture. For it is observable that St. Matthew is here cited as Scripture, as that*

## Addition to the Annotation, &c.

*form of Speech, SICUT SCRIPTUM est, manifestly shews: whence we may infer in how great Esteem this Gospel was, as soon as ever it was published. Hence it came to pass that when Barnabas his Sepulchre was thought to have been found out by Revelation, by Anthemius Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, it was feigned that St. Matthew's Gospel was found also on the breast of Barnabas, written in Tables of Thyne wood (Thyinis tabulis.) See Theodor. Lector Lib. 11. at the beginning: and Nicephorus Callist. Lib. xvi. c. 37. and Suidas on the word θυίνα. It is reported also that the same Gospel was carried by Bartholomew into India, that is Aethiopia, where it was found by Pantenus Catechist of the Church of Alexandria, under the Reign of Commodus: see Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. v. c. 10. These things, whether true or no, shew that the Antients thought this Gospel was written before the others, and that the Apostles carried it about with them.*

---

A N N O.



# ANNOTATIONS

## ON THE

### GOSPEL according to St. *Matthew*.

#### CHAP. I.

Verf. 1.  
Note a.

**T**HO לך which is properly *to bring forth*, metaphorically signifies *to effect*, yet it does not thence follow that תולדה *Tholedah* signifies *every event*; for the Metaphors of derivative words are often different from those of their Primitives. In all the places the *Doctor* alledges, *Tholedah* plainly signifies *the origin of a thing*, which the *Greeks* call γένεσις. If *Gen.* ii. 4. & v. i. be examin'd, it will appear that the meaning of the sacred Historian is *this*; viz. that *that* was the *origin* of the World and Mankind he had describ'd. Chap. xxxvii. 2. *These are the Generations*, refers to what goes before; and the meaning of *Moses* is nothing but *this*, that the Ancestors of *Jacob* were the same with those of *Esau*; whose Genealogy he had declared in the Chapter immediately preceding. So *Numb.* iii. 1. *The Generations of Moses and Aaron*, signify their *origin* from the Tribe of *Levi*. In the same sense we meet with the word γένεσις several times in *Homer*:

Ἄνευδὸς δ' ὅσπερ γένεσις πάντων τετυχθῆαι.

*The Ocean from which all things had their origin.*

And elsewhere, speaking of the *Ocean*, he calls it δεινὴ γένεσις, *that from which the Gods had their origin*. Βίβλος γένεσις therefore, as *Grotius* very well interprets it, is a description of the *Origin*, which title must be reckon'd prefix'd only to *this* Chapter.

Verf. 8. [Ἰαζάρου δ' ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ ἃ Ὀζιαν.] Here are three Kings left out, *Abuziab*, *Jets*, and *Amaziab*. Again, *St. Luke* reckoning up nineteen Generations

Generations of *natural* Descendents from *Salatbiel* to *Joseph*, whilst *St. Matthew* numbers but *ten*, according to *legal* extraction; this *latter* must needs have omitted *seven* persons likewise in his *last class* of Generations. Concerning these Omissions, many make divers Conjectures. That of *Grotius* is generally look'd upon to be the best; that *St. Matthew* kept to the number of Generations in the *first Class* from *Abraham* to *David*, which was most known, for *memory* sake, in the *rest*; and so it was necessary that some Generations should be omitted, that there might be just three *fourteens*. But it does not seem at all probable to others, that the *Evangelist*, merely for the sake of keeping to the number of *fourteen*, should designedly pass over *ten* Persons, especially in that part of his Computation in which it behov'd him to use the *greatest* exactness, because it was *least* known; for *till* the time of the Captivity, the Genealogical series of the Royal Family of *David* was very well *understood*, but from that time to *Christ* it was known but *obscurely*. Besides, a person cannot be said to *retain* any Genealogy in his *Memory*, that out of fifty Persons, or thereabouts, *omits* ten; and if the Genealogy of *Christ* must needs have been divided into *certain Classes*, it was not therefore necessary that a *fifth* part of his Ancestors should be pass'd over to make a division into *fourteens*, when it had been easy to make *another* division. This made a very good *Friend* of mine think that *St. Matthew* lighted upon a genealogical Book of *David's* Family that was defective; and accidentally observing there three Classes of *fourteen* Generations between these three great periods of time, *viz.* before the setting up of the Regal Government, during its continuance, and after its fall, was thereby mov'd to make *such* a division in his account of *Christ's* Lineage, which he would not so much as have *thought* of, if he had made use of an entire Book. There was no reason, he said, to wonder at his *saying* that a genealogical Book might be *corrupted*, because a very great and considerable Error, that had formerly perplex'd the Antients, and by that appears to be a very *old one*, had crept into the *11th* verse of *St. Matthew's* Text *it self*, and *that* notwithstanding his accurate enumeration of Persons, and *indication* of their number. And hence also he thought it was, that there are some Persons omitted in *1 Chron. iv. 1.* as likewise in *chap. vi.* in the recounting of *Aaron's* Race, which *Grotius* upon this place observes. But this is submitted to the Judgment of the learned Reader. However it looks as if *Matthew* did in the *1st* verse cite a *Book of the origin of Christ*, from whence he took *all* that follows, as far as *verse 16.*

\*

Vers.

Verf. 16. Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός. ] There are some Manuscripts in Chapter I. which the words Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος are wanting, because the Transcribers thought them too languid; but in most of 'em, and those the oldest, they are found, as also in the antient Versions. That *Christian* who inserted a Passage concerning *Christ* into *Josephus's* Antiquities, lib. 20. c. 8. did likewise make use of the same Phrase; upon which *Origen* against *Celsus* says, *Josephus* wrote that the Jews were oppress'd with so many evils for the bold attempts upon James the brother of Jesus, ἡ λεγομένη *Their* χριστός, that was call'd *Christ*, lib. 1. p. 37. concerning which place, see *Tan. Faber* in his Critical Epistles.

Verf. 18. Ἐυρέθη ] i. e. it fell out or happen'd that she was big with child. So the word is taken in *Apollodorus*, Biblioth. lib. 1. c. 4. f. 2. where he treats of the strife between *Apollo* and *Marsyas*; ἀγέρδεις κρείων ὁ Ἀπόλλων, when *Apollo* had overcome.

Verf. 19. Note g. ] To the Examples brought by *Grotius* and our Author, add this one more out of *Terence*, Heaut. Act. 4. Sc. 1. where the Wife thus bespeaks her Husband:

*Mi Chreme, fateor, vincor; nunc hoc te obsecro  
Ut mea stultitiæ in justitia tua sit aliquid præsidii.*

Ibid. note h. ] *Salmasius* seems rather to be in the right, who in his *Comment. de Hellenistica Præf.* after he had observ'd that ἄγασματισμα signifies to punish, because Punishments are ἀγασματισματα examples, in which sense it is often met with in the antientest Greeks, remarks that among the more modern it has the signification of exposing to shame; which he promises to confirm in another place by examples, and to shew that it ought to be so taken in *St. Matthew*. He adds, that if the *Evangelist* had meant by it a capital punishment, he would rather have said, μὴ θέλων αὐτῷ ἀγασματισθῆναι, being unwilling she should be punish'd.

This Remark of *Salmasius* is confirm'd by an example out of *Plutarch*, lib. de curiositate, p. 520. where he says that a person who is prying and inquisitive into the evils of other men, is like one that should have a Book full of *Homers* Verses without a beginning, of tragical Incongruities of Speech, καὶ ἥντιν Ἀρχιλόχου πρὸς τὰς γυναῖκας ἀπρεπῶς καὶ ἀκατάσως ἐρηυδίων, ἐαυτὸν ἀγασματισθῆναι: and of those things which were indecently and filthily spoken against women by *Archilocus*, by which he traduc'd himself, that is, made himself infamous, because such foul Speeches could come from none but a lewd and impure person.



Verf. 2. **N**EW Stars, among the Gentiles, were sometimes  
 Note c. look'd upon as *Omens* that the Infants born at the  
 time of their appearance should arrive to great power. See my Note upon *Num.* xxiv. 13. But whatever truth there was in such *Omens*, it was only understood and brought to mind after those Infants were *actually* possess'd of the supreme Authority; for no Astrology can assure such a thing any length of time before-hand. Suppose a new Star appears upon the birth-day of any one; was there no other Child born in all the Country, besides that *one*, on that day? Or is it written upon the Star in such characters as the rest of Mankind cannot understand, but are easily legible by *Astrologers*, that it appear'd in honour of such a *particular* Infant?

There is no recurring here therefore to *Astrology*; no more than to *Balaam's* or any such like *prophecy*, which had been too dark to help the Wise-men, upon sight of the Star, to *divine* that there was a *King* born to the *Jews*. It is much more credible, that they had been warn'd of it by a heavenly vision, as afterward *v.* 12. they are admonish'd to return another way into their own Countrey. However this Star was no *Comet*, for Comets are too high, to mark out *certainly* so small a place as a little House. It seems to have been a *fiery meteor* that was miraculously so long preserv'd, and appear'd in the *middle* of the Air like one of those we call *falling Stars*, or the like. This is the likeliest account of this matter; but it may not be unuseful, to shew out of a very learned Gentleman of *Ireland* what Arguments there are to support *their* opinion who attribute something here to *Astrology*, and the rather because there is something in *his* Opinion that is very well worth our observation, and of *special* use in the Interpretation of Prophecies. It is Mr. *Henry Dodwell* in his 2<sup>d</sup> Letter of Advice. His words are these.

[ *First* therefore, I suppose that God did intend the *Prophecies* which were committed to *writing*, and enroll'd in the *public Canon* of the Church, should be *understood* by the Persons concerned in them. For otherwise it could not properly be called a *Revelation*, if after the discovery things still remained as intricate as formerly. And it is not credible that God should publish Revelations only to *exercise* and *puzzle* the industry of human enquiries; or as an evidence of his own knowledg of things exceeding ours (tho indeed that it self cannot be known  
 by


by us unless we be able to discern some sense which otherwise could not Chapter  
 have been known than by such Prophecies ) much less to give occasion II.  
 to *Enthusiasts*, and *cunningly designing Persons*, to practise *seditions* and *in-*  
*novations* under the pretence of *fulfilling Prophecies*, without any possi-  
 bility of *rational confutation* by the *Orthodox*, who upon this supposal  
 must be presumed as ignorant of them as themselves: and there is no  
 prudent way of avoiding this *usefulness* and *dangerousness* but by ren-  
 dering them intelligible to the Persons concerned. And *Secondly*, the  
 Persons concerned in these kinds of *Revelations*, cannot be the *Prophets*  
*themselves*, or any other *private Persons* of the Ages wherein they were  
 delivered, but the *Church in general* also in *future Ages*. For as *Pro-*  
*phetic* in general is a *gratia gratis data*, and therefore as all others of  
 that kind given *primarily* and *originally* for the *publick use* of the *Church*;  
 so certainly such of them as were committed to writing, and designedly  
 propagated to *future ages*, must needs have been of a *general* and *perma-*  
*nent concernment*. And *Thirdly*, the Church concerned in those *Prophe-*  
*sies*, cannot only be those Ages which were to survive their accomplish-  
 ment, but also those before; and therefore it cannot be sufficient to  
 pretend, as many do, that these Prophecies shall then be *understood*  
 when they are *fulfilled*, but it will be further requisite to assert that  
 they may be so before. For the only *momentous reason*, that must be  
 conceived concerning these, as well as other Revelations, must be  
 some duty which could not otherwise have been known, which must  
 have been something *antecedent*; for all *consequent* duties of *patience* and  
*resignation* are common to them with other *Providences*, and therefore  
 may be known in an *ordinary way*. Now for *antecedent* duties, such as  
 seem to be intimated in the *Prophecies themselves* where any are mentio-  
 ned, nothing can suffice but an *antecedent information*. Besides, to what  
 end can this *postnate* knowledg serve? For satisfying *Christians* of the  
*Divine prescience* upon the *accomplishment* of his *Predictions*? This is  
*needless*; for they already profess themselves to believe it. Is it there-  
 fore for the *conviction* of *Infidels*? But neither can this be presumed on  
 a *rational account*. For how can it be known that a *prediction* was fulfil-  
 led when it is not known what was predicted? Or how can it be known  
 what was predicted when the prediction is so expressed as to be capable  
 of *many senses*, and no means are acknowledged possible for distinguish-  
 ing the *equivocation*? Nay, will not such a *design* of *ambiguity* seem to  
 such a Person suspicious of that *stratagem* of the *Delpick Oracles*, to  
 preserve the reputation of a *Prophetick Spirit* by a provision beforehand  
 for avoiding the danger of *discovery*? for indeed this kind of *Prophetic*  
 will be so weak an argument for proving *Divine Inspiration*, as that in-



Chapter deed it may agree to any natural Man of *ordinary prudence*. For in *publick affairs* (the subject of these Prophecies) which proceed more *regularly*, and are less obnoxious to an interpolation of *private Liberty*, the *multitude* who are the causes of such Revolutions generally following the *complexion* of their Bodies, and therefore being as easily determined, and therefore predicted from *natural causes*, as such their *complexions*; it will not be *hard*, at least very *probably*, to conjecture *future contingences* from *present appearances* of their *natural causes*. And then by foretelling them in *ambiguous expressions*, he may provide that if any of those senses, of which his words are capable, come to pass, that may be taken for the sense intended; so that a mistaking in all but one would not be likely to prejudice his credit. And at length if all should *fail*, yet a *refuge* would be reserved for their *superstitious reverencers* of his *Authority*, that themselves had rather failed of understanding his *true sense*, than that had failed of *truth*. Especially if among a multitude of attempts, but *one* hit in *one sense* (as it is hard even in a *Lottery* that any should always miss, much more in matters capable of *prudential conjectures*) that *one* instance of *success* would upon those accounts more *confirm* his credit than a *multitude* of *failures* would *disparage* it; because in point of *success* they would be confident of their understanding him rightly, but in *miscarriages* they would lay the *blame*, not on the *prediction*, but their own *misunderstandings*. Now seeing this way is so very easily pretended to by *Cheats* beyond any probable danger of discovery, it cannot to persons not already *favourably affected* (who only need *conviction*) prove any Argument of a *Divine Inspiration*, and therefore will, even upon this account, be perfectly useless. Supposing therefore that it is necessary that these predictions be understood *before*, as well as after that they are *fulfilled*; it will follow *Fourthly*, that where they were not *explained* by the *Prophets themselves*, there they were intelligible by the use of *ordinary means*, such as might, by the Persons to whom the Revelations were made, be *judged ordinary*. For that they should be explained by *new Prophets* to be sent on the particular occasion, there is no ground to believe; and if these Prophecies were so expressed as that they needed a *new Revelation* for explaining them, they must have been useless, and indeed could not have deserved the name of *Revelations*, they still transcending the use of *human means* as much as formerly. For if they had been revealed *formerly*, what need had there been of a *new discovery*? And if this need be supposed, it must plainly argue that the former *pretended Revelation* was not sufficient for the information of mankind in the use of *ordinary means*; and that which is not so, cannot answer the *intrinsic ends* of a *Revelation*.

This



This therefore being supposed, that *old Revelations* are thus intelligible Chapter  
 without *new ones*, it must needs follow that their explication must be II.  
 derived from the use of *ordinary means*. And then for determining   
 further what these *ordinary means* are that might have been judged such  
 by those to whom these Revelations were made, I consider *Fifthly*, that  
 this whole indulgence of God in granting the Spirit of Prophecie was  
 plainly accommodated to the *Heathen* practice of *Divination*. This might  
 have been exemplified in several particulars. Thus First, the very  
 practise of revealing *future contingences*, especially of *ordinary consulta-*  
*tions* concerning the affairs of *private* and *particular persons*, cannot be  
 supposed grounded on *reason* (otherwise it would have been of *eternal*  
*use*, even now under the *Gospel*) but a condescension to the *customs* and  
*expectations* of the Persons to whom they were communicated. And  
 Secondly, that an *order* and *succession* of *Prophets* was established, in  
*Analogy* to the *Heathen Diviners*, is by a very ingenious Person prov- Dr. Stil-  
 ed from that famous Passage of *Deut. xviii. 15, 18.* to which purpose *lingfleet's*  
 he also produces the concurrent Testimony of *Origen cont. Cels. L. 1. Orig. Sacr.*  
 And thirdly, that the sense of the *Platonists* and other *Heathens*, con- l. 2. c. 4.  
 cerning *Divine Inspiration*, its nature and *parts* and *different degrees*, and N. 1.  
*distinction from Enthusiasm*, does very much agree with the notions of  
 the *Rabbins* concerning it, will appear to any that considers the Testimo-  
 nies of both, produced by Mr. *Smith* in his excellent Discourse on this  
 subject. Hence it will follow *Sixthly*, that, as this *Divination* of  
 which they were so eager, was originally *Heathenish*, so they were most  
 inclinable to make use of those means of understanding it to which they  
 had been inured from the same principles of *Heathenism*; especially  
 where God had not otherwise either expressly provided for it, or ex-  
 pressly prohibited the means formerly used; and those Means, others fail-  
 ing, were most likely by them to be judged ordinary. And that *Onei-*  
*rocriticks* were the proper means among the *Heathens* for explaining  
 their *Divinatio per somnium*, answering the *Jewish* degree of *Prophecie* by  
*Dreams*; and indeed the principal Art of the *Harioli* and *conjectures* con-  
 cerning *Visions*, as far as they held Analogy with those Representations  
 which were made to other less prepared Persons in their sleep, will  
 not need any proof. It might have been shewn how the principal  
 Rules of the *Jewish Cabbala* were very agreeable to the like Arts of  
 Tradition among the *Heathen*, and among them were a curious mysti-  
 cal kind of Learning contrived for maintaining a conversation with  
 their Gods; wherein as they were imitated by the *Gnosticks*, so these  
 Rules themselves were derived from the *Heathen occult Philosophy*. And  
 certainly it is most likely to have been some kind of expressing and ex-  
 plaining

Chapter II. Concerning *Triglyphs*, and some kinds of *Learning* subservient thereunto, which was so solemnly studied by the *Jewish* Candidates for *Prophecy* in their *Schools* and *Colleges*, and which made it so strange, that Persons wanting that preparation, such as *Saul* and *Amos*, should be by God honored with it. Besides that we find the punctual fulfilling of several predictions of the *Chaldeans* by virtue of their *Oneirocriticks* (those most eminent Transactions of the Conquests of *Cyrus*, and the Death of *Alexander* the Great, were thus foretold) plainly implying that God himself, as he designed those *Dreams* to be *Divinatory*, so he observed the *Oneirocritical* Rules in their signification. For it is not probable that Revolutions managed by such special designs, and signal interpositions of *Divine* Providence, could have been foreknown or signified by the *Devil*, he being frequently put to his solemn shifts of *equivocation* for concealment of his ignorance in affairs of greater moral probability, and consequently of greater prediction. And it cannot seem more strange that God should observe the Rules of *Oneirocriticks* and *Hieroglyphicks* in his Responses when made use of with a pious design by his own people, than that he should answer the *Heathens* themselves in their own practice. Thus he observed the sign proposed by the *Philistines* for discerning the true reason of their sufferings, 1 Sam. vi. 2, 9, 12. and met *Balaam* in the use of his enchantments, Numb. xxiii. 4, 16. and revealed our Saviours Nativity to the *MAGI* by the means of a *STAR*. And particularly for *Oneirocriticks*, their futableness to this purpose will not be scrupulously questioned by them who admit the Testimony of *Trogus Pompeius*, who ascribes the first invention thereof to the *Patriarch Joseph*, which will be very congruous to that prevailing Opinion among the *Fathers*, and many late excellent Authors, that all *Arts* were derived originally from the *Jews*. Besides, *Daniel* who was so famous for expounding *Dreams*, tho he was thought by the *Heathens* to do some things by the Inspiration of the *Holy Gods*, Dan. v. 11. yet had *Chaldean* education, Chap. i. 4. and was a great proficient in it, vers. 17. and was accordingly included in the decree for killing the *Chaldeans*, Dan. ii. 13. and was therefore, after his ministers interpretation of *Nebuchadnezzar's* Dream, promoted to be Master of the *Magicians*, *Astrologers*, *Soothsayers* and *Chaldeans*, Dan. v. 11. and therefore certainly was thought, in things not exceeding the power of the Art, to have proceeded according to its Prescriptions; that is, in the interpretation, tho not in the discovery, of the Dream it self. And they, as well as the *Jews*, being concerned in the event of his Prediction, must also have been so in the understanding of them. So also *Moses* being expressly affirmed skilful in all the Learning of the *Egyptians*, must therefore be presumed skilful



ful not only in their *Hieroglyphicks*, for which they are so commonly Chapter famed, but also in *Oneirocriticks* to which they were also addicted, as II. appears *Gen.* xli. 8. And methinks that challenge made in the *Re-*velation concerning the *name of the Beast*, that *here is wisdom*, and *Rev.* xiii. that *he that hath understanding should exercise himself in counting the* <sup>18.</sup> *number thereof* (as it seems plainly to allude to the *Cabalistical* way of finding out *Names by Numbers*, whereof we have among the Heathens a precedent in *Martianus Capella*, who thus fits the *names of Mercury* and L. 2. *Philology*, to shew the congruity of their Marriage, besides very many more in the *Gnosticks* in *St. Irenaeus*, so ) seems to imply that it was, tho hardly, in the exercise of this Art, discoverable even by human wisdom. Certainly *St. Irenaeus* understood him so when he attempted to unriddle him by finding out names, whose numeral Letters, in the *Greek Tongue* wherein the Challenge had been made, might amount to such a number. I do not, by all that has been said, intend that all *Prophecies* are explicable by any *Rules of Art* or *suitable Conjectures*. I know many of the *Heathen Oracles* themselves were not. The Oracles expounded by *Themistocles*, *Curtius*, *Nebrus*, &c. did not depend on *Art* but *Luck*. My meaning is only concerning the *Prophetick Visions*, and only those of them which are left *unexpounded by God himself*, but are to be presumed sufficiently intelligible in the use of *ordinary means*.]

Thus far *Dodwell*, who advises them that study Divinity to read those Writings of the *Antients*, which concern the critical knowledg of *Dreams*, and the interpretation of *Oracles*, as that which would be of use to 'em in the understanding of obscure Prophecies. But as it is with great modesty that he proposes this, and only as a *conjecture* which he submits to the Learneds examination; so I shall also leave the Reader to his own Judgment about it.

*Ibid.* *προσκύνησαι.*] About the signification of this word, consult *Grotius* upon this place, and upon the second precept of the *Decal.* It being used promiscuously in *Scripture* to signify both *Divine* Worship, and also that Honour which we give to *Men*, because in the East the same gestures of Reverence were used towards *Men* as towards *God*, *1 Chron.* xxix. 20. it is not credible it should here be taken for an act of *divine* Worship, for the Wise-men did not know *Jesus* to be the *Son of God*, but only that he would be a very great *King*, and therefore they gave that Honour to him which us'd to be shewn to *Eastern Monarchs*. And for this reason I should decline the using of the word *adore* here, which tho it had heretofore a *doubtful sense* amongst the *Latins*, yet now by the use of the Schools is made to signify only *di-*



Chapter *wine Worship*. And therefore it is also a fault in the French Versions, II. where this word *προσκυνεῖν* is all along translated *adorer*, which in the French Language does by no means belong to *civil*, but *Religious Worship* only; it being altogether incredible, that *all* those who prostrated themselves at the Feet of *Jesus*, knew him to be the *Son of God*, who might and ought to be honour'd with *divine* Worship. And indeed what one *Apostle* calls *προσκυνεῖν*, another frequently expresses by *προσπίπτειν* to fall down prostrate. See *Matt.* viii. 2. compar'd with *Luc.* v. 12. and ix. 18. compar'd with *Marc.* v. 22. *Luc.* viii. 41. and *Matt.* xviii. 24, 25.

Verf. 15. [*Ἦν αὐτῶν τὸ ἰδεῖν, &c.*] Consult what our Author has upon the 22. *ver.* of the foregoing Chapter, and what *Grotius* before him has collected upon the same place. They say that there were two kinds of Prophecy; the one *διὰ ἰμμεάτων*, when the event is *directly* foretold, the words referring to *that only*; the other *διὰ ἀεγ.σμάτων*, when the words of a Prediction are so conceiv'd, as to respect indeed *primarily* a *certain event*, but yet *so also* as to shadow out something that is of *greater importance*. So *Hosea* spake indeed *directly* of the Israelites; but because the bringing of the People of *Israel* out of *Egypt* was a type of *Christ's* return out of the same Country into *Judea*, therefore in speaking of the *type*, he is to be thought to have spoken concerning the *Anti-type* also.

But there are a few things to be observed with relation to this matter, which the most learned Interpreters have past by.

*First*, to use the instance of *Hosea*, it must be confess'd that no body living in that Age could have possibly discern'd any *prediction* in those words of his, but by an intimation from the *Prophet* himself; *viz.* that tho he spake of a thing that was past, yet he had his mind upon an event that was to happen at some Ages distant, of which the former was a typical representation. Otherwise, who could in the least *suspect* that there was any Prediction latent in a simple relation of matter of Fact? *Israel was a Child, and I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt.* No body sure will say, that the *Jews* who were far from being a subtil People, could ever of their own heads, without any advertisment, have discover'd *here* a Prophecy. The same we are to think of all other Prophecies of this kind.

*2dly.* Since it is no where found in the old Testament, that any such *Intimation* or *Advertisment* was given, either we must acknowledg that no Prophecy being *διὰ ἀεγ.σμάτων* could be understood by the *Jews* before the *event*; or else that the Prophets did privately instruct their Disciples, if not also *admonish* the common People, that whenever they recounted

recounted any of *God's* past favours, or when they spake of themselves, Chapter. they had in their minds a respect to something *future*. Nay it was ne- 11. cessary they should have *particularly* and *severally* interpreted every Pre-  
 diction of that kind, and pointed to the *event* which it had a respect to; for otherwise *who* could be so subtil as between two not much *differing events*, to discern which of 'em was designed in the Prediction? But the first of these having been confuted by Mr. *Dodwell*, we must necessarily admit *the latter*, and say that there remained among the *Jews* in Christ's time several traditions concerning the *sense* of Prophecies, handed down from the *Prophets* themselves. The reason why they did not commit these traditions to writing, I confess I do not clearly see, but it does not follow from thence that there were *no* such unwritten *Doctrines*. Nor do I deny but that this way of teaching had its *inconveniencies*, and that some *false* opinions might creep in amongst the true traditions; but our enquiry is not what would be most *convenient*, or what we our selves should have done, but what *was* done; which is the *only* thing to be considered in searching into Antiquities.

3dly. The same we must think of the *types* and of *typical Predictions*, for no body that was not first warn'd could ever understand those things that were done, or which came to pass, to have been *representations* of things *future*.

4thly. Unless these things be so, all the use of those typical Predictions must have been confin'd to those to whom they were explained after the *event*, which how small that is, appears from what we have cited out of Mr. *Dodwell* at the 2d *vers.* And not to repeat what has been said by him, I might at least gather from hence, that no Arguments could be brought from that sort of Predictions to convince *Infidels* by; and whatever weight they had among *Christians*, it was intirely owing to the Authority of the *Apostles*, and not to the Evidence of the Arguments. For it is manifest to all that understand *Hebrew* that the *Prophet* speaks concerning *Israel*; and that he should, *speaking* of their going out of *Egypt*, have had a respect to *Christ's* return into *Judaea*, would have been impollible for us to know without a Revelation. And therefore we must be oblig'd to say that the *Prophets* left their *Disciples* a *Key*, *q. e.* by which to unlock their Predictions, which would otherwise have been shut up out of every body's view. And had not this been so, it is certain the *Jews* could *never* have grounded their expectations of a *Messias* upon some places in the *Prophets*, out of which no such matter could be fetch'd by the mere assistance of *Grammar*; nor would the *Apostles* have cited them as making for their purpose. For both the former had made themselves ridiculous if



Chapter they had neglected the *grammatical sense*, and recurred, without any other reason than their own fancy, to a more *sublime* one; and the latter had been but ill Disputants, to produce such Passages as might be *biss'd at*. The Authority of the *Apostles* ought not here to be objected, as that which added strength to their Reasonings; for they *themselves* did not rely upon their own Authority, but upon the force of their Arguments. You will no where find it said, that Prophecies ought so or so to be interpreted, because the *Apostles*, who were inspir'd by the Holy Ghost, and whose Doctrine God confirm'd by Miracles, did in that manner interpret them; but this they take every where for *granted*, that they should be so explained, as they explain'd them from the *receiv'd Opinion* amongst the *Jews*.

Verf. 23. Note 1.] Many think it strange that the *Prophets* should here be quoted, when no such thing as what is here mentioned can by the help of *Grammar* be deduc'd from any words of the *Prophets*; for there is no place from whence it can be *grammatically* gather'd that the *Messias* was to be called by this name of a *Nazarene*. That which is drawn from the *meer* similitude between the words *Nesfer* and *Nezir*, is harsh and far-fetch'd. By *what* means therefore could this be deduced from the Writings of the *Prophets*? It must be, doubtless, by an allegorical Interpretation of some place which was vulgarly known in those times, but is not now extant. And this seems to be the reason why St. *Matthew* did not produce any one *Prophet* by name, but said τῶν προφητῶν, the *Prophets*, in the plural number, as referring rather to some *allegorical* sense than any *Scripture* words, as *Jerom* has well observ'd. So the Writers of the *Apostolical times* used to cite a Tradition just as if they were the very words of *Scripture*, as we may see frequently done in the Catholick Epistle of *Barnabas*, Chap. vi. and especially where the Discourse is about the *Scape-goat*. He brings us, as out of the *Scripture*, these words, as they are extant in the antient Version. Exspuite in illum omnes & pungite, & imponite lanam coccineam circa caput illius, & sic in aram ponatur: & cum ita factum fuerit, adducite qui ferat hircum in erenum, & auferat & portet illum in stirpem, quæ dicitur rubus, cuius & fructus in agris adsumus (leg. adsolemus) inuenientes, &c. Spit all upon him, and prick him, and put scarlet wool about his head, and so let him be laid upon the Altar: and when you have done that, bring some body that may carry the Goat into the wilderness, and take him away and bear him to a plant call'd a Black-berry bush, the fruit of which we also us'd, finding it in the fields, &c. See also what *H. Grotius* has upon *Matth.* xxvii. 9. Just so *Philo*, p. 5. de mundi opificio, cites these for the words of *Moses*, Τὸν δὲ ἀβραμὴν καὶ νομτὸν δεῖον λόρον καὶ δεῖον λόρον ἐ-



κόνα εἶναι θεῶν, καὶ ταύτης εἰκόνα τὸ νοητὸν φῶς ἐκεῖνο, ὃ θεὸς λόγος γέγονεν εἰκὼν, &c. Chapter III.  
 That the invisible and intelligible reason, and the reason of God, was the image of God, and the image of this was that intelligible light which was the image of the divine reason, &c. But this is no where to be found in Moses. And this is a common practice with him.

That God might deprive the Jews of all pretence for unbelief, he would have all those things accomplish'd in Christ which the Jews thought were to be fulfil'd in their Messias, which were not contrary to the end for which he sent Jesus into the world, viz. the Reformation of Mankind, and the making of them happy, whether they were allegorically understood from the Scripture, or had their rise from somewhat else besides it. Thus because the Jews interpreted the *Ixix. Psal. 22.* of the Messias, Jesus knowing that they would give him Vinegar to drink if he said he thirsted, said accordingly, he thirsted: After this Jesus knowing that all things were accomplish'd, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, said, I thirst, &c. *Job. xix. 28.* And so likewise at other times he took the occasion of fulfilling certain other Prophecies that otherwise were of no such great moment in themselves; which the Apostles have studiously observ'd. See afterwards chap. iv. 14.

## C H A P. III.

Verf. 2. **I**mmediately after that Citat. *Tellus confracta peribit*] To the Note c. Collections that learned men have made, that they might shew the meaning of *Isaiab* to be only, that *John* was to prepare the way for Christ, these Verses may be added out of *Ovid. lib. 2. Amor. Eleg. xvi.*

*At vos, qua veniet, tumidi subsidite montes.  
 Et faciles curvis vallibus este viae.*

The Poet here wishes his Mistress a commodious Passage, and expresses his desire, by Metaphors taken from what uses sometimes to be done, upon the approach of Princes.

*Ibid. at the end of that Note.*] 'Tis a mistake in our Author, when he says that the Hebrew Judges were so denominated from their inflicting of Punishments, i. e. from the most hateful part of their office: They were called so from their judging or determining of Strifes between the Jews, as appears both by the History of *Samuel*, and also of the other Judges. This is the proper signification of the word Judge, (which

Chapter (which has nothing in it to provoke spite or ill-will) and from which  
 III. this term of their Office is more likely to have been deriv'd. This needs  
 no ampler proof, and nothing could have led *our very learned Author*  
 into such a mistake, but only his earnest desire to illustrate the Subject  
 he was upon, by too great a plenty of Examples, as his usual custom is.

Verf. 4. *Note e.*] We may add to what *Dr. Hammond* has here ob-  
 serv'd, these Verses of *Ovid. Fast. iv.* where he is describing how the  
 first men, that spent their days in the Woods, liv'd:

*Et modo carpebant vivaci cespite gramen,  
 Nunc epulae tenera fronde cacumen erant.*

And a little after,

*Pomaque & in teneris aurea mella favis.*

*Clemens Alexandrinus Strom. lib. 1.* relates out of *Hellanicus*, that the  
 most Northern People eat of the tops of trees ἀνεσθυσίαι γεωμήτες.

Verf. 7. *Τίς ἐπέδειξεν.*] This Interrogation has the force of a Ne-  
 gation: for *St. John's* meaning is this; You have *not* been taught by  
 any body, that by my Baptism *merely*, without Repentance, you shall  
 avoid the Destruction that hangs over you, therefore repent, &c.  
 Such another Interrogation the Learned think to be that in *Mic. v. 2.*  
 which *St. Matthew* has express'd by a Negation, *chap. ii. 6.* See *Gro-  
 tius* upon the place. Of the same kind is that Interrogation in *Virgil*,

*Nam quis te, juvenum confidentissime, nostras  
 Jussit adire domos?*

*i. e.* no body order'd you, but you came of your own accord. See *Isa. i.*  
 11, 12. I make this brief Remark, not for any difficulty there was in  
 the thing, but because our Author has not express'd the negative force  
 of the Interrogation in his Paraphrase, and no body else, that I know  
 of, has taken notice of it.

Verf. 11. *Note g.*] Those that know how very antient the Custom  
 was of purifying by Fire and Water amongst the Heathens, will hard-  
 ly give their consent to what *Dr. Hammond* here says, about the *De-  
 vil's* imitating the Baptism of *John* and *Christ*. See what *Job. Lomei-  
 erus de lustrationibus* has collected with relation to this matter, *Cap. xx.*  
 There being an evident and experienc'd aptitude in Fire and Water  
 to purge away filth, it is no wonder that they were by many Nati-  
 ons made Emblems of the purifying of the mind.

*Ibid.*

Ibid. *Note h.*] What our Author says here is true; but *raking* together all that seem'd to countenance or support his Opinion, he has alledg'd a place out of *Luc. xxii. 27.* that makes nothing to his purpose, for *Christ's* meaning is not that he conversed with his Disciples in the *quality of a Disciple*, but that tho he was their *Lord*, yet he had chosen rather to *minister* to them, than to *exact* any thing from them in an *authoritative* way. See that place.

Verf. 12. Τὸ ὃ ἄχυρον.] *Palea*, Straw, is not here intended, for that serves for many uses, and is never burnt; but it is the *Husk*, or that which the Grains of Corn are wrapt up in, and the *beards* or fragments of the ears, which by the *Greeks* are call'd ἄχυραι. *Hesych.* Ἄχυρον, τὸ ἄχυρον. Ὡς δὲ ἀνεμῶν ἄχυρας φορέει. Ἄχυρον, a husk, is the name of that which is ἄχυρον. We meet with it in a Verse of *Homer*, *Iliad. E. 499.*

Ὡς δὲ ἀνεμῶν ἄχυρας φορέει ἱερῶν καὶ ἀλωῶν  
Ἄνδρῶν λιμῶντων, ὅτε τε ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ  
Κεῖναι ἐπεισορῶν ἀνέμων, καρπὸν τε καὶ ἄχυρας,  
Ἄι δὲ ὑπολόγασθαι ἀχυρμαί.

*As the wind carries the husks in the sacred floors, when men are fanning, and when yellow Ceres separates, the winds violently rushing in, the fruit from the husks, whilst the places made to receive the husks wax white.*

The manner of fanning amongst the *Greeks* is described by *Xenophon*, in *Oeconom. pag. 863. Edit. Wechel.* where we meet with this word ἄχυρον several times both for the *straw* of Corn, and for a *husk*. But the *Septuagint* distinguish them in *Isa. xvii. 13.* where they call the *husk* χυρὸν ἄχυρον, the *small dust of the straw*.

Verf. 16. Ἀνεώχθησαν αὐτῶν οἱ ἕρανοι.] I am apt to think there was a parting of the Clouds, and then that a light shone very high out of the Sky, as it was in the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*; concerning which matter consult *Grotius*. *Plutarch* has somewhere this Saying, ἕρανὸν ῥαγήναι δόξαντα, which cannot be understood but of a *cleaving* of the Clouds by their *retiring* hither and thither.

CH A P. IV.

Verf. 1. Ἄνιχθη ὑπὸ τῶ πνεύματι.] What is here related, may more easily be conceived to have happened to *Christ* in a *Vision* or *Dream*, than *really*. It looks, methinks, very odd, that an *Evil Spirit* should be permitted to have such a power over our most holy *Saviour*, as to carry him through the *Air*; and then that *prospect* of the Kingdoms of the whole World could



Chapter no more be shewn from a *Mountain* than upon a *Plain*: for what is  
 IV. there to be seen from a Mountain, besides Woods, Fields, Rivers,  
 Villages, Towns, and the like, and those only afar off? But these  
 things do not use to be stiled in any Language, *the Kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them.* That which we call *the glory of Kingdoms,* is rather the splendor of a *King,* which consists partly in his splendid Attire, partly in his Guards or Attendants, and partly in his costly Edifices, and other things of that nature. So *the glory of a Kingdom* is taken 2 *Chron.* ix. 25. where *Solomon* is the subject of the Discourse; as afterwards here in *St. Matthew,* chap. vi. 29. where the word δόξα is used. See also *Rev.* xxi. 25, 26. Now it's true, in a *Dream,* the most powerful *Kings* of the Earth, with all their glory, might be shewn to *Christ* in a moment of time, as *S. Luke* says these things were, but not if he were awake or from a mountain. The Phrase ὑπὸ τῆς πνεύματι therefore, may be interpreted here as *St. Luke* does that of ἔν τῷ πνεύματι in the Spirit, i. e. in a *Vision,* as *Rev.* i. 10. And so *Ezekiel* declares himself ἀνεβῆναι ὑπὸ τῆς πνεύματι, ch. ii. 2. & iii. 12. when being in a *Vision* he thought the Spirit took him up. And chap. xl. 2. we find the same person again ἔφ' ἐπιφανίαν (as he fancy'd) caught up into a high mountain. And so likewise *St. John,* *Rev.* xxi. 10. But however, by this *Vision* *Christ* might learn that his Life would not be without Temptations, and that he must do really what he seemed to himself to do in a *Dream,* i. e. strive against Unbelief and Ambition.

Ibid. Note a. ] As *Satan* in Hebrew, so Διάβολος in Greek imports a *Hater*; for διαβάλλειν does not only signify to calumniate, but also to hate; and to this latter signification the *Septuagint* seem to have had a respect, when they rendered שׂוֹן by Διάβολον, for the Hebrew word signifies to oppose or hate, but never to calumniate. Of the signification of the word διαβάλλειν which I mentioned, we may see an example out of *Strabo,* in *Casaubon's* Notes upon p. 545. lib. xviii. where he observes that it frequently occurs in the same signification in *Philostratus.* In that sense 1 *Mac.* i. 38. *Antiochus* is called Διάβολος. To this the word ἀπειθεύς is synonymous; of which see *Grotius* upon 2 *Thess.* ii. 4.

Verf. 8. Τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν. ] i. e. the glory and riches which he saw lying in the vast tracts of the earth. So כְּבוֹד amongst the Jews signifies glory and wealth. See what I have observed upon *Gen.* xxxi. 1. *Apollo* in *Ovid* is represented speaking thus to *Phaeton,* whilst he was looking down from the palace of the *Sun* upon the Earth, *Metam.* l. 2.

— *Quidquid habet dives circumspice mundus,  
Eque tot ac tantis coeli, terræque, marisque  
Posce bonis aliquid, nullam patiere repulsam.*

Verf. 14. ἐπιπληρώσει ] See the Notes upon Chap. ii. 23. *H. Grotius* has observed upon *Jam.* chap. ii. 23. that it was common for the *Hebrews* to say, that such or such a place of Holy Scripture נתקיים *i. e.* ἐπιπληρώσει, or was fulfilled, whenever any thing came to pass, resembling what was mentioned in that place. But he gives us no example of it, and therefore I shall produce one out of *R. Salomon* upon *Gen.* xi. 8. where at the words *the Lord scattered them abroad*, he makes this remark, בעולם הזה מרה שאמרו פן נפוצ נתקיים עליהם הוה שאמר שלמה מנורה רשע היא תבאנו :

*As they had said, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth; so that Saying of Solomon was verified concerning them, What he is afraid of shall come upon him.* And this way of speaking the *Greeks* also themselves used upon a like occasion. *Ælian* lib. iii. c. 29. has these words: Διογένης ὁ Σινωπὴς συνεχῶς ἐπέλεγε, καὶ ἐρῶν ἑαυτῷ, ὅτι τὰς ἐν τῷ τραγῳδίῳ ἀρὰς αὐτὸς ἔκπληροι καὶ ὑποδύσει, εἶναι γὰρ πλανῆς, ἀποικῶ, &c. *Diogenes Sinopenis* used continually to be saying, that he fulfilled and underwent all the curses of Tragedy, for he was a vagabond, and had no home, &c. *i. e.* that one might see something in his condition resembling that which the Players in Tragedy used to wish, when they were in a rage, to others. So likewise *Olympiodorus*, in the Life of *Plato*, applies to him a Verse out of *Homer*: Κερδίε αὐτῷ μέλιττα προσελθῆσαι πεπληρώσασιν αὐτῷ τὸ στόμα κείων μέλιθ, ἵνα ἀλιθεῖ καὶ αὐτῷ γρηῖται. Τὸ καὶ ἐπὶ γλώσσης μέλιθ γλυκίων ῥέει αὐτοῦ. *As he was lying all along, a swarm of bees came and filled his mouth with honey-combs; that is that Saying of Homer might prove true of him, From whose tongue proceeded a sound sweeter than honey.*

Verf. 15. Note e. ] Our Author should rather have said, that several Nations dwelt in this Coast, than round about it. For there were several Nations that dwelt also round about the rest of *Judea*. We shall be most likely herefore to find out the reason of this Appellation, by what *Strabo* says about the northern parts of *Judea*, lib. xvi. Ταῦτα γὰρ περιέχειται, τὰ πλεῖστα δὲ ὡς ἕκαστα εἰσὶν ἐσθὲν φυλῶν οἰκίσθαι μικτῶν ἔκ τε Αἰγυπτίων, Ἀραβίων, καὶ Φοινίκων: Now these Countries lie towards the North, and each of them are mostly inhabited by a mixt sort of People, made up of *Egyptians*, *Arabians*, and *Phœnicians*.



Verf. 1. **T**His same *History*, and these very Discourses of *Christ*,  
 Note a. are related by *St. Luke*, chap. vi. but much more  
 compendiously, and not so distinctly; whence we  
 may perceive that the *Evangelists* have not reported the very words of  
*Christ*, but only the sense of what he said; according as their own or  
 others memory suggested it to them. And this may teach us that the  
 sense is that which we should principally look to, and that we ought  
 not to *anatomize*, or insist too nicely upon every single word. Other-  
 wise we shall hardly make the *Evangelists* to agree with one another.  
 As for instance, *Christ* says here in *St. Matthew*, vers. 3. *blessed are the*  
*poor in Spirit*, but in *St. Luke* this word *πν* *πνδμων* is wanting. Now  
 if we take these words of *St. Matthew* in the finest and nicest sense, *Christ*  
 will be found to speak here, not of those that are destitute of riches,  
 but those who in what condition soever they be are not too much puff'd  
 up in their minds. On the other hand, *St. Luke's* words do not proper-  
 ly import humble-minded persons, but persons of mean estate. The  
 like we may observe concerning the 6th verse, and abundance of other  
 places, in which the *Evangelists* report the same thing with some  
 variation.

Verf. 8. Note c. ] That in these words *the pure in heart* have a blessed-  
 ness conferred upon them, is plain enough; but what that blessedness  
 is, is not so clear. Of old the Jews as well as the *Heathens* thought  
 they might sometimes have a sight of the *Gods*. By the *Gods*, I do not  
 mean the very *divine Nature*, but *corporal Shapes* assumed by *Angels*.  
 Yea and so the *most high God himself* ( if it was not rather an *Angel* cal-  
 led by his name that appear'd to the *Israelites* ) gave notice of his pre-  
 sence by a cloud or by fire, which form the Jews called by the name  
 of *God*, as appears from the *Pentateuch*. They had a conceit also, that  
 if any one should see those forms against the will of the *Gods*, they  
 would certainly die, or lose their sight. See my notes upon *Gen. xvi.*  
*13.* And therefore whoever was admitted by any *God* to an interview  
 with him, was look'd upon to be his special favourite; as the Holy Scrip-  
 ture informs us concerning *Moses*, who went near to the Cloud, in  
 which the *Angel* had wrapt himself, and talked with him. Hence,  
 this phrase *to see God* was used to express some great happiness, even  
 amongst the *Gentiles*, which gave occasion to those Verses in *Virgil*;





*Ille Deum vitam adspiciet, divisque videbit  
Permistos Heroas, & ipse videbitur illis;*

and those in *Ovid*,

*Felices illi, qui non simulachra, sed ipsos,  
Quique Deum coram corpora vera vident.*

Add to this, that because *God* was thought, not only by the *Hebrews* but also by most *Heathen Nations*, to have his Habitation in a peculiar manner in *Heaven*, and *Heaven* was esteemed the seat of blessedness; therefore to see *God*, and to be in the seat of supreme happiness, came at last to signify one and the same thing. And hence it is said of the *Saints*, Heb. xii. 14. that they shall see the Lord, and 1 Cor. xiii. 12. face to face, i. e. like *Moses*, they shall be permitted to have an access to the Light it self by which *God* manifests his presence in *Heaven*; and because they are to see him as he is, they shall also, as *Moses*, whose countenance was made to shine, become like to *God*, 1 Joh. iii. 2. From this it appears, that if there be any solidity in what the Schoolmen say about the *beatifick vision*, they must deduce it from *metaphysical reasonings*, and not out of these places of *Scripture*.

Verf. 17. Note. g. ] The *Law* being here spoken of, I should rather think that by *γέγραμμενα* we are to understand the most simple, or that which we commonly call the *Grammatical* or *Literal* sense of the *Law*, in which respect there are innumerable external rites enjoined in it; and that by *πνεῦμα* is meant the *mind* of the *Lawgiver* lying hid under those symbolical Precepts. *Aristotle* in *Lib. de repub.* often uses the word *γέγραμματα* for *written laws*, in opposition to the will of the *Governour*, or the interpretation that he puts upon them. So *Lib. 2. ch. 9.* ἐκ αὐτοσυνώμονας βέλτιον κείναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ γέγραμματα καὶ τοὺς νόμους, it is not the best way to pass sentence according to our own will and pleasure, but by the written Statute and Laws. And *Lib. 3. c. 15.* after he had said that the *Law* speaks of things but in general terms, without accommodating it self to particular cases, he adds, τὸ κατὰ γέγραμματα ἀσχετὸν ἢ τῆσι, that it is a foolish thing for a *Governour* to follow strictly the written law; and a little after, ἐν ἔσση ἢ κατὰ γέγραμματα καὶ νόμους ἀείσει ποιεῖσθαι, it is not the best way of administering a *Commonwealth* to keep close to the Letter and the Laws. So also *Cicero* opposes the letter of the *Law* to the intuition of the *Law-maker*, *Lib. 1. de Inventione, cap. 38.* Omnes leges ad commodam *Reipublice* referre oportet, & eas ex utilitate communi, non ex scriptura,

Chapter *quæ in literis est, interpretari.* All Laws ought to be directed to the benefit of the State, and have such a construction put upon them as the publick interest requires, without sticking too close to the letters in which they are written. See likewise Lib. 2. cap. 48. And under this consideration the Laws of Moses are called *γερύμματα* and *γερύματα*, viz. when they are understood in a Grammatical sense; and are opposed to *πνεύμα*, i. e. the design of God in enacting them. The word *Spirit* is used in Scripture to signify any thing that is *out of sight*, in contradistinction to what is *apparent* and *conspicuous*, as the letters are of the Law. But this may be more clearly demonstrated in its due place.

Verf. 18. Note. i. ] Ludovicus Cappellus in Arcano punct. Lib. 2. Cap. 14. has said enough about this place; and if we consult him, and join what Dr. Hammond and he have observed together, we shall have as complete a Commentary upon this place as can be desired. Christ's meaning is that none, no not the least *moral* precept, which did not peculiarly respect the Jews as a *Commonwealth*, but was fitted to all men, and all Ages and Places, of which kind there were many in the Law, should ever be abrogated by God. 'Tis as if he had said, that he would be so far from licensing Men to break any of that sort of Precepts, that he would require an exact performance of the very least of them. As *λύσις νόμου* signifies an abolishing of a Law, so a Law is said *ζῆναι*, which continues in its full force and obligation. And therefore the phrase *ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται* does not signify *until all be fulfilled*, but, *but all its precepts shall be still obliging*, for *ἕως*, as Grotius has observed, has here the force of an *Adversative*.

Verf. 22. ὁ ὀργίζων, &c. ] Our Author, in his Paraphrase, partly makes Christ to speak himself directly, and partly insinuates and intermixes his *own* Remarks with *his* words. But yet I must say, that this is harsh and forced, as the Doctor's way of expression (no disparagement to his Learning) commonly is. Besides, his Paraphrase upon this period does not make the mind of Christ clear enough, which I take to be this. " 21, 22. Ye know that Murder was forbidden by  
 " *Moses*, and that this Law of his threatned Death to the Transgressors  
 " of it; but let me tell you, that it is not only those heinous sort  
 " of crimes that will be punished by God in another life: Whoever  
 " shall but *indulge his anger*, and make a custom of carrying himself  
 " hastily and morosely to others without reason, shall have a punish-  
 " ment inflicted upon him, comparable to that capital one to which  
 " persons are sentenced by the *lesser Sanhedrim*; and that shall be  
 " the lightest penalty for Sins committed against your Neighbour.  
 " But whoever shall be found to have got an ill habit of *mocking and*  
 " *deriding*



“ *deriding* others, shall in this kind of Punishments suffer as heavy a one; Chapter  
 “ as that which used to be inflicted by the *greater Sanhedrim* for V.  
 “ the boldest Crimes. But lastly, he that shall accustom himself to  
 “ *rail*, or *revile* other men, shall have a Penalty laid upon him by God  
 “ resembling the severest that is us’d amongst Men, such as to be  
 “ burnt alive.

This Doctrine of *Christ* may be referred to two Heads, the former of which is, that there are some Sins which have no Punishment denounced against them in the Law of *Moses*; and the latter, that for those very Sins men shall suffer as severe, nay and a severer punishment in the other life, than the Law of *Moses* inflicted for the greatest crimes. Which was a very necessary Doctrine for the *Jews*, who thought themselves to be very good men, and to have fulfilled their duty in all points, if they were but safe from any charge being brought against them out of the Law; as is the case of many even at this day, among *Christians*. But then we are not to understand by the Sins here spoken of, *single Commissions*, such as a sudden fit of Anger, *once* mocking, or *one* abusive Speech rashly thrown out; but a *habit* of being angry, or of deriding and reviling our Neighbour, and continuing in it as long as we live: for single acts of Sin, which we fall into not through a custom in sinning, but through infirmity, are according to the Laws of the *Gospel-Covenant*, pardoned by God. That which *Christ* here therefore condemns is, first an *angry Disposition*, or a habit of being easily, and for little or no reason, displeas’d with others; and then *Pride*, which is, as I may say, the Parent of *mocking*; and lastly, both an angry and proud custom of speaking *abusively* or *revilingly*. And indeed, these corrupt Dispositions of the Mind are like so many poisonous Fountains from whence innumerable Evils proceed; for they do not only induce a neglect of the contrary Duties, but are the occasion many times of the greatest Sins. Which I shall not, in these short *Ἐπιτομῆς*, at large prosecute.

The names whereby *Christ* describes the Punishments that are to be inflicted for these evil habits in another life, are (as Interpreters, and amongst the rest *Grotius*, who is always to be joined with Dr. *Hammond*, have observed) drawn from the *Jewish* Custom. And it is no wonder; for there were no *peculiar* names given to the unknown and invisible Punishments of the other life; and if *Christ* had called them by any *new* names, no body would have understood him. And therefore he was necessitated to make use of such names and representations of Punishments as were *known* by those he spake to.



Chapter. Vers. 28. Note o.] Ovid, that Master in Debauchery, describes this matter to the life, *Metam.* vi. where he says of *Tereus* looking passionately upon *Philomela*,

*Spectat eam Tereus, præcontrectatque videndo.*

Vers. 33. Ἀποδώσεις ᾧ κρείω τὰς ὀρκίαι σὺ. ] A person is said to pay his oath to the Lord, that fulfils a Promise confirmed by an Oath; because he that calls God to witness, does not so much oblige himself to the Party he makes a promise to, as to God. So *Joshua* kept to the Promises he made, in the Covenant entered into with the *Gibeonites*; not for the sake of the *Gibeonites* who had deceived him, but because of the obligation he was under to God, to whom he had appealed as a witness. See *Jos.* ix. 19. This also the *Heathens* understood, as we may see by the words of *T. Quintius Cincinnatus*, in *Livy* lib. 6. c. 29. when he was going to fight against the perfidious *Gauls*: *Adeste Dii testes fœderis, & expetite pœnas simul vobis violatis, nobisque per numen vestrum deceptis.* Be present, O ye Gods, that were witnesses of our League, and revenge both your selves for the affront that has been put upon you, and us who have been deceived by your Deity. And therefore they thought it no small part of divine Worship to keep their Oaths. *Isocrates ad Demonicum*: πρώτων μὲν δὲσεσθαι τὰ πρὸς τὰς Θεὰς, μὴ μόνον θύων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ὀρκίαις μυσθῶν: first worship the Gods, not only by offering Sacrifices, but by keeping your Oaths.

Vers. 36. Μίτη ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ ὁμόση. ] See what *H. Grotius* has upon this place; and to what he has observed add this Passage out of *Athenæus* Lib. 2. p. 66. "Ὅτι ἡ ἱερὴν ἐνόμιζον τὴν κεφαλὴν, δῆλον ἐκ τῆ καὶ κατ' αὐτῆς ὁμοθυμῶν. Καὶ τὰς ζυνοιδίους ὑπὸ αὐτῆς πηλαγὰς προσκυνεῖν ὡς ἱερεῖς. ἀλλὰ μὴ καὶ τὰς συζητησάμεναις βεβαιωθῆναι τῇ ταύτης ὀρκισθῆναι. ὡς καὶ ὁ Ὀμηρικὸς Ζεὺς φησὶν,  
Εἰ δ' ἄγε τι κεφαλῇ ὀκνησάσομαι.

But that they esteemed the Head sacred, may appear by their using to swear by it, and to reverence its Sneezings as sacred: And also by its having been a custom to confirm Agreements or Contracts by nodding of it; as *Jupiter* says in *Homer*, Go to, I will now nod my head.

Vers. 39. Στρέψον αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν ἀλλω. ] This is a proverbial Speech, and ought not to be understood properly. It signifies to expose ones self to be injured or vilified. So *Os contumeliis præbere* is taken in *Livy*, lib. 4. c. 35. where a seditious Tribune of the People says of the Commonalty that aspired to the Military Tribuneship, *Petisse viros domi, militiaque spectatos; primis annis fugillatos, repulsos, risui Patribus fuisse; desisse postremò præbere ad contumeliam os.* That such men had sued for

for it as were approved both at home and abroad; and at first were jeered and repulsed, and made a laughing-stock of by the Fathers, but now at length they were resolved not to suffer themselves tamely any longer to be abused. We meet with it also in Tacitus Hist. Lib. 3. c. 31. *Circumsteterunt victores, & primo ingerebant probra, intentabant ictus; mox ut præberi ora contumeliis, & posita omni ferociâ, cuncta victi patiebantur, subit memoria illos esse, qui nuper Bedriaci victoriæ temperassent.* The Conquerors stood round, and at first heaped Reproaches upon them, and lifted up their hands, making as if they would give them blows; but afterwards when they saw that the conquered let themselves be abused, and laying aside all fierceness, took every thing patiently, it came into their minds that they were those very same persons, that a little before had used their victory at Bedriacum with moderation.

Verf. 40. Ἰμώπων ] There is no body that is not a perfect stranger to the Greek Language, but knows that ἰμώπων signifies a Cloak, or that Garment which we wear outermost, and χιτῶνα a Coat, or one nigher our Bodies. But if, notwithstanding this is so plain and certain, any one should still be in doubt of it, the best way for him to satisfy himself would be to read *Ælian Var. Hist. Lib. 1. c. 16.* and *Octavius Ferrarius de Re Vest. Part. 1. Lib. 3. Cap. 1. and Part. 2. Lib. 4. c. 3.*

C H A P. VI.

Verf. 7. **O**F this sort of Battology, or idle repeating of the same thing, there are instances also to be found in the ritual Books of the Jews; where there are some Prayers so composed, as if they thought a particular laying open of their requests necessary to make God understand them. On the day before that of the Expiation, there are Prayers read, wherein in a long series all the kinds of Sins, together with the respective Punishments due to them, are distinctly enumerated. They begin thus: *Let it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our Fathers, to forgive us all our iniquities, and pardon all our offences, and to purge us from all our sins, the sins which we have committed against thee by compulsion, and the sins which we have committed against thee voluntarily and of our own accord, and the sins which we have committed against thee by uncovering our nakedness, &c.* The whole form as it was taken out of the manuscript Copy was published by *Selden de Synedriis lib. 1. c. 12.*

Verf. 8. Οἷδε γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὃν χρεῖαν ἔχετε.] Socrates, as Xenophon tells us, lib. 1. *Memor. p. 420. Ed. Græcæ H. Steph.* Ἔτυχον παρὰ τῆς θεῆς ἀπλῶς τ' ἀγαθὰ δεῖναι, ὡς τῆς θεῆς χεῖλιστα εἰδότες ὅπῃ αἰετὸν εἶναι, prayed simply



Chapter VI. ply to the Gods that they would bestow good things upon him, as knowing themselves best what things were good. See what *H. Grotius* says as to this matter: and hence we may conclude that the *Heathens* did sometimes speak of things more agreeably to the Precepts afterwards given by *Christ* than many *Christians* usually do.

Verf. 11. Note f.] There is none here but *Grotius*, whose opinion is first laid down by our Author, that deserves our regard; and the Doctor had done better if he had only endeavour'd to confirm his interpretation. Every body knows that the *Greeks* used the Phrase of ἡ ἐπιτιμία χρόνον to signify as well in general the time future as the day immediately ensuing, from the verb ἐπιτιμᾶν to approach or to be at hand. So *Euripides* in his *Alcestes*, v. 171. uses τὸ ἐπιτιμᾶν χρόνον for an evil that is future or ready to come to pass. So in that place of *Solomon* Prov. xxvii. 1. Boast not thy self of to morrow, for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth; the *Septuagint* have ἡ ἐπιτιμία ἡ ἐπιτιμία to signify the time future. The meaning of *Christ* therefore is this: "Give us every day, all the remaining part of our lives, as much as may be sufficient for our subsistence. *Vopiscus* has almost such another kind of expression in the Life of *Aurelian*, where he speaks of the loaves that were daily distributed to the People: *Siliginum suum* (viz. panem) quotidie toto ævo quisque recipiebat, & posteris suis dimittebat. Every one daily received his white loaf as long as he lived, and that custom was continued to their posterity. Upon this place *Salmasius* observes out of *Chronic. Alexandr.* that such Loaves were called στασιζόντες, i. e. such as every one was sure to have during his Life: so that στασιζόντες ἀσπες and ἐπιτιμία signify almost the same thing. It is likewise truly observed by *Grotius*, that this word comprehends under it both food and raiment, i. e. all the necessaries of Life, which we pray God we may never want as long as we live. Our Author makes it to relate also to the mind or soul; but without any necessity, for those things which concern the Soul are contained in the foregoing verses.

In *Solomon* Prov. xxx. 8. קִנְיִן חֶמֶד does not properly signify food convenient for me, but my allowance or proportion of it. 'Tis an allusion of the *Writer of Proverbs* to the custom of those who gave daily to their Servants or others a certain allowance which was called קִנְיִן חֶמֶד, i. e. as if one should say, appointed food. See my Notes upon *Gen.* xlvii. 22. Wherefore altho if we consider the thing it self, the translating of ἀσπες ἐπιτιμία by קִנְיִן חֶמֶד our proportion of bread may not be much amiss, as *J. Mercerus* upon the *Proverbs* has observed; yet the just force of the Greek word will be far from being thereby expressed.



Verf. 16. Note h. ] Ἀφανίζεν is to make any thing become ἀφανές, Chapter VI. which is the contrary of both φανόν bright or shining, and of φανερόν conspicuous. And hence the verb ἀφανίζεν has a twofold signification, according as it is either opposed to ποιῆν φανόν to make bright, or to ποιῆν φανερόν to make conspicuous. To begin with the latter, a thing becomes inconspicuous ἀφανίζεται, when it is either quite destroyed, or else carried to another place, or covered; for which sense there seems here to be no room, as has been well observed by the Doctor. In the former sense of the word, a thing is said to lose its brightness ἀφανίζεται, when it is somehow or other defiled. Thus the countenance, when the face is washed and anointed, is φανές, shines; and when instead of using oil to make it shine, we disfigure it with Ashes or Dust, then ἀφανίζεται. In which sense ἀφανίζεν is the same with μολύνειν, to pollute, to defile. But the Grammaticians observe the signification of polluting to have been more late, and that of taking out of sight to be the older of the two. Etymol. Magn. Ἀφανίσαι οἱ πάλαι ἔχει τὸ μολύναι ὡς νῦν, ἀλλὰ τὸ τελείως ἀφανῆ ποιῆσαι. Ἀφανίσαι was not used by the Antients for to pollute as it is now, but for to render wholly inconspicuous. Concerning the antient use also of this word, Suidas must be thought to speak when he says: Ἀφανίσαι ἔστι τὸ μολύναι καὶ χεῖραι δαυδοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅλας τὸ ἀνελεῖν καὶ ἀφανῆ ποιῆσαι: it does not signify to defile and pollute, but to take quite away and out of sight. But of this later signification of Greek words, discerned by the other which properly belongs to them, there are abundance of instances in the New Testament, amongst which the verb ἀφανίζεν must be reckoned one. Of this notion of the word the Doctor has given us several examples, and one out of Nicostratus, whose words he ought to have set down at their full length, for he understands them in a sense quite contrary to the intention of the Author. He is speaking concerning Women that had too great a passion for Ornaments, and brings reasons to dissuade and reclaim them from it. Πόρρω δ' εἶναι, says he, καὶ τὸ δευθῆναι γυνὴ ὑγιαίνεισα, καὶ φημιθῆναι, καὶ ὑποθαλάμῳ ὑπογεγραφῆς, καὶ ἄλλο χροματὸ ζωγεφῶντ καὶ ἀφανίζοντ τὰς ὄψεις: Far be it from a healthful woman to think she has any need of white paint, or red, to put under her eyes, or any other colour, in order to daub and pollute the face: not to make it more beautiful; for that is against the Writer's design, and contrary to what this Verb constantly signifies. And that this word ἀφανίζεν is used by Christ in the sense of polluting, and denotes a purposed endeavour to deform the face, is manifest from the manner of the opposition: When ye fast, be not as the Hypocrites, of a sad countenance, ἀφανίζου τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν, that they may appear unto men to fast; but thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face. It is as plain as the Sun at Noon-day, that

Chapter that an *anointed head* and *washed face* is opposed ἀρανιδέντι μεσώπω, i. e.

VII. a *dirty unwashed face*, and one that is *not anointed*; such as theirs used to be who fasted in sackcloth and ashes. About *anointing* the face with oil, in order to make it the more shining, see *Psalms* civ. 15. and what Interpreters say upon that place. But this used to be neglected by Mourners, as appears from 2 *Sam.* xii. 20. So that tho' what Dr. *Hammond* says upon this place contains a great many learned things in it, and is worth our reading, yet he has certainly mis'd the scope of it.

Verf. 22. Note 1. ] Our learned Author is mistaken in the sense he puts upon the words of *Hesychius*; for that which that Grammatician speaks of is *the soundness of the body*. See my Notes upon *Levit.* xxi. 17. It is most true that ἀπλῆς signifies *liberal*; but that Virtue, as on the *contrary* an envious and sordid way of giving, or also a denying any charitable assistance, is imputed to the eye; because there is a mighty discernible difference between the looks of a man that gives cheerfully and willingly, and one that either belies himself in saying he has nothing to give, or else gives but sparingly and unwillingly. It would be needless to go about to confirm what is plain from the Testimonies of the Antients; I shall only observe that *oculos dolere* was a *Latin Phrase* applyed to a person who could not, without regret, behold what another possessed, because that Passion chiefly discovers it self in the eyes. See *Plautus, Asinar.* Act. v. Scen. 1. v. 4. and upon that place *Fr. Taubmannus*.

Verf. 27. after the words *proportionable stature*.] Τετραγωνος in Greek, and *Quadratus* in Latin, does not signify as *broad as high*, which is absurd, but a just Stature. Consult *Constant. Lexic.*

## C H A P. VII.

Verf. 14. **T**Ι' σέντι. ] Τί for ὡς *Grotius* tells us is after the manner of the *Hellenists*, i. e. of the *Jews*, who spake Greek not so correctly as they should have done, and produces Examples of it. But *Salmasius*, in the *Epist. Dedic.* to his *Commentar. de Hellenist.* says, that he elsewhere proves it to be *Alexandrian*. Where this proof is I cannot tell; but it is enough to justify its being called a *Hellenism*, if it be but improper Greek, and has something discernible of a *Hebraism* in it. The Hebrews use *הם* to express *n* and ὡς, which it is no wonder if he that interpreted *S. Matthew* imitated. Now the reason why the Gate that leads to Happiness is said by *Christ* to be *straight*, is because as men live, it lets  
in



in but few. The same similitude is made use of, to intimate this to us, Chapter by *Cebes* in his *Table*, where we find these words: *Ὁυκὲν κὶ δύρα πινὰ VIII. μικρὰν κὶ ὁδὸν πινὰ πρὸς τὴν δύρα, ἥ τις ἔ πολὺ ὀχλεῖται, ἀλλὰ πάνυ ὀλίγοι παρδόνται ὡσπερ δυσανόδου πινὸς κὶ τραχείας κὶ πετρῶδου εἶναι δικάσις;* *Do you see also a certain little gate, and a path before that gate which is not much frequented, but trodden only by a very few, as seeming to be unpassable, rugged, and uneven?* And he that was asked, making answer, that he did see it; *αὕτη πίνου ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς, ἔρη, ἡ ἀγροα πρὸς τὴν ἀληθινὴν παιδείαν:* *This, he said, was that way that leads to true Learning.*

Verf. 23. *Note d.*] Our Author is here mistaken; for in all the best Greek Writers there is nothing more common than this Phrase, which is a form of turning the Discourse that was before indirect into a direct one, or of mixing both those ways of speaking together, and it makes the sense to be no other than if all the Sentence was indirectly spoken: *I will profess to them that I never knew them, and will bid all that work Iniquity to depart from me.* And this way of confounding a direct and indirect Speech together, tho it seems I know not how to have something that looks careless in it, yet it expresses the thing more to the life than any other way would do. There is an instance of this in *Theophrastus*, *Charact. cap. iii. de Adulatione*: *Περδουμῆος πρὸς πινὰ φίλων, πρὸς δευμῶν εἰπεῖν, Ὅτι πρὸς σε ἔρχεται καὶ ἀνασρέψας, Ὅτι πρὸς ἤγελτα:* *As he was on his way to a certain Friend of his, the (Flatterer) overtook him and told him, his (Friend) was coming to him; and then returning back, I have given him, says he, notice beforehand of your coming.* Such Examples as these we may, in our reading, every where meet with; which makes the bare suggesting of it here to be sufficient.

C H A P. VIII.

Verf. 2. **K**ΥΡΙΕ.] It was the custom of the Jews, says *Grotius*, to give any one they spake to, this title, yea tho they did not know the person, *Joh. xx. 15.* Were it needful, I could bring a multitude of proofs of its having been also the custom of the Romans. *Seneca Ep. iii.* says, *Obvius, si nomen non succurrit, dominos salutamus.* If we meet with any one, and cannot just then call to mind his name, we give him the title of *Sir, or Lord.* So *Martial lib. i. Ep. 113.*

*Cum te non noſſem, dominum, regemque vocabam;*  
*Cum bene te novi, jam mihi Priscus eris.*



Chapter VIII. I rather think nevertheless that there is something more here meant by it, and that the *Leper* gave our *Saviour* this title of אָדוֹנָי *adoni* with a design to honour him, tho perhaps so great and famous a *Prophet's* name might not be unknown to him. And so the *Romans* used also to do. *Sueton.* in Claudio cap. xxi. *Hortando, rogandóque ad hilaritatem homines provocabat, dominos identidem appellans.* He used by careffes and intreaties to excite people to chearfulness, calling them every now and then *Lords.* So *Seneca* Epist. civ. *Illud mihi in ore erat Domini mei Gallionis.* I had in my mouth that (saying) of my *Lord Gallio.* So the *Hebrews* use the word אָדוֹנָי See *Gen.* xxxiii. 8. and xliv. where you may meet with this word several times.

Verf. 4. Note b. ] Besides the reasons which the learned *Dr. Hammond* has assigned of *Christ's* unwillingness to have it divulged that he was the *Messias*, there may be two others given of no small importance. The first is, that *Christ* had rather this should be gathered from his works than by his *Disciples* or his own publishing it, because the *faith* that was hereby begotten in Men would be much the firmer, as having the true grounds of a *solid faith* to rely upon. And thus when those that were sent to him by *John the Baptist*, desired of him to be satisfied whether he was that person that was to come, he made answer: Go and tell *John* the things which ye hear and see; The blind receive their sight, &c. *Matt.* xi. 4, 5. The other is, because if his *Disciples* had openly proclaimed him to be the *Messias*, they would have drawn after them a vast multitude of People who expected the *Messias* under the notion of a *temporal King*, and were exceeding desirous of innovations; which sort of Men were more fit to raise a sedition than to advance the Kingdom of Heaven by just and proper Methods. To prevent therefore the resorting of evil men to him with a design to innovate, and so making a wrong use of his Name and Authority, he thought it better, till that danger was over, to have the publishing of the truth deferred. Thus *Job.* vi. 15. we see, the multitude after they had been fed by him, fell into such a sort of consultation; whereupon when he knew that they would come and take him by force, to make him a King, he departed alone by himself into a mountain. It was an extraordinary piece of Wisdom in *Christ*, to take care there might be no sedition laid either to his or his *Disciples* charge, whilst the Gospel was but begun to be preached; for if such a thing could have been done with any appearance of justice, every body easily perceives that it would have been a mighty prejudice to the Christian Religion.

Verf. 10. Note f.] Since our Author in his Notes upon this place has thought fit to put together all that he had observed concerning the

the different notions of the word πίστις, I will contribute also my share. Chapter VIII. VIII.  
 πίστις has several significations amongst the *Greeks* that have nothing to do here; but this is to be taken notice of, *viz.* that tho' *trust* be the first notion of that word, and its *secondary* signification is that *credit* or *assent* which we give to one who affirms things that we never saw, nor have any mathematical demonstration of; yet because among things of that kind, there are some asserted by all Nations that relate to divine matters, and which in points of faith challenge the first place, altho' we neither see them, nor have any mathematical evidence for them, therefore πίστις signifies καὶ ἔξοχῶ or by way of eminence a persuasion about matters of Religion. So *Ælian Var. Histor. lib. ii. c. 31.* having said that there was no Atheist to be found amongst the *Barbarians*, but only among the *Greeks*; and that the *Barbarians* believed that there were *Gods* who took care of human affairs, and foretold things to come, adds: ὑπὲρ τούτων ἰχθυεῖν ἔχοντες τὴν πίστιν, οὐκ οὐδέ τι καθαρῶς καὶ ἀγνεύουσιν ὁσίως, καὶ τὰ ἔξῃς: *having a firm persuasion of these things, they offer up sacrifices in a pure manner, and keep themselves chaste and holy, &c.*

When the *Jews* began to write Greek, they used the word πίστις in the same sense; for the *credit* yielded to their sacred Writings, and those that believed them, they called πιστοὶ and πιστεύοντες. So the *Son of Sirach*, Chap. i. 25. Ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ πίστις καὶ πραΰτης: *the things that please him (i. e. God) are faith and meekness*: and Ch. xlv. 6. ἐν πίστι καὶ πραΰτητι ἡγιασεν αὐτὸν: *he sanctified him by faith and meekness*. So 1 *Macc. iii. 13.* ἐκκλησία πιστῶν signifies a body of *Jews*. But the *Christians* that followed the *Jews* in their way of speaking, gave the name of πίστις to the Persuasion of those that believed in *Christ*, and opposed it to a twofold kind of ἀπιστία *Unbelief*, one of which was proper to the *Heathens*, and the other to the *Jews*, who notwithstanding they credited the *Old Testament*, yet refused to believe *Christ* and his *Apostles*. However, in all these instances πίστις signifies a *persuasion*, of those things particularly which the *Discourse* relates to; and as those are various, so we may, if we please, make *Faith* to be of several kinds. But because no one can believe the Authority of any *Laws*, but he must also observe them, provided he does not disagree with himself; therefore no body could seriously and heartily believe that *Christ* was sent down from *Heaven* to men, to teach them the way of eternal *Salvation*, without obeying *Christ's* Precepts: just as no body believed the *Law of Moses* to be the only *Rule of Life* revealed by *God*, who did not, in part at least, conform themselves thereto. And hence this word πίστις came, in the Writings of the *Apostles*, to signify not only a persuasion of the truth of the *Chri-*  
stian




Chapter stian Doctrin, but also a disposition of Mind, and Practice agreeable  
VIII. to it, the necessary effect of believing.

But it must be observed, that in different places of the New Testament, in proportion to the Subject treated of, this word has a larger or more contracted Notion. 1. Where the Discourse is about the *Faith* of the *Patriarchs*, we are to understand by it such a persuasion of the truth of those things they received as divine Revelations as was accompanied with an answerable temper of Mind and Life. In which sense it occurs frequently in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. xi. and elsewhere. 2. Where *Christ's* discourse is of those that believed in him as transacting upon earth, as he does here in *S. Matthem*, and up and down every where in the Gospels, by Faith is meant a persuasion of his having been truly sent of *God*, with a power of doing Miracles, and of the truth of all his Doctrin as far as it was known. 3. But after the Apostles had received the *Holy Ghost*, and expounded the whole Christian Doctrin more at large, the notion of *Faith* included in it a persuasion not only of the truth of *Christ's* Mission, but also of his *Apostles* and *Disciples*, whose Doctrin *God* gave a testimony to by innumerable wonders; and an assent accordingly yielded to whatever they asserted, joined with a Life suitable to such a persuasion. And this notion the word *πίστις* has in the Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, where *St. Paul* disputes about *Justification*. For in these places *πίστις*, i. e. a living according to the Christian Institution, setting aside the works commanded by the Law of *Moses* only, is said to *justify*, i. e. to procure mens being esteemed *just*, or good and pious by *God*, and being acceptable to him. And on the other hand, the Apostle denies that *Works*, viz. those which were opposed by the *Jews* to Faith, or the Christian Religion, did either under the Gospel, or ever of old, justify. And this he makes good by several Arguments, which shall in their proper places be explained. It shall suffice at present to have run over the different senses that the word *πίστις* is capable of, and pointed to its original Signification.

But there is this further to be added, that as *Faith* includes more than a bare persuasion about the truth of a thing in the mind; so this persuasion it self must be such a one, as is the result of having seriously weighed and examined the Arguments by which the truth of the Christian Doctrin is confirmed. For it is not to be imagined that the *Centurion*, for instance, did believe in *Christ*, hand over head, without reason or due consideration: He had, without doubt, seen some of his other Miracles, and heard his Doctrin, and had been made to believe that there was nothing too difficult for *Christ*, who had



had all power given him by *God*, to do. This his Discourse manifest- Chapter  
ly shews. But he could never have examined *Christ's* Doctrine and VIII.  
Miracles, as it was requisite he should, unless he had been freed from  
two of the mightiest Impediments to it, whereof one is Obstinacy,   
whereby we become impenetrable to all reasons, be they never so  
strong; and the other, a wicked Life, which makes Men unwilling to  
believe those things, the acknowledgment whereof would render it ne-  
cessary for them to live otherwise than they did before. And there-  
fore it is, that Faith has such a commendation bestowed upon it;  
which matter I have discoursed upon in my Notes upon *Gen. xv. 6.* and  
have there quoted out of *Philo* a very remarkable passage in which  
Faith is commended.

Verf. 11. Note h. ] It is no wonder, ( when men are neither able to  
discourse themselves, nor to understand what Beings of a different na-  
ture say about the Concernments of another Life, but in Metaphors  
taken from the things of this) that the future Happiness is described  
in this place by the similitude of a Feast. But yet I believe that  
*Christ* was not the first inventor of this similitude, but borrowed it  
from the *Jews* of that time, amongst whom it was in daily use, and  
who also were beholden for it, as they were for many other things,  
to the *Greeks*. The Poets of that Nation in order to represent *Ixion* as  
a most happy King, feigned him to have been entertained at a Feast by  
the Gods. The same they said of *Tantalus*, who, to use the words of  
*Pindar* in *Olympion*, Od. 1. καταπέψαι μέγαν ὄλβον ἐκ ἐδονάδῃ, could not digest  
that great felicity. Hence that of *Empedocles* about the eternal Fellowship  
and Conversation of the Just with one another:

Ἄθανάτους ἄλλοισιν ὁμέστοι, ἐν τε τραπέζαις  
Εὐνίας, ἀνδρείων ἀλέων ἀπόκηροι, ἀτειρεῖς

Companions with the rest of the immortal society, making themselves merry  
with feasting, free from those pains to which mortals are subject, and never  
weary. And *Epicetus* following his example, in *Enchirid. c. xxi.* bespeaks  
in this manner one that had made a great proficiency in Wisdom: ἔσῃ  
ποτέ τῶν θεῶν ἄξιον συμπότης; you will be a worthy guest, another day, for the  
Gods.

Verf. 12. Τὸ σκότος π' ἐξώτερον. ] For the understanding of this, we  
must reflect upon the similitude of a Supper here made use of. Now  
the time of supping was after the Sun was set, and the night came to  
be almost at the darkest. And therefore those that were thrust out  
of the place where the Supper was made, and the Room full of lights,  
are, in agreement with the other part of the similitude, said to be  
cast

Chapter cast into *outward darkness*. See also *Cb. xxii. 13*. This is the original of IX. this form of Speech, and the meaning of it is easy to be understood: *W* for as that which is signified by being a Guest at the Supper is *Happiness*; so to be put out of the place where the Supper was made, into the street, signifies the *losing or falling short of it*.

Ibid. *Note g* ] What authority the Doctor had for saying that κλαίειν signifies *to cry out*, I cannot tell; but tho that word may denote *wailing* or *lamenting* as well as *silently weeping*, yet it does not follow that it may be rendered by *crying out*, the word that he makes use of. Consult the *Lexicographers*.

Verf. 22. *Note k*. ] To what *Grotius* has said, according to the Opinion of *Philosophers*, about the various kinds of Death, add the Collections of *John Pricæus* upon the same subject, on *1 Tim. v. 5*. Those words, *If ye walk contrary*, &c. are in *Lev. xxvi. 21, 24*. and there is no ἀντιπαλάσις in them. See my Notes on the place.

Verf. 28. *Note l*. ] Our Author here seems to be of the Opinion of the *Platonists*, who thought the Devils used to rove about mens Sepulchres. *Synecius*, who every body knows speaks constantly like a *Platonist*, gives them upon that account the Title of *Τυμβογόμοι*, *Hym. iv. v. 47*.

Οἱ δ' ἐμπέδιοι  
Ἄγιων ὕμνων,  
Κεῦθμονοχαρεῖς,  
καὶ τυμβογόμοι,  
δαίμονες ἴδι  
φευγέτωσαν ἐμὴν  
Ὅσίαν δὶχαίν.

But now let the interrupters  
Of sacred hymns,  
That delight in lurking holes,  
And beset tombs,  
The Devils,  
Be gone from my  
Holy prayer.

But I do very much doubt whether any such thing as this can be concluded from this passage in the Evangelist; for it was very possible that the Devils might drive two men to the tombs, and yet those evil Spirits not make their usual abode in those places.

## C H A P. IX.

Verf. 14. *Note d*. **I** Question very much whether the *Doctor* rightly interprets the places he had occasion to quote in his Annotations upon this Verse. They will all very well admit of a different Explication. I. That Question, *Why do we and the Pharisees fast often, and thy Disciples fast not?* may be construed as if the Disciples of *John* had said, *Since we and the Pharisees often fast,*  
why

why do not thy Disciples also fast? or, Why do not they fast as we do? It was not the design of John's Disciples to enquire simply why the Disciples of Christ did not fast, but why they did not follow the example of all devout men among the Jews, who used to fast often. II. God's meaning in *Exod.* xx. is this: "After thou hast labour'd six days, thou shalt make the seventh a day of rest. Had God spoken any otherwise than he did, it could hardly have been known which that seventh day was which he would have to be kept as a day of rest; for it might have been the seventh day of every month, or of every year. III. That place in *St. Mark*, Chap. x. is nothing at all to the purpose: *Whosoever, says Christ, shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and if a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery.* Where Christ does not respect what might be done in pursuance of the Law, but the practice of the Gentiles, who allowed Women this power. We are sure that *Salome*, *Herod's* Sister, followed this example, and there were perhaps some others that would have been ready enough to have done the like. IV. *St. Paul's* meaning in *Ephes.* iv. is really, that Anger is not unlawful if it be but kept within bounds. V. The place cited out of *St. James* serves not in the least the Doctor's design. For the comforting of the rich upon the loss of their riches, is not the only thing that the *Apostle* there intends. See the Notes upon that place. VI. The form of speech used by *St. Paul* *Rom.* vi. 12. *But God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine, into which ye were delivered,* is almost like that of the Disciples of *John*. But *that ye were on sine* signifies either, *that ye are no longer the servants, &c.* or, *that tho ye were the servants of sin, nevertheless ye have obeyed.*

But notwithstanding all this, *Dr. Hammond's* Observation is true, if it be accommodated to other places. There are, for instance, several things said in *Parables* which do not concern the scope of them, but are only for ornament sake, and to make the Hearers the more attentive; tho it seems to have no manner of ground in the places by him alledged. But it is common for those that have not from their very youth made it their business carefully to study the Criticks, to find difficulties in the plainest things. And *Dr. Hammond* is far from being the only instance of this.



Verf. 2. ΠΕ'ΤΡΟΣ and Πέτρος are certainly used indifferently; but those  
Note b. Π that spake Greek preferred the use of the *former* because they thought a word of the *masculine* Gender more proper for the *Surname* of a Man than one of the *feminine*. But of this name here given to *Simon* there will be a fitter occasion to speak when we come to the xvi. Chapter.

Verf. 9. Note e. ] Our learned *Author* in this Annotation is mistaken, I. in that he denies the words spoken by *Jacob* of himself *Gen.* xxxii. to be declarative of his poverty; for all the meaning of that *Patriarch* is, that when he crossed over *Jordan*, in his way to *Mesopotamia*, he was *poor*, and that afterwards he returned back from thence *rich*. See the place, and my Notes upon it. Tho it would be but ill inferred from thence that he went thither in the habit of a beggar. II. *Homer* does certainly describe *Ulysses* at his return in the quality of a beggar. See *Udyss.* P. verse 197. & seqq. where *Ulysses* is represented as carrying a filthy purse full of holes in a great many places, and *Eumæus* is said to have led him into the City,

Πτωχῷ λυγαλέῳ ἐναλίγκιον, ἠδὲ γέροντι, σκῆπτρόωρον,

*Like a dirty beggar, and an old man, leaning upon a staff.* It was a long while since the *Doctor* had read *Homer*, when he was writing this. III. I think we ought to take quite another method to reconcile the *Evangelists*, of which I shall speak, when I come to the parallel in *St. Mark*.

Verf. 16. Note f. ] Our ingenious *Author*, to illustrate the general proposition he lays down by examples, plainly misapplies most of the passages here alledged by him. For excepting one place out of *Matt.* xxiii. 16. all the rest are either precepts or admonitions, as those who will but examin them will easily see. I shall instance but in two. *Behold*, says *Christ*, *I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye therefore wise as serpents, and simple as doves.* These words contain a plain precept, and that a very necessary one, as well as one that is agreeable to *Christ's* Doctrine. For the *Apostles* being not sent to men that were lovers of Truth and Justice, but to such Persons as were more like Beasts than reasonable creatures, there was a necessity of their using prudence, lest going to address themselves to Men who were wicked to a degree of madness, their pains should not only prove ineffectual and to no purpose, but they themselves also be oppressed by them. And  
this

this *Christ* commands *Matt. vii. 6. Give not that which is holy unto Dogs,* Chapter &c. But they were at the same time to take heed that that prudence of theirs did not turn to craftiness or deceit, as it would have done, if they had either privately renounced the Gospel which they had publicly preached, or feigned themselves inclined to the wicked opinions of the Pharisees. They were not to say every thing in all places and in all companies, but they were to say nothing that was in the least repugnant to the Doctrines which they had received from their Master, or that might hinder the Gospel's propagation. That which *Christ* therefore enjoyns his *Apostles*, is, to mix prudence and a sincere plainness together. Of which vertues he himself was a most perfect pattern, who never exposed himself to the fury of the Jews but when there was a necessity for it. But *St. Peter* offended against this precept by acting the part of a Dissembler, of which we have an account given us by *St. Paul*, *Gal. ii. 12.* making use of prudence to an extreme, he forfeited the commendation of being sincere and upright.

The following words, *Beware of men for they will deliver you,* &c. are a prohibition of *Christ* to his *Apostles* not to publish immediately to every one the instructions they had received from him, for fear they should be dragged to the Synagogues upon the very first beginning of their ministry. A thing which he himself also practised, delivering his mind in parables, that he might not give too great an occasion for the passions of ill minded men to exert themselves, and saying nothing which he thought would not at present be endured by the Persons he spake to. But this was to be no hindrance, as it really was not to the *Apostles*, from exposing themselves to such dangers as they could not avoid but by a culpable dissembling. These things are too manifest to need any longer insisting upon.

Verf. 16. Note g. ] The word ἀκέραιος being immediately subjoined to φρόνιμος, it cannot signify one that does not hurt, but one who together with his prudence does not use any cunning or shifting, but is fair and upright. In this sense we find it used by *S. Paul* *Rom. xvi. 19.* But yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil, i. e. far from being cunning to do evil. So in the *Addit. to Esther*, Chap. vi. 4. crafty men are said ἐξαλογίσουσαι τὴν ἡπείθερα τῶν ἀκέραιων ἀγνοουμένων, to have deceived the simple honesty of Rulers. Accordingly ἀκέραιότης signifies such a sort of temper, in the same manner that ἀπλότης signifies ingenuity or sincerity; to wit, when things are simple, and not corrupted by any art or deceit: whence this word ἀπλῆς came to denote a person who had not the least guile to be found in him. And so in the same manner, ἀκέραιος



Chapter or *ἀνδὲ κερύσεως*, is used not only for *pure*, as *οἶνον ἀκέραιον* *pure wine*,  
 X. but also for a man that is free from craft or deceit.

The Etymology which *Eustatbius* gives of the word from *κερύνειν* is harsh, and will not do in this place. And therefore the *Author* of the *Etymologicon magnum* supplies us with another, which is from *κερῶ*, i. e. *μίσγῶ*, *κερῶ*, *to mingle*, instead of which *κερύννυμι* is the word in use; from whence *ἀκέραιον* came to signify primarily *pure*, and secondarily also one that is not corrupted with any dishonesty. And therefore the old Greek and Latin Copy, which contains rather a sort of Paraphrase than (as is generally but erroneously supposed) the bare words of the Evangelists, uses here the word *ἀπλόεσται*, *most simple*. And thus also *Hesychius* renders *Ἀκέραιον* by *ἀνεπίπληκτον*, *καθαρόν*, *ἀκακόν*, *unblameable*, *pure*, *without deceit*.

I know that *ἀκέραιον* signifies likewise *unhurt*; but there is no room here for that signification. It would be nearer the sense, if we took it in the notion that it occurs several times in *Dionysius Halicarnassæus*, for one that is free from making a party either with the *Grandees* or the common People, and meddles with none of their designs. But neither does this notion of the word suite this place. There is nothing can be objected against the interpretation I have given of it, except that *Doves* may be said indeed to be *harmless*, but not properly *sincere*. But we must not be too critical about such things as these; for otherwise we might say in the same manner, that a *prudent* Nature is not so aptly represented by *Serpents* as one that is *treacherous* and *hurtful*. These are proverbial Sayings, which must not be over narrowly searched into; but we must gather their sense very often from Custom rather than the consideration of the things themselves. And of this kind of Sayings we may meet with an infinite number in common Speech.

Verf. 27. Note k. ] Hither perhaps may be aptly referr'd that Passage in *Herodotus*, lib. 3. cap. 24. where it is said that the *Magi* or learned *Philosophers* of the Country, who had seized upon the Persian Empire, would have obliged *Prexaspes*, by whom *Smerdis* the Son of *Cyrus* had been killed, to proclaim from a high Tower to the *Persians* in a full Assembly, that *Smerdis* was in the Throne. *Φάριβοι Πέρσαι πάντας συγκαλέειν ὑπὸ τὸ βασιλῆϊον τείχος, ἐκέλευον ἀναβάντα ἐπὶ πύργον ἀγγεῦσαι ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Κύρου Σμερδίου ἀρχόντου: Saying that they would gather together all the Persians under the wall of the palace, they commanded him to go up upon a Tower, and proclaim to them that they were governed by Smerdis the Son of Cyrus.*

Verf. 29. Note l. ] *Tiberius's Assarium* (which is that here spoken of) is said by Doctor *Edward Bernard*, lib. 2. concerning weights and  
 measures,



measures, sect. 2. to have been equivalent to six English grains of Silver.



Verf. 11. **M**είζων Ἰωάννης, &c. ] It would seem very strange that our Author, in his Paraphrase upon this Verse, should deny *John* to have been a *Prophet*, to whom at the 9th Verse, and often elsewhere, he gives that Title, were it not plain that either he had no manner of desire to express himself clearly; or else if he had, that how great soever his other excellencies were, Perspicuity was not his Talent. When therefore he denies *John* to have been a *Prophet*, he must mean that, compared with the *Apostles*, he was to be look'd upon rather as a *Disciple* than a *Master*, as he shews in his Note upon the 9th Verse.

Verf. 19. Τελωνῶν φίλοι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. ] Of what ill repute the *Τελῶναι* were among the *Greeks*, our Author informs us in his Notes upon Chap. ix. 10. But there were two sorts of Men at that time in the *Roman* Empire, that might be called *Τελῶναι*. There were some *Roman* Knights, Men of Honour and Credit, who were *Publicans*, and farm'd the Customs, and are often mention'd with Honour by *Cicero*, especially in his Orations *pro lege Manilia* and *pro Plancio*. This sort of *Publicans* do not seem to be referred to in the Gospels; and that *S. Matthew*, who is call'd *Τελῶνης*, was not of this sort, is beyond all doubt: but then those *Roman* Gentlemen did not gather the Customs themselves, but by their Servants, or Freed-men, or by other men of a low rank. And these also were called *Τελῶναι*, and were infamous persons, because many times they levied the Taxes and Duties by force, and, as is common in those cases, exacted more than was due. See *Suidas* upon this word. Upon this account it was that they had an ill name, and especially among the *Jews*, who paid Tribute to the *Romans* very much against the grain, and could not, without indignation, see their *Countrymen* employed by the *Romans* to gather it for them. These sort would in Latin be better called *Portitores*, if we should trust the old Latin and Greek Glossary, in which *Portitor* is put to answer *τελώνης*, and *Portitorium* *τελωνεῖον*. But in that wherein the Greek stands before the Latin, *τελώνης* is render'd by *Publicanus*, *Vestigalium conductor*.

Verf. 23. Note i. ] I have some things to observe upon this last Note of the *Doctor's*, which may serve partly to confute, and partly to confirm what he says.

Chapter  
XI.

I. It is true indeed, that the word *Ἅιδης* did not, as we shall presently see, immediately and properly signify among the *Gentiles* any place; but it is a mistake that it was put to denote the *State of the dead*, if we take the word in its proper signification. It is the name of a *Deity*, who was believed to be chief Ruler in *Hell*, and was otherwise stiled Πλούτων, *Pluto*, which every child knows. And hence the place where the Souls of the dead were thought to be, was usually called Ἄϊδος δόμος, *the house of Hades*. As in *Homer Odyss.* κ. 512.

Αὐτὸς δ' εἰς αἴδειω ἵεναι δόμον ὀρώεντα·

*But do you go into Pluto's dark house:*

and up and down elsewhere. And εἰς Ἅϊδος was used as a contraction of the same Phrase, as εἰς Ἅϊδην καταβῆναι, *to go down into* (sub. the house) *of Hades*. Nevertheless, afterwards this word was taken for the place over which *Pluto* was thought to reign, as *Iliad.* θ. v. 16. where Τάρταρος is said to be

Ἦσσον ἐνεσθ' αἴδειω, ὅσσ' ἕρηνός ἐς' ἄπὸ γαίης,

*as much lower than Hades, as heaven is distant from the earth.* The like Examples we may every where meet with. That this place was supposed to be under ground, no body needs to be told. This is the constant acceptation of the word *Ἅιδης* amongst the Greeks; it is either *Pluto* himself, or his *Kingdom* that is signified by it, but never *the State of the dead*.

II. But *Dr. Hammond* produces a place out of *Phurnutus* or *Cornutus*, where he interprets it by ἀφανισμός: but not to say that no sort of Writers can be imagined more impertinent than allegorical Interpreters of Fables, that *Triflemonger* never intended to shew what was the common signification of the word *Ἅιδης*, or what *Idea* those had in their minds who heard that word pronounced; but what sense might be put upon it, that those nauseous Fables might be found to have a meaning in them not perfectly absurd. But the signification of a word must be drawn from the sense that it is *vulgarly* taken in, and not from an *allegorical* Interpretation of it, which is generally unknown, and for the most part ridiculous. We must enquire what notion such a word used to excite in the minds of those that heard it, not what signification some doting Stoick that thinks every thing to be intended in Fables that his own idle fancy suggests to him, affixed to it.

III. But it will be said that the Etymology of the word is on *Phurnutus* and *Dr. Hammond's* side. And I acknowledg it is so, if that



be the true Etymology of it, which may with reason be doubted, because the word whose *original* we are inquiring into, is almost every where written with a *Spiritus asper* which is not usual in words compounded with a *Privative*. I confess that *Ἄϊδης* is also written with a *Spiritus lenis*; but this not being constant, it is probable that the former is the true pronounciation of the word, and that the manner of writing it was varied for no other reason than because the Greeks afterwards thought *that* to be the true Etymology of the word which Dr. Hammond gives us. So the Author of the *Etymologicon magnum* says, "Ἄϊδης, χρεῖον ἀφελγής, σκότους αἰώνιος καὶ ζόφου πεπληρωμένον. ὡσαύτ' τὸ εἶδω, τὸ βλέπω, εἶδης καὶ μετὰ τῆς σερηπικῆς Α, ἀειδής, ἐν ᾧ ἕδεν βλέπομεθα, ἄϊδης γάρ ἐστιν ἡ σκοτεινὴ οὐκία." But with all the *Greek Grammarians* leave, I should say that this is not the true Etymology of the word; but that it must be deduced from the Hebrew *אֵיד* which may be pronounced not only as the Authors of the *Masora* do, *ed*, but *ajid*. The *Phœnicians* perhaps wrote it *אֵיד*, as it is common for the *guttural* Letters to be confounded in the *Oriental Languages*, and as the *Arabians* at this day write it: and so from *אֵיד* *Hajid* came *haides* and *hades*; and that word, as it is very well known, signifies *destruction*. There are a great many words that the *Greeks* have in vain attempted to find the original of in their Language, and which have with good success been derived by learned men from the *Phœnicians*. I could shew why the youngest of *Saturn's* Sons was so called, and assign the reason of the Names of the rest of them out of the same Language: but this is not a proper place for it.

IV. I cannot see the reason why our learned *Author* citing *Esth.* xii. 7. will not allow the Heathen King *Artaxerxes* (a Decree of whose is in that Chapter recited) to have had any thoughts of *Hell*, or a place of punishments. *That heathen King*, says he, *cannot be thought to dream of Hell*. For who does not know that the *Heathens* believed there was a place under the earth, in which bad men were punished? 'Tis plain the *Greeks* did, and I need not prove the *Persians* to have been of the same opinion; for he that wrote the *Additions to Esther*, was not so well skill'd in the sentiments of the *Persians*, but that he might confound them with those of the *Greeks*. Or however there is nothing that should oblige us to think, that as to this matter, the opinion of the *Greeks* and *Persians* was not the very same. Besides, *εἰς Ἄϊδ'α* is not as much as to say in English *to Hell*, or in French *en enfer*; for these words do only signify the place of *punishments*, whereas the *Greek* are more comprehensive, and take in not only *Hell* or the place of *Torments*, but likewise the *Elysian fields*.



Chapter  
XI.

V. One question there is behind that is not easy to be resolved, viz. what notion the Jews who used the Greek Tongue, affixed to that word *ἄδης*: I will not heap together all that might be said with relation to this matter; Two things only I shall observe, that may help us to find out the meaning of *Christ's* words. 1. That the Jews had a word in their Language which signified a *grave*, any *subterraneous* places, and *the State of the dead*; and that was שְׁאוֹל *Scheol*, which I have treated of on *Gen.* xxxvii. 35. and which upon all accounts it seems likely that *Christ* here made use of. The *Syriack*, I am sure, has שְׁאוֹל. Now when this word is opposed to *Heaven*, it signifies, among the Hebrews, *the lowest places of the earth*; and where *Heaven* is by a metaphor taken for *Glory and Prosperity*, שְׁאוֹל denotes *obscurity and adversity*. Thus *Isai.* xiv. 11, 12. it is said in this sense of the King of Babylon: *thy pride is brought down שְׁאוֹל* ——— *how art thou fallen from Heaven!* &c. And just in this manner *Christ* here speaks to *Capernaum*, and uses the word שְׁאוֹל in the same sense with *Isaiab.* for a miserable and low condition; as he had before used the word *Heaven*, to express the happy State of that City whilst he preached and wrought Miracles in it. 2. Amongst the rest of the senses attributed to the word *ἄδης* by the Jews who spake the Greek Language, all which I shall not enumerate, there was that which I said belonged to the *Hebrew* word, instead of which they generally used this. Which appears clearly from hence, that *κατωτατη τῆς γῆς* and *ἄδης* were in their speech *synonymous*. Thus whereas it is said by *St. Peter*, that it was impossible for *Christ* to be left *eis ἄδου*, *Act.* ii. 27. *St. Paul* says that he descended *eis κατωτατην μέσην τῆς γῆς*, *Eph.* iv. 9. And in this sense *St. Matthew* or his Interpreter, in the room of the word שְׁאוֹל which *Christ* made use of, has used the Greek *ἄδης*. If this be true, as it is likely, almost all that *our Author* says upon this place must of necessity fall to the ground. To the other places of the New Testament, where this word is found, I shall say something when I come to them.

Verf. 27. Οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν ἄδου, &c. ] This Verse must be joined to the 25, that *Christ* may be understood to declare to the Jews, as well as *Gentiles*, that notwithstanding their professed eagerness after divine knowledg, the true Worship of God his Father, and the offices of the *Messias*, were things that they were strangers to. For the Jews imagined that the observation of the letter of the Law rendered them acceptable to God, whilst they neglected the purpose of the Law-giver; which was to make them truly vertuous, in the manner that *Christ* alone has taught us to be. And they expected also the *Messias*

to come in the quality of an earthly Prince, and free them from that Chapter  
extream bondage which they were under to the *Romans*. So that they XI.  
neither knew the *Father* nor the *Son*.

Verf. 28. *Κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι* ] We are to understand this only of the *Jews*, who *ἐκοπιῶν* were tired, by reason of the frequent journies that the Law obliged them to make to *Jerusalem*, and which they took for fear of offending *God*, tho not without a great deal of trouble. The design of *Christ* is to insinuate to the *Jews*, without speaking his mind in plain terms, which would have been unseasonable at that time, that he was about to teach his Disciples a way how they might worship *God* acceptably without that bodily labour. This he teaches the Samaritan woman more clearly *Joh. iv. 21.* to whom he might declare a thing which the *Jews* were utterly averse to without any present danger. The *πεφορτισμένοι* are persons burden'd with Legal rites, and all those things which they were to pay to *God*, the *Priests* and *Levites*, which were much more inculcated on them, than charity or any other vertue. And therefore these things are afterwards, chap. xxiii. 4. called *φορτία*. See also *Luc. xi. 46.* Those who understand *Christ* to speak here of vices, besides destroying their connexion with what goes before, offer violence to the very words; for such as serve their vices, are not *weary* or *heavy laden*, which are words that denote persons under *trouble* or *disquiet*, but they indulge their wicked inclinations with *delight*, and are hardly brought to renounce them. Those men do not think themselves to want any *ἀνέλπυστος*, for they acquiesce in their vices with abundance of pleasure. But the *Jews* groaned under a yoke of Ceremonies, which they were unable to bear, as *St. Peter* declares *Act. xv. 10.* and had need of rest, which under the Law it was impossible for them to enjoy, because they were forced to make a journey, thrice a year at least, to *Jerusalem*.

Verf. 29. *Πρᾶός εἰμι καὶ ταπεινός.* ] The Doctors of the Law, especially those of the Sacerdotal race, were neither meek nor lowly, being cruel exactors of those burdensom things that were commanded in the Law, and proud of having the common People of the *Jews* tributary to them. But there is nothing of this nature in *Christ*, who requires only a good Life, and condescends to the very meanest, whoever they be. How extreamly haughty and disdainful the *Priests* in those times were, *Josephus* informs us, *Lib. xx. c. 6. Antiq. Jud.*

Verf. 30. Note 1.] *χρηστός*; when spoken of a person, signifies good, bountiful, courteous, or merciful; but when it is a thing that is spoken of, as it is here, then it signifies the same with *χρησιμὸς* profitable, which comes from the same Primitive, or else something like it, according as



Chapter the nature of the thing is. *Jerem.* xxiv. 3, 5. good figs are called *σῦκα*  
 XI. *χρησά* by the *Septuagint*; and *Ezek.* xxviii. 13. a precious stone, *λίθος χρησός*.  
 ~~~~~ *Aeschylus*, in *Aristophanes*, *Ran.* Act. iv. Sc. 2. says to *Euripides*: *Πάνυ δὲ*  
*δεῖ χρῆσά κέγαι ἡμᾶς*: *We must by all means speak useful things*. Whence in  
 following Ages, any collections of useful things were called *χρησματοθεῖαι*,  
 and the sentences mark'd in the margin of the Books with the letter X,  
 which needs no proof. So in *Hesych.* *χρησός* (for so it is to be read and not  
*χρήσις*) is interpreted by *χρήσιμος*, and *χρησῶν* by *χρησίμων*. If this were  
 not a thing past doubt, I would add the words of *Suidas* and *Phavori-*  
*nus*; but I must not take up my own or the Readers time. *Ζυγὸς χρησός*  
 therefore signifies a profitable yoke, which is for the benefit or advantage  
 of those that bear it; which the *Mosaical* was not, but as it is opposed  
 to the Gospel yoke, was of it self unprofitable. For of what use were  
 so many sacrifices, so many taxes, under the name of First-fruits and  
 Tithes, taking so many journeys, and so many Purifications, if we con-  
 sider them in themselves? All that they served for was only to con-  
 sume that wealth which was gotten with a great deal of pains, and to  
 render Life more troublesome. For these things did not of themselves  
 make men good or acceptable to God. And therefore they were not  
*χρησά*, or, to speak in the words of *Ezekiel* c. xx. 25. they were *precepts*  
*that were not good*. But the yoke of *Christ* is useful to him that takes  
 it upon him, many times in this Life, and always in that which is to  
 come. It makes men good, and well pleasing to God, and confers eter-  
 nal happiness upon them.

Ibid. *Ἐλαφρόν*] This is opposed to the *δυσβάστακτα φορτία* of the *Doctors*  
*of the Law*, which neither the ancient *Jews* nor the men of that Age  
 were able to bear. This was a most heavy burden even to good men,  
 who were desirous to observe every thing which the Law commanded,  
 and yet could not do so but with a very great deal of pain and difficul-  
 ty; but on the other hand, nothing is more easy to a good man, than  
 obedience to the *Gospel*, which requires nothing but what all that are  
 good must needs approve. If any man thinks the precepts of the Gos-  
 pel to be difficult, he is still a bad man; and that may be fitly applied  
 to him,

*Nulla est tam facilis res, quin difficilis fiet,  
 Quam invitus faciat.*

It is strange that neither *Grotius* nor the *Doctor* should perceive that  
 these things were spoken in opposition to the *Jewish* rites.



V. 8. middle of Note a. **O**UR learned Author goes about here to confute *H. Grotius*, who thinks that by the *Son of Man* we must understand Man in common, and not *Christ*. The whole strength of the *Doctor's* reasoning is from the use of that phrase; for all that he says besides is so forced, that the bare comparing of it with what is said by *Grotius* is enough to shew how much he is that great man's inferiour in this debate. But however let us examin what he says. I. Those words in the 6 Verse, *one greater than the Temple is here*, are not connected with the following 8 v. *for the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath*, but with what goes before; and therefore it is not necessary that he *who was greater than the Temple* and the *Son of Man* should be the same. II. In *Dan. vii. 13.* the *Son of Man* is taken for a *Man*, and not for the name of the *Messias*, whatever was the use of that phrase in *Christ's* time. *I saw*, says the Prophet, *in the night visions, and behold there came with the clouds of heaven one like the Son of Man*, כְּבָר אֱנוֹשׁ, i. e. the appearance of a Man. This is known to be the constant use of this phrase in the Old Testament; and that *Christ* should sometimes use it in the same signification will not seem strange to any, tho at other times he calls *himself* the *Son of Man*, or a *Man*. III. The phrase *for man* in *St. Mark* does certainly signify *for the good of Man*; to wit, that Servants might have rest, which was the principal end of the *Sabbath*; from whence it follows that man is *Lord of the Sabbath*, in this respect, that he may either observe, or neglect the *Sabbath*, according as affairs, upon which his safety depends, require. For otherwise, if this had not been lawful, *man had been for the Sabbath* and *not the Sabbath for man*; in as much as it would have been his duty to set less by his own Life than the observation of the *Sabbath*. Thus, if there be a just occasion, we are obliged to lay down our lives, rather than not observe those precepts of eternal equity and obligation, that are contained in the Gospel; because the keeping of those precepts was the end for which *God* created us. And yet *they* too, I acknowledg, may in a sort be said to be *for us*, because, if they were but universally observed, they would be a means of making men happy both in this life, and everlastingly in the other. But the Sabbatical days of rest come quite under another consideration, and were not appointed for the good of the mind, so much as of the body. The *Jews*, according to the intention of the Lawgiver, were bound only to observe them so far as they could without inconvenience, and consistently with self-preservation. In all other cases they

Chapter XII. they were to have a greater regard to their life than to the keeping of holy days. *Dr. Hammond* therefore has made an ill advantage of the ambiguity of this phrase *for the good of man*, which does not always signify the same thing. Add to this that I have said what *Grotius* has upon this place, and then there will be no room to doubt but that this learned English Gentleman has mistaken the true design of it.

Verf. 20. Note e. ] Few that are skilled in the *Hebrew*, will allow our *Author* that *לְאֱמֹנָה יִצְיֵן מִשְׁפָּט* *he shall bring forth judgment unto truth* is the same with *he shall bring forth a true judgment*; for to express this the *Jews* would say *יִצְיֵן מִשְׁפָּט אֱמֹנָה* *he shall bring forth the judgment of truth*. It is more probable that the *Evangelist*, who produces rather the sense than the very words of the Prophecy, expresses that which the *Prophet* calls to bring forth judgment unto truth by *εἰσβάλλειν ῥῆλον εἰς ῥιζὴν*, and would be understood thus, to advance the Doctrine of true Piety so as that it shall prevail over falshood; which is the same, as to lay down that Doctrine in such a manner as to make it appear true. Undoubtedly that Doctrine which is looked upon as true, must be said to have overcome; and this is the only victory that the Gospel can obtain, to be looked upon as true.

Ibid. Note d. ] This proverbial expression, *not to break a bruised reed, nor to quench smoking flax*, is rightly expounded by *Dr. Hammond* as well as by many others before him. I add, that the *Latins* much after the same manner used the phrase *extinguere extinctos*, to signify the killing or destroying outright such as had before but little hope left of safety. Thus the *Writer* to *Herennius* Lib. 4. 52. after he had told how a City was taken by the Soldiers, brings in a Woman deprecating the Conquerors anger in these terms: *Parce, & per ea quæ tibi dulcissima sunt in vita, misere nostri; noli extinguere extinctos. We beseech you, by all that you count sweetest in life, to spare and take pity upon us, do not resolve to destroy those that are already destroyed.*

Verf. 24. Note f. ] What our *Author* has about the *God Achor*, perhaps he took out of *Selden de Diis Syris*, Synt. 11. c. 6. where this matter is copiously handled. Certain it is that *Mr. Selden* wrote first. But both of them were deceived by a false reading in *Pliny*, whose words, in the vulgar editions were corrupted. In the Manuscript Copy there is no mention made of the *Cyrenæans*, nor of *Achor Deus*, as *Salmasius* in his *Plinian. exercit.* p. 10. Edit. *Vitraj.* observes, who must be consulted by those that have a mind to enquire more thoroughly into this matter. He thinks, and very rightly, that we may from the marks that are found in the old written copy read the words thus: *invocant — Elei Myiagron Deum, muscarum multitudine pestilentiam afferente;*



*afferrante*; and this reading was taken into the context of the *Paris Edition*, ann. 1685: Chapter XII.

It will bear likewise a dispute, whether it be a probable conjecture of our Author, that the *Egyptians God Beelzebub* was the same with the *Grecians Jupiter*. For *Jupiter*, a Deity among the Greeks, was as unknown to the *Philistines*, as *Dagon* the God of the *Philistines* was to the *Greeks*. It was a piece of vanity in the poor silly *Grecians*, rashly to think that their Gods were every where worshipped, as I might easily shew if it was a thing to be done in this place: But I do not here take upon me to explain the *Greek Mythology*.

Verf. 27. Note g ] The *Doctor* might perhaps have added, that the whole of *Christ's* reasoning in this place consists of Arguments *ad hominem*; for there are several things here supposed as true, because they were believed by the *Jews*, which are no where designedly laid down for certain by *Christ*, nor any where confirmed by the *Apostles*: One is, that there is such a political order amongst the Devils, as that one rules over the rest in the quality of a *Prince*, and under the name of *Beelzebub*; which every one must needs look upon as doubtful. Another thing is, that that political order should continue for a great while after that time, and consequently the Devils should have no civil dissensions among themselves. It's certain that the *Persians*, who called the *Devil* by the name of *Arimanes*, thought that his Empire would never be at an end till it was overthrown by *Oromazes* or the good God. See *Stanley Philosoph. Oriental. Lib. ii. c. 6*. And much such an opinion as this seems to have been taken up by the *Jews*, who perhaps had it from the *Chaldeans*, and, if we believe learned men, the rest also of the Doctrine about the several orders that there are among the *Angels*. It may be further asked perhaps, why *Christ* did not answer an objection which easily springs up in a mans mind upon the reading of this reasoning of his. For it might have been pretended by the *Pharisees*, that this was only an artifice in the *Prince* of the Devils to expel his subject Devils for a little time, who might afterwards enter in again unobserved and settle him more securely in his Dominion; and so that there seemed to be a dissension among the Devils, tho' really there was none. But this pretence the Doctrine of *Christ* it self sufficiently confuted; and his Resurrection, which was purposely intended as a confirmation of his Doctrine, put the matter out of all doubt. For how could it be imagined that so holy a Doctrine, confirm'd by miracles from Heaven, should owe its being so universally spread to a previous juggle and contrivance among the Devils? This is in effect, tho' but obscurely, suggested by *Christ* at the 33d Verf.

Verf.

Chapter XII. *Verf. 32. Note h.* ] It is very true that רַבֵּר, which properly signifies a *word*, is taken very often for a *thing*; but the phrase *to speak a word* אָמַר רַבֵּר was never used to signify *to do any thing*. The first therefore is very well observed by the *Doctor*, and demonstrated before by examples at chap. xi. ver. 23. of this *Gospel*. But the latter nobody will ever be able to prove. For tho' רַבֵּר signifies both *word* and *thing*, yet it does not follow that *verbs* of a near signification, as particularly that the verb אָמַר *to speak* signifies *to do*, nor can any such instance be given. It is true also, that those who *speak words against the Holy Ghost* do *oppose* him; but the reason of that is, because *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh*, and it is impossible that a man should speak vilifying words of those Miracles that are wrought by a divine power, but he must have a design to resist them. So that our Author, which I am sorry for, has not in the beginning of this last Annotation of his, given us any Evidence of his great skill in *Grammar*: What he says besides is extraordinary; and nobody, that I know of, has so happily explained wherein the Sin against the *Holy Ghost* consists. This Sin is excellently compared to sinning under the *Law with a hand lifted up*; which those were guilty of who, after warning given them, put an open contempt upon the *Laws* authority, and spake in reproachful terms concerning it, as we have shewn in our *Notes on Numbers*. For just as those who are here said to sin against the *Holy Ghost*, defamed the Miracles wrought by *Christ*; so those that sinned under the *Law with a high hand* derided the Miracles wrought by *Moses*.

*Verf. 36. Note m.* ] There are some who would have *Christ* to argue here *à minori ad majus*. q. d. If men must give an account even of *idle words*, much more must they do so of *slandorous speeches*, such as had been utter'd by the *Pharisees*. But there is not so much as the least footstep of this ἀπόδειξις in our Saviour's words. And therefore I rather think with *Dr. Hammond* that this word ἀργόν implies something in it more than ordinary bad. For tho' it properly signifies *idle*, yet according to use, which often stretches the sense of words beyond what is contain'd in their true original, it may signify somewhat more. When any man was said to be ἀργός, the only meaning certainly was not that he had a great deal of leisure, which may be true sometimes of good and industrious persons, but that he was a *lazy, sluggish, stupid* Fellow, as the word is readred in an old *Lexicon*. And so ἀργὸν ῥήμα is not only a *vain* or *idle* word, such as the *Discourse* of trifling persons is oftentimes full of; but also a *wicked* one, such as is a means of corrupting the minds of the Hearers, and making



making them lazy and slothful, *i. e.* hindering them from doing any good works; and as a consequence of that, occasioning their running headlong into all manner of evil practices. And of this sort were the Discourses of such men as the *Pharisees*, who, in respect of Piety, might be justly said to be ἀργοὶ slothful persons, performed no good works, but were wicked themselves, and by their bad Conversation kept others from becoming sober or serviceable. Their Discourses were the Discourses of ἀργῶν ἢτοι ἀργῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ὅτι τὴν ὁμοίαν ἀργίαν ἀκόσμιος ἀργίης, lazy men (in point of Virtue) and such as induced the Hearers to be alike slothful. This Christ more than once upbraids them with. See afterwards Chap. xxiii. 13. And in this place we have an instance of it in them, in their not only refusing to believe Christ themselves, but using Arguments to persuade others that he was not to be believed, whilst they wickedly ascribed the Miracles that were done by him to the Prince of the Devils. So that I should understand the word ἀργῶν not only in a passive, but also in an active sense, *i. e.* that Christ speaks of such Discourses as were not only without the least spark of goodness in them, but had a bad influence likewise upon others. Thus the Doctrine of the Stoicks was by the rest of the Philosophers called ἀργὸς λόγος, in an active sense, as appears from a passage in Cicero Lib. de Fato: *Nec nos impedit, says he, illa ignava quæ dicitur ratio (appellatur quidem à Philosophis ἀργὸς λόγος) cui si pareamus nihil est omnino quod agamus in vita.* So ἀργός, of which ἀργῶς is but a contraction, is used also actively. Hesych. ἀργός, ἀργός ἢ κακός, idle or mischievous.

Verf. 42. Ἐκ περὶ τῶν τῆς γῆς.] See my Notes upon Abd. ver. 20.

CHAPTER XIII.

Verf. 8. See my Citations out of Pliny, about the fruitfulness of Egypt, Africa, and Sicily, upon Gen. xli. 47.

Verf. 12. Ὅστις ὃ ἐκ ἔχθ, καὶ ὃ ἐχθ ἀρθῆσαι ἀπ' αὐτῶ. ] *i. e.* He that makes an ill use of God's benefits, so as that they prove almost insignificant to him, and makes little or no advances in Piety, shall be so forsaken of God, as to fall even from those first beginnings he has made in Virtue. Just such another expression, but in a different case, there is in Juvenal, Sat. iii. verf. 208.

*Nil habuit Codrus, quis enim negat? & tamen illud  
Perdidit infelix totum nihil.*

Verf.

Chapter XIII. Vers. 21. *Ὁὐκ ἔχουσιν ῥίζαν.*] The same Metaphor is used by *Quintilian*, de præcocibus ingenijs, *Inst. lib. 1. c. 3.* *Non subest*, says he, *vera vis, nec penitus immixtis radicibus, ut quæ summo solo sparsa sunt semina, celerius sese effundunt; & imitatae spicas heriulæ, manibus arislis, ante messim flavesunt.* Their forwardness is not the effect of any settled strength of Judgment, but they are like seeds scattered upon the surface of the ground, which presently shoot up before they have taken any rooting; or like <sup>deep</sup> weeds growing amongst the corn, which ripen before the Harvest.

*Ibid.* The Exposition of this Parable is full of improprieties of speech, such as in their ordinary and daily discourse it is usual for men to be guilty of; but this does not make the sense obscure, because the thing is of it self so very manifest. We must not therefore criticize too much upon the words, but mind the thing it self. *When any one, saith Christ, beareth the word of the Kingdom, and understandeth it not, the wicked one cometh and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart: this is he which was sowed by the way side.* It is just as if he had said, and his meaning is no other than this; "That whosoever hears the Gospel, and does not with all his heart entertain it, is not long obedient to it; for the Examples and Speeches of wicked men soon engage him to return to his former evil course. This man is represented by that part of the field which is by the way side. After the same manner the rest is to be expounded.

Vers. 28. *Note c.*] That the Phrase *ἐχθρὸς ἀνθρώπου* is a Hebraism, may perhaps be true; but that Criticism is of no use here. For in this part of the Parable, where a Householder is represented as the Speaker, by a *man-enemy* is meant a *man*, and not the *Devil*.

Vers. 35. *Διὰ τοῦ Προφήτου.*] It is strange that in the ancient Copies, still extant, there should be no footsteps to be found of that reading which is so often mentioned by *S. Jerom*, and which gave *Porphyrius* an occasion to endeavour the lessening the *Evangelists* Authority. *I have read in some Copies*, says he upon this place, and perhaps any diligent Reader may find the same, in the place where we have put, and the vulgar Edition has dictum est per Prophetam dicentem; *I say, I have read in some Copies per Esaiam Prophetam dicentem.* And because no such thing as is here mention'd was to be found in *Isaiah*, I believe this was taken away afterwards by some prudent men; but I am apt to think that it was at first written per *Asaph* Prophetam (for the 77th Psalm, out of which this Testimony is taken, is entitled a Psalm of the Prophet *Asaph*) and that the first Transcriber did not understand what was meant by *Asaph*, but thinking it to be a mistake in the Writer, corrected it by putting *Isaiah*  
into



into its room, whose name was more familiar and better known. Much after the same manner he speaks upon the 78th Psalm; for all that is there said on this head seems to be truly S. Jerom's, tho' there be perhaps, as *Erasmus* thought, a great deal of another man's added to that Commentary. It is said therefore, says he, in *St. Matthew*, *Hæc facta sunt ut impleretur quod scriptum est in Asaph Propheta; but some ignorant men took that away, and ever since that time, MANY Gospels at this day have it, Ut impleretur quod dictum est per Esaiam Prophetam, tho' it was not Isaiah that said this, but Asaph. In a word, that wicked wretch Porphyrius objects this very thing against us, saying, Your Evangelist Matthew was so ignorant as to say, Quod scriptum est per Esaiam, &c. — it was an error in the Transcribers, who wrote Esaiam for Asaph: for we know that the Primitive Church was gathered out of ignorant and unskilful people; and so reading in the Gospel, Ut impleretur quod scriptum est in Asaph Propheta, he that first transcribed the Gospel began to question with himself, who should this Asaph the Prophet be? and because he was not known among the People, thinking it to be an error, and going about to correct it, committed one himself. If we believe those who have made it their business to collect the various Readings, there is no Copy now extant but what wants the Prophet's name. But tho' there was a very important reason for blotting his name out, the ancient Transcribers had none at all for adding it; which is a thing that deserves our consideration, as well as what S. Jerom says besides in that place.*

Verf. 54. Πατρίδα, i. e. *Nazareth*, where his Parents had fixed their habitation. One and the same man, as *Cicero* tells us, may have two distinct Countries. Lib. 2. de Legibus, *Municipibus duæ sunt patriæ, altera naturæ, altera civitatis; ut ille Cato, cum esset Tusculi natus, in populi Romani civitatem susceptus est. Itaque cum ortu Tusculanus esset, civitate Romanus, habuit alteram loci patriam, alteram juris. Strangers that are free of any City have two Countries, one where they were born, the other the City of which they are made free; as the famous Cato, who having been born at Tusculum, was admitted to the Privileges of a Roman Citizen: and so being a Tusculan by birth, and by freedom a Citizen of Rome, he had one Country which was his native soil, and another where he was naturalized.*

V. 5. middle  
of Note a.

**T**His observation seems to be taken out of *H. Stephens's Thesaurus*, and with very little care: for what is ascribed to *Budæus*, *Stephanus* sets down as out of the vulgar Lexicons; and those which are cited for the words of *Xenophon*, are *Aschines's*; and *Budæus* interprets  $\alpha\epsilon\lambda\iota\beta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  by *progredi facio*. So that it would have been better if the *Doctor* had left out what he here says.

Verf. 7. **Π**<sup>Προφήτης</sup> *mond*, that there is any respect here had to a further second accomplishment of a Prophecy of *Isaiab*, whose words contain not a *Prediction* of any thing, but are only a *reproof* which he gives to the *Jews* of his time. But the reason of *Christ's* using such a form of speech, is that *Isaiab*, in describing the *antient Jews*, did at the same time exactly represent the disposition of their posterity, even at that distance. And therefore the word  $\alpha\epsilon\lambda\iota\beta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  here must not be insisted on, the meaning of *Christ's* words being no other than this: *the Prophet Isaiab spake that of your forefathers which may very well be apply'd to you*. Something like this we may read in *Cicero's Orat. pro Sextio Cap. lvii.* where that Prince of Orators tell us that a great many things out of antient tragedy suting his case, were by *Roscius* and all the *Romans* accommodated to him; and after he had recited this Verse, *O ingratis Argivi, inanes Græci, immemores beneficii*, with a few more, he goes on thus: *illud scripsit disertissimus poeta pro me; i. e. these things do so exactly fit my case, that if the Poet had wrote about me on set purpose, he could not possibly have devised any thing more sutable*. And just thus I should here understand *Isaiab*, to be figuratively said to have *propheci'd* that which did so well agree to the *Jews* in the time of *Christ*, as that if he had *really* had a respect to them, he could not have spoken otherwise.

Verf. 19. Note e.] I. The phrase *to proceed out of the heart* does not signify for any thing that lies hid in the heart to discover it self by some external Action, but to have a Fountain in the Mind, which is the original of all our thoughts. And therefore it cannot be gathered from this phrase that *καρδιαι* in this place signifies any thing more than *bare thoughts*. And indeed *Christ* opposes here those things which



are conveyed from without into the body, to those which have their Chapter  
 rise from the Mind, whether they are *latent*, or whether they *manifest* XV.  
 themselves by outward Actions. Nor do evil thoughts less defile a  
 man whilst they remain *secret* in the mind, than when they are *expres-*  
*sed* in words. II. If there was a necessity of proving that *διαλογισμοὶ*  
 signifies *Machinations* or *Consultations*, the way would not be to consider  
 the significations of the *Noun λόγος*, but of the *Verb διαλογίζεσθαι*, from  
 which the word *διαλογισμός* immediately comes, and which amongst other  
 things signifies *to consult*. III. Our Author's reasoning from the sins  
 here enumerated being disposed according to the *order* of the precepts  
 of the *Decalogue*, besides that it is overthrown by comparing this with  
 the parallel place in *St. Mark*, does by no means agree with *St. Mat-*  
*thew's* way of writing, in which there is no such accuracy to be obser-  
 ved, no more than in the other writings of the *Apostles*. IV. As I  
 do not deny but that part of the Wickedness spoken of in *Gen. vi. 5.*  
 was the *murders* committed by those who lived before the Flood, so I  
 am far from thinking that this is the *only* signification of those words  
*the imaginations of the thoughts of the heart*, and I am sure it cannot be  
 proved to be so. In a word, the *Doctor* in this whole Annotation takes  
 more pains, and uses greater subtilty than he needed to have done. It  
 would have been sufficient for him to have shewn that *διαλογισμοὶ* does  
 not only signify the *thoughts* of particular persons, but also the *consulta-*  
*tions* of several persons together, and that *Christ* had a respect to  
 both, and by that word was meant *all* kinds of evil thoughts and  
 wicked consultations.

Verf. 22, Note f. ] I. I have not that Edition of *Pliny* which our  
 learned Author made use of, nor *Budæus*; but I read the place in *Pli-*  
*ny*, in the late *Paris* Edition of *M. J. Harduin*, thus: *Qui subtilius divi-*  
*dunt circumfundi Syriâ Phœnicem volunt, & esse oram maritimam Syriæ*  
*cujus pars sit Idumæa & Judæa, deinde Phœnice, deinde Syriæ. Those*  
*that divide more subtilly tell us that Phœnice is comprehended in Syriæ, and is*  
*the Sea-coast of Syriæ, of which Idumæa and Judæa make a part, then Phœ-*  
*nicæ, then Syriæ: where the word circumfundi signifies to be contained or*  
*comprehended, not encompassed, as the Doctor and Pliny's interpreter*  
*thought, as appears by the following words, by which Phœnice is made*  
*a part of Syriæ, and not meerly a Country which Syriæ surroundeth. And*  
*the reason why the Phœnicians are commonly called Syrophœnicians, is*  
*not because they border'd upon the Syrians, but because the same Per-*  
*sons were both Syrians and Phœnicians too; and that perhaps for a par-*  
*pose to distinguish them from the Carthaginians, or those Phœnicians*  
*who inhabited the Sea-coast of Africa.* II. The *Barbarians* mentioned

Chapter by *Laertius* in *Proœm.* can be no more the *Jews* than the *Egyptians*,  
 XVI. *Chaldeans*, *Brachmans*, or any other Nation which were all called by the  
 ~~~~~ *Greeks Barbarians*. I know the Fathers generally affirm that the *Greeks*  
 borrowed a great many things from the *Hebrews*; but I know too,  
 that the examples produced by them are not sufficient to prove it: for  
 the *Greeks* might as well be beholden for every thing that they in-  
 stance in, to the *Tyrians*, *Egyptians*, or *Chaldeans*, as to the *Jews*; or it  
 may be they might invent them themselves. This I could easily de-  
 monstrate if this were a proper place for it.

## C H A P. XVI.

Verf. 6. **T**H O I will not deny but that the *Sadduces* favoured  
 Note a. *Herod*, and so were *Herodians*, as *Grotius* has obser-  
 ved upon this place; yet I am inclined to think that  
*Herod* is mentioned by name instead of the *Sadduces* here in *St. Mark*,  
 by reason he was a *Sadducee* or one that denied a future State; and so  
 it was all one for the Evangelist to say *Herod* or the *Sadduces*. And  
 this seems to me to be the more probable, because it does not appear,  
 from the account we have of *Herod*, that he had any opinion peculiar  
 to himself; whereas that the *Sadduces* had so is manifest, which there-  
 fore *Herod* rather seems to have embraced than the *Sadduces* any Doc-  
 trine of his, he having none that was properly his own.

Verf. 10. Note b.] Between *κόβητος* and *σπυεις* there is not the least  
 difference, they both signify a vessel made of twigs worked together,  
 and might be both of several shapes and sizes. And therefore that  
*κόβητος* is used in one of the *Gospels* and *σπυεις* in another, seems to me  
 to be by mere accident, not from any choice or design of the *Evangelist*.  
 In the *old Glossaries*, *κόβητος* is rendred by *Corbis*, *Corbula*,  
*Qualus*, *Cista*; and *σπυεις* by *Sporta*, *Fiscella*, *Fiscina*. All which  
 words tho different in sound have the same signification.

Verf. 13. Note c.] I should not think it at all strange if a *Roman* or  
*Græcian* Writer should say that *Cæsarea* was in *Syria*; because *Palestine*  
 was reckoned by the *Greeks* and *Romans* a part of *Syria*. But a *Chri-*  
*stian*, that uses to follow the custom of the Scripture, which always  
 makes a distinction between *סור* *Syria* and *Canaan*, would have spo-  
 ken more accurately, if he had said that *Cæsarea* was in the territory  
 of the Tribe of *Manasse*, on the west side of *Jordan* in *Palestine* or *Ju-*  
*dea*. But the contention between the *Jews* and the *Syrians*, which he  
 afterwards mentions, was the reason doubtless why our *Author* thus  
 spake.

Verf.



Verf. 18. Εἰ πέτρα, καὶ ὅτι ταύτη τῆ πέτρα.] Such another παρανομία I Chapter have observed in my Notes upon Gen. xlix. 8. which see. Had Inter- XVI. preters taken notice only of this, they would never have denied *Petrum* and *Petram* here to be one and the same man, viz. *Simon*, that eminent Member of the Apostolical Society. Consult *Camero* in his *Prælect.* upon this place, or in his *Asyrothec.* where he has put this matter beyond all doubt.

Ibid. Note g.] There are two things here to be considered in *Christ's* words: 1. It must be enquired what the demonstrative Pronoun αὐτῆς, which concludes this Verse, is the Relative to. 2. What is meant by πύλαι ᾗδου the gates of Hell. As to the former, the Expositors generally agree in making αὐτῆς to refer to the Church, which is its immediate Antecedent, yet it might be referred to πέτρα the rock upon which the Church is built, or to *Peter* the Apostle; and this, notwithstanding the Pronoun's being usually the Relative to the Noun which most nearly precedes it; for it is frequently also to be joined with that which is farthest off, as Commentators have observed. See *Act.* vii. 19, 20. and x. 6. 2 *Job.* ver. 7. And that here αὐτῆς ought rather to be referred to *Peter* than the Church, appears by the scope of *Christ's* words: for his design in this place, as the thing it self declares, and *Camero* has shewed, is to promise something singular to *Peter*, who was no more concerned in the state of the future Church than the rest of the Apostles.

2. The phrase πύλαι ᾗδου cannot otherwise be interpreted than according to the use of that phrase in Scripture in which it occurs more than once. And we are not here to consider what the word *Gates* signifies when it is alone, or joined with any other word, but what is the meaning of this phrase πύλαι ᾗδου; for the signification of that word may be various, according as the place is in which it is found. Now no body will deny that πύλαι ᾗδου and *porta mortis* the gates of death are the same; and this phrase the gates of death signifies nothing but death it self. So *Job* xxxviii. 17. Have the gates of death been opened unto thee? or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death? So *Psal.* ix. 13. Thou hast lifted me up from the gates of death, i. e. deliverest me from death. So *Isai.* xxxviii. 10. Hezekiah being in fear of an untimely death, says, In the cutting off of my days I shall go to the gates, ἕως i. e. as it is rendered by the Septuagint, πρὸς πύλαις ᾗδου, I shall go to the gates of death. So that the phrase πύλαι ᾗδου signifies death it self.

But what does *Christ* then mean, when he says that the gates of hell should not prevail against *Peter*, or not overcome him? namely this; that the danger of a certain and speedy death upon the account of his preach-

preach-

Chapter preaching the Gospel, should not deter him from discharging the office imposed on him, and so not *death* it self. So that *Jesus* in these words promises *Peter*, after he had professed his belief that he was the *Messiah*, that he should be a foundation of his Church, and constant in the profession of the Truth he had declared; which he fulfilled accordingly; for *Peter*, as we are told by *Clemens* Ep. c. v. ἐξ ἑνὸς ἑσέθ' ὄνο, εἰς ἀπείρους ἑσέθ' ἔργων, καὶ εἰς ἀπείρους ἑσέθ' ἡμετέρας, καὶ εἰς ἀπείρους ἑσέθ' ἡμετέρας, καὶ εἰς ἀπείρους ἑσέθ' ἡμετέρας, did not only undergo one or two, but many sorrows; and so becoming a *Martyr*, went to his proper place in glory. We may apply to him that passage of *Seneca* as we find it in *Lactantius* Lib. vi c. 17. *Hic est ille homo, non siles, non apile, purpurave, non liciorum insignis ministerio, sed morte tantum, quicquam MORTEM in VICINIA videt, non sic perturbatur, tamquam non novam viderit; qui sive toto corpore tormenta patienda sunt, sive flammae recipienda est, sive extendenda per patulum manus, non querit quid patiatur, sed quam bene.* This is that brave and honorable person, who is not remarkable for his fine hat of feathers, his purple robe, or his guard of *Lictors*, which is the least part of his glory; but who when he sees death just before him, is not surpris'd with the strangeness of the sight; and whether he is to swallow the torment of the rock, or to receive fire into his mouth, or have his arms stretched out upon a cross, does not regard what, but how well he suffers.

There is one thing that may perhaps here be objected, viz. that according to this interpretation *Christ* does not keep to the Metaphor; for after he had called *Peter* a *stone*, he adds that *death* should not overcome him. It is true, but it was neither necessary that *Christ* should go on in the same Metaphor; nor yet supposing that what we refer to *Peter* did, as it is commonly thought, belong to the Church, will he be found to continue the same Metaphor. For he compares the Church to a *building*, which cannot properly be said to be overcome by the gates of death, but only to be pulled down or destroyed. Nothing is more ordinary in all sort of Writers than to begin with one Metaphor and end with another. As for instance, *Clemens* says a little before the words already alledged, concerning St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*: Ἐκκλῆσιας καὶ ἑσέθ' ἡμετέρας, καὶ εἰς ἀπείρους ἑσέθ' ἡμετέρας: the faithful and most righteous Pillars of the Church were persecuted even to death. Pillars can neither be pulled down nor destroyed.

However, by this it appears that St. *Matthew* or his interpreter very fitly will here use the word *vanquish*, which properly signifies to overcome by force; for this is what *Christ* means, that the terror of having a violent Death set before him, should not overcome St. *Peter's* constancy; who he saw the gates of death opened for him, yet he should notwithstanding

standing



standing hold fast his pious resolution. If any doubt of the signifi- Chapter  
 on of the verb *καταξέω*, let them turn to the *Greek Indexes* to the first 5 XVI.  
 books of *Diodorus Siculus*, and the Roman *Antiq.* of *Dion. Halicarnassicus*,  
 collected by *Rhodomannus* and *Sylburgius*, where they will meet with  
 more examples than in any *Lexicons*. But it occurs likewise in the  
 same sense often in the version of the *Septuagint*. I know very well,  
 that Interpreters commonly make use of these words to prove the per-  
 petuity, if not also the *divine immutability* of the Church; but they  
 will never be able to evince any such thing from this place by *Gramma-*  
*tical* reasons. The thing it self shews that the Church is liable to error,  
 nor is there any mention made in this place of errors. That the Church  
 has and always will continue, I do not in the least doubt, because of  
 the nature and force of the Evangelical Covenant; but this cannot be  
 concluded from these words, in which it is much more probable that  
 St. Peter is spoken of; both what goes before and what comes after  
 belonging to *him* and not to the Church. However I submit the whole  
 matter to the judgment of the Learned.

Verf. 19. Note h.] I. It is certain, I confess, that there was a  
 great difference between *that* Person's power who is said to have had  
 the *key of the house of David*, in *Isaiab*, and his who is represented  
 in the *Revelation* as carrying the *key of David*; but it would be hard  
 to prove this from the *sound* of the phrases, if it were not *otherwise*  
 plain and manifest: for the *key of David* is the key by which the  
 house of *David* was open'd and shut, and therefore the same with  
 the *key of the house of David*. Tho a *key* be an ensign of *power*, the  
 key of *David* does not signify the power of *David* himself, but a  
 power *over* the Kingdom of *David*. Our learned *Author* is not al-  
 ways happy in his subtilties about little things. However Mr. *Sel-*  
*den* has several Observations with relation to this matter, *lib. 1. de*  
*Synedrüs*, cap. ix. which those that will may read in himself.

II. Indeed for my own part, I do not doubt but that the *Apostles*  
 committed the Government of the Churches to single *Bishops*, and ac-  
 cordingly that these ought to be reckon'd their *Successors*; but as their  
 Gifts were not alike, so neither was their Authority equal. And  
 therefore whatever *Christ* says to the *Apostles* ought not presently to be  
 accommodated to *Bishops*, at least by the same Rule and in the same  
 Latitude: Especially in this place, where *Christ* promises to St. Peter  
 and the *Apostles* something extraordinary for the Confession made by  
 St. Peter in the Name of all the rest, no *Grammarian* would say that  
 the *Apostles Successors* were also included: and therefore the words  
 of *Christ* cannot, till the thing is first proved by Argument, be ap-  
 plied.

Chapter XVI. plied to Bishops; as if *Christ* had by these words alone conferred an equal Power upon the *Apostles* and their *Successors*. *Cyprian*, it's true, and some other *Bishops* did so interpret them, as if by virtue of these words of *Christ* they succeeded in the *Apostles* Rights and Privileges; but it were to be wish'd they had given their Grammatical Reasons for such an Interpretation of them.

Verf. 22. Note i.] Mr. *Fuller* is the first that ever explain'd this Phrase right, *Miscell. Sacr. lib. ii. c. 2.* where he shews that the word GOD must be understood, as if it were ἰλεώς σοι Θεός, *God be merciful or favourable to you*, i. e. *God* forbid it, and not be so angry with you as to suffer you to do such a thing. See likewise *H. Grotius*, who has confirm'd this in many places.

Verf. 24. Note l.] A Servant who is come to be under another man's power, no longer τὸ σῶμα ἑαυτοῦ κερταῖ, i. e. *is his own Master*, as *Aristophanes* speaks in the beginning of his *Plutus*. He must do, not what he might do, if he were free, or what he thinks most fit to be done, but what his Master commands him, without any regard to himself. He may be said ἀπεργήσασθαι ἑαυτὸν, that he should altogether depend upon the will of another. In the same manner *Christ* here would have his Disciples to resign themselves absolutely to the Will of *God*, renouncing all their former Desires, and resolving both to do and suffer whatever *God* should think fit to require of them. To deny ones self therefore is to conform ones self entirely to the Divine Will. In the place which the *Doctor* cites out of *Porphry*, the Phrase πρὸς αὐτὸν does not signify *to himself*, but *his own House*.

Verf. 26. Note m.] Our learned *Author* is mistaken, for nothing is more common with all Writers than to join the Verb ζημιῶσθαι with an Accusative Case, as *H. Stephens*, *R. Constantin*, or any other Lexicographer whatever will inform us. Thus *St. Paul* says, *Phil. iii. 8.* τὰ πάντα ἐζημιώθην, *I have lost all things*; in which place there is no room at all for the Preposition κατὰ, which is a restrictive Particle; for the meaning of the *Apostle* is, that he had abandoned *all* and *every* of those things of which he there speaks. So likewise *Dionysius Halicarnassens* *Antiq. Rom. lib. x. p. 675. Edit. Sylburg.* says, ἀνδρῶν ἐπιφανῶν δυνάτες τὸ καὶ ὕβρις καὶ ἐκβολὰς ζημιώθηναι, *to suffer loss by the death, reproachful treatment and banishment of famous Men.*

The Original of this Phrase is from the Attick way of speaking, in which Verbs very often govern an Accusative Case in Nouns of a near signification; and to speak properly according to that Dialect, we must say ζημιῶν & ζημιώθηναι ζημίαν, not κατὰ ζημίαν: to which purpose is the Observation of *H. Stephens*, that the Greeks do not use to say

ζημιώθηναι



ζημιωθῆναι ζημίαν θάνατον, but ζημίαν θάνατον, to be punished with the Punishment Chapter of Death, but with the Punishment Death. Besides, the Doctor's Anno- · XVII. tation is manifestly confuted by the parallel place in St. Luke, ch. ix. 25. where the Phrase is ἐαυτὸν ζημιώσῃς, losing himself, not καθ' ἑαυτὸν. It is past all doubt, that as to save Life does not signify in this Discourse of Christ, to save those things which concern or belong to Life, but Life it self; so to suffer the loss of the Soul is to lose the Soul, i. e. Life eternal.

Ibid. ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς.] The meaning is, that there is nothing which is equally valuable with Life. This matter is well enough expressed by Achilles in Homer, Iliad. i. ver. 401. & seqq.

Ὅου γ' ἐμοὶ ψυχῆς ἀντάξιον, ἢ δ' ἔσται φαιήν

Ἴλιον ἐκτῆσαι ἐυναίόμενον περὶ λῆθρον.

For there is nothing seems to me fit to be laid in the Balance with Life, nor all the Wealth that they say is contain'd in the populous City of Troy, &c.

## C H A P. XVII.

Verf. 5. **A** Ἵπῃ ἀκούετε] These words in Moses, Deut. xviii. 15. Unto him ye shall hearken, are not a Prediction, as the Doctor tells us in his Paraphrase, but a Command. See the place.

Verf. 24. Note e.] It is strange that our Author, when he had said that the name of Drachms came to the Jews after the time of the Seleucida, should produce as a proof of it, a place out of Ezra ii. 69. who lived in the Reign of Cyrus. Did he think that the Book of Ezra was written or altered after the time of Alexander? I do not believe so. It must be therefore an Error, occasion'd either through want of care, or that common Infirmary to which Human Nature is liable, which in so great a Man ought easily to be overlooked. Thinking with himself that δραχμῶν Drachmon was a Greek word, and knowing that the Jews had no Commerce with the Greeks before the time of the Seleucida, he imagined that that word was not before known to the Jews; and not taking sufficient heed to Chronological Accounts, alledg'd, before he was aware, that place out of Ezra. To the questi-

Chapter on, whether it was a double, sacred or common *Shekel*, I have spoken XVIII. upon *Exod. xxx. 13.*

~ Vers. 25. *Note f.*] The *Doctor* justly rejects the second Opinion mention'd by him, both for the reasons alledged by himself, and for *this* also (which he passed over) that what is said concerning the Prætor of *Syria* is perfectly false. The *Publicans* never exacted Tithes of the *Jews*, nor is there any mention made of *Syria* in *Cicero's* Orations against *Verres*. In his third Book, and particularly where he accuses *Verres*, he lays open the whole affair about the Tithes of *Sicily*, but there is not so much as one word about *Syria*. Without doubt the Author of this Opinion was deceiv'd by his Memory, which as he was writing suggested *Syria* to him instead of *Sicily*.

### C H A P. XVIII.

Vers. 6. **K**. *Ατυπονιδῆ*] *S. Jerom* upon this place tells us that *Christ* speaks according to the Custom of the Country, and the practice of the antient *Jews*, who used to punish extraordinary Crimes by drowning the guilty Person in the Sea with a Stone tied to him. *Secundum ritum Provinciæ loquitur, quo majorum criminum ista apud veteres Judæos pœna fuerit, ut in profundum, ligato saxo, mergerentur.* He had been more perhaps in the right if he had said, *apud veteres Syros, the antient Syrians*: for, as *Grotius* has observ'd, we do not any where find that this kind of Punishment was us'd among the *Jews*. About this Punishment see *Isaac Casaubon* upon the LXVII Chapter of *Suetonius's Augustus*, where he relates how the Tutor and Ministers of *Caius Cæsar* for taking the opportunity of his Sickness and Death to infest and ruin the Province by their Pride and Covetousness, were with a heavy weight put about their Necks thrown headlong into a River. *Oneratis gravi pondere cervicibus, præcipitatos esse in flumen.* And the place where that was done seems to be *Syria*.

Vers. 7. *Ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐλθεῖν σκάνδαλα.*] That is, Men are so wicked, that they will certainly put Stumbling-blocks in others way, but they shall be severely punished for doing so; namely, because there is no necessity of Mens being bad, tho' when they are bad, and as long as they continue bad, they must needs be an offence to others. There is an Expression not much unlike this in *Herodotus*, lib. i. cap. vii. where he speaks of the folly of *Candaules*, who was desirous to have *Gyges* see his



his Wife all naked: χρέον δὲ ἔ πολλαὶ διαλθόντων (χρεῖν γὰρ Κανδαύλῃ γενέσθαι καὶ Chapter καὶ). ἔλεγε πρὸς τὸν Γύγην: not long after that (for it was necessary that Can- XVIII. daules should have some evil befall him) he said to Gyges; i. e. Can- daules was so foolish that he could not possibly avoid bringing by his folly some mischief upon himself. I remember that I have also read the Verb ΔΕΙ used much to the same purpose in *Aristophanes*, but the particular place where is out of my mind.

Vers. 8. [Ἡ χεὶρ σου, &c.] The sense of these words is admirably well expressed in one Verse of *Dionysius Cato*:

*Quæ nocitura tenes, quamvis sint cara, relinquas.*

Vers. 10. Note a. ] *Grotius* ought to be read upon this place, tho I should by no means grant him that *Christ* does here make good the Opinion of the *Jews*, that every particular Man had a *Guardian Angel* assigned him. It was ground enough for *Christ* to speak as he did, that *Angels* had [in general] the care of Men committed to them, as *Dr. Hammond* well observes: And it was much at one whether they thought that every Man had constantly his own *Angel* to guard him, or that some number of them had the care of a whole Society, and upon some occasions of a particular Person. And therefore *Christ* neither contradicted nor justified either of these Opinions in particular, but left them in an uncertainty.

One thing there is which he here contradicts, viz. an Opinion that seems to have been common to the *Jews* with the *Heathens*, that according as Men differed in rank and condition, they had more or less powerful *Genius's* appointed to watch over them: So that great and rich Persons were attended, they thought, with a *Genius* of greater Power and Might than those that were poor, or of the lowest rank. So *Plutarch* in the Life of *Antony*, p. 930. Λι πρὸ τῆς παιδείας ἀμιλλῆς ἢ Ἀντωνίου ἐλύπειν, αἰεὶ τὸ Καίσαρος ἔλαττον φερόμενον. Ἦν γὰρ τις ἀνὴρ σὺν αὐτῷ μάχησθαι ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου, ἧν τὰς γενέσεις ἐπισκοπέωντων ——— λέγων τὴν τύχην αὐτῷ λαμπροτάτην ἔσσαν καὶ μερίστην, ἕως τῆς Καίσαρος ἀμαυροῦσθαι. Καὶ συνεβόλευε πρῶτον τῷ νεαρῷ ποιεῖν ἑαυτὸν. Ὁ γὰρ σὸς, ἔφη ΔΑΙΜΩΝ ἢ τέτυκτο φοβεῖται. Καὶ γὰρ ὦν καὶ ὑψηλὸς, ὅταν ἢ καθ' αὐτὸν, ἕως ἐκείνου γίνεται ταπεινότερον ἐγείσαντο, καὶ ἀγενέστερον. The ludicrous Contentions that Antony had with Cæsar in his Childhood, and in which he was always beaten, vexed him to the heart. For he had a certain Fortune-teller with him out of Egypt that pretended to understand what Men were born to — who told him, that tho his Fortune was great and extraordinary, yet it was obscured by Cæsar's. And therefore he advis'd him to

Chapter separate himself as far as possible from that young Prince. For, says he, XVIII. your GENIUS is afraid of his Genius; and tho it is fierce and lofty when alone, yet at his approach it grows remiss and cowardly. Now what our Saviour here says, directly thwarts this Opinion; for he teaches us, that Angels of the highest dignity are appointed to take care of little ones. For to see the face of God, is all one as to be permitted a near access to him, as Grotius has observ'd.

Verf. 15. *Εάν δὲ ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου σὺ.* ] Because our Author in his Paraphrase upon the 17th Verse refers the Reader to his Treatise of the Power of the Keys, where he explains this place more largely, I shall take out thence what is not to be found in his Annotations, that those who want that Book, may see fully what is Dr. Hammond's Opinion here.

“ Mat. xviii. 15. If thy Brother shall offend against thee: it seems  
 “ the place belongs not primarily (but only *paritate rationis*, by  
 “ analogy of Reason) to all Sins in the latitude, but peculiarly to  
 “ Trespasses or personal Injuries done by one Brother, one Christian  
 “ to another; as besides the express words v. 15. (if thy Brother  
 “ trespass against thee) is more clear by St. Peter's Question to the same  
 “ purpose, v. 21. How oft shall my Brother trespass against me, and I  
 “ forgive him?

“ Go and reprove him, *ἐλεγξον*, i. e. either reprehend him for it,  
 “ as the word is used sometimes when 'tis join'd with *παιδεύω*,  
 “ chasten, or discipline, Heb. xii. 5. *ἄρcc.* iii. 19. or again *ἐλεγξον* \*,  
 “ make him sensible of the Wrong he hath done thee, or as it may  
 “ be rendred, † make him *asham'd* of his Fact.

“ Betwixt thee and him alone, i. e. do thy best by private admonitions  
 “ to bring him to a sense.

“ If he hear thee, be thus wrought on:

\* *Ἐλεγξις*, *εὐρέσις* ἢ *κέρυμωξεν*, Phavor. *δὲ ἐλέγχο*, τὸ κέρυμωξόν αἰτόσημα πρὸς εἰς ὧς ἄγω, καὶ ἀπλῶς τὸ ἀληθὲς εὐρέσιω, ib. and so Joh. iii. 20. He that doth evil cometh not to the Light, lest his Deeds should be reprov'd, *ἐλεγχθῆ* [discovered] in our Margin: and therefore 1 Cor. xiv. 24. when 'tis said of the Unbeliever, that he is convinced of all, &c. 'tis added v. 25. Thus are the Secrets of his Heart made manifest: so Ephes. v. 13. All things that are reprov'd, or discovered, are made manifest by the Light; for whatsoever doth make manifest, is Light.

† *ἐλεγχθῆσαι*, *αἰχμηθῆσαι*, & *ἐλεγχθῆ* δὲ ἔσ' αἰχμῆναις πίπεται, & *ἐλέγχειν* ἀπὸ τῆ αἰχμῆναι, Phavor.



“ *Thou hast gain'd thy Brother ; gain'd him, first to thy self ( gotten a Chapter*  
 “ *Friend instead of an Enemy ; ) and secondly to Christ, gained a Con- XVIII.*  
 “ *vert, a Profelyte to him, and this also a great acquisition to thee, ~~~~~*  
 “ *to have had the honour of doing that glorious thing, and of be-*  
 “ *ing capable of the Reward of them that convert any to Righteous-*  
 “ *ness.*

“ *But if he hear thee not, if this first method of thy Charity, and disci-*  
 “ *pline of this calmer making succeed not, another essay must be*  
 “ *made, another artifice used.*

“ *Take with thee (ἐν farther, or over and above) one, or two,*  
 “ *that in the mouth of two or three Witnesses every word may be esta-*  
 “ *blished, i. e. that the thing which thou layest to his charge, be*  
 “ *so confirmed ; according to that Job. viii. 17. The Testimony of*  
 “ *two Men is true, i. e. of sufficient authority in Law (according*  
 “ *to an Hebraism, whereby [אנן], ἀληθὴς true, among the Greek*  
 “ *Translators signifieth πῶς, fit to be credited) that so either by the*  
 “ *Testimony of these as Witnesses, he may no longer be able to deny*  
 “ *the Fact (as Heb. vi. 16. an Oath is said to be εἰς βεβαίωσιν, for esta-*  
 “ *blishing, or confirmation, in that it is ἀντιλογίας πέρας, an end of affirm-*  
 “ *ing and denying ; the thing so establish'd (βεβαιωθέν or σταθέν) by Oath,*  
 “ *cannot be denied, or the Parties denial will no longer stand him in*  
 “ *stead) or by authority of these he may be induced (as the Judg is on*  
 “ *the accused, Deut. xix. 15. Heb. x. 28.) to give sentence on, to con-*  
 “ *demn himself ; which if it may be obtained, is the prime end of*  
 “ *all these charitable Artifices, to bring the Injurious to a sight and*  
 “ *shame, the best Preparatives to Reformation : To which purpose*  
 “ *is that of Tertullian, Apol. cap. 39. Disciplinam præceptorum incul-*  
 “ *cationibus densamus, We thicken the Doctrine of Precepts with ways of*  
 “ *inculcating, i. e. press them to Reformation whom our Doctrine*  
 “ *will not prevail on ; where he mentions these three degrees, Exhor-*  
 “ *tationes, Castigationes, Censura ; Exhortations and Chastisements, and*  
 “ *then Censure.*

“ *But if he hear not them (περὶ αὐτῶν, if he be still refractory, either*  
 “ *through non-conviction of the Fact, or non-contrition for it) if this*  
 “ *second Admonition be not in event εἰς ὀικουμένην, 2 Cor. xiii. 10. to*  
 “ *Edification, or Instruction ; if it work not on him,*

“ *Then tell it to the Church, I shall tell you what that is pre-*  
 “ *sently :*

“ *And if he hear not the Church, (continue his Refractoriness still)*  
 “ *let him be unto thee as a Heathen or a Publican ; which may*  
 “ *possibly*

Chapter XVIII. *possibly signify, that in that case thou hast liberty to implead him, as thou wouldst do any Heathen in any foreign Heathen Court for that Injury, that Trespass done to thee, which was at the first mentioned. For certainly though it were unlawful for a Christian both here, and 1 Cor. vi. 1. to implead a Christian for a personal Trespass before a Heathen Tribunal, yet to deal thus with a Heathen (or Publican, which was in account the same) was not either by Christ, or the Apostle counted unlawful (but only the ἀδελφὸς μετ' ἀδελφῶν, i. e. Christian with Christian, v. 6.) and consequently with a perverse refractory Brother, whom you see Christ gives leave to account and deal with as with a Heathen or Publican, it would not be unlawful also. But another Interpretation I shall not doubt to propose and prefer, that by Heathen and Publican may be meant a desperate deplored Sinner, such as the Rabbins call נזיף i. e. ἀμαρτωλὸς a Sinner, as in the Gospel γυνὴ ἀμαρτωλῆ, a deplored Sinner: Thus in Musar, If he will not then (i. e. when two or three Friends have been taken to be present at his Admonition) be reconciled, go and leave him to himself; for such an one is implacable, and is called נזיף, of whom again 'tis there said, Si nec hoc modo quicquam profecerit, i. e. adhibitis amicis, if this second Admonition do no good, debet eum pudefacere coram multis, he must be ashamed before many, (which may be the meaning of Dic. Ecclesiæ, tell it to the Church, as will anon appear by 1 Tim. v. 20.) And this interpretation of that Phrase will seem most probable, if you mark, 1. That τελῶνας & ἀμαρτωλοὶ, Publicans and Sinners are frequently joyned together in the Gospel, as once Publicans and Harlots, those γυνῆδες ἀμαρτωλοὶ Sinner-women. 2. That the Heathen are call'd κοινῶς Sinners, as when 'tis said that Christ was by the Jews delivered into the hands of Sinners, i. e. Romans Heathen, and in St. Paul [not Sinners of the Gentiles] and then those words, [let him be to thee a Heathen and a Publican] will sound no more, but [give him over as a desperate deplored Sinner] to whom those Privileges of a Christian (viz. of not being impleaded before an Heathen Tribunal) &c. do not belong, i. e. leave him to himself. This sure is the simplest rendering of the place; and then he that is such, that is capable of that Denomination, is certainly fit and ripe for the Censures of the Church, which follow in the next Verse, and are appointed to go out against this refractory incorrigible.*

For so immediately it follows, *Verily I say unto you; who are those you?* Why, 1. In the plural Number [ὁμῶν.] Secondly, ὑμῶν μαθηταῖς

to



“ to you Disciples, the same that were after made Apostles, (for so in Chapter  
 “ the first verse *ἠκολούθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ*, the Disciples came to him with a XVIII.  
 “ question; and v. 3. he said, *verily I say to you*, i. e. to you Disciples:  
 “ and ver. 12. *τί ὑμῶν δοκέτε*; what do you think? asking the Disciples,  
 “ or appealing to their own judgment, and so still the same Audi-  
 “ tors continued, and his Speech address’d to them, *I say unto you Dis-*  
 “ *ciples*) *whatsoever you shall bind on earth, &c.*

“ After this, it follows ver. 19. *again I say unto you, that if two of*  
 “ *you shall agree upon earth, &c.*] Many false illations are by men  
 “ of different persuasions made from these words, which will all  
 “ vanish, I conceive; and the truth be disinvolv’d, if the Reader will  
 “ not despise this one observation, which I shall offer to him; and it  
 “ is this, that the method oft-times used in Scripture is (when it  
 “ hath propos’d one or two severals to speak of) to resume the last  
 “ first, and so orderly to go back, till it come to the first, to which  
 “ you may accommodate that expression, and description of God’s me-  
 “ thod in other things. *Many that are last are first (the last in proposing,*  
 “ *first in handling or resuming) and the first last.*

“ Other Examples of this Observation I shall leave the Reader to  
 “ observe, when he reads the Scripture more ponderingly, and only  
 “ proceed to help him to take notice of it in the point in hand. Three  
 “ cases, it is apparent, are here mention’d orderly by our Saviour  
 “ in the matter of trespasss: 1. *Telling the Trespasser of his fault be-*  
 “ *tween him and thee alone.* 2. *Taking one or two with thee,* to do  
 “ it more convincingly, and with greater Authority. 3. *Telling*  
 “ *the Church of it.* Having said somewhat to each of these, as he  
 “ deliver’d them in the three first Verses, 15, 16, 17. he resumes  
 “ the matter again, and speaks first to the last of them, ver. 18.  
 “ telling them what, after the not succeeding of the third admo-  
 “ nition, the Apostles and their Successors are to do, when the cog-  
 “ nance of this injury and contumacy comes before them, (which,  
 “ that in every case of trespasss it always should, I conceive, doth  
 “ not hence appear to be necessary, save only in case that the Ma-  
 “ gistrate or secular Tribunal be Heathen, because that Supposition  
 “ may perhaps be the ground of the *sit tibi Ethnicus*, on which this  
 “ other is superstructed) viz. *excommunicate such a Refractory till re-*  
 “ *formation,* and then upon that, *absolve him again;* and [*verily I*  
 “ *say unto you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth, &c.*] From this  
 “ view it is not irrational to conclude, that the *ἐκκλησία* and the  
 “ *ὑμεῖς*, the Church, and the Disciples (considered prophetically sa-  
 “ dex...

Chapter XVIII. " possibly signify, that in that case thou hast *liberty* to implead  
 " him, as thou wouldst do any *Heathen* in any foreign *Heathen*  
 " Court for that *Injury*, that *Trespass* done to thee, which was  
 " at the first mentioned. For certainly though it were unlawful  
 " for a *Christian* both here, and 1 Cor. vi. 1. to implead a *Christi-*  
 " an for a *personal* *Trespass* before a *Heathen Tribunal*, yet to deal  
 " thus with a *Heathen* (or *Publican*, which was in account the  
 " same) was not either by *Christ*, or the *Apostle* counted unlawful  
 " (but only the ἀδελφὸς μετ' ἀδελφῆ, i. e. *Christian with Christian*, v. 6.)  
 " and consequently with a *perverse refractory Brother*, whom you see  
 " *Christ* gives leave to account and deal with as with a *Heathen* or  
 " *Publican*, it would not be unlawful also. But another *Interpretation* I  
 " shall not doubt to propose and prefer, that by *Heathen and Publican*  
 " may be meant a *desperate deplored Sinner*, such as the *Rabbins* call  
 " נשׂוּן i. e. ἀμαρτωλὸς a *Sinner*, as in the Gospel τοῦ ἀμαρτωλοῦ, a de-  
 " plored *Sinner*: Thus in *Musar*, If he will not then (i. e. when two  
 " or three *Friends* have been taken to be present at his *Admonition*) be  
 " reconciled, go and leave him to himself; for such an one is implacable,  
 " and is called נשׂוּן, of whom again 'tis there said, Si nec hoc modo  
 " quicquam profecerit, i. e. adhibitis amicis, if this second *Admonition*  
 " do no good, debet eum pudefacere coram multis, he must be ashamed  
 " before many, (which may be the meaning of Dic. Ecclesie, tell it to  
 " the Church, as will anon appear by 1 Tim. v. 20.) And this interpre-  
 " tation of that Phrase will seem most probable, if you mark, 1. That  
 " τρωῶναι & ἀμαρτωλοὶ, *Publicans and Sinners* are frequently joyned to-  
 " gether in the Gospel, as once *Publicans and Harlots*, those γυναῖκες  
 " ἀμαρτωλοὶ *Sinner-women*. 2. That the *Heathen* are call'd κοινῶς *Sin-*  
 " ners, as when 'tis said that *Christ* was by the *Jews* delivered into the  
 " hands of *Sinners*, i. e. *Romans Heathen*, and in *St. Paul* [not *Sinners*  
 " of the *Gentiles*] and then those words, [let him be to thee a *Heathen*  
 " and a *Publican*] will sound no more, but [give him over as a *despe-*  
 " rate deplored *Sinner*] to whom those *Privileges* of a *Christian* (viz.  
 " of not being impleaded before an *Heathen Tribunal*) &c. do not  
 " belong, i. e. leave him to himself. This sure is the simplest ren-  
 " dring of the place; and then he that is such, that is capable of  
 " that Denomination, is certainly fit and ripe for the *Censures* of the  
 " Church, which follow in the next Verse, and are appointed to go  
 " out against this *refractory incorrigible*.

" For so immediately it follows, *Verily I say unto you*; who are those  
 " you? Why, 1. In the plural Number [ὕμιν.] Secondly, ὑμῶν μαθηταῖς

" to



“ to you Disciples, the same that were after made Apostles, (for so in Chapter  
 “ the first verse *ἠκολούθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ*, the Disciples came to him with a XVIII.  
 “ question; and v. 3. he said, *verily I say to you*, i. e. to you Disciples: ~~~~~  
 “ and ver. 12. *τί ὑμῶν δοκᾷ*; what do you think? asking the Disciples,  
 “ or appealing to their own judgment, and so still the same Audi-  
 “ tors continued, and his Speech address’d to them, *I say unto you Dis-*  
 “ *ciples*) *whatsoever you shall bind on earth, &c.*

“ After this, it follows ver. 19. *again I say unto you, that if two of*  
 “ *you shall agree upon earth, &c.*] Many false illations are by men  
 “ of different perswasions made from these words, which will all  
 “ vanish, I conceive; and the truth be disinvolv’d, if the Reader will  
 “ not despise this one observation, which I shall offer to him; and it  
 “ is this, that the method oft-times used in Scripture is (when it  
 “ hath propos’d one or two severals to speak of) to resume the last  
 “ first, and so orderly to go back, till it come to the first, to which  
 “ you may accommodate that expression, and description of God’s me-  
 “ thod in other things. *Many that are last are first (the last in proposing,*  
 “ *first in handling or resuming) and the first last.*

“ Other Examples of this Observation I shall leave the Reader to  
 “ observe, when he reads the Scripture more ponderingly, and only  
 “ proceed to help him to take notice of it in the point in hand. Three  
 “ cases, it is apparent, are here mention’d orderly by our Saviour  
 “ in the matter of trespasss: 1. *Telling the Trespasser of his fault be-*  
 “ *tween him and thee alone.* 2. *Taking one or two with thee,* to do  
 “ it more convincingly, and with greater Authority. 3. *Telling*  
 “ *the Church of it.* Having said somewhat to each of these, as he  
 “ deliver’d them in the three first Verses, 15, 16, 17. he resumes  
 “ the matter again, and speaks first to the last of them, ver. 18.  
 “ telling them what, after the not succeeding of the third admo-  
 “ nition, the Apostles and their Successors are to do, when the cog-  
 “ nance of this injury and contumacy comes before them, (which,  
 “ that in every case of trespasss it always should, I conceive, doth  
 “ not hence appear to be necessary, save only in case that the Ma-  
 “ gistrate or secular Tribunal be Heathen, because that Supposition  
 “ may perhaps be the ground of the *sit tibi Ethnicus*, on which this  
 “ other is superstructed) viz. *excommunicate such a Refractory till re-*  
 “ *formation,* and then upon that, *absolve him again;* and [*verily I*  
 “ *say unto you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth, &c.*] From this  
 “ view it is not irrational to conclude, that the *ἐκκλησία* and the  
 “ *ὑμεῖς*, the Church, and the Disciples (considered prophetically un-  
 “ der

Chapter XIII. “ der the notion of *Apostles*, i. e. *Founders* first, then *Governours* of  
 “ *Churches* ) may in that place signify the same thing. So saith  
 “ St. Chrysostom in *Mat. Hom. 6.* εἶπε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ταῦτέστι τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις,  
 “ *Tell it to the Church*, i. e. *to the President and Rulers of it*; and  
 “ *Theoph.* in *Matt. xviii.* ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρεσβύτων, &c. *the Church for*  
 “ *the Rulers of the Church*: To which purpose it is observable, what  
 “ *Rimshi* a Jewish learned *Rabbi* hath affirmed, that the *Governours*  
 “ and *Rulers* are oft meant by the word *ἕκκλησία*, or *Congre-*  
 “ *gation*; and so the word *People*, *Exod. iv. 29.* doth clearly signify  
 “ the *Elders*, not all the *People*, *Exod. iii. 16.* Agreeable to which  
 “ is the Inscription of the *antient Apostolical Epistle of Clemens Ro-*  
 “ *manus* to the *Corinthians*, ἡ ἐκκλησία τῷ Θεῷ περιεχούσα Ῥώμῃ, *The*  
 “ *Church of God that dwells at Rome*, meaning I conceive by the Title  
 “ [*the Church*] himself (who wrote the *Epistle*, and was chief  
 “ there, or *Bishop* at that time) and the other *Clergy* with him;  
 “ for so the other part of the Inscription [ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ περιεχούσῃ Κο-  
 “ *ρινθῶν*, *to the Church of God at Corinth*] is after explained by him  
 “ in the words Ἐπισκόποις, καὶ Διακόνοις, *to the Bishops and Deacons*. But  
 “ if this will not be acknowledged, then by *ἐκκλησία* I shall give  
 “ you leave to understand any *meeting*, or *Congregation* of pious men,  
 “ either a *consessus Presbyterorum*, a *College of Presbyters*, which were  
 “ ordinarily assistant to the *Bishop* in the *antient Church*, or possi-  
 “ bly the whole or any part of the *People* convened, whose *Autho-*  
 “ *rity* or consent may work somewhat upon the *Offender*, as *S. Paul*  
 “ conceives it were apt to do, when he commands *Timothy*, ἀμαρ-  
 “ τανίας ἐνώπιον πάντων ἐλέγχεον, *to rebuke the offenders before all men*, i. e.  
 “ in the presence of the community of the *People*, *1 Tim. v. 20.*  
 “ and perhaps when he speaks of the *ἐπιτιμία ἢ ὑπὸ πολλῶν πλειόνων*, *2 Cor.*  
 “ *ii. 6.* *the rebuke that was by or under the many*, though it be not  
 “ certain whether that signify the *chastisement*, (as our *English* reads)  
 “ *punishment* and *censure* inflicted by the *Presbytery*, or ὑπὸ ὑμῶν  
 “ *under them*, those assisting or joining in the *censure*, *σκληροαγωγία*, *Acts*  
 “ *of Canonical severity*, (which in case of sorrow and relenting of the  
 “ *Offender* upon *rebuke*, or *admonition* before *ejection* out of the  
 “ *Church*, were wont to be thought sufficient without *excommunication*-  
 “ *on*; and after *excommunication*, as in this place to the *Corinthians*,  
 “ if they were submitted to, were sufficient, tho not presently to  
 “ restore him to the *Communion*, yet to make him capable of being  
 “ prayed for by the *Church*, *1 John v. 16.* and to be delivered from  
 “ the stripes of *Satan*, the diseases that the *delivering to Satan* in the  
 “ *Apostles*



“ *Apostles* times brought upon them;) or whether, as the words Chapter  
 “ may be render’d, it import the *rebuke*, or reproof, viz. the third XVIII.  
 “ *admonition* (or the second given by the *Bishop*, which was equiva-  
 “ lent to that) which was ἐνώπιον *under*, or in the presence of many, viz.  
 “ of the People or Congregation. The former of these senses seems  
 “ more agreeable to the place to the *Corinthians*, the latter rather  
 “ to belong to that in 1 *Tim.* and so that which even now in *Mu-*  
 “ *sar* was *coram multis*, before many, and in *St. Paul* (if not ἐνώπιον  
 “ πολλῶν *under many*, yet) ἐνώπιον πάντων, in the presence of all men,  
 “ *Christ* may here express by ἐκκλησία the *Church*. This Interpretati-  
 “ on being admitted, or not rejected, it then follows commodiously  
 “ and reasonably, in the Text of the *Evangelist*, that after the  
 “ matter is brought to them (*i. e.* to those many) or after this  
 “ act of reproof, or rebuke before them, and upon continued refractori-  
 “ ness to these last admonitions, then the ὑμεῖς (that sure is) the  
 “ *Apostles* or *Governors* of the *Church*, the *Pastors* (which cannot be  
 “ in any reason excluded from under the former word ἐκκλησία  
 “ *Church*, whatsoever it signifies) and those already promised this  
 “ power, chap. xvi. may, or shall bind, or excommunicate them.  
 “ And that is the sum of the 18th verse in reference to the 17th.  
 “ And then vers. 19, &c.

Thus *Dr. Hammond*, who adds some things like what we have had  
 already upon *Chap. vii. 6.* If any be desirous of more, they may turn  
 to the Treatise it self, viz. *Power of the Keys*, *Chap. ii. Sect. 6. & seqq.*  
 We should compare these things with what *Grotius* says upon this place  
 of *S. Matthew*, which is a great deal more plain and natural. The  
*Doctor* takes for granted, what he ought to have proved, that *Christ*  
 speaks to his *Apostles* as the *Governours* of the *Church*.

Vers. 23. *Note c.* Δέλων. ] The Eastern People used but one word  
 עֲבָדִים *hebed*, to signify both *ministros liberæ sortis*, *Servants who were at*  
*their own disposal*, and *Mancipia*, *Slaves*, as I have observed in my  
*Notes upon Gen. xx. 8.* And δέλοι in the *Greek* Interpreters and  
*Writers* of the *New Testament* has also the same ambiguity in it. But  
 when we speak *Latin*, there is no reason why we should not use va-  
 rious words, according to the nature of the subject spoken of.  
 Thus those whom *S. Matthew* here calls δέλοι ought to be render’d by  
*Ministri*, *Servants*, because *Slaves* or δέλοι are never sold by their  
 Master that he may have what is owing him paid.

Vers. 28. *Note d.* ] The Verb ἐπιτιθεῖν is used here in its proper sig-  
 nification; for when we take any man by the Collar, and hale him

Chapter along against his will, we almost *choak* him. The *Latin* Phrase for XIX. it is *obtorto collo trahere*, which *Erasmus* here makes use of. So *Plautus* in *Pænulo*, Act. iii. Sc. 5. ver. 45.

*Priusquam hinc obtorto collo ad prætorem trahor.*

Which is well interpreted by learned men, *to take hold of a man's collar, and squeeze his jaws together, and then drag him along.* So a *Philosopher* is represented by *Lucian* in *Hermotimo*, demanding his pay of one of his Scholars, and haling him before the Justice or *Prætor*, *ᾠειδὲς αὐτῷ δοιμάτιον ᾠεὶ ἢ τρέχλον*, *having thrown his cloak about his neck.* And in the same Author, in *Lapithis*, this Stoick *Philosopher* is reproached with this very thing thus: *ἔδὲ ἀΐχες τὴς μαθητὰς, ὡς μὴ καὶ καλεθὲν ἀποδῶσι τὴς μισθῶς: nor do I take my Scholars by the throat and drag them before the Justice, if they do not pay me my stipend when it is due.* See also the *Dial.* between *Æacius*, *Protesilaus*, *Menelaus* and *Paris*.

Verf. 35. Οὕτως καὶ ὁ πατὴρ μὴ ὁ ἐπιεργάζει πεινήσει.] Every body must perceive that these words cannot be urged to signify that the Justice of *God* will in its Retributions take notice of every single *circumstance* in the sins of men. We must consider only the main scope of *Christ*, which is no more than that those who do not forgive their Brethren their Offences, shall not obtain forgiveness from *God* for theirs. This is all therefore that can be concluded from this place; not as the *Doctor*, and *Grotius* before him, says, that Sins which are once pardoned in this life may be again charged upon a man. If we consider the thing in it self, 'tis then only that *God* passes Judgment upon men, when after the course of their life is ended, they are sent into the place of Rewards or Punishments. So that that is the time when persons are pardoned or condemned; and there is no need of any *previous* Sentence.

#### C H A P. XIX.

Verf. 8. Πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν.] But you will say then, that to ones thinking *God* should have changed it: *True*, if it were the ordinary way of *God* to change the dispositions of men by the exercise of his *infinite* power; but because in order to that end he for the most part makes use of Laws, Threatnings, Promises, and such other means, he could not possibly have acted otherwise than he did, when no Laws could prove effectual to reform the *Jews* as to this point of the hardness of their hearts. He would not therefore require of them what he knew they would never do. And this was partly the reason



reason that *Solon* went upon, when he reformed the severe Laws made by *Draco*, as *Plutarch* in his Life tells us: Δεῖ πρὸς τὸ δύνατον γράφειν ἢ νόμον, εἰ βέλτεται χρησίμως ὀλίγους, ἀλλὰ μὴ πολλὰς ἀχρηστῶς κολάζειν: He that makes Laws must consider the possibility of their being observed, if he intends to punish but a few, and do good by it, and not a great many to no purpose.

Verf. 12. Note a.] The place in *Aristophanes* is in *Nub.* p. 151. *Edit. Genev.* and needs no Correction, no more than *S. Matthew* did this Rapsody, to explain his meaning, occasioned by a foolish Etymology of the word *ἄνεχθ*.

Verf. 24. Note c. lin. 10. after the words *hole of a needle*.] These words are in *Berachoth* fol. 55. 2. and the foregoing in *Babametsia* fol. 38. 2. as they are rightly cited by *J. Buxtorf* in *ש"ס* and *Mr. Lightfoot* in *b. l.*

*Ibid.* at the end of that Note.] *Bochart* has treated much more accurately concerning this Proverb in *Hieroz. Part. 1. l. 11. c. 5.* We may learn from him, in opposition to what the *Doctor* thought, 1. That there was no need of *Christ's* changing the *Elephant* into a *Camel*, as the Beast which was most known, since the word *κάμυλθ* amongst the *Jews* who used the Greek Language might signify a *Cable* as well as a *Camel*, the word *כַּמֶּל* amongst the *Arabians* and *Syrians* signifying both. 2. That it was as common with the *Jews*, when they spake of a difficult thing, to say that the performing it was like making a *Cable* to pass through a narrow hole. I cannot also but wonder why the *Doctor* makes *Phavorinus* the Author of that Interpretation of the word *κάμυλθ* for a *Cable*; when *Phavorinus* quotes *Theophylact*, who was much older than himself, to the same purpose, and without doubt followed him in that Interpretation of it. The word *Cable*, as *Bochart* and others have observed, came rather from the *Phœnician* word *כַּבֶּל* *chebel*, which signifies a *rope*. To conclude, we must be cautious how we correct *Hesychius* in the word *κάμυθ*, for *κάμυλθ* cannot be said to be any part of a *ship*, tho' the place where the fire is kindled may fitly be called *κάμυθ*. Besides, *Phavorinus* has both *κάμυλον* and *κάμυνον* distinct, whence it appears he did not borrow from *Hesychius* what he says about the word *κάμυλθ*.

Verf. 28. Note d.] It is indeed truly observed by the *Doctor*, that the *παλιγγενεσία* or regeneration here spoken of, is not like that of the *Pythagoreans*; but he might have added that it was of a nearer similitude with that of the *Stoicks*, and that the *Stoick* Philosophers were the first that used this word to express the Restoration of the World after the burning of it. Tho' in the circumstances they differ very much in their opinion from the *Christians*, yet in the general they agree as to

Chapter this, that the World shall be first consumed by Fire, and then afterwards restored; and the Christian Writers, who knew the thing more certainly, and came another way by their knowledg, seem to have borrowed the word *παλιγενεσία*, in this sense, from them. *Philo*, in his book *de Incorrumpibilitate mundi*, p. 728. *Ed. Genev.* after he had spoken of the conflagration of the World, proceeds thus in giving an account of the *Stoick*: opinion: Ἐξ ἧς πάλιν ἀναγενήσιν κόσμος ἴσαται περιμειξία τῶν τεχνίτων, *from which the Stoicks say that there shall be another regeneration of the World, brought about by the Providence of its Author.* Δύναται ὅ καὶ τέρας, ὃ μὲν τις κόσμον αἰδίον, ὃ δὲ τις φθαρτὸς λέγεσθαι. φθαρτὸς γὰρ ὃ καὶ διακόσμησιν. αἰδίον ὅ δὲ μὲν τὸ ἐκπυρώσεως ΠΑΛΙΓΕΝΕΣΙΑΙΣ καὶ περιμειξίᾳ ἀθανάτων ἔπιτε ληγέσθαι: *Now according to these mens opinion, it may be said that there is one World which is eternal, and another which is corruptible; the corruptible one, so called, because of its Constitution; the eternal one, that which after its Conflagration, will by the perpetual REGENERATIONS and Revolutions of it be render'd immortal.* And often in that book he uses the word *παλιγενεσία* in this sense. So *Marcus Antoninus*, Lib. xi. Sect. 1. saith, Τὴν περιόδικὴν παλιγενεσίαν ἧς ὅλων ἐκπεριλαμβανή: *it perfectly comprehends (viz. human Reason) the periodical regeneration of all things.* So *Eusebius Præp. Evan.* Lib. xv. c. 19. shews out of *Boethius*, ὅπως δεξιάζουσι οἱ Στωικοὶ περὶ τὴν παλιγενεσίαν ἧς ὅλων, *what the Stoicks think about the Regeneration of all things.* And so likewise others speak of this opinion, which puts it out of all doubt that this word was borrowed from the *Stoicks*, who had a great many more of the same kind peculiar to their Sect. *Seneca*, in his *Nat. Question.* Lib. iii. c. ult. saith, *Omne EX INTEGRO animal GENERABITUR, dabiturque terris homo inscius scelerum, & melioribus auspiciis natus. Every living creature shall be regenerated, and the earth shall have men to inhabit it, that shall not know what it is to be vicious, and whose birth shall be attended with better tokens.* About the opinion it self see *Just. Lipsius Phys. Stoicæ*, Lib. ii. c. 22.

But to pass over this, we must observe, that tho in some sort the regeneration of Mankind is begun by the preaching of the Gospel, yet what is here said cannot in any wise be understood of that initial regeneration; for in what sense can the *Apostles* be said to have sat upon twelve thrones, and judged the twelve tribes upon earth? And therefore most of the Fathers, *St. Austin* himself not excepted, understand the words of *Christ* of the time after the Resurrection. See the Passages which *Swicer* has collected under this word in his *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*.

I wish our Author had warranted by sufficient testimonies what he says in concurrence with *Grotius*, about the authority of the φυλάρχαι or heads of the tribes among the *Jews*. For tho it be evident from the i, ii, and



vii, &c. *Chapters of Num.* that there were such Persons in the Camp of the Jews in the time of *Moses* as were called *ευλάρχαι*, yet we find afterwards no mention made of them, nor were the *heads of the tribes* Judges in the *Apostles* time. I rather think that when *Christ* spake of *twelve Thrones* he had no regard at all to the *ευλάρχαι*, but only to the number of the *Apostles*; and that he did not assign each man his own Tribe, but made them every one Rulers over them all. And that expression of *the Thrones*, I rather think to be an allusion to the Seats of the *Sanhedrim*, the Council of 72 Men, who were the chief Judges in *Israel*, than to the Seats of the *ευλάρχαι*, about which the Scripture is wholly silent. It is a very unhappy thing, that great men do often take things that are doubtful for known and certain, and use them as confirmations of what they say; for from uncertainties nothing but uncertainties can be concluded, and no man is obliged to believe what another says meerly because he *says* it.

Verf. 29. *Note e.*] Of such fruitfulness as this, see my Notes upon *Gen. xli. 7.*

## C H A P. XX.

Verf. 15. **I** Do not at all doubt but that *Christ* often made use of *Proverbs* and *Phrases* borrowed from the common way of speaking amongst the *Jews*, as learned men, and in particular *Dr. Lightfoot*, has shewn; but that he borrowed *whole parables* or *πίστες entire discourses*, I can by no means think. It does not seem to be the part of an *inspired* Teacher to propose to his hearers *Parables* that were vulgarly used, for his own. And indeed it does not appear that any body used them before *Christ's* time; for those which are alledged out of the *Talmudical* or other *Jewish* Writers, were all written some ages after *Christ's* birth. As for instance, this *Parable of the Householder and the Labourers*, which is extant in the *Jerusalem Gemara*, was written an age and a half at least after the Destruction of the Temple. And this being so, it seems to me a great deal more probable, that the Author of the *Jerusalem Gemara*, or whoever it is that is there represented as using this *Parable*, did it in imitation of *Christ*, than that he owed it to any antient tradition. The same I say of many others, as of that which learned Men produce upon *Matt. xviii. 17.* out of the book *Misnar*, and of another *Parable* like that, which we have afterwards in *Chap. xxv. 1. & seqq.* Or if this conjecture be not approved, it would not be perhaps absurd if one should say that sometimes the *Jews* happened upon the same thoughts with *Christ*; just as we see the *Heathen* Writers, who undoubtedly never read the Scrip-  
ture,

Chapter ture, did by accident sometimes say much the same things. I had rather  
 XX. say *so*, than imagin *Christ*, just like a *Rabbi*, repeating what he had learn-  
 ed from his Masters, as if he had not been *self taught*. Let this suffice  
 for what may be said upon this and other the like places in our Au-  
 thor. It must be observed here besides, by the way, that the Hebrew  
 words נטל שכרו משלם are not rightly translated by the Doctor, *he*  
*hath received his hire in peace*, but ought to be render'd, *he received his*  
*whole hire*. He seems in his haste to have read בשלום *Bschalom*, tho that  
 has no sense in it here.

Verf. 16. Note c.] In this long Annotation wherein the *Doctor* has  
 taken so much pains, there are several things fit to be approved of, and  
 others that may, with good reason, be found fault with, especially in  
 the first part of it. I shall, without making any reflection upon so great  
 a man, set down those things which seem to need correction.

I. If it were his design to express and accurately distinguish the pro-  
 per and figurative significations of the word κλητὸς, he should have be-  
 gun with the proper signification of the *Primitive*. καλέω properly  
 signifies *to call* any person *by name*, with a design to speak to him, or  
 admonish him of any thing, or to obtain something of him. Hence,  
 by a figure, it was used to signify several things. For instance, καλεῖν  
 is *to invite* to a feast, because he that is so invited is called upon by  
 name; which there was no need of proving, nothing being, in all  
 Writers, more common. And hence κλητὸς is put to signify one that  
 is called to a feast, as in *Homer Odyss.* p. vers. 386.

II. The *Doctor* had not look'd into that place in 1 *King.* i. 41, 49.  
 where the קראים *called* are manifestly those that were *invited to a*  
*feast*. See v. 9. of that *Chapter*. Read but the place, and you will  
 see that nothing can be more foreign to the sense of it, than to in-  
 terpret the *called* there to be the *Adonijans*, or those that *adhered to*  
*Adonijah*, when the discourse is about *Guests*, and the Hebrew Lan-  
 guage will not bear to have קראים אשר לאדניה *the invited that*  
*were present with Adonijah*, understood of such as were called by his  
 name, as being of his *side* or *party*. 'Tis a mistake also that those  
 who are stiled קראים in 2 *Sam.* xv. 11. ought to be understood to  
 be any other than they commonly are. They were *Absalom's* friends  
 whom he called, as to a Feast, which, as he said, he was about to  
 make in *Hebron* at the time that he paid his pretended vow; and yet  
 they had no share in his Conspiracy, for it is expressly denied by the  
 sacred Writer, nor could they be called *Absalomians*. By this it ap-  
 pears, that the Observation which *Dr. Hammond* hereupon makes,  
 is vain.



III. In that place of *Aristotle*, near the end of *lib. ii.* of his *Oecono-* Chapter  
*micks*, there is no connexion between *προσδοκίμους Σάτραπας* and the word *XX.*  
*κλητῶς*, for these are the words; *Τηρίσας τῆς τε Σάτραπας ἁπάντας προσδο-*  
*κίμους ὄντας, καὶ στρατιώτας, ἢ ἐλίγους τε πρέσβεις, καὶ τεχνίτας κλητῶς ἄλλους ἄγοντας:*  
*he observed all the Governours, Satrapæ, who were expected (viz. to come*  
*to Babylon) and the Soldiers, and not a few Embassadors, and Artificers*  
*leading others that were sent for.* These *τεχνίται* seem to have been *Fid-*  
*lers*, or any other sort of Musicians, who carried others along with  
 them to *Babylon*, in order to make a Consort: for *κλητῶς* signifies one  
 that is sent for or chosen out by name. So *Homer* *Iliad.* i. v. 165. calls  
 the Embassadors, which were chosen out of the Captains, and sent by  
*Agamemnon* to *Achilles*, *κλητῶν*, i. e. as *Eustathius* interprets it, *ἕξονομακλήδων*  
*ἐπιλεκτοῖς, pitched upon by name, or as the Scholiast ἕξ ὀνόματι κεκλημένους.*

IV. The *Septuagint* cannot be justified from the charge of having  
 barbarously and improperly translated *שָׁרַק מִקְרָב* *κλητῶς ἁγία*, since  
 not only the thing it self, but Grammar, shews that it is a *holy Convo-*  
*cation* that is there spoken of. See my Notes on *Exod.* xii. 16.  
 Their design, as it should seem, was to say that the days upon which  
 holy Assemblies were kept, were called *holy days*, which is indeed  
 true; but the place was improper for it, and they expressed them-  
 selves contrary to the Rules of Grammar: for to put *κλητῶν ἁγία ἔσαι*  
 for *ἁγία κληθίσεται*, is intolerable. However, *κλητῶν* is indeed the same  
 with *ἐπικληθῶν*, but this word signifies *called not renowned.* Neverthe-  
 less, to speak freely, it may perhaps be imagined that where we  
 find *κλητῶν* or *ἐπικληθῶν*, we must suppose the *Substantives* *ἐκκλησίαν* or  
*συναγωγῶν* to be understood; so that *ἡμερᾶν ἢ ἐβδόμῃ κλητῶν ἁγία ἔσαι ὑμῶν*  
 may be put for *ἐν τῇ ἐβδόμῃ ἡμέρᾳ κλητῶν συναγωγῆν ἁγία ἔσαι ὑμῶν.* This is  
 certainly the meaning of *Moses*, whose words the *Doctor* manifestly  
 strains. A festival day was called *πανήγυρις ἁγία*, because there was a  
*holy Convocation* or solemn Assembly of the People, kept on that day.

V. The *ἐπικλητῶν συναγωγῆς* in *Numb.* i. 16. are those that were chosen  
 or called by name out of the Congregation. The *קָרוּאֵי מוֹעֵד* in *chap.*  
*xvi.* v. 2. of the same Book, are the called together of the Assembly,  
 and *קָרוּאֵי עֵדָה* the called out of the Assembly or to the Assembly. In  
 the former place the *Septuagint* have, and that rightly, *συκλητῶν βουλῆς*  
 those that were called to the Council, and in the latter *ἐπικλητῶν τῆς συναγωγῆς*,  
 which is to the same sense. So *Xerxes* in *Herodotus* takes counsel  
 about his flight *ἅμα Περσέων τοῖσι ἐπικληθῆσι*, with the Persians called toge-  
 ther about him.

VI. I admire that our learned Author, whilst he was inquiring into  
 the signification of the word *κλητῶν* in the Old Testament, had no  
 regard

Chapter XX. regard almost to its primitive *καλέω*; which often occurs in the *Septuagint*, and is frequently made use of in the books of the *Prophets*, to signify what *God* did, when he called the People of the *Jews* to the knowledg of himself. See *Isa.* xliii. 1. and xlv. 3, 4. In the *same* Prophet we might have read *καλῆτός* in this sense, if the *Septuagint* had pleased, Chap. xlviii. 12. *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and thou Israel* 'מקראי *mkoraï, my called* *καλῆτέ με*. Hence *καλῆσις* also is taken for the Exhortation of the *Prophets*, calling the People to the Worship of *God*, *Jerem.* xxxi. 6. And this is the sense in which *καλῆσις* and *καλῆτός* are used in the New Testament; nor does the difference of Circumstances make any change at all in their signification, as appears by what the *Doctor* has said, who is but too curious and accurate in discussing the places where they are found. Several of them might from the Signification I have here given, be more *grammatically* and simply interpreted.

VII. I am ready to believe that this Phrase *Many are called but few are chosen*, is a proverbial form of Speech, as *Grotius* remarks, which alludes to that more sublime sense in which the words *Calling* and *Election* are used in the New Testament, but has another different original; which, if I am not mistaken in my conjecture, is from the way of mustering and choosing Soldiers, when all that were fit to carry Arms were ordered to present themselves upon such a certain day, and so were *called* to some particular place, where when more had met than were necessary to carry on the War they were going to be engaged in, the most valiant only were *chosen*: So that there were *many called and few chosen*. Thus when *Gideon*, *Judg.* vii. had *called* or summoned together *many* to repulse the *Midianites* who made War with the People of the *Jews*, there were but *few chosen* to perform that Service. See also *Josh.* viii. 3. And so likewise *Christ*, *Luk.* vi. 13. *called unto him his Disciples*, which were many, and out of them he chose twelve, whom also he named *Apostles*. The meaning therefore of this Proverb *Many are called and few are chosen*, is this, that among many that undertake the same thing, there are few that excel, and deserve to be preferred before others. And this sense very well agrees with the scope of the Parable that *Christ* makes use of; which is, that there are but a very few of those that believe, who are worthy of an extraordinary reward.

Vers. 28. Δένει ψυχῶ αὐτῆ λύτεσιν ἀπὸ πολλῶν.] Interpreters here justly insist upon the force of the particle *ἀπὸ*, which denotes a Substitution whereby *Christ* died not only for our good, but in our place or stead. And so the *Heathens*, in a matter of this nature, understood that Particle. Thus *Alceſtis* saith in *Euripides*:



Ἐγὼ σε προσέδωσα, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ  
 Ψυχῆς κατασίσαυα ὡς τὸδ' εἰσορᾶν  
 Θνήσκω, παρὲν μοι μὴ θανεῖν, ἵνα σε δεῖν.

Honouring you, and substituting your seeing this light in the room of my life, die, when I might refuse to die for you.

And Ovid. de Art. Amand. lib. 3. speaking of the same Woman, says,

*Fata Phœtiadæ conjux Pegasæa redemit,  
 Proque viri est uxor funere lata sui.*

The Particle ἵνα has also the same signification, as appears by the last Verse of that passage of Euripides. The Heathens in those first Ages, and not only then, but also in latter times, thought that any one might escape Death, if another put himself into his place. Aristides, who was of the same Age almost with the Emperor Adrian, tells us in V. Sacrarum, that when he was dangerously sick, he was admonish'd by an Oracle, ὅτι ἢ φιλεμένη ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ σῶμα ἀντὶ σώματος ἀντὶ τούτου, τὰ ἐντὶς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ. That Philumena (one that was nursed with the same Milk) gave Life for Life, and Body for Body, her's for his. See more Examples to this purpose in Isaac Casaubon upon Suetonius's Caligula, cap. xiv. and Spartianus's Adrian, upon which consult also Salmasius. Such Persons as these were called ἀντίψυχοι, which is a word often us'd by Ignatius in his Epistles, concerning which read Dr. Pearson's Vindiciæ, Part 2. cap. xv.

Verf. 29. Note d.] It were to be wish'd that Dr. Hammond, as well as others who quote that Greek and Latin Manuscript, had given us also the Latin Version out of it, or rather that it were published entire. But in the mean time, the more I consider the various readings of that Manuscript, as they are set down both in many places of Beza, and in the Oxford Edit. of the New Testament, the more I am confirmed in the Opinion which I have sometime since made learned Men the Judges of, viz. that that Manuscript does not so much contain the words of the Evangelists as of some Paraphrast, who now and then fills up what he thought was wanting, and where the Greek was not good mended the Language; and all that will but examine it with a particular care will be of the same Opinion. The Paraphrase of Epictetus's Enchiridion published by Americ. Casaubon, is much such another, in which there are most of Epictetus's words set down, but often in a different order and with several Enlargements. And therefore I disagree with the Doctor in his suspecting that St. Matthew ought to be

Chapter be supplied out of that one *Manuscript*, which all the rest contradict, XXI. it being more probable that that Addition is taken out of *St. Luke*, tho with some Alterations. But I say again, that it were to be wished that that Copy were published entire; and those who keep up such things to be burnt by the next Fire, are not to be commended.

Since the writing of this, I have happened to see some new Annotations upon the New Testament made by *R. Simon*, who is of the same Opinion with me, viz. that this Copy of *Beza* is nothing but a Composition made out of the four Gospels compared with one another. And this same Addition which *Dr. Hammond* mentions, he found also in those antient Manuscripts which have the Latin Version as it was before it was corrected by *S. Jerom.* He tells us *Part 1. c. 2.* that he had read these words in the Latin Manuscript of the four Gospels, which is extant in the *Jesuits Library at Paris: Vos autem queritis de pusillo crescere, & de majore minores esse. Intrantes autem & rogati ad cœnam, nolite discumbere in locis eminentioribus, ne forte clarior te superveniat & accedens, qui ad cœnam vocavit te, dicat tibi adhuc deorsum accede, & confundaris. Si autem in loco inferiori discubueris, & superveniat humilior, dicet tibi qui ad cœnam vocavit: accede sursum, & erit tibi hoc utilius.* The same he tells us, *Part 2. c. 21.* there is in another Copy in the *Colbertine Library*, and likewise in the *King's MS.* and some others of which he treats.

#### CHAP. XXI.

Verf. 7. **E** Πάρο αὐτῶν. ] Our *Author* understands this rightly of the *Colt.* 'Αυτῶν is improperly put for αὐτῆ or ἀναεῖς. See what I have said upon this place in my *Ars Critica*, *Part 2. Sect. 1. cap. 10.*

Verf. 9. *Note a.* ] About the custom of carrying Boughs, see my *Notes upon Levit. xxiii. 40.* I cannot readily agree with the *Doctor* in what he says about the typical signification of the *Feast of Tabernacles*: All the ground that he has for that Conjecture, is only *S. John's* making use of the word ἐσκένωσεν, *ch. i. 14.* which does not necessarily allude to the *Feast of Tabernacles.*

Verf. 12. *Note b.* ] I cannot imagine what ground our *Author* had to say, that the Jews were bound to go up to *Jerusalem* to pay their half *Shekel*, it being no where commanded in the *Law*, and the contrary being manifest from *Chap. xvii. 24.* of this Gospel, where *Christ* is said to have paid τὸ δίδραχμα to those who collected it, not far from *Capernaum.* And then supposing them to have been obliged to



to carry this Tribute to the Temple, yet there was no necessity of their using a *κολλυβιστὴς* to pay a *quarter of an ounce* of Silver. But it is certain that all the Males among the Jews were bound by the Law thrice a year to go up to the Temple, *Exod. xxiii. 17*. And because the richer sort did not use to go thither without offering Sacrifices, and being at great Expences, the assistance of the *Money-changers* was needful to furnish them for those Expences.

Verf. 25. Note e.] I know that the *Rabbins* used to reckon the word *שמיים* *Heaven* amongst the Names of God: but they abuse the word *שם* *Name*; for tho *Heaven* is often set to signify *God* who dwells in Heaven, not only in *Hebrew*, but also in other Languages, yet none besides the *Rabbins*, ever said that this is one of God's Names. Tho a *City* is often taken for the Townsmen or Citizens in it, yet no body would say that that word is one of the Citizens Titles; as for instance, that the Inhabitants of *Athens* were called the *Athenian Citizens* and the *Athenian City*. Every body knows that it is a *συνεκδοχικὴ λέξις*, a *Synecdoche*, whereby the *Container* is put for the thing contained.

Verf. 41. *Κακὸς κακῶς ἀπλέσει.*] This Phrase has something proverbial in it in the *Greek* Language, in which an Adverb is elegantly join'd with a Noun that is of a near affinity with it. *Aristophanes* in *Pluto* has this very Phrase *ὅτι σ' ὄλω κακὸν κακῶς*. This could not be expressed the same way in the *Syrian* and *Chaldee* Dialect, but only by *אִבְרָא יוֹבֵר* *in destroying he will destroy*.

## C H A P. XXII.

Verf. 2. **I** Do not think that it can be gathered from this Parable, *Note a.* that whoever was invited to a Feast and did not come *finely enough clothed*, was therefore thrust out; for who could be so inhuman to a Person that he knew and had invited? Parables ought not to be so strained, as if all that is related in them, used really to be done. And I am sure *Juvenal* Sat. v. ver. 131. represents to us a poor Man with a *ragged Gown*, as one of the Guests at a rich Mans Feast.

*Quis vestrum temerarius usque adeo, quis  
Perditus, ut dicat Regi, bibe? Plurima sunt que  
Non audent homines, pertusâ, dicere, lana.*

About the Garments used at Feasts consult *Oct. Ferrarius de Re Vest.* Part 2. l. 1. cap. ix, & xi.

Chapter Verſ. 14. Πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσι κλητοὶ ] See what has been ſaid already upon XXII. Chap. xx. 16. In that place the *called* refers only to the Jews, but in this it reſpects alſo the *Gentiles*; for this ſaying muſt be underſtood as well of thoſe who came to the Supper out of the *croſs Streets and Highways*, as thoſe who were *firſt invited*. The meaning is; God calls a great many both Jews and *Gentiles*, but few answering, as they ought, his Call, are *choſen* or *ſet apart* by him to be his peculiar People. So this place is interpreted by *Barnabas*, who was an Apoſtolic Perſon, Chap. iii. *Attendite ne quando quieſcentes jam vocati adormiamus in peccatis noſtris, & nequam accipiens poteſtatem noſtrum ſuſcitet & excludat a Regno Domini*, i. e. leſt the *ſerpent*'s that *wicked one* the Devil, as the *Minifter* of God's Diſpleaſure, getting us in his power, caſt us out of the Feaſt. A little after he ſays, *Attendamus ergo ne forte ſicut ſcriptum eſt, multi vocati, pauci electi inveniamur*. Let us therefore take heed leſt haply that ſaying of the Scripture prove true of us, Many are called but few are choſen.

Verſ. 16. *Note b* ] Our learned *Author's* Memory has fail'd him as to ſome things in this place, which I ſhall briefly take notice of.

I. In his Paraphraſe, he deſcribes the *Herodians* thus, *Others that adhered to Herod the Roman Governor*: in which words who would not think that he affirmed *Herod* to have been a *Roman* ſent by *Tiberius* to govern *Judaea*? than which nothing can be imagined more abſurd; neither can I conceive that a Man ſo learned as he could ever be guilty of ſo groſs a Miſtake. And therefore I rather think that it was his deſign to ſay, *Thoſe that adhered to the Roman Government, as Herod*. See his Note upon Chap. xvi. 6. *Herodes Antipas*, who lived in thoſe times, and was in favor with *Tiberius*, was the *Tetrarch* of *Gailee*, not of *Judaea*, of which *Pontius Pilate* was *Procurator*.

II. I do not ſee what uſe the *Doctor* could make of the *Syriack Interpreter*, who does not read *Herod's Followers*, but עַם רְבִית הַרְוֹדִים *the People of Herod's Houſe*, οἰκίαις τῆ Ἡρώδῆς, *Herod's Domesticks*: What he ſays afterwards does not concern *Herod*. I am apt to think that the Reason why the *Sadducees* are called *Herodians*, was becauſe *Herod* the Great was known to be a *Sadducee*, not becauſe ſome part of the *Sadducees* were called by that Name.

III. I wonder that our *Author* ſhould think all thoſe things which he ſays in his Paraphraſe, to have been implied in that Queſtion of our Saviour's, *Whoſe is this Image and Superſcription?* We ſhould read about this matter the learned Diſcourſe of *M. Fabricius de Numiſmate Cenſus*, where we ſhall find all theſe things more accurately handled, and better diſcuſſed than they are here by the *Doctor*.

IV. *Chriſt's*



IV. *Christ's* Answer, if throughly considered, will be found to have Chapter nothing in it that respects the *dueness* of the Tribute; he only warns XXII. the *Pharisees* that they had no ground for their thinking it to be a Sin against *God* to pay *Cæsar* the Tax imposed on them, because the rendering of a piece of *Mony* to *Cæsar* which had his Image impressed upon it, was no wise inconsistent with the strict and due Observation of the *Jewish* Religion. And all that we can gather from this is, that it was *lawful* to pay Tribute, not that the Tribute was justly imposed, which was not the thing enquired into. Our *Author* has several things upon this occasion that do not at all belong to this place, which I do not intend in these *ἄκριτα*, or short Remarks, to examin.

Verf. 20. Note that it might as well be one of *Tiberius's* *Denarii* as *Augustus's*, nor was it necessary that it should have the year wherein *Juæa* was subdued inscribed upon it. The *Denarius* that was required to be paid, was only such a one as had on it the Image of *Augustus* or *Tiberius*. See *M. Freberus*, whom I before mentioned.

Verf. 31. Note d. ] There are several things both in our *Author's* Paraphrase upon the Objection of the *Sadduces*, and in his Annotation upon this place, that need Correction.

I. *Moses* does not say, as the *Doctor* represents him at the 24th Verse, that the Children of the Person who raises up Seed to his Brother, should be accounted his dead Brother's Children, but only the *first-born*. See *Deut. xxv. 6*.

II. What he says about the Doctrine of the *Sadduces* is very true, as appears from *Acts xxiii. 6*. but his supposing that the *Sadduces* Objection was designed as a Confirmation of their *whole* Doctrine, is without any ground. Their words oppose only the Resurrection of the Body, for they knew well enough that marrying was a thing which respected only the Body, and had no place at all among separate Souls.

III. The word *ἀνάστασις* was never used in *Scripture* to signify any thing but the *Resurrection of the dead*, i. e. of Men whose Bodies were destroy'd; and which being raised, *Men* are said to be raised, because the Nature of Man consists in the conjunction of Soul and Body. *Ἀνάστασις*, when this is the thing spoken of, never signifies any thing but *to rise* or *to rise again*. In this sense it is used by *Achilles* in *Homer's* *Iliad. 9. 56*. where he speaks of the *Trojans* that he had killed.

Ἦν μάλ' αὖ δὴ Τρῶες μεγαλήτερες, ὅσπερ ἔπιφρον,  
 αὐτὸς ἀναστήσονται κατὰ ζῶον ἠερόεντο.


See *Iliad: w. 551.*

Chapter *The valiant Trojans whom I have kill'd, will certainly rise again out of* XXII. *obscure Darkness.* Tho St. Paul uses the word ἐγείρειν where the *Septuagint* have σταθεῖν, it does not follow that these words signify the same thing, but rather that St. Paul and the *Septuagint* rendered the Hebrew word differently. Tho therefore, absolutely speaking, ἀνάστασις may be called δευτέρευσις, a *second State* or *Subsistence*; yet since it is never met with in that sense, it must according to its constant use be understood of a thing that is *fallen* and then *raised up* again. Πρώσις & ἀνάστασις are, as the *Logicians* speak, in this case *Correlates*. See 2 *Maccab.* xii. 43, 44. This word was so very commonly used in that sense, that even when it is put *alone* it signifies the *Resurrection* of the *Body*. It is a mistake also that the words ἡνὶ νεκρῶν in this Phrase ἀνάστασις ἡνὶ νεκρῶν are of the *Neuter Gender*, the Substantive ἀνθρώπων being to be understood, as appears from several places where the νεκροὶ are said to be raised up, as in *Mat.* x. 8. and xi. 5. *Luke* xx. 37. *Job.* v. 21. 1 *Cor.* xv. 15, 16, &c. Our Author's reasonings against the perpetual use of the word are not to be regarded. The place which he cites out of *Luke* xiv. 14. may most fitly be understood of *the Resurrection of the Body*, as being the principal Reward which is opposed to the Rewards of this Life.

IV. Lastly, That the force of *Christ's* reasoning, *ver.* 32. might be discerned, he puts in as a supply to it in his Paraphrase upon that Verse, the words μετὰ τὴν τελευταίαν αὐτῶν: *it was spoken by God, I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, after their death.* I had rather infer it from the import of the Phrase, *I am the God of Abraham, &c.* considered in it self, whereby God dos not only signify that he had bin in time past the *Object* of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob's* Worship, but that he had had a peculiar *kindness* for them which he *still* retain'd; but now the *dead*, that is, those that are *eternally* dead, cannot be said to be the *Objects* of *God's* Favour or Kindness, but only those whose Souls live with him after Death, and whose Bodies also are to be raised. See my Notes upon *Gen.* xvii. 8.

*Verf.* 37. Ἀγαπήσεις κύριον.] Tho the *Love of God* is often set to signify the whole Duty which we owe to him, both the Duties of the first and second Table; yet it being in this place distinguished from the *Love of our Neighbour*, I am apt to think that by that great Commandment we are only to understand the Worship of the *one* true God, whom we may be said to worship with all our Heart, with all our Soul, and with all our Mind, when we worship him alone and not any *other*. For those that worship more *Gods* than one, worship none at all with their whole Soul, but divide, as it were, their Minds between



tween many. This seems to be the proper meaning of this Phrase, Chapter which is so much *diversified* to signify the highest *Affection* and *Intention* XXIII. of the Soul in Divine Worship. See *Deut.* vi. 5. and my Notes upon  that place.

Verf. 40. *Note f.* ] It is a Metaphor taken from those things which are hung upon a *Nail* or *Peg*, which sticking fast to the Wall, whatever hangs upon it is firm and secure, and it cannot be plucked out but all tumbles down at once. And so as long as these two things, *the Worshipping of God alone*, and *the loving our Neighbour as our selves*, stand firm, Religion and Probity are safe; but these being once loosened and removed out of the Soul, all Probity and Religion are at the same time rooted out. There is the same Metaphor used in all the places which the *Doctor* quotes, tho their sense be various, and he does not rightly compare or apply them. The proper signification of the Phrase being thus once suggested, it will be easy, if we have but a regard to the thing spoken of, to put a fitter Interpretation upon them. *Grotius* tells us he is of their Opinion who think this to be a Latin Phrase, of which kind there are many in the Books of the New Testament. But that he is mistaken, will appear by this Passage in *Plato* lib. x. *de Legibus*, at the beginning, where after he had said that there ought to be a Law made against Violence, that no body might take away what was another Man's, against the Owner's consent, he adds: ἐν γὰρ δὴ τῷ πλείοντι πάντα ἡσθημένα τὰ τε εἰρημένα καὶ μέγιστα, καὶ ἔσσι, καὶ ἔσσι: *for upon this all the Evils which I have mentioned, have hanged, do hang, and will hang.*

## C H A P. XXIII.

Verf. 5. *Note b.* **C** Concerning these *Phylacteries*, see my Notes upon *Exod.* xiii. 9. where I have confirm'd what the *Doctor* says.

Verf. 15. Πειράζετε τὴν θάλασσαν. ] So zealous were the Jews to make Profelytes to their Law, that it became almost a Proverb among the Romans, as we may see by *Horace*, who in the *ivth* Sat. of his *Lib.* 1. after he had said that he sometimes made Verses, and that ought to be excused in him, because it was but a small fault, concludes thus;

————— *Cui si concedere nolis*  
*Multa Poetarum veniet manus, auxilio quæ*  
*Sit mihi, nam multo plures sumus, ac veluti te*  
 J V D A E I, cogemus in hanc concedere turbam.

Verf.

Chapter XXIII. *Verf. 22.* Ὀμνύει ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς τῆ θεῆ ] This form of swearing the Jews used in imitation of the *Heathens*, amongst whom nothing was more common in ordinary discourse than to say *ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς*, as sufficiently appears from *Aristophanes*. And this Oath was used by the *Heathens* either because they thought Heaven it self to be a Deity, or else understood by Heaven *ἐξουσίαν*, the Gods that dwell in Heaven. But the Jews who charged the Heathen with folly and lightness in their Oaths, thought that they themselves might use that form of swearing. And hereupon *Christ* teaches them, that whenever they swore in that form of words, *by Heaven*, it was as if they swore by the true God himself, who dwells in a peculiar manner in Heaven. So *Achilles* in *Homer Iliad. A, v. 214.* swearing by his Scepter, the *Scholiast* observes that at the same time he swore by God: *ἰστέον δὲ*, says he, *ὅτι διὰ σκήπτρου ὀμνύουσιν αὐτὸν ἢ ἔφερον τὴ βασιλείας Θεόν*: It must be observed that in swearing by his Scepter, he swears by God himself who rules over Kingdoms. The reason of which is, because the Scepter is an Ensign of Kingly Power. And therefore he did but discover his Ignorance, whoever he was, that ridiculed this Oath, by saying,

————— *Sceptrum non putat esse Deos.*

*Verf. 27. Note h.* ] The *Doctor* contradicts himself, while he endeavours to reconcile *St. Luke* and *St. Matthew*: For he tells us that the Sepulchres were called *ἀεὶμα ἔξωθεν*, because they were grown over with Grass, and so were *ἀδυνα* undistinguishable from other ground. And yet in the mean while he affirms that they were whited over with Lime on purpose that they might be distinguished; whereas on the one hand, as Lime hinders the growing of Grass, so on the other, it was impossible that they should at the same time be *ἀδυνα* because of their being covered with Grass, and yet *κεκονιαμένα* by the ground's being daub'd with Lime. We had better therefore say, that *Christ* made use of both these Comparisons in the same Discourse, and spake in some such manner as this. “Wo unto you Scribes and Pharisees, Hypocrites, for ye are like to Sepulchres, which are whited over that they may be distinguished from other ordinary ground, and which indeed appear outwardly clean and beautiful, but are within unclean, because of the dead Bodies that lie in them: or ye are like also to Sepulchres which are covered with Grass, which cannot be discerned from the plain ground, and yet pollute those that go over them. The former sort appeared fair by their being whited, these latter because of the Grass that grew upon them. The custom  
of



of whitening Sepulchres has been shewn likewise out of the Talmudical Chapter Writers, by Dr. *Lightfoot* upon this place of *St. Matthew*. XXIII.

Verf. 35. Πάν ἀίμα δίκαιον, &c.] A Thief who should see his Father suffer for the same Crime, and yet should not forbear robbing and stealing, would undoubtedly be much worse than he, and deserve a more severe Punishment, because no warning or example would reform him. And therefore when he came to suffer for his own Crimes, it would be but justice that he should bear, in the first place, what his Father suffered; and then as an addition to his Punishment, that which he deserved more than his Father, by being worse than he. And in this respect he might be said to bear his Father's and his own Punishments. And thus those Murderers the *Jews*, who were very sensible that the Scripture denounced a most heavy Punishment upon such as committed Murder, and knew that a great many that were guilty of that Sin had been severely punished both by *God* and *Man*, did not only deserve to suffer what those suffered who had before been guilty of that Crime, and by whose Example they ought to have been deterred from doing the like, but as much as *all* those Murderers had endured, whom they knew had been condemned and punished for committing Murder. Consult *H. Grotius* upon *Chap. xxvii. 27.*

*Ibid.* in *Note i.*] After these words, *the Name of Jehojada for this of Barachiah.*] See *Note* on *Chap. xiii. 35.* where there is such another Example of a Name less known being changed into one more known.

*Ibid.* after *Note i.*] Among the several Opinions set down by the *Doctor*, the most probable by far is that wherein *Christ* is supposed to have had a respect to *2 Chron. xxiv.* That *Zachariah* who is there spoken of is very fitly put to answer *Abel*; because as *Abel* was the first of those righteous Persons, whose Murder the Scripture gives us an account of, so *Zachariah* the Son of *Jehojada*, or *Barachiah*, was the last of the Prophets whose Murder is recorded in the Old Testament. And therefore the *second Objection* which our *Author* mentions against this Opinion is plainly of no force: as for the *rest*, they are sufficiently answered by himself.

For my own part, I cannot by any means digest that last Interpretation to which the *Doctor* gives the preference. For of the Sins that the *Jews* would afterwards be guilty of in this kind, *Christ* had spoken before in the future Tense: *Ye shall kill and ye shall crucify*, says he, *and ye shall scourge and persecute*; and then it follows: *That upon you may come all the righteous Blood shed upon the Earth, from the Blood of*  
M righteous

Chapter *righteous Abel, &c.* whence it is plain that all the Murders mentioned XXIV. in this Verse (the number whereof *Christ* says in the Verse before, the Jews would afterwards augment) were already past. If I might be allowed to make a Conjecture, that which here biased the *Doctōr* was his desire of finding an Example to confirm what he says about *Antipas* in his *Premon.* to the *Revelations*, of which in its proper place.

Ibid. Note k. ] 'Tis through a mistake said by our Author; that the *High-priest* prostrated himself before the door of the *Porch*; for there was no door in that place but the door of the *Sanctuary* it self, which had a *Veil* drawn before it. The *Porch* facing the *Priest's Court* was all open, and was only surrounded with *Pillars*. See *Josephus, de Bell. Jud. lib. 1. c. 14.*

### C H A P. XXIV.

Verf. 3. **I**T had been better if our learned Author had omitted his Note b. **I** Comparison between *Vespasian* and *Christ*, wherein he is both too nice, and not so exact as he should be, as will appear by these following Remarks. I. Who can bear to have the Predictions of the *Prophets* concerning the future Reign of *Christ*, compared to a Prediction of flattering *Josephus*, or to meer uncertain Surmises? II. The place the *Doctōr* refers to in *Suetonius*, in the second part of the Comparison, is this. *Cenante bos arator decusso jugo, Triclinium irrapit; ac fugatis ministris, quasi repente defessus, procidit ad ipsos accumbentis pedes, cervicemq; submitit: i. e. as he abbreviates him, an Ox brake in, and fell down at Vespasian's feet, as an Omen of his becoming Emperor.* But all that is said by *St. Luke* of *Christ*, is that he was born in a manger, and wrapped in swadling clothes; as to any *Beasts* being with him in the Stable, or falling down before him, he is altogether silent, nor had the *Doctōr* any good Authority for his asserting it. III. I confess *Suetonius* and *Tacitus* do give us that account of *Vespasian's* Miracles of which the *Doctōr* speaks; but that what they tell us was real matter of Fact, is not sufficiently clear: for what assurance can any Man give us, that some vain fellows among the *Egyptians* did not make it their business to flatter *Vespasian*, or that he himself being a *Politick* Man did not seek such an occasion to gain the favour of the superstitious multitude, at his entrance upon the Government? or else it may be it was an invention of *Idolaters* to oppugn Christianity, by making people believe that *Christ* was not the only Person that had healed the blind with Spittle; and it was dangerous for.



for any man to go about to detect a Cheat which was countenanced by Chapter the Emperor. IV. I cannot imagin where the *Doctor* read in *Suetonius* XXIV. that *Vespasian* was *Humillimus & Clementissimus*; for these words are not to be found in the Life of *Vespasian*. He says indeed in Chap. xii. *Principatus ad ultimum civilis & clemens*; but he never calls him *humilis*, which amongst the *Latins* is a Reproach, and not the name of a Vertue. 'Tis only *Ecclesiastical Writers* who call that *Humilitas* which the old *Latins* call *Modestia*. *Humilis* with these signifies one of the common sort of People, a poor mean-spirited person, as I need not prove. V. I wish our *Author* had set down the place out of *Josephus* which made him think that he believed *Vespasian* to be the *Messias*. For it is possible, I confess, he might foretel that he should be *Emperor*, by misconstruing in his favour an antient and settled Opinion, famous throughout all the eastern parts, that the Fates had decreed, that there should come out of *Judea* at that time, those who should govern the World; but he never said nor could say that he was the *Messias*, i. e. the Deliverer of the *Jews*. And the same I say of his attributing afterwards the same Opinion to the other *Jews*: for tho some few of them might perhaps accommodate some Prophecies which were before thought to belong to the *Messias*, to *Vespasian*; yet it was impossible they should take one who almost extinguished the very *Jewish* name, for the *Deliverer* of their Nation.

I could find as many faults also with the *Doctor's* next Collection of Parallels, which are but manifest Niceties. I. What tolerable agreement is there, for instance, between what *Isaiab* says of *John the Baptist*, and the levelling of the High-ways for the coming of the *Roman Engines*? II. It is false, that it was at the approach of the *Balistræ* that the *Jews* cried out *filius venit, the Son cometh*, as our *Author* says. The Story according to the Distinction made in the *Latin Translation*, is in *cap. 7. lib. 6. of Josephus*, but in the *Greek* in *cap. 18.* That Cry was made from the Watch-towers of the *Jews*, when the Stones were flung out of the Engines. *Josephus's* words are these: Σκοπιῖ ἐν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ἦν πύργων καθεζούμενοι ὁπίσταν χυθεῖν τὸ ὄργανον, καὶ ἡ πέτρα πέσει, τῇ πατείῳ γλώσσῃ βοῶντες, ὃ υἱὸς ἔρχεται: The Spies sitting upon the towers gave them notice before-hand when the Engine opened and a Stone was coming, crying out in their mother-tongue, the Son cometh. Which I take, nevertheless, to be a mistake in *Josephus*, who standing without, did not distinguish the word *אבן* *eben*, which signifies a stone, from *בן* *habben* a Son; for without doubt they cried, when the Stone was flung out, *אבן בן* the stone cometh, not *בן בן* the Son cometh. And if this be true, then this part of the parallel is quite

Chapter spoiled. Our learned *Author* seems not to have looked into *Josephus* XXIV. when he wrote these things, or rather when he copied them out of some other book; as appears partly by the place alledged, and partly by the *Chapters* in *Josephus* not being always rightly referred to, but sometimes according to the division in the *Greek*, and other times in the *Latin*.

However, it is most certain that the *Jews* themselves acknowledged that destruction to have been brought upon them by *God*, and this is more than once observed by *Josephus* in his 6 and 7 *Books* of the *Jewish War*. See *Lib. vi. Cap. ii.* and *Cap. xi.* in the *Latin*, and *Lib. vii. Cap. xvi.* And *Titus* thought the same, who after he had viewed the fortifications of the City, *ὡν θεῶ γ' ἐπολιμήσατο, ἔρη, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ τῶν δευτέρων ἱερῶν καθελῶν, ἐπεὶ χεῖρες τῶ ἀνθρώπων ἢ μηχαναί, τί πρὸς τέτας τὰς πύργους δύναται.* *We have fought, said he, with the assistance of God, and it was God who dispossessed the Jews of those strong holds. For what human force, or engines could signify any thing against those Towers?* *Lib. vii. c. 16.*

Verf. 3. Note c.] The Phrase αἰῶνι συντέλεια cannot be understood unless we first know the just import of the word αἰῶν. Now that word seems to signify properly and primarily *Eternity*, for it comes from αἰεὶ *always*, and αἰῶνι signifies *eternal*. Afterwards it was used in a figurative sense to signify as long a duration as could agree to the thing spoken of, whence the time of *mans life* was called αἰῶν, as in *Latin ævum*. The Discourse here cannot be about *Eternity*, which has no συντέλεια *consummation*, or end; nor is it about the time of *mans life*, but about the space of time during which *God* had determined to preserve the *Temple* and *Jerusalem*, as our *Author* has best of all observed. So that if we consider only the series of the Discourse, this Phrase συντέλεια τῷ αἰῶνι will be Elliptical, and the words ἐν ᾧ δεῖ τὸ ἱερόν ἵστασθαι, *in which the Temple was to stand*, must be understood. But because the duration of the *World* is sometimes taken for the *World* it self, therefore αἰῶν and αἰῶνες also in *Greek*, and *Sæcula* amongst the *Latins*, do now and then signify the *World* it self. The same may be said of the Hebrew *כולם* *holam*, as learned Men have long ago observed. For which reason we use to interpret that word in the writings of the *Rabbins* sometimes *Eternity*, sometimes any long space of time during which a thing lasts, whatsoever it be, and sometimes the *World* it self. It is plain, that in the place cited out of the *Book of Tobit*, αἰῶν signifies both that determinate space of time during which the *Temple* was to continue, and also the whole duration of the *World*. For first *Tobit* says that they should build a *Temple*, but not such a one as the first, which should continue ἕως πλεῖστον κατεστὶ τῷ αἰῶνι till the times.



times of the duration (viz. of the Temple) were accomplished. Then Chapter he says that there should be afterwards *εἰς πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς αἰῶνος οἰκοδομὴ ἕρδωξο*, a structure that should be famous throughout all the ages of the world. Hence, by most Interpreters, the Phrase *ἐν πλείω τῶν αἰώνων* in this place of St. Matthew, is understood of the end of the world. They tell us that the Apostles ask'd Christ first, when the Temple was to be destroyed, and then what were to be the signs of his coming, and so of the end of the World? It being undeniable that the word *αἰών* is ambiguous, Christ's answers must be ambiguous too; some of his expressions agreeing best to the destruction of the Jews, as Dr. Hammond has extraordinarily well shewed, and others more properly describing the Conclusion of the World it self. I like Dr. Hammond's Opinion best; which yet may in some measure be reconciled with the other, if we do but suppose the Destruction of the Jews to have been designed as a faint Representation of the end of the World, as our Author likewise thinks in his Paraphrase upon Ch. xxv. And so this Prophecy will be just of the same kind with those Old Testament Predictions which were so worded as to respect some greater event than that which was expressly and plainly foretold in them; of which see Grotius upon Matt. i. 22.

Verf. 7. Note e.] Our Author's Remarks upon the word *ἔθνη* are indeed true, which is often used to signify, not the Nations belonging to several Commonwealths, and which were of different originals; but the Inhabitants of various Tracts or Territories, notwithstanding they were Members of the same Commonwealth, and of the same Lineage, such as were the several Tribes of the Jews. See my Notes on Gen. xlix. 10. upon the word *People*. But yet there really were in Judea it self very sharp Contentions between different Nations, viz. the Jews and Syrians, which are treated of by Josephus in lib. ii. cap. xix. in Latin, *de Bello Judaico*.

Verf. 11. *Ἐρδωξο πνεῦμα*.] Grotius thinks that the persons here intended were the ill Interpreters of the Law; and indeed, as Cicero lib. 1. de Divin. says, *Oraculorum interpretes, ut Grammatici Poetarum, proxime ad eorum quos interpretantur divinationem videntur accedere*. The Interpreters of Oracles, as Grammarians are to Poets, seem to be near akin to the Diviners themselves which they interpret.

Verf. 17. Note h.] Cæsarius was in a mistake; for as Josephus lib. vii. Bell. Jud. cap. xvi. and xviii. Lat. informs us, Jerusalem was taken on the eighth day of September, i. e. in the beginning of Autumn. And his description likewise of the Slaughter has more Rhetorick than Truth in it.

Chapter XXV. Vers. 19. Οὐαὶ καὶ τοῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχέουσιν.] Namely, because they could not easily fly away, which is the case likewise of those that have sucking infants or little children. To this purpose are the words of *Silius Italicus*, *Punic. lib. iv.* where he describes the flight of the Romans upon the approach of *Hannibal's Army*:

————— *Tum crine soluto,*  
*Ante agitur conjux, dextrâ, lævaque trahuntur*  
*Parvi non æquo comitantes ordine nati.*

Vers. 22. Note k.] By the ἐκλεκτοὶ here are meant *Christians*, as also in the places where they are set in opposition to the κλιτοὶ called, as chap. xx. 16. See the Notes upon that place.


Vers. 26. Note l.] Ταμεία are properly the *inner rooms or chambers* of the house; and it being usual to hide those things which we would have safely kept in such private places, whenever a Commonwealth is spoken of, it signifies a *Treasury*; and whenever a Family is spoken of, a *Storehouse*. So the *Old Glossaries*. Ταμείον τὸ δημόσιον, *fiscus, ararium, the publick Treasury*. Ταμείον τὸ ἰδιωτικόν, *Cellarium, Cella, a private Storehouse or Cellar, &c.* In this place it must be taken in the first signification, for an *inner room*, or that part of the house into which persons use to retire who are desirous of being private. It is not probable that there should be a respect here had to a *fortified City*, in which there are no more ταμεία or places for men to conceal themselves in, than in others; but only to a secret place in some house where the *Messias* might be said to lie hid. See the *Septuagint* in *Gen. xliii. 30.* and *Exod. viii. 3.* The word ταμείον is put in opposition to open places, such as is a *Desert*; and *Christ's* meaning is nothing but this, that there should be no Deliverer to be found either without doors or within. See *Deut. xxxii. 25.*

## C H A P. XXV.

Vers. 1. **T**ὸ ὄνομα.] *Grotius* has observed that the *Syriack* and *Latin* add here καὶ τὸ ὄνομα; and so does also the *Cambridg Greek* and *Latin Copy*.

Vers. 4. Ἐλαβον ἔλαιον.] There is not such a perfect *decorum* kept in Parables, as I have already observed elsewhere, as that every thing in them is an allusion to what was generally practised. This appears sufficiently from this place; for those that used Lamps, did not for one night, besides the oil that was in their Lamps, carry oil in  
*another*



another vessel, with which they might supply their Lamp that same Chapter night; but they filled their Lamp *once* for the whole night. But XXV. it is sufficient if what is said in Parables be not impossible, and there  be a fitness in them to express the mind of the person that uses them.

Verf. 9. *Μήποτε.*] The words *ἔδωσαν*, or some other such, must be understood, and supplied thus; *ἔδωσαν μήποτε*. An *Ellipsis* before the Particle *ἵνα* *lest that*, is very common among the *Hebrews*.

Verf. 14. *Τὸς δούλους.*] By *δούλους* here I am apt to think we must understand those which the *Romans* called *Liberti*, rather than *Servi*, or at least Hirelings who were at their own disposal. See my Note upon Chap. xviii. 23. To this agrees the Saying of *Trimalchio* in *Petronius*; *Postquam cœpi plus habere quam tota patria mea habet, manum de tabula, sustuli me de negotiatione, & cœpi libertos fœnerare.* After I had once gotten more than all my kindred put together, I threw by my Accounts, left off my Trade, and began to put out my money to such as had served for their freedom, upon Usury.

Verf. 15. *Κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν.*] *Εἰς τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι* must here be understood, *that he might traffick to the best of his ability.* Each Servant had a certain sum given him by the Master of the Family, that he might trade proportionably to the sum which he received, and according to the degree of his Prudence: for there are some that can manage prudently a great sum, and are fit to engage in much business, and there are others whose ability is less, and must have less employment given them. This has a *mystical* sense in it, and signifies that some have received more light and gifts from *God* than others; and that every one must give an account according to his Receipts. This is more natural than what is said by *Grotius*; and is the sense that *Dr. Hammond* puts upon it in his Paraphrase.

Verf. 21. *Εἰσελθε εἰς τὴν χορὴν τῆς Κυρίας* [c.] I cannot imagin what our Author's thoughts were taken up with, when he wrote his Paraphrase upon these words, for it has no agreement at all with the words of *Christ*. The word *χορὴ* here signifies a Feast, to which a Patron usually invited his *Libertus* or *Client*, upon his having well executed his Orders. The *Septuagint*, in *Esther* ix. 19. render the Hebrew *משתה* a feast, by *χορὴν*. And it is no wonder that things which do so often accompany one another, as joy and a feast, are sometimes promiscuously used. That the *Liberti* used to lie down at meat with their *Patrons*, a Privilege not granted to the *Servi* by their Masters, is notorious. *Demetrius* the *Libertus* of *Pompey* the Great, is particularly branded for his insolence in lying down before his *Patron*. The *Patron* therefore here in this part of the Parable, is represented as ordering:

Chapter ordering his *Libertus* or *Client* to come into the Dining-room that he  
XXVI. might partake of his Feast.

Verf. 24. *Σκληρὸς ἔστι ἀνθρώπου.*] In this part of the Parable there is no *decorum* at all observed; for no Servant or Client would dare to speak at this rate to his Master or Patron. But, as I said before, this is not necessary in a Parable; and these words are very fitly made use of to represent to us the idle Excuses that bad Servants are apt to alledg in their own behalf. However, it must be observed also, that this part of the Parable is but as the *παρέργον*, or that which serves to *fill up* in a *Picture*; for there is nothing to answer it in the *σπίδης* or mystical sense. All that *Christ* meant by it is, that no Excuse will be admitted for those who do not make a good use of the favours they have received.

Verf. 29. *Ὁ ἔχθ.*] See my Notes upon *Chap.* xiii. 12.

Verf. 30. *Τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον.*] I wonder that our learned *Author* should interpret this Expression *outer darkness* of the darkness of a *Dungeon*, which should rather be called *τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐνδότερον*, *inner darkness*. I have explained this Phrase already in a Note on *Ch.* viii. 12. where the discourse, as it is here, is about men excluded from the *Feast*, and cast out of the house where it was kept.

Verf. 34. *Ἀπὸ χρόνων κόσμου.*] Our *Author* very improperly paraphrases these words *before all eternity*; as if any thing could be prior to *eternity*. This is what I had to observe on this Chapter, to which the *Doctor* has said nothing. And I have only touched on those things which others have wholly passed by, referring the Reader for a more full Interpretation of it to *Grotius*.

#### C H A P. XXVI.

Verf. 7. **I** Don't believe that *that* is the true original of the word  
*Note b.* *ἀλάβαστρον* which the *Greek Grammarians*, who are very notable men at inventing trifling Etymologies, give us of it; for if it were, that sort of vessel would rather have been called *ἀλαβον* or *ἀλαβές*, than with so little regard had to the analogy of the derivation, *ἀλάβαστρον*. Besides, if that vessel had been so called, because it had no *λαβῆς* handles, it ought to have been said *adjectively* *ἀλάλαστρον*, *whatever is destitute of handles*, (which yet the Greek Language will not admit of) whence a particular sort of vessels were afterwards called *κατ' ἐξοχὴν Ἀλάβαστρα*. If the words were to be derived from a Greek original, I should rather deduce it, with *Salmasius*, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναβάσαι*, *imponere*, and so make *ἀλάβαστρον* to be an *Atticism* for *ἀνάβαστρον*. See *Salmasius* on *Ch.* xiii. of *Solinus*. But the true original of the word is certainly  
from



from that sort of *Marble* which was called *Alabaster*, of which those Chapter Vessels that bore that name were commonly made. For to say that *Marble* was so called, because out of that were formed Vessels without handles, as the *Doctor* and *Salmas.* himself does, is absurd; since not only Vessels of all shapes and forms, but even Pillars also were made out of it. 'Tis as if one should say, because the word *Onyx* sometimes signifies a Vessel, therefore that sort of stone was so called, because it was the matter of which those Vessels were made. Now as for the word *Alabaster* itself, it is an *Arabian* name for that kind of *Marble*, for *בצורת* *batfraton* is the Noun it self in use, which by an addition of the *Arabian* Article *ל* becomes *לבצורת* *albatfraton*, τὸ ἀλάβαστρον. The reason why I think it had an *Arabian* name is, not only because the *Arabian* Article *ל* makes it probable, but because it was cut out of the *Arabian* Mountains, and was first brought from thence. So *Pliny* tells us, *Lib. xxxvi. C. 7. Onychem etiam tum in Arabia montibus, nec usquam aliubi nasci putavere Veteres. The Antients also at that time thought that Alabaster grew in the mountains of Arabia and nowhere else. And a little after he says, Nascitur circa Thebas Aegyptias, Damascus Syria; it grows about Thebes in Egypt, and Damascus in Syria. And there was a City, somewhere between the Nile and the Red sea, or in Egyptian Arabia, called for that reason Ἀλάβαστρον, which is mentioned by Pliny Lib. v. c. 9. and by Ptolomy Lib. iv. c. 5. who places it in the Province of Cynopolis, near to which was the Alabaster Mountain mentioned by the same Author. So that the Doctor finds fault with Is. Casaubon unjustly, for saying that Vessels not made of Marble were but by a καταχρησις, or improperly, called Ἀλάβαστρα.*

Nor can I imagin how a person so extraordinary well versed in the Scriptures could deny that this Vessel was broken by the Woman who poured the Ointment out of it upon *Christ*, this being expressly affirmed by *St. Mark* Chap. xiv. 3. And tho it had not, yet our Authors reason against it is of no weight, for what ground had he to think that a little Vessel made of thin Marble could not easily be broken? As for the Reason of the Womans breaking the vessel, that seems to be because the mouth of it was so narrow that the *Spikenard* which is a thicker ointment than ordinary could not run easily enough out of it.

*Ibid. Note c.]* I have shewed in a Note on *Matt. xxv. 21.* that *χαρὰ* there, and sometimes the *Hebrew* *השמחה* signifies a feast. The French would say *une rejoissance*, which tho it does not signify properly a feast, yet never uses to be made without one. What our Author says about the use of ointments in Feasts is very true, but who does

Chapter not know it? He had better only have referred us to some *Critick* who  
 XXVI. had treated upon that Subject. The indignation which *Judas* expres-  
 sed against the Woman who poured the oil upon *Christ* concealed his  
 covetousness the better, because none but *delicate* or *voluptuous* per-  
 sons made use of such pretious ointments, and *Christ* was a pro-  
 fessed enemy to all sensual pleasures. So *Aristippus* perceiving that  
 he could not anoint himself without incurring peoples censures,  
 cried out: *Male istis effeminatis eveniat, quia rem tam bellam infamave-*  
*runt: A mischief take those effeminate persons for bringing so good a custom*  
*into disgrace.* See *Diog. Laert.* Lib. ii. S. 76.

Verf. 26. Note e.] I. Concerning the phrase *the body of the Passover*  
 and the like, see *Buxtorf in Diss. de Instit. Cœnæ Domin.* Sect. 25. from  
 whom our *Author* seems to have borrowed what he here says.

II. The word  $\tau\epsilon\tau\omicron$  is not the relative to the *ceremony* or *action*, but on-  
 ly to the *bread*; for who, besides *Dr. Hammond*, would ever have thus  
 explained *Christ's* words, *This eating and drinking denotes my body?*  
 That learned man did not care how he expressed himself, provided the  
 skilful Reader could but guess his meaning; but the words of Scrip-  
 ture must not be forced in that manner. 'Tis *bread*, not a *ceremony*,  
 that is called *the body of Christ*; and *eating* and *drinking* are only the  
 signs of our spiritual *participation* of that body. And it makes nothing  
 against this that  $\tau\epsilon\tau\omicron$  is of the *neuter* gender, it being usual in all Lan-  
 guages so to demonstrate any thing whatsoever; and the word  $\omega\epsilon\tilde{\gamma}\mu\mu$   
 being always to be understood in the *Greek* Language, when the name  
 that belongs to the thing intended is not expressed. Besides, the word  
 $\tau\epsilon\tau\omicron$  may be very well referred to  $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$ , and not to  $\alpha\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\theta$ , and yet  
 the sense be the same. The words of *St. Luke* are contrary to the  
*Doctor's* opinion, for who would say, *the eating of bread is the figure of*  
*my body?* In the rest of this *Annot.* our *Author* acts the part of a *Divine*  
 rather than an *Interpreter*, and speaks as if he were making a common  
 place about the *Lords supper*.


Verf. 33.  $\text{Ἀπακρίθεις ὁ ὁ Πέτρος, \&c.}$  ] It is an old Greek Proverb,  
 $\text{Ἐπειὸς ὡς ἐγγὺν ἐκ πολλῆς ἡλός:}$  he that undertakes a thing confidently is ge-  
 nerally fearful. And to the same purpose is that saying of *Epicarmus*  
 in the Scholiast upon *Homer* at ver. 93. *Iliad* H.  $\text{Κακὸς δὲ δαρρῆν ἰαλ' αὐτόθεν,}$   
 $\text{ἔπειτα φεύγει:}$  a coward is at first very confident of himself, and afterwards  
 runs away. And this was just *St. Peter's* case before he had been con-  
 firmed by the Holy Ghost, upon *Christ's* praying for him.



Verf. 5. **O**ur learned *Author*, that he might be able to reconcile  
*Note a.* S. *Matthew* with S. *Luke*, follows for the most part  
*D. Heinsius*, who by the word ἀπύχουσι understands  
a *suffocation* caused by *grief*. But, I. There is no place by any one  
alleged, wherein the word ἀπύχουσι signifies such a *disease*, especi-  
ally in *men*; for those which are cited by the *Doctor* are nothing to  
the purpose, as I shall presently shew. That word is always taken  
for strangling with a *Halter*, or some other violent way. II. The  
place alleged out of *Ælian* does not prove that the Verb ἀπύχουσι  
signifies any thing but strangling with a *Halter*. When he says that  
*Scoffs have not only grieved men, but also killed them*; he does not mean  
that some who had been scoffed had laid it so to heart as to die only  
with *Grief*, but that they had been so impatient of *Derision*, as to  
kill themselves. Thus *Poliager* being jeered hanged himself, ἀπύχασα.  
And so *Archilochus's* Iambicks made *Lycambe* and her Daughters hang  
themselves. III. The word in *Chrysoptom* is simply ἀγχεουσι, which is  
sometimes taken metaphorically for the *anguish of the mind*, but never  
a *Suffocation*. Nor does that place signify any thing to the business,  
as has been well observed by the learned *Jac. Gronovius* in his *Diss. de*  
*Casu Judæ*; for *Chrysoptom* speaks of *wicked men*, who he tells us at  
the last day, when their Sins shall be made publick and manifest, will  
be πνιγόμενοι καὶ ἀγγρόμενοι συνείδητι, *suffocated and strangled with Conscience*,  
which is not the same with what is said here of *Judas*. IV. The  
words ὡσεὶ ἀπύχασουσι in *Tobit*, signify *so as to think of hanging her self*,  
as is plain from what follows; where she is represented as blaming  
her self for entertaining such Thoughts, and saying, *I am my fathers*  
*only daughter*; *if I should do this, it would be a reproach*, &c. and a little  
after, *I said* (i. e. *I thought*, according to the genius of the Hebrew)  
*that I had best free my self from the earth, and bear no more reproaches*;  
for so we ought to render the words εἴπεν ἀπαλῶσαι με, and not, *I said, free,*  
*or take me away*; for it follows, καὶ μὴ ἀκούσαι με, which does not sig-  
nify *and do not bear me*, but *I ought not to bear or hearken*. And this,  
I know not for what reason, *Dr. Hammond* has omitted; by which it  
would have appear'd that the foregoing words were not rightly  
translated. Let but the place it self be read, and the thing will  
be plain. V. The Hebrew word קָרַח in *Job* vii. 15. is rightly ren-  
dered by *Aquila* ἀγχιμ a *halter*, because the thing intended is e-  
vidently a *squeezing of the throat with a rope*, as a way of dying: *My*

Chapter *soul hath chosen strangling, and death rather than my bones*; i. e. My grief XXVII. is so great, that I had rather die by strangling, or any other sort of death, than live. The *Septuagint* neither understood *Job's* meaning, nor knew perhaps what they meant themselves. It is certain at least, that their words do no more favour *Dr. Hammond's* Interpretation than any other. The Translation of the *Vulgar Latin* is very exact, *elegit suspendium anima mea, &c.* VI. There is no doubt but that the Hebrew קָמַת signifies to *choak* or *suffocate* by any means whatsoever, but it does not follow that the Greek ἀπέσχεδαται is used in any other notion than that of *hanging*; nor is any other signification to be affixed to it where the discourse relates to a person in despair, and that chuses Death rather than Life, which was the case of *Judas* and *Achitophel*. VII. But our *Author* tells us, that it is necessary to put another sense upon this word, in order to reconcile *St. Luke* with *St. Matthew*. This would be true, if we could not make them agree any other way; which we may very well do by compounding both their accounts together thus: Καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἀπὸ γαστροῦ, καὶ πρηνῆς γυνόμενος ἐλάκτισε μέσθου, καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ: *And going away hanged himself, and falling down forwards he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out.* But it may be asked, if he hanged himself, how could he fall down? to which I answer, ἐνελευσθητὸν βέλος ἢ ἀποκοπίσιν ἐπὶ πηλοῦ, *by the ropes breaking, or by being cut down by some body*; which circumstance, as long as it was known that he killed himself in despair, was not thought material enough to be set down. But it may be said again, How came he to burst asunder, and his bowels to gush out? I answer, because he fell down from on high, as he must needs have done if he hanged himself upon the battlement of some Terras, or upon a Tree that leaned over a deeper Valley than ordinary; for then if he fell upon some stone, or stump, or stake, that was underneath, his belly might easily be ripped open. *Pricæus* upon this place has given us several Examples of this nature, and the thing is plain. But never did any Woman, by a suffocation of the Mother, burst asunder in the midst, and much less did ever any Man do so. Our *Author* should have given us but one such instance at least; but I am sure he was not able. The Interpretation I have given is not only the most natural, but agrees exactly with the words. The learned Person I but now speak of, who has written largely and on set purpose about this matter, does indeed very well shew that the verb ἀπέσχεδαται signifies to kill by hanging; but he has not proved that *Judas*, as he conjectures, was thrown down from some steep Rock as a mark of infamy set upon him. It does not appear from  
any



any Testimony, that those who killed themselves were so punished Chapter  
by the Jews. Besides, the Phrase *περὶ τὸν γέρουμεν* sufficiently intimates XXVII.  
that the Body of Judas was not conveyed to any other place to be   
thrown down from; for that would rather have been expressed  
by *ἢ πῆρευσ ῖφθαις*, or some other such words; but the word *γέρουμεν*  
signifies that the Body fell down without any forcible impulse. It may  
be enquired perhaps why St. Matthew did not add the Circumstance  
taken notice of by St. Luke, and why St. Luke did not make mention  
of Judas's hanging himself? To which I answer, it may reasonably  
enough be supposed that St. Matthew heard only of his hanging, and  
St. Peter who speaks in *Acts* i. only of his falling down some steep  
place; and tho both were true, yet they related severally the story  
just as they had heard it. That in a matter of no great moment, all  
the Circumstances are not exactly set down, let such only wonder, as  
have not observed that Circumstances of much greater moment are  
frequently passed over by one or other of the *Evangelists*, as appears  
from other places. Compare St. Matthew and St. Luke as to what  
they both say about the *Thieves* that were crucified with *Christ*.

Verf. 15. Note d.] There are some things in this last Note that need  
Correction. I. The Phrase *ad faciendum populum* is not a Latin Phrase,  
nor has any signification, but I believe it was an Error of the *Printer's*,  
and that the *Doctor* wrote *ad faciendum sibi favorem apud populum*.  
II. What is here said about the singular Privilege of the Citizens of  
*Rome*, has no affinity with the matter in hand; for tho a Roman Ci-  
tizen could not be put to death without the Suffrage of the People,  
yet I suppose *Pilate* did not wait for the consent of the *Jews* to em-  
power him to behead such as he judged guilty. He gratified the *Jews*  
when he let go a Criminal at their request; and he did not condemn  
any at their request, when they were otherwise affected, but of his own  
accord to get their favour: but in *Rome* no Magistrate had authority  
to behead any Citizen without the peoples Consent, and those that  
the people absolved were to be let go whether the Magistrates would  
or not, and those whom they condemned were certainly to be punished.  
III. It would have been better observed that it was the custom also  
among other Nations to release their Prisoners upon festival days. So  
in *Athens* it was a Law, *ἐν τοῖς Θεσμογραφείοις λέγειται τὰς δεσφώτας*, that at the  
time when the Feasts were kept in honour of *Ceres*, the Prisoners should be  
let loose. And the same was practised upon other Athenian Feasts,  
as *Sam. Petitus* has shewn, *Lib. 1. de Legg. Att. Tit. 1.* See likewise  
*Jf. Casaubon* in his Notes upon *Suet. Tib. cap. lxi.* IV. This Custom was  
imitated by the Christian Emperors, who for joy at the *Passover* gave  
order

Chapter order in their Letters that the Prisons should be opened. But that XXVII. you may not mistake, this was done in honour not of the *Jewish*, but of the *Christian* Passover, and the *Jews* were released no more than others; which contradicts what the *Doctor* says. So in *Cod. lib. 1. Tit. iv. Leg. 3.* there is this Law made by *Valentinian, Theodosius* and *Arcadius*: *Ubi primus dies Paschatis extiterit, nullum teneat carcer inclusum, omnium vincula dissolvantur.* As soon as the first day of the Passover is come, let there be none kept shut up in Prison; let them be all released of their Chains. There is no mention at all here made of the *Jews*. And there are a great many such like Orders in *Cod. Theodos.* where the *Jews* are not mentioned. See the Collections of *Sam. Petitus* in the place before cited. 'Tis oftner than once that *Dr. Hammond* either adds or diminishes the sayings of the *Antients*, which he thought by being a little changed, would better illustrate the Writings of the New Testament. But yet I do not believe he did it designedly, who was so good a Man, and so great a lover of Truth, but rather was misled by others who were not so faithful as they should have been in their Citations.

Verf. 28. *κλαυδία ποικίλων.* ] It is true indeed that the *Consuls* and *Pretors* wore Gowns of divers colours, or such as were used in Triumphs when they made any publick Shows, as has been shewn by *Oët. Ferrarius, Part ii. Lib. 2. cap. 8.* but that which is respected here is the Custom of Kings, who thought it lawful for no body to wear Purple Robes but themselves. Thus it is observed by *Hiñius cap. lvii. de Bello Africano.* *Cum Scipio sagulo purpureo ante Regis adventum, uti solitus esset, dicitur Juba cum eo egisse, non oportere illum eodem uti vestitu, atque ipse uteretur.* Scipio using to wear a Purple Coat before the King's arrival, they say that Juba reproved him, and told him that he ought not to wear the same Garment that he wore. About this sort of Robe called *Chlamys* consult *Ferrarius.*

Verf. 34. Note f. ] Tho it be very true what our *Author* observes concerning the abuse of the Greek words *ζελή & θυμός* in the Translation of the *Septuagint*, yet he perfectly forces the place which he cites out of *Rev. xiv. 10.* as the Reader would easily have perceived, if he had set it all down. For these are the words: *The same shall drink of the Wine θυμός τῆς θυμῆς of the Wrath of God which is mixed with pure Wine in the cup of his Anger.* See *Isa. li. 17.*

Verf. 44. Note h. ] I confess that this latter Interpretation carries no repugnancy in it, but yet it has not the least shadow of likelihood. For who can conceive that a wicked wretch, who had just before reviled *Christ*, should be so changed in a moment of time as to acknow-  
ledg



ledg him to be the *Messias*? Yes, they say, because it was effected by Chapter a secret divine Power? But who reveal'd this to them? The *Evange XXVIII: lists* say no such thing. It is much more likely that Thieves being many times punish'd not only for Crimes which they have *lately* committed, but also for *old* ones, this Man had already had some knowledg of *Christ*, and repented, and believed on him before he was cast into Prison; and then being afterwards apprehended and convicted of Theft, was crucified by the Romans without any regard had to his Repentance.

I do by no means therefore think that this Thief railed at *Christ*: Nor do I think that St. *Matthew* spake figuratively, when he said *Thieves* for *Thief*: It is a meer Impropriety, as the Examples cited by our *Author* shew, to which add those words in *Chap. ii. 20.* where speaking of *Herod's* being dead, *it is said — they are dead that sought the young Child's Life.*

5A. Vers. 15. Note i.] I. Whether any such Earthquake is mentioned by *Macrobius* I do not know, but there is mention made of it in *Tacitus Annal. lib. 2. cap. 47.* and *Suetonius in Tiber. cap. 48.* See Interpreters upon the place. II. Since our Author reckons *the Tombs* amongst the parts of the Temple, he had done well to tell us what persons were ever buried in that Mountain upon which the Temple stood; for nothing being more unclean according to the Jewish Statutes than a *Sepulchre*, which polluted those that went over them, as has been observed upon *Chap. xxiii. 27.* it is too strange to be true that there were any Sepulchres in a place of the greatest Sanctity. I know St. *Jerom* in *Catal. Script. Ecclesiast.* tells us this of St. *James* who was thrown down by the Jews from the Pinnacle of the Temple, out of *Hegesippus: Juxta Templum, ubi & precipitatus fuerat, sepultus est. Titulum usq; ad obsidionem Titi, & ultimam Hadriani notissimum habuit.* He was buried near the Temple, and in the place where he had been thrown down, and had a Monument erected for him which continued famous to the siege of Titus, and the last of Hadrian. *Hegesippus's* Testimony is extant in *Eusebius's Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. c. 23.* But this very thing renders the History suspicious, as has been well remarked by *H. Valesius*, to pass by others that have very little appearance of truth in them.

## C H A P. XXVIII:

Vers. 2.  $\Sigma$  *Floris*] This is well interpreted by our Author, of a concussion in the Air; for in the *Septuagint* also the Whirlwind by which *Elijah* was caught up into Heaven,

Chapter is called *συναισμός*, 2 King. xi. 11. So Suidas: *Συναισμός*, *λαίλαψ*, *συνεσση* XXVIII *ἀέρας*, a Storm, a Whirlwind. And thus the Latins also say *cælum tonitru concuti*, to signify the concussion that is made in the Air when it thunders.

Verf. 19. ] *Μαθητεύσατε — βαπτίζοντες ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* ] That is, by Baptism make them the Disciples of *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, and willing to be so called. For *μαθητεύειν* is to *make Disciples*, and *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς ὄνομα* is to be baptized, that we may be called by that name. The Jews might have bin called the *Disciples of the Father*, because they professed themselves his Disciples; the *Apostles*, before they had received the Holy Ghost, and the rest of *Christ's Disciples* might properly have bin called the *Disciples of the Father and the Son*; but those who were afterwards baptized by the Apostles, were the Disciples of the *Father*, as revealing his Will in the Old Testament, and of the *Son* as speaking in the Gospels, and of the *Holy Ghost*, as more clearly explaining the Precepts of the *Father and Son* by the *Apostles*. The Hebrew Phrase for this would be *נִטְבְּלוּ לְשֵׁם* *i. e.* they were baptized that they might be called by their name. That this is the true importance of this form of Speech may appear by 1 Cor. i. 12. and *seqq.* where the *Corinthians* saying, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ*, *i. e.* calling themselves their Disciples, and as it were distinguishing themselves from one another by the names of their several Masters or Teachers; *Paul* says, *Were ye baptized in the NAME of Paul? I thank God, that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say that I had baptized IN MY NAME*; that is, that ye might be called my Disciples, and distinguished from others by the Title of *Paulites*. So in the Writings of the Rabbins, to be baptized *לְשֵׁם עֲבָרָה* in the name of *Servitude* is for the Person so baptized to become a *Servant*, and to take that name upon him. And on the contrary, to be baptized *לְשֵׁם בֶּן חוֹרִין אוֹ לְשֵׁם גִּירוּת* in the name of a *Son of free Men*, or in the name of *Profelytism*, is to receive Baptism upon condition that the Person baptized be called a *Freeman* or *Profelyte*. Consult *Selden de Jure Nat. & Gent.* lib. 2. c. 3. *Grotius* has committed a mistake in his Translation of the last words; but discerned however the import of the Phrase, tho *just as a Man sees the Moon through the Clouds*.



## ANNOTATIONS

## ON THE

GOSPEL according to St. *Mark*.

## C H A P. I.

Vers. 1.

A

ΠΡΗ ΤΟΥ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΥΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ  
ΘΕΟΥ.] These words I rather take to be as an In-  
scription to this whole Book, than a form of in-  
troducing what follows, as the *Doctor* does in his

Paraphrase. For even in the most antient times, these Books were called the *Gospels*, as *Grotius* has observed out of *Justin*, at the beginning of St. *Matthew*. And it is ordinary in Latin Manuscripts to find it written in the front, such or such a Book BEGINS, that the Reader may know the work to be entire, and that there wants nothing at the beginning. Such another Inscription as this, is that of the Book of the Prophet *Hosea* i. 2. *The beginning of the word of the Lord to Hosea*. I conceive therefore that these words ought to have a full stop made at the end of them.

Vers. 2. Ὡς ἔρχεται, &c.] We must conceive this beginning thus: AS it is written in the Prophet *Isaiah*; Behold I send my Messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee: A Voice crying in the Desert, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths streight: John BAPTIZED, &c. The force of the Particle AS belongs to the 4th Verse, where there is, as it were, an *ἰσχυρισμός*, by which the *Evangelist* shews that the Event was answerable to what was foretold. Some learned Men have thought that the beginning of *Herodotus* is just like this,

Chapter this, but without reason, as will appear to any one that compares  
II. them.

~ Vers. 38. *Note b.*] Our learned *Author* is mistaken, when he says that the word ἐξέμειϑ signifies here *adjoining*, from the *use* of it in the *Septuagint*: For so all the best *Greek Writers*, who were strangers to the barbarous *Dialect* of the *Septuagint*, used that word. It occurs very often in *Herodotus* in that signification, as the *Ionick Lexicon* of *Æmilius Portus* alone will shew.

## C H A P. II.

Vers. 26. *Note b.* **I** Chuse rather to interpret the Particle ἐν by *apud*, *at* or *to*, according to its usual signification, and so the sense will be, *He went* (viz. *David*) *into the House of God, to Abiathar the High-priest*. The Phrase ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, *the House of God*, is taken here more largely, not for the *Tabernacle* only, but also for the house in which the *High-priest* lived, which joined to the *Tabernacle* or *Court*. For the *Loaves* which *David* took away were not any longer in the *Sanctuary*, but had been removed before he came, that fresh ones might be put in their place, as the *sacred Historian* informs us, 1 *Sam.* xxi. 6. So in the same *Book Chap.* iii. 3. by the *Temple of the Lord*, we are to understand the *House adjoining to the Court*, in which *Samuel* slept, not far from the place where *Eli* lay down. But you will say, why does not *Christ* say [to *Abimelech*] who was at that time the *High-priest*, but instead of that says [to *Abiathar*] who was *Abimelech's Son*, and lived rather in his *Father's House* than his own? The reason is, because *Abiathar* was more known than *Abimelech*, by the *Sacred History*, as the *Learned* have observed. And so the meaning of *Christ* is this: *he went to Abiathar, who was High-priest, tho not at that time.*

## C H A P. III.

Chapter Vers. 21. *Note c.* **D**avid le Clerc, my Uncle, has treated upon this  
III. place in his *Quæstiones Sacræ*, *Quæst.* xiii. which  
~ is worth the reading.





Verf. 1. **K**αθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ ] *i. e.* in a little ship at a small distance from the shore. Thus *Prov.* xxiii. 34. *be that lieth down in the heart of the Sea*, is one that lies down in a Ship. And to the same sense is that of *Propertius* Lib. 1. Eleg. xiv.

*Tu licet, abjectus Tiberinâ molliter urda,  
Lesbia Mentoreo vina bibas opere.*

This would have been a needless remark, unless a man of a sharp wit, and whose judgment in critical matters is not to be despised, *viz.* *Tan. Faber* in *Epist. Crit.* Part 2. *Epist.* xvii. would have had this place, contrary to the Authority of all Copies, altered, by reading it ἐν τῇ πρῶμῃ in a Ship, and not ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ in the Sea, which would not go down with him.

Verf. 12. *Note* a.] This form of speech has something *proverbial* in it, and is set to signify such Persons as, if they made a right use of their faculties, would take notice of those things which their folly makes them pass over without attention. And in this sense the *Greeks* also used it. Thus *Prometheus* is represented in *Æschylus* as speaking in this manner of the ignorance of men in the first age, before he had taught them arts :

Οἱ πρῶτα μὲν βλέποντες ἔβλεπον μάτην  
Κλύοντες ἔκ ἠκούν, ἀλλ' ὄνειρότων  
Ἀλίγκιοι μορφαῖσι, ἢ μακρὸν χρόνον  
Ἐφύεον εἰκῆ πάντα.

*They at first seeing, saw in vain ;  
Hearing they did not hear ; but just  
As men in dreams, for a long time  
Confounded all things.*

And so *Demosthenes* *Orat.* 1. *contra Aristogit.* sect. 123. Τὸ τῆς περιμίας, ὁρῶντας μὴ ὁρᾶν, καὶ ἀκούντας μὴ ἀκούειν : according to the Proverb, that those that see do not see, and those that hear do not hear.

Verf. 22. **S**ince a *Synagogue* does sometimes signify a *Consistory* of *Judges*, whose Authority related to civil matters, it is certain that the person who presided over them might well enough be called ἀρχισυνάγωγος. Of the word συναγωγή as signifying a Consistory or Sanhedrim, see our Author's notes upon *Matt. vi. 5.* The Judges and the Presidents of Ecclesiastical assemblies, which our Author has forgot to observe, were called by the same name of ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, because they were the same Persons; of which see the learned *Camp. Vitringa*, de *Synag.* Lib. 2. c. 9. But *Dr. Hammond* in what follows seems to confound בית מדרש a *School* with בית דין a *consistory of Judges*, which are quite different things.

Verf. 30. Δύναμιν ἐξελθῆσαν ] If this Phrase were to be understood properly and literally, we should be obliged to think that *Christ* cured the sick of their Diseases by certain *effluvia* that proceeded from him, which is very difficult to conceive. And therefore I rather think, with *Grotius*, that this was a *vulgar way of speaking*, by which we are to understand no more, than that this Woman was cured by *God*, at the instant in which she touched our Saviour. See *Luke vi. 19.* where it will appear that that expression was taken from the use of the common People.

Verf. 34. ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε ] i. e. hath healed thee. Thus *Barnabas* in *Epist. Cathol.* Cap. ix. brings in *Moses* speaking in this manner of the brazen Serpent: νεκρὸς ὢν δύναται ζωοποιῆσαι, καὶ ὁ ἀρχαῖος σωθήσεται: it being dead can make alive, and he shall presently be saved, i. e. healed, viz. that looks upon it.

## C. H. A. P. VI.

Verf. 2. **T**ίς ἡ σοφία ἢ δόθεισα αὐτῷ; ἔτι καὶ δυνάμεις, &c.] i. e. *What is this wisdom which is given unto him? And how is it that such Miracles are wrought by his hands?* For the particle ἔτι must not be joined with *Wisdom*, which may be very great and yet separate, in the Person that has it, from the power of doing *Miracles*; but it signifies the same with πῶς how. And so the Hebrew כִּי, which is very frequently rendered by ἔτι, is sometimes used, as *Isai. xxix. 16.* כִּי ἵךְ ἔτι ἔλεγε ἡ ἔρα ἡ ἐργασία αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔποίησεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς. *How should the work say of him that made it, he made me not?* See afterwards *Chap. ix. 11, 28.* of this Gospel.

xx Vid. Xenoph. de Cyri Exped. Edit. Hutchinsoni Verf. p. 143. 800.



Verf. 5. *ὕψ ἐδύνατο*] *i. e.* According to the laws which he had pre- Chapter  
scribed to himself, he could not there do any miracles. For he did not VI.  
use to work Miracles where he was not sought unto to work them, or  
where no body believed that he was able to work them. *He could not*  
therefore, is as much as *he would not*. The *Evangelist*, to use the words  
of *Hierocles*, τὸ τὸ πνευματικῆς ἐστὶ φύσεως μέγιστον τὴν δύναμιν κανονίζει, speaks of  
*a moral and not a natural power*. And *Hierocles* is in the right when he tells  
us, δυνατώτερον εἶναι τὴν τῆ νοῦ ἀνάγκην τῆ ἐξωθεν βίας, ἢ τὴν πῆσ ἐξ ὀφθαλμοῦ: that  
*the necessity of the mind is more powerful than any external force, with wise*  
*men*. See his *Notes on Pythag. Aur. Carm.* ver. 8.

Verf. 8. *Εἰ μὴ ῥά τι δέδωκεν ὁ κύριος*] To reconcile these words with *Matt. x.*  
*10.* it must be taken for certain in the first place, that the *Evangelists*  
do not always set down the very words of *Christ*, but very frequently  
only his sense, as appears manifestly by comparing them together.  
And then the sense may be the same, tho at first sight the words seem  
to contradict one another. Now the meaning of *Christ* here is only  
this, that the *Apostles* were not to make any preparation or provis-  
ion for their journey; and that may as well be expressed in the words  
of *one Evangelist* as the *other*. In *St. Matthew* it is, *Do not get any gold*  
*or silver or brass in your purses, nor any satchel for your journey, nor any*  
*staff, for the workman is worthy of his food*. The plain meaning of this  
is, that *God* would take care of those things which were necessary for  
the *Apostles*, and therefore that they were immediately to set upon  
their Journey without making any preparation for it, but just as they  
were. If it happened that they had a Staff already in their hands,  
there is no command given them to throw it away; but if they had  
never a one, they are forbidden to get any, or to furnish themselves  
with any thing that they then had not. And this, as to the sense, is  
not contrary to what is here said in *S. Mark*; *He commanded them that*  
*they should take nothing for their journey, save a staff only, no satchel, &c.*  
*i. e.* to begin their Journey just as they were when he spake to them,  
with a staff only, which some of them perhaps already had, without  
getting any thing that they wanted. If the words of both the  
*Evangelists* were to be expressed together in a Paraphrase; they  
might most fitly be explained thus: *Go immediately and preach the*  
*Gospel, provide no money, nor clothes, nor victuals for your Journey.*  
*Those that have slaves let them travel only with them; and those that*  
*have none let them not get any, but enter upon their Journey without. They*  
*whom you preach the Gospel to, God so ordering it, will furnish you with all*  
*necessaries.*

Chapter VII. Verſ. 20. Note b.] Dr. Hammond's Opinion may be confirmed by the Authority of the *Gloſſes* of *Philoxenus*, in which *συντηρῶ* is rendered by *conſervare*, to *preſerve*, and *συντηρεῖ* *conſervat*, *tuetur*, *preſerves*, *defends*.  
 Verſ. 46. Note f.] See my Notes on *Gen.* iv. 8.

## C H A P. VII.

Verſ. 2. **I**T is true indeed that the word *κοινὸς* ſignifies *polluted* as Note a. well as *common*; but the proper ſignification of it ſeems to be *common*, whence by a *Meta.* it was uſed to ſignify *polluted*, becauſe thoſe things which are intended for common uſe, are generally polluted, by ſuch uſe. II. The Greek *πῆξις* cannot properly be ſaid to be *a part of the hand* or *arm*, but is the hand contracted to make the fiſt. So *Heſych.* Πῆξις, γροῖθις. ἡ γὰρ τὸ συγκαταίεσθαι τὰς δακτύλους, *the fiſt, or the ſhutting up of the fingers.* And *Phavorinus*, Πῆξις ὅτι τὸ γροῖθις, ὅταν ἔξη τις συνεπιρροῖς τὰς δακτύλους: *in the hand, when a perſon has his fingers contracted.* It is rather the contraction of the hand than the hand it ſelf; but by a *Metaphor* it may ſignify the hand it ſelf. The Phraſe Πῆξις βαπτίζεσθαι therefore is not properly *to be waſhed up to the wiſt* קַרְנֵה לַיַד, as the *Rabbins* ſpeak, but to put the fiſt into water, or to be waſhed with the hand contracted; tho' conſidered in it ſelf, the thing be much the ſame. See *Jof. Scaliger* upon *Serarius* cap. 7. and *H. Grotius.* *Palladius* abuſed the word when he applyed it to the feet. III. This Cuſtom of waſhing the hands amongſt the *Jews*, had its riſe in part from the Law: *Levit.* xv. 11. *Whomſoever he that bath the iſſue toucheth, and bath not waſhed his hands, he ſhall waſh his clothes, &c.* The *Jews* thought that by this Law, as they miſunderſtood it, he that had been touched by one who had an *Iſſue*, was preſently to waſh his hands, or elſe he was obliged to waſh his clothes and all his body. And therefore when they came out of any mixed aſſembly of people, amongſt which there might poſſibly be ſome ſuch unclean perſons, they immediately waſhed their hands. But *the not having the hands waſhed*, in that place of *Moses*, relates to the man that had the *iſſue*, and not to him whom he had touched.

Verſ. 4. Note c.] In the beginning of this Note our *Author* ſpeaking of *Eupolis*, ſays *Tragedy* inſtead of *Comedy*; for *Eupolis* was a *Comedian*, and we have no account of his having ever wrote any *Tragedy*. The Play called *Bapta* is ſaid alſo to have been a *Comedy*, and it's certain that Poets did not uſe to inveigh againſt thoſe that they had a hatred againſt in *Tragedies*, but only in *Comedies*. See the *Scholiaſt* upon *Juvenal*, Sat. 2. v. 92. concerning this *Comedy* of *Eupolis*.  
 Ibid.



[Ibid. καὶ κλινῶν.] Here our Author, in his Paraphrase, has these Chapter words, *and also of beds ON which they did eat then as NOW on tables.* Now it is certain that they had heretofore Tables to eat on as well as now; but only whereas we sit upon chairs or benches, they sat upon beds: the *Meat* was placed upon Tables, as well as it is now, tho the Guests sat upon beds. And this, I doubt not, Dr. *Hammond* very well knew, only he was not careful enough to avoid speaking improperly. As for the reason why the beds in those Chambers where they dined were washed, that was because possibly they might be polluted by some or other that sat upon them; and so if they were not washed, they might defile the next comers. See *Levit. xv. 4. & seqq.*

[Vers. 22. Note d.] Tho St. *Paul* charges those that boast with folly ἀφροσύνη, yet it does not follow that that word signifies *boasting*, and may be understood so when it is alone; because all *boasting* indeed is ἀφροσύνη, but all ἀφροσύνη is not *boasting*. Our *Author* very often imposes new significations upon words different from what they are used in; tho it is certain that Use is the great thing that determins what words signify, according to that of the *Poet*,

*Quem penes arbitrium est & jus & norma loquendi.*

That I may discuss therefore the ambiguity of this word, by the use of it; I observe that ἀφροσύνη signifies two things, whereof one is a distemper of the brain, and the other of the mind. Sometimes it is taken for *madness* proceeding from some disease, or disturbance of the brain, without any fault in the patient. And in this sense the word ἀφρον signifies a Person that is not in his right senses. But this signification has no place here, where the discourse is about a distemper of the mind. And in this acceptation again it is used two ways; first ἀφρον signifies *imprudem*, and is opposed to εἰσυμῶν *prudent*: and ἀφροσύνη signifies *imprudence* in opposition to εἰσυμῶσις *prudence*. Secondly, ἀφρον signifies also *intemperate*, contrary to which is σωφρον *temperate*, as in like manner ἀφροσύνη is used for *intemperance*, and is opposed to σωφροσύνη *temperance*. And in this last sense it is taken here in St. *Mark*; for *imprudence* without malice, which is very common, does not pollute the mind out of which it proceeds. But as ἀφροσύνη signifies a habit and actions opposite to σωφροσύνη, that is, *Intemperance* and its usual effects, are sins which do really defile the mind. I need not bring many examples to prove that these words are used in the significations mentioned, for they may be had out of Lexicons, tho these do not sufficiently

Chapter VII. ciently distinguish them. I shall produce only a few: I. ἄφρων signifies *mad* in these words of Xenophon, *de Exped. Cyri*, lib. 4. towards the end, where he speaks of the honey of Colchis, whereof the Greeks, not knowing its nature, had eaten: ὅσοι ἔφαγον τῆς σελήωτων πάντες ἀφρονεῖ τε ἐξίνοντο, καὶ ἤμυν: *all the Soldiers that did eat of it became mad, and vomited.* But the next day after, as he tells us in what follows, ἐμπρὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας ἐπέστησαν, *about the same hour they came to their right senses again.* II. ἄφρων signifies *imprudent*, and ἀφροσύνη *imprudence*. Thus Homer *Iliad*. Γ. ver. 220. speaking of the outward appearance of Ulysses, says:

Φαίης γὰρ ζήλοισιν πρὸς ἑμὲ φάσκει, ἀφροσύνη δ' αὖτις.

You would say that he was an angry sort of man, and one that acted rashly and imprudently. And *Iliad*. Η. ver. 110. Menelaus desiring to fight with Hector in a single combat, is commanded to abstain from that piece of imprudence, οὐδὲ πῶς γὰρ, says Agamemnon, πῶτις ἀφροσύνης, *you have no need to be guilty of this imprudence.* III. Lastly, ἄφροσύνη is opposed to σωφροσύνη, and in contrary actions is used in the same latitude. As in Xenophon lib. 3. *de Instit. Cyri*, not far from the beginning, where after Tigranes had said ἀπὸ σωφροσύνης, οὐδ' ἄλλης ἀρετῆς ἐστὲν ὄφελος εἶναι, *that without temperance no other vertue is of any use*, ἀφρων is several times opposed to σωφρων: and then afterwards Tigranes adds, ἐπεὶ ἢ τίς καὶ ἕνα ἀνδρῶν δι' ἀφροσύνης ἢ ἐπιχειρήσεια χρεΐσθαι ἑαυτὸν μάχεσθαι, ἐπειδὴν ὃ ἡττηθῆναι, ἀπὸς πεπαιδευμένον ἢ πρὸς τῶν ἀφροσύνης; *have you never observed so much as one man, that through intemperance (i. e. transported with Anger or any other extravagant passion) went to fight with one stronger than himself, how after he was beaten, his intemperance against that man was presently cooled?*

So likewise among the Hebrews נָבָל *nabal* signifies *mad* and intemperate, and נְבָלָה *nabalah* madness and intemperance; and the former is rendered in both senses by ἀφρων, and the latter by ἀφροσύνη in the *Septuagint*. See *Psalms* xiv. 1. where the word נָבָל *mad* does not signify one that is mad ἀφροσύνη through a bodily distemper, or is imprudent through an error in his mind, but a wicked evil man. And so נְבָלָה is not only folly, but a bad or wicked action. See *Deut.* xxii. 21. *Judg.* xix. 23, 24. xx. 6, 10. And yet the *Septuagint* have in these places ἀφροσύνη, and in *Psal.* xiv. ἀφρων. And hence it came to pass that Phavorinus, and Suidas before him, misinterpreted the word ἀφρων by ὁ μὴ εἰδὼς τὸ ὄντως θεῖον, ἀμύνησθαι τὸ σοφίαν, *one that is ignorant of the true God, and unacquainted with the first principles of Wisdom.*



Verf. 35. Ἐλάλει ὁρῶν.] If this man was naturally deaf and dumb, Chapter VIII. as Dr. *Hammond* seems to think, the meaning of these words must be, that he imitated rightly those sounds which he heard made by others; for it was necessary that he should have some *time* allowed him to learn to *discourse* in, even after that which obstructed his organs of speech was removed. But if we suppose, that whereas he heard and spake before readily, he came by a disease to be deprived almost of his hearing, and to speak with difficulty, as *Grotius* thought, then these words must be understood in their usual and obvious sense. And this makes me prefer this Opinion to the former, which is most agreeable also to the proper signification of the word *ωρμαλῶ*, which cannot signify a dumb person any otherwise than figuratively.

## C H A P. VIII.

Verf. 11. **A**λλὰ τὰ θεῶν.] Tho' all divine Miracles are from Heaven, i. e. from God; yet I am apt to believe that here is meant such a Miracle as was seen by *John the Baptist* at the time when he baptized our Saviour, viz. when the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon him, and behold a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased.

Verf. 12. Τῷ πνεύματι.] This word is used to express the vehemence of the groan, which *Christ* fetched upon this occasion; just as *Acts xvii. 16.* when *St. Paul* was at *Athens*, and saw the City filled with Idols *ταροξύνετι*, it is said, τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ, his Spirit was stirred up within him; which expression denotes the vehemence of the commotion that was in *St. Paul's* mind. The word *πνεῦμα* does not only signify barely the mind, but the mind moved by some passion; as the Hebrew *רוח*, of which consult *Schindler's* Lexicon.

Verf. 24. Ὡς δένδρα περπατῶντας.] The sense of these words is rightly expressed by our *Author* in his Paraphrase; but he tells us in the Margin that the *King's MS.* and many printed Copies, read βλέπω τὰς ἀθρόους, ὡς ὡς δένδρα ὡς περπατῶντας. Yet still these words ὡς δένδρα περπατῶντας make but harsh construction, and I do not know but that the ancient reading was ὡς δένδρα περπατῶντας, as trees that walk; and so the meaning of the blind man will be, that two sorts of objects presented themselves to him, whereof one stood still, viz. Trees; and another, which were also like Trees to his apprehension, walked, or were like walking Trees. The *Syriack* ܩܘܠܘܢܐܝܐ is ambiguous, and may as fitly be rendered I see men like walking trees, as like trees walking. Perhaps  
P the

Chapter the *Evangelist* wrote as I said, but the Transcribers would not endure *ὅτι δύνετα περιπατεῖν τὰ walking trees.*

## C H A P. IX.

Verf. 13. **K** *Ἄλλως γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτὸν* ] *Grotius* thinks that what is said here of the Jews, *that they had done to John whatsoever they would*, is said to have been foretold by *Malachi*, because he called him *Elias*: and *this very thing*, says he, *shewed that he should not want Ahabs and Jezebels.* But this seems to have too much subtilty in it, nor was it necessary that there should be a perfect similitude between *John* and *Elias*, that he might be intended by the Prophet by his name. I chuse rather to make the words *as it is written of him*, to refer only to those, *Elias is come*; as if *Christ* had said, *Elias is come, as it is written of him, and they have done to him whatsoever they would*; the misplacing and cross ordering of words being usual in Scripture. See my Notes upon *Gen. xiii. 10.* As for the sense of this whole passage, it is in the general well enough expressed by our *Author* in his Paraphrase; but if we read *Christ's* words, and would understand by what *Dr. Hammond* says, the series or connection of his Discourse, we shall find our selves disappointed. I express it therefore thus: “ 12. But  
 “ *Christ* answered them, it was requisite indeed that *Elias* should first  
 “ come, and call all the *Jews* to their duty, that they might entertain  
 “ the *Messias*, who was suddenly to come amongst them, in a fit man-  
 “ ner; nor was this Prophecy contrary to those by which it was fore-  
 “ told that the *Messias* should be ill treated by the *Jews*: 13. For *Elias*  
 “ also was already come, who was *John* the Baptist, intended for cer-  
 “ tain reasons by that name, and had gone about to call the *Jews* to  
 “ Repentance, that they might be so disposed as persons ought to be  
 “ who were to receive the *Messias*; but the *Jews* had refused to hear-  
 “ ken to that holy man, yea and had killed him. The words of the  
*Evangelist* must be rendered thus: 12. *And he answering, said unto them,*  
*Elias indeed must first come and restore all things. But how ( πῶς ) is it*  
*written of the Son of Man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at*  
*nought? 13. But yet ( ἀλλὰ ) I say unto you, that both Elias is come, and*  
*they have also done unto him whatsoever they would.*

For the better understanding of these words there are these three things to be observed: *First*, That the Apostles understood the verb *ἀποκαθιστῆναι* of the event, whence they inferred that it was impossible that *Christ* should be killed by the *Jews*; because he was not to enter upon his Reign till a great Reformation had been made among the People of the  
 Jews



*Jews by Elias.* But *Christ's* answer, which is grounded upon matter of Chapter fact, shews that this ought to be understood of the design of *John's* preach- IX.  
ing, and what it would have effected if the *Jews* had *hearkened* to it, and not of what really came to pass. That active Verbs do commonly signify a design and endeavour to do any thing, tho it may be the event does not follow, is known to every one. See my Notes upon *Gen.* xxxvii. 21. Secondly, that the words  $\kappa\acute{\iota}\ \pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ , and *how*, &c. contain another Objection which might be made against what *Christ* had said, besides that which was made by the Apostles, as the *interrogatory* Particle  $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  shews. Thirdly, That the Particle  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$  must be rendered by *attamen nevertbeless*, or *but yet*, according to its usual signification. See *1 Cor.* iv. 4.

Verf. 23.  $\text{Εἶπερ αὐτοῦ, τὸ εἰ δὴ οὐκ ἔστιν.}$  ] The Article  $\tau\acute{o}$  is indeed, as *Grotius* has observed, superfluous in *Lucae* xxii. 2. as well as here; but the construction in that place is different from what it is in this. I know all that is said by others about this Particle; but to me nothing seems more probable, than that it proceeded from some Transcriber's repeating the last syllable of the foregoing word. It is certain, it is left out in *Beza's* antient copy, and two others in the *Barberine* Library; and that neither the *Vulgar* nor *Syriack* version take any notice of it.

Verf. 49. Note c. ] 1. That *Christ's* words here may be understood, they must first be set down in *Hebrew*, and then it must be shewn how fitly they are turned into Greek. The expression in *Hebrew* is:  $\text{כִּי הֵבֵל בְּאֵשׁ יִמְלַח וְהַכֹּהֵל הַמִּנְחָה בְּמִלַּח תִּמְלַח}$  for every one shall be consumed by fire, and every offering of corn shall be seasoned with salt. And in the same manner it may be expressed in *Syriack*, as appears from the *Syriack* Interpreter. All the elegancy of the expression lies in the ambiguity of the word  $\text{יִמְלַח}$  *jimmaleabb*, which signifies both *salictur shall be seasoned with salt*, and *absumentur shall be consumed*; which ambiguity cannot be expressed in *Latin*. Nor is the *Greek* Language more fit for this purpose, in which there is no word that signifies both *to season with salt* and *to consume*. Which the *Evangelist* perceiving, in imitation of the *Septuagint*, and the *Jews* who spake Greek in *Syria* and *Palestine*, he abused the verb  $\alpha\lambda\iota\zeta\epsilon\alpha\iota$  which properly signifies to be seasoned with salt, by putting a new sense upon it. And so *Symmachus* rendered afterwards the word  $\text{נִמְלַח}$  in *Isai.* li. 6. for the *Heavens*  $\text{נִמְלַח}$  shall be consumed like smoke, by  $\alpha\lambda\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ , or rather  $\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$ . The meaning therefore of *Christ* in these words is this: that as every Corn-offering according to the Law extant in *Levit.* ii. 13. was seasoned with salt  $\text{יִמְלַח}$ : so likewise every bad man shall at last be consumed  $\text{יִמְלַח}$  with fire. The conjunction  $\kappa\acute{\iota}$

Chapter IX prefixed to the words *every sacrifice*, is of the same import here as the particle *ὡς* *as*, as it is afterwards *Chap. x. 12.* and *John xiv. 20.* That which seems to have occasioned *Christ's* comparing bad men to sacrifices, is partly his having made use of the word *קָרְבָּן* in order to describe the future condition of the wicked; and partly his having made mention of *unquenchable fire*, such as was the fire of the Altar, as *Grotius* has observed. And so because the words by which he had described the Punishments of bad men had led him as it were to it, he did not decline the using of such an ambiguity as might easily be understood by persons skilful in the Language he spake in. And so likewise *God*, in the books of the *Prophets*, sometimes uses such kind of elegances, proceeding from the ambiguity of words. See *Jer. i. 11, 12.* and at your leisure *Mer. Casaubon* in *Diss. de Lingua Hebraica.*

II. The conjecture of *Jos. Scaliger* is by *Grotius*, and here by our Author deservedly rejected; but he might have been more effectually confuted, if they had observed that *St. Mark* did not want a proper Greek word whereby to express the Hebrew *קָרְבָּן*, and so that there was no need of his coining that new and unheard of word *καυτά*. For that which the *Hebrews* express by *קָרְבָּן* an offering to be consumed (*קָרְבָּן*) with fire, the *Greeks* call *ἑμπύρον*, a word which often occurs in *Euripides* and *Callimachus*, to mention no more. *Aquila*, who translated words according to their Etymologies, could not have rendered the Hebrew word into Greek more fitly; it being derived from *πῦρ* fire, as the *Hebrew* from *קָרַן*, which has the same signification. *Mesyrius* and *Phavorinus* interpret *ἑμπύρον* by *τὰ καυτὰ ἱερά*, sacrifices which are burnt.

III. Nevertheless, *Dr. Hammond* is mistaken when he says that *ἀλωθήσεται*, which is the verb *ἀλίσσω* to take, signifies *shall be consumed*. *Ἀναλωθήσεται* indeed from *ἀναλίσσω* has that signification, but this is not to be confounded with the tenses of the verb *ἀλίσσω*.

Verf. 50. Note f. ] I do not know whence the *Doctor* took the passage he speaks of out of *Aeschines*, but he does not seem to have looked into *Aeschines* himself. For it will appear to any one that reads the whole passage, that it is to be understood of the provision which was allowed to the *Embassadors* out of the publick revenue. The story in short is this. *Aeschines* and *Demosthenes* were sent together as *Embassadors* to *King Philip*, and eat at the same Table with the rest of the *Embassadors* throughout the whole journey; nevertheless *Demosthenes* accused *Aeschines* and the rest of the *Embassadors* of having ill discharged their Commission. And hereupon *Aeschines*, p. 31. *Ed. Stephani*, not far from the beginning, charges him with practising *πρώτους ἐπιβολὰς καὶ ἀγροῶν*



ἀνδρῶν συσίτων ἢ συμπίσβεων, ἃς ἐδὲ καὶ τῶν ἐχθίστων εἰκῆ ποιήσασθε, such Trea-Chapter  
 chery towards his Companions at the same Table, and in the same Embassy, X.  
 as a man would hardly be guilty of to his greatest Enemies. And then it  
 follows, τὸς γὰρ ἡ πόλιος ἄλας ἢ τὴν δημοσίαν τραπέζαν ἡδὲ πλείους δὴ φησι ποι-  
 εῖσθαι, ἢκ ὠν ἐπιχρῶμεθα: for he professes to have a high value for the salt of  
 the City, and the publick Table, not being a Native of our Country, &c. So  
 among the Latins the publick Corn that was allowed to the Military  
 Tribunes and others, was called *Salarium*.

## C H A P. X.

Verf. 6. **A** Πὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως.] This word *κτίσεως* not being in *Beza's*  
 antient Copy, nor in the *Syriack*, nor in the parallel  
 place in *St. Matthew*, may justly be suspected. It is  
 possible that some Transcriber thinking it not to be sufficient to say  
 ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς might add the word *κτίσεως*, to shew that the beginning of  
 the World was spoken of. But this was needless; the beginning of  
 the World being called *ἀρχὴ*, by way of eminence as it were. See my  
 Notes upon *Gen. i. 1.*

Verf. 12. Note a.] See my Notes upon *Mat. ix. 14.* and *Grotius*  
 upon this place in *St. Mark*. The sense of *Christ's* words is this:  
 Whosoever puts away his Wife and marries another ought to be re-  
 puted an Adulterer, as a Woman that puts away her Husband and is  
 married to another Man is an Adulteress. The Particle *καὶ*, which  
 begins the 12th Verse, is all one with *καὶ* as, as I observed before up-  
 on *Chap. ix. 49.* In this respect *Christ* levels the Husband with the  
 Wife; whereas under the Law it was lawful for a Man to put away  
 his Wife, tho not for a Woman to put away her Husband.

Verf. 17. Καὶ ἐκπορευομένη, &c.] This whole Passage is explain'd by  
*Clemens Alexandrinus* in his Book entitled *πρὸς τὸν ἑρμηνεύοντα*, and  
 in §. 4. he sets it down, but not without some alterations, substitu-  
 ting synonymous words, and correcting some Hebraisms in it; which  
 makes it probable to me, that tho he did not indeed read the Passage  
 so in his Copy, yet thought however that it was all one whether he  
 expressed it in the *Evangelist's* own words, or in a little better *Greek*,  
 in compliance perhaps with critical Ears. The beginning of it is this:  
 ἐκπορευομένη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁδὸν παρελθὼν πρὸς ἑρμηνεύοντα λέγων, &c.

Verf. 19. Note b.] What our *Author* says about the sense of the  
 tenth Commandment is, I grant, true; but we shall interpret both  
*Moses* and *St. Mark* more *Grammatically*, if we understand the verb  
*σπυρεῖν* of those fraudulent methods by which a Person may endeavour

Chapter to invade another man's Possessions. For there are two ways of injuring our Neighbour, *viz.* by Theft, whether privately or by force, against the will of the Owner, and by taking away what belongs to another without any pretence of Right or Justice, which is forbidden in the *seventh* Precept of the *Decalogue*, or else by secret and cunning Devices, where the Law and a pretence of Right is made use of to cover the Injury, which is prohibited in the *tenth* Commandment, whereby all such Artifices are made unlawful, whether they prove successful or unsuccessful: And this *Christ* here calls ἀποσεγήν, *i. e.* to defraud. So the *Old Glosses*; ἀποσεγήν privo, defraudo, abnego, to deprive, to defraud, to deny ones Trust. ἀποσεγήν, inficiatur, he disowns or denies his Trust, or the Debt charged upon him. ἀποσεγήνσις fraus, abnegatio, denegatio. ἀποσεγήνσις fraudator, fraudulentus, inficiator. See my Notes upon the *Decalogue*.

Vers. 24. Πιστοῦσθαι ] *Christ* here shews what sort of πλούσιοι, or rich Men, they are that cannot heartily entertain his Doctrin, *viz.* such as trust more in their Riches, than to *God's* Promises. And those are said to trust in their Riches, who had rather preserve them, than obey *God*; who promise themselves a happy Life if they are but rich, and think themselves so miserable that no Piety can afford them any Comfort, if they are poor.

## C H A P. XI.

Vers. 13. **T**hat the time of Harvest was earlier in *Judaea* than ordinary, is well proved by our Author, of which see *Note a.* my Notes also upon *Exod. ix. 32.* And hence likewise he rightly infers that other Fruits were gathered sooner in that Country than in many other places. But I have several Observations to make both with relation to this matter, and to what *Dr. Hammond* says in this Note.

I. That *Aristophanes* does ill confound the time of Wheat and Barly Harvest among the *Phœnicians*, which fell out in divers Months. See my Notes upon *Gen. xxx. 14.*

II. I wonder that the *Doctor* should speak of the Fruit of Trees in *Judaea* without any distinction; whereas it is certain that all sort of Fruits do no more come to their full growth at the same time in that Country than in other places: They have their Summer and Autumn Fruits in *Judaea* as well as elsewhere. Nor does it appear by the Passage cited out of *Philo*, that the Fruits of Trees were gathered at the same time with the *Corn*, as our *Author* says, but only that if the

Statue



Statue of *Caius* was set up in the Temple, it was to be feared that the Chapter  
*Jews* would destroy the ripe Corn: and then he adds that care was also XI.  
 to be taken for the gathering in of the Fruits, which the Country that  
 was planted with Trees brought forth; which may be understood not  
 only of the Fruits that were ripe at *that* time, but also of those that  
 were of a *later* growth, and which could not have been gathered if the  
 Trees were destroyed before they came to perfection.

III. I should not doubt but that the Interpretation given by the  
*Doctor* of this place were true, if he had but produced any Example  
 to shew that the *Greek* Phrase *καιρός σῦκων* might signify what he calls a  
*good Fig year*, or a *kindly seasonable year for Figs*; and we French Men *une*  
*saison favorable aux figues*, i. e. so temperate a year that abundance of  
 Figs came to their perfect ripeness in their proper season. Thus in  
*Horace* a fruitful year is called *pomifer*, and *locuples frugibus annus*.  
 But the words *καιρός* and *χρόνος* must not be confounded; for tho the  
 latter do indifferently signify any time whatsoever, yet the former  
 is taken only for a *particular juncture of time*, and for *opportunity*, and  
 is therefore capable indeed of being used to signify set seasons in the  
 year, but not simply a year. Tho this it may be might be observed  
 in favor of *Dr. Hammond*, that by *καιρός* here is not meant simply *year*,  
 but as I may say *ἐνιαυτός ἐνκαιρός*, a *seasonable year*, or a *fit season* to  
 look every where for Figs in. But this likewise is something harsh,  
 and I want still Examples of the like Phrase, having never been able  
 to find or meet with any.

IV. It had been better if our *Author*, instead of what he says about  
 the time of Harvest, had observed that there were two sorts of Figs  
 in *Judæa*, one of which might have been ripe at the time of the  
*Passover*, but the other not till the height of Summer. The former  
 sort are mentioned by *Solomon* in *Cant. ii. 13.* where, describing the  
 beginning of the Spring, he says among other things, *the Fig-tree*  
*hath brought her Figs to perfection.* And these were called *early Figs*, as  
 we learn from *Theophrastus* and *Pliny*, and were common in *Syria*.  
*Theophrastus* Hist. Plant. lib. 4. c. 2. Ο' δε καρπὸς ἑλλασθεῖ, ὃν καλεῖται πρὸς  
 Αἰγύπτου σῦκον διμωστακότες, ἔγινεται γὰρ ὅλως πρὸς Αἰγύπτου, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς Συρίαν—  
 αἰφύλλον δὲ—; i. e. as *Pliny* lib. xiii. c. 8. interprets him, *Quidam*  
*Ægyptiam ficum dixere, errore manifesto; non enim in Ægypto nascitur,*  
*sed in Syria, semper comantibus foliis.* Some have said that it was the  
*Egyptian Fig*, but they were manifestly mistaken, for it does not grow in  
 Egypt, but in Syria, and its leaves always flourish. And a little after  
*Theophrastus* says; ἔχει δὲ ἅμα καὶ τ' ἔρον καὶ τ' νέον καρπὸν. Ἀραιωμένα γὰρ διατερε  
 μετὰ κώνια, καὶ ὁ ἔτερος δὲ θύς φανερός κυσίμενος.—εἰτ' ἀνεύθεισ ἀρβύλα πρὸς ἀγρὸν—

Chapter XI. *ἡ ἰσχυρία. Ἄτι τὸτε δὴ διαλείψῃ χειμῶνα μέλει ἡρώς.* The sense of which is thus expressed again by *Pliny*; *Pomo antecedentis anni circa canis ortus detracto, statim alterum parit. Postea florem per Arcturum, hyeme foetus enutricite.* The last years Fruit being pulled off about the beginning of the dog-days, it presently brings forth more. Then when the Sun rises with *Arcturus* it blossoms again, the Winter nourishing its Fruit. And that such a sort of Fig-tree as this is meant here, appears both by its having Leaves at that time, and by *Christ's* going to look for Fruit upon it. This Fruit the Jews called *בבורה* *bicborrah*, as appears from *Hos. ix. 10.* where it is said, *I found Israel like Grapes in the Wilderness, as the first ripe בבורה in the Fig-tree.* And these Figs were very much valued, as *Jeremiah* informs us, *Chap. xxiv. 2.* *One Basket had very good Figs, like the Figs that are first ripe הבבורה.* See also *Isa. xxviii. 4.* and *Mic. vii. 1.*

The other sort of Figs were of a later growth, and ripened at the same time with Grapes. And it is this sort that is mentioned in *Numb. xiii. 24.* and which were gathered in the Land of *Canaan* together with the Grapes, by the Spies that were sent by *Moses*, and brought to the *Jericho* Camp. The Trees which bear this sort have no Leaves at the *Passover*, but the time of their first shooting out is at the approach of the Summer, as *Christ* teaches us, *Math. xxiv. 32.* *Now learn, saith he, a Parable from the Fig-tree: when its branch is yet tender, and putteth forth Leaves, ye know that Summer is nigh.* And so likewise afterwards here in *St. Mark xiii. 28.* I could illustrate all these things by a multitude of Citations out of the Antients if it were necessary: But I am not ambitious of the useless Copiousness of some learned Men, who spend abundance of time in proving what might have been shewn in fewer words, and of whom I may say with *Callimachus*,

Ἄσπευς ποταμῶν μέγας ῥέουσι, ἀλλὰ πὰ πολλὰ  
 ἄνματα ἦν, καὶ πολλὴν ἐσ' ὕδασι συρρετὸν ἔλκε.

V. Our *Author* indeed justly rejects the Conjecture of *D. Heinsius*, but he censures too severely the changing of an *accent* or *spirit*, which it is certain are wanting in the most antient Copies; for who can be certain when he sees this Particle *OU* written without an accent, whether it is to be read *ε not*, or *ε where*? This must necessarily be learned by the sense, and when that is obscure, the Reader is left in suspense. And before ever he had objected to that learned Man, that no Example could elsewhere be found of any such form of Speech as he conjectured this here to be, he ought himself to have produced a place in which  
 the



the Phrase *καὶ εὖ καρπὸς πρὸς* signified *a fruitful season* for such or such a sort of Fruit. Chapter XII.

CHAPTER XII.

Verf. 14. **T**his one thing is enough to shew that that *MS.* does not contain the very words of the *Evangelists*, but a kind of a Paraphrase of them: For it interprets the *Latin* word *κῆρσον*, to *Grecians* who did not understand that word, by one more familiar to them. So in the *Glossaries* for *Law-terms* published by *Car. Labbæus*, *κῆρσον* is explained to be *εἶδος νομισματός*: whence it may be inferred that the *κῆρσον* here spoken of was to be paid in a certain species of Money, *viz.* in *Denarii*, which had the image of the *Cæsars* impressed upon them, as was conjectured by *Marq. Freberus*.

Verf. 44. Note b. ] The Phrase *ὑπερήματα θλίψεων τὰ χεῖρῶν*, *Colos. i. 24.* is, what remained for *St. Paul* to suffer for the sake of *Christ*, as I have shewn in my *Ars Critica*, Part 2. *Sect. 1. cap. xii.*

CHAPTER XIII.

Verf. 32. **I**t is no wonder that it is so hard to understand wherein the Heresy of the *Agnœtæ* lay, because if it was their Opinion that *Jesus*, i. e. the *Man* that was born of the *Virgin Mary*, was ignorant of any thing, it is manifest that they were of the same opinion with our *Saviour* himself, who could not have affirmed this more plainly; but if they asserted that *God* also who dwelt in the human Nature of *Christ*, knew not when the day of Judgment was to be; such an Absurdity as this hardly any but mad Men could be guilty of. For my part, I am apt to think that the *Grecians* at that time were mightily given to be contentious, and falsely attributed Opinions to one another which they disowned, and were unwilling to understand themselves. Some have been inclined to think the same as to the business of *Eutyches* and *Nestorius*, who differed from one another and the rest of *Christians* more in Words than in Things. It is plain the *Greeks* took no care at all to speak their mind clearly in these matters, and a contentious humour might easily make them mistake one anothers sense. But this is not a place to treat of this matter in.

Chapter XIII.

## C H A P. XIV.

Verf. 3. **T**Here are some things in this *last* Note that may lead  
 Note a. the Reader into a mistake, which I shall therefore  
 briefly confute.

I. If *Nard* were a dry Ointment, yet it might as easily be contained in a Marble or Alabaſter Box as if it were liquid. Do not *σταπίσματα* or *dry Ointments* use to be put in ſuch ſort of Veſſels for the better preſervation of them? This every body knows that has but once been in an Apothecary's Shop.

II. *Nard* is not always liquid. There was a liquider and a thicker ſort of it, as *Dioſcorides* informs us, *Mat. Med.* lib. 1. cap. lxxv. where having deſcribed the manner of making this Ointment, he ſays; *ύγρον δε εſτι, κ̄̄ ε̄ γλοιώδης, ε̄αν μη̄ ρ̄πῑνον̄ ε̄χη̄: it is liquid, and not thick like dregs unleſs it have gum in it.* Now nothing hinders but that the Ointment which *St. Mark* here ſpeaks of might have gum mixed with it, and ſo be a *thicker* ſort of *Nard*, which might eaſily alſo be if it had been a great while kept.

III. Our *Author* deſcribes a ſort of *Nard* unknown to all Antiquity, who never reckoned *Nard* among the *σαρκά*. None of the Antients, and perhaps no one Modern Author beſides *Dr. Hammond*, ever ſpoke thus, who ſeems to have confounded *Nard* with *Myrrh*. *Nard* is an *Herb* of an indifferent bigneſs, as *Dioſcorides* lib. 1. cap. vi, and viii. and *Pliny* lib. 12. cap. xii. tell us. The words of *Pliny* are theſe: *De folio Nardi plura dici par eſt, ut principali in unguentis. Frutex eſt gravi & crassa radice, ſed brevi ac nigra fragilique — folio parvo, denſoque, Cacumina in aristas ſe ſpargunt; ideo gemma dote, Nardi ſpicas ac folia celebrant.* Of the leaf of the *Herb Nard* more ought to be ſaid, as that which has the principal place in Ointments. It is a Plant that has a thick and heavy Root, but a ſhort black and brittle one — its Leaf is ſmall and thick, the top of it is bearded; *Nard* therefore is famous both for the virtue of its ſpikes and leaves. So he deſcribes the *Indian Nard*, and having mentioned other kinds of it, adds; *Sunt autem omnia herbae, præter Indicam; they are all Herbs, except that which comes from India.* Of theſe leaves, or the ſpikes bruised together and mixed with Oil and other Spices, the Ointment of *Nard* was made, and not of any Liquor which is diſtilled from them. This appears alſo from *Dioſcorides*, lib. 1. cap. lxxv. and from *Pliny* lib. 13. cap. i. Our *Author* ſeems again to have confounded *Nard* with *Myrrh*, which makes an Ointment of it ſelf without Oil, as *Pliny* tells us. He confounds alſo the  
 word



word *Nard*, as that signifies either the *Plant* before described, or the *Chapter Ointment* which is made of it; for the *Plant* indeed is called *spicata* XIV. *Nardus*, because of its spiked leaves, but not the *Ointment* which was called *unguentum spicatum*, or *unguentum Nardi spicatae*, not *Nardus spicata*, viz. because the *spike* was the principal Ingredient in that *Ointment*, which Name was given to *Nard* by way of eminence. See *Salmasius* upon *Solinus*, p. 750. Ed. *Ultraj.* about this matter.

IV. The Phrase *pura Nardus*, *pure Nard*, in *Tibullus* does not signify, as the *Doctor* thinks, *Ointment* made *only* of *Nard*, or the juice of *Nard*, but that which was called *Ointment of Nard*, in which besides other Spices there was *pure Nard*, i. e. not adulterated, as it frequently was, as *Dioscorides* and *Pliny* tell us. And this *Ointment* it is that *St. Mark* calls *νάσδο πιστή*, i. e. *Nard faithfully made* or *prepared*, such as had *true unsophisticated Nard* in it, which was the reason of its being *πλυτταῖς* of *great price*. *Pliny* lib. 12. cap. 12. *Pretium spicae in libras x. c. Folia divisere annonam, ab amplitudine hadrosphaerium vocatur, majoribus foliis, x. xxx. &c. The price of Nard is x. c. a pound. The difference in the bigness of the Leaves made a difference in the price; that which had the biggest Leaves was called Hadrosphaerium, and the price of it was x. xxx.*

V. The *Ointment* of *Nard* cannot be called *Nardus spicata*, but the *Plant* only; and therefore *Grotius* is mistaken when he says that *πιστή* and *spicata* are the same. Tho' *πιστή*, for that which we express by *faithfully made*, is none of the best *Greek*, yet it is possible that those whose trade it was to make *Ointments*, the *Apothecaries* or *Perfumers*, might use it in that sense; and that *St. Mark* made use of their terms, especially where he speaks of their Commodities, ought not to seem strange. Consult also *Salmasius* in the place before-mentioned.

Ibid. Note b. ] I grant the Verb *συντείβω* does not signify always to *break*, when the discourse is about a thing which may be hurt without being broken, as about a *wounded Man*, or a *bruised Reed*; but where the discourse is about a *Vessel*, and especially such an one as is made of *brittle* matter, it has ever that signification: and whoever says, *συντείβειν σκεῦος μαρμαίρεον ἢ πει ὑέλινον*, it must be rendered *to break a Marble or Glass Vessel*. See *Levit.* vi. 28. xi. 33. xv. 12. *Rev.* ii. 27. And those that endeavour to put any other sense upon that Phrase here, strain it. Dr. *Hammond's* two first Reasons for another Interpretation I have confuted already in a Note upon the parallel place in *St. Matthew*. The third, together with the rest, are, I suppose, taken out of *Baronius*, and rely upon a nauseous Fable which is related in the following words by *Suidas*, whom, if our *Author* had but look'd

Chapter into, I believe he would never have made use of this Testimony.  
 XIV. Thus *Suidas* tells the story in  $\Phi\beta\epsilon$ , out of some unknown Fable-maker, as he used to do.  $\text{Κάτωθεν τῶν κειρωμένων ἐπιήρχον δύο σταυροὶ, (or rather σταυροὶ Crosses, as *Amil. Portus* has observed) τῶν δύο ληστῶν, καὶ λίκιον μύρον ὃ ἠλείψατο ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα σημειοφρεικὰ, τεθέντα μὲν ὑπὸ Κωνσταντίνου τῶν μεγάλου, ἀφαιρούντα δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν μεγάλου Θεοδοσίου: under the Market-place were buried the two Crosses of the two Thieves, and the little Ointment Pot out of which Christ was anointed, and many other remarkable things that were laid there by Constantine the Great, but taken away by Theodosius the Great. *Suidas* does not give the least intimation that he thought this silly Fable to be true; he only tells it, as he does many others, as he had read it. And therefore the Consequences that the *Doctor* draws from his Authority and Learning are insignificant. Nay, tho' *Suidas* had said that he believed this Fable, yet it would be much more likely that he had either forgot this Passage in *St. Mark*, or that it did not come into his mind, than that he thought the Phrase  $\text{συντείλειν σταυρῶν}$  to signify any thing different from what I have said it does.$

Neither is there any more weight in the *Argument* which our *Author* grounds upon a Passage out of *Pollux*, because the Phrase  $\text{συντείλειν ἀλάσασεν}$  cannot signify to open the *Cruise* and stir the Ointment about with a *Spathula*, or Slice. All the rest that he says is manifestly besides the cause, because he considers the *Verb*  $\text{συντείλειν}$  abstractly, not as it is joined with the name of a brittle Vessel; nor have I leisure to examine every thing particularly. I conclude therefore that this Phrase is rightly translated in the vulgar Latin *fracto alatastro*. See what I have said on the parallel place in *St. Matthew*.

Verf. 54. Note f. ] What our *Author* says about the words  $\text{πρὸς ἔκ φῶς}$  he seems to have borrowed from *Dan. Heinsius*; who may be consulted by those that have leisure.

Verf. 72. Note i. ] The *Participle*  $\text{ἐπιβλέων}$  ought not to be separated by a *Comma* from the following word, which is the *Verb* to that as its *Nominative Case*. The opinion of *Grotius* which is by our *Author* mentioned in the second place, is the most probable. The *Verb*  $\text{ἐπιβλέειν}$  alone does not signify to see or look upon, but only when the *Noun*  $\text{πρὸς ὄψιν}$ , or some other like that is added to it, and  $\text{εἰς πρὸς}$  or  $\text{πρὸς}$  for the most part follows. I am apt to think that in the place cited out of *Thavorinus* we ought after  $\text{ἐπιβλέω}$  to read  $\text{εἰς τὸνδε}$ , because  $\text{ἐπιβλέω πρὸς}$  for to look upon any one, is no Greek Phrase; and  $\text{ὄψιν}$  also must be understood,  $\text{ἐπιβλέω εἰς τὸνδε πρὸς ὄψιν}$ .



Verf. 6. **A** Πέλευεν ] That is, εἰώθει ἀπολύειν, he used to release, as it is in St. *Matthew* Chap. xxvii. 15. After this manner the future Tense in *Hebrew*, and the *arist* in *Greek*, and the *preterperfect* in *Latin* is many times used. See my Index to the *Pentateuch* upon the word *futurum*, and *Rom.* viii. 29, 30.

Verf. 8. Ἀναβοήσας ] In some *Manuscripts* it is ἀναβᾶς, the reason of which is not, as *Grotius* thought, that some *Greek Copies* of this *Gospel* were altered to make them agree with the *Latin Version*; for besides the *Vatican* mentioned by him (but omitted in the *Oxford Edit.* of the *New Testament*) and the *Manuscript* that was sent by *Beza* to *Cambridg*, the *Copy* also which those that made the *Coptick* and *Gothick Translations* used read it so, which it is plain could never have it from the *Latin Versions*. If we admit this reading, the sense will not be inconvenient. - *And the multitude going up* (into the *Hall*) *began to desire*, &c.

Verf. 17. Note a. ] Concerning those things in this *History* which relate to the *Roman Customs*, we must read the *Philological Notes* of that learned *Lawyer Edm. Merillus* upon the *Passion*; who has treated of this matter on set purpose. Add also what I have said about this place in *St. Matthew*.

Verf. 33. Τρυφεύων δὲ ὡς ἑκπύς ] This is very well expressed by our *Author* in agreement with the *Roman Custom*, in his *Paraphrase*. For they used as in the night, so also in the day time, to give notice what hour it was by the sound of a *Trumpet*. This appears from a *Passage* in *Lucan*, lib. 2. ver. 689. where, speaking of *Pompey's flight*, he describes him forbidding *ne buccina dividat horas*, that his flight might be the more secret.

Verf. 42. Παρασκευῆ, ὅ ἐστι προπέμπεται ] This *Interpretation* of the word παρασκευῆ is added for the sake of the *uncircumcised Gentiles* who were ignorant of the *Jewish Customs*. Every *Friday*, or προπέμπεται, was so called, as *Bochart* in concurrence with others before him tells us, *Hieroz.* P. 1. lib. 2. cap. 50. p. 567. And not only the *Jews*, but *Christians* also afterwards made use of that word παρασκευῆ. See *Grotius* upon *Luke* xviii. 11.

Verf. 43. Note d. ] I rather think that by βελευτής we are to understand that dignity that *Joseph* was in among the *Jews*, by being one of the *Sanhedrim* of LXXII Men, or the lesser of xxiii. For *Strimathæa* was not a *Roman Colony*.

Verf. 18. **I** Will not undertake here to examine whether those ancient and true *Sibyls* did foretel any thing concerning *Christ*; but I shall observe that no such thing can be inferred from those Verses of *Virgil*: for it is not necessary to suppose that the sense of that *Sybil's* words are so expressed by *Virgil*, as to have no addition made to them. Perhaps the *Sybil* had prophesied that after the tenth Age, which was that of the Sun, there should be another Golden Age; and that Saying alone gave *Virgil* occasion enough to describe that new Age, just like that Golden one which was said by the *Poets* to have been in the Reign of *Saturn*. And it was only in the *Silver Age*, as they tell us, that Serpents became poisonous, which in the Golden Age had no Poison. This we are told, to go no farther, by *Virgil* himself, *Georg.* 1. ver. 128.

*Ille (viz. Jupiter) malum virus serpentibus addidit atris.*

Verf. 19. Ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δεξιᾶς ] *Grotius* has very well observed, that this form of Speech is borrowed from the Custom of *Kings*, who use to command those whom they have a mind to confer the highest Honour upon, to sit at their right-hand. See his Notes upon *Mat.* xx. 21. The *Greek Poets* speak also in the same manner concerning the *Heathen Gods*, as that great man has shewed by an Example out of *Pindar*. And, if you please, you may add this out of *Callimachus* about *Apollo*, in his Hymn consecrated to that God, ver. 28.

Τὸν χορὸν ὃ πολλοὶ ὄπ' αἰ κτ' εὐμὸν ἀείδουσι  
 Τιμῆς, δόξουσι γὰρ, ἐπεὶ Διὶ ΔΕΞΙΟΣ ἦΣΤΑΙ.

*Apollo will honour this Quire, because it sings to please him; for he is able, since he sits at Jupiter's right-hand.*

But this might by the *Poets*, who fancied their *Gods* to be in the shape of men, be understood *properly*: the difficulty is, how *S. Mark*, who had quite another Notion of *God*, understood this Phrase ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δεξιᾶς. *Interpreters* tells us that it is a Metaphor, and must be understood to signify only the great Glory to which *Christ* was exalted, and nothing more. And it is certain, that this Expression of *the right hand of God*, if by *God* we understand the *divine Nature* considered in it self, must needs be metaphorical; but is it not something



thing odd that a *Christian* Historian should in a naked account of Chapter  
 things make use of such a Metaphor? So it will seem, if I am not XVI.  
 mistaken, to those that attentively consider it. And therefore per-  
 haps (for I affirm nothing positively) we ought rather by the Word  
*God* to understand a *Light inaccessible* to any but *Christ*, which is a  
 Symbol of the divine Presence, and on the right side of which he,  
 whom the Father hath made King of Heaven and Earth, sits. And  
 this is that which the *Martyr Stephen* seems to have seen when he be-  
 held *δοξάν θεῶν καὶ Ἰησοῦν ἐστῶτα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ*, *the glory of God, and Jesus*  
*standing on the right hand of God*, viz. of that inaccessible Light or  
 Glory; of which see my Notes upon *Exod. xxxiv. 18.* For without  
 doubt, properly speaking he did not see *God*; and to say that when  
 it is affirmed of him that he saw *Jesus on the right hand of God*, the mea-  
 ning is, that he saw him in the enjoyment or possession of the highest  
 Glory, is harsh and unnatural. See also *Matth. xxvi. 2.* and *Mark*  
*xiv. 62.* Let the Learned consider whether this be not what the Author  
 of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* also intended in *Chap. xii. 2.* where he  
 says, that *Jesus is set down at the right hand of God.* I have not time at  
 present to prosecute these things at large: Which I mention, lest the  
 Reader should think that I had too slightly passed over a Subject which  
 deserves to have a great many Thoughts spent upon it.

---

ANN O -

# ANNOTATIONS

ON THE

GOSPEL according to St. *Luke*.

CHAP. I.

Verf. 1. I. **I**T might have been said without any more ado, that the  
*Note a.* verb πληροφροεῖν signifies *to certify, or assure*, and is properly spoken of *persons*. Thus in the collections of *Ctesias* Cap. xxxviii. πολλοῖς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ὅρκοις πληροφροήσαντες Μεγαβύζον: *having by many words and oaths assured Megabizus*. So in *Socrates* Orat. Trapozit. pag. 360. Ed. H. Steph. ἐμὲ ὃ πολλῶν αἰετόντων ἕξαστον πληροφροηθεὶς γελῶσθαι μηδ' ἐν κεκτῆσθαι: *when he knew for certain that I had in the hearing of a great many witnesses denied that I had any thing*. And from hence the word being applied to *things*, πληροφροήματα signifies such things which we are sure are true, as in this place in St. *Luke*, as the following words shew. Πληροφροῦσθαι no where signifies *to come to pass, or to be fulfilled*, where the Discourse is concerning a *Prophecy*. II. Πληροφροεῖν ἐπιθυμίαν is *to comply with or satisfy a desire*; for so the verb πληροφροέω also signifies. As in the old Glosses; πληροφροεῖω morigero, satisfacio. Agreeable hereto is the *Latin* phrase explere animum, libidinem, &c. And which is much to the same sense, the Greek διακονίαν πληροφροεῖν signifies *to fulfil his trust or office*, which the *Latins* express by implere partes officii sui, numeros omnes implere. III. Πληροφροεῖν is often of the same signification with the simple verb πληρῆν, and πληροφροία with πληρότης. And in the old Glosses πληροφροήματα also is rendred by plenitudo, satisfactio, fulness, satisfactio. What is further observable about this word, Dr. *Hammond* has here set down.

Verf. 2. *Note b.* ] I. The ἐξέρχεται λόγοι are those which have fulfilled their office of preaching the Gospel, pursuant to *Christ's* Command. The word λόγος is often taken for the *Gospel*. See *Act.* iv. 4, &c. In the same phrase almost the office of such Persons is described by St. *Luke* in *Act.* vi. 4, where he calls it διακονίαν τοῦ λόγου the *ministry of the word*



word or Gospel. II. The reason why St. John calls the Godhead dwelling Chapter  
bodily in Christ, by the name of λόγος, I have shewn in my *Animadver-* I.  
*sions* upon St. John, Chap. i. 1. I cannot tell whether our Au-  
thor thought that the *Chaldee Paraphrasts* lived before Christ's time;  
but there are a great many things in them, which make it probable  
that they are of a later date. Besides, the Phrase "מִמֶּנּוּ the word  
of the Lord, which is so often used by them, does not signify a distinct  
ὑπόστασις or *subsistence*, as has been shewn by a learned man in a Discourse  
intituled *de sermone Dei cuius creberrima fit mentio apud Paraphrastas Chal-*  
*dæos*; tho I am not in all things of his opinion. III. In what sense the  
word λόγος was known to the antient Heathens, I have shewed in  
the forementioned *Animadversions*, out of older Authors than *Ame-*  
*lius*. *Amelius's* Testimony is extant in *Eusebius Præp. Evang. Lib. xi.*  
cap. 9.

Verf. 17. Note f. ] Our learned Author trusting too much to his me-  
mory, vainly contends that the preposition ב in *Malachi* iv. 6. ought  
to be rendered *with*, not *to*; for it is the preposition ל and not ב that  
is used in that place of *Malachi*, and he shall turn the fathers ל upon or  
to the children, and the heart of the children ל upon or to their fathers. It  
seems to be a proverbial form of speech, to signify that John was to call  
the Jews, who were at very great *variance* among themselves, to agree-  
ment and *concord*. Our Saviour, that he might represent the great dif-  
fensions that were occasioned by the variety of mens opinions about mat-  
ters of Religion, speaks in this manner, *Matt. x. 21. The brother shall*  
*deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall*  
*rise up against their parents and kill them; and verse 35. I am come to set a*  
*man at variance against his father, and the daughter against the mother.*  
Now to shew that John was to extinguish all such animosities, or at least  
use the properest means to that end, the Prophet made use just of a  
*contrary* expression, and said, *he shall turn the heart of the fathers, &c.*  
This is by two *Evangelists* called the *restoring of all things*, and here by  
the Angel turning the disobedient to the sentiments of the just; and in-  
deed, the Jews could not be reclaimed from their dissensions, and dis-  
posed to submit to one Master Jesus Christ, unless John had been to  
make it his endeavour to *restore* the whole Jewish Nation, and to bring  
them over to the *quærens* mind or opinion of the just. See *Grotius* on  
*Malach.* and this place in St. *Mark*. The Doctor here takes abundance  
of pains to interpret this place, to little purpose, because he had not  
looked into the words of *Malachi*. He represents the Prophet speak-  
ing the same thing over and over, like him that said:

For what else but a nauseous Tautology are those words, *old and young, young and old*? But that which the Prophet says, is, that *John* should endeavour to turn *the hearts of the fathers to the children*, i. e. the fathers who were *mistaken* in their *Opinions*, to the Children who had *righter apprehensions* of things; and *the hearts of the children to the fathers*, or the erroneous Children to the judgment of their Fathers, who embraced the true Doctrine of *Christ*; in a word, to bring ἀπειθεῖς πρὸς φρόνησιν δικαίων *the incredulous and disobedient to be of the mind or sentiments of the just*.

II. The word φρόνησις I render *mind* or *sentiment*, and not *Wisdom*, because that is the most usual signification of the word, and agreeable to the common acceptation of the primitive φρονεῖν for *sentire* to *think*, or be of such a sentiment, as it is used by *St. Paul* in *Phil. ii. 2.* where the Phrases τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, and τὸ ἐν φρονεῖν, signify *to think the same thing, to be of the same mind*. And my reason for this is, because the Discourse here is περὶ τῆς συμφρονησεως, the consent of the *Jews* who disagreed among themselves. But then it must not be thought that by *sententiam, sentiment*, I understand the same with δόξα a *speculation* or *opinion*, which entertains only the *understanding*, but an *affection* or *disposition* of the *Soul*, which discovers it self in external actions, and is that vertue which the *Latins* usually call *prudentia*, as the *Greeks* φρόνησις. And this was the reason it may be, why the *Evangelist* rather made use of the word φρόνησις, than δόξα; for φρόνησις is properly neither *sententia* opinion, nor *prudentia* prudence or *wisdom*; but an *affection* of the *Soul*, by which we not only think and judg, but also love and hate. See *H. Stephens Thesaur.* upon the word φρονεῖν.

Verf. 28. Note k.] I. For the understanding of what is meant by κειρατομένην in this place, it must be enquired not what Noun κείρις, but what the Verb κειρώ signifies, and particularly in the *New Testament*. And we find this verb κειρώ used by *St. Paul* in a very clear notion, in *Eph. i. 6.* where he says that *God* has *predestinated us to the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ, to the praise of the glory of his grace, ἐν ᾗ ἐχαιρώσωμεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἀγαπημένῳ, in which he hath gratified us in the beloved*, i. e. by which he hath dealt most bountifully with us through *Christ*. And agreeably hereto the meaning of the Angel here must be: “O *Virgin*, “who art highly favoured by *God*. *Phavorinus* renders κειρατομένην by περιλημμένη, ἐυλογημένη, *beloved, blessed*.



II. What our Author quotes out of *Hesychius*, relates rather to the *Chapter*  
*body*, or to *elegancy* of speech, than to the *Mind*, which certainly we  
 can have nothing to do with here. Thus *χαίεντα* he interprets by *καλα*  
 and *κεχαριτωμένα* pretty, elegant sayings. And the old *Onomasticon*, *κεχαρι-*  
*τωμένῳ* facetus, graciosus, witty, pleasant. In which sense it is taken in  
 the *Son of Sirach* Chap. xviii. 19. where the discourse is concerning  
 one that was well skilled in the art of speaking, or an eloquent man.  
 The word *κεχαρισμένῳ* in *Hesychius* ought not to be changed into *κεχαρι-*  
*τωμένῳ*. The old Glosses have that word, and render it by *gratus*, *gra-*  
*tuitus*, *acceptus*, *grateful*, *freely bestowed*, *acceptable*. But *χαῖς* is un-  
 doubtedly, as the *Doctor* supposes, a false print for *χαίς*.

III. The Phrase *ἡ ἄνθρωπος ἡ ἀγαθή* in *Prov.* xi. 16. signifies a  
*handsom Woman*; for which sense there can be no room here.

Verf. 39. Note m.] Of this Phrase in those days, see my Notes  
 on *Gen.* xxxviii. 1.

Verf. 67. Note n. at the end of the third sense of the word *προφήτης*  
 pag. 190. lin. 24.] I. Our Author had done well, if he had pro-  
 duced the words of those Grammarians who say that *προφήτης* signifies  
 naturally no more than one that speaks *πρὸ ἑτέρου*, for or in the stead of  
 another. And he might have shewn us too at the same time, that *πρὸ*  
 in composition is the same sometime with *ὑπὲρ* or *ὑπὸ*, as *pro* in Latin in  
*Proconsul*. For as for me, I know of no Grammarian that has proved  
 this, but I know of one that thinks them both false. When Poets are  
 said to be the *προφῆται* or *ὑποφῆται* of the *Muses*, it is not meant that they  
 speak in the place or stead of the *Muses*, but by their inspiration, no  
 less than *Prophets* by the inspiration of that particular *Deity* to  
 which they are consecrated. For it must be observed, that tho the  
 word *προφήτης* properly signifies one who foretels things to come, yet  
 when *Poets* are so stiled, it signifies only men inspired by the *Muses*.  
 Which is the reason also, why *Poets* used to invoke them.

II. Amongst the Heathens, the *Divines*, *Prophets* or *Priests*, did not  
 teach the People how they were to live, but only the manner of wor-  
 shipping and pacifying the *Gods*. And therefore *Lactantius* Lib. v.  
 c. 3. speaking of the Heathen Divinity, very truly saith: *Nihil ibi dis-*  
*seritur quod proficiat ad mores excolendos, vitamque formandam, nec habet*  
*inquisitionem aliquam veritatis, sed tantummodo ritum colendi.* That it  
 does not in the least teach men how to live, nor give any rules how to find out  
 the Truth, but declares only in what manner and with what ceremonies the  
*Gods* are to be worshipped. It was the business of the *Philosophers* to teach  
 those things which related to Peoples *Manners*, as the same Author  
 observes. *Philosophia*, says he, *& religio Deorum disjuncta sunt, longeque*  
*discreta.*

Chapter I. *discreta. Siquidem alii sunt professores sapientiæ, per quos utique ad Deos non aditur; alii Religionis Antistites, per quos sapere non discitur; apparet nec illam esse veram sapientiam, nec hanc Religionem. Philosophy and the worship of the Gods are two very different things among the Heathens. For their Professors of Wisdom are one sort of men, who teach nothing that relates to divine worship, and their Priests another sort, which give men no instructions how to grow wiser. But it is manifest, that neither the former is true Wisdom, nor the latter true divine Worship.*

III. As for *Epimenides*, who wrote no books of *Ethicks*, but rather taught the way of *purifying* or *expiating*, I know not why our Author should deny him to have been a *Foreteller* of things to come, merely because of *Aristotle's* single Testimony, and thereupon argue that he was not for that reason called a *Prophet*. For others do affirm him to have been skilful in the art of *Divination*, and produce some instances to that purpose. See *Laertius* Lib. i. Sect. 114. and his *Interpreter*. And we have no reason to suppose but that *St. Paul* might rather have a respect to the *general* Opinion than to *Aristotle's*.

Ibid. After the 4th sense given of that word, pag. 190. lin. 29. ] When the verb *προφητεύειν* signifies to *interpret* Scripture, or *exhort* the People to *Virtue*, or *both*, it ought not to be rendered by *prophesying* or *foretelling*, which is its most usual signification, but by *preaching* or *speaking publickly*. And the reason of this is, because the Preposition *πρὸ* is ambiguous, and does not only signify *ante* before, when it is referred to *time*; but also when the Discourse is about *things* and *Persons*; i. e. *propè* or *coram*, *nigh* to, or *in the presence of*; which last signification it manifestly has in many compound words. Thus *προάγειν* is *producere*, *provehere*, to *bring forth*, to *carry on*; *προάγειν*, *promere*, *proferre*, to *bring out*, to *produce*; *προβαίνειν*, *progredior*, *procedo*, to *go forward*, to *proceed*; *προβιβάζω*, *promoueo*, *provehō*, to *put forward*, to *lead on*; *προγραμμά*, *proscriptum*, a *publick order* posted up in writing; *προγγεγραμμένος*, *proscribo*, *profiteor*, to *publish*, to *profess*, with many more which may be had out of any *Lexicon*. I have transcribed these out of the *old Glossaries* of *Philoxenus* and others, and to transcribe more was needless. It cannot therefore seem strange to any, if we interpret this verb *προφητεύειν* by *proloqui* to *utter* or *pronounce*, which is rendered in the *old Onomasticon* by *προλαλεῖν*, and accordingly call him a *Prophet* who *delivers* or *pronounces* a *pious discourse* in a *Church Assembly*. It is certain that the word *προφήτης* is used thus in *Lucian* in *Auct. Vitarum*, where *Diogenes* is represented as giving this short Character of himself, that he was one who took it to be his province publickly to teach *Vertue*, and inveigh against *Vice*: τὸ δ' ἔλεγε, saith he, ἀληθείας καὶ παρρησίας ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ εἶναι



βούλωμαι, in short, I am resolved to be a PROPHEET of truth, and liberty of Chapter  
 speech; i. e. to speak freely whatever I think to be true and just. I con- I.  
 tefs, Diogenes seems here to have taken Ἀλήθεια and Παρρησία for two God-  
 desses by whom he was inspired; but then it was only in order to this  
 end, that he might boldly speak the truth concerning mens manners, and  
 not that he might foretel things to come. This is the sense in which the  
 Verb προφητεύειν is used by Aristotle in lib. de mundo, where he speaks thus  
 concerning Philosophy: ῥαδίως, εἰμυ, τὰ συζητῆ γινώσκουσα, καὶ δεῖω ψυχῆς  
 ἔμματα δὲ δεῖα καταλεβοῦσα, τοῖς τε ἀνθρώποις προφητεύεσα: understanding, I sup-  
 pose, easily things agreeable to her nature, and comprehending divine things  
 with the divine eye of her mind, and declaring them to men. In this place  
 also there is a respect had to inspiration, but not such a one as has any  
 relation to the knowledg of things future. These two passages were  
 not understood by H. Stephanus. Because therefore the Genius and use  
 of the Greek language would admit preachers to be called προφήται, St.  
 Paul made use of this word; and so much the more willingly, because  
 therein he did not depart from the custom of his Country-men the  
 Jews; among whom it was a Prophet's office not only to foretel things to  
 come, but also to teach the People Piety and Vertue. The Egyptians  
 also had their προφῆται; but that they prophesied, or confer'd with the  
 People about their manners, is not known.

Ibid. under the 6th sense of that word.] See my Notes upon the passage 11. 25.  
 cited by the Doctor out of Numbers.

Verf. 70. Note p.] I. The learned Jac. Rhenferdius has written a  
 Discourse very well worth our reading about this phrase, *seculum præ-*  
*sens & futurum, the present and future age*; in which he asserts that the  
 Phrase **הַבַּיִת הַבָּא** the age to come, was used in antient times, and so in  
 the time of Christ, to signify only the next life, and not the age of the  
 Messias. And indeed all the examples brought by the Doctor do con-  
 firm this very thing; nor is there any clear place alledged by him  
 out of the New Testament, which puts the contrary out of doubt.  
 One or two passages in a late Rabbin ought not to be taken for a cer-  
 tain proof of what was the custom and doctrine of the Antient  
 Jews.

II. The interpretation which the Doctor gives of the phrase **לְעוֹלָם  
 לְעוֹלָם** appears to be ingenious at first sight; but if it be narrowly  
 examined, it will be found inconsistent with the use of the Hebrew  
 language. For as the Phrase **לְרֹר וְרֹר** to age and to age signifies no-  
 thing but to all future ages; so the meaning of that other is no more  
 than, for ever. It is a Hebraism, wherein the same word is repeated  
 to express all that such or such a word signifies. And thus **אִישׁ אִישׁ**  
 man, man, is used to signify every man. III.

Chapter III. The Gospel is called *αἰώνιον*, *eternal*, because it will never be made void by any other Covenant or Dispensation, as the Law had been. It has no relation at all to the Phrase *the present or future age*.

IV. The Phrase *εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας ἢ αἰῶνων* is a Hebraism likewise, such another as *לדור ודור* *to age of ages*, that is, *perpetually*, or to the very last age.

Verf. 73. *Note q.*] What is said here about the allusion of this whole passage to the names of *John* and his Parents, is a meer trifle, only fit for an Allegorist to say, not for a serious and exact Interpreter, such as *Grotius*, from whom the *Doct̄or* took this remark. Our Author supposes, with others, that the name of *Zacharias's* wife was *אלישבע* *Elishebah*; but if that had been her name, she should have been called in Greek *Ἐλισαβέ* or *Ἐλισαβή*. Nor do I see why her name might not have been *אלישבעת* *Elishebat*, *my God is a Scepter*, or *אלישבת* *Elishebat*, *my God is rest*.

*Ibid. Note r.*] The word *ἀφόβως* must undoubtedly be joyned with *λατρεύειν*, as *Grotius* rightly thought; nor can any thing be imagined more harsh, than this Phrase *ἑύσαδαι ἀφόβως* *to be delivered without fear*; whereas *ἀφόβως λατρεύειν θεόν* *to serve God without fear* is a Phrase that every body will acknowledg to be proper when the enemies of Gods worship are so punished and kept under by him as to be incapable of hindring his being openly and publickly worshipped. But that which made our learned *Author* suppose that the *Evangelist* made use of so harsh a Phrase was the difficulty of understanding what *deliverance* was here properly spoken of, considering the *primary* notion of the words. *Zacharias* here speaks concerning the Kingdom of the *Messias* as the Prophets generally did, *viz.* as of a deliverance of the Jews from the dangers that hung over them from their enemies. At the time when *Zacharias* spake these words, the *Syrians*, *Egyptians* and other Heathen Nations that bordered upon *Judæa*, bore the Jews such a grudg, and were such troublesome neighbours to them, that they could not exercise their Religion *ἀφόβως* *without fear*, where the Heathens were more numerous than themselves, nor go up to *Jerusalem* to offer Sacrifice without danger. Nay, they were not without some fears and jealousies of the *Romans* themselves, lest being blinded with superstition they should some time or other oppose the Worship of the true *God*, as afterwards they often did. *Zacharias* therefore speaks of the *Messias* as of one that was about to rescue the Jews from these dangers, in agreement with the common opinion; nor did the Spirit of Prophecy undeceive him as to this matter, and the proper sense of his words is this which



I have mentioned. But in a more *sublime* sense, this deliverance is to be understood in general of the Enemies of Christianity, who were in time to be converted to the Christian Religion, so that those who were before a terrour to the Christians, should enter themselves into *Christ's* sheepfold, and set the Christians free from all their fears, which came to pass only in the time of *Constantine*. It was then and not before that *πάσα καταψία ἀμφιβολίας τῶ φόβῳ ἀενομένη*, all suspicion, misgiving and fear was taken away from the Christians, as it is said in the Edict of *Constantine*, extant in *Eusebius* Hist. Eccles. Lib. ix. c. 10. Τὰ ὅ τῆς δουλοκρατίας καὶ τῆς δεσποτίας ἐχθρῶν ἀιχλῶν καὶ ἀτιμίας ἐχάτης ἐρεπίπλωτο: and the side of the wicked was filled with the highest degree of shame and dishonour by the piety of their enemies; as *Eusebius* expresses himself in the next Chapter. These seem to be the Enemies here spoken of.

II. The passage cited by the *Doctor* out of *Prov. i. 33.* in the *Greek* translation, will not prove that *ῥῆσασθαι ἀφόβως* is a proper Phrase, for these are *Wisdoms* words: *But whoso hearkeneth unto me, shall dwell safely, and at peace, and free from fear of evil,* which the *Septuagint* render by *ἡσυχάσει ἀφόβως ἀπὸ παντὸς κακῆ*, that is, *he shall fear no evil.* The rest of the passages which he compares with this place in *St. Luke*, are foreign to the purpose.

## C H A P. II.

Verf. 1. I. **O**F this passage in *St. Luke*, the learned *Jac. Perizonius* Note b. has treated in a particular Discourse by it self, wherein he has confuted *Dr. Hammond* and others opinion at large, and, if I am not mistaken, solidly. He affirms that *St. Luke's* words in the 2 *verse* ought to be rendred thus: *hæc descriptio ante facta est, quam præesset Syriæ Quirinus, this enrolling was made before Quirinus was Governour of Syria;* and having examined his reasons, I freely subscribe to them, and refer the Reader to the *Discourse* it self.

II. Our Author has committed a great mistake in his paraphrase upon the 2 *verse*, where he tells us that at that time, *i. e.* in the reign of *Herod the Great*, *Palestine* was under *Syria*; whereas it is most certain that the King of *Judæa* had no dependence upon the Proconsul of *Syria*, and that *Judæa* was not a province, at that time. This appears evidently from *Josephus* Antiq. Jud. Lib. xviii. c. 1. where he tells us that *Judæa* was not made a Province till after *Archelaus's* banishment. But perhaps our Learned Author fell into the same Mistake with *Eusebius*, who says that *Josephus* made mention of the same registering which *St. Luke* here speaks of, because he affirmed it to have been made by *Quirinus*, whose name is mentioned by *St. Luke*; for which mistake nevertheless.

Chapter theless, he has long since been corrected by learned Men. The passage which *Eusebius* refers to in *Josephus* is at the end of his seventeenth book of *Antiq.* in these words: τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελαίου χώρας ὑποτελής προσνεμηθεῖσι τῆς Συρίας, πέμπεται Κυρήνῃσι ἀπὸ Καίσαρος ἀνὴρ ὑπαπικὸς ἀποπημοσύλῳ τε ἐν Συρίᾳ, καὶ τῆς Ἀρχελαίου ἀποδοσύλῳ δίκον: after *Archelaus's* country was made tributary and added to *Syria*, *Cesar* sent *Quirinus*, one who had been *Consul*, to enroll *Syria*, and sell *Archelaus's* own house. See also the beginning of the next book.

Verf. 3. Εἰς τὴν Ἰδέαν πόλιν ] This was not only the Custom among the *Jews*, as has been observed by *Grotius*, but also among the *Romans*, as appears by these words in *Livy*, lib. 42. cap. 10. *Censa sunt civium Romanorum capita ducenta sexaginta novem millia & quindecim. Minor aliquanto numerus, quia L. Postumius Consul pro concione edixerat, qui socium Latini nominis ex edicto C. Claudii Consulis, redire in civitates suas debuissent, ne quis eorum Romæ, sed omnes in suis civitatibus censerentur.* There were enrolled of *Roman Citizens* two hundred sixty nine thousand and fifteen; a number somewhat less than ordinary, because the *Consul L. Posthumius* had publicly proclaimed that those of their *Confederates* who should have returned into their respective *Cities*, pursuant to the Order made by the *Consul C. Claudius*, should not any of them be enrolled at *Rome*, but in the several *Cities* to which they belonged.

Verf. 8. Ἀγραυλῆντες. ] From the *Shepherds* having spent the night abroad in the open Field, it cannot be interred that the *Birth of Christ* was not in *December*, as *G. J. Vossius* has very well shewn, in a small *Treatise de Nat. Christi*. But the *Antients* however not agreeing in their *Opinions* about the day, nor so much as the *year*, in which *Christ* was born, one might be ready perhaps to question the *Authority* of *Justin* and *Tertullian*, who tell us that the *Tables* on which this enrolling here spoken of was made, were extant in their time. For from those *Records* this whole matter might easily have been known, and it would have been an *inexcusable neglect* in the *Christians* of that age, who could have looked into those publick *Registers*, and transmitted to *Posterity* what they had there read, and yet would not do it. But I am afraid that *Tertullian* and others spake only by *guess*, because it was not certainly known that those *Records* were lost. But this is not a place to treat of this matter.

Verf. 14. Note e. ] The *Alexandrian* and *Cambridg* Copies which are both venerable for their antiquity, and the *Latin* and *Gothick* Interpreters have that reading which the *Doctor* here expounds. And therefore it is not true, as *Grotius* says, that all the Copies consent in reading *ἰουδαία*, tho the greatest part read it so.

Verf.



Verf. 35. *Note f.* ] It is easy to conjecture what was the occasion of that grief that *like a sword pierced through the heart* of this holy Woman. For how could she see without extreme sorrow and trouble, almost all the *Jews* persecuting her Son, and that with such implacable fury, as to nail him at last to a Cross? As for the *ψυχή ἐστὶν*, that is either *Mary her self*, according to the genius of the Hebrew, or if you please her *heart* which might metaphorically be said to be struck through, when she beheld her Son crucified. So in *Statius Lib. x. Thebaid.* a Father hearing his Sons life demanded, received the sentence.

Chapter  
III.  
~

*Non secus ac torta trajectus cuspide pectus  
—— exanimis.*

There was no need of interpreting *ψυχή* here to be *the sensitive Soul*, to give light to an easy phrase, used also in other Languages.

C H A P. III.

Verf. 1. **T***Ἡγεσχεστῶ* ] The *Doctor* interprets this in his paraphrase thus: *Governour of that fourth division of the kingdom called Galilee*; by which words there is no body but would think that *Herod* was here equal'd with *Pilate*, and was a President sent by *Tiberius*. But the difference between a *Governour* or *President* and a *Tetrarch* he explains in part in his Annotations. He should have added that this *Herodes Antipas* was in possession of this Tetrarchship in pursuance of *Herod the Great's* will, and did not send the revenue of that territory to *Rome* as the Roman Presidents did, but converted it to his own use. He depended indeed upon *Cæsar*, against whose will he could not have took possession of his inheritance, and who could take it away from him when ever he pleased, and at last did so. But he was not however the Emperors tributary, but his friend; and wanted nothing but the title of one to make him a King. And upon this account *Josephus Antiq. Jud. Lib. 17. Cap. 10.* calls him *Ἡγεσχεστῶς*. I make this remark because our Author seems in another place, by an intolerable impropriety of speech, to give *Herod* the title of *a Roman Governour*, as if he had not ruled his Principality in his own name but in the *Emperors*. See Note on *Matt. xxii. 16.*

Verf. 23. *Ἐξαρξήσας*.] The force of this word is not sufficiently expressed by the *Doctor* in his Paraphrase. *St. Luke's* words are to be rendred thus: *And Jesus himself when he began to execute his office, or*

Chapter to preach the Gospel, was about thirty years old, and, as was supposed, IV. was the Son of Joseph, &c. In the last words, ὧν ὡς ἐνομιζέτο is all one with καὶ ἐνομιζέτο, for the Participle ὧν is nothing but a form of passing over to the next words, and they who interpret it otherwise make a difficulty where there is none. Ἦν ὧν ἀρχόμενος cannot be said in Greek for *he began*, which yet is commonly here supposed, tho without producing any such Example. I should paraphrase therefore this Passage thus: “When Jesus first began to preach the Gospel, which  
“ he did a little after he had been baptized by John, he was about  
“ thirty years old; and was of the Stock of David, his Mother being  
“ of the same Family, and Joseph her Husband, who was the Son  
“ of, &c.

## C H A P. IV.

Verf. 8. **E**ἴπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς γέγεννηται] Besides what has been said by Grotius to confirm the truth of this reading, it may be farther observed, that it is read so in Beza's Cambridge Copy, and three others which he mentions, besides that which the Authors of the Coptick and Gothick Versions made use of.

Verf. 9. Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ] The Article ὁ is wanting in the Alexandrian and Beza's antient Copy. It is not expressed in the 3d Verse, nor in Matth. iv. 6. And therefore Beza, who uses to render that Article by a demonstrative Pronoun, has here omitted it, and told us in his Notes that he suspected it. It was possible that the Devil might have known it to have been affirmed by Mary and Joseph, that Jesus was conceived without the assistance of a Man, and by the power of the Holy Ghost; and that for that reason the Angel who had foretold his Birth, had said that he should be called the Son of God: but it was possible also, that he might question whether that was true or no, and so be willing to tempt our Saviour himself, that he might be more fully satisfied about it. And accordingly the Temptation may be thus expressed; “If thou art the Son of God, and  
“ not of a Man, as thy Mother says, cast thy self down from hence;  
“ for since thou may'st put thy trust in God thy Father, there is no  
“ thing that thou needest to fear, because it is written in Psal. xci.  
“ concerning those that trust in God, that he has commanded his  
“ Angels to take care of them.



C H A P. V.

Chapter  
V.

Verf. 27.

**T**ΕΛΩΝΙΩ ὀνόματι Λεβὶ ] St. *Luke* here follows S. *Mark*; but St. *Matthem*, Chap. ix. 9. mentions his own name.

2.14.

It is supposed by most, and by our Author here among the rest, that *Levi* was but another name for S. *Matthem*; but this is confuted by *Grotius* by divers considerable Arguments, in his Notes on *Matt.* ix. which I wonder that Dr. *Hammond* should take no notice of, but follow the common Opinion. St. *Matthem* and *Levi* were perhaps Companions in the same *Custom* or *Tollhouse*, and dwelt together. And *Christ* seems to have called them both, and to have been entertained at a Feast by them both at their own house. But *Levi* was not chosen to be one of the twelve Apostles. And yet why St. *Mark* and *Luke* pass by *Matthem*, and make mention of *Levi*, I confess I can give no reason.

C H A P. VI.

Verf. 13. I.  
Note c.

**T**Hat *Christ* was commissioned and authorized by God to found and govern the Church, and the Apostles by *Christ*, cannot be matter of doubt

Chapter  
VI.

with any Christian: but I question whether the importance of the word Ἀποστολῆ be such, as that the Authority which belonged to the Apostolical Office can by Grammatical Reasons be thence deduced. *Mission* does not, to speak properly, signify *Authority*, but only the purpose or action of *sending* by which there is a greater or lesser Power conferred upon the person sent, according as seems good to the person that sends him. Nor can the person that is so sent, assume to himself the Authority of him that sent him, merely because he sent him, but only because when he was sent, he received such or such a *Commission*, which he is obliged also not to exceed. This our *Author* seems indeed to have perceived, tho but obscurely, whilst he affirms and denies in the same Annotation that the word *Apostle* is a Title of Dignity.

II. The *Talmudists* term'd them שליחים, or שליחי הצבור *Messengers of the Congregation*, that were sent by the Synagogues on any business whatsoever, and who among other Offices which they performed, offered up Prayers for those who could not pray for themselves, in the Synagogue, especially at the beginning of the new year, and on the day of expiation. See *Joan. Buxtorf*, in *Lexic. Talmud.* and *Camp. Vitringa* de *Synagog.* Lib. 3. Part 2. c. 11. But there were never any Tithes either due, or paid to the *Synagogues*, but only to the *Temple*, as long as it stood; to which also it was that the ἱερεῖς spoken of in

Chapter *Philo*, brought money, and not to the Synagogues. Thus *Philo* p. 785.  
 VII. *Ed. Gen.* faith of *Augustus*: ἠπίσταντο καὶ χρήματα συναγαγόντας ἀπὸ ἧβ' ἀπερχομένων  
 ἱερέων καὶ πέμποντάς εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα διὰ ἧβ' τοῖς θυσίαις ἀναξόντων: he knew that they  
 gathered the consecrated moneys under the name of first-fruits, and sent them to  
 Jerusalem by those who were going to offer up sacrifices there. The like he  
 repeats in p. 801. where he calls those persons ἱεροπομπῶν.

Verf. 22. Note c. ] Tho it be true that the word ὄνομα is sometimes  
 taken for a man, yet the phrase ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα ὡς πονηρὸν does not signify  
 to cast out a man as wicked, but to defame, as *Grotius* has evidently prov-  
 ed, whom the Reader may consult.

Verf. 30. Note f. ] It is true that the person here intended is a poor  
 man, who makes use of what is anothers; but that the Phrase ἀπαρτεῖν  
 τὸ ἐαυτοῦ signifies to require *Usury*, or αἰεῖν by it self to receive upon use,  
 I am not apt to believe, if those words be considered conjunctly. For  
 it is not all one as to the finding out the signification of words, what  
 connexion or relation they have with one another. I rather chuse  
 therefore to understand this Precept of *Christ* thus; That those who  
 can be without what another person, who absolutely needs it, posses-  
 ses of theirs, tho it be unjustly detained from them, ought rather to  
 recede from their right, than by taking what is their own again, re-  
 duce a poor distressed man to his last shifts. Indeed if a rich man  
 should unjustly keep back what is anothers, which he stands in no need  
 of, it would not be the part of a liberal Man, but a Fool, to neglect  
 his right; but there cannot be a more generous or liberal Action, than  
 to connive at such a fault in a poor man. And this being a very good  
 sense of this Precept, and agreeable to the usual signification of every  
 word in it, I do not see why we should recur to any other.

## CHAPTER VII.

Verf. 3. **O**UR Author might have added, that it was ordinary  
 Note a. in Scripture to bring in Messengers speaking in the  
 same words that those would have done who sent  
 them, if they had been present. See my *Index* to the *Pentateuch*, upon  
 the word *Nuntius*.

Verf. 29. Ἐδικαίωσαν θεόν ] *i. e.* They acknowledged *God* to be just,  
 and themselves to be guilty, and that they deserved the destruction  
 which *John* had denounced against them. Of the verb *δικαίω* see our  
 Notes upon *Rom.* iii. 4.

Verf. 30. Τὴν βελτίω τὴν θεοῦ ] *i. e.* They rejected *Gods* purpose of re-  
 forming them by *John's* Ministry. See *Acts* xx. 27.

Verf. 44. Note c. See my Notes on *Gen.* xviii. 4.

CHAPTER





Verf. 3. I. **I**T is true indeed that the meats at Feasts were divided and distributed to the Guests by the *δᾶκνοι*, or *δέλοι δακνεῖντες*, *ministring Servants*; but he is mistaken, whoever thinks with Dr. Hammond, that the Verb *δακνεῖν* signifies this particular action rather than any other service, nor do the places alledged by him prove it. Servants had various employments, which were all called *δακονία*, as among the Latins *ministeria*. He that divided the Meats, was not called by the general name of *δάκονος*, but *δακνειῖς* or *χειροειῖς* in Greek, and in Latin *scissor* or *carptor*. See Laur. Pignorius, and Aus. Poëma in *Comment. de Servis*. The Verb *δακονίσει* in Luke xii. 37. does not signify only to divide to every one his portion of meat, but any errand or employment that used to be given to Servants, whilst their Masters were feasting. The same I say of *Matth. xx. 28.* and *Mark x. 45.* which the Doctor puts a forced sense upon, when they might be most fitly explained, according to the constant signification almost of that Verb *δακνεῖν*.

II. Our Learned Author had not sufficiently examined the passage he speaks of in St. Matthew; for it is manifest that *κατακυριεύειν* there signifies to exercise Dominion or Kingly Authority over *Subjects*, and not that of a *Master* over Servants; the Discourse not being about Masters and Servants, but about Kings and Subjects: *Ye know that the Princes of the Nations, τὰς ἀρχοντας τῶν ἐθνῶν, exercise Dominion over them.* It follows; and *those that are great exercise Authority upon them, κατεξουσιάζειν αὐτῶν*, such an Authority as belongs to a Vice-Roy, or the King's Lieutenant. Christ here forbids the Governours of his Church to assume a Regal Power over Christians, which they do whensoever they put them to death, or persecute such as cannot say just as they say: or to take any such Authority upon them, which, on pretence of acting in the name of the Supreme Governor *Jesus Christ*, they might easily abuse to the destruction of Christians. In fine, he would have nothing done in an imperious domineering way, but all by persuasion and entreaty.

III. The *δᾶκνοι* in *John ii.* are those that served the Guests in all things which they wanted, as well as in distributing to them Meat and Drink. It is not from this latter that the Deacons of the Church were so called, as by a Metaphor taken from a Feast, but rather from a borrowed signification of the word *δακονία*, which is taken sometimes for *furnishing*, i. e. *χορηγία* *supplying*, or *delivering out*. And the rea-  
son

Chapter IX: son of the Metaphor's being taken from hence, seems to be because  
 IX: Servants or Ministers, at their Master's command, used to bring out  
 whatever was necessary, not only for a Feast, but all other uses of  
 Life. But this signification of that word seems to have obtained only  
 after the purity of the *Greek Language* had bin lost; for in the anti-  
 entest Writers, it is certain that διακονεῖν is never used for χρηματίζειν, nor  
 διακονία for χρηματία. And in like manner the *Latins* have altered the sig-  
 nification of their words ministrare and subministrare, which are fre-  
 quently of late used for suppeditare, to supply. Perhaps also in this  
 place there is a *Latinism*, of which kind there are a great many in the  
 New Testament. But I leave this to be considered by the Learned.

### CHAPTER IX.

Verf. 12. **T**HE Verb καταλύειν signifying properly and literally  
 Note b. to loose, it is much more likely that it was used me-  
 taphorically for *baiting* or *lodging* by the way, from  
 the custom of those who use to travel in Coaches or Chariots, and  
 whenever they light and betake themselves to any Inn, have their *Horses*  
*loosed* and carried into a Stable; and because the word κατάλυσις came  
 thence to signify the end of any Journey, therefore καταλύειν was used  
 in general for *leaving off*, or *putting an end to*, and amongst other things,  
*a Sea Voyage*. The Verb καταλύεσθαι is so far from being properly said  
 of a Ship's leaving off sailing, if we consider the natural and primi-  
 tive signification of that word, that on the contrary they ought then  
 rather to be said ἀναδέσθαι, to be tied fast or laid up, and καταλύεσθαι to be  
*loosed* when they are put to Sea. And therefore also the Greeks do not  
 use the Verb καταλύειν simply, in the signification of *arriving* or coming  
 into Port, but the phrase καταλύειν ἢ πλεῖν. It's true, our Author fol-  
 lows *Phavorinus*, who says, Καταλύς τις εἰς πανδοχεῖον, ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς ἢ κατα-  
 λόντων ἀπὸ πηλάγους εἰς λιμένα τὰ τρεταί. But this observation of that, other-  
 wise very learned, Grammarian, is contrary both to the use and genius  
 of the *Greek Language*; nor is it always safe to rely upon his Autho-  
 rity. And he himself also confirms in another place what I have said,  
 by a much better remark: Καταλύειν, φαίη ἡ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ξενοδοχεῖου λαμβάνουσι.  
 Ἐκ τούτου λέγεται τὸ κατάλυμα, ἐν ᾧ διακασθὴ πρὸς ἑσπέρα ἢ τὰ φρετὰ λύονται:  
 Καταλύειν is taken from lodging in an Inn; and hence comes κατάλυμα for an  
 Inn, because therein the Beasts or their burdens were loosed. He seems to  
 have taken this observation from *Eustathius* on *Odyss.* p. 1480. Ed. Rom.  
 who says there the same. And *Suidas* whom the *Doctor* has elsewhere  
 (see Not. upon *Mat.* xiv. 3.) commended for his great skill in Gram-  
 mar,



mar, when there was no occasion for it, plainly favours what I say: *κατα-* Chapter  
*λύσαι*, says he, *ἔχει Θεωροῦσθαι ὅτι ἦν ὀχυμένων ὅτι ἄρματῶν: καταλύσαι* in Thu- IX.  
*cidides is said of those who ride in Chariots; καταύγειν δὲ, ὅτι νεώε, & καταύγειν,*  
*of those who travel in Ships, viz. who are come to the place to which*  
*they were bound. Which is said in so many words by the Scholiast up-*  
*on Thucydides, Lib. 1. p. 89. Ed. F. Porti. These things being evi-*  
*dent, it must be observed by the way, that before ever we can safely*  
*make use of the antient Grammarians for finding out the significations*  
*of words, the genius and use of the Greek Language must be known*  
*some other way, viz. by a long and careful reading of the antient*  
*Writers, both in Verse and Prose; for otherwise he that hath no*  
*more knowledg of the Greek Tongue than what he has attained to by*  
*reading the New Testament, and a few of the Fathers, and that not*  
*so much with a design to understand the Language, as for the sake of*  
*Divinity, and only occasionally consults the old Lexicons, will fre-*  
*quently be led into Mistakes. And I wish this could not be said of*  
*Dr. Hammond, who was otherwise a very excellent Divine, and a man*  
*of an extraordinary Judgment.*

Verf. 31. Note c.] In my last Note I undertook to confute our Au-  
 thor, because I thought he was in a mistake; but in this I shall confirm  
 his Opinion because I think it to be true, and agreeable both to the  
 use of Scripture and the Greek Language. For the word *ἔξοδος*, where  
 the discourse is concerning a King, signifies his *going forth* to make  
 War with any one, as *Christ* did with the unbelieving *Jews*. So 2 *Sam.*  
*xi. 1. at the time when Kings go forth, εἰς τὸ καιρὸν τὸ ἐξοδίας ἢ βασιλέων,*  
*is very well rendered by the Vulgar, Tempore quo solent Reges ad bella*  
*procedere, at the time when Kings use to go forth to battel. The same*  
*word which is there used ἐξοδος, the Septuagint translate by ἐκστρατεύω,*  
*Prov. xxx. 27. So also the Greeks used this word, as H. Stephanus,*  
*out of Herodotus, Xenophon, and Herodian, shews. Add likewise these*  
*Passages to the same purpose out of Dionysius Halicarnass. Antiq. Rom.*  
*Lib. 8. p. 303. πρῶτῳ ἐκστρατεύσασίμῳ ἐξοδὸν κομιδῆν νέῳ ὄν, the first Expedi-*  
*tion that I served in was when I was very young. Lib. 11. p. 734.*  
*τῷ ἐξοδὸν μὴ κωλύειν ἢ καταγεφέντων, not to hinder the going out of the Soul-*  
*diers to battel. In the same sense he useth ἐξοδὸν ποιῆσαι for to make an*  
*Expedition, Lib. 8. p. 531. So the old Glosses, Ἐξοδος εἰς πόλεμον, an*  
*expedition. Ἐξοδος ἐκδημητικὴ στρατιωτῶν, a military Expedition, or the go-*  
*ing out of Souldiers to war.*

And it cannot seem strange that the Vengeance that *Christ* was a-  
 bout to take upon his Enemies the *Jews*, should be represented by his  
 going out to battel against them; for also in the Old Testament the pu-  
 nishments

Chapter X. punishments which *God* threatned to inflict upon wicked men, are often represented in the same manner. So *Iſa. xlii. 13.* where there is the same Phrase made use of as here, it is said, *The Lord shall go forth as a mighty Man, he shall stir up jealousy like a Souldier; he shall cry and roar, he shall prevail against his Enemies.* Which might be rendered into Greek very well thus; ὁ Γενναίος ὡς πρὸς ἀνδρείου ἀνὴρ ἐξέρχεται πολεῖσθαι, &c. See also *Chap. xiii.* of the same Prophet, where *God* is represented as leading an Army of the *Medes* against *Babylon*.

*Ibid.* "Ὁν ἔμελλε πληρῆν] The *Evangelist* might have expressed it by ὃν ἔμελλε ποιῆν; but the reason of his using the word πληρῆν was, because this Expedition of *Christ* against the *Jews* was foretold by *Malachi* in *Chap. iv. 1.*

## C H A P. X.

Verſ. 12. **E**N τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται.] Altho the *Sodomites* had been punished long ago, and still suffer by a fearful expectation of further Vengeance from *God*, yet it seems by this place that they will not have their utmost punishment inflicted upon them till the universal Judgment. And the same we are to think of all the rest of the wicked; see *verſ. 14.* of this *Chapter*. And upon this account it is, that the punishments of bad men are frequently referred to that day, not only in the Scripture, but also in the Books of the Antient Fathers. Read to this purpose the excellent Discourse of *Lud. Capellus* about the State of the Soul after Death.

Verſ. 18. Ἐθεύριον ἢ Σατανᾶν ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ πικρῶντα] i. e. I was thinking and representing to my self before-hand, the destruction that is suddenly to befall the Devil's Kingdom. The overthrow of the Devil's Kingdom is described by his falling from *Heaven*; because as being lifted up to *Heaven*, signifies the greatest Glory, as we may see here by the 15th *Verse*, where it is said, *And thou Capernaum which hast been exalted to Heaven, &c.* so the falling from *Heaven*, or being thrust down to *Hell*, signifies the losing of that former Glory. So, *Iſa. xiv. 12.* the King of *Babylon* being dethroned and dead, the other deceased Kings of the Nations are represented as meeting him, and saying amongst other things; *How art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning?* i. e. How camest thou to be dethroned and killed? So the *Latins* also used to express themselves. Thus *Cicero* saith of *Antonus*, who had deprived his Collegue of all his Authority, *Phil. 2. Collegam quidem de cælo detraxisti.* And, *Lib. 1. ad Atticum, Ep. 20.* Speaking of *Pompey*



Pompey he saith; *Quia deciderat ex astris, lapsus potius quam progressus videbatur.* Chapter XI.

~

C H A P. XI.

Verf. 7. Παιδία.] Tho this word παιδία doth for the most part signify Children; yet I should chuse here to interpret it Servants, so as to make it answerable to the Hebrew עֶבֶד which signifies both Child and Servant, and is rendered δούλον by the Septuagint in 1 Sam. xxi. 5. where the Discourse is not about Children, but about Servants: Παῖς & παιδαῖον often signify the same.

Verf. 42. Πᾶν λάχανον.] If this be interpreted according to the Doctrin of the Talmud, the Adjective ἐδώδμων must be understood; for the Jews paid Tithes of such Herbs only as were eaten, and not of all sorts: see Selden of Tithes, Chap. 2. S. 7.

Verf. 47. Note c. I am apt to think that it is the very adorning of the Sepulchres it self, with which the Jews are here upbraided, tho they did it with a contrary design, as if this had been a symbolical expression of their cruelty. See Grotius upon Mat. xxiii. 29. what our Author says here is forced.

C H A P. XII.

Verf. 13. Ἰδοὺ σκαλε, &c.] The Doctor follows Grotius in his Paraphrase upon this Verse; but if we carefully consider the words we shall find, that the Man who here makes his complaint to Christ, does not desire him to perform the Office of a Judg or Arbitrator between him and his Brother, but to make use of his prophetic Authority to oblige his Brother who detained the whole Inheritance, to divide it with him. But Christ tells them that such civil Matters did not belong to his Office. Tho he might have occasionally concerned himself in them, yet he declined it; not that he feared the ingratitude or ill-will of the contending Parties, if they were not both satisfied; but as I rather think, lest he should be said by the Pharisees, to lessen the Magistrates Authority, and be ambitious of Government: See Note on Mat. viii. 4. Chapter XII.

~

Verf. 19. Ψυχὴ ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ.] Seneca Ep. c. 1. hath a very elegant Passage to this purpose, concerning such another man as Christ here speaks of: In ipso actu, says he, bene currentium rerum, in ipso procurrentis pecuniæ impetu, raptus est. He was snatched away in the full career of his Fortune.

Inferre nunc, Melibæe, pyros, pone ordine vites.

*Quam stultum est ætatem disponere? ne crastino quidem dominamur. O quanta dementia est spes longas inchoantium! Emam, ædificabo, credam, exigam, honores geram, tum demum lassam & plenam senectutem in otium referam. Omnia mihi crede, etiam felicibus dubia sunt. How foolish a thing is it for a man to dispose of his life, when even so much as to morrow is not in our power? O how great is the madness of those who propose to themselves designs that must be a long while in compassing! who say within themselves, I will buy, I will build, I will trust out, I will gather in again, I will go through such and such Honours and Dignities, and then at length spend a full and tired old Age in rest and ease. Alas, the most fortunate are sure of possessing nothing long.*

C H A P. XIII.

Verf. 23. I. **T**HE Verb σωζω properly signifies to preserve safe, and comes from Σως safe. It uses for the most part to be applied to bodies, and such things as relate to the Body. The Hebrew Verb ישׁוּ has the same signification, as appears by abundance of places. So Psal. xxxvi. 6. Thou preservest man and beast, יְשׁוּ is rendered by the Septuag. ἀνθρώπους καὶ κτήνη σώσεις. So the word Σωτῆρ is taken by St. Paul in 1 Tim. iv. 14. where, speaking of God, he says, He is the Saviour of all men, but especially of them that believe. Our Author produces a great many more Examples.

II. Afterwards this word was applied to the safety of the Mind; in which sense also we find it used by the Heathen Writers, out of whom I shall set down some Instances which will confirm what Dr. Hammond says. Thus Cebes in his Tab. p. 11. Ed. Amst. Gronov. speaking of the Genius which he supposed every one had to direct and instruct him, saith; δεικνύει ποίαν ὁδὸν αὐτὸς δεῖ βαδίζειν, εἰ ΣΩΖΕΣΘΑΙ μέλλουσιν ἐν βίῳ: it shews what way they are to take if they would be *SAVED* in life, i. e. if they would be preserved from those Calamities and Evils with which Vice is usually attended. And, pag. 13. speaking of the Passions that were drawn in the shapes of Women, and which are the causes either of Mens safety or destruction, he saith; πῶς δὲ ἀπάγουσιν αὐτὸς; but whither do they lead them? Αἱ μὲν εἰς τὸ σωζέσθαι, ἕρην, αἱ δὲ εἰς τὸ σπύλλουσαι: Some lead them to safety, and others to ruin. And, pag. 25. speaking of one that embraced the opinion which led to true Learning, he saith; καθαρθεὶς ἕκ' αὐτῆς σώζεται, καὶ μακάριον καὶ εὐδαίμων γίνεται ἐν

παντὶ



παντὶ τῷ βίῳ: being purged thereby, he is saved and made blessed and happy Chapter  
 all his life; that is, he is preserved from vice, and the miseries that ac- XIV.  
 company it. And, pag. 43. he that is represented as the explainer of  
 the Table, says to his inquisitive Hearers, after they had promised to  
 live according to what they had heard; Τετραρὲν σωθήσεσθε, If you do so  
 you shall be saved. So *Plutarch* in his Book of the difference between a  
 Friend and a Flatterer, towards the end; Διογένης ἔλεγε ὅτι τὰ μέλλοντα σώ-  
 ζεσθαι δεῖ φίλους ἀγαθὸς ἢ διαπύρους ἐχθρὸς ὑπάρχειν: *Diogenes* said, That he that  
 would be saved, must either have good Friends, or furious Enemies. For  
*Diogenes*, who was a despiser of Riches, and all those things that re-  
 lated to the Body, considered nothing but the safety of the Mind. I  
 have met with several other Examples to the same purpose, which I  
 cannot at present remember, but these are more than enough.

## C H A P. XIV.

Verf. 23. **A** Νεῖμασον εἰσελθεῖν.] See *Grotius* upon this place, and  
 how he corrects *St. Austin* for his most shameful a-  
 buse of it, for it deserves to be called no better. And  
 yet there are some that resolve still to follow *St. Austin*, contrary to all  
 the rules of Grammar, the nature of the Christian Religion, and com-  
 mon Sense it self. Nay, there is a late Enthusiastical upstart, a con-  
 temptible Woman's follower, that has foolishly attempted to skim over  
 and defend *St. Austin's* Opinion, tho he either never read him, or never  
 understood him; and he every where falls foul upon the Criticks for  
 not interpreting the words of Scripture according to the wild fancies  
 of crackbrain'd Women, but according to the nature of things them-  
 selves, and the constant use of Languages. But this Passage alone is  
 enough to shew us of what advantage Grammar, or if you please *Cri-*  
*ticism*, is to the right interpretation of Scripture, seeing *St. Austin*,  
 who was otherwise a very ingenious man, but an absolute stranger to  
 this sort of Learning, did so wretchedly force and misinterpret this  
 Passage, and make use of it to defend the most cruel Opinion imagi-  
 nable. Add to what *Grotius* has said upon this place, my Notes upon  
*Gen. xix. 13.* If there were any sort of force here intended, it must  
 be that which God makes use of by his severe and afflictive Providen-  
 ces, which do often constrain, as it were, wicked men to live better  
 than they did before, tho gentler methods had been ineffectual to re-  
 form them. There is an elegant Passage, and a true one (if we do  
 but change the word *Gods* into *God*) to this purpose, in *Aeschylus* in  
*Agamemn.* not far from the beginning:

Καὶ παρ' ΑΚΟΝΤΑΣ ἦλθε σωφρονεῖν,  
 Δαιμόνων δέ τε χείρας, βιαίως  
 Σέλιμα σμῶν ἠμίνων.

Even the unwilling have grown wise by force, through a particular favour of the Gods, who sit in a venerable Seat. But whatever God does, doubtless men ought not to force their fellow Creatures to be of their Perswasion.

Verf. 34. Τὸ ἄλας, &c.] Because Proverbs, and proverbial forms of Speech are commonly grounded upon what is really done, when the matter of them is something possible. I have been ready sometimes to imagin, that the τὸ ἄλας here is not to be understood of *Salt* properly speaking, because that which is here said of Salt, neither does nor ever can happen to it. For, *First*, Salt is never infatuated,† *μωραίνεταί.* *Secondly*, Salt which keeps its favour, is not fit either for the Land, or for the Dungbil. *Thirdly*, When it is infatuated, it is not CAST OUT. What if we should suppose therefore that Wood-ashes was by the Husbandmen called Salt? They, it's certain, are, 1. *infatuated*, if they are washed or soak'd in Water, as it happens when they are made use of for the cleansing of foul Linen. And, 2. after they have been thus soaked in water, they are unfit to be used as a means to enrich the ground, either alone or mixed with dung, because it was only the Salt that was in them before their being so soaked, which made them proper for that purpose. And if they be spread upon the Land before the Salt is washed out, they serve very much to make it fruitful, either by themselves, or else mixed with dung. And, 3. when they are infatuated, that is, when all the Salt Particles are washed out of them, they used rather to be cast out into the way or street, than upon a dungbil or the fields. But I confess I can produce no Example to shew that these Wood-ashes were called Salt, and therefore I affirm nothing peremptorily. But let the Learned consider what there may be in this Conjecture.

## C H A P. XV.

Verf. 16. **O**F this Fruit *Salmasius* hath treated at large in his  
 Note b. *Exercit. Plin. in Solin. p. 326. & seqq. Ed. Ultraj.*  
 who may be consulted by those that are curious about  
 such matters. However it is no where said by *Pliny* that this Fruit  
 was ordinary among the *Egyptians*; nay, on the contrary, he denies,

*The error is certainly mistaken: see Mr. Ingham's account of the hills of salt near Aleppo.*



as *Theophrastus* had done before him, that it grew in *Egypt*, Lib. 13. Chapter c. 8. but affirms that it was common in *Syria*; so that in this also our Author is mistaken. Consult *Salmasius*.

XV.



Verf. 22. Εξενέσχετε τῷ σολῶν ——— ὁπτε δακτυλίου.] *H. Grotius* thinks, that as we ought not to be superstitious in searching for Allegories in every part of a Parable; so neither ought we to overlook them when they are suggested by the agreement of what is said in Parables, with other places of Scripture. And therefore if we believe him, the *σολῶν*, or *Robe*, here signifies that constant innocency of Life, which by God's Grace, a Person who has receiv'd so much mercy from him, is enabled to persevere in. And for this he refers us to *Rev.* vi. 11. & vii. 13, 14. & xix. 8. Now I do not indeed deny, but that a white Robe is taken sometimes for an Emblem of Innocence; but I say that there is nothing said of that here; and that the bestowing of the precious Robe, signifies the Father's Joy for the return of his Son: so that we are not to consider the Robe in it self, but only the Father's Affection in giving it. He tells us also, as the Antients have done before him, that by the *Ring* we are to understand the Gift of the Holy Ghost, by which we are sealed, as the Apostle *Paul* speaks *2 Cor.* i. 21. But this part of the Parable likewise is only a farther description of the Father's Joy for the safe return of his prodigal Son, whom he thought to have been lost, and mourned upon that account. And to represent this Joy to us, *Christ* makes use of Similitudes taken from the received custom; for at that time a Superior could not confer a greater Honour upon his Inferior, than by bestowing a *Ring* and a *Robe* upon him. Of which we have an Example in *Gen.* xli. 42. See my Notes on the place. The best way therefore had been to look only to the main scope of the Parable, which is sufficiently plain, and not to insist upon the significancy of every particular word: For whatsoever may be said of that kind, tho' not altogether frivolous, is certainly besides *Christ's* design; and has no other foundation than the ingenious fancy of the Interpreter. But that learned Expositor had put almost all the principal Observations which he had to make upon the three first Gospels, in his Notes upon *St. Matthew*, and therefore he could not be charge upon the two following; and sometimes, that he might not be wholly silent, he was forced to say a great many far-fetch'd things, and now and then intermix Allegories in his Annotations. Tho' I would not have this taken as an Argument that I have the least undervaluing thought of that incomparable Man.

Verf. 9. **I**T is most true, that there are a great many Verbs used in the Scripture without any *Nominative case* to them; and that therefore we must supply that defect in our own thoughts, unless they be impersonal Verbs. See my Notes upon *Gen. xi. 9.* and my *Index* to the *Pentat.* on the word *Persona.* But this Observation can have no place in *1 Sam. xxi. 8.* because it holds only when the Verb is in the third person *masculine*, and in that place it is in the *feminine.*

Verf. 12. *Note c.* This interpretation of *ἀλλότειον* is, with the learned Doctor's leave, a mere nicety. The word *ἀλλότειον* is taken here in a Philosophical sense, for that which does not belong to the Mind, and is such as may be taken away from us against our will, as *Riches.* And on the other hand, that which *Christ* calls *ὑμέτερον*, is that which pertained to the minds of those whom he spake to, and could not be taken away from them against their wills, *viz.* the Truths of the Gospel. The meaning of *Christ* in this place is, that those who abused their Riches, and could not obtain of themselves to employ them to better purposes, were unfit to receive the true Gospel-riches as they ought, and would not use them better than they did the other. Nothing is more common among the *Philosophers*, and especially the *Stoicks*, than this distinction of *ἀλλότεια* & *ἡμέτερον*. *Priscianus* upon this place has given us some Examples of it; and a great many more might be added out of *Epictetus* only. Thus, *Enchirid.* Cap. 1. telling us what things are not in our power, he instances in the Body, Riches, Honours, Empires, and in a word, saith he, *ὅσα ἢ ἡμέτερα ἔργα, every thing but our own Works.* And, *Cap. 2.* he says, that those things which have their dependence on us, cannot by any one be hindered; but those which are not in our power, are weak, obnoxious to servitude, and a great many impediments; in fine, they are *ἀλλότεια*. And, *Cap. 3.* he hath these words; *Μέμνησο ἕν ὅτι ἐάν τὰ φύσιν δ' ἄλλα ἐλευθέρῃ οἰκίῃ, καὶ τὰ ἀλλότεια ἴδια ἐμποδισθήσῃ. — ἐάν ὃ τὸ σὸν μόνον οἰκίῃ σὸν εἶναι, τὸ ὃ ἀλλότειον, ὅσπερ ἐστίν, ἀλλότειον, ἕδειξέ σε ἀναγκάσει, &c.* Remember therefore, that if thou thinkest those things which are servile to be free, and those things which are *ἀλλότεια*, another's, to be thy own, thou wilt be hindered, — but if thou countest that only to be thy own which is thy own, and that which is another's to be as it is another's, then no body will compel thee, &c. See likewise his larger Discourses, *Lib. 3. c. 24.* I have also taken notice of a word borrowed from the *Stoicks*, in a Note on *Mat. xix. 28.*

Verf.



Verf. 19. *Noté d.* This Translation which the *Doctör* gives us of Chapter the Parable set down in *Gemara Babyl.* is partly according to the words XVI. in the Hebrew, and partly according to the Latin Version of *R. Sberingamus*, and taken from thence; and this has led our exact Author into a mistake which ought indeed easily to be forgiven him: but whereby it appears that Learned Men are overseen sometimes when they seem to be most exact. That part of the Parable which there is a mistake in the *Doctör's* Translation, is word for word according to the Talmudical Dialect thus; *A King of Flesh and Blood made a great Feast, and called to it all the Children of his City. There came a certain poor Man and stood at the Gate, &c.* *Sberingamus* in *Præf. ad Cod. Joma*, sets down this Parable in Hebrew and Latin, and with more freedom than ordinary translates the words כָּל בְּנֵי עִירָא, which ought to have been rendred *omnes filios urbis sue*, by *multos hospites*. And *Dr. Hammond* knowing that the word *hospes* is sometimes used in the same Notion with *exterus* or *peregrinus*; and not sufficiently considering that the Discourse here was about *Guests*, translates that by *Strangers*, whereas it is very manifest that the words כָּל בְּנֵי עִירָא signify *Citizens*, i. e. Persons belonging to the same City. And this I have thought fit here to take notice of, not out of a captious humor, but only to warn the Reader that he ought not to be too severe a Judg of those mistakes which the Learned sometimes fall into through want of care, since we err sometimes when we are most careful. But I have this farther to add, that I cannot see any reason why this Parable should be thought to be the same with that here in *St. Luke*, when all the likeness that there is between them is only, that the subject of them both is a rich Man and a Beggar. But their scope is quite different.

Verf. 22. Ἀπνεχθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων.] *Plato* in *Phædone*, S. 41. (however he came by the Notion) has a Passage much to this purpose, for he supposes the Souls of good men to have their ξυνομήτους καὶ ἡγούμενας θεούς, *Gods who accompany and conduct them, εἰς τόπον ἐκάστη πρῶσθήκοντα, into their proper place.*

Ibid. Τέκνον.] Οὐκ εἶπεν, says *Titus Bostrensis*, Pag. 808. C. ἀπένθρωπε καὶ ὠμὲ, &c. ἀλλὰ πῖ τέκνον, φησὶ: *he did not say cruel and inhuman wretch, &c. but what? my Son, saith he.*

Verf. 7.  $\Delta$  οὐλον.] This word the *Doctor* in his Paraphrase interprets an *hired Servant*; but the proper Greek word for that is *δούλος*, not *δούλος*, which is the name of a *Slave*. I know the word *δούλος* is used in the New Testament in both these senses; but there is no mention made here of any *hire* or *reward* due for service, and I do not see any reason why we should depart from the most usual signification of the word.

Verf. 9. Μὴ χάριν ἔχει.] A Master whose Authority over his Servant is absolute, is not obliged, *χάριν ἔχειν*, to *thank* that Servant who does nothing but what he is commanded; for the condition of a Slave is such, that he is *bound* to do whatsoever he is ordered, and is able to do. But on the other hand, a *Hirer* is not obliged to perform any servile Offices against his will. Having agreed with his Master for such a reward for such or such work, he cannot be compelled against his will to any other employments; and if he voluntarily undertake them, he ought to be thanked for it. It was the general Notion of Masters, that *giving attendance was the peculiar office of a Slave, whose condition was such, that nothing which he did was looked upon as an obligation by his Master.* They are the words of *Seneca*, Lib. 3. c. 18. *de Benefic.* who nevertheless, contrary to the vulgar opinion, affirms, that a Master may receive a benefit from his Slave. But *Christ* here speaks of Masters that use the utmost rigour, and according to the received Notion and Custom. I shall only add that our Author has admirably connected this Parable with what goes before in his Paraphrase.

Verf. 5. Note b. **T**H O the Verbs *ὑποτιθέναι* & *ὑποτιθέναι* come from the same Primitive, yet they cannot therefore be compared with one another; for we ought not to consider the significations of their Primitives, but the words from which they are most immediatly derived. *ὑπότιμος* is that part of the face or countenance which lies just under the eye, and is taken also for a blue Scar caused by a bruise given to that part. And because the *pugils* or *cuffers* used often to strike those parts with their Fists, the Verb *ὑποτιθέναι* properly signified *sugillare*, to give one a black and blue Eye, as it is rendered in the *Old Glosses*. Afterwards the Noun *ὑπότιμος* was metaphorically used to signify *disgrace* or *infamy*, as by *Cicero* and *Nilus*.

And



And in the same sense also the Latins often used the words *notæ* and *plaga*: And from this signification of the Noun *ἄσπις*, it is that the Verb *ἀσπίσει* came to signify, as in this place, to *defame*; just as among the *Latins* likewise the Verb *sigillare*, which is properly to give one a blow upon the Eye, signifies also the same with *infamare*. And in this sense undoubtedly it is that the Greek is rendered in the *vulgar* by *sigillare*, and that rightly. The unjust Judg was afraid lest the Woman should defame him, and ruin his reputation every where where she went, by her cries and complaints.

The proper signification of the Verb *ἀσπίσει*, according to its etymology, is indeed that which our *Author* says; but where the discourse is of God, it signifies only *to beg so as to obtain*; and we ought not to insist upon the original of the word: for *to put God to shame* is a phrase that must needs seem intolerable to all, but such as are not ashamed when they speak never so clownishly or improperly; of which number certainly was the *Doctor*, whose want of expression was equal to his learning. The *Heathens* perhaps would not scruple saying, that *they put their Gods to shame*; but I should hardly forgive a *Christian* that would speak in that manner of *God*.

## C H A P. XIX.

Verf. 9. **T**ῆ ἕκαστος τῆσδε.] It is a *Synecdoche*, saith *Grotius*; for the house is put for the master of the house. But I rather think that it is put, as it most usually signifies, for the *Family*, which by the Master's example might be reduced to a better life; or for his *Wife and Children*, who perhaps imitated the one her Husband, and the other their Father.

Verf. 12. Ἀρχιερέως τῆς ἰουδαίας, &c.] Tho the meaning of *Christ* in this Parable be sufficiently plain, and rightly enough explained by the *Doctor*; yet he did not see the reason of its being so conceived or worded by *Christ*, neither ought *Christ* to be understood to speak of an independent King, or one that went to take possession of a Kingdom which he had a *natural* right to. But he took this Parable from the custom of the Kings of his time, who reigned rather by the courtesy of the Roman Emperors, than by any privilege of birth: Such as all those were, who were in *Judæa* from the time of *Herod the Great*. They could not take the Scepter in their hands, without the permission of those who had the supreme Government at *Rome*. *Herod the Great* took a long Journey, that he might obtain the Kingdom of *Judæa* from *Antoni*, and he did not go in vain; for as *Josephus* tells us,

Chapter XIX. *Antiq. Jud.* Lib. 14. c. 25 & 26. he went out of *Judæa* to *Rome*, and thence, *πὶν βασιλείαν παραλαβὼν*, having received the Kingdom, he returned into *Judæa*. And afterwards he took another Journey, that he might have his Kingdom confirmed to him by *Cæsar*, as we are told by the same *Historian*, Lib. 15. cap. 10. And his Successors were forced to do the same, as that Author likewise informs us, *Lib. 17. cap. 13.* Against these the Jews sometimes sent Embassies to *Rome*, either to hinder the Kingdoms being conferred upon them, or else that they might procure their being deposed. So they accused *Archelaus* to *Cæsar* by their Embassadors at that Court; see *Cap. 11, & 15. of that Book.* And this shews us the reason why this Parable here is so conceived, which it is impossible to learn by our Author's Paraphrase. *Archelaus*, for example, was *ἀνθρώπου ἐξ ἑσπέρης*, a Man of noble birth, for he was the Son of *Herod*. And this Nobleman went into a far Country (viz. *Italy*) to receive for himself the Kingdom (of *Judæa*) and to return (into *Judæa*.) But his Citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying (to *Cæsar*) we will not have this man to reign over us; which nevertheless they could not obtain. And so he returned, having received the Kingdom or *ἐθνερχίαν παραλαβὼν*, as *Josephus* speaks: And severely punished those Enemies of his who would not that he should reign over them. What is said here by Interpreters about the Grammatical sense of this Parable, (give me leave to say it) is very obscure in comparison of this.

. Vers. 20. *Ἐν Σιδαιίῳ.*] *Grotius* who is followed therein by a great many others, thought that the word *σιδαίῳ* here signified any sort of Linen cloth. But I believe it is to be understood properly of that particular piece of Linen which serves to wipe the sweat off the Face, and which used in Latin to be called *Orarium*, a Handkerchief; as has been proved at large by *Is. Casaubon*, and *Cl. Salmasius* upon *Aurclian*. And this, as it is now, being constantly wore, served People for want of a Purse to tie and wrap up their money in, which is also sometimes still practised.

Vers. 21. *Αἶρας ὃ ἔκ' ἔθραυς.*] Instead of this *St. Matthew* hath *συνάγων ὅθεν ἔ διεσκόρπισας*, gathering where thou hast not scattered, which is to the same sense. But *St. Luke* seems to have expressed this proverbial form of speech most exactly, which had its rise from a Law common to the Jews, with many other Nations: *Quæ non posuisti, ne tollito*; What thou hast not laid down, do not take up: Of which Law see my Notes on *Levit. vi. 3.* This was a kind of theft: but because those that found any thing after it was lost, could not be prosecuted at Law, as being for the most part alone when they found it, and telling



no body of their good Fortune; such as restored what they had so found to the right owner, were looked upon as fair and just men, who acted from religious Principles, and not the fear of human Laws. And on the other hand, a covetous or greedy person generally kept whatever he found, because he could not be forced by the Law to restore it. And therefore such a man as lays hold of every opportunity which offers it self for his own interest, without having any regard to equity, is called by St. *Matthew* σκληρός, and by St. *Luke* αυστηρός, a hard, close-fisted, tenacious, rough man, as *Prickens* upon *Mat.* xxv. 44. has well observed. Αυστηρός is an ambiguous word, and signifies both a grave and severe man, and one that is rustick and savage. *Suidas*: αυστηρός είναι πάντας τὸς σοφὸς καὶ σπουδαίους, πρὸς μὴτε αὐτὸς καὶ ἡδονὴν ὁμιλεῖν, μήτε παρ' ἄλλοις τὰ κατὰ ἡδονὴν ᾄδεται. Καὶ ἄλλον δὲ εἶναι αὐστηρὸν, ᾧ ἀπλησίως λεγόμενον πρὸς αὐστηρῶ οἶνω ἢ καὶ μὲ φαρμακοποιίας χρῶνται, πρὸς δὲ πρόπτον ἢ πάνυ, ὅτι αὐστηρὸν ἢ κωμῶδία ἀγρικὸν ἠγείται: They call all wise and grave men austere, because they neither converse themselves for pleasure, nor admit any pleasant discourse from others; and there is another sort of men called austere, just as Wine is said to be austere, which is used in medicinal Potions, but never drank; because in Comedy a rustick man is called austere. In the signification of fierceness or savageness, it is used by *Diodorus Siculus*, Lib. 3. p. 168. where, speaking of a sort of beast that has a head like a dog, he saith; ἀγριώτατα δὲ πάντι τὰ ζῷα, καὶ παντελῶς ἀπιδάωσονται. Τὴν ἀπὸ τῶ ὀφρύων πρόσωπον αὐστηροτέρων ἔχει. They are exceeding fierce Creatures, and impossible to be tamed by any means whatsoever. They have a fiercer aspect under the Eyebrows than ordinary. I need not tell the Reader, that this word is taken here in the worst sense.

## C H A P. XX.

Verf. 16. [Λέγουσιν, &c.] This is the answer of the *Sanhedrim*, tho their name for brevity sake be here omitted; as appears from *Mat.* xxi. 41. See on *verf.* 24.

Ibid. Λέγουσιν δὲ εἰπὼν· μὴ γένοιτε.] This must be rendered thus; And when they had understood (viz. that these things were spoken against them) they said (within themselves) God forbid; for they did not apply the Parable to themselves aloud: See *Mat.* xxi. 45. and afterwards *ver.* 19. of this Chapter. Thus the omission of a Circumstance often seems to alter a History; so that those who tell it large, seem to contradict those who relate it more briefly, when yet really they agree with one another.

Chapter XX. *Verf. 20. Παρρησιάζεσθε.*] It is well observed by learned Men, that this Verb *παρρησιάζεσθε* signifies to wait for an opportunity of doing mischief: See *Chap. xiv. 1.* of this *Gospel*, and my Notes upon *Gen. iii. 15.*

*Verf. 24. Τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν.*] *St. Luke* omits here what *St. Matthew* expresses, and must necessarily be understood, *viz. And they brought unto him a Penny, and he said unto them, Mat. xxii. 19.* Such another omission I have already taken notice of on *vers. 16.*

*Verf. 27. Ἀνάστασις.*] Our learned Author interprets this word in his Paraphrase, *a future state after this life*: And indeed the Sadduces did deny, not only the resurrection of the Body, but also the immortality of the Soul. But *ἀνάστασις* never signifies simply a future State, and the Argument of the Sadduces opposes nothing but the Resurrection. I have elsewhere confuted the *Doctor's* opinion about this word; see Note on *Mat. xxii. 31.*

*Verf. 26. Ἐν Στραῖσι.*] It is very well known that the Greek word *στράσι* is used as well for a *man's* as a *woman's* Garment, tho the Latin *stola* signifies only a *woman's*. This is more than once proved by *Or. Ferrarius Lib. de Re Vestiaria.* And yet *Epiphanius* seems to have understood the word *στράσι* here of a *woman's* Garment, who *Hæres. 16.* says, that the Pharisees were like the Scribes, *ὡς τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν* ——— *ἡ γυναικίαν ἱστίαν, for their apparel and womanish Garments.* But perhaps he speaks in that manner, because amongst the Greeks the men wore short Garments, or *χιτῶνες* Coats, and the women long Gowns, such as were usual among several of the Eastern Nations. In antient times also *stola talaris*, a gown reaching down to the Ancles, seems to have been a Garment worn by Women among the *Assyrians*; See *Or. Ferrarius in Anal. c. 23.* But it is a good observation that *Pope Celestine the first* makes concerning Clergymen, in his Epistle to the Bishops of the Provinces of *Vienne* and *Narbonne*; *Discernendi, inquit, à plebe vel ceteris sumus doctrinâ, non veste; conversatione, non habitu; mentis puritate, non cultu.* We ought, saith he, to distinguish our selves from the common people, or the rest of mankind, by our *Doctrin*, not by our *Apparel*; by our *Conversation*, not by our *Habit*; by the purity of our *Minds*, not by our *Dress*.



## C H A P. XXI.

Verf. 4. **T**HΟ κάλλειν εἰς τραπεζαίαιον & βάλλειν εἰς θώρα, be all one  
 Note a. as to the sense, yet it is false that θώρα & τραπεζαίαιον  
 are the same; for the latter phrase properly signifies  
*to cast in among the Gifts or Offerings*, and the former only *into a Chest*,  
 of which there were several in the Temple wherein the Money was  
 deposited, that was voluntarily consecrated to the use of the Temple.  
 See *Lightfoot's Descript. of the Temple*, Chap. 19.

Verf. 6. Ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε.] There are some that add here a note of  
*interrogation*, as if *Christ* had said, *Are these the things which ye look up-  
 on?* as it is in the *Cambridg Copy*, wherein the Gospels are rather pa-  
 raphrased, than the words only variously read: and therefore *Gro-  
 tius* justly rejects this note of Interrogation. The *Evangelist* expressēs  
 himself here just as the best Writers sometimes do. The end of the  
 sentence does not answer the beginning, but the whole is made up of  
 two different forms of speech mixed together: For either he should  
 have said Ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε παντελῶς καταλείπονται, ἐλεύσονται τὸ ἡμέραι, &c.  
*These things which ye behold shall be quite destroyed, for the days will come, &c.*  
 or τέτων ἃ θεωρεῖτε ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς ἃ ἀφελήσεται λίθον, &c. *Of these  
 things which ye behold, the days will come in which there shall not be left one  
 stone upon another.* But the *Evangelist* begins just as if he was about to  
 express himself the former of these ways, and ends with the latter.  
*Grotius* has given us two examples of the like Syntax; and I add this  
 one more out of *Terence*, *Phorm.* Act. 3. Sc. 2. *O fortunatissime Anti-  
 pho, qui quod amas domi est.* He should have said, *Qui quod amas domi  
 habes*, or *cui quod amas domi est*, *Who hast what thou lovest at home.*  
 Such phrases as these have something of that impropriety in them  
 which is frequent in ordinary speech.

Verf. 24. Note b. 1. Our Author tells us as out of *Eusebius*, that  
 there died during the Siege of *Jerusalem* eleven millions of People, *i. e.*  
 ten times more than there did according both to *Eusebius* and *Josephus's*  
 account, who reckon up but eleven hundred thousand. 2. The words  
 in *Eusebius* which the *Doctōr* translates *to be slaves there*, are αἱ πρὸς αὐτῷ  
 Αἴγυπτου ἔργα, which *Henr. Valesius* renders *ut metalla exerceant*, *to work  
 in the Mines*, and so they ought to be interpreted. 3. *Eusebius* is mis-  
 taken in the last Circumstance, and disagrees with *Josephus* whom he  
 professes to follow; for that Historian tells us, that the number of  
 those that were taken during the whole *War* was ninety seven thousand,  
*Lib. 7. c. 45. de Bell. Jud.* which was very ill understood by *Eusebius* of  
 those

Chapter those that were made Captives after the taking of the City. Besides  
XXII. that *Euseb.* reckons but 90000, whereas *Josephus* reckons 7000 more.

W Ibid. Note c. The phrase *καὶ ἐθῶν* may, I think, much more naturally be understood of the time in which the Heathens, i. e. the Idolaters should continue the Governors of the World, as if the meaning of *Christ's* words was this: *Jerusalem shall be possessed and inhabited by Idolaters until the time during which the Idolaters must govern the World is expired; for then it shall be inhabited and possessed for the most part by Christians; which came to pass in the time of Constantine, who ordered the Temples of the Idols which were in Jerusalem to be destroyed. See his Life as it is written by Eusebius, Lib. 3. c. 26. καὶ ἐθῶν signifies the time during which the Nations were to have the supreme Authority in the World; as afterwards Chap. xxii. 53. of this Gospel, Christ speaking to those who had apprehended him, saith, This is your Hour, i. e. the time in which you may do to me what you please. That ἐθῶν here should be taken for Idolaters, is not strange, because all Nations besides Judaea were wholly given up to Idolatry. If this conjecture about the sense of this place be not true, I am sure Dr. Hammond's interpretation of it is less likely to be so.*

Verf. 25. *Ἡ γένεσις θαλάσσης.*] *The Sea, saith Grotius, in the Books of the Prophets, signifies the state of the World when it is troubled with various events: I do not think it has any reference to that. But the Prophets used, when they describe any great alteration, to speak in the words of Juvenal, Misere cælum terrâ & mare cælo, i. e. to represent the changes that are made in Mankind by the motions of the Heavens, Earth and Sea; see Isa. xiii. For the same reason I should refuse to interpret the powers of Heaven spoken of in the next Verse, of the Christian Churches: We must take all these Metaphors together, and not examin each singly by it self, as if there was something particular signified by every one of them.*

#### C H A P. XXII.

Verf. 6. *Ἐξουλογήσατο* signifies *he accepted the Reward offered him,*  
Note a. **E** or *he agreed to the Bargain; for ἐουλογία is ordinarily taken for a Bargain or Agreement, as Stephanus has proved by many examples. In the 2 Cor. ix. 13. it signifies consent, as the same Author observes. And the old Glosses render it by stipulans, pactio, convenientia, covenanting, bargaining, agreeing; the Verb Ἐξουλογῆσαι includes indeed a Promise: and the Greeks used that word in Bargains or Contracts, where the Latins used promitto and spondeo.*



*spondeo*. After the proposing of the Terms, the proposer demanded Chapter of the other party, whether he would *spondere engage*, or *promittere* XXII. *promise* to stand to those Terms; and the answer was *spondeo, promitto*. Thus the *Latins* used to speak, but the *Greeks* made use of the word ὁμολογῶ or ἐξομολογῶ, *i. e.* not properly indeed I *promise*, but I *consent*. The *Cambridge Copy* has ὁμολόγησε which is most common, and signifies often the same with *consenting* or *agreeing about a price*, ὁμολογῆν μισθόν, after the proposal of it as it was here, as appears by the foregoing Verse: See the Greek Index to *Xenophon* made by *Amil. Portus*, and to *Dionysius Halicarn.* Ant. Rom. by *F. Sylburgius*, in which there are a great many examples given of this signification: Ἐξομολόγησε therefore here signifies, he consented to the Price, and *Dr. Hammond* has manifestly missed the sense of it.

Verf. 26. Note d. The phrase εἶναι ὡς ὁ νεώτερος, signifies to serve the interests of the rest, as *young People* used to obey the commands of their *Seniors*. Tho' νεώτερος be a name not only of Age but of Dignity, yet I have never seen it demonstrated by any example hitherto, that those who are destitute of any Office are called νεώτεροι, without any respect had to their Age. The places which the *Doctor* refers us to, do not in the least prove what he would have them, for they may all be very well understood concerning *Age*.

Verf. 52. Note g. For the reconciling of *Josephus* with *St. Luke*, and so the understanding of the Evangelist's words, it must be observed that there were two Garisons plac'd in the Temple, which had their several Captains; one consisted of *Levites*, who kept guard in the Temple night and day, down from the time of *David*, as appears from 2 *Chron.* viii. 14. For that there was a guard kept in the 2<sup>d</sup> Temple, the *Talmudists* assure us in *Cod. Middoth*, Chap. 1. §. 1 and 2. And the Captain of this Garison was a Jew, whom the *Talmudists* call אִישׁ הַר הַבַּיִת the *Man of the Mountain of the House*, or ראשׁ הַשָּׂמֶרֶת the *head of the Watch*, as appears from the forementioned place in the *Talmud*. And this Man might have other inferior Captains under him, whom he set over each single Band or Guard, which are all called by *St. Luke* ἡγεμῶν ἱεροῦ Captains of the Temple; who nevertheless calls the chief Captain in the singular Number ἡγεμῶν τῷ ἱερῷ, *Act.* iv. 1. & v. 24. So that it is not to be wondred at if *Josephus* gives the same title to Jews, this Office belonging only to them: And hence we see that the Captain or Captains of the Temple are always by *St. Luke* joined with the *Priests* and *Princes* of the Jews. Now it was lawful for the *Sanhedrim*, who might employ for that purpose the *Levites* which kept watch about the Temple, to apprehend any Jew, and

Chapter cast him into Prison, if he offended against the Law; tho they had no  
 XXIII. power to put him to death, as appears from the History of *Christ's*  
 Passion, and the *Acts* of the *Apostles*.

But besides this, there was a Roman Garrison put into the Tower called *Antonin*, which had a *Roman Tribune* for its Captain, not a *Jew*. And this *St. Luke* makes mention of *Acts* xxi, and xvii. The Soldiers that were under the command of this Captain are stiled *Mat. xxvii. 65. κεντηριαι*, a word borrowed from the Romans, either because they were themselves Romans, or else because they had taken an Oath of Fidelity to the Romans. These were under the Procurators Authority, and obeyed him and their Tribunes and Centurions only; not the *σκαυτοφωλαρχος*, who was a Jew, and commanded only the Levites.


But it may be demanded perhaps why the Captain of the Guard of Levites is called *σκαυτοφωλαρχος*, which properly signifies a *military Captain* or *Commander* whereas the *Levites* were no Soldiers? And this is undoubtedly the reason why *Dr. Hammond* thought it was the *Tribune* who was set over the *Roman Garrison* that was called by that name. But he and others who have fallen into the same mistake, should have remembered that the sacred functions of the *Levites* are more than once stiled by *Moses* a *Warfare*, *κλιμακ*: See *Num. viii. 24, 25.* where the *S. mag.* have *κλιμακ*. And therefore he that was chief over the *Levites* might very well be called *κλιμακ*, which in Greek is usually rendered by *σκαυτοφωλαρχος*. See the *Doctor* upon Chap. xxiii. 11. Note a.

## C H A P. XXIII.

Verf. 11. **H**A V E a care of thinking that *σκαυτοφωλαρχος* ever signifies  
 Note a. **H** to *serve*, or *σκαυτοφωλαρχος* *Servants*. The Hebrew word *κλιμακ* which is applied sometimes to the service of the *Levites*, is therefore made use of because it signifies *congregari* to *assemble* or *gather together*, as the *Levites* used to do about the *Tabernacle* or *Temple*; or because they were *God's garrison Soldiers*, who came together for the defence of the *Temple*, not because that word ever signifies *to serve*. *Timothy* is called a *good Soldier*, not simply as a *Servant* of *God*, but as a *fighter* in *God's cause*: tho the thing considered in it self be the same yet the significations of words are various; and it is not all one whether we say a *Servant* or a *Soldier*, tho both may be stiled sometimes of the same Person. Our Author therefore here looked for a knot in a *Bulrush*, when it had been easy to understand the word here used of *Herod's guard*.

Verf.



Verf. 35. Ἔσται, &c.] The *Cambridg Copy* here reads, ἔσται, σεαυτὸν Chapter  
σῶσον, εἰ ὑὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰ χειρὸς αἷ οὐ κληρονομία: and in a great many other XXIV.  
places there is as great a variation as this between it and other Copies,  which discovers it to be a sort of a Paraphrase.

Verf. 47. Ἐδύξασε τὸ θεῖον.] *i. e.* He acknowledged the truth, he confessed that *Jesus* was indeed the Person whom he would have himself believed to be. That this is the meaning of this Phrase, appears by the following words, *saying, truly this was a Just Man*; and just in the same manner it is used in *Chap. v. 26.* of this Gospel, and in *Josh. vii. 19.* And therefore *Grotius* who interprets it, *he acknowledged the power of God*, and our *Author* who follows him in his Paraphrase, are mistaken.

## C H A P. XXIV.

Verf. 16. **O** ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκκατέβητο.] *i. e.* Their Sorrow was so great that they had not sufficiently taken notice, nor looked stedfastly enough upon the Man that had joined himself to their Company, to know him to be *Jesus*. So *Hagar* was so overwhelmed with Grief at the thoughts of her Son's dying, that she did not see, or did not take notice of the Well of Water that was just by her, *Gen. xxi. 19.* And so when it is said afterwards, *Verf. 31.* of this Chapter, that the same Disciples Eyes were opened, διωοίχθησαν, the meaning is nothing but this, that looking more stedfastly upon *Christ*, they knew him; which very Phrase is used in the story of *Hagar* in the same sense.

Verf. 19. Δυνατὴς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ.] *i. e.* Pious and Eloquent, not like the *Pharisees* who talked very big of Virtue, without practising it; and were powerful men in words, but not in works, which was the general reproach cast upon the Philosophers among the Heathens. *Cebes Thebanus* in his Table, describing a true Philosopher, tells us, that he is ἀνὴρ ἔμφρων καὶ δεινὸς ποιεῖ σοφίαν, λόγῳ τε καὶ ἔργῳ; a prudent Man, and mighty in Wisdom both in Word and Deed: See *Acts vii. 22.*

Verf. 23. Λέγουσαι καὶ ὀπτισίαν Ἀγγέλων ἑωρακέναι, οἱ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν.] These two Disciples of *Christ* do not seem to have spoken with the Women themselves, but only to have heard the report of others, by which means they came to know but half the Truth; for the Women affirmed that they had also seen *Jesus* himself. Nor can this seem strange, since it is evident from the 21st verse, that these Disciples went from *Jerusalem* the same day that *Christ* rose from the Dead, a very few Hours after his Resurrection, and so could not have a perfect knowledge of all the Circumstances of it.

Chapter Verſ. 28. Περσεπιέϊτο.] See my Notes on *Gen.* xix. 2.

XIV. Verſ. 29. Καὶ παρεβιάσαντο.] *i. e.* they besought him instantly; so

2 Kings v. 16. *Naaman* the Syrian παρεβιάσατο urged or importuned *Elisha* to take the Gift which he refused, for curing him of his Leprosy: See note on *Char.* xiv. 23.

Verſ. 31. Ἄφαντο ἔγενετο.] *i. e.* he went out of the Room on a sudden, and they could not possibly understand whether he was gone: for it is not necessary to suppose that he became invisible before he went out of the Room. *Pindar* uses the same word of *Pelops* who had conveyed himself away, but certainly without becoming invisible; *Olympion.* 1. ἄφαντο ἔπελες, saith he, you disappeared. So afterwards verſ. 36. of this Chapter, ἔση ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν is, he came amongst them on a sudden and before they were aware.

Verſ. 45. Διήνοιξεν αὐτοῖς τὸ νόον.] *viz.* by his explaining the Scriptures to them, whereby they came to perceive that there were several things spoken of *Christ*, which they did not before take notice of. For *Christ* had not as yet given them the *Holy Ghost*; and it appears from *Acts* i. 6. that after all these Discourses of his, they did not understand the nature of *Christ's* Kingdom. In my *Ars Critica*, I have interpreted this Phrase more at large.

Verſ. 46. Καὶ εἶπεν, &c.] *St. Luke* who often omits several Circumstances which are related by the other *Evangelists*, joins together several Discourses that were delivered by *Christ* at different times; and here in this place he seems to connect these words with the foregoing, tho they were spoken by *Christ* many days after; for he said the former on the very day of his Resurrection, but these latter were not spoken till after the Apostles were come back from *Galilee*. Compare these things with the History of the other *Evangelists*.



## A N N O T A T I O N S

O N T H E

G O S P E L according to St. *John*.

*NB.* Tho Mr. *Le Clerc* did not insert this Paraphrase and Animadversions on the 18 first Verses of the first Chapter of this Gospel in his Latin Edition of *Dr. Hammond*, because it had been publish'd twice before; yet 'twas thought fit, for the convenience of English Readers, and to make the Work more complete, to put it here in its proper place.

The Author's Preface to the 2<sup>d</sup> Edition of his Paraphrase on the first eighteen Verses.

**I** Have already in the first Edition of this little Commentary, given the Reasons which induced me to publish it, and therefore I shall not here repeat them. I freely give my consent to the reprinting of it, because it is my interest to have my thoughts concerning the beginning of St. John's Gospel publicly known. I have so confuted Socinus, as yet sufficiently to intimate, that I intend not to publish any Theological Disputations about those things in which I disagree with him; and have expressly said so in a former Preface to these Animadversions. For that reason I have not affirmed, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, do not *ὁμοούσιον* in one and the same manner, but that each has his peculiar *ἁποσύνη*: Nor was I under any obligation to do so from the thing it self; for Philo to whom St. John seems to have had a respect (in the beginning of this his Gospel) did not deny that the Father, the first begotten Son, and the Soul of the World, had their several distinct *ἁποσύνη*. The Evangelist corrects only what that Alexandrian Philosopher said concerning Reason, or the Son.

Some have been disgusted with my rendering the Greek word, which is usually translated Word, or Sermo discourse, by Reason. But I intreat them first thoroughly to consider the Reasons I have given for that rendering of it, and then to remember that the word λόγος is in it self ambiguous, and may as well be translated Reason as Word. And tho this latter signification obtained in the West, because of the unskilfulness of the old Latin Interpreter, or, if you please, the poverty of the Latin Language; yet the Greek Fathers do shew, when they treat of this matter, that they understood Reason by it, no less than Word: see Dion. Petav. Dogm. Theolog. T. 2. Lib. 6. c. 1.

Nay the Latin Fathers also themselves, who examined the Greek word made use of by St. John, do acknowledg that we ought rather to understand Reason by it, than what the Latins call Verbum, when they say that they do not understand by it λόγος ἡ ἐξωτερικόν verbum prolatum, but ἐνδιάθετος ἰνσίτουμ; or an internal, not an external word: for what is an internal word but Reason, or reasoning? Besides, the whole Christian Church, both Greek and Latin, do frequently confound the word λόγος with σοφία Wisdom, which is the same with Reason, but vastly different from a word uttered or pronounced. So that tho I have receded in some measure from the custom of the Latins as to the sound, yet not at all as to the thing it self.

If any object that the word Reason signifies rather a Quality than a Substance, let them shew me that the term Word is any fitter than that to signify a Substance, and I engage to revoke publickly all that I have said: But if any one think he may make use of an improper word, because it was generally used by the Latin, and those unlearned men, let him give me leave to make use of one that is altogether as proper, because it was constantly used by the most learned Greek Fathers. In the mean time let him permit me to intend by the word Reason that which, if he were asked the meaning of the term Word, he would be forced to express by internal discourse, i. e. reasoning. And lastly let him hear what Tertullian says, in Lib. adversus Praxeam, Cap. 5. where he discourses thus: Ceterum ne tunc quidem solus (Deus, nempe, erat) habebat enim secum, quam habebat in semetipso; Rationem suam, scilicet. Rationalis etiam Deus, & Ratio in ipso prius; & ita ab ipso omnia. Quæ Ratio sensus ipsius est. Hanc Græci λόγος dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam sermonem appellamus. Ideoque jam in usu est nostrorum per simplicitatem interpretationis (i. e. imperitiam interpretandi) Sermonem dicere in primordio apud Deum fuisse; cum magis Rationem competat antiquiorem haberi; quia non Sermonalis à principio, sed Rationalis Deus, etiam ante principium; & quia ipse quoque sermo Ratione consistens, priorem eam, ut substantiam



stantiam suam, ostendat, &c. But neither then was he alone (*viz.* Chapter God) for he had with him his *Reason*, which he had within himself. I. God is *Rational* also, and *Reason* was before in him; and so all things were of him. Which *Reason* is his Sense. This the Greeks call  $\Lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\theta$ , which word also we use to signify *Sermo*. And therefore it is become the common custom among us, through a simplicity of interpretation (*i. e.* an unskilfulness in interpreting) to say that *Discourse*, *Sermo*, was in the beginning with God, whereas it would be more proper to say, that *Reason* was so which is more antient; because God was in the beginning not *sermonal*, but *rational*, even before the beginning; and because *Discourse* it self depending upon *Reason*, does shew that to be prior to it, as its substance, &c.

## C H A P. I.

SOME who have joined the study of the Heathen Philosophy, with the Profession of the Jewish or Christian Religion, have took upon them to teach a great many things concerning the Divine REASON, LIFE and LIGHT, and the ONLY BEGOTTEN Son of God, which they have inculcated upon their Disciples as points of Faith of the greatest moment. And because what they have asserted is neither all true, nor all false, that we may know what we are to reject, and what we are to admit of, I shall in few words set down that which is agreeable to the Doctrin of Jesus Christ, before I enter upon his History.

Verse 1. *In the beginning was REASON, and that REASON was with GOD, and GOD was that REASON.*

1. It is true, before the Creation of the World, there was REASON, for REASON was then in GOD, yea GOD himself, since God cannot be without REASON.

2. *The same was in the beginning with GOD.*

2. There was, I say, REASON in GOD, before the World was created.

3. *All things were made by it, and without it was not any thing made that was made.*

3. For every thing in the World was made with the highest REASON; nor can any one thing be instanced in, that was created without REASON.

4. *In it was LIFE, and this LIFE was the LIGHT of Men.*

4. Heretofore was lodged only in this REASON, a full and complete knowledg of the way that leads to Eternal LIFE; and this Knowledg wanted only to be communicated to Men, to be a sufficient LIGHT to guide them in their pursuit after that LIFE.

5. *And.*

5. *And the LIGHT shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.*

5. And now that LIGHT has been brought down upon Earth, amongst Men, and has shined for many years past upon the way that leads to LIFE; but the greatest part of Mankind chuse rather to wander in the darkness of Ignorance than to make use of that LIGHT.

6. *There was a Man sent by God, his name was John.*

7. *The same came for a Witness, to bear witness of the LIGHT, that all Men through him might believe.*

6, 7. *John the Son of Zacharias was sent by God to the Jews, to shew them in whom that LIGHT resided, and by bearing witness to him openly, to induce them to believe on him.*

8. *He was not the LIGHT, but was sent to bear witness of the LIGHT.*

8. But *John* had not this LIGHT in himself, nor was it the end of his Coming, to make Men partakers of that LIGHT; but only by his Testimony to procure Credit and Authority to him who had that LIGHT among the Jews.

9. *That LIGHT was the true LIGHT, which came into the World, and lightneth every Man.*

9. In that Man, and no other resided this LIGHT, which in the most excellent Sense deserves only to be so called, and which now shines among Men; so that every one who will but follow this Light may be sure of being brought to eternal LIFE.

10. *REASON was in the World, and the World was made by it, but the World knew it not.*

10. And he in whom that LIGHT was, conversed for some time among Men; but they notwithstanding their having been created by the Divine REASON which dwelt in that Man, did not distinguish him from false Teachers.

11. *It came to its own, but its own received it not.*

11. Nay he lived amongst those who alone were called the People and Children of God, and yet they did not know the Doctrine of their God.

12. *But to as many as received it, it gave power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on its Name.*

12. But all that embraced his Divine Revelations, were thereupon made God's People, and taken, tho they were not Jews, into the number of his Children.

13. *Who were born not of Blood, nor of the will of the Flesh, nor of the will of Man, but of God.*

13. Tho they were neither Jews by Birth, nor by Marriages, nor Profelytes, yet God was pleased freely to honour them with that Title.

14. *And that REASON was made Flesh, and dwelt among us, (we beheld its Glory, the glory as of the ONLY BEGOTTEN of the Father) full of Grace and Truth.*

14. That



14. That REASON which I before spake of, and asserted to have been with GOD from the beginning, yea to have been GOD himself, and in which was LIFE and the LIGHT of Men, did not always, as I said, conceal it self from us; but by the Man in whom it was, became conspicuous, and dwelt for some time among us. (We saw the majesty of the Divine REASON which was never before beheld, discovering it self in that Man, as it became him who is the SON of God, not in that manner that we are, but in a manner peculiar and proper to himself alone.) That Eternal REASON made it self visible and manifest to us in him, and shewed it self Merciful and Gracious to us.

15. *John bare witness of him, and cried, saying: This was he of whom I spake, He that is to come after me, is preferred before me, because he was before me.*

15. *John bare witness concerning this Man openly, and declared him to be the Person whom he had described in these words: He that is to come after me, shall be greater than I.*

16. *And of his Fulness have we all received, and Grace for Grace.*

16. From that Knowledg wherewith the divine REASON hath MOST FULLY enlightned that Man, all the Knowledg that every one of us have, is derived; and by him we are assured that the Mercy and Goodness of God to us is such, as that for all the GRACE and Favour which he resolved to shew us, and those great Benefits which flow from his Love towards us, he requires nothing in return but a GRATEFUL Mind.

17. *For the Law was given by Moses, but Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ.*

17. For whereas *Moses* published Laws, in which he imposed most grievous and burdenson Rites upon the *Jews*, and threatned with Death those who did not punctually observe them; *Jesus* who is the true CHRIST, and in whom the Divine REASON resides, came to assure us of the Goodness and Mercy of God in pardoning all our past Sins, and easing us of that intolerable Mosaical Yoke.

18. *No Man hath seen God at any time; the ONLY BEGOTTEN SON, which is in the bosom of the Father, has been his Interpreter.*

18. Before, that Will or Purpose of God was not fully understood by any but he of whom I spake; the ONLY BEGOTTEN SON of GOD, who was singularly and peculiarly beloved by his Father, was sent by God to declare it to us.

**B**EFORE I come to enquire severally into the sense of the words here made use of by the Evangelist, I must endeavour to ascertain some things on which the Interpretation I shall afterwards give of them, will in a great measure depend. As first, I shall examin whether this Gospel (as I my self think it is, and all the Antients universally almost affirm) be justly attributed to the Apostle *John*, there being

Chapter being some in our Age, who, treading in the steps of the antient *A-*  
 I. *logi*, a sort of *Hereticks* so called, and described by *Epiphanius* in *Hæ-*  
 ref. 51. endeavour to bring that opinion into question. *Secondly*, I  
 shall enquire into the time when it was written. And, *lastly*,  
 where St. *John* writ it; and what was the occasion and design of his  
 beginning his Gospel in this manner.

1. That the Apostle *JOHN* was the Writer of this Gospel, the  
 Antients do universally, as I said, affirm, whose Testimony in a  
 matter of this nature cannot by any one be rendered invalid, unless  
 he can plainly make it appear, that the Antients were all mistaken,  
 and shew us at the same time the occasion and original of their mistake.  
 For to justify our dissent from the most antient Christian Writers,  
 who saw the Disciples of St. *John*, and testify that they heard this  
 affirmed by them; and to charge the Christian Churches of that Age  
 with Error, who read this Gospel as the genuin product of the Apostle  
*John*; it is not sufficient to propose some slight conjectures, or shew a  
*Metaphysical possibility*, if I may so speak, of their erring. But to make  
 it credible that they were all really mistaken, and that so soon after St.  
*John's* death, there must be those evident proofs given of their mistake,  
 as none of the weighty reasons I shall hereafter alledg can be  
 thought sufficient to cope with: For it is absurd, against most pro-  
 bable Arguments, and such as in another case we should acquiesce in,  
 to object bare suspicions or conjectures which have not the least ap-  
 pearance of likelihood in them, and prefer these to the former,  
 merely because the opinion which we have espoused, and are resolved  
 to maintain, makes it necessary for us to think that those conjectures  
 are of great weight. It is just as if one that was accused of writing  
 bad Latin, upon comparing and examining it with *Livy's*, who was  
 certainly a very clean Writer, should therefore begin to doubt whe-  
 ther the History, which goes under *Livy's* name, and which all the  
 Antients with one consent attribute to him, were really his; and pro-  
 posing some very slight conjectures against it, should think he had  
 rendered the Authority of that History questionable; and because it  
 might possibly have been written by some other, pretend that no body  
 ought to produce any testimony out of it ever after. And yet this they  
 do, who, as I understand, go about to rob the Apostle *John* of that Gos-  
 pel, which has always been reckoned his; as I shall briefly shew, by  
 producing some of the most antient Testimonies to that purpose;  
 which are well enough known already to learned Men; but it may be  
 not so well to those for whose sake I now write, who seldom spend  
 much time in reading the Writings of the Antients.

The



The first Testimony I shall mention, and the most antient of all, is Chapter at the end of St. *John's* Gospel it self, Chap. xxi. 24. where, after a Prediction delivered by *Christ* concerning the great Age that St. *John* should live to, it is immediarely added; Οὗτος, &c. THIS is the Disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things, and we KNOW that his Testimony is true. We may read what *Grotius* says in his Notes on Chap. xx. 29. and *Dr. Hammond* on this place it self. Where those great men have shewn that this is the Testimony of the Church of *Ephesus*; whereby it appears that from the very first, this Gospel was thought to be the Apostle *John's*, even by those who lived and conversed with him; which is a certain evidence of its being genuine, because this Testimony was given by Persons who lived at the time when it was written, and might certainly know who was the Author of it. Nor let any one say that this Testimony, or this whole Chapter was an addition put in by some other a considerable time afterwards, for it is read in all the Copies, and all Interpreters acknowledge it.

Another proof of this may be taken out of *Justin Martyr*, who when a Child might perhaps have seen St. *John* himself. And he in that Apology, which is commonly called his *second*, and which he presented to *Antoninus Pius*, in the year of *Christ* 140. where he describes the sacred Assemblies of the Christians, says, that in them were read τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, the Commentaries of the Apostles, pag. 98. Ed. Paris. & Colon. By which he means the Gospels, as appears by what he says a little before: αἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἐν ταῖς γενομέναις ἐκείναις συναγωγαῖς ἐκείναις ἐκλάττειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, &c. The Apostles in their Commentaries, which are called the Gospels, &c. And tho he does not very often cite the Apostles words themselves in those Writings of his which are extant; yet he frequently alludes to them, and particularly to the beginning of St. *John's* Gospel, from whence he took what he says in several places, about the λόγος and its incarnation, and which he every where sets down as points of Faith generally received among Christians: Which he durst not to have done, unless he had relied upon the Authority of the Apostles; for who among the Orthodox would have presumed first to use the word λόγος, which was commonly abused by the *Valentinians* and others at that time? Who would have ventured to make use of the word σαρκοπείσις, which might easily, by bad or unwary men, have been perverted to a wrong sense, unless an Apostle had first used it? It belonged only to the Apostles who were the ἐπισημοὶ, inspectors of Mysteries, and not to the ordinary sort of Mystics, to use new words in such kind of matters; for they alone might safely

Chapter 1. impose new names upon things above the reach of human understanding, who understood them better than others, and so as none ever did without a particular Inspiration. I know indeed this was not observed in later times, but in those first it unquestionably was. Now *Justin* frequently makes mention of the ὁ Λόγος, as all know that have but occasionally read any thing in his Writings. I shall produce only one or two passages out of the forementioned *Apology*. In pag. 74. he has these words; ἡ πρώτη δύναμις μετὰ τῶν πατέρων πάντων καὶ δεσπότης θεῶν, καὶ ὁὗτος ὁ Λόγος ἐστίν· ὅς ποτε τέλει σαρκοποιήσας ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς ἔξῃς ἐρῶμαι· *The first Power next to the Father and Lord of all things God, and the Son is the Reason, which how it became man by being incarnated, I shall afterwards shew.* And hence, pag. 83. he affirms, that all mankind who follow the direction of Reason, are also partakers of *Christ*: And adds; οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοὶ εἰσι, καὶν ἄλλοι ἐνομιμάσθησαν· εἶον ἐν Ἑλλήσιν Ἰσοκράτης καὶ Ἡρακλείτης καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς: *They who lived according to reason were Christians, tho they were thought to be Atheists, as among the Greeks Socrates and Heraclitus, and others like them.* And afterwards, pag. 98. Διὰ Λόγου Θεοῦ, ἵσθις ἡμεῖς, σαρκοποιήσας Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ πάτερ καὶ αἴμα καὶ σὰρξ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔχον: *Jesus Christ our Saviour was incarnated by the Reason of God, and had both flesh and blood for our Salvation.* Any body may see that these are manifest allusions to the beginning of this Gospel, and none but an *Ignoramus* will deny it. But there are extant also in that Book the express words of *Christ* as they are related by *St. John*, in *Chap. iii. 3, 5.* Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν, ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, ἐμὴ ἐπιέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. He cites likewise the *Apocalypse* as that Apostle's Work, in *Dial. cum Tryphone*, which yet many have doubted of, tho all agreed as to the Gospel.

Thirdly, Among those who acknowledged the Apostle *John* to be the Writer of this Gospel, I might alledg the Testimony of the *Valentinians*, who, as *Irenaeus* tells us, endeavoured to pervert it to their own advantage: For they pretended that *St. John* asserted what they called an *Ogdoas Pleromatis*, in the beginning of his Gospel, and thought, tho erroneously, that he very much confirmed their opinions; which makes it evident however, that before *Irenaeus*'s time, this Gospel was vulgarly reputed to be *St. John*'s. See what the *Valentinians* themselves say, in *Irenaeus* Lib. i. c. i. p. 36.

A fourth Testimony may be taken out of *Irenaeus* himself, who lived almost at the same time with *Justin*; his words I shall afterwards produce, to avoid repeating them.

The last shall be out of *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 24.* who relying on the Authority of former Ages, and not merely on his



own, or of the Age in which he lived, speaks in this manner: Τὸ κατὰ κεφάλαιον τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις διεγνωσμένον Ἐκκλησίαις, πρῶτον ἀνομολογείτω: Let his (viz. St. John's) Gospel, which is very well known to (all) the Churches under Heaven, be first acknowledged. And about the latter end of the same Chapter, he says; Τῶν δὲ Ἰωάννου συγγραμμάτων, πρῶτος πρὸς τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἡ πρώτη τῶν Ἐπιστολῶν ἀπὸ τε πάντων καὶ πάντων ἐστὶ ἀρχαίως ἀναμάρτητος ἀποδοχῆται: Of St. John's Writings, besides his Gospel, the first of the Epistles is, and always was acknowledged without dispute: See also Chap. xxv. I shall not alledg the Testimonies of any other Writers, because it is certain, that from *Irenæus's* time this was the general opinion; and if these Testimonies which I have alledged, as one said, be not sufficient, I know not what is. But certain Hereticks, whom *Epiphanius Hæres. 51.* seems to have called ἀλογοί, because they denied the λόγος, for the same reason, rejecting the Authority of all the Antients, denied St. John to be the Author of this Gospel. It were to be wished that *Epiphanius* had given us their right name instead of catching at the ambiguity of the word ἀλογοί, to shew his wit. But whoever they were, it is certain they were ignorant Criticks, who for the sake of a preconceived opinion, affirmed this Gospel to be supposititious, which they would have owned to be genuin, if it had not contradicted that opinion. But to pass this by, *Epiphanius* observes that they appeared after the *Cataphryges*, *Quintilians* and *Quartadecimians*, i. e. about the end of the second Century, or the beginning of the third. Nor are they any where mentioned by *Irenæus*, who spends a great many words in praise of St. John's Writings, and would certainly have taken notice of them, if there had been any such persons in his time.

And therefore since they began so late to oppose the Authority of this Gospel, which before was universally owned and received, they ought to have given very clear proofs of its being supposititious, which yet they neither did nor were able to do. For whereas they say in the first place, that St. John writ in a singular method; this is plainly nothing to the purpose: for why might not St. John use a different way of writing from the rest of the *Evangelists*? But there are a great many puzzling difficulties, they tell us, in his account of the last years of Christ's Life. But this is not peculiar to St. John, for there are great difficulties also in St. *Luke's* Chronology, as every one knows; nor can it be denied, that the sacred Historians had generally very little regard to the order of time, in their relation of the Life and Discourses of Christ. But that is no Argument that all their Writings are supposititious. The *Evangelists*, it is plain, did not design

Chapter I. design to make a Chronology, or an exact History of *Christ's* Life; but only to record his principal Discourses, and the main Circumstances of his Life, and some of his Miracles. But this pretence is confuted by *Epiphanius*, who has shewn that those times of *Christ's* may be easily digested by an attentive Reader; and his Animadversions are excellently illustrated by *Petavius*.

But there are some, I understand, who object also against the opinion commonly received about the Writer of this Gospel, That the Discourses of *Christ*, which are recorded in it, are many times more intricate and obscure, than those which are related in the other Gospels, nor so often intermixed with *Parables*. But doubtless all *Christ's* Discourses, for three years together or thereabouts, were not of the same sort, but some were plainer, and others more obscure: and when the clearest of them, and most of his *Parables* had been already related by the other *Evangelists*, it is no wonder that *St. John* should not have so many *Parables* as they; or that the Discourses which he relates as spoken by *Christ*, have sometimes more obscurity in them than those which they have recorded. Besides, the Holy Ghost, by whom the Writers of the Gospels were inspired, that they might not say any thing that was not agreeable to Truth, did not alter any thing peculiar to each in their way of speaking or writing, but left them to use their own style in relating the principal heads of *Christ's* Discourses; and possibly *St. John's* style might be more intricate sometimes than ordinary, which is also discernible in his *Epistles*, and in the *Revelations*. There is no body but has observed that *St. Luke* writes the purest Greek, and that there are more Latinisms to be found in that *Evangelist*, than in any of the rest. And so *St. John* likewise has his Peculiarities, as Interpreters, and among the rest *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond*, have observed.

These being the only Arguments that can be alledged to prove this Gospel to be supposititious; and those being very slight and frivolous, or rather none at all, it is no wonder that the *Alogi* of old had no followers: and I dare say, whoever shall revive their Heresy, and have no better grounds for it than they had, will meet with as few; if they will but lay aside their preconceived opinions, and apply themselves for sometime to the study of Criticks, they will be ashamed of their own rashness. When the *Alogi* were asked who it was that wrote this Gospel, if it was not *St. John*, they answered *Cerinthus*, notwithstanding it was universally reckoned that *Cerinthus's* Opinion was directly opposite to this Gospel: and the same is pretended now by those who follow the *Alogi*. But their making such an absurd conjecture,



jecture, manifestly shews what excellent Criticks the Antients and Chapter we have to deal with: For it's most certain that *Cerintbus's* error I. was opposed by *St. John*, as I shall shew on *vers. 1.* And then can any one be induced to believe, that any thing which was written by so detested a Person as *Cerintbus*, could be so obtruded upon the Disciples of *St. John*, and all the Orthodox, as to be unanimously received by all the Christian World for Genuine, not long after *St. John's* Death? Who will believe that all the Antients were so blind as to think an opinion was confuted in a Book that asserted it? These things are absolutely incredible; nor would they have seemed less so to the *Alogi* of old, or now to their followers, than to us, if they had been able then, or could at present shew that the beginning of this Gospel does not contradict the opinion of the *Unitarians*; which because they despaired of, they resolved, contrary to all the Rules of Criticks, to deny this Gospel to be the Apostle *John's*. But with what success may be discerned from what I have hitherto said, and it is superfluous to add more.

II. The Antients which speak of the time when *St. John* wrote his Gospel do agree, that it was not written before his departure into the Island of *Patmos*; but some say that it was dictated in that *Island*, and published at *Ephesus*; and others that it was written in that *City* after the Apostles return. Now *St. John* was sent into the Isle of *Patmos* in the year of Christ 94. and thence he returned to *Ephesus* in the year 96. as appears from *St. Jerom* in *Catal. Script. Eccles.* And therefore it must either have been written between those 2 years, and afterwards made publick about the end of *St. John's* Life, or else both written and published at *Ephesus* after the year 97. The Author of the *Synopsis of the Holy Scripture*, whether *Athanasius* or some other, a very antient Writer, tells us that, τὸ καὶ Ἰωάννου Εὐαγγέλιον ὑπεγράφηκεν τῷ αὐτῷ τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἰωάννῃ τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ καὶ ἡγαπημένῳ, ὄντι ἐξορίσει ἐν Πατμῷ τῷ νήπῳ, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐξετέθη ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, διὰ Γαίου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ ξενοδοχοῦ τῷ Ἀποστόλου: the Gospel according to *St. John* was dictated by the holy and beloved Apostle *John* himself, when he was an Exile in the Island *Patmos*, and was published by him at *Ephesus*, by *Gaius* the beloved and host of the Apostles. But *Suidas* on the word *Ἰωάννου* affirms, out of a more antient Author, that it was written at *Ephesus*: καὶ δὲ, faith he, ἐν Πάτμῳ ἐξείρας ἐπαυθέντος συντάξεν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ὡς ἑπὶν ς': Being returned from his Banishment in the Isle of *Patmos*, he composes his Gospel when he was a hundred years old. It is no matter to us which of these Opinions be true, as long as we are certain that *St. John* wrote his Gospel about the end of the first Century. *Epiphanius* confessing, that *St. John* wrote it μετὰ ἑμ ἑνεκόντων τῷ αὐτῷ

Chapter design to make a Chronology, or an exact History of *Christ's* Life; but only to record his principal Discourses, and the main Circumstances of his Life, and some of his Miracles. But this pretence is confuted by *Epiphanius*, who has shewn that those times of *Christ* may be easily digested by an attentive Reader; and his Animadversions are excellently illustrated by *Petavius*.

But there are some, I understand, who object also against the opinion commonly received about the Writer of this Gospel, That the Discourses of *Christ*, which are recorded in it, are many times more intricate and obscure, than those which are related in the other Gospels, nor so often intermixed with *Parables*. But doubtless all *Christ's* Discourses, for three years together or thereabouts, were not of the same sort, but some were plainer, and others more obscure: and when the clearest of them, and most of his *Parables* had been already related by the other *Evangelists*, it is no wonder that *St. John* should not have so many *Parables* as they; or that the Discourses which he relates as spoken by *Christ*, have sometimes more obscurity in them than those which they have recorded. Besides, the Holy Ghost, by whom the Writers of the Gospels were inspired, that they might not say any thing that was not agreeable to Truth, did not alter any thing peculiar to each in their way of speaking or writing, but left them to use their own style in relating the principal heads of *Christ's* Discourses; and possibly *St. John's* style might be more intricate sometimes than ordinary, which is also discernible in his *Epistles*, and in the *Revelations*. There is no body but has observed that *St. Luke* writes the purest Greek, and that there are more Latinisms to be found in that *Evangelist*, than in any of the rest. And so *St. John* likewise has his Peculiarities, as Interpreters, and among the rest *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond*, have observed.

These being the only Arguments that can be alledged to prove this Gospel to be supposititious; and those being very slight and frivolous, or rather none at all, it is no wonder that the *Alogi* of old had no followers: and I dare say, whoever shall revive their Heresy, and have no better grounds for it than they had, will meet with as few; if they will but lay aside their preconceived opinions, and apply themselves for sometime to the study of Criticks, they will be ashamed of their own rashness. When the *Alogi* were asked who it was that wrote this Gospel, if it was not *St. John*, they answered *Cerinthus*, notwithstanding it was universally reckoned that *Cerinthus's* Opinion was directly opposite to this Gospel: and the same is pretended now by those who follow the *Alogi*. But their making such an absurd conjecture,



jecture, manifestly shews what excellent Criticks the Antients and Chapter we have to deal with: For it's most certain that *Cerintbus's* error I. was opposed by *St. John*, as I shall shew on *vers. 1.* And then can any one be induced to believe, that any thing which was written by so detested a Person as *Cerintbus*, could be so obtruded upon the Disciples of *St. John*, and all the Orthodox, as to be unanimously received by all the Christian World for Genuin, not long after *St. John's* Death? Who will believe that all the Antients were so blind as to think an opinion was confuted in a Book that asserted it? These things are absolutely incredible; nor would they have seemed less so to the *Alogi* of old, or now to their followers, than to us, if they had been able then, or could at present shew that the beginning of this Gospel does not contradict the opinion of the *Unitarians*; which because they despaired of, they resolved, contrary to all the Rules of Criticks, to deny this Gospel to be the Apostle *John's*. But with what success may be discerned from what I have hitherto said, and it is superfluous to add more.

II. The Antients which speak of the time when *St. John* wrote his Gospel do agree, that it was not written before his departure into the Island of *Patmos*; but some say that it was dictated in that *Island*, and published at *Ephesus*; and others that it was written in that *City* after the Apostles return. Now *St. John* was sent into the Isle of *Patmos* in the year of Christ 94. and thence he returned to *Ephesus* in the year 96. as appears from *St. Jerom* in *Catal. Script. Eccles.* And therefore it must either have been written between those ~~two~~ years, and afterwards made publick about the end of *St. John's* Life, or else both written and published at *Ephesus* after the year 97. The Author of the *Synopsis of the Holy Scripture*, whether *Athanasius* or some other, a very antient Writer, tells us that, τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον ὑπερορῶσιν τὸ αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγιὸν Ἰωάννην τὸ Ἀποστόλου καὶ ἠγαπημένου, ὄντος ἐξορίσσει ἐν Πατμῷ τῆ νήσου, καὶ ἐκ τῆ αὐτῆ ἐξεδόθη ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, διὰ Γαίου τὸ ἀγαπητὸ καὶ ξενιδόχου τῆ Ἀποστόλων: *the Gospel according to St. John was dictated by the holy and beloved Apostle John himself, when he was an Exile in the Island Patmos, and was published by him at Ephesus, by Gaius the beloved and host of the Apostles.* But *Suidas* on the word *Ἰωάννης* affirms, out of a more antient Author, that it was written at *Ephesus*: ἀπὸ δὲ, saith he, ἐν Πάτμῳ ἐξορίας ἐπανελθὼν συντάττει τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ὡς ἑτῶν 97: *Being returned from his Banishment in the Isle of Patmos, he composes his Gospel when he was a hundred years old.* It is no matter to us which of these Opinions be true, as long as we are certain that *St. John* wrote his Gospel about the end of the first Century. *Epiphanius* confessing, that *St. John* wrote it μετὰ ἑπὶ ἑννεήκοντα ἔτη

Chapter *αὐτὸς ζῶντις, μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆ Πατρὸς ἐπάνοδον*, after the ninetieth year of his Age, and after his return out of *Patmos*, erroneously makes that to have been in the reign of *Claudius*, as learned Men have observed: See his words in *Heruf. Alogorum*, which is the 51. *Secl.* 12.

III. By these Testimonies it appears that *St. John* either wrote or published his Gospel at *Ephesus*, which *Irenæus* also expressly affirms, *Lib. 3. c. 1.* *Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου, ὁ καὶ ἐστὶν τὸ σὺνθεῖσθαι αὐτῷ ἀναπτῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆ Ἀσίας διατείτων:* *St. John* one of our Lord's Disciples, who also leaned upon his Breast, and himself published a Gospel, dwelling at *Ephesus* in *Asia*.

If it be enquired on what occasion, and to what end *St. John* began his Gospel, so as we see he does? *Irenæus* answers in these words, *Lib. 3. c. 11.* after he had spoken of the other Evangelists: *St. John* the Disciple of our Lord, designing to extirpate that error which had been sowed (in mens Minds) by *Cerinthus*, and a great while before by those that are called *Nicolaitans*, who are a branch of that Heresy, which is falsely called *Knowledg*, (*γνώσις* from whence they had the name of *Gnosticks*) that he might confound them, and perswade them, that there is one God who made all things by his Word, &c. So that *St. John*, if we believe *Irenæus*, began his Gospel so as he did, on purpose to refute the Doctrin of *Cerinthus* and the *Gnosticks*, as he declares afterwards more at large. *Eusebius* in *Hist. Eccles. Lib. 3. c. 24.* affirms, that the intention of *St. John* was to fill up what was wanting in the relation of the other Evangelists: In his room I shall substitute *St. Jerom*, who in *Catal. Script. Eccl.* has these words: *Novissimus omnium scripsit Evangelium, rogatus ab Asiæ Episcopis, adversus Cerinthum, aliosque Hereticos, & maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogma consurgens, qui asserunt Christum ante Mariam non fuisse; unde & compulsus est divinam ejus nativitatem ediffere-re. Sed & aliam causam hujus scripturæ ferunt, &c.* He wrote his Gospel last of all, at the desire of the Bishops of *Asia*, against *Cerinthus* and other Hereticks, and the Heresy of the *Ebionites* which began to prevail exceedingly at that time, who asserted that *Christ* was not before the *Virgin Mary*; upon which account also he was forced to declare his *Divine Birth*. But there is another reason likewise given of this writing, which is the same I have alledged out of *Eusebius*, and is not to our purpose. The same Author in *Proem. ad Matthæum*, speaks thus, *Joannes Apostolus & Evangelista ——— cum esset in Asia, &c.* *St. John* the Apostle and Evangelist — being in *Asia*, and the Heresies of *Cerinthus*, *Ebion*, and others, who denied that *Christ* was come in the *Flesh*, and whom he also in his Epistle calls *Antichrists*, springing up at that very time ——— he was compelled almost by all the then Bishops of *Asia*, and the Messages of many Churches,



Churches; to write concerning our Saviour's Divinity more particularly — Chapter  
 Whence it is also related in Church-History, that being urged by his Bre- 1.  
 thren to write, he promised that he would, provided they would all keep a fast  
 and implore the assistance of God on his behalf, which being accordingly per-  
 formed, he was filled with the Holy Ghost, and immediately dictated as  
 from Heaven that Proemium: In the beginning, &c.

Altho all these Authors had been silent, we might easily enough have drawn a conjecture from the thing it self: for celebrated Writers, and Sects of Hereticks, having introduced several *Platonick* terms into the Jewish and Christian Religion, before St. *John* wrote; and the Apostle *John* being the first Christian Writer that used those terms in a peculiar Sense, in the beginning of his Gospel; it may be easily conjectured that he alluded to the Doctrin of those Men, and that it was his design to teach Christians in what sense those terms might be made use of. If the Writings of those antient Hereticks were now extant, they would be a great help doubtless to our understanding of this matter; but since they are lost, we can only make use of their fragments which are extant in *Irenæus*, the most antient Writer that has related their Opinions. There are extant also several Books of the famous *Philo Alexandrinus*, who was contemporary with the Apostles, and if we believe some of the Antients, familiar with them; where the same terms are so often used, that I am apt to think St. *John* has as great a respect to him as the forementioned Hereticks. It is certain that all his Writings were published a long while before ever St. *John* wrote; and his eloquence is such, that he was justly had in admiration by all who lived in his time, and is still read by learned Men with great delight. What high Commendations *Josephus*, *Justin Martyr*, *Eusebius*, St. *Jerom*, and others give him, I need not say.

So celebrated a Writer therefore could not be unknown to the Apostle *John*, who dwelt so long at *Ephesus*, in the very eye of *Asia*. That he had been carefully read by the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, the great *Grotius* has observed. And therefore being often read by the Christians, and having a great many things in him of a near affinity with the Christian Tenets, it was possible that many who were taken with his Eloquence, might imitate him, and mix his Opinions before they were aware with Christianity. To prevent which St. *John* in the beginning of his Gospel, made use of those terms which were most likely to impose on the unwary, that the Christians might understand in what sense they might be used: and how probable this is, will, by comparing the words of the Apostle with those of *Philo*, sufficiently appear. But





This it is certain was thought by learned Men among the *Arians*, Chapter I. to be the very Tenet of the Christians, as may be gathered from what *Eusebius* in *Præp. Evangelica* says out of *Philo*.

2. But especially he affirms those things concerning the Divine Reason, which as to the words, and sometimes also as to the sense, are very like the Christian Doctrin, of which I shall produce some examples. He calls *Reason* more than once the *Πρωτόπαιος*, as *St. Paul* *Col. i. 15.* in *Lib. de Agricultura* p. 152. where after he had mentioned the parts of the Universe, he tells us that God, *προσέταξαυτῷ ὁρθὸν αὐτῷ Λόγον Πρωτόπαιον υἱόν, ὅς τῷ ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς ἐκείνης ταύτης ἀγέλης, οἷά τις μεγάλῃ βασιλείῃς ὑπαρχῶν διατέξεται*, had set over it his right Reason, his first born Son, who undertook the care of this sacred Flock as some great King's Deputy.

3. He describes it as executing the Office of a *Mediator* between God and Men, in his Book entitled, *Quis rerum divinarum habes*, p. 396. *Τῷ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτάτῳ Λόγῳ δωρεὰν ἐξείρεται ἔδωκε ὁ τὰ ὅλα γεννήσας Πατήρ, ἵνα μετῴκαται τὸ γενόμενον διακείνη τῷ πεπαικώτῳ. Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἰκέτης μὲν ἐστὶ τῷ θνητῷ κηραίνοντι ἀπὸ πρὸς τὸ ἀφθαρτον, πρεσβυτὴς δὲ τῷ ἡγεμόντι πρὸς τὸ ὑπὸν—ἕτε ἀνεπίπτος ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ὢν, ἕτε γεννητὸς ὡς ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ μεσῶν τῶν ἀκρῶν, ἀμφοτέροις ὀμνηρέων. ὡς τῷ ἱερωτάτῳ φυντῶντι, πρὸς πᾶσιν τῷ μὴ σύμπαν ἀφάνισαι ποτὲ καὶ ἀπιστῆναι τὸ γένῳ, ἀκοσμίαν ἀντὶ κόσμου ἐλόμενον. ὡς δὲ τῷ φυντῶντι πρὸς εὐελπισίαν τῷ μήποτε τῷ ἰλεων θεῶν περὶ δὲ τὸ ἴδιον ἔργον: On the Prince of Angels, and most antient Reason, the Father who created all things, conferred this excellent gift, to stand as a Mediator, and divide that which comes to pass from that which he has made. And he perpetually intercedes for perishing Mortals with the incorruptible Nature, and is the Princes Embassador to his Subjects — He is neither unbegotten as God is, nor made as we are, but of a middle Nature between both extremes, acting the part of a Surety or Pledg with both; with the Creator, by engaging that Mankind shall never all grow corrupt, or rebel, preferring Confusion to order; and with the Creature, by giving them good hope, that the Merciful God will never overlook or neglect his own Workmanship.*

4. Upon this account he calls him also *Ἀρχιερεῖα* a High-Priest, in *Lib. de somniis*, p. 463. *Δύο γὰρ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἱερὰ θεῶν, ἐν ἧ ὅδε ὁ κόσμος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ Ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτῷ ὁ θεῶν Λόγος. ἕτερον δὲ λογικὴ ψυχή, ἢ ἱερῶν ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἀνθρώπων: God seems to have two Temples, whereof one is this World, whose High-Priest is the Divine Reason, his first begotten Son, and the other the reasonable Soul, the Priest whereof is he that is truly a Man. In like manner *St. Paul* says, that we are the Temples of God, *1 Cor. vi. 19.* and elsewhere.*

5. In the same Book, pag. 461. *Philo* tells us, that there are *τελεῖαι Ἀγοαί*, viz. a Divine, and a human *ὃν ὁ ἱερεὺς καθαίρει καὶ κερῶν ψυχῶν αἰμαρῶν*

Chapter *ἀμαρτημάτων, whereof one (i. e. the Divine) purifies and cleanses the Soul*  
 I. *from Sin.*

6. The same Author in several places affirms, that the Λόγος is εἰκὼν Θεῦ, the Image of God. So in Lib. *περὶ κοσμοποιίας*, pag. 11. Τὸν ὁ ἀόρατον καὶ νοητὸν θεῖον λόγον, καὶ Θεῦ λόγον εἰκόνα λέγει Θεῦ: The invisible and intelligible divine Reason, and the Reason of God, he calls the Image of God, viz. Moses. So in Lib. *de Somniis*, towards the end, he tells us that those who cannot understand God himself, yet sometimes τὸν ὁ Θεῦ εἰκόνα ἢ ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ λόγον, ὡς αὐτὸν κατανοῶσι, do understand the Image of God, his Angel Reason, as himself. And elsewhere he gives the same description of the Λόγος, which St. Paul also called the Image of the invisible God, the First-born of every Creature: see Lib. *de Profugis*, p. 363.

7. In his Book inscribed, *Quod pejus est meliori insidiatur*, he says, that the Lawgiver (viz. Moses) καλεῖ μάννα, ἢ πρεσβύτατον ἢ ὄντων λόγον θεῖον, calls by the name of *Manna* the most ancient of all Beings, the divine Reason: see also Lib. 2. *de Allegoriis Legis*, p. 70. & seqq. So in his Book intitled, *Quis rerum divinarum haberes*, pag. 784. he interprets τὸ μάννα by ὁ θεῖος λόγος, τὸν ἑράνιον φιλοθεάμονος ψυχῆς ἀφθαρτὸν τροφὴν: the divine Reason, the celestial and incorruptible Food of a contemplative Soul. Which compare with the words of Christ in *John* vi. 31. & seqq. There are many other things in *Philo*, resembling the Christian Doctrine, which I shall not here transcribe; for what I have alledged out of him *περὶ Λόγου*, is over and above sufficient to shew the possibility of his leading the Christians into an error by his Eloquence, if it were not prevented by the Apostles Authority. I shall now endeavour to interpret St. *John's* words, and shew that in many things he had a respect to *Philo*.

Verf. 1. *In the beginning was*] Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν. Tho the word ἀρχῇ be in the number of those which signify τὸ πρῶτον, or in the language of the Schools, *relatives*; it is not therefore to be thought that it refers to the Argument or Subject of this Book, which is the Gospel. According to all the rules of Grammar we ought rather to regard the signification of the words which immediatly follow, and their connexion. And here the following words are Λόγος, and all things were made by it; and the Evangelist says, the World was made by it; which shews that he speaks of the beginning of all things, or of the Creation of the World. None of those that made use of the word Λόγος in this sense, viz. for a Nature, which is with God, and is God, could understand these words otherwise, because they attributed, as I shall afterwards shew, the Creation of the World to Reason. And no wise  
 .man



man ought to take uncommon phrases in a quite different sense from Chapter that wherein they are understood by those who mostly use them, and yet never warn the Reader of his understanding them otherwise. Nor is it the part of a skilful Interpreter to understand Phrases in a perfectly new and unusual sense, unless it manifestly appears by the Writer whom he interprets, that they ought to be so understood.

Ibid. Reason] Λόγος. So I interpret the Greek word, and not by *Verbum the Word*, or *Sermo Speech* or *Discourse*; because those who first and mostly used it to signify a divine Mind, or God himself, did never mean by it a Nature speaking in the Name of God, but only understanding and disposing all things into order. *Timæus Locrus*, a *Pythagorean*, who perhaps first used this word, in his description of the Creation of the World speaks thus: Πριν ὧν ὠρανὸν γινέσθαι ΛΟΓΩ ἦσαν ἰδέα τε καὶ ὕλα, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς δημιουργὸς τῷ βελτίονι. Before therefore the Heaven was made, there were in Reason the Idea and Matter, and God the Creator of a better. So *Epicharmus* the Comædian, in his *Commonwealth*, as he is cited by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, Strom. Lib. 5.

Ἔστιν ἀνθρώπων λογισμὸς, ἔστι καὶ Θεῶν Λόγος.  
 Ὁ Λόγος ἀνθρώπων πέφυκε πρὸς βίον καὶ τὰς τέχνας.  
 Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τὰς τέχνας ἅπασιν συνέπεται Θεῶν Λόγος,  
 Ἐνδιδάσκων αἰὲν αὐτὰς, ὃς τι ποιεῖν δεῖ συμφέρειν.  
 Οὐ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων τέχνας εὗρε, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ταύτων φέρει.  
 Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τὸ ἀνθρώπων Λόγος πέφυκε ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου.


Which *Grotius* interprets thus;

*Est humana ratio; hanc præter est & divina altera.*  
*Ratio humana circa vitam & victum semet occupat;*  
*At divina Ratio est artis opifex & comes omnibus,*  
*Edocens ipsos quid usus maxime facto fiet.*  
*Quippe homo non reperit artem, sed dat hanc auctor Deus,*  
*Ipsaque illa humana ratio nata est ex ratione Dei.*

*Plato*, *Timæus's* Interpreter, and *Epicharmus's* Imitator, in his *Timæus*, calls likewise the Λόγος, λογισμὸς, reasoning, p. 528. Ed. Gen. of *Ficinus*: ἔπος δὲ πᾶς ὄντος αἰεὶ λογισμὸς Θεῶν——λογισμὸς: All this true reasoning of God——being reasoned, &c. But in his *Epinomis* he uses the word Λόγος, speaking of the World: ὃν ἔπαξε, saith he, Λόγος ὁ πάντων δεῖνός τε ὄρατον. The *Stoicks* who, as *Diogenes Laertius* tells us, in Lib. 7. Sect. 135 & 136. affirmed, ἔν τε εἶναι Θεὸν καὶ νόον, καὶ ἐμαρμένον καὶ Δία, πολλοῖς

Chapter I. *πολλάς τετέροις ὀνομασίαις προσονομάζεσθαι*, That it was the same thing which was called God, and the Mind, and Fate, and Jupiter, and by a great many other names, said also that God καὶ ἀρχαῖς σπευματικὸν ἐν λόγῳ ἔκασμι, did in the beginning, being the seminal Reason of the World, dispose all things. The same Author, in Sect. 134. says, it was the Doctrin of the Stoicks, that there were two Principles of all things, viz. an Active and a Passive; the latter of which was Matter or Substance without any Quality; Τὸ δὲ πρῶτον ἢ ἐν αὐτῇ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ. Τῆτον γὰρ ὄντα αἰτίον διὰ πάσης αὐτῆς συμπεργεῖν ἕκαστα; but the former, viz. the Active, was REASON, which was in it, and which was GOD; for this being eternal, out of all that (viz. Matter, or Passive principle) formed every thing. And to this Doctrin of the Stoicks, Tertullian in *Apol. cap. 21.* had a respect, when he says; *Apud vestros quoque sapientes λόγον, id est, Sermonem atque Rationem, constant artificem videri Universitatis. Hunc enim Zenon determinat factitorem, qui cuncta in dispositione formaverit; eundem ἔ fatum vocari ἔ Deum ἔ animum Jovis, ἔ necessitatem omnium rerum.* It is well known that also among your wise men, λόγος, i. e. Speech and Reason, was thought to have been the maker of the Universe. For this Zeno affirms to have been the Creator, who formed and disposed all things, and was called Fate, and God, and the Mind of Jupiter, and the Necessity of all things. There was no need of joining the word *Sermo* to *Ratio*, to render the Greek word λόγος; for what place could there be for Speech in the Creation and Disposition of the Universe? But there was for Reason; and therefore *Seneca* setting down the Opinion of *Plato* and the Stoicks, makes frequent mention of that, as in *Ep. 65.* *Causa autem, saith he, id est Ratio, materiam format, ἔ quocumque vult versat——Querimus quid sit causa? Ratio faciens, id est, Deus, &c.* The cause, that is Reason, formeth Matter, and turns or diversifies it how it pleases——If you ask what is meant by Cause, it is Reason creating, that is, God. And in *Lib. de Vita Beata, cap. 8.* he stiles it, *incorporalis Ratio ingentium operum artifex; incorporal Reason, the Author of great Works.* Consult also *Philo* wherever he speaks of the λόγος, and the Creation of the World, and we shall see that he never understands Speech by it, but only Reason. See his Book *de mundi opificio*, where he says that it was the intelligible Pattern of the World, and had no other place, ἢ ἢ Θεῶν λόγον ἢ ταῦτα διακινεῖσθαι, than the divine Mind or Reason which disposed those things: Other Passages out of him I shall produce afterwards. I might alledg also the Testimonies of Modern Platonicks, and Ecclesiastical Writers to this purpose, but that I have determined to shew only how the Antients used this word. The Jews who were more antient than *Philo* himself, called *Angels,*  
both



both good and bad, λόγος, which is the same as if they had said, Chapter  
 λογικὰς δυνάμεις, Powers endued with Reason, not with Speech; which Philo I.  
 also imitated. So the Author of the Book of Wisdom, Chap. xviii.   
 15, 16. speaking of the revenging Angel that was sent against the  
 Egyptians, says: ὁ παντοδυναμὸς σε λόγος ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἐκ θρόνων βασιλείων, &c.  
 Thine almighty Reason leapt down from Heaven out of thy Royal Throne, as  
 an inexorable Warrior, into the midst of a land of destruction, and brought  
 thine unfeigned Commandment as a sharp Sword, and standing up filled  
 all things with Death; and it touched the Heaven, but it stood upon the  
 Earth, &c. The Writer of this Book attributes a Throne to this An-  
 gel, in agreement with the custom of the Eastern Nations, who cal-  
 led Angels Thrones. Otherwise he imitates Homer, who Iliad Δ, vers.  
 443. speaking of Iris, saith: Οὐρανῶ ἐστειίξε κέφαλον, καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίναται She  
 fixes her head in the Heaven, and walks upon the Earth.

I know indeed there are some Interpreters who would make St. John  
 to have a respect to the Expression of Moses, who represents God as  
 creating the World by speaking or saying. But tho' Moses teaches us,  
 that God made all things, as it were, by a Command, yet it is mani-  
 fest he does not mean speech properly so called, as I have shewn in my  
 Notes on Gen. Ch. i. So that it would be but a dull Allusion to say  
 upon that account, that the Word was with God, yea, God himself; nor  
 are there any such Allusions observable in St. John's stile.

Ibid. *And that Reason was with God.*] Καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν μετὰ τὸ Θεόν. It is  
 said here, that Reason was with God, by way of antithesis or opposi-  
 tion to what is afterwards said concerning the manifestation of the  
 divine Reason among men. Afterwards it was μετὰ ἀνθρώπων, when it  
 dwelt in Jesus Christ, nay μετὰ ἀνθρώπους; forasmuch as Christ con-  
 versed with men, and by the inspiration of the divine Reason called  
 them to a better life. I might produce out of Plotinus, if he were not  
 a late Author, a like expression, μετὰ τὸ Νῆ, or Λογῶ. But I shall alledg  
 only the words of Ignatius, in his genuin Epistle ad Magnesios, con-  
 cerning Jesus Christ, pag. 33. Ed. Voss. ὅς μετὰ αἰώνων μετὰ Πατέρα ἦν, καὶ ἐν  
 τέλος ἐφάνη; who before [all] Ages was with the Father, but in the end ap-  
 peared. Which words allude to this place in St. John, and may serve  
 instead of an interpretation of it, as also what he says a little after:  
 εἷς Θεὸς ἐστὶν ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἡμετέρας αὐτῶ ὅς ἐστιν αὐτῶ Λόγος αἰώνιος:  
 There is one God, who has revealed himself by Jesus Christ his Son, which is  
 his eternal Reason.

Ibid. *God was that Reason.*] Καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος. St. John adds this,  
 lest it should be thought that there was any thing besides the Divine  
 Nature before the Creation of the World. Philo also calls the λόγος  
 God,

Chapter God, in Lib. *de Somniis*, p. 465. on these words in *Genes.* xxxi. 13. I am the God that appeared to thee, in the place of God. Καλεῖ δὲ, saith he, ὁ Θεὸς ὃν προσβύτατον αὐτῷ Λόγον. That which the [Scripture] calls God, is his most ancient Reason. But there is this difference between St. John and Philo, that Philo would have the Λόγος to be called God only abusively, or improperly; for a little before he saith: ὁ ὡς ἀληθεία Θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν· οἱ δὲ ἐν ἀλλοτριότητι γινόμενοι πολλοί: He that is truly God is one; those that are abusively so, are many. And after the words before alledged, he subjoins that the Scripture does not, διασεμνομένῳ περὶ πλὴν θεῶν ἢ ὀνομάτων, is not superstitious about the imposing of names. But St. John teaches us, that Reason not only was from the beginning, and with God, by which word he understands him who is in the most excellent sense so called, but adds, as it were, καὶ διόρθωσιν, by way of correction, And that Reason was God; which, according to Philo, could only be said improperly. And indeed Philo every where makes his Λόγος inferior to the most high God; whereas St. John asserts the Λόγος, which he says conversed afterwards with men, to have been the one only true God, properly so call'd. And this he says also in opposition to Cerinthus, of whom Irenæus in Lib. 1. cap. 25. speaks thus: But one Cerinthus in Asia affirmed that the World was not made by the supreme God, but by a certain Power separate and very distant from that Principality which is over all things, and which did not know him who is over all things, God. See also Lib. 3. c. 11. For if Reason be God, even that God with whom it was from the beginning; and if Reason made the World, as St. John affirms, then Cerinthus was manifestly mistaken.

Verf. 2. *The same was in the beginning with God.*] These words St. John repeats out of the foregoing Verse, for the sake of connexion, being about to say, that all things were made by Reason.

Verf. 3. *All things were made by it.*] Πάντα δι' αὐτῆ ἐγένετο. This is nothing to Cerinthus, who did not deny that all things were made by Reason; but it is said, that the Christians might understand it to be true, what Philo and others before him among the Jews, asserted concerning the Creation of the World by the Λόγος. He opposes the Doctrine of the Epicureans, who contended that all things were made by Chance, and without Reason. That this was the opinion of Epicurus, contrary to the sentiments of most other Philosophers, and particularly of Plato, every one knows, and it is needless to prove. Lucretius also, in Lib. 5. expressly denies that the Universe was made by Reason, where he affirms that it is senseless to say,

—————*Deum quod sit Ratione vetustæ  
Gentibus humanis fundatum*—————

That



That the [World] was founded for Mankind by the ancient Reason of the Chapter Gods. In which he has a respect to the Platonists, who used so to I. speak, as the following words shew, in which he denies that God had *exemplum gignendis rebus ullum*, any Pattern to make the World by. So that according to the Opinion of Epicurus, the World was produced *χωρὶς λόγου*, without Reason; or as Plutarch, *de Philos. Placitis*, Lib. 1. c. 4. speaks, *ἢ ἀτόμων σωματίων ἀτεχνήτων καὶ τυχαίαν ἐχόντων τὴν κίνησιν*, by indivisible Bodies having an unforeseen and fortuitous motion. But Lactantius speaking of this Opinion in Lib. *de ira Divina*, cap. 10. after he had described the beauty of the Universe, and proved it to have been created by God, against Leucippus and Epicurus, very well says, *Tanta ergo qui videat & talia, potest existimare nullo effecta esse consilio, nulla providentia, nulla RATIONE divina, sed ex atomis subtilibus, exiguis concreta esse tanta miracula?* Can therefore one that beholds such and so great things, think that they were made with no design, no foresight, no divine REASON, but that all these great Miracles were produced by the conjunction of subtil small Atoms? And *Instit. Divin.* Lib. 1. c. 2. after he had said that Democritus and Epicurus thought all things were made and are governed by Chance, he subjoins a little after, *Quos tamen & ceteri Philosophi ac maxime Stoici, acerrime retuderunt, dicentes nec fieri mundum SINE divina RATIONE potuisse; nec constare, nisi summâ RATIONE regeretur.* Whom yet the rest of the Philosophers, and particularly the Stoicks, did most sharply oppose, affirming that the World could neither have been made without the divine REASON, nor consist unless it were governed by the highest REASON. And Lib. 3. c. 17. he expresses again the Opinion of Epicurus thus; *Nihil in procreandis animalibus Providentiæ RATIO molita est, REASON used no foresight in the producing of living Creatures.* In opposition to which he says a little after, *Non potest quidquam rationale perficere nisi RATIO, Nothing but REASON can make any rational being.*

But let us return now to the Jews, and particularly to Philo, who speak in the same manner as St. John: So the Author of the Book of *Wisdom*, cap. ix. 1. addresses himself to God thus; *ὁ πνύσας τὰ ΠΑΝΤΑ ἐν λόγῳ σε, καὶ τὴν σοφίαν σε κατασκευάσας ἄνθρωπον*: who hast made ALL THINGS by thy Reason, and adorned Man by thy Wisdom. And Philo Lib. 2. *de Monarchia*, p. 736. saith, *Λόγος ἐστὶν εἰκὼν Θεοῦ, δι' ἣν ὅλη ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργήθη*: Reason is the Image of God, by which the whole World was created. But there is this difference between St. John and Philo in this matter, that whereas St. John affirms, that the Λόγος was God himself, viz. the most High, Philo would have it said that the World was created by it, as God's Instrument. So in Lib. *de Cherubinīs*,

Chapter p. 100. after he had said, that there must be four things considered  
 I. in every Production, viz. the cause, the matter, the instrument and  
 end for which it is produced, and had applied those things distinctly  
 to an Edifice, he adds concerning the World, that: ἐξ ἧστίς αἰτίαι ἦν  
 αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς, ὑφ' ἧ γέγονεν — ὅργανον δὲ λόγον Θεῶ, δι' ἧ κατεσκευάσθη: you will  
 find that the cause of it was God, by whom it was made: ——— and  
 the instrument the Reason of God, by which it was disposed. But in  
 St. John, all things are said to have been made by Reason, in the same  
 manner as if it were said the World was created by the Divine Pow-  
 er διὰ τὴ δύναμειος Θεῶ: which words do not signify an instrument distinct  
 from God, but God himself. Tho it's true, Origen thought it follow-  
 ed from hence, that Reason was something inferior to God, as we  
 may see in his Comment. on St. John, T. II. p. 55. Ed. Huet. But  
 his reasoning is vain, as appears by what I said: So St. Paul says, that  
 he was an Apostle διὰ θελήματι Θεῶ, by the Will of God, 1 Cor. i. 1.  
 and 2 Cor. i. 1. but it cannot be inferred from thence, that the will of  
 God is inferior to God.

That the word πάντα, all things, is to be understood of the Uni-  
 verse, I need not here prove; for tho that word may have several sig-  
 nifications, yet in this matter it cannot be otherwise understood:  
 They are bad Criticks who consider what words signify separately,  
 and think that any of those significations may be any where applied,  
 without any regard had to the Phrases in which they occur, or the  
 occasion on which they are used; or who think that an interpretation  
 ought to be admitted, only because it does not make the sense altoge-  
 ther absurd, and it is not *Metaphysically*, if I may so speak, *impossible*  
 but that the Writer, whom they interpret, might mean as they  
 would have him. We ought carefully to consider, in what sense  
 words are commonly used in any Language, with the occasion of the  
 writing, and all the circumstances of the Discourse, in order to give  
 a right interpretation of them.

Ibid. *And without it was not any thing made that was made.*] γοεὶς αὐτῷ  
 ἐγένετο ἐξ ἧ ἦν ὁ γέγονεν. Tho it be a very true Observation of a great  
 Man, that the Holy Scriptures do many times explain what they as-  
 sert by a Negation of the contrary; yet I do not think that these words  
 are added to that end. The Epicureans thought that all and every  
 particular thing was made *without Reason*; in contradiction to which  
 the Apostle here affirms, that not only *all things*, that is, the Uni-  
 verse, but *every single thing* was made with Reason. The Epicureans,  
 when any objected against their opinion the beauty of the World,  
 and the great Benefit which Men received by the Order and Disposi-  
 tion of it, pretended to prove

*Nequi-*



*Nequaquam nobis divinitus esse paratam  
Naturam rerum, tanta stat prædita culpa!*

Chapter  
I.



That the World was not made by a divine Power and Wisdom for our use, there are so many faults in it. And they composed a Catalogue of things that were hurtful to Mankind, and seemed to be made without Reason, as we may see in *Lucretius*, Lib. 5. after the words alledged. And so *Cicero* likewise in *Acad. Quæst.* 4. c. 38. disputes thus against the *Stoicks*: *Cur Deus omnia nostri causâ cum faceret (sic enim vultis) tantum natricum, viperarumque fecerit? cur mortifera tam multa perniciofa terra, marique disperferit? &c.* Why God having made all things for our use, as ye affirm, should make so many Watersnakes and Vipers? Why he should disperse so many deadly and pernicious things on the Earth, and in the Sea, &c. These Arguments had such an effect upon some who were otherwise friends to Providence, that they granted the *Epicureans* there were some things made *χωρὶς λόγου* without Reason. And among these *Philo* was one, to whom I make little doubt but that the Apostle had a respect in this matter also: as he has approved some things in his Doctrine, so he has rejected others, lest by the unwary the bad should be mixed with the good, and lest because he had approved some things, he should seem to have assented to all. That Doctrine of *Philo* was extant in his Book *de Providentia*, out of which we have a long disputation set down in *Eusebius*, *Præp. Evang.* Lib. 8. c. 14. where among other passages we meet with this: *τὸ δ' ἐρπετῶν τὰ ἰοβόλα γέρονεν ἢ καὶ πρόνοιαν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπακλήθεισιν, ὡς καὶ πρότερον εἶπον. Ζωογονεῖται γὰρ ὅταν ἐνυπέρχουσα ἰκμάς μεταβάλλῃ πρὸς τὸ θερμότερον. ἔνια δὲ καὶ σὴψις ἐψύχουσιν, ὡς ἔλμινθας ἢ, ἢ ἀεὶ τροφῆν. φθίρας δ' ἀπὸ τῶ ἰδρώτων. Ὅσα δ' ἐξ οἰκείας ὕλης καὶ εὐσιν σπέρματος, καὶ ἀεργαμένην ἔχουσαν γένεσιν αἰκότως ἐπιγέγραπται πρόνοιαν:* Those creeping things that are poisonous are not made by Providence, but come of course as I before said: For they are generated when the moistness that is inherent in them, or whereof they consist, becomes warmer than ordinary. [I think Mr. le Clerc does not express the sense of this period, when he translates it, *Nascuntur enim cum humiditas terræ inherens calore mutatur;*] Some are animated by Putrefaction, as worms in the Belly, viz. by the putrefaction of Food, and lice of Sweat. But every thing which is procreated from a seminal and antecedaneous Nature [in the Latin it is *prævisam*, which I take to be a mistake either in Mr. le Clerc, or in his Printer, for *prægressam*] out of its proper matter, is justly ascribed to Providence. This is contrary to the Christian Doctrine, which teaches us that all things were created, and are taken care of by God; see *Mat.* x. 29. and Interpreters upon that place.

Chapter  
I.

Verf. 4. *In it was Life*] Ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. *Life* in this place seems to signify a clear Doctrin concerning eternal Life, and the way of attaining it, which were but obscurely known before *Christ*; upon which account *St. Paul*, 2 *Tim.* i. 20. says, that *Christ brought Life and Immortality to Light by the Gospel*. And that this is here *St. John's* meaning he himself shews, in 1 *Epist.* i. 2. *For the Life*, saith he, *was manifested, and we have seen it and bear witness, and declare unto you that eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us*. And in the same *Epist.* Chap. v. 11. *God hath given to us Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son*: Or else the *λύγθ* may be called *Life*, because it gives spiritual Life to Men in this world, and eternal Life in the other. *Ignatius*, *St. John's* Disciple, in his genuin Epistle to the Inhabitants of *Smirna*, after he had said that it was difficult for bad Men to repent, subjoins; τέτε δὲ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν Ἰησοῦς χριστός, τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἡμῶν ζῆν: *but this is in the power of Jesus Christ, (who is) our true Life*. And in his *Epist.* to the *Trallians*, p. 51. *Ed. Voss.* speaking of *Christ*, he saith; ἢ χωρίς τοῦ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν ἐκ ἔχομεν, *without whom we have no true Life*. There are some who think that *St. John* has a respect to the Doctrin of the *Gnosticks*, who affirmed, that *Reason* and *Life* were two several divine Emanations. But whether this, which was afterwards the opinion of *Valentinus*, was before known, is very uncertain: See Note on *Verf.* 16. Besides, the sense I have given is plain, and agreeable to what follows.

The Apostle seems rather to allude here to a Passage in *Philo*, who in his Book entitled, *Quis rerum divinarum Hæres*, p. 381. saith, Ζωῆς δὲ τριτλὸν γένθ, τὸ μὲν πρὸς Θεόν, τὸ δὲ πρὸς γένεσιν, τὸ δὲ μέθριον μικτὸν ἀμφόβιν· τὸ μὲν ἔν πρὸς Θεόν ἔκατέβη πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἡ δὲ ἦλθεν ἐς τὰς τὲ σώματθ ἀναγκασθ &c. *There is a threefold kind of Life, one which is with God, another which is with the Creature, and a third which is of a middle Nature mixed of both: That which is with God has not descended to us, or come for the necessities of the Body, &c.* But *St. John* teaches us, that that kind of Life was brought down upon Earth by *Christ*.

*Ibid.* *And this Life was the Light of Men.* Ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. The light of the Mind is a thing very often mentioned by *Philo*; but because he does not fetch that light from the Doctrin of *Christ*, but from *Judaism*, mixed with an opinion of *Plato*, it is all frivolous that he says of it. It is only therefore to the Gospel that that Passage of his, concerning the Divine Light, in *Lib. de Humanitate*, p. 551. agrees; καθάπερ γὰρ ἀντείλαντθ ἡλιε τὸ μὲν σκότθ ἀφανίζεται, φωτὶς ὃ πληρῆται τὰ πάντα· τὸ αὐτὸν τρίτον ὅταν θεοπέμπτες ἡλιε ἀνάσχη καὶ ὀπλάμψη ψυχῶν, ὃ μὲν τῶν κακιῶν καὶ παθῶν ζόφθ ἀνασκίδνεται, τὸ δὲ ἀυρειδεσῆτης ἀρετῆς τὸ καθαρώτατον καὶ ἀξιώεσεν εἶδθ ὀφραίνεται: *For as when the Sun rises the darkness is dissipated, and all things*



things are filled with Light; so when the Sun made by God arises and enlightens the Soul, the darkness of Vice and Passion is dispelled, and a most pure and amiable form [in the Latin it is *sanctissima species*, but it should have been translated *digna amata*] of most shining Vertue appears.

Chapter  
I.  
W  
E

Verf. 5. *Shineth in darkness.*] Ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει. i. e. is risen to dispel Mens ignorance.

Verf. 7. *Through him might believe*] Πισεύσωσι δι' αὐτοῦ. i. e. that they might by John's Ministry be induced to believe in Christ. Grotius's interpretation is harsh, that through the Light they might believe in God.

Verf. 8. *He was not the Light*] viz. that excellent Light of which St. John speaks both before and after: For otherwise in Chap. v. 35. of this Gospel, John the Baptist is called a burning and a shining Light.

Verf. 9. *That Light was the true Light*] Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν. In Plato and his followers, and amongst the rest Philo, those things are said to be such or such truly, which may be so called in an excellent sense. Thus in Lib. de mundi Opificio, p. 13. Philo says, that in the harmony of the parts of the World, there is ἀληθὴς μουσικὴ true Musick. And this phrase St. John seems to have taken delight in, and frequently makes use of, as in 1 Epist. ii, 8. where he says again, the true Light. And so in this Gospel Chap. vi. 32. Christ is called the true Bread, and his Flesh, verf. 55. true Meat, and Chap. xv. 1. he is said to be the true Vine.

Ibid. *Which came into the World*] Ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸ κόσμον. This I refer, as Grotius does, to the Light, not to Men. Consult his Notes.

Ibid. *Every Man*] Not only the Jews, as John Baptist and the other Prophets did, but all Men of what Nation soever they are, of whom vast numbers had received the Christian Faith at that time. This is afterwards more clearly explained by St. John.

Verf. 10. *Reason was in the World.* I have supplied the word Reason, because the Pronoun αὐτὸν presently follows, which is the Relative to Λόγος. By the World here we are to understand men, amongst whom Christ conversed.

Ibid. *And the World was made by it*] i. e. especially mankind, whose first Parents were created by the divine Reason.

Ibid. *Knew it not*] viz. to be the divine Reason, when they ought to have collected from the Discourses and Actions of Christ, that that same Λόγος, by which all things had been created, dwelt in him. He did not bring Laws that were useful for one Nation, and hurtful to others, but such as were equally profitable for all mankind, and therefore manifestly proceeded from the common Parent of mankind. They were Laws becoming the Creator of all things to make, and fit for all Nations and all Ages; and if the Jews had not been blind, *Si mens non*

Chapter *leva fuisset*, as the Poet speaks, they might have easily discerned their  
I. Author.

~ Vers. 11. *To its own.*] *Tà ἴδια*, i. e. the Jews: Consult *Grotius*. The Jews are so stiled, because they are called *the People of God*, and so of the *Λόγος*.

Ibid. *Received it not.*] For they rejected the Doctrin of *Christ*, by whose Mouth the divine Reason spake, and in whom it dwelt.

Vers. 12. *As many*] viz. of what Nation soever, because the greatest part of the Jews rejected him.

Ibid. *Received,*] ἔλαβον, viz. as their only Master.

Ibid. *It gave them power to become the Sons of God,*] that is, to be called *God's Children* as well as the Jews, and that in a more excellent sense than they. *Moses*, *Deut. xxxii. 6.* calls God the *Father of the Israelites*. In *Psalms lxxiii. 15.* the same People are called *the Generation of God's Children*; and *Hos. i. 10.* the *Sons of the living God*. In this Gospel, *Chap. viii. 41.* they boast of their *having one Father, even God*. Now those are called the *Sons of God*, who worship the true God, and living conformably to his Commands, have a well-grounded hope of being made partakers of the good things he has promised. And this privilege the Jews contended to belong only to themselves, and those who embraced their Religion, by virtue of the *Mosaical Covenant*. But *St. John* teaches us, that the *Divine Reason* has conferred this privilege on all that believe the Gospel. Perhaps the Apostle designed also in this passage to contradict *Philo*, who distinguishes between the *Sons of God* and the *Sons of Reason*, in *Lib. de confusione Linguarum*, p. 267. Οἱ ὀπίσθη, saith he, κεχρημένοι τῷ ἐνὸς ἑοῦ Θεοῦ προσπαρρέονται δέοντως, καὶ ἀπὸ Μωσῆος ὁμολογεῖ φάσκων, “ Ἴσθι ἐστὶ κρείττον ἢ Θεοῦ· καὶ Θεὸν τὸ γεννήσαντά σε. Οὐκ αὐτὸς ἔστὶ σε πατήρ; ————— Καὶ μὴδέπω τυγχάνη τις ἀξιώχρεως ὢν ἑὸς Θεοῦ προσπαρρέουσα, σπένδαζε κοσμηῖσθαι καὶ τὸ πρωτόγονον αὐτῷ Λόγον, τὸ ἀγγελον πρεσβύτατον· καὶ γὰρ εἰ μήπω ἰκανοὶ Θεοῦ παῖδες νομιζέσθαι γέγοναμεν, ἀλλὰ τοὶ αἰδίε εἰκόντες αὐτῷ Λόγῳ τῶ ἱερῷτάτῳ. Those that make use of knowledg, are deservedly called the *Sons of one God*; as *Moses* also acknowledges, saying; Ye are the *Sons of the Lord God*: and, God who hath begotten thee: and, is not he himself thy Father? —————

*If any one be not as yet worthy to be called a Son of God, let him endeavour to be adorned by his first-born, Reason, the most antient Angel: For if we are not yet fit to be reputed the Sons of God, yet (let us strive to be so) of most holy Reason, his eternal Image.*

Vers. 13. *Born not of blood*] As those who were descended from *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, and thought themselves to be the *Sons of God* upon that account: See *Chap. viii. 33. & seqq.*

Ibid.



Ibid. *Nor of the will of the flesh.*] Strange women that were taken Chapter  
 Captives in war, and married to Jews, were look'd upon to be ad- I.  
 mitted into the number of God's Children, that is, to be also *Jews*.  
 And of such it is properly said, that they became *Israelites* (or Chil-  
 dren of God) *by the will of the flesh*, that is, by fleshly concupiscence:  
 see *Deut. xxi. 11. & seqq.*

Ibid. *Of the will of man.*] This has a reference to the Children of  
 Profelites, who upon their Father and his Family's turning Jews, be-  
 came, if they were little, *the Sons of God* only *by the will of one man*.  
 Yea, and an adult Person, who embraced the Jewish Religion, may be  
 said to have become a *Jew* by the *will of man*, viz. his own. It must  
 be carefully observed, that St. *John* here uses the word *ἀπὸ τοῦ κρέατος* *viri*,  
 and not *ἀπὸ τοῦ κρέατος hominis*; to distinguish that kind of adoption which  
 was made by the will of a Father, from the former, whereby a strange  
 woman became a *Jew* *by the will of the flesh*.

Ibid. *But of God*] viz. By Regeneration, or a change of manners,  
 whereby, forsaking Heathenism, and embracing the Gospel, they  
 lived according to the rules of Christianity. Of this Regeneration  
 St. *John* speaks afterwards in *Chap. iii. 3. & seqq.* And St. *Paul* in-  
 sists upon it very much, in his *Epistle* to the *Romans* and elsewhere;  
 for to this all that he says almost about the *ὑποθέσις*, or *adoption* of the  
 Gentiles, has a respect. Which my design in this place will not per-  
 mit me at large to shew.

Vers. 14. *Was made flesh.*] *Σὰρξ ἐγένετο*. That by *flesh* we are to  
 understand *human nature*, is generally observed by Interpreters, who  
 may be consulted. But the *ἄσχητον* may be said to have been *made flesh*,  
 or *man*, in more respects than one; and here it is said to have been  
*made flesh*, in regard that, being clothed, as it were, with the *Flesh*  
 of *Christ*, it became conspicuous; for *Flesh* sometimes signifies a con-  
 spicuous nature in opposition to one that is spiritual or inconspicuous.  
 So it is used by St. *Paul* in *1 Tim. iii. 16.* where he tells us that *God*  
*appeared in Flesh*, *ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί*, *was justified in Spirit*, &c. i. e. *God*  
 became, as it were, conspicuous, when all *the fulness of the Godhead*  
*dwelt bodily in Christ*; in *Christ*, I say, who being a *Man*, was conspi-  
 cuous and visible, and in whom *God* shewed himself to be present. I  
 know other Copies have *μυστήριον*, but the sense is the same. That the  
 word *Flesh* is taken here for *human Nature*, as conspicuous, appears  
 by the following words in this, and by the 18th verse. Tho when I  
 say that *Flesh* is considered here by St. *John* as *conspicuous*, or precisely  
 under that notion, that is so far from excluding the other *properties*,  
 as the Schoolmen speak, of *human nature*, that on the contrary it *sup-*  
*poses*

Chapter poses them. For our Flesh is therefore conspicuous, because it is a necessary property of human nature to be conspicuous.

It is rightly said by Divines, that *Reason was made Flesh*, not by a conversion of the divine Nature into a human, which is as impossible as for a human to be changed into a divine; but by an unexpressible *indwelling* of God, whereby the humanity of *Christ* became the humanity of *God*, in a singular and extraordinary manner; as on the other hand the *divine* Reason was made the Divinity of *Christ*, by that secret union. From that time *God* might be called *Flesh*, and reciprocally the name of *God* might be attributed to *Flesh* or *Man*. And upon the account of this conjunction of two Natures in *Christ*, the Apostles speak of him sometimes as *God*, sometimes as a *Man*; and do not only ascribe to *Christ*, what they had seen done by the *man Jesus*, but also what the divine Reason did before *Jesus* was born: see *Col. i. 14. & seqq. & Heb. i. 2, 10.*

Ibid. *Dwelt among us.*] Ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν. That is, it dwelt in a man who conversed among us. All these things *Philo* was ignorant of, or else resolved to be so, if it be true what some of the Antients say, that having embraced the Christian Religion, he afterwards apostatized from it: see *Euseb. Hist. Ecclesj. Lib. 2. c. 17. & Photius Cod. 105.*

Ibid. *We beheld its Glory*] *i. e.* such Miracles as were never before, or in the same manner done by any. That Miracles are called the *Glory* of *God*, I have shewn in my Notes on *Exod. xvi. 7.* Amongst those Miracles which were wrought for the honour of *Christ*, a very eminent one was that of his Transfiguration, spoken of by *St. Peter* in his 2 *Epist. i. 16, 17.* whose words give great light to this passage: *For we have not followed, saith he, cunningly devised Fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; but were eye witnesses of his Majesty. For he received from God the Father, honour and glory, [δοξαν] when there came such a voice to him from the magnificent Glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased: see Mat. xvii.*

Ibid. *As of the only begotten*] whom he accordingly gave that glory to, which he had never before conferred on any, or ever will. The Prophets who were Brethren, and the Sons of *God* in the same manner as one another, had often an equal glory put upon them by the Miracles which *God* wrought at their request. But the Miracles of *Jesus Christ* were so many and great, that they were capable, if I may so speak, of obscuring all that had been formerly wrought by their multitude and splendor.



By this word *only begotten* perhaps St. John might have a secret design Chapter I. to oppose the Doctrin of Philo, who generally calls the *ἄγος οὐκ μονογενῆν* the only begotten, but only *πρωτότοκον* the first begotten, and *πρεσβύτατον* the most antient of the Angels. Grotius thinks that the Gnosticks are here condemned, who made the *ἄγος & Μονογενῆν* to be two different persons; but it is uncertain whether those frivolous *Syzigie Pleromatis* had been invented when St. John wrote: see on *vers.* 16.

Ibid. *Of or from the Father*] *Πατρὸς παλῆδος.* This must be referred to the word *Glory*: see Grotius.

Ibid. *Full of Grace and Truth,*] *Πλήρης χάριτος ἔ ἀληθείας.* If these words be referred to the immediatly foregoing, we must supply *ὅς ἦν who was*, viz. the only begotten. Otherwise they must be included in a Parenthesis, as I have done them. Grotius however is of another opinion, who may be consulted.

*Grace and Truth*] that is, in Hebrew *חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת* *hesed veemeth*, of which phrase I have discoursed in my Notes on *Gen.* xxiv. 27. There is an opposition made here between the Gospel and the Law, as appears from the 17th verse. The Mosaical Law appointed Sacrifices for the expiation of some sort of Sins; which if they were wilfully and knowingly neglected, tho it were but once, it denounced death upon the Sinner, whatever his Repentance was afterwards. For other sins there were no expiatory Sacrifices instituted, but they were to be punished with death. Neither did God by virtue of that Covenant promise to any one that died for transgressing the Law, tho never so penitent, any mercy in the life to come. And yet these were Sins, which by reason of the multitude of the Laws were frequently committed; so that God discovered nothing but his inflexible Justice in the Law. It's true, he promises Forgiveness to the whole Jewish Nation, becoming penitent after the destruction of their Commonwealth, in *Levit.* xxvi. and elsewhere. But particular Persons, as long as the Commonwealth stood sinning in that manner as I have said, had no hopes of pardon. But it is quite otherwise under the Gospel, in which God promises pardon to the greatest Sinner, upon repentance and amendment of life, and that without the intervention of Sacrifices. And in this sense the Gospel alone is full of the *grace and mercy* of God.

*Vers.* 15. *John bare witness*] or *bears witness*, *μαρτυρεῖ*, viz. in the Gospels. But I have preferred the former, because it follows (in the Preterperfect tense) *ἔνεγγε* *he cried*. It is thought by some, that this is repeated by the Evangelist, because there were some who chose to be the Disciples of John the Baptist rather than of Christ. and so gave the

*prese-*

Chapter preference to him. And when the Gospel was first preached, it is certain there were such persons, as appears by *John's* having Disciples of his own that went under his name, and from *Acts* xix. But that so many years after Christ's ascension into Heaven, there remained any such persons, is not probable; and the words of the *Evangelist* may respect any of the *Jews* whatsoever, who having a good opinion of *John the Baptist*, because he was of a Sacerdotal Order, and uncondemned by the Sanhedrim, did yet reject *Christ*, because he was condemned unjustly, and did not know that *John the Baptist* had given a most clear testimony of him.

Ibid. *That is to come*] viz. In the Name of God to his People.

Ibid. *Was before me.*] That is, in dignity, or a more eminent Person than I: see *Grotius*. And to the passages alledged by that great Man to this purpose, add this out of *Euripides*, in *Oreste* ver. 488. where it is said to be the Character of a Greck:

καὶ τῶ νόμων γε μὴ πρέτερον εἶναι θέλειν:

*Not to desire to be above the Laws, or superior to the Laws, πρέτερον, as the Scholiast well explains it.*

Verf. 16. *Of his fulness*] Ἐκ τῆς πληρώματός. *Irenæus* supposes this to have a reference to the *πλήρωμα*, which he attributes not only to the *Valentinians*, but to *Cerinthus*, and such as were antienter than he, the *Nicolaitans*, Lib. 3. c. 11. But I cannot perfectly agree with him for the following reasons.

1. He himself in *Lib. 1. c. 25 & 27.* where he sets down the Doctrine of *Cerinthus* and the *Nicolaitans*, has nothing about this *Pleroma*, which he affirms to have been peculiar to the *Valentinians* in *Chap. 1.* of the same Book.

2. These words do not confute those who invented that term, for all whom it might be said, that men do receive Grace from the *fulness* that is in *Reason*: see *Irenæus* himself, *Cap. 1. lib. 1.*

3. *Irenæus* might easily confound the Doctrins of various Hereticks, as he did the Fooleries of the *Millenarists*, with the Doctrine of the Apostle *John*. He was a very pious man, and a great lover of the Christian Religion, the truth of which he sealed with his Blood; but that he was any great Judg of things or opinions, will not be thought by any who shall but carefully read his Writings. It were to be wished also, that he had rather left us instances of his Charity to the Heterodox, than of his Zeal, which is often so like Anger, that it can hardly be distinguished from it. I am sure the innumerable dotages of those men



men deserved rather pity than anger. In fine, it is highly probable Chapter I. that the word πλήρωμα came into St. John's mind, and was therefore used by him, because he had said just before, that Christ had appeared πλήρης χάριτος; and he used it the rather, because he knew that St. Paul had made use of it in a like sense in his Epistle to the Colossians, Chap. ii. 9. and elsewhere. Now πλήρωμα here signifies the fulness of the Godhead, as St. Paul speaks, which dwells in Christ; that is, the divine Reason it self, from whence issued the Gospel, which is often called χάρις by St. Paul.

Ibid. Grace for Grace.] χάρις ἀντὶ χάριτος. These words have strangely perplexed Interpreters, whose conjectures I shall not here set down. They have been collected by J. C. Suicerus in Thesaurus, on the word χάρις; I shall only propose my own. The χάρις which we have received from God is, as I before said, the Gospel it self, and all the benefits of it, which he bestows upon us ἀντὶ χάριτος, that is, gratis, and with a proviso only that we are thankful to him; which comprehends all the duty of a Christian, because we cannot heartily ἀντιχερίζεσθαι Θεῷ return thanks to God unless we also obey his Gospel. For when God promises us eternal life, if we believe on Christ, and renounce our former sins, and amend our lives; How can we be said to be thankful to him, if we do not so small a thing for that great benefit? God therefore in this sense may be said to give us χάρις ἀντὶ χάριτος. When I interpret χάρις by thankfulness, or a thankful disposition of mind, I go according to the common use of that word among the Greeks, with whom χάρις ἔχειν or εὐδέναι is an ordinary phrase. So also it is taken by St. Paul in Rom. vi. 17. χάρις τῷ Θεῷ, thanks be to God. See likewise 1 Cor. xv. 57. & 2 Cor. viii. 16. And there is a sort of an elegance in repeating the same word in a different sense, of which see Grotius. As for the Preposition ἀντὶ, I take that also in its proper and most usual sense, whereby it signifies a permutation, as in these words which others have cited out of Euripides's Helena, χάρις ἀντὶ χάριτος ἐλθέτω, let benefit come for benefit, V. 1250. Not to depart from the words before us, or to be laborious in the proof of what is plain, it shall suffice to observe that the Greeks call a benefit, which is return'd for a benefit received, ἀντιχάρις, and thence deduce the Verb ἀντιχερίζεσθαι to return, or repay a benefit: So that that passage of Euripides would be almost perfectly parallel to this in St. John, if we could but demonstrate our thankfulness to God in the same manner as we can to men. Which being unable to do, we express our gratitude to him by our words and faithful obedience. Summus rerum invisibilium procreator, to use the words of Arnobius, dignus est verè, si modo cum

Chapter *dignum mortali dicendum est ore, cui spirans omnis intelligensque natura,*  
 II. & habere & agere nunquam desinat gratias. The great Creator of things  
 invisible is worthy, is truly worthy, if mortal lips are not too mean to say that  
 he is worthy, to be incessantly praised and thanked by every living and intelli-  
 gent nature. This is our ἀντιχρῆς which we give to God. What shall I  
 render unto the Lord? saith the Psalmist in Psalm cxvi. 12. All his bene-  
 fits are above me: I will take the cup of Salvation, and call upon the name  
 of the Lord.

Verf. 17. The Law was given by Moses.] Νόμος is often in St. Paul,  
 as it is here, opposed to χάρις the Law of Grace, which I have observed  
 on verf. 14.

Verf. 18. No man hath seen God at any time] That is, before the  
 revelation of his Son, no body ever understood the will of God; for  
 sometimes we are said to see those things which we have an exact  
 knowledg of: See Grotius.

Ibid. Which is in the bosom of the Father] That is, most dear to God,  
 as the same learned Interpreter has shewn.

Ibid. Was his Interpreter.] Ἐξηγησάμενος, viz. God, i. e. his Will: See  
 Mat. xi. 27. and Expositors on that place.

Verf. 46. Ὁν ἔγχευε——ἐυρήκαυθ] For ἐυρήκαυθ ἀνδρα ὄν ἔγχευε. Of  
 the like misplacing of words, see Examples in Chap. x. 36. & xvii. 3.

## C H A P. II.

Verf. 4. **T**Here are two things which I would have here further  
 Note a. observed for the understanding of *Mary's* Petition,  
 and *Christ's* answer. One is, that the words *they have*  
*no Wine*, are the expression of *Mary's* request to her Son to supply  
 that defect, as appears by the answer which *Christ* made her. But how  
 was it that she would have him do that? Undoubtedly not by pur-  
 chasing Wine with *Money*, with which she knew *Christ* did not abound;  
 but, as Interpreters generally suppose, by working a *Miracle*, and  
 supplying the new married couple with *Wine*, in the same manner as  
*Elijah* of old had supplied the widow of *Sarepta* with *Oil*. And hence  
 it may be probably inferred that *Christ* had done some other Miracles  
 before this time: For how could his Mother have desired him to work  
 a *Miracle*, if she had never seen him do any before? She knew indeed  
 by the revelation of the Angel, that her Son was the *Messias*; but she  
 could not from thence conclude that he would work Miracles, espe-  
 cially such a one as that, when she pleased to desire it. And therefore  
 whe



when it is said at *vers.* 11. that *this beginning of Miracles did Jesus, &c.* Chapter II.  
we must understand the Evangelist to speak of such Miracles as were done *publicly*.

*Secondly*, I would have it observed, that the answer which *Christ* here gave to his Mother, contains nothing in it whereby she might conclude his purpose to comply with her Request; nay that on the contrary he seems to have rejected her Petition. And therefore it may be matter of enquiry, whence she gathered that he intended to fulfil it; and doubtless it must be from some other words of his, which perhaps *St. John* not having heard, has omitted; or some sign he afterwards gave her to assure her of it, tho her Request was at that time unseasonable.

*Verf.* 6. Δύο ἢ τρεῖς.] *It is the part of a conscientious Witness*, saith a great Man, *to affirm nothing too peremptorily or particularly.* But *St. John* had not been the less conscientious a Witness, if he had *determinately* said either *No* or *τρεῖς*, for there is no such exactness requisite in such matters as these; and the reason of his speaking as he did, was, because he did not justly know the size of the Waterpots. Nothing is more ordinary than this way of speaking in common discourse.

*Verf.* 9. φωνεῖ.] This word in the *Vulgar*, and other Interpreters, is rendered by *vocat*, *called*, which is properly the signification of *καλεῖ*; but it ought rather to have been rendered by *compellat*, *spake to him*, *φωνεῖ* here signifying the same as *προσφωνεῖ*; for the translating it by *vocare*, *calling*, seems to imply that the Bridegroom was not at that time present with the company, but came when the Governour of the Feast called him, which is not at all likely.

*Verf.* 11. Τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν συμείων,] *viz.* which he did *publicly*: See Note on *vers.* 3.

*Verf.* 18. Τί συμείων] The reason of their questioning *Christ* thus, was because none might alter any thing that was done in the Temple, unless he had either a Commission from the *Sanhedrim*, or Prophetical Authority; and that *Christ* had no Commission for doing what he did from the *Sanhedrim*, they were very well satisfied, and therefore they presently ask him how he proved himself to be a Prophet, since he acted in that quality. This our Author ought to have expressed more distinctly than he has, in his Paraphrase; in which he often elsewhere hooks in less necessary Remarks.

*Verf.* 23. Ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.] This might be expressed in Hebrew by *לשמור לשמו*, *i. e.* they did not only *believe him*, but they believed him also to be the Person that he was *called*, or that the *name* of a Prophet or *Messias* was truly attributed to him.

Verf. 5. **T**H E *παλιγενεσία* or *regeneration* spoken of in *Matt.* xix. *Note a.* 28. has no relation at all to *Baptism*. See my Notes on that place.

Verf 19. Ἦν γὰρ πειρασὶ αὐτῶν τὸ ἔργον. ] The proofs of the Divinity of the Gospel are such, that as perspicuous as they are, they are only so to those that are of a teachable temper and disposition, and not blinded by their lusts. The holiness of *Christs* Commands, notwithstanding their agreableness with human nature, and the interest of men, displeases those who are obstinately addicted to the contrary Vices; who do not fall into Sin through ignorance or infirmity, but knowingly and wilfully serve their wicked inclinations, and would not be rescued from that slavery or bondage. Such men as these do not desire to have their evil deeds *enlightened* by the Gospel, and so made manifest to every one. But on the other hand, those that for the most part lived agreably to Nature, and were misled only by ignorance or infirmity, were mightily refreshed and pleased with the light of the Gospel, and most readily entertained it, either because it was agreable to those true notions that they had before, or delivered them from that ignorance and impotency which they would gladly have been freed from if there had been any light to convince them of the Truth, or confirm them in it. See *Chap.* vii. 17. This subject is excellently and eloquently prosecuted by *Lactantius Instit. Divin.* Lib. 7. c. 1. out of whom I shall transcribe one or two passages. *Hæc nostra*, saith he there, *quæ tradimus, pravæ vitiosæque mentes aut omnino non intelligent (hebetatur enim acies eorum terrenis cupiditatibus, quæ sensus omnes gravant, imbecillesque reddunt) aut etiamsi intelligent, dissimulabunt tamen, & hæc vera esse nolent, quia trahuntur à vitiis & scientes malis suis favent, quorum suavitate capiuntur; & virtutis viam deserunt, cujus acerbitate offenduntur. Nam qui avaritia & opum inexplebili quadam siti flagrant, quia non possunt venditis aut dilargitis, quæ amant, tenui cultu vitam degere; sine dubio malunt id esse fictum, quo desideriis suis renuntiare coguntur.* These things which I have said, *vicious and depraved minds will either not understand at all (their apprehensions being darkned with carthly desires, which weaken and stupify all the senses) or if they understand them, they will make nevertheless as if they did not, and be unwilling that these things should be true, because they are overpowered and hurried away by their lusts, and knowingly indulge their evil practices, with the sweetness of which they are captivated; and forsake the paths of virtue, the ruggedness whereof* *offends.*



offends them. For those who are inflamed with a covetous and insatiable desire after riches, because they cannot sell or give away those things which they love, and be content to live upon a little, will doubtless be willing to believe that false, which would oblige them to renounce their sinful desires. And having instanced in some other sorts of persons, he proceeds thus, *Il sunt homines, qui contra veritatem, clausis oculis, quoquo modo tarrant. Qui autem sani erunt, id est, non ita vitiis immergi, ut insanabiles sint; & credent his & libenter accedent; & quaecunque dicimus aperta, plana, simplicia, & quod maxime opus est, vera & inexpugnabilia illis videbuntur. Nemo virtuti favet nisi qui sequi potest, sequi autem non est facile omnibus, &c.* These are the men that shut their eyes against the truth, and do all they can to oppose it. But all unprejudiced persons, that is, such as are not incurably vitious, will easily assent to these things, and readily entertain them; and whatever we say will seem plain and natural to them, and as it is especially requisite they should, true and impossible to be confuted. No man favours the side of virtue but he that has the heart to practise it, and the practice of virtue is not easy to all, &c.

Verf. 21 Παιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν] This is not properly to be understood of one that acts sincerely, as Grotius speaks, that is, whose virtue is not counterfeited; but of an honest or good man. The Hebrew אמת truth is taken for righteousness and goodness in 2 Chron. xxxii. 1. and so the Greek ἀλήθεια is used in Eph. v. 9. And the opposition that is here made between these persons and πάντας τὸς φαῦλα πράξαντας, not particularly Hypocrites, confirms this Interpretation.

## C H A P. IV.

Verf. 1. Ως ἔγνω ὁ κρείσσων] viz. by his divine knowledg, saith Grotius. But there is no reason to suppose but he might know it too by the report of others, since it is not secret thoughts that are here spoken of.

Verf. 5. Σιχάρ] S. Jerom it seems read it in his Copies, or at least thought that it ought to be read Sichern; for in his Epitaph on Paula he has these words: *Transiit Sichern, non ut plerique errantes legunt Si-char, quæ nunc Neapolis appellatur, & ex latere montis Garizim exstructam, circa puteum Jacob, intravit Ecclesiam; super quo residens Dominus, sitiensq; & esuriens Samaritanæ sive satiatum est.* She passed through Sichern, not Sichar, as most erroneously read it, which is now called Neapolis, and entered into the Church that was built on the side of the mountain Garizim, near Jacobs Well, on which our Saviour sat, and satisfied his hunger and thirst with the faith of the Samaritan Woman. But all our Copies and

Chapter and the Antient Interpreters agree, and possibly *Sychar* and *Sichem*  
 IV. might be two different Towns, as *Eusebius* thought, who in *locis Hebr.*  
 speaks thus : Συχαρ, πρὸ τῆς νέας πόλεως παλαιῶν τῶν χειρῶν, ἃ ἔδωκεν Ἰακώβ Ἰωσήφ  
 τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ὁ Χριστὸς κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην τῆ Σαμαρείᾳ ἐδίδασκεν τὴν πηγὴν διαλέγεται, καὶ  
 ἐπιπῦν δαίκνυται : which words are thus rendered by *S. Jerome* : *Sychar an-*  
*te Neapolin, juxta agrum, quem dedit Jacob filio tuo Joseph, in quo Do-*  
*minus noster atque salvator, secundum Evangelium Johannis, Samaritanae*  
*mulieri ad puteum loquitur, ubi nunc Ecclesia fabricata est. Sychar before*  
*Neapolis, near the field which Jacob gave to his son Joseph, in which our*  
*Lord and Saviour, as St. John tells us in his Gospel, discoursed with the Samari-*  
*tan woman, sitting upon a Well, where there is a Church now built. Yet*  
*Grotius* and other learned men confound these two Cities. And doubt-  
 less they were near to one another.

Verf. 20. *Ἐν πρῶτῳ ὄρει τέτρω* ] *Dr. Hammond* understands this of the moun-  
 tains of *Shiloh*, which are twelve miles distant from that of *Garizim*,  
 as *S. Jerom* affirms. But *Grotius* and others more truly think that we  
 are to understand it of the mountain *Garizim* it self, because the dis-  
 course is concerning a mountain in which *God* was at that time publick-  
 ly worshipped by the *Samaritans*.

Verf. 34. *Ἐμὸν βρωμα* ] The Apostles discourse gave *Christ* an occa-  
 sion to make use of this Metaphor ; by which he intended to shew that  
 the bringing of men to repentance was that which he was most intent  
 upon, and could for sometime also neglect eating and drinking for.  
 There is such another metaphor in *Plautus, Cistellar. Act. 4. Sc. 2. v. 54.*  
 where a Servant, to shew that he was attentive to what a Woman said,  
 is represented speaking in this manner :

*Istuc ago, atque istuc mihi cibus est, quod fabulare :*

i. e. *I should not eat more heartily when I am hungry, than I now*  
*listen to what you say.* So likewise *edcre sermonem* is another phrase  
 made use of by that Comedian in *Aulular. Act. 3. Sc. 6. v. 1.* See *Taub-*  
*mannus* upon the place.

Verf. 42. *Ὁ σωτὴρ τῶν Ἰσραήλ* ] i. e. he that is come to save or deliver *us*.  
 By the *World* here is meant only the *Circumcised*, for it is not likely that  
 the Samaritans had any thoughts about the salvation of the Gentiles,  
 which the Apostles themselves knew for a long while nothing of.  
 Compare *Chap. vii. 4.* with *xii. 19.* where the word *Ἰσραήλ* signifies on-  
 ly the *Jews*. And so in our modern languages, and particularly in the  
 French, the Phrase *tout le monde*, is taken sometimes more strictly, and  
 sometimes more comprehensively.



Verf. 2. Ἔστι δὲ ἐν ταῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ] Either the Verb ἐστὶ here must be understood to signify the time past, or else instead of it we must, as some Copies do, read it ἦν was; for St. John, as the Antients unanimously testify, wrote a great many years after the Destruction of Jerusalem. See my *Animadversions* on the beginning of this Gospel.

Verf. 31. Ἐὰν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ ἐμοῦ, &c. i. e. If I only affirmed my self to be sent from God, and did not prove my self to be so, you might justly reject my testimony. For he that says he is a Prophet, and does nothing at all to confirm such an assertion, is certainly no Prophet, because God does not leave his Prophets without any testimony from himself that they are so. This argument quite overthrows the pretence of Mahomet. See Chap. viii. 16.

Verf 32. Οἶδα ] The *Cambridg Copy* reads οἶδατε, and some others οἶδαμεν. The former indeed seems proper, but the *Copy* is suspected. And besides, the latter is oftner used by St. John. See Chap. xxi. 24. I should render it in French by *on sait, tis known*, for it is put for the Indefinite οἶδασι.

Ver. 38. Οὐκ ἔχετε μένοντα ] i. e. Ye have heard and read indeed his word, but it has not entered into your hearts, so as to be a perpetual rule of life always in your view, and never to be forgotten by you. When we despise any thing that another says, the remembrance of it seldom abides with us long; but what we are affected with, *manet*, as the Poet says, *alta mente repostum*, abides deeply fixed in our mind, and upon the next fit occasion it breaks out. This is the importance of the Verb μένειν here, and we meet with it in the same sense several times in the 2d Chap. of the 1st Epist. of St. John, and in the 2d Epist. and 2d verse.

Verf. 39. Ἐρῶντες ] This verb I rather take to be in the *Indicative* than in the *Imperative* mood, and interpret the words of Christ to this sense: “ You are generally very curious in searching into the abstruse meaning of the Scriptures, because ye think, and that justly, that ye shall derive those instructions from thence which will lead you to eternal Life; and these give their Testimony to me which ye do not hearken to, because ye suffer your selves to be prejudiced by perverse Affections. It is very probably conjectured by a Learned Man, that the ἔρῶν, or *searching*, here spoken of, does not refer to the Grammatical, but the Mystical sense of the Scriptures. It is certain that the Jews at that time neglected the study

Chapter VI. Study of Grammar, and therefore those Scripture passages which concerned the *Messias*, do not seem to have been understood by them by the assistance of that Art, but by the instructions of the antient Prophets: See *Bruno Dissert. de Therapeutis*. Perhaps *Christ* used the word  $\psi\eta\eta$ , which at that time did not signify simply to *inquire*, but to *search into* the Allegorical meaning of any Passage: Consult *Buxtorf in Thesauro*, if you doubt of it.

Verf. 46.  $\text{Eis } \delta\upsilon \text{ } \eta\lambda\theta\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\text{.}]$  i. e. "By whose Doctrin which ye profess to believe, ye think ye can attain to Salvation; for *Christ* here speaks of what will be at the day of Judgment. I do not believe these words are to be understood of *Moses* making *intercession* for the *Jews*, tho I know what is alledged by a great Man in favour of that opinion, out of the *Rabbins*. The sense will be most commodious, if we understand it to be that those who imagined themselves to act consonantly to the Law in rejecting *Christ*, shall be condemned hereafter by the Law it self, according to which they were certainly obliged to receive him. See *Deut. xviii. 15*.

#### C H A P. VI.

Verf. 15. **C**H R I S T avoided the Multitude who took counsel together about making him a King, not only because this was a bad design, and proceeded from Persons of wicked and carnal Minds; but also because he would not give the least occasion for a Sedition, and that his enemies might never be able to accuse him with any appearance of Justice, of having affected to be an earthly Prince. If he had tarried among these Men, tho he had opposed them, and openly rebuked them, and hindred them from executing their designs; yet their very *attempt* alone would have caused suspicious Men to conceive such a bad opinion of the Gospel (which was then but in its infancy) as it would have been very hard to dispossess them of. *Christ's* enemies would have said that he had plotted a change in the Government, and that he was not so much displeas'd with his followers for their desire to deliver the Kingdom into his hands, as for their unseasonable resolution to make him their King, before he had brought his Conspiracy to a head, and increased the number of his Followers: They would have said that it was dangerous to suffer such a Teacher to live amongst the *Jews*, who might even without his knowledg and consent, give the common People an occasion to take up arms against the State. It is well known how mistrustful and cautious those to whom the government of



of the World belonged at that time, were in such matters; and when I do but mention the name of *Tiberius*, every one will presently apprehend that it was a most dangerous thing then, so much as unwillingly to be the cause of a Seditious. This seems to be the reason why *Christ* would not have it divulged that he was the *Messias*, viz. lest the very mention of that name should, like the setting up of a Flag, occasion a great confluence of People to him. See Note on *Mat. viii. 4.*

Verf. 27. Note b. *ἔργαζομαι βρώσιν*, to speak properly, is neither *operari cibum*, as it is rendered in the *Vulgar*, nor *acquirere cibum*, to acquire Food, as by our Author; but *laborare ut acquiras*, to acquire it by Labor. And so the Greeks say likewise, *ἔργαζομαι τὴ ἐπιτήδεια* & *ἔργαζομαι βίον*, for *necessaria* or *victum labore suo lucrari*, to earn necessaries or a livelihood by ones Labor, or as the French call it *gagner sa vie*, to get ones living: See only *Constantin's Lexicon*. So in the example brought out of *Palæphatus*, *εἰργάσατο βροῦμα* signifies he got his living by his Labor. In the example of the *Pounds*, *Luk. xix. 16.* the word *παραεργάσατο* signifies rather *peperit*, *genuit*, it hath produced or brought forth, than *comparavit* it hath acquired.

Verf. 44. *Εὰν μὴ ὁ Πατήρ ὁ πέμψας με ἐλκύσῃ αὐτὸν*] i. e. unless they have been already so affected with God's former benefits, as to be ready to follow God whithersoever he leads them, which will make them come to me as soon as ever they hear my Doctrin. I like what is said by *Faustus Regiensis*, *Lib. i. c. 17. de Lib. Arbitrio*. *Quid est*, says he, *attrahere nisi prædicare, nisi Scripturarum consolationibus excitare, increpationibus detertere, desideranda proponere, intentare metuenda, judicium comminari, præmium polliceri? Audi Dominum non duris manibus, sed spei nexibus attrahentem, & dilectionis brachiis invitantem, sicut ait Propheta, attraxi eos vinculis caritatis, Hof. xi. 4. What is it to draw, but to preach, but to encourage People by the consolations of the Scriptures, and deter them by its Reproofs, to propose to Men such things as they should desire, and menace them with what they ought to fear, to threaten them with Punishments, and promise them Rewards? Hearken therefore to God who draws not with rough hands, but with the ties of Hope, and invites with the arms of Love, according to that of the Prophet, I drew them with the bands of Love.*

Verf. 55. Note f. For the understanding of what the word *ἀληθινός* signifies, when it is thus metaphorically used, we must consider whence such forms of Speech had their rise; which in all probability was from the custom of Merchants who used to distinguish true merchandizes from false, i. e. those to which the name they went by was truly attributed, (the received Custom determining that) from those to which it cannot be given but falsely: thus true *Ammonium*, for instance,

Chapter VII. stance, will be that Plant to which this name is properly attributed; and *false Anomum* another on which it is abusively imposed. And because any sort of Plant which is truly called by the name it bears, has a much greater Virtue in it than a Plant falsely denominated, therefore *true Anomum* was preferred before *false*. And for the same reason, when any two things are compared together, which are endued with a like quality, tho' in a different degree; that which has the strongest and best, and which is of most use, is said to be *true*, and the other compared with it, *false*. So the Platonicks used to call *the divine Patterns of all things*, as they expressed themselves, *true*, when they compared them with the things upon Earth, which are only their Pictures, according to them. And whatever Virtue there is in things visible, it could be no otherwise compared they thought with the Celestial, than as counterfeit things with those that are sincere and genuin: and therefore they called these *false*, and the other *true*. And just thus *Christ* in this place is said to be *the true Bread*, and *the true Meat*, and elsewhere *the true Light*, viz. because whatever propriety there is in Bread or Meat to nourish the Body, or in Light to illuminate the Eyes, that and a much greater there is in *Christ's* Doctrin to nourish and enlighten the Mind. Bread nourishes the Body, but does not exempt it from Death, which corrupts and dissolves at length its frame; but the Doctrin of *Christ*, whilst it nourishes the Soul with Hope, and excites and cherishes in it the love of Vertue, does not only fill it with solid and substantial joy at present, but also rescues it from dying for ever. Light illuminates the Eye, and shews it visible Objects when it is rightly disposed in their proper forms; but it neither cures the distempers of the Eyes, nor can hinder them from being closed at last by Death: but the Doctrin of *Christ* makes blind Souls to see clearly, and enlightens them for ever; so that in this sense it is most truly called both *the true Meat* and *the true Light*.

## C H A P. VII.

Verf. 35. I. **I**T is true indeed that there was a vast number of Jews at *Alexandria*, who used the Translation of the *Septuagint*, as appears by many passages in *Philo Alexandr.* See *Lib. against Flaccus*. But that the European Jews had their chief Assembly at *Alexandria*, I cannot tell how our Author could have proved, unless he thought *Alexandria* to be in *Europe*, which would have been a strange mistake. It's true, some of the old Geographers



graphers place it in *Asia*, and others in *Africa*; but none of them ever said that it was in *Europe*, which is too absurd. II. He ought also to have proved, that the *Onkelos* was at that time read in the Synagogues of the *Jews* at *Babylon*; for it is not safe to rely upon the Authority of the *Rabbins*, who are always for putting as great a face of Antiquity upon their Writings as they are able. Chapter VIII.

Verf. 53. Note i. It is strange that Dr. *Hammond*, after giving sufficient proofs of this story of the Adulterers being supposititious, and saying nothing almost on the other side to confirm its being thought genuin, should yet assent to *Grotius* who has not in the least solv'd the matter. If the Church in the time of *Papias*, or in the next Age after him, judged this Tradition of his to be true; how comes it to pass that so many Fathers and so many Copies a great while after those times omitted this Story? It is much more probable that it was added at first only to a few Copies by some *Transcribers* or *Criticks*, who took it from the Tradition or Copy of the *Nazarens*, and in time came to be inserted by that means into more; nor is there any footstep any where to be found, of the judgment of the Antient Church concerning this Story: So that I think we ought rather to be of *Beza's* opinion, who suspects this Story; at least what he says as to this matter, is worth considering.

## C H A P. VIII.

Verf. 3. <sup>y</sup> **A** Γεσι δε οι γεγραμταις, &c.] It is true indeed, that at this time the power of inflicting capital Punishments was taken away from the *Jews* by the *Romans*; but the *Jews* had no occasion to enquire about this matter of *Christ*, who might easily have answered them, that the Woman deserved indeed, according to the Law of *Moses*, to be put to Death, but that the execution of the Punishment depended upon the pleasure of the *Roman President*. There was no room here for any scruple, and I do not conceive how the Scribes or Pharisees could have taken any occasion to accuse *Christ* if he had given them this ready answer, tho he declined it by giving them that which follows.

Verf. 6. 'Ο δε Ιησους κεινω κωψας, &c.] Those who are of opinion that this Story is supposititious, might probably enough suspect that *Papias* or some other, borrowed this Circumstance here mentioned from that which is related of *Menedemus*, as it is thus set down by *Diogenes Laertius*, Lib. 2. §. 127. Ἦν γδ ἐπισκόπῳ κ' παρρησιασῆς, μειρακίῳ γ' ἐκ καταθρονονομένου, εἶπε μὲν ἕδην, λαβὼν δὲ κάρφον διέγραψεν εἰς τὸ ὕδαρ' περιποιημένε

Chapter VIII. *χῆμα, ἕως ὀργάντων πάντων συνὲν τὸ μειεστικὸν πῖν ὕβειν, ἀπαιλλέχθῃ.* For he was a Man that took a great liberty in talking, and used to jeer People; and once when a young Man spake something roughly and sharply to him, he made him indeed no answer, but taking up a little stick he drew upon the ground the figure of a Man, muliebria patientis, till the young man perceiving the Affront put upon him before all there present went away.

Verf. 7. [Ὁ ἀναμαρτυροῦν ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἢ λίσσιν ἐστὶν ἢ βολέτω.] But no Law makes it requisite, that those who bring a Criminal taken in the very act to judgment, should be perfectly innocent themselves. It is sufficient if they do but prove him to be really guilty of the Crime they charge him with, by competent Witnesses. And besides, by giving such an answer as this, *Christ* might have exposed himself to the invidious Censures both of the *Jews* and *Romans*: for the *Jews* might have said, that he made the Law of no force, because he stuck at pronouncing a Harlot to be worthy of death; and did in effect affirm, that Offenders could not justly be punished but by those who were conscious of no guilt themselves. And the *Romans* might have complained that he would have had the Power of inflicting capital Punishments restored to the *Jews*, because he authorized those of that Nation that were innocent, to stone a Woman to death: I confess I do not see what danger *Christ* could think to avoid by such an answer.

Verf. 9. [ὑπὸ πῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι.] Is it credible that all that were there present had been guilty of Adultery, or some other crime as heinous as that, not so much as one excepted? That the Nation of the *Jews* was extremely corrupted at that time I grant; but it is improbable that lewd Men who had committed Adultery themselves, or been guilty of as great a sin otherwise, should be for having an Adulteress condemned to death.

Verf. 10. [Οὐδὲίς σε κατέκρινεν.] This question could not properly be made in such general terms, for she might have been condemned by one, viz. the *Roman Procurator*: For the word κατέκρινεν cannot be understood but of such a Condemnation, because questionless every one of them condemned, that is, disapproved Adultery, at least in words; and *Christ* himself accounted it a very great Crime.

Verf. 13. [Οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής] i. e. Your testimony does not only deserve to be rejected by us, but you your self cannot reasonably believe your self in this case, because you may be deceived by self-love: you think you are the Light of the World, but you ought also to regard the judgment of others who think otherwise. That this is the meaning of these words *Christ's* answer shews, *My Testimony is true, because I know whence I came, &c.* which is as if he had said, I am sure I am

not



not deceived, I do not speak out of love to my self, for I know that I was sent from God. Chapter VIII.

Verf. 18. [Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν, &c.] The Testimony of two Witnesses was principally required, when the question was about the punishment of a Criminal: See *Numb.* xxxv. 30. *Deut.* xvii. 6. and xix. 15. For any one to prove himself a *Prophet*, he needed no other witness of his Mission but *God*, who confirmed his word by a *Miracle*: See *Deut.* xviii.

Ibid. Μὴν μαρτυρεῖ;] *Tan. Faber* in his *Epist. Crit.* conjectured that it ought to be read μαρτυρεῖ, go afar off. But as long as the sense is good according to the vulgar reading of the word, and all Copies as well as Interpreters favor that reading, it ought by all means to stand as it is.

Verf. 25. Note b. There is a third, not less probable, interpretation that may be given of these words πρὸ ἀρχῆν, viz. for *jam tum*, already, or at that very time, i. e. in the beginning of this my Discourse with you. So the *old Onomasticon*; πρὸ ἀρχῆν, *jam tum*, already, I have told you what I was; *the Light of the World*, verf. 12.

Verf. 29. Note c. 1. I easily believe our Learned Author when he says, that the Phrase *Common-Pleas* in English signifies a *Court of Judicature*; for it is hard if he did not understand his own Language: but that in *Latin* the phrase *Placita Principum*, and *Arrests of Parliament* among the French signifies any thing but the *Decrees* of both, no body would say that would not be guilty of an intolerable impropriety of Speech, which is a thing the *Doctor* never scrupled.

2. What need was there of recurring to this? ἀρεσά δεῶ are those things that are *grateful* or *pleasing to God*, without enquiring any further: And so in *Acts* vi. 2. the phrase οὐκ ἀρεσόν does not signify *'tis not determined*, but it is not grateful or pleasing to us to leave the word of *God* and serve Tables. And *Acts* xii. 3. ἀρεσόν Ἰουδαίων is not *what was determined or voted by the Jews*, but *what was pleasing to them*, with whom *Herod* endeavoured to ingratiate himself, as sufficiently appears by the passage alledged by the *Doctor* out of *Eusebius*. What he says, he seems to have taken from *Budæus*, who out of love to the Greek Language, thought that the French word *arrest* ought to be derived from the Greek ἀρεσόν, whereas it manifestly comes from *arrêter*, which sometimes signifies to *decree* or *determine*, and is derived from the Latin Verb *restare*, from which comes the French *rester*, to *stay*. But he has produced no example out of any Greek Writer, to shew that ἀρεσόν signifies a *decree* or *determination*.

3. It is utterly false, what our Author says about the *Roman Custom's* being observed in the *Provinces*, where he speaks of *Capital Causes*:

Chapter VIII. Causes: For tho the Citizens of *Rome*, whilst the Commonwealth stood, might appeal first to the *People*, and then to the *Emperor* in such Causes; and accordingly the Magistrates, whilst the Commonwealth stood, could not condemn any one, either without the consent of the *People* if they were appealed to, or without the Authority of the *Emperor*, if an Appeal was afterwards made to him; yet it will not follow that what the *Doctor* says is true. Whilst the Government of the *Roman Empire* was in the hands of more than one, the *Roman Magistrates* no where expected the Suffrage of their *Provincials*, to empower them to condemn or absolve; and much less did they do so, when the supreme Authority came to be lodged in the hands of the *Emperors*. Tho the *Jews* were permitted to live according to their own Laws, yet at that time they had no power to sentence any one to death, as appears from *Chap. xviii. 31.* when *Pilate* condemned *Christ* because of the importunity of the *Jews*, he did it to gratify them, when he might have refused to do it; and not as our *Author* thought, because he was obliged to do so, as I have elsewhere already observed. The *Proconsuls*, *Pretors* and *Procurators*, did always with unlimited Authority, by the advice of their Council, *i. e.* a few *Roman Citizens*, pass sentence upon their *Provincials*, without ever consulting or convening their *Provincials*, unless they had a particular mind to gratify them. This sufficiently appears by *Cicero's Orations* against *Verres*. But the *Doctor* objects that *Pilate* asked the Multitude; *What then shall I do with Jesus, who is called Christ?* as if he waited for their Suffrages. I answer, it is certain that the common *People* of the *Jews* condemned none, no not whilst their Commonwealth stood. This Office belonged to the *Judges*, and in such Causes as these, to those of the *Great Sanhedrim*; see *Grotius* on *Mat. v. 22.* And after *Judaea* was made a *Roman Province*, the common people had not, I suppose, a greater Power allowed them, than they ever had by the Laws of their own Country. The reason therefore why *Pilate* asked the multitude this question, was not that he might hear their resolution or determination, without which he could not have proceeded to pass Sentence, either of Absolution or Condemnation; but because he thought they favoured *Christ*, and would have rescued him out of the hands of the chief Men among the *Jews*, who had accused him out of malice and envy, as *St. Mark* in setting down this story tells us. He could have released him indeed without their consent, if he had not feared a Sedition; but he thought it better to condemn the innocent than to run that hazard. This is apparent from the relation that all the *Evangelists* give us of  
 this



this matter, according to which the people did not condemn *Christ* by any Authority they had so to do, but seditiously demanded of *Pilate* his life. *Pilate* did not in the least act in this case as a *Tribune of the People*, who upon the peoples determination pronounced sentence in the name of the Commons; but as the *Roman Presidents* used to act, who gave judgment according to the advice of their Counsel. I have been the larger upon this subject, lest *Dr. Hammond's* Authority should deceive such as are not very well versed in the *Roman Customs*. Or else to skilful Persons, it had been sufficient just to admonish them of his mistake.

Verf. 48. *Note d.* I have observed in my Notes on *Gen. xxxi. 20.* that the name of *Syrian* carries in it something, I know not what, reproachful; see there. *Levit. xxv. 47.* is a false quotation in our Author for *Deut. xxvi. 5.* for in this place indeed we may find the word *Arameans* used in a bad sense, but in the other there is no mention made of *Arameans*. Many such faults there are in *Dr. Hammond's* Annotations, which are owing either to the carelessness of the Printers, or the Author's thoughts being otherwise employed, which is no strange thing; and I do not reproach him with it.

## C H A P. IX.

Verf. 2. *Note a.* **I**T was a long while before this time, that many of the Jews believed the preexistence of Souls, and that they were sent down into such or such Bodies according to their several deserts, as appears evidently by these words in the Book of *Wisdom*, Chap. viii. 19, 20. *παῖς ὃ ἦμιν δέουσις, ψυχῆς τε ἔλαχον ἀγαθῆς, καὶ ἄλλον ὃ ἀγαθὸς ὦν ἦλθον εἰς σῶμα ἀμίαντον: I was a witty child, and had a good spirit; yea rather being good, I came into a body undefiled.*

Verf. 22. *Note b.* Of this word *ἔκσυναγωγῆς* *Selden* has treated at large, *Lib. 1. c. 7. de Synedriis*. And if we believe him, *συναγωγῆ* here signifies any assembly of people whatever, publick as well as private, in which it was not lawful for any that were *ἔκσυναγωγῆ*, put out of the *Synagogue*, familiarly to converse. But they were not excluded from the publick Prayers, or forbidden to be present at Sacrifices, as the same Author shews, who is well worth our reading, and to whom I refer the Reader, tho all are not of his opinion.

Chapter  
X.

## C H A P. X.

Verf. 35. **I**T must be observed that the word *Law* includes some-  
 Note b. times the Book of *Psalms*, (see *Chap.* xii. 34.) as some-  
 times all the Old Testament is called the *Law* and the  
*Prophets*; tho ordinarily it is divided into three parts, whereof a  
 third makes the *ἀγιόγραφα*, under which the Book of *Psalms* is con-  
 tained.

## C H A P. XI.

Chapter  
XI.

Verf. 4. **O** [Κ' ἐστὶ μεθ' ἑαυτῶν] *i. e.* shall not die of this Disease  
 as others do, who continue under the power of Death  
 till the general Resurrection. It is a form of speech  
 peculiar to *St. John*: So in his 1 *Epist.* v. 16, 17. by *ἁμαρτία μὴ μεθ' ἑαυτῶν*  
 he means, a sin that is not of such a nature, as to make it proba-  
 ble that the Sinner will continue spiritually dead as long as he lives:  
 See the Notes upon that place.

Verf. 22. [Ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν αἶψα, &c.] These words have no agreement  
 with *Christ's* answer, unless something be understood which is not ex-  
 pressed, and which *Christ* perceived to be in *Martha's* mind. Our Au-  
 thor should have solv'd this difficulty in his Paraphrase; which because  
 he has not done, I shall endeavour to do my self. “*V. 21.* And  
 “ when she was come to him and had saluted him, she told him that  
 “ she should have been very glad if he had come some days before to  
 “ *Bethany*; because he would then have healed her Brother, who had  
 “ been dead now four days, and so he would have been still alive.  
 “ 22. But now he was dead, there was no hope of recovering him;  
 “ for tho she very well knew that *God* would grant *Jesus* whatsoever he  
 “ asked of him, yet she hardly believed that he would raise up a dead  
 “ man at his request. 23. To which *Christ* replied, that *Lazarus*  
 “ should be raised up again. 24. But *Martha* saying, that she did not  
 “ doubt indeed but he should at the universal Resurrection; 25. *Jesus*  
 “ told her more plainly, that *God* had endued him with a Power to  
 “ bring the dead to life again, especially those that had believed on  
 “ him. I have here expressed the whole connexion of the discourse,  
 that the sense might be the more evident. But the 22d *verse* might  
 also be thus expressed: “ That she knew indeed that all that the *Lord*  
 “ *Jesus* asked of his *Father* would be granted him. She did not dare  
 “ to add, that she did not believe he would presume to ask his *Father*  
 “ to



“ to raise a man that had been dead four days to life. 23. But this being Chapter  
 “ in her thoughts, *Christ* answered, &c. *Christ* answered therefore XII.  
 εὐὲς τὸ σωπὶλῶν π to something not expressed ; and it is easy to under-  
 stand the reason of the ἀποσπῆσις, viz. that *Martha* broke off her dis-  
 course for fear of offending her Lord. Unless this Interpretation be  
 admitted, the 22d verse must be placed after the 27th, and then there  
 will be no difficulty in the series of the discourse : but this would be  
 contrary to the Authority of all the Copies.

Verf. 39. Ἡδὲ ὄζει.] Our Author represents *Martha* in his Para-  
 phrase speaking too learnedly, according to the opinion of some Phy-  
 sicians, for she never thought perhaps of the time of the revolution  
 of the Humors. And indeed as the thing it self is false, so it is no-  
 thing at all to the purpose. The revolution of the Blood is comple-  
 ted in a shorter time, and the *climate* or *season of the year* is the chief  
 thing to be considered, when the discourse is concerning the *putrefac-*  
*tion* of a dead body ; but this is not very material.

Verf. 48. Note b. Our learned Author had done well to produce  
 the Testimony of some ancient Writer, that related what he said here  
 concerning *Armillus* ; for the later *Rabbins* fancy a great many things  
 for which they have no Tradition. We read indeed in a *Chaldee* Para-  
 phrase which is said to be *Jonathans*, on *Isa. ii. 4.* that a *wicked Ar-*  
*millus* should be slain by the *Messias*. But who shall certify us of the  
 time when this *Jonathan* lived ? For it is childish to give credit to the  
 boasting pretences of the *Jews*. I am apt to think that by this word  
 these men meant the *Romans*, whose Empire, after the destruction of  
*Jerusalem* by them, they had a very great spite against, and therefore  
 gave out that it should be overthrown by the *Messias*. Afterwards  
 they invented some other stories about this *Armillus* ; of which see  
*Buxtorf's Lexic. Talmudicum.*

## C H A P. XII.

Verf. 28. Δ'Οξασόν σε τὸ ὄνομα.] One of the Copies of *R. Stephanus*  
 has μὲ instead of σὲ, because the Transcriber thought that  
 this agreed better with *Christ's* discourse. And the Au-  
 thor of the *Coptick* Translation seems to have read ὑὸν σε. But there  
 is no need of these Alterations, for God the Father *glorifies his Name*,  
 when he openly acknowledges his Son whom he sent to men in his  
 Name ; see *Psal. cxvi. 1.* and afterwards *Chap. xiii. 31, 32.* of this  
 Gospel.

Chapter  
XIII.

## C H A P. XIII.

Verf. 26. **T**HE Doctor's conjecture is confirmed by *Hesychius* and *Phavorinus*, who interpret βαπτίζω by ἀντλημένον. And so I find βαπτίζω expounded by ἀρτύνειν to draw, in the *Lexicons*, out of the Scholiast on *Nicander*.

Verf. 27. Ὁ ποιῆς πίπσον.] See my Notes on *Exod.* iv. 13.

## C H A P. XIV.

Chapter  
XIV.

Verf. 14. **E**N τῷ ὀνόματι μου.] This phrase deserved in the Paraphrase at least to be expressed in other words, for a great many use it every day that do not understand it. And therefore I shall here briefly explain it. The Jews used to ask God, particularly in their solemnest Prayers, in the name of their Forefathers, and especially the Patriarchs and Prophets; *i. e.* to pray to God that he would grant them their requests, because they were their Posterity, and called by their Name, or *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob's* Posterity: This was to call upon God in the name of the Patriarchs. But *Christ* would have his Disciples to pray to God *in his Name*, *i. e.* to desire what they would have granted to them, because they were called, and were the Disciples of *Christ*. So the gathered together in the *Name of Christ*, are *Christian* Assemblies in opposition to an Assembly of *Jews*; see *Mat.* xviii. 20. And so afterwards, *vers.* 26. of this *Chapter*, the Holy Ghost is said to be sent *in the Name of Christ*, *i. e.* as that Spirit which was to be called the *Spirit of Christ*, and to be conferred only on *Christ's* Disciples. A great many Passages may receive light from this Interpretation.

Verf. 16. *Note b.* What our *Author* observes about the signification of the Greek words, is very true; but that *Christ* used the word ἀράκλιτος, as the *Talmudists* did מַרְקְלִיט, or פְּרַקְלִיטָא *phraklita*, I very much doubt. Perhaps he used מְנַחֵמָן *mnahman*, which in *Syriack* signifies only a *Comforter*; and if that were out of doubt, the *Greek* were to have no other signification put upon it. It is certain that there is no *Hebrew* word of the same latitude with the *Greek* ἀράκλιτος.



## C H A P. XVI.

Verf. 7. *Note a.* **T**HERE is not the least footsteps of any mention made of the Devil in this matter by *Moses*. Our learned *Author* lent the Prophet, before he was aware, his own conjecture.

*Verf. 13. — vid. Le Clerc's Critica Sacra. 2. S. 1. Cap. 2.*

## C H A P. XVII.

Verf. 1. **Ε**πίρη τὸς ὀφθαλμοῖς] *Grotius* conjectures that this Prayer was conceived in the view of the Temple, when *Christ* went into the Garden of *Gethsemane*. But if we carefully read *Chap. xiii. 21.* it will seem rather to have been pronounced in the same Room in which the Passover was celebrated after *Judas's* departure; and that *Christ* did not go with his Disciples into the Garden till he had said this Prayer, because *Chap. xviii.* begins thus; *When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his Disciples over the Brook Cedron.*

Chapter  
XVII.

Verf. 3. *ἵνα γινώσκωσι σε ὃν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν χριστόν.]* These words must be rendred thus; *That they may know thee who art the only true God, and Jesus who is the Christ that thou hast sent:* For the article *ὃν* must be repeated before the word *Christ*. 'Tis as if the sense were expressed by the Infinitive Mood thus; *That they may know thee to be the only true God, and Jesus to be the Messias whom thou hast sent,* as if it had been said in Greek, *ὅτι εἶ ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεός, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστός.* *Christ* here says, *that this is eternal Life,* not because the whole Christian Faith in its greatest extent, is comprehended under these two Heads considered in themselves; but because these two things are, as it were, the foundations of all the rest, to believe him who is the Father of *Jesus Christ*, to be the only true *God*, and *Jesus* to be the *Messias* whom he purposed to send. Without these Christianity cannot stand, because all the rest of the Truths asserted in it are built upon these; and these being admitted as true, every one must admit the rest. and regulate his Life according to them, unless he be mad, and resolve to be inconsistent with himself, as every body easily perceives: See *vers. 7, 8, 25.*

Verf. 6. *Ἐκ τῶ κόσμου.]* Tho the word *κόσμος* signifies *all Men* in this Gospel, yet in this *Chapter* it seems to respect principally the *Jews*, as that word is also used elsewhere by *St. John*, as I have observed in a *Note on Chap. iv. 42.* That *Christ* chose Disciples out of all Mankind,

Chapter is too general a Phrase to signify his choosing some *Jews*. Thus *vers.*  
 XVII. 14. ὁ κόσμος ἐμίσησεν αὐτὰς ὅτι ἔκ εἰσιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, *the World hateth them be-*  
 cause they are not of the *World*: by the word *κόσμος* there is meant the  
 wicked *Jews*, who hated the Apostles because they were no longer of  
 their number; and not the Heathens to whom they were perfectly un-  
 known.

*Verf.* 12. Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου] *i. e.* by a Power derived from thee, being  
 present with them, and acting as an Embassador in thy Name, and  
 taking upon me that Character. There seems here to be understood,  
 Νῦν δὲ τίησον αὐτὰς, ἐμὲ ἀπόντος, διὰ τὸ πνεῦματός σου, *but do thou keep them*  
*in my absence, by thy Spirit.* For there is nothing set to answer the  
 words, *while I was with them in the World I kept them in thy Name*, in  
 what comes after, which yet the context requires: And therefore  
 what *Christ* did not express in words, he made up in his thoughts,  
 as the Apostles easily understood, for whose sake this Prayer was  
 made. And accordingly after *Christ's* Ascension the Holy Ghost came  
 down to supply his place, as *Christ* had promised, *Chap.* xvi. 7, 13.

*Verf.* 15. Ἴνα ἄρῃς αὐτὰς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου] *i. e.* I do not pray thee to take  
 them away from this wicked Generation of Men, and particularly of  
*Jews*, and within a few days translate them along with me into the  
 regions of Happiness; but that thou wouldst preserve them from be-  
 ing corrupted by those evil Customs and Opinions with which Mankind  
 is so universally infected. By the *World* here, we are to understand  
 wicked Men whom the Apostles could not avoid conversing with.

*Ibid.* Ἀγιάσον αὐτὰς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου] *i. e.* Cause them to be so affected  
 with that true Doctrin that I have taught them, as to express it in  
 their Lives. And indeed whoever understands *Christ's* Doctrin, and  
 thinks it to be true, if he suffers that thought to sink deep into his  
 Mind, will at length be sanctified by the Truth. The Doctor did not un-  
 derstand these words, as appears by his Paraphrase. There is an ex-  
 pression much to the same purpose in *Chap.* viii. 31, 32. *Then said Je-*  
*sus to those Jews which believed on him; If ye continue in my word, then are*  
*ye my Disciples indeed, and ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall*  
*make you free.* It is all one as to the sense, whether we say *to be made*  
*free by the Truth*, or *to be sanctified by it.*

*Verf.* 19. Ἴνα καὶ αὐτὰ ὧσιν ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ σου] *i. e.* I offer up my self  
 a Sacrifice to thee, to obtain for them the pardon of their Sins, and  
 also the Spirit of Sanctification, that they may be so affected with  
 the Truth they are to preach, as to regulate their actions according  
 to it, as I have done. *Christ* puts up this Petition principally for his  
*Apostles*, because it was impossible they should preach the Gospel with

any



any success, if they did not live according to its Precepts. There Chapter could not have been a greater prejudice to the success of the Gospel, XVIII. than the ill Life of those that preached it: and next to the Apostles were all other Christians, upon whose behaviour the success of the Gospel did also depend, and for whom Christ therefore prays. This is the design of the following words, and therein lies that agreement both in Doctrin and sanctity of Life, whereby the Apostles would become *one* among themselves, and *one* with Christ, as Christ himself had been *one* with God. These things are not sufficiently expressed in our Author's Paraphrase.

Verf. 22. Τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς.] This is rightly interpreted by the *Doctor* of the Power of working Miracles, consequent upon which is their obtaining the highest Credit and Authority with those who saw the Miracles which were done by them. So likewise in *Numb.* xxvii. 20. the Hebrew *וְיָהוּדָה* *hod*, which the *Septuagint* render *δόξαν*, signifies that *Authority* which *Moses* at his Death conferred upon his Successor *Joshua*. *Thou shalt transfer*, saith God there, [*some*] of thine *Authority* to him, that all the *Congregation* of the *Israelites* may be obedient to him. Δώσεις τῆς δόξης σε ἐπ' αὐτὸν, as it is in the *Septuagint*.

Verf. 24. Πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου] The *Doctor* renders this in his Paraphrase, *before all eternity*, which is an unsufferably improper Phrase, elsewhere made use of by him, as I have already observed. This is what I had to observe upon this Chapter, on which our Author has made no Annotations. But for a more full explication of it, I refer the Reader to *H. Grotius*, whom the *Doctor* follows in his Paraphrase, desiring this may stand only as a Supplement to what *Grotius* has said.

## C H A P. XVIII.

Verf. 10. \* **O**νομα τῷ δέλω Μάλχος. There are some who tell us that this name must not be derived from the Verb *ἰβιά* to reign; and their reason is, because a Servant would never have had such a Name given him, as imported authority in it: But notwithstanding that reason, this was a very usual name, and common to Noble Persons with Ignoble. Thus *Porphyrie*, who being a *Tyrian* had a *Phœnician* name, was called *Malchus*. His own words in the *Life of Plotinus*, where he speaks of a Book that was dedicated to him by *Anulius*, are these: *περὶ τῶν ἐπιπέδων δὲ ἀπὸ βασιλείᾳ ἐμοί. βασιλεὺς δὲ τὸν ὄνομα τῷ Πορφυρίῳ ἐμοί περὶ τῶν ἐπιπέδων, καὶ ἰὸν πάτριον διάλεκτον Μάλχῳ κακλήμενον· ὅτι μοι καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὄνομα κέκλητο· τῷ δὲ Μάλχῳ ἐρμηνείαν ἔχοντος βασιλεὺς, ὅτι εἰς ἑλληνίδε διάλεκτον μεταβάλλειν ἐθέλει: he dedicated that Book to me under the title*

Chapter XIX. *title of a King; and I Porphyrius had this name of King, because I was called Malchus in my own Country Dialect, which was also the name of my Father; for Malchus, if it be turned into Greek, signifies King. There was also one Malchus a Hermit, whose Life is written by St. Jerom; There was, says he, there a certain old Man named Malchus, whom we in Latin may call Regem a King, by Birth and Language a Syrian. Whence it appears that this was a very common name in Syria, as Luc. Holstenius has also shewn by many examples, in the life of Porphyrius, Chap. ii.*

Verf. 31. Note c. See the words of the *Rabbins* themselves, concerning the power of Judicature in Capital causes being taken away from the *Jews*, as they are set down by *Dr. Lightfoot* on this place. It is no good custom to mention Authors names and words, without citing the very place, as the Criticks of the last Age generally do. Of the manner of hanging, consult the Talmudical Book *de Syncedrio*, Cap. 6. §. 4.

## C H A P. XIX.

Verf. 14. Note b. **W**HAT our Author has here is borrowed from *Grotius*, who says the same in his Notes on *Mat. xxvii. 45.* and confirms it by Testimonies. But there are several things to be observed in relation to what *Grotius* there says, which I shall briefly set down. 1. He produces a passage out of *Ignatius*, as in his Epistle to the Inhabitants of *Smyrna*, which is not in that Epistle, but in his Epistle to the *Trallians*. 2. He makes use of an *Interpolator* instead of the true *Ignatius*, but in this he ought to be excused, because *Ignatius's* true Epistles were not then published by themselves. 3. But it is strange that he should alledg that Passage as agreeable to the reading of our Copies, both in *St. Mark* and *St. John*, when if we believe that *Interpolator*, we ought in *St. John* to read *the third* and not *the sixth Hour*; and in *St. Mark*, the *sixth*, not the *third*, just contrary to the reading of the Copies: For his words in *Chap. 9. Ep. ad Trall.* are these: τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Πέμπτης, τετάρτῃ ὥρᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐδέξατο δὲ τὸ Πάθος, συζητήσαντες τὸ Πάθος· ἕκτῃ ὥρᾳ ἐσταύωθη, ἑνάτῃ ἀπέπνευσε: on *friday* therefore, at the *third hour* he received sentence of Death from *Pilate*, the *Father* so permitting it; at the *sixth hour* he was crucified; at the *ninth* he expired. But *St. Mark* says, ἦν δὲ τρίτῃ ὥρᾳ καὶ ἐσταύωσαν αὐτόν, it was the *third Hour*, and they crucified him. And according to *St. John* he did not receive the Sentence of Death, but ὥρα ὅσα ἕκτῃ, about the *sixth Hour*. 4. The *Clementine Constitutions*, which *Grotius* also quotes, say



say the same, *Lib. 5. c. 14.* and *Lib. 8. c. 34.* and almost in the same Chapter words; whereby the Author of them appears to have thought that the Hours of Christ's-Condernnation ought to be so distributed as to make that in which he received the Sentence of Death to have been the *third* (and not as it is in our Copies of *St. John*, the *sixth*) and that of his Crucifixion the *sixth*, and not (as we read it now in *St. Mark*) the *third*. 5. And yet that Great Man infers from the Authority of *Ignatius* and the *Clementine Constitutions*, that we ought not to admit any alteration, *contrary to the Authority of the most antient Copies, and of the Metaphrasts.* But not to say again, that the contrary ought to have been inferred, I would fain know what *Metaphrasts* he means? *Nonnus* it is certain, who generally goes only by that name, expresses himself in his *Metaphrasis* of *St. John*, so as that he seems to have read in him *τεῖτη* and not *ἕκτη*, for he says thus:

Ἦν δὲ πτανομένη τετάρτη θανάτορος ὤση.

*The third mortal Hour was lengthened out; i. e. was not yet past.* And it is plain that if the Hours be thus disposed, and the *Evangelists* supposed to have written so, there will be no difficulty; and it is highly probable that there was a considerable interval of time between *Pilate's* pronouncing the Sentence and *Christ's* Crucifixion. For there was a *Cross* to be provided, which perhaps was not yet got ready; and it would take up some time to go to the *place of Execution*, because *Christ* was not well able to carry his *Cross*, and then there must be some time also allowed for their *crucifying* him.

It can hardly be doubted but that it was so, and therefore if *Christ* was not condemned, properly speaking, till a little before the sixth Hour, as the *Doctor* supposes, it will be difficult to understand how he was crucified in the second quarter of the day. And yet I hardly think that the *Copies* of both the *Evangelists* are corrupted. It would not indeed be incredible that *St. Mark* was corrected out of *St. John*, or *St. John* out of *St. Mark*; and there are frequent instances of such corrections as those; but that this seeming contrariety between them is owing to the corrections of some Criticks is not credible: and therefore I am apt to think that the ordinary reading is true, but we must take another Method to solve the difficulty.

*St. Mark* who wrote before the destruction of *Jerusalem*, seems to have reckoned the Hours after the manner of the *Jews*: and the *Jews* dated their first Hour from the rising of the Sun, and so by the third Hour we must understand the third from that time, *viz.* the Sun's rising;

Chapter XIX. rising; and accordingly if we suppose that the Sun (pursuant to our way of computation from Midnight) rose about six a Clock, that which is St. *Mark's* third Hour will be our ninth. And the relation which the *Evangelists* give us of this matter, makes it reasonable to think that *Christ* was not crucified sooner. For early in the Morning he was sent by the *Sanhedrim*, and accused before *Pilate*, *Mat.* xxvii. 1, 2. *Mark* xv. 1. *John* xviii. 28. Then *Pilate* questioned him, and sent him to *Herod*, and tried to rescue him out of the hands of the *Jews*, by ordering him only to be scourged, and suffering him to be mocked; and at last being no longer able to resist the *Jews* importunity, he condemned him. And about the third hour from the rising of the Sun we will suppose that he was fastened to the Cross; and after he had hanged there three hours, at the sixth from the Sun's rising, but the twelfth from Midnight, began that darkness mentioned in *Mat.* xxvii. 45. which rested till the ninth (*i. e.* our three in the Afternoon) upon *Judaea*. And then a little after the ninth *Christ* expired.

But how then is it said by St. *John*, that *Christ* was condemned about the sixth Hour? *viz.* according to the custom of the old *Romans* who used to reckon the beginning of their *civil* or *artificial* day from Midnight: of which see *A. Gellius Noct. Attic.* Lib. 3. c. 2. & *Censorinus de die Natali*, c. xxiii. I grant the same way of computation obtained afterwards among the *Romans* as among the *Jews*; but nevertheless the old Custom might also continue in some parts of the Empire: and therefore *Plutarch* in his *Quaest. Rom.* 83. makes it a matter of enquiry as a thing then in use, *διὰ π τὴν τῆς ἡμέρας ἀρχὴν ἐν μέσῃ νυκτὸς λαμβάνουσι;* why they counted the beginning of the day from Midnight? And this Custom was probably followed by St. *John*, who wrote a great while after the destruction of *Jerusalem*.

Verf. 23. Ἦν δὲ ὁ χιτὼν ἀρραβῶν] If we believe the conjecture of *Ost. Ferrarius de Re Vest.* Lib. 3. c. 16. this Coat was like our silk or worsted Stockings, which are knit with long Needles: or at least if that art was not then found out, it was, as he thinks, made only with hands without any Needle, and of the nature of small Nets, or a particular sort of Hoods which Women sometimes wear. And upon this account, he supposes, it is said to be ἀνωθεν ὑφαντὸς, *i. e.* wrought upwards, and δι' ὅλε, *i. e.* orbicularly, and all together, without having any Seam made in it. After this manner were made the straight Garments which *Fathers*, as *Festus* tells us, caused to be move for their Children, as an omen of their being lucky; so called, because they were wrought from the bottom upwards, and by Persons standing: which Custom also prevailed amongst the Inhabitants of *Palæstine*, as has been shewn by learned



learned Men out of *Theophylact*. But *Euthymius* tells us, that this Chapter Coat was wrought from the upper parts, just, *saieth he*, as amongst us the Winter-coverings for the Head or Feet; and he is in the right, for the Phrase ἐκ τῶ ἀνωθεν cannot signify *towards the top upwards*, as *Ferrarius* would have it, but *from the top downwards*, so as Stockings use to be knit.

However, those are mistaken who are of opinion that the Workmanship of this Coat was extraordinary rare and curious, which does not at all suite with the humility and poverty of Christ. Let us rather hear what *Isidorus Pelusiota* says, Lib. 1. Ep. 74. Τίς ὃ ἀγνοεῖ τὴν δουτέλειαν τῆς ἐδῆτος ἐσεινης, ἥπερ οἱ πτωχοὶ κέχρηται τῶν Γαλιλαίων, καὶ ἔς κ' ἡ μάλιστα τὸ τοιοῦτο φιλεῖ γίνεσθαι ἱμάτιον, ὡς αἱ σηδοδεσμίαι, ἀνάκρεσεν ἢ ὑφανόμενον; *But who does not know the meanness of that Garment which the poor of the Galileans wore, amongst whom chiefly this sort of Garment used to be made, like Stomachers pressed or wove?*

Verf. 35. Note c. lin. 29.] *Bartholinus* in *Diss. de latere Christi aperto* has treated more exactly of this whole matter, who may be consulted.

## C H A P. XX.

Verf. 23. Note d. **S**upposing the same thing to be conferred upon the Apostles in this place, as in *Matth. xvi* and *xviii*.

Our Author justly rejects the interpretation of *Mr. Selden*. But perhaps some may doubt whether it be just the same thing which is promised in both these passages, they being delivered upon different occasions, and no proof being given that the promise made in them is the same. And besides, the sense of the phrases *to remit* and *retain Sins*, is sometimes quite different from that which can belong to them in the business of the excommunication of an Offender, or the admission of a Penitent. The phrase *to remit sin* in the New Testament, signifies sometimes to deliver a person from the punishment inflicted upon him by God for his sins; and if we admit that sense here, *to retain sins* will be to inflict or continue the infliction of such punishment. Thus *Matth. ix. 2. Thy sins are remitted to thee*, is all one as, I deliver thee from thy Palsy, which has been sent upon thee as a punishment for thy sins, as the following words manifestly shew, and *Dr. Hammond* acknowledges; and so if we apply the phrase in this sense to this place, that which Christ here bestows upon his Apostles, will be a power of *delivering up to Satan*, as *St. Paul* speaks, *i. e.* of inflicting diseases upon the impenitent,

Chapter and curing them upon their repentance. Which Power depending  
 XX. upon the gift of doing Miracles, can have no place where that gift is  
 not conferred, as learned men have observed on 1 Cor. v.

Thus also *to bind*, signifies sometimes to inflict diseases, and *to loose*,  
 to cure them. So *Luke* xiii. 12. *Christ* speaking to the Woman that  
 had been diseased eighteen years, says: ἐπλέλυσαι, *thou art loosed from*  
*thine infirmity*. And, *ver.* 16. *Ought not this Daughter of Abraham,*  
*whom Satan hath bound* ἔδουσε, *behold these eighteen years, be loosed from that*  
*bond* λυθῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ δεσμῶ τέτυ. So that granting our Author that the same  
 thing, as it seems to be, is intended in *Mat.* xviii. and here; yet it  
 does not follow, that *Christ* speaks of mere excommunication, with-  
 out any disease consequent upon it. Let the Learned consider and judg  
 of this matter.

*Verf.* 27. Καὶ ἴδε τὴν χεῖράς μου.] After *Christ* had said, *Reach hither*  
*thy finger*, it was consequent that he should say, Καὶ ἥψαζουσιν τὰς χεῖράς μου,  
*and feel my hands*, or something like that, for we do not reach out  
 our finger to *see* a thing, but to *feel* or *touch* it. And therefore there  
 is an impropriety of speech here, ordinary in every ones discourse,  
 whereby we apply a word that belongs properly to *one sense*, to *another*.  
 And particularly, nothing is more common than to find this Verb *to*  
*see*, used for that which is to try or examin by some other sense. See  
*Exod.* xx. 18. and more Examples which have been collected by *Sal.*  
*Glassius Rhet. Sacr. Tract.* 1. *Cap.* 12. where he treats of the Metaphors  
 that are taken from human senses. However, *Christ* seems to have  
 kept the marks of the Nails and Spear unclosed, that that might be a  
 certain sign to know him by; otherwise he needed not to have left the  
 least sign of them in his body.

*Ibid.* Εἰς τὴν πλάγην μου.] He does not add εἰς τὰς πόδας μου, because his  
 feet had not been pierced through with nails, but only bound, contra-  
 ry to what our Painters and Statuaries now adays generally think.  
 And therefore *Dr. Hammond* also well observes, that the Legs of the  
 Thieves were broken, that they might not be able to run away;  
 which the Roman Procurator would never have been apprehensive of,  
 if both their feet had been fastened to the Cross by a huge nail driven  
 through the soles of them.

*Verf.* 28. Ὁ χεῖρός μου, ἢ ὁ θεός μου.] Tho the Nominative case is often  
 put for the Vocative, I chuse rather with the *Vulgar* to use here the  
*Nominative*, as if the words εὖ εἶ were to be understood, *thou art my*  
*Lord and my God*, i. e. I acknowledg thee to be truly that same Lord  
 whom I before followed; and not a Man only, but to be also God, in  
 as much as thou hast overcome death, which keeps all men under its  
 power;



power: which sense exactly agrees with *Christ's* words; *be not incredulous, but believing.* Chapter XXI.

Verf. 29. Πιστεύουσ.] *Faith* is properly of those things which are not seen; because what we see, we are said to *know*, not to *believe*: see *Heb. xi. 1.* But yet sometimes any persuasion whatsoever is called *Faith*, even that which is built upon the testimony of the Senses. Thus the Latin *credere* is taken in that Verse of *Plautus*, *Asinar. Act. 1. Sc. 3. Semper oculatæ manus sunt nostræ, credunt quod vident.*

Ibid. Καὶ πισύσωντες.] This seems to refer to the time future: *Blessed are those who tho they will not see, yet shall believe.* And this is *Faith* properly called, whereby we assent to a thing upon solid reasons, which we never saw, notwithstanding the seeming strangeness of it. Consult Interpreters on *Heb. xi. 1.* and what I have said concerning *Faith*, on *Gen. xv. 6.*

## C H A P. XXI.

Verf. 1. ΠΑΛΙΝ] *i. e.* in *Galilee*, or at the Lake of *Gennesareth*, as *Grotius* has observed; for at *Jerusalem* he had appeared to his Disciples before, more than once. This ought to have been expressed in the Paraphrase.

Verf. 5. Πιστοποιον] does not seem to signify in this place ὀψώνιον, but that which being sold might help to buy any sort of ὀψώνιον: for by what follows it appears that the Apostles had ὀψώνιον already by them on the shore; and the end of their fishing was not so much to get fish for themselves to eat, as to sell that they might provide themselves with other necessaries. As long as they followed *Christ*, they subsisted by the same liberality of pious Women that he himself did; but at this time the Apostles not being yet in any repute, there seems to have been a stop put to that liberality. And therefore they had been forced to betake themselves to their old trade of fishing again to get their living.

Verf. 9. Ὁψέων.] The *Doctor* in concurrence with *Grotius* and others supposes that these Fish were produced out of nothing, which yet is unnecessary, considering that the Lake was very full of Fish, and that there was no body to see how they came upon the Coals; not to say that *St. John* gives no ground for such a supposition.

Ibid. Ἐπλάμα.] Since the words *knowing that it was the Lord* follow, the Verb ἐπλάμα here cannot so properly signify *dared*, as *thought fit* or *advisable*; no body judged it convenient to ask him who he was, perceiving it to be the Lord, tho they did not presently know his face,

Chapter XXI. which had a greater majesty in it than before. But yet St. John chose rather to say *ἑδὴς ἐτόλμα ἐξετάσαι αὐτὸν*, than *ἑδὴς ἐνόμιζεν ὅτι ἑδὴ ἐξετάσαι αὐτὸν*, because the Disciples abstained from asking that question, not only because of the Tokens by which they knew him to be the Lord but also out of fear, lest he should be displeas'd with them as incredulous. They knew indeed that it was the Lord, but their knowledge of it was not so certain as to make it perfectly needless to ask him; but yet they dared not do it.

Verf. 14. *Τρίτον.*] I have already intimated that our Author in his Paraphrase does not clearly enough interpret this word. As therefore I have before interpreted the word *πύλιν* in *vers.* 1. with *Grotius*, of a Place, viz. *Galilee*; so in like manner I think that this *τρίτον* ought to be understood of a place. And indeed it can hardly be understood of the third day after the Resurrection, it being certain that on the day of the Resurrection it self, the Disciples tarried at *Jerusalem*, and incredible that the Apostles could be a fishing so soon as the third day after it; for it is at least two days journey from *Jerusalem* to the Lake of *Gennesareth*, especially on foot. But besides, this was not the sixth, but the seventh or eighth time, if we reckon right, that Christ appeared to his Disciples: Consult *Steph. Curcellæus Instit. Rel. Christ.* Lib. 5. c. 14. about this matter.

Verf. 15. *Note b.* I am apt to think that the immediate occasion of *Christ's* question (for that there might be some remoter reasons of it I do not deny) was *St. Peter's* over-hasty descent into the Sea, not being able to stay till the Ship came to Land. For as soon as ever he had notice given him by *St. John* that *Jesus* stood on the shore, he presently leaped into the water, impatient of delay; that he might, as soon as possible, come to the Lord, whilst the rest tarried in the Ship, till they could step out of it upon Land. This occasion *St. Peter* gave *Christ* to ask him whether he loved him more than the rest of his Disciples, because he came sooner to him than they.

Verf. 18. *Ὅταν γενέσῃς.*] *Grotius* here has this gloss: *When thou hast added almost forty years to those which thou hast lived already.* But out of what Chronology did he learn, that from the year of *Christ's* death to the last of *Nero*, beyond which the death of *St. Peter* cannot be deferred, there was the space of forty years? From the year of *Christ* 33, in which he ascended into Heaven, to the 68th in which *Nero* died, there were only 35 years. And supposing *St. Peter* to have died *Anno Christi* 65, as the most exact Chronologers think, there will be fewer. I wonder that *Dr. Hammond* too should follow *Grotius* here, without any examination.

Verf.



Verf. 22: *Note c.* This *coming of Christ* is very well interpreted by Chapter **XXI.**  
**Dr. Hammond**, who deserves to have almost all the glory of it. For few other Interpreters besides him ever discerned the true meaning of it, and no body has ever so clearly explained it, or so copiously demonstrated it. This opinion of his is confirmed by the Church of *Ephesus*, which in *vers.* 24. declares the truth of *St. John's* Testimony, both as to this and all other things. If the Christians of that Age had believed the words *ἕως ἔρχουαι* to signify *till I come to judg the living and the dead*, as the Apostles had thought, they must have judged the testimony of *St. John* not be true; because he was dead, and yet that last day was not come. Since therefore they thought *St. John* a faithful Witness, both of *Christ's* Doctrin and Resurrection, and knew that he was dead, they must have understood this *coming of Christ* in another sense. And nothing happened in all that interval of time which could be called *Christ's coming*, but that remarkable Vengeance which he took upon the *Jews*.

Verf. 23: *Note d.* How could the *Ephesians* say *οἱδμεν*, *We know that his testimony is true?* namely, not only by those evidences of veracity and prudence which they observed in *St. John* himself, but chiefly by his *Doctrin* and *Miracles*, the former being a holy Doctrin, and the latter *God's Seal* to the truth of it.

---

ANNO.



# ANNOTATIONS

ON THE

## ACTS of the Holy Apostles.

**A**T the end of the *Premon.*] It is much more probable that St. Peter died in the Reign of Nero, and that in the year of Christ 65. as A. Pagus has shewn in *Baron Epicr.* ad Ann. 67.

### CHAP. I.

Verf. 13. **I** Have several Remarks to make on this Interpretation of Dr. Hammond.

*had* I. That he recurred to this singular Interpretation, because he thought that these two Passages of St. Luke could hardly otherwise be reconciled. In the last Verse of his Gospel he has not said that the Apostles were always in the Temple, *διὰ πάντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*. And here he speaks, *καὶ τὸ ἑσπέρα ἐν ἑνὶ ὑπαυμένωρτες*, of an upper room where they abode, and pray'd to God. But the Doctor himself acknowledges that the Apostles were not in the Temple the whole day, but only at the stated times of publick Prayer: At other times therefore they were at their own Houses, in which I do not see why there could not be *ἑσπέρα*, into which they might retire in order to pray, or to spend their time with their Master, or in pious Discourses about him. And therefore this place may be very well understood thus; where they abode when they were not in the Temple, or hinder'd by other Affairs; where they were for the most part when they kept at home.

II. It is indeed very true, that there were several Chambers or Rooms in the Temple, which might be called so many *ἑσπέρα*, and the Doctor might have taken less pains in proving it; but he should have given us some Examples, to assure us that the common People, and especially Strangers, did not only pray in the Court of *Israel*, but went up also into the Chambers that lay over the Porches, in order to pray with the more secrecy. For it is not at all probable that the Apostles who



who were poor men, and *Galileans*, and odious for their Master's sake Chapter I. to the *Jews*, dared to do any thing which others could not in the Temple, in which they might have been taken notice of by the *Priests* and *Levites*. Our Author therefore ought to have shewn that it was the custom of pious Men to retire sometimes into the more secret Chambers of the Temple for their private Devotion, which I cannot tell whether any body can prove; at least I never met with any foot-step of that custom.

III. He perfectly forces the words in *Chap. ii.46.* as I shall afterwards shew.

IV. *Epiphanius* doth not affirm that the *ὑπερώον* here spoken of was where the Temple had been, but in *Mount Sion*, upon which, as all know, was built the *Palace* or *City of David*, and not the *Temple*, which lay more towards the East and South, and stood upon another Hill, supposed to be *Mount Moriah*, and commonly called the *Mountain of the House*. He that does not know this, let him consult *Dr. Lightfoot* in *Cent. Chorograph.* premised before *St. Matthew*, *Cap. xxii, xxiii, and xxvii.* where, by Passages taken out of *Josephus* and the *Rabbins*, he puts this matter out of all doubt. It must be acknowledged however that *Epiphanius* by the inaccurate order of his words gave the *Doctor* an occasion to mistake: For he speaks thus; *Εὗρε τὴν πόλιν πᾶσαν ἐδαφισμένην· καὶ τὸ ἱερόν τῷ Θεῷ καταπατημένον, παρεκτὸς ὀλίγων οἰκημάτων:* He found the whole City demolished, and the Temple of God trampled upon, except a few Houses. The three last words the *Doctor* makes to refer to the Temple, when they ought to be referred to the City. It follows; *καὶ τῆς τῷ Θεῷ ἐκκλησίας μικρῆς ἕσσης, ἐνθα ὑποσέβαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτε ὁ Σωτὴρ ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἐλαιῶνος, ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὑπερώον. ἐκεῖ γὰρ ᾤκησθησαν:* and the Church of God which was little, in the place to which the Disciples returning, when our Saviour was caught up from Mount Olivet, went up into the upper room, for there it was built. This Church was not on the ground where the Temple stood, but in *Mount Sion*, as *Epiphanius* tells as in the next words: *ἑπτὰ ἐν τῇ Σιών, ἢ πρὸς τὴν ἐρημώσεως παρελείφθη, καὶ μερῶν οἰκήσεων περὶ αὐτὴν τὴν Σιών, καὶ ἑπτὰ συναγωγαὶ, αἱ ἐν τῇ Σιών μόναι ἐσθίκεσαν:* that is, in a part of Sion which was left undestroy'd, and some parts of the Houses that were about the same Sion, and seven Synagogues which stood alone in Sion.

Verf. 15. Note e.] It is true indeed; that the Name of God in Scripture is often put for God himself, and that the Rabbins call God *שׁוּמַי* the Name with an Emphasis: But we never find it set to signify Men or Persons in the Old Testament. I am apt to think that it is rather a *Latinism* than a *Hebraism*: For in Latin Authors nothing is more common:

Chapter common than for the word *Names* to be put for *Men* or *Persons*.  
 II. So *Ovid*. *Amor.* Lib. 2. El. 1.

————— *Heroum clara valet*  
*Nomina*

So *Statius* lib. 6. *Thebaidos*.

————— *Quisnam iste duos, fidissima Phœbo*  
*Nomina, commisit Deus in discrimina Reges?*

So *Valerius Flaccus*, lib. 4.

*Nomen ait prædulce mihi, nomenque sequutus*  
*Otreos;*

That is, *Otreus*. See *vers.* 225. of the same Book, and *Lib.* 5. *vers.* 61. and 120.

7. 5. *vers.* 18. *Note g.*] See my Note on the parallel place in *St. Mat-*  
*thew*, and what I have said there in opposition to *Dr. Hammond's*  
*Opinion*.

*vers.* 25. *Note k.*] If our Author's Interpretation were true, the  
*Conjunction*  $\kappa\iota$  should have preceded the Verb  $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\upsilon\theta\eta\iota\nu\alpha\iota$ . It will be ve-  
 ry modestly said concerning *Judas* by the Apostles, that he went into  
 his proper place, if by  $\dot{\iota}\delta\iota\theta\text{-}\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma$  be meant that State, whatsoever it  
 was, which he passed into after his Death. Such another Phrase *Plato*  
 makes use of in *Phædone*;  $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \kappa\iota\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\omega\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\iota}\ \beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\ \delta\iota\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\lambda\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\iota$   
 ———  $\acute{\omega}\kappa\mu\omicron\sigma\epsilon\ \tau\acute{\iota}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\sigma\eta\ \tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu\ \omega\rho\theta\acute{\omicron}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\iota$ : *the Soul which has lived purely and*  
*soberly, dwells in a place suitable to it self.*

## C H A P. II.

*vers.* 17. *Note b. lin.* 49. **A**fter the *Cit.* out of *Deut.* xxxi. 29.] I have shewn in  
 my Notes on *Deuteronomy*, that these words signify  
 only in general, *after days*. If they signify *the days*  
*of the Messias*, the reason of that is because those days were *after-days*,  
 or *days then to come*. Sometimes the Phrase  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\iota$  signifies *the*  
*last days*, not of the *Messias*, but of those Writers that made use of  
 it, *i. e.* the days just past, or that were near at hand. This may easi-  
 ly be applied to the places that *Dr. Hammond* alledges.

*vers.* 46.  $\kappa\alpha\tau'\ \acute{\epsilon}\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$ ] This is well translated by the *Vulgar*, *circa*  
*domos*, *i. e.* not in any one House, but sometimes in one and some-  
 times



times in another, for fear of being surprized by the Jews. I do not deny but that the word οἶκος may be set to signify a Chamber or Room in the Temple; but the Phrase κατ' οἶκον can no more signify in one of the Rooms of the Temple, than ἐπὶ πόλιν in Jerusalem, Chap. xv. 21. & xx. 23. Tit. i. 5. Who will ever believe that a vast multitude of Christians did every day eat in the Chambers of the Temple? No body besides Dr. Hammond.

*Ibid.* It is true indeed that the word χάρις signifies often a Benefit, as also the Latin *gratia*; but the Phrase ἔχειν χάριν πρὸς πνα signifies only to be in favor with him, and not to give any thing to him. The case is plain. We must not enquire what words signify by themselves, but in conjunction with one another. Our Author's arguing here is absurd.

C H A P. III.

Verf. 19. **A**fter the words *utter ruin.*] Our learned Author's Memory here failed him. See my Notes on *Gen. v. 29.*

Verf. 21. *Note b.*] This Interpretation which the Doctor here gives us of the words ὃν δεῖ ἕργον δεξαῖναι, is not, as he pretends, most agreeable to the Context, but a very harsh one; for it is manifest that what is here said concerning Christ, viz. *that the Heaven must receive him,* is opposed to the foregoing words, *And he shall send Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you.* St. Peter first exhorts the Jews to repent of their Sins, that they might obtain Mercy and Forgiveness when Christ should come from Heaven, and then he adds, ὃν δεῖ ἕργον δεξαῖναι, &c. i. e. *whom the Heaven must contain,* or who must continue in Heaven until the times of the restitution of all things. There could be no mention here made of Christ's Government, or his having taken upon him the Government of Heaven, but only of his staying in Heaven, which is the opposite to his returning from thence. Our Author out of a desire to propose something new, says sometimes such things as none that have any skill in this sort of Learning can admit of.

*Ibid.* Ἀποκατάστασις πάντων.] What the Syriac and Chaldee word was that St. Peter made use of I cannot tell. But St. Luke expressing his sense, and meeting with a word proper to his purpose among the Stoicks, he used that. Thus *Numenius* in *Eusebius Præp. Evang. lib. 15. cap. 19.* setting down the Opinion of the Stoicks says, that after the Conflagration of the World, Nature ἐπανελθῆσαν εἰς τὸ πρῶτον ῥηθέντα λόγον, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐκείνην τὴν ποῖσαν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸ μέγιστον, καθ' ὃν αὐτῆς μόνης εἰς αὐτὴν γινεται ἡ ἀποκατάστασις, *will return to its first, as it is called, Reason, and that*

Chapter *Resurrection which will make the great Year, in which year the restitution of IV. it self alone into the same will be brought about.* See *Lipsius de Physiol. Stoic. lib. 2. c. 22.* where there is a very remarkable Passage out of *Julius Firmicus* to this purpose.

Verf. 24. Note c. ] I wish our Author had given us the Reasons which made him think that *Samuel* first of all instituted the Schools of the Prophets, for I confess I do not know how he could be certain of this. It is true, *Samuel* is described the first in the company of the Prophets, and going before them, 1 *Sain. xix. 20.* But it no where appears that he was the first Institutor of such Schools. I should rather say that his Name is here put first, because he was indeed the first famous Prophet, whose Predictions are extant, that succeeded *Moses*.

#### C H A P. IV.

Verf. 1.  $\Sigma$  *Τρατηρός τῶ ἐβραϊ.* ] This was not a Heathen, but a Jew, the Captain of the Levites, of which see my Note on *Luke xxii. 44.* The Priests did not use to walk so close together with Heathens for fear of being polluted.

Verf. 7. *Ἐν πύσιν δυνάμεις* ] Did you do this by a *magical* Power, or a Power derived from the Devil, or from *God*? ἢ ἐν πύσιν ἑβραίων; or by whose *authority*, since you had none from the *Sanhedrim*? In whose Name do you pretend to be sent? That the *invocation* of any Name is here intended, I do not think.

Verf. 12. *Οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν ἄλλῳ ἕδενι ἢ σωτηρία.* ] This is rightly interpreted by the *Doct̄or* in his Paraphrase, so as to make the sense of *St. Peter's* words here to be, that *Jesus* is the only Mediator by whom we can have access or admission to *God*, and that *God* has sent no other; from which it is consequent that those must fall short of Salvation, who rejecting him, betake themselves to any other Mediator, as the *Jews* did who placed their Confidence in *Moses*. But this is nothing at all to the Heathens, who have neither ever heard any thing of *Christ*, nor ever cast him off to substitute any Mediator in his room. If *God* will think fit to pardon some of them who live the most agreeably to right Reason, and confer upon them some measure of Happiness out of mere Grace and Mercy; do we think that *Christ* will intercede that he may not? Sure he will not; and I do not see why we silly Mortals should set bounds to *God's* Mercy. But this belongs to the Theory of Divinity, which I have purposed not to meddle with.

Verf. 28. *Γενέσθαι* ] *Δι' αὐτῶν* must be understood. The meaning of the Apostles is, that *God* had before decreed not to hinder by his  
Wisdom



Wisdom and Power what he foresaw would be done by them, unless his Wisdom and Power interposed to hinder it. *Affirmatives*, as they call them, must be often expounded by *Negatives*. And so γενέσθαι here is all one as ἢ κωλύειν ἵνα μὴ γένοιτο, *not to hinder its being done*. See Gen. xii. 13. and my Notes on that place, as also on Chap. v. 3. of this History. And whereas the Apostles say not only βελὴ παροίσει, but also ἢ χεὶρ σε, when it is only the Counsel of God, to speak properly, that *determins*, and his *Hand*, that is, his Power, which *executes* what he has decreed; the reason of that is, because they would have it understood, that God did not want Power to have hinder'd this if he had pleased, but only he did not make use of it; which confirms the Negative Sense I have given of the word γενέσθαι, *to be done*.

Vers. 35. Καὶ ἐπιθεῖν, &c. ] The Testimonies of Philosophers, who thought all things ought to be common, and Examples likewise of some Nations which have reduced that into practice, have been collected by *Lucas Holstenius* on the Life of *Pythagoras*, p. 82. Amongst the rest he sets down these Verses of *Scymnus*, an antient Geographer of *Chios*, concerning the *Nomades* in *Scythia* who dwelt beyond *Panti-*  
*cape*.

Ζῶσι δὲ τὴν τε κτήσιν ἀναδεδιαιχότες  
Κοίμην ἀπάντων, τήντε ὅλην ἔσταν.  
Καὶ τὸ σφὸν Ἀνάχαρσιν ἐκ τῶ Νομαδικῶν  
Φησὶ γενέσθαι τὸ σφύδρα δισεβασάντων.

*They live in common upon what they all possess, every one receiving as much as he has need of from the publick Stock. And the wise Anacharis, they say, came of this very pious Nation of the Nomades.*

C H A P. V.

Vers. 1. **E**Πώλησε κτήμα. ] I cannot see any reason to suppose, as the *Doctour* does in his Paraphrase, that *Ananias* and *Saphira* did this in pursuance of a Vow they had made to do it, *i. e.* to sell their Estate. It is not necessary to add any thing to *St. Luke's* History. *Ananias* and *Saphira* hoped, that giving part of the Price to the Apostles, they should enjoy the rest themselves, and at the same time have a maintenance allowed them out of the common Stock of the Church. In which they were guilty of a *double Sin*; *First*, That tho they had no need of it, yet they would have the Church maintain them, and so rob those that were really indigent: And, *secondly*, That to that end they told a Lie, by saying that they had brought the

Chapter V. whole Price for which they had sold their Estate. That this is the true state of the Case, the bare reading of St. Luke's words will shew, in which there is nothing that implies these two Persons to have been guilty of breaking any Vow.

Verf. 2. ἔθιζεν. ] The Context shews, that in this place we must supply in our thoughts this Circumstance; καὶ ὅλην τιμὴν τῆς κτήματός ἐῖναι εἶπεν, and said that it was the whole Price of the Possession. See my Index to the Pentateuch, on the word *Circumstantia*: Otherwise St. Peter could not have been angry with *Ananias*, or upbraided him with lying.

Verf. 3. Δια' τι ἐπλήρωσε. ] These words must be interpreted by a Negation, for St. Peter's meaning is no more than this; *Why didst not thou hinder Satan from filling thy mind?* i. e. Thou oughtest to have hinder'd Satan from having so great a power over thee, as to persuade thee to tell a Lie, viz. by begging God's Grace to enable thee to resist and overcome that Temptation. Of this way of interpreting an *Affirmation* by the help of a *Negation*, see my Note on Chap. iv. 28. The Verb πληρῶν here includes not only the Devil's tempting *Ananias*, but the noxious effect or prevalency of his Temptation: for when the Devil tempts a Man he does but as it were knock at the Door, without entering in; but when his Temptation prevails, being admitted, he fills his Mind, and casts all thoughts of Virtue out of it. St. Jerom, not sufficiently understanding the force of this Interrogation, or of the Verb πληρῶν, translated it by *cur tentavit*, *Why hath he tempted?* Beza indeed supposes the reason of his rendering it so to have been, that he read the Greek ἐπέειχε, i. e. *tentavit*, *tempted*. But there are two things which make it probable, that he endeavour'd rather to express the sense of the place, or if he thought that it ought to be so read, that he relied only upon his own Conjecture, and not on any Copies. First, All the Copies out of which any various readings have been taken, that ever I could meet with, read it as we do. Secondly, It is certain that the old Translation before St. Jerom's time, had *implevit*, *filled*; for so this place is alledged by S. Cyprian Testim. Lib. 3. Sect. 30.

Ibid. Note b. ] The sense which our Author prefers before the rest, relies only on this supposition, which has been liked also by many others, that *Ananias* and *Sapphira* made a Vow, of which there is not the least word said by St. Luke. It will be much more natural to interpret the words so, as to understand *ψεύδεται τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα*, to signify *to lie to the Holy Ghost*, speaking by the Apostles, or by lying to deceive him. Consult H. Grotius. If it be demanded why *Ananias* and  
*Sapphira*



*Sapphira* suffered so severe a Punishment for telling a Lie? the Answer is ready. There were three very important Reasons why that Severity should be used. *First*, Those that acted in that manner, can hardly be supposed to have thought the Apostles to be *Prophets*, who could know Secrets by Revelation from God; which Opinion; if it had spread, would mightily have lessened the Apostles *Authority*, and consequently very much hindered the propagation of the Gospel. If any should doubt whether it were generally thought that Prophets could discern Secrets, he need only read *Luke vii. 29.* *Secondly*, It was for the interest of the Christian Religion, that above all Crimes, dissembling should be most severely punished, none being more pernicious or of more fatal Consequence, according to those words of *Cicero de Offic. Lib. 1. c. 3. Totius injustitiæ nulla capitalior est, quam eorum qui cum maxime fallunt, id agunt ut viri boni esse videantur.* Of all Crimes there is none more heinous and capital than theirs; who whilst they deceive most, endeavour to appear honest Men. *Thirdly*, It was also of very great concernment, that those who first joined themselves to the Apostles, should not be hypocritical Persons, that made a shew of Piety, when they had none, because the sins of such Persons would have discredited the Christian Religion it self, among those to whom it had not been yet preached. Especially, if it had been commonly reported, that Men that were slothful or covetous had joined themselves to the Christians; because all that brought a little Mony to the Apostles, pretending it to be their whole Estate, were maintained at the publick Charge: as this would have been a great Reproach to Christianity, so it would have induced a great many lewd People to feign themselves Christians, that they might abuse the Churches Liberality, as it frequently, I believe, happened in succeeding Ages, when the Possessions of the Christians were enlarged: Of which we have a famous Example in one *Peregrinus* mentioned by *Lucian*.

Vers. 4. Note c. There is no difficulty at all in this place, if we do but lay aside the thoughts of a *Vow*, about which *St. Luke* is perfectly silent. The sense will be very natural and commodious; if we understand the Apostle thus: “Who compelled thee to sell thy Estate?  
 “Would it not have continued thy own if thou hadst not sold it?  
 “But thou wert resolved to sell it. And couldst thou not have kept  
 “all the money which thou hadst for it after it was sold? Who re-  
 “quired any part of it from thee? Thou mightest have kept it all to  
 “thy self, and no body would have complained; but thou oughtest  
 “not to come with a lie to those that are Prophets, and inspired by  
 “the

Chapter V. “ the Holy Ghost, and feign thy self to have brought the whole Sum,  
 “ that thou mightest be maintained by the publick Liberality; as if  
 “ thou hadst left thy self nothing at all, and made thy self as indigent  
 “ as the poorest. The word *μέρον* never signifies an *immovable Estate*; that is nothing but our learned Author’s own invention.

Verf. 13. *Τῶν ὃ λοιπῶν ἐδίδας ἐπέλογα καὶ λῆξιν.*] The word *λοιπῶν* here does not signify those that believed and heartily embraced the Gospel, but rather *Hypocrites* or *Dissemblers*; who would in vast numbers have joined themselves to the Church, if the Apostles could have been imposed on. This *Grotius* perceived, whom our Author ought to have followed in this, as he ordinarily does in other things. The Apostles were not solicitous *how many* professed the Christian Faith; but how *good* and *sincere* they were in that profession, lest by the evil practices of its Professors, the Christian Religion, when it was but in its rise, should be dishonoured; which would have been a thing of very bad consequence, as I have already observed.

Verf. 24. *Στρατηγὸς τῶ ἱερῶ*] *i. e.* The Captain of the Garison of *Levites*, as I have shewn on *Luke* xxii. 52. And hence *vers.* 26. St. *Luke* calls those that he had under his command, not *στρωτάς* *Souldiers*, but *ὑπητάς* *Ministers* or *Officers*, viz. of the Levitical Tribe, who according to the direction of the Law, obeyed the Priests that had the oversight of the Temple.

Verf. 33. *Note f.* If our learned *Author* had look’d a little further into *Hesychius*, he would have understood what was the proper signification of this word: For thus that learned Grammarian interprets the word *διεπέοντο*: *Διεπέοντο, ἐθυμῶντο, ἐτείζον τὰς ὀδόντας, They were angry, they gnashed with their teeth.* Which *Phavorinus*, as he uses to do, has transcribed.

Verf. 41. *Note k.* It is true, among the *Romans* scourging was a servil punishment, because it was not lawful to scourge any *Roman Citizen*; but it was not among the *Jews*, tho’ those upon whom it was inflicted, *ἠτιμάζοντο*, were also reproachfully used. And St. *Luke* makes use of that word rather than *ἐκολάζοντο*, because the reproachful usage *ἠτιμία* of the Apostles, was worse than their punishment *κόλασις*: See the *Doctor* on *Luke* xxiii. 16.





C H A P. VI.

Verf. 1. **T**HE words τῶν Ἑλλήνων φρονῶ, in the place alledged by Note a. the *Doctor* out of *Phavorinus*, are not well translated by him to *have skill in the Greek learning*, but ought to be rendered *to be on the Greeks side, or of the sentiments of the Greeks*. And hence the learned *Jf. Vossius*, *De Sybillinis Oraculis*, Cap. 16. affirms those to be mistaken who interpret the word Ἑλληνιστῆς as *Dr. Hammond* does, because Ἑλληνίζειν does not only signify to imitate the Language of the *Greeks*, but also to side with the *Greeks*, as Ῥωμαίίζειν, Περσίζειν, Μιδιίζειν, Ἀντιγονίζειν, signify to imitate the Manners or Customs, or be of the side of the *Romans, Persians, Medes, or Antigonus*, or any who howsoever countenance them. For it is certain, saith he, that the *Jews* were divided into two parties: Those that were for the Rites and Customs of their Country, bore the Grecian and Roman yoke, &c. impatiently. But those that were of a more peaceable temper, and exhorted the rest to bear with patience the yoke which God had laid upon them, were said to be on the Grecians side, and upon that account were called Ἑλληνισταὶ and φιἙλληνας. But notwithstanding this, it is possible that some of the *Jews* might have this name of *Hellenists* given them merely because they understood Greek, and others because besides that, they were more favourable to the *Greeks* than the οἱ βαθεῖς profound *Hebrews*, and imitated in some measure their manners; nor do I see how either of these can be denied obstinately. But those, I think, are guilty of a mistake, who make a distinct language of that which was used by the *Hellenists*, and call it the *Hellenistical Tongue*; whereas it seems only to have been the Language of those who could speak nothing well but Hebrew, and spake Greek very ill; such as were those who translated the Old Testament into that Language, and likewise the Apostles and others who had learned to speak Greek in *Judæa*. But this was rather a corruption of the Greek Tongue, by mixing it with Hebraisms, than a distinct Language or Dialect, as *Salmasius* and others have shewn at large.

C H A P. VII.

Verf. 3. **E**ΞΕΛΘΕ ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου.] Twice *Abraham* received such a com- Chapter  
mand as this from *God*; first when he was in *Ur* of the VI.  
*Chaldees*, from whence he set out with his *Father*, and  
went to *Charran*, as we are told by *Moses*, Gen. xi. 31. and here by  
St.

Chapter VII. *St. Stephen*; and then afterwards at *Charran*, where he left his Father, of which *Moses* gives us also an account, *Gen. xii. 1.* Unless we distinguish these, we shall hardly make *Moses* agree with *St. Stephen*, or be consistent with himself: See my Notes on *Gen. xii. 1.*

Verf. 4. Μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τῆς πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.] If this discourse of *St. Stephen* were not extant, and the sacred Chronology were taken only out of *Moses*, every thing in *Moses* would be plain; for *Abraham* would be understood to have began his Journey whilst *Terah* was alive, as I have shewn on *Gen. xii. 4.* But because *St. Stephen* here says that *Abraham* departed from *Charran* after his Father's death; therefore the Mosaical Chronology is otherwise digested, and *Abraham* is reckoned to have gone into *Canaan* sixty years later. But if we examin the matter more throughly, it will seem much more probable that *St. Stephen* spake according to the account generally received in that Age, in which there might have been a mistake, than that he was inspired by the *Holy Ghost* to speak as he did, because it signified very little whether the year of *Abraham's* departure were exactly known; and the force of *St. Stephen's* reasoning, or the truth of the Christian Religion, did not at all depend upon that Chronology. And I suppose the reason of this mistake in the common account of the Jews, viz. that *Abraham* set out from *Charran* not till after his Father was dead, was because *Moses* in *Gen. xi.* made mention of the death of *Terah* before he spake of *Abraham's* departure. And it is no wonder that the Jews, who took little or no care to improve in any sort of Learning, were so mistaken in matters of Chronology, and overlooked those things which later Writers on *Gen. xii. 1.* have observed. Just such another Error I have taken notice of in *Josephus*, on *Gen. xxv. 20.*

Those who correct the Mosaical Chronology by *St. Stephen's* discourse, of which number is *Lud. Cappellus*, think that *Abraham* was born, not in the *sixtieth*, but in the *hundred and thirtieth* year of *Terah's* Age. But if this were so, why did *Abraham* think it so strange that a man of a hundred years of Age should be able to get Children, when he himself had been begotten by his Father when he was thirty years older? See *Gen. xvii. 17.* But then they on the other hand, ask us whether it is likely that *Terah*, who accompanied *Abraham* out of *Ur*, should rather chuse to stay five and sixty years at *Charran*, than go to *Abraham*? Why not, since he had his Son *Nachor* there with him, who had a numerous Family? But at least, say they, after the miraculous birth of *Isaac*, he should have gone to *Abraham*. This cannot according to them be any such great Miracle, and their inference from it is weak: For *Terah* might have a great many reasons for his staying at *Charran*, more than we know of. Verf.



Verf. 14. Note g. Col. 2. lin. 12. after the words, *Jacob's going into Egypt.*] Our learned Author is mistaken: See my Notes on *Gen. VIII. xxviii. 1.* Chapter

Verf. 51. Note i. See my Notes on *Exod. xxxii. 9.*

C H A P. VIII.

Verf. 32. Note g. **G**rotius justly rejects the Opinion of *Beza*, who thought that the word *περιεχθη* was made out of the Hebrew *פִּרְשָׁהוּ*, tho there be no great difference between them, either in sound or signification. Nor is *Dr. Hammond's* Conjecture any thing more probable, which relies upon the same grounds with that of *Beza*. *Grotius* has shewn out of *Cicero*, that *περιεχθη* is a genuine Greek word which signifies *periodus, a Period*. For it comes from the Verb *περιέχειν*, to contain or comprehend, which is used by *St. Peter*, 1 *Ep. ii. 6.* where, citing a place of Scripture, he says, *περιεχθη εν τῇ γραφῇ, it is contained in the Scripture.* I confess *περιεχθη* has other significations belonging to it; but amongst those significations there is one that has a near affinity with this. So in the *Old Glosses*: *περιεχθη* *βιβλίου* *argumentum*, *περιεχθη* *βασιλειᾶς* *argumentum*, *περιεχθη* *continentia*, *περιεχθη* *tenore*, *leg. tenoris*; all which signify what may be otherwise barbarously called in Latin *contentum*, in French *le contenu*, the *Contents*.

Verf. 33. Note g. If *St. Luke* spake Hebrew, there is no doubt but that he cited the words of *Isaiab* as they are in the *Hebrew*; and that therefore his meaning is to be understood by the signification of the *Hebrew* words. But the *Septuagint* do not differ much from the sense of the *Hebrew*, if their words be bat rightly pointed, thus: *εν ταπεινωσει αυτου η νεκρωσι αυτου, ηγω, in his humility was his judgment, he was taken away*: That is, *Christ* appearing to be a person of a mean and low condition, the *Jews* and *Pilate* passed judgment on him as an inconsiderable contemptible man, who ought to be put to death to prevent any *Seditious* being made upon his account: And so in effect he was by *Pilate's* order. The words in the *Hebrew* are to be rendered thus: *By reason of force and punishment he was taken away, or by reason of restraint and punishment*; for the Verb *קָצַו* signifies both *to force* and *to restrain*. The Prophet's meaning is, that *Christ* suffered that punishment of death, by reason the *Jews* hindered *Pilate* to pass an equitable judgment upon him, or forced him, as it were, to condemn him. It appears by the paraphrase on *vers. 35.* that *Dr. Hammond* was of *Grotius's* opinion, or one very near it; for he thought that this Prophecy was literally fulfilled

Chapter IX. filled not long after *Isaiab's* time: I wish he had spoken more plainly. It is not, as the *Doctor* tells us, the word *רצר* *hotser* in the Hebrew, but *רצרה* *hatsarah* that is render'd *ἀνυπόστατος*; but they may, I confess, be used promiscuously, and therefore I will not quarrel with him about that.

## C H A P. IX.

Verf. 31. **T**HE 9th Similitude in the 3d Book of *Herma's* Pastor is worth our reading upon this Subject.  
Note d.

## C H A P. X.

Chapter X. **T**HE Hebrew word alledged by our Author, signifies *Incense* or *Perfume*, or an *Offering*: See my Notes on *Levit. ii. 4.*  
Verf. 25. [See δε ἐν νεκρῶν εἰσαλαθεῖν ἢ Πέτρον.] The *Cambridg* Copy, which was formerly *Beza's*, reads this Passage thus; *κατεργαζόμενος δὲ τῷ Πέτρῳ αἰς καιρίθειαν, κατεργαζομένων αἰς τὴν δόξαν διεπίστωτο ἄφραστον εἶναι αὐτὸν, ὁ δὲ Κορινθίοις ἐπιστολῆς αὐτῆς συνάντησεν αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν κατὰ τὸν ἄλλον, &c.* It is manifestly a Paraphrase on *St. Luke's* words, and not a various reading taken out of any antient Copy; for the Greek is purer, and the stile more natural and fluent than is usual in the New Testament Writers. There are in this Book a great many Passages paraphrased by the Author of that Copy: See *Chap. xi. 1, 2, 26.* and *xiii. 44.* and *xiv. 1.* and *xxiii.* by which places it will evidently appear, that the Writer of that *Manuscript*, being more skilful than *St. Luke* in the Greek Language, has every now and then changed the Phrase to make the construction more elegant. Those who affirm these, notwithstanding the contrariety of them to all the other Copies, and the agreement of the most Antient Fathers with those Copies, to be various readings, and that too older than any in our Copies, were certainly never any great masters of Criticks.

## C H A P. XI.

Chapter XI. Verf. 30. **C**OL. 1. lin. ult. after the *Cit.* out of *Deut. xxxi. 28.*]  
Note b. Our Author would have said what was more likely, if he had told us that old Men signified Magistrates, because publick Trusts were generally committed to aged Persons, upon the account of their great experience, and the Government which they have over their Passions above the younger sort.

C H A P.



## C H A P. XII.

Verf. 1. **Y**E A, and which is more than that, it signifies to do a thing, for in *Gen. iii. 22.* by putting forth the hand and taking, we are to understand taking, and not merely an attempt to take.

*Ibid.* Ἐξέπεσαν αὐτῷ αἱ ἀλύσεις] There never really happened any thing that was wonderful almost, but fanciful Men have feigned something or other like it. So *Ovid. Metam. Lib. 4. Fab. 10.* speaking of one *Acatas* who had been cast into Prison by *Pentheus*, upon *Bacchus's* account, and was afterwards released, says that,

*Sponte sua, patuisse fores, lapsasque lacertis,  
Sponte sua, fama est, nullo solvente, catenas.*

It was the common report that the [Prison] doors opened of their own accord, and the Chains fell off from his hands of themselves, no body loosing them.

Verf. 13. *Note d.* Tho the Verb ὑπακούσαι often signifies to answer one that calls, as *Stephanus*, before *Dr. Hammond*, had observed, and proved at large in his *Thesaurus*; yet when the Discourse is about one whose business it is to keep a Gate, it signifies the same as in Latin *subauscultare*, i. e. to hearken from within side to the Voice of them that knock, in order to know who they are: For the Porter or Portress used to ask who it was that knocked before ever they opened the Door, and to hearken to the Voice to see if they knew the Person: At Night especially this was requisite, lest they should let in Thieves instead of Friends. See *Stephanus* and *Pricæus* on this place, and there will be no room to doubt but that *Erasmus* has rightest of all translated this Verb, by *subauscultare*.

## C H A P. XIII.

Verf. 10. **I**T is ill supposed by the Doctor, that the words last cited Chapter *Note d.* by him out of *Hesychius*, are to be read without a comma; for the Greeks do never, after the English manner, heap up three Adjectives without any Conjunction, or Noun Substantive, no not the Poets themselves; in which if there be two that seem to meet together, one of them stands for a Substantive, as *Eustathius* has observed on *Iliad. Γ. Ed. Rom. p. 427.* ἐπέπετε, saith he, ἢ ἐπέπετε


Chapter XIII. *δύο ὀπίθεται, πολλῶ δὲ πλέον ἐδὲ τρία κἄνται, χρεῖς κτεῖν ἢ πρῶτον:* for there are never two, and much less three Epithets put together, without some Noun proper or appellative. The same learned Grammarian in his Notes on *Odyss.* Δ. p. 1506. explains the words *ῥαδιερὸς* & *ῥαδιερία* thus; *ῥαδιερὸς* κτ' *Ἄλιον Διονύσιον, ὁ ῥαδιερὸς, καὶ ῥαδιερία, φησὶν, ἢ πρὸς πᾶν ὀλιγωρία καὶ θεσπότης:* the first, according to *Ælius Dionysius*, signifies mischievous or wicked, and the latter, saith he, carelessness and confidence about all things. But there is no signification which will better sute this place, where the discourse is about a Magician, than that which we meet with in the *Old Glosses*, where *ῥαδιερία* is rendered by *falsum* a cheat or falsehood, and *ῥαδιερία* *falsarius*, a falsifier or deceiver; for it is well known that a Magician is for the most part but another name for an Impostor. *Dionysius Halicarnass.* Lib. 1. *Antiq. Rom.* p. 63 and 64. uses the words *ῥαδιερύμιον* & *ῥαδιερύμιον*, speaking of some false Miracles by which a certain lover of the Female Sex was supposed to have deceived a simple young Girl.

Verf. 15. Note e. That it was the Office of an *Archisynagogus* to appoint one to read in the Synagogue, as *St. Luke* here teaches us, the Jews also said. See *Camp. Vitringa in Synag. Veteri*, Lib. 3. P. 1. C. 9.


Verf. 31. That *Christ* by his Resurrection received as it were a new birth, and so was begotten of God, might be properly enough said also according to the way of speaking usual among the Greeks; as appears by *Hesychius* on the word *δευτέρωπιον*: ὁ ὑπὸ πίων, saith he, ὑσερόπιον, ἔπω δὲ ἔλεγον ὀπίον πρὶ ὡς τεθνεώπια τὰ νομιζόμενα ἐγένετο, καὶ ὑσερον ἀνεζάνη. ζῶν. — — — ἢ ὁ φημιδῆς ὅτι ζῆναι τετελεστικῶς, ἔπειτα ἐπαρελθῶν, ἢ ὁ δεύτερον διὰ γυναικίε κόλπε διαδύς ὡς εἶπεν ἢν ἄρσι. Ἀθηναίσις, ὅτι δευτέρω γεννάσθαι: which is the same with the ὑσερόπιον of others, applied to a Person who having had the funeral Rites performed for him, as for one that was dead, afterwards appeared alive — — — or who after he was reported to have died in a foreign Country returned again, or one who had again passed from between his Mother's Breasts, as the custom was among the Athenians, was said to be born or begotten again.

Verf. 48. Note m. It is a true Observation of the Doctor, that the word *πεταγμένους* is used by a Metaphor taken from military Affairs, to signify that course of Life to which we are called by God. Thus it is used by *Socrates*, in his *Apology*, extant in *Plato*, whose words for brevity sake shall be set down only in English. In whatever place a Person either puts himself (*εἰς τὴν τάξιν*) thinking that to be the best, or is put by his Commander, (*ὑπὸ ἀρχόντου πεταγῆναι*) in that, in my judgment, he ought to abide and face danger, fearing neither death nor any thing else more than baseness. Really, O Athenians, I should be guilty of a very great



great fault, if when the Captains chosen by you to be my Commanders, Chapter  
had placed me (ἐτάτην) at Potidæa, at Amphipolis, or at Delius, I XIV.  
then kept the post in which they had set me, and underwent the danger of   
Death; and yet when God, as I thought, has set me (τάτην) and I  
have determined with my self to spend my Life in Philosophizing —  
there fearing Death or any other thing, I should forsake my rank, τάξιν.  
So likewise Epictetus in Enchirid. c. 29. ἢ δε βελτίων σοι φαινόμενων ἔχει, ὡς  
ὅπου τὸ θεῶν τεταγμένον: Those things thou accountest best, adhere to, as if  
placed by God in such a Station.

C H A P. XIV.

Verf. 17.  *ὅτι κἀμάς ποτεν ἑαυτὸν ἀφῆκεν*] *i. e.* God did not so entirely  
ly conceal himself from the Heathens, as to give  
them no evidences at all of his Providence; for e-  
very thing in nature was a standing witness of God's Wisdom, Pow-  
er and Goodness. Nor were the Heathens altogether deaf to this  
voice of Nature, as appears by many of their sayings which learned  
Men have collected on this place, to which I shall here add these re-  
markable words out of Cicero, Tuscul. Lib. 1. *Hic autem*, saith he,  
*ubi habitamus, non intermittit suo tempore:*

*Cœlum mitescere, arbores frondescere,  
Vites lætificæ pampinis pubescere,  
Rami baccarum ubertate incurvescere,  
Segetes largiri fruges, florere omnia,  
Fontes scatere, herbis prata convestiri.*

*Tum multitudinem pecudum, partim ad vescendum, partim ad vehendum, par-*  
*tim ad corpora vestienda, hominemque ipsum quasi contemplatorem cœli ac Deo-*  
*rum, ipsorumque cultorem, atque hominis utilitati agros omnes & maria paten-*  
*tia. Hæc igitur & alia innumerabilia cum cernimus, possumusne dubitare, quin*  
*his præsit aliquis aut effector, si hæc nata sunt, ut Platoni videtur; vel sibi*  
*semper faciunt, ut Aristoteli placet, moderator tanti operis & muneris? And*  
*here on this Earth on which we dwell, the Sky does not cease to grow calm,*  
*nor the Trees in their proper season to shoot forth Branches, nor the*  
*Vines to bud and bring their reviving Fruit to perfection, nor the Boughs*  
*to hang down with ripe Berries, nor the Corn to yield its expected*  
*increase; but all things flourish, the Springs are constantly running,*  
*and the Fields are clothed with Grass. And then if we consider what a mul-*  
*titude there is of Cattel, partly for Food, partly for carrying, and partly for*  
*clothing.*

Chapter clothing our Bodies, and the nature of Man it self, who seems to be formed  
 XVI. for contemplating Heaven and the Gods, and to adore and worship them,  
 and that the whole Earth and Sea lies open for his use: When we see, I say,  
 and consider these and innumerable other things, can we doubt whether there  
 is a superior Being, who is either the Creator of these things, if they were  
 indeed created, as Plato thinks; or if they always were, as Aristotle sup-  
 poses, who is the manager and disposer of so great a work and charge?

Verf. 23. Note b. P. 394. Col. 2. Lin. 42. after the words used of  
 the Apostles] If we add what Mr. Selden has observed, concerning the  
 word *ἡγεμονίαν*, in *Syned. Hebræorum*, Lib. 1. c. 14. to what is here  
 said of it by Dr. Hammond, there will be nothing material left for us  
 to know, either about the various significations of that word, or a-  
 bout that particular signification of it for simple constituting, which  
 Mr. Selden, as well as Dr. Hammond, has shewn to belong to it, in this  
 place. You may add if you please, the Testimony of Cicero about  
 the Decrees of the Greeks, *Orat. pro Flacco* Cap. 6. *Sunt expressa illa  
 præclara quæ recitantur psephismata, non sententiis, necque auctoritatibus  
 declarata, nec jurejurando constricta, sed porrigenda manu, profundendo-  
 que clamore multitudinis concitata.* Those excellent Decrees which are re-  
 cited (among them) are expressed, not declared by Opinions or Authori-  
 ties, or ratified by Oaths, but by the stretching out of the Hand, and the  
 loud cries of the heated Multitude. By this it appears what *ἡγεμονίαν*  
 properly signifies, but it is metaphorically applied to signify any con-  
 stitution, or, as Ecclesiastical Writers speak, ordination, as those learn-  
 ed Men thought, and have at large proved.

#### C H A P. XVI.

Verf. 13. Note a. **I** Cannot imagin what took up our Author's Thoughts,  
 when he said that the *Neapolis* here mentioned in *vers.*  
 11. was the same with that in *Epiphanius*; for St. Luke  
 speaks of a City in *Macedonia*, which was situated upon the Gulph of  
*Strymon*; and *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* 80. which is that of the *Massalians*,  
 of the City *Sichem*, in the middle of *Palestine*. But the greatest Men  
 do sometimes commit mistakes through forgetfulness or want of care.  
 Of *Proscuchæ*, *Oratories* or places for Prayer, consult at leisure the Col-  
 lections of *Si. le Meine Var. Sac.* p. 74. & seqq.

Verf. 16. Note b. 1. What our Author here says about the word  
*Python*, as a name of the City *Delphos*, he took out of *Grotius*, as he  
 often does other things. If you would see more of that matter, con-  
 sult *Luc. Holstenius ad Stephanum Byzantinum*. For my own part I  
 do



do not think that *the Spirit of Python* here has any thing common to Chapter it with the City *Delphos*, or with *Apollo*, besides the name. That XVII. name of the City *Delphos* was grown quite out of date, before ever the word *Python* was in use in this sense; nor would the Greeks upon that account have called a divining Spirit *Python*, or the Spirit of *Python*. *Apollo* himself was not called in Greek Πυθών, but Πυθίο. But in the *Phœnician* Language, as in the Hebrew, פֹּתַח *photoh*, or perhaps פִּיתוֹן *phython*, was used to signify a Womans Privy-parts: See *Isa.* 3. 17. And hence a Prophetess, out of whose Privy-parts the voice proceeded or seemed to come, might be called in that Language נְחֻשׁ פִּיתוֹן *a Prophetess by Python*, i. e. one that prophesied out of her Privy-parts; of which kind she that first of all resided at *Delphos* seems to have been, who having been killed by *Apollo*, gave occasion to that Fable about the killing of the *Serpent Python*, because the *Phœnician* word נַחֲשׁ נַחֲשׁ *nabhafsh* signifies both a *Serpent* and a *Prophet*, and פִּיתוֹן *Python* was looked upon as a proper Name. Afterwards by a word borrowed from the *Tyrians* or *Sidonians*, the ἐγγρασεῖμυθοὶ were called *Pythons*, or such as had the Spirit of *Python*; for this word having grown out of use among the Greeks, was afterwards brought in again, as *Plutarch* affirms, who is cited by *Grotius* to that purpose. And hence the Antients always interpret Πυθῶνα by ἐγγρασεῖμυθον, and attribute this kind of Divination chiefly to Women. Besides the Passages alledged by *Grotius*, add this out of *Hesychius*; Πύθων ὁ ἐγγρασεῖμυθος, ἢ ἐγγρασεῖμυθης, ἢ βυζάντιος τὸ γένος: *a Man or Woman that speaks or prophesies out of the Belly, or a Byzantian by Birth*. Read ἢ ῥήτωρ, &c. *an Orator who was a Byzantian by Birth*, of whom see *Suidas*. Πύθων, δαιμόνιον μάντιον, *a divining Spirit or Devil*.

2. The Hebrew בֶּרֶא *ob* does not signify the *Belly* but the *Womb*: It is rendered indeed by the *Septuagint* ἐγγρασεῖμυθος, but not rightly, as I have shewn in my Notes on *Levit.* it being rather to be rendered *19. 31.*  
 γενόμενης.

## C H A P. XVII.

Verf. 11. [γενέστεροι.] **B**eza has rightly observed, that there is a comparison here made between the Jews of *Thessalonica* and those of *Berea*; and that by this Word *γενέστεροι* we are to understand an extraordinary excellency of temper in the *Bereans*, which was not in those of *Thessalonica*. Thus the Philosophers thought a Person had need of *γενεα* to make him despise pleasure, and set himself to the study of *Philosophy*. *Zeno* in his Epistle  
 :to

Chapter to *Antigonus*, extant in *Diogenes Laertius*, Lib. 8. Sect. 8. has these  
 XVII. words: ὁ γὰρ φιλοσοφίας ἀρετῶν ἑκκλίαν ἢ τὴν πολυφύλιαν ἡδονῶν, ἢ τῶν  
 θαυμάτων ψυχῆς, φανερῶς εἰς τὸ μόνον εὐσεβείας ἀρετῆς κλίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρετῆς:  
 For having a great desire to become a Philosopher, and shunning that plea-  
 sure which is so much cried up, and which effeminates the minds of some  
 young men, thou manifestly shewest thy self inclined to generosity, not only  
 by nature but by choice. φύσις ἢ ἀρετῆς μέλει ἀσκήσιν ἀρετῆς, ἐν τῇ ἀρετῆς  
 διδάσκῃ, ῥαδίως ἔρχεται πρὸς τὴν τελείαν ἀνάληψιν τῆς ἀρετῆς: And a generous  
 disposition with a little exercise, and a good Master, easily attains to the  
 perfection of Virtue. The *Beræans* are as certain and noble an example  
 of this as any that can be given. The word ἀγένεια signifies properly  
 nobility of Birth or Descent; but it is metaphorically used to signify  
 greatness of Mind. *Seneca* likewise interprets the Latin *generosus*  
 thus, *Epist.* 44. *Quis generosus?* saith he, *Ad virtutem bene à natura*  
*compositus: Who is a generous man? He that is by nature well disposed and*  
*formed for virtue.* *Plato*, or as others think, *Speusippus* in his *Definiti-*  
*ons* tells us that *Ευγένεια* is ἀρετῆς ἀρετῆς ἡδονῶν. Εὐαγωγία ψυχῆς πρὸς λόγους, καὶ  
 ἀρετῆς: The virtue of a generous disposition, a pliability of mind to good  
 thoughts and actions.

Verf. 19. Note c. Long before I had read what the *Doctor* here  
 says, or had any thoughts of interpreting the New Testament, the  
 etymology of the word *Αρειόπαγος* seemed suspicious to me; because I  
 had observed that the silly Greeks do often very unhappily pretend  
 to discover the originals of old Names in their Language, and after-  
 wards endeavour to confirm those Etymologies by feigned Stories, as  
 might be made appear by a hundred instances. And therefore search-  
 ing a little further back, it came into my mind that it was a reproach  
 formerly cast upon the *Athenians*, that they came from *Ionia* into  
*Attica*, and were called *Ἰάονες* by *Homer*; of which see *Bochart* in *Phaleg.*  
*Lib.* 3. c. 3. And I knew otherwise that the Language of the *Pelasgi*, the  
 most antient Inhabitants of *Greece*, was a barbarous Language, and un-  
 known to those that came after them, as the Glory of *Great Britain*  
*Dr. Stillingfleet* in his *Origines Sacrae* has shewn. And hence I made no  
 great difficulty to infer that the *Iaones* and *Pelasgi* were the Posterity  
 of *Javan* or *Jon*, יָוָן, who spake that Language which they had  
 brought with them out of the East, i. e. the Hebrew, or one very  
 like it. Now in that Language יָוָן הַר-פֶּגָא signifies a Mountain of  
 violence, or incursion, or also of slaughter; whence it may be conjectured,  
 that that Hill was by the first Inhabitants of *Attica* so called, because  
 of some slaughter or fight that had happened in that place; of which  
 some footsteps remained in the story about the slaying of *Halirrothius*  
 Neptune's



*Neptune's Son*, mentioned by *Dr. Hammond*, and which may be read in those Authors which he alledges. *Asus* also the name of *Mars*, is a *Hebrew* word, for *הרי* or *הררי* signifies a *Mountaineer*, as *Mars* was, who is said to have had his aboad in the Mountains of *Thrace*, and was made the God of War, because, as those that live in mountainous places generally are, he was a valiant Man, and had made himself famous in War. *Athens* also had its name, as the Greeks say, from *Ἀθήνη* an Epithet of *Pallas*, which is the same with the *Hebrew* *עֵתָר* *ethar*, i. e. *valiant*. And *Pallas* is feigned to have been the Goddess of War in the same manner as *Mars*; and seems to have been some *Amazon* or warlike Woman that ruled over *Attica* in those fabulous times. She is called also the Goddess of *Wisdom*; and this seems to be intimated by the name *Πάλλας*, if that be derived from the *Hebrew* *פָּלַס* *palas*, i. e. *directed, considered, examined*; from whence comes the Noun *פֶּלֶס* *peles*, which signifies *Justice*, *Prov. xvi. 11*. But these things do not belong to this place.

Chapter.  
XVII.

Verf. 22. Note f. Col. 2. lin. 32. after the words, *move for it.*] One that had never read *Plutarch's* Treatise *περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας*, and should take strict notice of *Dr. Hammond's* words, would easily persuade himself, that what he produces as out of *Plutarch*, were taken out of that Author himself; but they are not.

1. What he alledges as out of the *Life of Alexander*, is in the fore-mentioned little Treatise *περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας*, p. 170. F. Edit. *Francofurtensis*, Ann. 1599. which is the Edition that I have, and is set down thus: *ὅτι οἶεται δεῖς εἶναι ὁ ἄθεός, ὁ ἧ δεισιδαίμων ἔβλεται.*

2. An ingenious thought of *Plutarch's* is manifestly perverted by him, which is in the last lines of the foregoing Page, and the beginning of that which I have mentioned. *Plutarch* affirms that superstitious people are worse than Atheists; and he subjoins: *ἔγωγε ἂν ἐθέλωμι μᾶλλον τῆς ἀνθρώπων λέγειν ἄθεόν, μῆτε γυρονέναι περὶ ἄλλου, μηδὲ εἶναι τὸ Πλάταρχον, ἢ λέγειν ὅτι Πλατάρχος ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπος ἀβέβαιός, ἀμετάβατός, ἀχρηὶς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν, ἐπὶ τοῖς τοχῆσι πικροπηκός, μικρόλυπος:* I had rather, for my part, that men should say of me; that there never was, nor is any such man as *Plutarch*, than say that *Plutarch* is an inconstant, changeable man, one that is easily provoked to anger, greedy of revenge upon every slight provocation, and melancholy upon the least adversity that befalls him.

3. The whole passage about the *Jews*, which is also in p. 169. is not set down by him intire; for *Plutarch* justly derides their Superstition, who sat still on the Sabbath and let their Enemies scale the walls of the City, without making the least opposition against them, but lay all tied and bound by their Superstition as in one net. However, this is not a

Chapter common practice with our learned Author, to cite the Testimonies XVIII. of the Antients upon the Authority of others.

Verf. 23. *Note g.* The place referred to by the *Doctor* in *Pausanias* is nothing to the purpose; for *Pausanias* does not say that the *Lydians* sacrificed to a *God* which they did not themselves know, but which was unknown to him. It is in pag. 391. *Edit. Hanov. Ann. 1613.* where speaking of a *Magus*, he says that ἐπέκλιον ὅτι δὴ θεῶν ἐπαΐδα βάρβαρον, καὶ ἔδωκός σὺν ἑλπίδι Ἑλλήσι: *He sang an Invocation to any of the Gods in a barbarous Language, impossible for the Greeks to understand.* Besides, our Author misrepresents *Pausanias* as saying the *Lydians* and *Persians*, whereas his words are, Λυδίας ἐπέκλιον Περσικῶς, *The Lydians surnamed Persian.* If you would see more Testimonies about the unknown God of the *Athenians*, consult *Mursius de Piræeo*, cap. 10.

Ver. 28. *Ibid.* The *Doctor* should have added the name of the Poet, or the place where he took those Verses, for there will be some that may suspect them to be made by some Christian. This passage of *St. Paul* may be illustrated by the words of *Apuleius* in *Lib. de mundo*: *Vetus opinio est, atque cogitationes omnium hominum penitus insedit, Deum esse originis, & haberi auctorem; Deumque ipsum salutem esse & perseverantiam earum, quas effecerit, rerum. Neque ulla est tam præstantibus viribus, quæ viduata Dei auxilio, sui natura contenta sit. Hanc opinionem vates sequuti profiteri ausi sunt, omnia Jove plena esse; cujus præsentiam, non jam cogitatio sola, sed oculi & aures, & sensibilis substantia comprehendit. It is an antient opinion, which has possessed the minds of all men; that God is, and is accounted the Author of the World; and that God himself is the safety and perseverance of those things which he has made: And that there is nothing of so great strength, as to be self-sufficient, and not to stand in need of God's assistance. And this opinion the Poets having espoused, have not stuck to say, that all things were full of God; whose presence it seems not our minds only, but also our eyes and ears and every sensible substance comprehends. He had a respect to the same passage of *Aratus* as *St. Paul*.*

#### CHAP. XVIII.

Verf. 22. *Note c.* **O**UR learned Author is mistaken, when he says that *Cæsarea Philippi* was not far from that *Cæsarea* which was also called *Turris Stratonis*, between which there was the distance of two days journey, which is a great deal in a little Country: See the Maps of *Judea*.



C H A P. XIX.

Verf. 33. **I** Had rather interpret the word *προβάλλειν* with the *Vulgar* Note g. by *propellere* to *push forward*, or to carry along to Judgment; for it did not belong to the Jews to question any man, but only to the Judges. So this word is taken, in that excellent saying of *Solon* in *Plutarch*: *Τῶν πόλεων ἐλάττω δικαίται ἐκείνη, ἐν ἣ ἢ ἀδικημάτων ἐκ ἡπίου οἱ μὴ ἀδικήσασσι προβάλλονται καὶ καταΐξουσιν τὰς ἀδικήσας*: *That City is extremely well governed, in which those that are not injured, as well as those that are, carry such as do any injury to judgment, and punish them.*

Verf. 35. Note i. The title of *Νεωκόρος* is common in the Coins of the Cities of *Asia*; but *Ephesus* gloried in it above the rest. For there are some pieces of *Ephesian* Money to be seen at this day, in which *Ephesus* is not only simply stiled *Νεωκόρος*, or twice *Νεωκόρος*, but there is also a piece coined under the reign of *Caracalla* inscribed *ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ ΤΡΙΣ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ*; and another under *Heliagabalus*, *ΜΟΝΩΝ ΑΠΙΛΩΝ ΤΕΤΡΑΚΙΣ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ*, in which they boast that *they only of all the Cities of Asia had been four times Νεωκόροι*. See *J. Foy-Vaillant* in *Num. Aer. Imp.* coined in Colonies and Corporations, T.2. pag. 171.

C H A P. XX.

Verf. 28. **Δ** [ *Α' ἢ ἀμαρτῆ ἢ ἰδὲ.* ] In the *Alexandrian* Copy the word Chapter *ἰδὲ* is omitted, as the *Oxford Edition* of the New Testa- XX. ment observes. I wonder that *Dr. Hammond*, who often sets down the various readings of that Copy, should take no notice of this. It is observable also, that instead of ἢ δεῦ many Copies read ἢ κυρίως, and some κυρίως καὶ δεῦ. And such variations as these are common in the places heretofore controverted, in the time of the *Nicene Synod*. \* *This word is not omitted in that MS. See D. Mill.*

C H A P. XXI.

Verf. 7. **T**HE *Vulgar* reading is certainly right, and ought not Chapter Note a. to be changed; for no body besides the *Doctor* ever XXI. used *διαναύειν πλέον* as a Greek phrase for *sailing*; but *διανύειν πλέον*, as *διανύειν ἕδον* is very properly made use of to signify the finishing of a Voyage. The meaning of *St. Luke* is clear: *Having finished our Navigation from Tyre, we came to Ptolemais*; for they had first finished their Navigation before they came to *Ptolemais*, from whence

Chapter common practice with our learned Author, to cite the Testimonies XVIII. of the Antients upon the Authority of others.

Verf. 23. *Note g.* The place referred to by the *Doct̃or* in *Pausanias* is nothing to the purpose; for *Pausanias* does not say that the *Lydians* sacrificed to a *God* which they did not themselves know, but which was unknown to him. It is in pag. 391. Edit. *Hanov.* Ann. 1613. where speaking of a *Magus*, he says that ἐπέκλιον ὅτε δὴ θεῶν ἐπαΐει βάρβαρον, καὶ ἔδομῶς συνέειπ' Ἑλλήσι: *He sang an Invocation to any of the Gods in a barbarous Language, impossible for the Greeks to understand.* Besides, our Author misrepresents *Pausanias* as saying the *Lydians* and *Persians*, whereas his words are, Λυδίας ἐπέκλιον Περσικῶς, *The Lydians surnamed Persian.* If you would see more Testimonies about the unknown God of the *Athenians*, consult *Mursius de Piræco*, cap. 10.

Ver. 28. *Ibid.* The *Doct̃or* should have added the name of the Poet, or the place where he took those Verses, for there will be some that may suspect them to be made by some Christian. This passage of *St. Paul* may be illustrated by the words of *Apuleius* in Lib. de mundo: *Vetus opinio est, atque cogitationes omnium hominum penitus insedit, Deum esse originis, & haberi auctorem; Deumque ipsum salutem esse & perseverantiam earum, quas effecerit, rerum. Neque ulla est tam præstantibus viribus, quæ viduata Dei auxilio, sui natura contenta sit. Hanc opinionem vates sequuti profiteri ausi sunt, omnia Jove plena esse; cujus præsentiam, non jam cogitatio sola, sed oculi & aures, & sensibilis substantiæ comprehendit. It is an antient opinion, which has possessed the minds of all men; that God is, and is accounted the Author of the World; and that God himself is the safety and perseverance of those things which he has made: And that there is nothing of so great strength, as to be self-sufficient, and not to stand in need of God's assistance. And this opinion the Poets having espoused, have not stuck to say, that all things were full of God; whose presence it seems not our minds only, but also our eyes and ears and every sensible substance comprehends. He had a respect to the same passage of *Aratus* as *St. Paul*.*

#### C H A P. XVIII.

Verf. 22. *Note c.* **O**UR learned Author is mistaken, when he says that *Cæsarea Philippi* was not far from that *Cæsarea* which was also called *Turris Stratonis*, between which there was the distance of two days journey, which is a great deal in a little Country: See the Maps of *Judea*.



C H A P. XIX.

Verf. 33. **I** Had rather interpret the word *προβάλλειν* with the *Vulgar* Note g. by *propellere* to *push forward*, or to carry along to Judgment; for it did not belong to the Jews to question any man, but only to the Judges. So this word is taken, in that excellent saying of *Solon* in *Plutarch*: *Τῶν πόλεων κάλλιστα δικάται ἐκείνη, ἐν ἣ ἢ ἀδικησάντων ἢ ἰσίων οἱ μὴ ἀδικήσαντες προβάλλονται καὶ ποινάζονται τὰς ἀδικήσας*: *That City is extremely well governed, in which those that are not injured, as well as those that are, carry such as do any injury to judgment, and punish them.*

Verf. 35. Note i. The title of *Νεωκόρος* is common in the Coins of the Cities of *Asia*; but *Ephesus* gloried in it above the rest. For there are some pieces of *Ephesian* Money to be seen at this day, in which *Ephesus* is not only simply stiled *Νεωκόρος*, or twice *Νεωκόρος*, but there is also a piece coined under the reign of *Caracalla* inscribed *ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ ΤΡΙΣ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ*; and another under *Heliagabalus*, *ΜΟΝΩΝ ΑΠΙΑΣΩΝ ΤΕΤΡΑΚΙΣ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ*, in which they boast that *they only of all the Cities of Asia had been four times Νεωκόρος*. See *J. Foy-Vaillant* in *Num. Ær. Imp. p. 171*.

C H A P. XX.

Verf. 28. **Δ** *ΙΑ ἢ ἀμαρτῆ ἢ ἰδία*.] In the *Alexandrian* Copy the word *ἰδία* Chapter XX. is omitted, as the *Oxford Edition* of the *New Testament* observes. I wonder that *Dr. Hammond*, who often sets down the various readings of that Copy, should take no notice of this. It is observable also, that instead of ἢ *δεῦ* many Copies read ἢ *κυρία*, and some *κυρία καὶ δεῦ*. And such variations as these are common in the places heretofore controverted, in the time of the *Nicene Synod*. \* *This word is not omitted in that M.S. See Dr. Mill.*

C H A P. XXI.

Verf. 7. **T**HE *Vulgar* reading is certainly right, and ought not Chapter XXI. Note a. to be changed; for no body besides the *Doctor* ever used *διανύειν* *πλέον* as a Greek phrase for *sailing*; but *διανύειν* *πλέον*, as *διανύειν* *ἰδὸν* is very properly made use of to signify the finishing of a Voyage. The meaning of *St. Luke* is clear: *Having finished our Navigation from Tyre, we came to Ptolemais*; for they had first finished their Navigation before they came to *Ptolemais*, from whence

Chapter whence they went on foot to *Cæsarea*. Whether a *Comma* be put between *διανύσαντες* and *ἔπο*, or whether it be omitted, the thing is the same, for *διανύσαντες* is to be connected with *κατεντήσαντες*, *having finished*, or *made an end of our Navigation*, we arrived.

## C H A P. XXII.

Verf. 11. **Ο**ΥΚ ἐνέβλεπον ἔπο τῆ δόξης.] God did sometimes shew himself to Persons, encompassed with so dazzling a light; as even blinded the lookers on. And hence that saying of *Hagar* in *Gen. xvi. 13.* where see my Notes, as also what I have written on *Exod. xxxiv. 18, 20.*

Verf. 25. Note c. *lin. 24.* after the word *such an one?*] 1. Our Author's memory failed him, when he said, *So saith Philo of Agrippa, &c.* for what is there said, is spoken by *Agrippa of Caligula*, in *Philo de Leg. ad Caium*, p. 798. *Edit. Genev.* *Philo* produces a Letter of *Agrippa* to *Caius*, in which *Agrippa* writes to him thus: *Φίλων ἐνίων πατρίδος ὅλας τῆ Ρωμαϊκῆς ἡξίας πολιτείας.* And it is certain that could only be done by the *Emperor* at that time, and not by *Agrippa*, as every one knows. He should have said therefore: *So saith Agrippa of Caligula in Philo.*

2. It is strange our Author should produce a passage, as out of the 47th Book of *Diodorus Siculus*, who wrote only 40, as *Photius* affirms *Cod. 70.* of which we have only half extant and some fragments. But he meant *Dion Cocceianus*, whose words those are in *Lib. 47. p. 228.* *Edit. Græc. Rob. Stephani.* Besides, those words of *Dion. ὅτι τῆ Ἰουλιόπολιν σφῆς ἀπ' αὐτῆ μετενομάσθη*, ought not to be translated, *that from his own name he call'd them Juliopolis*, but *that they changed their name and called themselves from him, Juliopolis.* For it was a piece of flattery in the Inhabitants of *Tarsus*, who afterwards also out of flattery to other Emperors, called their City *Adriana*, *Antoniniana*, and *Severiana*: Of which see *Luc. Holstenius* on *Stephanus Byzantinus*. The words of *Dion* are no proof at all that *Tarsus* had the freedom of the City of *Rome* given to it; and it otherwise appears, that after *Augustus's* time that was a *free City*, which was govern'd not by the *Roman* Laws but by its own, and therefore did not enjoy the privileges of the City of *Rome*: Consult on this place *H. Grotius*, whom the *Doctor* would have more safely followed, as being not so well acquainted with antient History. Perhaps *St. Paul* had been made a *Roman* Citizen, because his Father, tho a Jew, had been made free of *Rome*; such as *Philo* speaks of in the place quoted by the *Doctor* in the next Annotation.



C H A P. XXIII.

Verf. 5. **Ο**ΥΚ ἴδεν ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεὺς.] *St. Paul* seems at that time to have looked another way, so as not to have observed who it was that had commanded him to be smitten. So that we must supply out of what goes before, the words; ὅς ἐπέταξε πύπτισαι αὐτῷ τὸ στόμα, *who had ordered him to be smitten on the mouth.* There is nothing more natural than this; others seek a knot in a bulrush.

C H A P. XXIV.

Verf. 1. **Ε**ΝΕΦΑΝΙΣΑΝ] The *Doctor* has hit the true sense of this word Chapter XXIV. in his Paraphrase, but only, as he now and then does, he borrows terms from the present custom to express it by, which he should not have done, because at that time those who had an accusation against any, did not use to bring in the heads of it to the Proconsuls in writing, but only to speak what they had to say. However Ἐμφανίζεν is not *comparere to appear or come before*, as it is rendered by *Beza*, but *to accuse, to lay open a Crime*, as it is explained by *Suidas*, ἐμφανίζω σοι, φανερώ σοι, with whom agrees *Phavorinus*, who interprets it by φανερώς σοι δείκνυμι, *I shew it you manifestly.* It comes from φανός, as *Pricæus* upon this place has well observed; and φανός, according to *Aristophanes's Scholiast* on *Equites*, is ὁ κατὰγγέλλων, ἢ φανερώς ποιῶν τὰ πρῶγματα, ἢ μνηστῶν, *an accuser, and one that lays open causes, and an informer.* And the *Old Glosses* have ἐμφανίζω *allego, intimo, to alledg, to intimate*: ἐμφανίζεν *declarare, to declare*: ἐμφάνεια *intimatio, an intimation.*

Verf. 25. *Note a.* We may apply those Verses of *Juvenal*, Sat. 13. even to the Heathen Judges of that lewd and wicked Age.

— *Prima est hæc ultio, quod se  
Judice nemo nocens absolvitur, &c.*  
— *— bos tu*  
*Evasisse putas, quos divi conscia facti  
Mens habet attonitos, & surdo verberare cædit  
Occultum quatiente animo tortore flagellum?*

Ver. 27. Χαρίσας κατὰδέδου] *i.e.* To please or gratify the Jews, lest they should send Informers to Rome, and complain of his lewd actions to Nero; or else that he might appease and silence in some measure the Jews

Chapter XXV. Complaints. The Governors of the Provinces used to be particularly cautious how they offended any, just before their departure, as we may perceive by the Counsel given by *Cicero* in his first excellent Epistle *ad Quintum fratrem*: *Tanquam Poetæ boni, & Actores industrii solent; sic tu in extrema parte & conclusione muneris diligentissimus sis.* As good Poets and industrious Actors use to be; so be you very careful in the last part and conclusion of your Office.

And yet for all this *Felix* could not avoid making himself Enemies, for the chief Men among the Jews went to *Rome* in order to accuse him; and he had certainly been punished, but that *Nero* was prevail'd upon by his Brother *Pallas*, whom he had an extraordinary love for at that time, to pardon him, as *Josephus*, lib. 20. c. 7. informs us.

## C H A P. XXV.

Verf. 12. **M**ετὰ τῆ Συμβουλίας. ] That is, with a Council of his own Friends, such as the Presidents of Provinces used to have with them, as *Grotius* has well observed; by not following of whom in such matters as these, our Author sometimes falls into Mistakes. So in *Josephus* Ant. Jud. lib. 14. cap. 17. *Julius Cæsar* himself begins an Edict in favour of the Jews thus; *I Julius Cæsar, made again Emperor and High-priest, μετὰ συμβουλίας γράμους ἐπέκεινα, have decreed with the advice of my Council.* It is absurd to represent a Roman President, before he passes Judgment, conferring with the Accusers at the Judgment-seat, and especially when he could not gratify them. See *Grotius*.

Verf. 23. Note b. ] Instead of *Dio*, where the *Doctor* alledges the words of *Laertius*, read *Bio*; for those words of *Laertius* are in the Life of *Bio Borysthenites*, Lib. 4. Sect. 53. Ed. *Amstel*.


## C H A P. XXVI.

Chapter XXVI. Verf. 18. **A**νοίξαι ὀφθαλμούς. ] That is, to teach them, as the *Doctor* rightly paraphrases it. See my Notes on *Gen.* xxi. 18.

Verf. 23. Εἰ παθόντες ὁ Χριστός. ] *Verbatim*, that the *Messias* was passible. Examples of this signification of the Particle εἰ have been given by *Budæus* out of *Demosthenes*, Comment. L. Gr. p. 978. And so the Hebrew ׀ chi, which for the most part signifies ׀ m, is often used for si, if; see *Chr. Noldius* num. 24. and ׀ m, which is si if, signifies also quòd that, *Gen.* xxxi. 52.

Verf.



Verf. 28. Ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθει χειριανὸν γενέσθαι.] This is certainly an *Irony*, Chapter and should have been explain'd as such by our *Author* in his Paraphrase; XXVII. for it is sufficiently known that *Agrippa* never became a *Christian*. 

## C H A P. XXVII.

Verf. 2. **A** Δραμυτίνῳ.] *Grotius* thinks with *St. Jerom*, that it is *Adramyttum*, a City of *Africa*, that is here intended: But I am rather of *Beza* and *Dr. Hammond's* Opinion, who suppose it to be *Adramyttium* a Town in *Mysia*, for two reasons. First, Because *St. Luke* says that they were to sail by the Coasts of *Asia*; and a Ship in its return out of *Palestine* to *Adramyttium*, could not avoid coasting *Asia*, as any one that does but look into the Maps will plainly see. And, secondly, Because it seems to have been the *Centurion's* Resolution to go into that part of *Asia*, and cross over from thence to *Thrace* or *Macedonia*, the Passage being but short and much frequented: And then from *Thrace* or *Macedonia* to *Epirus*, and so into *Italy*. It is certain this was the safest way, because of the uncertainty of the Wind. And this seems also to be the reason why *Aristarchus* the *Macedonian* travell'd in the same Ship, because accompanying *St. Paul*, he should have an opportunity of passing through his own Country.

Verf. 6. Πλοῖον Ἀλεξανδρείου.] viz. Which in its course to *Italy* had been driven by a violent South-wind on the Coast of *Lycia*. The *Centurion* seems to have alter'd his first Resolution upon this occasion, because perhaps he thought he should be at less charges if he sailed directly to *Italy*.

Verf. 7. Κνίδου.] This *Grotius* interprets of an Island that lay over against *Caria*, and was famous for the Image and Worship of *Venus*. And *Cnidus* indeed properly was a Town situated in a Peninsula, but there was before that Peninsula a little Island which the *Cnidians* possessed; and which, as *Strabo* speaks, lib. 14. εἶπλιν τεύπον πρὸς τὴν Κνίδου [ἐπίαι] divided in a sort *Cnidus* into two Cities.

Verf. 14. Ἐν εὐκαλύδῳ.] For so the word ought to be read, and not *Ἐν εὐκλώδῳ*, as *Grotius* has shewn, to whose Reasons add this; that whilst that Wind blew, the Mariners were afraid of falling into the Quick-sands, viz. one of the *African Syrtes*, which was called simply *Syrtis* κατ' ἐξοχὴν. For with such a Wind one might sail directly from *Crete* thither. The letter *Λ* might easily be changed into *Δ*, and the Greek Transcribers understanding well enough the word *καλύδων*, which is in English

Chapter English a *Storm*, but not the word Ἀλώων, which is *Latin*, it is no wonder they mistook and writ Ευεκαλύδων.

Verf. 15. Ἀντροθαλαμείν. ] For in order to sail into *Italy* it was necessary they should have a contrary Wind, which blew from that quarter of the Heaven that is between the *South* and the *East*.

Verf. 23. Θεός ἔ είμι. ] *Subintell.* δῶλθ, which word signifies not only a *Worshipper*, but a *Minister* or *Servant*, as appears by the Inscriptions of *St. Paul's* Epistles.

Verf. 39. Ἐρχοντα ἀγριαλόν. ] The word ἀγριαλός here does not signify any ordinary shore, for there is no Gulph or Bay but has some shore; but a *sandy* or *gravelly* shore, as it is interpreted by *Hesychius*; ἀγριαλός, saith he, ὁ παραθαλάσσιος, ἐν τόπω ἄμμώδης, ἢ ἑπίδους ἔχων. And it appears that this shore was ἄμμώδης *sandy* by the 41st Verse.

Verf. 44. Ἐπί τινων ἤν' ἀπὸ τῶ πλοίου. ] The words ἀπορρίψαντας [εαυτῶς] εἰς γῆν ἐξίέναι ἐκέλευσεν in the foregoing Verse, must be here repeated, and he commanded the rest to get to Land, some on boards and some on broken pieces of the Ship, i. e. to take pieces of wood to bear themselves up with. The *Vulgar* absurdly renders it & ceteros alios in tabulis ferebant, as if those that could swim, had carried the rest to land upon Planks.

## C H A P. XXVIII.

Verf. 3. Ἐχιδνα ἐκ τῆς θερμῆς, &c. ] This place has been largely handled by the learned *Bochart* in *Hieroz.* Part. 2. Lib. 3. c. 2. But I wonder so diligent a Man, as well as *Steph. Curcellæus* in *Parallelis*, should overlook that Passage in the Prophet *Amos*, Chap. v. 19. where, speaking of wicked Men who endeavoured in vain to escape the Justice of God which pursued them, as the *Maltees* thought *St. Paul* did, he says, *The day of the Lord is darkness and not light. As if a Man did flee from a Lion, and a Bear met him; or went into a house and leaned his hand on the wall, and a Serpent bit him.*

Verf. 4. Note b. ] Ἡ Δίκη is the proper Name of a Goddess, which was look'd upon by the Heathens as the Revenger of Wickedness, and was otherwise stiled *Nemesis*. So saith *Suidas*, Νέμεσις, μέμψις, δίκη, *Accusation, Justice*. There is a notable Description given of her in *Ammianus Marcellinus*, lib. 14. cap. 11. which I shall here set down, that the reason of this Speech of the *Maltees* may be the better understood. After he had spoken of the Punishments which some wicked Men had suffered for their evil Practices, he proceeds thus:

*Hæc*



*Hæc & hujusmodi quædam innumerabilia ultrix facinorum impiorum, &c. Chapter  
These and innumerable other such things the Revenger of wicked and villa- XXVIII.  
nous Actions, and the Rewarder of those that are good, Adraestia, many  
times effects, (and I wish she always did) whom we otherwise call Nemesis. ~~~~~  
Some sublime Power of an irresistible Deity, plac'd, as Men suppose, upon  
the Circle of the Moon; or as others define it, a substantial Guardianship  
presiding with a general Power over particular Fates: Which the antient  
Divines feigning to be the Daughter of Justice, from some bidden Eter-  
nity, affirm to inspect all Affairs here on Earth. She, as the great Mistress  
on whom the decision of all Causes depends, and the Disposer and Deter-  
miner of Chances, varying the courses of Lots by turns, and many times  
giving our Actions a different issue than it seem'd at first they would  
have, works a manifold change in the Purposes and Acts of our Will.  
And by an indissoluble chain of necessity tying up the Haughtiness of Mor-  
tals, vainly puffing themselves up, and (as she understands how) turning  
and winding about the Junctures of thriving and decaying in the World,  
one while she treads upon the Necks of the proud and insolent, and quite  
dispirits them; and another while she raises the good from a low and mean to  
a happy and prosperous condition. The fabulous Antients feigned her to have  
Wings, that by her extraordinary swiftness she might be thought present  
with every one, and represented her as holding a Rudder, and standing over  
a Wheel, that she might be understood to steer and govern the Universe by  
running over all the Elements. On which words see Valesius and Linden-  
brochius.*

Verf. 15. Note e. ] To confirm what is said by Jos. Scaliger, our Author might have alledg'd the Testimony of *Ammianus Marcellinus*, who seems to have been the Writer out of whom he learned it, and who in *Lib. 16. cap. 11.* has these words: *Conversus hinc Julianus ad reparandas Tres Tabernæ, munimentum ita cognominatum, haud ita dudum obstinatione subversum hostili quo ædificato, constabat ad intima Galliarum, ut consueverant, adire Germanos arceri.* From hence Julian went and repaired the *Tres Tabernæ*, a Fortres so called, that not long before had been ruined by the Stubborness of the Enemy; which being rebuilt, he retired into the innermost parts of Gallia, and stayed there, in order to hinder the Incurfions which the Germans us'd to make into the Country. And the *Tabernæ* having been so called, because they consisted of *Tabulæ*, Boards or Planks; it is probable that there were little Houses built there with Boards for the Souldiers to lodg in, because they could not endure to abide always in the Camp.

Verf. 20. Τῆς ἐκπίδ'Θ τῆ Ἰσραήλ.] Both by this place and what we find said in *Chap.* xxii. 6. and xxiv. 15. and xxvi. 6, 7. it seems probable that *St. Paul's* chief Adversaries and Accusers were not the *Pharisees* but the *Sadduces*; who were most of all offended with his saying that *Christ* had been raised from the Dead, and lived with God in Heaven; because they denied the Resurrection. And so besides the hatred common to them with the *Pharisees*, there was this peculiar reason of their cruelty towards the Christians. It's true, there is no mention made of this, either in the Accusation brought against *St. Paul*, or in any other part of *St. Luke's* History relating to that matter; but from the defence which *St. Paul* makes for himself, this may be collected, who here mentions a circumstance which *St. Luke* left out in its proper place; and that is no rare thing in the History of the Scripture. See my *Index* to the *Pentateuch*, on the word *Circumstantia*, and Note on *Verf.* 5. This is better I think than to say, as some others do, that it was a stratagem made use of by the Apostle *Paul*, to feign himself accused for asserting the Resurrection of the Dead, when the question was about something else, that he might get the *Pharisees* to be more favourable to him.

Verf. 21. Τῶν ἀδελφῶν.] Our Author did not sufficiently mind who the Persons were that spake this, when he interpreted the word ἀδελφοὺς *Brethren* by *Christian Jews*: For it is clear that they were *unbelieving Jews* whom these Persons (who were also themselves such) called *Brethren*.

Verf. 22. Περὶ τῆς αἰρέσεως ταύτης.] It cannot from the foregoing words be inferred, that *St. Paul* was a favourer τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν χριστιανῶν, or of the *Christian Religion*; and these *Jews* having no knowledg of him any other way, they could hardly have made this answer, if he had said nothing but what *St. Luke* here relates. But *St. Luke* has not set down all the Circumstances or particulars of *St. Paul's* Discourse, but only the principal part of it, and so it cannot seem strange if it be inferred from what follows, that there was something done or said which in the foregoing Context is omitted, viz. that *St. Paul* did declare himself to believe that *God* had raised *Christ* from the dead, or that some others had affirmed this of him. See on *Verf.* 20.

Verf. 23. Οἷς ἐξέπιθετο διαμαρτυρόμεν'Θ τὴν βασιλείαν τῆ θεῶ, πείθων τε αὐτὰς τὰ πρὸς τῆ Ἰησοῦ, ἀπὸ τε τῆ νόμου, &c.] These words are displaced, and for the better understanding of them, are to be read in this order: οἷς ἐξέπιθετο τὰ πρὸς τῆ Ἰησοῦ, διαμαρτυρόμεν'Θ τὴν βασιλείαν τῆ θεῶ, πείθων τε αὐτὰς ἀπὸ τε τῆ νόμου, &c.] to whom he expounded those things which concerned *Jesus*, bearing Testimony to the Kingdom of God, and perswading them both out of the



*Law of Moses, and out of the Prophets.* I know very well that there are Chapter a great many instances to be found of the misplacing of words in the XXVIII. very best Greek Writers, and particularly in *Aristotle*, as *Is. Casaubon* in his Notes on *Theophrastus's* Characters c. 7. *καὶ λαλίας* has observed. But such transpositions sounding very harsh in Latin, and much more to those who understand only the Modern Languages; this here in *St. Luke* ought not to have been retained by Interpreters, because tho' the thing is plain to one that is skilled in the Greek, yet it makes the sense very obscure to others. Translators ought no more to imitate the Original in such things, than the peculiar construction of the Greek Language, which it is impossible without altering to turn into other Languages. For the clearer perceiving of which I shall here set down the words of a few Versions of this Passage. The *Vulgar* has, *Exponebat testificans regnum Dei, suadensque eis de Jesu, ex lege Moysis, &c.* What is *exponebat testificans*? Besides, *de Jesu* does not express the sense of the words *τὰ καὶ τῆ Ἰησοῦ*, which ought to have been rendered *quæ pertinent ad Jesum, those things which concern Jesus.* But yet *Erasmus* so translates them, omitting the article *τὰ* as superfluous. And *Castellio* was guilty of the same fault, who otherwise uses to recede, when there is no reason for it, from the Phrase of the Sacred Writers: for thus he renders the words, *quibus ille differebat, divinum regnum testificans, & eis de Jesu ex Moysis lege persuadere conans*; which is neither *Latin*, nor expresses *St. Luke's* sense. *Beza's* translation is a great deal better, *cum attestatione exponebat regnum Dei, suadens eis quæ de Jesu Christo sunt ex lege, &c.* but he did not observe there was a transposition here, nor come up to the sense of every word. The not understanding of this, was the occasion of the *Geneva* and other French Interpreters mistranslating this Passage. The *Geneva* renders it, *ausquels il expliquoit par divers temoignages le Royaume de Dieu, & les induisit à croire ce qui concerne Jesus, &c.* as if *St. Luke* had said *διὰ πολλῶν μαρτυρίων ἐξηγῆτε.* The *Port-Royal* has, *il leur prêchoit le Royaume de Dieu, leur confirmant ce qu' il leur disoit, par plusieurs témoignages, &c.* which is taking too great a liberty, whereas they should have said, *il leur racontoit ce qui concerne Jesus, rendant temoignage au Royaume de Dieu, & les persuadant par la Loi, &c.*

In the first place, the Verb *ἐπιθεῖται* does not signify to *interpret*, but to *relate* or *declare*, when the Discourse is about matters of Fact, such as the coming of *Christ*, his Resurrection and Ascension into Heaven. Secondly, the words *τὰ καὶ τῆ Ἰησοῦ* signify the History of *Jesus*, by which he was understood to be the *Messias*. Thirdly, *διωμαρτυρεῖται* is to bear Testimony to the truth of any History, as the Apostles did,

Chapter when they testified that *Jesus* was risen from the Dead and gone up to XXVIII. Heaven; upon which account they are called his *μάρτυρες Witnesses*:

See *Acts* i. 8. 22. and x. 39, 41. *St. Paul* indeed was not capable of bearing the same Testimony to *Christ* as the rest of the Apostles, who declared that they had seen him dead, and a little after alive again, and had heard and touched him, &c. But he was able to testify that he was still alive, which he knew by what had happened to him in his way to *Damascus*, *Acts* ix. See also *Chap.* xvii. 15. And thus we find the word *διαμαρτυρέω* used in *Chap.* x. 42 of this History; *He commanded us to preach unto the People, and to testify διαμαρτυρέω, that it is he which is ordained of God to be the Judg of the living and the dead, viz. by giving account of what had happened to him, and of his Doctrin. St. Paul bore Testimony in a peculiar manner to the Kingdom of God, when he declared that Christ reigned in Heaven, and had been seen by himself surrounded with immortal Light and Glory. Of the transposing of words there is another plain instance in Chap. i. 2. of this Book.*

---

ANNOS



## ANNOTATIONS

## ON THE

## Epistle of S. Paul the Apostle to the Romans.

**A**T the end of the *Premon.*] Tho most of what our Author says in this Premonition be true, yet there are two things in him liable to reprehension; and those are, *first*, that he supposes many times the Apostle to have a respect to the *Gnosticks*, where the *Heathens* or *Jews* are thought to be spoken of by other Interpreters, and that with more probability, as will appear by those places, and especially by *Chap. i.* and *ii.* The *second* relates to his *Paraphrase*, which is many times intricate and obscure, full of Repetitions, harsh and forced, and in a word not sufficiently adapted to explain the Series of St. Paul's Discourse; tho as to the main, he seldom misses the true scope of it. But no body will ever explain an obscure Epistle, without endeavouring perspicuity and brevity; which two things our Author's Paraphrase is extremely defective in.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 4. **T**O τὸ θεοδένειον ἡμεῖς θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, &c.] This passage S. *Austin*, de *Prædest. Sanct.* c. 15. says, may be so almost understood as the Unitarians commonly understand it. *Prædestinatus est ergo*, saith he, *Jesus, ut qui futurus erat secundum carnem filius David, esset tamen in virtute filius Dei, secundum Spiritum sanctificationis; quia natus est de Spiritu Sancto, ex Virgine Maria.* Jesus therefore was predestinated, as one who was to be according to the flesh the Son of David, and yet should be in Power the Son of God, according to the Spirit of Sanctification; because he was born of the Virgin Mary by the power of the Holy Ghost. But the following words ἡμεῖς ἀναστρέψας, must have a different sense put upon them, which I take to be this; *viz.* that the Holy Ghost, which Jesus had received, was as it were a Voice whereby it was miraculously [ἐν δυνάμει] signified or declared that he should be the Son of God, after his resurrection from the dead, ἡμεῖς ἀναστρέψας. He was the  
Son

Chapter I. Son of God it's true, not only in decree as the Schoolmen speak, but actually before his Resurrection; but he was again called the Son of God in a peculiar manner after his Resurrection, as appears from *Acts* xiii. 32, 33. And therefore in this respect he might be said, *καὶ πνεύμα ἁγίου ὑπὸν θεοῦ*, to be ordained by the Holy Ghost [to be] the Son of God, *ἐξ ἀναστάσεως* after his Resurrection. This same Verb is used by St. Peter in *Acts* x. 42. in a like matter, where having said that he and the rest of the Apostles had eaten and drank with Jesus after he was risen from the dead, he adds: And he commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that it is he which was *ὡρισθῆναι* ordained by God to be the Judg of the living and dead. As by the Holy Ghost which descended upon him, he was ordained or marked out by God to perform the Office of the *Messias*, and so to rise again, and upon that account to be called the Son of God, besides other reasons, for which he has that title, by a special Right and Privilege given to him; so also by his being raised from the dead, he was ordained or marked out by God to be the Judg of the living and dead. That *ὠρίσθαι* & *προὠρίσθαι* here are the same, is truly observed by *Grotius*, who yet interprets the sense of this passage somewhat confusedly. Add to the Examples and Authors by him alledged, the Authority of the *Old Glosses*, in which *ὠρισθῆναι ἡμέρα* is rendered *statuta dies*, an appointed day; and *ὠρισθῆναι* *præstituto*, foreordained or appointed. And that the Preposition *ἐκ* signifies sometimes *after*, appears from *John* xiii. 4. and *2 Pet.* ii. 8.

Verf. 7. *Οὓτων ἐν Ρώμῃ.*] He does not say *Ρωμαίους*, because the greatest part of those who professed the Christian Religion in *Rome* at that time, were not *Roman Citizens*, but *Jews*, and people of other Nations who lived at *Rome* upon the account of Commerce. This has been imitated by *Clemens Romanus*, and *Polyearpus Smyrnenfis*, in the inscriptions of their Epistles; on which see the Notes of learned Men.

Verf. 8. *Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ με διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*] That is, as a Christian I thank my God. So *Ephes.* v. 20. *Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father, in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, i. e. as Christians:* See Note on *John* xiv. 14. and xv. 16.

Verf. 17. Note b. It is a harsh transposition which our Author and others before him suppose to be in the Apostles words; nor is there any need of it, the sense being commodious if we understand them thus: "That from the Faith whereby the Jews believed the Prophets, and the Gentiles their Ancestors, they might proceed to another Faith. The opposition here which is between *ἐκ* and *εἰς*, confirms this Interpretation. *Clemens Alexandrinus* uses the same phrase  
in



in his Book intituled, *Quis dives salvetur?* Sect. 8. p. 24. Edit. Ox-Chapter  
 on. where he speaks of a Jew that was converted to the Christian I.  
 Faith: Ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίσιν, saith he, μετατίθεται, ὡς ἀσφαλερῶς ἐν νόμῳ σαλεύων  
 καὶ ὀπικινδύνης ναυλοχῶν εἰς τὸ σωτήρα μεθορμίζεται: *He is carried from Faith to*  
*Faith, as being unsafely tossed in the Law, [like a Sea] and having a*  
*dangerous station in it, he betakes himself to our Saviour as to a Ha-*  
*ven.*

Verf. 20. Note d. I shall set down in this place an Animadversion of  
 the learned Doctor *Pearson*, formerly *Bishop of Chester*, which is in his  
*Exposition of the Apostle's Creed*, Art. 1. p. 19. Ed. 5. wherein he  
 reprehends Dr. *Hammond*, and sharply confutes *Socinus*; from whom  
 our *Commentator* seems to have borrowed this Interpretation: "This  
 " place, saith he, must be vindicated from the false gloss of *Socinus*,  
 " who contends that it cannot be proved from the Creature that  
 " there is a God; and therefore to this place of St. *Paul* answers thus:  
 " *Sciendum est verba à creatione mundi debere conjungi cum verbo Invisi-*  
 " *bilia — Ait igitur eo in loco Apostolus, æternam divinitatem Dei,*  
 " *id est, id quod nos Deus perpetuo facere vult, (Divinitas enim hoc*  
 " *sensu alibi quoque apud ipsum enuntiatur, ut Coloss. ii. 9.) æternamque*  
 " *potentiam, id est, promissiones quæ nunquam intercident, (quo sensu*  
 " *paulo superius dixerat Evangelium esse potentiam Dei) hæc, inquam,*  
 " *quæ nunquam postquam mundus creatus est ab hominibus visa fuerant,*  
 " *id est, non fuerant eis cognita, per opera, hoc est, per mirabiles ipsius*  
 " *Dei & divinorum hominum, præsertim verò Christi & Apostolorum ejus,*  
 " *operationes, conspecta fuisse. In which Interpretation there is no-*  
 " *thing that is not forced and distorted: for tho his first observation*  
 " *seem plausible, yet there is no validity in it. He bringeth only for*  
 " *proof Mat. xiii. 35. κερυμδῶνα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, which proves not*  
 " *at all that ἀπὸ πίστεως has the same sense: and it is more than proba-*  
 " *ble that it hath not, because that is usually expressed by ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς*  
 " *πίστεως, Mark x. 6. and xiii. 19. 2 Pet. iii. 4. never by ἀπὸ πίστεως.*  
 " Besides, the κερυμδῶνα in St. *Matthew* bears not that analogy with  
 " ἀόρατα which *Socinus* pretends, signifying not things unseen or un-  
 " known till then, but only obscure Sayings or Parables; for which  
 " purpose those words were produced out of the *Psalms* by the *Evan-*  
 " *list*, to prove that the *Messias* was to speak in Parables, in the Ori-  
 " ginal מני-קרי, in the LXX πρὸ βλήματα ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς, i. e. wise,  
 " ancient Sayings, which were not unseen and unknown, for it imme-  
 " diately follows, *which we have heard and known, and our Fathers have*  
 " *told us, Psal. lxxviii. 3. And tho he would make out this Interpre-*  
 " *tation, by accusing other Interpreters of unfaithfulness, Plerique*  
 " *inter-*

Chapter I. *interpretes ex prepositione à fecerunt ex, contra ipsorum Græcorum codicum fidem, qui non ἐκ κτίσεως sed ἀπὸ κτίσεως habent: yet there is no ground for such a Calumny, because ἀπὸ may be, and is often rendered ἐ or ex as well as ἐκ, as Matth. iii. 4. ἀπὸ τείχων καμηλάε, ἐ ρίλις camelinis, and vii. 4. ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σε, ex oculo tuo. 16. ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν, ex spinis; and even in the same sense which Socinus contends for, Mat. xvii. 18. ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης, Vulg. ex illa hora, as Tully, ex eodie, and Virgil, ex illo Corydon, Corydon est tempore nobis, and, Tempore jam ex illo casus mihi cognitus urbis Trojanæ. So the Greek ἀπὸ μέγας the Latins render ex parte, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴσου, ex æquo: of which Examples are innumerable. There is no unfaithfulness then imputable to the Interpreters: nor can such pitiful Criticisms give any advantage to the first part of Socinus's Exposition.*

*However, the Catholick Interpretation depends not on those words ἀπὸ κτίσεως, but on the consideration of the Persons, that is, the Gentiles, and the other words ποιήματα νοούμενα, which he farther perverts, rendring them the miraculous Operations of Christ and his Apostles, or, as one of our Learned Men [Dr. Hammond] their Doings, mistaking ποιήματα, which is from the Passive πεποίηται, for ποίησις, from the Active ἐποίησα; for ποιήματα is properly the thing made or created, not the operation or doing of it; as κτίσις is sometimes taken for the Creature, sometimes for the Creation, but κτίσμα is the Creature only. As therefore we read 1 Tim. iv. 4. πᾶν κτίσμα Θεοῦ καλόν: So Eph. ii. 10. αὐτῷ γὰρ ἐσμεν ποιήματα. In this sense spake Thales properly, Πρῶτον γενέσθαι τὸν Θεόν, ἀγέννητον γὰρ καλλίστην κόσμου, ποιήματα γὰρ Θεοῦ, in Laertius.*

*The other Interpretations which he was forced to, are yet more extravagant; as when he renders the eternal Godhead, that which God would always have us to do, or his everlasting Will, and proves that rendring of it by another place of St. Paul, Col. ii. 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily; that is, says he, all the Will of God: (whereas it is most certain, that where the Godhead is, especially where the fulness, even all the fulness of the Godhead is, there must be all the Attributes as well as the Will of God:) and when he interprets the eternal Power to be the Promises which shall never fail, and thinks he has sufficiently prov'd it, because the same Apostle calls the Gospel the Power of God. For by this way of Interpretation no Sentence of Scripture can have any certain sense.*

*Thus he with a great deal of reason refutes Faust. Socinus, who in this matter shewed himself neither a Philosopher nor a Grammarian.*

But



But he is too sharp upon him, and at the same time upon Dr. Hammond Chapter I. for understanding the Phrase  $\alpha\pi\omicron\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$  in the same manner as Beza did, who renders it *jam inde a Creatione mundi, ever since the Creation of the World*. They went according to the proper signification of the Preposition  $\alpha\pi\omicron$ ; and the word  $\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\sigma\iota$ , which follows, being understood in the sense that Dr. Pearson would have it to be, proves it: *the invisible things of God, from or ever since the Creation of the World, being understood by the things which he has made, are seen*. For if it had been St. Paul's design to say what the learned Bishop would have him, he should have expressed it thus:  $\epsilon\kappa\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\iota$ , by the Creation and [his] Works, and not by  $\alpha\pi\omicron\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ , from the Creation by [his] Works. The Examples he brings to prove that  $\alpha\pi\omicron$  is used for  $\epsilon\kappa$  are nothing to the purpose, because the Phrases are different. He should have given us an Example in which  $\gamma\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \pi\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \alpha\pi\omicron\ \pi\upsilon\theta$  to know any one from any thing was put for  $\gamma\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \pi\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \epsilon\kappa\ \pi\iota\theta\omicron\varsigma$ . The Greeks say;  $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\ \delta\iota\upsilon\chi\omega\upsilon\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota$ ,  $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\epsilon\lambda\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \upsilon\phi\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$ ,  $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\mu\alpha\tau\omicron$ ,  $\tau\omicron\ \lambda\iota\theta\iota\omicron\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\ \upsilon\phi\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ,  $\tau\omicron\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\tau\pi\acute{\epsilon}$ ,  $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \gamma\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ . But they say also  $\alpha\pi\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ , (see *Matth. vii. 16, 20.*) tho the Preposition  $\epsilon\kappa$  is more commonly used in this Phrase. I could confirm this by the Authority of many Interpreters who are far enough from Socinianism; but this way Dr. Pearson himself does not take.

Further, tho it be very true that  $\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$  does not signify an *Action*, but the *Work* it self, or *thing done*; yet because there is no *Work* without an *Action*, nor any *Action* of God without a *Work*, Dr. Hammond might well enough in his Paraphrase make use of a word which signified an *Action*, being it included also in it the *Work* it self. In fine, Dr. Hammond thought that what is here said respected chiefly the *Gnosticks*, in which I think he was mistaken; but being of this opinion he was obliged to understand by the word  $\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ , not so much the Works of Creation as of Providence, both ordinary, and principally such as were extraordinary, and made a mighty impression upon the Minds of Men in *Christ's* time. As for *Socinus's* Interpretation of the words *Power and Divinity*, as it is manifestly forced; so it is rejected by his Brethren of the *Polish Society*, *Crellius* and *Slichtingius*, in their *Commentaries* on this Epistle.

Verf. 23. Note f.] There are some things with relation to what our Author here says about the *Gnosticks*, that deserve to be considered, and I shall briefly set them down in this place, not designing afterwards to repeat them.

I. It cannot be deny'd, that there were even from the Apostles time pernicious Hereticks, to whom there is often a respect had in these

Chapter these Epistles, as our Author has shewn: Of which number were the

I. followers of *Simon*, if what the Antients say concerning them be true. And it is possible likewise that these Men might even at that time boast of their extraordinary Knowledg, and call themselves *Gnosticks*, tho that Name came to be more famous afterwards. *Γνώσις* among the Christians of that Age did not signify only Knowledg or Learning in general, but also some peculiar knowledg of the abstruse Points of Religion, and the mystical sense of Scripture; in which sense we more than once meet with it in an Epistle of St. *Barnabas*. See in the *Greek*, Chap. 6. not. 35. and Chap. 10. not. 60. and in the *Latin*, c. 1. not. 15. of the *Amsterdam* Edition, and the learned Dr. *Pearson's Vindic. Ignat.* Part 2. c. 6. But yet that the Participle *γρόντες* in the 21<sup>st</sup> Verse has a reference to these Hereticks, I do not think, nor is it necessary.

II. The *Doctor* is rash in following *Justin Martyr*, who erroneously thought that *Simon Magus* was deified by the Romans, because there was a Statue at *Rome* consecrated to *SEMON SANCTUS*, which was an antient Roman Deity. *Cæsar Baronius* indeed had gone before Dr. *Hammond* in this, but he had been corrected by *Des. Heraldus* in *Comment. ad cap. 13. Apolog. Tertul.* And his Opinion was afterwards confirmed by *Henr. Valefius* on *Euseb. H. E. lib. 2. c. 13.* and *Ant. Pagus* in *Epicr. Baroniana*, ad An. 142. I do not think there is any more truth in what is related concerning the Contest between St. *Peter* and him; but if it were true, the Romans had undoubtedly pulled down his Statue: for how could they have thought him to be a God who was overcome by a Man? but *Heraldus* justly calls this a *Fable* in his Notes on the second Book of *Arnobius*.

III. I do not doubt but the *Gnosticks*, or followers of *Simon*, imitated the Heathens; but I am of opinion, with most other Interpreters, that the Apostle had a respect here to the Heathens themselves, and particularly to their Philosophers, not those who imitated them. See *Grotius*. All that the Apostle here says very fitly agrees to the *Heathens*, but there are some things which cannot commodiously be applied to the *Gnosticks*.

IV. I wonder our learned Author should think the word *δόξα* here to refer to *Exod. xxiv.* and signify that Splendor which appeared on the top of *Mount Sinai*, when the Law was given to the Jews; and afterwards say that the Phrase *to change the Glory*, is borrowed from *Psalin cvi. 20.* For it had been sufficient to mention that Passage in the *Psalmist*, to which this here manifestly refers, and not to that Splendor or glorious Appearance. The *Glory of God* is God himself, or his eternally



eternally glorious Nature. If by the *glory of God* in this place, were to be understood that glorious *appearance* before spoken of, the crime charged upon the *Gentiles* would be, not that they had represented God by a visible shape, but that they had made use of *another* than that. They ought to have expressed that splendor by Fire, as the *Persians* use to do; not by figures of living Creatures, as the *Greeks* and *Romans*. In the *Psalms* it is said they changed their *Glory* כבודם *chבודam*. But *St. Paul* could not call God the glory of the *Heathens*, who knew very little of him; and perhaps in the *Chaldee Paraphrase* of the *Psalms*, which was used at that time by the *Synagogues*, the words were read as they are now in ours ת אקד רבנהון *the glory of their Lord*.

V. To shew how aptly what *St. Paul* here says, may be applied to the *Heathens*, and particularly their *Philosophers*, I shall express the sense of his Discourse from *Vers. 17* to the *26th*, in a short Paraphrase.

“ 17. For in the Gospel there is a way shewn, whereby those that believe it may obtain the pardon of their Sins from God, to the end that from the Faith which they had in their former Religion, they might be induced to believe the Gospel; for to such only we may apply that passage of the Prophet *Habakkuk*, *The just shall live by Faith.* 18. Those who refuse to believe it, shall be punished by the Divine Justice for their former Sins, which cannot be expiated any otherwise than by Faith in the Gospel; and whercof the greatest by far is that whereby the *Heathens*, and even their *Philosophers* do dissemble the knowledg which they have of the true God, and do not conform their Divine Worship to it. 19. For many of them understood what God would have them know concerning himself, and hath manifested to them, 20. From the beginning of the World, by his Works, wherein his infinite Power and transcendent Nature do illustriously shew themselves, and are as it were visible; so that they have no excuse to make for the absurd Religion which they profess. 21. Tho they knew how wise and powerful a Being God was, and had great experiences of his Goodness and Bounty, yet they neither gave that honour to him openly, which the perfection of his Nature challenged from them, nor thanked him for his Benefits. And therefore God in just Indignation suffered them to fall into so many errors, which he would otherwise have delivered them from, that they even rendered the most certain things doubtful. 22. And whilst they professed the study of Wisdom, they lost their Understandings. 23. Being  
 “ blinded  
 K k 2

Chapter I. “ blinded through their own fault, as one error produces another,  
 “ they represented God whom they might, as I said, have under-  
 “ stood to be an infinitely more perfect Being than a Man, not only  
 “ like a Man, but even like a Beast.

“ 24. Nor did their depravation stop here, in the errors of their  
 “ Minds, or in Divine Worship, but they became also most impure  
 “ and abominable in their Lives, God not restraining them. 25. For  
 “ the same Persons who had formed such vile Images of the Godhead,  
 “ and so extremely unworthy of the Divine Majesty, and worshipped  
 “ those Images, neglecting God himself; 26. As they had as much  
 “ as in them lay, disgraced the Divine Nature; so forgetting also,  
 “ as it were, themselves, they confounded the Offices of both Sexes,  
 “ which Nature has distinguished, by Lusts not to be named, &c.

All these things the Heathens fell into, even their Philosophers not  
 excepted, as might be easily proved out of *Aristophanes*, *Laertius*,  
*Lucian*, the Satyrick Latin Poets, *Seneca*, and in a word all Anti-  
 quity.

Verf. 29. Note i. Lin. 7. After the words, *giving over all labour*] This is an absurd Translation of the word ἀπηργασίας, which never had any such sense, but signifies *having lost all sense of Pain or Grief*. See on *Ephes. iv. 19*.

Ibid. *At the end of that Note*] Tho *πλεονεξία* be truly deduced ἀπὸ τοῦ πλεον ἔχειν, and is used both in a good and bad sense, of Riches, or Power, or Victory, or endowments of Mind, and other things in which some exceed and go beyond others; yet I do not think it any where signifies *a desire of Pleasure*; nor does any of all those places which our Author has here heaped together, prove what he intends, as I shall shew by a brief examination of them. For it is not ground enough, that such or such a sense of a word is not foreign to the design of any place, nay that it is very agreeable to it, to infer that that is sometimes the signification of that word; seeing the series of the discourse will often permit it to be taken in other senses altogether as commodious; and less proper words likewise are many times made use of instead of more proper. And therefore before we make use of reasoning to find out the signification of any word, the certain use of it must be otherwise known; for else it is very easy to mistake. Now to review the Passages alledged by our Author: (1.) The words of *St. Paul* in *Ephes. iv. 19*. will very well bear to be understood of *Covetousness*, as *Grotius* has observed, because there were a great many of the Male Sex, that prostituted themselves for the sake of Gain. (2.) The words of *Photius*, *St. Chrysostom* and *Antiochus*, do not necessarily.



cessarily require the sense of *Lusts*, but may easily be understood like- Chapter  
 wise of *Covetousness*. (3.) The example of *Asterius* proves nothing I.  
 at all, because his words may be very well understood of a desire of Riches and Power, yea ought to be so. I have not indeed *Alexander*  
*Aphrodisiensis*, nor can I conveniently get him; but I dare lay any  
 wager, we ought to read *πλέον ἢ δεῖον* more than he should; for that is  
 the definition of an unjust Man τὸ ἀδίκον, nor does that word among the  
 Greeks ever signify a voluptuary. (4.) Tho the *Septuagint* render the  
 Hebrew word *עָבַר* both by *πλεονεξία* and *μιασμός*, it does not follow  
 that these Greek words ought to be used promiscuously. It is not to  
 be thought that the Greek words made use of in the barbarous stile of  
 those Interpreters, are always of the same latitude with the He-  
 brew; and besides, there was no necessary reason for the *Septuagints*  
 translating the Hebrew word in that place of *Ezekiel* by *μιασμός*. See  
 Interpreters on the place. (5.) In the Prayer of *Ephraim*, there is  
 nothing that should oblige us to understand *πλεονεξία* any otherwise  
 than it commonly is; for why may not we suppose him to ask pardon  
 for his Covetousness, as well as his Lusts or Uncleanness? Do not those  
 Vices sometimes go together? (6.) Tho *Plato* uses the Phrase *πλεονεξία*  
*τέτων* after the mention of Pleasures, it does not follow that *πλεονεξία*  
 there signifies Lust, for that Phrase may be very well rendered a great-  
 er abundance of these things, major horum copia, as *Mars. Ficinus* has  
 translated it. See *Plato* himself, pag. 508. Ed. Genev. of *Ficinus*.  
 (7.) *Πλεονεκτεῖν τῷ ἀφρόδευσιν* in the Epist. of *Barnabas*, does not signify  
 to be lustful, but multiplicare animum. See Cap. 10. Not. 51. Edit. *Amstel*.  
 (8.) It is without cause that the *Doctor* interprets *avaritia*, in *Poly-*  
*carpus* and *Bede*, by Sensuality or the love of Pleasures. Could not  
*Valens* be at the same time *πλεονεκτής* or covetous, and lustful too? And  
 do not sensual or lustful Persons use to be covetous, and to seize upon  
 other peoples Possessions when they have opportunity, that they may  
 spend them upon their Lusts? *Bede* does not seem neither to have con-  
 founded the word *avaritia* with the love of Pleasure, tho he joins to-  
 gether things that are in effect often conjoined. The same may be  
 said of other Authors who have any like Passages; for what is more  
 common than to speak of several Vices together? (9.) Tho the *Sodo-*  
*mites* be upbraided for their *πορνεία* and *κακία*, it does not follow that  
 these words properly signify villanous Lusts; they are general terms, by  
 which their wickedness may be described, whatsoever it consisted in, as  
 the constant signification of those words shew. (10.) Of the Passages  
 cited by the *Doctor* out of *St. Paul*, I shall speak when I come to them,  
 as also of the other places of the New Testament. (11.) The word  
 ἀδικία

Chapter *αἰμαία* in *Gen. vi. 5.* is a general name likewise, signifying any sort of Vice or Wickedness, and not particularly *Lust*. Our Author made it his business to enquire not what was the constant and usual signification of a word, but what he would have it to signify, that he might the better apply some passages in *St. Paul* to his *Gnosticks*.

## C H A P. II.

Verf. 1. **T**HE Apostle as far as the eighth Verse, goes on to condemn the Heathen Philosophers, who did those things which they condemned in others, and knew to be evil; upon which account they were reproached even among the Heathens themselves: See *Lactantius Instit. Divin. Lib. 3. c. 15.* who produces out of *Cicero, Corn. Nepos* and *Seneca*, very remarkable Testimonies against those who were Philosophers more in words than in manners. Dr. *Hammond*, to make these things agree to his *Gnosticks*, puts several things into his Paraphrase, whereof there is not the least footstep in *St. Paul*. It is easy to find out what sense we please in any Author whom we interpret, if we may take the liberty to patch up his Thoughts in that manner with our own. I wonder also at *Grotius* for thinking the Apostle here had reference to the Roman Magistrates, because of the word *κρίνων* which he saith properly signifies a *Judg*; when that word may as well be taken for any one *that judgeth*, as a Philosopher who judgeth concerning Vice and Virtue, as a *Magistrate*. Yea *Plato* in *Lib. 9. Reip. p. 506. Edit. Ficini*, applies that word to a Philosopher, where he speaks of judging concerning what is good or evil. *Δὲ ἔ γ ε δ αῖ*, saith he, *ὀργάνου κρίνεσθαι, ἢ τῷ φιλοσοφῆσαι τὸ τοῦ ὄργανου, ἐστὶ τῷ φιλοσοφῆσαι, ἀλλὰ τῷ φιλοσοφῆσαι: A covetous or ambitious Man is not qualified to judg, but only a Philosopher.* And a great many more such examples, if I had time, and it were necessary, might be found out to shew that a Philosopher may be properly called *ὁ κρίνων*.

Verf. 8. *Τοῖς ἐξ ἐριθείας, &c.*] This has a respect to the Philosophers, who when they ought, according to their own Doctrin, to have obeyed the Gospel, abused that skill in disputation which they had acquired by the study of Philosophy in resisting it. And such were afterwards *Lucian, Celsus, Porphyrius, Hierocles*, and others, who out of a love to contention, opposed the Christian Religion. *Ἐρίθεια* is aptly to this purpose defined by *Phavorinus*, *καταλαλία, ἢ κακολογία, ἢ ἢ δια λόγου φιλονεικία, contradicting or evil speaking, or contending by words*, for which most of the Philosophers were infamous.



Verf. 9. Θλίψις, &c.] Here the Apostle returns to what he had said Chapter II. in the 15th *Verf.* of the foregoing Chapter, viz. that the Gospel belonged to the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews*, and brought Salvation equally to them both; as in this place he tells them that if they continued in their Sins and Unbelief, and neglected the only way of Salvation, they would both bring destruction upon themselves. These he compares first with one another, and then inveighs against the *Jews* who persisted in their Sins; nor is there any thing that properly concerns the *Gnosticks*, as any one will see that does but read the Apostle.

Verf. 13. Οὐ δ' ἀκροαταὶ τῶ νόμου δικαιο.] This Passage perhaps *Porphyrus* had in his mind, who often read the Holy Scriptures that he might be able to oppose them, when he wrote in his Book *de Abstinent.* c. 57. that it was impossible for a Man to attain εἰς τέλος, i. e. to Happiness, μὴ προσηλωθέντα ᾧ, εἰ χρη φάναι, πρὸ θεοῦ, ἀφηλωθέντα δὲ ἐν σώματι, καὶ τῷ δια τέρε τῆ ψυχῆς ἠδὲ παθεῶν, unless he were nailed, if I may so speak, to God, and divided from the Body and the Pleasures which by that affect the Mind: δι' ΕΡΓΩΝ ἡμῶν τὴ σωτηρία, ἢ δι' ΑΚΡΟΑΣΕΩΣ λόγων ψιλῆς γενομένης. for we are saved by WORKS, not by a bare HEARING of words.

Verf. 15. Γεωπτόν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν.] That is, they were not instructed out of the written Law, but their own Reason informed them what was good, and what was evil. For that is said to be written in the Heart or Mind, which we understand by reasoning, without any written Institution. This is not opposed to the knowledg of the *Gnosticks*, but of the *Jews*.

Ibid. Note c. To this purpose is that elegant Passage in *Plautus* in *Rudente*, Act. 4. Sc. 7.

*Spectavi ego pridem comicos ad istum modum.  
Sapienter dicta dicere atque iis plaudier,  
Cum illos sapientes mores monstrabant populo;  
Sed cum inde suam quisque ibant diversi domum,  
Nullus erat illo pacto ut illi jufferant.*

Verf. 17. Note e. This is all forced. Read the Apostle himself, and it will appear that he speaks of a *Jew* properly so called, and one that was circumcised.

Ἐπινομιζέσθαι here, is not properly to be called or denominated, but to be celebrated or famous; so that *St. Paul's* meaning is this: it is a thing universally known, that thou art a *Jew*; or a *Disciple of Moses*; this is what.

Chapter what thou pretendest thy self to be, and gloriest in. The Apostle  
 11. has no respect in this to the *Gnosticks*, who could not neither be said  
 ~~~~~ ἀναπαύεσθαι ἐν νόμῳ, to rest in the Law, which they took not the least care  
 to observe, as our Author confesses, but when the fear of the Jews  
 urged them to it.

Verf. 18. *Note f.*] Dr. *Hammond's* Interpretation of the Verb  
 δοκιμάζειν may be confirmed by the Authority of an *old Glossary*, in  
 which that Verb is render'd not only by *perpendere, examinare, to*  
*weigh, to examin,* but also *approbare, comprobare, to approve.* And in  
 the same διαφέρω is rendered by *præsto, præcillo, to excel.* But yet be-  
 cause the Discourse is concerning one that is able to teach others what  
 is good and profitable, and what is not, or of a Master, I chuse ra-  
 ther to understand it of *trying those things that differ,* or trying the  
 difference of things, that is, distinguishing between lawful and un-  
 lawful. And so in that Passage of the *Epist. to the Philippians, δοκιμάζειν*  
*τὸ διαφέροντα* may signify to distinguish carefully good from evil, or not  
 ignorantly to confound things which are different: Whence the Apo-  
 stle adds *ἵνα ᾖτε εἰλικριναῖς, that ye may be sincere,* that is, without mixture  
 of good and evil, not sufficiently distinguished by you; and conse-  
 quently, as it follows, *ἀπερίσκατοι, without offence.* However, it is most  
 true, that the Verb *δοκιμάζειν* does not only signify the examining  
 of a thing, but also that which is consequent upon it, the approba-  
 tion of it. But this may very aptly be said of the Jews compared  
 with the Heathens, because the Jews were *instructed out of the Law,*  
 which the *Gnosticks* were not, but were part of them Heathens.

Verf. 19. Ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τὸν ὁδόν.] The Blind cannot discern the right  
 way from the Path which would lead them out of the Road they desire  
 to take; and therefore they need a Guide to discern it for them.  
 And in like manner such as cannot *δοκιμάζειν τὸ διαφέροντα,* as to those  
 things between which the Will of God makes a difference, have need  
 of a Teacher to shew them the difference between what is lawful and  
 unlawful. This, and what follows, plainly confirms the Opinion which  
 I have preferred to Dr. *Hammond's* Interpretation, and agrees exactly  
 to the Jews compared with the Heathens.

Verf. 22. Ἰεραυλαῖς.] I do not think the *Doctor* has expressed the  
 Apostle's sense here in his Paraphrase, I chuse rather to understand  
 this word *ιεραυλαῖς* of stealing the Vessels that were consecrated to  
*Idols;* as if the Apostle had said; "Thou who pretendest to abhor  
 " Idols, as most polluted things, which thou wouldst not so much as  
 " touch, dost nevertheless, if thou hast an opportunity, steal the  
 " Vessels



“ Vessels which are consecrated to them, and are as polluted as the Chapter  
 “ Idols themselves. In which he has a respect undoubtedly to that II.  
 Law in *Dent. vii. 25.* *The graven Images of their Gods shalt thou burn* ~~~~~  
*with fire; thou shalt not desire the Silver or Gold that is upon them, &c.*

Verf. 25. Πειρομὴ ἰσὺ ᾧ ὠφελεῖ, &c. ] That is, it is advantageous for a Person to profess himself a Jew, and to carry about him the sacred χάρισμα of that Religion in his body, provided he observe its Laws, and those especially which relate to a good Life, and the Interest of Human Society. I know Divines usually call Circumcision *a Seal of the Covenant*, in the sense our Author uses those words. But see what I have said of that matter in my Notes on *Gen. xvii. 10.*

Ibid. Ἐὰν δὲ παραβῶπις νόμῳ. ] If those who boast themselves to be circumcised Persons, and bear the token of God's Covenant in their Bodies, neglect the most holy Laws delivered to them by *Moses*, their Circumcision can be of no use to them, which is only a sign of their professing Judaism, not the whole Jewish Religion.

Verf. 26. Ἐὰν ἐν ἡ ἀκελευσία. ] That is, as all Interpreters have observed, the *uncircumcised*. Circumcision was instituted as a sign of God's Covenant, with which all that were marked professed their Resolution to obey the only true God, Creator of Heaven and Earth. But if there were any among other Nations who, without that mark set upon the Jews only, obey'd God in those things which they knew to be acceptable to him, their Piety was as pleasing to God as that of the circumcised Jews. That Sign was instituted only to put the Jews constantly in mind of their Duty, and not as a thing in it self grateful to God.

Ibid. Εἰς αἰτιμὴν λογισέται ] That is, whoever observes those Laws that are of eternal Equity, δικαιώματι, wherever he be, and what Nation soever he be of, shall be accounted by God in the number of his People, as much as if he were circumcised. Δικαίωμα among the Greeks properly signifies *Equity*, or that which is alledged to shew a Cause to be just or good: But in the *Septuagint* it is used to signify the Laws of God of what kind soever they be: But in this place δικαιώματα are those things which God may equitably require of all Nations, such as Experience and right Reason dictate to be just.

Verf. 27. Note h. ] I wonder learned Men did not perceive there was an *Ellipsis* in this Phrase, and that the word ἰσχυρὸν must be understood, which is expressed afterwards. The meaning of *S. Paul* is this: They that have been hitherto uncircumcised, *as they are born* (for so the Phrase ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκελευσία signifies) and yet observe the Moral Laws, are Jews, that is, in the number of God's People, not indeed accord-

Chapter III. ing to the letter of the Laws themselves, but according to the mind of the Lawgiver; and accordingly will shew by their Example that you are justly condemned, who by the letter of the Law and Circumcision are esteemed the People of God: τὸς διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς ἰουδαῖοι καὶ ἐστὶν ἢ διὰ πνεύματος καὶ δικαιοσύνης ὄντες ἰουδαῖοι: *Those that are Jews by the Spirit and Righteousness, shall condemn such as are Jews by the Letter and Circumcision.* Afterwards in Chap. iv. 11. the Phrase διὰ ἀνελευσίαν has another signification, to wit, among the uncircumcised Nations, or whilst they are uncircumcised; for the Preposition διὰ often signifies distance of place or time. See ver. 29. in which this Interpretation is confirmed. Of the signification of the word γράμμα as it is opposed to the Intention or Mind of the Lawgiver, I have already spoken in a Note on Mat. v. 17.

Verf. 29. Ἐν πνεύματι, ἢ γράμματι ] That is, that Circumcision is worthy of Praise, which is agreeable to the spiritual Intention of God in instituting carnal Circumcision; not that which according to the letter of the Law is made in the Flesh, which in it self is neither good nor evil. So that when the Apostle uses the Phrase ἐν πνεύματι, it is as if he had said κατὰ πνευματικὴν Θεοῦ βουλὴν, according to the spiritual Intention or Will of God: as on the other hand, ἐν γράμματι is the same with κατὰ τὰ γράμματα νόμου, according to the letters of the Law. Whence in the Writings of St. Paul, the Law of Moses is often called γράμμα, the Letter; and the Gospel πνεῦμα, the Spirit, because this revealed the spiritual Intention of God, which was concealed under the letter of the Law. See 2 Cor. iii. 6.

Ibid. Οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων. ] To wit, the Jews, who highly preferred a Person that was circumcised to one that was not, having little or no regard to how they both lived. They considered the letter of the Law, and not the spirit of the Lawgiver; and so neglecting Mens internal Qualifications, commended chiefly their external.

### C H A P. III.

Verf. 2. Note a.  
Col. 3. lin. 16.

Nothing could have been said more falsely concerning the Original of the word λόγια, which was commonly used by the Greeks in that signification before ever the Greek Language was spoken in the Land of Canaan. It was used by Herodotus and Thucydides, who lived whilst the Persian Monarchy stood; nor did the Septuagint for any other reason call the Pectoral λόγια, tho' improperly and barbarously, than because that word ordinarily signified in Greek an Oracle, and λόγια in the Plural



Plural, *Oracles*; which were so called because they were *σὺν λόγῳ*, that Chapter is, audibly pronounced or expressed, when otherwise the Gods were III. supposed to give their Responses by Dreams, Intrails, Signs, or Omens without any Voice. This derivation of the word seems to be more proper than that which is given of it by *Thucydides's* Scholiast in Lib. 2. p. 104. *Ed. Am. Porti*, where on those words of the Historian; *πολλὰ μὲν λόγια ἐλέγετο, πολλὰ δὲ χρησμολόγοι ἤσαν: Many Oracles or Responses were given, many things were sung by the Prophets*; he makes this Remark; *Λόγια ἐστὶ τὰ ὧσα τῷ Θεῷ λεγόμενα καταλογοῦσιν· χρησμοὶ δὲ εἰπνες ἐμμέτρως λέγονται: Λόγια are those Responses which are made by God in Prose, and χρησμοὶ those which are given in Verse.* Hence also the Author of the Book of *Wisdom*, chap. xvi. 11. and the Son of *Syrach* in chap. xxxvi. 16. call *λόγια* the Revelations of God by the Prophets. And such the Apostle here means, and not the Responses given by the High Priest, as *Grotius* has shewn. But our Author being deceived by the ambiguity of the word, treats of the Pectoral in an improper place.

*Ibid.* In the same Col. after the words, *Judgment of Urim.*] How foreign all this is to this place in *St. Paul*, I have already shewn. But I have one or two things more here to observe. *First*, That the *Doctor* took what he here says out of *Rob. Scheringamus* in his Notes on cap. 8. *Jomæ*, as he has done other things also of that nature. *Secondly*, That the *Rabbins*, whose Authority he here alledges, were as ignorant of this matter as we, only they had the confidence to set down their own Inventions for known and certain Truth, which is a very usual thing with them. Every one knows, that during the second Temple there was no *Urim* and *Thummim*; and I would not have any one so silly as to think that the *Rabbins*, who lived some Ages after the destruction of that Temple, understood by certain Tradition what *Urim* and *Thummim* were. Their Opinion is evidently confuted by *Spencer* in his Treatise of *Urim* and *Thummim*, cap. 3. sect. 11. As for me, I think quite otherwise of the whole matter, as I have declared in my Notes on *Exod.* xxviii. 30. and *Numb.* xxvi. 21.

*Ibid.* Col. 4. in that Note, *lin.* 10. after the words *dead Witnesses.*] I have shewn that *λόγια* signifies in Greek God's Responses, without any respect had to the Pectoral; and *λόγια ζῶντα*, as has been well observed by *H. Grotius*, are *enlivening* or *quickning* words. I wonder he did not alledg to that purpose *Heb.* iv. 12.

*Ibid.* *lin.* 20. after the words *there consisted*] Our learned Author heaps Mistakes upon Mistakes; for it is certain *σερχαία* has no allusion to the Pectoral, and does not signify Letters, but the Rudiments or first Principles of Piety.

Chapter III. *Verf. 4. Note b.* ] That the Doctrine which our Divine here teaches is very true, considered in it self, no one can doubt, that understands the nature of the Gospel-Covenant. But I expected he should have acted the part of a Grammarian rather than a Divine, and reasoned not from the Analogy of Faith, but the grammatical use of words. What our Author therefore has not done, shall be briefly done by me. And first, It must be observ'd, that the words צַדִּיק in Hebrew, and *δίκαιος* in Greek, are most frequently used in the largest sense, to signify a good Man, or one that loves Righteousness, but are sometimes taken in a more limited notion, and signify a Man who is guiltless of any particular Crime. Of the first signification we may every where meet with Examples; of the latter there is an Instance in *Prov. xvii. 1*; *He that justifieth the guilty (רשע) and he that condemneth the just (צדיק) are both an Abomination to the Lord.* See also *Isa. v. 23.* And agreeably to this twofold sense of the word *Just*, the signification also of the Verbs צַדִּיק and *δικαίω* to justify, is twofold; either for to esteem *just*, that is, good; or *just*, that is, innocent or guiltless of the Crime charged upon him. In this latter signification they are used in the Passages before mentioned in the *Proverbs* and *Isaiab*; but this Notion in this dispute concerning Justification, can have no place: For God does not *justify* any Man from all Sin, that is, account him guiltless; because all Men are Sinners. But there remains another sense, in which God may properly be said to esteem those *just*, that is, good Men, and acceptable to him, who believe in Christ, tho their Righteousness be not perfect or sinless; because he mercifully accepts of an imperfect Vertue instead of a perfect one, upon the account of Christ's Sacrifice. And in this sense it is said of *Abraham* that *ἐδικαιώθη, he was justified*, that is, accounted a just Man, not according to strict Justice, but the gracious acceptance of God, who judged him to be a good and pious Person: Whence it is said in Scripture, that *Abraham believed God, and it was counted, or imputed to him for Righteousness*; that is, that Faith was look'd upon as the Act of a good Man, and one that feared God; and therefore *Abraham* was judged by God to be such an one. See my Notes on *Gen. xv. 6.*

These things, if carefully observed, will give great light into this whole Disputation of *St. Paul*, which is otherwise hardly intelligible. The *Jews* affirmed, that by the bare observation of the Law of *Moses*, as they interpreted it, a Man was *justified in the sight of God*, that is, accounted just by God, and accordingly accepted by him, and might expect from him the Reward promised to all good Men. And they thought



thought they could exactly fulfil the Law in all points, and so be justified as good Men upon that account; meaning by the observation of the Law, a Life so regulated, that no Charge could by any one be brought against them out of the Law, as Transgressors of any of its Precepts, which had a threatning of Punishment annexed to it: And if they lived so, they thought the Reward of pious Men was justly due to them. This was the Opinion of the Jews, against which St. Paul disputes, and shews that Men are not justified by the Works of the Law, that is, esteemed pious by God; but by Faith, i. e. upon their believing God's Revelations, and for the future obeying them, tho they had not before observed the Law, or any of its Ceremonies: To which purpose he alledges the Example of Abraham, who, when uncircumcised, was accounted just by God, upon believing his Promise. And he urges that no Man can justly contend with God, because all have heinously sinned, and therefore stand in need of God's pardoning Mercy in order to their being accounted just: With many other Arguments, of which, as the matter shall require, I shall afterwards speak.

Two things I will further observe in this place; First, That *δικαιωθῆς* here is taken in that sense in which I said a Person was justified, who is not esteemed guilty of any unjust or wicked Action: for David's meaning in Psalm li. 6. is this, that he acknowledged he had committed a very great Sin, so that he had no reason to doubt of the Divine Justice in threatning to punish him. Secondly, That towards the end of the foregoing Annotation, Dr. Hammond does ill compare the Phrases to be imputed to Righteousness, and to be accounted worthy of a Reward, with one another, as will appear if we look into St. Paul's words.

Verf. 8. Note d. ] There is no necessity of any Parenthesis in this place; if we do but supply the word *πιστεύω* from what follows, the sense will be plain thus: Why yet am I also judged as a Sinner? Why do not we do, as we are slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say, that we will do evil that good may come?

Verf. 25. Note b. lin. 13. after the words propitious to the People. ] Our learned Author is mistaken in thinking that the Hebrew word *חַפְּזֵי* *chapporeth* is indifferently rendered *inshew* and *καταπέτασμα*. There is only one place in Exod. xxvi. 34. where the Septuagint can seem to have translated it by *καταπέτασμα*; but if it be more narrowly look'd into, it will appear that they read *פַּרְוֵי* *pharocheth*, which is the name of the Veil that was drawn over against the most Holy place, and thought that Moses was commanded to put the Ark there within that space. I have rendered the place, *impones operculum arce testimo-*

Chapter *nii in sanctissimo adyto, Thou shalt put the Covering upon the Ark of the*  
 III. *Testimony in the most Holy Place; and they, κατακαλύψεις τῆς καταπέτασ-*  
 ματι τῷ ζιβωτῶν. And it is certain τὸ καταπέτασμα signifies only a Veil,  
 which καταπέτασται is extended, in order to hide any thing; and so  
 they constantly translate פֶּרֶכֶת *pharocheth*, which is the name of the  
 Veil or Curtain that hid the most Holy Place. But a Covering, such as  
 that was which was put upon the Ark, would be more fitly called in  
 Greek *ζύλωμα*, or *ἐπιζύλωμα*, or *πῶμα*, or by another Name. I fear  
 our learned Author confounded the Hebrew words alledged, because  
 of the similitude there is between them, and through want of me-  
 mory.

*Ibid. Lin. 39. After the words, to be performed.]* To speak freely  
 my opinion, I am apt to think there is no allusion here to the  
 Covering of the Ark, but that Christ is called *ἱλασίον*, *subintell. ἱερεῖον*  
 or *θῦμα* *sacrifice*; because immediately there is mention made of *Blood*,  
 which has no affinity with a *Covering*. So the Greeks call *ἱλασίον*, a  
 Sacrifice offered up by way of Thanksgiving. But I confess I never  
 could meet with that word in this sense save in the old *Onomasticon*,  
 where *ἱλασίον* is rendred *propitiabile*, which word is to be understood  
 actively, for that which is capable of pacifying or rendring God pro-  
 pitious, as in like manner *impetrabilis* signifies one that can easily obtain  
 what he desires. So that the *vulgar* who renders this word *Expiationem*,  
 and *Beza* who renders it *Placamentum*, i. e. an *expiatory Sacrifice*, have  
 translated it better than others, who render it by *propitiarium*, a  
*propitiatory*, by which word is generally understood the Covering of  
 the Ark.

*Ibid. At the end of that Note.]* Tho what our Author here theo-  
 logically discourses be very true, yet it does not much conduce to the  
 understanding of *St. Paul's* words, if the proper signification of them  
 be considered. Πίσις ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ αἵματι, is here spoken of, not for the  
 reasons mentioned by our Author, but because the Discourse is about  
 an expiatory Sacrifice, whereof the Blood can be of no use to us unless  
 we believe on Christ, and hope that by his Sacrifice God will become  
 propitious to us, tho we have been great Sinners against him.

*Ibid. Δια τῶν πῶσεων.]* The Doctrin indeed laid down by our learn-  
 ed Author in the foregoing Annotation, I heartily subscribe to; but  
 I think it is foreign to this place, as depending upon a wrong inter-  
 pretation of the word πῶσεις. The scope of the Apostle is to shew  
 that there is another kind of Righteousness brought in by Christ,  
 which he calls *the righteousness of God*, different from that which re-  
 sults from Works, and by which we are justified freely by his Grace.  
 through



through the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus. And for the clearer explaining of that, he adds; whom God hath set forth as an Atonement, through Faith in his Blood; that is, "which Jesus God declares in the Gospel to be an expiatory Sacrifice, by whose Blood the Sins of those who believe on him are expiated: To make known his Righteousness, because of the remission of former Sins under the forbearance of God; — To shew that those are just in his sight, whose past Sins he has remitted, and whose Repentance he did not in vain wait for: At this time, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that is of the Faith of Jesus; " which at this time only is manifest to all: whence we may conclude, that God is both a lover of Righteousness, and also accounts those just who have believed in Christ, and heartily obey him. The whole series of the Discourse does as it were proclaim this to be the scope and sense of the Apostle; and I wonder that Grotius himself did not see it, tho the Doctor, who often gives forced Interpretations of Places, might easily not discern it.

Tho I do not deny that the δικαιοσύνη, or Righteousness of God, is often put for his Goodness and Mercy, as Grotius has shewn; yet in this dispute it has another signification, as appears from Chap. i. 17. and vers. 21, 24, and 26 of this Chapter, where it is manifestly taken for Gospel-Righteousness, that is, for sanctity of Life, consequent upon Repentance. And this Righteousness which God accepts, upon the account of Christ's Sacrifice, is not grounded upon a connivence or taking no notice of past Sins, but the remission of them. For God accounts those just, not whose Sins he overlooks or connives at, but those whose Sins he has already pardoned, and upon their Repentance takes into his favour, contrary to their deserts.

I contend that *πίστεως* is all one with *ἀπιστίας*, and that the Preposition *ἐν* cannot be urged to prove *παιδείας* to be the same with *παιδείων*. Nothing is more common in the Greek Language, than for Prepositions to lose their proper force in compound words, as every one knows, who has had but the least taste of that Language. And therefore Grammarians and Greek Writers make the words *παιδείας* and *ἀπίδειας* promiscuous. *Hieronymus* inter. *παιδείας* not only by *ἐν*, *κατὰ* *ἀμάρταν* to suffer, to omit, but also by *εὐχαρίστων*, *ἀπίδειας* to grant, to remit, and *πίστεως* by *ἀπιστίας* remission. So *Dionysius Halicarnass.* *Antiq. Rom. Lib. 2. p. 103. Ed. Sylburg.* *ἐπιπέσει αὐτοῖς τὸ ἀμαρτάνειν ταύτης ἐξήκουσιν: We forgive them this Offence without setting any fine upon them; or if you please, we let it go unpunished, which is the same with pardoning.* And *Lib. 7.* he opposes *πίστεως* not to remission, but delaying or putting off: *p. 446. Πιστεὶ δὲ ἢ ἀμαρτάνων πολλά καταλείποντες τὸ πρὸς ἐλάττωσιν*  
ΠΑΡΕΣΙΝ

Chapter ΠΑΡΕΣΙΝ ἔχ' ἐύχοντο, τὴν δὲ εἰς χεῖρον ὅσον ἠξίαν ἀναβολὴν ἔλαβον: They did  
 IV. not, tho they begged very hard, obtain from the Tribunes a full REMIS-  
 SION, but as long a delay as they desired. So in Ecclesiasticus, Chap.  
 xxiii. 2. φείδεσθαι to spare, and παρέναι are put one for another: Sins  
 committed through Ignorance φείσθαι do thou spare O Lord; but the reproaches  
 of those who by profession are Sinners μὴ παρῆς do not pardon. So that all  
 that learned Men have said about the distinction of πάρεσις and remission,  
 comes to nothing.

Verf. 26. Note k. I have before interpreted the word δίκαιον, not  
 a revenger of Sin, but a lover of Righteousness, or Gospel-sanctity;  
 which agrees very well with the scope of the Apostle. For having  
 said that God accounted those Persons just, whose Sins he had re-  
 mitted, he adds with great reason, that God was nevertheless Just or  
 Holy; lest the Jews should perhaps object, that by his Doctrine the  
 Justice or Holiness of God was impeached, because he justified Men  
 that had lived in a course of Sin. But he does but touch upon this  
 here transiently, designing in the vi, vii, and viii. Chapters to speak  
 to that matter more at large: So God is said to be just, in Deut. xxxii.  
 4. and elsewhere often.

#### C H A P. IV.

Verf. 1. Note a. **T**H O as to the thing it self, our Author seems to have  
 reached the scope of this place, yet as to all the words  
 he will not satisfy an exact Grammarian. For κατὰ σάρκα  
 cannot without violence be interpreted ἐξ ἑργῶν or also by human  
 strength, both which he seems to think are meant by that Phrase.  
 Κατὰ σάρκα in the places alledged by him, signifies according to the course  
 of the Flesh or human Generation, as Christ is said Chap. i. 3. to have  
 been of the Seed of David according to the Flesh; which signification  
 cannot be pertinent here, unless these words be joined with πατὴρ Fa-  
 ther, which yet he will not allow of: See Chap. ix. 3, 5. St. Paul's  
 words therefore must be explained thus; What shall we say then? that  
 Abraham our Father hath found (χάριον grace) according to the Flesh?  
 that is, in the judgment of Man, or according to a carnal Judgment.  
 It is certain this alone can be said; for if Abraham was justified by  
 Works, he hath whereof to glory before Men, but not before God. So  
 John viii. 15. to judg according to the Flesh, signifies to judg after the  
 manner of Men. See also 2 Cor. i. 17. which very thing is expressed  
 in 1 Cor. ix. 8. by speaking κατ' ἀνθρώπων.



The use of the Phrase  $\kappa\tau\iota \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta\alpha$  in this sense, being thus known, it must be considered whether the Context requires it to be understood in this sense here. Now St. Paul shews in the foregoing Chapter, that all Men were Sinners, and therefore had nothing to alledg in their own defence; and that none could boast of their justification before God, as if they were therefore accounted just by him, because they had never sinned. This is the sum of the foregoing Chapter, whence it might be justly inferred that *Abraham* himself was not justified by Works before God; and therefore in that sense could not be said to have found or obtained Grace before God, but only in the judgment of Men, who cannot judg of things exactly, and to talk of whose judgment in this case is absurd. For which reason to the question proposed, that *Abraham our Father hath found Grace according to the Flesh?* the Apostle answers nothing, because it is confuted by the bare proposal of it, it being manifest that in this dispute he speaks of the judgment of God, and not that of Men. And therefore he goes on, *If Abraham was justified by Works, if he was accounted just for his works  $\kappa\tau\iota \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta\alpha$  in the judgment of Men, he hath whercof to glory, viz.  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\omega\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta\alpha$ , before Men; but not before God,  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\prime \acute{\epsilon}\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\omega\varsigma \tau\omicron\ \delta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ .* These last words manifestly shew the judgment of God here to be opposed to the judgment of Men, of which there should accordingly have been something said before, and yet of which nothing will have been said, unless  $\kappa\tau\iota \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta\alpha$  be interpreted  $\kappa\alpha\tau\prime \alpha\upsilon\theta\eta\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ . This our Author was in some measure sensible of, as appears by his Paraphrase on the 2d verse; but he discerned it as other Interpreters also did, just as a Man sees the Moon through the Clouds, which put him strangely upon the wrack to find out the sense of these words, and the connexion of the Discourse. This Verse does not contain any objection made by the Jews, who not only said that *Abraham* was justified  $\kappa\alpha\tau\prime \alpha\upsilon\theta\eta\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ , but also  $\kappa\tau\iota \delta\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\ \kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omega$ , as the Scripture declares. It is rather a concession of St. Paul, wherein he grants that *Abraham* might possibly in the judgment of Men, for his spotless Life before them, be accounted just; which is not the thing here spoken to, the Discourse being about the judgment of God.

Verf. 5.  $\Delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\upsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\sigma\epsilon\beta\eta\iota$ .] That is, him who accounteth one just, that was before ungodly; because he believes in *Christ*, and obeys his Precepts. The Works which are excluded from Justification, are those which precede Faith and Repentance, and are wicked Works; in the room of which succeed Faith and new Obedience, which are accepted instead of constant Righteousness and Innocence: and therefore Faith is said to be imputed for Righteousness.

Chapter V. *Verf. ii. Σφραγίδα ἡ δικαιοσύνης.*] Our learned Author's Paraphrase on this and other Verses, is so very full of his own Additions and Remarks upon what the Apostle says, that it is impossible almost to know what to attribute to *St. Paul*. He puts in so many *Parentheses*, and repeats the same thing so often, that he makes it very difficult to discern the contexture of the Apostle's Discourse: And here particularly in this Verse the word *σφραγίς* might have been explained in much fewer words, which refers only to *God*, and signifies a *sign* whereby *God* assured *Abraham* that he accepted of his Piety. So this word is used in *1 Cor. ix. 2.* where *St. Paul* bespeaks the *Corinthians* thus; *If I be not an Apostle unto others, yet I am so to you; the seal (σφραγίς) of my Apostleship are ye in the Lord: that is, by you it may be known that I am an Apostle, or you are a certain Evidence of my Apostleship.* It is a Metaphor taken from the custom of confirming things by setting a Seal to them. See Note on *Gen. xvii. 11.*

*Ibid. Δι' ἀνεγκυσίας.*] I have said on *Chap. ii. 27.* that these words signify among the *uncircumcised Gentiles*, or in the time of their *Uncircumcision*, not in *Uncircumcision*. And here it is visible, that when the Apostle had a mind to express that, he uses the Phrase *ἐν ἀνεγκυσία*, both in the Verse before and after. *Ανεγκυσία* in *Chap. ii. 26, 27.* signifies the *uncircumcised Gentiles*; and therefore *δι' ἀνεγκυσίας* may signify among the *uncircumcised Gentiles*, as *διὰ μέσσω* signifies through the middle of, and *διὰ πάντων* among all things. And it may also signify the time in which any one is *uncircumcised*, as *διὰ βίης* does in *Life*, and the like.

*Verf. 17. Note b.* *St. Chrysostom's* Interpretation is a mere Nicety, as *Beza* rightly thought, nothing being more common in Scripture than this Phrase, *before God*, *לפני אלהים*, which has no such signification, as in the place alledged by our Author out of *Gen. xvii.* In this it signifies truly, tho Men, *viz. the Jews*, falsely thought otherwise. See my Notes on *Gen. x. 9.*

## C H A P. V.

*Verf. 5. ΔΙΑ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ἁγίου.*] That which seems to be intended by these words is, a power of doing Miracles conferred on the Apostles and innumerable others by *Christ*, as the *Doctor* intimates in his Paraphrase. For hereby the Apostles and the rest of the Christians were assured that *Christ* would not disappoint those who waited for the accomplishment of his promises, having already so plentifully bestowed on them the promised gifts of his Spirit.

*Verf.*



Verf. 7. Ἀγαθῶν.] That is, as our Author well observes in his Para-Chapter phrase, ἀγαθοποιῶν *beneficent or charitable*, which is more than δικαίᾱ *just*. VI. So in a great many places God is said to be ἀγαθός, which signifies not his Goodness, that is, his *Sanctity*, but his *Bounty*, or ἀγαθοεργία towards Men: See *Psalm cxxxvi*. So *Mat. xx. 15*. *Is thine Eye evil because I am good?* ἀγαθός εἰμι, that is, *bountiful*, as the Parable shews. So in *Ælian Var. Hist. Lib. 3. 17*. Ταρεντινοῖς ἐγένετο ἀγαθὸς Ἀρχύτας, *Archytas was good to the Tarentines, i. e. a Benefactor to them*. So the *old Glosses*; ἀγαθός, *bonus, benignus, good, gracious*; and *Phavorinus* among other things says, it signifies, ὁ χωρὶς αἰτήσεως τὰ καλὰ χαρίζομενος ἀφθόνως, *one that without asking bestows good things freely*.

## C H A P. VI.

Verf. 3. **E**βαπτίσθημεν εἰς χριστόν.] The sense of this Phrase is not sufficiently expressed by our Author, nor by other Interpreters. The Particle εἰς here signifies, as it usually does, the end of Baptism; and the Apostle's meaning is no more than this, *we were baptized TO this end, that we might be Christians*. So in *1 Cor. x. 2*. the antient Jews are said to have been baptized εἰς τὸ Μωσῆν, *i. e. to that end that they might be the Disciples of Moses*: See Note on *Mat. xxviii. 19*. And so in the next words, εἰς τὸ θάνατον, signifies *to the end we might imitate his Death, viz. Christ's*.

Verf. 6. Note a. Col. 1. Lin. 34. after the words, *in the notion of* ἡμῶν] There are several things in the beginning of this Annotation I cannot assent to.

1. To confirm the sense our learned Author puts upon the word σώμα he alledges places as parallel that are not. For there is a great difference between places in which the word σώμα is joined with *Pronouns Possessive*, where the discourse is about *Men*, as *my Body*, &c. and places in which it is joined with the names of other things. There is no doubt but the Phrase *my Body*, is often all one with *I myself*, by a *Synechdoche* of the *part* for the *whole*, common in many Languages. But when other Names are added to the word *Body*, the Phrase is quite different, because they cannot be said to consist of two parts, of which one may be called the *Body*, and give a denomination to the whole thing, as to a *Man*. Nor is there any comparison between Phrases, whercof one, as the *Logicians* speak, signifies a *substance*, as when *Body* is attributed to a *Man*, and the other an *accident*, as *the body of Sin*, if that Phrase be to be understood of *Sin* it self.

Chapter II. I had rather in this place, and such others, recur to another  
 VI. very frequent Idiom of the Hebrew Language, whereby a Noun Sub-  
 stantive in the Genitive Case is put for an *Adjective*, and so by the *Body*  
 of *Sin* understand a *sinful Body*, or a *Body obnoxious to Sin*: which  
 Interpretation how agreeable it is to this place I shall afterwards shew.  
 So in *Chap. vii. 24.* σῶμα θανάτου τέτυκται is a *Body obnoxious to death*, as I  
 shall prove. And *Phil. iii. 21.* σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως and σῶμα τῆς δόξης is  
 manifestly a *vile Body* and a *glorious Body*. From whence, saith *St. Paul*,  
 (viz. from *Heaven*) we look for our *Lord Jesus Christ*, who shall change  
 our *Body of Vileness*, that it may be fashioned like unto the *Body of his*  
*Glory*.

III. By the *Body of Sin*, or *obnoxious to Sin* here, we are to under-  
 stand *reduplicative*, as the Schoolmen speak, the *Body as such*, or the  
*Body as a body of Sin*. The Apostle does not respect the *Substance* it  
 self of the *Body*, but this *quality* of it, that it is the original, in-  
 centive and instrument of *Sin*, as he tells us in the next *Chapter*. And  
 it is certain sensible things do not draw us to sinful Actions any other  
 way than by affecting our *Bodies*, and by that means impressing our  
*Minds*. And that most of the *Sins* we are guilty of, proceed from an  
 inordinate love of *sensible things*, every body will readily acknowledg.  
 After therefore the Apostle had said *our old Man was crucified*, that is,  
 we had left our old sinful Customs, he very fitly adds, that hereupon  
 that deadly and destructive Power which was in our *Bodies* to draw us  
 to *Sin* was taken away, ἵνα καταργηθῆ, saith he, τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, so that  
 the *body of Sin* is weakned or disabled, for so I interpret the Particle ἵνα  
 by the figure called *Ecbasis*, not as a *Causal*. So *Col. ii. 11.* In whom  
 also ye are circumcised with the *Circumcision made without hands*, in the put-  
 ting off the *Body of the Sins of the Flesh*; for that *Body* which before  
 served *Sin*, is as it were put off, in order to put on another *new Body*  
 which may serve *Righteousness*. The change is in the *use* of the *Body*,  
 not in the *substance* of it, that is here meant.

IV. The Hebrew word עֶצֶם *etsim* properly signifies a *Bone*, not  
 the *Body*, of which there is no Example, and comes from a Root  
 which signifies *to be strong*, because the *Bones* are the *strongest* parts of  
 the *Body*. But afterwards, I know not for what reason, it came to  
 signify *the thing it self*, which the Discourse related to. Instead of  
*Judg. 9.* our Author writes *Jos. 9.* as it is falsely quoted also in *Val.*  
*Schindler*, from whom, or some other *Lexicographer*, he took it upon  
 trust, without looking into the place, which is thus: Remember that  
 I am עֶצֶם וְעָרֶץ, your *Bone and your Flesh*, which is a Hebrew Phrase used  
 to signify *Consanguinity*. See my Notes on *Gen. ii. 23.* The Phrase in



Job ii. 5. Touch his Bone *וְעַצְמוֹ* and his Flesh, is a Periphrasis of the Body, Chapter which consists chiefly of Flesh and Bones. Nor do either of those VI. places serve the Doctor's design. I confess, among the Rabbins, the word *עוֹר* is used to signify a Substance, as it is opposed to Accidents, and that *אֲנִי* signifies my self; but it would not be properly rendred *σῶμα* Body. Of the word *σωματικῶς* in Col. ii. 9. I may have occasion to speak elsewhere, for we have nothing to do with it here.

Ibid. At the end of that Note. ] These descriptions of Regeneration illustrate indeed the thing St. Paul here speaks of, but do not shew us what is the proper meaning of the Phrase *καταργεῖν τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, which was most requisite. The word *καταργεῖν* is as seldom used by Heathen Writers, as it is frequently by St. Paul, in whom it occurs more than twenty times. The simple Verb *ἀργεῖω* signifies to be at rest, to cease, from *ἀργός* or *ἀεργός*, idle, one that has nothing to do. And hence *καταργεῖω* is to make to cease, and by consequence to render vain or useless. In the Old Glossary it is rendered by *casso* to frustrate or make void, and *καταργεῖν* by *avocat* calls off, viz. from business, to *ἀεργία* idleness, or rest. And Phavorinus has *καταργήση, νικήση, πύση, should overcome, should make to cease; καταργῶ τὸ ἀποπαύω, ἢ πωλησῶ, κατηργήθη γὰρ ὁ νόμος, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπεπαύθη, to make to cease, and finish: for κατηργήθη ὁ νόμος, is as much as ἀπεπαύθη, it was made to cease. And so here καταργεῖν σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is to make those Sins which have their rise from the Body to cease.*

Verf. 19. Note b. ] I. I believe our Author never look'd into the Passage in Demosthenes, for if he had, he would have seen that it was nothing to his purpose, and would have otherwise translated it. It is in the Greek Ed. of Morellus, Num. 72. where Demosthenes, speaking of the Stripes inflicted on him by Midias, saith, *τίς ἀνθρώπινη καὶ μετεῖα σκῆψις φανεῖται ἢ πεπευγμένων αὐτῆ;* what excuse will seem human and modest for those things which he has done? That is, in which a Man would acknowledge that he had been humanly treated; of which Phrase see H. Stephanus in his Thesaurus. The place in Horace ought to have been more exactly referred to: For who ever alledged a Testimony out of Horace, lib. 2. without adding *Carm. Sat. or Epist.?* That place is in *Epist. 2. Lib. 2. ver. 70.* where, speaking of the tediousness of the ways, which could not be travelled but with great pain, he ironically says, *Intervalla vides humanè commoda*, that is, *valde commoda*, or such as you would in all reason desire. The Doctor, who did not look into the place, renders it *parum commoda*, little profitable.

II. The latter Interpretation is favoured by Phavorinus, who saith out of a Lexicon which contained perhaps the words of Scripture, of which:

Chapter VII. which sort there are a great many in the *Italian Libraries*: Ἀνθρώπων, σύμμετρον, μικρόν. Καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος, ἀνθρώπων λέγω, διὰ τὴν ἀδένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν.

But *S. Chrysoſtom* ſeems to favour the former, who interprets it by ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων λογισμῶν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῇ συνήθειᾳ γινόμενων: from *human reasonings, from thoſe things which are commonly or uſtomarily done*. And indeed the word λέγειν ſufficiently ſhews, that τὸ ἀνθρώπων is to be underſtood αὐτῆς λέξεως of the *Apoſtles form of ſpeaking*: And becauſe words borrowed from common uſe are plain and clear, therefore the Phraſe ἀνθρώπων λαλεῖν ſignifies to ſpeak plainly, as it is uſual to ſpeak, not in a bigger or more ſwelling ſtile than ordinary, and conſequently more obſcure. A Cook in *Strato in Phœnicide* is brought in ſpeaking of another that uſed old fashioned and poetical words, thus:

Πλὴν ἱκετεύω γ' αὐτὸν ἦδη μεταβαλεῖν,  
Ἀνθρώπων λαλεῖν τε.

But I earneſtly beſeech him to change his *Dialect*, and ſpeak humanely. It is in the 9th Book of *Athenaus* cap. 7. on which ſee *Jſ. Caſaubon*. It is certain what *St. Paul* had ſaid before was not κατὰ ἀνθρώπων ἔθος, and therefore it is no wonder if, changing the form of his Diſcourſe, he ſays here ἀνθρώπων λέγω. So alſo the Latin *humanè* is oppoſed to poeticè in *Petronius* cap. 50. *Minùs quàm duabus horis mecum moraris, & ſapius poeticè quàm humanè loquutus es*; You have been with me leſs than two hours, and have talked oftner poetically than humanely.


## C H A P. VII.

Verſ. 5. **O**UR Author confounds here things that ought to be Note c. diſtinguiſhed, and diſtinguiſhes between things that are the ſame, becauſe he had a greater regard to Divinity than to Grammar.

I. *Being in the Fleſh* is a Phraſe here applied to the *Jews*, who obſerved only the letter of the Law, as *St. Paul* ſpeaks, that is, its carnal Commands, which reſpected only the Body, but had no regard to the ſpiritual deſign of them. But this could not be ſaid of all the *Jews*, among whom ſuch as were pious did doubtleſs take more care about real and inward Holineſs, than external Ceremonies. To this purpoſe is that Declaration in *Hoſea* vi. 7. concerning the excellency of *Mercy above Sacrifices*, and the like ſayings in the Prophets.

II. The Phraſe εἶναι ἐν πνεύματι, ſignifies to enjoy the ſpiritual ſenſe of the Law, not the literal or grammatical; that is, to regard the Mind



Mind or *Spirit* of the Lawgiver more than his Words, as the Christians Chapter did. See on *Chap. ii. 29.* and compare that Verse with the foregoing, VIII. which will shew what is the meaning of the word *Spirit* on one hand, and *Letter* or *Flesh* on the other; for these two last are used promiscuously. 

III. But because they that followed only the carnal sense of the Law, were not lovers of true Piety, the Phrase *to be in the Flesh*, taken in this sense, draws another Notion along with it, which is to indulge the Lusts of the Body, or *κατὰ σάρκα εἶναι*, *to be according to the Flesh*, those Phrases being indifferently used by *St. Paul*, chap. viii. 5, 8, 9.

Verf. 7. *Note e.*] But the discourse is not about a *Jew*, who could not doubt but that Coveting, which was forbidden by the Law, was a Sin, but one that knew not the Law, as those *Jews* which lived before the Law was given. Unless God had prohibited coveting, they had not believed it to be a Sin no more than most of the Heathens. To seize upon what was anothers by force, or secretly take it away, they knew to be Theft, and a thing manifestly prejudicial to human Society, and therefore evil and offensive to God; but they did not think it unlawful either to covet what was not their own, or to get what was another's by Artifices, such as are used by Merchants, who think they may lawfully do a great many things either to raise the Price of their own Goods, or to buy anothers cheap, and the like, which are undoubtedly unjust, tho very agreeable to the Custom of most Nations. But this *ἐπιθυμία*, or coveting, God forbad, and that inward affection from which such Sins proceed, as I have shewn on *Exod. xx.* See also on *Mat. v. 28.*

Verf. 15: "Ὁ θελω.] That is, *would, vellent*, as *Grotius* and others have rightly observ'd. See *1 Cor. vii. 7.* So it is used also by *Anacreon* in the beginning of his *first Ode*:

Θέλω λέγειν Ἀτρείδης,  
Θέλω δὲ καὶ δμῶν ᾄδειν.

*I would speak of the Atridae, I would sing also of Cadmus.*

CHAP. VIII.

Verf. 2: **T**H O it be very true, that he who is freed from the *Note a.* *Law of Sin*, is freed from Sin; and that the *Law of the Spirit* is not without the Spirit, so that what is said of the Law of the Spirit may be said also of the Spirit; yet neither of these Phrases can be properly and literally explained so as our Author inter-

Chapter VIII. interprets them. The *Law of Sin* is properly the *Dominion of Sin*, as appears from the 23d Verse of the foregoing Chapter, namely, because it belongs to a Ruler to impose Laws. And on the contrary, the *Law of the Spirit* is the *Dominion of the Spirit*: So that St. Paul's meaning is, that the Spirit which Christ gives, and whose Commands Christians obey, does free them from the Dominion which Sin formerly had over them; which is so manifest, that in his Paraphrase the *Doctor* has followed this Interpretation: Only having no regard to propriety of Speech in his own stile, he is as careless of it in interpreting anothers.

Verf. 4. Note c. ] *Grotius* in his Notes on Chap. ii. 26. interprets this word in a sense quite contrary to Dr. Hammond. The *Apostle*, saith he, here explains what he means by νόμος, to wit, מצוות, which is usually rendered δικαιώματα, not only by Interpreters, but also by Josephus, and properly signifies such things as are in their own nature good and just, as I have said on Luke i. 6. and in Lib. 1. c. 1. 9. de Jure B. & P. But they are both in an error; for, First, The distinction which the *Rab- bins* make between the Hebrew words מצוות mitzvoth and חוקים hukkim, has no foundation either in their Etymology or Use, as I have observ'd on Gen. xxvi. 5. Secondly, The Greek word δικαιώματα is used by Greek Interpreters to signify the Divine Laws in general; and tho they most commonly render חוקים by δικαιώματα, yet they use also that word sometimes where the Hebrew has מצוות. See Deut. xxx. 15. and 1 Kings ii. 3. Among Attick Writers, or the best Grecians, δικαιώματα signifies a Statute, Jus, or Record, Instrumentum, by which the justice of any Cause is determined; but in the Old and New Testament God's Ordinances or Institutions, of what sort soever they be, are called δικαιώματα, because it is just δικαιο, to obey them; and sometimes the observation of those Laws it self, as in Rev. xix. 8. which place our Author forces. So that it must be collected from the thing it self, and not from the word, whether the Discourse be about Moral Precepts or others.

Verf. 15. Πνεῦμα δουλείας. ] The word Spirit here manifestly signifies an affection of the Mind, as the Spirit of Jealousy in Numb. v. the affection of a jealous Mind, and so in many other Phrases of the same kind. St. Paul's meaning here therefore is, that the manner of God's Behaviour toward the Jews, had rather produced in their Minds a slavish Disposition, than a filial one. But wherein did that servile Temper consist? This we are told in the following words εἰς φόβον to fear, that is, that ye should be governed more by fear than by hope; for that is the case of Servants who stand in great fear of their Masters,



Masters, but hope for very little from them; whereas *Children* hope much from the bounty of their Parents, and fear but little. But what was the reason why the Jews *fear* of God was greater than their *hopes*? *Namely*, because the breach of his Laws, excepting Sins of Infirmity, and some of less moment, was threatned with Temporal Punishments, which were unavoidable whilst the Jewish Commonwealth stood and flourished, and God had not any where promised Mercy to Persons so offending, either in this Life or in the next, or allowed any place for Repentance: Because he had not appointed any Expiatory Sacrifices in the Law for spiritual Sins, such as Pride, or Covetousness, or the like, tho he had denounced no Temporal Punishments against them; whereby it came to pass, that tho covetous, proud, or any other such sort of Sinners had nothing to apprehend from the Magistrate, yet they were afraid of being punished by God, who had made no Promises so much as to the penitent. But under the Gospel things are quite otherwise, as I need not here at large shew.

This is what Dr. *Hammond* ought only to have expressed in his Paraphrase, which may be gathered from St. *Paul*'s words themselves, and not arbitrarily have inserted foreign things into his Discourse. Compare with this place *Gal. iv. 1, &c.* Who in reading St. *Paul* would ever have dream'd that under those things, which are signified by the *Spirit of Adoption*, were contained the mild Punishments of the Church? Where did Christ, where did his Apostles teach any such thing? More might be said which I designedly pass over.

Verf. 19. *Note f.*] If ever any thing was written by Dr. *Hammond* that was harsh and forced, (and a great many Instances of such things might be given) it is certainly what he says in this place, as I shall briefly prove.

I. He confesses that the *δοξα μέλλουσα ἀποκαλυφθῆναι*, in the 18th Verse, is either a deliverance from the Persecutions of the Jews in this Life, or the happiness of the next; of which *last* it is only to be understood, the Discourse being about that Inheritance whereof we are joint Heirs with *Christ*, which respects only the other World. But the Apostle goes on: *For the Creature lifting up* (as it were) *its head* (*ἢ ἀπκαεσδοκία τῆς κτίσεως*) *waits for the Revelation* (*ἀποκάλυψιν*) *of the Sons of God*; which manifestly shews that he still speaks of *the Glory which is to be revealed*, and which makes nothing to the distinction that was to be put between the incredulous Jews, and those among them who believed and obey'd the Gospel. If our Author had not been

Chapter VIII. used to a most intricate Stile, he would soon have perceived that he offered Violence to the Series of the Discourse.

II. The word ἀποκατάσχεσις cannot be applied to such an *expectation* as he describes, for we are properly said ἀποκατάσχεσιν, when upon previous notice given of it, we understand there is some great happiness to be looked for, and which we impatiently expect, tho perhaps we do not know perfectly what it is. But the *Gentiles* knew *nothing* at all of their vocation to the true Religion upon the Gospel's being rejected by the *Jews*. Who will believe that St. Paul, in order to express the Affection of the *Gentiles*, plunged in the greatest ignorance and wickedness, and who accordingly could not be said otherwise than ἐξαρτυνόμενος, to be in expectation of the Gospel, would make use of a word that has a singular *emphasis* in it? It had been hardly tolerable if he had mollified it as much as possible, by adding ὡς ἐπεὶ ἐπιπέσειν, or some such other form. The phrases *to seek death*, and *to love death*, which signify to do those things which such as *sought* or *loved death* would do, are not here to the purpose. For the Heathens did not do what those ought to have done who were in a longing expectation of the Gospel. The words of *Jacob* in *Gen.* xlix. are otherwise to be understood, as in my Notes on that passage I have shewn. Nor is there any necessity of interpreting the words of *Haggai* of the *Gentiles*, to whom Christ should be as yet unknown; but they may be very well understood of those which, after they had already embraced the Gospel, should make Christ their *desire*, that is, should long to enjoy his promised Benefits, and see him returning from Heaven to judg the World. This is that which is the object of our ἀποκατάσχεσις, or *earnest expectation*.

III. It is very true that ἡ κτίσις in the Language of the *Rabbins*, signifies *men*. Our Author might also have added, that in the same dialect the word בריות signifies *Heathens*, in opposition to *Jews*, as his Countryman Dr. *Lightfoot* on *Mark* xvi. 15. has observed. The meaning of St. Paul therefore is, that the *Heathens* who were converted to the Christian Faith, did earnestly expect the time when *the Sons of God* were to be revealed, that is, as the foregoing and following context shews, were to be made partakers of eternal Glory and Happiness by Christ after the universal Judgment. He distinguishes afterwards himself and the believing *Jews* from the *Heathens*, when he says that *not only they, or the Creature, did expect* that time, *but we also that have the first fruits of the Spirit*, i. e. we *Jews* who have first received the Holy Spirit from God. The *Gentiles* at this time were no longer in expectation.



tion of what the *Jews* were about to do; for the Gospel upon their rejection of it, and continuing incredulous, had been preached a good while ago to the *Gentiles*, as is plain from the History of the Apostles, and that account of times which our *Author* himself gives us in his *Premonition* to this *Epistle*. Chapter VIII.

4. Besides, I cannot imagin whence our *Author* inferred, that the happiness of the *Gentiles* did depend upon the *obduracy* of the *Jews*; as if upon supposition that the whole *Jewish* Nation, or the greatest part of it, had believed in *Christ*, the *Gentiles* were never to have had the Christian Faith preached to them! We are told indeed, both by *Christ* and his Apostles, that the Gospel was to be preached first to the *Jews*, pursuant to God's decree, but no where to them *alone*. There was no difference to be made in this matter between the *Jews* and the rest of the World, but only in the *time* of preaching the Gospel. If the whole *Jewish* Nation had received *Christ*, they had understood that the *Gentiles* were to be called to the same Faith, and that they must abandon their Rites and Ceremonies; and so all the *Jews* had become the Disciples of *Christ*. I confess the obstinacy of the *Jews* was the occasion of the Apostles going to the *Gentiles*; but what the *Jews* obstinacy was the occasion of, Religion and Charity would have obliged the Apostles to, if the *Jews* had all or most of them believed in *Christ*. This we may conclude from the story of *Cornelius* in *Acts* x. to whom *St. Peter* was directly sent before the Apostles had departed from the *Jews*. And this *Christ* expressly commanded in *Mark* xvi. 15. and *Acts* i. 8. So that it hence also appears that our *Author* puts a wrong interpretation on this discourse of *St. Paul*.

*Ibid.* Note g. The *Revelation of the Sons of God* is manifestly the same with the *Adoption* spoken of in *vers.* 23. and that being nothing else but an admission into the Kingdom of Heaven in the view of all the World, the *Revelation of the Sons of God* must be that same Action of God whereby he will make known to all, who those are that he acknowledges for his Sons. The series of the discourse puts this out of all doubt: *The CREATURE earnestly waits for the REVELATION OF THE SONS OF GOD, in hope because the Creature it self also shall be delivered from the bondage of Corruption, into the glorious liberty of the Sons of God: for we know that every Creature groaneth, and travelleth in pain until now; and NOT only they [expect, to wit, the Revelation of the Sons of God, and groan because of their present condition] BUT we our selves also who have the first Fruits of the Spirit, groan likewise our selves within our selves, waiting for the ADOPTION of Sons, viz. the Redemption of our Body.* The *Doctor*

Chapter hinder'd his discerning this, by mixing a great many foreign things  
 VIII. with St. *Paul's* discourse, of which there is not the least mark or foot-  
 step in the *Apostle*, perhaps to have the reputation of saying some-  
 thing new.


By the *Revelation* or *Adoption of the Sons of God*, is signified an act of Christ, acknowledging those that are his, at the day of Judgment, in some such words as those, *Come ye blessed*, &c. because it does not now appear who are the Sons of God by any particular and visible evidences of the divine Favour towards them above the rest of Mankind, and so others deny them to be by a special privilege the *Sons of God*; but when *Christ* comes to separate the Godly from the Wicked, this will be plain and manifest. See *John* 1 Ep. iii. 1, 2.

Verf. 20. Note i. ] Our Author covers one Mistake with another, to keep them, as one said, from leaking. This I most of all wonder at, that he should produce the Example of a most superstitious Heathen, and most malicious and implacable Enemy to the Christian Religion, viz. *Porphyry*, as a Philosopher who groaned under the burden of Idolatry. Whoever reads his Writings and his Life, writ by the learned *Luc. Holstenius*, and understands but the nature of that new Platonick Philosophy, will soon perceive that no Men were ever more devoted to Idolatry, than *Porphyry*, and the rest of the Philosophers of that Age. Our Author ought rather to have produced the Examples of *Socrates*, *Plato*, and others, who in some measure disapproved Idolatry, than of such as were its greatest Champions, and with all their might defended it against Christianity.

But there was no need of recurring to that, for the word *μεταίωσις* does not signify *Idolatry*, nor is the Discourse here about *Idolaters*. For tho I should grant our Author that Idolatry is called *μεταίωσις*, and *Idolaters* *μεταίωτοι*, it does not follow, that wherever that word is used it must be so interpreted, or that it respects the Worship of Idols rather than any other *Vanities* of the Heathens. It may be better understood here of that *Emptiness* or *Vanity* which is in all the things of this Life. For the Heathens who had embraced the Gospel did earnestly expect that time wherein they knew they should be delivered from the *Vanity* of this World; to wit, when Christ should openly acknowledg and declare them to be the Sons of God, as I before said. Those who have entertained the Christian Religion, and seriously considered it, do best of all know that those things which relate only to this Life are *μεταίωσις μεταίωσιτων*, perfect *Vanity*; such only understand the truth of that saying of the Preacher, *Vanity of Vanities, all things are Vanity*, and of the Poet, *Hec quantum est in rebus inane!*

And



And accordingly the Heathens who had been converted to Christiani- Chapter  
ty, did *groan* and as it were *travel* in pain, till they were set free from VIII.  
those vain Occupations, which partly necessity, and partly the igno-  
rance and weakness of human Understanding, has imposed on us. 

That is the proper signification of the word *ματαιότης*, viz. a *vain* desire or *labour*, for it signifies what is done *υάτω* in *vain*, as *υάτω* signifies *frustraneous*, *insignificant*, and in the *old Glosses* is rendered by *inanis*, *cassus*, *vanus*, *super-vacuus*, and *ματαιότης* *frustratio*, *vanitas*. Such are most of the Employments of this Life, designed either to procure what we judg profitable, or to redress those Evils which trouble and torment us, in which we often find our selves disappointed; so that we grow weary of our present Condition, and are made to wish for that time wherein being delivered from all these vain distractions we shall enjoy the happiness of the Sons of God.

Ibid. Note h. Having already overthrown what Dr. Hammond says in the foregoing Annotations, what he has here about the word *υπατάξας* must needs fall to the ground. The *υπατάξας* is *God* who has made Men for their Sins subject *υαυόμα* to *vanity*, that is, as I said before, the vain employments of Life; which the Wise Man in *Eccles. i. 13.* and *iii. 10.* calls *הבלים* *habalim*, and the *Septuagint* elegantly render *ματαιότης*. *This sore Travel*, saith he, (*this vain Labour*, *ματαιόπου*, as it may be rendered in Greek) *hath GOD given to the Sons of Men, to be exercised therewith.* And to so many vain labours with which humane Life is encumbred, we are *unwillingly* subject, and should not patiently undergo them but *for God*, who has subjected us to them, and in whose most wise and just Providence it is fit we should acquiesce. But in the mean while nothing hinders but we may desire to be delivered from these vexations, which will then only be, when *the Sons of God shall be revealed*, who now together with the wicked are subject to the same Troubles and Labours, and will not be set at Liberty till Christ's return. In comparison of this Interpretation, to omit the rest, Dr. Hammond's is violent; and all he says besides is nothing to the purpose.

Verf. 21. Note k. *φθγγ* in this place; signifies nothing but that corruption to which our Body is naturally liable, and which in this Life we are unwillingly in Bondage to: So it is used in *1 Cor. xv. 42, 50.* It is not the same with *ματαιότης* *vanity*, that being but a consequent of it; for the corruptibleness of our Bodies is the reason of our being exercised with so many vain Labours.

Verf. 23. Note l. *νικήσια*, as I before said, is that solemn acknowledgment of the Sons of God which will be made at the day of Judgment,

Chapter VIII. ment, presently after the ἀπολύτρωσις σώματος, that is, the Resurrection of the Dead. Now we are rather *ordained* or *appointed* ὀριζόμενοι to be *the Sons of God*, than actually enjoy that Dignity; as *Jesus* was ὀριζόμενος *determined the Son of God* after his Resurrection, as *St. Paul* speaks in *Chap. i. 2.* No one besides *Dr. Hammond* would say ἀπολυτρωθῆναι σῶμα ἀνθρώπων, when it is delivered from Persecutions.

*Ibid. Note m. Lin. 9.* After the words, *in a different sense.*] Our Author forgot himself when he wrote this, for we do not find this word ἀπολύτρωσις used in the 22d *verse*, nor any where else in this *Chapter*, or in this *Epistle*, but in *Chap. iii. 24.*

*Ibid. At the end of that Note.*] It is much more agreeable to *St. Paul's* style and the series of his Discourse in this place, to understand the word ἀπολύτρωσις of the resurrection of the Body; after which we shall enter upon that Happiness which is opposed to the ματαιότης or *vanity* of this Life.

*Verf. 26. Note n.* There was no need of proving that ἀδένειαι in the New Testament often signifies *Diseases*, that being very well known, and to be learned by any *Concordance*. The rest our Author had from *Grotius*, and nothing is his own but his translating the Greek word πόνος by *labour*, which in this place ought to have been rendred *grief*; for the Hebrew never signifies *labour*, and the Greek is very often used in the *other* sense.

*Verf. 28. Note o. Col. 1. Lin. 36.* After the mention of *1 Kings i. 41, 49. 2 Sam. 14. 11.*] Our learned Author is mistaken in his interpretation of these two places, as I have shewn on *Mat. xx. 16. Numb. ii.*

*Ibid. At the end of that Note.*] Πρόθεσις here seems to be taken for that purpose or course of Life which those who embraced the Gospel lived in before they came to the knowledg of it; and so *St. Paul's* meaning will be, that all things turn to the advantage of those to whom the Gospel-call was, καὶ πρόθεσιν, *agreeable* to their former purpose, *i. e.* disposition of Mind, and manner of Life. And indeed those Persons prove the most constant, who receive the Gospel in an *honest Heart*, as *Christ* tells us in the Parable of the Sower, *Luke viii. 15.* because they throughly discern the beauty and excellency of it above all other Doctrins, and suffer it to sink deep into their Minds.

They are distinguished in the New Testament by several commendable Characters, which *Dr. Hammond* has excellently treated of in his Annotations on *John vi. 37.* and *Acts xiii. 48.* and elsewhere. Such a one was *Cornelius the Centurion*, whose manner of Life was such that he needed not to change his πρόθεσις or *purpose*, to believe the Gospel.

Such



Such also were the *Beræans*, whom that *εὐγένεια*, or *excellent and generous* Chapter VIII. *Disposition*, which God had before planted in their Minds, had prepared VIII. for a ready submission to the Gospel, and all others among the Jews who with a pious Mind waited for the Kingdom of God, or among the Gentiles like them. These all persisted in their former *purpose* of living piously, and did not alter it when they embraced the Gospel.

The Verb *προσθέβαι* signifying to *resolve* or *decree beforehand*, *προθέσις* must also be a *previous Purpose*, or *Resolution formerly taken up*: And that Purpose may be either concerning any thing in particular, or about the whole course of a Man's Life: so that what comes to pass *κατὰ προθέσιν*, or *ἄρὰ προθέσιν*, may be understood of what is either contrary or agreeable to a particular purpose, or the whole scope and aim of a Man's Actions. So *προαίρεσις* signifies both a single purpose, and *προαίρεσιν βίη* the general course a Man resolves to live in. So *Propositum* in Latin is used in both those senses: And these words we may the more confidently compare with that here in *St. Paul*, because the Greek *Grammarians* use the former by which to interpret *προθέσις*, and the latter is manifestly an imitation of the Greek.

Hence when the discourse is about any particular thing, *κατὰ προθέσιν* signifies *on set purpose*, and *ἄρὰ προθέσιν* that which comes to pass *against our Will or Intention*. Thus in *Suidas* *προθέσις* is rendred by *προαίρεσις* *will* or *design*, of which he gives this Example: *ἀλλ' ἔσθ' ἀδίκησέ τινα κατὰ προθέσιν*, but he did not injure any one wilfully, or on set purpose. So the Author of the *Quest.* and *Answ.* to the *Orthodox Quest.* 19. speaking of the palpitation of the Heart, which takes Men sometimes on a sudden, demands *εἰ μὲν φαῦλον τῆτο, πῶς ἄρὰ τιῶ ἡμετέρῳ ἐπιγίνεται προθέσιν*; if this be an evil, how comes it to happen against our Will? The same Phrase he uses in his Answer. That *Propositum* among the Latins signifies a certain way of Life, *Rob. Stephanus* in his *Thesaurus* has shewn by several Examples, as his Son *Henricus* will furnish us with others of the word *προθέσις* for *design* or *purpose*.

So that whereas *Beza* supplies here *ipsius, his*, and renders the words *ex præstituto ipsius*, according to [his] purpose, referring the word *purpose* to God; if any thing be supplied, I think it should rather be *suum, their*. And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to their purpose. For that it is rather the purpose of Men than of God that is here intended, appears by the *Active Participle ἀγαπῶσι*, because if *St. Paul* had spoken only of God, he would have said *ἠγαπημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, to them that are beloved of God.

Chapter IX. *Verf. 30.* Οὓς δὲ ἀγαθήσιν, τέτοις καὶ ἐκάλεισε, &c.] The discourse here being about a thing, which at the time that *St. Paul* wrote was as well both *present* and *future* as *past*, I would not have all these *Aorists* render'd by the *Preterperfect tense*, because it is certain the *Aorist* among the *Greeks*, as the *Future* among the *Hebrews*, often signifies a *Custom*: See my *Notes* on *Gen. x. 9.* So that I think these words should be translated thus: *Whom he hath predestinated, them he also calleth* (*i. e.* useth to call) and whom he hath called, them he also justifieth; and whom he hath justified, them he also glorifieth. That this is the *Apostle's* sense all *Interpreters* acknowledg, only they did not observe that the *Aorists* denote a *Custom*.

*Verf. 34.* Κατακείνων.] That is, who shall implead or prove them to be guilty? For so the *Lawyers* speak, amongst whom this is an *Axiom*: *Peregisse reum non aliàs quis videtur, nisi & condemnaverit, A Person does not seem to be proved guilty, unless he be also condemned.* *St. Paul* speaks of an accusation before *God*, against *Christians*, which he affirms would be ineffectual to procure their condemnation, because they had *Jesus* for their *Advocate* with the *Father*, if they lived according to the *Laws* of the *Gospel*.

#### C H A P. IX.

*Verf. 1.* **I**T is a perfect force our Author puts upon that expression *Note a.* in *Acts v. to lie to the Holy Ghost*, of which see what I have said on that place, as also of the *Vow* that *Ananias* is groundlessly supposed by learned men to have made.

*Verf. 4.* *Note c.* *Col. 2. Lin. 38.* After the mention of *Heb. ix. 5.*] By the glory of *God* in *Acts vii. 55.* I rather understand some dazzling glorious *Light*, than *Angels*. See my *Note* on *Mark xvi. 19.*

*Ibid.* In that *Note, Lin. 41.* After the words, *most High.*] There is no such expression as this in *Job i. 5.* and I cannot tell whence our Author took it, unless it were from some *Greek Interpreter* on that place.

*Verf. 5.* *Note d.*] It were to be wished our learned Author had examined here the *Animadversion* of *Grotius* on this place, rather than copied out *Jewish Fables* that make little to the purpose; especially seeing *Erasmus* had long ago written enough to overthrow all that can be inferred from them. For if what *Grotius*, and before him *Erasmus*, have observed stand good, *Dr. Hammond's* reasoning cannot be thought of any force. Let those that are inquisitive into these matters compare both places.

*Verf.*



Verf. 9. *Note e.*] By the place in 2 *King.* iv. 16. it appears that the *Doctor* was in the wrong, to think that the Passage in *Genesis* was corrupted, on which see my Notes. Chapter IX. 18. 10.

Verf. 11. *Note g.*] There is no *election* or *chusing* without *preferring*, and therefore there was no need of observing that the Hebrew word is rendred to *prefer* as well as to *chuse*.

Verf. 12. Ὁ μείζων δαλεύσει τὸ ἐλάσσον.] It being certain that these words are alledged by *St Paul* in the same sense that they are used in *Gen.* xxv. 23. they must here be understood not of the Persons of *Esau* and *Jacob* themselves, but of their Posterity: for these are the words of the Oracle; *Two Nations are in thy Womb, and two manner of People shall be separated from thy Bowels, and the one shall be stronger than the other, and the greater shall serve the less.* Of which prediction see my Notes on that place in *Genesis*. Therefore in this Passage of *St. Paul*, the Phrase *μείζων δαλεύσει ἐλάσσονι*, ought not to have been rendred in the English Translation, *the elder shall serve the younger*, but *the greater shall serve the less*. And so the Apostles scope also requires, who manifestly speaks of the Election, not of *particular Persons*, but of whole *Nations*.

Verf. 13. Τὴν Ἰακώβ ἠγάπησα.] It is manifest from the *Prophet*, that this has a reference to the Nations that descended from *Jacob* and *Esau*, and not to them themselves. So that I wonder our Author in his Paraphrase, on occasion of these words, should observe that that Prophecy, *the greater shall serve the less*, was fulfilled personally in them, especially seeing the contrary appears from the History of *Moses*, as in my Notes on the forementioned Chapter of *Genesis* I have observed.

Verf. 15. Ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ δικταιρήσω ὃν ἂν δικταίρω.] This place I have interpreted on *Exod.* xxxiii. 19. and shewed the meaning of God to be, that “because he had began to shew Favor and Mercy to the “*Israelites*, he would continue to do so: and this is all that is here intended by these words. The Apostle having said that the Posterity of *Jacob* were preferred by God before the *Idumæans*, because it so seemed good to him, and not because *Esau's* Posterity were worse than that of *Jacob*, proposes to himself an objection, *Is there unrighteousness with God?* Which he denies with detestation, saying, *God forbid*; for, saith he, *he said to Moses, I will have Mercy on whom I have Mercy, and I will have Compassion on whom I have Compassion*: that is, as God began to shew kindness to *Jacob* himself, so he continued his kindness to his Posterity, without the least injustice; because he did not deny any benefit to the *Idumæans* which they had deserved, but

Chapter IX. only went on to do good to the *Israelites* tho unworthy. For it is no injustice to be *merciful* to those that do not deserve it, tho it would be so to *punish* those that do not deserve it. Mercy may be justly shewn, when punishment cannot be justly inflicted.

As this Interpretation is favoured by the place referred to in *Moses*, as I have shewn in my *Comment* on *Exodus*, so it agrees also with the Greek words as they are here accented, for we read them ἐλεῶ & ἐλεῶμαι in the *present tense Indicative*, which is not so favourable to the *vulgar* Translation, according to which we ought rather to read in the *Subjunctive* ἐλεῶμαι, as it is generally accented in the Greek Copies of the *Septuagint*, so that it might be rendred as it is by *Beza*; *Miserebor* *cujus* *misertus* *fuero*, & *commiserabor* *cujus* *commiseratus* *fuero*; *I will have Mercy on whom I shall have Mercy*, and *I will have Compassion on whom I shall have Compassion*. But this is contrary to the Hebrew words which are thus: חַנּוּתִי אֲרַח אֲשֶׁר אֲרַחֶנּוּ I have favoured him whom I will favour, I have had Mercy on whom I will have Mercy; where one of the Verbs is in the *future* tense, and the other in the *preterperfect*; which preterperfect is rendred here in the *Present*, because it is the same thing, for God did still then shew Mercy to the *Israelites*, and had never ceased to shew Mercy to them, when he so spake. Which being so, I wonder that *Beza* should find fault with the *Vulgar*, and *Erasmus* for making use here of the *present* Tense, and rendering it *cui misereor*, or *cujuscunque misereor*, *To whom I shew Mercy*, or *to whomsoever I shew Mercy*, and give this reason for it, that in the *Hebrew* the *Verb* is in both places in the *future*, which the Reader has just now seen to be false. He adds that the *Particle* ἐν shows it must be interpreted by the *future as past*; and I cannot deny but that *Particle* uses to be joined to a *Subjunctive*, but it being joined to a *Preterperfect* tense *Indicative*, it may be also joined to the *Present*, especially where the purity of the Greek Language is not observed, as it is not in *St. Paul*. It must be observed further, that the words of *Moses* are inverted; for whereas in him it is, *I have favoured him whom I will favour*, &c. the *Septuagint* understood it as if it had been said, *I will favour him whom I do favour*, &c. because tho those Phrases signify the same thing, yet the order of the words in the latter fits better with the Greek Language.

Verf. 16. Οὐ τὸ δέλοντ', ἢ τὸ τρέχοντ'.] This seems to be a proverbial form of Speech, commonly used to signify that all human endeavours are insignificant unless God countenance them. I suppose it was taken from the *Grecian Games*, to which *St. Paul* often alludes. In like manner an unknown Poet, in *Grotius's excerpta*, says that,



ἄνθρωπος ἀβουλοῦ εἰς κενὸν κόπιται τρέχων.

*A Man void of Counsel, labours and runs in vain.*

The meaning is, that from the meer arbitrary pleasure of God proceeded that favour he continued to shew to *Jacob's* Posterity, rather than to *Esaus*; not from any thing that the *Israelites* had done to deserve the divine Favor more than the *Idumceans*. From which Doctrin it followed that *God* might without any injustice, call the *Heathens* to the knowledg of the Gospel, and reject the carnal *Jews*, tho otherwise the *Heathens* had done no more to merit this token of *God's* favour than the *Jews*. Having thus far endeavoured to clear the Apostle's sense in this place, I shall subjoin a Paraphrase of seven Verses, from the tenth to the sixteenth, to shew how aptly what I have said agrees with *St. Paul's* scope, and the series of his Discourse.

“ Vers. 10. And not only the Example of *Isaac* and *Ishmael* teaches  
 “ us, that it is not sufficient for any Nation to have descended from  
 “ the *Patriarchs*, to claim to themselves a right in the Divine Pro-  
 “ mises, or entitle them *God's* People. This appears likewise by the  
 “ instance of *Esau* and *Jacob*, which *Rebecca* bare to one *Isaac*. 11. For  
 “ before ever they were born, and consequently had done good or  
 “ evil, by which to procure the favour of *God*, or make him their  
 “ Enemy; that the purpose of *God* concerning chusing a certain Peo-  
 “ ple to himself, might appear to proceed from his own arbitrary  
 “ pleasure, and not to have been excited by any Virtue or Merits of  
 “ that People; 12. *God* answered *Rebecca* when she consulted him a-  
 “ bout her Children striving in her Womb: That she carried in her  
 “ Bowels the Fathers of two great People; of which People that  
 “ which did first become the most numerous, and acquired the greatest  
 “ Riches and Power should afterwards serve the other, tho in the be-  
 “ ginning not so powerful. 13. To which purpose also is that saying  
 “ of *God* in *Malachi*, that he had preferred *Jacob* and his Posterity,  
 “ to *Esau* and his Progeny, and upon the former conferred much  
 “ greater Benefits. 14. Perhaps some may object that *God*, accord-  
 “ ing to this Doctrin, seems to be unjust, who, as I affirm, so much  
 “ prefers one People before another, that are no better than they.  
 “ But that does not in the least follow from this Doctrin. 15. For  
 “ *Moses*, whom none will affirm to charge *God* with any injustice, tells  
 “ us, that when he had prayed *God* to continue to go before the Camp  
 “ of the *Israelites*, tho they had deserved his anger, and prevailed,  
 “ he received this answer from him, that the *Israelites*, tho they had  
 “ heinously

Chapter IX. “ heinously offended him, since he had begun to shew them favour,  
 “ should find him also for the future gracious to them, and still be ac-  
 counted by him his People. 16. So that the Mercy of God in cal-  
 ling any Nation to the knowledg of himself, and making them his  
 peculiar People, does not use to depend on the Merits of that Na-  
 tion, but on his own free Will and arbitrary Purpose.

This is, if I am not mistaken, the Series of the Apostle’s discourse; which being so explained, directly answers his design in this place, and admirably agrees with the sense of the places he refers to in *Moses*, as it is in *Moses* himself. About the 12th Verse we must consult *Grotius*.

Verf. 17. λέγει γὰρ ἢ γεγραπὸν.] The Particle γὰρ here seems to refer to the sense latent in the foregoing words, in which tho *St. Paul* speaks only περὶ τῆς ἐκλογῆς concerning the election, yet by this very thing, that he declares God to chuse a Nation whom he may shew a peculiar kindness to, he intimates that he leaves other non-elect Nations in their Sins. For as I before suggested, there can be no election where something is not cast off, because that which is not chosen must necessarily be rejected. And to this the Apostle’s words in this and the Verses following refer, wherein he discourses separately concerning rejection, as in the foregoing he had mostly treated about election. So that I should paraphrase this 17th Verse thus: “ *Moses* also teaches us that, as to  
 “ the rejection or præterition of sinful Nations, whereby it comes to  
 “ pass that the People so abandoned fall into the greatest evils and  
 “ calamities, that may without blasphemy be imputed to God, be-  
 “ cause he says he was commanded to speak to *Pharaoh* in God’s name  
 “ to this sense, that he, if he so pleased, could easily destroy both  
 “ the King himself and the whole *Egyptian* Nation, and so make his  
 “ People a free passage, which they had so often refused them, out of  
 “ their Country; but he would suffer *Pharaoh* still to live, that he  
 “ might give further demonstrations of his Power, and make his  
 “ Name great and famous throughout the World. See what I have  
 written on *Moses*’s words, in *Exod.* ix. 15, 16. for what our *Author*  
 says in the following Annotation, does not agree with them.

Ibid. Note h. Tho the Hebrew word be in the *Preterperfect* tense, yet I have rendred it in its proper place, as if it were the *Future*, because of the Verse foregoing, which seems to require its being so rendered: See my Notes on that place, by which this must be understood.

Verf. 18. Note i. By God’s *hardening the Heart* of *Pharaoh*, I think is neither intended any action of God upon *Pharaoh*’s Mind, nor so  
 much



much as any *withdrawing of his Grace* from him, seeing there is neither Chapter any mention made of such withdrawing in *Moses*, nor is it necessary IX. to suppose it. Nor do I think that *Moses* purposely abstained from using the Phrase, *the Lord hardened his Heart*, till the *sixth* Plague that he inflicted upon that *Egyptian King* was past, as if then, and not before, he particularly forsook him. For before ever *Moses* went to *Pharaoh*, God foretold that he would *harden* him, *Exod. iv. 21.* which refers to all his obstinacy from first to last. See therefore my Notes on that place.

Verf. 28. Note k. What our Author says in this Annotation he took from *Grotius*, with whom nevertheless I cannot agree in correcting this place out of one *Alexandrian Copy*, contrary to the Authority of all the rest, and the Antient Interpreters. It is harsh I confess for τὸ ὄπ to be put after ἔσ, and the construction is intricate; but neither is it much clearer in the *Septuagint*. Besides, in alledging Testimonies of Scripture, there is but little regard had to the series of the Discourse, provided the Writers words are but to the purpose, and rightly quoted. The words in the Hebrew are thus, *vers. 21.* כְּלִיּוֹן חֲרוּץ שֹׁטֵף צִדְקָה which the *Septuagint* render, λόγον συντελεῶν καὶ συντέμνων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, *finishing and making up his account in Righteousness*; whence it is probable they read חֲרוּץ *hborets*, the Participle *Benoni* for *Pahul*. Then follows in *v. 22.* כִּי כִלְרָה וְנַחֲרִצָה אֶרֶץ יְהוָה, צְבֹאוֹת עֲשֵׂה. בְּקֶרֶב כָּל הָאָרֶץ which they render, ὅτι λόγον συντετιμημένον κύριος ποιήσει ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη, *because an account cast up will the Lord make in all the Earth*, by which it appears that they thought כְּלִיּוֹן *chiljon* & כִּלְרָה *chalab*, to signify *an account*; and if that be true, we may render the words something more commodiously, tho to the same sense, thus: *he will hasten an account exactly cast up in Righteousness; for an account, and that exactly cast up, will the Lord God of Hosts make in the whole Earth.* The words חֲרוּץ & נַחֲרִצָה signify *diligently and particularly cast up*; and this very thing in part συντέμνειν also seems to signify, so as to be the same with συναίρειν to cast up, or draw together several sums into one. And the Verb שֹׁטֵף, according to the use of the *Chaldee*, I render by *to hasten*. In French the words might be translated thus: *il dépêchera de faire exactement son compte avec justice, car le Seigneur créateur, Dieu des armées, fera un compte & un compte exact, dans tout le pais; He will hasten to make exactly his account with Justice, for the Lord God of Hosts will make an account and an exact account in all the Land.* The Prophet's meaning is, that as one who carefully casts up an account of his expences and receipts, sees if there remains any thing over, and tho it be but a small sum lays it safe up; so God will destroy all the wicked, and save only

Chapter X. the good, tho they be but very few : which admirably well futes with the design of the Apostle. I shall add nothing more in this place, because I intend hereafter, if God permit, to handle this matter more largely in a *Commentary* on the Prophet *Isaiab*.

Verf. 33. *Note m.* As there are two Passages here in the Prophet *Isaiab*, at a considerable distance from one another, put together by the Apostle, so there are two Figures also conjoined. *First*, Christ is considered as a *stone of Offence*, at which whether it be in walking or running, if any one do itumble, he is in danger of falling ; and this refers to the Metaphors the Apostle had before taken from the Grecian *Games*, and particularly that of *Running*, which made him think of a *stone of Offence*, than which, in a swift motion, nothing can be more dangerous. Afterwards in the next words, *every one that believeth on him shall not be confounded*, Christ is represented not as a stone of Offence, but as a *corner stone*, which he that builds any Wall upon, must trust to the firmness of ; and if he be deceived in his confidence, after he has finished his Structure, his building falls, and that fills him with shame.

This *latter* Similitude is in *Ist. xxviii. 16.* where God speaks thus ; *I lay in Sion for a foundation, a Stone, an elect Stone* (if we read בְּחֹרֶה *bebbourah* elect, for בֵּיתן *bobban* a Tower) *a corner Stone and precious, a most firm foundation. He that believeth shall not make hast, יִהְיֶה* ; that is, shall never be judged to have made too much hast in choosing it, nor ever be ashamed of his choice. And the *former* is in *Chap. viii. 14.* *He shall be for a stone of Stumbling and for a rock of Offence to the two Houses of Israel* ; where the Metaphor is quite different, and it is no longer a corner Stone that is spoken of, but a stone on which a Persons foot or the wheel of a Chariot happens to strike, as the following Verse more clearly shews.

#### C H A P. X.

Verf. 5. *Note b.* **T**HE meaning of *St. Paul* in this place seems to be only this, that the Law promised nothing, but to those that observed it so as *Moses* taught it was to be observed ; that is, unless either all its Precepts were obeyed, or the Sacrifices appointed by the Law were offered up for the expiation of some sort of Sins against it. Otherwise it promised no Mercy from God to those who had committed such a Sin as the Law threatned with death, or allowed no Sacrifice for. But on the contrary, the Gospel assures us that God will pardon such sins as those, if the Sinner



ner does but firmly believe they shall be remitted to him, and abstain Chapter  
from them for the future. This is all we are here to consider; for XI.  
what our *Author* says in his Paraphrase, that it was impossible the Law  
should be observed, *that* is so far from being the assertion of *Moses*,  
that he every where supposes the contrary, as appears even by the  
very next words. See my Notes on *Deut.* xix. 9.

## C H A P. XI.

Verf. 8. **O**UR *Author* truly observes, that according to the use  
*Note b.* of the *Atticks*, or those that spake the *purest* Greek,  
*κατάουξις* signifies *compunction*; but he might have ad-  
ded that the Greek Interpreters, whether through ignorance, or ac-  
cording to the use of the *Alexandrians*, confounded the Verbs *ρύω* &  
*ρυσαζω*, the first of which signifies to *prick*, to *pierce*, and the latter to  
*nod* or *slumber*; which made them think that *κατάουξις* signified *nodding*,  
tho it comes from the Verb *καταρύω*. It will be worth our while to  
read *Lud. Cappellus* about this matter, in his *Critical Notes* on *Psalms*  
iv. 4.

Verf. 12. *Note d.* I have often observed our *Author* to write so as  
not to make what he says at last to agree with what he had said at  
first; because, I suppose, after he had written half an Annotation he  
changed his Mind, and yet was loth to blot out what he had already  
written. And this we have an instance of in this place; for after  
he had proved that the word *πλήρωμα* signifies a *multitude*, he alters his  
opinion, and gives it another signification. But his second thoughts  
here were not the best, as I shall briefly shew. For

1. That this word does sometimes signify a *multitude*, appears also  
by *Hesychius*, who interprets it among other things, by *πλήθος*.

2. The Hebrew *אָלַם* is not used for *collecting*, but for *that which fills*  
*up*, as the Lexicons will shew. Neither was a *multitude* so called  
*ἀπὸ τῆς πληρώματῃ* from a piece of Cloth put into a torn Garment to make  
it whole again, but because it makes a *πλήρην ἐκκλησίαν* or *full* and com-  
plete *Assembly*, or *ὅτι πληρῆι πέρας εἰς ἧς συναθροίζεται*, because it fills the pla-  
ces into which it is gathered together. Perhaps also there may be a respect  
here had to the original of the word *πλήρης*, which is thus set down in  
the *Etymologicon*: Παρὰ τὸ πολὺ πολυήρης, καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν πλήρης ἢ ἐστὶ πλεῖθ  
πληήρης, καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν πλήρης.

3. The *Jews* who were to come in late to *Christ*, are no more called  
*πλήρωμα* because of their filling up what remained empty in the Church,  
than the *Heathens*, who are called by the same name, and made up  
the greatest part of the Church.

Chapter XII. 4. I wish our learned Author had alledged the Passage he speaks of in *Seder Olam*, in Hebrew, or referred to the *Page*; for I have not leisure to read it all through, and the words he produces out of it look very suspiciously.

## C H A P. XII.

Verf. 1. **I**T is so manifest that the word *λογος* is to be understood only in this last sense, that I wonder our learned Author would spoil Paper, and lose time in propoling the other Conjectures. For they are such as may be reckoned indeed in the number of those things that have no natural repugnancy in them; but there is not the least shadow of likelihood in them, nor can they be confirmed by any example. But, unless I am mightily mistaken, he had never set them down, but only to fill up his Annotations on this Chapter, which he found would otherwise be but short. And a great many other things there are of the like nature in this Volume, which yet I pass by without reprehension: Such is what he inserts into his Paraphrase on this Chapter about the *Gnosticks*, without any necessity; as if there could have been none corrupted with Vices contrary to the Vertues which the Apostle here commends, besides the *Gnosticks*!

Verf. 2. *Ἀνακαινώσει τῆς νοῦς.*] The word *νοῦς* here does not signify only *knowledg*, or an *opinion* conceived in the Mind, but an *affection* of the Soul: And thence comes *μετένοια*, which is not only a change of *Judgment* or *opinion*, but also of *Affections*. See *Beza* on *Mat.* iii. 2.

Verf. 5. *Ἐν σώματι ἔσμεν ἐν χριστῷ.*] That is, we all make one body of Christians, or all we Christians are one Body. The Phrase *εἶναι ἐν χριστῷ* is often used by *St. Paul* for *being a Christian*. So *Chap.* viii. 1. *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, that is, to Christians*: See likewise *Rom.* xvi. 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13. and *2 Cor.* xii. 2, &c. This I thought fit to observe, because I perceived this expression was not understood by *Grotius*, who says here; *We are one body in Christ, that is, by Christ who was the Compactor of that Body*; for tho' that be true, yet it is not the meaning of the Phrase.

Verf. 6. *ἀναλογία πίστεως.*] That is, let him say no more than what *ἐπιτεύθει αὐτῷ* he is entrusted with; in which word the Apostle has a reference to the antient *Prophets*, who were to say nothing but what God revealed to them: See *Verf.* 3. and *Ephes.* iv. 7. and *Beza* and *Grotius* on these words, whom our Author would have done well to follow, and not suffered himself to be imposed on by that which is

now



now ordinarily called the *Analogy of Faith*. I wonder the English Chapter Translation did not suggest to him another Interpretation of this XII. Phrase, in which it is truly rendered, according to the proportion of Faith.

Verf. 8. Απλότιπ.] This word ἀπλότιπ our Author in his Notes on *Mat. vi. 22.* has very well shewn to signify *liberality* or *bounty*; of which interpretation I shall here give this brief account. Ἀπλότιπ or *simplicity* is opposed to διακρίσις putting a difference, or using too much Caution in distinguishing those that are proper objects of our Charity from those which are not. Hence the *Wisdom which comes from above* is said in *James iii. 17.* not only to be full of *MERCY* and good *Fruits*, but also ἀδιακρίτῳ without difference, that is, not too nice or scrupulous in putting a difference between those which it does good or shews *Mercy* to. To which purpose is that advice in *Herma, Past. Lib. 2. Mand. 2.* OMNIBUS in opibus da SIMPLICITER, nihil dubitans cui des. Omnibus da. Omnibus enim dari vult Deus de suis donis. Qui ergo accipiunt reddent rationem Deo quare acceperunt, & ad quid. Qui autem accipiunt sicca necessitate, reddent rationem, qui autem dat innocens erit. Sicut enim accepit à Domino, ministerium consummavit, nihil dubitando cui darct & cui non daret; & fecit hoc ministerium SIMPLICITER gloriose ad Deum. Give to ALL that are poor SIMPLY, without scrupling whom you give to. Give to all. For God will have all to partake of his Gifts. Those therefore that receive shall give an account to God, why they received it, and to what end. And such as feigned themselves to be poor that they might receive the Charity of others, shall be called to a strict account for it, but the giver shall be judged innocent. For by giving universally and without difference to all, he fulfilled the Trust committed to him by God, and did it SIMPLY and to God's Glory. The Greek words are thus set down by *Antiochus, Hom. 98.* tho perhaps with some alteration. Καλὸν ἔν ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ κώπων, ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἐπέχει, πῶς ὑποκειμένοις παρέχεν ΑΠΛΩΣ, μηδὲν διακρίσσει, πῶς δῶς. Ἡμεῖς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ δωρημάτων, καὶ μὴ ΔΙΑΚΡΙΝΑΙ πῶς δῶς, πῶς μὴ δῶς. Ἡ γὰρ διακονία ΑΠΛΩΣ τελεθεῖται, ἐνδοξῶς ὑπερέχει παρὰ τὸ Θεῖον. Καὶ ἕως ἀπλοῦς διακονῶν, τῷ Θεῷ ζήσεται. Several other Passages might be produced out of the Antients to the same purpose. See *Lib. 3. Constit. Apost. cap. 4.*

Ibid. Ἐν ἰλαρότιπ.] Partly because that *cheerfulness* discovers a truly liberal disposition of Mind, it being natural to Men to be cheerful in following their own Inclinations, and partly because it makes the benefit seem the greater to him that receives it, if it be bestowed cheerfully. See *Seneca de Beneficiis, Lib. 2. cap. 4.*

Verf. 11. Note b. This conjecture of Dr. *Hammond* is favoured by the series of the discourse, in which it is not probable that among particular Precepts the Apostle would bring in that general one, comprehending all the duties of a Christian's Life, of *serviving the Lord*. Besides, after the words *πνεύματι ζέοντες*, it very aptly follows *καιρῷ δουλεύοντες*, and both together make up an excellent Precept to this sense :  
 “ In the business of Piety you must be zealous and fervent, but yet so as  
 “ to observe the proper time for it, lest by your unseasonable fervor  
 “ you should bring your selves into danger without doing any body  
 “ else any good. The Apostle here makes use of a known Proverb, and ordinary both in Greek and Latin Authors. So *Phocylides* :

*Καιρῷ λατρεύειν, μήτ' ἀντιπνέειν ἀνέμοισι.*

*We must serve the season, and not blow against the Winds.* So *Cicero de Finibus*, Lib. 3. num. 73. among other Precepts of the antient Sages sets down this, *tempori parere*, for one. So the Author of the *Panegyrick ad Pisonem* :

*Temporibus servire decet, qui tempora certis  
 Ponderibus pensavit, eum si bella vocabunt,  
 Miles erit ; si pax, positis toga gestiet armis.  
 Hunc fora pacatum, bellantem castra decebunt.*

It's true, in *St. Paul*, the sense is something different, but it is sufficient if it have but an affinity with that which it is commonly taken in ; for such sort of sayings have generally more senses than one. Which the Transcribers of the New Testament not sufficiently understanding, and knowing that this Proverb was sometimes used in an ill sense, for *hypocritical time serving*, changed *καιρῷ* into *κειῶ*. This is much more probable than that the word *κειῶ* was changed into *καιρῷ*, or the Phrase *to serve the Lord* so very common in these Books, into one less usual, *to serve the time*.

Ver. 15. Note c. Tho *Grotius* also, as well as our Author, supposes this Verse to have a reference to the two Gates of the Temple, yet I am not of their opinion, nor do I think the *Apostle* had any particular respect here to excommunicated Persons. The words are *general*, and contain an excellent general Precept to all Christians, to endeavour to get the Love and Friendship of those with whom they live, nothing being more pleasing to Men than to see others sympathize with them in their Afflictions, and rejoice at their Prosperity. I know they are for the  
 most



most part Flatterers and Hypocrites that practise this; but then it is not for *that* that they are to be condemned, but their hypocrisy in pretending to grieve or rejoice at what happens to others when they really do not, but have other Ends and Designs. But a good Man also not only may, but ought to be truly affected with others Prosperity or Adversity. I am apt to think also that *St. Paul* here rather made use of a common proverbial form of Speech, than a new phrase not before heard of. We meet with the like expression, tho' to another purpose, in *Horace de Arte Poetica*:

*Ut ridentibus arident, ita flentibus adflent  
Humani vultus.*

*Adflent*, for so the word must be read, according to the opinion of learned Men, not *adsunt*. Of the thing it self see *Stobæi Florileg.* Tit. 113, and 115.

### C H A P. XIII.

Verf. 1. Note a.  
Col. 1. Lin. 21.

**A**fter the words, *avenger of Wrath.*] I don't well understand what our Author meant, in taking so much pains to prove that ἐξουσία Power signifies the *person of the Ruler or Magistrate*; for who would have ever question'd it? But perhaps his design was to shew that the ἐξουσία or governing Power was so confined by God to some particular Persons or Families, that it could never pass from them. Which is true, where the Kingly or any other Power, according to the custom of the Country, descends by Succession to the next Heir, and that Custom cannot be altered without great danger. But where the Custom is otherwise, as it was in the *Roman Empire*, in the time of *St. Paul*, I do not see the use of what our Author here says: For it is known, that the supreme Power was not confined to any one Family in *Rome*, but belonged to those whom the Army elected.

Ibid. Col. 2. Lin. 4. After the words *Fideni or Gabii.*] Our learned Author misquotes here the words of *Juvenal*, and puts *Fidenorum Gabiorumque*, instead of *Fidenarum Gabiorumque*, which for want of sufficient skill in the Roman Antiquities, he seems to have taken for the names of two People; whereas *Fidenæ* was the place where *Juvenal* wrote; and every Child that has read but the first Book of *Livy*, knows that *Fidenæ* and *Gabii* were two *Cities* of that name, whereof the People were called *Fidenates* and *Gabini*, not *Fideni* and *Gabii*.

Chapter XIII. *Ibid.* At the end of that *Note.*] The Verb ὑπέχειν signifies no more than ἔχειν πρὸς ἄλλους, *to have something that another hath not*, to excel or be eminent in any thing; and so may be applied, not only to that which is in its kind and order *supreme*, but also to that which in any thing whatsoever excels others destitute of it. Thus in the *Old Glosses* ὑπέχειν is rendred by *exsto, emineo, excello, præcello, exsupero, antecello*; all signifying *to excel*: ὑπερέχει, *eminet, existit*: ὑπέχειν, *exstans, excellens*. ὑπερέχειν therefore here is rendred rightly by the Vulgar *sublimioribus*. The Powers here meant, are the Emperor, and all the other Roman Magistrates, who ὑπερέχειν, were at that time *superior* to all the Princes of the Nations contained within the bounds of the Roman Empire. And these Powers were all *from God*; not that God had conferred a greater or a less degree of Power to *this* or *that* person *immediatly*, but because it being the Will of God that men should form themselves into political Societies, and live peaceably with one another, he is said, upon that account, to will also that there should be Magistrates, both supreme and subordinate; because there can be no *Commonwealth*, nor any *Peace* kept without Government. And this being so, whenever any one, either with the consent of the People, or by an ὑπερέχειν, *superiority* of strength seizes upon the Government, provided we may live peaceably under it, we ought to be subject to him for the sake of the *Commonwealth*, and consequently of *God's Ordinance*, and of *Conscience*. So did the Christians under the Heathen Emperors; and so did also the wisest men among the Heathens.

1 Vers. 6. Διὰ τὸτο καὶ φόβος τελεῖτε.] *viz.* Because it is but just that those who employ themselves in the service and defence of the *Commonwealth*, should be furnished for all necessary expences. This being a necessary consequent of *Society*, God who will have men live in *Society*, must accordingly be supposed to require the paying of *Tribute* to its *Governors*. In which nevertheless the *Laws* always are to be regarded which appoint that *Tribute*: For this *Reward* given to the *Magistrate* for serving the *Community*, is constituted by *Men*, not by *God immediatly*; tho it ought not therefore to be accounted the less sacred, because in this particular of requiring *Tribute*, men act according to the *Motions* they have received from *God*, by the very *Constitution* of human *Nature*. This is what *St. Paul* means, and not that *God* has *immediatly* ordained either *Kings*, or the payment of *Tribute* to them, as our *Author* seems to think, which no one would say concerning the *Roman Emperors*, and the *Tribute* paid to them.



Verf. 9. Το ὃ ἐμοι χροῖσται, &c.] As it is very certain to me that Honor is due to Kings, and none but seditious persons can make a question of it; so I cannot tell whether any one can prove that the fifth Commandment requires us to pay that Honor which is due to Magistrates. There is the same reason indeed for both; but they are not required in the same Precept. See what I have written on the beginning of the *Decalogue*, in my *Comment* on *Exod. xx.* Chapter XIV.

Verf. 13. Note e. All this, *Plautus's* Interpreters, and the Greek Lexicographers had observed a great while before our Author. But what is the meaning of *lotis* in the last Verse he cites out of *Plautus*? Perhaps it is a false print for *lotus*: The ordinary reading is thus;

*Tute tibi puer es lautus, luces cereum.*

Which needs no alteration. See *Taubmannus* on that place.

C H A P. XIV.

Verf. 1. I. OUR Learned Author, on *Matth. xv. 19.* took abundance of pains to affix a sense upon the word *διαλογισμὸς*, which does not belong to it in that place.

And so he does here to as little purpose; for tho' *διαλογισμὸς* may signify that reasoning which respects the regulation of a man's Life, yet that is not the literal importance of the word, which signifies any other sort of reasoning equally with that.

II. In *Epicurus* his *Epist.* to *Idomeneus*, *διαλογισμοὶ* signifies all the Inventions and Disputations of that Philosopher, of what kind soever they were, which he had committed to writing, and the remembrance of which so much refreshed him. *Λογισμὸς* in his *Epist.* to *Menæceus*, is another thing, and signifies the act of reasoning it self. Hence *Cicero* (not in *Lib. 5. Tuscul. Quest.* but *de Finibus Lib. 2. Cap. 30.* where he recites that whole Epistle) renders *διαλογισμὸς* by *rationes & inventa, Reasons and Inventions.* As for *St. Ambrose*, who did not design to be extraordinary exact in rendering that word, his Authority can signify nothing.

III. In this place I take *διαλογισμοὶ* to signify a *Speculation*, or *Opinion conceived in the Mind*, and the meaning of the Apostle to be, that those among them who were more knowing and intelligent, ought to receive and treat the ignorant with all mildness, tho' weak in the Faith; that is, tho' having a less degree of knowledg and understanding in

\*

Christi-

Chapter XIV. Christianity, they differed from them in their Opinions. So the *μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν*, will be equivalent to *ἀνευ διακρίσεως διαλογισμῶν*, without discrimination of Opinions. The Judaizing Christian was to be received and entertained with as much affection by those that understood their liberty better, as if he did not Judaize. It is plain *διακρίσεις* signifies *discrimination* in 1 Cor. xii. 10. and Heb. v. 14. And *διαλογισμοὶ* are the reasonings of the Philosophers, in Chap. i. 2. of this Epistle, on which their Opinions or Errors were grounded.

Verf. 4. Σπίκη ἢ πῖπτει.] H. Grotius has observed before the *Doctōr*, that the phrase *to stand or fall*, signifies to be acquitted or condemned; and that the Latins say, *cadere causa*. We have an Example of both in this one Verse of Ovid, in Lib. *Fastorum*, where speaking to *Germanicus*, he saith:

*Ingenium vultu statque caditque tuo.*

That is, according as you receive this Work, favourably or otherwise, my Wit will find its endeavours either *condemned* or *approved*.

Verf. 12. Ἄγγεν δώσῃ τῷ Θεῷ.] This Verse is strangely paraphrased by the *Doctōr*; for what occasion was there here to say any thing about the Power of the Keys? any thing else might as well have been found out in this place.

Verf. 15. Note c. 1. The following words shew that *λυπεῖσθαι* signifies something more in this place, than barely *to be grieved*, as Dr. Hammond well observes, *viz.* to be prejudiced and alienated by that grief from the Christian Religion, which is the Notion of *ἀπολλεῖσθαι* *to perish*, or *be destroyed*. But the reasons he gives for this signification are not only forced, but also in part contrary to what he endeavours to prove. In one word, he might have shewn us what he meant, if he had said that the *Antecedent* was put here by a *Metonymy* for the *Consequent*, *λύπη* or *λυπεῖσθαι* for the effect of that grief, *i. e.* for a defection from the Christian Religion. By a like figure the words *to love* and *hate* signify the effects of those Passions, as in that famous place in *Malach. i. 2, 3.* *Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated*; that is, I have confer'd those benefits upon *Jacob*, which I never bestowed upon *Esau*. See other Examples of the same, in *Sal. Glassius Rhet. Salt. Tract. 1. Cap. 1.* On the contrary, our Author produces Examples wherein the *Effect* is put for the *Cause*; which are nothing to the purpose, the *Cause* here being put for the *Effect*.

2. It is yet less to the purpose, what he says about the Conjugation *ἑπιθήσει*, and its being rendred in Greek by a Verb Active. For that which



which is used here is a Verb Passive, which is taken for the effect of Chapter XIV. that which it properly signifies. Besides, he confounds Nouns with Verbs, and Verbs with Nouns, as if they were all one; and is hard put to it to extricate himself out of the maze of his perplexed reasoning. He had said afterwards that “ אָבָד which signifies destruction, and is often rendered by ἀπώλεια, is, in Prov. xxxi. 6. rendered λόπυ, εἰ ἐν λόπυ; Just as if אָבָד *abad* were a Noun, and in the place of *Proverbs* were not the Participle אָבָד *abad*, *perishing*, but a *Noun*.

Verf. 17. Note d. The most simple and natural sense of this Verse seems to be this: “ That which Christ, who is our King, requires of us, does not consist in abstaining from meat or drink, but in living righteously, peaceably, and cheerfully under the sense of those Gifts of the Holy Ghost which we have received from God; and therefore we should endeavour to follow after Righteousness and Peace, and not be morose towards others who do not abstain from the Meats forbidden by the Law. *Χαρά* here properly signifies *cheerfulness* or *pleasantness*, in opposition to the *moroseness* of the Jews, who could not look upon those who ate of all sorts of Meats indifferently without frowning. The same word signifies *Joy*, in Gal. v. 22. which is reckoned among the Fruits of a Gospel-Spirit, and comprehends both that affection of mind which I have described, and that behaviour towards our Neighbour which proceeds from it, and which consists in living and conversing with him in a friendly manner. And this amicable disposition and behaviour St. Paul recommends elsewhere, as in 1 Thess. v. 16. where he exhorts Christians to rejoice always; or, as it is in Phil. iv. 4. to rejoice in the Lord always, that is, for the Benefits they have received from the Lord. This Joy, as it shews that we are satisfied with our condition, so in all our transactions with our Neighbour it clearly discovers it self, in the courteousness and affableness of our behaviour towards him. Whereas on the contrary men who are discontented with the condition they are in, as they want this Joy, so they are generally rugged and morose in their deportment. Of which number were the Jews, who were very much offended at the approaching destruction of their Temple, and could not upon any terms be friends with the Gentiles, who did not observe the difference between Meats prescribed by the Law. It is truly said of such a man by *Amphis* in Florileg. *Stobaei*, Tit. 99.

——— Ὡς ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ ἐς ἀνωμαλίαν

ἀνθρώπων, ἐν ἀπειρίᾳ τε δυσχεροῦς ἔχῃ.


Chapter XV. *How ingrateful a thing is a pensive discontented Man! in every thing he carries himself morosely.*

¶ Vers. 23. Πάν ὃ ἐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἀμαρτία ἐστίν.] i. e. Whatever we do, not knowing whether it is lawful or not, is a Sin, because it proceeds from a Mind careless of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of Actions. This *Philo Judæus* has expressed almost in the same words as *St. Paul*, in *Lib. de Profugis*, pag. 336. where after he had given an allegorical interpretation of *Abraham's* Sacrifice, he subjoins that, ἀριστον ἱερῆον ἡσυχία καὶ ἐπιουχία καὶ ὧν ἐκ πίστεως: *The best Sacrifice is Forbearance and Abstinence, in things about which we have no certain Faith.*

*Ibid. Note c.* Our learned Author had no reason to speak of the *Posthumous Notes of Grotius*, as if he doubted whether they were *genuine* or not. They were committed to the care of *Joan. Mercerus*, who published them very faithfully; nor did any of *Grotius's* Family ever complain that they were not faithfully published. I speak this, because I know *Dr. Hammond* has elsewhere, for no reason, call'd into question the fidelity of that honest Man. Nor indeed is there any thing here or elsewhere in those *Notes* unworthy of *Grotius*, tho' there may be somethings in them liable to censure, as there are in his other works, and in all the Writings almost of all other Men.

However it is well shewn by the *Doctor* out of *St. Paul* himself, that *Doxologies* are not only used by way of *Conclusion*: Which may be confirmed by the instance of *St. Clement*, one of *St. Paul's* Disciples, who has the like *Doxologies* more than once in his *1st Epistle* to the *Corinthians*. See the end of *Cap. 20.* and what *Patric. Junius* has observed on that place, and *Cap. 58.*

## C H A P. XV.

¶ Vers. 3.  I ὁυδισμοὶ τῶν ὁυδισζόντων σε ἐπέπεσον ἐπ' ἐμέ.] In this Citation we have an instance of what I observed on *Chap. ix. 28.* that when any passages of Scripture are cited, the connexion of the Discourse is generally neglected. For the sense here is imperfect, and must be made up by the Reader thus, or to this purpose:  
 “ For even Christ did not please himself, but was very careful to avoid  
 “ every thing that might prejudice the weak, and did not give his  
 “ own Judgment that free liberty that he might have done, for fear of  
 “ giving them an occasion to blaspheme against God, which he was as  
 “ careful to shun as if those Blasphemies had fallen upon himself; so  
 “ that it may be justly said of him, *The reproaches of them that reproach-*  
 “ *ed thee fell on me.* It is certain Christ might have said a great many  
 things



things as to the abrogation of the Law of *Moses*, and the calling of the *Gentiles*, which afterwards he revealed to the Apostles, and by the Apostles to others; he might have gone before them himself by his example, in neglecting the vain Ceremonies of the Law, and conversing freely with the Heathens, which undoubtedly would have been more ἀρέσκοντα *grateful* and *pleasing* to him than to hold his peace, because the *Apostles* could not as yet bear what he had to say, and much less the rest of the *Jews*; or to avoid the society of the *Heathens* as polluted Persons, who would more readily have believed on him than the *Jews*, lest he should give these latter an occasion to blaspheme the Christian Religion, which was then but in its infancy. This is the sense, if I am not mistaken, of this place, which our Author did not sufficiently understand.

Verf. 4. Ὅσα ἂν ἐπεγεγέρθη, &c.] Here also there must be something supplied to this purpose. “ These words of the *Psalmist* shew you what it is your duty to do in endeavouring to avoid giving any occasion to Men to blaspheme Religion: For whatever things were written, &c. The despising of the scruples of the weak was a thing of very dangerous consequence, because it might alienate their Minds from Christianity, and make them turn Apostates and Blasphemers, and so expose it also to the contempt of Infidels, when they saw it forsaken by them that had first of all embraced it, and that the Christians were divided amongst themselves.

Verf. 8. Διὰ κλονὸν γυνήδαι ἀειτομῆς.] That is, preached only to the Circumcised; which our learned Author has not clearly enough expressed in his Paraphrase. See *Grotius*.

Verf. 12. Note a. Those which are here called ἔθνη, and in the Prophet *People* and *Nations*, are literally the *Tribes* of *Israel*, as will appear to any one that compares the 10th *verse*, out of which the Apostle cites this Passage, with the following *verses*. But as under the person of *Hezekiah* is described the *Messias*, so by the *Jews* and their several *Tribes* are represented all the *Nations* throughout the *World*, that should believe on the *Messias*. And the *Jews*, in *St. Paul's* time, generally took those Passages to belong to the *Messias*, and therefore they are here fitly urged.

But our Author is mistaken when he supposes the power of making War, which belongs only to him that is supreme, is here referred to; for *Isaiab* does not speak of making War, but of bringing back the *Israelites* that were dispersed in the neighbouring Countries in *Judæa*, of which he says that *Hezekiah* should be an *Ensign*: See *Isa. xiii. 2.*

Chapter It is a Metaphor indeed taken from Military Affairs, because at the XVI. setting up of an *Ensign* Souldiers use to gather together, but the power of making War is not alluded to. Nor had the *Septuagint* any such thing as that in their thoughts when they translated this Passage, but only for *נסל* *Ines*, for an *Ensign*, read, or thought it ought to be read *נשי* for a *Prince*; by which the sense is not much alter'd, because the same Person that was to be a *Prince*, was also to set up an *Ensign*.

Vers. 16. *ἁγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.*] Two ways any Offering might be said to be sanctified; *first*, by him that determined to offer up any Sacrifice to God, and delivered it already consecrated in his Mind to the Priest to be actually offer'd up: and *2dly*, when it was placed upon the Altar, which sanctified, *i. e.* made it to be esteemed Sacred whatever that touched: See *Exod.* xxix. 37. and *Mat.* xxiii. 19. This I suppose, the Apostle here has a reference to, rather than, as the *Doctor*, to the *Priests*, or as *Grotius*, to *Salt*; and that by *πνεῦμα ἁγίου* are meant the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, whereby the *Gentiles*, after they had believed, were consecrated to God as by the sacred fire of the Altar. See *Acts* x.

Vers. 21. *Οἳ μὴ ἀπογγέλη πρὸς αὐτοῦ, &c.*] To understand here Dr. *Hammond's* Paraphrase, we must read *Grotius* on this place, and on *Isa.* lii. where he interprets the words of the Prophet as spoken primarily of *Jeremiah*, and secondarily of *Christ*, *forcedly* indeed in my opinion. But I have not room here to discuss that matter: I shall only remark, that St. *Paul* might very pertinently alledg this Prediction, speaking of the calling of the *Gentiles*, because it was commonly supposed to have a reference to the *Messias*.

Vers. 31. *Ἀπαθάντων.*] This Dr. *Hammond* in his Paraphrase interprets of the judaizing *Christians*; but I think it ought rather to be interpreted of the *unbelieving Jews*, whom St. *Paul* had most reason to be afraid of, as the thing it self shews.

#### C H A P. XVI.

Vers. 1. **I**T is very true that in the *New Testament* *διακονεῖν* signifies *Note a.* to supply the poor with necessaries, and *διακονία* *liberality*; but it does not appear from any example that any one was therefore called either simply *διάκονος* or *διάκονος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*. No Grecian ever spake in that manner, to signify a Woman that was liberal to the poor of any Church, out of her own substance. So that



it is much more probable a *Deaconess* is here meant, as the Christians afterwards used to speak, which had the oversight of the publick Alms of the Church, and performed perhaps other Offices in it. Not all it may be then that have since been attributed to them, but there were undoubtedly in those Primitive times *Deaconesses*, which administred several things relating to the Church; as appears both by this place, and by an Epistle of *Pliny* to *Trajan*, wherein he makes mention of such *ministrae* (so he calls them) among the Christians. On which passage *Ger. Vossius* has put together almost all that belongs to that Office, as *Joan. Bapt. Cotelerius* has also done on several places of the *Apostolical Constitutions*. See particularly on *Lib. 3. cap. 15.* Chapter XVI.

I wonder *Dr. Hammond*, when he had *Grotius* to go before him, did not rather keep to this, than say things which are nothing to the purpose: For it is no where said that *Phæbe* accompanied any of the Apostles, and what is affirmed of such Women is very suspicious. For it is true, certain rich Women did sometimes follow *Christ*, but this seems neither to have been constant, nor ever practised in great Journeys, when the longest were from *Galilee* to *Jerusalem*, and that at the time of the Feasts, in which Women otherwise used to go up to that City. But that in the journeys which the Apostles made into far distant Countries, they had rich Women to accompany them, and supply them with necessaries, which might otherwise have been more easily and decently done, let them believe who use to give credit to all that the Antients affirm, without the least appearance of likelihood. It were easy to shew the improbability of it, and I shall say something to that purpose on *1 Cor. ix. 5.*

Verf. 7. [*Ἐν Χριστῷ.*] That is, *Christians*, as I observed on *Chap. xii. 5.* See there.

Verf. 16. *Note c.* It is uncertain whether *St. Paul* here had a respect to that Salutation which the Christians us'd to give to one another in their holy Assemblies; nay it is very *improbable*, and that for these two reasons. *First*, because the Apostle here speaks of such a Salutation as was given by Friends in the room of their Friends, to persons whom they desired in a Letter to be saluted in their name; which Salutation has nothing common with that Church-salutation. *Secondly*, in the Church where Men and Women sat apart from one another, the Men were saluted by the Men, and the Women by the Women; not promiscuously the Men by the Women, or the Women by the Men. The Author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, *Lib. 2. c. 57.* where he sets down the whole order observed in the Christian Assemblies,

Chapter  
XVI.

blies, describes that Custom thus: εἶτα ἀσπαζέδωσαν ἀλλήλους οἱ ἄνδρες, καὶ ἀλλήλας αἱ γυναῖκες, τὸ ἐν Κυρίῳ φίλημα: Then let the Men salute one another, and the Women one another, with a kiss in the Lord. He had said before: εἰς τὸ ἔπειρον μέγθ' οἱ Λαϊκοὶ καθεζέδωσαν, μετὰ πάσις ἡσυχίας καὶ εὐταξίας, καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες κεχωρισμένως καὶ αὐταὶ καθεζέδωσαν, σιωπὴν ἀγνοῦσαι: Let the Laicks sit on one side in all quietness and good order; and the Women also sit apart by themselves, keeping silence. I know there were several alterations made in the Order of the Church in the following Age, but thus in all probability it was antiently, not only because of the decency of it, but also because it is certain this was the Custom among the Jews, whom in many things the Primitive Church followed, as *J. Bapt. Cotelarius* on this place in the *Constit. Num. 32. Edit. Amst.* has well observed.

Verf. 17. Τὰς τὴν διχοστασίας, &c.] At the end of the *Premonition* to this Epistle, I said I did not think that the *Gnosticks* were referred to wherever *Dr. Hammond* thought so; but I did not deny that sometimes the reproofs of the Apostles might belong to them, as these do in this place. They were subtil crafty Persons, who perceiving that a great many had embraced the Christian Religion, who were very liberal to the poor of that Profession, and ready to hearken to any that made a shew of Piety and Learning, took occasion to deceive the simple, that they might live idly at their cost, and privately indulge themselves in all manner of Sensuality: Of which number seems to have been that *Peregrinus*, whose death is related by *Lucian*, if we may give credit to an *Epicurean* and an Orator. And to these Hereticks seem to be owing that multitude of supposititious Writings which were received and used by the Christians ever since the first Ages, and those Philosophical Opinions with which Christianity was very early corrupted, and were taken by the ignorant and unwary for Apostolical Doctrines. See *Col. ii. 8.* and *2 Tim. iii. 2, &c.*

Verf. 20. Συντελείει τὸ Σατανᾶν.] *Dr. Hammond* in his Paraphrase puts several things together, to shew the full importance of this Phrase. But I believe it has a reference only to the persecuting Jews, who waged an irreconcilable War with the Christians as Apostates: For these being the instruments of the Devil, who is called κατ' ἐξοχὴν *Satan*, or an Adversary, and by his inspiration endeavouring to oppress the Christian Religion at its first rise, could not be destroyed, but Satan must be trod under foot as it were, at the same time. The Heathens had not as yet begun to persecute the Christians for Religions sake, but only under the notion of seditious Persons, by which

name



name the *Jews* endeavour'd to defame them amongst the *Romans*, Chapter as appears from the History of the *Acts*. So that the Christians XVI. had no Adversaries at that time but the *Jews*; who having some years after become odious themselves to the *Romans* upon the account of their Seditious, were not in a condition to do the Christians any great harm. And that seems to be the reason why St. *Paul* promised the Christians peace ἐν ταχῆι *shortly*, from the *God of Peace*. What the *Doctor* says here besides this, is besides the meaning of the Apostle: That about the silencing of the Oracles is perhaps false; and it is certain *Satan* ceased not to stir up the Heathens for some Ages after against the Christians.

---

ANNOS



## ANNOTATIONS

## On the First Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to the *Corinthians*.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 5.  
Note b.

**I**T is easily discernible, that all Dr. *Hammond* says in this Annotation are mere Niceties, which have no foundation in *Grammar*, but depend upon bare reasoning, every part of which almost may be denied. Nor is it needful to confute it all particularly. It is much more natural, both here and in 2 *Cor.* viii. 7. by the word λόγος to understand the knowledg of Religion; which the Apostle *Paul* calls λόγον in the same sense that the Latins call Learning *litteras*, and the Greeks *litteras λόγους*, as every one knows, or if they do not, they soon may by the *Lexicons*. Ἐν παντι λόγῳ therefore signifies *in all knowledg*; that which relates, for instance, to the interpretation of Prophecies, that which concerns the speculative part of Religion, and that which respects the government of the Life. Nor is it any objection against this Interpretation, that hereby γνώσις and λόγος are made to signify the same thing, nothing being more common than for synonymous words to be joined together. But see also Dr. *Hammond's* next Annotation.

Verf. 15. Εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα.] That is, that they might be called my Disciples, or receive a denomination from me, and be stiled *Paulites*. See my *Note* on *Mat.* xxviii. 16.

Verf. 20. Note f. What our Author says on this place, is certainly very ingenious; and some things he has transcribed out of *Grotius* so as to mend, and add to them. But if we consider, we shall find that the Prophet *Isaiab* is cited as a *Witness* to the Gospel only in *ver.* 19. out of *Chap.* xxix. 14. and that the following words in *ver.* 20. are taken by St. *Paul* out of *Isa.* xxxiii. 18. not to *prove* any thing, but only express his mind by them as his own words. Just as the Greeks and Latins frequently borrow passages out of their own *Poets*, not

to



to prove any thing by their Authority, but to express their mind in Chapter *their* words more elegantly than they could do in their *own*; and to II. the same end likewise the Hebrews frequently alledg the words of the *Old Testament*. And as the Greeks and Latins make no difficulty of applying the sayings of their Poets to a different purpose than they intended them, provided they do not apply them absurdly; the same is observable also among the Hebrews: Of which there are innumerable Instances to be met with in the *Talmudists*, and the mystical Interpreters of the Scripture; and before them in *Philo*, who seldom ever cites the Scripture but in that manner. And this being a usual practice in the time of the Apostles, it is no wonder if *they* followed the custom of the Age wherein they lived, there being no harm at all in that custom. A very remarkable instance of such a Citation we have in *Rom. x.* where the discourse is about the Righteousness of the Gospel. But those passages are carefully to be distinguished from others, by which any thing is *proved*, or any *conclusion* drawn from them. I don't think *St. Paul* did so subtilly examin the agreement of the words of *Isaiab* with what he designed to say, as *Dr. Hammond*.

## C H A P. II.

Verf. 4. **W**HAT our Author says here about the several Arguments that might be used to procure credit to the Gospel, is all very true and undeniable; but the greatest part of it is besides the scope of this place: For by *πνεῦμα* here is meant only the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, which were used by those who are called *πνευματικοὶ* in this very Chapter, in the Church; as the *Gift of Tongues*, which was no small evidence of the truth of Christianity. *Achaia* at that time being a place of great commerce, a great many *Jews* and *Gentiles*, out of *Africa*, *Egypt*, and other places where the Inhabitants were *βασταρφόροι*, if I may so speak, resorted to it. And these could not hear the Apostle speaking properly in their several Languages without the highest admiration, knowing that he had never learned them. See *Chap. xii.* of this Epistle, where the word *Spirit* often signifies such Gifts. And by *δύναμις*, as *Grotius* rightly observes, is meant the Gift of *healing Diseases*, or the like. See the same Chapter, *vers. 10, 28, 29.* *St. Paul's* meaning therefore is, that he did not come to the *Corinthians* as a Philosopher, to persuade them to believe what he said by argument and reasoning, but endued with miraculous Gifts, such as the Gift of Tongues and the like, and a power of curing the diseased; that the credit they

Chapter II. gave to him might not be as to a Philosopher, who confirmed the truth of his Doctrin by probable reasons, but as to God's Messenger, demonstrating by Miracles that he had a Command from Heaven to say what he preached to them, and did not discover it by reasoning.

The Arguments for the truth of the Christian Religion taken from Prophecies, which *Grotius* and our Author would have to be partly here intended, were not ἀποδείξεις demonstrations to any but the Jews, who had already fixed a certain sense upon them, and believed them; but they could not in the least move the Heathens. The rest also were not ἀποδείξεις, distinct from reasonings, but to those that had seen them: It is present Miracles that are here meant, whereby the Apostle, without any long arguing, proved ἀποδεικτικῶς, that he was sent from God. Our Author in his Paraphrase on this Chapter, puts in so many things foreign to the sense of St. Paul's words, that it is rather he himself than the Apostle that reasons in it.

Vers. 5. Δυνάμει Θεῶ.] That is, the Power of God; from which he received an ability to work δυνάμει. This word in the foregoing Verse signifies the effect of the divine Power, but here the divine Power it self which was the cause of those Miracles. That Faith which relies upon Miracles wrought by a divine Power, relies upon the divine Power it self by which those Miracles are wrought. Dr. *Hammond* here, according to his manner, makes a difficulty where there is none.

Vers. 6. Σοφίαν ἢ λαλιῶν, &c.] This Verse should be paraphrased thus: "All that throughly understand what is true Wisdom, will easily perceive that the Gospel is so. It is not, I confess, such Wisdom as that of Philosophers or Orators, who by their subtilty and eloquence render themselves so acceptable to the great Men of the World, which Wisdom is made vain by the preaching of the Gospel. Σοφία τῶ αἰώνου is Philosophical Learning, which is vain in the account of those that are perfect, or that throughly know what it is to be wise, as Christians do. And by the Wisdom of the Princes of the Age seems to be meant Eloquence, which in that Age the Nobility of Rome did diligently study, as appears by both the *Seneca's*, *Quintilian*, both the *Pliny's*, and others. Ἄρχοντες I render the Nobility, to make that word comprehend, not only the Roman Emperors, but also lesser Powers, such as the Presidents or Governors of Provinces.

Ibid. Καταργημάτων.] This word is not to be referred to the Authority of the Roman Magistrates, which at that time prevailed, and afterwards continued, but to their Wisdom or Learning, which was vain and



and empty, because it could not make them *happy*, or lead them to the Chapter  
knowledg of the true Religion. II.

Verf. 8. Ἀρχόντων τῶν αἰώνων.] I don't think this Phrase signifies the chief Men among the Jews, excluding the *Heathen* Magistrates; or these latter only, and not the Jews. For both may be intended, it being manifest that some multitude is designed in this expression: NONE of the Princes of this Age, &c.

Verf. 11. Πνευματικὰ πνευματικῶς συζητούντες.] That is, to *spiritual* Men speaking *spiritual* things. For that after πνευματικῶς we are to supply ἀνθρώποις, appears by the next Verse, where the ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος is opposed to them: And *spiritual* things are such as agree with the *spiritual* Nature of the Gospel, according to the usual notion of that word; not Arguments deduced from Prophecies, which πνευματικὰ is no where else used to signify: this appears further from the following Verse, which makes me wonder that both *Grotius*, and *Dr. Hammond* who follows him, should talk here of Prophecies, of which *St. Paul* does not speak one syllable in this place.

Verf. 14. Ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐδέχεται.] I don't think that by ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος here is meant a Man that makes use of nothing but reason, as our Author supposes, after *Grotius*; such a Man should rather have been stiled λογικός, for *reason* is called λόγος not ψυχή. I rather think it signifies a Man who is no more raised in his Mind to *spiritual* things than any other ἐμψυχον *living Creature*, i. e. than *Plants* and *Animals*. Perhaps *Plants* were called ψυχικά, but at least *Animals* were stiled so in Greek at that time, in imitation of the *Latins*, so that ψυχικόν & ζῷον were all one. And to this the *old Glosses* seem to have a reference, which interpret ψυχικά by *animalia*, & ψυχικὸς by *animalis*. It is certain ψυχή is frequently taken for that life which is common to us with *Brutes*. Ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος therefore is a Phrase used by way of contempt to signify a Person that is wholly devoted and enslaved to earthly things, and entirely taken up with the concerns of this Life, like a brute Creature: As on the other hand πνεῦμα signifies the *Mind* or reasonable Soul, which is peculiar to Men, and capable of discerning and assenting to πνευματικὰ *spiritual things*. The Verb δέχεται signifies here to *assent*, in the notion it is more than once met with in *Thucydides*, as *H. Stephanus* will inform us. Tho there is no need of *Thucydides*'s authority, it being often so taken in the *New Testament*, as in *Mat. xi. 14.* where *Christ* speaking to the multitude concerning *John the Baptist*, saith: εἰ θέλετε δεχασθαι, if ye will admit or receive it (that is, assent to what I say) this is *Elias*, which was to come: See *Mark x. 15.* *Luk. viii. 13.* and *xviii. 17.* *Acts xi. 1.* and *xvii. 11.* *Jam. i. 21.* The

Chapter III. sense according to this interpretation is very proper: "He that is not raised above an animal Life, and so thinks of nothing but this World, does not assent to those things which come from the Spirit of God, for he looks upon them as Trifles.

Ibid. Οὐ δύναται γινῶναι.] The simple Verb γινῶναι here seems to be put for διαγινῶναι to discern them, viz. from such as are false. So it is used in John x. 14. I know γινώσκω my Sheep, and am known γινώσκονται by them. That is, as I discern those who are so disposed as to believe in me from all others, so they in like manner discern me from Impostors. And I interpret this word γινῶναι here to discern, because of what follows, where on the contrary spiritual Men are said ἀνακρίναι to discern, for it is a clear opposition: "For such a Man does not distinguish or discern those things which are from the Spirit of God, from Trifles. When it is said ἔδυναται, he cannot discern them, the meaning of that is ἐφ' ὅσον ψυχρὸς μὲν εἶ, ἢ ψυχρὸς κείνός, as long as he continues sensual, and judges sensually, viz. because being biased by his sensual disposition, he minds only present and sensible things.

Ibid. "Ὁπ πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται.] That is, because the Doctrin of the Gospel is grounded not upon carnal reasonings, which respect only present things, but upon spiritual, which take in the knowledg of things Future and Invisible, and suppose it to be already in the Mind: or in fewer words; by such a disposition of Mind as whereby wise Men are not less affected with incorporeal and future Things, than those which are present and sensible. It is true what our Author here says in his Paraphrase, but beside the scope of this place: The opposition here made between *Spiritual* and *Animal* things, plainly proves what I have said. So in John vi. 63. by the *Spirit* is meant such things or *Doctrines* as could not be understood by the use or knowledg of things sensible. See afterwards Chap. iii. 1, 11. and x. 3, 4.

### C H A P. III.

Verf. 15. **I**T is truly observed by learned Men, that this is a proverbial form of Speech, taken from those who hastily and narrowly make their escape from a Fire which had like to consume them. Such another Metaphor there is in *Livy*, Lib. 22. cap. 35. *L. Æmilius Paulum, qui— ex damnatione collegæ, & sua, prope ambustus evaserat— ad petitionem compellit.* And cap. 40. the same *Æmilius* saith, *se populare incendium, priore consulatu, semivustum effugisse; That in his former Consulship, he had escaped out of a common Fire, half burned.*

But



But our learned Author forcedly applies all this to his *Gnosticks*: Chapter for tho in *Judæa* it is possible the *Gnosticks* might feign themselves to be *Jews*, to escape persecution from them, because the *Jews there* were far more numerous than the *Heathens*; it does not follow there was any reason to be afraid of them at *Corinth*, or in *Achaia*, where the *Jews* were much fewer in number than the *Greeks*, and where their Complaints of the Christians were not hearkened to by the Roman Magistrates, as appears from *Acts xviii. 12, &c.* And after the *Jews* once began for their Seditious to be suspected by the *Romans*, as not long after it happened, it had not been carnal Policy for any to join themselves to their party: So that there is no room here for what the *Doctor* says about the compliance of the *Gnosticks* with the *Jews*. III.

If the *Gnosticks* had reason to fear any danger in *Greece*, it was from the *Romans*; but it does not appear there was any persecution raised against the Christians in those parts, till a great while after the destruction of *Jerusalem*: See Mr. *Dodwell's* Dissert. de paucitate Martyrum, among his *Cyprianicæ*. So that that day of which *St. Paul* speaks, cannot be referred to the destruction of the *Jews*. It is much better by *Grotius* understood of a long space of time, which very often discovers what is true, and what is false, as many of the Antients have observed. Consult *Stobæi Excerpta de Rerum Natura*, Tit. 11. where there are a great many sayings to that purpose. As for the *Fire* which *St. Paul* here makes mention of, that is nothing but an examination of Doctrins, which after some time the Christians would set themselves to, and upon which all that were false would be rejected, and the true retained; which is called *Fire* by a Metaphor taken from Metals. They that retained the foundation of Christianity, tho they built strange Doctrins upon it, would at length upon that examination of them, find that they had built *stubble* upon *Gold*; and when they understood that they had been in danger of calling away the foundation of Religion it self for those Errors, they would presently forsake them, and escape as out of the *Fire*, not without the loss of their Reputation and Time, besides what they must be reckoned to have lost in pious Actions and right Apprehensions, by continuing so long in their Errors.

That Character of the *Gnosticks*, which our Author would have to be contained in the following words, agrees to any others that err through a false notion of Wisdom, and do mischief to the Christian Church. So that what he thought to be manifest, seems to me to be plainly false.

Verf. 6. **Φ**ρονεῖν properly is *to think*, and does not signify *to be proud* simply taken, but only when there is something else added to it, as here ὑπερ ὃ γέγραπται: that is, be not lifted up in your Minds, beyond what these Instructions will allow which I have already written, either in this *Chapter*, or the foregoing, but especially in *Chap. iii.* where *St. Paul* had taught the *Corinthians* what they ought to think both of themselves, and of their Teachers.

Verf. 13. *Note b.* I. It is true indeed what our Author says about the signification of the words πειθήνεια and πειθαρχία. But there is another notion given by the same Grammarians of these words which I like better, as seeming to be more agreeable to this place, for purgamenta, filth, quisquilia, recrementa, the dregs or refuse of any thing. For the Apostles meaning is no more than that he was the Object of every bodies Contempt, and so was περίψημα πάντων, or πειθαρχία τῶ κόσμῳ, look'd upon by all the World as refuse. And this notion of the words is agreeable to their Original, πειθαρχία coming from καθαίρειν *to purge*, and περίψημα from περιψῆν *to wipe off*. *Hesychius* has indeed πειθαρχία, but without any interpretation of it, which must be supplied out of *Phavorinus*, who seems to have had the most correct Copy of that Grammarian, and tells us, that πειθαρχία is ἀπὸ τῶ ἀποψήγματος, καὶ ἀσπιδίου ἀποψήγματος, *for filth, and as refuse*. The other word is interpreted in *Hesychius* by ἀκατάμαγμα which comes from ἀκαταμάσσειν *to wipe off*, and ought not to be alter'd. It follows; ἀνήλυτοι, ἀπὸ ψύχα, ἢ ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη πάντων, it should be, ἀψήματα, ἀνήλυτοι, ἀπὸ ψύχα, ἢ τὰ ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη πάντων: but the former word was omitted because of its likeness to ἀκατάμαγμα, which went before. In *Suidas* also it should be read ἀκατάμαγμα, as *Emil. Portus* observed, who ought to have corrected the whole passage by *Hesychius*: For it follows in *Suidas*; ἢ ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη ἀπολύτρωσις, which he ridiculously renders; ipsa sub vestigiis redemptio, when it is manifest the words ought to be read with a Comma after ἴχνη thus: ἢ τὸ ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη, ἀπολύτρωσις, *or what is under foot, also redemption*. *Phavorinus* interprets ἀψήματα not only βδέλυγμα *abomination*, but also τὸ σβῆλον ὃ τὰς ἰδρωτάς τῶ κάρμυτος ἀποψύχει: *a Towel which wipes the Sweat off one that is tired with work*: ἢ τὸ ἀπορρίπτμενον σβῆλον, ὡς ἀειτὸν: *or refuse which is cast away, as useless*: ἀπὸ μεταφορῆς τῆς τὰς τραπέζας ἀποψήντων μάλιστα τὸ φάγειν: *by a Metaphor taken from those who wipe down Tables after eating*. He adds, περιψῆν ἀπὸ τῶ καταμάσσειν, ἀποσπογγίζειν: Περιψῆν is put for that which signifies *to purge, to wipe off with a sponge*; but he ought



to have said *ἀεψάν*, for it is a Compound of the Verb *ψάω*, to wipe, to shave. Whence in an old *Onomasticon* *ἀεψήμα* is rendred *scobs, shavings* or *filings*. The old Glosses published together, render *ἀεψήμα* *purgamentum*. And *Eustathius* in the place alledged *E. lit. Rom. p. 1935.* interprets both the words by *σπόνγισμα & σπόγγισμα*, that which is washed and wiped with a Sponge. And *Apostolius* in *Cent. 16. 3.* interprets them also τὸ καταπίπτειμα πάντων ὑπὸ τὰ ἴχνη, ἢ ἔμπαιγμα, that which every one treads under foot or despises.

II. I do not think that those Nations who had purifications, in some respect like the Jewish, imitated therein the Jews, to whom most of them were perfect Strangers, and some of them more powerful and antient than they, as the *Egyptians*. Nor have such Rites considered in themselves any thing *Divine* in them, that they should be referred to *God* as their first institutor. It is much more probable that the Jews had been already accustomed to them, whilst they were among other Nations; and that *God* in those *πρωχῆς σαρχείας κόσμου* beggarly clements of the World, as *St. Paul* calls them, did accommodate himself to their Capacity and Temper. Of which matter I have had occasion to speak in many places of my *Commentary* on the *Pentateuch*.

## C H A P. V.

Verf. 1. **T**HE word *ὅπως* can signify but two things in this place. *Note a.* First, it may denote the certainty of the Report, and be referred to the Verb *ἀκέεται*, and so *St. Paul's* meaning will be, that that report had been a long while spread, and it was universally affirmed for a certain truth, by all that knew the Church of *Corinth*; in which sense *ὅπως* is an *Adverb* of affirming. Secondly, it may be a Particle, whereby the Apostle signifies he would tell them briefly and in one word, why he should come to them ἐν ῥάβδῳ with a Rod. In both these senses this Particle is used in good Authors, but never in *Dr. Hammond's*, that I know of; and if it were, yet in this Construction, that could not be the sense of it. It signifies also *παντελῶς*, wholly or altogether; but for that signification of it there can be no room neither here: See *Mat. v. 34.* and afterwards *Chap. xv. 29.* of this *Epistle*. I rather think it is here an *Adverb* of affirming, because the Verb *ἀκέεται* immediately follows it.

Verf. 2. *Note c. Lin. 13.* After the reference to *Rom. xii. Note c.*] This passage of *St. Clement*, as also the Citation out of *Origen*, was taken by our Author out of *Grotius*, as is evident by this, that *Grotius* refers us only to *Constit. 2.* without setting down the *Chapter*, which

Chapter he ought to have done in the quotation of a Book that had been long  
 V. since divided into Chapters: and so does the *Doctor*. *Grotius* does not  
 truly cite the words of the *Constitutions*; no more does *Dr. Hammond*.  
 The place is in *Lib. 2. cap. 41.* and the last word of it here alledged,  
 is not ἀποπέμπετε, but ἀπόκοπτε cut off. By this it appears that learned  
 Men are not to be absolutely trusted in citing the Testimonies of the  
 Antients.

*Ibid.* At the end of that *Note.*] If our learned Author to this  
 passage in *St. Paul*, had added only that in *2 Cor. xii. 21.* no one would  
 ever have disputed with him about these interpretations. But all that  
 he says afterwards is manifestly forced, because *St. Paul* does not  
 speak of that Sorrow which was caused by the censures of the Church,  
 or *Excommunication*, but concerning Sorrow which proceeded from a  
 depravation of Manners in the *Corinthians*, for which *St. Paul* had  
 justly reprehended them. For it is apparent that *St. Paul* speaks to  
 the whole *Corinthian Church*, which no one would say was excommuni-  
 cated because the Apostle had in this Epistle reprov'd their Manners,  
 or because he had ordered that one incestuous Person, spoken of in  
 this Chapter, to be delivered to Satan. The thing confutes it self upon  
 the very mention of it; and I dare say our Author had never written  
 in this manner, if he had not some time before compos'd a disputati-  
 on about the *Power of the Keys*, which he was very much in love with,  
 and perhaps more than he should have been, and that made him think  
 he saw those *Keys* where no body else would ever have thought of  
 them.

Verf. 5. *Note c.* I. It had been better in my judgment, if our  
 learned Author had insisted only on the *second* reason he assigns of  
 this phrase, which is manifestly grounded on the Apostle's writings;  
 for what need was there of inventing another *new* one, when the A-  
 postles had given one very sufficient reason of it? But, unless I am  
 mistaken, the *Doctor* did not sufficiently distinguish the common *Ex-*  
*communication*, as it is described by the *Jews*, or as it obtained in *after*  
*Ages*, from that *delivering up to Satan* in the time of the *Apostles*. For  
 this was a consecratory of that miraculous Power of the Apostles, where-  
 as the power of *Excommunication* was not conjoined with any Miracle.  
 What *Josephus* relates concerning the *Esseni*, may so be understood, as  
 that the Excommunicate Person should be said to have died for Grief,  
 not by the miraculous Virtue of the *Excommunication*; which yet if *Jose-*  
*phus* had believed, it would be no Crime to refuse to give Credit to him.  
 And it is certain those *Esseni* were neither *Prophets* themselves, nor  
 instituted by *Prophets*: But of this and other things which belong to  
 Excommuni-



Excommunication, we may consult Mr. *J. Selden*, de *Synedr. Judæorum*, Chapter Lib. i. cap. 7, &c.

II. What our Author conjectures about the sense of the Verb *παρδίδωαι*, that it signifies here *to deliver up upon Demand or Petition*, is certainly ingenious; but if it should be denied, I don't see how it could be proved. For an Executioner does not use to require the Magistrate to deliver up Malefactors to him, but they are delivered up to him without his *demanding* them. And when it is said that Satan desired permission of God *to sift the Apostles*, that was not properly to execute Punishment on them for their Sins, but to assault them the more vehemently with his Temptations and wicked Suggestions: Nor indeed can the Devil be supposed to demand bad Men of God in order to torment them, whom he would rather make happy, if he could, that he might entice others into sin by the example of their Prosperity; so that he is rather to be thought to punish bad men against his will, than to ask leave of God to afflict them. And it's visible that bad men who serve Satan, are so far from being more miserable and obnoxious to diseases than the good, that the contrary is generally true. Whence also by the way we may infer, that if *to be delivered to Satan*, were all one as to be cast out of the Church, those who never were within the Church must have been reckoned from their very birth to have been *delivered up to Satan*, and by consequence have been all more obnoxious to diseases than the Christians: And all likewise that were rightfully Excommunicated should have been said to have been *delivered to Satan*, and been afflicted with Diseases, which yet that it was of old so, no Writer has ever asserted, nor does any one believe. But *delivering up to Satan*, tho' conjoined with Excommunication, is not the same thing: And therefore our Author ought not to have confounded this unusual Punishment inflicted by Apostolical Authority, with the ordinary Censures of the Church. Nor is he more fortunate in conjecturing that this *delivering to Satan* was an imitation of God's dealing with Sinners, when he leaves them to the power of the Devil to execute his pleasure upon them.

Verf. 9. [Ἐγενετο ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλήσια.] Many Interpreters would have this to be understood of this very Epistle, contrary to all the rules of Grammar, lest it should be thought that any of St. Paul's Epistles were lost; which yet why they might not, no reason at all can be given: For if so be, we want none of those things which are necessary to Salvation, what reason can we have to accuse the Providence of God, if any of the Writings of the Apostles were lost? Should we have been ever the less Disciples of Christ, if any of those Epistles

\*

had

V.  
~

Chapter V. he ought to have done in the quotation of a Book that had been long since divided into Chapters: and so does the *Doctor*. *Grotius* does not truly cite the words of the *Constitutions*; no more does *Dr. Hammond*. The place is in *Lib. 2. cap. 41.* and the last word of it here alledged, is not ἀποπέμψτε, but ἀποκόπττε cut off. By this it appears that learned Men are not to be absolutely trusted in citing the Testimonies of the Antients.

*Ibid.* At the end of that *Note.*] If our learned Author to this passage in *St. Paul*, had added only that in *2 Cor. xii. 21.* no one would ever have disputed with him about these interpretations. But all that he says afterwards is manifestly forced, because *St. Paul* does not speak of that Sorrow which was caused by the censures of the Church, or *Excommunication*, but concerning Sorrow which proceeded from a depravation of Manners in the *Corinthians*, for which *St. Paul* had justly reprehended them. For it is apparent that *St. Paul* speaks to the whole *Corinthian Church*, which no one would say was excommunicated because the Apostle had in this Epistle reprov'd their Manners, or because he had ordered that one incestuous Person, spoken of in this Chapter, to be delivered to Satan. The thing confutes it self upon the very mention of it; and I dare say our Author had never written in this manner, if he had not some time before compos'd a disputation about the *Power of the Keys*, which he was very much in love with, and perhaps more than he should have been, and that made him think he saw those *Keys* where no body else would ever have thought of them.

*Verf. 5. Note e.* I. It had been better in my judgment, if our learned Author had insisted only on the *second* reason he assigns of this phrase, which is manifestly grounded on the Apostle's writings; for what need was there of inventing another *new* one, when the Apostles had given one very sufficient reason of it? But, unless I am mistaken, the *Doctor* did not sufficiently distinguish the common *Excommunication*, as it is described by the *Jews*, or as it obtained in *after Ages*, from that *delivering up to Satan* in the time of the *Apostles*. For *this* was a consecratory of that miraculous Power of the Apostles, whereas the power of *Excommunication* was not conjoined with any Miracle. What *Josephus* relates concerning the *Esseni*, may so be understood, as that the Excommunicate Person should be said to have died for Grief, not by the miraculous Virtue of the *Excommunication*; which yet if *Josephus* had believed, it would be no Crime to refuse to give Credit to him. And it is certain those *Esseni* were neither *Prophets* themselves, nor instituted by *Prophets*: But of this and other things which belong to  
Excommuni-



Excommunication, we may consult Mr. *J. Selden*, de *Synedr. Judæorum*, Chapter Lib. i. cap. 7, &c.

II. What our Author conjectures about the sense of the Verb *παράδοται*, that it signifies here *to deliver up upon Demand or Petition*, is certainly ingenious; but if it should be denied, I don't see how it could be proved. For an Executioner does not use to require the Magistrate to deliver up Malefactors to him, but they are delivered up to him without his *demanding* them. And when it is said that Satan desired permission of God *to sift the Apostles*, that was not properly to execute Punishment on them for their Sins, but to assault them the more vehemently with his Temptations and wicked Suggestions: Nor indeed can the Devil be supposed to demand bad Men of God in order to torment them, whom he would rather make happy, if he could, that he might entice others into sin by the example of their Prosperity; so that he is rather to be thought to punish bad men against his will, than to ask leave of God to afflict them. And it's visible that bad men who serve Satan, are so far from being more miserable and obnoxious to diseases than the good, that the contrary is generally true. Whence also by the way we may infer, that if *to be delivered to Satan*, were all one as to be cast out of the Church, those who never were within the Church must have been reckoned from their very birth to have been *delivered up to Satan*, and by consequence have been all more obnoxious to diseases than the Christians: And all likewise that were rightfully Excommunicated should have been said to have been *delivered to Satan*, and been afflicted with Diseases, which yet that it was of old so, no Writer has ever asserted, nor does any one believe. But *delivering up to Satan*, tho' conjoined with Excommunication, is not the same thing: And therefore our Author ought not to have confounded this unusual Punishment inflicted by Apostolical Authority, with the ordinary Censures of the Church. Nor is he more fortunate in conjecturing that this *delivering to Satan* was an imitation of God's dealing with Sinners, when he leaves them to the power of the Devil to execute his pleasure upon them.

Verf. 9. *Ἐγείλα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ.*] Many Interpreters would have this to be understood of this very Epistle, contrary to all the rules of Grammar, lest it should be thought that any of St. *Paul's* Epistles were lost; which yet why they might not, no reason at all can be given: For if so be, we want none of those things which are necessary to Salvation, what reason can we have to accuse the Providence of God, if any of the Writings of the Apostles were lost? Should we have been ever the less Disciples of Christ, if any of those Epistles

\*

had

Chapter had been lost, which we now have? Was it absolutely necessary that every thing which the Apostles wrote should be transmitted to Posterity? Nay we may suppose that there were some such Epistles, which it was the interest of the Churches, and Men of that Age to conceal; for there are secrets which every body need not to be acquainted with. And it would be no hard matter to produce instances of such secrets, if every one could not easily find such himself. So that there being no sufficient reason to persuade us that all the Apostles writings either were or ought to have been preserved, if it be most agreeable to the rules of Grammar to suppose, that the Discourse here is about an Epistle which is lost, I do not see why we should not be of that Opinion. And there are three things that shew St. Paul to speak of some other Epistle.

*First*, That he had no where in the foregoing part of this admonished the *Corinthians*  $\mu\grave{\eta}$   $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\gamma\upsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ , not to associate with Fornicators: For what he had said about the *Corinthian* who was guilty of *Incest*, cannot be the thing here referred to, because that had no ambiguity in it; and it appears by the following Verse, that the ambiguity of St. Paul's words either did, or at least might have given the *Corinthians* an occasion to mistake: *I wrote unto you*, saith he, *in an Epistle not to keep company with Fornicators; but not altogether with the Fornicators of this World, or with the Covetous, or Extortioners, or Idolaters, for then must ye needs have gone out of the World. But now I have written unto you, not to keep Company with any Man that is called a Brother, and is a Fornicator, &c.*

*Secondly*, The 11th Verse which begins with the Particle  $\nu\upsilon\upsilon\iota$  now, sufficiently shews that the Apostle in that speaks of *this* Epistle, and in the 9th Verse of *another*: *I WROTE* unto you, saith he, *in an Epistle, not to, &c.* But *NOW* I have written unto you, &c. There is here a plain opposition between the time of the Apostles writing the one and the other; for tho the Particle *now* be sometimes only a *transition*, and does not signify any difference of time, yet it is manifest that St. Paul speaks here of a thing that was past, which he now explains more clearly. Nay tho we should grant the Particle *now* to be here a form of *transition*, and the Apostle to speak of the same Epistle in both Verses; yet that Epistle must be an Epistle in which St. Paul had spoken *ambiguously*, and not this in which there is *no ambiguity*, as I have just now said.

*Thirdly*, If the Apostle had meant *this* Epistle, he would not have said  $\epsilon\nu$   $\tau\eta$   $\delta\omicron\pi\iota\sigma\tau\lambda\eta$ , but either have wholly omitted it, or said  $\epsilon\nu$   $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$   $\tau\eta$   $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\lambda\eta$ , *in this Epistle*; tho even that could not be handsomly enough said, if but just before he had written that which by many he is supposed



posed here to refer to. But undoubtedly he meant *another* Epistle, as Chapter in his 2<sup>d</sup> Epist. Chap. vii. 8. where he speaks of *this*, which is come to our hands: ἐλύπισα ὑμᾶς, saith he, ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *I made you sorrowful in a Letter*, viz. formerly written to you. Tho I confess the Phrase τὴν ἐπιστολὴν is used elsewhere by St. Paul, to signify τὴν ταύτην ἐπιστολὴν, *this Epistle*, viz. in Colos. iv. 16. and 1 Thess. v. 27. But I do not rely only on this reason, or the bare omission of the *Προνομι ταύτης*.

All this did not hinder Dr. Hammond, who was an excellent Divine, but an indifferent Grammarian, from declaring himself of another Opinion in his *Note* upon this *Verse*, which, if I am not mistaken, was owing to a Theological prejudice, mentioned in the beginning of this Animadversion.

Ibid. Note g. Col. 2. Lin. 23. After the words, *guilty of those Sins.*] I have already confuted what Dr. Hammond here says, who would have done better to follow Grotius whom he so often had recourse to. That none of the Antients have made any mention of that Epistle to the *Corinthians*, which I say is lost, does not prove that there was no such Epistle; because there might be reasons, as I before said, for the concealing of it, or perhaps also after it was read, for the tearing and burning it, by the Apostle's own order who had written it.

Verf. 10. Note h. I. As πλεονέκτης no where signifies a *Voluptuary*, unless it be in Dr. Hammond's Lexicon, as I have shewn on Rom. i. 29. so neither does ἀρπαξ when it is alone, signify a Ravisher of Boys or Women; but the circumstances of the place where that word occurs, must oblige us to take it in that sense; otherwise it always signifies one that is greedy of Money, and takes away what is anothers, either under a pretence of right, or by abusing his Authority to that purpose. And in this place where the word πρῶτος is set in the first place, and signifies a Person addicted to Venery, there is no necessity to take it in any other than its ordinary sense: See especially the following Verse, where ἀρπαξ is last mentioned after the names of four other Vices.

II. The word ἄλωσις in 2 Pct. ii. 12. signifies no such thing; for *Animals made εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν* are Animals therefore created that they might be taken and destroyed: See Grotius on that place. There was no necessity of recurring to the Version of the *Septuagint*, to shew that ἀρπαξίζειν signifies *ravere* to ravish; for who does not know that?

III. What is said of the sense of Gen. vi. 11. is all mere conjecture, which has no ground either in the History, or the proper signification of the words. The Hebrew חמא *hamas* does not signify *Violence* but *injury*; and חמש *schibbeth*, *he was corrupted*, signifies any change whatsoever

Chapter V. whatsoever for the worse, and not only Lusts, as any Lexicon will shew. It's true, the Marriages of the *Ensidæ* with the *Cainites*, were a means of corrupting all Mankind; but it does not thence follow that Lust was their principal Sin, no more than from St. Peter's joining the Men who lived before the Flood with the *Sodomites*; for to put them together, it is sufficient that they were both Sinners, tho' their sins were different, and both utterly destroyed, tho' not in the same manner.

IV. I grant a lustful Person was the occasion of what the Apostle here says; but it does not follow therefore that the Vices which he mentions in *vers.* 10, and 11. belong to the same thing. Surely *ἰδωλάτριαι, λίσσοι, & μέθυστοι*, do not signify one given to *Venery*, tho' I confess, Idolaters, Railers, and Drunkards, have been often addicted to Lust.

V. There is no doubt but *ἄρπαξ* is sometimes taken for a Ravisher of Boys or Women; but as I said before, the Circumstances of the place must shew that the word is used in that sense, as in the place alledged out of *Harmenopolus*, which nevertheless I do not warrant, because I have not look'd into him. But the Passages cited out of the *Sybillin Oracles*, are certainly wrested; nor do I believe that our learned Author took them out of the Book it self: For the first is in the *first* Book, not the *second*, out of which he cites it. And the place it self shews that he misinterprets it; for after the word *ἄρπαισι* is subjoined the word *τύραννοι*, Tyrants, who are rather Ravishers of Goods and Possessions than of Men. In the *second* are collected the names of several Vices, whether they have any Affinity with one another or not: and tho' Men are called by the Sybil, *A race of Adulterers, Idolaters, Deceivers, and Persons whose breasts are full of Rage*; and she adds,

*Αὐτοὶς ἄρπαζόντες, ἀναιδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες,*

*Snatching to themselves, having an impudent Mind*; it does not thence follow that *ἄρπαξεν* must here be understood of the ravishing of a Boy or a Woman, tho' there were nothing added which shewed the contrary. But it follows,

*Οὐδεὶς γὰρ πλετῶν, εἰ ἔχων ἄλλω μετεδώσει.*

*For no rich Man that has great possessions, will make another participate of them.* By which it is evident that it is not so to be understood. Two Verses after that it follows,



————— Χίμαι τε θυγατέρες  
Στέρξουσιν κρυφίως άλλως πολλὰ διὰ κέρδους.

*Many Widows will privately love others for Gain.* Which is nothing to the Verb ἀρπαζέσθαι. In the last Verse but two of the Book, the Sybil saith, that the day of Judgment, of which she had before spoken, would come

————— Ὅπου τὸν θεὸς διαβήσεται ὄσμῃ,

*When the smell of Brimstone should be gone.* In which I cannot tell whether she had any respect to the destruction of Sodom.

VI. In *Mat.* xxiii. the words ἀρπαγή & ἀκροσία are used in their ordinary signification; and καθαρότης, which is opposed to them, is not only that purity which consists in Abstinence from carnal Pleasures, but from any sort of Wickedness, as appears by the place alledged out of *St. Luke*, where πορνεία signifies all kinds of Vice, as the Hebrew רַבָּה *rabah* in *Gen.* vi. 5. They who think otherwise, can bring no Argument either from the thing it self, or the word to confirm their Opinion: So that upon the whole here is, as the Poet speaks,

*Pergula pictorum, veri nihil, omnia falsa.*

*Ibid.* Note i. Here is, I confess, μέγας ῥέος a mighty flood of Examples, but

————— Πολλά  
Λύματα γῆς καὶ πᾶν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρρετὸν ἕλκερ.

For it is true indeed, the Solemnities used in the worship of some Deities, in some places, were accompanied with shameful Lusts, as I have shewn my self on *Exod.* xxxiv. 15. But that either every where, or for the most part it was so, I leave them to believe who are ignorant of the antient Heathen Customs. Our Author speaks as if the *Greeks* and *Romans* did very freely suffer their Wives and Children to be corrupted and prostituted in their sacred Mysteries; and as if that was the general Custom, than which nothing can be more false: Nay there were severe Decrees sometimes made against Impurities in the worship of their Gods, as appears from *Livy*, Lib. 39. and by an order of the Senate it self still extant: See also *Cicero de Legibus*, Lib.

Chapter Lib. 2. Cap. 14, 15. I do not therefore believe that an *Idolater* simply is ever taken for a *Fornicator* or *Adulterer*, as if Idolatry and Uncleanness had always gone together: Nor does our Author produce any one Passage to make it probable; for tho all the Sins which are joined with Idolatry here and elsewhere, respected carnal Pleasures, it would in no wise follow that by *Idolatry* is meant *Impurity*, when neither the proper signification of that word, nor its use will admit that sense; and it is very common for Sins of various kinds to be joined together. And yet upon this only ground almost, our learned Author in his *Note* on *Rom. i. 29.* endeavoured to prove that *πλεονεξία* signified *Luxury*, against the proper signification of the word, and the constant use of all Writers, as I have there shewn. And the same I shall do here, as to the word *Idolatry*, lest any should be deceived by his Authority, or multitude of Examples.

I. The Hebrew word גִּלּוּל *gilloul* signifies *Dung* properly, and Idols are by way of contempt so called, not because of those carnal Pollutions that accompanied the Worship of them, but because they were made no more account of than *Dung* by the *Jews*: For *Dung* did not pollute, *viz.* with any legal Pollution. By the *Septuagint* this word is rendred βδέλυγμα, not as if that were the proper signification of it, but because the *Jews* who spake Greek, commonly called Idols βδελύγματα *abominable things*, not polluted; for βδελύττεται does not signify *to be polluted*, but *to abhor*, *to detest*. And the same is the signification of the Hebrew root שָׂקַץ *schakats*, whence שָׂקִיצָה an *abominable thing*, not properly because of carnal Pollution, but because it is evil. *Lyra's* Authority is not to be regarded. See my Notes on *Gen. xxi. 7.*

II. I do not doubt but in the *Bacchanalia*, or night Revels of *Bacchus*, there were horrible Villanies committed; but I do not think it was universally known in *Greece*, that those things were done there in honour of that God. Our learned Author might have produced a great many sifter Testimonies, to shew that the Mysteries of *Ceres* were *secret*, than those which he alledges out of *Horace* and *Seneca*; or rather have let them quite alone, since every Child knows such things.

III. That passage in *Jerem. xlv. 19.* is perfectly foreign to this business, there being nothing there said about nocturnal Sacrifices: For thus the Women who had offered Sacrifice to the Queen of Heaven, that is, the Moon, speak: *When we burned Incense to the Queen of Heaven, and poured out drink Offerings, did we make her Images without our Husbands?* &c.

IV. I am of opinion indeed with our Author, that God by the sacred mark of Circumcision, did signify the amputation of inordinate Pleasures;



Pleasures; but whether he had a particular respect to the shameful practices of the Heathens in their Religious Solemnities, which in that Ceremony he condemned, I cannot tell; nor is it evident from any place of Scripture. Chapter V.

V. Our Author had not look'd into 2 Kings xxiii. 7. for the word there in the Hebrew is לַאֲשֵׁרָה *laascherah*, that is, *in a Grove*, not עֲשֵׂתְרוֹת *bashteroth*, which has a different signification. But he was deceived by an overhasty reading of what Mr. Selden says about this matter, *de Diis Syris*, Synt. ii. Cap. 2. who may be consulted; and who has also treated at large of *Milytta* and the rest here spoken of, in *Syntag. 2. Cap. 7.* To me likewise it seems most probable, what he conjectures about the original of the names *Atergatis* and *Derceto*, in *cap. 3.* of the same *Syntagm.* as if they were the same with אֲדִיר דָּג *addir-dag*, a magnificent Fish, because he sets down a story which agrees with his conjecture, as he at large shews.

VI. By a pleasant mistake our Author produces Verses out of the 3d Book of the *Sybillin Oracles*, as respecting the *Roman Lustrations*, of which there is not in them the least mark or footstep; merely, if I am not mistaken, because *Joan. Opsopæus*, who turned the *Sybillin Oracles* into bad Latin Verse, had thus translated the two first which *Dr. Hammond* alledges:

*Masque mari se junget, statuentque pudendis  
In LUSTRIS pueros.*

But these *Lustra* any one will see to be *Bawdy-Houses*, who observes it to be in the Greek ἀίχμα τέμν. The other places prove nothing, but only that the Heathens were generally given to inordinate Lusts, but not that those Lusts were reckoned by the most of them a part of Religion.

VII. In the *Eleusinia Sacra*, or Rites performed in honour of *Ceres*, there were indeed some indecent things practised, as *Joannes Meursius* in *Eleusiniis* will inform us; but that any horrible Villanies, and such as are not to be named, were committed in them, will not be thought by any that shall read what is said of them by *Cicero de Legibus*, Lib. 2. in the place before cited.

VIII. In *Coloss. iii. 5.* the word πλεονεξία is taken in its usual and constant signification for *Covetousness*, and not for lustful Idolatry: The same I say of *Ephes. v. 5.* The rest of the places alledged prove nothing at all, for the Affinity there is between some Vices does not make it necessary that all others should be of the same kind. What is pro-

Chapter duced out of *Polycarpus* and *Beza*, has been already confuted on *Rom. i. 29.*  
 V. The words of the *Council of Illiberis* are figurative, and signify no more than that the Heathen Priests, who after they had taken upon them the profession of Christianity, did again return to the worship of Idols, were as guilty as if they had committed the three Sins there mentioned.

*Vers. 11.* Our Author did well to add this at last, for it is false that *κακός* ever signifies a lustful Person: See *Hesychius*, *Phavorinus*, the *Old Glosses*, and all the *Lexicons* in the World. I name *Hesychius* among the rest, because he interprets *ὕβρις* by a *Railer*, for there is one sort of *ὕβρις* which lies only in words: Whence the *Old Glosses* render it not only *injuriam* Injury, but also *convitium*, *probrum*, railing, reviling, & *ὕβρις* *convitiatur*, *convitium* *facit*, *contumeliatur*, *ὕβρις* *contumeliosus*. *Phavorinus*; ὕβρις ἔστι μόνον ἐν λόγοις, ἐκ τῆς δὲ ἢ καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀποχρῆσιν ὕβρις γὰρ καὶ ἢ κακότητος ὕβρις δὲ μάταια καὶ ἀποχρηστικῆς. As for the *Gnosticks*, I should no more imagin them to be here referred to, than any other bad Men, unless our Author meant to give the honourable name of *Gnosticks* to all the vile wretches that in the Apostles times had crept into the Christian Assemblies; tho why he should, I can see no reason.

*Vers. 12. Note 1.* Our Author who makes his stile both in English and Latin rugged with unnecessary and misplaced Parentheses, and thereby often renders it tedious to the Reader, makes too much use of that expedient to connect the Discourse of the Sacred Writers. Besides, if we read the Greek words, it will appear that the Discourse does not insufficiently hang together; for we should be obliged to read: *τὸν παύσατε ἑαγεῖτε*, *doing this ye shall put away.*

I shall propose here a Conjecture, which if it were true, would make all things plain. We read the words in our Copies thus: *τί γὰρ μοι καὶ τὸς ἔξω κείνους;* Now what construction this is, *τί μοι κείνους*, I confess I do not understand. I know the sense commonly put upon it is, *What have I to do, or what business is it of mine to judg them that are without? i. e. it is not my business.* But there is no example given of any such Phrase. Besides, the *Conjunction* *καὶ* intervening, makes the Phrase still more harsh; for which reason it is left out in the *Alexandrian* and other *Manuscripts*, and omitted by the *Syriack* Interpreter; but in my judgment rashly, because that Particle may be of use to direct us to the true reading, which seems to be this: *Τί γὰρ μοι καὶ τοῖς ἔξω; καὶ μὲν οὖν τε τὸς ἔσω ὁμοίως κείνους τὸς δὲ ἔξω ὁ θεὸς κείνους; καὶ ἑαγεῖτε τὸ παρῆν, &c.* For what have I to do with those that are without? But do you judg those that are within; and those that are without  
 God



God judgeth: and ye shall put away the wicked Person from among you. Chapter VI.

First, *ἡμεῖς καὶ οὐ* is a Phrase very common in the Sacred Writers, and is as much as, *take care of your own Business, and I'll take care of mine*: See *Mat.* viii. 29. *John* ii. 4. and Interpreters on those places. And the sense here must certainly be; It is not my business to take care of the Manners of the Heathens, who have not yet embraced the Gospel. Next, the words *καὶ μὴ νομίετε* might easily enough be changed into *κρινεῖν ὀφείλουμι*, because the Verb *κρίνω* occurs twice in the following words. And *καὶ* is an *Adversative Particle* frequently used by *St. Paul*: See *Rom.* iv. 20. and x. 18. and *Phil.* iii. 8. This makes the sense very plain, whereas that interrogation, *do not ye judg them?* is very harsh and improper in this place. If *St. Paul* had said; It is not my business to judg those who are *among you*, do not ye judg them? this would be some sense, tho' foreign to this place, and the discourse would be current; but as it is now, the connexion of the words is extremely harsh. Thirdly, the following words *τὰς ΔΕ ἔξω* (there being here a manifest opposition between the *εἰ ἔξω* & *εἰ ἐν*) shews there ought to have preceded the Particle *ΜΕΝ*, which is contained in *ἡμεῖς καὶ οὐ*, for *μεν* is all one with *καὶ ἐν*, and if we believe *H. Stephanus*, ought to be so distinctly written. Fourthly, *καὶ ἔξω* is evidently conjoined with *κρίνετε*, *judg and ye shall put away*: The words intervening, *and those that are without God judgeth*, ought not to be included in a *Paraphrasis*, because they are set in opposition to that which went immediately before, and not inserted *καὶ τὰ ἐξω*.

And it cannot seem strange, that I suppose this place to be corrupted, seeing the *Syriack* Interpreter seems to have thought the same, who has left out in the 12th Verse *καὶ ἐν*, & *καὶ* again in the 13th, because he did not see how the *Aposile's* words could otherwise be made to hang together. The *Latin* also and the *Arabian* Interpreters omit the Particle *καὶ* in both Verses. The *Ethiopian* departs yet further from the rest, who has; *Et cum qui intus homines judicabit*. And there are other variations in the *Manuscript Copies*, which I pass by.

## C H A P. VI.

Verf. 2. **W**HAT our Author says here about the notion of  
 Note a. the word *κρινεῖν* is true; but as that word has more significations than one, so in this place it seems rather to be taken for judgment: for *ἀναξιὸν ἐκαστὸν κρινεῖν* signifies not *Persons unworthy to sit in the lowest Judgment-seats*, but to judg of the *smallest matters*; and therefore is very rightly rendered by the *Vulgar*

Chapter *qui de minimis judicetis*. And thus the *Old Glosses* render κριτήριον *judicium, examen, sensus, Judgment, Examination, Opinion*, and κριτήρια *judicia*. But in *vers.* 4. Κριτήρια βιωτικὰ ἔχειν seems to signify *to have things to be judged of relating to life*, as *Dr. Hammond* himself interprets it in his *Paraphrase*. So that in this *Verse* κριτήριον is taken for the *act of judging*, and in *Vers.* 4. for *things to be judged of*.

*Vers.* 7. *Note b.* Here the word ὅλως is as much as *omnino*, or a Particle of affirming, as I have shewn on that place in *Chap.* v. 1.

*Vers.* 10. Πλεονέκτης.] This word our Author here in the Margin, according to his manner, interprets of *a Person of inordinate Lusts*. But if that were the true sense of it, it should have been joined with the foregoing words in the *9th Verse*, and not have been put here in the *10th* after the word κλέπτης: But πλεονέκτης signifies in this place, as it is rendred in the *Old Glosses*, *fraudator, avidus, A cheating, covetous Person*.

*Vers.* 11. Εδικαιώθητε.] Δικαιοδοῦναι in this place is the same with ἀπολούσασθαι & ἀγιαδοῦναι, *to be washed and sanctified*, which went just before. The Phrase ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου signifies, when ye became Christians, or took upon you the profession of the Christian Religion in Baptism; which obliged all those that received it, to reformation of Life. See *Acts* ii. 38.

*Vers.* 19. Ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος.] This expression may be illustrated by a passage in the Epistle of *Barnabas*, where he saith: Ναὸς ὃ ἁγίος παρὰ κρείων τὸ κατοικητήριον ἡμῶν τῆ καρδίας: *For the habitation of our Heart is a holy Temple to the Lord*. The Holy Spirit is said to dwell in our Bodies, because it is present with our Minds, which inhabit our Bodies. *Grotius* does but trifle when he tells us, that *the Spirit of the Mind is the Sanctuary, the other parts of the Mind the Court of the Temple, and the Body the Porch and its outward parts*. Such a Remark as this might perhaps be tolerable in a Pulpit, but by no means in an exact Interpreter. *Claudian* has an expression much like this in his *Second Book*, on the first Consulship of *Stilichon*, speaking of the Goddess *Mercy*:

*Hæc Dea, pro templis & thure calentibus aris,  
Te fruitur, posuitque suas hoc pectore fedes.*

And a little after:

*Huic Divæ germana Fides, eademque sorori  
Corde tuo DELUBRA tenens,*

*Vers.*



Verf. 20. *Ἐργασθε τὸ πνεῦμα*.] St. Paul seems to allude here to a House, Chapter VII. which none but he may use how he pleases that has purchased it. And God having, as it were, bought our Bodies as well as our Souls, he only has a sovereign Right to prescribe to us how we shall use them.

## C H A P. VII.

Verf. 3. **O**F this matter, according to the Doctrine of the Rab-  
Note a. bins, Mr. Selden has treated at large in his *Uxor Hebraica*, Lib. 3. c. 4. and seqq.

Verf. 5. Note b. *Ἀκρασία* and its opposite *ἐγκράτεια*, according to the subject matter, are taken sometimes in a larger, and sometimes in a more contracted Notion. In general *ἀκρατής* signifies one that has not the command of his Passions, *ὅστις ἔκρεται ὑπὸ πάθων, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ αὐτῶν κρείταιται*, but is commanded or overruled by them: And on the contrary, *ἐγκράτης* one that is not subject to the dominion of any Passion, but is always his own master: But because the Passions are various, proportionable to the variety of objects to which they may be carried out, therefore *ἀκρασία* & *ἐγκράτεια* have also divers objects, as Aristotle will teach us in the beginning of his 7th Book of *Ethicks*, *ad Nicomachum*. And so in this place, where the discourse is about the lawful pleasures of Marriage, *ἀκρατεια* is used in a much narrower signification, not for a Vice, i. e. a disposition of Mind contrary to the Law of God, and pernicious to humane Society, but a certain natural heat of Body, which of it self is neither a Vice nor a Vertue. But it is described as a Vice, because it is an occasion of becoming vitious to those who do not govern it with reason.

Verf. 6. Note c. Col. 1. Lin. 45. After the words, *on the other side*.] Our learned Author might have confirmed this observation about the use of the word *θέλω* for *malō*, *I had rather*, by that Passage in *Hos. vi. 6*. *I will (חפצתי) have Mercy and not (ולא) Sacrifice*; which is all one as if God had said, *מזבח mizzebahh, than Sacrifice*: and if the Prophet had written so, it could not have been rendred otherwise than by *I will*, or *had rather*. And that this the Prophet meant is evident by the next words; *and the knowledg of God, מעולות meholoth, than burnt Offerings*: whence the Septuagint according to the Vatican Copy, read; *διότι ἔλεϑ θέλω ἢ θυσίαν, καὶ ἐπιγνώσων θεῶ ἢ ἑλοκαυτώματα*; and Jonathan, *ממרבח than Sacrifice*: But in *Mat. ix. 13*. and in the *Alexandrian* Copy we read *καὶ ἔθυσιαν*, which is yet to the same sense. It is certain the Hebrews have no Verb whereby to express the Latin *malō* or *μᾶλλον θέλω* in Greck.

Chapter VII. *Verf. 14. Note d.* From this place I readily allow the deduction of this Confectary, that the Infants of Christian Parents may be baptized, because they are *Holy*, i. e. reckoned as a part of God's People; but that this Phrase signifies Baptism it self, does not appear by any thing that Dr. *Hammond* here says: For tho the Verb קדש to *sanctify*, signify also *to wash*, it does not follow that by קדש אבות may be meant one whose condition is such as to make him capable of being *washed*, or *baptized*. And on the contrary, the Children of Heathens were accounted ἀκάθαρτοι *impure*, that is, as part of those who were out of God's Covenant; and so could not be baptized, because Baptism follows the profession of Christianity, which could neither be made by Parents who were Heathens, nor by Infants. This is the Notion of the words *Holy* and *Impure*, which being first used in that sense by the *Jews*, came afterwards to be taken in the same by the *Christians*; which is the reason why *Christians* are so often stiled *Saints* in the Epistles of the Apostles. See the inscriptions of St. *Paul's* Epistles.

*Verf. 17. Note e.* I. The same reason which moved Dr. *Hammond* to prefer the reading of some antient Copies mentioned by *Theophylact*, before that in ours, makes me think that the ordinary reading ought to be retained: Namely, because the obscurity arising in the sense from εἰ μὴ might easily induce some Scribe or Critick to change εἰ into ἢ, and join these words with the foregoing, to make the sense more perspicuous; but there was no reason why, when the sense was clear, it should be made more obscure.

II. I have more than once observed, that the end of an Annotation does not agree with the beginning; the reason of which I suppose to be, that the *Doctor* did not write it all at the same time: For otherwise he would have made his Discourse here hang better together. For after he had said, *it will be reasonable to acquiesce therein*, viz. in that *other reading*, he gives a reason for so doing, which makes it unreasonable; for if the sense will be current, tho we retain the ordinary reading, and only change the pointing of the words, what reason can there be to acquiesce in any alteration of them?

III. We ought therefore to keep to the present reading of all Copies and Interpreters, and τὸ εἰ μὴ must be rendred *but*, as the *Syriack* and *Arabick* render it אלא, that is, ἀλλὰ.

*Verf. 34. Note h.* The *Oxford Edit.* of the *New Testament*, Anno 1675. takes notice of some Copies which read this place in the same manner as the *Alexandrian*, here mentioned by our Author, excepting that the second ἀγαμέ is omitted; but there is no mention there made of the *Alexandrian* Copy, the difference between which and others



others in the reading of this place, is nevertheless set down in the *Chapter London Polyglott*: But in that Edition there are other instances of very great negligence. I am perfectly of Dr. *Hammond's* opinion, as to the use of the Verb *μερίζω*, which I shall confirm by these Verses of *Virgil*, wherein he elegantly describes the Mind distracted with variety of Cares, and uses the word *dividere*, *Æneid.* 8. at the beginning.

VIII.

— *Magno curarum fluctuat æstu,*  
*Atque animum nunc huc celerem, nunc DIVIDIT illuc,*  
*In partesque rapit varias, perque omnia versat.*

Nay and the Verb *μεριμνέειν*, which signifies *to be vexed with Care*, is defined by the *Greek Grammarians* to be *ΜΕΡΙΖΕΣΘΑΙ εἰς διαφόρους βελάς, ὅτι παρὰ τὸ μερίζειν λέγεται τριπλῆ τῷ Ε εἰς Η.* *to be divided between different Resolutions, because it comes from μερίζειν by changing the Letter E into H.* See *Eustathius on Homer*, pag. 80. and 1427. *Edit. Rom.*

But there are two things in this Annotation of the *Doctor* liable to censure. The first is his Citation out of the *Jerusalem Paraphrase*, which makes nothing to the purpose, it being manifest that those words signify *Distrust* or *Unbelief*, not *Cares* or *Distractions*. And the second is his saying that *a Verb in the Singular number cannot be applied to two Nouns*: whereas nothing is more common in all the best Authors in both Languages than that Construction, and, which I wonder he did not take notice of, it must be admitted according to the reading of the *Alexandrian Copy*, which he prefers before the other: *ἢ γὰρ ἡ ἀζαμῶ, καὶ ἡ περὶ ἡ ἀζαμῶ μεριμνᾷ τὰ τῶ Κυρίῳ, &c.*

C H A P. VIII.

Verf. 4. **I** Don't think *St. Paul* had a respect to the Hebrew word; *Note a.* which perhaps was unknown to the *Corinthians*, but to the meaning of the word *εἰδωλον* it self which he here uses, and which properly signifies an Image conceived in the Mind, which is no where but in our Understanding; and afterwards was applied to other things which are look'd upon as vain Spectres. And this is the reason why the *Jews* who spake Greek, gave the name of *Idols*, first to the Gods of the Heathens themselves, and then to their *Statues*. All which I shall deduce a little more particularly, because it will conduce very much to the clear understanding of this Passage. And first of all it must be observed that the Verb *εἰδεῖν* signifies *to be*

Chapter like unto, in which sense it is often used in *Homer*, as for instance in VIII. *Iliad* B. *Vers.* 280.



— Παρὰ δὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη,  
Εἰδομένη κήρυκα.

And near to him stood greyeyed *Minerva*, like to a *Cryer*; ὁμοιωθεῖσα, saith the *Scholiast*. Whence the words ἰδέω & εἶδω came to signify an *Image* or representation of things, such as is formed in the *Mind*. And εἶδωλον, as *H. Stephanus* has shewn out of *Plutarch*, signifies sometimes the same. And therefore *Plato* in his *Phædrus*, p. 346. *Ed. Gen. Ficin.* calls an incorporeal thing, supposing it appeared in a visible shape, εἶδωλον, in that remarkable Sentence: Δεινὸς γὰρ ἂν περιέχον ἔρωτος ἢ φρόνησις, εἴ τι τιεῖται ἑαυτῆς ἐναργέως Εἰδωλον περιέχετο εἰς ὄψιν ἴδον: Men would be extremely in love with *Wisdom*, if it did but present some lively *Image* of it self to their view. And because they thought that the *Souls* of dead *Persons* were clothed with a certain airy *Form*, resembling outwardly that *Body* which they inhabited when those *Persons* were alive, that *Form* they usually called εἶδωλον. We frequently meet in *Homer* with this half Verse, νεκῶν εἶδωλα καμόντων the *Images* of deceased *Men*. *Virgil* renders it *simulachra* & *figuras*, which he thus describes in *Æneid*. 6. *Vers.* 292. speaking of *Aeneas*, who was going to encounter the *Ghosts*, if *Sybilla* had not diverted him:

*Et ni docta comes tenues sine corpore vitas  
Admoneat volitare, cava sub imagine formæ,  
Irruat & frustra ferro diverberet umbras.*

This was the use of the word εἶδωλον among the *Greeks*, when the *Jews* first came acquainted with them; and therefore when they had learned to speak *Greek*, they fitly called the *Gods* of the *Nations* εἶδωλα, partly because they were but meer human *Inventions*, having no real *Existence*; and partly because they generally worshipped dead men, νεκῶν εἶδωλα καμόντων, or to use the words of *Virgil*,

*Horum umbras tenues, simulachraque luce carentum.*

Which shews likewise the reason why the *Apostle* says that an *Idol* is nothing in the *World*, for the *Fictions* of *Men* have no real *Existence*, nor are there any such *Images* or *Apparitions* of dead *Persons*, as the *Poets* speak of, no more than there is any

*Horrendum*



*Horrendum stridens, flammisque armata Chimæra.*

*Philo Judæus*, Lib. *de Monarchia* affirms, that *Riches* also are called in Scripture *ἰδωλα*, because they are but the fading Images of true good: *τάδε εἰσὶν*, saith he, *ἄφρον ἰδωλα, σκιαῖς εἰκότα καὶ φαντάτων, ἐδεδόσ ἡρημένα ὄχρη καὶ βεβαιῶ*: *these are the things which [the Scripture] calleth Idols, like Shadows and Phantoms, which depend upon nothing firm or certain.*

Verf. 5. *Καὶ ὃ ἐπὶ εἰσι λεγόμενοι θεοί, &c.*] The sense of this Verse is not truly expressed by our Author out of *Theophylact*. It must be rendred; *for tho there be they which are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth (as really there are Gods many, and Lords many) yet to us there is one God the Father, &c.* By *Gods in Heaven* are meant God and the Angels; *in the Earth* Magistrates, who are also called *the Lords of the World*. But Christians called only *the Father*, by whom all things were created, *God*; and *Jesus Christ*, by whom were all things, *Lord* in the most excellent sense. The Apostle has no reference to the false Gods or *Idols* of the Heathens, nor to the common way of speaking among the *Jews* themselves; for he grants that those were truly called Gods and Lords. He seems when he wrote this, to have had in his mind that passage of *Moses* in *Deut. x. 17.* *The Lord your God is God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, a great God, mighty and terrible, whom the Jews ought alone to serve.* And in like manner *St. Paul* here teaches, that tho there were many that were called Gods and Lords, yet there was but one of those Gods, and one of those Lords that were to be made the Objects of divine Worship.

Verf. 7. *Note b.* No body will deny but *ἀδυνεῖν*, where the Discourse is about the Body, signifies to be sick, and is taken also for a disease of the Mind, if the discourse be about the Mind. But I don't think *St. Paul* here has a respect to the general Notion of a distemper of the Mind, or of Sin, but rather speaks of an infirm purpose in the profession of the Christian Religion, and the observation of its Precepts; such as is usual in ignorant People, who are hardly brought to an entire renunciation of their former Errors. This is the proper signification of the word *ἀδυνεῖς*: And these the Apostle calls *ἀδυνεῖντας τῇ πίσει*, *Rom. xiv. 1, 2.* which does not signify *sick or diseased in the Faith*, but Persons whose Faith was not so firm and strong as it should have been. As on the other hand in *Chap. iv. 19.* of the same Epistle, speaking of *Abraham*, he says that *ἐκ ἡδυνεσε τῇ πίσει* he was not weak in Faith, i. e. he did not doubt: And so in the *Septuagint*, *ἀδυνεῖν* is sometimes taken for to *stumble*, because those who do not take their steps firm, often stumble, as Children do when they first begin to go alone. \* Our

Chapter  
IX.

Our Author alledges St. Paul's words in the 7th Verse, as if St. Paul had said *συνειδήσῃ τῷ εἰδώλῳ*, and not *συνείδησῃ τῷ εἰδώλῳ* with Conscience of the Idol; in which he follows the *Alexandrian* and two other *Roman* Copies. But I suspect that to be only the gloss of some Men, that did not understand the meaning of the Phrase *συνείδησις εἰδώλου*, which signifies an Opinion or Perswasion concerning the favourable presence of the Idol at their Holy Feasts, with which some of the *Corinthians* were still at that time possessed, as Dr. *Hammond* has well observed.

Verf. 10. *Οικοδομηθήσεται.*] That is, *confirmed*, as I have shewn in my *Ars Critica*, Par. 3. Sect. 1. c. 16. 11.

## C H A P. IX.

Verf. 5. **M**Η ἔκ ἐχρμεν ἐξυπὶαν ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν;] *Have we not power to lead about a Sister, a Wife?* So it must be rendred, for I have already shewn on *Rom. xvi. 1.* that the Opinion which Dr. *Hammond* follows here in his Paraphrase, in concurrence with some of the Antients, is very improbable. If St. Paul had designed to say what they affirm, he would not have added *γυναῖκα*, for *ἀδελφὴ* alone would have been sufficient; and the Greeks do no more use to say *ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα* for a *Sister*, than *ἀδελφὸν ἄνδρα* for a *Brother*. St. Paul therefore here intimates that he had married indeed a Wife, whom he might if he pleased take along with him as a Companion in his Travels, but he did not *περιάγειν* lead her about, lest she should be burdensom to the Churches; for tho he could have easily got his own living by working, yet it would have been much more difficult for him to provide both for himself and his Wife, if she had travelled with him.

It is groundlessly therefore inferred by some from this place, that St. Paul was a single man, for he does not say, *have not we power to have a Wife*, *γυναῖκα ἔχειν*, but *to lead about a Wife*, viz. which he already had. And to this place perhaps the *Interpolator* of *Ignatius's* Epistle to the *Philippians*, pag. 98. *Ed. Usser.* had a respect; where having spoken of unmarried Persons, he saith: *Οὐ ψέγω δὲ τὰς λοιπὰς μακαρίας ὅτι γάμοις προσμίλησαν, ὧν ἐμνήσθη ἄριστος ὁ Χριστός· ἵνα ἴδωμεν ὅτι ἄξιόν ἐστι εὐσεβείας, πρὸς τοῖς ἔχουσιν αὐτῶν εὐρηθῆναι ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, ὡς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ, ὡς Ἰωσήφ, καὶ Ἰσαΐα, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Προφητῶν, ὡς Πέτρος, καὶ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἀποστόλων τοῖς γάμοις προσμιλησάντων:* but I do not derogate from the rest of the Blessed that were joined in marriage, which I have now mentioned. For I desire to be found worthy of God at their footsteps in his Kingdom; as of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, as of Joseph and Isaiah, and the rest of the Pro-



phets, and as of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the other Apostles, who were married Men. Nor is it any objection against this, what St. Paul says in Chap. vii. 7, 8. of this Epistle; for the meaning of the Apostle in that place is only, that he wished every body else had as little Appetite to the lawful pleasures of Marriage as himself, and that it was expedient for Widows and unmarried People at that time to remain as he was, that is, not to be more desirous of Marriage than he was of the Society of his Wife. Chapter IX.

Verf. 10. Τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτοῦ μετέχων ἐπ' ἐλπίδι.] The same word ἐλπίς has a twofold Notion in this place; for the former signifies the *thing* hoped for, and the latter the *Affection* it self. Such things are common in the writings of the Apostles. See Note on St. John's Gospe. c. i. 16.

Verf. 12. Ἐξαιτίας ὑμῶν.] That is, *eis ὑμᾶς* over you: See Mat. x. 1. John xvii. 2. and what I have observed in my *Ars Critica*, Par. 2. S. 1. c. 12. 11. So likewise afterwards Chap. x. 6. of this Epistle, *τύποι ἡμῶν* are *τύποι εἰς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν*, *examples for our Instruction*.

Verf. 17. Note a. Some such works of *Supererogation* may really be done, but have a care of thinking upon that account that they deserve any reward from God: The reason is, because tho Men may out of a pious zeal do that whereof the omission would not bring punishment upon them; yet they have offended in other respects, and stand in need of God's Mercy, by which alone they can obtain the pardon of their Sins. If God had dealt according to strict justice with St. Paul, he had never pardoned those Sins which he had been guilty of whilst he remained a Jew, nor had his successful Zeal in the service of God when a Christian, been sufficient to expiate the Persecutions he had formerly stirred up against the Christians. But as he had mercifully forgiven him all his past Sins, so also out of his infinite Bounty and Goodness, which is as it were the peculiar Character of the Divine Nature, he resolved to reward his pious Actions.

Verf. 18. Τίς ἔν μοι ἐστὶν ὁ μισθός;] That is, *τίνα τι*, for what does God propound to me a reward? Not simply for preaching the Gospel, but for preaching it *gratis*, so as to be able to say I never used the Power I had, to take Mony of my Hearers to maintain me. So that I should render this interrogation: *of what sort then is my Reward?* i. e. what is the condition of the Reward that God proposes to me. Which I think is better than to interpret *ἰνα* which follows by *if* or *when*, tho I confess the signification of that as well as other Particles is various. The word *μισθός* here, tho set without any addition, must be observed to signify an extraordinary Reward, greater than that which should be conferred on all that preached the Gospel; for they might

Chapter all expect from God some degree of Reward, upon the performance  
IX. of their Office, tho they did no more than what they were necessarily  
obliged to.

Verf. 25. *Note h.* I have several Animadversions to make upon this foregoing Annotation. I. That the *Doctor* did not sufficiently understand the meaning of the word ἀναγκοφαγία, when he supposed it to signify a custom of the *Athletæ*, “*In forcing themselves to eat, that by that means they might become fleshy and corpulent.* For the *Athletæ* did not strive to make themselves fat or thick beyond measure; because that would have lessened their Activity, and been a great hindrance to them both in Cuffing and Running; but they endeavoured to get such a habit of Body as was requisite for the well performing of those Exercises, *i. e.* to become strong and nimble: For which purpose the *Gymnasiarchæ*, or *Masters of the Games*, did prescribe to them the eating of certain Meats, and such a proportion of them at stated times; and it was not lawful for them to use any other sort of Diet, or to eat how and when they pleased, but they were bound to follow anothers prescriptions. And this is the meaning of the word ἀναγκοφαγίαν, and not to *cram* themselves *per force*, as the thing it self will afterwards shew. *Lucian* in *Lib. περὶ Γυμνασίου* describes the *Athletæ*, or those that often exercised themselves in these sort of *Games*, thus: ἄτε ῥικνοὶ, καὶ κατεσκληρότεσ, ἔτε πλεπληθεῖσ ἐσ βάρῃ, ἀλλ’ ἐσ τὸ σύμμετρον ἀειργεμμένοι· τὸ μὲν ἀγρεῖον ἢ σαρκῶν, καὶ πλεπλὸν τῶν ἰδρῶσιν ἐξαναλωρότεσ: *they are neither shrivelled or wasted away, nor yet so extraordinary big as to be heavy, but of a just size; the useless and superfluous parts of their Flesh having been consumed in Sweat.* See also what follows.

II. Our learned Author seems to owe the greatest part of what he here says to *Pet. Faber*, or *Hier. Mercurialis*; whom he also hastily perhaps looked over, and collected as much as he had occasion for about the ἀγῶνεσ of the *Grecians*, out of the works of those Writers. For by his citation of some Passages, it appears that he did not look into the Authors themselves, out of which they are taken. The place alledged out of *Lucian*, is in *Dialogis mortuorum*, p. 279. *Ed. Amst.* and it is not *Charon*; but *Mercury* that is there represented, as afraid of letting *Damafias* with so much Fat about him come into his Boat; which yet we are not to understand was so much neither as to hinder his Activity, as if he had been a Man that had minded nothing but his Belly. The passage cited out of *Julian* does not shew that the *Athletæ* ate immoderately, but only certain Meats, in a certain quantity, and at a certain time; which would be very inconvenient for an Emperor, especially when journeying, or engaged in important Affairs, who  
must



must eat, ἐπειδὴν αἱ πράξεις ἢ καιρὸν ἐνδῶσιν: when Business will permit.

III. If our Author had looked into *Suidas*, or at least not read him negligently, he would have alledged his definition of ἐγκρατεία, which shews what that word properly signifies: It is διαθεσις, saith he, ἀνυπέβουπε ἢ κατ' ὀρθὸν λόγον: a disposition which will not suffer a Man to go in any thing beyond reason: καὶ ἔξις ἀήτητου ἠδονῶν, and a Habit which cannot be conquered by Pleasures: So that ἐγκρατὴς is one that has such a power over his Passions, as to abstain from those things which he judges hurtful to him, notwithstanding the pleasantness of them. And accordingly where the discourse is about an *Athleta*, who is said πάντα οἱ καὶ πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται, the meaning is, that he is one who in all things is so much his own Master, as to eat nothing, and do nothing which may impair his Strength. Which the Apostle did in another sense, who governed his Affections so as not to gratify them in any thing, tho' lawful, that might in the least hinder the propagation of the Gospel.

IV. The place in *Ælian* is absurdly thus quoted by our Author: So *Ælian* of the *Tarentinus Lucator*; as if the *Lucator's* name had been *Tarentinus*, whereas he was called *Iccus*, and *Tarentum* was the name of his Country. I shall set down the words of *Ælian* entire, which are these: ὅτι Ἰκκὸς ὁ Ταραντίνου πύλαις ὑπέβητε σωφρονέσειν ἢ τὴν ἀθλήσεως χρόνον διαζήτησας, καὶ ΚΕΚΟΛΑΣΣΕΝΗΙ ΤΡΟΦΗΙ διαβιώσας, καὶ Αφροδίτης ἀμαθίης διατελέσας: *Iccus* the *Tarentinian* was a *Lucator*, who lived soberly all the time of his combating, and used to eat moderately, and abstained to the last from *Vener*y. See *Joach. Kubnius* on the words put in Capital Letters, who by other Testimonies proves that the *Athletæ* lived quite differently from what the *Doctor* imagined.

V. Our Author erroneously thought that the word πάντα in this place of *St. Paul* was governed by the Verb ἐγκρατεύεται, whereas the Preposition καὶ is understood, and the words ought to be rendred, is temperate in all things, or with relation to all things. Which all things must be understood, according to the subject matter, of those things which were capable of weakning, if the Discourse be about an *Athleta*; and if about *St. Paul*, of those things which might obstruct the course of the Gospel.

Verf. 26. Note I. Πάγκρατον was an exercise performed by the Combatants standing, whereas they often strove on the Ground, as we are told by *Lucian* in *Dial.* ἀεὶ γυμνασίῳ, and fighting both with their Hands and Feet. So, in that Book, *Anacharsis* after he had described the Combatants in Sand and in Clay, represents them: εἰ δὲ ὀρθοὶ δύνανται κλονημένοι, καὶ ἀυτὶ παύσιν ἀλλήλους παροπισσόντες, καὶ λακτίζουσι: and these standing upright and all covered with Dust, strike and kick one another. And

Chapter *Solon* a little after, reciting the names of the Exercises which *Anacharsis* had described, is brought in as speaking thus: τῶν γυμνασμάτων δὲ τέτων, τὸ μὲν ἐν τῷ πηλῷ ἐκείνῳ, πάλιν καλεῖται· οἱ δὲ ἐν τῇ κόνει παλαίσσι καὶ αὐτί· τὸ δὲ πάλιν ἀλλήλους ὀρθοσάδων παγκρατίζεν λέγμεν: Of these Exercises, that which is performed in that Clay is called Wrestling: And those in the Dust do also wrestle, but their striking one another standing upright, we call *πανκρατίζεν*. Of these saith *Suidas*: ταῖς χερσὶ καὶ ποδὶ πανκρατίζουσι, they fight with their Hands and Feet; in which kind of combat they used to exert all their Strength.

*Ibid.* Note m. The place cited out of *Eustathius* is not in his *περὶ ἑρμηνείας* on *Iliad E*, but *Iliad Y*. pag. 1215. *Ed. Rom.* and if *Dr. Hammond* had took it out of the Author himself, he would have set it down intire, because it may help us to understand *St. Paul's* words. *Homer* had said of *Achilles*, who had endeavoured thrice to strike *Hector* to no purpose: τρίς δ' ἤερε τὴν ἄε βαθείαν, thrice he struck the thick darkness, with which *Apollo* had covered *Hector*; ἐξ ἧ, saith *Eustathius*, εἰληθεῖαι περιμίαν δοκῆν τὸν ἀέρα δαίρειν, ὅτι τῶν ἀπρόεμπις ἐγγυμέντων· τίνες ἤ τι δὲ τῶν πυγμαίων τὴν τιμωτήν περιμίαν εἰληθεῖαι δοκῆσιν· οἱ πάλαι ἐκ ἐυστοχόντες, μάλιστα κινῶσι τὰς χεῖρας: From whence the Proverb to beat the Air seems to be taken, which is applied to Persons who undertake impracticable things. But some think this Proverb was taken from *Cuffers*, who often, &c.

*Verf. 27.* Note n, and o. I have confuted *Dr. Hammond* on *Rom. vi. 6.* where he endeavours, to no purpose, to prove that *συνὸς μὲν* signifies *my self*: and therefore what he here says upon that Hypothesis is all vain. Besides, it is refuted by what he himself adds last of all in this place; for it is the Body that is subdued by bodily exercises, and not the Mind, any further than as the Body being once subdued, the Mind is no longer infected with those evil Affections which arise from the Body.

## C H A P. X.

*Verf. 1. Note a.*  
*Col. 1. Lin. 19.*

**A**FTER the words, *to do them.*] What our Author here says about the symbolical signification of the Wings of the *Cherubims*, he ought to have confirmed by some express Testimony out of *Moses* or the Prophets; for it is not necessary to think that God had a respect to all those things in instituting of the *Mosaical Rites*, which learned Men conjecture he might have a respect to. An infinite number of such things were of old fancied by the *Fathers*, who thought they might say what they pleased in this kind, tho they had no ground for it; and as many more



more are every day invented by our late Divines, which if denied, they Chapter  
can bring no Argument to make them appear probable. As to the X.  
*known saying* which Dr. Hammond speaks of among the Jews, that is  
taken from a passage in *Moses*, which is in his last Song in *Deut. xxxii.*  
11. in these words: *As an Eagle stirreth up her Nest, fluttereth over her*  
*young, and spreadeth abroad her Wings; so the [Lord] took him (viz. the*  
*People of the Jews) and bore him upon his Wings.* Which place is at  
large illustrated by *Sam. Bochart*, in *Hieroz.* Part. 2. Lib. 2. c. 3.

*Ibid.* In that *Note*, Col. 2. Lin. 7. after the words, *that followed*  
*them.*] Any one may see that this is a forced interpretation, which  
seems to be grounded only on this, that *St. Paul* says the *Israelites* were  
*under a Cloud*; as if they could not have been said to be *under a Cloud*,  
if the Cloud had lain only on the foremost part of the Camp. *Rabbi*  
*Eliezer* never saw that Cloud, or knew any thing about this matter,  
no more than the rest of the pretending Tribe of *Rabbies*, but what  
they could collect from *Moses*, who has no such thing. But, saith our  
Author, the protection of God will be better represented by a Cloud  
encompassing the Camp, than only going before it. That I utterly  
deny, for the Divine Protection was sufficiently signified by a perpetu-  
al symbol of his Presence whatever it was, if it could but be seen by  
all; and we are not to change stories written in the plainest words,  
into intolerable improprieties, to make them express what we would  
have them.

*Ibid.* In that *Note*, Lin. 24. after the words, *under thy Wings, &c.*] *A pillar of Cloud* cannot be otherwise understood than of an oblong  
Cloud, which like a Pillar suspended in the Air, was visible to all  
the *Israelites*: And *under* it might be said to be, not only those over  
whom it hung *perpendicularly*, but also who were placed *on every side* of  
it. As *under the constellation of the Crab* are said to be, not only those to  
whom that Constellation is *vertical*, but also all the *Ethiopians*: So that  
what our Author dreamt in order to explain this Phrase, like other  
Dreams, has no truth in it. The phrase *under the shadow of his Wings*  
is not, as I have already said, taken from a Cloud, but from the  
custom of Birds, who use to defend their tender Brood against the  
heat of the Sun with their Wings.

*Ibid.* In that *Note*, Col. 3. Lin. 17. after the words, *mention of*  
*both.*] *St. Paul* rather seems here to make mention of the *Cloud*, as  
afterwards he does of the *Fire*, because he intended to allude to the  
Christian Baptism, which is more resembled by a *Cloud*, that is, a  
watry Vapour, than by *Fire*.

*Ibid.* In that *Note*, *Lin.* 39. after the words, *were by the other.*] This passage in *Moses* is misunderstood, as I have shewn in my *Dissert. de tra-*  
*jectu maris Idumæi*, and I shall not here repeat what I have there said, which overthrows all that the *Doctor* here discourses.

*Ibid.* In that *Note*, *Lin.* 56. after the words, *belongs to the Fathers.*] The miraculous passage of the *Israelites* through the *Red-Sea*, and the Cloud going before them, were undoubtedly signal Evidences of the love of God to that People, as the thing it self shews; but that they are to be look'd on as a tacit Declaration from the *Israelites* to yield Obedience to God, I should hardly grant; and it is certain there is nothing either in the Scripture-History, or in the thing it self upon which such a Supposition can be grounded. These sort of things are only the products of a fruitful Invention, which if they be look'd on as Demonstrations, what will not Divines find in the Scripture? The *Israelites* are said to have been *baptized in the Cloud* and *in the Sea*, because the Cloud that hung over them, and the Sea that encompassed them, were Water, which may be reckoned as it were to have wet them, because of its nearness; as we are washed by the Water of Baptism. Besides this reason, taken from the nature of the thing it self, all others are mere Trifles and Niceties, and have no more truth in them than what our Author says about the Cloud environing the *Israelites* on every side, or the Sea's being divided in the form of a Semicircle.

*Ibid.* At the end of that *Note.*] Here our Author, for the sake of his *Gnosticks*, says a great many forced things, and shews himself a very unfortunate Critick. For 1<sup>st</sup>, the Passage he has a referencè to in *Irenæus*, is in *Lib.* 1. *c.* 9. but there is nothing there about the Cloud or Sea, which may illustrate this place in *St. Paul*: He says only that the Disciples of *Marcus* believed, *διὰ τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν ἀκρατίτες καὶ ἀσέβητοι γίνεσθαι πρὸς κριτῆν*: that by their Redemption they became incapable of being taken or seen by a Judg. Which *Irenæus* compares to *Pluto's Helmet* in *Homer*.

2. It is true indeed, that the Sect of *Marcus* was a branch of the *Valentinians*, yea of the *Gnosticks* too; for, as *Irenæus* afterwards says, these Men called themselves *τέκνα γνώσεως* the *Children of Knowledge*: but will it thence follow that they added nothing, nor took away any thing from the dotages of the *Gnosticks*, that we should be able to affirm for certain, that whatever the followers of *Marcus* said, was truly attributed to the ancient *Gnosticks*, who lived in the time of the *Apostles*? I think not.



3. Our Author should have produced some plain Testimony to Chapter prove that those antient *Gnosticks* made themselves parallel to the X. primitive *Jews*, and that in those things which *St. Paul* here mentions: for otherwise, whilst he produces only slight Conjectures, I don't know who is bound to believe them.

Verf. 2. Πάρεσ εἰς τὸ Μωσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο.] Our Author did not understand the meaning of this Phrase, nor is there any thing said about it in *Grotius*, whom he follows sometimes right or wrong. Baptism being a Ceremony of initiation, whereby he that received it, openly testified his willingness to be accounted his Disciple whose discipline he submitted himself to; *to be baptized into Moses*, is no more than to profess in Baptism, whether true or metaphorical (as that is whereof the Apostle here speaks) his resolution to become the disciple of *Moses*, and is all one as if *St. Paul* had said *to be baptized into the name of Moses*; of which phrase I have spoken before, on *Chap. iii. 15.* of this Epistle, and *Mat. xxviii. 16.*

Verf. 3. Τὸ αὐτὸ βρώμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον.] The word *πνευματικὸς* here is opposed to *φυσικὸς natural*, not to *σωματικὸς corporeal*; for *Manna* was a *corporeal* Food, which could not be called spiritual in any other respect than as it was prepared, not by sensible Causes, but by Spirits, *viz.* Angels, whose Bread therefore it is said to be in *Psal. lxxviii. 2.* I know the general Opinion is, that it is called *spiritual Food*, because it represented, or also typified spiritual things. But *first* this should be proved out of the Old Testament; for if it does not appear that the antient *Jews* had any such apprehensions of it, there is no reason to say that *Manna* signified or prefigured that which it does not appear the *Jews* understood by it. But it may be proved perhaps out of the New. If it be asked where? out of *John vi. 31. & seqq.* where Christ opposes his Doctrine to *Manna*: As if a mere allusion or opposition put by Christ between his Doctrine and *Manna*, did necessarily imply that it was the design of God in giving the *Israelites* *Manna*, to typify the future promulgation of the Gospel by Christ! But I further ask, for whose sake were these typical representations made? Was it for the sake of the *Jews*? This cannot be pretended, for that dull Nation hardly understood the plainest and expresslest things, tho' frequently inculcated upon them, and much less such as were obscure and intricate. And it is not probable that any thing was instituted by God for the sake of the *Jews*, which they did not at all understand. But that those Types were given for the sake of Christians is yet far more unlikely; because if they were to be believed by us, they were to be deduced from the Writings of the Apostles, whose Authority alone would move us in  
this

Chapter this matter; when otherwise we should never have so much as dreamt  
 X. of them. So that in order to our understanding that kind of Pre-  
 dictions, the assistance of other Divine Persons would have been ne-  
 cessary, whom for other reasons we already believe, viz. for the ex-  
 cellency of their Doctrin, and the Miracles which were wrought in  
 confirmation of it. But this being supposed, what need is there of  
 Types to those who already believe Christ and his Apostles upon the  
 firmest grounds? They illustrate, it may be you'll say, the Apostles  
 Doctrin; that I deny, and say that they would rather obscure it if  
 they occurred in their Writings, for the alledged reasons: See my  
 Note on *Mat.* ii. 2. Let the Learned judg of these things, and consider  
 whether it be not better at last to let all this Doctrin about the Types  
 alone, which the Heathens of old derided, and the *Jews* ridicule at  
 this day; and only make use of the most convincing Arguments where-  
 by to prove the truth of Christianity. But this would be the subject  
 of a whole Volume, which I have here but transiently touched, intend-  
 ing wherever there is a fit occasion, to shew the weakness of all that  
 is alledged in defence of Types out of the Apostles Writings.

Verf. 4. [Ἐπισημασμένης ἀκαταβύβουτος πέτρας.] That is, of that spiri-  
 tual *Water*, which God made to proceed out of the *Rock*, which *Water*  
 followed the Camp. So *Gen.* iii. and elsewhere, to eat of the *Tree*, is  
 to eat of the fruit of the *Tree*. Which must be carefully observed,  
 lest any one think that the *Rock* it self is here properly called *spiri-*  
*tual*, that Epithet being to be attributed to the *Water* which flow'd out  
 of the *Rock*, which tho not expressed, is yet to be understood: For  
 no one will suppose that the *Rock*, from which the *Water* proceeded,  
 followed the *Israelites*, or was carried about with them through the  
 Wilderness. But granting, may some say, that the *Rock* is here put  
 by a *Metonymy* for the *Water* that came out of it, yet how is it said  
 that the *Water* it self followed the *Jews*? The common opinion is, that  
 a little River or current of *Water* proceeding out of the *Rock* follow-  
 ed the Jewish Camp whithersoever it moved. But there is not  
 one syllable about that in *Moses*, who yet it is not probable would  
 have omitted the mention of so great a Miracle, if any such had been;  
 for it would have been no small Miracle for God to have made a Chan-  
 nel for that *Water* to run in, and follow the *Israelites* whithersoever  
 they went. But there is no need of feigning here a Miracle, in order  
 to explain St. *Paul's* words, which may be very well understood with-  
 out it, to wit, by supposing only that this *Water* was carried about by  
 the *Israelites* through the Deserts of *Arabia*, in leathern Bottles, or  
 any other Vessels, that followed them with the rest of their Carriage.

For



For thus this Phrase is used by *Ælian Var. Hist.* Lib. 12. Chap. 40. Chapter  
 πειρὶ τῆς ἐξέξεως ἐπομένων ἐφοδίων: about the Convoy that followed Xerxes. Chapter  
 Which he begins thus: Τάτε ἄλλα ἐφόδια ἔπειτα τῆς ἐξέξεως πολυτελείας καὶ ἀλαζονείας  
 X.  
 πεπληρωμένα· καὶ ἔν τῃ γὰρ ἡ ΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΙ τὸ ἐν τῷ Χοάσπε: Among other  
 Provisions full of Magnificence and Ostentation which followed Xerxes,  
 WATER also FOLLOWED him out of Choaspes. And this  
 was the Custom of all the Kings of Persia, if we believe Herodotus,  
 Lib. 1. c. 188. Καὶ δὴ καὶ ὕδαρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χοάσπε ποταμοῦ ἄμα ἄγεται, ἢ ὅσα  
 ῥέοντες, ἢ μόνον πίνει βασιλεὺς, καὶ ἄλλοι ἐδεῖν ποταμοῦ: And they carry Water  
 with them out of the River Choaspes, that runs by Susa, of which alone,  
 and no other River the King drinks.

Ibid. Ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἣν ὁ Χριστός.] That is, saith Grotius, prefigured Christ.  
 But it may every whit as well be interpreted: “ And that which  
 “ might be said of that Rock in a carnal sense, may in a spiritual  
 “ be affirmed of Christ. As all the Israelites drank of the Waters  
 of that Rock, and yet those among them who rebelled, were destroy-  
 ed in the Wilderness: so all are equally enlightned by the Doctrin of  
 Christ, but whoever does not regulate his Life according to it, shall  
 perish. This is the sense of the Apostle, which needs no typical Pre-  
 figuration to explain it, his Discourse not being at all grounded  
 thereon: or else this Passage may be rightly paraphrased to the same  
 sense thus: “ And the case was the same of the Water that flowed out  
 “ of that Rock, and those that drank of it; and of the Doctrin of  
 “ Christ and Christians. So in the Parables of Christ, the parts of  
 the ἀποστόλων are often called the parts of a Parable, because they are  
 compared with one another, and the case is the same in both: As  
 Mat. 13. 19. When any one heareth the word of the Kingdom, and under-  
 standeth it not, then cometh the wicked one and catcheth away that which was  
 sown in his Heart: THIS IS he which received Seed by the way side.  
 But he that received the Seed into strong places, THIS IS he that heareth  
 the Word, &c. And it is known that the Jews, whom the Apostles fol-  
 lowed, do very frequently borrow Comparisons from the Old Testa-  
 ment, and allude to the stories of it so, as often to apply the words of  
 them to their purpose; not that they thought those places contained  
 prefigurations of that which they accommodated them to, but be-  
 cause they thought it a piece of elegance to appear to take every thing  
 out of the Old Testament. See Gal. iv. 24, 25, 26.

Ibid. Note b. I. Something, but briefly and obscurely, there is  
 about this matter in Rabbi Solomon, on Numb. xx. 2. perhaps taken  
 from the Christians; for it is not easily to be believed that all the late  
 Rabbins say, they owe to ancient Tradition. It's certain neither the

Chapter X. Paraphrase of *Jonathan*, nor the *Jerusalem Targum*, have any thing about the Water which followed the *Israelites*, on *Exod. xvii.* but in quite another place, *viz.* on *Num. xxi. 19, 20.* where *Moses* speaks of a Well that was digged upon the border of the *Moabites*, the year before the *Israelites* entred into *Canaan.* The words of *Jonathan* are these: *And ever since the Well was given them in Mattan, it went up again with them into the high Mountains, and from the high Mountains it descended with them into the Hills. It encompassed all the Camp of Israel, and yielded it self for every one to drink of at the door of the Tabernacle. It descended also with them out of the high Mountains into the low Vallies, &c.* The like we read in the *Jerusalem Paraphrase*, but with this difference, that there is nothing there said of this Well encompassing the Camp, or breaking out at the Gate of the Tabernacle, as *Jonathan* affirms.

II. The *Jews* did not want Water, because they both carried about with them the Water of *Horeb*, and might also meet with Springs in other places; for tho the *rocky Arabia* be a dry Country, yet it is not every where without Water, there being mention made of several Rivers which run through it. See my Notes on *Gen. ii. 12.*

III. What *Dr. Hammond* says about the Water's ceasing to follow the *Jews*, upon the course of their Travels being changed, is a mere Invention, to support his tottering Interpretation.

IV. If the Water of *Horeb* followed the *Israelites* without a Miracle, they must have all along journied near a Valley, in which it might have a free course after them, from the time of their departure from *Horeb.* But that is another of *Dr. Hammond's* Fictions, which I need not say much about.

Verf. 5. *Τῶν πλείστον αὐτῶν ἐκ εὐδόκησεν:*] It is warily here said by *St. Paul*, with the *Most* of them God was not well pleased, not with *all* of them, *except two*, as our Author says in his Paraphrase, which is not true. See my Note on *Num. xxiv. 65.*

Verf. 6. *Τύποι ἡμῶν.*] That is, the punishments inflicted on the rebellious *Israelites*, are so many examples which God proposes to us, to take heed of falling into the like Sins. So also *vers. 11.* *St. Paul* having again made mention of God's destroying the murmuring *Jews*, saith, *πάντα δὲ πάντα τύποι συνέβαιον, all these things happened unto them for examples, and were written for our Admonition, &c.* that is, God designed those things for Examples, to be recorded in the Holy Scriptures, and proposed as Warnings to every one that should read them. They that render the word *τύποι* here by *in figura, in a Figure, or typice, typically,* must shew that God intended to prefigure the punishments of Sins by the punishments of the *Israelites*; which I suppose they will never



never be able to do. But it is certain this word  $\pi\pi\Theta$  is taken only Chapter X.  
in a threefold sense in the New Testament.


And first for any *Form*, whether corporeal, or conspicuous only to the Mind; which sense does not belong to this place. See *John* xx. 25. *Acts* vii. 43, 44. and xxiii. 25. *Rom.* vi. 17. *Heb.* viii. 5.

Secondly, It signifies an *Example*, as here and in many other places, as we shall presently see. The first signification of it is proper, this metaphorical. For  $\pi\pi\Theta$  is properly a *Figure* or *Form* into which any thing is *beaten* or *hammer'd*,  $\pi\pi\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ . But because such figures were sometimes made to serve instead of patterns to others (in French, *pour servir de modelles*) therefore it was metaphorically applied to any sort of Figure or Example proposed to others for their imitation or warning. So *Phil.* iii. 17. *Brethren, be ye followers of me; and mark them which walk so, as ye have  $\pi\pi\Theta$   $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  us for an example.* So *1 Thess.* i. 7. *Ye were  $\pi\pi\Theta$  examples to all that believe in Macedonia, &c.* See also *2 Thess.* iii. 9. *1 Tim.* iv. 12. *Tit.* ii. 7. *1 Pet.* v. 3.

Thirdly, In another metaphorical signification, because a Model or Pattern is like those things which are made according to it, the word  $\pi\pi\Theta$  in one place of *St. Paul* is taken for a thing which in some respect resembles another: And that is in *Rom.* v. 14. where *Adam* is said to be  $\pi\pi\Theta$   $\tau\acute{\omicron}$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\Theta$ , that is, like him that was to come, viz. in this, that he alone had done something that was propagated to all Mankind, as Christ did something alone which extends to all Men. For in other things the Apostle observes not only a dissimilitude, but an opposition between them. But now who will believe that it was God's design, that *Adam* should first of all sin alone, and that that Sin should do mischief to all his Posterity, to prefigure what was to be done by Christ? Who was able to discern the Similitude before the Event? Who after the Event finds his Faith confirmed by that Similitude? Nor certainly was this the Apostle's meaning, but only that in the respect I have mention'd there was a Similitude between *Adam* and *Christ*, as there is between a  $\pi\pi\Theta$  and an  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\tau\upsilon\pi\Theta$ .

This last word perhaps may be made the ground of an Objection; which is twice found in the New Testament. The Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, Ch. ix. 24. denies that Christ was entred into Holy Places made with Hands,  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\tau\upsilon\pi\alpha$   $\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\upsilon\omega\acute{\nu}$ , but that is, which were made after the example of the true, viz. Heaven, or which were the images of Heaven, not which prefigured Heaven. So Baptism is said in *1 Pet.* iii. 21. to be  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\tau\upsilon\pi\omega\varsigma$  to *Noah's Ark*, that is, in some measure to resemble it. But no Man of sense would thence infer that it was

Chapter God's intention by the Ark to prefigure Baptism, and reveal this  
 XI. Mystery which was before unknown by St. Peter.

 Ibid. Εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν.] These words manifestly shew that τῶνοι ought to be rendred *Examples*, for Punishment is inflicted on guilty Persons, for an example to others not to imitate them: So that it is absurdly rendred by the *Vulgar* and *Erasinus*, *figura*, and as ill by *Beza*, *typi*; but rightly in *Castalio*, and in the *English* and *Geneva* Translations, *Examples*. Which being so, I wonder *Grotius* should speak here of *Prefigurations*.

Ex: 32. 6.

Verf. 7. Note c. Notwithstanding all the *Doct̃or* has with so much care here put together, I rather think the place in *Exodus* here refer'd to, is to be understood of *Dancing* about the Golden Calf, on which place see my Notes, as also on *Gen. xxi*. I do not pay so great a deference to the *Rabbins*, as to take all which those Men fancy, to explain the Old Testament, for certain truth; nor perhaps would our Author himself have attributed so much to their Authority, if he had not resolved to force his *Gnosticks* here upon us.

Verf. 20. Δαιμονίαις θυῖς ἢ ἐ θεῶν. The word *δαιμόνιον* in this place does not necessarily signify *Devils*, or *evil Spirits*; for the Heathens did not always sacrifice to evil Spirits, if we consider what were their true Thoughts. But the greatest part of their Idolatry consisted in this, that when they ought to have been θεοσεβῆς, they were δαιμονοσεβῆς. And the Heathens also themselves have confessed that they did not offer sacrifice to *Gods*, but to *Demons*: As appears by the words of *Porphyry*, in Lib. 2. *de Abstinencia*: Οὐδὲ πῖς Θεοῖς, ἀλλὰ Δαίμοσι, τὰς θυσίας, τὰς διὰ τὸ αἱμάτων σφραγήαρον οἱ τὰς ἐν τῷ παντὶ δυνάμεις καταμαθόντες, ἢ τῆτο πέπισται παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν θεολόγων: nor did those who knew the powers of the *World* offer bloody *Sacrifices* to the *Gods*, but to *Demons*; and this is affirmed [in the Latin it is translated *creditur*, which is πέπισται] by *Divines* themselves.

#### C H A P. XI.

Verf. 4. **I**F it had been the Custom in capital Punishments, to cover  
 Note a. the Heads only of Men and not of Women, our Author would have rightly deduced what St. *Paul* here says from that practice; but seeing there was no difference between Men and Women in this respect, why would it have *dishonoured the head* of a *Man* to have a Veil cast over him like a condemned Person, and not of a *Woman*? I rather think therefore that the Apostle had a respect only to the Custom of the Greeks, among whom it had been a disgrace  
 for



for a Man to speak publicly with his Head covered, and a Woman Chapter  
with her Head bare. Our Author's distinction between the Preposi- XI.  
tions  $\alpha\tilde{\nu}$  and  $\delta\tilde{\nu}$  will appear to be vain, if we compare *Mark* xiv. 3.  
and *Mat.* xxvi. 7.

Verf. 7. Note b. Here our learned Author abuses an impropriety in the *Septuagint*, to enlarge our Lexicons with new significations of the word  $\delta\tilde{\nu}\alpha$ , as he does also elsewhere.

I. It is false that the Hebrew  $\text{כבוד}$  *chabod* simply taken, signifies a *Beam*, tho if it be added to the word *Sun*, it signifies its Splendor and Beams. It is false also, that because the *Septuagint* have perhaps somewhere (tho I cannot tell where) improperly rendred what ought to have been translated a *Beam* by  $\delta\tilde{\nu}\alpha$ , therefore the word  $\delta\tilde{\nu}\alpha$  signifies a *Beam*. To authorize that signification, it was requisite they should have frequently and industriously used the word  $\delta\tilde{\nu}\alpha$  to that purpose, and not rashly before they were aware.

II. Nor is it true that the word  $\text{כבוד}$  was ever rendred by  $\alpha\tilde{\nu}\alpha\tilde{\nu}\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$ , or tho  $\alpha\tilde{\nu}\alpha\tilde{\nu}\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$  be metaphorically called  $\delta\tilde{\nu}\alpha$ , that those words are promiscuous. The *Doctor* should have produced but one example, in which  $\delta\tilde{\nu}\alpha$  signified a *Beam* or *Splendor*. Besides, is this Phrase, *the Woman is the beam of the Man*, any thing plainer than this, is *the glory of the Man*, which he interprets by the former? But the truth is, what our Author here says is only a misinterpretation of *Grotius's* Note upon this place, to which I refer the Reader.

III.  $\Delta\delta\tilde{\nu}\alpha\ \kappa\omega\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  is used by the *Septuagint* for  $\text{תמונה}$  or that symbolical likeness of God which appeared in the Tabernacle, because that used to be so called, and not because  $\delta\tilde{\nu}\alpha$  signifies any Similitude, as well as the Hebrew word. There is nothing more deceitful than such sort of reasonings, as the *Doctor* often makes use of in order to find out the signification of words, unless at the same time their Use and Analogy be regarded.

IV. Setting aside what is said about the *Glory of God* in the *Pentateuch*, which does not at all belong to this place, tho *Grotius* thinks otherwise; the Man is called the *Glory of God*, because whoever looks upon a Man, will perceive him to be a piece of Workmanship worthy of the divine Majesty, and give Glory to him upon that account. And the Woman is the glory of the Man, because there is some ground for the Man to glory, when he considers that the Woman was formed out of his Body, and created for his Help and Assistance. The following Verse does shew that by being his *glory*, the Apostle means that for which he was made, and we need not go any further to understand *St. Paul's* Mind: The sense of the whole place is, that


Chapter XI. the Man indeed ought to have his Head uncovered, because God made him, as his other Works, to be beheld ; and it is not for the glory of God, to have that Work of his hid by a Veil: but the Woman, which was made for the Man, ought to be veiled, because she is inferior to the Man, who uses her as he pleases, and would have her veiled. It is for the Man's glory to have his Authority appear over the Woman, and as in other instances, so in this particularly, of having her conceal her self whenever he pleases. *Solomon* has a saying in the xith Chapter of *Proverbs*, vers. 16. which according to the Version of the *Septuagint* is, *Τυνὴ δὲ χείρας ἐπέσει ἀνδρὶ δόξαν, δρόνον δὲ ἀπμίας γυνὴ μισῶσα δίκαια.* And so saith *Esdra*s, Lib. 3. c. iv. 7. of Women: *ποῖῶσι δόξαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.*

But of this whole reasoning, and many other such, it must be observed, that they are not at all demonstrative, because they are not grounded upon things that are unchangeable, but alterable according to the Custom or Opinion of Men. It was thought by the *Greeks* to be a token of the Mens Authority over the Women, for the Men to appear abroad with their Heads uncovered, as being their own Masters, and exposing themselves to every ones view ; and on the contrary an Argument of subjection in Women to go abroad veil'd, because that signified them to be but one Man's, who had power to remove their Veil, and would not have them publicly beheld. But if a contrary Custom had prevailed, *St. Paul* would have reasoned quite otherwise, to perswade the *Corinthians* to what he endeavoured to induce them, *viz.* to do all things decently in the Church, and wherever any one prophesied. I confess he grounds his Argument also upon the History of the Creation ; but if we consider the thing, who can deny but that the Woman was created after the Image of God, and for his Glory as well as the Man ? See *Gen.* ii. 27. Nor indeed is this denied by *St. Paul*, but only in a certain sense, *viz.* as the Woman is said to have been created after the Man, and to be an assistant to him. And in this sense only his reasoning is valid, and not by a general, and, if I may so speak, mathematical deduction.

Vers. 10. Note d. The *Rabbi* cited by *Schickard* was not a *Talmudical Doctor*, but only cited a place out of the *Talmud*, as we may see by the words that *Schickard* alledges.

*Ibid.* Note e. About this difficult place of Scripture, I have written two years ago two Letters in answer to a Friend, who desired to have my Opinion of it, which I shall here propose to the Readers examination, declaring my self ready to alter it whenever I see sufficient reason. That part of those Letters which relates to this matter is as follows.



I. I shall never forget that advice of *St. Austin*, than which nothing Chapter  
in such matters can be more seasonably call'd to mind: *That in things XI.*  
obscure and remote from our senses, if so be we read any thing in Holy   
Scripture, which may without endangering the Faith we profess, be made to  
comply with different Opinions, we should not rashly espouse any of them; or if  
we do, yet not so as to resolve not to change our Judgment whatever light be  
offer'd to us afterwards, or to contend not so much for the sense of the Holy  
Scriptures, as our own Opinion, as the true sense of the Scripture, when it  
is our own, whereas we ought rather to make that to be ours which is the  
assertion of the Scripture. I have set down the whole Passage at length,  
to shew you that I am not so wedded to my present Opinion in this  
matter, as to resolve that no reasons shall move me to forsake it.  
Two things must here in the first place be observed. *First*, that the  
Discourse in 1 Cor. xi. is about Men and Women praying, or pro-  
phesying among others at home: For the Women among the *Greeks*  
did not appear abroad without a Veil, nor therefore stand in need of  
the Apostle's Admonition, which no honest Matron ever acted con-  
trary to. And that some of their Neighbours or Acquaintance were  
present with them in those Exercises is manifest; because it is absurd  
for a Woman praying by her self to cover her Head, or to prophesy  
alone. *Secondly*, that as far as the *fifteenth Verse*, the chief scope of  
the Apostle's Discourse is to shew the *Corinthian Women*, they ought  
not to prophesy or pray when Men were present, without being veil-  
ed. These two things I take here for certain, because they offer them-  
selves to the Readers Mind at first view. After therefore *St. Paul* had  
alleged Reasons to that purpose, at the *10th Verse* he concludes thus:  
Διὸ τὰτο ὀρεῖται ἡ γυνὴ ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆ κεφαλῆς, *For this cause ought the Woman to*  
*have upon her Head, what? viz. a Veil, which the Apostle calls ἐξουσία,*  
*as the Jews* יָרִיב *from* יָרִיב *dominatus est, of which see* *Dr. Hammond,*  
*and my Notes on* *Gen. xxiv. 64.* If *St. Paul* had added nothing more,  
there would have appeared no defect in his Discourse; but there follow  
three words which have extremely perplexed Interpreters, because they  
seem to be altogether superfluous, and to have no dependence upon  
what goes before. And indeed if *in the Conclusion*, as *Logicians* speak,  
*there ought to be nothing but what is contained in the Premises*; either it  
must be shewn that the sense of these words is couched in what went  
before, or we must acknowledg them to be supervacaneous: and to  
me the former seems to be very easy, as it is certainly the best, if we  
do but instead of *διὰ τὰς ἀγγελίας*, which is manifestly not contained in  
the Premises, read *διὰ τῆς ἀγγελίας*, that is, when she declares  
the Revelations made to her, or while she is delivering her ἀγγελία. So a  
\* propheticall

Chapter XI. propheticall Doctrin, which *Isaiab*, Chap. xxviii. 9. calls *שמעיה* *schmouba*, is stiled by the *Septuagint* *ἀγγελία*. To which I might add a passage out of *Herodotus*, where the word *ἀγγελία* seems to be taken in the same signification; but because it is obscure, and *St. Paul* did not learn from him to speak Greek, I shall abstain from it. But you will ask me, I suppose, how it came to pass that *ἡ ἀγγελίας* was changed into *τὰς ἀγγέλους*; To which I answer, because *ὁ ἀγγέλ* is a word much more common in Scripture than *ἡ ἀγγελία* which occurs but once in all the New Testament, and not often in the Old. And many times it happen'd that the Transcribers substituted a more usual and familiar word in the room of one less known, as *St. Jerom* thought of the Name *Isaiab*, which occurs in *Mat. xiii. 35*. The Apostle adds *διὰ τῆς ἀγγελίας*, because it was not necessary for the Woman to cover her self with a Veil at home, but only when she went abroad, unless there was this or the like reason for it. They that make the discourse here to refer to the Church, do not remember that it was unlawful for Women, covered or uncovered, to speak in the Church, as *St. Paul* teaches in this same Epistle, *Chap. xiv. 34*. But at home amongst their Acquaintance nothing hinder'd but they might prophesy, if they had received that Gift from God; but they ought to have their Heads covered, as when they appeared in publick. This is my conjecture about this place, which I shall not abandon till I meet with something more probable.

II. It is a place of that nature, that as by its obscurity it opens a door for Conjectures, so likewise it leaves room for innumerable Difficulties; and it is no wonder that very great ones are objected against this of mine, which would not be a conjecture if those who are of another opinion could bring no probability against it. Nevertheless what you alledg, I shall consider as briefly as I can. 1. You suppose the Apostle's Discourse here to refer to publick Assemblies, in which all or most of the Christians of the Church of *Corinth* met. But it is plain *St. Paul* forbids Women to speak in publick Assemblies, either covered or uncovered, *αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν*. But in private Conversation, say you, it does not seem probable that the Spirit of Prophecy was given: Why so? It's true, the principal use of it was in Churches, but it might be useful also sometimes in private Conversation amongst familiars, for Christians to edify one another privately. And it is certain, Women had it not to preach, *that* being not allowed them by the Apostle. 2. But you say, tho it was not lawful for Women to teach others, yet they might *ᾄδειν*, that is, *sing* in the Church, as the learned *J. Mede* interprets that word.



word. I do not deny but the Hebrew **נבונה** in the Old Testa-Chapter  
 ment has that signification, and is rendred by the Greck Interpreters **XI.**  
**προφητείας**, but in the New Testament I do not know of any place  
 wherein that word is so taken, and in this disputation of St. Paul I  
 am sure that signification does no where agree to it. 3. That the  
 fault of the *Corinthian Women* lay in their coming to Church with  
 their Hair all loose, is no where intimated by St. Paul, who would  
 have much more vehemently inveighed against Christian Women that  
 should have imitated the *ὑποφητέας ἀκαθάρτων πνευμάτων*, the *Prophetses* or  
*Interpreters* of impure Spirits. He does not say one word about their  
 Hair being loose or bound up, but speaks only of a *Veil*. 4. But why  
 did the Apostle call the pious Discourses of the *Corinthian Women*,  
*ἀγγελίας*, and not *προφητείας* or predictions? In answer to that, I acknow-  
 ledg that the latter was the most common word, but the former also  
 was used, as I have shewn. And then *προφητεία* signifies, at least for  
 the most part, the *thing* it self prophesied, not the *act* of prophesy-  
 ing; but *ἀγγελία* not only the thing declared, but the *Action* it self,  
 or *Office* of declaring, if we believe *Eustathius* on *Iliad* λ. *vers.* 140.  
 where by *ἀγγελία* he thinks that *Homer* means ἡ ἐξ ἀποστολῆς ἀγγελία. And  
 in this place I did not say that by *ἀγγελία* was meant the spiritual Gift  
 of Prophecy, but either Prophecy, or the action it self of prophesy-  
 ing of what kind soever that be, which the Apostle has chiefly a re-  
 ference to; tho because of their affinity they may be easily confound-  
 ed, as the word *κήρυγμα* is taken both for the thing it self preached,  
 and for the *Office* or *Action* of preaching. 5. Another thing which  
 you seem very much to stick at is, that this word *ἀγγελία* is but once  
 used in all the New Testament: but consider *first* that it is very com-  
 mon in *Homer*, *Xenophon*, and other Greek Writers, and therefore  
 taken from the vulgar use. And then *secondly*, there are in St. Paul's  
 Epistles, as well as in other Authors, words that are but seldom used,  
 as for instance *περπερεύειν* in *Chap.* xiii. 4. of this Epistle, *καταναγκάζω* in  
 2 *Cor.* xi. 9. and several others which learned Men have taken notice  
 of. 6. You add that in *vers.* 16. the Apostle draws an Argument  
 from the Custom of the *Churches*; but that Custom does no more re-  
 spect publick than private Assemblies; for the Apostle does not say,  
*πρώτην συνήθειαν ἐκ ἔργων ἐν ἐκκλησίαις*, but ἐξ αἰ ἐκκλησίαι τῶ θεοῦ. St. Paul  
 here has a respect to the Custom of the *Jews*, which the Apostles  
 had introduced into Churches consisting partly of *Jews* and partly  
 of *Greeks*, together with other *Jewish* Customs. Hear what *Tertulli-*  
*an* says, *de Corona*, *Chap.* 4. *Among the Jews it is so ordinary for the*  
*Women to have their Heads covered, that they are distinguished by it from*  
*others.*

Chapter others. This is what I had to reply to your objections, which are so far from satisfying me, that they confirm me in my conjecture. If we had any Old Copy which instead of *διὰ τὰς ΑΓΓΕΛΟΥΣ* read *διὰ τὰς ΑΝΔΡΑΣ*, I should have no manner of doubt about this place, whatever others thought.

Verf. 14. Note f. I. I have at large shewn in my *Ars Critica*, P. 2. Sect. 1. c. vii. §. 6. that St. Paul's meaning in *Ephes. ii. 3.* is this, that the Jews (meant by the word *us*, and not the Romans) were of as lewd and wicked a Disposition as other Nations.

II. But in this place to the *Corinthians*, the word *Nature* does not signify properly a Custom or Disposition, but is opposed to Instruction. It is just as if the Apostle should have said, Do not you know this of your selves? Do you want any one to teach it you? So the Latin *natura* is used by *Cicero* in Lib. 1. *Tuscul. Quæst.* where comparing the Romans with the Greeks, he saith: *Illæ quæ naturâ, non literis, adsequuti sunt neque cum Græcis, neque ulla cum Gente sunt conferenda.* As to those things which they have acquired the knowledg of by Nature, not by Learning, they (*viz.* the Romans) incomparably go beyond the Greeks and all other Nations. The same Author in *Philip. 2.* thus bespeaks *Antonius*: *An verebare, ne non putaremns natura te potuisse tam improbum evadere, nisi accessisset etiam disciplina?* Were you afraid lest we should think you could not have arrived to such a pitch of wickedness by Nature, unless you had also been instructed?

Verf. 29. Note g. I. The Hebrew *שקד* in the Book of *Joshua*, manifestly signifies *to consecrate*, the Discourse being about places of Refuge, which were esteemed Sacred. The *Septuagint* unnecessarily expressed the sense, rather than the proper meaning of the word; for the Cities consecrated for places of Refuge, were by that Consecration distinguished *διατέλλοντο* from others. But hence it does not follow that *διατέλλειν* or *διακείναι* signifies reciprocally *to sanctify*.

II. The Apostle's sense is best interpreted by those who affirm this to be an *Elliptical Phrase*, and the meaning of it to be, *not discerning the Lord's Body, ἀπὸ τῆ ἄλλης ἄρτης, from other Bread*; or not eating the Consecrated more reverently than any common Bread. In the 31st verse we have the same expression again; for if we did but distinguish (*διακείνομεν*) our selves, we should not be condemned; that is, if we distinguished those that were not rightly disposed or qualified, from those that were; *εἰ ἑαυτὸς ἀνοσίως διακεμένος διακείνομεν ἀπὸ καλῶς διατεθέντων.* To look here for any thing else, is to seek a knot in a Bulrush.



## C H A P. XII.

Verf. 2. **E**ἰδωλα ἄφωνα.] I do not often find fault with our Author's Paraphrase, tho in a great many places the mind of the Apostles might have been more fitly expressed. I am contented if he does but any how interpret the sense. But his Paraphrase of this Verse is intolerable; for the Heathens did not believe that their Idols spake of themselves, or that their Priests answered them of their own Heads, but were both moved by the Gods, whose Priests and Statues they were: So that the two first could not be charged upon them, and all that could be objected against them was, that it was not any *God*, as they supposed, that answered them by their Idols, but an evil Spirit. But the Apostle does not upbraid them so much as with that in this place, but only that they had formerly suffered themselves by their own blindness to be led to the worship of Idols, which gave no answers to them that enquired of them, either by their Priests or by evil Spirits; but were shamefully deceived by their crafty Priests, who pretended themselves to be acted by the Spirit of the Gods, or by mere human artifice imposed on the credulous, so as to perswade them that Images could speak, which were εἰδωλα ἄφωνα. And such sort of Men were very unfit to distinguish between true Inspiration and feigned, which therefore the Apostle here teaches them how to do. I confess Dr. *Hammond* had *Grotius* to go before him, but the thing it self confutes him.

Verf. 4. Τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα.] This place was imitated by *St. Clement* in his 1 *Epistle* to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 46. Οὐχὶ ἓνα θεὸν ἔχουμεν, καὶ ἓνα χριστὸν; καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα ἃ χάρις τὸ ἐκχρῆσθαι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ μία κλήσις ἐν χριστῷ; *Have we not one God and one Christ, and one Spirit of Grace given unto us, and one calling in Christ?*

Verf. 12. Καθ' ἅπαντα τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστίν.] This Similitude also is used by the same *St. Clement* more than once, in the forementioned *Epistle*, and among other places in *Chap. 36*. Οἱ μεγάλοι δίχμη τῶν μικρῶν ἔδυναται εἶναι, ἔδὲ οἱ μικροὶ δίχμη τῶν μεγάλων· σύγκρασις τίς ἐστιν ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ ἐν τέτατις χρῆσις. Λάβωμεν τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν· κεφαλὴ δίχμη τῶν ποδῶν ἔδὲ ἐστίν, ἕτως ἔδὲ οἱ πόδες δίχμη τῆ κεφαλῆς· τὰ δὲ ἐλάττω μέλη τῶ σῶματ' ἡμῶν ἀναγκαῖα καὶ ἀχρηστὰ εἰσιν ὅλω τῷ σῶματι· ἀλλὰ πάντα συμπνεῖ, καὶ ἑσποταγῆ μιᾷ χρῆται εἰς τὸ σωζέσθαι ὅλον: *The great cannot be without the small, nor the small without the great; there is a kind of mixture in all things, and every thing has its use. Let us take for instance our Body. The Head without the Feet is nothing, nor the Feet without the Head. The*

Chapter XII. *smallest parts of our Bodies are necessary and useful to the whole Body; but they all conspire and jointly subserve the preservation of the whole.*

Verf. 13. *Εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν.*] That is, we were baptized that we might be called by one name, of one Society, the Church of Christ. See my Note on *Chap. x. 2.*

Ibid. *Ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν.*] Having spoken before of Baptism, which is performed with Water, the Apostle here keeps to the same Metaphor, and says, that Christians *had drank of the same Spirit.* Which is to be understood both of the Spirit of Miracles, and of the Spirit of Christianity. Such another Metaphor is made use of by *Cebes* in the beginning of his *Table*, where he feigneth *Ἀπάτην τὰς εἰσπορευομένους εἰς τὴν βίον ποτιζεν τῇ ἐαυτῆς δυνάμει, Imposture making those who enter into Life to drink of her power.*

Verf. 28. *Note d.* I. Of the difference between a *Teacher* and a *Prophet*, some things must be further observed, which our Author having omitted has left us not a little in the dark about this matter. The *Prophets* under the Old Testament had a twofold Office: The first and highest consisted in declaring those things which they had received immediately from God, or by the mediation of Angels, and were such as could not have been known by Men, without a Divine Revelation: The other was to persuade Men to the observation of the Law already revealed, by pious Exhortations, Reproofs and Counsels. And to this seems to belong those Schools of the Prophets, so often mentioned in the Old Testament, and particularly in *1 Sam. xix. 20.* *2 Kings iv. 38.*

Because the Worship of the only true God was to be firmly established among the *Jews*, a generation of Men that chiefly regarded the things of this Life, and defended against the encroaching Idolatry of their neighbour Nations for several Ages, God saw it necessary to raise up Prophets, by inspiring them in an extraordinary manner. And under the New Testament likewise, to establish the Authority of the Apostles, God vouchsafed them and others the same extraordinary Inspiration; but as the Christian Religion grew and flourished, and by growing acquired Strength, the gift of foretelling things to come was by degrees more sparingly conferred. And because Christianity did not much regard what was to happen in this World, but put Men upon the thoughts and expectations of another Life, the principal Office of the New Testament Prophets lay in interpreting those things more clearly and at large, which were revealed by Christ and his Apostles, for the benefit of the common People.

In



In which Office there are two things to be carefully distinguished: *one* Chapter XII. is, their preparation for the exercise of that Office, in which besides XII. natural Gifts, and Knowledg acquired by Industry, they were endued with the Holy Ghost, which was conferred on them by the imposition of the hands of the Apostles, as appears from 1 *Tim.* iv. 14. *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* And tho we do not know how the Holy Spirit influenced their Minds, or what change it produced in them; yet it appears by what is afterwards said about these Prophets by *St. Paul*, that this was the effect of that divine Inspiration, to fit them to preach the Gospel: Which *fitness*, *ἰκανότης* as *St. Paul* calls it, was all at once conferred upon them.

And when they were thus made fit, *ἱκανοὶ γενόμενοι*, for this Office, they executed it not by a particular sort of Inspiration, by which such things were revealed to them as they knew not before, or which unaccountably and extraordinarily moved them to speak, but as they saw fit themselves; and those things which they had received from Christ and the Apostles, they interpreted after their own manner. Which was the ground of those Disorders and Tumults in the Church, of which *St. Paul* speaks in the 14th Chapter, when more Prophets than one would be heard at the same time. And hence this Gift did not supersede the necessity of Study and diligent reading, as appears by that advice of *St. Paul* to *Timothy*: *Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, &c.—Meditate upon these things, give thy self wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all.*

These are they whom the Apostle calls *Prophets*; the *Teachers* seem to be those who had qualified themselves for preaching the Gospel only by Study, and had not received the extraordinary Gift of the Spirit. The *Prophets*, for the most part at least, did not teach by Inspiration, but had been *fitted* to teach by Inspiration; but these who are here peculiarly called *Teachers*, did not only teach without Inspiration what they had learned, but had received no extraordinary preparation from God for the exercise of their Office. In which particular they were inferior to the Prophets, besides that these did sometimes foretel things to come. Unless this Interpretation be admitted, it will be hard to understand any thing that *St. Paul* says afterwards about Prophets.

II. As for these *Teachers* in that Age having been always Bishops or Priests of the first Rank in the Church, I do not know whence that can certainly be concluded. I am sure what our Author alledges

Chapter to that purpose, does by no means prove it; nor is there any reason  
XII. from the thing it self, which should oblige us to be of his opinion.

~ Ibid. Note e. If the Apostles had shewn any other instances of severity beside that on *Ananias*, in the beginning of their Ministry, I do not think but St. *Luke* would have related them, and therefore I suppose they are other Miracles intended in *Acts* ii. 43. But why doth St. *Luke* say there was such a general fear upon that account? To wit, because that fear might as well follow upon beneficial Miracles, as punishments inflicted on wicked Persons; for any Miracles joined with a pious and reasonable Doctrin, are capable of impressing an awe upon the Minds of Men, and making them afraid to oppose the Teachers of it, lest they should be found fighters against God. This is a much better Interpretation, than to say that the Apostles terrified Men by inflicting Diseases upon them, and menacing them with Death; which they very seldom did, and could not have been frequently done without giving a fair occasion to the enemies of Christianity to cavil both at the Apostles conduct, and it. And I as little believe that this power belonged to all Governors of Churches, which we read of none that used beside the Apostles, and those to whom the Apostles did as it were lend it, as St. *Paul* did to the *Corinthians*: See chap. v. But the Doctor thought he could never say enough about Church Censures.

Ibid. Note h. I. Of the word *γλώσσαι*, *Phil. Jac. Maussacus* has copiously and learnedly treated, in a *Dissert.* premised to *Harpocraton*, where he has at large shewn that *γλώσσαι* signifies not only Languages in general, but strange Languages, and words peculiar to certain Dialects, for the interpretation of which *Glossaries* were composed.

II. Tho it is said in *Acts* ii. 5. that there were at *Jerusalem* devout Men, out of every Nation under Heaven, who heard the Apostles speaking in their own Languages; yet that expression is not to be taken in the strictest and most comprehensive sense, because it is certain universal Phrases are often used for indefinite or particular ones, of which see my Notes on *Gen.* vii. 19. and *Part.* 2. *Sect.* ii. cap. vi. §. 16. of my *Ars Critica*. And indeed it is not at all probable that the Apostles could speak all the Languages so much as of the *Asian* People, among which were the *Scythians*, who inhabited a great and vast Country towards the North, and the *Seres* and *Japanners*, and divers *Indian* Nations, to which they never went. And therefore by all Nations and all Languages must be meant the most and most famous within the *Roman* Empire, and in bordering parts of the World: Tho I do not doubt but that if the Providence of God had called the Apostles to the most remote Countries, God would have miraculously conferred on them the  
knowledg



knowledg of their Languages. But it was time enough for that when Chapter they had occasion to use them. XIII.

III. There are some things to be observed about the Gift of Tongues, which I shall afterwards set down, because our Author has past it by.

## C H A P. XIII.

Verf. 1. **E**ΑΝ ταῖς γλώσσαις ἢ ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ ἢ ἄγγέλων.] St. Paul here seems to speak according to the opinion of the Vulgar, who think that the Angels cannot communicate their Thoughts to one another without speech; tho Spirits, whether pure, or clothed with another kind of Body, may have other ways to convey their Thoughts to each other: And those ways altogether as conceivable as the manner how we understand one anothers Thoughts by Speech, which is *not at all*, as I might easily shew, if this were a proper place to philosophize in: But I shall rather set down a passage out of *Michael Psellus*, in his little Book *de operationibus Demonum*, where he describes thus the manner of their discoursing: ὡς ὁ λέγων πρὸ ὄψεως ἢ ὡν ἰσχυρότερας δεῖται κραυγῆς, ἀγγεῖ δὲ γινόμενοι εἰς τὸ τῶ ἀκούοντι ὡς ψιθυρίζων ὑπάρχει· καὶ εἰ ἐγγὺν αὐτῷ συνεγγίξαι πνεύματι ἢ ψυχῆς ἕθενός αὐν ἐδεῖσθαι λόγῳ, ἀλλ' ἴν' ἔτι βέλυσιν λόγῳ ἀφόρῳ κελεύθῳ πρὸς τὸ δεχόμενον ἐγγινόμενοι, ὅ φασι καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς ταῖς ἐξίστασις εἶναι· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τυύτας ἀπλήκτως ὁμιλεῖν ἀλλήλαις. Τῶν δὲ τῶ τρόπον καὶ δαίμονες πειθῶνται τῶ ὁμιλίαν λαμβάνοντες, ὡς μηδ' ὀπόθεν ἡμῶς ἐστὶν ὁ πόλεμος συναισθάνεσθαι: *He that speaks, if he be afar off, is forced to speak very loud; but if he be near, he whispers what he has to say into the Ear of the Person he speaks to. And if he could have an immediate access to the spirit of the Mind, he would not need so much as to whisper, but he might make himself be understood, and communicate whatever he had a mind by a secret way, without any noise; in the same manner as they say Souls do after their separation from the Body, who converse without making any sensible impression on each other. And this way the Devils also discourse with us Men, and wage war with us unperceived. And afterwards he saith thus: Γλώττιαν ἢ ἰδίαν δαιμόνων ἐφάρων ἐκ ἔσται, καὶ ἢ Ἑβραϊκὴν πῖ εἶποι, καὶ ἢ Ἑλληνίδα, καὶ ἢ Σύριαν, καὶ τῶ ἄλλαν βάρβαρον· πῖ γὰρ ἔδξ φωνῆς τοῖς ἀνευ φωνῆς ὁμιλεσσι, ὡς καὶ πρὸς ἐν εἶπον; That Demons have any peculiar Language we shall not find; for instance, Hebrew or Greek, or Syriack, or any other barbarous Tongue: For what occasion have they for Speech, who converse together without Speech, as I before said? But he goes on and saith: Ἐπι δὲ καθάπερ ἐν ἀγγέλοις ἐθνῶν ἑτέροις ἑτεροι πρὸς ἑαυτοῖς, ἄλλοι ἄλλοις συμπυρεδρεύεσθαι, ἕνασι ταῖς ἐκείνων ἐξασκῶσι γλώττιαν, ἐρ' ὡ καὶ τῶτοις οἱ ἢ παρ' Ἑλλήσιν ἐχρησμοῦδεν ἡρωικῶς,*

Chapter *ἡρωϊκῶς, οἱ δὲ παρὰ Χαλδαίους πρὸς κλίσεις ἔχον τῆ Χαλδαίων γλώττῃ, &c.* But as  
 XIII. among the Demons of the Nations, some presided over one, and some over  
 another, and had each their distinct place of Residence; so they severally spake  
 the peculiar Languages of those Nations. For which reason those of them  
 that resided in Greece, gave their responses in Greek Heroick Verses, and those  
 in Chaldea were invoked in the Chaldean Language, &c. This as it is not  
*ἀβασανίζως* without any examination to be admitted, so nor absolutely I  
 think to be rejected; wherefore I thought fit to set it down here, that  
 the Learned might judg of it.

Ibid. Note a. There are several things in this Annotation which I  
 cannot assent to, and are undoubtedly false.


I. From the order observed, in reckoning up the Consort in *Psalms*  
*cl.* it cannot be inferred that the *Cymbal* was a musical Instrument of  
 a bigger sound than those before named; for who told Dr. Hammond  
 that the Discourse ascended? Does the *Psalmist* use to be so exact in  
 placing his words? They must have read the Psalm but very carelessly  
 that can think so.

II. The *Cymbal* cannot be said to have been a *wind Instrument*. It was  
 made in the form of a Hemisphere, hollow within, and two *Cymbals*  
 were shaken and struck one against another, to make a sound. “If  
 “any one ask me (saith *Adr. Turnebus* in *Advers. Lib. 26. c. 33.*) what  
 “sort of Instrument a *Cymbal* was, I will send him to the *Herb Cotyle-*  
 “don, Pennywort, whose Leaves resemble a *Cymbal*. So saith *Scribonius*  
 “*Largus*, *Mentastrum* vel radicem *κοτυλίδων*, quæ herba similia folia  
 “*Cymbalis* habet, *Wild Mint*, or the root of the *Herb Cotyledon*, the  
 “leaves of which are like *Cymbals*. He might have added, that this  
 Herb was for that reason called *κυμβάλιον*, as appears by *Dioscorides* in  
*Lib. 4. c. 92.* who gives this description of it, and at the same time  
 tells us what was the form of the *Cymbal*. *Κοτυλιδών, οἱ δὲ σκυτάλιον, οἱ*  
*δε κυμβάλιον φύλλον ἔχει ὡσπερ ὄζυβαρον, περὶ τρεῖς, λευκῆς τοῦ κοῦρου:* *Cotyledon*,  
 some call it *Scytalium*, others *Cymbalium*, hath a Leaf like a Sawcer, of  
 a round shape, and gradually concave. That the manner of sounding  
 these Instruments was by dashing or shaking them against one another,  
 appears by this Verse of *Virgil Georg. Lib. 4. vers. 64.* where he  
 shews the way how to call back a swarm of Bees:

*Tinnitusque cie & matris quate cymbala circum.*

On which place *Servius* hath this Note, by whose words it will more  
 fully appear what was the form of the *Cymbal*: *quæ* (viz. *cymbala*)  
*in ejus* (*Matris Deum*) *tutela sunt, quia sunt similia HEMICYCLIS*  
*caeli,*



coeli, quibus cingitur Terra, quæ est mater Deorum: Which are under her Chapter  
 protection, because they are like the half Circles of the Heaven, by which XIII.  
 the Earth is encompassed, which is the Mother of the Gods. That they   
 were shook together, we may learn also from the words of Isidore in  
 Orig. Lib. 2. c. 21. Cymbala & acetabula quædam sunt, quæ percussa in-  
 vicem se tangunt & sonum faciunt. Dicta autem Cymbala, quia cum  
 ballematica simul percutiuntur. Ita enim Græci dicunt Cymbala ballemat-  
 ica. Cymbals are a sort of Sawsers, which being struck against one ano-  
 ther, make a sound. The reason why they were called Cymbals was because,  
 &c. What the meaning of the word ballematica is I do not under-  
 stand; but the word Cymbal must be derived not ἐπὶ τῆς συμβάλλεσθαι, but  
 ἐπὶ τῆς κώμης, which signifies concave, as ἐπὶ τῆς κέρτε, κέρταλον. Whence  
 Cymbals are called concave by Lucretius, Lib. 2. speaking of Cybele's  
 Priests:

*Tympana tenta sonant palmis & cymbala circum  
 Concava.*

Nonius Marcellinus interprets cymbaliffare, cymbala quaterere. And it's  
 certain they were used in Dances, as the Timbrels and Tabors, as ap-  
 pears by Lampridius in Commodus: Præfectum Prætorio suum Julianum  
 ——— saltare etiam nudum ante concubinas suas jussit, quatientem Cym-  
 bala deformato vultu: He commanded his Præfect Julian to dance naked in  
 the Court before his Concubines, shaking Cymbals, and with his Countenance  
 disfigured. But the manner of sounding Cymbals is best of all described  
 by Ausonius, in Ep. 25.

*Cymbala dant flictu sonitum, dant pulpita saltu  
 Icta pedum, tentis reboant cava tympana tergis,  
 Iliacos agitant Mareotica sistra tumultus. \**

III. The matter of these semicircular Instruments being Brass, they made a tinkling or shrill sound, not a loud or big one, as the Doctor thought; whence they are stiled ὀξύφθογγοῖς in the Epigram of Alexis Priest of the Mother of the Gods, of which I shall here produce these Distichs out of the Anthol. Lib. vi. p. 416. cap. 5.

\* Since the Impression of this I have observed that the learned Laur. Pignorius has printed Figures of Cymbals from the antient Marbles, exactly in the same form as I have described them.



Σοὶ τὸδε θήλυς Ἀλεξίς εἰς οἰσρήματα λύσης  
 Ἄνθετο, χαλκοτύπε παυτάμενον· μανίης.  
 Κυμβαλα τ' ὀξύφθογγα, βαρυφθόγγων τ' ἀλαλιτῶν  
 Αὐλῶν, ἕς μὲν γε λοξὸν ἔκαμψε κέρας.  
 Ὑμπανα τ' ἠχίεντα, καὶ αἶματι φοιτιχθέντα  
 Φάσγανα, καὶ ξανθὰς τὰς πείν ἔστεισε κόμας.

The female Alexis bequeaths this to thee, the mad tokens of her Fury, leaving off her brass striking Rage: Her shrill sounding Cymbals, and high grave sounding Pipes, which are made of the crooked Horns of a Calf: And her echoing Drums and Swords dield with Blood, and yellow Hair, which she formerly shook.

IV. Hesychius interprets the word χαλκόσυμα by καλκία, κύμβαλα, that is, brazen Kettles, Cymbals, as Phavorinus also reads it, not χαλκία κύμβαλα brazen Cymbals, as it is falsely quoted by our Author. And the reason why these Instruments are called χαλκόσυμα is because they were made of Brass, not because they were πνευματικά wind Instruments.

V. The Epithet ἀλαλιζόν here proves nothing but that the Cymbal was an Instrument of a shrill sound; and indeed two such semicircular Instruments made of Brass could not be beat one against another, without making a pretty great Ringing or Tinkling, which yet was not so great as to equal the sound of Organs, especially if of a large size. Hence Xenophon, in the beginning of his Book *de re Equestri*, compares the sound of the hollow hoof of a Horse to the sound of a Cymbal: ὡςπερ κύμβαλον ἄρσενι περὶ τῷ δαπέδῳ ἢ κοίλῃ ὀπλή: a hollow Hoof struck upon the ground makes a noise like a Cymbal. Besides the word ἀλαλιζόν signifies to make any sort of confused noise, not only for Joy, but for Grief, as appears even from *Mark* v. 38. Consult what *H. Stephanus* says about this word under its primitive ΑΛΑΛΕΩ, with which what is said here by our Author is nothing to compare. So that *St. Paul* admirably resembles the sound of the words of an unknown Language to the confused noise of a Cymbal, or ἀλαλιτῶν. Perhaps *Tiberius Cæsar* had almost the same reason for calling the *Grammarians* *Apio*, *Cymbalum Mundi*, the Cymbal of the World, viz. because he dunned mens ears by his vain and unprofitable talking. See *Pliny's* Pref. to his *Nat. Hist.*

VI. The use of the Cymbal does not belong to this place. The Apostle does not here respect the occasions or times in which it was made use of, but only its confused sound: However I shall in a few words here set down the use of that Instrument, because our Author had



had not a true Notion of it. It was used whenever any confused Chapter noise was to be made, either as a signification of Joy or Mourning. XIII. For the antient Eastern People used that sort of Musick on both those occasions, whether in War or Peace. It was a token of Mourning in the sacred Solemnities of the Mother of the Gods, as we are told by *Martial*, Lib. 14. Epig. in *Cymbala*, 204.

*Ara, Celanacos lugentia Matris amores,  
Esuriens Gallus vendere sæpe solet.*

Of which see the Additions of *T. Demsterus* to the *Rom. Ant.* of *Rosinus*. But in the worship of other Deities, they played upon Cymbals for the sake of mirth; as appears by *Athenæus's* description of the *Parilia*, or Feasts in honour of the Goddess *Pales*, Lib. 8. p. 361. *Ἐξάκιστος ἐγένετο, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν ἀνάλων βόμβου, καὶ κυμβάλων ἦχου, ἐπὶ τε τυμπάνων κτύπου μετὰ ὠδῆς ἅμα γινόμενον*: There was heard through all the City, the noise of Pipes, and the sound of Cymbals, and the beating of Drums, and singing. So *Herodian*, Lib. 5. speaking of *Heliogabalus*, cap. 5. 19. *Περὶ τε τῶν βωμῶν ἐχόρευεν ἑαυτὸν παντοδαπίαις ἡχοῖς ὀργάνων· γυναῖδά τε ὀπιχάεια ἐχόρευον αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν βωμῶν κύμβαλα ἢ τυμπανα καὶ χεῖρας φέροντα*: He danced about the Altars, with the sound of all sorts of Instruments; and the women of the Country danced with him, running round the Altars, and carrying Cymbals or Tabers in their bands. That there were Cymbals also used in private Meetings for dancing and mirth, I have already shewn, and could easily prove more at large. It is known also that they were used in War, but it was only among the *Arabians*. And so saith *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Stromat.* 2. p. 164. *Χρῶνται οὖν καὶ τῶν πολέμων αὐτῶν— Λιβύωνται τυμπάνω, καὶ Ἀραβικοὶ κυμβάλω*: The Egyptians in their Wars use Drums or Tabers, and the Arabians, Cymbals.

VII. Because I have said so much about the Cymbal, I shall add something about its Original, tho it contribute nothing to the illustration of *St. Paul's* meaning in this place. It sufficiently appears by the places already alledged, that it was neither a *Roman* nor a *Greek* Instrument, but an *Asian*: because it was principally in use among the *Phrygians* and *Phenicians*, as we have seen out of *Herodotus*; and the *Arabians*, as we have been told by *Clemens*. And hence saith *Apuleius*, in Lib. de *Deo Socratis*: *Gaudent Ægyptia numina ferme plangoribus, Græca plerumque choræis, barbara autem strepitu cymbalistarum, & tympanistarum & choraularum*: The Egyptian Deities are pleased generally with Beatings, the Greek for the most part with Dances, and the Barbarian with the noise of men playing upon Cymbals, or Tabers, or Pipes.

Chapter XIV. It was very common among the *Jews*, in whose Language it is called *תְּסִלְסֵל* *tsiltsef*, from a Root which signifies to *ring* or *tinkle*, both among them and the *Arabians*. The word *תְּסִלְסֵל* *tsiltsef* is constantly rendered by the *Septuagint* *κύμβαλα*, except in one or two places, which are perhaps corrupt. Possibly it signified also *Sistrum*, a *Timbrel*, as I shall have occasion hereafter to observe on *Psal.* cl. It is certain both these Instruments might by an *Onomatopœa* be so called.

I have been larger than I usually am, in treating of the *Cymbal*, partly because *Dr. Hammond* did not know what it was, and partly because two other great Men were as ignorant in this matter as he: One is *H. Grotius*, who tells us, that *for the most part* this Instrument *was made of Silver*, which by what I have said already, appears to be false; and for further proof take this passage out of *Josephus*, in *Lib. 7. cap. 10. p. 243.* where among the rest of *David's* musical Instruments, he reckons *κύμβαλα*, and describes them thus; *ἦν πλατέα καὶ μεγάλη χάλκεα*, they were broad, great, and brazen. The other is *S. Bochart*, who in his *Phaleg. Lib. 4. c. 2.* affirms, that the *Cymbal* differed hardly in any thing but the roundness of its form from the *Timbrel*, whereas the *Timbrel* was an Instrument with holes in it, and made with little cross bars of Metal, not like a pewter Saucer as the *Cymbal*. Which it is not proper in this place to prove at large.

Verf. 4. Note c. See my Note on the word *χεῖρὸς*, in *Mat. xi. 30.*

#### C H A P. XIV.

Verf. 2. **Ο** *Γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ.*] What is said in this Verse, seems to be by way of concession, and therefore should be paraphrased thus: “For granting that he who speaks in an unknown Language, does really use a Gift which he has received from God; yet he should remember that he can speak in that Language only to God, not to men who do not understand it, and to whom all that he says is unintelligible. It was certainly a piece of folly and arrogance, not to say any worse of it, to speak so as to be understood by no body; for it was a mere ostentation of the Gift of Tongues. But there are some things to be observed with relation to that Gift, which our Author has past by, and will it may be give light to this whole Business.

I. They who received the Gift of Tongues, were doubtless instructed with them, in order to propagate the Gospel among those Nations whose Languages they were; whether they went into their

Conn-



Countries, or discoursed with such as came out of them: and therefore the time for using them was only when they could not be better understood in any other Language. Those that were at that time at *Corinth*, and could speak Greek, ought to use the Greek Tongue among the *Corinthians*, and not strange Dialects which they could not understand, and for which they might be suspected of Imposture, because no body understood them. For certainly one who could speak Greek, and industriously used another Language among *Grecians* who understood nothing but their native Dialect, might not without reason be taken for a Deluder or Impostor.

II. But besides *Grecians*, and those who understood Greek, there were at *Corinth* some other People out of *Africa*, *Asia*, and *Europe*, who resorted thither for the sake of Trade, and were unskilful in the Greek Language, and who having been converted by the Apostle to the Christian Faith, had also received the Gift of Tongues, to enable them when they went into their own Country to preach the Gospel among barbarous Nations. And these seem to be the first who might abuse the Gift of Tongues in the Church of *Corinth*; as if for instance, a man that could speak Latin, because born and bred in *Italy*, had used the *Illyrian*, *Celtick* or *Spanish* Language, the knowledg of which had been conferred upon him by God, when no body was present that understood any of those Tongues.

III. It must be acknowledged notwithstanding, that a Grecian, before Grecians, might, for example, speak *Spanish*, that those of his own Country might know he was instructed by God with the knowledg of the *Spanish* Tongue; to which purpose there was need of an Interpreter, who by a faithful interpretation of what he said, might shew that he did not speak some fictitious Language, or use sounds that had no sense belonging to them, but the true *Spanish* Language: For if he himself had first used a strange Language, and then spoken in Greek what he had said before in an unknown Tongue, he might be suspected by those who did not understand that strange Language. But if no body were present, who could perform the Office of an Interpreter? It was better for the Person so miraculously endued with the knowledg of the *Spanish* Language to hold his peace, lest he should speak to those who did not understand it, to no purpose, or become suspected to the Hearers, if he himself should take upon him to be his own Interpreter, or at least by his proud ostentation of an useless accomplishment, at that instant of time, offend them.

IV. These two sorts of men *St. Paul* here reproveth, who used the Gift of Tongues in an improper place and time, and prefers such Pro-

phets as spake nothing but Greek to them. But you will say, Were not those who preached the Gospel in strange Languages, also Prophets? Yes, undoubtedly; but not to those who did not understand those Languages, and therefore the Apostle distinguishes them from those who spake only Greek. And he justly prefers a Grecian, endued only with the Gift of Prophecy, and speaking to his Countrymen in their own Language, to one who did not use the Gift of Prophecy, but of Tongues, among those who did not understand them. These things being diligently observed, which, if I am not mistaken, are true, or very probable, the Apostle's whole discourse will be perspicuous, which is otherwise very dark and intricate.

Ibid. [Πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἢ λαλῶν.] I do not think this is to be understood of a particular Inspiration, for they who had once received the Gift of Tongues, were not inspired as often as there was occasion to use them; but they expressed their minds whenever they pleased, in any of those Languages with which the Spirit of God had instructed them. So that by *πρὸς ἑαυτὸν* here is meant *to his own understanding*, but not to another's.

Verf. 5. [Ἐπις εἰ μὴ διεγερθεῖν.] That is, not as our Author says, *unless he afterwards speak in a known Language, what he had expressed in an unknown*; for it would have been absurd to speak, for instance, in *Spanish* to *Grecians*, that which one should be forced afterwards to speak ones self in Greek; but, "he is a greater Prophet who prophesies in one known Language, than he that prophesies in many unknown, if he cannot deliver his mind without them in a known Tongue. A *Carthaginian*, for example, who besides the *Punick*, should have understood all the Dialects of the *Mores* and *Lybians*, could not be so much esteemed at *Corinth*, as a *Greek* Prophet that understood only his *native* Language, unless he were able also to express in *Greek* what he could say in the Language of the *Mores* or *Libyans*. This *St. Paul* calls here *ἑαυτὸν*, because he is speaking of a man who did not understand Greek, and wanted an Interpreter among the *Grecians*, and so would have been his own, if he had understood that Language. No other Person can be intended, for who doubts but a native *Grecian* was able to speak in his *own* Tongue what he said in a strange one? *Grotius* would have the Gift of Interpretation to be understood of a *faithful Memory*, but that is manifestly a harsh and far-fetch'd Interpretation.

Verf. 10. [Τοσαύτα γένη φωνῶν.] I wonder *Dr. Hammond* in his Paraphrase should represent *St. Paul* as using that Fiction of some of the Antients about *seventy Languages*; which has been confuted by *S. Borchart*





chart in his *Phaleg*. Lib. 1. c. 15. to whom I refer the Reader.

Verf. 13. Περὶ δὲ ἑτα ἵνα διεξιμῶν.] Of one that could speak Greek this cannot, as I have said, be understood; for what need had any man of a miraculous Gift, to enable him to express that in his Mother Tongue, which he himself spake in a strange Language, if he did but understand what he said? And every one that uses a Language, the knowledg of which he has received from God, is supposed to understand what he himself says; for he would really be a *sounding Brass*, or a *Cymbal making a confused noise*, who should speak words in a strange Dialect, which yet he did not know the meaning of. *Grotius* interprets these words thus: *Let him pray that he may faithfully retain in his memory what he speaks outwardly with his Tongue, that so he may deliver the same things in Greek.* But, first, this Interpretation does not agree with the sense of the word διεξιμῶν, which signifies to interpret, not to remember. Secondly, He supposes that those who used strange Languages, spake from Inspiration, not their own thoughts, but what was suggested to them by the Spirit; which we have no certain ground to believe, nor is it probable it was so, at that time particularly, and in that place: For if this supposition of *Grotius* were true, the Holy Ghost would have inspired a *Corinthian* to speak, for example, in the *Punick* Language, in such time and place as he would least of all have stood in need of that Tongue, there being no *Carthaginian* present. But to what end I pray? Was it that he might hold his peace in the Church; in which certainly it would have been very improper to speak in the *Punick* Dialect, if there was no body there that understood it? Or was it that he might keep his skill in that Language till a fitter occasion? But he had better have been inspired with the knowledg of the *Punick* Tongue, when there was need of that Inspiration, lest his memory should not retain it, or there should be occasion for a new Miracle to confirm his memory. For if (which I observe in the *third* place in opposition to *Grotius's* Interpretation) he could not have interpreted by his memory in Greek, what he had said by heart and extempore in the *Punick* Language, without a Miracle, much less could he have performed that some time after. And the Interpretation which *Dr. Hammond* gives of these words in his Paraphrase, is altogether as insignificant, unless we understand the Apostle to speak of a Stranger that could not speak Greek.

Verf. 14. Ἐὰν ᾗ προσώχομαι γλώσση, τὸ πνεῦμα με προσώχεται, ὁ δὲ νῦν με ἀκατάως ἐστίν.] I have set down this whole Verse in Greek, that the Reader may compare it with our Author's Paraphrase, in which he speaks so barbarously and improperly, that he rather obscures the sense of

the Apostle, which is dark in it self, than explains it. What mortal would have interpreted *τὸ πνεῦμα μου* by *my Gift*, or *the Gift of Tongues* which is given me? and what intolerable Language is it to say *my Gift prays?* and so of the rest. This is *lapides loqui*, as one said, not *verba humana*, to break a Man's teeth with hard words. *Grotius* much more fitly interprets *τὸ πνεῦμα* of a motion from Inspiration, and explains the last words by this Paraphrase: *Mens mea nihil bene excogitatum profert; My own mind produces no good thoughts.* But this is nothing to the purpose, for who had not rather hear an inspired discourse, if he can but understand it, than one that is merely the product of a man's own meditation? Some other Interpretation therefore must be given of this place; and *St. Paul's* mind, if I am not mistaken, expressed thus: "If I make use of an unknown Tongue, I pray indeed my self with my mind, because I understand what my words signify; but the sense of what I say is of no use to others who do not know it; and if they join with me in that Prayer, pray rather with their bodies than with their minds."

First, The Phrase *τὸ πνεῦμα μου προσεύχεται* signifies, *I pray with my mind*; and is tacitly opposed to the action of the Hearers who were then present, and prayed rather with their bodies than their minds, because they did not understand what he that made use of a strange Language said. Nothing is more ordinary than for the Spirit and the Body to be opposed to one another; which in the use of the Sacred Writers are such perpetual correlates, as the Logicians speak, that upon the mention of one, the other is presently thought on. See *Rom. viii. 23.* and *Gal. v. 16.*

Secondly, The phrase *ὁ δεῦρος μου*, *my mind* or *understanding* signifies the sense or meaning of what I say; which is *ἀκαρπώτης*, without Fruit; viz. to others who do not understand it. So this word *δεῦρος* is frequently used, and among other places in the Book of *Wisdom*, Chap. ii. 16. These things being supposed, the sense also of the following words is evident, which will otherwise be very obscure.

Verf. 15. *Προσεύχομαι ὡς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους.*] That is, I will pray so, as at the same time to pray to God with my mind, and that the sense of what I say may be understood by the standers by. I confess an Attick Writer, or one that had studied to express himself neatly and elegantly, would never have said *προσεύχομαι τοῖς ἄλλοις*, for ἕως προσεύχομαι ὡς πάντες ἄλλοις ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἀκούωμεν, to pray so as that those who are present may understand the meaning of my Prayer. But *St. Paul* was never curious in his stile, and he said to pray with my mind, tho in a different sense, because he had said before to pray with the Spirit. But he certainly



tainly meant what I have said, or something like it, as appears by what Chapter follows: See *vers.* 19. *Grotius* interprets this Verse thus: *Optandum est, ut orem, id est, ut oret aliquis non tantum motu illo afflatitio, verum etiam iis quæ ipse excogitavit; It were to be wished that I prayed, that is, that a Man prayed not only from that Divine impulse, but also out of his own Thoughts.* But I say it were to be wished rather that all who pray in publick, prayed by Inspiration or a Divine Impulse, but in a known Language. *St. Paul* in this Discourse does not oppose that which a Man *devises* himself, and speaks in a known Tongue, to a Prayer that is *inspired*, but is expressed in a *strange* Language; but only a Prayer which cannot be understood, to one that may. They who had the Gift of Tongues might as well express their own Thoughts in a strange Dialect, as that which was revealed to them by Inspiration. This our Author in some measure perceived, and therefore mollified a little *Grotius's* Interpretation.

*Verf.* 16. *Note a.* I rather think the Apostle means here other acts of Thanksgiving, which particular Persons, according as it seemed good to them, offer'd up to God in the Church, in strange Languages, to which they who did not understand those Languages, could not say *Amen*. For who will believe that there was any Governor of a Church so senseless, as when he celebrated the *Eucharist*, a religious Ceremony in which all the Members of the Church were to join, to use an unknown Language? This is confirmed by the Pronoun *σῆ* *thy*, which shews the Apostle to speak of Thanksgivings offer'd up in the name of *one* Man, and not of the *whole* Church.

*Verf.* 19. *Διὰ τῶν νοῶν μου λαλήσω.*] Tho *διὰ νοῶν* in this place as well as *ἐν νοῶν* *vers.* 15. seems to be but a harsh Phrase, to signify, *that I may be understood*; yet that *that* is the meaning of it, may appear by the following words, *ἵνα καὶ ἄλλοις καταγγίλω,* *that I might teach others also*; as also by its being opposed to *λόγων ἐν γλώσσῃ* *words in an unknown Tongue.* *Grotius* interprets this also *a me ipso cogitata, The product of my own Thoughts*; as if one that had been endued with the Gift of Tongues, could not have expressed the product of his own private Thoughts in an unknown Language! Or as if he that so unseasonably made ostentation of that Gift, spake by Inspiration!

*Verf.* 21. *Ἐν ἑτέρῃ γλώσσῃ καὶ ἐν χάριτι ἐτέροις λαλήσω.*] *Dr. Hammond* follows indeed for the most part *Grotius*, and not without reason, as being unquestionably the best of all the Interpreters of Scripture. But here he justly forsakes him, because that great Man puts such an Interpretation upon this Passage alledged out of *Isaiab*, as makes it to be nothing to the purpose. Besides, there are other things in his Annotation

Chapter XV. tion on this place liable to reprehension: As when he saith; *Hæc citari à Paulo, ex loco quidem Esaiæ xxviii. 11, 12. non tamen ex versione LXX Intt. sed ex versione Aquilæ docet nos Origenes Philocaliæ viii.* For, first, *Origen* speaks of this passage, not in the viiith, but ixth Chapter of his *Philocalia*. Secondly, he does not say that *St. Paul* had cited *Isaiab* according to the Version of *Aquila*, whom he very well knew to have lived but in the time of the Emperor *Adrian*. All that he says is this, after he had set down this place of *St. Paul*, wherein he alledges *Isaiab's* words: *Εὗρον γὰρ τὸ ἰσοδυναμῆντα τῇ λέξει ταύτῃ ἐν τῇ τῆς Ἀκύλας ἐρμηνείᾳ κείμενα:* for I have found what is equivalent to this expression in the interpretation of *Aquila*. *St. Paul*, who understood the Hebrew Language, cited these words out of the Hebrew Copy, not out of the Version of *Aquila*, which was composed a great many Years after the Apostle's death. If *Aquila* translated them in the same manner, the reason of that was, because he also carefully follow'd the Hebrew. This was an error in *Grotius*, which proceeded not from carelessness or oscitan- cy, and much less from ignorance, but from an unavoidable weakness in human Nature, which will not bear a perpetual Intention of Mind. For I do not doubt but this difficult Chapter kept that great Man's Thoughts a long while employed; and so writing this after he was tired with too long Study, he fell into a double Mistake, which I do not speak to upbraid him, far from that, but only to caution the Reader.

## C H A P. XV.

Verf. 8. **W**HAT is observed by *Baronius* out of *Suetonius*, and here *Note b.* since him by *Dr. Hammond*, is vain, being grounded upon a corrupt reading of the words of *Suetonius*, where instead of *Abortivos*, the best Copies have *orcinos* or *orcivos*, which *Is. Casaubon* and *Læv. Torrentius* have shewn to be the true reading. The phrase used here by *St. Paul*, is much older than *Augustus*; for the Hebrews metaphorically call any mean or contemptible thing *נפל*, and that word the *Septuagint* very truly render by *ἐστρωμα* in *Job* iii. 16. and *Eccles.* vi. 3. So any thing whatsoever that is in its kind little, might be called *abortive*, as *Antonius's Dwarf* in *Horace*, *Sat.* 3. *Verf.* 46.

*Appellat — pater — pullum male parvum*  
*Si cui filius est, ut abortivus fuit olim*  
*Sisyphus.*

On which place see the old Interpreter.

Verf.



Verf. 19. 'Εἰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ ἡλπιότες ἐν Χριστῷ μόνον, ἐλαυνότεροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐσμέν.] Two things St. Paul proves in this Discourse: 1. That the Apostles did not falsely pretend themselves to expect a Happiness after this Life from Christ, but truly expected it; because otherwise they would never have underwent so many Hardships and Dangers for his sake. 2. That this their expectation was not vain, because it was grounded upon the Resurrection of Christ, whereof they were witnesses, and therefore credible, because they suffer'd so much for being so, and it was a thing in which they could not be deceived. This arguing has a great deal more strength and certainty in it, than that of Cicero in a like matter, and grounded in part upon the same Topicks, Acad. Quæst. iv. where saith *Lusullus*: *Ille vir bonus, qui statuit omnem cruciatum perferre, intolerabili dolore lacerari potius, quam aut officium prodatur aut fidem; cur has sibi tam graves leges imposuit, cum quamobrem ita oporteret nihil haberet comprehensi, percepti, constituti? Nullo igitur modo fieri potest, ut quisquam tanti æstimet æquitatem & fidem, ut ejus conservandæ causâ nullum supplicium recuset, nisi iis rebus adensus sit, quæ falsæ esse non possunt. That good Man who resolves to undergo all manner of Torments, and to be torn in pieces with unsufferable pain, rather than to betray his Duty or Trust; why has he imposed upon himself such severe Laws if he did not see sufficient reason for him to do so? It is utterly impossible that any Man should put such a value upon Justice and Honesty, as to submit to any Tortures rather than act contrary to them, unless he have assented to such things as cannot be false. And Tuscul. Lib. 1. Cicero himself speaks thus: *Nescio quomodo in hæret mentibus quasi sæculorum quoddam augurium futurorum, idque in maximis ingeniis, altissimisque animis & exstitit maxime & apparet facillime; quo quidem demto, quis tam esset amens, qui semper in laboribus & periculis viveret? I know not how, there abides in the Minds of Men as it were a presage of a future State, and especially in Persons of the greatest Capacity and deepest Thoughts, in whom it most easily discovers it self; and if this apprehension was taken away, who would be so mad as to live perpetually in Troubles and Dangers? This indeed shews that those Heathens believed another Life after this, but does not prove that they were not mistaken. For it was possible they might be deceived by an Opinion taken up in their Childhood, for which they could produce no sufficient Arguments. But the case of the Apostles was quite otherwise, who proved the reality of a future State by the Authority and Resurrection of Christ; which they themselves had seen, and confirmed the truth of by their Sufferings.**

Ibid. 'Ελαυνότεροι πάντων.] Who can neither live quietly nor die naturally, nor so much as find a Grave after Death. To this purpose is

Chapter that Inscription on the Monument of *Callistus*, if it be an antient one, XV. in *Rom. Subterr.* Par. 1. p. 307. ALEXANDER *mortuus non est, sed vivit super astra, & corpus hoc tumulo quiescit. Vitam explevit cum Antonino Imp. qui ubi multum beneficii antevenire praevideret, pro gratia omnium, odium reddit. Genua enim flectens, vero Deo sacrificaturus, ad supplicium ducitur. O tempora infausta! quibus, inter sacra & vota, ne in cavernis quidem salvari possimus. Quid miserius vita? Sed quid miserius morte, cum ab amicis & parentibus sepeliri nequeant?*

Verf. 29. Note c. I. That *Ellipsis*, which our Author would have to be in this Phrase ὑπὲρ τῆς νεκρῶν for ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἧστ' νεκρῶν, in the series of such a Discourse as *St. Paul's* here is, and in the middle of a Disputation which required that every thing intended should be expressed, is very harsh, and has nothing common with those examples which he alledges.

II. What he confidently asserts in the latter end of this Annotation, that the πρὸς ὑμῶν Verf. 12. is the Nominative case to the Verb βαπτίζονται, is groundless and unnecessary, βαπτίζονται having a Nominative case belonging to it in this very 29th Verse, viz. οἱ βαπτίζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῆς νεκρῶν, which immediately goes before. But that intricate way of Writing which the *Doctor* had accusom'd himself to, made him able to digest what none besides himself could do.

III. I confess the opinion of *St. Chrysostom* and others about this place, contains a very commodious sense, if we consider it in it self, but compar'd with the *Apostle's* words it cannot stand. And to me their Interpretation seems to be most probable, who take ὑπὲρ here to be equivalent to ἀντὶ, and so the sense to be this: "If there were no Resurrection, what would become of those who every day, tho' they see Christians put to Death for their Profession, do yet cheerfully receive Baptism, that they may supply the place of those that are dead in the Christian Church? By the same way of arguing we might prove, that bearing of Arms is not without a reward annexed to it: If those that bore Arms were to have no reward for so doing, when so many Soldiers are continually killed, what should they do who are listed in the room of those that are dead, and supply their place? That ὑπὲρ is frequently used for ἀντὶ no one can doubt. Yet I shall add a Passage out of *Dionysius Halicarnass.* in which he speaks of Soldiers substituted in the room of others that are killed, whereby not only that appears, but *St. Paul's* words may be very much illustrated. And it is in his *Antiq. Rom.* Lib. 8. p. 553. ΤΗΡΕΤ' ἘΠΙΘΑΝΟΝΤΩΝ, saith he, ἐν ταῖς μετὰς Ἀντιάτων πολέμοις στρατιωτῶν ἡξίαν ἑτέρας καταγεσθῆναι: FOR those that DIED in the War with the *Antiatians*, they determined to levy other Soldiers.

IV. What



IV. What our Author relates out of *Photius* concerning *Synefius*, Chapter is in *Cod.* 26. But there was a great difference between *Synefius* and those against whom *St. Paul* disputes: For he being a *Platonick*, believed the Immortality of the Soul, and the Rewards and Punishments of another Life; but these *Corinthians*, together with the Resurrection of the Body, denied the Soul's Immortality, and a future Judgment, and were perhaps *Jews*, who of *Sadduces* had embraced the Christian Religion. Now *St. Paul*, in order to prove the Resurrection, proves that there were rewards to be expected after this Life; which reasoning could not be designed against the *Platonists*, because they confessed a future Happiness, tho they did not believe the Resurrection of the Dead. And Religion might well enough consist with the opinion of the *Platonicks*, tho the *Sadduces* who disowned the Immortality of the Soul utterly overthrew it. And therefore the *Egyptians* bore with *Synefius*, notwithstanding he was a *Platonick*, which they would never have done if he had been a *Sadduce*.

Vers. 33. *Φθείρουσαν ἡθῆν χρεῖς ὀμιλίαι κακαί.*] There are some who from this place, and the citation out of *Aratus*, infer that *St. Paul* was conversant in the Writings of the Heathen Poets: But without sufficient ground, because such as these were common proverbial forms of Speech used by every one, and might be easily learned from ordinary Discourse, even of ignorant Persons, by which means I am apt to think the Apostle came to the knowledg of them. For the *Jews* did not use to read much the Writings of the Heathens; nor does the stile of *St. Paul* otherwise give us the least reason to imagin that he ever so much as attempted any thing in that sort of Study. For if he had been at all conversant in Heathen Authors, we should doubtless have seen more effects of it in his way of Writing. However we may learn from hence, that Christians ought not to reject any thing which was well said by the Heathens: And therefore I think it not amiss to produce two more Passages, besides those which have been alledged by *Grotius*, out of Heathen Writers to this purpose. *Aeschylus* ἐπὶ τῷ δὴ δίκας:

Ἐν πάντι πρῶτος δ' ἐδ' ὀμιλίαι κακῆς  
 Κάλιον ἔδεν, χάρπθ' ἔ κομισέθ'.  
 Ἄτης ἀρετα δάνατον ἐμκαρπίζεται.

That is, according to the interpretation of *Grotius*:

*Adeo malorum, scilicet, commercio  
Nil pejus usquam est; oritur infelix seges,  
Nam sceleris arvom nil nisi mortem parit.*

*Epicetus in Enchirid. cap. xlv. 'Εάν ὁ ἑταῖρος ἢ μεμιλυσμένῳ, καὶ ὁ συγκατα-  
τεβόμενον αὐτῷ μολύρεται ἀνάγκη, καὶ ἂν αὐτὸς ὦν τύχη καθαρός: If a Companion be  
corrupted, he that converses with him must needs also be corrupted, tho per-  
haps he were [before] pure.*

Ibid. Note e. I take *χρηστὰ ἦθῃ* here in the sense in which it is com-  
monly understood, because those who denied the Resurrection were  
undoubtedly Persons of *evil Manners*; and that this was St. Paul's  
meaning, appears by the following words; *Awake to Righteousness, and  
sin not.* So in *Aristophanes in Nub. p. 177. Ed. majoris, Act. 3. Sc. 2.*  
the Chorus addressing themselves to *just Reason*, say:

Ἄλλ' ὦ πολλοῖς τὰς πρεσβυτέρους ἠθῆσι χρηστῆς σεφανώσας  
'Ρῆζον φωνῶ ἢ πνὶ χρίμας, καὶ πλὴν σαυτῶ φύσιν εἶπέ.

*But O thou who hast crowned our Ancestors with abundance of good Manners,  
speak and declare thy Nature.* Where unquestionably *χρηστὰ ἦθῃ* signifies  
*good Manners*, as in many other places: Yet Dr. Hammond's Interpre-  
tation and this may be joined together.

Verf. 54. Note g. This remark our Author took out of *H. Grotius*; but tho the Hebrew *עַדְעַד* signify *for ever*, and Death be to be finally abolished after the Resurrection, yet St. Paul does not refer to that here: for if he had, he would have rendred the words of *Isaiab, Chap. xxv. 8.* by *εἰς αἰῶνα*, which he now interprets *εἰς νῖκος*, because he had before reckoned Death in the number of *Christ's Enemies, vers. 25, and 26.* and afterwards in *vers. 57.* he saith that God had given us *τὸ νῖκος* the *victory* over Death. So that of two significations, whereof the Phrase *עַדְעַד* *metaph* is capable, viz. *for ever*, and *in victory*, St. Paul here follows the latter, which made most for his purpose: And indeed that signification agrees best to the place in *Isaiab* it self.



## C H A P. XVI.

Ver. 19. I. **I** Wonder our learned Author should begin this Annotation with saying that *Εκκλησία* the Church did not ONLY signify the place of assembling together, but also the Persons that used to do so: When it is certain the former signification of the word, for a Place, was wholly unknown in the times of the Apostles, in which *Εκκλησία* was always used for an Assembly, as well among the Christians as by the Greeks.

II. I rather also understand *ἐν οἴκῳ* of the House it self; which is said here to have had a Church in it, because there were in it several Christians, so that that House seemed to contain a whole Church. Tertullian in Lib. de Exhort. ad castit. cap. vii. Where there are three Persons, there is a Church, tho they be Laicks.

Verf. 22. Note d. I. Those learned Men who affirm there were only two degrees of Excommunication among the Jews, are Selden and his followers: See his Treatise de Synedriis Judæorum, Lib. 1. cap. 7. And I confess I could never meet with any that has answered his Arguments, tho Dr. Hammond does not doubt but he was mistaken; but our Author was too great a favourer of Ecclesiastical Punishments, which yet it is certain have done more mischief than good to the Christian Church.

II. What he says about the word *Maran*, is taken out of Grotius, without Care or Examination. (1.) The Etrurians did not call their Kings *Marani*, but *Murrani*, as Grotius tells us out of Servius on *Aneid.* 12. vers. 529. (2.) The Syrians are not stiled *Maronitæ* because they call Christ Lord, but from one *Maron* an Abbot, whom the *Maronitæ* affirm to have been Orthodox, but others a Heretick; or from *Maronia* a Territory of Syria: on which matter there is extant a Dissertation of *Gabriel Sionita* and *Joannes Hezzonita*, both *Maronites*. It is certain *Maron* is a Syrian name, there being in the *Recognit.* of S. Clement, Lib. 3. c. 2. mention made of *Maron* the Tripolite who entertained St. Peter. (3.) I cannot tell where *Epiphanius* says that God was called by the *Gazari*, *Marnas*; but I know that Mr. Selden, a great while before this was published by Dr. Hammond, or before ever Grotius first wrote it, had shewn that *מַרְנַשְׁכָּה* *marnascha* was the name of a Deity among the *Gazæans*, in his Treatise de Diis Syris, Synt. 2. c. 1. (4.) *Stephanus* was mistaken, when he said that the *Cretians* called their Virgins *Μαίρηαι*, for they were called

Chapter called *Mæstus*, of which see *J. Selden*, and *C. Salmasius* on cap. 11. XVI. of *Solinus*.

III. The *Spaniards* do not say, *Anathema Maranatha*, but *Anathema Marano*, as it is rightly set down by *Grotius* out of *Mariana*, Lib. 7. cap. 6. *Rerum Hispanicarum*. The *Arabick* words subjoined to that form of speaking among the *Spaniards*, are not an interpretation of it, nor brought as such by *Grotius*, but of this place in *St. Paul*, out of the *Arabick* Translation, published by *T. Erpenius*.

IV. The conjecture set down by the *Doctor* concerning the passage in *Steph. Byzant.* on the word *Λαοσίκεα*, is taken from *Dan. Heinsius*, whose name he ought to have mentioned, tho it be but an unhappy conjecture. The Shepherd there spoken of, said in *Syriack* ܐܢܬܐ ܥܠܝܐ *ram-anth*, thou art high, viz. O God. *Stephanus* misunderstood *Philo*, as *S. Bochart* well observes in *Chanaan*. Lib. 2. c. 12. to whom I refer the Reader.

Verf. 24. [Ἡ ἀγάπη μὴ μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐν χειρῶν Ἰησοῦ.] The Pronoun μὴ here is omitted in the *Alexandrian* Copy. But I have sometime suspected that the true reading was ΘΟΥ the same with Θεός, which by a mistake came to be changed into ΜΟΥ.

---

A N N O.



ANNOTATIONS 

## On the Second Epistle

## Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 11. **T**HIS Observation our Author had out of *Grotius*; *Note a.* but it is false, that the Hebrew מִפְּנֵי ever signifies *in respect of*: And if it did, the phrase ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων would not signify *in respect of many*, viz. men, but *in many respects*; and the latter part of the Verse should be rendred thus: *That the Gift bestowed upon us in many respects, might be received by many with thanksgiving for us.* To make sense of which words, we should be obliged to interpret *in many respects*, by *to many purposes or ends*; which yet will not agree either with the Hebrew or Greek phrase. I believe therefore indeed that there is here a *Hebraism*, but so as that ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων is answerable to the Hebrew words מִפְּנֵי רַבִּיּוֹת *mippbene rabbim, from the face of many*, that is, from many. It is certain מִפְּנֵי often signifies *from*, as *Cbr. Noldius* in *Conc. Particularum* has observed. The Greek words are only transposed, and ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων put for ἐκ προσώπων πολλῶν, *from the faces of many*. And διὰ πολλῶν which follows, is put for διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστίων, as it is set at length in *Chap. ix. 12.* of this Epist. just as διὰ βραχέων signifies *in a few words*, in *Heb. xiii. 22.* So that this Verse ought to have been rendred thus: *That many thanks may be given for us by many, for the Gift bestowed upon us by God.*

Verf. 13. Η' ἂν ἀναγινώσκετε, ἢ καὶ ἐπιγινώσκετε.] This is a *Paranomasia*, or figure in which words of a like sound and different sense are joined together. Such another as that of *Dionysius Cato*: *Nam legere & non intelligere, negligere est*; on which see *Jos. Scaliger*. It is a noted saying of *Julian*; ἀέγνω, ἔγνω, κατέγνω, *I have read, I have known, I have condemned.*

Verf.

Chapter II. *Verf. 22. Σφραγισάμενοι ἡμᾶς καὶ δὲς ἃ ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος.]* Those who purchase any thing, for which they do not pay ready Money, nor take it immediately away, use, for fear of its being changed, or a worse commodity substituted in its room, to mark it with their Seal, and give the Seller earnest. And this seems to be the ground of this metaphorical description here, of those benefits which God confers upon us, whilst we live in this world, by the names of *Seal* and *Earnest*. God has redeemed us with the Blood of his Son, and yet he does not presently for ever make us his own, by bestowing eternal Blessedness upon us, but leaves us in this mortal Life. But that the Primitive Christians might not doubt whether God had really bought them, they were distinguished, as it were, by God's Seal from the rest of mankind, and received as an Earnest from him the Spirit of Miracles. See *Ephes. i. 13. and iv. 30.* Yet the thing from whence the Metaphor is taken, does not in every respect agree with that which is thus metaphorically described; nor is it necessary it should, for it is sufficient if there be but some similitude between them.

## C H A P. II.

*Note b.* **T**H O, properly speaking, the Apostle was the Author, both of the Punishment inflicted upon the incestuous *Corinthian*, and of his Cure upon repentance, yet *ὑπὸ πλειόνων* ought not therefore to be rendred *under many*, or *in the presence of many*, contrary to the use of the Greek Language. *St. Paul* here joins others with himself, because they had consented to the punishment; which thereupon might be said to have been inflicted by *them*, especially considering it was denounced by their mediation.

*Verf. 11. Ἰνα μὴ πλεονεκτῆσώμεθ' ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ.]* It may possibly, not without some colour of truth, be conjectured that by *Satan* in this place we are to understand a *man* who was an *enemy* to the *Corinthian* Church, rather than the *Devil*; which endeavoured to draw away him who had been delivered to Satan and others from its Communion. And therefore it follows; *for we are not ignorant of his devices*: Which words if they be understood of the Devil, seem to be flat and superfluous; for who does not know that the Devil does all he can to pluck men out of the hands of Christ? Thus the word *ὑπὸ Σατανᾶ* is used in *2 Sam. xix. 22. and Mat. xvi. 23.* which word the Apostle seems to have paraphrased in his *Epistle to Titus, Ch. ii. 8.* by *ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας*. I cannot tell whether *Dr. Hammond* had not also some such thoughts about this



this place, because he paraphrases it as if the Apostle had said; *for we are ignorant of his Devices.* Chapter III.

Verf. 16. Οἷς μὴ ὁσμὴ θανάτου, &c.] Namely, by *their* fault, whose folly and wickedness made them reject the Divine Mercy; and not without commendableness in those who received so great a favour as they ought to do. Such another ἐννοια came into the mind of *Cebes*, when he was composing that excellent little piece called his *Table*, wherein he represents the old Man that undertook to explain the design of it, speaking in this manner to the Spectators: Εἰ μὴ προσέξητε καὶ συνήσεται τὰ λεγόμενα, φρόνιμοι καὶ εὐδαίμονες ἔσεσθε. εἰ ὅ μὴ, ἀφρονες καὶ κακοδαίμονες καὶ πικροὶ καὶ ἀμαθεῖς γινόμενοι κακῶς βιώσεσθε. Ἔστι γὰρ ἡ ὀξύγαστος ἐοικυῖα τῷ τῷ Σφίγγος ἀινίγματι, ὃ εὐκρίνη πρεβάλλετο πῖς ἀνθρώποις. εἰ γὰρ ἔν αὐτὸ συνίη τις, ἐσωζέτο· εἰ δὲ μὴ συνίη, ἀπόλλυτο ὑπὸ τῷ Σφίγγος: *If you mind and understand what is said, you will become wise and happy; but if not, you will be foolish and miserable, and wicked in your lives. For the explication (of this Table) is like the Riddle of Sphinx, which she proposed to men; if any one understood it, he was saved; but if not, he was destroyed by the Sphinx. This is the case of all those whose fate it is,*

*Virtutem ut videant, intabescantque relicta.*

### C H A P. III.

Verf. 1. **T**HE Epistles commendatory usual among Christians, did not owe their Original to the *tesseræ hospitales* of the Heathens, but to an universal custom among all Nations of writing Letters of Recommendation in behalf of their Friends. And those publick Letters which were sent by the Bishops of one Church to another, were instituted especially upon the account of Heathens and Hereticks, for fear Idolaters, or Persons of erroneous Opinions in the Faith, should creep into the Churches, and make an ill use of their Liberality. See *Beveridge on Can. Apost. 12. and 33.*

Verf. 5. Οὐχ ὅτι ἱκανοὶ ἐσμὲν λογισαμένοις, ὡς ἔξ ἑαυτῶν.] It is certain that all our Faculties, Encouragements and Helps to Faith and Piety, both General and Special, Natural and Evangelical, are entirely owing to God; and therefore all thanks and praise must be given for them to him alone: But these things *St. Paul* does not here speak of, but of those Thoughts and Gifts which were necessary to enable men, whether

Jews or Gentiles, to preach the Gospel. And it is certain that neither Jews nor Gentiles could any of them of their own heads have preached any thing like the Christian Doctrin; but it was requisite that those first Preachers of the Gospel should receive the Evangelical Doctrin by Revelation from God and Christ, and be endued with necessary extraordinary Gifts, to communicate the knowledg of it to others, such as the power of working Miracles, a singular constancy and unweariedness of mind, and incredible patience to undergo all manner of Afflictions, and the like. Both the foregoing and following Context clearly shew, that the Apostle here speaks about a sufficiency to preach the Gospel, and nothing else; and therefore our Author should have kept to that alone in his Paraphrase.

Verf. 6. Οὐ γράμματι ἀλλὰ πνεύματι.] I have already more than once observed, that by γράμμα is meant the Law, as it was understood by the Jewish Doctors, in a literal or grammatical sense, and so proposed by them to the observation of their Disciples; and by πνεῦμα the *mind* of the Lawgiver, in giving the Law, that is, the Doctrin of the Gospel, of which the Law contained only the *στοιχεῖα* *Elements*. And this St. Paul here seems to have a reference to, and tacitly to oppose his Apostolical Ministry to the Industry of those Jews who travelled over Sea and Land to make Profelites to the *Letter* of the Law. There is a manifest opposition put between the Law and the Gospel in the 3d Verse. See my *Note* on *Mat.* v. 17. and *Rom.* ii. 29.

Ibid. Τὸ γὰρ γράμμα σκοπεῖν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ.] The mere observation of the *Letter* of the Law would not save any Man, or make him acceptable to God, unless he had also a regard to the *Spirit* or Intention of the Lawgiver, that is good Works, such as are prescribed in the Gospel. But the *Spirit*, that is, the Gospel, saves alone, without the observation of the *Letter* of the Law. This is the meaning here of St. Paul, and not what our Author says in his Paraphrase, which has no manifest ground in Scripture, but relies purely upon Theological conjecture.

Verf. 17. Ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν· ἔστι δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα Κύριος ἐκεί ἐλευθερία.] That is, the Lord Jesus, and his Gospel, is the spiritual End of the Law, or the ultimate Scope to which the Lawgiver had a respect. And where that spiritual Intention of God or the Gospel is known, there is Liberty; that is, men are no longer dealt with as Servants, who obey more out of fear than love. See my *Note* on *Rom.* viii. 15. There is nothing here that has any reference to a *Veil*, which is a token of subjection, as Dr. Hammond thought. The *Veil* which  
St.



St. Paul mentions belongs no more to that than the Veil of *Moses*, Chapter IV. which was not put upon those that obeyed, but on him that commanded.



C H A P. IV.

Verf. 7. **I** Am apt to think that the word ὄσφρακον properly signifies *testa*, that is, *baked Clay*; and thence by a Metaphor was applied to Animals covered with a certain Shell, which for the hardness of it might be compared to ὄσφρακον. Yet I affirm nothing positively; but this I affirm, that in this place ὄσφρακινῶσκειν undoubtedly signifies *earthen Vessels*; because that is the perpetual signification of this Phrase, and the other alledged by Dr. *Hammond* is without example. Besides, the place it self necessarily requires the word ὄσφρακινῶσκειν should be so understood; for it is manifest that St. Paul compares the Apostles to frail and contemptible, and not precious or artificial Vessels, such as are made of the finest sort of Shells. There is a clear opposition here put between the great Excellency of the Gospel, and the meanness of its Preachers; or between the Power of God which exerted it self in the Gospel, and the Infirmitiy of the Apostles.

Verf. 8. *Note c.* I fully agree with our learned Auther in interpreting St. Paul's words here, by the customs of the Heathens in their *Agones*. But there are some things to be observed on this Annotation.

I. It is strange he should confound the Verb ἀλγέω in Greek with the Latin *algeo*, when the Greek constantly signifies *to grieve, to be tormented*, and the Latin *to be cold*. Yet he has elsewhere committed the same mistake, lest any one should think it was by mere accident. It is manifest that St. *Chrysostom* interprets the Verb θλίβειν by the word ἀλγεῖν, and this latter does no more signify *to be cold* than the former, but *to be grieved or afflicted*.

II. In the place of St. *James*, λεπτόμοροι is not an *Agonistical* term. The words of the Apostle are: *Let patience have its perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, deficient in nothing, τέλει καὶ ὁλόκληροι. ἐν μηδενὶ λεπτόμοροι*: where the thing spoken of is manifestly a defect, and not any Victory which might be gained over the Christians.

III. It would have been worth observing that the Preposition ἐξ in composition, carries a greater *emphasis* with it than ἐπὶ; for which reason ἀπορεῖσθαι signifies only *to be perplexed*, but ἐξ απορεῖσθαι *to despair utterly*. So *Aristophanes* in *Nubibus*, Act. 4. Sc. 1. Ἐπολεῖν με φησὶ κάξολεῖν,

Chapter he saith he will destroy and utterly ruin, or undo me.

V. Vers. 13. Το αὐτὸ πνεῦμα ἢ πίστεως.] That is, saith Grotius, *Habentes communem nobiscum Dei Spiritum, qui non datur nisi credentibus. Iterum hic genitivus causam significat; id est, conditionem requisitam. Having the common Spirit of God with us, which is not given to any but Believers. Again here the Genitive Case signifies a Cause; that is, a necessary Condition.* But I should rather interpret the Spirit of Faith, of a disposition of Mind suitable to what we believe, or to the Faith which we profess. So the Spirit of Jealousy, and the Spirit of Bondage, &c. are the dispositions of jealous Persons, or Servants. Which Interpretation agrees better with what follows; for because the Apostles were so disposed, as Persons who did not doubt of the truth or excellency of the Gospel, ought to be, therefore they boldly preached it, and could not be deterred from so doing by any danger.

### C H A P. V.

Vers. 1. <sup>2</sup> Οἰκία τῆ σκηνῆς.] I don't think this is an *Hypallage*, whereby οἰκία τῆ σκηνῆς is put for σκηνῆς ἢ οἰκίας, as *Beza* supposed, and therefore without necessity inverted the words in his Translation. But an *House of a Tabernacle* is a Hebraism, for a House which, like a Tabernacle, is easily dissolved, a House that is built of Boards which may be easily taken asunder; in opposition to a House of Stone, which abides firm after its Tenant is removed. So that the Genitive σκηνῆς is equivalent to an Adjective, which would signify *like a Tabernacle*, such as σκηνώδης, if it were in use, for then it might have been said, εἰάν ἢ ὀπίκειτο οἰκία σκηνώδης καταλυθῆ, *if our earthly House, like a Tabernacle, were dissolved.* Which the Greek not permitting, it is no wonder that *St. Paul*, after the manner of the Hebrews, supplied the place of an Adjective by a Substantive. *Hippocrates* in Aphorismis: Ἐπολιπεῖσα ἢ ψυχὴ τὸ τῆ σώματος σκηνῆ, *the Soul having left the Tabernacle of the Body.*

Vers. 10. Note a. The *Vulgar Interpreter* read also τὰ ἴδια, as appears by his translating it *propria*, and the sense is not improper; but have a care of thinking that σῶμα signifies a Man himself. See what our Author has said about that matter on *Rom. vi. 6.* and what I have there objected against him.

Vers. 11. Note b. Tho πείθειν be often joined with a great opinion of the Person who perswades; and he that desires to perswade, must above all things endeavour to get the approbation and good opinion of his Hearers; yet the use of the Greek Language will not permit that



that word to be taken in the sense which our Author here fixes upon it. The Accusative case to the Verb *πειθεῖν* is *φύλον*, which must be repeated from what goes before. The sense is: *knowing how much the Judgment of God ought to be feared, we persuade others to fear it, that we may induce them to a Holy Life; of which God is our witness, and you also, if am not mistaken, conscious.* Nor is it to be expected that the Doctor will any where else prove that *πειθεῖν* signifies any thing but to persuade. It is common with him to impose significations upon words, collected from mere uncertain reasonings; whereas Use is that which ought to be principally regarded, and nothing else, when a word may be conveniently taken in its usual sense. Nothing is more dangerous than those kind of reasonings, which ought never to be resorted to, but when it is impossible to apply the ordinary signification of words to any particular places in which they occur.

Chapter  
VI.  
~~~~~

## C H A P. VI.

Verf. 2. **I** Have already elsewhere said, that out of *Judæa* the Christians had no reason to fear the *Jews*, in those times; and therefore the *day of Salvation* here cannot reasonably be referred to the *Jews*, the Apostle writing to Persons that lived in *Achaia*. But *Grotius* and others more fitly understand it of *eternal Salvation*. But I am not against thinking that the Apostle here opposes his own and the rest of the Apostles Life, to the ill Manners and Effeminacy of false Teachers; provided the 2d verse be not interpreted of a Deliverance from them, by a sudden destruction which was to befall them. For what deliverance could this be from Hereticks, when the Heathen Persecutions daily encreased from this time, throughout all the *Roman Empire*?

Verf. 14. Note b. Our learned Author, who finds fault with *Budæus* and *Stephanus* for taking up with a conjecture, rather than attending to the use of the word, ought to have produced a place in which the Verb *ἐπεσζυγῆν* signified to *incline to one part more than another*; not a single Passage out of *Phocylides*, where the Noun *ἐπεσζυγος* signifies an uneven balance. For if the signification of the Verb must necessarily be deduced from the Noun *ἐπεσζυγος*, by the same reason I will derive it from another signification of the same word, viz. for of another kind. In which sense it is used by the *Septuagint* in *Levit. xix. 19.* where for, *thou shalt not let thy Cattel gender with a diverse kind*, they read, *τὰ κτήνη σα ἔκοτοχούσεις ἐπεσζυγῶ.* And so *ἐπεσζυγεῖν ἀπίστοις* will be, by joining themselves to Unbelievers, to mix with another sort of  
Men,

Chapter VII. Men, viz. different from Christians, or ἀπίστis διείσαν ἐτερόζυγοι παροσμυλιῆς. St. Paul seems to have had a respect to that Law in *Levit.* It's certain at least that *Moses* by that Symbolical Law signified the same which the Apostle here forbids, as I have shewn in my Notes on that place. But why are Cattel of a different *Species* called ἐτερόζυγοι? namely, because they do not use to be joined together in the same yoke ἢ ἐνὶ ζύγῳ. So saith *Hesychius*: ἐτερόζυγοι, οἱ μὴ συζυγῆντες, those that are not yoked together. And on the other hand, γαμήπιῃ a Wife is by the same Grammarian called ἑμώζυγος, because she is linked together in the same Yoke with her Husband.

This Interpretation is more natural than that of the learned *M. Meibomius*, in *Lib. de Fabrica Trirremium*, p. 37. where he renders this place; *do not strive with Unbelievers*, viz. like Rowers who endeavour by unequal force of rowing to pull the Vessel to one side. But what he says is worth our reading, tho it be much more simple and agreeable to the scope of the Apostle to interpret ἐτερόζυγεῖν σὺν τῆς ἀπίστοις, to yoke themselves with Infidels, so as that ἐτερόζυγος, which is in the composition of this Verb, be not opposed to the yoke of Unbelievers, but to the Yoke of Christ.

## C H A P. VII.

Verf. 2. **Ε**πλεονεπήσαμεν. ] That is, as it is rightly rendred by *Beza*, *quæstui habuimus*, made gain of them. Our Author's interpretation I have confuted on the place of the *Epistle* to the *Romans* referred to in his Paraphrase.

Verf. 8. *Note a.* Unless our Author had here look'd for Church Censures of all kinds, he would not have had one word to say upon this Chapter; but with all due respect to the Memory of so great a Man be it said, he had better have said nothing than wrested the Apostle's words at such a rate.

I. He should not have said indefinitely that the Greeks used the word ἄρῃ to signify a short space of time, but only the latter Greeks, as it is said by *Grotius*, from whom he took this remark, but should have better transcribed him. And the latter *Greeks*, as the same learned Man thinks, borrowed the word in that signification from the *Latins*. So it is taken in *Horace*, *Sat. 1. Lib. 1.*

————— *Horæ.*  
*Momento eita mors venit aut victoria lata.*



II. The Verb *λυπᾶν* here does not signify to excommunicate, but to grieve by severe Reproofs, as I have already observed on 2 *Cor.* v. 2. And the *Corinthians* are said to have been grieved for a short time by St. *Paul's* reproofs, because they were sensible they had *deserved* them; but when they had a little while after seen that they whom St. *Paul* had particularly aimed at in those reproofs became sober and penitent, they rejoiced that the reasonable severity of the Apostle had so good an effect upon them. St. *Paul* has no reference here to Excommunication, nor must *delivering to Satan* be confounded with Excommunication, a Punishment peculiar to the Apostles times, but afterwards unknown, as I have on 1 *Cor.* v. observed. Chapter VII.

III. It's true indeed there are others besides the incestuous Person here referred to; but that they had the Censures of the Church inflicted upon them, is not said by the Apostle, nor so much as intimated, but only that they were at first sorry that there had been such Disorders committed among them, as gave St. *Paul* just reason to reprehend them; and afterwards rejoiced that they had been reclaimed by his reproofs from those sinful practices. There is no regard here had to Excommunication, inflicted either for a longer or a shorter space of time.

Verf. 9. *Ελυπιθήτε.*] Our Author goes on in his Paraphrase to interpret this word of *excommunication*, contrary to the Rules of Grammar: For who does not see that, *to sorrow to Repentance*, is to be grieved so for what we have done amiss, as to forbear offending for the future? Obstinate Persons are troubled indeed when their Sins are reprov'd, but they are not troubled because they have sinned, they are troubled only because they are reprov'd. And therefore they are angry with those who reprehend them, and never think of reforming their evil Practices. But Persons of a yielding Temper are not sorry that they are reprehended, but that they have sinned, and therefore they take it well of those who reprove them for their faults, and carefully abstain from them ever after. And this Sorrow St. *Paul* here calls *λυπῆν χεῖρ ἢ θεόν.*

Ibid. *ἵνα ἐν μηδενὶ ζημιωθῆτε ἐξ ἡμῶν.*] That is, so as not to think that you suffered any loss of Reputation by my severity in reprov'ing you; quite otherwise than obstinate Men would do, who would have cried out that they were injured and defamed, without ever becoming better.

Verf. 10. *Ἢ γὰρ χεῖρ θεόν λυπῆν, &c.*] An excellent sentence is here quite spoiled by our Author, and turned into an empty sound of words, by his wresting the words of the Apostle. *λυπῆν χεῖρ θεόν*, saith he, is *the Discipline of the Church*, and *λυπῆν κόσμῳ* are *punishments inflicted by Men*.  
Who

Chapter VIII. Who will endure such an Interpretation as this, so distant from the literal sense of the words, especially when a very good and excellent one arises from a Grammatical Explication of them? For the meaning of St. Paul is this, "That a Sorrow agreeable to the Divine Will, such as is the Sorrow of all good Men, worketh Reformation of Manners, and consequently Life; but the sorrow of worldly minded Persons makes them but sin the more, and that brings eternal Death upon them, the just reward of obstinate and incorrigible Offenders. For, as I have already said, good Men are sorry that they have sinned, bad Men that they are discovered and reprov'd; the former upon Reproof amend, but these latter grow but the more hardy (tho perhaps more close) in sinning.

## C H A P. VIII.

Verf. 2. **A** Πλόπτου.] That is, of *Liberality*, the original of which phrase I have set down on *Rom.* xii. 8.

Verf. 10. Note a. I cannot persuade my self that St. Paul would say, *ye have begun not only to do, but also to will*, in the same sense as he would have said, *ye have begun not only to will but also to do*; nor is there any example of such an inversion. So that I had rather, with Dr. Hammond, enquire for some other notion to fix here upon this word *Will*; and because it is common with us to do some things, especially in acts of Charity, with some kind of regret and not heartily, *ἐκόντες ἀεχοντί γε θυμῶ*, as Homer speaks, interpret it of a cheerful and liberal Mind, and so make the sense to be: Ye have not only from a Year ago begun to contribute a sum of Money, but also as to your manner of doing it, it was not by compulsion, or the bare importunate persuasion of those whom you could not deny, but with a ready, cheerful and charitable Mind: Without which qualification, the liberality which any Man exercises is *ἔθειλοντ* against his Will, and becomes unacceptable, so that those who receive a Benefit from one who is not hearty in bestowing it, had almost rather not receive it at all, as esteeming more the Will of the giver than the Gift it self. And if it be so sometimes among Men, with God it is always so, who has ever a greater regard to the Disposition with which a Man gives, than what he gives. St. Paul therefore might aptly subjoin a word, which signified the affection of the Persons who gave, to a word which signified their Gifts themselves; and his Discourse does not descend, but ascend. Seneca has a great deal to this purpose in the beginning of his Lib. 2. *de Beneficiis*, and elsewhere in the same Book. This interpretation



terpretation is confirmed by the following *Vers.* and the beginning of Chapter the ixth *Chapter*.

*Vers.* 19. *Χειροτονθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν συνέκδημιθ, &c.*] This our Author must needs understand of a Synod and Bishops, as if some Churches could not by Letters declarative of their Mind, have agreed about sending a particular Person along with *St. Paul*. I should rather have used general words, because it in no wise appears that this matter was determin'd in a *Synod*. The same Person that is here intended, is afterwards, *vers.* 23. called ἀπόστολθ ἐκκλησιῶν, that is, one deputed by the Churches to accompany *St. Paul* in his Travels, and ease him of part of his work. Of this see the learned *Mr. Dodwell* in *Dissert. Cyprian.* 6. S. 17.

*Vers.* 23. Δόξα Χρισθ.] That is, *instruments*, saith *Grotius*, of the *glory of Christ*; viz. in *advancing the Gospel*, saith our Author in his Paraphrase. But I think it is much more natural to say, that those are here called the *glory of Christ*, who are an honour to Christ by the integrity and sanctity of their Life; as bad Christians are a disgrace and reproach to him. See what I have said about a like expression on *1 Cor.* xi. 4.

## C H A P. IX.

*Vers.* 2. ΠΑΡΕΣΚΕΥΑΣΑΙ.] That is, that from a whole year past they had been forward to give, and begun already to contribute. Our Author here fancies some *new act* of liberality in the *Corinthians*, as if they had already *before* sent a sum of Money to *Judæa*, which is no where intimated by *St. Paul*. This opinion of his proceeded from misunderstanding the 10th *verse* of *Chap.* viii. on which see my Note. *St. Paul* had not told the *Macedonians*, that the *Corinthians* had a year ago got ready a sum of Money to send to *Judæa*, which he knew to be false; but that they had begun to contribute from that time, and were so forward and chearful in their Contributions, that the whole Sum expected from them would easily be completed. So that the word *παρεσκευασαι* here must be referred to a *readiness of Mind*. To which it is very properly applied: *Gratissima* (saith *Seneca de Beneficiis Lib.* 2. c. 1.) *sunt beneficia PARATA, facile occurrentia ubi nulla mora fuit, nisi in accipientis verecundia.* Those Benefits are most grateful which are READILY bestowed, that come easily from a Man, and as it were of their own accord; and if there be any hesitation, it is on the part of the bashful receiver.

Chapter IX. *Verf. 8. Δυνατὸς ἢ ὁ θεός.*] Our Author interprets what *St. Paul* here says that God was *able* to do, so as if he had said he would certainly do it; and thence he infers that Riches are promised to the liberal, even under the *Gospel*. But the promises of the *Gospel* respecting all of them, the Soul and a future State, as appears both by the nature of the *Evangelical Covenant*, and innumerable places in the *Gospels*, it is not necessary to represent *St. Paul* as saying here what he did not say. Nay he seems to have on set purpose spoken cautiously, when he said *δυνατὸς θεὸς πλεωθῆσθαι*, and not *πλεωθῆσθαι* he will make to abound; because God does not promise, or give such things under the *Gospel* but for certain reasons, which are many times unknown to us. And if he does not give them; we have no cause to complain, because he has not promised them, and those things which he gives us are infinitely more valuable. But does not the Apostle, you will say, pray to God that he would reward the bounty of the *Corinthians*, by bestowing upon them greater Riches? I acknowledg he does, but it does not therefore follow that God has promised to make the bountiful always rich, but only that this is sometimes done by him, and that it is lawful to pray for it, because we may desire Riches both for our selves and others, on this condition, that we make a good use of them. So that all that our learned Author says about Riches being promised under the *Gospel* to the liberal, is insignificant, and, to speak the truth, more worthy of those who affirm Riches to be a mark of the true Church, than of *Dr. Hammond*.

*Verf. 9. Ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκε, &c.*] These words only, which are alledged by *St. Paul*, ought to have been urged, and not others which he omits: For otherwise it is not the Apostle, but *Dr. Hammond* that here reasons, who groundlessly infers from hence that Riches are promised in the *New Testament*. The place which he refers to in his *Annotation* on the foregoing Verse, viz. *Mat. xix. 29.* does not prove that good Men shall be made rich in this World, or receive again their Kindred and Friends, and other things of the same nature, which they have forsaken for Christ; but only what will be *ἑκατονταπλασίον* an *hundred-fold* better in the room of them, viz. a Mind contented with its present State, and the sure hopes of eternal Happiness. So that what our Author infers from the Passage alledged here out of the *Psalms*, has no foundation, and cannot be attributed to *St. Paul*.

*Verf. 11. Ἐἰς πάντα ἀπλόγητα.*] See before *Char. viii. 2.* and my Note on *Rom. xii. 8.*



## C H A P. X.

Verf. 4. I. **I** Do not at all doubt, but that St. *Paul* here speaks, as  
 Note b. *Grotius* before our Author had observed, of that Rod  
 with which he had chastized *Elymas*, the incestuous  
 Person, *Hymenæus* and *Philetus*, and with which St. *Peter* had cha-  
 stized *Ananias* and *Sapphira*; but I confess I cannot digest what Dr.  
*Hammond* here and elsewhere does, viz. the confounding of that mi-  
 raculous Power of the Apostles with the ordinary Excommunication  
 of Bishops. He ought to have proved first, that that *delivering to Sa-  
 tan*, or any other such Punishments inflicted by the Apostles, were the  
*arms* not only of the Apostles, but of all the Governors of the Chris-  
 tian Church; which he neither ever did before his Death, nor, I be-  
 lieve, would ever do if he were to live again. This was a Seal which  
 God set to the Apostles Doctrin, to fix the Christian Church upon a  
 lasting and immoveable Foundation; and all the rest of the Miracles  
 wrought in the Apostles time were designed to the same end: But  
 that being once settled, no Man had such a Power granted him, nor  
 can any one be supposed to have had the like Authority.

II. However, it is well observed by the *Doctor*, that *carnal* here is  
 all one with *weak*, which I shall confirm both by Reason and Examples.  
 The *Flesh* is very often opposed to the *Spirit*, that is, the Body to the  
 Soul, in which comparison the *Flesh* is the most infirm and feeble; and  
 hence the word *carnal* came to signify *weak*, as it is used in *Isa. xxxi. 3.*  
 where the Prophet thus bespeaks the *Fews*, who put too much confidence  
 in the *Egyptians*: *The Egyptians are Men and not God, and their Horses  
 Flesh and not Spirit; the Lord shall turn his Hand, and he that helpeth  
 shall fall, and he that is holpen shall fall down, and they shall all be consumed  
 together.* To this purpose also is that saying of Christ in *Mat. xxvi.*  
*41. The Spirit indeed is willing, but the Flesh is weak.*

III. Tho *καθαίρεσις* signifies sometimes *Excommunication* in the Wri-  
 tings of the Fathers, and *ὄχις* may very aptly be applied to a Mind  
 full of Pride and Obstinacy, and by those Vices fortified against the  
 Truth; yet it in no wise follows that *καθαίρεσις ὄχις* signifies *the  
 Excommunication of an obdurate Sinner.* What words do or may sepa-  
 rately signify, they do not always signify conjunctly, as every one  
 knows, who is any thing of a Critick in this sort of Learning. The  
 reason is, because one Phrase can have but one metaphorical sense be-  
 longing to it, and *ὄχις* being properly a *strong Hold* or *Fence*, and  
 here translated to signify whatever *Flesh and Blood* puts in the way of

Chapter the Gospel, to hinder the success and efficacy of it; it is necessary  
 X. that καθαίρειν ὀχυρώματα & καθαίρειν ὀχυρώματα should be rendered the *destruction of the Fence*, and to *destroy the Fence*, by a Metaphor taken from Military Affairs. So in *vers.* 5. λογισμὸς καθαίρειν is not to *excommunicate those that reason*, but to *overthrow reasonings*. Nor let any one say that *Fences are destroyed*, and *Reasonings overthrown* by Excommunication; for granting that, yet it will not follow that the Verb καθαίρειν and the Noun καθαίρεσις in these Phrases signify to *excommunicate and excommunication*.

IV. It is a pleasant mistake also in our Author, which his too great desirousness to find Excommunication every where spoken of in the Writings of the Apostles led him into, when he says that καθαίρεσις in *vers.* 8. signifies *Excommunication*, where St. Paul saith that he might boast of the Power which God had given him *for edification*, and not *for destruction*, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ ἔτι εἰς καθαίρεσιν. For who does not see that the opposite here to the *Edification* of the House of God, is not *excommunication* but *destruction*? One may as well say an *Edifice* is *excommunicated*, meaning that it is *destroyed*, as that an *excommunicated Person* is *edified*, to signify that his Sins are forgiven him. The same must be said of *Chap.* xiii. 10. where the same Phrase occurs.

V. Even in Ecclesiastical Writers, καθαίρεσις does not properly signify Excommunication, but only Abdication or degrading from Office, and is applied to Clergymen; nor is it always joined with Excommunication. See *Intt.* on the *Eleventh Apostolical Canon*.

*Vers.* 5. Λογισμὸς καθαίρωντες.] Our Author intrudes again into this place the Censures of the Church without any distinction, whereas those *Apostolical Arms*, of which I before spake, are here intended. And indeed with whatever Arguments any Philosopher came armed, or what sublimity soever his Reasonings seemed to have in them; if he attempted to disturb the Church by Heretical Doctrines, and went to resist the Apostles, as if he had found them in an error; the Apostles could presently shew how much he was mistaken, by sending a Disease upon him, such as Blindness, which St. Paul inflicted on *Elymas*, or delivering to Satan, to which others were subjected. For these were plain signs, by which it appeared that God approved of the Apostles Doctrin. But in ordinary Excommunication the case is otherwise: For all that can be concluded from *that* is, that when any one upon the springing up of some new Controversies, was excommunicated for disagreeing with the Bishop of the Church to which he belonged, the Bishop and the rest perhaps of the Clergy were of another Opinion; which might as easily be the worse of the two as the better.



better. For Excommunication was a certain evidence of Mens differ-Chapter  
ing among themselves, but not that the excommunicate Person was in XI.  
an error; because one that had the Truth on his side, might be excom-  
municated by ignorant and prejudiced Persons. But if any were  
chastised in the manner aforesaid by the Apostles, viz. by having  
a Disease inflicted on their Bodies, this was an infallible proof of their  
being Hereticks; because God would not have suffered any pious  
orthodox Person to undergo a Punishment which he had not at all  
deserved. Besides, that a Miracle wrought in confirmation of any  
Doctrin, such as this was, the present inflicting of a Distemper upon  
Mens Bodies, was of it self sufficient to shew the falseness of any thing  
advanced in contradiction to it, tho with some appearance of proba-  
bility; but certainly the Excommunication of any Bishop, who might as  
easily abuse his Authority, as others fall into Error, was no sure evi-  
dence of any Man's being an Heretick. These two things therefore  
must not be confounded, nor the ordinary Governors of the Church  
equal'd to the Apostles in their Censures, any more than in other  
Gifts and Endowments, as our Author occultly does, whether de-  
signedly and knowingly I cannot tell, but I am sure without reason.

## C H A P. XI.

Verf. 2. I. **T**HE first signification which our Author produces  
Note a. out of *Pollux*, sutes best with this place, for St. Paul  
does not say simply that he was an ἀρμόσυνος, or did  
ἀρμόσυνον ἀγοστήσαν χειρῶν; but ἡρμόσαμεν ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ, which cannot o-  
therwise be rendred than *I have espoused you to one Man or Husband*.  
Which words we rightly read with a *Comma* after them, which can-  
not be transferred after the Verb παρᾶσῃσαι, but absurdly, so that I  
wonder Dr. *Hammond* should judg that to be the best punctuation.  
The following words παρθερον ἀγνήν παρᾶσῃσαι τῷ χριστῷ, ought, as they  
are rightly by *Grotius*, to be rendred, *that I may present or deliver you a  
chast Virgin to Christ*. A Virgin is first espoused to one Man, and af-  
terwards she is delivered to him. And because it was possible, and  
sometimes also happen'd, that a Virgin who was espoused to any Man,  
upon intervening strifes, or for some other reason was given in Mar-  
riage to another, and that between her Espousals and Marriage she  
might be vitiated; St. Paul says, *I have espoused you to one Man, even  
Christ*, and I never intended that this Match should be broken off, or  
suffered you to be privately corrupted by any other, but have done  
my utmost to keep you pure, *that I might present you a chast Virgin to  
him.*

Chapter the Gospel, to hinder the success and efficacy of it; it is necessary  
 X. that καθαίρειν ὀχυρώματα & καθαίρειν ὀχυρώματα should be rendered the *destruction of the Fence*, and to *destroy the Fence*, by a Metaphor taken from Military Affairs. So in *vers.* 5. λογισμὸς καθαίρειν is not to *excommunicate those that reason*, but to *overthrow reasonings*. Nor let any one say that *Fences are destroyed*, and *Reasonings overthrown* by Excommunication; for granting that, yet it will not follow that the Verb καθαίρειν and the Noun καθαίρεσις in these Phrases signify to *excommunicate and excommunication*.

IV. It is a pleasant mistake also in our Author, which his too great desirousness to find Excommunication every where spoken of in the Writings of the Apostles led him into, when he says that καθαίρεσις in *vers.* 8. signifies *Excommunication*, where St. Paul saith that he might boast of the Power which God had given him *for edification*, and not *for destruction*, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἢ ἐκ εἰς καθαίρεσιν. For who does not see that the opposite here to the *Edification* of the House of God, is not *excommunication* but *destruction*? One may as well say an *Edifice* is *excommunicated*, meaning that it is *destroyed*, as that an *excommunicated* Person is *edified*, to signify that his Sins are forgiven him. The same must be said of *Chap.* xiii. 10. where the same Phrase occurs.

V. Even in Ecclesiastical Writers, καθαίρεσις does not properly signify Excommunication, but only Abdication or degrading from Office, and is applied to Clergymen; nor is it always joined with Excommunication. See *Intt.* on the *Eleventh Apostolical Canon*.

*Verf.* 5. Λογισμὸς καθαίρειντες.] Our Author intrudes again into this place the Censures of the Church without any distinction, whereas those Apostolical *Arms*, of which I before spake, are here intended. And indeed with whatever Arguments any Philosopher came armed, or what sublimity soever his Reasonings seemed to have in them; if he attempted to disturb the Church by Heretical Doctrins, and went to resist the Apostles, as if he had found them in an error; the Apostles could presently shew how much he was mistaken, by sending a Disease upon him, such as Blindness, which St. Paul inflicted on *Elymas*, or delivering to Satan, to which others were subjected. For these were plain signs, by which it appeared that God approved of the Apostles Doctrin. But in ordinary Excommunication the case is otherwise: For all that can be concluded from *that* is, that when any one upon the springing up of some new Controversies, was excommunicated for disagreeing with the Bishop of the Church to which he belonged, the Bishop and the rest perhaps of the Clergy were of another Opinion; which might as easily be the worse of the two as the better.



better. For Excommunication was a certain evidence of Mens differ-Chapter  
ing among themselves, but not that the excommunicate Person was in XI.  
an error; because one that had the Truth on his side, might be excom-  
municated by ignorant and prejudiced Persons. But if any were  
chastised in the manner aforesaid by the Apostles, viz. by having  
a Disease inflicted on their Bodies, this was an infallible proof of their  
being Hereticks; because God would not have suffered any pious  
orthodox Person to undergo a Punishment which he had not at all  
deserved. Besides, that a Miracle wrought in confirmation of any  
Doctrin, such as this was, the present inflicting of a Distemper upon  
Mens Bodies, was of it self sufficient to shew the falseness of any thing  
advanced in contradiction to it, tho with some appearance of proba-  
bility; but certainly the Excommunication of any Bishop, who might as  
easily abuse his Authority, as others fall into Error, was no sure evi-  
dence of any Man's being an Heretick. These two things therefore  
must not be confounded, nor the ordinary Governors of the Church  
equal'd to the Apostles in their Censures, any more than in other  
Gifts and Endowments, as our Author occultly does, whether de-  
signedly and knowingly I cannot tell, but I am sure without reason.

## C H A P. XI.

Verf. 2. I. **T**HE first signification which our Author produces  
Note a. out of *Pollux*, sutes best with this place, for St. Paul  
does not say simply that he was an ἀρμόσιον, or did  
ἀρμόζεν ἀνοσμίαν χεῖραῶν; but ἡρμόσαμεν ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ, which cannot o-  
therwise be rendred than *I have espoused you to one Man or Husband*.  
Which words we rightly read with a *Comma* after them, which can-  
not be transferred after the Verb παρᾶσῃσαι, but absurdly, so that I  
wonder Dr. *Hammond* should judg that to be the best punctation.  
The following words παρᾶθεν ἀγνὴν παρᾶσῃσαι τῷ χεῖρῳ, ought, as they  
are rightly by *Grotius*, to be rendred, *that I may present or deliver you a  
chast Virgin to Christ*. A Virgin is first espoused to one Man, and af-  
terwards she is delivered to him. And because it was possible, and  
sometimes also happen'd, that a Virgin who was espoused to any Man,  
upon intervening strifes, or for some other reason was given in Mar-  
riage to another, and that between her Espousals and Marriage she  
might be vitiated; St. Paul says, *I have espoused you to one Man, even  
Christ*, and I never intended that this Match should be broken off, or  
suffered you to be privately corrupted by any other, but have done  
my utmost to keep you pure, *that I might present you a chast Virgin to  
him.*

Chapter *him*. Of those things which might fall out between Espousals and  
 XI. Marriage, we may read Interpreters on *Mat. i. 18*. Now the Christian Church in this World seems to be only espoused to Christ, and the Marriage between them not to be celebrated till all other things are consummated: so that many things may fall out between that spiritual Espousing and Marriage, and really do so, whereby the Church which is espoused to Christ is vitiated and defiled, or sometimes also married to another. The *Corinthian Church* was by *St. Paul* espoused to Christ; but before he presented it, and delivered it as it were into his hand, false Apostles might allure it again to the love of Heathenism, or wed it to another opinion almost as bad as that, by which means the Espousals of that Church would have been made of none effect.

II. The Doctor does not seem sufficiently to have distinguished between the nuptial Solemnity and Espousals, because he alledges a passage out of *Cinnamus*, where the Discourse is about the marriage Solemnity, which he immediately subjoins to the place cited out of *Pollux*, as parallel to it. He had better have produced some examples out of *Herodotus*, in which the word ἀρμόσσει clearly signifies *to espouse*, and which have the more agreement with this matter, because the Virgins of which that Historian speaks, were not as yet delivered to their intended Husbands, the very thing which *St. Paul* was solicitous about, as to the spiritual Marriage of the *Corinthian Church* with Christ. And he in *Lib. 5. c. 47*. speaks thus about one *Philip the Son of Bztacidus*: ἀρμόσσει Τήλυθ τῆ Συβαρίτω θυγατέρα, ἔργον ἐν Κρότωνθ· Νευαίς θ̄ τῆ γάμου εἶχτο πλέον εἰς Κυρήνην: *having espoused the Daughter of Telys a Sybarite, he fled from Croton, and being disappointed of the Marriage, he sailed to Cyrenæ.* And *Lib. 6. c. 65*. Ἀρμόσσειν Λόπχαλον Πέρκαλον τῷ Χίλωνθ τῆ Δηαρμένε θυγατέρα, ὃ Δηαρματθ ἐπιβουλεύσας ἀποστερεῖ Λόπχαλον τῆ γάμου φάσας αὐτῆς, τῷ Πέρκαλον ἀρπίσας ἢ γῶν γυναικα: *when Percala the Daughter of Chilo the Son of Demarmenes had been espoused to Leutyichides, Demaratus by Treachery deprived Leutyichides of the Marriage, coming himself and taking away Percala and marrying her.* And *Lib. 9. c. 107*. speaking of *Xerxes*, who espoused at *Sardis* the Daughter of his Brother *Masistes*, he saith: ἀρμόσσει ἢ καὶ τὰ νομιζόμενα πενήσας, ἀπὸ Δαρσίου εἰς Σῆσα. ἐπειθ ἢ ἐνταῦθα ἀπῆκε καὶ ἠγάγετο ἐς ἐαυτὸν Δαρσίω τῷ γυναικα, &c. *Having espoused her, and performed what was customary, he went to Susa: And being come thither, and having led home to Darius his Wife, &c.* By these examples it appears that *St. Paul* may properly enough be said ἀρμόσσειν to have espoused the *Corinthians* to Christ; seeing that word is applied as well to a Guardian, or him that espouses, as to the Man to whom a Virgin



Virgin is espoused. Nor is there any other Notion of this word to be look'd for, where the Discourse is about Marriage, this being then the perpetual signification of it; tho if St. Paul had spoken of any thing else, it might perhaps be said that he had a respect to the custom of the *Lacedaemonians*, which our Author now unnecessarily supposes. Chapter XI.

Verf. 6. Εἰ καὶ ἰδιώτης λόγῳ, ἀλλ' ἐτὶ γνώσει.] The word λόγῳ in this place signifies a stile or faculty of speaking, as it is opposed to knowledg in the Mind. As there are Persons of no great Learning, who yet are skilful in the art of speaking; so on the other hand there are a great many learned Men, who are unhappy in expressing their Conceptions, in which number St. Paul here reckons himself. For ἰδιώτης signifies one of the vulgar sort, a Person of no polite Learning. And agreeably ἰδιωτισμοί, and ἰδιωτικὰ λέξεις are Phrases vulgarly used among the common People. But here we must carefully distinguish things from words and their oratorical Disposition; for things in themselves very excellent, may be expressed ἰδιωτικῶς, tho those ἰδιωτισμοί be not elegant, and ἰδιωτικῶς disposed, tho the disposition be improper. In respect of knowledg the Apostle Paul was not ἰδιώτης rude or ignorant; but he does not deny but his stile was ἰδιωτικὸν. Which because learned Men have not sufficiently understood, but have confounded things with words, I shall insist on a little more at large.

Orators differ in three things from the illiterate Vulgar, in discoursing upon any Subject. *First*, in *Invention* and choice of matter; in which they far surpass the ordinary sort of People; but this I need not treat of, the Discourse here being about Elocution. *Secondly*, in *Disposition*, the rules of which are laid down by *Rhetoricians*, and are unknown to the Vulgar. *Thirdly*, in *Elocution*, or choice of words and Sentences: And as to these two last, *Idiots* never equal Orators unless it be by chance, and in a very short Discourse. So that ἰδιωτικὸς λόγῳ is a Stile or Discourse, in which neither the Laws of Disposition nor Elocution, such as are laid down by the Masters of Rhetorick, are observed; tho it be otherwise full of excellent Sentences, and shew the Speaker to have a great measure of Wisdom and Knowledg.


In *Diogenes Laertius* in *Platone*, §. 87. according to the opinion of *Plato*, ὁ λόγος διαίρεται εἰς πέντε, ὧν εἰς μὲν ἔστιν ὃν οἱ πολιτεύομενοι λέγουσιν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, ὅς καλεῖται πολιτικός: Discourse or Stile is divided into five kinds, whereof one is that which the Administrators of the Commonwealth make use of in publick Assemblies, and is called Political. Of this kind is the stile of *Demosthenes* and other Orators, whose Employment lay in pleading at Court. Ἐτέρη δὲ διαίρεσις λόγου, ὃν οἱ ῥήτορες γράφουσιν, εἰς ἐπιδείξιν τε αἰσθητικῶν, ὡς ἐγκώμια καὶ ψόγους καὶ κατηγορίας. Τὸ δὲ τρίτον εἶδος ἐστὶν ῥητορικόν. Another kind of

Chapter XI. of *Stile* is that which is used by Rhetoricians, and is for ostentation, in which are written *Encomiums*, and *satyrical Discourses* and *Accusations*; and this kind we term *Rhetorical*. Such is the *Stile* of *Isocrates*, and other Rhetoricians, who spent all their time in Schools. This latter kind has more of *Grace* and *Ornament* in it than the former, otherwise there is no difference between them. *Τεῖτη ἡ δαιρέσις λόγου, ὃν οἱ ἰδιῶται διαλέγονται πρὸς ἀλλήλους, οὐδὲ δι' ὃ τρέπεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἰδιωτικὸς*: A third kind of *Stile* is that which *Idiots*, or illiterate Persons, use in common discourse; and this is called *Idiotick*. That is the *Stile* which I before described, and which is used by *St. Paul*. And it is not opposed only to the painted Eloquence of Rhetoricians, but also to the Elegance of Politicians, to whose *Stile* that of the *Vulgar* is much inferior. This as to *St. Paul*, and the other Writers of the New Testament, has been shewn at large by *C. Salmasius* in *Comment. de Lingua Hellen.* Sect. 2. The other kinds of discourse mention'd by *Diogenes* I omit, because they are not to our present purpose.

But when I say that a *Rhetorical* or *Political* *Stile* excels that of the *Vulgar* or *Idiotæ*, my meaning is not that it surpassed it only in *Ornaments*, which do not belong to the *Matter*, but also in *Disposition* and *Propriety of words*, which very much contribute to the perspicuity of any Discourse. For which reason, one that is skilful in the Greek Language may much more easily understand *Demosthenes* or *Isocrates*, than *St. Paul*; not only because the *Stile* of this latter has abundance of *Hebrew Idioms* in it, but because the order of his Sentences is many times inverted, his Phrases and Terms improper, and his Metaphors harsh. As *Diogenes Laertius* also, who wrote in an *Idiotick* *Stile*, and had no great regard to order or choice of words, is in many places very hard to understand. And such are, among the Greek Fathers, *Epiphanius*, and the Author *Historiæ Lausiacæ*, in whose Writings often occur the like difficulties, proceeding from negligence of *Stile*.

Which being so, I cannot sufficiently wonder why *Beza* was so angry with *St. Jerom*, because he did not admire *St. Paul's* Eloquence, which setting aside his *Matter*, and considering only his Words, was certainly none at all. But let us hear *Beza* himself: *Quid igitur, scilicet he, an imperitus loquendi Paulus, & elinguis, ut Hieronimus existimat? What then, did not St. Paul know how to express himself, or had he not the use of his Tongue, as St. Jerom thinks? No, he was not so perfectly tongue-tied neither, that the Substance of his Discourse and Doctrine cannot be understood; but his Stile is not so clear, nor his Expression so elegant, as to make every thing that he says easy, or pleasant to*  
critical




critical Ears. St. Paul did not aim at that disposition in his Words Chapter  
 which might facilitate the understanding of a thing in it self obscure, XI.  
 or render his Discourse more plain and perspicuous: which Beza   
 very well knew, and no one can be ignorant of who has read but St.  
 Paul's Epistles in Greek. But Beza goes on, and saith: *Imo vero Chry-*  
*sostrorum potius, & doctissimos quosque ex Græcis, ipsam denique rationem*  
*sequutus, quamvis nativa illa & germana masculæ facundie ornamenta*  
*ipsi videri possint non defuisse, fatcor tamen illum fucatæ illius rhetorices pig-*  
*mentis uti noluisse.* Yea rather following St. Chrysostom, and the most  
 learned among the Greeks, and Reason it self, tho' those native and genuin  
 Ornaments of masculine Eloquence seem not to have been wanting in him;  
 yet I confess he uses none of those colours of false Rhetorick. But a clear  
 way of speaking, to begin with his last Words, and disposing every  
 thing we say in its right order, is no *fucus*. That artifice of those Rhe-  
 toricians who endeavor to magnify by words, things that are in them-  
 selves inconsiderable, or skim over those that are base, may properly  
 be stiled *fucus, daubing*; but not apt Expressions, or soft Metaphors,  
 and an orderly disposition of every part in a Discourse; in which the  
 Speaker has no other end than to make himself easily understood, and  
 carefully to avoid all Ambiguity, which might lead his Hearers into a  
 mistake. And St. Paul's stile is not only without *fucus*, but deficient  
 also in these things, which are not discommendable: So that if we  
 follow reason, we shall never say that St. Paul was eloquent; provided  
 it be remembred we are speaking of words, or disposition, and not  
 of matter. That St. Paul's matter is praised by St. Chrysostom, and  
 other Greek Fathers, and preferred before all the Arguments which  
 the antient Greeks have treated of, I know, and none but a Mad-man  
 will deny: but that they commended his Style, or the Order of his  
 Words and Sentences as clear and elegant, I do not think; and if I  
 did, their Authority would not move me, because the contrary is so  
 manifest. But they were not altogether so void of Understanding,  
 as to attribute that Eloquence to St. Paul which he himself disclaims.  
 Nor does Beza himself disagree with me in this matter, when he adds,  
 that St. Paul would not make use of Rhetorick, *Ut vi spiritus hominum*  
*animos ad Christum raperet, non autem Sermonis blanditiis, adulatorum*  
*more alliceret.* That he might bring men to Christ by the Power of the Spirit,  
 and not allure them after the manner of a Flatterer, by smoothness of Speech.  
 Which is as much as if he had said, Those who are affected with what  
 St. Paul says, are affected with his Matter, not with his Words or  
 Expression, as being brought by the Spirit of God to an Enquiry and  
 Love of the Truth, tho' deliver'd in a rude stile.

Chapter XI. He adds: *Cum orationis ipsius totam indolem & characterem propius considero, &c.* When I more narrowly consider the whole Strain and Form of his (the Apostles) Discourse, I must needs say I never could see any such Loftiness in Plato himself, when ever he undertakes to thunder out the Mysteries of God; any such *Sublime Majesty* or Force in Demosthenes, when ever he applies himself either to terrify Men with the fear of the Divine Judgment, or to admonish them, or to draw them to contemplate the Goodness of God, or to exhort them to the Duties of Piety and Mercy; or lastly a more exact Method in teaching, even in Aristotle or Galen, who were otherwise very excellent and skilful Artists. If we consider the things themselves, I acknowledg all this to be very true, but we are speaking now about Stile and Order of Discourse; in which as those Authors mentioned by Beza were superior to St. Paul, so as to things themselves they are vastly inferior. Yet I do not deny but there occur even in St. Paul also, some Sentences admirably well expressed, but then they are but rare, and his Stile is for the most part barbarous, as the Speech of *Idiotæ* uses to be. But as things of small moment in themselves being set off with Rhetorical Colours, are and have been often admired; so on the other hand, things of the greatest importance have many times made an obscure and ill ordered Discourse to be extolled; whereas those two things should be distinguished and separately consider'd.

I have been the larger upon these things, that I might shew in what sense, and how truly the Apostle here calls himself *ἰδιώτην λόγῳ*: and what I have said may be of exceeding use to direct us in the interpretation of these Books; for knowing that they are written in a rude Stile, we must not go about to anatomize every single Word or Expression in them, or examin all that is said with a kind of Geometrical Exactness, which the nature of an Idiotic Stile will not bear, which regards things only in general, and not every minute or particular circumstance; nor may we deduce too rigorous Consecratories from any phrases used in these Writings, which those who speak rudely never think of. We must have always before our Eyes the substance of the Gospel, and the main design of the Speaker; and by that his expressions must be explained, rather than by an over-nice and subtil scanning of every word. But this is a Subject which would require a whole Volume to treat of it as it deserves; in this place it may suffice to have touched briefly upon the chief heads.

Verf. 9. Note b. It is certain that *καταναγκᾶν* signifies *to be burdensom; esse oneri*, as it is render'd in the *Vulgar*, or something like it, that signifies a Man's living upon another's Charity. But the only difficulty



difficulty is how the word *καταναρξάν* comes to have this signification. Chapter XI:  The Doctor conjectures that it is *to ask* or *importune*, because they that ask any thing of another, cause a *chilness* or *numness* in those whom they ask. But this is harsh and forced: The passage which he refers to in *Seneca* is in Lib. 2. *de Beneficiis*, c. 2. But *Seneca* does not speak of a Person of whom any thing is asked, but that asks; and therefore that passage is nothing to the purpose: *Molestum verbum est, saith he, onerosum, & demisso vultu dicendum, Rogo: I ask, is a troublesome and burdensom word, and must be spoken with a submissive look.* I had rather say that *καταναρξάν* is *to be burdensom*, because those who are benumbed with a Disease, are much heavier than ordinary, whence by a Metaphor it was used to signify to be a burden to others through Poverty. Whence *St. Paul* elsewhere expressing the same thing, uses the word *βαρέω*, 1 *Thess.* ii. 9. *For ye remember, Brethren, our labour and travel: for working night and day, because we would not burden any of you, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαι πινὰ ὑμῶν, we preached unto you the Gospel of God.* See likewise 2 *Thess.* iii. 8. This Interpretation is confirmed by the opposition which is made in this very Verse between *καταναρξάν* and *ἀβαραῖ ἐαυτὸν τηρεῖν*, *to keep himself from being burdensom.*

Verf. 22. Εβραῖοι εἰσι; καὶ ἡ. Ἰσραηλῖται εἰσι; καὶ ἡ. σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ εἰσι; καὶ ἡ.] The false Apostles with wonderful haughtiness, boasted that they were *Hebrews*, that they were *Israelites*, that they were the Seed of *Abraham*; the very same thing expressed several ways, for *Emphasis* sake; which *St. Paul* here, to shew the vanity of that empty, vain-glorious boasting, imitates. *Quaunque eadem fere sunt, & unâ sententiâ cooriuntur, plura tamen esse existimantur, quoniam aures & animum sæpius feriunt: Tho they are almost the same things, and come all to one sense, yet they are thought to be many, because they strike several times upon the ears and mind, saith Favorinus in Gellius, Lib. 12. c. 24. where he gives us several Examples of such Repetitions out of the best Authors both Greek and Latin.*

Verf. 24. Note c. It is manifest that our Author had not look'd into the Passage which he cites out of *Josephus*, in the *Historian* himself, because he alledges it but by halves, and translates it absurdly: It is in *Lib. 4. c. 8.* in these words: Τὸ ἢ πλεονεξίᾳ, ἢ πρεσβυτέρῳ ἐπιτιμῶν αἰτίαν ἢ διαβολὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκπέτω, πληγὴς τεσσαράκοντα μιᾶς κατέπεσεν λαβόμενος: *For his bold and rash Accusation and Calumny, let him suffer punishment, receiving forty stripes save one.* Our Author absurdly renders the word *ἐκπέτω*, *let him extend himself*, as if it were *ἐπιτελέσω*, which would be a corrupt reading, if it were any where extant, because there is nothing that can be referred to the word *αἰτίαν*, except

ἐπιπέτο or ἐπιπύτο, as other Copies read it, that is, *beat, let him suffer.*

Verf. 25. *Note d.* Since several other hardships, which St. Paul here says he had undergon, as his being thrice scourged by the Jews, &c. are not mentioned by St. Luke, I do not doubt but he has omitted also this of his having been in the Deep. And hence it may be infer'd, that Arguments drawn from St. Luke's silence about any thing are not very strong, because he has not written an entire History of St. Paul's Actions, even for the time that his History refers to.

Verf. 32. *Note e.* Mr. Peacock in his Notes on Greg. Abul-Farajius his *History* of the People and Customs of the *Arabians*, p. 77. acknowledges that many of the *Gassanii* were called *Harethi*, or *Aretæ*; but he tells us, he never observed that all the *Arabian* Chiefs were so stiled by them, as *Jos. Scaliger* affirmed. But *Scaliger* does not speak of the Kings of *Damascus*, but of the *Hagarens*, whose strongest Fort. was *Petra*. See Lib. 2. de *Emenl. Temp.* p. 111. Ed. *Roverianæ*.

## C H A P. XII.

Verf. 2. *Note a.* Ἄνθρωπος ἐν Χριστῷ is rightly here interpreted by *Grotius*, a *Christian*, whom our Author ought to have followed, since there are manifest Instances of this Phrase in that sense, as I have shewn on *Rom. xii. 5.* It is a thing to be wonder'd at, that Dr. *Hammond* in his Paraphrase on *Rom. xvi.* has not once rightly interpreted this Phrase. The Examples which he here alledges, are perfectly forein to his purpose, and all the likeness between them is only in the Particle ἐν.

Verf. 7. *Note b.* If St. Paul had said simply, that there was given to him a Messenger of Satan, that thrust a σκόλοψ Twig in his Flesh, I should easily believe that this passage were rightly understood by Dr. *Hammond* and other Expositors, of some Persecutions which St. Paul suffered. But seeing he says, there was given me a Twig in the Flesh, a Messenger of Satan to buffet me; I rather think a molestation from some particular evil Spirit is here meant, who continually afflicted him, and put him to as great pain as if he had thrust a Twig into his Flesh, and brought as much contempt upon him as if he had been buffeted; St. Paul not being ignorant of the cause of his suffering so many Evils. And because it is before said, *Lest the greatness of the Revelations should exalt me, or lest I should be lifted up above measure by the excellency of the Revelations*; I am apt to think that the word σκόλοψ is an allusion to some very sharp piece of Wood, not of any sort whatsoever,



soever, but one which should be placed over a Man stooping, ready Chapter  
to prick him grievously when ever he rose up. Let us represent to XIII.  
our selves the case of *Regulus*, whom the *Carthaginians* καθεξαιτες εν γα-  
λαγυρα κέντρα πάντοτεν ἐχέτην διέρθειεν, killed by shutting him up in a Cage  
that had Goads on all sides; which are the words of *Appian* in Lib. 1.  
Which way soever he moved himself, the Goads prick'd him. And  
something like this would be the case of a Man who should have some  
sharp Stakes or wooden Spears hanging over him, whilst he bowed  
his body, that would run into his Flesh, whenever he raised himself.  
And so if *St. Paul* grew proud, or suffer'd himself to be puffed up  
because of the Revelations which he had received from God, there  
was ready at hand an evil Spirit, who had obtained permission of God  
to oppose him, to torment and afflict him.

Verf. 8. Τεὶς ἢ Κόριον παρελάτισσε ἵνα διασηῖ ἀπ' ἐμῶ.] These words, in  
my judgment, shew that it is not any sort of Persecutions stirred up  
by Men against *St. Paul* (which he was always ready to suffer for the  
sake of the Gospel) that are here spoken of; but a particular evil  
Spirit, which, as it were, accompanied *St. Paul*, and wherever he  
went, did him all the mischief he could, either of himself, or by  
men as his Instruments.

Verf. 11. Ηναγχαίσατο.] It seems then by this, that it is not always  
unlawful for a Man to speak in his own praise. See *Plutarch's* little  
Treatise *de laude sui*.

Verf. 21. Περνεία καὶ ἀσελγεία.] Our Author thinks the Apostle has a  
respect here to the unnatural lusts practised at Idol-Feasts; as if there  
were no Feasts kept by the Heathens in honour of their Idol Gods  
where such Lusts were not practised, whereas it is certain that the  
Heathens, especially in *Greece*, seldom mixed any such vile practices  
with their Religious Solemnities, as I have already elsewhere more  
than once observed. See on 1 *Cor.* v. 10. So that I rather think any  
sort of unlawful Lusts whatsoever are here intended.

## C H A P. XIII.

Verf. 1. I. **T**H O the conjecture which our learned Author  
Note a. here proposes be ingenious; yet if it be more  
narrowly examined, it will be found not to be so  
probable. His principal reason why *St. Paul* should be thought to  
have had a respect to the words of Christ in *Mat.* xviii. is this, that  
he makes use of some part of those words, viz. *In the mouth of two  
or three Witnesses every Word shall be established.* But these were not  
the

Chapter XIII. the words of *Christ*, but of *Moses* in *Deut.* xix. 15. and *St. Paul* in reciting them may as well be supposed to have had a respect to that place in *Moses* as the other in *St. Matthew*: which of the two is so much the more probable, because *St. Paul* does not subjoin them to a discourse about Censures, but a Journey he was to make to *Corinth*; which now he purposed the third time, because he had been twice before disappointed. So that it is all one as if he had said: “ I have twice resolved already to come to you, and yet have been frustrated in my design; but a third resolution which I have taken up about the same thing, shall not be defeated; as that which was confirmed by the testimony of three Witnesses under the Law, could not be made void. It is an adapting the words of *Moses* to the present business, *καὶ προσωδία*, as the learned *Grotius* observes.

II. *Dr. Hammond* unnecessarily joins the word *δούτερον*, ver. 2. to *πρεσβύτην*, from which it is separated by the Participle *πρωτον*, when from the order of the words as they now lie, arises this very commodious sense; “ I have told you already before, and foretel you again, as intending to be with you a second time, and being absent I now write, that I will not spare, &c. *Πρωτον* here is all one with *μέλλον προεῖναι*, as *Grotius* observes. The Apostle had been once already at *Corinth*, and he intended to go thither again. The *Hebrews* having no *future Participles*, it is no wonder that *St. Paul* speaking after the manner of the *Hebrews*, uses a Greek Participle in the Present Tense for the Future. See my Notes on *Gen.* vi. 7. & *Exod.* iii. 2.

III. That passage in *Mat.* xviii. is supposed by our Author to belong chiefly to private Persons, and not to the Governours of the Church, to whom it is not thought that this Precept, *Tell it to the Church*, can be directed, without doubt, because they themselves are supposed to be the *Church* whereof *Christ* speaks; which ought to have been proved, this being not an Age wherein Men are apt to believe every thing that serves to magnify the Governours of the Church; or else it had been better to have said nothing. Of the passage in *Tit.* iii. 10. I shall speak when I come to it, for it is nothing to the *Doctor's* purpose.

Verf. 4. *Ὁ θεὸς ἐκ δυνάμεως θεῶν.*] *Dr. Hammond* refers the word *θεῶν* here to *Christ*; but the stile of *St. Paul* shews that God the Father is intended. See *Rom.* iv. 24. & viii. 11. & x. 9. *1 Cor.* vi. 14. & xv. 15. *2 Cor.* iv. 14.

Verf. 5. Note b. I. It may be not unfitly conjectured, that the word *ἀδύνατοι* in this place is used in an *Active sense*, for one that cannot *δυνατίζεσθαι* prove or try, and so the sense will be: Except ye are unable



able to try things, you will know that the true Gospel has been Chapter  
preached among you by a true Apostle. But I confess I have never XIII.  
yet met with the word ἀσφάλειαν used any where else in this sense.

II. I cannot tell in what Copy our Author read the Particle ἀεὶ cer-  
tainly, for I have never read it in any. If he thought that it was an  
Omission, he ought to have told us his mind. However, St. Paul's  
words here are *Elliptical*, and signify what Dr. Hammond would have  
them. It is all one as if the Apostle had said; *Do ye not know that  
Christ Jesus is among you?* Ye must needs certainly know it, unless ye  
are incapable of trying and judging in such a case.

Verf. 11. Note c. I. Our Author in this Annotation follows those  
who deduce the word ἀσπῆ and its Derivatives from the Verb ἀσπῶ,  
that is, *to fit*; which derivation is not altogether so certain. But  
grant it to be true, yet he should have observed that the Verb κατασπίζω  
does not immediately come from ἀσπῶ, and therefore should have had a  
greater regard to its nearest Original. From ἀσπῆ, which signifies  
*entire, safe, perfect*, is first made the Verb ἀσπίζω, which is properly  
ἀσπῆν ποιῆν, *to make, to perfect*, as it is taken in Theocritus Idyll. 13. or  
Hyla Verf. 43. Νόμῳ χεὶν ἀσπίζοντο, that is, ἐχρῆσαν danced, saith the  
Scholiast. And because those things which are designed for any par-  
ticular use, ought to be ἀστία, *entire and perfect* in their kind, or *fit*,  
if the forementioned etymology of the word be approv'd; there-  
fore ἀσπῆ signifies also *fit, and made ready*, in Homer and Herodotus,  
and ἀσπίζεν in Hesychius is explained by ἀρμόσαι, συναγαγεῖν, πλέξαι, *to fit,  
to gather together, to knit*, and ἀσπίζωμαι by ἄρσασθαι, *to make, to  
prepare*. And so in Suidas there are two places alledged, in which  
this Verb signifies, *to be set in order, or prepared*: Οἱ δὲ ἀσπιζόμενοι διεῖλον  
τὸν στρατόν, *being set into order, they divided the Army*. Ὁ δὲ παρῆρτος ὄν  
ἐν αἰετῶν τὸ ἄτολόν ἀσπιζόμενος, *but he being subtil, and prepared for  
all the uncertainties of Fortune*. But the Compounds of the Verb ἀσπίζεν  
are much more in use, and especially the Verb κατασπίζεν.

II. The primary signification of this Verb, as of the simple, is *to  
make, to perfect, to finish*. For which reason in Suidas it is interpre-  
ted by τελῆσαι, without the addition of any other signification. But  
afterwards it signified, 1. *To make ready, to fit*; 2. *To repair, or re-  
store*; which significations belong as well to the Mind as to the Body:  
3. *To reconcile, or bring to agreement*. Of all which Examples may be  
had out of Lexicons, and especially Henr. Stephanus, whom I shall not  
here transcribe. The same Lexicographer has observed also that κατασπ-  
ισις is said by some to be used by Plutarch in the Life of Themistocles  
for *institution*, of which by and by. The Old Onomasticon readers

Chapter κατατίθει by *struo, instruo, construo, perficio, reficio*; to build, to set in order, to join together, to perfect, to repair. I shall now apply what has been said to the Scripture Examples.

III. κατατίθει a House, a Wall, a Body, is to make or finish them, as κατασκευάζειν, not to compact them. κατατίθει δίκτυα is to repair or make ready Nets, to make them ἀστία entire and prepared. κατατίθει αἶμα is to prepare or make praise. κατατίθει μαθητὴς is a perfect Disciple, as Beza in his Notes on St. Luke has shewn. κατατίθει ὑστερήματα must be rendered with the Vulgar, *complere quæ defunt*, to fill up what is wanting, that is, to perfect. κατατίθει ἐν παντί ἔργω ἀγαθῷ is to perfect in every good work, or to render perfect and compleat in all kinds of Virtue. Vessels κατατίθει εἰς ἀπώλειαν are Vessels prepared for destruction. God is said κατατίθει τὴν αἰῶνα, that is, to have made the World, κατασκευάσασθαι. In all this we meet with no such Notion of the word as that of *compacting*.

IV. To defend likewise the other places alledged in Ephes. iv. 12. κατατίθει ἁγίους, is the perfection of the Saints, or the compleatness of all its Members, so that nothing is wanting to the Church, εἰς διακονίαν ἔργου, which is necessary for the Work of the Ministry, or for the performing all Offices in the Church. In Gal. vi. 1, the Verb κατατίθει has the signification of *restoring*, as Dr. Hammond well observes. So, as Budæus remarks, κατατίθει signifies to put Members out of joint into their right place again; whence it might be applied to the recovering a Person whose mind is disturbed and put out of its natural posture. In this place, Chap. xiii. 9. of 2 Cor. κατὰστάσις is the soundness of the Body, and consequently its health; as in Hesychius ἀστία is not only explained by ἰσχυρότης, *sound or entire*, but also by ὑγιής *healthful*. In 1 Cor. i. 10. κατὰστάσιμα signifies *unanimous*. I beseech you, Brethren, saith St. Paul, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no Schisms among you, but that ye be κατὰστάσιμα, joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment. In that signification this word is more than once used in Herodotus, as appears by *Æmilius Porcus* his *Lexicon Ionicum*. In which sense it seems to be here taken in Chap. xiii. 11. of 2 Ep. to the Corinth. In 1 Pet. v. 10. κατατίθει ὑμᾶς will be best rendered *perficiat vos, make you perfect*, with the Vulgar. All which being clear, if the immediate Original of the word κατατίθει, and the use of it in other Authors be attended to, I do not see why we should run to another signification deduced from a more remote Etymology, and of which no certain Instance can be alledged.

V. As for the word κατὰστάσις, I don't know whether it signifies just the same as κατατίθει; but there is a passage in *Plutarch*, in the Life of *Themis*.



*Themistocles*, in which it seems to signify the same, as it does in the words of *Hippodamus*, viz. in pag. 112. *Ed. Francof.* where he tells us, that *Themistocles* used to say, τὸς τετραγύτους πώλους αἰεὶς ἵππες γίνεσθαι, ὅταν ἢς ἀεσπικεὶ τὸ γωσι παιδείας καὶ καταρτίσεως: That the fiercest Colts become the best Horses, when they have that management and bringing up which is requisite. And to this place *Henr. Stephanus* seems to have had a respect, tho he reads τετάρπης instead of κατάρπης. But between these two, as there is no great difference in the sound, so neither seemingly in the signification. And therefore *Dr. Hammond* had no reason to think that κατάρπης in *Hesychius* was a corrupt reading for καταρτίσαι; the Verb καταρτίω being as true Greek as καταρτίζω, and having that signification which *Hesychius* in the place alledged assigns it.

And this is abundantly sufficient to confute the little subtilties of our Author in this place, interpreting the Greek word rather by arguing, than according to use.

Verf. 14. Note d. I. From this place it may be gathered, that we ought not to dispute too subtilly from the order of words in the New Testament, since *Christ* is here mentioned before the *Father*: The Grace of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.

II. χάρις Χριστοῦ is the favour of *Christ*, from which all his Benefits flow, not his *Liberality*, properly speaking. χάρις does not signify *Charity*, nor would *Caritas Dei* in Latin signify the Love of God to us Men, but our Love to God. I wish our Author had cited more exactly the Passage which he refers to in *Cicero*, by setting down the Chapter, or noting the Page, for I cannot find it; and any one that understands Latin, will presently see that it is misquoted.

III. Κοινωνίαν Πνεύματος I rather take to be the Communion of the Spirit, or the common fruition of Spiritual Graces, whereby all are made partakers of them. So the word κοινωνία is taken in 1 *Cor.* x. 16. & *Phil.* i. 5. ii. 1. iii. 10. & 1 *John* iii. 6, 7. Our Author indeed interprets κοινωνίαν πνεύματος, in *Phil.* ii. 1. actively also, of the Liberality of the Holy Ghost, but without reason; for who will grant him that that interpretation is rightly deduced from the following words, as if *Bowels* and *Mercies* signified Liberality? But see the Notes on that place.



# ANNOTATIONS

## On the Epistle

### Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Galatians.

**A**T the end of the *Premon.*] I. We have no certain ground to believe that those whom St. Paul confutes in this Epistle were Uncircumcised ; but it is much more probable they had received Circumcision, whether they were *Jews* or *Gentiles*.

II. That the Christians had so much reason to be afraid of the *Jews* in *Galatia*, that the *Gnosticks* should be forced to feign themselves *Jews* when they were not, is not at all likely. For the *Roman* Magistrates, as appears by the instance of *Gallio*, did not give much ear to the Accusations of the *Jews*, or lend their Axes or Rods to the Circumcised. And that without the Magistrate the *Jews* could do any great matters, will not be thought by any who know what was the form of the *Roman* Government. So that it had been much better to say that St. Paul here opposes the *Jews*, who indeed had embraced the Christian Religion, but yet were tenacious of their antient Customs and Ceremonies.

#### CHAPTER I.

Verf. 1. **K**ΑΤ' Θεοῦ πατρὸς.] We must supply here the Preposition 'Από, that there may be a perfect opposition thus: ἐκ 'ΑΠ' ἀνθρώπων, ἐδὲ ΔΙ' ἀνθρώπων· ἀλλὰ ΔΙΑ 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ΑΠΟ Θεοῦ πατρὸς: not from Men, neither by Men ; but by Jesus Christ and from God the Father. Besides, it is certain that God the Father did not call St. Paul immediately, but by Christ, who appeared to him as he was on his journey to *Damascus*.

Verf. 7. Τινὲς εἰσὶν οἱ παρελαβόντες.] Dr. Hammond brings into his Paraphrase on this place not only his *Gnosticks*, but Men that by birth were *Heathens* and uncircumcised ; as if in *Galatia* they had been under the  
same



same necessity of endeavouring to gain the favour of the Jews, as in Chapter *Judæa*. But there should have been something in *St. Paul* to support this interpretation, otherwise it may very reasonably be rejected, as I have already said at the end of the *Premonition*. It is more than probable that these disturbers of the Churches of *Galatia* were Jews, and consequently circumcised, and had embraced the Gospel, the Design and Virtue of which they did not however understand. I confess *Grotius*, in the Preface to his Annotations, had gone before our Author in the contrary Opinion; but how great soever the Authority of that learned Man is with me, when it is not accompanied with solid Reasons, it does not in the least move my assent.

He thinks that *St. Paul* is more vehement in this than in his other Epistles, because those who would have deprived the called among the Gentiles of their Liberty as to the Jewish Ceremonies, were not Jews, whose zeal for their Religion might in some measure be excused, but Strangers who lived in *Judæa*, of whom the chief was *Cerinthus*. But it's true, it was a pardonable thing in the Jews themselves to observe the antient Rites imposed upon their Nation, and to be willing that the rest of their Countrymen should observe them, provided they were otherwise obedient to Christ; but to impose them upon the Gentiles, and endeavour to make all the World submit to the same Yoke, this surely could no more be born in the Jews than in others. Besides, there is nothing here that gives the least ground to think that those who were so zealous for the observation of the *Mosaical* Ceremonies, were by birth Heathens. But *Grotius* goes on and says: *And such were those who at Philippi taught the same Doctrine, as St. Paul himself tells us, Phil. iii. 3.* To which I say, it appears indeed by *St. Paul's* words that there were some at *Philippi*, who gloried in the Circumcision of the Flesh; but they were Jews and not Gentiles: For we, saith *St. Paul*, are the Circumcision, who worship God in the Spirit, and glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the Flesh. In which words he has undoubtedly a respect to the Jews, who gloried in fleshly Circumcision, as the context evidently shews. So that I wonder that both *Grotius* and our Author should alledg this place.

The same Men, saith the learned *Grotius*, asserted the necessity of conforming to the Law of Moses, not out of any principle of true Piety, but that they might grow rich and great by the assistance of the Jews. But I confess I do not see what Honors or Profits Men that were Heathens and Uncircumcised could expect from the Jews, a People despised and hated by the Romans, and that in a Roman Province, as *Galatia* ever since the time of *Augustus* had been, as we are told by *Strabo*, Lib. 12.


Chapter I wish either of these learned Men had essayed to prove more at large  
 I. what they say, for they would presently have perceived the vanity of  
 such an undertaking. But perhaps they thereby avoided those pressures which  
 lay upon the Christians, for in those times the Jews, by the Roman Laws and  
 Edicts, had the free exercise of their Religion; which the Christians had not,  
 but begun then to be persecuted, as appears from the Acts, and other Epistles  
 of St. Paul. To which I answer, if such as were not heartily and  
 really Jews, had a mind to escape persecution, they ought rather to  
 have feigned themselves Heathens than Jews, in Galatia. Besides, tho  
 the Jews were allowed the profession of their Religion in the Roman  
 Empire, they had not therefore any power granted them over others,  
 so as to be able to do any hurt to the Christians. They might indeed  
 by Calumnies, and such kind of unjust Methods, endeavour to mischief  
 them, but that was all they could do, as sufficiently appears from the  
 Acts of the Apostles. And they annoyed the Christians that way, who  
 were resolved to obey all Christ's commands, and firmly adhered  
 to their purpose, whom upon that account they accused and charged  
 with Sedition; but they could not molest Men, who if it were necessary  
 feigned themselves to be Heathens, of which sort were the Gnosticks.

Verf. 8. *Αναθεμα ἔστω.*] Our Author in his Paraphrase rightly thinks  
 that this has a respect to the second degree of Excommunication; but I  
 don't well understand what he means by the last words: *that none is*  
*to have any commeree with in sacred matters.* For if we may judg of  
 the effects of Excommunication by the Doctrin of the Rabbins, excom-  
 municated Persons were neither excluded out of the Temple nor the  
 Synagogue, as Mr. Selden has shewn, *de Synedr. Judæorum*, Lib. 1.  
 cap. vii. It was only unlawful to converse with them familiarly, and  
 within the space of four Cubits, as the same Author has proved at  
 large. And if the Christians at that time behaved themselves other-  
 wise towards the excommunicated, our Author would not have spent  
 his time ill to have shewn it us: For it is not safe to judg of what was  
 done in those Primitive times, by the practice of latter Ages.

Verf. 10. *Note b.* Tho our Author in this Annotation follows *Gro-  
 tius*, yet I cannot assent to either of them for this reason, because the  
 Verb *πειθεῖν*, according to the perpetual use both of Sacred and Pro-  
 fane Writers, always signifies elsewhere *to persuade*, and never *to ap-  
 pease*. I can neither find after the most diligent search, nor remember  
 any passage in any Author I have read, in which it can be reasonably  
 taken in any other sense; and if I can shew that this signification will  
 agree to all the instances produced by the learned *Grotius* and *Dr.*  
*Hammond*, there will be then no necessity of recurring to any other.

And



And this it will be very easy to do, when I have only premised that there Chapter  
is an *Ellipsis* in all the alledged examples, in which that which is want- I.  
ing must be supplied to shew what the Verb *πίθω* in them signifies. 

In the example out of the Book of *Samuel*, there is a manifest *Ellipsis*, which must be thus supplied: *καὶ ἐπεισε Δαβὶδ τὰς ἀνδρας αὐτοῦ μὴ ἀποκτείνειν βασιλέα*, and David persuaded his Men not to kill the King. Not he appeased them, but he prevailed with them not to slay him.

A *Patron* or *Advocate* is said indeed *πίθειν δίκασιν*, but that is to persuade the *Judg*, not to appease him; that is, persuade him that his Cause is just. For if *πίθειν δίκασιν* could be rendred to appease the *Judg*, there should be added the *Person* of the *Accused*, or whose cause is pleaded, in the *Dative* case thus: *πίθειν δίκασιν τῷ κατηγορημένῳ* or *τῷ κείνῳ*, to appease the *Judg* to the party accused or contending, which yet there is no instance of.


In *Mat.* xxviii. 14. there is the like *Ellipsis*, which must be supplied again in this manner: if this come to the Governor's ear, *ἡμεῖς πείσομεν αὐτὸν*, we will persuade him, *μὴ ἀγανακτεῖν ὑμῖν*, not to be angry with you, and secure you.

So in this place, *ἀρθρώπους πίθω ἢ τὸ Θεόν*, is all one as if *St. Paul* had said: do I persuade God or Men *μὴ ἀγανακτεῖν μοι* not to be displeas'd with me. And thus all those Phrases must be understood, in which neither the *Case* of the *Defendant* nor any *Infinitive mood* is subjoined to the Verb *πίθειν*, which often occurs, contrary to what *Beza* thought. I know *Henr. Stephanus*, and other learned Men, render it then, *flectere*, to incline or bend; but it's plain they have more regard to the sense than the proper signification of the word; and in all that multitude of examples which are alledged in the *Thesaurus Linguae Græcæ*, the Figure *Ellipsis* takes place. I shall instance only in one, by which we shall be able to judg of the rest. In *Plutarch*, in *Lib. de cobibenda Ira*, *Euclides* to his Brother who had angrily said, *ἀπολαίμεν εἰ μὴ σε πικρῶσαιμεν*, let me perish if I be not revenged on you, returns this mild answer, *ἀπολαίμεν εἰ μὴ σε πείσαιμι*, let me perish if I cannot bend you, *Peream nisi te flexero*; in which Version the sense indeed is expressed, but not the just import of the word. For we must supply *συγκαρτεῖν μοι τῷ π*: If I cannot persuade you to forgive me this [offence] or some such thing. And that such Supplements as these are understood in all these Phrases, may appear by infinite examples of intire expressions wherein the Verb *πίθειν* is made use of, some of them to be had out of any *Lexicon*. I have been the larger in disputing against our two learned Men about this word, lest mere reasoning from some few places, contrary to the rules of Grammar and constant use, should prevail: A thing which *Grotius* is very seldom guilty of, but *Dr. Hammond* often, as I have shewn.

Verf. 1. **T**HAT correction according to which instead of  $\iota\delta^2$ ,  
*Note a.* that is, *fourteen*, we ought to read  $\delta$ . *four*, is proposed  
 by *Lud. Cappellus* in *Hist. Apostol. Appendice*, Character  
 4. which is worth consulting, because he starts a great many difficul-  
 ties there against our Author's Chronology. And that Conjecture was  
 approved by *Grotius*, because of the connexion of the Discourse: Yet  
*Dr. Pearson* has excellently shewn in his *Annales Pauline*, that *St. Paul*  
 here reckons the years that had passed from the time of his Conver-  
 sion. But he refers the *Jerusalem Synod* to the year of Christ *xlix*, and  
 makes *St. Paul's* Conversion to have happen'd two Years later than  
*Dr. Hammond*, and that with good reason. Consult himself, and  
 compare him with *Cappellus*.

Verf 6. *Note d.* I. It is very true what our Author here says about  
*St. Paul's* Solæcisms, which others using a softer term call *σολοικισμῶν*  
*seeming solæcisms*. But it matters not much by what name they are  
 called, if we do but agree as to the thing. And it is universally  
 acknowledg'd by those who understand Greek, that there are a great  
 many expressions in the Writings of *St. Paul*, which cannot accord-  
 ing to the rules of Grammar be resolved into proper Construction.  
 The examples alledged by *Dr. Hammond*, put this matter out of all  
 doubt: yet some learned Men have made it their business to collect a  
 certain number of *ἀνακόλυθα* & *ἀναντιπρόσπε* *inconsequences* and *incoheren-*  
*ces* out of the best Authors both Greek and Latin, to shew that the  
 Stile of *St. Paul* ought not therefore to be accounted the less elegant.  
 But there are two things which may make it appear that those Authors  
 are ill compared with *St. Paul*. The *first* is, that those forementi-  
 oned defects do seldom occur in *them*, whose whole Discourse is other-  
 wise agreeable to the Rules of Grammar, and has all those orna-  
 ments which are requisite to make it proper and elegant. On the con-  
 trary, the stile of *St. Paul* is both destitute of all those things which  
 are so much admired and commended in any Discourse, (I speak of  
 words; and not of Matter) and has abundance of *seeming Solæcisms*. *Se-*  
*condly*, the most elegant *Heathen* Writers, tho they were at the same  
 time very well skilled both in Grammar and Rhetorick, do *designedly*  
 sometimes violate the Rules of Grammar for variety sake, lest their  
 Stile should seem too studied and artificial; which therefore may be  
 look'd upon as so many *Figures*, and a particular sort of elegance.  
 But *St. Paul* naturally *falls*, as it were, into these kind of *ἀνακόλυθα* &  
*ἀναντιπρόσπε*



ἀναπρόδρα, because regarding things and neglecting words, he thought Chapter  
 it enough if he were understood by an attentive and diligent Reader, II.  
 who loved the Truths he declared. So far is he from *designately di-*  
*versifying* his Discourse with that kind of Negligence, that he does  
 not seem to have aimed at so much as the common ornaments of Stile.   
 Let us hear about this matter *Quintilian*, in Lib. 9. cap. 3. *Esset, faith*  
*he, omne schema vitium, si non pteretur, sed accideret. — Virtus*  
*est, si habet probabile aliquid, quod sequatur. Una tamen in re maxime*  
*utilis, ut quotidiani & semper eodem modo formati sermonis fastidium levet,*  
*& nos a vulgari dicendi genere defendat. Quo si quis parce, & cum res*  
*poscet utetur, velut adperso quodam condimento jucundior erit. At qui ni-*  
*mium affectaverit, ipsam illam gratiam varietatis amittet, &c. Every*  
*figure would be an imperfection if it were not chosen, but casual. —*  
*It is an excellency if it have something probable following it. But there is*  
*one thing in which it is most useful, and that is to take away that nauseous-*  
*ness which is bred, by forming our Discourse always after the same manner,*  
*and to keep us from a vulgar way of expression: Which if any one sparing-*  
*ly use, and only when the thing requires it, it will give a grateful relish as it*  
*were to his Discourse. But if he unnecessarily affects it, he will lose all that*  
*agreeableness which a Variety would otherwise cause, &c. Now I do not*  
 think there is any one will suppose that St. Paul purposely chose those  
 harsh and frequent ἀναπρόδρα, to make his Discourse less distastful to  
 his Readers. And therefore it remains that they be looked on as De-  
 fects and Imperfections, which yet are no prejudice to his matter,  
 because the Gospel is a very plain and easy thing, which does not need  
 to be illustrated by any Light depending upon Elegancy, or exactness  
 of Expression. It is well said by St. *Jerom* on Chap. vi. of this Epistle  
 to the Galatians, vers. 1. *Qui putant Paulum juxta humilitatem & nos*  
*vere dixisse, et si imperitus Sermone, non tamen scientia, defendant hu-*  
*jus loci consequentiam. Debit quippe secundum ordinem dicere: vos qui*  
*spirituales estis, instruite hujusmodi, in spiritu lenitatis considerantes*  
*vosmet ipsos, & vos tentemini; & non plurali inferre numerum flagu-*  
*ixrem. Hebræus igitur ex Hebræis & qui esset in vernaculo sermone docti-*  
*simus, profundos sensus aliena lingua exprimere non valebat; nec CURA-*  
**BAT MAGNO PERE DE VERBIS, CUM SENSUM HA-**  
**BERET INTUITO.** They who think that St. Paul spake only out of  
 Modesty, and not the real truth, when he said, tho I am rude in Speech,  
 yet not in Knowledg, let them defend the Connexion of this place. For  
 according to good Syntax he ought to have said, Ye that are Spiritual re-  
 store such a one in the spirit of Meekness, considering your selves,  
 lest you also be tempted, and not have brought a Single word upon a

Chapter *Plural*. But being a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and very skilful in his own  
 II. Native Dialect, he could not express his profound sense in another Language; and AS LONG AS THE SENSE WAS SAFE, HE DID NOT MUCH CONCERN HIMSELF ABOUT WORDS.

II. The Passage referred to by our Author in the same *St. Jerom*, in *Comment. ad Ephes. iii.* I have set down a little more fully [in my *Latin Translation*] than the *Doctor*, who did not complete the sense, but ended at the word *adnotamus*; and it is thus: *Quotiescunque solacismos aut tale quid adnotamus; non Apostolum pulsamus, ut malivoli criminantur, sed magis Apostoli adsertores sumus, &c.* Whenever we take notice of any *Solecisms* or the like, we do not injure the *Apostle*, as some malicious Persons would lay to our charge, but we do him so much the more Justice, &c. Our Author adds, and so *Epist. cap. 1. Quæst. 10.* which I have omitted, because to produce the testimony of *St. Jerom* in that manner is absurd, and I could not find the passage to which he referred. I don't think he look'd himself into *St. Jerom* when he sent us to that place: For otherwise he would certainly have cited him with more care, and instead of those *Divines* which he alledges, appealed to the Testimony of *St. Jerom*, whose Authority is much more considerable. And with *St. Jerom* he might have joined *Origen* who lays down this Rule, of which more at large in *cap. 8. Philocalia*: *μη δειν τα σολοικισμῶν, η̄ μη σωζοντων τὴν χρῑστον ἀποκλεθῆσαν ῥητὰ τῆ γεγραμῆς, ὅτι χειρῶν διασθεδῶναι, πλὴν τοῖς συνιέναι δυναμένοις τὸ τῆ διανοίας ἀκόλῃθον σωζοντα*: that we ought not to attempt the correcting of any seeming *Solecisms*, or verbal incoherences in Scripture, where to discerning Persons the sense is well enough connected.

*Verf. 11. Note g.* I. I do not think that from an ill interpretation of one place in the *Old Testament*, we ought to deduce an unheard of sense of the word *καταγωνίσκειν*, as if it therefore ordinarily signified the same with the Hebrew used in that place. One single place in the *Septuagint* where they arbitrarily fix a sense upon a word which they could not properly render, does not change the use of a Language, as I have already elsewhere suggested: For they used the word *καταγωνίσκω*, not because they thought it signified just the same with the Hebrew *קקח*, but because it contained a sense not altogether disagreeable to that place, as they imagined. So that I chuse here to follow the vulgar Interpretation, and especially seeing it best suites with the context, viz. when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed; that is, because he did what he ought not to have done, not because he was look'd upon by others as a *Dissembler*. For first he did really pretend to avoid the Society of the *Gentiles*, which he used not to do, nor ought to have done. And secondly, others did not see



see him dissemble, because by his example and manner of Life, the *Gentiles* began to be perswaded that they were obliged by the Jewish Laws. So that it is rightly observed by *Grotius*, after a great many others, that the Participle *καταγνωσμένος* here is the same with the Verbal *καταγνωσός*. Chapter III.

II. The Passage in *Ecclesiasticus* makes nothing at all to the purpose, which is thus: *ὅτι πῶς κλέπτῃ ἔστιν αἰσχρὴ, καὶ κατάγνωσις πορνείᾳ ὅτι διγλώσσῃ: Shame is upon the Thief, and an evil Condemnation upon the double Tongue; that is, they are at length condemned, and suffer a shameful Punishment. I do not see any necessity of interpreting *κατάγνωσις* here by *detection*.*

Verf. 14. *Ἀναγκάζεις Ἰσθαίξεν.*] They are said to *compel* not only who use Commands, Threatnings, or Violence; but those who when they say or do any thing, others dare not but follow their Example or Authority, or cannot neglect any thing which they would have them do, without great prejudice to their Interest or Reputation. So the word *ἀναγκάζειν* is taken in 2 *Cor.* xii. 11. where *St. Paul* says that the *Corinthians* had so carried themselves towards him, that to keep up his Reputation he was *compelled* to speak somewhat more highly and honourably of himself than he would otherwise have done. And to the same sense the Latin *cogere* is used by *Cicero* in the beginning of his Book *de Amicitia*, where *Lælius* speaking to his Sons-in-law, who had earnestly entreated him to discourse concerning *Friendship*, says: *Vim hoc quidem est afferre, quid enim refert qua me ratione cogatis? Cogitis enim certe, studiis enim generorum, præsertim in re bona, cum difficile est, tum ne æquum quidem obsistere.* This is pure *compulsion*; for what does it signify what way you take to force me? For force me you certainly do; for not to comply with the desires of my Sons-in-law, especially in a good thing, as it is hard, so it is unreasonable.

CHAP. III.

Verf. 1. I. IF the *Ebionites* were so called from an Opinion, I am apt to think that name was given to them by the Christians, after the writing of this *Epistle* in which their Doctrin is called *πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα κόσμου*, *beggary Elements of the World*, chap. iv. 9. And this seems to be intimated by *Origen* in the beginning of his 2d Book *contra Celsum*, where he says: *Οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων οἷς ἡ Ἰουδαία πεισθέντες ἐκαταλείπισαν τὸ πάτριον νόμον· εἶδον γὰρ κατ' αὐτὴν ἐπώνυμοι τὴν κατ' αὐτὴν ἐκδοχὴν πτωχείας τῶν νόμων γεγραμμένοι. Εβραίων τε γὰρ ὁ πτωχὸς παρὰ Ἰουδαίους καλεῖται, καὶ Εβριωνῶν χρηματίζουσι οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡ Ἰουδαία ὡς κρείττον παραδείξαμενοι.*

Chapter III. *The Jews, who believe in Christ, have not forsaken their antient Law; for they live according to it, and are surnamed from the poverty of their Law. For Ebion in the Hebrew Language signifies Poor; and those of the Jews who receive Jesus as the Christ, are called Ebionites. And it's true that in Hebrew עֲבִיּוֹן ebjon, is used indeed for Poverty, but never for Folly that I know of, tho I have made diligent search. But to speak what I think, I am of opinion that this name of Ebionites belonged to some poor Samaritans, who had embraced the Gospel; but not being sufficiently acquainted with its Doctrins, had mixed their antient Religion with it: which mixture they too obstinately adhered to, when they might have learned better from the Apostles and other Christians. The reason why I think they were Samaritans and not Jews, is this very considerable one, that they received only the Law of Moses, and rejected the Prophets, as Epiphanius in their Heresy tells us, which was a principal part of Samaritanism. See Num. xv. It's certain the Ebionite who wrote the Clementine Homilies, alledges only the Law: Nor is it any wonder that these Men were poor, because they were universally hated, both by Jews, Christians, and Heathens, who none of them took any care to relieve their Necessities.*

II. But I do not think that St. Paul hath a reference here to these Hereticks, because he upbraids them with nothing but their obstinate adherence to the *Mosaical Ceremonies*; the observation of which they endeavoured to impose also upon the *Gentiles*. Our learned Author will have them to be the *Gnosticks*, whom for that reason he represents as the Promoters of all kind of Heresies. But whereas the Case as to the *Gnosticks* is doubtful, it is certain that the *Jews* of that Age who had received *Christ*, were very zealous for having the *Mosaical Rites* observed; and there is nothing said here by the Apostle which does not exactly agree to them. And therefore we ought not to feign St. Paul to have had any other Adversaries. Tho if any one think fit to call some of the *Jews Gnosticks*, because they boasted of an extraordinary measure of *γνώσις knowledg*, with all my heart.

III. The Allusion which Dr. Hammond supposes the Apostle here might have to the name of *Ebionites*, is vain: for it is not true that their name signifies *folly*; nor is it necessary, because St. Paul calls the *Jewish Rites* πτωχὴν poor and beggarly, that therefore he should be supposed to have a respect to that name, because there are other reasons, and those very considerable ones, for his speaking in that manner, as we shall see on Chap. iv. 9.

Verf. 8. Note c. What our Author says here at last are mere Niceties; but nothing can be truer, than what he has before, as I have shewn



shewn on *Gen.* xii. 3. and those who carp at it never consider'd the Chapter Reasons which Dr. *Hammond* and I have there given, which yet they ought to have done before they condemned us. III.

Verf. 10. "Ὅσοι γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμος εἰπὼν, ὑποὶ κατάργον εἰσὶ, &c. to the end of Verf. 11. and Verf. 21, 22. Εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος δυνάμει ζωοποιῆσαι, &c.] All these Verses I shall interpret together, because tho they are disjoined in place, they are united in sense. In interpreting the Law of *Moses*, and enquiring into its nature, the first thing to be taken care of, is, that we do not confound things which are distinct, that is, the Law it self as it is recorded in *Moses*, and may be understood according to a literal and simple interpretation of the words, with the Opinion of the *Jews*, prevalent in *St. Paul's* time, and against which he here disputes. For otherwise we shall hardly be able to reconcile *St. Paul* with *Moses*, or with right Reason.

If we consider the Law of *Moses* as it is set down in the *Pentateuch*, we shall plainly perceive that it was very difficult indeed to observe all the Rites therein prescribed; but yet that it was not such as that the performance of it was impossible, as I have shewn on *Deut.* xix. 9. And indeed *Moses* every where supposes that it might be observed, as all Lawgivers also do; and if they did not, there should be no Laws made, because it is absurd to make Laws which cannot be kept, and unjust to punish Men for not doing what they cannot do. Nor indeed is the Law of *Moses* so very severe, as not to pardon the least Sin, or to require such a degree of Holiness as is above human strength: As appears only by two things which put the matter beyond all controversy. First, That God had instituted Sacrifices for some Sins; I do not mean *ritual* but *moral*, upon the offering up of which he promised to forgive the penitent Offender; of which we have several Instances in *Levit.* v. 4. & vi. 2. & seqq. Secondly, That he suffered Divorces, which were contrary to Charity, and might be attended with very great Inconveniencies, as every one easily sees. Such is the Law considered in it self, if we examin it a little more closely.

But the *Jews* in *St. Paul's* time, had got quite another Notion of it, and boasted it to be the most compleat and perfect Pattern of Sanctity imaginable; as appears by several places in *Josephus*, and particularly in his Books against *Apio*, and of them chiefly the 2d. And it signifies nothing to say that the *Jews* otherwise thought, and did those things which shew that they ought not to have had such a Notion of their Law, if they would be consistent with themselves; for it is certain they frequently both did and spake Contradictions.

The same Persons interpreted several places in the Law, not *grammatically*, as *Lawyers* use to do the Roman Laws, but *Theologically*; that is, not with a bare regard to the use of the Language and the connexion of the Discourse, but to their Opinions, with which they made the Law to agree, as is evident from several places in *Philo*, *Josephus*, and the *Talmudical* Doctors. For they made their Traditions equal to the Law, which Christ often upbraids them with. As for instance, The *Rabbins* used (as appears by the Version of the *Septuagint*, and the Citations of *St. Paul* in this place) to interpret *Deut. xxvii. 26.* as if the meaning of *Moses* there was, that God required of them the most perfect Holiness, which if they did not perform, they were to expect to be cursed by him. But in reality, all that *Moses* says, is only that the People were to curse him *that did not confirm the words of the Law to do them*, as I have shewn in my Notes on that place.

*St. Paul* who disputes here against the Jews, and endeavours to overcome them with their own Weapons, reasons from these Opinions of theirs, and shews that supposing the Truth of what they asserted, it was manifestly impossible any Man should be accounted just before God by the Law, because they acknowledged that all men were Sinners. So that it is all one as if the Apostle had said: "You say, O Jews, that ye expect Justification from God by the Law, and think that the Law is a most perfect Rule of Life. From whence it follows that you lie under the Curse of the Law, because you have not perfectly kept it, for you do not pretend to be absolutely sinless; and by your own concession, the Law denounces a Curse upon all that do not perfectly obey it. So that you cannot hope for Justification by the Law, but must seek it from the Gospel.

If it be enquired how I know *St. Paul* does not reason here from the thing it self, but upon the Jews Principles? I answer, By his citing the place of Scripture here alledged, not as it really is, but according to the Interpretation of the *Rabbins*. For the words of *Moses* are these: ארור אשר לא יקים את דברי התורה הזאת לעשה אתה  
*Curse to he that confirmth not the words of this Law, to do them.* Which the *Septuagint* render, ἐπιμαρτυροῦσθαι τὰς ἀρχαίας ἐν ἑσὶ ἐπιμαρτυροῦσθαι τὰς ἀρχαίας ἐν ἑσὶ ἐπιμαρτυροῦσθαι τὰς ἀρχαίας. And these *St. Paul* follows as far as the word ἐπιμαρτυροῦσθαι but then changes the rest into τὸ ἐπιμαρτυροῦσθαι ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ἀρχαίας. But doubtless he would never have alter'd any thing in the words of *Moses*, nor followed the *Septuagint* at all, but render'd the Hebrew himself exactly, if he had reasoned from the true Authority of the *Prophet*, and not from the Opinion of the Jews. And it is common with *St. Paul* to cite the Old Testament, so as it  
 was



was usually alledged by the *Doctors* of the *Jews*, whom they called *דַרְשָׁנִים* *darschanim*; that is to say, with little regard to the circumstances of the place, or the proper signification of the words, and to argue from them so alledged, because that was the custom of the *Jews*. See but the place cited out of the Prophet *Habakkuk* Chap. ii. 4. in *vers.* 11. Chaper III.

*Verf.* 11. Ἐν νόμῳ ἕστεις δικαιοσύνη πρὸ Θεοῦ.] That is, by perfect Holiness, for the *Law* and a pattern of perfect Holiness was the same in the opinion of the *Jews*. And the thing it self is true, tho the *Jews* had a wrong Notion of the *Law's* perfection; which truth of the thing it self made *St. Paul* express himself as the *Jews* did, tho not so accurately as they should have done.

*Verf.* 13. Χειρὸς ἡμῶν ἐξήργησεν ἐν τῇ καταργεί τοῦ νόμου.] There are three things here worth our enquiring into, which most other Interpreters securely pass over. *First*, who are meant by the word *ἡμεῖς* us; *Secondly*, what is *the Curse of the Law*; *Thirdly*, how *Christ* has redeemed us from it.

By *us* we are to understand the *Apostle* himself and his Countrymen the *Jews* to whom the *Law* was given, not all Mankind. This is evident from the thing it self, because other Nations were utter Strangers to the *Law* of *Moses*, which cannot be said to have been given to such as were always ignorant of it. Nay it was not given so much as to the *Jews* themselves, who were born after the revelation of the Gospel, and much less yet to Christians tho they knew it; because it was already abrogated before they came to the knowledg of it, yea before ever they had a being. The following words also shew that the *Jews* are opposed to the *Heathens* in this Verse: and therefore what *Dr. Hammond* here says in his Paraphrase, about the redemption of *Man* in general, tho it be true, does not belong to this place, because the Discourse is not about all *Mankind*, but the *Jews* only.

The *Curse of the Law* here spoken of, seems to be that mentioned by *Moses* in *Deut.* xxvii. and denounced upon those who were guilty of several Impieties, and, as I before observed, who refused to confirm the *Law*, and did not think themselves obliged by it. And those who were so cursed, could not expiate their Sins by any Sacrifice, but ought to be punished with Death; which because it could not always be inflicted, (as in case the Crime or its Author was not known) therefore the Person so offending had a Curse denounced upon him, or was pronounced worthy of all manner of Evils and Calamities: See my Notes on that Chapter of the Book of *Deuteronomy*. It is certain while the *Law* remained in force, or before it was abrogated by God, all the *Jews* ought to have engaged to observe it; and it was not lawful for them to say that

Chapter III. that they would not be obliged by it, or live otherwise than according to its prescription. And if any of them did so, they unavoidably subjected themselves to the Curses of the Law : Nay those who thought the Law required perfect Holiness, and yet did not think themselves perfectly Holy, ought, if they would be self-consistent, to look upon themselves as under the Law's Curse.

But Christ having established a New Covenant, whereby that old Mosaical one was abolished through his Death, did at the same time free the *Jews* from all the curses contained in the Law ; for whoever brings in a new Covenant, and makes new Laws, abrogates the old : Only that the *Jews* might partake of that Redemption, or be absolved from the necessity of observing the Mosaical Law, and exempted from its Curses, it was requisite they should embrace the Gospel-Covenant, and keep it. And thus the *Jews* were redeemed from the Curses of the Law, but not the *Gentiles*, who were never obnoxious to them, and, as St. Paul tells us in *Rom. i.* shall be judged without the Law. The *Jews* might therefore, after the New Covenant's being established by the Death of Christ, deny that they were any longer obliged by the Law, and neglect its prescriptions where they disagreed with the Gospel, without any fear of its curses, to which God from that time ceased to have any regard.

Ibid. *Τενόμεν* ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατὰ ἐγ. ] Namely, for us *Jews* ; for Christ offering himself a Sacrifice to God the Father for all Mankind, and expiating thereby the Sins of all Men, died for the *Jews* as well as others, and at once reconciled them to God, and freed them from a necessity of observing the Law, which denounced a Curse upon those who transgressed it. *κατὰ ἐγ.* here is for ὡς κατὰ ἐγ. as is rightly observed by *Grotius* ; for nothing worse could have befallen a Man whom the Law cursed, than Crucifixion. And ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν is in our room : for as a Sacrifice is killed in our stead, and suffers that Death which we deserved ; so Christ died in the stead of the *Jews*, and all Mankind.

Ibid. *Ἐπικατάραται* πᾶς ὁ κρετιόμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου. ] Of this place I have treated at large on *Deut. xxi. 23.* and I shall not here repeat what I have there said. All that remains is to shew that St. Paul does not disagree with *Moses* : *Moses* had said, that he that is hanged is the curse or abomination of God, that is, according to the Statutes of the Law, a very polluted thing. But St. Paul follows the *Septuagint*, excepting that he omits the word *θεός*, which they have, because indeed it is not necessary, nay in the Greek Language might have bred a mistake : For all that the Apostle means is this, that Christ was dealt with by the *Romans* as a vile Malefactor, tho he was perfectly innocent, and under-



underwent a very infamous Punishment, which according to the Customs of the *Jews*, render'd the Person so suffering a polluted thing; and a greater and more disgraceful than which could not have been inflicted upon the most profligate and cursed Offender. So that *ἐμωτάειρα* is here the same with *κατάρα* in the foregoing words. If *St. Paul* had added, *by God*, tho according to the Hebrew phrase that signifies no more than what I have here said, and shewn in my Notes on *Deuteronomy*; yet those who understood only Greek might have been offended with an expression which seemed to intimate *that Christ was cursed by God*, that is, hateful to God; which is so far from Truth, that God was always well pleased with Christ, and especially then when he beheld him on the Cross, performing or having performed the highest Office of Love to Mankind, and most signal instance of subjection to himself. It is certainly known that the *Jews*, who from that time did not sufficiently understand the Hebrew Language, abused that phrase. *Nobis*, saith *St. Jerom* on this place, *solet a Judæis pro infamia objici, quod Salvator noster & Dominus sub Dei fuerit maledicto.* It is a thing we (Christians) are often upbraided with by the *Jews*, as a matter of disgrace, that our Lord and Saviour was under the curse of God.

Verf. 14. [*Ἰνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, &c.*] While Christ established a New Covenant through his Death, and thereby abrogated the old one, he did not only free the *Jews* from the Mosaical Yoke; but dying also for the *Gentiles*, he obtained from God the forgiveness of all their past Sins, if they did but believe and obey for the future: so that upon their Faith they are accounted just by God, in the same manner as *Abraham*. The Connexion therefore of this Verse with the foregoing is this: “*Ver. 13.* Christ has delivered the *Jews* from a necessity of observing the Mosaical Ceremonies, and from the fear of that Curse which was threatned against those of that Nation who wilfully neglected them, or thought themselves not bound to observe them; having established a New Covenant between God and Men, by an ignominious and cruel Death, which may be called cursed according to the stile of the Law. 14. And he has so freed the *Jews* from the Mosaical Yoke, as at the same time to provide that the *Gentiles*, upon whom it was never imposed, and who by those Ceremonies were kept off from having any communion with the *Jews*, might, setting aside the observation of those Rites, be adopted into *Abraham*’s Family, become partakers of the same benefits with *Abraham*, and embracing the Gospel, receive the gifts of the *Holy Ghost*, as well as the believing *Jews*.”

Ibid.

Ibid. *Λάβωμεν διὰ τὴν πίστεως.*] It seems at first sight that the word which here followed should have been *λάβωσι*, because the Verb *λέγεται* went before in the third Person; but the reason of St. Paul's using the *first*, is because this latter part of the Verse belongs as well to the *Jews* as the *Gentiles*, with whom he therefore here joins himself and his Countrymen.

Verf. 16. *Οὐ λέγει ἐν τοῖς σπέρμασι.*] It is highly probable that this was a commonly received way of arguing in the *מדרשין* *midraschim* or Allegorical Interpretations of that Age. And the *Jews* indeed might well enough make use of it against the *Arabians*, *Edomites* and *Samaritans*, who boasted that they also were the posterity of *Abraham*, to shew that the Promises made to *Abraham* and to his Seed, did not belong to them. But if it be considered in it self, it cannot be thought of any force by those who have other Sentiments, because the Hebrew *צֶרֶב* *zerab* is a collective name, and signifies any succeeding Generations whatsoever, tho of a different Race: Nay, as learned Men have observed, the *Jews* never used to apply the word *צֶרֶב* in the plural number, but to the Seeds of divers sorts of Plants. But it was sufficient that this way of reasoning was thought to be conclusive by the *Jews*, to give the Apostle ground to make use of it against them; and what they were wont to say on behalf of the *Israelites* according to the *Flesh*, against the *Arabians*, *Edomites* and *Samaritans*, St. Paul might properly enough alledg in honour of those who were *Israelites* according to the *Spirit*, to overthrow the carnal *Jews* with their own Weapons. I have already before observed, that St. Paul disputes against the *Jews* upon their own Principles, and there will be other examples of that in this Epistle.

Verf. 16. Note d. Tho the word *Christ* elsewhere signifies the Head of the Church, in conjunction with his Body or Members; yet in this place I rather think it is used for his Body alone, that is, *Christ's* Disciples: for there is nothing in the Covenant made with *Abraham*, properly speaking, promised to *Christ*; but rather *Christ* himself was promised therein to *Abraham*, together with all his Benefits.

Verf. 19. *Παροβόλων χάριν προσετέθειν.*] That is, God did not acquiesce in the Revelations he made to *Abraham*; but when he saw that the *Israelites* transgressed all rules of Piety and Vertue, he added the *Mosaical* Law, to keep them in some measure within the bounds of their Duty, till the *Messias* should come. This is all that St. Paul here means, whatever our Divine pieces up his Paraphrase with.

Ibid. *Σπέρμα ὃ ἐπιγγέλλεται.*] So undoubtedly it must be read, and not *ἐπιγγέλλεται*, as may appear from the 16th Verse, where the Promises



are said to have been made *πρὸ σπέρματος*, to the Seed, not the Seed it self Chapter III.  
 promised. That is only a correction made by some Criticks, who thought *Christ* to be here intended, whereas *St. Paul* speaks about Christians of all Nations, who without Circumcision, after the example of *Abraham*, were accounted just and righteous before God, upon the sole observation of the precepts of the Gospel. And these are called *κατ' ἐξοχὴν* the Seed of *Abraham*, because they obtain justification while uncircumcised; and the promises made to *Abraham*, at that time uncircumcised, are fulfilled in them in a more eminent sense than in the believing Jews, as *St. Paul* himself shews in *Rom. iv.*

Verf. 20. [Ὁ ὃ μείτις ἐνὲς ἢ ἐστίν, ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν.] I cannot sufficiently wonder at *Dr. Hammond's* Paraphrase of this Verse, and if he had paraphrased the rest of this Chapter in the same manner, I should have quite lost my labour in translating him. For who would ever have imagined that the Apostle meant any thing like what he says, upon reading only *St. Paul's* words? At this rate of paraphrasing a Man may make any thing what he pleases of any Verse of Scripture. This Verse therefore must be better explained.

It seems to be brought in by way of *Parentthesis*, for the 21<sup>st</sup> Verse is manifestly to be joined with the 19<sup>th</sup>, and so to be consider'd as a digression in which the Apostle upon occasion of the word *μείτις*, admonishes the *Galatians* as he goes along, that as the Covenants made by God with Men were more than one, so each had their distinct Mediators, tho God himself was one. The words *ἐνὲς ἢ ἐστίν* signify *is not one*, as appears from the opposite member of the Sentence, *but God is one*; tho they properly signify *is not of one*, *παράγματος* or *εὐαγγελίου* or some such word being to be understood. It is all one as if *St. Paul* had said: I told you that there was a Mediator between God and the Ancient Hebrews; because tho God be one and the same, yet he has not appointed one single Mediator of one Gospel, but the Law likewise had its Mediator, viz. *Moses*. Which comes to no more than if the Apostle had said, *there is not one Mediator*; for to say that the Law had a Mediator appointed it as well as the Gospel, is nothing but to say that it is not one only that may be called by that Name. If it be asked why *St. Paul* admonishes the *Galatians* of this; I answer that it is an *Exegesis* by way of *Parentthesis*, of the word *μείτις*, which kind of *Parenttheses* are very frequent in *St. Paul's* writings. See *Ephes. ii. 5.* and *iv. 9, 10.* This I thought to be the sense of this obscure place, which if not true, does however very little depart from the Apostle's words; whereas nothing can be more distant from them than *Dr. Hammond's* Interpretation.

Verf. 21. 'Ο συνείμενος ζωνοποιῖται.] The Apostle here argues upon the *Jews Hypothesis*, as I have before said, who affirmed that God required perfect Holiness in the Law; upon which supposition, no Man can be justified by it, nor consequently attain to Life. Otherwise *Moses* every where supposes and takes it for certain, that it was possible to observe the Law; but he had not that Notion of the Law which the later *Jews* had, who interpreted every thing *mystically*. And according to these Mens Sentiments *St. Paul* here disputes, and not that of *Moses*: Which unless we observe, it will be impossible to reconcile the Prophet with the Apostle.

Verf. 24. Παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν ἕρξεν εἰς Χριστόν.] In this particular *St. Paul* does not reason from the Sentiments of the *Jews*, but declares his own Mind, tho it be a Confectary necessarily following from what went before, supposing the truth of the *Jews* opinion concerning the perfection of the Law. But the same also might be inferred from the Nature of the Mosaical Law it self, as that which contain'd only the *εὐχέλια* elements of the Christian Religion. And those who are taught only the Elements of a thing, are still under a Schoolmaster. This might be proved by other Arguments if it were necessary: So that what in it self was true and relied upon firmer grounds, *that St. Paul* proved also from the Jewish Opinion, by this means the more effectually to put the *Jews* to silence, a thing which he often does. Such is the perverseness of Mankind, especially in matters of Religion, that they are not moved so much by cogent Reason, as by prejudices and opinions taken up in their Childhood. Such is the pride of Mens Hearts, that they cannot bear to have their Errors confuted or inveigh'd against, especially when their mistakes are of a long standing and grown inveterate, or when those who are charged with Error have been always judged by their own party to be in the right, and look'd upon as learned and judicious Men. And for these reasons *Christ* and the Apostles reprov'd as few of the *Jews* mistakes as they could, *viz.* those only which would not consist with Christianity; but their other prejudices that had no very bad consequences attending them, and which their obstinacy would not suffer the eradication of to be attempted without manifest danger, they chose rather to bear with, and to reason against them upon their own principles, because they perceived that that way of arguing had the greatest influence upon them. But seeing we now live in a time in which we are to search out the Truth more for our *own* use, than for the use of the *Jews*, it is our part, after the discovery of it, to set it down just as it is: Because if we do not, we shall never understand the Apostle's Writings, nor  
be



be able to defend them against the objections of Infidels; yea perhaps Chapter (which God of his infinite Mercy prevent) instead of a solid Piety IV. established upon its own Light and Evidence, all our Religion may degenerate into but dark and fearful Superstition. ~~~~~

## C H A P. IV.

Verf. 3. " **Ο**ΥΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΗΜΕΙΣ.] That is, we *Jews*; for the *Gentiles* were never under the discipline of the Jewish Law, which they were ignorant of, and from which they were excluded by the very nature of the Law. For it was a Law given to one Nation living in one Country, the Land of *Canaan*. This deserved here to be noted, because if it be not observed, the whole Discourse of the Apostle in this place will be very obscure.

Ibid. Στοιχεῖα νοσμου.] The *same* St. Paul calls ἀπειρή καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, in *vers.* 9. And there is no doubt but he means the *Mosaical* Law; whence it may be again inferred that St. Paul did not think, with the *Jews*, that that Law was a perfect rule of Sanctity: For if he had been of that mind, how could he have called it *the Elements of the World*, and *weak and beggarly Elements*? The *elements* are the rude beginnings of any Art or Science, and far from containing the whole art in its greatest Extent and utmost Perfection. Which being so, undoubtedly he thought those *Elements* might be observed by Men if they were consider'd in themselves, as they are in *Moses*; tho' perfect Holiness, such as the *Jews* affirmed the Law to be a complete pattern of, was never by any Man, excepting the Saviour of all Men Christ Jesus, expressed in his Life.

But it will be said, it may be that St. Paul has a reference to the Ceremonial part of the Law, and not that which is Moral. To which I answer, by confessing indeed that he has a respect chiefly to the Ritual part of the Law, but so as not to exclude the *Moral* part of it, nor consequently the Moral Law it self; which if compared with the Commands of Christ, comprehends only the *Elements* of true Piety, as sufficiently appears from *Mat.* v. and the following *Chapters*. For many things were lawful under the *Mosaical* Law, relating to Manners, which are there forbidden by Christ. What the Moral Law given by *Moses* commands is indeed Good and Holy, and what it forbids Evil; but it is not a perfect rule of Holiness, that is, it does not command every thing that is Holy, nor forbid every thing that is evil. For instance, Husbands loving their Wives to such a degree as to bear with their Manners, and never to put them away but in case of

Chapter IV. Adultery, is a vertue not enjoined in the Mosaical Law; as the contrary Inhumanity in putting them away at every turn, is not therein prohibited, nay is exprelly permitted, if they did but give them a Bill of Divorce. See *Mat* v. 31, 32.

Verf. 5. [*Ἰνα τὸς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγορεύσῃ.*] That is, the *Jews*, or their *Pro-selytes*, as is rightly observed by *Grotius*, who upon embracing the New Covenant, were no longer oblig'd by the Laws of the old, to which they were before subject. See my Note on *Chap.* iii. 13.

Verf. 6. [*Τὸ πνεῦμα ἡἶ ἀυτοῦ.*] The words *Spirit of his Son*, are capable of two senses, both which *St. Paul* seems to have comprehended under this Phrase. *First*, by the *Spirit of Christ* may be meant the Spirit which Christ had promised to the Apostles and the rest of the Christians, which he accordingly afterwards sent down upon them, and by whose power they were enabled to work Miracles. For on the effusion of that Spirit upon them, the *Jews*, and such as of *Gentiles* had embraced the *Jewish* Religion, perceived that they were then much more bountifully dealt with than when they were under the Law, and called upon God afterwards with greater assurance, no longer now behaving himself as a hard Master, or requiring the observation of superfluous Rites upon the severest Penalties, but as a most gracious and compassionate Father. Whence that Spirit is said to cry *Abba Father*, that is, to make the *Jews* upon their Conversion to the Christian Religion, to look upon God as a Father and not as a severe Master. *Secondly*, by the *Spirit of his Son* may be meant such an affection of *Mind* towards God as was in his Son; as the *Spirit of Elias* and the like. And that Affection was produced in the minds of the *Jews*, by the knowledg and participation of the Benefits of the Gospel. Both these Spirits jointly residing in the minds of Men, seem to be called by *St. Paul* πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας the *Spirit of Adoption*, in *Rom.* viii. 16.

Verf. 8. [*Τότε ὃ ἐκ εἰδότες Θεόν, &c.*] *St. Paul* here speaks not to those who were εἰσὶ by birth *Jews*, and had been brought up in the knowledg of the true God, but those who were made *Jews* θεῶν by assumption, that is, *Pro-selytes* to the *Jewish* Religion before their Conversion to Christianity. And it appears that what the Apostle here says, has a reference to such Persons, because he afterwards demands of them, how they could turn again (πάλιν) to the weak and beggarly Elements; that is, to the Jewish Rites which they had before, in part at least, observed. If *Dr. Hammond* had not overlook'd this, which is obscurely intimated by *Grotius* on *vers.* 5. he would have given a much more clear and exact Paraphrase of this and the following Verse.

Ibid.



Ibid. *Μὴ εὐσεβῆσθε Θεοῖς.*] That is, to Gods which Men had made and invented for themselves; for the opposite to *τὰ εὐσεβῆ* is *τὰ θεῖα*, that is, things which depend upon the decrees and institutions of Men. That this place ought to be thus understood, I have shewn at large in my *Ars Critica*, Par. 2. Sect. 1. Cap. vii. Chapter IV.

Verf. 9. *Πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀδυνάμη καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα.*] I have already before said, that by *weak and poor Elements* is meant the Jewish Law, and that is clear from this and the following Verse. But there are two things which I shall here a little more particularly enquire into, *first*, why the Mosaical Precepts are called *weak and poor*; *secondly*, how the *Galatians* who had worshipped false Gods, are said to return to those weak Elements.

The Elements of any Discipline relating to good Manners and divine Worship, such as is the discipline of *Moses*, cannot be stiled *weak* in any other sense, than as they are not effectual to reform Mens Manners, or bring them to worship God in that manner as they ought to do. And indeed the Rewards and Punishments of the Jewish Law, which in a literal sense were only temporal, could not have such an influence upon the Minds of Men, as to bring them to any great degree of Vertue. For tho they might restrain them from committing those Sins which would have render'd them infamous in the Eyes of others, or exposed them to civil Punishments; yet they could not keep them from doing a great many things contrary to true Vertue; of which see *Mat. v.* and what is said by *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond* on that Chapter. In this sense therefore the Law was *ἀδυνάμη weak*, that is, ineffectual and incapable of making Men truly Pious and Vertuous. See also *Rom. viii. 3.* with the same learned Mens Notes.

Again, any Institution may be called *πτωχὸς*, in a metaphorical sense, when it is imperfect in its kind, and a great many things are wanting in it which must be made up and supplied out of another: as *πτωχοὶ ἀνθρώπων* are Men destitute of the necessary supports of Life, and who unless relieved by the liberality of others, are unable to subsist. And such an Institution is the Law, which unless it be perfected by the Gospel, cannot bring Men to such a degree of Piety as to make them acceptable to God, and worthy of eternal Life; as manifestly appears both from the nature of the thing it self, and a great deal said by Christ to that purpose in the fifth Chapter of *St. Matthew*. And this may possibly be the reason why *St. Paul* here uses the word *πτωχὸς* rather than *ἀτελής imperfect*, to intimate by a word of a special Emphasis, that the Law of *Moses* was not only in a few things but exceeding poor and defective. For *πτωχὸς* does not only signify *poor*, but poor to

Chapter a degree of *Beggery*. And therefore the Greeks distinguish *πτωχία* from *πενία*, & *πτωχός* from *πενός*. *Poverty* or *Πενία*, in *Aristophanes* in *Pluto*, in an elegant disputation, wherein he endeavours to shew that *Poverty* is advantageous to Men, after *Chremylus* had described the inconveniences of *Beggery*, is brought in speaking thus:

Σὺ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ βίον εἰσηλάσας, ἢ πτωχῶν δ' ἕπελεξέσσω.

You have not been speaking of my Life, but declaring that of *Beggers*. On which words the Scholiast makes this observation: ἢ μὲν *πενία* μεμεσημένη ἐστὶν ἐνδία, πόνῳ τὰ χρεώδη συζῶσα, ὡς τὸ πένεσθαι, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐνεργεῖν, εἰσηλασὶς, ἢ ἐν τέτῳ πείζειν τὰ χρεώδη· ὃ δὲ *πτωχός* παρὰ τὸ πτώσειν πάντας: The word *πενία* signifies a middle sort of indigence, when a Man acquires necessaries by Labour; and comes from the Verb *πένεσθαι*, that is, to labour, and by that to acquire Necessaries: but a *πτωχός* is so called from his begging of every Body. See also the following words of *Chremylus* and *Poverty*. But I dare not insist too much upon the significancy of this word in *St. Paul*, who does not use to be very critical in the choice of his words.

Further, the *Galatians* who when they knew not God, did service unto them which by nature are not Gods, are said here by *St. Paul*, upon their defection to *Judaism*, to have turned to the weak and beggarly Elements, wherunto they desired again to be in bondage; because, as I have already suggested, they had gone over from *Heathenism* to *Judaism*, before they became Christians. There is no doubt but many of those who first believed the Gospel among the Gentiles, were before *σεβόμενοι*, or *Profelytes of the Gate*, as the *Rabbins* speak, or also of *Righteousness*. Of the former sort were *Cornelius* the Centurion, spoken of in *Acts* x. and *Lydia* in *Acts* xvi. And there is no reason to think but the greatest part of the *Galatian* Christians were such Men, who certainly might much more easily relapse to *Judaism*, than embrace it, if they had not before known it, after their Conversion to the Christian Religion. I remark this, because *Grotius*, who on *vers.* 5. had observed that *St. Paul* spake of *Profelytes*, unmindful of what he had there affirmed, tells us that the *Galatians* are said here to return to the elements of *Piety*; non quod *Judaizassent* antea, sed quia multa usurpassent cum *Judeis* communia, ut ciborum delectum, dierum discrimina, &c. Not because they had *Judaized* before, but because (whilst they were Heathens) they had a great many Customs common to them with the Jews, as the distinction of Meats, and Days, &c. But that he is mistaken is evident; because it is the Jewish Law that was before called the *Elements of the World*, on which words he has an excellent Annotation;



tation ; and because the following Verse here clearly shews that they are said to return to the Jewish Ceremonies ; not to say how manifest that is from the whole series of St. *Paul's* disputation in this place. Besides, the Religion of the Heathens cannot be said to contain the *elements of Piety*, which taught the most consummate wickedness. So that St. *Paul* would rather have said that they returned *εἰς ἀσέβειαν*, if what *Grotius* here says were true. And therefore we must understand him to speak of the Mosaical Rites, which the *Galatians*, who were once Jewish Profelytes, before they had embraced Christianity, had in part at least observed.

Verf. 12. *Τίθετε ὡς ἐγὼ, ὅτι καὶ γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς.*] I don't know which to chuse, Dr. *Hammond's* interpretation of these words, or *Grotius* his, who makes them to be a Description of St. *Paul's* extraordinary affection to the *Galatians*. The place in *Cicero*, which *Grotius* refers to, is in *Ep. ad Famil. Lib. 7. Ep. 5.* to which add this Distich out of the Epigram of *Zeno*, the founder of the Sect of the Stoicks, which *Apuleius* sets down in his Apology :

*Hoc modo sim vobis unus sibi quisque quod ipse est.  
Hoc mihi vos eritis quod duo sunt oculi.*

Verf. 15. *Τίς ἐν ὁ μακαρισμός, &c.*] I cannot see what reason moved our Author in his Paraphrase of this and the following Verses, to make mention of *Persecution*, whereof there is no footstep in St. *Paul's* words. He is as much out of the way too in seeking here for his *Gnosticks*, and the Authority of the *Jews*, out of their own Country.

Verf. 21. *Τὸν νόμον ἔκ ἀκούετε;*] That is, do ye understand the Law, or do ye not hearken to it attentively when it is read to you? It deserved here to be noted, that St. *Paul* argues from some received *מדרש midrasch* vulgarly known: For if that Allegory, whereof he here speaks, had not been before heard of, he would have had no reason to wonder that the *Galatians* had never collected any such thing from the Story which he refers to; it being not at all necessary that the words of Scripture should have any such allegorical signification as that is, supposed to belong to them. And therefore undoubtedly it was a known Allegory, tho perhaps somewhat otherwise expressed by the *Jews*.

Further ; seeing this Interpretation could not be urged against those, who might deny that the Scripture ought to be so understood, and the Apostle does not make use of his Authority to confirm it, it is evident that he argues here from what was generally allowed. Which


Chapter kind of things it is not material should be true or well grounded,  
 IV. as long as they contain nothing in them prejudicial to Piety, and are  
 believed by those against whom we dispute. So that from St. Paul's  
 using such an Allegory against the Judaizing *Galatians*, it does not  
 follow that we in this Age are bound to admit it, as a secret re-  
 vealed from Heaven to the Apostle. For if we thoroughly consider  
 it, we shall find that most which has ever been said by learned Men  
 against this way of interpreting Scripture in general, may be objected  
 against this particular Allegory.

Verf. 24. Note b. *Ἀλληγορούμενα* is not a Participle in the *Middle*  
 voice, as every one knows, and as Dr. Hammond himself very well  
 knew, tho he said otherwise before he was aware. It is to be taken  
 in a Passive sense, and rendred thus: which things *are allegorically ex-*  
*plained*, or use to be so explained, that is, by a mystical Interpretati-  
 on applied to signify other things besides those which that History li-  
 terally contains.

This kind of Allegories must be carefully distinguished from the  
 Allegories of *Homer* and other Poets: For the Greek Grammarians, and  
 especially their Philosophers, affirmed that a great many things which  
 were said by their Poets about the Gods, were false in a proper sense,  
 and never really happened; but in another obstruse and secret sense  
 were true. Whereas the *Jews* did not deny but that their Histories  
 were true, but from real events deduced Consecrations belonging to o-  
 ther matters, as if those events had been as so many representations  
 of other things. *Heraclides Ponticus* in his little Treatise *de Allegoriis*  
*Homericis*, gives us this true definition of a Poetical Allegory;  
*ἀλλὰ μὲν ἀρξενίων τρέπτει, ἕτερα δὲ ὧν λέγει σημαίνων, ἐπιτύχια ἀλληγορεῖα καλεῖται:*  
*A Trope wherein one thing (ἀρξενίον) is said, and another thing different*  
*from that signified, is called an Allegory.*

Verf. 25. Note c. Our learned Author has sufficiently indeed here  
 shewn that the *Arabians* were circumcised, but not in conformity to  
 the *Mosaical* Law, but a more ancient Precept given to *Abraham*  
 himself; and in imitation of *Ismael*, not of *Isaac*. Whether they  
 had any other Custom which might be look'd upon as an imitation  
 of the Law of *Moses* I cannot tell; but it is false that the *Ismaelites*  
 ever bound themselves to observe the *Mosaical* Ceremonies, as was  
 observed by *Grotius*, whom I wonder Dr. Hammond did not give ear  
 to. I have often observed that learned Men supply out of their own  
 Invention what is wanting in the Testimonies of the Antients; and  
 afterwards thence draw Conclusions, as grounded upon the undoubt-  
 ed Authority of Ancient Writers; which yet is certainly no good  
 way of arguing. The



The 24th and two following Verses, may be thus paraphrased: Chapter  
*Ver.* 24. “ These things use to be allegorically explained by the Jews, IV.  
 “ and may be interpreted so as to signify what I a little before said.   
 “ *Sarah* and *Hagar* are as it were the Symbols of two Covenants;  
 “ the latter, viz. *Hagar*, of the Covenant given from Mount *Sinai*,  
 “ the Laws of which impose nothing but Slavery upon those who seek  
 “ to be justified by it. 25. (And *Hagar* is so much the more fitly  
 “ said to be an emblem of the Covenant delivered from Mount *Sinai*,  
 “ because her name signifies a *Rock*.) And to that Covenant, of which  
 “ the Servantmaid *Hagar* was an Image, belongs the earthly *Jerusa-*  
 “ *lem*, which is entirely taken up in the observation of servil Rites,  
 “ and acted by a slavish Fear. 26. But *Sarah* the free Woman is a  
 “ Symbol of the Evangelical Covenant, according to the Laws of  
 “ which the Citizens of the Spiritual *Jerusalem* live, that is, all we  
 “ Christians.

The Apostle undoubtedly alludes to the name of *Hagar*, which being written with an  $\aleph$ , according to the usual confusion of the guttural Letters,  $\aleph \aleph$  *hbagar*, signifies a *Rock* among the *Arabians*. It is probable that the *Jews*, who were no very great Friends to the *Arabians*, said a great many things by way of *Allegory* out of the History of *Moses*, to extol their Nation, and on the contrary to depress the *Hagarens*; and that *St. Paul* here applies to those who were *Israelites* according to the *Spirit*, what the *Jews* used to say in honour of their Nation; as on the contrary to the *carnal Jews*, what they often asserted to the disadvantage of the *Hagarens*.

I shall take the liberty here, which I do not otherwise use, to *allegorize* a little after the *Jewish* manner, that we may the better see what might give the Apostle *Paul* an occasion to speak so as he does. And first I shall perform the part of a Jewish  $\aleph \aleph$  *darshan*, or Allegorical Preacher; and then represent a Christian retorting the like Allegory upon the Jew.

### THE JEWISH $\aleph \aleph$

That ye may be sensible, O *Israelites*, of the great benefits which God has conferred upon you, compare your Original with that of your Neighbours the *Hagarens*. The founder of your Nation *Isaac* was born of a free Woman and Mistress of a Family, *Sarah*; on the contrary, *Ismael* the Father and Founder of the *Hagarens*, was born of a *Servant*. *Isaac* was conceived by a particular efficacy of the Divine Power, when *Abraham* was neither able to beget, nor *Sarah* to conceive, by reason

Chapter of old Age; on the other hand, *Ismael* was born of *Abraham* and *Hagar* when younger, according to the ordinary course of Nature: Nor did the distinguishing Providence of God terminate only on *Sarah* and *Hagar*, and their Sons *Isaac* and *Ismael*; but drew as it were in them the figure of what has already come to pass in former Ages, and shall hereafter happen to both their Progenies. The Posterity of *Isaac* have been protected almost with perpetual Miracles, and often enjoyed the sweets of Liberty, and had dominion over their neighbour Nations, and shall again have, when that great King whom we so much expect and long for, and whose Reign our antient Prophecies foretel, comes to rule over us. But the *Hagarens*, like their Mother, cast out and disinherited, have already more than once been our Servants, and shall hereafter be so, being subdued by the Power and Authority of the *Messias*. Do not in the least doubt of the truth of what I say, for God has heretofore given you a pledg of future events, on one hand in *Sarah* and *Isaac*, and on the other in *Hagar* and *Ismael*, who, as I said before, represented the several Conditions of their posterity.

#### THE CHRISTIAN ALLEGORIST.

We take you at your word, O *Jews*, that antient Events did shadow out and represent things future. But as of old the Offspring of *Abraham* was twofold, so it is now; and the same which was the condition of that twofold race of *Abraham*, is at present the lot of their Posterity. *Hagar* and *Ismael* were Images of the *Carnal Israelites*, who are the Seed of *Abraham* indeed according to the Flesh; but because they do not imitate his Faith and Piety, shall not inherit the Promises made to him upon believing. They shall be cast out of his spiritual Family, and be subject in a servil manner to the Covenant established on Mount *Sinai* in *Arabia*; of which *Hagar* may the more fitly be said to be an Emblem, because her name signifies a *Rock*, and her Posterity still inhabit that Country. So that the Bondwoman *Hagar*, who was cast out together with her Son, represented the state of the earthly *Jerusalem*, which is subject to slavish Rites and Ceremonies. But *Sarah* the Freewoman, of whom *Isaac* was heretofore born beside the course of Nature, in like manner as now Men are made Christians by an extraordinary efficacy of the Divine Power, was an Image of the Evangelical Covenant, and the *Jerusalem* which was to come, that is, the Christian Church. As *Sarah* and *Isaac* were Free, so also Christians freely obey God, and are not tied to any ser-



vil Rites: As *Isaac* only was *Abraham's* Heir, so none but Christians shall obtain that heavenly Inheritance which *Abraham* by his Faith obtained. Chapter V.

If the *Jews* thought their reasoning against the *Arabians* to be cogent, there was no reason why they should reject the Christian Allegory. And this I doubt not made *St. Paul* here use an allegorical way of reasoning, which he otherwise would not have done.

## C H A P. V.

Verf. 6. I. **S**EEING our Author has thought fit to put together *Note b.* in this place all he had to observe about the word *ἐνεργεῖται*, I shall examine all that he says; for there are some things in it which I cannot assent to. I grant the Verb *ἐνεργεῖται* may, according to the Analogy of Grammar, be taken as well in a *Passive* as an *Active* sense, as the matter requires; but I do not think it is so used in all the places here alledged. In *Rom. vii. 5.* *ἐνεργεῖτο* signifies *actively*, and the whole passage is rightly rendred, *the affections of Sins which were by the Law, wrought in our Members, not were consummated or perfected in them*; for *ἐνεργεῖν* has never that signification, nor do the places alledged out of the Apostle *James*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus* prove it, as we shall presently see. The second place is *2 Cor. i. 6.* which may receive indeed a *Passive* signification, if we read *σωθείας ἢ ἐνεργουμένης*, with the *Vulgar* Interpreter and other Copies. And the same may be said of *2 Cor. iv. 12.* But in *Ephes. iii. 20.* and *Col. i. 29.* the Participle *ἐνεργουμένη* must in all reason be understood *actively*, for the discourse there is about the power of God which is not wrought but works. In *1 Thess. ii. 13.* *ἐνεργεῖται* cannot be rendred *obtains its end*, by any who understand Greek, or consider carefully what they say. But in *2 Thess. ii. 7.* it may well enough be interpreted in a *Passive* sense. In this place *δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη* is best of all rendred *working by Love*, that is, which performs works of Love.

II. Tho *St. James* says that *ἡ ἐξ ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη* Faith was made perfect by Works, it does not follow that *ἐνεργουμένη* signifies all one with *τελειωμένη* made perfect; for why may not *St. James* say something different from that which is said by *St. Paul*? How did *Dr. Hammond* know that *St. James* performs the part of *St. Paul's* Interpreter? Besides, granting these two Passages in both the Apostles to be parallel, it will not thence follow that exactly the same thing is said in both; so that the Verb made use of by *St. Paul*, may grammatically be interpreted by

that which is used by St. James. Nor will the Etymology or perpetual use of the word ἐνεργημεν suffer it to be rendred, *made perfect*.

III. The place referred to in Clemens Alexandrinus is in *Strom. Lib. iv. Pag. 518, & 519. Ed. Paris. & Colon.* but is not here pertinently alledged, as will appear by his words, which I shall therefore set down entire. He is speaking in praise of Love, out of Clemens Romanus, and among other things says thus: ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐτελειώθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ: *in Love have all the Elect of God been made perfect.* And a little after: οἱ ἐν ἀγάπῃ τελειωθέντες καὶ πρὸς τὸ Θεοῦ χάριν, ἔχουσι χάριν δούλων: *those who are perfected in Love, according to the Grace of God, obtain the place of Pious Men.* And underneath he says: ἀγάπη γένετο μὴ μοιχεύσαι καὶ τὸ μὴ ἐπιθυμῆσαι τὸ τῷ πλησίον τελειῶται, φόβῳ πρότερον κεκωλυμένον· τὸ αὐτὸ γένετον διαφορὰν ἔχει, ἢ διὰ φόβον γινόμενον, ἢ διὰ ἀγάπην τελειῶν, καὶ ἢτοι διὰ πίστεως, ἢ καὶ γνωστικῶς ἐνεργούμενον: *Love therefore makes us not to commit Adultery, and not to covet what is our Neighbours, which before we were restrained from by fear. So that there is a difference in the same action, as it is either done out of Fear, or wrought in Love; or as it is performed only out of Faith, or also from Knowledg. In this place τελειῶν is no more than ποιῶν done or wrought, as its synonymous words ἐνεργούμενον & γινόμενον, and the thing it self shew. So that it cannot hence be inferred that ἐνεργεῖσθαι is the same with to be consummated or made perfect, in French être perfectionné. Besides, τελειοθεῖς δι' ἀγάπης before, signifies another thing, where the Discourse is about Persons, not about Actions.*

IV. In James v. 16. δέησις ἐνεργημένη seems to signify *an earnest Prayer.* Of the word ἐνεργημένη, being taken in a good sense, add to what the Doctor says, the observations of Budæus and Henr. Stephanus, who have done the World a great deal of Service in the pains they have taken about the Greek Language.

V. The words of Hesychius are much worse corrupted by our Author, than they are in the common Editions. If he had looked into Phavorinus, perhaps he would have understood how they were to be corrected. That Grammarian has out of Hesychius, Ἐνεργεῖ, ἔτοιμοι πρὸς ἐργασίαν, ἢ ἐνεργημένοι, αἱ μὴ ἀργαί, ἀπακκοιμένοι, τελειμένοι. But it must be read: ΕΝΕΡΓΟΙ, ἔτοιμοι πρὸς ἐργασίαν, ἢ ἐνεργημένοι, *prepared to work, or working.* ΕΝΕΡΓΟΤΜΕΝΑΙ, αἱ μὴ ἀργαί, ἀπακκοιμένοι, τελειμένοι, *not vain, heard, perfected, or fulfilled, viz. εὐχαί, Prayers; Hesychius having a respect to the forementioned Passage in the Apostle James. So that it's true there was here a void space, or Lacuna, but different from what Dr. Hammond thought. The Scribe, whocver he was, omitted the word ἐνεργημένοι because of the next following, which differs only from*



from that, in having the Letter A instead of O. Such Omissions are frequent in the Writings of the Antients, proceeding from the same Cause, as I have shewn in my *Ars Critica*, Part 3. Sect. i. Cap. 5. and it is needless to add any thing more about this particular corruption in *Hesychius*.

Verf. 12. Note c. ὄφελον signifying *utinam*, I wish, is always joined with an *Infinitive*, *Optative* or *Subjunctive* Mood or Preterperfect Tense, never with a Future, nor is the Particle *ἤ* ever interposed. See *Thomas Magister* on that Particle. And therefore I should understand ὄφελον here as if it were ὄφειλον, if not also read it so, to this sense: *They ought to have been cut off, and shall actually be cut off, when I come among you, that trouble you; and so it will be an Elliptical phrase, for this entire one: ὄφειλον ἀποκόπτεσθαι, ἢ ὄντως ἀποκόψονται; Such another as that in these Verses of Virgil in Catalectis, after the Verb debuit:*

————— ——— *quæ maxima deterrendi*  
*Debit, audendi maxima causa fuit.*

Where out of what follows we must supply, *causa esse*, as here ἀποκόπτεσθαι. Or else we must understand *ζημίαν, δίκην, Loss or Punishment*, which often use to be understood after the Verb ὄφελον; whence it comes to pass that ὄφελον is taken simply for *he was condemned*, because condemned Persons ought to suffer *Loss or Punishment*. As in *Dionysius Halicarnassensis* Lib. ix. Ant. Rom. pag. 585. speaking of *Menenius* who was accused by the Tribunes of the People: *δικάζοντες ἅς δημοτικῆ ἄχλα κτ' οὐλας, ἢ παρ' ὀλίγας φήρες, ὄφειλε: the People giving Sentence by Tribes, by no small number of Votes, he was condemned.* It is all one which of these ways we interpret the word ὄφελον. It might be confounded with ὄφειλον, of which it is really made, by taking away the augment, unless it be thought rather to come from ὀφέλλω, which often signifies the same, with ὀφείλω; or else the Transcribers might easily change ὄφειλον into ὄφελον. St. *Jerom's* interpretation of this place, which *Grotius* follows, is intolerable, *utinam abscindatur, ipsum membrum genitale*. Such an imprecation would have been fitter for a lewd Buffoon than for St. *Paul*. And Dr. *Hammond's* last conjecture lessens the Apostle another way, because it represents him as dissident of his Authority among the *Galatians*, notwithstanding it was supported by so many Miracles; which cannot reasonably be thought. Besides, as I before said, they are both contrary to the Rules of Grammar.

Verf. 14. Πᾶς νόμος.] That is, all in the Law that relates to our Neighbour; against which part of it those who offended their Neighbour

Chapter VI. bour by their Liberty in not observing the Law, might sin, tho' not against God.

Verf. 20. *Note d.* I. Tho' *Simon* and *Menander* were Magicians, it does not follow that *they* are here referred to; for there might be other Impostors besides them. Perhaps too *φαρμακείας* may here signify *Sorceries* or *Witchcrafts*, rather than *Magical Arts* properly so called.

II. The place in *Eusebius*, or rather in *Irenæus*, was not sufficiently understood by our Author, as appears by his making *ἀόρατοι αἰῶνες* to be the same with the *ἀγγελοι κοσμοποιοι*, which are to be distinguished. For *Menander* would have had it believed that he was *ἐπὶ τῆ ᾧ ἀνθρώπων ἐρωθέν· πρὸθεν Ἰξ ἀοράτων αἰώνων ἀπεσταλμένῳ σωτηρίᾳ: sent from some superior place and invisible Æones for Mens. Salvation*, to overcome the *Ἄγγελοι κοσμοποιοι*.

## C H A P. VI.

Verf. 1. *Note a.* OUR Author seems here to suppose that none were privileged with extraordinary Gifts, but the Officers or Governours of the Church, otherwise there is no reason why *they* should be called *Spiritual* rather than others. For as to the *Duty* here spoken of by the Apostle, it may belong to any Christian, who ought to endeavour by Admonition to reduce his wandering Brother into the right way, and that by a gentle way of Admonition, or in the Spirit of Meekness. See *Rom. xv. 1.*

Verf. 2. *Τὰ βάρη.*] I don't believe that the Apostle here alludes to a *Building*, as *Dr. Hammond* thinks in his Paraphrase, but to Men travelling together *loaded*, of which those who have the lightest Burden, help such as are overcharged, by taking from them part of their Load. By *Burdens* here are meant those Difficulties and Temptations which beset Christians in this World, and endanger their falling into Sin. And so we are said to *bear one anothers Burdens*, when we mutually assist each other in those difficulties, to prevent our being surprized by them into Sin: See *Mat. xx. 12.* where *βάρη ἡμέρας βασάσαι*, signifies to have laboured all the day.

Verf. 3. *Εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι.*] I do not see why this may not be meant of any proud conceited Persons, who despise their Neighbour, and will not vouchsafe to assist him; that it should be necessary to recur to the *Gnosticks*, as our Author does in his Paraphrase.

Verf. 12. *Μόνον ἵνα τῷ σαυρῶ τῆ Χεῖρα δώκωνται.*] *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond* would have *St. Paul* here to speak of a Persecution that was to be feared from the *Jews*, in which I cannot agree with them for the reasons



reasons alledged at the end of the *Premonition* to this *Epistle*. All the danger was from the *Romans*, whom they needed not to fear if they declared themselves to be circumcised, because the *Jewish* Religion was tolerated by the *Romans*; and for that reason those here spoken of strove to impose the Mosaical Yoke, which they themselves bore, upon the uncircumcised *Gentiles*, to save them, together with themselves, from the Roman Persecution. Chapter VI.

Verf. 13. Οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι.] These words make it highly probable that the Persons here spoken of were circumcised; otherwise they would not agree to this place. For I cannot see with what face or prospect any number of Men could attempt to force others to become circumcised, if they themselves had not received Circumcision. It is very unlikely that the Heathen Magistrates and *Jews* would suffer themselves to be so imposed upon, as to take uncircumcised Persons for *Jews*; nor could their persuasions have any influence upon the *Gentiles*, if they did not observe themselves what they exacted from others.

Ibid. "ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέσῃ σαρκὶ χαυρήσωνται.] That they may boast of their bringing you to submit to Circumcision, because they are *Jews*, and so would be hugely pleased to see all the *Gentiles* subject to their Laws. The phrase ἐν σαρκὶ is all one with ἐν σαρκικῇ περιτομῇ, *in fleshly Circumcision*. I am not of our Author's Opinion, that the Apostle here speaks of the *Gnosticks*.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to the *Ephesians*.


**A**T the end of the *Præmon.*] This Epistle is with more probability referred by Dr. *Pearson* to the Year of *Christ* *Ixii.* or the ninth of *Nero.* The same learned Man proves that what our Author mentions in this Premonition, about *Timothy's* being left at *Ephesus*, happened in the Year of *Christ* *Ixiv.* Consult himself.

Instead of the single Sect of the *Gnosticks*, which our Author thinks *St. Paul* opposes in this Epistle, *Grotius* with much more reason supposes that the Apostle inveighs against the *Heathens* and *Jews.* For it is certain there were *Jews* and *Heathen* Philosophers almost every where at that time, but it is not so clear that the followers of *Simon* were dispersed in all places.

C H A P. I.

Verf. 4. **W**HAT is here said by our learned Author is true, but  
 Note a. the thing must be proved a little more *Grammatically.*  
*To choose* properly is out of many things proposed to us to prefer one thing before the rest, which we may make use of to a certain end, rather than any other. Upon which follows the execution of that preference, whereby we do what we had before purposed, and which is also sometimes called *choosing.* In this latter sense God did not choose us *before the foundation of the World;* but in the former only, wherein he *purposed* to call those Nations whom he afterwards called actually to the knowledg of the Gospel, by *Christ Jesus.* And so ἐξελέξατε ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀντιᾷ πρὸς καταβολῆς κόσμου, is all one as if *St. Paul* had said: before the World was made he preferred us before other People, as those whom he intended by *Christ* and his Apostles (that being very fitly attributed to *Christ*, which is done by his Apostles in his



his Name) to call, &c. That ἐν Χριστῷ is the same with διὰ Χριστοῦ ap- Chapter  
 pears by the Verse following; and nothing is more common in these II.  
 Books than that Hebraism of *in* for *by*. See *Chap.* ii. 14, 15. and  
 iii. 6. 

Hence the execution of that preference is sometimes signified by the same word as the Decree it self: As we may see by *Clemens Romanus* in *Epist.* i. to the *Corinthians*, chap. 1. Οὗτῳ ὁ μακαρισμὸς ἐγένετο ὅτι τὰς ἐκλελεγμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν: *This blessedness came upon those that were chosen by God through Jesus Christ our Lord.* And the same Writer in *Chap.* lvii. saith: Οὐ πανεπόπτης Θεὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν πνευματικῶν καὶ κυρίου πάσης σαρκός, ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ λαὸν ἁγίον: *God the overseer of all things, and sovereign of Spirits, and Lord of all Flesh, who has chosen Jesus Christ, and us by him, for a peculiar People.*

## C H A P. II.

Verf. 3. **E**N ὅις καὶ ἡμεῖς.] I cannot see why *Dr. Hammond* chose rather here to follow other Interpreters than *Grotius*, who with good reason thought that *St. Paul* in this place speaks of the *Jews*; especially seeing he himself thought that the same word ought to be so taken in *Chap.* i. 11. of this *Epistle*, as appears by his *Paraphrase*. For *St. Paul* did not write this *Epistle* in the name of the *Church of Rome*; so that when he says ἡμεῖς, he should be understood to speak of the *Christians* who dwelt in that *City*. And besides, nothing could be said more flat in the name of the *Roman Gentiles* than, *among whom also we all had our Conversation*, &c. seeing every body knew that the *Romans* had lived in the same *Vices* with other *Heathens*, yea had been worse it may be than their *Neighbours*, as the *Inhabitants* of great *Cities* are generally most devoted to the *Vices* of the *Age*. But that might very fitly be said of the *Jews*, whom *St. Paul* would otherwise have seemed to distinguish from other *Nations*, as to the course of their *Lives*; in which as he would not have declared the truth, so he might have offended the *Gentiles*. And for this reason he says here, *we all*, that is, *Jews* as well as *Gentiles*.

*Ibid.* Τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς.] The meaning of this expression I have shewn at large in my *Ars Critica* Part 2. Sect. i. cap. 7. to be no more than this; that the *Jews* were a *People* of as wicked *Dispositions*, and deserved as much the *Wrath* of *God* as other *Nations*.

Verf. 10. Αὐτῷ γὰρ ἐσμεν ποίημα, κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὅτι ἔργα ἀγαθῶν, εἰς ὀργητοῖμασθαι ὁ Θεός, ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περὶπατήσομεν.] I have set down the whole

Chapter II. Verse to shew that the sense of the last words is different from what is vulgarly thought. They render  $\delta\iota\varsigma \alpha\epsilon\theta\eta\tau\omicron\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$ , by *quæ præparavit, which he hath prepared*, and I do not deny but that according to the Greek Construction it may be so rendred; but the thing it self, and the Phrase, ought to have admonished Interpreters that  $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  was rather to be understood, and that it should be rendred *for which he hath prepared us or made us fit*. The foregoing words, in which Christians are called *God's workmanship*, and said to be *created by Christ*, shew that *St. Paul* speaks of a change made in Men, who of bad and indisposed to good Works, were made good and fit for the exercise of Christian Vertues. And therefore the Verb  $\alpha\epsilon\theta\eta\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$  should have been referred to *them*. It's certain  $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu \delta\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota} \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ , is the same with  $\alpha\epsilon\theta\eta\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ .

There can scarce be a harsher Phrase, and more destitute of examples than this, *to prepare good Works that Men might walk in them*. But Men themselves are frequently said  $\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  &  $\alpha\epsilon\theta\eta\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ . So in *Rom. ix. 23.* where *St. Paul* speaks of a like matter, God is said to *make known the riches of his Glory on the vessels of Mercy, which he had before prepared, & αεθητοιμασεν, to Glory; whom he also hath called, not only us of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles*. God is here said  $\alpha\epsilon\theta\eta\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota$  to have prepared us to good Works, because the knowledg and belief of the Gospel has that influence upon us as to fit us for the performance of vertuous Actions. So in the Book of the Son of *Sirach* Chap. ii. 1. all that intend to serve God are exhorted  $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu \epsilon\iota\varsigma \pi\epsilon\iota\theta\epsilon\sigma\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$  to *prepare their Souls for Temptation*. See *vers. 18.* of the same Chapter, and *Chap. xvii. 25.*

*Vers. 14. Note a.* The place in *Ecclesiasticus* is nothing to this business, which perhaps our Author did not look into, in the Book it self, because he quotes it wrong out of *Chap. xix. 29.* whereas it is in *Chap. xxix. 30.* and  $\pi\epsilon\theta\acute{\omega}\pi\epsilon\nu \delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\upsilon\varsigma$  signifies *an honorable Man*, and the discourse there is about another thing. Nor was the stranger commanded to go out of the Sanctuary of *Israel*, but forbidden to enter into it.

*Vers. 15. Εν εαυτη]* Here our Author tells us in the Margin that the *Kings Manuscript* reads  $\epsilon\nu \alpha\nu\tau\eta$ , which he renders *together*; but to express that, *St. Paul* should have said  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\grave{\alpha} \alpha\nu\tau\eta\nu$ .

*Vers. 19. Note b.* It is truly observed by *Dr. Hammond* that  $\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$  here refers to the Jews, but there was no necessity of recurring to *Procopius* for the reason of their being so called. The Jews are stiled קדושים *Saints*, because they were consecrated to the true God, and not because their Forefathers were holy in their Lives. See *Exod. xix. 6.* and my Notes on that place.



## C H A P. III.

Verf. 5. **O**'EN ἐπέγεις γενεαῖς ἐκ ἀγνωσίας τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, &c.] The same thing which is here said *in other Ages not to have been made known to the Sons of Men*, is said in *vers. 10.* to have been unknown also to *Angels*. Which being so, I confess I do not well understand how those who are neither Prophets nor Angels, can find out so many places in the Prophets, in which the calling of the *Gentiles* is manifestly and directly foretold. For certainly if it was of old revealed to the Prophets, they understood it; for that which is not understood cannot be thought revealed. And if it could have been gathered from the literal sense of any Prophecies, the Angels might have understood it by those Prophecies. But the event, you will say, which is the best Interpreter of Prophecies, has unfolded the sense of them. But I demand whether such an event can be easily supposed to be respected in Prophecies, which are so obscure, that neither Men nor Angels could before understand them to contain any such sense? If that can be supposed, I do not see what event may not be found in them. But, you will say again, the Apostles, and so the Angels, came to know that they had a respect to such an event by divine Revelation. But, as I said before, that cannot be called a Revelation which no body understands, and therefore it was of no use to the Prophets: See what has been alledged out of the learned *H. Dodwell* on *Mat. ii. 2.* From hence all that I here infer is, that we ought not presently to condemn those who look for *other* events, which happen'd before *Christ* in the ancient Prophecies, of which number the great *Grotius* must be reckon'd the chief: otherwise this matter would deserve to be more exactly discussed.

## C H A P. IV.

Verf. 8. **A**ιχμαλώτευσεν αιχμαλωσίαν.] It is a conjecture of a Friend of mine, that by Captivity here is meant the dead bodies of Saints, which were held captive by Death, but were raised with Christ at his Resurrection, and ascended with him into Heaven, *Mat. xxvii.* And accordingly he thought that *St. Paul* says, *Christ descended into the lower parts of the Earth*, because he descended into the Grave, that he might bring them out from thence. And there is nothing in the thing it self, nor in the words repugnant to this Interpretation.

Chapter  
IV.


Ibid. Note a. I. *Marcus Aurelius* gave nothing to the common People of *Rome* in the time of Triumph, nor any thing of his own accord. The story is thus related by *Xiphilinus* out of *Dio*: Πρὸς τὸ δῆμον διαλεγόμενος, ἐπιδὼν μέταξυ λέγειν αὐτῷ τὰ τε ἄλλα, καὶ ὅτι πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ἀποδεδυμικῶς ἦν, ἀνεβόησαν, ὀκτώ· καὶ τῆτο καὶ ταῖς χερσίν, ἵνα δὴ καὶ χρυσῆς πσέτες εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον λάβωσι, προσενεδείξαντο· διεμείλασε, καὶ ἔφη καὶ αὐτὸς, ὀκτώ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνὰ δικαιοσύνης δευχημὰς αὐτοῖς κατένειμεν: *As he was making a speech to the People, and saying among other things that he had been abroad many Years, they cryed out, Eight; and this they signified also with their Hands, that they might receive so many pieces of Gold. Upon which he smiled, and said himself also Eight; and afterwards distributed among them two hundred Drachms.* It had been better therefore to have instanced in some other Triumph, which might easily have been done: See what is said by *Suetonius* about the Gifts of *Julius Cæsar* upon that occasion, in *Chap. xxxviii.* of his Life.

II. What our Author says here about the signification of the Verb *יָקַח*, he owes to Mr. *Pocock*; whose conjecture that is, in *Porta Mosis* Cap. ii. But when that Verb signifies to give, there follows a Dative case, because to receive for any one is to receive that we may give it to him: See *Exod. xviii. 12.* and *xxv. 2.* But the Hebrew here has *אָדָם* in *Man*; which has made learned Men conjecture, and not without reason, that *St. Paul* read *אָדָם* *laadam, to Man.*

Verf. 14. Note c. Seeing *κύβη* properly signifies a square Body, and secondarily a Dye because of its figure; and seeing Impostours made use of Dice or Lots for divination, the word *κυβεία* here would not be ill rendred *sortilegium, a Lottery or divination by Lots.* And this is what was meant by *Irenæus*, in the place alledged by the Doctor; for *μαγικὴ κυβεία* is *magical divination by Lots, not deceitful Artifices, such as are used by Conjurers.* And tho the word *πανουργία* here follows, it is not therefore consequent that *κυβεία* signifies the same with that, but only that they were often joined together. Conjectures about the meaning of words which are grounded neither upon their Etymology, nor their proper signification, nor use, are not to be much regarded, nothing being more uncertain.

Verf. 16. Note e. I confess the Apostles words in this place are somewhat dark and intricate, but yet they did not need such a laborious explication as this, whereby tho the substance of the matter be made clearer, yet the particulars are more obscured. The Doctor, who never minded propriety of words in his Stile, or knew what it was to carry on one design with the same simple thred of Discourse, confounds here every thing with his forced and perplexed reasonings, and has no regard at all to the use of words. I. His



I. His first question is altogether unnecessary and impertinent in this Chapter place, for St. Paul says nothing here about the Heart; nor is there any Metaphor taken from the Heart in his words. So that in explaining this Verse there can be no room for any enquiry about the Heart: tho the Heart be as it were the workhouse of the Blood, in which the vital Moisture is temper'd, and whence it is spread by a reciprocal flowing through the whole Body, St. Paul has no reference at all to that, but to the *effluvia* of the Brain, from which proceed Spirits, that help the motion of the Blood, and moisten the whole Body; and so the Body, which would otherwise wither and decay, is made to encrease. IV. 

II. The words *διὰ πέντης ἀφ᾽ ἧς ἐπιχρηστίαις*, must not be joined with those immediately going before, but with the Verb *ποιεῖται*, so as to signify those Conduits or Passages by which the Body receives Spirits from the Brain, thus: *from which (Head) the whole Body being fitly compacted and joined together, according to the working or efficacy of the Head in proportion to every part, maketh encrease of the Body, i. e. is encreased by receiving Spirits from the Brain, through the joints of supply, or by which the Spirits are conveyed for the supply of the whole Body.* It's certain the Body cannot be said to be *συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβάζομενον* with Nerves, Arteries, and Veins; but rather with Muscles, Tendons, and Bones. But St. Paul says nothing of these, but only that the Body being fitly compacted and joined together, receiveth *effluvia* from its Head, by Conduits belonging to the whole Body; which therefore it would not receive if the Members were put out of Joint, or divided from one another, because those *effluvia* pass through the Joints or Ligaments of the Body. So that *ἀφ᾽ αἶ & σύνδεσμοι* are the *Joints* and *Ligatures* of the Members properly so called, through which the Nerves pass, which convey the Spirits proceeding from the Brain to all the parts of the Body.

III. The place in the *Colossians* is wrested by our Author while he supposes it to be clear and undoubted that St. Paul has a respect there to Veins and Arteries, of which perhaps he had not the least thought. He speaks thus, after making mention of the Head: *from which all the Body, διὰ τῶν ἀφ᾽ ἧς καὶ συνδέσμων, ἐπιχρηστίαις καὶ συμβιβάζομενον, increases with the increase of God.* Where by *ἀφ᾽ ἧς καὶ συνδέσμων* the Apostle means the *Joints* and *Ligaments* of the Body, that is, the Muscles, Tendons and Gristles, which are in those places where the Members are joined together, to perform as it were two Offices; *first*, to receive the Conduits whereby the *effluvia* which proceed out of the Brain descend into the Body: *secondly*, to cement or knit together all the Members with one another. So that the Apostles meaning is this: From which: Head

Chapter Head the whole. Body receives a divine Increase, by the Joints and  
 IV. Ligaments whereby those Spirits are supplied, and by which the  
 Members are joined together as by so many strong Bands. This seems  
 to me to be clear, especially seeing every one knows that no Arteries  
 descend from the Brain, but only Veins, by which the Blood is carried  
 back to the Heart and Nerves, which are dispersed through the  
 whole Body.

IV. I cannot tell what made our Author think that the Genitive  
*ἐπιχειρήσιος* was in the place of *συνδέσμων*, the only signification of that  
 being, that the Joints are the ways by which the *ἐπιχειρήσιος* is made: as  
 the Joints of Tubes which receive Water flowing into them out of  
 some large Fountain, and convey it wheresoever they are directed,  
 are the Joints of the *ἐπιχειρήσιος* of that Water.

V. Κατ' ἐνέργειαν must not be referred to the Conduits, through which  
 the *effluvia* that proceed out of the Head do pass, which Conduits  
*ἐδὲν ἐνεργεῖσι operate nothing*, but to the Head it self, from which, to use  
 the words of *Virgil* with a little alteration,

————— *infusa per artus*  
*Vis agit mollem, & toto se corpore miscet.*

So *St. Paul*, who was none of the extreme Members in the Body or  
 Church of *Christ*, says that he laboured, striving according to his work-  
 ing, κατ' ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ, which he worked in him, in *Coloss.* i. 29. See also  
*Chap.* i. 19. and iii. 7. of this Epistle.

VI. Σῶμα ποιεῖται ἀύξισιν τῶ σώματι, is a noted *Hebraism*, in which  
*σώματι* is repeated for ἐαυτοῦ, as *Grotius* observes. What is said by our  
 Author is taken from the use of the *Rabbins*.

Verf. 19. Note f. I. Who this *Pausanias* is I cannot tell, but per-  
 haps *Dr. Hammond* wrote *Phavorinus*, whom he often cites, and who  
 has, ἀπαληθίσαντος ἀντὶ τῶ πυσσαμένους ἀλγείν, & ἀπαλγόντας ὃ αὐτὸς ἔπε τῶ πολλῶ  
 ῥίγυς ἐπερρώνησον. To which places our Author refers, which *Suidas* also  
 has out of *Thucydides* and *Polybius*.

II. But wheresoever *Dr. Hammond* had this, it is certainly false,  
 for ἀλγέω never signifies *algere* in Latin, to be cold, nor ἀλγῶ *algor* cold,  
 tho they resemble one another in sound. ἀπαλγέω is to lose ones feeling,  
 to be no longer sensible of any Pain, whatever be the cause of it. I con-  
 fess it proceeds sometimes from extremity of Cold, when the parts  
 of the Body being congealed with the sharpness of Air or the like,  
 cease to feel any Pain; but ἀπαλγέω does not therefore signify to cease  
 to feel cold, but any sort of Pain. So in *Hesychius*: ἀπαληθιότες, μικρότεροι  
 δέλοντες



δέλυντες πονεῖν, ἀναισθητοὶ γινόμενοι, ἀποκαμύοντες, those that will no longer work, Chapter  
that are become insensible, that are tired. Ἀπληγικῶς, ἀναισθητός, ὡδὴ πὸ ἄλγος, IV.  
insensible, one that is past pain. Besides, εἰλέω always has a Passive sig-  
nification, and never an Active. The thing is manifest and needs no  
proof, yet this is not the first time of our Author's mistaking the sense  
of this word. See Note on *Rom.* i. 29.

Verf. 26. Note h. I. I confess I do not see any allusion in the words  
of the Apostle to those three kinds of angry Persons mention'd here  
by our Author out of *Aristotle*. He teaches us that all excessive  
Anger is to be avoided, but he does not seem to refer to the distincti-  
on made by that Philosopher between the several degrees of Anger;  
at least there is no sign of it in his words. Besides, why did not the  
*Doctor* say that *St. Paul* had a respect to four sorts of angry Persons,  
seeing so many sorts are reckon'd up by *Aristotle*, viz. ὀργίλοι, ἀμετρολόγοι,  
πικροὶ & χυλεποὶ? The reason of that, I suppose, was because he did not  
look into *Aristotle* himself, but cited his words upon trust; for what  
he alledges out of him is not in either of those places which he refers  
to, but in *Lib.* 4. *Cap.* 11. If we reason out of *Aristotle*, *St. Paul* here  
will not condemn the ὀργίλοι, that is, those who tho they are soon an-  
gry, soon forgive, but the excessive anger of other Persons.

II. The place referred to in the *Psalms* is in *Psal.* iv. 4. not in ii. 4.  
but our Author could not infer any thing from thence, because the  
Hebrew word רִגְזוֹן *rigzou*, ought rather to be rendred *fear*, tho the  
*Septuagint*, whom *St. Paul* follows out of Custom, translate it other-  
wise.

III. The Passage alledged out of *Plutarch* is much more pertinent  
than that out of *Aristotle*. And it is pag. 488. *Ed. Wecheliana*.

Verf. 30. Note k. I. By *the Holy Spirit*, here seems to be meant the  
Gifts of the Holy Ghost conferred by God on the *Ephesians*, whereby  
they were enabled to work Miracles; for by them they were sealed,  
as sufficiently appears from what is said by *Dr. Hammond*. But be-  
cause those Gifts were bestowed on the *Ephesians* by a Person, there-  
fore they are forbidden here to grieve them, that is, to do any thing  
which might displease the Person from whom those Gifts came, or pro-  
voke him to withdraw them. But *St. Paul* seems principally to refer to  
the Gift of Prophecy, which lewd Discourse corrupted and rendered  
useless. For it appears by other places, that those who had received  
that Gift were obliged to preserve it by care and holiness of Life,  
which if they neglected to do, it was taken away from them. See  
*1 Tim.* iv. 14.

\*

II. Our

Chapter II. Our Author confounds things which ought to be distinguished ;  
 IV. for *Christ* is not said to have been sealed by the Father, just in the same sense as the *Ephesians* and others, who had received the Gifts of the Spirit. God is said to have sealed *Christ* by way of Allusion, not to any ordinary Servants, but to the Ambassadors of Kings ; who are then first believed when they produce their Masters Letters marked with their Seal. Labour not, saith *Christ* in *John* vi. 27. for the Meat which perisheth, but for that Meat which endureth unto everlasting Life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you ; for him hath God the Father sealed, ἐσφραγίσθη ἔξει that is, hath sent with Power and Instructions, as you may see by his Miracles, which are as the Seal of God, for which ye ought to believe me. But the *Ephesians* are said to be sealed to the day of Redemption, by a Metaphor taken from Merchandizes or Slaves, which the buyer did not take away with him as soon as he had bought them. See my Note on 2 *Cor.* i. 22.

III. I cannot see to what purpose our Author, tho it is but by the way, sets down the Etymology of the word *servi* from *servando*, when he is explaining an Author who wrote in Greek, and could not have any respect to that Latin word.

IV. Our Author's interpretation of the words, to grieve the Holy Spirit, and to the day of Redemption, is perfectly forced. The meaning of the Apostle is this : " Ye that have received Gifts from the Holy Spirit, do not either by neglecting them or despising them grieve him, and provoke him to take away from you those things which he has given you, to distinguish you from other Men even in this World ; till that day comes, in which in the view of Men and Angels, he will distinguish you from all the rest of *Adam's* Posterity. See my Note on *Rom.* viii. 21.

Verf. 31. Πᾶσα πικρία, καὶ θυμὸς, καὶ ὀργὴ, καὶ κενοδοξία, καὶ βλασφημία.] By these words Dr. *Hammond* might have discerned that *St. Paul* had no reference, when he wrote this, to *Aristotle's* distinction between the several degrees of Anger, because he does not reduce them to the Order and Notions of that Philosopher : Which it may not be unuseful to shew briefly, out of *Aristotle* himself, by alledging his words. For by this alone it will appear that Interpreters ought to omit all unnecessary Niceties, in explaining the rude or idiotick Stile (as *St. Paul* himself calls it) of this Holy Apostle. That Philosopher therefore in *Mar.* Lib. 4. c. ii. setting down the several degrees of Anger, and proceeding from those who are least vitious in that kind, to those who are tainted with the highest degree of this Vice, defines ὀργίλος to be so called ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς : εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὀργίλοι πικρίας αἰσθίζονται, καὶ οἷς ἐδεί, καὶ ἐφ' οἷς



ὡς δὲ, καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δὲ· παύονται ἢ ταχέως· ὃ καὶ βέλτιστον ἔχουσιν: They that are called ὀργίλοι are such as are soon angry, and with those that they ought not, and for those things which they ought not, and more than they ought. But their Anger is soon over, and this is their best property. And a little after he says: ὑπερβολῆ δὲ εἰσιν οἱ ἀκροχόλοι ὄξεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ὀργίλοι, καὶ ἐπὶ παντί· ὅθεν καὶ τὸ ἔνομα: The ἀκροχόλοι are those that are beyond measure fierce and angry at every thing, and for every thing, which is the reason of their being so called. After which he proceeds to the third sort, and saith: οἱ ἢ περὶ δυσδιέλυται καὶ πλὴν χρόνον ὀργίζονται, κατέχευσι γὰρ τὸ θυμὸν· παῦλα ἢ γίνεται ὅταν ἀνταποδιδῶσιν· ἢ γὰρ πικρεία παύει τὴν ὀργήν, ἡδονὴν ἀντὶ τῆς λύπης ἐμποιοῦσα· τέτε ἢ μὴ γινόμενα, τὸ βάρῃ ἔχουσιν, διὰ γὰρ τὸ μὴ ὀφρανεῖς εἶναι, ἔδὲ συμπύθη αὐτὲς ὑδαίς· ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ πέλει τιμὴ ὀργὴν χρόνον δὲ· εἰσὶ δὲ τοῖσδε αὐτοῖς ὀχλιώτατοι, καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς φίλοις: But the περὶ are (those that) are hardly reconciled and are angry a great while; for they keep in their Anger, and it ceases when they have revenged themselves. For revenge extinguishes anger, by causing Pleasure where before was Grief. But when this is not done they are pressed with (an inward) weight; for because they do not manifest their Anger, no one endeavours to appease them. And for a Man to digest his Anger within himself, requires time. Now such Men as these, as they are a great torment to themselves, so they are most of all to their Friends. Lastly, those who are vicious in the highest degree in this kind, he describes thus: χαλεπὸς δὲ λέγομεν τὸς ἐφ' οἷς τε μὴ δὲ καλέπινοντας, καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δὲ, καὶ πλείω χρόνον, καὶ μὴ διαλλαττομένους ἀνεπιμωρίας, ἢ κολάσεως: We call those χαλεποὶ who are angry both for those things which they ought not, and more and longer than they ought, and are never appeased without Revenge or Punishment. By these descriptions it sufficiently appears that St. Paul did not take the several words whereby he describes Anger in this place, from the use of Philosophers, or dispose them in the same order; nor is that his Custom, but to take mostly what he says from vulgar use, and dispose it without any Philosophical or Rhetorical Artifice.

## C H A P. V.

Verf. 2. I. **Π**ροσφορὰ and θυσία may, I confess, be distinguished as Dr. Note a. Hammond would have them, but they are very often confounded; and προσφορὰ particularly frequently signifies all kind of Oblations, in Hebrew קרבן *Korban*, or whatever is laid upon the Altar, as Kircher's *Concordances* will inform those who are ignorant. In this place they seem to signify the same thing, because the scope of the Apostle does not oblige us to distinguish them.

II. Our Author's reasoning to this purpose from *Heb. x. 5, 6.* has no validity in it: for it is not necessary that these two words occurring in *vers. 6.* should be perfectly synonymous or answerable to those two others in *ver. 5.* Wherefore, saith that divine Writer, when he cometh into the World, he saith, *θύσαν καὶ προσφορὰν, Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldst not,* but a Body hast thou fitted me, in *ὅλοκαυτώματα καὶ ᾠφείληματιαις, whole Burnt-offerings, and for Sin thou hast had no pleasure.* If according to Dr. Hammond's reasoning, a whole Burnt-offering, *ὅλοκαύτωμα,* and a Sacrifice *θύσια* be exactly the same, an offering *προσφορὰ* and a sacrifice for Sin *ᾠφείληματιαις* will be literally the same also, which yet he would not allow. But the words of the sacred Writers must not be reduced to the rules of Rhetoricians.

Verſ. 3. Πλεονεξία.] Our Author in his Note on *Rom. i. 29.* endeavours all he can to prove that this word signifies a *desire,* not of Riches, but of *Pleasures*; tho with what success I leave the Reader to judg, by what I have written on that Annotation. This is the chief place that gives any countenance to his conjecture. And indeed there are two specious reasons which, as to this Passage of *St. Paul,* may be alledged on his behalf.

I. It is said *ἀκαθαρσία ἢ πλεονεξία, Uncleanneſs OR Covetouſneſs,* and the Particle *ἢ or* seems to join together words of the same signification. In answer to which I acknowledg that that is very frequently the use of the Particle *ἢ or*; but it is very often also a Disjunctive, and connects together words of a different sense. And when a Negation follows or goes before, it is equivalent to *nor,* as in this place; for it is all one as if *St. Paul* had said: "Let neither Fornication, nor any  
" Uncleanneſs, nor Covetouſneſs be named amongst you.

II. It may be said that the words *not be named among you,* contain a prohibition which agrees better to *Lusts,* whereof the very names are obscene, than to Covetouſneſs, or the Sins which proceed from that Vice. Which I do not deny; nay, I think *St. Paul* spake thus, merely because he had before made mention of *Fornication* and *Uncleanneſs,* to which that prohibition seems properly to belong. But it cannot hence be inferred, that *πλεονεξία* signifies a vice of the same kind with those beforemention'd, contrary to the etymology and perpetual use of the word; for it is very common for one Verb to be subjoined or prefixed to many Nouns, with all which it does not equally well agree. See my *Index* to the *Pentateuch,* on the word *Verbum.*

Verſ. 4. Note b. All that our Author here says is very much to the purpose; to which add, that Men of debauched Lives use to call their Vices by soft and gentle names. For which reason *μεγρολογία & εὐτραπιλία* might



might properly signify, in common use, not only light and rash, Chapter  
 but even obscene and filthy Discourses, such as the Jest's which we V.  
 every where meet with, especially in antient Comedies. This *Plu-*  
*tarch* has observed with relation to the *Athenians*, in the *Life of Solon*,  
 p. 86. Ἄ ἵ ἐν, saith he, οἱ νεώτεροι τῆς Ἀθηναίων λέγουσι τὰς τῶν πραγμάτων δυσχερείας  
 ὀνόμασι χρηστοῖς καὶ φιλανθρώποις ἐπικαλύπτουτας ἀσέως ἀποκοινοῦσθαι, τὰς μὲν πόρνας  
 ἑταίρας, τὰς δὲ φόβους συντάξεις, φυλακὰς δὲ τὰς φρενὰς τῶν πόλεων, οἰκῆμα δὲ τὸ δεσμο-  
 τῆριον καλεῖντας, πρῶτον Σόλωνος ἦν, ὡς ἔοικε, σόφισμα τῶν τῶν χρεῶν ἀποκοπὴν σεισάχθει-  
 αν ὀνομάσαντες: For what is said of late, that the Athenians, covering odi-  
 ous things with mild and pleasing Titles, to avoid giving offence, call Strump-  
 ets Companions, Taxing Registering, Garisons Safeguards of Cities, and a  
 Prison a House; that seems to have been first the device of Solon, who called  
 the forgiving of Debts an Acquittance. Other examples to the same  
 purpose may be had out of *Helladius Besantinous* in *Chrestomathis*. We  
 may easily conceive how such sort of Men might call their obscene  
 and filthy Discourses by the names of *μωρολογία* & *εὐτεροπλία*.

Ibid. Note c. This latter Interpretation would very well agree to  
 this place, if it were certain that *εὐχαιρία* was ever taken in the same  
 sense with τὸ δὲ χάρι, which signifies *elegancy* of Speech, as well as of o-  
 ther things. The passage cited out of *Prov. xi.* does not at all belong  
 to this matter, the Discourse there being about a beautiful, not a pious  
 Woman.

Verf. 14. Διὸ λέγει.] *Viz.* γὰρ τὴν *Scripture*, the Apostle here refer-  
 ring to the place in *Isaiab* alledged by our Author in his Paraphrase,  
 tho rather expressing its sense than citing the Prophet's own words.  
*Barnabas* in *Epist. Catholica*, particularly in cap. v. often uses the  
 same term in citing the *Scriptures* words: *Scriptum est enim*, saith he,  
*de illo, quædam ad populum Judæorum, quædam ad nos.* DICIT autem  
*sic: Vulneratus est propter iniquitates nostras, &c. Supergratulari enim*  
*debemus Domino, quia & præterita nobis ostendit & sapientes fecit, & de*  
*futuris ut non simus sine intellectu.* DICIT autem: Non injuste ten-  
 duntur retia avibus. For it is written of him, some things (relate) to the  
 People of the Jews, and some to us. And he SAITH thus: He was  
 wounded for our Transgressions, &c. For we ought to be exceeding thank-  
 ful to the Lord, because he hath both shewed us past things, and (so) made  
 us wise, and (instructed) us also in the knowledge of things Future, that we  
 might not be without understanding (as to them.) And he SAITH:  
 Not without cause are Nets spread for Birds. A great many more  
 examples to the same purpose might be alledged out of that Epistle.

Verf. 16. Note e. It being manifest from the place cited out of  
*Daniel* in the beginning of this Annotation, that the phrase *to redeem*

*the time*, signifies to delay, or put off as long as possible; that only Notion of it should have been kept to; and not things of an Affinity with it, or very distant from it mixed together, as they are here by our Author, that he might have an occasion to obtrude his *Gnosticks* upon us: See *Grotius* on this place. *St. Paul* here advises the *Ephesians* to endeavour by all lawful means to get time allowed them by the *Heathens*, and to take heed lest by their rash fervour they should bring Persecution upon themselves, especially in an evil and troublesome time, such as that was wherein he wrote this Epistle; which was towards the end of *Nero's* reign, or those black and dismal days in which that monster of a Man outdid all that ever went before him in Wickedness and Villany. The reason of the Apostle's Admonition is this, that there was a time coming wherein the Truth might be defended with less danger. And the nature of Truth is such, that if it have but time allowed it, and is not presently extinguished, tho' it lie cover'd as it were under Ashes for a while, yet afterwards in a fitter time it shines out, and makes an universal day. So that those who defend it, ought never, as long as they can avoid it, to run all adventures, or undergo the last hazard, that it may either triumph instantly over Falshood, or else unavoidably be oppressed for ever.

Now I am apt to think that this phrase had its rise from the custom of Debtors, who when payment is demanded of them, and they cannot restore the whole sum or principal due, obtain a longer time to discharge their Debt in, either by a present Fee, or by advancing the use of the Mony lent them. For this is truly *to redeem time*; whence it afterwards came to pass, that because the solution of a Debt is thus deferred, therefore to defer or delay is sometimes called *to redeem the time*. Parallel to this is the Latin phrase *moram acquirere*, which occurs in *Cicero pro Caccina* cap. ii. or Num. 6. where the Delegates, who had, after twice hearing the Cause, deferred to pass Sentence, are said *moram ad condemnandum acquisivisse*, and also to have given the Defendant a space wherein to recollect himself.

Verf. 18. *Note f.* There was no need here of the *Bacchanals* or *Gnosticks*, because there were Heathens enough in *Asia* that loved Wine, and whenever they had an opportunity drank to excess, and indulged themselves in other Lusts; whose example might have had a bad influence upon the Christians, if they did not take great heed to themselves.

Verf. 19. *Note g.* Our Author has shewn indeed here, that Songs are called by three several names; but that those were so many different kinds no one can prove, because they are often confounded, as  
appears



appears by the titles of the *Psalms*. The Greek words might also be referred to several sorts of Songs, if the most frequent use of them be respected, but those also are often put one for another. So that I should rather say that St. *Paul* here does but express the same thing in three different words. Chapter V.

Verf. 21. ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις, ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ.] That is, so complying with each other, as yet to do nothing which may displease God to gratify any one whatsoever. That this is here the signification of the Verb ὑποτάσσειν may appear by the word ἀλλήλοις, which shews that it is a mutual subjection, that is, compliance, which is here spoken of. So the Noun ὑποταγή must be understood in *Gal. ii. 5.* where St. *Paul* speaking of false Brethren saith: *To whom we did not so much as for an hour give place, ὑποταγή, by compliance.* Yet *Grotius* to explain the word ὑποτασσόμενοι here saith thus: *nempe secundum ordinem naturalem, civilem, ecclesiasticum, quæ omnia nobis servanda, propter Christum: viz. according to order, whether natural, civil, or ecclesiastical, which must all be kept for Christ's sake.* And this *Dr. Hammond* follows in his Paraphrase. But to signify *that*, it should have been said: ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ὑπερέχουσιν, or τοῖς ἐπιτασσόμενοις, or something to that purpose, and not ἀλλήλοις, which shews that it is a mutual Duty here intended.

Verf. 30. Note h. Our Author here compares together things that have no agreement with one another, for *to be of Christ's Flesh and Blood*, is not to be Christ himself, as that which is called *the Heaven and Earth* is the very Universe, but to be very intimately joined to Christ, in like manner as Kinsmen by Blood, and Man and Wife are to one another. See *Grotius* on this place, and my Notes on *Gen. ii. 34.*

Verf. 31. Καταλείψῃ ἄνθρωπος.] This is not a Precept wherein Matrimony is commanded, or its Laws enforced; but an observation of a Custom begun ever since *Adam*, and propagated to all Mankind. See my Note on *Gen. ii. 24.*

Verf. 32. Τὸ μυστήριον τῆτο μέγα ἐστίν.] I. From *vers. 23.* of this Chapter St. *Paul* compares the love which does or ought to intercede between Man and Wife, with the love of *Christ* and the Church; for which reason he mixes Precepts belonging to married Persons, with Precepts which relate to the love of the Church towards *Christ*. And therefore he subjoins *vers. 31.* in which the union of the Husband with the Wife is described, immediately and without any transition after the foregoing words, whereby he had described the union of the Church with *Christ*; not because they belong to the same Argument, but because he so mixes the thing compared, with the thing to which it is compared. If he had intended to make a perfect Comparison, he would

Chapter would first have set down that which relates to *Christ* and the Church  
 V. ἐν ὁμοίᾳ, and afterwards described the conjunction of Man and Wife  
 ἐν ἀποδόσει; but he makes use of an imperfect comparison, in which the  
 ὁμοίᾳ is hardly distinguished from the ὁμοίᾳ. His meaning may be  
 expressed in this Paraphrase. “ *Vers.* 30. For between us and *Christ*  
 “ there intercedes so near a conjunction, that we may be called his  
 “ Flesh and Bones, as it is said of a Woman with relation to her  
 “ Husband. So that as *Christ* loves his Church, as if it were his Wife  
 “ and so his own Body; 31, 32. so Husbands having left their Fathers  
 “ House for the sake of their Wives, and become as it were one Flesh  
 “ with them, should look upon it as their Duty to love their Wives as  
 “ themselves. If we carefully read *St. Paul’s* words, and consider the  
 scope of his Discourse, we shall not doubt but this is his meaning. For  
 the Apostle’s design here, at least *primarily* and *professedly*, is not to  
 teach any thing concerning *Christ*; but from the noted example of  
*Christ* to shew what conjunction and intimacy of Affection there ought  
 to be between *Man and Wife*. So that what he says of *Christ*, is said  
 but by the way, and assumed as sufficiently known.

II. This being supposed, it will be easy to perceive that the 32d  
*verse* is a *Parentthesis* inserted between words belonging to the same  
 thing, but which make nothing to the series of the Discourse. And by  
 this *Parentthesis* the intention of the Apostle is only to shew, that what  
 he had said about that intimate union of *Christ* with his Church for  
 which he suffer’d Death, was hitherto unknown to Mankind. This  
 he calls μέγα μυστήριον, as in 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. and so these words are re-  
 ferred, not to the mystical sense of the place in *Genesis*, but to the  
 thing it self; that is, to the love of *Christ* to his Church, which was  
 so great that he did not refuse to die for its sake. Away therefore  
 with that mystical sense, which is without reason sought for in the  
 words of *Moses*, as by the suggestion here of the Apostle.

III. But what shall we say then to those *Jews*, whom our Author  
 cites in his Paraphrase, as knowing that great Mystery from the  
 secret sense of the words of *Moses*? To speak what I think, they are  
 either the words of some Impostor acting the part of a *Jew*, or mis-  
 construed to a wrong sense. Our Author took this Testimony from  
*H. Grotius*, who on this place saith: Sic & Hebraei aiunt mulierem de  
 latere viri desumptam, ad significandum conjugium viri supremi, benedicti:  
 So the *Jews* also say that the *Woman* was taken out of the side of the *Man*,  
 to signify the marriage of the highest, blessed *Man*. But where are those  
*Jews* who say this? Do they with one consent speak thus in any pub-  
 lick form? Or is it some *Rabbin* who proposes his own Conjecture, or  
 the



the Tradition of the Antients? Such Citations as these, in a matter Chapter  
of no small moment, or not universally known, should be avoided by V.  
learned Men; seeing they cannot be relied on, unless it be supposed  
that a vain uncertain report may be so. But I know, if I am not  
mistaken, whence *Grotius* took this observation; to wit from *Camero*,  
who himself had it from *Sebast. Munster*, the first Author of it, in  
his Annotations on *Gen. ii. 24. Hebræi magistri*, saith he, *docent id*  
*quod Paulus docuit, &c. The Jewish Rabbins teach the same thing which is*  
*taught by St. Paul, that a Man should love his Wife as his own Body, and*  
*honour her more than his own Body, because of that signification and Mystery.*  
אדם העליון יתברך לרמון לכה ווג אדם. Of which *Mystery* *St. Paul* also  
makes mention, who teaches that we are espoused to *Christ*. He did not  
render the Hebrew words, which seem to be corrupt; but they are  
rendred by *Camero*, after premising that he took them from *Munster*,  
thus: *ad significandum conjugium viri superni, qui benedictus est; to sig-*  
*ify the marriage of the Man on High, who is blessed.* And so they are  
rendred by *Grotius*. But אדם is not *vir*, but *Homo*; besides what is  
the meaning of לכה? Should it be read לכה to thee? What can be  
the sense of these words, the most high Adam shall be blessed? In fine,  
both *Munster* ought to have more exactly cited his Witnesses, and  
others been more cautious in believing him. For who will not prove  
any thing from the *Jews* or others, if such Testimonies as these be  
admitted? I know this was the custom of the Philologers of the  
last Age; but it was certainly a very bad one, and justly censured by  
the more exquisite Wits of ours. I am apt to think it proceeded  
either from want of Judgment, or unfaithfulness, in their not being  
sensible with what caution and tenderness Testimonies ought to be  
handled, from which any Consectary is to be deduced, or being un-  
willing to have their Citations examined. Both which a Man that  
aims at Accuracy and pursues Truth, should be very far from; for he  
that would neither be deceived himself, nor deceive others, cannot  
desire to have what he affirms believed rashly and without examina-  
tion.

IV. A vast inconvenience arises from the custom of writing out o-  
ther Mens Citations, unless we look into the Authors themselves from  
whence they are taken; because something may easily be added,  
whilst the sense is rather expressed than the words. The Hebrew  
words alledged by *Munster* can hardly be understood, and he dared  
not translate them. *Camero* has rendred them, and added of his own,  
that the *Jews* confess the creation of a *Woman* out of the rib of the *Man*,  
was to signify, &c. when *Munster* says nothing of that, but only what

Chapter VI. I have produced out of him. *Grotius* followed *Camero*, and neither added nor changed any thing, but *Dr. Hammond* has changed *the highest Man, who is blessed*, into *the most High, God blessed for ever*. Perhaps there will come some body afterwards, and add to these words, that which our Author subjoins out of *St. Chrysostom*, as taken out of some *Rabbin*; from whence he will infer that all the mysteries of the Christian Religion were very well known to the ancient *Jews*. As common Fame is magnified the further it goes, so Testimonies not looked into in the Authors themselves, are many times enlarged, as they are deliver'd from hand to hand.

## C H A P. VI.

Verf. 1. **T**<sup>A' τέρτα.</sup> Our Author here in his Paraphrase adds to Children, Subjects, and to Parents, Princes; in which he seems to have committed a double fault. *First*, in supposing that the word Children here comprehends under it *Subjects*; and the word Parents, in the Decalogue, *Magistrates*; which appears by no example, nor any reason. I do not deny indeed but that according to the most sacred Laws of human Society, and consequently of God himself, People ought to obey Magistrates, as long as they command nothing which is contrary to true Devotion, Society, or good Manners. That Obedience being as necessary and natural a Duty as for Children to obey their Parents; because without it Society, for which we are formed and born, cannot consist. But hence it does not follow that, when the Scripture speaks of the honour due to Parents, we must presently run the discourse to Magistrates. *Secondly*, he ought to have represented *St. Paul*, in his Paraphrase, speaking so as he speaks; and not fasten'd upon him a Consecratory, which he did not think of. *Dr. Hammond* might, if he would, in his *Annotations* have deduced from the words of the Apostle, what seemed deducible from them, but not in his *Paraphrase*, in which *St. Paul* himself ought to speak, and not his Interpreter. But even in this *Dr. Hammond* is not so consistent with himself as he ought to be; as I shall observe on *vers. 4*. See my Notes on the fifth Commandment in *Exod. xx*.

Ibid. <sup>Ἐν κρείττ.</sup> That is, as far as the Laws of God will permit, as Interpreters generally observe, which was a necessary Admonition, especially at that time in which without doubt there were a great many Heathen Parents, who were displeas'd with their Children for having embraced the Christian Religion. But *Dr. Hammond*, who makes the Apostle here to speak of obedience to Magistrates, interprets these words *in the Lord* by *under the Gospel*; for as to Parents, it would have been



been but flat to say, that *they* ought as much to be honoured under the Chapter Gospel as under the Law, for who could have doubted of it? But VI. there might have been some among Christians who thought, as most of the *Jews* did, that they were not to be subject to the Roman Magistrates; for which reason St. *Paul* more than once in his Epistles teaches the contrary. But he says nothing at all about it in this place. See *Rom.* xiii. 1.

Verf. 2. Πρῶτον ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ.] I am apt to think there is a *Hebraism* in this place, and that St. *Paul* renders the word אֶתְּחִיל, which perhaps he had in his mind, by the Greek πρῶτον, because that word signifies both *first* and *one*. And thus as the Hebrew word and the Greek *μὴ* frequently signify *first*; so reciprocally πρῶτον *first* will be taken here for *one*.

Verf. 3. Ἦρα εἰς πνεύματι.] This promise, in *Moses*, belongs only to the *Jews*, and to those only among *them* who were obedient to their Parents, and gave them all due Respect and Honour. Besides, that which is there promised is a long and happy Life in *Canaan*, and that respected not so much *particular* Persons as the *whole* Commonwealth; for if the Commonwealth were overthrown, a small number who had honoured their Parents could not expect by virtue of this Promise, to live happily in their own Country. I do not believe that St. *Paul* understood this Promise in any other sense, because there can be no doubt raised about it. Why therefore did he mention here a Promise which did not at all concern the *Ephesians*? Undoubtedly not to move or persuade them by that Promise to honour their Parents; but to shew them how very pleasing the performance of that Duty was to God, because he had formerly annexed a promise to the Precept wherein the Duty of Children to their Parents was enjoined. As for what our Author says here about a *peaceable Life* being the effect of obedience to Superiors or Magistrates, that as it is often true, so it is frequently false. Civil or foreign Wars, not to mention Tyranny or Arbitrary Government, do no more spare faithful than unfaithful Subjects. Tho' it be very true, that factious Persons, and such as are desirous of Innovations, do bring upon themselves a great many evils from the supreme Power; it do's not therefore follow that such as are quiet and willing to obey, do enjoy a longer or more happy Life. Which as it holds good at all times, so then especially when the supreme Power is of a different persuasion in Religion from those who honour their Parents, as it was in the time of St. *Paul*. So that what the *Doctor* says here about the honour which is to be given to Magistrates, tho' true, does not belong to this place.

Chapter VI. *Verf. 4.* Οἱ πατέρες καὶ μαγιστράτοις. ] The word *πατέρες* here undoubtedly signifies the same with *πρῶτος*, in the first Verse of this Chapter, that is both Parents. But I cannot but wonder that Dr. Hammond, who took *μαγιστράτοις* in that first Verse to be meant of Princes as well as Parents, and thought the Apostle spoke there of that honour which is due from Subjects to Magistrates, should not have one word about them in his Paraphrase on this place, but make mention only of Parents. Is it so therefore, that when the Discourse is about the Duty of Children to Parents, to Parents must be joined Princes; but when the Scripture speaks of the Duty of Parents to Children, in that Magistrates are not at all concerned? Or is it true, that tho Subjects ought to obey Magistrates, yet there is no Duty incumbent upon Magistrates with respect to Subjects? What can be the reason of this difference? Surely it deserved to be mentioned if there was any. But, to speak my thoughts, our learned Author writing this in a time when he saw his Countrymen had rose up in Arms against the King, whose cause he very much favoured, and that a great many abused the Power which they thought was lodged in the People, resolved to omit no occasion of magnifying the Authority of Kings; and carefully to avoid every thing which might seem to countenance the Cause of the People, lest his Adversaries should abuse it. By which it came to pass, that sometimes he does not so much perform the Office of an Interpreter, as a Preacher for the King's party. About the Cause it self, which I have not sufficiently consider'd as to *England*, I pass no judgment; but it had been better to interpret St. Paul so, as if there never had been any seditious Persons in *England*, because our learned Author wrests a great many things in favour of his own side.

*Verf. 11.* ὅσους ἔχετε. ] This word must not be rendred *all the Arms*, as if St. Paul had said, take *all the Arms* which you have. For tho this word be compounded of *πάντα* all, and *όπλον*, that is, *Arms*; yet Use has made it to signify another thing, which belongs to a particular sort of Souldiers: To wit, that *heavy Armour* which was born by the *Legionarii* among the *Romans*, or those that served in the *Phalanges*, *Brigades* of the *Macedonians*. For tho the *Slingers* and *Archers* were furnished with *all the Arms*, wherewith according to Custom they ought to be armed, yet the *πανοπλία* was never said to belong to them. So *όσους* signified *heavy armed Souldiers*, without any Addition. And St. Paul very fitly made use of that word in this place, where he does not speak about a *Skirmish* which might be made with light Armour; but about a long and sharp engagement with very formidable Adversaries. To which purpose he advises them not to take a Sling or a  
Bow,



Bow, which are light Weapons, but the Armour of *Legionary* Souldiers, Chapter VI.

Verf. 12. *Note a.* I will not deny but that the Devils made use of the assistance of Hereticks, whoever they were, to destroy the Pious and Orthodox; but I do not believe that *St. Paul* has here a *direct* reference to any *Hereticks*. For all that is here said, *immediately* at least, belongs to *evil Spirits*, as *Grotius* has shewn, and *Dr. Hammond* acknowledges. So that there was no necessity for introducing here the *Gnosticks*.

Verf. 14. Περὶ ζωνημένων.] The Apostle here alludes to *Isa. xi. 5.* and at the same time to the Custom of Soldiers. The first thing they did was to put a Girdle upon their Coat to keep it fast, and hinder it from moving one way or other under their Breastplate; but they did not put it over their Armour, as *Dr. Hammond* thought: See *Ever. Feitibus Ant. Homeric. Lib. iv. c. 8.* And therefore *St. Paul* says ζωνηόμενοι ὅσφον, and not ὅπλα. But it must not be particularly or nicely enquired, why *St. Paul* compares some Vertues with this kind of Armour, rather than with any other; because he might as well have said that Christians ought to take the girdle of Righteousness, and the breastplate of Truth, as the girdle of Truth and the breastplate of Righteousness. All that he means in this whole Discourse is, that Christian Vertues are Arms which good Men may and ought to use, both to repel the assaults of their Enemies, and to overcome them. Nothing else is here to be sought for, unless we have a mind to feed our selves with Fancies instead of Realities.

Verf. 15. *Note b.* I. It may be worth our while to read what the learned and diligent *Ant. Bynæus*, *Lib. 1. Cap. 5. de Calceis Hebræorum*, has written on this place. But I am rather of *Dr. Hammond's* Opinion, which may be confirmed by several places which he alledges, or which are to be found in those Authors whom he cites. But to give further light to *St. Paul's* words, I shall subjoin here a Passage out of *Virgil*, in which he describes the πανοπλία of *Aeneas*, and omits no part of the Armour mention'd by the Apostle, but the Girdle, nor adds any thing but the Spear, in *Aeneid. viii.* beginning at *vers. 619.*

*Miraturque, interque manus & brachia versat  
Terribilem cristis galeam flammisque vomentem,  
Fatiferumque enses, lorica ex ære rigentem, &c.  
Tum læves ocreas, electro auroque recocto,  
Hastamque & clypei non enarrabile textum.*

II. I cannot tell whence our learned Author took this Interpretation of the *Egyptian* Custom, that the *Egyptian Virgins* were not permitted

Chapter to wear Shoes, lest they should be ready to go abroad. I have shewn out of VI. *Diodorus Siculus*, on *Exod. xii. 11.* that it was the Custom not only for Virgins, but also for Children to go unshod, in *Egypt*, because of the mildness of the Air.

Verf. 16. Τα βέλη τῶ πονηρῶ τὰ πεπορομένα.] Our Author in his Paraphrase is of opinion, that the Apostle here alludes to *poisonous Darts*, which, saith he, are called fiery because they inflame the parts that are wounded with them, as *Serpents with poisonous Stings* are called fiery Serpents. But I do not think that all sort of *poisonous Serpents* may be called fiery; because the biting of all such Serpents does not hurt by causing an inflammation, and there is a peculiar kind of Serpents called by that name. I should rather say that the *Darts* of the Devil are called here fiery, by a Metaphor taken from the fiery Darts, which the besieged use to fling at the Souldiers and Works of the Besiegers, whereof there is frequent mention made in the Histories of the Antients, where Sieges are described. I shall produce but one example, in a matter very well known, out of the Writer of the *Spanish War*, cap. xi. *Noctis*, saith he, *tertia vigiliâ, in oppido acerrime pugnatum est, ignemque multum miserunt; sicut & omne genus, quibus ignis per jactus solitus est mitti: In the third watch of the Night, they fought in the Town very sharply, and threw a great deal of Fire, as also all kind (of Darts) in which Fire uses to be thrown.* These are fiery Darts properly so called; which lighting upon an iron Shield, could do no harm to the Souldiers. And *St. Paul* here seems to have called the Darts of the Devil fiery, rather than by any other Epithet; because they do mischief by inflaming the sensual Appetite.

Verf. 18. Περὶ πάντων ἁγίων.] Our Author, as appears by his Paraphrase, and the Note in the Margin, thought that the word *περὶ πάντων* should here be understood, and so renders this last part of the Verse, concerning all Holy things. And it is certain that an *Ellipsis* of that word is very common in the Greek Language, but never in such a Phrase as this that I know of. And therefore I had rather follow the *Vulgar* and other Interpreters, till an example be alledged, in which *πάντα ἁγία* is the same with *πάντα ἁγιόσωτα*, or in which *δέησις περὶ πάντων ἁγίων* signifies, evidently, *Prayers for the obtaining all Holiness.*



ANNOTATIONS 

## On the Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to the *Philippians*.

**A**T the end of the *Præmon.*] I. I rather refer this Epistle, as the foregoing, to the Year of Christ LXII. with Dr. *Pearson*, whom I desire the Reader to consult in his *Annales Paulinæ*.

II. Instead of the *Gnosticks*, who had formerly been Heathens, and which our Author too easily supposes to have been almost in all places where the Apostles had preached, I rather think S. *Paul* here refers to the *Jews*, who it is certain were dispersed throughout the whole *Roman Empire*, and being tenacious of their own Ceremonies, endeavoured to impose them upon all others.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 1. I. **W**Hat Dr. *Hammond* here says of *Philippi*, may be confirmed by other Arguments, by which it will become more manifest. It is very true that *Philippi* was a *Roman Colony*; as appears not only from the express Testimonies of the Antients, but also from the Coins of that City. There is a piece of *Philippian Money* coined in honour of *Claudius*, the backside of which has this Inscription; *COL. AVG. JUL. PHILIPP.* that is, *Colonia Augusta Julia Philippensis*. And there are other pieces coined in the times of *M. Aurelius*, *Commodus*, and *Caracalla*, that have the like Inscriptions. The learned *Joan. Euy-Vaillant* had reason to think that the name *Julia* signified that *Julius* first planted a Colony at *Philippi*, as *Augusta* that another was afterwards order'd thither by *Augustus*. After which Observation, he produces a place out of *Dio lib. 51.* where he speaks thus about *Augustus*, after the Victory at *Actium*: Τὰς δόμους τὰς ἐν τῇ Ἰουλίῳ, τὰς αὐτῶν Ἀντωνίου φερρήσαντος ὑξαισίας, τῆς αὐτῶν σερπῶταις τὰς τὸ πῆλιν ἐξ ἡμετέρας ἀνάγει ἐξ αὐτῶν.

Chapter οὐλο' ἐκείνων ὃ δὴ τῆς γῆς πλείοσι τό, τε Δυρράχιον, καὶ τὴς Φιλίππου ἀλλὰ τε ἐποικεῖν

I. ἀντέδωκε: Having banished those People in Italy which had favoured Antonius, he gave their Cities and Territories to his Soldiers. But instead of them, he gave the greatest part of those whom he had banished, Dyrrachium and Philippi, and other Towns, to inhabit. By this it appears, how a little before St. Paul's time, Philippi came to be enlarged, because that City had twice received a Colony of Romans. We may consult Foy-Kaillant, on *Numismata aera Colonialium*. The same Author testifies, that Philippi, in pieces of Coin, is stiled *Metropolis*. But that there was any regard had in that to Ecclesiastical order, or dignity of Bishops, even from the very time of St. Paul, Dr. Hammond has not proved, nor will any other, I believe, prove; tho' the thing be undoubtedly more antient than many think. The Passage alledged out of the *Digest*. is in lib. 50. tit. 15. *de censibus*, leg. 8. §. 8. and is Paulus's, not Ulpian's, as is said by our Author; who, it seems, cited him upon trust. He might have added that of Celsus in leg. 6. *Colonia Philippensis juris Italici est*.

II. Our Author affirms, that after *Vespasian* had brought a Colony into *Cæsarea*, that City became immediately, even in respect of Ecclesiastical Government, a *Metropolis*; under which *Jerusalem* it self was. But at that time there was no *Jerusalem*, because it had been razed to the ground, and was not rebuilt till under *Adrian*, who put into it a Roman Colony; as we are told by *Xiphilinus* in the Life of *Adrian*, and as appears by a great many Medals in which it is called *COL. AEL. CAP. Colonia Aelia Capitolina*. And who told our Author there was a Bishop at *Cæsarea* in the time of *Vespasian*? From what marks of Antiquity did he gather that the *Cæsarean* Bishops were reckoned superior in Dignity and Order to those of *Jerusalem*, from the Age of *Vespasian*? If what he says be true, that a City which had a Roman Colony brought into it was made a *Metropolis*, *Jerusalem* enjoyed that Privilege as well as *Cæsarea*, tho' not quite so soon. *Ulpian*, in the fore-mention'd *Tit. lib. 1. §. 6*. saith, *Palæstina duæ fuerunt Coloniae, & Cæsariensis & Aelia Capitolina, sed neutra jus Italicum habet*. But I look upon this also as improbable.

III. I am ready to think, that the reason why the Antients place *Philippi* sometimes in *Thrace*, and sometimes in *Macedonia*, is not because those Provinces were variously divided, which yet I do not deny; but because when Cities stand upon the borders of any two Countries, it is doubtful to which of them they belong. The same I say of *Nicopolis*. What our Author says besides about many Churches, and those *Episcopal*, depending upon the *Metropolis* of *Philippi*, is nothing



thing but Conjecture, which I am not wholly for rejecting, but which I do not easily believe. Learned Men often partly *prove* things out of the Ancients, and partly make up by Guess and Conjecture what they would have to be true; then they equal their Conjectures to that which they have proved, and from all put together they very easily infer what they please. Because St. *Paul* preached the Gospel first at *Philippi*, does it presently follow that that City was also accounted the *Metropolis*, in respect of Ecclesiastical Order? The rest also is very deceitful and uncertain.

Chapter  
I.

Ibid. Note b. I. The Opinion of *Grotius* and others seems to be much plainer; who think that as the words *Presbyter* and *Bishop* are promiscuously used, tho' there was one *Bishop* κατ' ἐξουσίαν so called: so also the word *Bishop* signifies both Orders, first and second; which is the reason why we meet with this word in the Plural Number where the Discourse is but of one Church. There was a Communion of Names between Ministers of the first and second Rank, so that those of the first Rank were sometimes stiled *Presbyters*, and those of the second *Bishops*; not because their Authority was the same, and their Office in every respect alike, but because there was little or no difference between them as to preaching the Gospel, and administering the Sacraments. But the particular Power of Ordination might belong to *one* Bishop, κατ' ἐξουσίαν, so called.

II. That which our Author says about *Metropolitans*, and by the help of which alone he defends himself against his Adversaries, as to those Apostolical Times, is very uncertain; nor can it be proved by the Authority of the Writers of the following Ages, who speak of the Primitive Times according to the Customs of their own, and not from any certain Knowledge: not to say at present, that Bishops or Presbyters aspiring to that Dignity, cannot always safely be heard in their own cause. It is not probable that there was any Episcopal Church in the Proconsular *Asia*, besides *Ephesus*, at the time spoken of in *Acts* xx. or in *Macedonia*, besides *Philippi* and *Thessalonica*. But a little while after, when the number of Christians was encreased, there were other Episcopal Seats constituted in them.

Ibid. Note c. I. I also have spoken pretty largely of the word *μετρον* on *Luke* viii. 2. and I shall not repeat what I have there said. Our Author in the beginning of this Note uses the word *demenſum* for *demenſum*, tho' that it self was not proper to be used in this place, because *demenſum* signifies the Portion or Allowance of *Servants*, not of *Guests*. See *Frid. Tausmannus* on *Plautus* his *Stich*, *Act* i. Sc. ii. *v*. 3.

Chapter II. I think indeed with Dr. *Hammond*, that the Original of *Deacons* must be fetched from the *Jews*, and that *Deacons* were in the Christian Church what the *שופרים* *bbazanin*, were in the Jewish Synagogue. But I do not think we have any thing to do here with the *שופרים* *schoterim* which was the Name only of the Officers that attended upon Magistrates, or certain publick Criers. See my *Note* on *Exod. ver. 8.*

III. Nor do I think that *ἀδελφοὶ Juniors*, ought to be confounded with the *Charanite*, especially in *Acts* v. 6. where any of the younger sort, who were accidentally then present, seem to be meant. Tho the Disciples of Doctors are called *Juniors*, in *Maimonides*, it does not therefore follow that that word must be so taken where-ever we meet with it.

IV. The Saying of the Jews about the decay of Learning among them, which our Author speaks of, is, in *Sotæ*, fol. 49.1. thus, *שחרב ביה שדו חכמים למהרי כספריא וכפריא כחונא לחונא כעמא דארעא*: *Since the second House was destroyed, the wise Men began to be as the Scribes, and the Scribes as the Minister of the Synagogue, and lastly the Minister of the Synagogue as the People of the Earth.* Which Dr. *Hammond* mistranslates, and inverts the Words themselves. They may be found by those that may perhaps have a mind to turn to them in the Editions of *Joan. Chr. Wagenfeilius*, in *Sotæ*, Cap. ix. S. 15. It appears that our Author did not look into this Saying himself, but went upon trust for it, and that made him render it so ill, and not so much as refer to the Book in which it is set down.

Verf. 13. Note c.] Some years ago there arose a great Controversy about this place, between two Gentlemen very skilful in the Roman Antiquities, *Ulricus Huberus* and *Jac. Perizonius*, concerning the Signification of the word *Prætorium* here; whence there was a considerable Volume made, which may be read by those who are curious about such Matters, not without advantage. *Huberus* thought that *Prætorium*, where the Discourse was about Civil Affairs, signified the *Palace* of *Cæsar*, or properly his Judgment-hall; but *Perizonius*, a Body of *Prætorian* Troops, or the Camp in which the *Prætor's* Guards used to pitch their Tents. And there is no doubt but that the most frequent notion of the Word, in the best Writers, is agreeable to the Opinion of this latter. And so *S. Paul's* meaning will be, that his Bonds, that is, the Reason for which he was cast into Bonds, was known to the *Prætor's* Guards, to which the Soldiers with whom he was bound, might have brought him. Yet others quote a Passage in *Cicero*, in which *Prætorium* seems to signify a publick Place of Judicature, in *Orat. 5.* against *Verres,*



*Verres*, cap. ult. *Vos omnes rerum forensium, consiliorum maximorum, legum, judiciorumque arbitri & testes celeberrimo in loco PRÆTORII locati, Castor & Pollux, &c.* *Ye Judges and Witnesses of all matters belonging to Court, of the greatest Counsels, Laws and Suits, who are seated in the place of the Prætorium, Castor & Pollux, &c.* The *Forum* is the place in which was the Judgment-seat of the *Prætor*, which may seem to confirm the Interpretation of *Phavorinus* and *Dr. Hammond*. For it appears, that there was in the *Forum* a Temple dedicated to the *Castors*, by *Suetonius* in the Life of *Julius Cæsar* cap. x. But it is not probable that *St. Paul*, who had appealed to *Cæsar*, was judged by a *City Prætor*; and I am rather of *Perizonius* his Opinion. See his 1st. *Dissert. de Prætorio*, S. 35. & seqq.

Verf. 23. Note h. I. What our Author says about the word *ῥατ* he owed in part to *Grotius*, but it is not a *Hebrew* word which has that signification, but a *Chaldee* and *Syriack* one, as *Lexicons* will shew. When *Grotius* said it was commonly used by the *Jews* to signify *Death*, he meant only the *Rabbins*; who often speak more in *Chaldee* than in *Hebrew*.

II. That which our Author here says about the word *ἀναλύσαι*, may serve to confirm what I have said against him about another compound of the same Primitive, on *Luke ix. 12*. The conjecture of *Philoronus*, about the reason why a particular sort of Method is called *ἀναλυτική*, tho' very agreeable to the nature of the thing, yet seems to be false; because the term *ἀναλυτική* must be understood by its opposition to *συνθετική*, which is another kind of Method. And that being called *συνθετική* which gathers up Principles, and deduces Confectaries from them compounded and joined together, by *ἀναλυτική* must necessarily be meant that which resolves things conjoined, and separates the parts, to make way for the knowledg of each particular. And indeed that is the use of this Method, as every one knows. *Phavorinus* saith much righter than *Philoronus*: *Αναλύει, ἀπὸ τῆς συμπλοκῆς πινῶν πραγμάτων εἰς ἀρχῆς διαλύει· ὅθεν καὶ ἀναλυτικὴ καλεῖται· Δεισιπέλης· καὶ ἀναλύει, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπανάγωγος. Συνέσις, καὶ ἀναλύει, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπανάγωγος ἀνέλυται ὅτι καὶ ἀναλύει λέγεται τὸ τῆς συνθέσεως συλλογισμὸς ἀνολύειν εἰς τὰς ἀρχάς, καὶ εἰς τὰς προτάσεις εἰς ὧν αὐτοῖς τὸ εἶναι.* Whence it appears that *ἀναλύσαι* is here rightly indeed rendred by *reverti*, to *return*, but that this interpretation of it is ill confirmed by the name *ἀναλυτική*.

Vers. 6. **O**UR Author has well enough confuted, in this place, *Note a.* the Interpretation of *Grotius*, but has proposed nothing more certain instead of it, nor sufficiently consider'd the series of the Discourse.

I. He ought not to have interpreted *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ὑπάρχων* as if it were *θεὸς εἶναι*, without bringing an example of the like phrase. For as to the word *μορφῇ* separately consider'd, supposing that signified what our Author affirms, it will not follow that it has the same signification in this Phrase. But *Aeschylus*, who was a very bold Poet, is no fit Author to be made use of in explaining the simple stile of *St. Paul*. And *Phavorinus* judged of the sense of the word *μορφῇ* partly by the use of the *Peripateticks*, partly by the opinion of Divines, not by its vulgar acceptation. *Μορφῇ δέδοται* really signifies a servil Form or Appearance, as we shall afterwards see. These things could not be opposed to the perpetual use of the *Septuagint* and the Writers of the New Testament, according to which, as *Grotius* has observed, that word does not signify something internal and secret, but apparent and visible.

II. If that were the meaning of *St. Paul* in this place, which our Author after others supposes, the Apostle should have exprest himself thus: *ὅς ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ ὑπάρχων, καὶ ἐκ ἡγέμενος ἰσότητων εἶναι ἰσὸν θεῶ, ἕως ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε*: who being in the form of God, and thinking it no robbery to be made equal with God, yet emptied himself. And so *ἐκένωσε*, &c. would be opposed to all which goes before. But as the words now lie, it is opposed only to *ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ εἶναι*, who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery, but, &c. Which is all one as to say; tho he was in the form of God, yet he did not think he might assume to himself an equality with God, but submitted himself to his Will, and took upon him the form of a Servant, &c. That this is the series of the Discourse, this the sense of this place, was well understood by *Novatian* in *Lib. de Trinitate*, cap. xvii. whose words I shall not think much to set down. *Imitator omnium paternorum operum, dum & ipse operatur sicut & Pater ejus, forma, ut expressimus, est Dei Patris. Et merito in forma pronunciatus est Dei, dum & ipse super omnia, & omnis creaturae divinam obtinens potestatem, & Deus est, exemplo, Patris; hoc ipsum tamen a Patre proprio consequutus, ut omnium & Deus esset & Dominus esset, & Deus ad formam Dei Patris ex ipso genitus, atque prolatus. Hic ergo quamvis esset in forma Dei, non est rapinam arbitratus æqualem se Deo esse. Quamvis enim se ex Deo Patre Deum esse meminisset,*



nisset, nunquam se Deo Patri aut comparavit, aut contulit; memor se esse ex suo Patre, & hoc ipsum quod est habere se, quia Pater dedisset. Inde denique & ante carnis assumptionem, sed & post assumptionem corporis, post ipsam præterea resurrectionem, omnem Patri, in omnibus rebus, obedientiam præstitit pariter ac præstat. Ex quo probatur nunquam arbitratum illum esse rapinam quandam divinitatem, ut æquaret se Patri Deo; quinimò contra omni ipsius imperio & voluntati obediens atque subjectus ut formam servi suscipere contentus est. Being an imitator of all his Fathers works, and working also as his Father does, he is, as I have expressed, the form of God the Father. And justly was he pronounced to be in the form of God, because he also being over all things, and having a divine Power over every Creature, is God after the example of the Father; yet so as to have obtained this Dignity from his Father, that he should be God and Lord of all things, and to be God according to the form of God the Father, begotten and brought forth by him. And therefore tho he was in the form of God, he did not think it robbery to be equal with God. For tho he knew within himself that he was God of God the Father, yet he never compared himself with God the Father, being mindful that he was of his Father, and whatever he was, he was by his Father's Gift. And both before and after his assuming Flesh, and after his Resurrection, he yielded and still yields all obedience to his Father in all things. Which shews that he never thought any Divinity robbery, to equal himself with God the Father; nay on the contrary, being obedient and subject to all his Commands and Will, he was content to take upon him the form of a Servant. This is the direct tendency of the form of St. Paul's discourse, which will not admit of any other interpretation. And with this sense all the words made use of by him agree, as I shall shew. But first of all it must be supposed that the Discourse here is about the Man Jesus, and not about the Deity, which is evident, to produce but this one Argument for it, from that which follows; for he whom God hath exalted, and given him a Name above every Name, that in the name of Jesus every Knee should bow, is undoubtedly the Man Jesus, and not the Deity, which never received any thing, nor could receive any new Dignity; and he whom God so very highly exalted, is the same who had humbled himself, and suffer'd Death in obedience to the Will of his Father. This reasoning, which yet is the sum of the common Interpretation, is hardly tolerable. The Divinity of Christ, tho equal (yea numerically the same with the Divinity of the Father) to the Father, humbled it self to put on Humanity; wherefore, that Humanity received this Reward from the Father, to be raised to the highest pitch of Glory. On the contrary, it is he that humbled himself, that St. Paul

Chapter here says was rewarded. This premis'd, I shall now explain the several Phrases the Apostle makes use of.

III. Ἐν μορφῇ θεῶν is best of all interpreted by *Grotius*, of that Power which was observable in Christ, in so great a degree, that he could do whatever he pleased, wherein he came as near as possible to the most High God. The same thing is elsewhere intimated by *St. Paul*, where he says that Christ was the visible *Image of the invisible God*, Coloss. i. 15. For εἰκὼν & μορφή are sometimes the same. *Elesychius*: Μορφή, ἰδέα, εἶδος, the word signifies a form or species. So *Suidas*: Μορφή, εἶδος, ἰδέα, ἀέσπευς, a Species, Form, or Aspect. And *Phavorinus* hath the same. Whence μορφαὶ θεῶν among the Heathens, signifies the *Images of the Gods*; as in *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* de Romulo, Lib. 2. Ant. Rom. p. 90. ἵερα ἢ ἐν κ) τεμένει, κ) βωμῶς, κ) ἑορῶν ἰδρύσεις, (μορφαί) τε αὐτῶν κ) σύμβολα ——— κατεστήσατο: he erected therefore their Temples, and Groves, and Altars, and the places of their carved Statues, and their (Images) and Symbols.

IV. Οὐκ ἀρπαγῶν ἠγάσασα seems to be all one with ἐχ ἠγάσασα ἀρπακτῶν, that is, he did not think it a thing which he might snatch or ravish to himself. So *Gregory Nazianzen* uses the word ἀρπαγμα, in *Orat.* 1. against *Julian* pag. 67. where he speaks of the Government's being usurped by *Julian*: ἢν ἐχ ἀρπαγμα τύχης, ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς ἄθλον, ἢ χρόνον, ἢ ἡμετέρας βασιλείας χρεΐζεται: which not a rape or robbery of Fortune, but the reward of Virtue, or Time, or the suffrage of the King bestows. But the expression of *Cicero*, in Latin, comes much nearer that of *St. Paul*; who in his V. *Orat.* in *Verrem*, speaking of *Verres*, says: *Omnia bona prædam suam duxit*, He thought every oncs Goods his prey. And in *Lib. vii. Ep. 13. ad Atticum*, speaking of *Cæsar*, after *Pompey* had forsaken *Rome*, he says: *Huic tradita urbs est, nuda præsidio, referta copiis. Quid est quod ab eo non metuas, qui illa templa & tecta non patriam, sed prædam putat?* The City was delivered up to *Cæsar*, destitute of its Garrison, and was filled with Souldiers. What is there not reason to fear from him who thinks those Temples and Houses, not his Country, but his Prey? The Man Christ, tho he had received all Power both in Heaven and in Earth, yet said in *John xiv. 28.* That his Father was greater than he, and would not suffer himself to be made equal with God. Contrary to what was done afterwards by *Simon Magus*, who trusting only to Magical Artifices, dared to equal, if not to exalt himself above God: See *Acts viii. 10.* and *H. Grotius* on that place. Which if our Author had but here thought on, without question he would have greedily took up, to say that *St. Paul* here opposed *Jesus Christ* to *Simon the Patriarch of the Gnosticks.*



V. Τὸ ἴσους αὐτῷ, that is, to make himself equal with God. Which *Christ* openly professes in *Job. v. 19.* for after he had said to the Jews, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;* and the Jews thereupon sought to kill him, *not only because he had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself, as they affirmed, equal with God;* ἵσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ: *Jesus answers, that the Son could do nothing of himself, but what he saw his Father do;* that is, that he only followed the Example of God, in which he shewed himself to be inferiour to him; for he that follows another's Example, and cannot depart from it, is inferiour to him who sets the Example. But all this must be understood of the *Humanity* of *Christ*, and not of his *Divinity*.

Verf. 7. Note b. To keep to the Propriety of the Verb *κενόω*, it must be rendred thus: He behaved himself so, as if he were *void* of all that Power which he had received from his Father. He used it no more, than if he had not had it. Which must be understood only of those times, in which *Christ* was to suffer any thing, either from the *Jews*, or from the *Romans*.

Ibid. Μορφὴν δούλου λαβών.] He did not really become a Servant, but, having taken upon him the form of a Servant, he seemed to be such. For when *Christ* behaved himself towards the Jews and Romans, who vilified and loaded him with all manner of Injuries and Reproaches, as if he had been subject to their Power, like the rest of the Jews, he truly took upon him the form of a Servant; that is, a servile Appearance. He did no more use that Power which he had received from God, and whereby he had wrought so many Miracles, and with which he was then endued as much as before, to defend or deliver himself, than if he had quite exhausted it. It is known that among the Hebrews those who obey, are called *Servants* עבדים *habadim*, and those that are subdued by Power, are said to become its Servants. They who understand these Words of the Divine Nature, interpret them of the Assumption of Humanity, because Men are the Servants of God; which might be born, if any thing in the Context favoured their Opinion.

Ibid. Ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος.] The Apostle does not say ἀνθρώπος γενόμενος, *being made Man*; which might intimate his Incarnation, and would be the same Phrase with that in *Job. i. 14.* but *he was made in the likeness of Men*; that is, was like other Men, who submit to a Superiour Power, because they cannot resist it, and suffer themselves to be ill used, when they are unable to defend themselves. *Christ* was neither a Servant to the Jewish or Roman Magistrates, nor destitute of Power, to deliver himself from their Injuries and Cruelty;

but

Chapter but he behaved himself so, as if he were like the rest of the Jews, and had  
 II. nothing in him peculiar or extraordinary. The External Appearance of  
 Christ at that time was *μορφή δέλου*, the form of a Servant; he was *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων*, or, as the Jews speak, *כְּנֶגֶר בְּנֵי אָדָם*, changed  
 bne adam, like the Sons of Men, that is, *χουδαίων ἀνθρώπων*, ordinary Men; for so the Hebrew word *אָדָם* *adam* sometimes signifies. I wonder here at *Grotius*, who interprets these Words, made like to the first Men, *i. e.* sinless; which is a Phrase without Example, and very distant from this place; where it is manifest the Discourse is about the Humiliation of Christ. I know he puts a *Diastole* after *λαβὼν*, and makes these Words to begin a new *ἀντίθετον*, opposite Member in the Discourse, but nothing can be more violent.

Verf. 8. *Καὶ ὁμοιωτι ἐνεθεὶς ὡς ἀνθρώπου.*] When the Jews and Romans persecuted him, he was just like an ordinary Man in outward Appearance. This is the proper Signification of the word *ὁμοίωμα*. *Hesychius*: *Σχῆμα, πλάσμα, ἰματισμὸς, διάθεσις, κόσμος*, [in the Latin it is printed *κόμπου*] a Fiction, a Garmēt, Disposition, Habit, or Ornament: *Σχηματιζόμενοι προσποιούμενοι, ὁμοίωμα ὁπιδεκινῶντες*, counterfeiting, making a shew, or appearance. The old Glosses: *Σχῆμα, figura, cultus, habitus, gestus, gestamen, forma*. And this is extremely well opposed to the form of God, in which tho Christ appeared when he wrought so many and great Miracles; yet when he was abused and persecuted by the Jews and Romans, he was like one of the Multitude, and put on no other appearance than belonged to any ordinary Person.

Here again I cannot but wonder at *Grotius*, who interprets these Words thus: *Dignitate talis apparuit qualis Adamus, id est Dominio in omnes creaturas, in mare, ventos, panes, aquam, &c.* He appeared such in Dignity as Adam, that is, with Dominion over all Creatures, over the Sea, Winds, Bread, Water, &c. For Adam indeed had the use of all those things which God had made, and which were within his reach; but he had not a Command over the Sea and the Winds, and every thing in Nature, like Christ. See my Note on *Gen. i. 26*.

*Ibid.* *Ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν.*] That is, in obedience to the Will of his Father, he subjected himself to all manner of Indignities, and Death it self, no less than if he had been one of the meanest sort of Persons. He who had the command of the whole World, suffered himself to be despitefully used, and cruelly killed by wicked Men. This cannot in the least be said of the Divine Nature, and therefore nor that which went before. For such a Discourse as this would be intolerable: The Divine Nature of Christ condescended so low as to assume Humanity, and humbled it self so, as to become obedient to the Death of the Cross.



Cross. The Divinity of Christ was not *obedient unto Death*, but his Humanity only, as all agree. And all that is in the same compass of Words, and the same *Antithesis* ought to be referred to one and the same Nature, unless the undoubted Signification of Words, or the things spoken of require the contrary. Chapter II.

Ibid. Γερόμηνος ἕως ἡμέρας μέλει σαυάτε, σαυάτε δὲ μου. ] In this part of his Humiliation, which was the greatest, Christ might be said in a special manner to have taken upon him the form of a Servant; the Cross being, among the *Romans*, a servile punishment. See *Grotius*.

Ver. 9. Διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν. ] This is the reward of the Humiliation which that Nature underwent that was obedient unto death; that is, the *Humane*. The Divine Nature cannot have any reward conferred upon it, which as it is never lessened, so it is never exalted, or made greater.

Ibid. Ὄνομα ἕως πάντων ὀνομα. ] This is well interpreted by *Grotius*, of Christ's *Dignity*; for when a new Dignity is conferred, there is a new *Name* also conferred. *St. Paul*, who is his own best Interpreter, in *Eph. i. 20.* says: *He raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every NAME that is NAMED, not only in this age, but in that which is to come, and hath put all things under his feet.* Where a *Name* that is *named* signifies a *Dignity*, as the foregoing words manifestly shew.

Verf. 10. Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ. ] That is, not because he is called *Jesus*, as *Dr. Hammond* misinterprets it; but, that all Creatures might reverence the man *Jesus*, exalted to so high a dignity as to be God's Vicegerent. By his Redemption indeed he acquired to himself a power over all *men*, whom he made his own; but not over other intelligent Natures, who receive, properly speaking, no benefit by the Redemption of Mankind. And therefore the Apostle has no reference here to the title of Redeemer, but of King, and one that was so even of the Angels, because it so pleased God, no less than of Men.

Verf. 11. Ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. ] *Lord*, namely, of all things, excepting him that put all things under him. This is *the Name above every name*, which *St. Paul* before spake of, and not the name of *Jesus*.

Verf. 17. Note c. There is no doubt but *St. Paul* here has a reference to the pouring out of Wine upon Sacrifices, and compares his Blood also to Wine. And it is as undeniable, that the Faith of the *Phillipians* is here consider'd as a Sacrifice which the Apostle offered up to God. But what our Author says here besides, are vain Niceties, which have no ground either in the use of the Greek Language, or the sacred

Writers.

Chapter  
III.

Writers. It is false that *θυσία* signifies the slaying of a Sacrifice rather than the Sacrifice it self, or a Sacrifice generally consider'd: and as untrue is it, that *λείτεργία* signifies the Office or Action of the Priests and Levites in preparing the Sacrifice to be offered, rather than any other part of the publick Worship of God. So that *θυσία καὶ λείτεργία ἢ πίστεως* is nothing but a publick Oblation of the *Philippians* Faith to God: and those two words signify one and the same thing; to wit, the Action of the Apostle publickly offering up to God the Faith of the *Philippians*.

Verf. 20. I think the place in *Ishobius* needs no correction, unless perhaps instead of *ἀρτίσικρον* we ought to read *ἀντισικῶν*, that is, *equal, in a balance of equal weight*; for so the Verb *ἀντισικῶ* signifies, as any Lexicons will shew, which I wonder our Author did not consult.

## C H A P. III.

Verf. 1. **Ο**Υκ ὀκνεῖν μοι here being subjoined to *τά αὐτὰ γράφειν*,  
Note a. cannot otherwise be rendred, than *is not to me grievous*, i. e. *I do not think it grievous to write the same things*. It does not appear by any example, that *ὀκνεῖν* signifies cowardly, or that which is a sign of Fearfulness. Dr. *Hammond* did not well understand *Phavorinus*, whose words are these: *Ὁκνεῖν, ἰστέον ὅτι καὶ Ὀμηρῳ ὅτι τὸ ὀκνηῶς ἔχειν ἔτιξεν, ἵνα ἢ ὀκνεῖν τὸ ἐκ ὀνεῖν, ἢ γὰρ μὴ ἐνεργεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἢ πλείων χρεῖσι ἢ μεθ' Ὀμηρον ὅτι φόβος τ' ὀκνον πίθησι, καὶ ἐστὶ πολλὴ ἡ χρεῖσι ὡς Σοφοκλεί: that is, It must be observed, that tho Homer has put ὀκνεῖν for ὀκνηῶς ἔχειν, that is, not ὀνεῖν, or not to labour; yet the more common use of those who have written since Homer, is to put, ὀκνῶ for Fear, in which sense it is frequently used in Sophocles. See about this, *Eustathius* p. 545. *Ed. Rom.* from whom *Phavorinus* borrowed this Remark.*

Verf. 2. Note b. It is much better to understand these things as spoken of the Jews, to whom *Grotius* applies them, who may be consulted. For they who proudly called themselves the *καταλομή*, are with reason stiled here *καταλομή*, that is, *the cutting or rending*, because they rent asunder the Church of *Christ*.

I. The passage which our Author cites out of the *Apocal.* shall be considered in its proper place. But from *Gal. vi. 13.* it does not at all appear that those whom the Apostle there blames were not circumcised; nay, the contrary may be inferred, as I have shewn on that place. It is strange our learned Author should cite the words of *S. Paul* so, as if he had expressly said that the *Gnosticks* were *ὡς ἐκ καταλομῶν*, not so much as circumcised; when the Apostle speaks quite otherwise, as any one that looks into the place will see. II.



II. The word *καλαίωσι* belongs to those who were truly Jews, because those men *κατέτεμον cut asunder* the Christian Church, whilst they endeavoured to impose the Mosaical Rites upon the Gentiles, against their will. And such were justly call'd both *Dogs* and *Schismatics*, who bark'd and snarl'd at all that refus'd to submit to the Jewish Yoke, and kept up *Factions* in the Church. See *Rom. xiv.* Chapter III.

Verf. 11. *Εἰ πως καταντήσω εἰς τὴν ἕξανάστασιν.*] By *ἕξανάστασις* here, tho set simply without any addition, must be understood a Resurrection to a *blessed life*; because tho the dead bodies of the wicked are to be restored to their former state, yet that Restoration is hardly worth the happy name of a Resurrection, which is succeeded by eternal death. Thus *Polycarpus* also speaks in his Epistle to the *Philippians*: 'Ο ὃ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν (Χριστὸν) ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ, ἐὰν ποιῶμεν αὐτῷ τὸ θέλημα καὶ περιδώμεθα ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς αὐτῷ: *He that raised Christ from the dead, will raise us up also, if we do his will, and walk in his commandments.*

Verf. 12. Note d. Tho *S. Paul* here uses several words taken from the *Agones*, and tho *τέλεια νικητρία* may perhaps signify the most noble and valuable Rewards; yet that *τελειωθῆναι* is an *Agonistical* term, I shall not believe till I see some place in an antient Writer, who in the description of an *Ἄγων* uses it in that sense. For it is not necessary to think that *St. Paul* keeps in every thing to the same Metaphor; nor can it be inferred from the phrase *τέλεια νικητρία*, that *τελειωθῆναι* is to attain to those Rewards, unless an example to that purpose be alledged.

I. I acknowledg that *Gregory Nyssen* calls the Death of a Martyr *τελείωσις ἀθλητῆς*, but he does not therefore allude to the *Agonistical* way of speaking, in that word, as in the word *ἀθλήτης*. Ecclesiastical Writers very often call Martyrs *Athletæ*, and the Death of Martyrs *τελείωσις*, and use *τελειῶναι* to signify that they are dead; not that those three words are all by the same Metaphor taken from the *Agones*, but because they who had struggled under the Torments inflicted on them by the Heathens, were at length *consummated* by Death; that is, finished suffering all that they could suffer for the sake of Christ. The learned *Joan. Casp. Suicerus* has collected a great many examples of the words *τελείωσις* and *τελειωθῆναι* in these Acceptations, in his *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*. And the Latin Fathers frequently use the words *consummari* and *consummationem*, which without doubt are not *Agonistical* terms.

II. It is not probable that the Apostle *James*, in c. i. 17. had a reference to the Rewards of the *Agones*, because *δοσις* and *δώρημα* are not *Agonistical* names, signifying the Rewards of such as overcame. Of the passages alledged out of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, I shall treat in that Epistle.

Chapter III. What our Author says about the word  $\alpha\pi\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  is true ; but S. *Cory-*  
 III. *Justom's* Observation does not belong to that, but to the word  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\iota\varsigma$   
 netsabb.

IV. St. *Paul* here uses the Verb  $\alpha\pi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  in a more general sense, not for Death, but *the attainment of Perfection*, from which men cannot fall into an unhappy condition ; such as is the Perfection of the Saints, admitted into the mansions of eternal Blessedness. So that his meaning is this ; that he had not as yet attained to such a degree of Holiness, as was perfect, from which he could not fall. We meet with this Verb used to signify *Perfection in Vertue*, in *Jam. ii. 22.* 1 *Job. ii. 5.* and *iv. 12, 13, 18.* See also *Vers. 15.* of this *Chap.*

Ibid. *Note f.* That which was said of one of the Antients, *Nescivit manum de tabula tollere*, may justly be applied to our Author, who seldom knew when he had said enough about one thing. Because in some places he had some reason to think that the *Gnosticks* were referred to by the Apostles, therefore wherever there was but the least occasion for such a suspicion, the *Gnosticks* must undoubtedly be respected ; as if all the Hereticks and wicked men that disturbed the Christian Churches at that time, had been *Gnosticks*. And so here, because there are some *Agonistical* terms used, he strains them all to the same Metaphor, and can see nothing in this place but Metaphors borrowed from the use of the *Agones*. The Verb  $\alpha\pi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  here may much more naturally be interpreted of that Action of Christ, when he suddenly  $\alpha\pi\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon$  apprehended S. *Paul* as he was persecuting the Christians in his way to *Damascus*, in order to make him an Apostle. But if any one will needs, with Dr. *Hammond*, have this to be an *Agonistical* word, I should not interpret it of the attaining a prize, but of *overtaking* or *catching*, viz. when a swift Runner overtook another that ran more slowly ; as if Christ should be said to have run after St. *Paul*, and overtook him. *Suidas* :  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\iota\nu$  εἰρηλατῆς ἢ ἐπὶ πύχης ποδῶν ὄντων λέγεται, ὁ δὲ τὸ φέρωντα διώξας κατέλαβε : *The word is applied also to the swiftness of the feet, and therefore we say, such a one pursuing another that ran away, overtook him.*

*Vers. 20. Note l.* I. Our Author, in the beginning of this Note, puts *municipium* for *municipatus* ; for *municipium* is the Town corporate it self, and *municipatus* the Privileges or Condition of *municipes*, *Free-men of any City or Corporation.* Which word *Tertullian* and S. *Jerom* make use of to explain this place, as learned men have observed.

II. But, the truth is, neither of these words belong to it ; for no *municipes* could say, My *municipatus*, or *my municipium is in Rome.* *Rome* could not be called a *municipium*, which name belonged first on-  
 ly



ly to the Cities of *Italy*; but afterwards also to others, the Inhabitants of which were indeed *Roman* Citizens, but in their *municipia* were govern'd by their own municipal Laws, and not those of *Rome*: of which see *A. Gellius*, lib. xvi. c. 13. If we would describe the Condition of Christians by a Metaphor taken from the Condition of *municipes*, we ought to say, *that they have indeed a municipium on Earth, but their City is in Heaven.* Chapter IV.

III. I can't tell whether the place in *Cicero* was transcribed by our Author out of *Cicero* himself; but it's certain it is false quoted. For it is in lib. 2. *de Legg.* cap. 2. in these words; *Omnes municipibus duas esse censeo patrias; unam naturæ, alteram civitatis (not juris) ut ille Cato cum esset Tusculi natus (not exemplo Catonis qui) in populi Romani civitatem (not societatem) susceptus est.* If our Author wrote this passage out of *Cicero* himself, he was scarce awake; if he transcribed it out of another, he did not act prudently. [See Note on *Act.* xiii. 54. where this place is cited by Mr. *le Clerc* upon another occasion.]

IV. Πολιτεία in *Acts* xxii. 28. does not signify *municipium* or *municipatus*, but the Privilege of the City of *Rome*. Besides, that word does not belong to this place; for no one would say, besides Dr. *Hammond* who abounds with improprieties of Speech, *our privilege of Citizenship is in Heaven?* Πολιτεία here is all one with *πᾶσις* City, that is, *Patria* Country; ἡμῶν τὸ πολιτεία ἐν ἑλενοῖς ἐπαρχίᾳ, that is, *our City or Country is in Heaven*, and not on Earth. Elsewhere *πᾶσις* signifies the way of administering a Commonwealth. According to the twofold signification of the Verb *πολιτεύειν*, which is taken, for living in a City, or administering a Commonwealth, the word *πᾶσις* has also the two alledged significations. But the former only can be admitted here, because *St. Paul* speaks of a *Place*, as appears by the *Preposition* ἐν, *in*; ἐν ἑλενοῖς, *in Heaven*. See *Heb.* xi. 13. and *seqq.*

## C H A P. IV.

Verf. 3. **O**F this Phrase see my Note on *Deut.* xxxii. 32. where I have *Note a.* spoken of it at large, and confirmed what Dr. *Hammond* here says. But he produces imprudently a piece of a Verse as out of *Homer*, taking it upon trust, which is no where extant in him. At least as I never read it, that I remember, so neither can it be found by the help of *Seberus's* Index. It is very ill done in any to alledg the Antients in such a manner, that the Reader cannot know whether they are truly cited: such Persons deserve never to be trusted.

Chapter IV. Vers. 7. *Note b.* I can easily assent to what our Author here says, if we put but *Jews* instead of *Gnosticks*, or if by the name of *Gnosticks* we understand the *Jews* themselves; because tho it is certain there were *Judaizers* wherever the *Jews* were, it is not certain that the Heathen Sect of the *Gnosticks* was so widely dispersed. It must be further added, that *vñs* does not signify only the *Mind*, but also frequently quickness of Wit or Understanding; whence *vñν ἔχειν* is to be ingenious. *Hesychius* tells us, that this word signifies *κρείως, σώφρονος ψυχῆς ἐπίσυνα*, properly, the action of a composed mind, that is, a clear understanding of things. And so *St. Paul's* meaning here will be, that the love of Peace was much better than all the Wit and Subtilty that the Disturbers of the Church boasted of.

---



## ANNOTATIONS

## On the Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to the *Colossians*.

**A**T the end of the *Præmon.*] I. It may not be unuseful to observe that *Colossæ* was even in antient Times a wealthy and populous City; as those generally were which the first Preachers of the Gospel went to, because of the likelihood of having a greater harvest in them than in others. *Xenophon* in *Lib. 1. de Exped. Cyri* speaks of it in this manner: Ἐξελαύνει διὰ Φρυγίας σταθῶν ἕνα, παρασάγγας ὀκτώ εἰς Κολοσῆας πόλιν οἰκημένην, εὐδαίμονα καὶ μεγάλην: he led (them) through Phrygia one Station, eight Parasangæ, to Colossæ, a populous, rich and great City.

II. This Epistle seems to have been written in the same Year with the two foregoing, that is, according to the account of *Dr. Pearson* whom I follow, *Anno Christi* lxxii. and the ixth of *Nero*.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 15. **E**ἰκὼν τοῦ ἀορατοῦ.] The word *ορατός* must be supplied here after *εἰκὼν*, thus: *the visible Image of the invisible God*; which is to be understood of the Humanity of Christ it self, as *Beza* well observes, who may be consulted. But to the Humanity of Christ we must add the visible Miracles which he wrought in the view of Multitudes. This is that which is otherwise called *μορφῆ θεῶ* in *Philip. ii. 6*. Our Author ought to have expressed this more fully in his Paraphrase.

*Ibid. Note a.* I. If we carefully examin the places brought by our Author and others, to prove that *πρωτόπικος* signifies sometimes a *Lord*, we shall find them to be of no force. In *Psal. lxxxix. 28.* *the firstborn of the Kings of the Earth*, doth not signify a *Lord over other Kings*, but an excellent or most glorious King, as *Dr. Hammond* himself acknowledges, and the thing it self shews. But *Job xviii. 13.*

Chapter makes nothing at all to the purpose, for *the firstborn of Death* is not there *the Lord of Death*, but a mortal or deadly Disease. In the Civil Law, *Heres* an Heir, does not signify properly *Dominus* a Lord; but *Justinian* tells us, that he who *pro Domino gerit*, represents or manages for a Lord, *gerit pro Herede*, does the same for an Heir; and then he adds: *Veteres enim heredes pro dominis appellabant: For the Antients used to say Heirs for Lords.* But hence it does not follow, that because the Heir was the First-born, therefore *the First-born of an Estate* may be put for an Heir, and so for the *Lord of an Estate*.

II. I think therefore with *Beza* and others, that by *αετότοκος πρώτης κτίσεως* is meant *he that was before all Creatures*; but I interpret *αετότοκος* just in the same manner as if *St. Paul* had simply said *αετέρος*, laying no *Emphasis* at all on the two last Syllables *τόκος*, which come from the Verb *τινω* to bring forth. Because *αετότοκος* a firstborn is before the rest of his Brethren, therefore *St. Paul* calls Christ *the first-born of every Creature*, just in the same sense as if he had called him *αετέρος πρώτης κτίσεως*. This Interpretation the Apostle himself suggests to us, who explaining his own mind, says more clearly in *vers. 17.* he is *αε' πάντων* before all things; and in *ver. 18.* calls Christ *αετότοκος εκ τῶν νεκρῶν* the first-born from the dead, that is, *αετός ἐγενήεις εκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, he that was first raised from the dead. *St. Paul* proves that Christ was before every Creature, because by him all things were created. But nobody in his wits ever dreamt that the Man Jesus was before every Creature; and therefore this must be understood of the *Λόγος* or divine Reason, the *πῶν ἀνάγκη* of which, as *St. Paul* afterwards speaks, it pleased the Father, *ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικῆσαι*, should dwell in him. See my Notes on *John i.*

III. I know that not only *Joan. Crellius*, and other *Unitarians*, but also *H. Grotius* interpret these things of the new Creation, and tell us that Christ is called here *the first-born of every Creature*, because he was the first and chief in the new Creation. But that is a forced interpretation, and remote from the most usual sense of the words, if we consider what follows. Besides, that in this place it should be said in the praise of Christ that he was before every new Creature, that is, before the Renovation made by himself, and this again proved by that Renovation, and repeated in *vers. 17.* is certainly flat and mean, when the thing is so evident of it self. Compare this place with *John i.* and see what I have there said.

*Verf. 16.* *Ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις, καὶ τὰ ὄντι ἂν ᾤσιν.*] I acknowledg that things are sometimes said *κτισθῆναι* which are constituted, or which have acquired a new State, as *Grotius* has shewn in his *Prolegomena*



*mena* before the Gospels: So Men converted to Christ are called *new* Chapter  
*Creatures*, and the like. I have shewn also that *κτίσειν* signifies *colonis* I.  
*instruere*, *To furnish with Inhabitants*, on Gen. i. 1. But if we through-  
 ly examin this phrase of St. Paul, we shall easily perceive that those  
 interpretations can here have no place. Christ is said here *κτίσας* to  
 have created all things in Heaven, which St. Paul afterwards inter-  
 prets of *Angels*. Now, 1<sup>st</sup>. This cannot signify *to constitute* the Angels  
 in Heaven which were already in it, and performed the same Offices  
 as before. 2<sup>ly</sup>. Nor can the Angels be said to have been put into a new  
 State, because nothing new betel them, but their becoming subject to the  
 Man Christ; upon which account they can no more be said *κτίσας*  
 by him, than the *Romans* by *Julius Caesar*, because he ruled over them  
 with the title of Perpetual Dictator; that is, not without speak-  
 ing very improperly. 3<sup>ly</sup>. Nor would it be any thing more proper  
 to say that the Angels *ἐκτίσθησαν*, because Heaven received new Inhabi-  
 tants into it. That these significations or any of them might be ad-  
 mitted, it should have been said *ἄγγελοι ἐκτίσθησαν*, and not the *Angels*, be-  
 cause we might then indeed think (if there was nothing in the Con-  
 text to oppose it) that things in Heaven were disposed after a new  
 manner, or that there was a certain use of it constituted and settled,  
 or lastly, that it was furnished with Inhabitants; but that the Angels  
 themselves, who were already in Heaven before the Man Christ, and  
 discharged the same Offices, should be said to be created or *conditi*  
*made*, the use of the Holy Scriptures will not bear, nor the genius of  
 the Hebrew or Greek Languages. I observe that the Learned do often  
 err, in thinking that any signification which belongs to words when  
 they are found separately, or in such or such a particular constructi-  
 on, may also be attributed to them in any construction whatsoever.  
 But if the reading of the Antients did not, methinks the very geni-  
 us of Modern Languages might teach them, that there is a great dif-  
 ference between the significations of words, according as they are  
 joined with one another, and that the sense of Phrases is quite chang-  
 ed by the addition or alteration of one small Particle.

To understand therefore the Apostle's mind, nothing can be here  
 more fitly devised than this Paraphrase: "Ὁς ἐν ἀρχαῖς ἦν ὁμοιωσ ἐν ἑαυτῷ  
 Θεῷ ἀειπαύ, καὶ ὡς Θεὸς ἦν ἀειπαύς πᾶσι κτίσας. δι' αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐκτίσθη τὸ πᾶν."  
*Who among Men was a visible Image of the invisible God, and was with*  
*God before all Creatures, for by him were all things created, &c.*

Ibid. Note b. I do not think the same words can be understood of  
 Angels and Men, as if the several Orders among both were intended  
 by the same Names. See *Grotius* on this place.

Ibid.

Chapter I. Ibid. Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται.] *All things were created by him, viz. διὰ Δεῦρα, by the divine Reason; and for him, that is, that the infinite Wisdom of the divine Reason might be made manifest. See John i. and my Notes on the first 18 Verses of that Gospel.*

Verf. 20. *Note c.* This Interpretation is violent and forced, and tho agreeable enough to *Divinity*, quite contrary to *Grammar*, and therefore I think it is wholly to be rejected. For the question is not, whether what Dr. *Hammond* says be true, but what the Apostle says in this place.

I. I acknowledg there is some agreement between *Ephes. ii. 14. & seqq.* and this place, for in both the Redemption of Christ is spoken of; but that they are perfectly and in all things parallel, I utterly deny, and so will any one who does but read both places with any Application. And therefore this place ought not to be strained, to agree exactly with that other.

II. This reasoning of our Author is inconclusive: *The Heavens and the Earth signify this lower World; this lower World is all one with Men; therefore all things in Heaven and Earth signifies all Men, Gentiles as well as Jews.* The parts of this Argument are false, and the consequence illegitimate. *First*, it is false that *Heaven and Earth* does any where signify merely this lower World, that is, the Earth and the Air lying round about it, exclusive of the upper spaces. For those words are used to comprehend the whole Universe, not excepting the Starry Heaven, as appears by *Gen. i.* I confess *Heaven* often signifies the Air, but then it is not joined with the *Earth*, which must be carefully observed; for the usual signification of an entire Phrase is one thing, and of single words another. *Secondly*, granting that the Phrase *Heaven and Earth* signifies this inferiour World, it will not follow that *Men* are so called, nor indeed *are* they so ever. But *thirdly*, suppose that also were true, it must be observed that it is not said here simply that *Heaven and Earth* were reconciled, but *all things which are in Heaven or in Earth*, which is a quite different thing; for in this phrase, the Heaven and the Earth, are clearly distinguished from those who are in them; nor can the words *Heaven and Earth* be here thought synonymous to the name *World*, which often signifies Men. The Particle *ἢ* or, which being twice repeated is a *Disjunctive*, shews also that *those who are in Heaven*, are not the same with those *who are on Earth*, and therefore that *Men* only cannot be intended. Besides, tho the word *World* signifies all Men, and *Heaven and Earth* is called the World, it does not follow that Men may be signified by these words, *all things which are in Heaven or in Earth.* In interpreting Languages



guages it must not only be consider'd what may be said without absurdity according to Analogy, but with Analogy we must join use ; Chapter I.

*Quem penes arbitrium est, & lex, & norma loquendi.*

Fourthly, hence it may be inferred, that what our Author adds about the Phrase *πάντα κτίσις every Creature*, is to no purpose, for it is certain that is often used to signify all Men ; but that this other *all things both which are in Heaven and on Earth* signifies the same, appears by no example.

III. If *Eph. ii. 16.* ought to be corrected to Dr. Hammond's mind, we should not change *εἰς αὐτὸν* into *εἰς αὐτὸ*, which would here signify nothing, but into *εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ* into the same : But there is no need of any correction. What follows makes nothing to the purpose ; and as it does not help Dr. Hammond, so it does not hurt me.

IV. The reconciliation of Angels is not to be understood of a reconciliation with God, but with Men, who being God's *Enemies by evil Works*, were at the same time Enemies to the Holy Angels ; which are so intimately allied to God, that the Friends and Enemies of the one are the Enemies and Friends of the other. But Men being once converted by Christ to a holy and religious Life, and made Friends with God, they become also Friends to the Angels, who love the good as much as they detest the wicked. Thus God has reconciled all things *into him*, that is, Angels and Men, acknowledging and worshipping one Lord Jesus Christ ; made them Friends with one another, and composed one Family of both these orders of Creatures, who were before at a vast distance from each other, both in their Habitations and Dispositions. This is that which is signified in *Ephes. i. 10.* on which place see *Grotius*. It was a Mystery before unknown, that the time would come when *πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ γῆ*, that is, *all the Nations upon Earth*, should become one Family with the Angels, as well as the Jews ; that is, should own and worship the true God according to his own prescriptions, and so be accounted his Children. Which being so, what our Author alledges as out of that place in *St. Paul*, to confirm his interpretation of this, is insignificant.

Verf. 22. *Note d.* *Grotius* and others, much better interpret this Phrase of a *fleshy Body*, that is, obnoxious to the same Infirmities as ours. It is not true, that *σῶμα* signifies *Body*, tho our Author has several times affirmed it.

Verf. 24. *Τὰ ὕστερόματι ἢ ἐλίψεων τὰ Χριστοῦ.*] That is, I that formerly persecuted the Church of Christ, do now on the contrary suffer many evils

Chapter evils for its advantage, and go on to suffer with undaunted constancy.  
 II. all that Christ has left me to suffer for his Church. So I have interpreted this place in my *Ars Critica*, Part 2, S. 1. C. xii. where see what I have said.

## C H A P. II.

Verf. 8. **I** Easily grant that these Words signify Philosophical Doctrines; but it does not appear to me that the *Gnosticks* are here referred to. For why may not the Apostle have a respect to the Heathen Philosophers, who had not a full and entire knowledg of true Vertue, but only some *Elements* of it? No body certainly can doubt but there were Philosophers in all parts of *Asia*, who might oppose the Christian Religion; but it is not so easy to prove that the Followers of *Simon* were so universally dispersed.

Verf. 9. Note c. The Context seeming to require the sense which our Author gives of this place, it is probable to me that *συχία* signifies here indeed Elements, or Rudiments of Vertue; but that *S. Paul* alludes to another Signification of that Word, because he opposes to *συχία*, *σῶμα θεότητος*, the *Body of the Deity*. And that is when it is taken for a *Shadow*, of which Signification we have a clear Instance in these words of *Julius Pollux*, Lib. VI. c. 8. τῇ σκιᾷ δ' ἐτεκμαίεοντο ἢ καλεῖσθαι τὸ ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον ὄδῳ, ἢ καὶ ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΟΝ ἐπιλάβην. καὶ ἔδῳ σπεύδειν εἰ δεχόμενοι τὸ συχίον εἶναι: they gathered from the Shadow when it was time to go to the Supper, which [shadow] they called *συχίον*: and it behoved them to make haste if the *συχίον* was ten foot long. This he took from *Aristophanes*, in whom a Woman is brought in speaking thus, in *Concionat.* pag. 744. Ed. *Maj.* Genev.

————— σὺ δὲ μελίση

Ὅταν ἢ δεχόμενοι τὸ συχίον, λιπαρῶς χωρεῖν εἰς δεῖπνον.

Take care, as soon as the Shadow (on the Sundial) is ten foot long, to go [instantly] or neatly to the Supper. On which place the Scholiast has the same Observation with that I have set down out of *Pollux*. And hence perhaps the Representations which are made to us in Dreams were called *συχία*, because they are as the obscure Shadows of things. *Suidas*: Συχία, αἱ εἰκόνες καὶ διαπλάσεις τῶν ὀνείρων, αἱ δὲ ὀλίγη ἢ πολλὰ χρόνῳ ἔλθουσιν ἔξω: the Images and Fictions of Dreams, which in a shorter or longer time have their exit. So that *συχία κόσμος*, that is, an obscure and faint Description of those Duties which Men ought to perform, or the gross and rude Elements of Vertue, are very fitly here opposed πάντι πληρώματι θεότητος σωματικῶς κατοικήσει ἐν Χριστῷ, to all the Fullness of the Godhead dwelling bodily in Christ. Verf.





Chapter II. Vers. 19. Πάν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τοῦ ἀφῶν, &c.] I have explained this place, contrary to Dr. Hammond, on Eph. iv. 16.

*Ibid.* in Note i. pag. 658. col. 2. lin. 16. After the words *Advice or Opinion only.*] That which Dr. Hammond adds, in the end of this Note, after the words here set down, being an explication of some passages in the *English-Saxon* Councils, which cannot be understood by those who are ignorant of the old Saxon Language, and is in it self of little moment, I have omitted in my Latin Translation. But instead of it I shall make some remarks on St. Paul's words, and the foregoing part of the *Doctor's* Annotation.

I. The words *μὴ ἀψῆ, μὴ γεύσῃ,* are very fitly referred to forbidden Meats; for Swines-flesh could not be touched according to the Jewish Statutes, without pollution; and it was unlawful to taste or eat several other sorts of Meats which might be touched without Defilement. Or else, as *Grotius* thinks, these words might be rendred, *ne tangas ut vescaris,* touch not with a design to eat, of which see my Note on Gen. iii. 3. The words *μὴ ἅψῃς* I refer also to the same forbidden Meats. Tho the Verb *ἅψῃς* be used in places where another that signified to come near might have been used almost in the same sense, it does not therefore follow that that Verb may be so rendred, or signifies just the same, because handling is something more than coming near; for one that comes near a thing does not therefore touch it, tho it cannot be touched without coming near it. The *Judaizers* often made use of these words, speaking of those Meats which were prohibited by the Law, touch not, taste not, handle not; not all perhaps at the same time, or in the same order, but now one, and then another, just as it happen'd. So that it is no matter if the same thing be repeated, as long as they are different words, which were equally used to signify one thing.

II. The following words *ἃ ἐστὶν πάντα εἰς ἐπιπέδον τῆ ἀπορροῆς,* are, I suppose, to be understood, with *Grotius*, of the corruption of Meats call out of the Body *τῆ ἀπορροῆς*; (for so it must be read with some of the Antients) by excretion, i. e. by their being turned into excrements. To which there is a parallel sense in *Mat. xv. 17.* In-comparison with this, our Author's interpretation is harsh and violent. For how could it be said of the Meats from which the Jews abstained, *which are abused to bring in abominable Lusts?* That agrees indeed to the Doctrine about the unlawfulness of Marriage, but by no means to abstinence from Meats, which yet the *Doctor* would have to be also respected in the words immediately foregoing.

III. *Τὸν* does sometimes undoubtedly signify a Price, or also a Reward, from *τιμὴ* to pay; but *μηδὲ τιμῆς* cannot therefore here be the supplying of  
the



*the wants of the Flesh*, because it is opposed τῇ ἀσκειᾷ σώματος to *pinching and not sparing the Body*. And so those who live an austere Life, and content themselves with mean fare, are very fitly said to live ἐκ ἐν τιμῇ σαρκός, because they seem to give no *honour* to their Bodies. It is also a forced Interpretation of τιμῇ σαρκός to say that it signifies *Marriage or the honourable use of Marriage*, because the conjugal State is somewhere said to be τιμῆ, *honourable*, and he that lives chastly, and does not pollute his Body with shameful Lusts, may be said ἐν τιμῇ σώμα ἔχειν to *possess his Body in honour*. There must always be a regard had to places and construction, in finding out what words signify, and not any signification affixed to them in all places, as our Author sometimes does.

IV. In 1 *Thess.* iv. 5. a. Copies read πάθει ἐπιθυμίας, not πάθει ἀτιμίας, and Dr. *Hammond* ought not to have produced his own Conjecture for the words of *St. Paul*, without an Admonition. See on that place.

V. I do not indeed condemn all ἐθελουσισκεία, as it is described by our Author; but I cannot persuade my self that *St. Paul* here uses that word in a good sense. When he says that the Life of those whom he condemns, had some λόγον σοφίας, he does not speak his own Sentiments, but the opinion of the Vulgar, who are more taken with those outward shews; than with true inward Piety. And I have this reason on my side, that according to the judgment of *St. Paul*, that *Humility* which consisted in the worship of Angels, had no appearance of Virtue in it; because to speak in the softest terms, it favoured something of Idolatry. The same may be said of ἀσκειᾷ σώματος, which he declares to profit but little; which place I wonder Dr. *Hammond* would alledg, seeing it makes so much against him. But besides this, there is another reason which puts this matter out of all doubt, and that is, that the ἐθελουσισκεία here spoken of, is the worship of Angels, which was therefore unlawful because *voluntary*; it being unwarrantable to invent εἰδωλετῶν objects of *Worship* to our selves, of our own accord, without a Command from God. Compare this verse with the 18th, where *St. Paul* speaks thus, *Let no Man seduce you in a voluntary Humility, and worshipping of Angels*; and there will be no doubt but the *voluntary Worship*, which the Apostle here speaks of, is the *worshipping of Angels*, it being manifest that he treats of the same thing in both places. So that ἐθελουσισκεία according to *St. Paul's* notion of it, signifies something unlawful, tho the common sort of People who did not understand the nature of true Piety, admired such *voluntary and affected Worship*.

Chapter VI. But the case, as to the freewill-Offerings of the Jews, and the  
 II. *voluntary Worship of Angels*, of which S. Paul here speaks, was quite  
 different. For God had commanded that Sacrifices should be offer'd  
 to him, and prescribed the way in which they were all to be offered ;  
 so that all that was voluntary in those Sacrifices, was the offering them  
 up at such certain times as the Suppliant of his own accord determined,  
 according to God's prescribed Rule, both as to the matter and man-  
 ner. But God never commanded or permitted that religious Worship  
 should be given to any but himself and his only begotten Son ; and  
 much less has he prescribed the manner how Angels ought to be wor-  
 shipped. So that there can be no comparison between these two  
 things.

VII. I acknowledg there may be some things good in themselves,  
 which yet may be omitted without Sin ; but that therefore ἐθελοθρησκεία  
 here is taken in a good sense, I do not think, because θρησκεία properly  
 signifies religious Worship, which we may not give to any of our  
 own accord. But the *Doctor* understood the matter here so, as if  
 θρησκεία signified either a lawful way of divine Worship, or any Action  
 good in it self, but not indispensably commanded. And so indeed  
 ἐθελοθρησκεία may be taken in a good sense : but the former, which I take  
 to be the sense wherein it is used by the Apostle, is a bad one.

VIII. After all, there are two things which seem necessary to be  
 observed concerning all voluntary Actions relating to Piety ; which if  
 they be not consider'd, this whole business will be very obscure, and  
 may be misunderstood.

*First*, That under the Gospel, to make any voluntary course or act  
 of Piety acceptable to God, the matter about which it is conversant  
 must be good in it self, and such as cannot be done but by a good man,  
 and consequently a better than those who do not perform any such  
 Action : otherwise, if it be a thing indifferent in its own nature, and  
 may be done by bad men as well as good, that voluntary Piety can-  
 not be thought to please God. To preach the Gospel with a pious  
 design, and ἀδύπαρον without making it chargeable to the Hearers, that  
 so men might be the more easily perswaded to the practice of Ver-  
 tue, and brought to believe in Christ, was a thing good in it self,  
 and could not but be commendable in St. Paul, and acceptable to  
 God. But to live a single Life, tho chaste, is a thing neither good  
 nor evil, if it be opposed to a chaste married Life ; and may be found  
 in a man that is proud, unmerciful, contentious, or imperious, and  
 consequently worse than others who are married. And therefore that  
*voluntary Piety*, as it is called, cannot please God, whatever is said  
 by



by S. *Jerom*; who was not a whit the better for being a single man. Chapter II.  
The same may be said of all other things of the like nature.

The *second* thing to be carefully observed in this matter is, that voluntary acts of Piety are commendable only in those who observe what is indispensably required, and not in those who neglecting necessary and commanded Duty, as mean and trivial, would seem to aspire to some higher degree of Piety. For what Master would be well pleased with a Servant, who omitting his express Orders, should set himself to do other things greater than he commanded him to do? All Masters, and that with reason, expect their Servants should do first what they require of them; and then, and not before, they may attempt to do something extraordinary; otherwise they are offended with the pride and perverseness of those Servants, who when they do not perform what is exacted from them, are yet vainly ambitious of appearing better than others. St. *Paul*, after he had done all those things which became a good man and an Apostle, preached the Gospel *freely*, to his great Commendation, and with the sure hope of a special Reward. But if he had neglected plain Duty, or any essential part of his Apostolical Office, and pleased himself only with this, that he had preached the Gospel without making it costly to his Hearers, he would not upon that account have been any thing the more acceptable to God. And so when we see that some of those in antient times who shut up themselves in Monasteries, under a pretence of exercising themselves in a more sublime course of Piety, and being righteous above what is commanded, do manifestly discover a great deal of Pride, Hatred of their Neighbour, Impatience of Injuries, and the like Vices, in their Writings; he must be either stupid, or infected with the same Vices himself, that admires them, or thinks they were for that reason at all more pleasing to God. Such also were the *Pharisees*, at least for the most part, whom Christ so sharply reproveth, and whose ἐδειλοπεριουθησικαία I cannot but wonder that Dr. *Hammond* should take in a laudable sense. No one that reads the beginning of the description of their Heresy, in *Epiphanius*, can doubt but that word is used in a bad notion. The learned *Dion. Petavius*, tho a Jesuit, presently saw this, as appears by his Version of *Epiphanius*'s words, here subjoined: Ἐλέγητο ὁ Φαρισαῖος διὰ ἀφωρισμῶν εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐπὶ ἑσῶ ἄλλων διὰ τὴν ἐδειλοπεριουθησικαίαν παρ' αὐτοῖς νενομισμῶν: *Qui ideo, saith Petavius, Pharisei dicti sunt, quod essent, propter adscititiam, superstitionisamque disciplinam à reliquis sejuncti; who were therefore called Pharisees, because by their affected and superstitious Discipline they were distinguished from others.*

Hence.

Chapter  
III.

Hence it may be inferred in the *third* place, that those whose business it is to persuade men to Piety, have seldom need to recommend *supererogation* to their Auditors, there being very few who perform necessary duties as they ought. These are the things which should be urged, and often inculcated; seeing, especially, they are of a vast extent, and frequently violated. Other things may be safely let alone, because those who are fit to be exhorted to works of Supererogation, are not only few in number, but do not need Exhortations to them.

IX. Sacrifices not commanded by God, and Holy-days, and other things of the same nature, not prescribed by any divine Laws, were in themselves neither good nor evil; nor could they be acceptable to God, any otherwise than as they were performed with a devout and affectionate mind: and therefore accurately speaking, it was not those voluntary acts of Piety, materially considered, wherewith God was pleased, but the devout Mind of those that performed them. Which was then only truly so, when, after they had done what was commanded them, they performed over and above those uncommanded things. The same may be said now of Ecclesiastical Rites, not prescribed by God, the observation of which can no otherwise, than upon those terms, be pleasing to him.

X. I wonder our Author should alledg the words of *Maimonides*, which have no manner of agreement with what he says; nay, are contrary to it. And yet he uses them elsewhere to the same purpose. See his Note on 1 Cor. ix. 17.

### C H A P. III.

Verf. 14. **I**F the phrase *Bond of perfectness* were an *Hypallage*, it would signify *perfectness of Bond*, and not a *perfect Bond*. If we observe that S. Paul in the 12th Verse uses a Metaphor taken from Garments, and that the word *ἑνωσθε* there used must be repeated again in this, we shall easily see that he continues the same Metaphor: *And over all these things [put on] Charity, which is the Bond of perfectness*. In which words, the Apostle alludes to a Girdle, which being put over our Garments, binds them fast together; and his meaning may be expressed in this manner: "After ye have put on all other Vertues, over them put on Charity, which, like a Girdle, may bind them fast together. So that *ἑνωσθε* will signify here what it usually signifies; that is, a concurrence or consort of all Vertues; which wherever it is found, denominates a Christian *ἑνωσθε*."

CHAP.





CHAP. IV.

Verf. 5. **K** *Αἰεὶν ὁρῶμεν ἅμα.*] That is, endeavouring to get time allowed by the Heathens for the spreading of the Gospel, lest it be oppressed in its first rise, which it was possible for them to obtain by Prudence. See my Note on *Eph. v. 16.*

Verf. 16. *Note a.* I. As to the thing it self, I fully agree here with *Dr. Hammond*; yet I cannot but caution the Reader, that he should not think the words he produces as out of the *Digest.* to be the very words of the antient Lawyers. Our learned Author did not look into the *Digesta*, but transcribed the words of *Grotius* in his *Annot.* on the Inscription of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, which he erroneously thought to be the same with those contained in the *Digesta.* *Grotius* his words are these: *Litteræ ejus sunt, cujus tabellario sunt traditæ, multoque magis ubi & redditæ sunt. L. Si Epistolam D. de acquirendo rerum Dominio.* But *Labeo* in *Lib. vi. Pitban.* epitomized by *Paulus*, whose words are in *Dig. Lib. xli. Tit. 1. S. 65.* speaks thus: *Si Epistolam tibi misero, non erit ea tua, antequam reddita fuerit. Paulus: imò contrà, nam si miseris ad me Tabellarium tuum, & ego rescribendi causa litteras tibi misero, simul atque Tabellario tuo tradidero, tuæ fient. Idem accidit in his litteris, quas tuæ duntaxat rei gratia misero; vultu si petieris a me, uti te alicui commendarem, & eas commendatitias tibi misero litteras. If I send you a Letter, it will not be yours before it is delivered to you. Paulus: Nay on the contrary, if you send me your Carrier [with a Letter] and I write another in answer to it, as soon as ever I deliver it to the Carrier, it becomes yours. And the same may be said of a Letter which I should send only on your behalf to another Person; as suppose you should desire me to recommend you to any one, and I should send you that commendatory Letter. These words *Grotius* abbreviated, whose Epitome of them, the *Doctor* rashly took for the words of the Lawyers themselves. Yet hence it appears that an Epistle of *Laodicea* may signify not only one written by the *Laodiceans*, but also one sent to the *Laodiceans.* In the mean while, those who desire neither to be mistaken themselves, nor to deceive others, may learn by this example, not rashly to believe other Mens Citations, nor to alledg Authors themselves upon trust.*

II. Our learned Author seems as little to have look'd into those places of *Tertullian*, where he speaks of the Epistle to the *Laodiceans*; for he

affirms expressly, and does not only *seem to affirm*, that it was the Epistle to the Ephesians, whose Inscription *Marcion* had changed. Lib. 5. c. ii. against *Marcion*. *Præterea hic, saith he, & de alia Epistola, quam nos ad Ephesios præscriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodiceos. I forbear also to speak of another Epistle which we have inscribed to the Ephesians, but the Hereticks to the Laodiceans.* And cap. 17. *Ecclesiæ quidem veritate Epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodiceos; sed Marcion alterando ei titulum interpolare gestiit, quasi & in isto diligentissimus exhibitor.* *We of the true Church read that Epistle as directed to the Ephesians, not to the Laodiceans; but Marcion once thought fit to change its Title, desiring in that also to be look'd on as a very diligent Critick.*

Verf. 15. *Act. b.* I. Every time almost that *Dr. Hammond* speaks of *St. Paul's Bonds*, he uses the word *imprisoned*. As here speaking of *Philemon*, he says, *he was imprisoned at Rome with St. Paul*, and again, *James Prisoner with St. Paul*. But *St. Paul* was not imprisoned, but he was bound in the same Chain with a Souldier, as the *Doctor* himself has shew'd out of *Lipsius*, in a Note on *Acts xxviii. 16*. And perhaps he meant no more than that here, when he uses the word *imprisoned*; but because such an improper Phrase might lead his Reader into a Mistake, it was not to be pass'd by without Censure.

II. I do not well understand how the *Colossians* should here be exhort'd to a law with *Archippus*, who had an Episcopal Authority over that Church, according to *Dr. Hammond*, with these words, *Take heed to the Ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, to fulfil it; unless perhaps Archippus be charged with negligence, and therefore is here commanded to be publickly reprov'd and admonish'd by the whole Congregation.* But it may be he was not the Bishop of *Colossæ*, but an *Evangelist*, who did not execute his Office so diligently as he ought; and lying idle among the *Colossians*, or somewhere in the *Neighbourhood*, was to be admonish'd by them. Which seems the more probable, because this *Archippus*, in the *Epistle to Philemon* ver. 2. is call'd the fellow Souldier, *συνεργός* of *St. Paul*. On which place see *Grotius*.

Verf. 17. *Ἐπίστευσα ὑμῶν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὸν πληροῖς.*] *Grotius*, who is followed therein by our Author, thinks there is a *Hebraism* in these words for, *see that thou fulfil in the Lord the Ministry which thou hast received; so that the phrase in the Lord should signify, according to the Precepts of the Lord.* But tho I do not deny but this may be the meaning of *St. Paul's* words, they are capable of two other senses:

first,



first, Consider thoroughly the Office which thou hast received in the Lord, in Chapter order to a complete discharge of it; or else, secondly, Consider in the Lord, IV. that is, as in the sight of the Lord, or, according to the Precepts of the Lord, &c. So the Verb βλέπειν is sometimes taken, as in 2 John 8. βλέπετε ἑαυτοὺς, &c. See your selves that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full Reward; that is, thoroughly consider or examin your selves, &c. Ἐν Κρείῳ and ἐν Χειρῶν are all one, and according to the various significations of the Preposition ἐν, which is ordinarily rendred ἐν and used in a manifold sense, signify diverse things. I confess I do not know which of these senses is the best.

Verf. 18. Μνημονεύετε με τῶν δεσμῶν.] The bare remembring of St. Paul's Bonds being in it self no part of Piety, it is consequent the design of the Apostle in these words must be, to admonish the Colossians to behave themselves both towards God and towards him, as became those that were mindful of his Bonds; that is, who very well knew that he was cast into those Bonds only for the sake of the Gospel; or to be constant in the profession of the Christian Religion, as he was, and love him, and pray to God in his behalf, that he might be set at liberty.

# ANNOTATIONS

On the First Epistle

Of St. *Paul* the Apostle to the *Thessalonians*.

**A**T the end of the *Præmon.*] I. Dr. *Pearson* and other the most exact Chronologers, suppose this Epistle was written in the year of *Christ* lli. or the xiith of *Claudius*.

II. I have already several times observed, that the *Jews* were neither so formidable as our Author thought, nor the *Christians* so perfectly set free from persecution by *their* destruction throughout all the parts of the Roman Empire; so as that those who dwelt in *Greece* found the Heathens more favourable to them, after the overthrow of *Jerusalem*, and the excision of the *Jews*.

III. I do not easily believe what *Eusebius* says about the journey of *Simon Magus* to *Rome*, nor *St. Peter's* contest with him, which seems to be all taken *ex Clementinis*, and out of *Justin*; the former being a feigned History, and *Justin* having run into a mistake through his ignorance in the Latin Tongue, as learned Men have long ago observed. I wonder our Author, in this discerning Age, in

*Quo pueri nasum Rhinocerotis habent,*

should build his Interpretation upon such rotten and nauseous Fables: But he produces, you will say, the Testimonies of *Eusebius* and *St. Jerom*, and *Orosius*. But this is but one Witness all this while, because the two latter only transcribed *Eusebius*; and the single Authority of *Eusebius* is not much to be regarded, because he often affirms things without considering whether they are true or false, and some that are manifestly feigned. It's true, *Justin* makes mention of the Statue of *Simon*, in his Apology, commonly called the *Second*; but he says nothing at all about *St. Peter's* Conflict or Victory over him, which he would never have omitted, if that had been the general opinion of those times, because it might be made very great use of against  
the



the Heathens, whom he upbraids with deifying *Simon*. *Irenæus* also Chapter I.  
mentions the *Statue*, in Lib. 1. c. 20. but says nothing about the con-  
test. That was but an invention of the *false Clement*, which others  
rashly received for truth. There being very few, if any Histo-  
rical Records in the first Age, excepting the *Acts* of the *Apostles*,  
Men that had nothing else to do, misemployed their wits in devising  
Fables, which the injudiciousness of Posterity has almost made it  
a Crime to question the truth of. But I am sorry to find Dr. *Ham-*  
*mond* should so easily give Credit to these Trifles.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 1. **T**ῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ.] There are a few things which it may not be  
amiss to remark upon this Chapter, tho Dr. *Hammond*  
has passed it over without any Annotations, content-  
ing himself to express what he thought to be the meaning of it in his  
Paraphrase. *Grotius* explaining these words tells us, that the Apostle,  
*non nominat hic Presbyteros & Diaconos, quia recens erat Ecclesia, nec  
dum formam plenam acceperat; does not name here Presbyters and Dea-*  
*cons, because the Church of Thessalonica had been but lately gathered,*  
*and not yet formed into a regular Church.* But if this reason be good,  
none of the Churches to which St. *Paul* wrote, except that of *Philippi*,  
were regularly formed Churches; because there is no mention made of  
Church-Governors, Bishops and Deacons, in the inscriptions of any  
of the Epistles, but to the *Philippians*. But who will believe that the  
*Ephesian* and *Corinthian* Churches, in which St. *Paul* had for a great  
while resided, were not yet so constituted as to have Rectors in them;  
and yet that the Church of *Philippi*, in which he made a shorter stay,  
had? Of the Church of *Ephesus* the contrary appears from *Acts* xx.  
17, 28. and of the *Corinthian*, by the Epistles themselves written to that  
Church. So that there must be another reason given for St. *Paul's*  
not making mention of *Bishops and Deacons* in the Inscriptions of all  
his Epistles. And that which seems to me the most probable is,  
that the Governors of the Primitive Churches were modest, humble  
Men, who were unwilling to have themselves distinguished from the  
rest of the People in the front of St. *Paul's* Epistles, that they might  
not appear to pretend to any magisterial Authority, but to look up-  
on themselves only as Ministers instituted for the sake of Order and  
Christian Society. There are a great many signs of this, especially  
in the Epistles to the *Corinthians*, in which the Governors of the  
Churches of *Achaia* are no where order'd to use any Authority in the  
Administra-

Chapter Administration of their Office, or in curbing evil Men who broke the Order of the Church. *St. Paul* every where speaks to whole Churches, never to the Governors of them apart from the People. However I would not be thought to deny, that some Churches were not yet compleatly formed when *St. Paul* wrote to them; in which number seems to have been the Church of *Rome*. But this of *Thessalonica* must be excepted, as appears from *Chap. v. 12, 13*.

Ibid. [Ἐν Θεῷ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ.] That is, the Church of God and Christ. The Jews often pleaded that they were קהל מן עמך יהוה *Kahal o bedath Jehovah, The Congregation of the Lord*, a phrase not unusual in *Moses*, of which we have an example in *Num. xvi. 3*. Now to distinguish the Christians from the Jews, *St. Paul* calls them, not only the Church or Congregation of God, but of Christ. The Phrase ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι to be in Christ, is to be a Christian, and being subjoined to ἐκκλησία signifies a Christian Church, or a Church of Christ. See Note on *Rom. xii. 5*.

Verf. 3. [Ἐργῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως.] The Genitive Case here signifies the relation of a cause to its effect; so that ἔργον τῆς πίστεως, is a work of which Faith is the cause, or such a work as can proceed only from Faith. Such was mens renouncing Heathenism, and totally forsaking their old Customs and Practices in order to embrace the Christian Religion, and regulate the remaining part of their Lives according to its Precepts; which could not be done but by those who believed *Jesus* to be truly sent from God, and gave the Apostles a Commission to preach what they did, and so the whole Doctrine of the Gospel to be true. About the ambiguous signification of a Genitive case, see what I have said in my *Ars Critica*, Part 2. Sect. 1. C. xii.

Ibid. [Κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης.] Love or Charity creates κόπον, that is, labour to a degree of Fatigue, when a Man loves his Neighbour so as to put himself to a great many Hardships and Troubles, and resolves to spare no pains whereby he may benefit others. Such was the Charity of *St. Paul*, who patiently underwent incredible difficulties in those long Journeys, to mention no more, which he made, that he might rescue multitudes of Men from eternal Destruction. And that the *Thessalonians* followed his example, as far as they could, he himself teaches us in this place.

Ibid. [Τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος.] That patience of Adversities, which Hope produces, is never more remarkable, than when Christians are persecuted for their Religion, and submit to any Sufferings rather than comply with the demands of Heathens. For the hope of eternal Happiness makes them most patiently undergo the cruellest Torments.

The



The Apostle therefore here teaches us that from the three great Vertues of Faith, Charity, and Hope, proceed as all kind of good Works, so particularly an officious Diligence, which declines no Labour, and submits to any Calamities whatsoever. Chapter:  
I.

[Ibid. Ἐμπεσόντων τῷ Θεῷ.] That is, God looking on, as an *Agonotheta* or *Overseer of the Games*, who confers a Crown on those that exercise themselves in Christian Vertues, and persevere in them to their lives end. The *Arabick* and *Syriack* seem to have omitted these Words, because they could not connect them with the foregoing, when other Copies have them. But they might have been left out without disturbing or altering the Sense.

Verf. 4. Εἰδότες — τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν.] That is, knowing and seeing that upon your embracing the Gospel, God has actually distinguished you from other People. See Note on *Eph.* i. 4. They who rejected the Gospel when preached to them, were not discriminated from other people, but lay buried still among the unbelieving multitude of Mankind, as before.

Verf. 6. Ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ.] Supply ἔντι, *having received the Word, which was in much affliction*, that is, the Preachers of which were grievously afflicted; *with joy of the Holy Ghost*, that is, with a pious cheerfulness, preferring a good Conscience and the hope of eternal Happiness, to carnal Joy, joined with a course of Sin, and worldly Possessions.

Verf. 7. Ἰστέτε.] See what I have said on this Word on *1 Cor.* x. 7.

Verf. 8. Ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἃ ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐμόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν παντί τόπῳ ἢ πίστις ὑμῶν — ἐξελήλυθεν.] *Beza* and *Grotius* think that ἐμόνον must be prefixed to the Words ὁ λόγος, as if the Sense should be: *For from you not only sounded forth the Word of the Lord in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place your Faith is spread abroad.* But if we carefully consider these words, we shall perceive that the opposition here is not between ἐξήχησεν λόγος *the sounding out of the Word*, and πίστις *the Thessalonians Faith*, but between *Macedonia and Achaia*, which were parts of *Greece*, and every place, that is, all the places of the *Roman Empire* in which there were any Christians. For the Discourse ascends in this manner: “The Gospel is become famous not only in some Countries of *Greece*, by the means of your Faith, whereof they have heard, but also through all the Christian Churches your Faith is spread abroad. *The Word of God* is said to have sounded forth from the *Thessalonians* in *Macedonia* and *Achaia*, that is, to have been made famous by their Faith. And this is what is meant by the ἐξήχθη ἐκ ὑμῶν πίστις, *the going out of their Faith*, for to go out is to be spread abroad. See *Psalms* xix. 4. and interpreters.

Verf.

Chapter II. Verſ. 9. [Ὁπίαν εἰσόδον ἔχομεν.] The *Alexandrian* Copy here reads ἔχομεν *we had*, which is better than ἔχομεν, becauſe ἐπιτετέλετε follows, and the *Discourſe* is about a thing paſt: So that it *muſt* be read either ἔχομεν, or εἶχομεν.

Verſ. 10. Τὸν φόβον.] *Grotius* thinks this is the Preſent tenſe for the Future, but without any neceſſity; for he at *preſent* frees us from the *Wrath to come*, that ſets us upon ſuch a Courſe of Life, which if we conſtantly follow, we ſhall have no reaſon to fear that Wrath. *Dr. Hammond* thinks the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* is alſo here inti- mated; but I am not of his opinion.

## C H A P. II.

Verſ. 1. **I** had rather retain here the uſual ſignification of the Word *Νόσα*. *κενός*, for *vain* or *light*. For *St. Paul* ſhews in the following Verſe, that it was not any Raſhneſs or Vanity that had put him upon preaching the Goſpel, which he himſelf did not believe to be true, in *Macedonia*: becauſe notwithstanding the fierce oppoſition and deſpiteful uſage which he met with from the *Jews* at *Philippi*, he had conſtantly perſiſted in his Work. For raſh and vainglorious Men do indeed eaſily ſometimes undertake difficult things, but they eaſily lay their Deſigns aſide, if they meet with any great difficulties in their way: But thoſe who have thoroughly conſidered things, and think, for very good reaſons, they ought to do that which they have undertaken, cannot be deterred by any Difficulties from pro- ſecuting their firſt Purpoſe. They may apply to themſelves that ſaying of *Aeneas* to the *Sybil*, in *Virgil*, *Aeneid. Lib. vi. verſ. 102.*

*Non ulla laborum,  
O Virgo, nova mi facies, inopinave surgit;  
Omnia praecepi, atque animo mecum ante peregi.*

Verſ. 5. *Notes d and e.* I. I eaſily aſſent to *Dr. Hammond*, interpreting the Word *ἀγορεύω* here by *talk* or *report*; for *ἀγορεύω* has often that ſignification, as *H. Stephanus* will ſhew. I ſee alſo that *Conſtantine* produces out of *Ariſtotle* the Phraſe ἐν ἀγορῇ ἕσθαι, for *to be the Subject of mens Diſcourſe*; *hominum ſermonibus celebrari*. So that if *St. Paul's* Words were to be rendred in *French*, in agreement with that Latin Phraſe, they would be rightly translated thus: *nous n' avons jamais été en réputation de flatterie: We were never reputed to flatter.*

II. But



II. But I question whether he did not misunderstand the Words Chapter of *Phavorinus*, from which he endeavours to prove that *αἰτία* signifies an *Accusation*; for wherever he renders *αἰτία* an *Accusation*, it might as well be rendered a *Cause* or *Plea*, whether true or pretended. For instance, *Phavorinus* saith, *αἰτίας, κρείας ὁ ἀστυνόμος ἐναγίστα πρὸ λόγου, ἐπὶ καταρκεία πρὸς καὶ ἀποτέτυ ἀπλῶς καὶ αἰτία*: the word *αἰτίας* is properly a *specious Oration pretended in accusation of any one, but secondarily simply a Cause*. I am apt to think this must be understood of one that acts the part of an Advocate, and brings an Excuse in defence of his Client against his Plaintiff; because the word *αἰτίας* in good Authors often signifies an *Excuse*, but never an *Accusation*. And the Defendant or accused Party is excused *αἰτίας*; that is, by a feigned Cause or Plea alledged to shew that he ought to have done as he did. His Fault is coloured over with a handsom name. Afterwards *αἰτίας* signified any *Cause*. This I am sure is agreeable to the perpetual use of Greek Authors. Besides, *Phavorinus* interprets the Verb *αἰτίας* in Latin by *ἐξέσω excuso*, which ought not to be changed, that being undoubtedly often the signification of that Verb. However, our Author seems to have understood the Words of *St. Paul* rightly as to the Sense of the Phrase, tho perhaps he did not perceive the full and critical importance of it, it being more probable that *ἐν αἰτίας* signifies in a pretence of *Covetousness*, and so the just meaning of the Apostle will be, that he never gave any man the least *pretence* or occasion to accuse him of *Covetousness*. So *αἰτίας* in the *Septuagint* on *Deut. xxii. 14.* seem to be Discourses, wherein a Man seeks a *pretence* or occasion to put away his Wife, which agrees with the Vulgar Translation. And in *Dan. vi. αἰτίας* is to seek a *pretence*, which the Conspirators might speciously use to destroy *Daniel*.

III. I have shewn on *Rom. i. 29.* that our Author is mistaken, wherever he interprets the word *αλεονεξία Lust*, and in this place he commits the same Error. *St. Paul* shews that he never gave any one the least ground to suspect him of *αλεονεξία*, or *Covetousness*, in *vers. 6. and 9.*

*Vers. 6. Note f.* To denominate Letters *βαρῆς* weighty or severe, it is not necessary they should threaten *Excommunication*; for there may be weighty, *i. e.* severe Letters, which have nothing in them about *Excommunication*. Besides *βαρῆς* no where signifies *Excommunication*, or any thing like it; and much less can the Phrase *ἐν βαρῆς* be interpreted to *excommunicate*, according to the use of the Greek Tongue, either in Profane, or even in Sacred Writers. *ἐν βαρῆς*, as *Crotius* and others well observe, is the same with *ἐπιβαρῆς*, in *ver. 9.* It is of-

Chapter posed to ἡμοὶ γενέσθαι, because he that rigidly or severely exacts his right  
 III. is ἐν βάσει, *burdensome*, but he that recedes from it, ἡμῶν. If the *Doctor*  
 had thought of these things, he would not have look'd here for  
 Church-censures without any example: but it was his failing to be  
 more inquisitive after them than he should be, which made him think  
 he had discovered them sometimes where they were not.

Verf. 19. Note κ. Στέφανος καυχίας is a Crown of which any man  
*boasts*, not in which he rejoices; for tho those things are often joined,  
 yet they are not to be made the same, unless we would equal Dr. *Ham-*  
*mond* in impropriety of Speech.

### C H A P. III.

Verf. 10. Ὑπερ ἐν περισσῷ δεόμεθα εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον.] I am apt to  
 think there is a transposition in these Words, and that  
 they must be put into this order: δεόμεθα εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν τὸ  
 πρόσωπον ὑμῶν ὑπερ ἐν περισσῷ: *praying that we might see your face, as that which*  
*would overflow our heart with joy, or would be a super-abundant cause*  
*of joy to me.* St. Paul was not satisfied to know that the *Thessalonians*  
 stedfastly adhered to the Gospel, tho the news of that was matter of  
 very great joy to him, but he desired ὑπερπερισσῶς, *over and above* to see  
 them. Ἐκ περισσῶς signifies somewhat, which if not superfluous, is at  
 least unnecessary, and abounds, and therefore cannot fitly be joined  
 with δέησις Prayer, which is always necessary: And with the addition  
 of ὑπερ it signifies an *overflowing* or *excess*, which by no means agrees  
 with a necessary Duty. That this is the force of that Particle appears  
 by *Eph. iii. 20.* where St. Paul says that God is able [ὑπερ] πάντα ποιῆ-  
 σαι [ἐκ περισσῶς] ὡς ἀτόμεθα ἢ νοῦμεν, *to do exceeding abundantly above all that*  
*we can ask or think.* So likewise in this Epistle to the *Thessal. c. v. 13.*  
*We beseech you* — ἡγαῖον αὐτοὺς ὑπερπερισσῶς ἐν ἀγάπῃ, *i. e. to love them*  
*with a superabundant love.* So that it is better to refer this word to  
 that which St. Paul prayed for, than to his Prayer it self. See an in-  
 stance of the like transposition in *ver. 7.* of which there are a great  
 many in St. Paul.

Ibid. Τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆ πίστεως ὑμῶν.] The word πίστις here must not be  
 understood of an assent of the Mind yielded to the Gospel, which  
 was as *perfect* in the *Thessalonians* at that time as it could be, of which  
 their constancy in suffering Persecution for Religion was a clear evi-  
 dence; but *Knowledge*, which might be increased by further In-  
 struction. For St. Paul had not tarried long at *Thessalonica*, nor  
 had time enough to teach them perfectly all that concerned the  
 Christian



Christian Religion. So the word  $\pi'_{\sigma\tau\varsigma}$  is taken in *Rom.* xiv. 23. where Chapter  
see my Note. IV.

## C H A P. IV.

Verf. 4. **W**Hat our Author says here out of *Barnabas* and the  
Note a. *Jews*, he took from *Grotius*, except the interpreta-  
tion he gives of the word  $\cup\text{os}$ ; which never  
signified an *Instrument*, but only a *Cup*: Nor is there any such affinity,  
as he contends, between that word and the Greek  $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\theta$ , either in  
found or signification.

Verf. 6. Note b. All that our Author here says does not persuade  
me to believe that  $\cup\text{ρ}\gamma\alpha\iota\text{ν}\epsilon\iota\text{ν}$  or  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\text{ρ}\epsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon\iota\text{ν}$  are to be referred to *fleshly De-*  
*sires*, contrary to the use of Scripture, and all other Greek Writers.  
For,

I. What he infers from the Series of this place, he would plainly  
have perceived to have been of no force, if the *Gnosticks* had not stood  
in his light, and like a Cloud hinder'd him from seeing the thing as it  
is. The Apostle here teaches us that there are two sort of Vices to  
be especially shunned; the lusts of the Flesh, and an inordinate de-  
sire of other mens possessions: The former in *verses* 3, 4, 5. in these  
words: *This is the Will of God, your Sanctification, that ye should ab-*  
*stain from Fornication; that every one of you should know how to possess*  
*his Vessel in Sanctification and Honour, not in the lust of Concupiscence,*  
*even as the Gentiles which know not God.* The latter in *vers.* 6. where he  
speaks thus: *And that no man go beyond, or overreach his Brother in any*  
*matter, because the Lord is the avenger of all such, as we also have fore-*  
*warned you, and testified.* Then he subjoins the special reasons of both  
these Injunctions; of the former in *ver.* 7 and 8. and of the latter  
in *ver.* 9. which shews that the 7th *verse* must not be immediately con-  
nected with the 6th *verse*, as it is by our Author, but with the 5th  
*verse*, and the 9th with the 6th. That this may be the order of the  
Discourse is undeniable, and that it not only may, but really is so, e-  
very one will think, who knows that the Verbs  $\cup\text{ρ}\gamma\alpha\iota\text{ν}\epsilon\iota\text{ν}$  and  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\text{ρ}\epsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon\iota\text{ν}$   
never signify what *Dr. Hammond* would have them. And we  
ought not to impose an unheard of signification upon these words, be-  
cause of the Series of the Discourse, when the order of *St. Paul's* rea-  
soning is clear without it. Of the Verb  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\text{ρ}\epsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon\iota\text{ν}$  and the Noun  $\omega\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\text{ρ}\epsilon\zeta\iota\alpha$   
I have spoken on *Rom.* i. 29.

Chapter II. As to the Verb *ὑπεβαίνειν*, the places alledged by our Author do not prove that word to signify the practice of unnatural Lusts. The IV. last Verse of *Hesiod's* Εργα καὶ Ημέρ. shews that *ὑπεβαίνειν* signifies *Sins* or *Transgressions*, but that is nothing to Dr. Hammond's purpose. The place in *Phocylides* must be set down more correctly and at large.

————— ———— ———— ———— ———— ———— ———— ———— ———— ————  
 καὶ δὲ ὑπεβῆς,  
 Πάτω μέτερον αἰεσσὶν, ὑπεβαίει δ' ἀλεγευαί.

*Do not transgress, of all things a mean is best, and Transgressions are grievous.* Where the Discourse is about breaking into another man's Ground, as appears by the words immediatly going before.


Ἄγρῃ γείτονος ἔστω ὑπάγχευς —————

*Abstain from thy neighbour's Field.* But what is this to Sodomy or unnatural Filthinesses? The place cited out of *Hesychius* proves nothing, because *ὑβείν* there is rather taken for an Injury joined with contempt, *ὑπεβαίνειν* signifying *præcellere, superare, to outgo, to surpass*, and *ὑβείν* being afterwards interpreted in *Hesychius* by *ὑπερηγανία*. What our Author adds about the Verb *βαίω* and its Derivatives, or Compounds, does him as little service: for the signification of a simple Verb, or of some of its Compounds, does not necessarily pass to all the rest; and there is no example brought by the Doctor, where *ὑπεβαίνειν πρὸς* signifies to commit filthiness with him.

III. Besides, the annexed Words *ἐν πρὸς πρῶτον καὶ ἀδελφῆς* shew that *St. Paul* did not so much as dream of that sense, which our Author here affixes to his words. For no body ever said in Greek *ὑπεβαίνειν ἐν πρὸς πρῶτον καὶ πρῶτον*, to signify an act of Uncleanness; and, if *St. Paul* had so meant, he would not have said *πρὸς ἀδελφῶν*, that is, a Christian, but *πρὸς ἄλλοις* *ἢ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*, for it was as bad to commit that Sin with Heathens as with Christians.

IV. Nor did ever any one say, in that signification, *πλεονεκτεῖν πρὸς ἐν πρῶτον καὶ πρῶτον*; and I wonder how any Expositor could differ here as to the sense from *Beza*, who interprets these words: *Ne quis opprimat aut. habeat questui in ullo negotio fratrem suum: That no man oppresses or make a gain of his Brother in any matter.* Consult himself and *Grotius* on this place. *Πλεονεκτεῖν* signifies to make a gain of in 2 Cor. vii. 2, and xii. 7, 8.



Verf. 1.  OUR Author here, as in many other places, merely  
 Note a. serves an *Hypothesis*, and forces every thing to a compliance with his own opinion.

But I, Why may not we think that St. *Paul*, after he had spoken of the last coming of *Christ* in the conclusion of the foregoing Chapter; passes here to the time of it, not as to another thing, but as another circumstance of the same thing; so as also to speak in this place about the last coming of *Christ*? The *Thessalonians* lamented the condition of those who died under Persecutions; and therefore St. *Paul* in the end of the last Chapter comforts them with the prospect of an endless Reward, which such persons were to receive at the coming of *Christ*; and here he adds, that there was no need of his writing to them about the time when that should be, because it would come on a sudden, and when it was least expected, as *Christ* himself had more than once said. Which can be understood only of his final coming. For tho' the Siege of *Jerusalem* might perhaps be sudden and unexpected to the *Jews* who lived in that City; yet it was an easy matter for others to conjecture that some great calamity was like to come upon them from the *Romans*, for their perpetual seditions and unruly tempers. *Josephus* has shewn at large in Lib. ii. of the *Jewish War*, that the indignation of the *Romans* against the *Jews* was not presently stirred up. But those especially, who were dispersed through the *Roman Empire* had time enough to know that the *Jews* were upon the point of utter ruin, when they saw *Judea* laid waste by the *Roman Armies*. Besides, the *Jews* who lived out of *Palestine*, as those who were dispersed through *Greece*, did not perish by any sudden Destruction, in which they involved the *Gnosticks*; but only those who took up Arms against the *Romans*, as the *Antiochians*, *Cyrenians*, and some others. I know indeed the *Jews* suffer'd very great Miseries under *Adrian*, in the Isle of *Cyprus*; but our Author will not have the time of *Adrian* to be here referred to, nor did those Calamities befall them on a sudden. It is not probable that the *Gnosticks*, who had no true Zeal for the Jewish Religion, and who, as the Doctor often tells us, complied with the *Jews* to escape being accused by them before the *Roman Magistrates*, did yet conspire with a handful of that Nation against the whole *Roman Power*.

Chapter  
V.

II. Our Author supposes that a constant Faith and holy Life would be an infallible means to preserve the Christians, which as I acknowledge to be most true, understood of *eternal Salvation*, so I do not believe it true, if understood of a Deliverance from the Persecutions of the *Romans*. For could not the *Gnosticks* feign themselves to be Heathens, and do sacrifice to their Gods, that they might not be accounted *Jews*? And that, if I am not mistaken, was abundantly enough to cause a distinction to be put between them and the Circumcised, especially if the *Gnosticks*, as our Author thinks, were not real *Jews*. Besides, the Christians in *Greece*, whilst the *Romans* were incensed against the *Jews*, did not escape the fury of the Magistrates because they were *Christians*, but because they were not *Jews*, and were look'd upon as peaceable Men, who were not for making any disturbance in the Government. I wonder our learned Author did not see these things, but so often serves himself of an Hypothesis which he never attempted to prove by History.

Verf. 10. Note b. Our Author goes on to fasten his own Conjectures upon *St. Paul*, without any regard to Grammar.

I. It is true indeed, that *to live* may signify to be in prosperity, and there are several examples of the word taken in that sense, as our Author has shewn on *Chap. iii. 8.* of this *Epistle*; but that *to live with Christ* has ever any such signification, *Dr. Hammond* will never prove without examples, to any that understand Greek, or are acquainted with the style of Scripture. Whatever a word signifies alone, it does not signify in conjunction with others. Whatever is meant by it in one place, it cannot signify in all. In this place, *to live with Christ* does not only include the notion of eternal Life, but signifies nothing else, as the bare reading of the Verse shews: *who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we might live together with him.* Can Christ be said to have died for the Christians of *Thessalonica*, that they might not perish in that destruction which was to come upon the *Jews*, but survive them? Where does the Scripture mention any such end of the Death of Christ? *Dr. Hammond* did not think fit to say so much as this in his Paraphrase, where he does not express the words of *St. Paul*, but what he himself thought.

II. But Christ having died for Men, that they might live with him, *i. e.* that they might enjoy eternal Life with him in Heaven, and that being the sense of the Apostle's words, the next thing to be consider'd is, what is meant in this place by *waking or sleeping*. And because *St. Paul* says that neither of these things signifies any thing to Salvation, for *whether we wake or sleep we shall live together with Christ*;  
those



those Phrases cannot be thought to signify either a *Vice* or a *Virtue*, Chapter  
 contrary to what they do in *vers.* 6, 7, & 8. Our Author who thinks V.  
 the Discourse is about a temporal Deliverance, interprets them of  
*Sollicitude* and *Security*; which I cannot admit, because I affirm that  
 the Discourse is about eternal Salvation, as the thing it self also de-  
 clares. What therefore do they signify? why this, and nothing else,  
 Whether we are still alive, when he shall come to judg the Living and  
 Dead, or whether we die before that time. As in *Chap.* iv. 13, 14.  
*κοιμῶντες*, those who were asleep, are they who shall be dead at the com-  
 ing of Christ: so here those who shall be awake, signify them which  
 shall be found alive at that time, as *Grotius* well observes, whom our  
 Author ought to have followed. What the *Doctor* says in this Anno-  
 tation besides, I have already confuted.

III. Yet there is one thing perhaps that may be objected in favour  
 of *Dr. Hammond*, viz. that *St. Paul* seems to speak of a thing which  
 was to come to pass in his time, because he exhorts the *Thessalonians* to  
 watch, in *ver.* 6. lest they should be found in Darkness at the day of  
 the Lord's sudden Coming. But God having not revealed the day in  
 which he will judg Mankind, so much as to his Son *Jesus Christ*, whilst  
 he conversed in this World, but only said that it would come on a  
 sudden, and when it was least expected, with a design, seemingly, to  
 keep Men from delaying their Repentance, while they hope to have  
 time enough to repent before that day comes; it is no wonder that  
*St. Paul* here speaks of the last Judgment, as a thing which was to hap-  
 pen in his Age. He could not speak otherwise, seeing God had not  
 revealed the thing more clearly. To which purpose it must be ob-  
 served that he does not deny but that the Judgment was deferred, in  
 which there would have been a manifest Error, but only teach the  
*Thessalonians* that Men ought to be always prepared, for fear of being  
 surprized by the sudden coming of *Christ*. I know indeed *Dr. Ham-*  
*mond* in his Paraphrase of the 2d *Verse*, represents the Apostle as say-  
 ing that the Coming of *Christ* was not far off; but if we read *St.*  
*Paul's* words, we shall see that he only teaches that it would be sud-  
 den and unexpected, not that it was near at hand, or shortly to be.  
 For it is compared to the coming of a *Thief in the Night*, in which  
 nothing but the *ἄπροσδευτον* or unexpectedness of it is considered.

*Verf.* 12. *Note c.* The word *ἐπίσκοποι* may much more simply be in-  
 terpreted to signify the Governors of both Orders in the Church,  
 who may be comprehended under the common name of *ἐπισκοποι*, as  
 being all set over the Church of *Thessalonica*, tho not with an equal  
 Authority. Considering this is grounded upon the proper significa-

Character of the word, it may much more easily be admitted, than that there were more Episcopal Churches in *Macedonia* besides that of *Philipp* and *Thessalonica*, which were contained under these as their Metropolitans. See my Note on *Philipp* 1. 3.

Verf. 22. Note e. Our Author rightly interprets the words of St. *Paul* in this place of all kind of Evil: for after the Apostle had said, *abstinate a carnalitate, et ab omnibus, hold fast that which is good*; it very fitly follows, *abstinate from all kind of evil*; which is all that he had said: When ye have carefully examined all that any Prophet shall say to you, be sure to embrace and retain whatever you find to be good, and reject all that is evil. As *ἀκαθάρτου* does not signify that which has no appearance of good, so *κακῶς*, which is set opposite to it, is not every appearance of Evil, but all that is really Evil. That *κακῶς* is often taken for *kind*, there is no need of proving. But if any doubt of it, they may consult the *old Glosses* of *Labbeus* his Edition, on the word *κακῶς*.

Verf. 23. Note f. I. This in earnest is a medley of insignificant places, and for the most part foreign to the words of St. *Paul*, in which the first thing liable to censure is, that our Author here follows the old way of Philosophizing, which in this particular is certainly false, there being nothing in a Man but his Body and reasonable Soul, which Soul is moved by Affections arising from the Body, without the intervention of any third Faculty, as learned Men have long ago shewed, even before this was published by Dr. *Hammond*: And that Soul alone, not any inferior Nature, is the subject of *τὸ ἀποτελεύσιον* or Free-will. It is strange that wise Men, in order to know what is in Man, that is, in themselves, should go and consult *Plato* or *Aristotle*, as if they were enquiring into the nature of a living Creature, which they only had seen, and we knew nothing of, and make it their business to repeat what Men of little accuracy have said about a thing, which every one may much better understand of himself.

II. It is false that any such thing can be deduced from the History of Man's Creation, as it is set down by *Moses*. For tho' it be said that God formed Man out of the Dust of the Earth, by which words is meant his Body, yet he is not said to have added two other parts to him, for *Moses* proceeds thus *verbatim*: and breathed into his Nostrils the breath of Life, and Man became a living Soul; or as I have rendered it in more proper terms, *spiritumque vitalem in nares ejus flavit, atque homo animal factus est*; and breathed into his Nostrils a vital Spirit, and Man became a living Creature. Which words signify only, that God put Life into Man's Body which he had fashioned out of the Earth: and properly



perly speaking, contain nothing about an immortal and reasonable Chapter  
Soul; tho there is no doubt, but that God, together with Life, infused V.  
*that* also into Man's Body. The distinction of the *Rabbins* between *the*  
*breath of Life* נשמת הים, and *a living Soul*, נפש חיה is grounded  
neither upon the Phrase it self, nor any Scripture example, tho it is  
alleged on this place by *Grotius*. However it must be acknowledged,  
that we may consider in the nature of Man his Body and Soul as two  
distinct parts; and then his Life, not as another part or effect of some  
third Principle, but as a certain affection of the Body; and that to this  
*St. Paul* seems to have had a respect, ψυχὴ being very frequently taken for  
*the Life*. And so the Apostle will be understood to pray for the *Thes-*  
*salonians*, that God would preserve their Bodies, Spirits and Lives *un-*  
*blameable*, which he calls *their* ἀλόκλιτον, or all that was in them, and  
indeed there is nothing else to be found in Man.

III. I acknowledg also that the *Soul*, in the old Testament, is some-  
times taken for the *Will*, but *Gen. xxiii. 8.* is in vain alleged to that  
purpose. Where the Hebrew has: *if it be* [with] *your Soul that I*  
*should bury*, and not, *if it be your Soul*; as our Author has it out of the  
English Translation, which renders only the sense, not the words.  
And the *Chaldee Paraphrast* does not render the word *Soul* by a word  
which signifies *Will*, but the whole Expression, *if it be your Soul*, by  
this entire Phrase, *if there be a will in your Soul*, אם רעונא פשכון.  
All choice or will is in the Spirit, but the Spirit is sometimes divided  
between carnal Affections and the Law; so as on the one hand to see  
what it is obliged to, and on the other to be held by Pleasure and the  
lusts of the Body. For all that our Author has here heaped together,  
I would not give one rush.

IV. The only difficulty is, wherein consists that *preservation* by  
which God is said to keep the Spirit, Life and Body *blameless unto the*  
*coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Those three not being of the same  
nature, they cannot be said in the same sense to be preserved *blame-*  
*less*. The *Spirit* is *blameless* when it is not perverted by any pernici-  
ous Error, or defiled with any habit of Sin. The *Life* may be said  
to be *blameless* in a peculiar manner, considered separately from the  
Spirit and Body, when it is kept without dissembling or revolting  
from the Christian Religion; in which respect fearful Men incurred  
*Blame*, who to save their *Lives*, either dissembled or renounced the  
Faith. Lastly, the *Body* is *preserved blameless*, in a particular sense,  
when it is not polluted by the enjoyment of any unlawful Pleasures.  
But these all making up the τὸ ἀλόκλιτον ἀνθρώπου, neither ought nor can  
properly be considered separately, because they are conjunctly de-

Chapter filed and incur *blame*. And the reason why *St. Paul* mentions them severally, is not because he would have them conceived as disjunct, but only that he might describe the whole Man the more distinctly.

V. As for the words ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου *unto the coming of the Lord*, they must be understood thus: That when *Christ* comes ye may be judged *blameless*, that is, such as according to the tenour of the Gospel-Covenant, cannot be accused before *Christ*. So that it is as if *St. Paul* had said: εἰς τὸ ἀμέμπτως εἶναι ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, that ye may be *blameless when Christ comes*; so as that your *Spirits* may neither be upbraided with dangerous Errors, or vitious Habits, nor this charge brought against you, that you once redeemed your Lives by dissembling or Apostacy, nor, in fine, that you polluted and profaned your Bodies with sensual Lusts. Many perish by one of these three things, but no Man is saved but by a conjunction of all the contrary Vertues.

---

A N N O.



## ANNOTATIONS

## On the Second Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to the *Thessalonians*.

**A**T the end of the *Premon.*] This Epistle is referred by Dr. *Pearson* to the Year of *Christ* LIII, or the XIIIth of *Claudius*, at which time St. *Paul* still remained at *Corinth*, after he had been in vain accused by the Jews at the Tribunal of *Gallio*: Of the occasion on which it was written I shall speak on the Epistle it self.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 5.  
Note a. **W**Hat the Christians said about Christ's coming to punish the Jews, might possibly expose those of them that lived in *Judea*, to the Fury of that Nation; but in *Greece*, or other remote Provinces of the *Roman* Empire, that the Christians were persecuted particularly upon that account I do not believe; so as that St. *Paul* could say that the *Thessalonian* Christians suffered *ὑπὲρ τῆς μελλέουσας παρεσίας Χριστοῦ*. The *Roman* Magistrates did not so much befriend the Jews, especially out of *Judea*, as to afflict the Christians because they portended that the seditious Jews would ere long be destroyed by the *Romans* themselves. Of which we have a manifest instance in *Gallio*, *Acts* xviii. 12, & *seqq.* And it appears no less from profane Writers, that the Jews were not at that time in favour with the *Romans*. *Tiberius* compescuerat, had restrained not only the Egyptian but *Judaicos ritus*, the Jewish Rites, as we are told by *Seutonius* in the Life of *Tiberius*, *Cap.* xxxvi. *Judæorumque juventutem, per speciem Sacramenti, in provincias gravioris cæli distribuit, reliquos gentis ejusdem, vel similia sectantes urbe submovit, sub pœna perpetuæ servitutis*; and distributed the Youth of the Jews, under the pretence of a military Expedition, into Provinces of an unwholsom Air, forbidding

Chapter II. *the rest of that Nation, or any that were of the same Sect, to make their abode in the City, upon pain of perpetual Slavery. Claudius also, a very little while before the writing of this Epistle, Judæos, impulsore Christo, as the same Author speaks in the Life of Claudius, cap. xxv. assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit; that is, I suppose, cast the Jews, disagreeing among themselves about Christ or the Christian Religion, some standing up for it and others opposing it, [upon which account Christ may in some sense be said to have been the impulsive Cause of their Banishment] out of the City. This might be confirmed out of Philo and Josephus; but the thing is so clear that it needs no further proof.*

Verf. 7. *Note b.* Whatever our Author here says, all these things may much more fitly be understood only of the last Judgment; of which see *Grotius* and other Interpreters. Tho *St. Paul* speaks of the Judgment, as of a thing near at hand, it does not follow that it is not the last Judgment which he speaks of; because, not knowing the time when that was to be, he was obliged to speak of it as of a thing not afar off, that so the Christians might be always ready, considering Christ might come when he was least expected.

## C H A P. II.

Verf. 1. *Note a.* **I** Have shewn, on the former Epistle, that the places which our Author applies to the Destruction of the Jews, may very well be understood of the last Judgment: And what *St. Paul* says here, being written on occasion of what he had said before, must be referred to the same coming of Christ.

*Ibid. Note b.* As the *παρουσία*, or coming of Christ, both in the first Epistle to the *Thessalonians* and this, is his final coming to judg the living and the dead; so also *ἐπισυναγωγή ἐπ' αὐτόν* signifies, as *Grotius* has well observed, the gathering together of good men to him, that they may be made Copartners with him of eternal Happiness in Heaven. See *Mat. xxv. 31.* Our Author should have produced an Example in which *ἐπισυναγείσθαι εἰς Χριστόν* signified to be assembled for the Worship of Christ.

Verf. 2. *Note c.* All that our Author here says may as fitly agree to those, who through a misapprehension of *St. Paul's* Words should have thought that the end of all things, and the coming of Christ to judg the World, was at hand. And so there is no need of recurring to any other coming of Christ.

Verf. 3. *Note d.* I. To speak the truth, I confess none of the various Interpretations which I have read of this place, fully satisfy me:





Chapter II. I deny but *Simon Magus* deserved to be thus signalized, or rather branded, but I do not believe it is he whom the Apostle here has a respect to; nor is there any certain History which relates all that is said of him by *Dr. Hammond*, or agrees with his conjectures. It is affirmed first by *Eusebius* out of *Justin*, that *Simon* went to *Rome* under the Reign of *Claudius*, ἐν Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος, which our Author interprets of the beginning of the Government of *Claudius*, because it seemed to agree better with his conjectures. *Justin*, and out of him *Eusebius*, say that *Simon* was accounted a God, and that a Statue was erected to him as such. In which learned Men have long since shewn that *Justin* was mistaken; and it may be probably conjectured that that Journey of *Simon* to *Rome* was a Fiction of some ignorant Man, who had not a due regard to Truth, and misunderstood the Inscription of that Statue. At least that *St. Peter* came to *Rome* in the time of *Claudius*, there are very important Chronological Reasons to disbelieve, tho I do not doubt but he came into that City, and suffer'd Martyrdom in it, under the Reign of *Nero*. *Justin* further adds, σχεδὸν πάντας Σαμαρείας, that almost all the Samaritans worshipped *Simon*; but perhaps he speaks hyperbolically, perhaps *Justin* relates a thing which he was not sure of, who wrote all whatsoever he heard without making any difference. That which he says about the deifying of *Simon* is alone enough to shew, that he is not an Author, whose bare Affirmation may be safely trusted. And hence perhaps *Irenæus* would not positively affirm a *Claudio Cæsare statua honoratum propter magiam*, that [*Simon*] was honoured with a Statue by *Claudius Cæsar* for his magick; but prefixed to this Story dicitur, it is reported. What our Author says about his concealing himself, and contending with *St. Peter*, is taken ex *Clementinis*, and unworthy of any credit. The rest which he relates concerning his Followers should have bin particularly proved by the testimonies of good Authors; because it is the ground of what he says here about the revelation of the *Gnosticks*, and that being uncertain, the other must be so too. Any one may easily deduce what Interpretations he pleases out of feigned Circumstances.

II. Now to give my own opinion concerning the *Man of Sin*, seeing I have interpreted Σποσαία of the Rebellion of the Jews, it follows that the ἀνθρώπος ἀμαρτίας must be the rebellious Jews themselves, and especially their Ringleader *Simon*, not the *Magician*, but the Son of *Giora*, spoken of by *Josephus* towards the end of his 2d Book of the *Jewish War*, and afterwards often: Which *Simon* gathering together a Company of Robbers in the Lordship of *Acrabatena*, began to play the



the Tyrant, but first more secretly; till at last despising the Authority of the chief men of the Jewish Nation, he violated all Laws both divine and human in *Jerusalem* it self, as *Josephus* in the following Books declares at large. And that such a man, or any who were like him, should be called ἀνθρώποι ἀμαρτίας, is not strange. Chapter II.

Ibid. Ὁ μὲς τῆ ἀπολείας.] *A son of Perdition* is one that deserves to be destroyed, or is condemned to Death, as our Author well observes; and how properly this Title belonged to *Simon* and his Companions, *Josephus* will inform us, who in *Lib. vi. c. 36.* speaking of all the People [of the Jews] observes that, Θεὸς ἦν ὁ τὸ παντὸς λαοῦ [κατακείνας] καὶ πᾶσαν ἀπὸ τῆς σωτηρίας ὁδὸν εἰς [ἀπώλειαν] ὑποστέφων: It was God, who had condemned all the People, and turned all means of safety into Destruction. And in *Lib. vii. c. 7.* speaking of *Simon* himself, after he had related how he shewed himself out of a Vault under ground, where the Temple had stood, and was taken by the Romans, he says, Σίμονα μὲν ἔν εἰς δίκην τῆ κατὰ τῶν πολιτῶν ὀμότητος, ὣν πικρῶς αὐτὸς ἐτυρένησεν, ὑπὸ τῆς μάλιστα μισῶσι πολεμίοις ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς, ἢ βία γινόμενον αὐτοῖς ὑποχείριον, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκούσιως εἰς τὴν τιμωρίαν πειθαλόντα, δι' ὃ πολλὰς αὐτὸς ὀμῶς ἀπέκτεινε, ψευδῆς αἰτίας ὀπιφύρων τῆ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους μεταβολῆς. ἢ γὰρ διαφεύγει πονηρία Θεοῦ χόλον, ἢ δὲ ἀδενήσῃ δίκη. χερόνω δὲ μέτεσι τὸς εἰς αὐτὴν ὄρανομήσαντας καὶ χεῖρω τὴν τιμωρίαν ἐπφέρει τοῖς πονηροῖς, ὅτι καὶ προσεδύκησαν αὐτῆς ἀππλάχθαι, μὴ ὄραυτῆκα κολαδέντες: God therefore delivered up *Simon* for the punishment of his Cruelty towards the Citizens, over whom he had bitterly tyrannized, into the hands of his greatest Enemies, not taken by force, but throwing himself of his own accord upon punishment (God so ordering it) because he had cruelly put a great many [others] to death, bringing false Accusations against them, of a defection to the Romans. For Wickedness can never escape the Vengeance of God, nor Justice ever be enfeebled, but early or late it overtakes those that bid defiance to it, and inflicts a heavier punishment upon the Wicked, because they expected to be delivered from it, not being presently punished. He suffered in the Publick place at *Rome*, as this Writer tells us in *Cap. xvii.* of the same Book according to the division in the *Greek.* By this it appears how fitly those wicked men might be called ἀνθρώποι ἀμαρτίας and ὑπὸ ἀπολείας. And that the rest of the characters contained in the following verse do as well agree to them, shall be distinctly shewn on each.

Verf. 4. Ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπερημρόμενος ὅτι πᾶν τὸ λεγόμενον Θεόν.] These Words express the extream Wickedness of men, and their marvelous Insolence towards Governours, proceeding from an incredible Zeal for Innovations. For he is truly called ἀντικείμενος an *Adversary*, viz. of God, who has no more regard to his Laws, than if he industriously opposed and fought against him with all his might, and

Chapter endeavoured to destroy his Worship, and root his Fear out of the minds of men. And such were *Simon, John, and Eleazer*, and the rest of the Captains of the Seditious, whose horrible Impieties *Josephus* often mentions, openly charging them with *Atheism*. See the last Chapter of *Book vi.* where he says that that *Generation* of men was *πολυ' ἀθεωτέρον* much more impious than any of those who for their Wickedness were swallowed up by the Earth, or destroyed by the Flood, or perished by Lightning. Magistrates or Governours are called also Gods, as every one knows. And these seditious men rose up in great fury, both against the Rulers of the Jews, such as were the Priests, and against the Romans; for they killed the former, and waged an obstinate War with the latter, as *Josephus* throughout his whole History relates. See particularly about the *Priests*, *Cap. xviii. Lib. iv.*

*Ibid.* [Ἡ σέβασμα.] I am apt to think *St. Paul* added this word *κατ' ἐπισημῶν*, by way of *Exegesis*, that the *Thessalonians* might the better understand what he meant by *πάντα λατρεύοντες θεῶν*, for the Hebrew *אלה* which is rendred *θεὸς*, properly signifies *σέβασμα*, as coming from the old root *אלב* *alab*, which at this very day among the Arabians signifies to honour or reverence, *σεβέδαι*. And there could not be a fitter Greek word chosen to express the sense of the Hebrew; for *σεβέδαι* signifies as well that Honour which is due to Magistrates, as to God. So it is used by *Chironidas* in *Stobæus* *Serm. xlii.* *καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχοντας εὐνοίαν διαφυλάττειν, καθάπερ πατρικῶν, ἐπιθεῖντας καὶ [σεβομένους]* We ought to bear as good a will to Rulers as to our Parents, submitting our selves to them, and reverencing them. But the seditious Jews were so far from reverencing the lawful Authority both of their own Countrymen and Strangers, that on the contrary they thought themselves superiour to them, killing all the chief men among the Jews, and acting in a hostile manner against the *Romans*.

*Ibid.* Note g. I. *Ὁ ναὸς τῶ θεῶ* is not, in the style of *St. Paul*, simply *ναὸς*, any Temple, but the Temple of *Jerusalem*, which alone was so called. This appears by the doubling of the Article, nor can those words, in any Jewish Writer, be ever understood otherwise. The Jews would not allow the Temple of *Garizim* that title, which they look'd upon as no better than a *Temple of Idols*.

II. Our learned Author here pays a greater deference to the Authority of *Justin Martyr* than he need; for why might not he be mistaken in this, who erred in so many other things? Did not the same man make *Herod* to be contemporary with *Ptolomæus Philadelphus* and the *Septuagint*? Did not he say that the word *Satanas* was compounded of *Sata* and *nas*, tho he was disputing with a Jew, who could easily



Chapter II.  
 sily refute such a mistake? Did not he very unjustly and falsely, and yet with no small confidence, accuse the Jews of corrupting the Holy Scriptures? And could not he who erred so grossly in these things, not to mention any more, rashly take an occasion from the inscription of a Statue, which he misunderstood, to say what was not true? He was a Martyr, what then? Are Martyrs infallible, or to be believed when they are manifestly mistaken? And if they have been deceived in some easy things, and are not to be credited in all, why might not they be mistaken in matters of greater difficulty? Besides, this Inscription, if it be understood of *Simon Magus*, is contrary both to the use of the Latin Tongue and the Custom of the *Romans*, nor is it at all countenanced by the History of that Age. In Latin there is none so called, absolutely *Deus Sanctus*, besides *Semon* or *Simon* (if we chuse so to write it, tho corruptly) an unknown God of the *Sabins*, or *Hercules*, as *Lilius Giraldis* will inform us in *Hist. Decorum*. And it was not the custom of the *Romans* to erect Statues to private men, and that before their Death, such as *Simon the Samaritan*, as to Gods; nor can any one instance to that purpose be produced out of all the Roman History. And if so unusual a thing had been done by *Claudius*, whose Folly so many Writers have recorded, there would be some mention made of it by the Heathens, whereas there is not the least mark or sign of it any where to be found. But, says our Author, if *Justin* had been mistaken, or wrote what he knew to be false, the Emperors to whom he wrote, would easily have discovered the Cheat. But the Emperors perhaps did not so much as look into the *Apologeticks* of *Justin*, it may be which was their ignorance or wickedness; they laughed at them, and despised every thing else that was good in them, because of this error. And who can doubt, if there was ever any *Tripbo Judæus* in the World that should have read his Dialogue, or any other Jew whatsoever, but he would have scorned, and that justly, what *Justin* upbraids the Jews with, as to the corruption of the sacred Writings, which in a modern Author would be called a Calumny. The bare authority therefore of *Justin* is not to be regarded.

III. But it is confirmed by *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*. I have answer'd this in part already, by observing that *Irenæus* premises before this Story the word *dicitur*, *it is said*, which shews he was not confident of the truth of it, but only declares what some others reported. And *Tertullian*, as those Apologetick Writers used to do, did but transcribe those that went before him, never minding or examining whether what they said was true; and out of him again this Story was taken by the later Writers of the Church of *Rome*: but that these

Chapter took any great care, not to affirm any thing concerning former Ages, II. but what was certain and unquestionable, no one will believe that reads their Writings with his eyes open.

IV. But if *Simon Magus* be not the Person here described, who is it, you will say, that is thus characterized? I answer, Those wicked *Zelots* and *Edomites* who forcibly possessed themselves of the Temple of *Jerusalem*, and so settled themselves in the place of God's peculiar residence, in which they behaved themselves very proudly and insolently, despising all the Laws of God, filling the Temple with the blood of the Citizens, and profanely using the holy things of it as their own; as *Josephus* in many places tells us. First, the *Zelots* made themselves Masters of the Temple, and used its holy things as their own, as we are told in *lib. vi. cap. 1.* Then *John* with his *Edomites* entered into it, as we may learn from *cap. 11.* and as little abstained from the holy things, being used to say in his own justification, *ὡς δὲ ἡμεῖς ἀδείας καὶ ἀρχήσασθαι τῆς θείας, ἢ τὰ θεία, καὶ τὰς τῷ ναῷ ἁγιασμένους εἶναι αὐτὸς τρέφεται,* That those who stood up for God, ought boldly to use the consecrated things, and they who fought for the Temple be maintained out of it, as *Josephus* informs us in *cap. 37.* And those that did such things, might well enough be said to sit in the Temple of God, as God, shewing themselves as if they were God.

Verf. 5. Ταῦτα ἔλεγον ὑμῖν.] The things here spoken of, seem to be taken from Christ's Discourse in *Matth. xxiv.* where the like things are mentioned, as forerunners of the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and so of his final Coming. Whence it might be easily inferred, that the last Judgment was not as yet at hand, because those things, which were as the Harbingers of the excision of *Jerusalem*, had not as yet happen'd.

Verf. 6. Note h. The τὸ κατέχον is that which restrained the Jews from breaking out into open Rebellion; viz. partly the Reverence of the chief men of the Jewish Nation, who were against making War with the *Romans*, because they saw there was no hope of shaking off their Yoke, and that the thing could not be attempted without the Ruin of the Jews; partly the fear of the *Roman* Armies, which the Jews had not yet laid aside, especially while they hoped they might live a quiet life under their Governours. As long as these things continued in the minds of the Jews, the Counsels of the Seditious rested secret, and the number of those that were desirous of Innovations was but small: but as soon as the chief Men of the Nation began to be despised by the Conspirators, and some hope of Victory appear'd, because the greatest part of the People were incensed against the *Romans*, and the President was remiss and cowardly; then the Jewish Nation,



Nation, like a swift Torrent, that should have broken down its Chapter  
banks, rushed headlong into its own Destruction; then all the vilest II.  
sort of men began openly to put in practice their impious Designs. ~~~~~  
This *Josephus* relates at large in several places of his *History of the Jewish War*, and particularly in *lib. 2.* And *S. Paul* wrote this in the 13th year of *Claudius*, when *Felix* had been again sent Procurator into *Judea*; at which time tho the *Jews* were weary of their Yoke, and had raised the last year a Tumult, yet they still obeyed, as to the main body of the Nation.

What the chief Men among the *Jews* thought of engaging in a War with the *Romans*, *Josephus* in many places shews; see but *Agrippa's* Oration in *lib. 2. cap. 28.* in which he dissuades the *Jews* from rebelling, and endeavours to keep in κατέχειν the seditious. And till that time he and the rest of the principal Men of the *Jewish* Nation had some Authority over the common People; but *Gessius Florus* had so highly injured and provoked them, that they utterly refused to obey him; and when *Agrippa* would have perswaded them to submit patiently to his Government, till there was another sent in his room, *προπαροξυνθέντες ἐβλασφήμουν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ τὴν πόλεως αὐτὸν ὀζηκήμενοι ἐτόλμων δὲ τινες αὐτῷ σασιασῶν καὶ λίθους ἐπ' αὐτὸν βάλλειν· ὃ δὲ βασιλεὺς πρὸ ὄργου αὐτῷ νεώτερον ἰσχυρῶν ἀκατασχετόν ὄργων — ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν:* in a great rage they reviled the King, and commanded him to go out of the City; yea some of the Seditious were so bold as to sling stones at him. And the King seeing the fury of the Innovators to be UNRESTRAINABLE — departed into his Kingdom. They are the words of *Josephus* in *cap. 29.* Afterwards he relates the beginning of the Rebellion; to which the Priests and all the leading Men in vain opposed themselves, being no longer able to hold in the enraged multitude, as they had done in former times. Yea many of them were killed, as *Ananias, Ananus, Jesus* and others; whose Authority being once despised, those wicked Captains of the Seditious discover'd their minds, and shewed that it was a tyrannical Power, and not the Liberty of the People that they had aimed at. At the same time they set upon the *Romans*, and took courage from the cowardise of *Gessius*, as *Josephus* declares at large in *lib. ii. c. 31. & seqq.*

So that the Authority of the chief of the *Jewish* Nation, and the fear of the *Romans* were the τὸ κατέχειν, *viz. περιγυρία*, or the thing that withheld the *Jews*. Which obstacle being removed, the Seditious thought the time was now at length come, in which they might ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, openly declare their purposes, and act as the Leaders of the People of the *Jews*. That *Simon* the Son of *Giora*, who affected to become a Tyrant, and robb'd and plunder'd the *Arabatena* *Toparchia*, was repressed by

Chapter *Ananus*, Περὶ φθίσεως ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐπ' Ἀνάην καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων σερατιῶν, by an Army sent  
 II. against him by *Ananus and the Rulers*; but he fled to the Robbers which  
 were at *Massada*, and stayed till *Ananus* and the rest of his Enemies  
 were killed, as we are told by *Josephus* in the last chap. of the 2d Book.  
 See lib. iv. and v. where the Villanies of these wicked men are at large  
 related. This is much more probable, than what *Dr. Hammond* has  
 invented about the dissembling of *Simon* and the *Gnosticks*, whilst the  
 Jews and Christians did in some measure agree with one another;  
 for which he alledges no Argument out of History.

Verf. 7. Note i. The *μυστήριον ἀνομίας* which began to work at this time,  
 consisted in this, that under the pretence of setting the people of the  
 Jews at liberty, yea and of a more strict observation of the Law of *Mo-*  
*ses*, a most treacherous and wicked Design of domineering was conceal-  
 ed, till the strength of the Conspirators being increased, it appeared  
 at last what they aimed at. So the *Zelots* behaved themselves, who,  
 as an unlawful thing, rejected the Sacrifices which used to be offered  
 up for the Romans; tho the Priests shewed that it was not a crime  
 to receive Sacrifices from the Gentiles. See *Josephus de Bello Judaico*,  
*lib. ii. c. 30.* who affirms that this was the beginning of the Jewish War.  
 In the meanwhile the *Zelots* did not think it unlawful for them to  
 commit any villany whatsoever after they had laid aside the fear of  
 punishment. The same *Historian* speaks of them thus in *lib. vii. cap. 1.*  
 Ἐλεάζαρ ὁ υἱὸς Σίμωνος ὅς δὴ καὶ τὰ πρῶτα τῶν δόξων τῶν ζηλωτῶν ἀπέστησεν εἰς τὸ τέμνιον,  
 ὡς ἀνανακλιῶν δὴθεν ὅτι τοῖς ὁσιμέραι τῶν Ἰωάννην πολυμήνοισι, ἔτι γὰρ ἀνεπαύετο φόνων ἔτος.  
 τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς αὐτῷ μετὰ χρόνον τρεῖντων μὴ φέρων ὑποβλάσθη, ποθῶ τῶν ὄλων, καὶ δυνά-  
 σεως ὀπίθυμία, δίστασι: *Eleazar the Son of Simon, who had first separated the*  
*Zelots from the People, and carried them into the Temple, as offended with*  
*the continual bold attempts of John, who did not cease from shedding of blood,*  
*but in truth not enduring to be subject to younger Tyrants than himself,*  
*went off through a desire of Superiority, and thirst after Dominion.* And in  
*lib. vii. cap. 30.* after he had said that the *Edomites* τὴν πλειωπᾶτῶν εἰσα-  
 γαγῆν διὰ πάντων ANOMIAN, had introduced into all places the highest Iniquity:  
 he adds, ἐν ᾗ τὸ τῶν ζηλωτῶν κληθέντων γένος ἠκμαζεν, οἱ τὴν προσηρείαν τοῖς ἔρ-  
 γοις ἐπιλήθευσαν. πᾶν γὰρ τὸ κακίας ἔργον ἐξεμιμήσαντο, μηδ' ἐτι σφόδρον προὔπερχειν  
 ἢ μνήμη ἡρώδου δέδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἡρακλῆς ἀζήλων καίτοι τὴν προσηρείαν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν  
 ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ζηλωτῶν ἐπέθεσαν, ἢ καί τινων ἀδικοῦντων τῶν ἀδικημάτων, διὰ τὴν αὐτῶν δι-  
 κεινὴ φύσιν, ἢ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν κακῶν ἀγαθὰ νομιζόντες: in which that sort of men  
 called *Zelots* had arrived to the highest pitch, who stained their Title with  
 the foulness of their Actions. For they imitated every evil work; even that  
 which had never been done before in the memory of man, they did not leave  
 unimi-



unimitated. Tho they imposed on themselves a specious Name borrowed from Chapter the love of Virtue, either their savage Disposition made them deride those II. whom they injured, or they thought the greatest Evils to be Virtues. This was a Mystery, which was concealed under the name of a Virtue, viz. Zeal; but in reality it contained the vilest Iniquity; which principally discover'd it self when Gessius Florus was President of Judea, towards the end of Nero's Reign.

But there was a Mystery, as I said, in this also, that these desperate Villains made the Liberty of the People of the Jews a pretence for their Robberies, whilst their design was to tyrannize over their Countrymen, as appeared afterwards by their Actions. Of this number were the Sicarii who opposed the Taxing of Judea by Cyrenius, and as Josephus a little before says, συνέτισαν ὅτι τὰς ὑπακούων Ῥωμαίων δέλονας καὶ πάντα τρόπον ὡς πολεμίοις προσερέεον, καὶ τὰς μὲν κήσεις ἀρπάζοντες, καὶ καταλαμβάνοντες, ταῖς δὲ οἰκήσεις αὐτῶν πῦρ ἐνιέντες. ἔδὲν γὰρ ἀλλοτρίων αὐτὰς ἔφασκεν διαφέρειν, ὅπως ἀγνοῶν τὴν πραγμασίαν Ἰουδαίαις ἐλάττειαν προσημαίνοντες, καὶ δουλείαν αἰρεῖσθαι τὴν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις ἀνωμολογητότατα. ἡ δὲ ἀρετὴ τῆτο ΠΡΟΦΑΣΙΣ εἰς ᾧ ἀκαλύπτουσι τὴν ὁμιλίαν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ὑπὸ αὐτῶν λεγόμενον σαφὲς ὅτι διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐποίησαν: conspired against those who were willing to obey the Romans, and exercised all manner of Hostilities against them, spoiling and carrying away their goods, and setting their houses on fire: for they said there was no difference between them and Strangers, who so basely gave up the Liberty of their Country, for which they ought to fight, and professedly chose to be in bondage to the Romans. But this was a meer PRETENCE, and said only to cover their Cruelty and Avarice, as their Actions plainly shewed. Hence it appears, that before ever S. Paul wrote this Epistle, the Mystery of Iniquity began to work among the Jews.

Ibid. Μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἀρετὴ ἕως ἐκ μέση θύνηται.] It was not one man who withheld the Jews from breaking out into open Rebellion: but on one side they were restrained by the Roman President; on the other by the chief men of the Nation, King Agrippa, and a great many Priests, as I have before shewed. But after these were expelled out of the City, or slain, the Seditious were at liberty to do what they pleased, and accordingly committed the most abominable Outrages, and acted contrary to all Laws both of Religion and Humanity. See Josephus de Bello Judaico from cap. 28. lib. 2.


Verf. 8. Note k.] I. Our Author truly observes, that the ὁ ἄνομος here are the same wicked persons which were before called ὁ ἀντικείμενος, but those, I think, are the Seditious Jews, not Simon and the Gnosticks, notwithstanding the mention made afterwards of lying Wonders, as I shall presently shew.

Chapter  
II.

II. The destruction of *Simon*, which he relates out of *Arnobius*, is a meer Fable, which *Arnobius* had taken out of the *Clementine Homilies*, a Book full of Fables. This was the fault of Men and the Times, not of the Christian Religion, which is grounded only upon Truth, to take up right or wrong every thing that offer'd it self to their Minds, and make use of it against the *Heathens*, whom otherwise they might have overcome with very good reasons, and really did so. Tho' it is manifest that the foremention'd Book is supposititious, not St. *Clements*, and abounds with fallities; yet a great many have cited it as the genuin product of St. *Clement*, and confidently transcribed Fables out of it for certain Truths. Which I know not whether we ought to attribute to want of judgment, or unfaithfulness; yet one of them it must needs be. But now after the revival, not only of good Learning, but also the cultivating and restoring of right Reason, to give credit to such Fables, is to prefer the darkness and deceits of former Ages to Light and Truth.

III. It is strange that Dr. *Hammond* was not sensible of this, but no less strange that he should use the Authority of the Antients, so as to trust them whenever they speak in his favour, and lay a great stress upon their Testimonies when they seem to confirm his Conjectures, but not regard them at all when they speak against him. For if they have any Authority at all distinct from probabilities of truth taken from things themselves, it is as great in one thing as another; and if their Authority be none in it self, let probabilities of Truth be alledged, and not vain Testimonies. Dr. *Hammond* produces a saying out of *Eusebius*, whom he would have believed, about the destruction of the *Gnosticks*, because if that be not thought true, a great many of his Interpretations must necessarily be rejected. But that *Eusebius* was mistaken, I shall shew out of *Eusebius* himself, and the thing it self at once. After he had mention'd the Heresies of *Melander* the Disciple of *Simon*, and the *Arch Heretick Cerinthus*, and the *Nicolaitans* in *Lib. iii. Cap. 26, 27, 28, & 29.* he concludes this last Chapter thus: Ταῦτα ἢ ἐν αὐτῇ ἢ καὶ τὰς συνειρημένους χρόνους παρεβόηθησαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐξηρηραίνοντες, λέγει γὰρ μὴν δαίμων ἐς τὸ παντελὲς ἀπιστηκότων εἰσέδω  
*And so much for those who having attempted to corrupt the truth, about the forementioned times, were in a moment destroyed.* But if we believe *Eusebius* himself, the followers of *Simon* were not utterly destroyed, even in the reign of *Constantin*, that is, when *Eusebius* himself lived, who in *Lib. ii. c. 13.* speaking of *Simon*, says thus: ἐξ ἧς Εἰς Δετρο εἰ τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν μετῴντες ἀίρησι, τὴν σάφεια καὶ διὰ καθαρότητα βίωσιν ὅσα πᾶσι βελούμενον χειραγῶν εἰσοσφῶν ὑποκειόμενοι, ὡς ἢ εἰδῶσαν ἀπαλειπτεῖσαι ὡς τὰ  
εἰδωλα



Ἐξ οὗ αἰσθητικῆς ἐδὲν ἵπτον αὐθις ὀπιλαυβάνονται, καταπίπτειτες ὑπὲρ γραφῆς καὶ εἰκόνας αὐτῶν τε τῶν Σιμωνῶν, καὶ τῆς σὺν αὐτῷ διακονήσασσας Ἑλένης, θυμιάματα τε καὶ θυσι-  
αις καὶ σπονδαῖς τέρας δεησκύειν ὀπιχειρῶντες: From whence (according to H.  *Valesius* his Interpretation) till our Age, those that profess his Heresy, pretending to have embraced the Christian Religion, which is so famous for its Modesty and Sanctity, have yet relapsed again to the superstitious worship of Dæmons, which they seemed to have cast off, falling down before the Pictures and Images of Simon and the aforesaid Helena, and not scrupling to worship them with Incense, Sacrifices and Drink-offerings. This shews that the Disciples of Simon did not perish with their Master, nor were destroyed in a moment of time. It is certain Menander, Basilides, and Carpocrates, who were either his Disciples or Imitators, did not die with him, but together with their Followers flourished in the second Age, as every one knows.

III. Which being so, it is strange that Dr. Hammond should contend for the extinction of the Gnosticks at that time, after which they chiefly flourished and were most known; viz. after the destruction of Jerusalem. Nay if any of Simon's followers happen'd to perish with the Jews in Jerusalem, or Judæa, it is not probable that their obstinate adherence to the party of the Jews, was the occasion of it; because the Gnosticks (as our Author himself often tells us) made no scruple when it was for their safety to comply with the Heathens in their Worship, and it was easy to conjecture that the Romans would be Conquerors. So that neither History nor Probability is on our Author's side.

IV. I will not repeat that what he says about the Conflict which St. Peter and St. Paul had with Simon is a meer Fable, but shall observe that by the Spirit of the Mouth of the Lord is meant, not the Gospel, but the great Ease with which Christ should destroy the obstinate Jews. So Psalm x. 5. he shall blow upon all his Enemies (*in omnes hostes suos sufflabit*; ) that is, he shall easily destroy them, as Interpreters will shew. So in Plautus, in *Milite Glorioso* Act. 1. Sc. 1. v. 17. a certain Flatterer, to intimate the great ease with which a Victory is obtained, expresses himself thus:

*Cujus tu legiones difflavisti spiritu,  
Quasi ventus folia, aut panniculum tectoriam.*

So *Valerius Maximus* Lib. ix. cap. 1. Exemp. 5. *inter Externa*, speaking of the Egyptians, saith: *Quapropter deliciis tam enerves animi SPIRITUM exercitus nostri sustinere non potuerunt.* The same thing is otherwise

Chapter otherwise here expressed by τῆ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆ παρυσίας αὐτοῦ, that is, by the  
 II. mere brightness of his Coming; as we say of an Army which is easily  
 W defeated, that it could not so much as abide the glittering of the ene-  
 mies Arms. And God is said ἐπιφανέσθαι when he gives the Victory:  
 See *Grotius* on this place, and *Dr. Hammond* on *Mat. xxiv.* It's cer-  
 tain the attempts of the *Magicians*, of which afterwards, were easily  
 defeated, and the Jewish War finished by *Vespasian* in little more than  
 a Years time.

Verf. 9. Οὐ εἰσιν ἡ παρυσία κατ' ἐνέργειαν τῷ Σατανᾷ, Sic.] These words are  
 thought by our Author to be so clear a description of *Simon*, that he  
 often repeats it as the chief ground of his Interpretation of this  
 whole place. But there were also other Impostors, of whom this might  
 be said by *St. Paul*, which are frequently mention'd in *Josephus*; to  
 prevent all doubt of which, I shall alledg the words of that Historian;  
 who in *Lib. xx. c. 6. Antiq. Judaic.* where he relates the transactions  
 of *Felix*, saith thus: Διησιέων ἡ γὰρ πάλιν ἀνεπλήθη καὶ γότων ἀνθρώπων, οἱ δ'  
 ὄχλον ἠπάτων: the Country was filled again with Robberies, and Magicians  
 who deceived the Multitude. And not long after: οἱ γότες καὶ ἀπατεῶνες  
 ἀνθρώποι τὸ ὄχλον ἐπειθον αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἐρημίαν ἐπεδαι, δείξεν γὰρ ἔρασαν ἐναργῆ  
 τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα, καὶ τὴν τῷ Θεῷ πείθειαν γινόμενα, καὶ πολλοὶ πεισθέντες τ' ἀθεσύνης  
 πικρίας ὑπερχον: some Magicians and Deceivers perswaded the People to fol-  
 low them into the Desert, saying that they would shew them mighty Signs and  
 Wonders, which were wrought by the Providence of God; and many heark-  
 ning to their Perswasions, suffered for their Folly. Afterwards he menti-  
 ons the *Egyptian*, who is spoken of in the *Lits.* The like he says in  
*Lib. ii. de Bello Judaico c. 23.* To the same purpose is what he relates  
 in *Lib. vii. c. 30.* about six thousand Men that were burnt in the Porch  
 of the Temple. Τάτοις αἰτίοις τ' ἀπολείας Ψευδοπροφήτης κατέστη, κατ' ἐκείνην  
 κηρυξας ἡμέραν πῖς ὅτι τ' πόλεως, ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ὅτι τὸ ἐξθὺν ἀναβῆναι καλῶς δεξομένους  
 τὰ σημεῖα τ' σωτηρίας: The cause of these Mens destruction was a certain false  
 Prophet, who had declared that day to those who were in the City, that God  
 commanded them to go up into the Temple, in order to receive signs of  
 their safety. And there was a multitude of such false Prophets, as *Jose-  
 phus* tells us in the following words: Πολλοὶ δ' ἦσαν ἐγκαθέτοι πᾶσι τ' πείθειων  
 τότε πρὸς τὸ δῆμον πεισθέντες, πεισθέντες τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ βούθειαν καταγγέλλοντες, ὡς  
 ἠτίον αὐτομόλοισεν, καὶ τὸς ἐπάνω δέες καὶ φυλακῆς γινόμενης ἐλπίς παρασκευατοῦ· πείθειται  
 δ' ταχέως ἀνθρώπος ἐν συμφοραῖς· ὅταν δ' δὴ τ' κατεχόντων δανῶν ἀπλλαγῆν ὁ ἐξα-  
 πατῶν ὑπογράφῃ, πᾶσι ὁ πάρον ὀ.Θ. γίνεται τ' ἐλπίδ'Θ. Τὴν γὰρ ἀθλιον δῆμον οἱ τ'  
 ἀπατεῶνες καὶ καταβευθεμένοι τῷ Θεῷ πικρικῶτα παρέπειθον: for there were many  
 Prophets at that time suborned by the Tyrants, to admonish the People to  
 wait for the assistance of God, that they might not go over to the Enemy,  
 and



and to confirm the hope of such as needed not to be watched, and were above  
 fear. And a Man is soon perswaded to any thing in Adversity. But when  
 he that deceives promises him also deliverance from the evils he is under, he  
 that suffers becomes all Hope. And therefore those Impostors and beliers of  
 God perswaded the miserable People. This excellently well agrees with  
 the 10th, 11th, & 12th verses, where the condition of the unbelieving  
 Jews is represented by St. Paul, almost in the same colours.

Chapte<sup>r</sup>  
 III.  


Ibid. [Ἐν πίστει δυνάμει, ἢ τέλει ψεύδους.] It is highly probable that St.  
 Paul has a reference to the words of Christ in Mat. xxiv. 24. whence  
 it may be inferred that the Discourse here is about Judæa and the  
 Jews, as it is there.

C H A P. III.

Verf. 2. \* **A** ΤΟΠΘ when spoken of a Man, signifies *lowd, base, villa-*

Note a. **A** nous, and belongs no more to a *Gnostick* than any o-  
 ther wicked Man; such as there were a great many  
 among the *Jews* and *Heathens*, who opposed the Gospel, which makes  
 it unnecessary to recur to the Disciples of *Simon*, whom our Author  
 supposes like so many Shadows to have followed or gone before the  
 Apostles, without any certain ground from the History of that Age.  
 What he says, that *Simon* is described by *Polycarp*, is also his own  
 Conjecture, not the Affirmation of *Polycarp*, who speaks of any one  
 possessed with those errors, and does not mention *Simon* by name. But  
 this does not belong to this place. *Hesychius*; ἄτοπα, πονηρὰ, ἀίχερὰ, wick-  
 ed, base things. ἄπειρα, ἀίχερτης, πονηρία, baseness, wickedness. The old  
 Glosses: ἄτοπιμα, flagitium, facinus, A villany, a wicked Action. ἄτοπιμα-  
 τοποιός, facinorosus, villanous. ἄτοπΘ, facinorosus, flagitiosus.

Verf. 2. Οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις.] Dr. Hammond in his Paraphrase inter-  
 prets these words so, as if he thought that πίστις Faith here signified  
 true Faith, in opposition to pretended. Which interpretation he  
 seems to have invented for the sake of the *Gnosticks*, who feigned  
 themselves to be Christians when they were not, and of whom he  
 understood these words of St. Paul. But St. Paul says nothing here  
 about the *Gnosticks*, but speaks of any bad Men, who through their  
 wicked Dispositions did not only refuse to believe the Gospel them-  
 selves, but also hindred others from embracing it. Such were the *Jews*,  
 who had a greater regard to the Ceremonies of the Law than to true  
 Vertue, and every where opposed the progress of the Gospel with all  
 their might, as appears from many places in the *Acts*, and the *Epistles*  
 of the Apostles. Such were the *Epicureans* and other Pseudo-Philoso-





ἐκλόπτειν. *Grotius* thinks, if there had been a Presbytery at *Thessa-* Chapter  
*lonica*, *St. Paul* would have commanded these disorderly Men to be III.  
 excommunicated ; but because there was not, he only commands the  
 rest to avoid all familiar Conversation with them, which every par-  
 ticular Christian had a power to do. But when he says there was no  
 Presbytery at *Thessalonica*, he is mistaken, as I have shewn on 1 *Thess.*  
 i. 1. That double Admonition which our Author in his Paraphrase  
 finds to be intimated in these words, and which ought to precede Ex-  
 communication, few doubtless would have perceived, without being  
 advertised of it: Nor can I, for my part, perceive it yet. I grant  
 the Apostle had twice admonished the *Thessalonians* about this matter,  
 but does it presently follow that those Admonitions, which were twice  
 read in the Church of *Thessalonica*, were accounted as forerunners of  
 Excommunication? Does it follow also that *St. Paul* had a respect to it  
 in this place? I think not.

Ibid. Ἀτακτῶς ἀειπατέοντας.] The Phrase ἀτακτῶς ἀειπατέειν is not barely  
 to be idle, but to do that which Idleness, especially in young people, is  
 the cause of, that is, to live wantonly and irregularly. The *Old*  
*Glosses*: Ἀτακτῶς, inquietus, inordinatus, petulans, troubiesom, disorder-  
 ly, wanton. Ἀτακτῆτες, tumultuosiores. Ἀτάκτως, inordinatè. Ἀταξία,  
 enormitas, tumultuatio.

Verf. 12. Ἐαυτῶν ἄρτον ἐδίωσι.] That is, the Bread which they shall get  
 by their Labour, for that is every ones own which he acquires by law-  
 ful Industry. This perhaps may lead us into the true meaning of that  
 in the Lord's Prayer, ἵ ἄρτον ἡμῶν δός ἡμῖν, give us OUR Bread;  
 that is, order it so by thy Providence, that we may not live by other  
 Mens Labours, but upon Food got by our own Labour. And so the  
 sense of the whole Petition will be this, Grant that the remaining part  
 of our Lives we may daily by our Labour provide Food for our selves.  
 On the contrary, they are said in Latin *alieno pane vesci*, not whom a-  
 nother Man maintains, because they are industrious in his Service,  
 but who like Drones, live idly at another Man's cost. So *Juvenal* be-  
 gins his *vth Sat.* against Parasites thus:

*Si te propositi nondum pudet, atque eadem est mens*  
*Ut bona summa putes, aliena vivere quadra,*  
*Si potes illa pati, &c.*

Verf. 14. Εἰ δέ τις ἐκ παλαιῆς πρὸ λόγου ἡμῶν διὰ τὸ ὀπισθεῖν τῆτον σημειῶδε.]  
 The Antients for the most part omitting the use of Points, it is un-  
 certain whether these words should be rendred, if any Man does

Chapter *not obey our Word, signify that Man by an Epistle, i. e. write me word*  
 III. *who it is; or, if any Man obey not our Word by this Epistle, note that*  
 ~~~~~ *Man.* The former is preferred by *Erasmus* and *Grotius*. and indeed  
*σημειῶσαι δι' ἐπιστολῆς* is oftner said than *λόγῳ δι' ἐπιστολῆς*. The latter by  
*Beza* and *Dr. Hammond*. Besides, these who are fond of Excommuni-  
 cation, make *σημειῶσαι* to be all one with *to brand* by Excommunicati-  
 on, but they ought to have produced an example of that signification.  
 For all *Lexicons* indeed tell us, that *σημειῶσαι* is to *signify* or *notify*; but  
 I don't know whether it be ever used for *to brand* or *set a mark of in-*  
*famy* upon a Man, *ignominia notare*. I confess that is often the notion  
 of the Latin Verb *notare*, but hence it does not follow that the Greek  
 Verb *σημειῶσαι* signifies the same.

Verf. 16. Ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ.] It seems the *Vulgar Interpreter* read *τόπῳ*,  
 having rendred it *loco*. And that reading is approved by *Grotius*, who  
 explains the mind of the Apostle thus: *Deus det vobis res bonas. sive*  
*Thessalonicae eritis, sive in Judæam, seu Syriam redibitis, sive aliò migra-*  
*bitis: God give you good things, whether ye stay at Thessalonica, or whe-*  
*ther you return into Judæa or Syria, or wherever else you go.* This is sense  
 good enough, but most Copies have ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ, which I chuse to fol-  
 low, in this sense: *God give you always* (διὰ παντός, viz. χρόνῳ) *Peace by*  
 ✎ *all means*; [so it is in the English Translation] that is, whether  
 Peace be taken for all Prosperity; or for Tranquillity, which the Hea-  
 thens may let you enjoy; or for Concord, which ye may preserve a-  
 mong your selves, both publickly and privately. For all these things  
 are in Scripture comprehended under the name of *Peace*. This is cer-  
 tainly the fittest sense of these words, if the whole Assembly be con-  
 sidered, which lived at *Thessalonica*, and to which *St. Paul* writes; not  
 to particular Persons, who might take those Journeys which *Grotius*  
 speaks of.



## ANNOTATIONS

## On the First Epistle

## Of St. Paul the Apostle to Timothy.

**A**T the end of the *Præmon.*] What Dr. Hammond here attempts in order to assign the time in which this Epistle was written, is contrary to what he says about the Journeys of Timothy; for it is not likely that Timothy was left Bishop at *Ephesus*, that presently after he should leave that City, and travel with St. Paul, and go to visit him as far as *Rome*. It is much more probable that Timothy was ordained Bishop of *Ephesus* after St. Paul was released from his Bonds, and went from *Rome* to *Asia*, about the year of Christ *lxiv.* or the *xith* of *Nero*, and that the year after this Epistle was written, as Dr. Pearson in his *Annales Paulinæ* thinks.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 3, & 4. **K**<sup>Αθῶς παρεχάλεσα, &c.</sup>] These two Verses must be joined with the *18th*, all the rest which intervene being a *Parenthesis*. It is, I confess, a harsh *Hyperbaton*, but St. Paul was not curious about such things.

Verf. 4. Note a. What Dr. Hammond says here about *Antiphanes*, as the Author of the *Gnostick* or *Valentinian* Genealogies, he owes to *Irenæus* in Lib. 4. c. 19. who affirms that that Poet wrote such things in his *Theogonia*. It is strange that Comedy of *Antiphanes* should nowhere else be cited. But perhaps this was not the name of a Comedy, but *Irenæus* refers to a place in which something was said upon that Subject, [viz. the generation of the Gods] as in *Aristophanes* his *Aves* we have something still extant about that matter. As to *Hesiod* the thing is plain, if we read the beginning of his *Theogonia*; and the *Valentinians*


Chapter *Valentinians* are more than once upbraided with applying the fabulous Stories of that Poet to their purpose, by *Irenæus* and *Epiphanius*. But as to *Philistio* who wrote Mimick Poems, I very much doubt whether he be rightly reckon'd in the number of those who described the Genealogies of the Gods. I am apt to think our Author was deceived as to him, by misunderstanding a Passage in *Epiphanius*, in *Hæres.* xxxiii. which is that of the *Ptolemaïtes*, S. 1. where *Epiphanius* speaks thus: ἔτε γὰρ τῶν παλαιῶν τραγωδοποιῶν τις, ἔτε οἱ καθ' ἑξῆς μιμητοὶ τῶν τῶν, οἱ αὖτε Φιλιστίων λέγω, καὶ Διογένη, ἢ τὰ ἄπιστα γράψαντα, ἢ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες, οἱ τὸς μύθους ἀναγεγραφότες καὶ ῥαψωδῆσαντες, τοσούτων ψεύδῃ ἠδυνήθησαν ἐκτυπῶσαι, ὡς ἔτοι τολευμερῶς φερόμενοι μετα τῶν ἑαυτῶν ζωῆς δὲ ἀὐτοῖς κατεσκεύασαν, καὶ τῶν νῦν τῶν πειθομένων αὐτοῖς ἀνθρώπων εἰς μωροῦς ζητήσεις ἀειβάλλον καὶ γενεαλογίας ἀπερσύντες: For none of those antient Tragedians, or their Successors the Mimicks, *Philistio*, I speak of, and *Diogenes*, who wrote things exceeding all belief, nor any of all those other Writers and patchers up of Fables, could have forged so great a Ly as these men [temerè suæ ipsorum vitæ periculo æcti sinxerunt] acted by the fear of their own lives, have boldly invented, and intangled the minds of men who believe them, in foolish Questions and endless Genealogies. *Epiphanius* here compares the τὰ ἄπιστα falseness or incredibility of the Fables, which were written by the Mimick Poets, with the τὰ ἄπιστα of the fooleries of the *Valentinians*, but he does not say these latter owed their Genealogies to the *Mimicks*.

Verf. 15. Note c. I do not believe *St. Paul* here has a respect to the *Jews Cabbala*, for ἀποδέχεσθαι in Greek very often signifies to approve, and ἀποδοχὴ approbation. So that ἀποδοχὴς ἀξιῶ is a pure Greek Phrase, in which there is no allusion to the *Cabbala* *Sui las*: ἀποδέχομαι, ἀιτιατικῆ καὶ γενικῆ ἰμολογῶ. ἀποδέχομαι σε τῶν τῶν, καὶ ἀποδέχομαι σε τὸς τῶν: The word is joined with an Accusative and Genitive Case, and signifies to approve, as ἀποδέχομαι, &c. I approve your manners. So *Hesychius*: ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀποδοχῆς ἀξιωθέντα: esteemed worthy of acceptation. So the old Glosses: ἀποδέχομαι, probō, acceptum habeo, comprobo, I approve, I account acceptable. ἀποδέχεται, comprobat. And hence comes ἀπόδεκτος, which *Hesychius* interprets by ἐπαινετός laudable. See also my Note on 1 *Cor.* ii. 14.

Verf. 17. Note d. I. Βασιλεὺς αἰώνων is an imitation of a Hebrew form of speech very common among the *Rabbins*, who often call God מלך העולם melech holamim, or מלך עולם melech holam, that is, the King of the World, as appears by their forms of Prayer. It is not probable that *St. Paul* would use a foolish term of the *Gnosticks*, where he does not dispute against them.

II. I am apt to think that the *Gnosticks* called Angels, or inferiour Deities, αἰῶνες, not from *Ezechieh*, where they are stiled living Creatures,



tures, which has no affinity with *αἰὼν* ages, but as it were *αἰὲν ἐόντες* Chapter  
*everlasting*, as *Homer* often calls the Gods: And so wrested an usual I.  
 word to a signification which did not belong to it. In the mean while,   
 what is here said by *St. Paul* may as well be opposed to the *Heathens*  
 as the *Gnosticks*; to whom our Author had no reason to suppose the  
 Apostle alluded almost in every word.

Verf. 18. *Note f.* Our Author here confounds things very different  
 with one another, because there is some similitude between them in  
 found: which is a fault he often commits, not being sufficiently ac-  
 customed to a grammatical *ἀνέλεσθαι*, nor having taken so much pains  
 in studying Criticks, as Divinity and Ecclesiastical History. I. In  
*Num.* iv. 3. the word *חַיָּוִת* must not be rendred *into the host*, but  
*into the troop*, or *company*, as I have shewn on that place. And a *troop*  
 or *company* is so called, because any company of men marching in or-  
 der, is in some respect like an Army, whether put in array or moving  
 forwards. See my Notes on *Exod.* vi. 26. and xii. 41.

II. In *Numb.* i. 50. This Law is given to the *Levites*: *They shall bear  
 the Tabernacle, and all the vessels thereof; they shall minister unto it, and  
 shall encamp round about the Tabernacle*: which words must be under-  
 stood in their proper sense; for the *Levites* in the Desert did really en-  
 camp about the Tabernacle. And therefore they make nothing to  
 the metaphorical signification of an *Army*, tho they gave occasion  
 to it.

III. Our learned Author had not look'd into the place in *Exodus*  
 xxxviii. 8. for there is no mention there made of Women lately deli-  
 vered. *Moses* is said to have made *the Laver of brass, and its foot of  
 brass, of the Looking-glasses of women assembling by troops at the door of the  
 Tabernacle of the Congregation*. There is no signification here of *war-  
 ring*, or of sacred Ministration. See my Notes on that place.

IV. In *2 Sam.* vi. 2. God is called *the Lord of Hosts*, in the same  
 sense, as frequently elsewhere, not as the Lord of the Ark or Taber-  
 nacle, which is a Phrase that no where occurs, and the Ark and Taber-  
 nacle are never called *hosts*; but the Discourse is about conveying the  
 Ark from one place to another, to which the title of *Lord of hosts*,  
 that is. President of War, has no manner of relation. But what then?  
 Is not God often called by that name in the Prophets, where neither  
 War, nor the Ministry of the Priests or Levites is spoken of? Yes, it  
 is a title the Prophets frequently make use of, whatever be the subject  
 of the Discourse; just as *Homer* in abundance of places calls *Jupiter*  
*νεφεληγεγετης*, where he has nothing at all about Clouds or Rain; and  
*Achilles* *ποδῶν ὠκίς*, where there is nothing said about running. Such as  
 these.

Chapter I. these are perpetual Epithets, and as it were Appendages to proper Names, or like Surnames, which are used whenever those Names are mention'd without any certain design. The Jews called the true God *the Lord of Hosts*, because they look'd upon Victory as one of the chief Favours God could confer upon men in this World; and on the contrary, a Defeat in War, whereby whole Nations were sometimes subjected to Slavery, as the greatest evil. They saw also often, that those whom God favoured obtained the Victory, tho they were inferior both in Policy and Strength to their Enemies: and that tho all military Stratagems were used in Battels, yet the Event was uncertain, and did not depend upon men; because unforeseen Accidents, tho very small, are sometimes the cause of Victories and Defeats. Therefore they thought that God did preside in a special manner over War, and thence made him a Surname. The Heathens sometimes speak almost in the same manner about their Deities, as *Hirtius de Bello Alexandr.* c. 75. where he describes the Battel between *Cæsar* and *Pharnaces*, whom *Cæsar* overcame with much fewer Forces, and those not sufficiently prepared to fight: *Clamore sublato, saith he, confligitur, multum adjuvante natura loci, plurimum DEORUM immortalium BENIGNITATE; qui cum OMNIBUS CASIBUS BELLII INTERSUNT, tum præcipue eis, quibus nihil potuit ratione administrari: After a great shout (on both sides) the two Armies engaged one another, the situation of the place being a great advantage (to Cæsar's Party) but the FAVOUR of the GODS a much greater; who as they are PRESENT in ALL the CHANCES of WAR, so especially in those in which there is no room for the exercise of Conduct.* For these Reasons, the Jews attributed to God the title of *Lord of hosts*, which must by no means be urged, as if it were never used but where there is a respect had to an Army, either properly so called, or metaphorically.

V. The Angels are called *Gods Hosts* in *Psalms* ciii. 21. because God uses them as Kings and Generals do Armies, to assist their Friends in danger, and subdue their Enemies; and the Stars, not the Sun and Moon only, because they are like a straggling Army, dispersed over all parts of the Heaven.

VI. Our learned Author had not cast his eyes upon *Isa.* xl. 2. where there is no mention of the *Priesthood*, no footstep of the *Levites*. The Prophet speaks thus: *Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak that which may please Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, because her sin is expiated.* That which the Prophet here calls *Jerusalems warfare* is the banishment of the Jews, and the miseries ensuing thereupon, which he foretels would shortly be at an end.



I cannot conceive by what Engines this can be applied to the Cessation Chapter of the Levitical Priesthood.

VII. In 2 *Tim.* ii. 4. there is mention indeed made of *fighting*, but in a proper sense. But the place alledged by Dr. *Hammond* is in the same Epistle, *chap.* iv. 7. and the Apostle does not there speak about Warring, or make use of a Metaphor taken from War, but from the *Agones*. I have strived, saith he, a good strife, ἢ ἀγῶνα ἢ καλὸν ἠγώνισμα, I have finished my race, δέσω, I have kept the faith. So that I wonder our Author should alledg that place.

## C H A P. II.

Verf. i. I. **T**HE word *μύσαι* in the passage of St. *Chrysoſtom*, alledged in the beginning of this Note, is not well rendered *Priests*; for *μύσαι* signifies any Believers, that were present at the Celebration of the Eucharist, or any other religious Mysteries. And the reason why St. *Chrysoſtom* says the thing was known to *them*, and not to others, is because the Christians prayed for the Emperors *μετὰ τῆν θεῶν ἀναφορῶν*, when there were none but *Mystæ* present. In the *Apostolical Constitut.* lib. 8. c. 13. in a Prayer for the faithful, *μετὰ τῆν θεῶν ἀναφορῶν*, after a divine Oblation, we meet with these words; Ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ τῶν ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ διακονούντων, ἵνα εἰρηδῶνται τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, &c. Let us pray for Kings, and those that are in Authority, that we may live at peace, &c.

II. In St. *Chrysoſtom's* Liturgy, Dr. *Hammond* renders the words *θεοφυλάκτες βασιλέων* by *Defenders of God*, or of the Faith of Christ, because, I suppose, he had in his mind the Title of the King of Great Britain, who is ordinarily called *Defender of the Faith*. But *θεοφυλάκτες* signifies one that is kept or preserved by God, not one that preserves or defends God; as *θεοδιδάκτες* is one taught of God, and not one that teaches God. So in the old Latin Version of the Liturgy of St. *Basil*, Ed. Plant. An. 1560. Pro piissimo & à Deo conservando Imperatore nostro, omnique palatio & exercitu ejus, Dominum postulemus. Let us beseech God for our most pious Emperor, to be preserved by God, and for all the Court, and his Army. So in the Translation of the Mass of S. *Chrysoſtom*, publish'd by Leo the Tuscan: Pro piissimis & cælitus custoditis Imperatoribus nostris, toto palatio & exercitu eorum, Dominum deprecemur. Let us pray earnestly to the Lord for our most religious Emperors, which Heaven preserves, for the whole Court, and their Armies. The thing is clear, and needed no proof, if our learned Author had not stumbled in it.

Chapter III. *Verf. 8, Note b.* The Doctor read *Aristeas* too hastily; for if he had read the following words, he would have seen that there was no need of any Correction, there being immediately added after the words alleged, ἐτέπειπο αὐτὸς πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, καὶ πρὸς ἑκάστη διασάφειαν, and so the entire sense being, *as it is the general custom of the Jews, having washed their hands in salt water, after they had prayed to God, they went to reading, and every one interpreted.*

*Verf. 15. Note d.* I wonder our Author has made no mention of the Opinion of *Grotius*, who following *Beza*, interprets διὰ τεκνογονίας by ἐν τεκνογονίᾳ; and so the Apostle's meaning will be, either that Women, tho they are punished for Sin in Child-bearing, should nevertheless be saved if, &c. as *Beza* thinks; or, that their bearing of Children should be no hindrance to their Salvation if, &c. which *Grotius* prefers. These are certainly the most natural Interpretations, and from them we may easily assign a Reason of the confusion of the Numbers, which are often set promiscuously, when the Discourse is about a whole Species, as *Grotius*, and *Dr. Hammond* himself, well observes.

### C H A P. III.

*Verf. 1. Note a.* **N**O Man that understands what is the Office of a Bishop or Presbyter, which may be learned from these Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, can doubt but that it is a very honourable and excellent work καλλίστον ἔργον. But we ought not therefore to decry other conditions of Life, as worldly; in which a man may as truly serve God, provided he regulates himself according to the prescriptions of the Gospel: nor can I assent to what our Author here says about *Demas*, of which I shall have occasion to speak afterwards.

As to the desertion of that Office, it is a great Sin without doubt in those, who have applyed themselves to it being duly qualified, and can discharge it as they ought and usefully; but how many are there who rashly aspire to that Office, as to some Magistracy or secular Dignity, for the sake of Honour and Profit, who are destitute of Gifts necessary to the right exercise of it? And it would be much better if such men repented of their Vow (if a purpose respecting only Riches and Honours ought to be called a Vow) after they had found by experience how unfit they were for the Ministry of the Gospel, and set themselves to some other employment, for which they were better qualified. Such Men ἐκ ἐπεθύμησάν καλῶ ἔργον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς καὶ πλάττε, who whatever Orders they have entered into, or whatever Promises they have made, it would



would be well if they were loosed from their Engagements, and re-Chapter  
turned to the World as they use to say, than that they should profane and III.  
abuse so sacred an Employment. But if that were done, so many Le-  
gions of *Angels of the Lord* would be reduced to a few.

Verf. 2. Note b. I. There is a fault either of the Printer, or Dr. Hammond in his haste, in the citation of the *Neocæsarean Synod*, for that which he refers to is in *Canon 7.* and there are but 15 Canons of that Synod.

II. There is such another mistake in the citation of the *Ancyran Synod*, for Dr. Hammond referred to *Can. 19.* and there are no more than 25 in all. Besides, the word ἐϑ does not signify in that Canon a term of time, but a Constitution or Determination, by which a certain penalty was imposed upon such as had been twice married. "Ὁθεν γὰρ τὸ πονηρὸν καὶ ἄκα νόμος λέγεται, by ἐϑ is meant a Constitution and Canon, saith Zonaras.

III. Our Author cites *Plutarch* in his *Ῥωμαίων.* as if he had looked into the Greek; whereas *Plutarch* says the quite contrary, as will appear by his words, which I shall set down entire, that the Reader may see Citations are not always to be trusted; because our learned Author relying upon the fidelity of others, obtrudes upon us I know not what Dreams for the sense of *Plutarch.* These are that Writer's words in *Quest. c. 3.* Δια τίνα αἰτίων ἐν ταῖς δημοσίαις ἐορταῖς ἐϑ ἔστι γαμεῖσθαι παρθένας, αἱ δὲ γάμοι γαμῶνται; *Why is it not the custom for Virgins to be married on the publick Feasts, and for Widows to be married?* Dr. Hammond supposes the contrary; tho he is not consistent with himself in what follows. Now to that Question *Plutarch* answers thus: Πότερον, ὡς ὁ Βάρρων εἰσηκεῖ, ὅτι λυπαρῆσαι μὲν αἱ παρθένοι γαμῶνται, χαίρειναι δὲ αἱ γυναῖκες. ἐορτῇ δὲ μηδὲν λυπαρῆσαι ποιεῖν, μηδὲ πρὸς ἀνάγκην; ἢ μάλλον ὅτι ταῖς μὲν παρθένοις καλὸν μὴ ὀλίγων, ταῖς δὲ χήραις αἰσχρὸν πολλῶν παρόντων γαμεῖσθαι, ζηλωτὴς γὰρ ὁ πρῶτος γάμος, ἡ δὲ δεύτερος ἀποκρίσθαι. *Is it, as Varro said, because Virgins when they are married are sorrowful, but women joyful? And at a feast time nothing should be done sorrowfully or by constraint. Or rather because it is decent for Virgins to be married in the presence of a great many, but not for Widows. For the first marriage is desirable, but the second is abominable.* The last words are alledged by *Grotius*, than which nothing can be more pertinent to the business in hand; and our Author would not have done amiss, if he had followed him, who is for the most part a faithful guide. *Plutarch* adds some things to which our Author refers, which I shall therefore transcribe: Αἰσχρὸν γὰρ εἰς ζώντων ἢ πρῶτον ἑτέρου λαμβάνειν, ἐδύσειν δὲ εἰς ἀποθανόντων, ὅθεν ἡσυχία χαίρειναι μάλλον, ἢ δορυχοῖς καὶ περὶ πόμπαις: *for they are ashamed, if while their former Husbands are alive, they are married to others; and if they die, they mourn, which makes them pre-*

Chapter *fer Quiet, to the noise of a Multitude, and pompous Solemnities.* Note, III. that the Law had imposed this upon Widows, or such as were forsaken by their Husbands, that they might not be too hasty to marry a second time.

IV. To the places alledged by *Grotius* and our Author, as well here as on *Chap. v. 9.* add this out of *Livy*, [Lib. x. c. 23. Mr. *Le Clerc* does not cite the place, which I wonder at, because he blames Dr. *Hammond* so often for the same thing] by which it will appear, who it is that is said to be *the Husband of one Wife.* That Historian describing the strife between the Roman Matrons, in the Nobles Temple of Chastity, out of which *Virginia* was expelled, because she being a Noble Woman, had married a Commoner, saith: *Brevis altercatio inde, ex iracundia muliebri in contentionem animorum exarsit, cum se Virginia patriciam & pudicam in patriciæ Pudicitæ templum ingressam & UNINUPTAM, ad quem virgo deducta sit ———— verò gloriaretur.* A short quarrel occasion'd by that means, through the Womens peevishness, grew to a very fierce contention, *Virginia* boasting that she being a noble and vertuous Woman, had enter'd into the Nobles Temple of Chastity, and had been MARRIED to ONE Man, to whom she had been deliver'd a Virgin.

Verf. 15. in Note e. Col. 2. Lin. 8. after the words, *Donour, or Plenipotentiary.*] Dr. *Hammond* would have done well if he had proved what he asserts here about a Metropolitan Power, and the rest of what he says, out of Scripture, or those Antients which lived nearest the times of the Apostles; because he could not but know that there were some in the World who would look upon the greatest part of those things as Fables. But perhaps they were delivered first from the Pulpit, in a Discourse to the People, and afterwards inserted in his Annotations on the New Testament, but in an improper place. What he says about the Church and the House of God, there is no one undoubtedly but knows, and it might have been said much more clearly in three words, without the tediousness of so many repetitions.

*Ibid.* Lin. 39. after the words, *one and the same Title.*] Our learned Author might have alledged another place out of *Maimonides*, more like this of *St. Paul*, which has been already alledged by Mr. *Lightfoot* in his *Description of the Temple of Jesus*, Chap. xxii. *This great Council setting in Garib* *הם עקר תורה שבכל פה ועמודי הוראה* was the FOUNDATION of the Oral Law, and the PILLAR of Instruction. For this is said of an Assembly, as it is also an Assembly which *St. Paul* speaks of.

*Ibid.*



*Ibid.* At the end of the same *Note.*] I. All this will be insignificant, Chapter III. if the words *Pillar and ground of Truth* should not belong to the Church, but to that which follows, viz. *the mystery of Godliness*. Which is the opinion of *Episcopus* and *Camero*, none of the lowest rank of Divines, who may be consulted.

II. I wonder our Author should produce these words as out of the Epistle to the *Magnesians*: for they that did so, &c. when there are no such words in that Epistle. Whether they are to be found in any other place of *Ignatius*, I cannot tell, nor have I time to look; but it was not prudently done to cite them as out of a place where they are not.

III. Nor is that confused heap of places out of *Ignatius* much to the purpose, because *St. Paul* says nothing here about Bishops, and because such times may happen wherein it would be a piece of madness to trust Bishops, as our Author acknowledges. So that whatever is said by *Ignatius*, must all be understood with this exception; provided a Bishop truly discharge the Office of a Pastor, not if he be a Herctick, or a Tyrant, who thinks he is not for the Flock, but the Flock for him; not if he obstinately persist in gross Errors, which he will not by any reason be brought to renounce, through his Pride or Covetousness. It was possible that in the time of *Ignatius*, all the Bishops, of whom many had seen the Apostles, and many had their Disciples for their Teachers, might be Men devoted to the Truth, and faithful Pastors; and that induced him to insist so much upon their Authority: but these are not lessons for all times and places.

*Vers.* 16. It must be owned that our Author in the precedent Annotations, has often acted the part of a Preacher or Divine, rather than an Interpreter. And therefore to supply what is wanting in him, I shall subjoin here out of another English Gentleman, a Discourse much more *critical* than any thing said by *Dr. Hammond*. I mean *Dr. Pearson*, who has treated of the true reading of this place, on the 2d Article of the *Apostles Creed*, p. 128. where after he had said that all the Greek Copies have θεός, *God was manifested in the Flesh*, &c. not ο *which was manifested*, &c. he speaks thus: "Nor need we be troubled  
" with the observation of *Grotius* on the place: *suspectam nobis hanc*  
" *lectionem faciunt Interpretes veteres, Latinus, Syrus, Arabs & Ambro-*  
" *sus, qui omnes legerunt ο εσαρησθη.* I confess the *vulgar Latin* reads it  
" otherwise than the Greek, *Quod manifestatum est in carne*; and it  
" cannot be denied but the *Syriack*, however translated by *Tremellius*,  
" agreeth with the Latin; and both seem to have read ο instead of  
" θεός. But the joint consent of the Greek Copies and Interpreters,  
" are

Chapter  
III.

“ are above the Authority of these two Translators; and the *Arabick*  
 “ set forth in the *Biblia Polyglotta*, agreeth expressly with them. But  
 “ that which *Grotius* hath farther observed, is of far greater conside-  
 “ ration: *Addit Hincmarus Opusculo lv. illud θεός hic positum a Nestori-*  
 “ *anis.* For if at first the Greeks read ὁ ἐφανερῶθη, and that ὁ were  
 “ altered into θεός by the *Nestorians*; then ought we to correct the  
 “ Greek Copy by the Latin, and confess there is not only no force, but  
 “ not so much as any ground or colour for our Arguments.  
 “ But first it is no way probable that the *Nestorians* should find it  
 “ in the Original ὁ, and make it θεός, because that by so doing they  
 “ had overthrown their own Assertion, which was, that God was not  
 “ incarnate, nor born of the *Virgin Mary*; that God did not ascend  
 “ unto Heaven, but *Christ*, by the Holy Ghost remaining upon him,  
 “ καὶ τὸ ἐξελθὼν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς Concil. Ephes. Part. 1. cap. 17. Se-  
 “ condly, it is certain that they did not make this alteration, because  
 “ the Catholick Greeks read it θεός before there were such Hereticks,  
 “ so called. *Nestoriani à Nestorio Episcopo, Patriarcha Constantinopo-*  
 “ *litano.* Aug. Hæres. *Nestorius*, from whom that Heresy began,  
 “ was Patriarch of *Constantinople* after *Sisinnius*, *Sisinnius* after *Atticus*,  
 “ *Atticus* after *Nectarius*, who succeeded *Joannes*, vulgarly called  
 “ *Chrysostomus*. But *S. Chrysostom* read not ὁ, but θεός, as appears by  
 “ his Commentaries on the place; Θεός ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί, τετίσιν, ὁ  
 “ ἐφανερῶθη. And *St. Cyril*, who by all means opposed *Nestorius* upon  
 “ the first appearance of his Heresy, wrote two large Epistles to the  
 “ Queens *Pulcheria* and *Eudocia*, in both which he maketh great use of  
 “ this Text. In the first, after the repetition of the words, as they  
 “ are now in the Greek Copies, he proceedeth thus; τίς ὁ ἐν σαρκί φανε-  
 “ ρῶθης; ἢ εὐλογ, ὅτι πάντη τε καὶ πάντως ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγος. ἔγω γὰρ ἔσμαι μέγα  
 “ τὸ εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, θεός ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί. Wherefore in *St. Paul* he  
 “ reads Θεός God, and took that God to be the Word. In the second,  
 “ repeating the same Text *verbatim*, he manageth it thus against  
 “ *Nestorius*: Εἰ Θεός ὢν ὁ Λόγος ἐνανθρωπήσας λέγεται, καὶ ὁ δὴ ποτε μέγας τὸ εἶναι  
 “ Θεός, ἀλλ’ ἐν οἷς ἦν ἀεὶ διαμένων, μέγα δὲ τότε καὶ ὁμολογημένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ εἶ  
 “ εὐσεβείας μυστήριον. εἰ δὲ αἰθέρωτος νοεῖται κοινῶς ὁ Χριστός, πῶς ἐν σαρκί πεφάνερω-  
 “ ται; καὶ τί πῶς ἐκ ἀπαπῆν ἐναρξῆς, ὅτι πᾶς αἰθέρωτος ἐν σαρκί τε ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐκ αὐ-  
 “ τῆς ἑστῆς ἐστὶ πᾶσι; And in the explanation of his second Anathematism,  
 “ he maketh use of no other Text but this, to prove the Hypostatical  
 “ Union, giving it this Gloss or Exposition: τί ἐστὶ τὸ ἐφανερῶθη ἐν σαρκί;  
 “ τετίσιν γὰρ σαρκὸς ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγος, &c. The same he urgeth in his  
 “ *Scholion de Unigeniti incarnatione.* So also *Theodoret* contemporary  
 “ with *St. Cyril*: Θεός γὰρ ὢν καὶ Θεὸς υἱός, καὶ ἀόρατος τὸν φύσιν, δὴλ. ἄπασιν  
 “ ἐνανθρωπήσας



“ ἐνανθρωπίσας ἐγένετο, σαφῶς γὰρ ἡμεῖς δύο φύσεις ἐδέξαμεν, ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ τὴν θεῖαν Chapter  
 “ ἔφη φανερωθῆναι φύσιν. Thirdly, *Hincmarus* does not say, that the *Nesto-* III.  
 “ *rians* put θεὸς into the Greek Text, but that he which put it in was  
 “ cast out of his Bishoprick as a *Nestorian*. His words are these:  
 “ *Quidam nimirum ipsas Scripturas verbis illicitis imposturaverunt; sicut*  
 “ *Macedonius Constantinopolitanus Episcopus, qui ab Anastasio Imperatore*  
 “ *ideo a Civitate expulsus legitur, quoniam falsavit Evangelia, & illum*  
 “ *Apostoli locum ubi dicit, quod apparuit in carne, justificatum est in*  
 “ *Spiritu, per cognationem Græcarum literarum Ο in Θ hoc modo mutando*  
 “ *falsavit. Ubi enim habuit Qui, hoc est ΟΣ monosyllabum Græcum, li-*  
 “ *tera mutata Ο in Θ vertit; & fecit ΘΣ, id est, ut esset Deus apparuit*  
 “ *per carnem. Quapropter tanquam Nestorianus fuit expulsus. Hincm.*  
 “ *Opusc. lv. c. 18.* Now whereas *Hincmarus* says *expulsus legitur*, we  
 “ read not in *Evagrius*, or the *Excerpta* of *Theodorus*, or in *Joannes*  
 “ *Malala*, that *Macedonius* was cast out of his Bishoprick for any such  
 “ falsation. It is therefore probable that he had it from *Liberatus*, a  
 “ Deacon of the Church of *Carthage*, who wrote a Breviary, collect-  
 “ ed partly out of the Ecclesiastical Histories, and Acts of the  
 “ Councils, partly out of the relations of such Men as he thought fit  
 “ to believe, extant in the fourth Tome of the Councils. In which,  
 “ chap. 19. we have the same relation, only with this difference, that  
 “ Ο is not turned into Θ, but into Ω; and so ΟΣ becomes not ΘΣ,  
 “ but ΩΣ.  
 “ So that, first the Greek Copies are not said to have read it ο,  
 “ but ος, and so not to have relation to the Mystery, but to the Person  
 “ of Christ; and therefore this makes nothing for the Vulgar Latin.  
 “ Secondly, whereas *Hincmarus* says there was but one Letter chang-  
 “ ed, no such mutation can of ΟΣ make ΘΕΟΣ, it may ΩΣ, as we  
 “ read in *Liberatus*; and then this is nothing to the Greek Text.  
 “ Thirdly, *Macedonius* was no *Nestorian*, but *Anastasius* an *Eutychi-*  
 “ *an*; and he ejected him not as he did other Catholick Bishops, under  
 “ the pretence of Nestorianism, but for other reasons. However  
 “ *Macedonius* could not falsify all the Greek Copies, when as well  
 “ those which were before his time, as those which were written  
 “ since, all acknowledg θεός. And if he had been ejected for substi-  
 “ tuting θεός, without question *Anastasius* would have taken care for  
 “ the restoring ἐς, which we find not in any Copy. It remaineth  
 “ therefore that the *Nestorians* did not falsify the Text, by reading  
 “ θεός ἐφανερῶς, but that the antient Greek Fathers read it so; and  
 “ consequently being the Greek is the Original, this Lession must be  
 “ acknowledged Authentical.

This

Chapter IV. This is excellently said by the learned *Doctor*, but he is mistaken when he denies that any Greek Copy reads  $\delta$ , unless we are deceived by the *Oxford* Edition, which sets down the various Lections, and wherein the *Clarimont Copy*, of great Antiquity, and another of *Lincoln College*, are said to have  $\delta$ , which the Latin and Syriack Interpreters undoubtedly found in their Greek Testaments.

## C H A P. IV.

Verf. 8. **I** AM plainly of the mind that *St. Paul* here despises bodily Exercises, as altogether unprofitable to Salvation, for of that profitableness he here speaks, because he considers them apart from Piety, which he opposes to them; and if they are abstracted from that, they do not serve for *few things*, but for nothing at all. For let those who are destitute of true Piety exercise their Bodies as much as they please, it will never avail them any thing as to eternal Salvation. For who will believe that the *Brachmans*, [for instance] who live an austere Life in the Woods, and abstain from many lawful things, for ostentation sake, or out of superstition, are any thing more acceptable to God than the other *Indians*, who do not think such Abstinences necessary? If we use those bodily Exercises, on purpose to make our selves fitter for the performance of some Duties of real Piety, then it must be granted that they are not profitable  $\alpha\epsilon\delta\epsilon\varsigma\ \delta\lambda\iota\gamma\omega\nu$  but  $\alpha\epsilon\delta\epsilon\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\iota$ : and therefore *St. Paul* does not here consider *that* use of corporal Exercises, but that which does not render Men more fit for the practice of Vertue. He would have commended *Socrates*, *qui inter labores voluntarios, & exercitia corporis, ad sortuitas patientiæ vices firmandi, stare solitus dicitur perdius atque pernox, à summo lucis ortu ad solem alterum orientem: Who is said to have continued whole Nights and Days from the Sun's first rising, till it rose again, in voluntary Labours and bodily Exercises, to harden himself to undergo whatever it might be his lot to suffer.* Which are the words of *A. Gellius* in Lib. ii. c. 1. Thus *Socrates* behaved himself, that he might become the more stedfast in Vertue, and that the fear of bodily pain might never remove him from it. But *St. Paul* would not have praised the patience of a Robber, who exercised his Body that he might be the more fit for spoil, and harden himself against the fear of suffering for his Crimes, no more than the exercises of the *Athletæ*, which were performed only out a desire of vain glory.

Verf. 10.  $\text{Ὁς ἐστὶ σωτὴρ πάντων ἀσεβῶν, μὲν ἰσὺ πρῶτον.}$  These words our Author, after others, interprets of eternal Salvation; but I rather understand



understand them of a deliverance from temporal Dangers, out of Chapter which God often rescues all Men, but especially those who put their trust in V. him. St. Paul's meaning is this: that he did not refuse to expose himself to the greatest Dangers, Reproaches, or Persecutions; because he knew that God could rescue him out of all those dangers if he pleased. He has a respect to *Psalms* xvii. 7. where the Psalmist speaks thus: *Make thy loving kindness marvellous, O thou Saviour, O Lord,* which may be rendred of *them that believe*; for *to hope* and *believe*, when the Discourse is about a thing which is matter of Joy, and that yet future, signify almost the same thing. So, as others have observed, God is said to *save Man and Beast*, in *Psalms* xxxvi. 6. So the Author of the Book of *Wisdom*, chap. xvi. 7. speaking of those who looked up to the brazen Serpent, and were healed, says, *he that turned himself was not saved, ἐσωζεν, by that which was seen, but by thee the Saviour, σωτήρα, of all Men.*

*Vers.* 15. I will not deny but the word *μελετῶν* is used in an *Agonistical* sense; but there being nothing said here of those Exercises, I rather think it ought to be rendered *mind*, or *take care* of these things; so as that *μελέτα* should be the same with *μὴ ἀμέλει*, *do not neglect*, which went before. So, *μελέτη*, in *Hesiod*, signifies *care*, *Ἔργ.* *vers.* 380.

Πλείων ἢ πλεόνων μελέτη, μείζων δὲ ὀπιθήκη.

Where saith *Proclus*: *μελέτην λέγει τὴν φροντίδα*, so he calls *care*. And *μελετῶν* in the same Poet is used for *to take care*, as in *vers.* 316.

——— *μελετᾶς βίε ὡς σε κελεύω:*

I know in Prose the word rarely occurs in this signification, but as long as it very well agrees to this place, nothing should hinder us to admit it. Out of this, which is the proper signification of the Verb *μελετᾶν*, as appears by its coming from *μέλει*, resulted that other mention'd by *Dr. Hammond*; for they that exercise themselves in any business, are careful and diligent about it.

C H A P. V.

*Vers.* 17. I. **T**ὴ μὴ signifies unquestionably sometimes *Wages* or *Re-*  
*Note d.* **T**oward, according to the signification of the Verb *πῶ*  
 or *πῶω*, for *to pay* or *requite*, and I doubt not too, but  
*διπλὴ πμζ* here must be interpreted *double Wages*. But the other pla-

Chapter  
V.  
w

ces alledged by our Author, to prove that *τιμῶν* signifies to reward, or something of that kind, do not seem to prove it. For tho there were Rewards joined with the *Honours* there spoken of, it does not follow that the word *τιμῶν* is expressive of those Rewards, which undoubtedly were not the *τιμῆ* Honour it self, but an outward signification of Honour, and are joined with Honour, as its Consecratories.

II. It is true also, what our Author says about the Verb *ἀξιοῦμαι*; but here it seems to signify not only to receive, but also to be judged worthy to receive, which is the most usual signification of the word. In the place of the *Exposition of the Faith*, printed with the Works of *Justin*, *ἡξίωσαν* is not simply they have or have had, but they have been endued with that dignity or excellency of Nature as to be partakers of the same Divinity. That is the perpetual signification of the word, which is hardly ever used but in a good sense, and to signify that he, of whom it is said, enjoys that of which he is worthy.

Verf. 22. Note g. Dr. Hammond, in this Annotation, has ingeniously cleared the order of the Discourse, but has omitted one thing, which he ought first of all to have proved; viz. That the *Gnosticks* forbad not only *Matrimony*, but the use of *Wine*. For tho the former be universally charged upon them, yet I cannot tell whether any did ever accuse them of prohibiting the use of *Wine*. It is certain neither *Irenæus* nor *Epiphanius* object any such thing against them; and later Writers we need not trouble our selves about, who for the most part copy after them. Tho those Fathers omit nothing, whereby they may render the *Gnosticks* infamous and odious, so that we can scarce believe all they say. Nay, there is a passage in *Epiphanius*, which if true, shews the *Gnosticks* did not abstain from *Wine*; in *Hæres.* xxvi. which is that of the *Gnosticks*, Sect. 5. where he speaks thus: Τα σώματα δὲ αὐτῶν ὑπέβλεπον καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν, τιμολῶσι γυναικεία, καὶ ἀνθρωπάκια, μυζήματα, κρόμαλοι, σπιναλίονοι, κοίταις δὲ καὶ μέθαις ἡλάζοντες. καὶ χαλαρώνουσι ἢ νηστεύοντα, λέγοντες, ὅτι δεῖ νηστεύειν, ὅτι δ' ἀρρογίῃ τέτυκτο τὸ πνεῦμα ἢ αἰῶνά ἐστιν ἡ νηστεία. δεῖ δὲ τρέφεσθαι εἰς τὸ τὰ σώματα εἶναι ἰσχυρὰ, εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι ἢ καρπὸν ἀπεδιδόναι, καὶ κολεῖν αὐτῶν: Night and day sorry Fellows and Wenches employ themselves in taking care of their Bodies, anointing, washing, feasting, whoring, and making themselves drunk. And they curse all that fast, saying, that People ought not to fast, because fasting belongs to the Maker, and Prince of this Age; and they must feed, that their Bodies may be strong, and able to bring forth fruit in its proper season. There were indeed afterwards other Hereticks, who taught it was unlawful to drink *Wine*, as the *Encratites*, as we are told by *Epiphanius* in *Hæres.* xlvii. But all the Doctrines of all Hereticks cannot be attributed to the single Sect of the *Gnosticks*; unless perhaps the *Gnosticks* were of several sorts.



## C H A P. VI.

Verf. 2. **I**T is strange that those who have written about the Heresy of the *Gnosticks*, did not upbraid them with this, That they attempted to deprive Masters of their Servants; and I do not well understand why Dr. *Hammond*, if any Vice be reprov'd, presently imputes it to the *Gnosticks*, without any Authority from the Antients. By this way of interpreting, a wide door is opened for innumerable Fictions.

Verf. 19. Note h. St. *Paul* seems to have attributed to the word *θεμέλιον*, from *πιδέναι*, the same signification as to the word *κειμήλιον*, from *κεῖδαι* to *lye*, viz. in a Storehouse, unless it is to be read in this place *κειμήλιον*, which is a very usual word, whereas the former nowhere occurs in the notion of a *Treasure* or a precious thing. It is certain there is no great difference between *ΘΕΜΕΛΙΟΝ* and *ΚΕΙΜΗΛΙΟΝ*, for instead of *θεμέλιον* the Greeks use also *θεμείλιον*.

Verf. 20. Note i. Seeing the word *γνώσις* signified Knowledge, and such Knowledge as the *Jews* boasted they had received not from the Scriptures, but by Tradition from their Ancestors; there is no doubt but Men endued with that sort of Knowledge might be called *γ.ωστικοί*, *Gnosticks*. But it may not without reason be doubted, whether even from the Apostles time that name was peculiarly attributed to one particular Sect of Heathens, who feigned themselves to have embraced the Christian Religion, and that owed its beginning to *Simon Magus*, as it was afterwards. Our Author has not said any thing to prove this latter; and I have elsewhere observed many things which overthrow his Conjectures. I am apt to think, the *Gnosticks* of the Apostles times were *Jews*, either by Birth or Profession, who because they conversed among the *Greeks*, mixed a great many things out of their Philosophy with the *Jewish* Divinity, and by that mungrel Doctrine interpreted Scripture and Religion. Afterwards the name of *Gnosticks* was appropriated to a certain Sect of Heathens mention'd by *Irenæus* and *Epiphanius*.

In *Barnabas*, the word *γνώσις* is more than once used in a good sense for the knowledge of the mystical sense of Scripture. In chap. vi. after he had alledged words out of *Moses* in *Exod.* xxxiii. 1. and *Lev.* xx. 24. in which the *Jews* are commanded to enter into the Land of *Canaan*, he presently subjoins; *Τὸ λέγει δὲ ἡ γνώσις, μέλλει ἐλπίσαι ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ μέλλοιτε φανερωθῆναι ὑμῖν Ἰησοῦν*: and understand, what saith Knowledge: hope in *Jesus*, who is to be manifested to you in the flesh. After-

Chapter VI. wards he interprets the words of *Moses* allegorically, and says that by the *Land* was meant *Jesus*. See also *Chap. x.* towards the end, where that word occurs twice in this signification. Some persons seem, as they easily might, to have abused that way of interpreting, whose knowledg *St. Paul* here calls *ψευδωνύμιον γνῶσιν*, and to whom he often alludes in this Epistle. But we must beware of seeking such Allusions where it is not necessary, as our Author does in many places, who yet sometimes seems to have hit the nail on the head, as in *Chap. iv. 4.* & *seqq.*

513



# ANNOTATIONS

## On the Second Epistle

### Of St. Paul the Apostle to Timothy.

**A**T the end of the *Premon.*] Notwithstanding all that is here said by our Author, it is much more probable that St. Paul wrote this Epistle after his last Bondage, in the year of Nero XIII. and of Christ LXVII. a little before his death; as it is thought by Dr. Pearson, who has easily solved all the Difficulties which our Author here objects against that Opinion. I shall say something to them on Chap. iv.

#### CHAP. I.

Verf. 3. **X**A'ειν ἔχω τῷ Θεῷ——ὡς ἀδιάλειπτον ἔχω τὴν αἰσίν σου μνησίαν, ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσίν μου.] The sense of these words seems to be this; I thank God, that he gives me cause to make perpetual mention of you in my Prayers; that is, because thou adherest to the Gospel: for the Apostle did expressly make mention of those in his Prayers for whom he had a particular Affection, and whom he knew to be faithful to Christ. This may be gather'd from the beginning of most of his Epistles. See especially that to *Philemon*, verf. 4, and 5.

Verf. 9. Xάειν τὴν δοθῆσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἀπὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων.] That is, ἢν ἀπὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων ἀπεθέρισ ἡμῶν διδόναι δια Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which of a long time God had purposed to give us by Jesus Christ. He means the Gospel, which God had purposed should be preached both to Jews and Gentiles, as appears from *vers.* 10. That αἰωνία χρονοί is used for a long time, is evident from *Tit.* i. 2. where see our Author, and *Grotius* upon this place. And that is said to be given, which is by a certain and immutable Counsel decreed to be given. So *Virgil*, *Æneid.* 1. *vers.* 282. represents *Jupiter* speaking thus concerning the *Romans*:

*His ego nec metas rerum, nec tempora pono,  
Imperium sine fine DEDI.*

See Note on *Ephes.* i. 4.

CHAP.

Verf. 16. **T**HE place in *Tertullian* is in *Chap. xxxiii. de Præscr.* Note b. *Hæret.* where he speaks thus: *Paulus in prima ad Corinthios notat negatores & dubitatores resurrectionis. Hæc opinio propria Sadducæorum. Partem ejus usurpat Marcion & Apelles & Valentinus. St. Paul in his first to the Corinthians marks those who denied or doubted of the Resurrection. This opinion was peculiar to the Sadduces. Part of it is espoused by Marcion, &c. And a little after: Æque tangit eos, qui dicerent factam jam resurrectionem, id de se Valentiniani asseverant: He likewise takes up those that said the Resurrection was already past, which the Valentinians affirm of themselves. The rest which our Author says in this Annotation about the Verb νέμειν and its Derivatives, and about νέμισμα, is a mere Medley, and perfectly useless, I will not say to those that understand the Greek Language, but those also who can consult *Lexicons*, in which they may find these words more largely and better explained than they are here. I shall note only a few things concerning them.*

I. Because while Cattel νέμονται are feeding, they wander out of one place into another, therefore νέμεσθαι sometimes signifies to wander, as on the contrary the Latin word *errare* signifies to feed, as in that Verse of *Virgil*:

*Mille meæ Siculis errant in montibus agnæ.*

The same I may say of the Hebrew נָעַר, which we find in *Numb. xiv. 3.* where the *Vulg. Interp.* renders the word נָעַר *robim* by *vagos, Wanderers.* The *Nomades* in *Scythia*, and the *Numidians* in *Africa*, were really both *Shepherds* and *Wanderers*, so that they might be denominated from both; which every one knows. But what is that to the νόμις of a *Gangrene*? Our Author ought to have produced Examples, which shewed that νόμις is taken for the eating of a spreading Ulcer, of which there are several given by *H. Stephanus.* The Doctor alledges a Verse as out of *Hesiod*, which is *Homers*, in *Iliad. γ. v. 249.* where ἐπέων νόμις is a profusion of words, with which any one feeds himself, as *Eustathius* on that place observes. Yet that word occurs in *Hesiod* in the same sense, in *Ἔργ. vers. 403.* where the Poet admonishes *Persa*, that if he did not labour, there would come a time when he should beg with a great many words in vain:

Ἄχρησθ' ἂν ἔσαι ἐπέων νόμις ———

*A profusion of words will be useless.*



II. There was no need of recurring to the *Septuagint*, to shew that Chapter the Verb *πεισάμαι* signifies sometimes to *shun*, that being the use of III. it in the best Greek Writers, as *Lexicographers* will shew. And therefore *πεισάμαι* signifies to *shun*, because if we meet with any thing in our way which we would not run upon, and we cannot remove, we go round about it. Or if we would come nearer the proper signification of the Verb *ἵσημι*, *πεισάσαι* will be to *stand about*, that is, to stand still when we meet with any stumbling block, for fear of falling upon it. *Suidas* interprets *πεισάμεν* by *φεύγων* flying from or avoiding; and then he produces the place concerning *Moses* alledged by our Author, *Πεισάλο, ἢ ὄχλον γὰρ ἐκείνῳ αἰεὶ καὶ τὰς θορύβους πεισάλο μάλιστα: he always avoided a multitude, and Tumults especially.*

## C H A P. III.

WHAT our Author says here about *Simon's* Contest and Flying, he took out of *Cæsar Baronius*, as also other things of no great moment. See *Baron. Annal. ad A.C. LXVIII. of Nero the 12th.* But these things I have already elsewhere confuted. See especially what I have said on *2 Thess. ii. 3.* I shall only add, that the place which our Author refers to in *Suetonius* does not at all belong to this matter: it is in Chap. 12. of the *Life of Nero*, and the words are these: *Inter Pyrrhicarum argumenta, Taurus Pasiphaen ligneo juvencæ simulacro abditam iniit, ut multi spectantium crediderunt. Icarus primo statim conatu juxta cubiculum ejus decidit, ipsumq; cruore respersit.* Among the Arguments of the *Pyrrich Sports* (which *Nero* represented to the People) a Bull covered *Pasiphae* inclosed in an Engine of Wood made in the shape of an Heifer. One that acted the part of *Icarus* immediately upon the first attempt fell down near the Emperor's Pavilion, and sprinkled him with his blood. What is there here about the Contest of *Simon* with *S. Peter*? Who does not see that *Suetonius* speaks of a poor miserable Wretch that was forced to attempt flying to make the People a show? We may be sure if any such Conflict had passed before *Nero* and the People, in the Amphitheatre, the fame of it would have been so great among the Heathens, that it would never have been forgotten. But these are the Fables of some idle Christians, which Posterity greedily took up.

Verf. 6. **E**Γὼ γὰρ ἵδον σπένδουμαι.] Tho σπένδουμαι is properly said of the Wine which was poured out upon the Head of the Sacrifice; yet here I think it ought to be understood metaphorically of the Sacrifice it self, upon which the Wine is poured out, a little before it is killed. So *Hesychius*: σπένδουμαι, θύειν. σπένδουμαι, θύειν. St. Paul uses the *Present Tense*, because of the nearness of the danger, as the Particle ἵδον now shews. Our Author forces this place, when he interprets it of a past danger.

Ibid. ἔφευγον.] This indeed is a Verb in the *Preterperfect Tense*, but it is very frequently taken for the *Present*; whence the Vulgar Interpreter, and almost all others, render it *estai, is at hand*. And that it is to be so understood, the foregoing words shew. So that our Author had no reason to interpret it in the *Preterperfect Tense*, in his Preme-nition and Paraphrase of this Verse.

Verf. 7. Note a. It is true indeed, that St. Paul here uses Agonistical words; but as the Crown was due not to him who was yet running, but who was come to the end of his race, and that before others, so also God bestows a Crown not on him that behaves himself manfully in any particular Calamity, but during his whole Life. So that what St. Paul calls a *good Combat*, is the whole course of his Life, which he tells *Timothy* he had finished *τετελειώται*, because he knew his Death was near, as the foregoing Verse sufficiently shews. What our Author says in his Note on *Acts* xxi. 7. I have confuted already on that place. See *1 Tim.* vi. 12. and *Acts* xx. 24.

¶ The word δικαιοσύνης seems here to be in the place of an *Adjective*, so as that, according to a known Hebraism, a *Crown of Righteousness* should be put for a *righteous* or *just Crown*, that is, a Crown justly due. This is confirmed by the Epithet *Just* added to the word *Judg.* The places which our Author produces, as if the Hebrew אֱוָרָה signified in them *Felicity*, I might shew to be improperly alledged, if it would contribute any thing to the illustration of St. Paul's words.

Verf. 9. Σπένδουσιν ἔλθειν πρὸς με ταχέως.] It is certain indeed that *Timothy* was present with St. Paul when he made his first Defence, but whether he could go again to *Rome* soon enough, to be there before St. Paul's Death, is somewhat questionable.

Verf. 10. Ἀγαπήσας ἢ τῶν αἰῶνα.] Our Author will not have *Demas* to have revolted from the Faith, but only, forsaking his Office of preaching the Gospel, to have applied himself to worldly Affairs. But to love  
the



the present age, signifies something worse than that, viz. to prefer it before the future; which he that forsakes an Office, which he finds himself insufficient for, does not. See *Matt.* xiii. 22. and *James* iv. 4. Chapter IV.

Verf. 13. Note b. The *Etymologicon Magnum* hath it so, as Dr. *Hammond* thinks the words of *Phavorinus* should be read; but in this matter I neither believe the Writer of the *Etymologicon* nor *Phavorinus*, because *φελόνι* is not a Greek word, and signifies no such thing in the Latin Tongue. See *Grotius*.

Verf. 14. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ χαλχῶς πολλά μοι κακὰ ἐνεδέξατο.] Dr. *Hammond* thinks St. *Paul* here has a reference to the Troubles he endured at *Ephesus*, mention'd in *Acts* xix. but neither is it from that place sufficiently evident what *Alexander* did against St. *Paul*; and if he did any thing, I do not think the Apostle here has a respect to that, but something which was done at *Rome*: for this *Alexander* seems to have gone from *Asia* to *Rome*, where he fiercely oppos'd S. *Paul*, and from thence returned to *Asia*; for which reason St. *Paul* here admonishes *Timothy* to beware of him.

Verf. 16. Ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ με Ἀπολογία, &c.] This cannot be understood of that Defence which St. *Paul* made for himself when he was first in bonds: for undoubtedly he would not have told *Timothy* a thing which he already very well knew, as having been present with him at that time, nor have said what was nothing to the purpose. He speaks of his pleading before him whom *Nero* at his departure into *Greece* left Governour of the City of *Rome*, by whom he was not presently condemned, but yet kept still in bonds, perhaps till *Nero's* Return, by which means many in the mean time had the Gospel preached to them. See *Grotius* on the following Verse, by whom it will appear, it was not well understood by our Author, in his *Premonition* to this Epistle.

Verf. 17. Note d. The mouth of the Lion does not, it's true, signify *Nero*, who seems at that time to have been in *Greece*, but *Helius*, to whom *Nero* committed the Government of *Rome* during his Absence. See Dr. *Pearson* in his *Annal. Paulin. ad A. C. LXVII*.

Verf. 18. Ῥύσεται με ὁ Κύριος.] These words are alledged by our Author in his *Premonition*, to prove that St. *Paul* here speaks of a Danger he was deliver'd from. But the Apostle does not add *ἀπὸ τῶν κινδύνων τέτυ*, but *ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ*, that is, as *Grotius* well interprets it, from doing any thing unworthy of a Christian, or unworthy of an Apostle. This is clear from the next words, and will preserve me to his heavenly Kingdom; as Dr. *Pearson* also has observed.



# ANNOTATIONS

On the Epistle

Of *St. Paul* the Apostle to *Titus*.

**A**T the end of the *Promon.*] Dr. *Pearson* with more reason refers the writing of this Epistle to the Year *lxxv.* in which also *St. Paul* wrote his first to *Timothy*. It is probable, *Titus* remained in *Crete*, under the name of an *Evangelist* rather than of a *bishop* or *Archbishop* (a word then unknown, as well as the thing it felt;) because *St. Paul* afterwards commanded him to meet him at *Nicopolis*, as appears from *Chap. iii. 12.* and after that he went to *Dalmatia*, as *St. Paul* tells us in *2 Tim. iv. 10.* undoubtedly to perform there the Office of an *Evangelist*. Which Function can hardly consist with the Office of a *Bishop*, watching over the Flock committed to him, with that care and diligence he ought. The Testimonies of the Antients about this matter, who judged rashly of the times of the Apostles by their own, and spake of them in the Language of their own Age, are of little moment; and so do no more prove that *Titus* was *Bishop* of the Island of *Crete*, than what Dr. *Hammond* says, proves him to have been dignified with the Title of an *Archbishop*. So the Antients very unanimously affirmed that *St. Peter* was the first *Bishop* of *Rome*; but the more judicious sort of Persons presently discovered them to be in an Error.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 2. **I**T deserved to be noted, that in this one Verse, the word  
 Note a. *αἰώνιος* is taken in two several senses; for *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* signifies *eternal Life*, that is, which shall never have any end; but *χρόνοι αἰώνιοι*, *eternal times*, is no more than *antient times*. This is a usual thing with *St. Paul*, of which see what I have said in my *Ars Critica*, P. 2. S. 1. c. 6.

Verf.



Verf. 12. *Note c.* I. I do not believe *Phavorinus* read these words otherwise than we, but rather set them down as he remembered them. It is an improper Etymology which our Author gives of the word *γαστριμαργός*, wherein contrary to all Analogy, *μ* is inserted between two words. *Clemens Alexandrinus* gives us a much better interpretation of it, in *Pædag.* Lib. ii. c. 1. Ἡ γαστριμαργία, ἀκροσία πρὸς τὴν τροφήν, ὡς δὲ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἀειρέχθαι, μαρτυρεῖ ὅτι γαστέρα ἐπὶ μάργου ὁ μωμνῶς: it is an intemperance about Food, and as the word literally signifies, a madness in the Belly, for *μαργός* signifies *Mad*. This Etymology is suggested also by *Phavorinus*, which I wonder our Author did not take notice of.

II. The word *ἀργός* both in *Epimenides* and in *St. Paul*, signifies what it ordinarily signifies, that is, *idle* and *slothful*, as *Gluttons* usually are. It's true, *Slothfulness* and *Gluttony* are very often attended with *Uncleanness*, but *Idleness* and *Uncleanness* are not therefore the same. In *Ezekiel*, *Idleness* does not signify *Uncleanness*, but that which is the cause of it: *Behold*, saith he, *this was the Iniquity of thy Sister Sodom, Pride, fulness of Bread, and abundance of Idleness was in her, &c.*

## C H A P. II.

Verf. 2. *Note a.* **B**Y a comparison of this place with *1 Tim. iii.* our Author has well shewn that the Discourse here is about *Deacons*; but there are two things he will hardly persuade those that understand Greek, and are exercised in the reading of these Books to believe. One is that *πρεσβύτης* is distinguished from the word *πρεσβύτερος*, both those words being promiscuously used in the Version of the *Septuagint*, as well when they signify *Dignity*, as *Age*, as *Kircher's Concordances* will shew. The word *πρεσβύτης* is taken for a *Judge* in *Isa. iii. 2.* *Lament. ii. 21.* & *v. 14.* and *πρεσβύτερος* for the same in *Levit. iv. 15.* *Num. xvi. 25.* and elsewhere often. And so in many places both these words are used for an *old Man*. The degrees of Comparison ought not to be urged, against the perpetual use of the Language, especially *πρεσβύτης* & *πρεσβύτερος* being properly said with a respect to younger or young. As these two last words signify the same, so likewise the two former; and the two last, as *Logicians* speak, are *correlates* to the two first. They are used also indifferently in the *New Testament*. Compare *Philem. 9.* with *2 John 1.* & *3 John 1.*

The other is, that the word *νεώτεροι* in *vers. 6.* signifies *Believers*, who have no Office in the Church. It signifies only young *Men*; as the word *νῆαι* signifies before *Women*. See what I have opposed to *Dr. Hammond* on *Luke xxii. 26.*

Chapter III. *Verf. 3. Note b.* Tho *καταστήσει* be to ordain or constitute, it does not follow that *κατάστημα* signifies the rank of those who are constituted in any certain Office. For nothing is more common than for Derivatives to depart from the signification of their Primitives. So that the use of a word must always be joined with Analogy and Etymology; unless perhaps it be a *singular* word, or the series of the Discourse shews it must necessarily be understood in a particular sense. But neither does the series of the Discourse in this place favour our Author, and Use is evidently against him. The Deaconesses are commanded to be *ἱεροπρεπεῖς ἐν τῷ καταστήματι*, that is, to go in such a dress, and behave themselves in such a manner as became Women consecrated to God. This very well agrees with the whole series of the Discourse; and Use constantly interprets *κατάστημα* of a dress, habit, or gesture of Body. Consult *J. C. Suicerus* in his *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*, or any other *Lexicographer*.

*Verf. 13. Πεσοδεχόμενος — τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ.*] A Gentleman of great reading, who published some years ago Notes and Observations on the Epistle of *Polycarp*, thinks *St. Paul* here so alludes to the *Cabiri*, or great Gods that were worshipped not only among the *Samothracians*, but also in the Isle of *Crete*, as to oppose Christ to them. And it is certain *כביר* *chebir* in *Arabick*, signifies great, and thence the Greek word *καίρειος* seems to have been formed, as *S. Bochart* well conjectured. Those Gods also were thought by some to be the same with the *Corybantes*, which every one knows were very much worshipped in *Crete*. And there was a mighty talk concerning their *ἐπιφάνεια*, as well as of other Gods, as the learned Gentleman before mentioned has largely proved. But I think there is more wit than truth in this Interpretation, there being nothing in *St. Paul's* words that shews he had a respect to the Religion of the *Crete*s; for if there be, it must be something else besides the words *ἐπιφάνειας* & *μεγάλου Θεοῦ*, appearance and of the great God, which were often in the mouth of the *Jews*, without any allusion to the Isle of *Crete* or its Gods. See the *Greek Index* of *Kircher's Concordances*.

### C H A P. III.

*Verf. 10. Note b.* **A** *ἱερετικὸς* properly is the same with *αιρετικός*, that is, he that follows any *αιρεσις* *Self*, whether its Doctrins are true or false. But the Doctrins of the Apostolical Churches, govern'd by the Apostles, or by Apostolical Men, that



that agreed with their Teachers, being true; whoever departed from their *αἰρεσις* (that word being understood in a good sense) did by consequence maintain false Doctrins. And hence Persons of erroneous Opinions, whether they were such as desired to live in the Church provided they might be tolerated, or whether they chose to separate themselves from it, were afterwards called *Hereticks*. But as there is a difference to be made between Men and Times, so also between Hereticks; and therefore this Precept of *St. Paul* must not be urged beyond what he intended it. Whoever heretofore departed from the Apostles, did by that very thing deny themselves to be Christians, because they contradicted inspired Men, from whom alone the Christian Doctrin could be learned, and whose Authority was confirmed by Miracles. Those undoubtedly were to be avoided by Christians, who when they had believed the Apostles, did afterwards reject their Doctrin and follow other Teachers. But those who after the Governors of Churches were not inspired, nor endued with a Power of working Miracles, seemed to themselves to observe in the Churches a departure from the Apostles in things themselves, tho they were cunningly dissembled, and requested a reformation of those Errors from the Governors of Churches; these, I say, were not any longer *αἰρετικοί* to be avoided, if they could truly charge others with dangerous Errors and Tyranny. These cannot have that *μορμολύκειον* *bugbear name* of the Church objected to them, as if the greatest number which are qualified with that name, could not by degrees at least fall off from the Doctrin of the Apostles; and all that separated from it must necessarily be in a state of Damnation.

*Ibid. Note c.* I. Besides the difference which our Author has observed between this place and the words of *Christ* in *Mat. xviii.* there is this further observable, that *there* *Christ* speaks of an injury done to any private Man, and which if it endamaged him, it was only with relation to his private Affairs; but *here* the Discourse is about a departure from the Apostles Doctrin, which concerned both the Apostles and the whole Church; in which case one or two Admonitions might be sufficient, to know whether those who separated themselves from the Churches, would again return to them. Yet I do not think the words of *St. Paul* are to be taken so, as if he forbid such Men to be admonished a third time, before they were avoided, if there was any hope of reclaiming them. He only says *after the first and second Admonition*, to shew Christians that Men are not to be given over for lost presently after the first Admonition, but to be

Chapter often admonished. Surely Christian Charity will not allow us to  
 III. number St. *Paul's* words so, as if after two Admonitions, without any  
 regard had to Circumstances, it were necessary to proceed to Excom-  
 munication. Here are no Lawyers forms, in which Words are weigh-  
 ed, and Citations counted; but only a repressing of an overhasty Judg-  
 ment, that no one might be condemned unheard, or given up too soon.

II. As in *Mat. xviii. 17.* *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen and a  
 Publican,* does not signify Excommunicate him, for the Discourse is  
 about any private Men, who had not the power of Excommunicati-  
 on: so also in this place, *ἐξοματῆς* is not to *Excommunicate*, but do not  
 any longer converse with him, after several Admonitions given him  
 to no purpose, avoid him. It is plain this is the proper signification  
 of the word *ἐξοματῆς*, nor can it be applied to Excommunication, unless  
 the thing it self requires it. But here there is no necessity of its being  
 taken in that sense, because an *Heretick* was self-excommunicate, and  
 because he made a new Sect, and did not look upon Excommunicati-  
 on as a Punishment. *Sinners* who desire to continue in the Church  
 notwithstanding their sinful practices, are excommunicated, that they  
 may be reclaimed to a more Holy Life, when they see they cannot be  
 accounted Members of the Church as long as they live wickedly; not  
 those who voluntarily separate, and will no longer communicate with  
 the Church. The following words confirm this interpretation, which  
 is also *Grotius's*.

III. I have shewn on 2 *Cor. xiii.* that that place of St. *Paul* is wrest-  
 ed by our Author, and I will not repeat what I have there said.

Verf. 11. *Note d.* Here our Author does not seem to be sufficiently  
 consistent with himself, having before interpreted *ἀπομαρτυρεῖται* to avoid  
 of Excommunication; besides, he does not clearly enough shew what  
 is meant by *ἀπικατάκειτο*, because he confounds the present Churches  
 with the Apostolical, which in that Age agreed with their Teachers.  
*Ἀπικατάκειτο* here is one who forsaking the Apostolical and Christian  
 Assemblies, did by that very thing deny himself to be a Christian, and  
 therefore ought not any longer to be accounted a Christian by his own  
 judgment. He was to be avoided therefore by Christians, of whose  
 number he denied himself any longer to be. But now there are a  
 great many who are called by other Christians by the hateful names  
 of *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*, who yet cannot be said to be *ἀπικατάκειται*,  
 because they endeavour as much as others, to understand the Doctrin  
 and Precepts of Christ, and conform themselves to them, and no less  
 hope to be saved by the Grace of Christ alone. In this imperfect  
 state of Mortality, many Errors creep into mens Minds through ig-  
 norance,



norance, or prejudice and weakness of Judgment, who live no less Christianly, as to other things, than those that are free from such Errors. And it would be very unjust to call such ἀποστατάριαι, because they separate from others. Again, they who denied themselves to be Christians, could not complain if they were avoided by the Christians; but one that charges others with what he thinks to be Error, and cannot be present at their Assemblies, unless he approve them, and therefore absents himself from them, but yet does not avoid the Men themselves. or treat them less Christianly, is highly injured, if equal courtesy be not shewn him. This which was plain of it self, I thought fit to say in a few words, because our Author did not seem clearly enough to explain the mind of the Apostle; not that I designed to handle the thing as it deserves.

Vers. 14. Note f. In the place of the *ἀπὸ χρεία* is a *business*, not a *Act: 6.3* providing of necessaries for Life. See *Grotius* on that place.

# ANNOTATIONS

## On the Epistle

### Of St. Paul the Apostle to Philemon.

**A**T the end of the *Premou.*] I have observed on the *Premou.* before the Epistle to the *Colossians*, that that Epistle seems to have been written, according to the account of the most exact Chronologers, in the Year of *Christ* lxiij, or the ixth of *Nero*.

Vers. 12. Ταῦτά ἐμαὶ σπλάγχνα.] That is, my Son; for St. Paul accounted all those he had converted to the Faith of Christ, his Children; and it is usual for Children to be called the *Bowels* of their Parents. So *Cepheus* in *Ovid. Met. Lib. v. Fab. 1.* speaking of his Daughter *Andromeda*:

*Sed quæ visceribus veniebat lellura ponto  
Exsaturanda meis.*

\*

ANNOS .



# ANNOTATIONS

## On the Epistle

### Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews.

#### CHAP. I.

Verf. 2.  $\Delta$  *Ἰ' ἔκ τῶν αἰώνων ἐποίησεν.*] He hath appointed Jesus Heir or Lord of all things, *by whom also he made the Worlds*; that is, having heretofore by that *Λόγος* Reason, or eternal Wisdom which resided in Jesus, and was most nearly united to him, created all things. In the Paraphrase, that which distinctly agreed to each of these, should have been distinctly expressed, that the meaning of the Apostle might be the clearer: For want of which our Author's Paraphrase is often obscurer than the Apostle's Text it self.

Verf. 3. *Ὅς ἐν ἀπύγασμα τῆ δόξης, καὶ χαρακτῆρ τῆ εἰσαστάσεως αὐτοῦ.*] That there are a great many things common to the Writer of this Epistle with *Philo Alexandrinus*, has been observed by the great *Grotius* on *Chap. iv.* and elsewhere. He might have added *these* expressions which *Philo* also has in *Lib. de Creatione Mundi pag. 25. Ed. Gen. Πᾶς ἀνθρώπος καὶ τῶν δαιμόνων ὡκείωται θεῷ Λόγῳ, τῆ μακαρίας φύσεως ΕΚΜΑΓΕΙΟΝ, ἢ εἰσαστάσεως, ἢ ΑΠΛΥΓΑΣΜΑ γεννώς: every Man, in respect of his Understanding, is allied to the Divine Reason, being an IMPRESSED IMAGE, or abstract [i. e. a Particle broken off] or BRIGHTNESS [a Ray] of that blessed Nature.* The expressions in both places are so like one another, that hardly any two can be more like. The word *ἀπύγασμα* is the same in both places, and *ἐκμαγεῖον* & *χαρακτῆρ* are all one in sense. For as *χαρακτῆρ* is derived from *χαράσσειν*, to engrave, and is properly a *graven Image*: so *ἐκμαγεῖον* comes from *ἐκμάσσειν*, to impress, or express, and signifies such an Image as is made by the impression of a Seal. And hence these words are joined together as synonymous in the Writer *de Mundo*, who passed under the name of *Philo*, pag. 892. Ed. Gen. *Ἄ γὰρ εἰσὶ γὰρ ἐκάστω τῶν αἰδότητων, ὡσπερ δακτύλιος πρὸς τὴν σφραγῆν, ἢ σφραγῆς, ἐναπυμάξατο τῆ οἰκείῳν χαρακτῆρα, ἢ τὸ ἐκμαγεῖον φυλάττει παρ' ἑαυτοῦ: for what-*  
*ever*



ever each of the senses intronits, like a Ring or Seal, it impresses its own Image, or it [viz. the sense] retains the impressed Image on it self. Chapter II.  
 Εικοναίον therefore being the same with χαρακτις, φύσις & εἰκόνας will be also the same. And indeed the Son of God, even as Man, is the brightness of his Fathers Glory, because he expressed the divine Power in the greatness of his Miracles; and the impressed Image of his substance, because he resembles him in his Perfections. And it must be the humane Nature which this sacred Writer spake of, that the Jews might understand what he said was true; for that alone is visible, and nothing but what is such, can be called the Image or Brightness of any thing among Men. Other things might be alledged to this purpose, which for brevity sake I forbear to mention.

C H A P. II.

Verf. 3. **I**F these places, which our Author here wrests, comprehend eternal Salvation, it is needless to recur to that Note b. temporal Deliverance, which they cannot be applied to without Violence. For as for his saying that the design of this whole Epistle is to confirm the believing *Hebrews* in the hopes of a sudden deliverance from the persecutions of their Countrymen, if it be denied, he will not prove it, unless by some wrested places, as he too often endeavours to do.

Verf. 7. Note c. I. Tho Men in *Psal. viii.* are called בן אדם & אנוש, and those words usually signify the meanest sort of Men; yet whoever attentively reads that place, will see that all Men without exception are intended, who upon the account of their meanness are so called; and that they are compared with the Angels, than which they are said to be a little less.

II. I cannot see why *Grotius* and our Author interpret βραχύ τι for a little while, contrary to the signification which it has in *Psal. viii.* For doubtless *Jesus* was a little less than the Angels, whilst he conversed here on Earth, because he was liable to death, and did actually die; to which Infelicity the Angels are not subject. But this was but for a short time. I grant it, but neither the Psalmist nor the Apostle have any respect to that.

Verf. 10. Τελειῶσαι.] This word is not well rendred to consummate or make perfect, because the Discourse is about a Priest, who is said τελειῶσαι, when he is consecrated for the exercise of his Office. The Jews call this to fill the hands (*implere manus*) which the Septuagint often render by τελειῶσαι. See *Exod. xxix. 10, 33, 35. Levit. viii. 35. &*

Chapter xvi. 32. & xxi. 10. *Num.* iii. 3. The Glosses of *Philoxenus* have:  
 III. *ἁγιάω*, *saero*, to consecrate. Christ was consecrated a Priest, not by  
 any outward Ceremonies, but those grievous Sufferings which he  
 constantly endured. See afterwards *vers.* 17. and *Chap.* vii. 28.

## C H A P. III.

*Verf.* 3. **T**HIS observation our Author took out of *Grotius*, and  
*Note a.* is very true. See my Notes on *Gen.* xvi. 1. and *Exod.*  
 i. 21.

*Verf.* 11. *Note c.* I. In the time of *Moses*, *Canaan* was called  
*מנוחה* *mnoubbah*, because it was a place in which the *Israelites* after so  
 many and great Labours were to rest. To enter into rest, was all one as  
 to enter into a Land where they should be at rest: Nothing else is to be  
 look'd for in that word. See my Note on *Gen.* xlix. 15.

II. *Psalms* xcv. 11. has nothing prophetic in it, nor is the Discourse  
 so much as about *David's* times. The *Psalmist* only relates what had  
 happen'd in the time of *Moses*, and endeavours to dissuade the Men  
 of his Age from imitating the *Israelites* of those times, who had pro-  
 voked God to that degree, that he had sworn they should not enter  
 into the Land of *Canaan*. This is so manifest, that I wonder our  
 learned Author should study for any thing else; for what he adds a-  
 bout the Ark, there is no mention of in the *Psalms*. It is a mere guess  
 of our Author, who often adds to the sacred Writers what he pleases,  
 tho the series of the Discourse requires no such thing.

III. As the Rest promised to the *Jews* in the Wilderness, was the  
 Land of *Canaan*; so the Rest promised to *Christians* is Heaven, or a  
 place of eternal Happiness. Nothing can be more natural, nothing  
 more agreeable to the Apostles Doctrine: on the contrary, what our  
 Author here says is forced, and far fetch'd, nor is it needful to con-  
 fute it all particularly. They are the fancies of a Man looking into  
 the Clouds, and seeing what he pleases.

IV. Of the *Halcyon* Days, which our Author so often repeats,  
 we shall see what may be said on the place in the *Revelations*, to which  
 he refers us.

## C H A P. IV.

Chapter *Verf.* 1. **K***ἀπέπυσαν αὐτῶν.*] That is, into Heaven, of which the Land  
 IV. of *Canaan* was a Representation; not the time when  
 the *Jews* did no longer persecute the *Christians*, who  
 nevertheless were despitefully used by the *Heathens*. Our Author here  
 wrests every thing. *Verf.*



Verf. 2. *Ἐυαγγελισμένοι.*] That is, we have received a gracious promise, as well as they. For if God promised to the antient Jews a quiet Habitation in the Land of *Canaan*, he hath promised us eternal Rest in Heaven. So that here *ἔυαγγελίζεσθαι* is taken in its proper, that is, in a general sense, for receiving of any good tidings, as it is often used in the Version of the *Septuagint*, where the Verb in the Original is *בִּשְׂרָר* *bisser*. Nothing can be more flat than what the generality of Interpreters think the sacred Writer here says concerning Christians, *we have received the Gospel as well as the antient Jews*; because there can be no comparison made between the knowledg which the Primitive Jews had of the Gospel, and ours. What our Author says in his Paraphrase, agrees neither with the words, nor the series of the Discourse.

Ibid. Note a. It is much more probable that the true reading is *συγκεκραμένῳ*, for the words are these: *ὃς ὠφέλησεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνης, μὴ συγκεκραμένῳ τῇ πίστι ἀκοῦσας*, the Word of HEARING did not profit them, not being mixed by Faith with those that HEARD it; that is, the words of the Promise concerning a quiet Habitation, did not profit those who only heard it without believing it. For they who believe the Word of God are *nourished* by it so, as if it were *incorporated* with them, and converted into their substance; that is, they are no less acted and moved by the things which they receive by revelation from God, than those which they have found to be true by reasoning and experience. And that which makes this mixture of the Word of God with the hearers of it, is *Faith*, for which reason the sacred Writer saith, *λόγον συγκεκραμένον τῇ ΠΙΣΤΕΙ ἀκέσασι*, that the Word is mixed by FAITH with those that hear it.

Verf. 3. *Καθὼς εἶρηκεν, ὡς ἄμωσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μὲν, εἰ ἐξελύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου.*] Tho the words of the *xcvth Psalm* be here alledged, I do not believe the Sacred Writer uses the Authority of the *Psalmist* to prove what he designs, but only expresses an antient Story in his words; which is related in *Num. xiv.* and *Deut. i.* And he interprets *Rest* in the words of God, expressed by *Moses* and by *David*, in a sublimer sense, according to the custom of his Age, in which all the places of the Old Testament were explained in a more sublime sense than what the words literally contained. And as those who believed, in the time of *Moses*, enter'd into the Land of *Canaan*, which then might be called *God's Rest*: so the Souls of pious Christians enter into the mansions of eternal Happiness, to which that name more eminently belongs. Therefore it is said by the sacred Writer, *we that believe do enter into Rest.*



Verf. 5. Εἰς τὴν κατὰ παύσιν μὲ.] That is, into *Canaan*, which was as the shadow of the heavenly Rest. I say again, there is no mention in the Psalmist of any future Rest; but only the Writer of this Epistle deters the Men of his Age from sinning, by the example of the antient Jews.

Verf. 6. Ἐπεὶ ἔν ἀπελείπειται, &c.] These words are to be referred and joined to the 2d Verse in this sense: “Seeing therefore we also are to enter into Rest, understood in a higher sense, as I have already said; when the greatest part of those to whom rest in the Land of *Canaan* was promised, fell short of it. That this Verse is to be joined with *verf. 2.* may appear by these words *πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες,* which have a respect to those other in the 2d Verse, *ἔσμεν εὐαγγελισμένοι.*

Verf. 7. Πάλιν τινὰ δεῖξαι ἡμέραν σήμερον ἐν Δαβὶδ λέγων, &c.] *Subintellig.* γρατὴ, the Scripture, which word is often understood in antient Christian Writers. The sense of this place is, that not only the Primitive Jews should have taken heed of Unbelief, but all their Posterity, and consequently Christians; seeing the Scripture teaches that whenever the Voice of God is heard, it is to be obeyed, and Rest is no less promised to the Obedient than formerly.

Verf. 8. Εἰ γὰρ αὐτὸς κατέπαυσεν Ἰησοῦς.] That is, if no other Rest were to be expected, besides that which the believing Jews of old obtained under the conduct of *Joshua*, the Psalmist would have had no reason to admonish the Men of his Age and the following Ages, to take heed of imitating the primitive *Israelites*, whom Unbelief excluded out of the promised Rest, lest God should punish them after the same manner. In interpreting these words, two things are necessary to be done. First, we must consider the scope of the Speaker, and by that his words are to be understood rather than by the proper meaning of every particular Phrase. The words *Εἰ γὰρ αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσε* signify literally, as they are rendred in the *Vulgar*, *nam si eis Jesus quietem præstitisset, For if Jesus had given them Rest.* But if they be so interpreted, the Apostle's reasoning will be of no force: *If Joshua had conducted those antient Jews into a quiet Habitation; the Scripture would not speak of another day, in which the Voice of God ought to be heard. Why not? Ought not the Men of the following Ages to be obedient to the Commands of God? Yes. But the meaning of the Sacred Writer in the words alledged is this, which I have expressed in the beginning of this Note, ἢ μηδεμίαν κατὰπαύσιν ἢ, πάλιν κατὰπαύσιν, ἐν ᾗ κατέπαυσε Ἰησοῦς παλαιὸς Ἑβραῖος.* Secondly, something is to be supplied in the following words, for otherwise what opposition could there be between rest and another day? If there were no other rest, besides that which *Joshua* gave the anti-



ent *Israelites*, it would not thence follow there could not be another *Chapter*  
*day* or another time, in which the Voice of God could not be despised *IV.*  
 without danger. But we must supply here what I have also before in-  
 timated, ἐν ᾧ ἀποτυχήσωμεν καταπαύσεως θεοῦ, ἐὰν μὴ ὑπακούωμεν τῇ φωνῇ αὐτοῦ,  
*in which we shall be excluded out of God's Rest, if we do not obey his Voice.*

Yet two things ought to be carefully observed in such Interpretati-  
 ons and Additions, *First*, no Interpretation is to be admitted, which  
 the design of the Speaker clearly understood does not require, and  
 to which design the Writers reasoning makes nothing, unless it be  
 otherwise understood than the words properly signify. Our Author  
*Dr. Hammond*, has but little regard to the scope of this place, into  
 which he brings his *Gnosticks* by head and shoulders, when the scope  
 requires no such thing. I have endeavour'd to make directly towards  
 it, and think I have not much erred from it. *Secondly*, that which is  
 supplied, must be taken, if I may so speak, out of the very bowels of  
 the Discourse, so that what is expressed do naturally and purely arise  
 from propositions that must necessarily be supposed to be understood.  
 And what I have supplied seems to me to be such, but what *Dr. Ham-*  
*mond* adds, seems altogether foreign to this place, of which let the  
 Reader be judg.

Hence we may infer that the stile of this Writer is far from being  
 formed by the Laws of Rhetorick; according to which our first care  
 should be to speak properly and clearly what we would have clearly  
 understood, that the Reader or Hearer may comprehend what we say  
 without any pain; and the second to omit nothing but what any one  
 may easily supply. *Nobis*, say the Masters of that Faculty, *prima sit*  
*virtus perspicuitas, rectus ordo, non in longum dilata conclusio; nihil neque*  
*desit, neque superfluat. Ita sermo & doctus probabilis, & planus imperitius*  
*erit.* They are the words of *Quintilian Instit. Orat. Lib. viii. Cap. 2.*  
 But the stile of the Jewish *Midraschim* is nothing less than Rhetorical,  
 and them the Writer of this Epistle follows, and not without great  
 reason, because he spake to a Nation accustomed to such a stile. This  
 by the way, which it may suffice to have said once, tho we must carry  
 it in our eye throughout this whole Epistle.

Verf. 9. Ἄρα ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς.] This inference manifestly shews  
 that the ἄλλη ἡμέρα, *another day*, spoken of in the foregoing Verse, must  
 be understood of *a day wherein, unless we obey the Voice of God, we shall*  
*fall short of a Rest which he has promised;* and therefore that this must  
 necessarily be supplied. Otherwise there would be more, as the Logicians  
 speak, *in the Conclusion than in the Premises*, which it would be a crime  
 to suppose of the Sacred Writer.

Chapter IV. *Verf. 10.* Ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν, &c.] Here the Author of this Epistle renders a reason why he called the *κατάπασις θεῶ*, by a name taken from the Sabbath, viz. *σαββατισμός*: namely, as the day in which God ceased to create, or; as *Moses* speaks, *rested from his Works*, was called the Sabbath; so the time wherein we shall rest from all those Labours and Troubles we are forced to undergo in this Life, may be called a *Sabbatism*. What our Author here says in his Paraphrase, of a rest from Persecutions, and a liberty to worship God, is violent.

*Verf. 12.* Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, &c.] What is said here by Interpreters about the *Word of God*, is harsh, to which what the Author of this Epistle affirms concerning the ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, cannot be applied without violence. Can any Man think this to be a tolerable way of speaking: *the Gospel is living and powerful, and more piercing than any two edged Sword, reaching even to the dividing of Soul and Spirit, and of the Joints and Marrow, and is a discerner of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart, nor is there any Creature that is not manifest in his sight?* Yet I can hardly persuade my self the Discourse is about the *Divine Reason*, which is so much spoken of by *Philo*. But I am apt to think this Phrase is taken from the Custom of the *Jews* of that Age, who for God, and any of the divine Attributes, used to say *the Word of God* מִימְרָא יְהוָה, of which Custom there are still frequent instances in *Chaldee Paraphrases* of the Old Testament; where in many places we find the *Word of God* set for God, not for the *Messias*, as some think. This conjecture is confirmed by *vers. 13.* where *all things* are said to be *naked and opened unto his Eyes*, which cannot be said of the Gospel, but only of God. See about this matter a *Dissertation de Verbo vel Sermone Dei, cujus creberrima fit mentio apud Paraphrastas Chaldaeos*, printed at *Irenopolis*, Ann. M.DC.XLVI. So that the meaning of the Sacred Writer is this, that God who is displeas'd with Apostates, cannot be deceived, *for God is living, &c.*

*Verf. 13. Note c.* I do not indeed doubt, but the Metaphor which the Author of this Epistle here uses, is taken from the cutting of the Sacrifices. But 1<sup>st</sup>, it is a mistake, that this was the business of a *μυροσκόπος*, who, among the *Jews*, searched only for outward blemishes, such as we find mention'd in *Levit. xx. 22. & seqq.* not for inward defects, which were unknown to those who deliver'd the Sacrifice to the Priests. 2<sup>dly</sup>, It is as untrue, which our Author says, that the Sacrifice after its being τετραχλισμένον was laid upon the Altar to be searched into; for the Altar of Sacrifices had a continual Fire kept in it; nor was any thing laid upon it, but only the pieces appointed by the Law.



CHAP. V.

Verf. 2. **A** Γνοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις] It is not to be thought with Dr. *Hammond*, that the Apostolical Writer of this Epistle speaks here so, as if no Sacrifices at all were admitted, but for Sins that proceeded from mere Ignorance; for there were also other Sins committed against Light and Knowledg that were expiated, and are mentioned by *Moses* in *Levit. Chap. vi. 1.* to the 7th, where see my Notes. But the Sacred Writer speaks in this manner, because the greatest part of those Sinners, for which Sacrifices were offer'd up, were ἀγνοῦντες and πλανῶντες.

Verf. 7. Note b. I. Our Author tells us in the beginning of this Note, that the word מורא <sup>פֶּלַח</sup> fear, coming from ירא timuit, is rendred ἐυλαβεῖσθαι in *Exod. iii. 6.* but it is the Root it self which is used in that place. It is strange our learned Author should sometimes cite places of Scripture upon trust.

II. The words of *Isaiab* are in *Chap. viii. 12, 13.* not in *vers. 16.* and מורא signifies there *that which fears*, to wit, the People of the Jews who are there spoken of, and not *the terrible thing*, as will appear to any that look into the place. I will not say that in the places of *Deuteronomy*, the word מורא was ill translated by the *Septuagint*, because they erroneously derived it from the Root מורא raah, *he saw*, which was to be derived from ירא jare, *he feared*. For those places in the *Septuagint* are nothing at all to the purpose; and it is true that *fear* may be taken for the cause of Fear.

Verf. 9. Note c. It is true what our Author here says about the Verb τελείω, which he might have said before on *Chap. ii. 10.* where see my Note. But I think he had better have omitted the Dream of *Menander*, which has no agreement with the thing here spoken of, but only in the likeness of some words.

Verf. 14. Note d. *Solid Food* compared with *Milk*, and fitter for *grown Men* than *Babes*, in that figurative sense which it is here taken in, may be understood two ways. It may signify either something more excellent, that is, more useful than first Elements; or simply Doctrins hard to be understood, and such as cannot be digested but by skilful and judicious Persons. In the first sense it cannot here probably be taken; for tho all that is here said be useful, yet the Doctrins proposed as *Principles* and *Foundations*, in the beginning of *Chap. vi.* are much more useful than the Allegories we find in *Chap. vii. & seqq.* For these were as so many ornaments of the Christian Religion, particularly

particularly among the Jewish Allegorists; which if we had lost, we should have missed nothing necessary. But on the other hand, the Doctrin of Repentance, Faith, the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Judgment to come, are so necessary, that being unknown, the Christian Religion is also unknown; as on the contrary, being understood, nothing necessary escapes our knowledg. Nay if any one could write of these things which belong to the nature of Christianity, wholly omitting Judaism, as if there had never been any such thing, in that manner as they deserve; nothing could possibly be devised more divine, more excellent, more sublime. We must understand therefore by the name of *solid Food*, some difficult interpretations of the Old Testament, which the Jews mightily valued, and did not use to propose, if I may so speak, to Novices or fresh Men. Such is that representation of Christ, which the Author of this Epistle finds in the History of *Melchisedek*. Such is also the comparing of the Priesthood of *Christ* with the *Aaronical* Priesthood. None of these could well be proposed to Men newly initiated, because they supposed this, *viz.* that the Priesthood of Christ was already very well known. But they are not sublimer than those things which are taught concerning Christ's *Sacrifice*, separately from Judaism, or the rest of the Doctrins peculiar to the Christian Religion: I am sure, as I said before, they are not so useful.

Ibid. Τα ἀιδιπλεια γυμνασμένα.] These words seem to be taken from the use of the Philosophers, and especially the Stoicks; who defined ἀματαιότητι the avoiding of vain things, ἔξιν ἀναφέρουσαν τὰς φαντασίας ὅτι τ' ἐρθὸν λόγον, a habit reducing Fancies or Visions to right Reason, as we are told by *Diogenes Laertius* in *Lib. vii. S. 47*. The same Men taught τὰς ἀγυμνάσεις ἔχοντας τὰς φαντασίας, that Persons who had unexercised Fancies, fell into Absurdity and Vanity.

C H A P. VI.

Verf. 1. Τελειότητα.] By this word the Apostle means, not a more useful knowledg than of those things which he presently after enumerates, but some Doctrins which might be added to them, to render Christianity more perfect. So a building has several things added to it, not necessarily belonging to a Building, and without which it cannot stand firm; but πρὸς τὴν τελειότητα, to make it the more complete, such as are several kinds of Ornaments. Yet no allegorical Interpretation, of whatever sort it be, is any wise comparable either for its Usefulness or Wisdom, with the elements of



of Christianity taught by our Saviour in *Mat.* v, vi, & vii. What Chapter  
 Dr. *Hammond* adds in his Paraphrase of this Verse, about his *Gnosticks*, VI.  
 he inserts purely of his own head; the Sacred Writer did not give  
 him the least occasion for it. ~~~~~

Verf. 6. Note a. I. I acknowledg Baptism is very frequently in the  
 Fathers, called φωτισμός, but that use of theirs seems to be grounded  
 upon this very place, where they thought φωτιζέντας to be all one  
 with βαπτίζοντας; in which, because they might be mistaken, I do not  
 think the Apostle's Language can be understood by their use. And  
 here I had much rather take φωτιζέντας to be meant of the enlightning  
 of the Mind, than the external rite of Baptism: See *Grotius* about  
 this word; which, I may also here add, is to be understood of spiritual  
 illumination in the *Old Testament*, in the version of the *Septuagint*.  
 See *Psalms* xii. 4. & xviii. 9. & cxix. 129. according to the Greek  
 distinction.

II. It is very uncertain whether ever **הַיָּמִים הָאֵלֶּיךָ** or μέλλον αἰών sig-  
 nifies the times of the *Messias*; and tho those may be called הַיָּמִים  
 אֲחֵרִים the latter days, yet compared with former, they are no where κατ' ἐξοχλήν  
 so called. And in this place μέλλον αἰών much more probably signifies the  
 Life to come, the πνεύματα or foretastes of which Christians have in  
 this, when they are weary of all earthly things, and nothing moves  
 them but the expectation of eternal Happiness, in which they sweetly  
 acquiesce. This is indeed to taste the powers of the *World to come*, when  
 the hope of that only, accompanied with a contempt of all other things,  
 affects and delights our Minds. Of this and the other words consult  
*Grotius*. .yet.

Ibid. Note b. I. The signification of the Verb ἀνακαινίζειν must be  
 taken from the simple καινίζειν, and not from another compound of the  
 same Verb. For all that understand Greek, know that the compounds  
 of the same root have sometimes very different significations. So that  
 tho ἐγκαινίζειν be to dedicate, it does not follow that ἀνακαινίζειν signifies  
 the same. Besides, who but Dr. *Hammond* that had accustom'd him-  
 self to a barbarous and intolerable way of speaking, could endure  
 this phrase to dedicate to Repentance? καινός is, as every one knows,  
 new, and καινίζω to make new, whence ἀνακαινίζω is to renew or to make new  
 again. They who first took upon them the title of Christians, with a  
 sincere resolution to live piously and vertuously, were so very much  
 changed from what they were formerly, that they are called new Men,  
 and new Creatures, by the Apostles: See 2 *Cor.* v. 17. *Gal.* vi. 15. *Ephes.*  
 ii. 15. & iv. 24. Consequently those who forsaking these first pur-  
 poses, fell off again to the weak elements of the Jewish Religion, or

Chapter VI. to Heathenism, must, if they would return to Christ, *πάλιν ἀνακαινίζεσθαι εἰς μετάνοιαν*, be made new again, or become new Men, that they might repent. I alledg the Authority of St. Paul for this interpretation, who speaks thus in *Coloss. iii. 10.* Lie not one to another, putting off the old Man, with his Deeds, and putting on the new Man, ΤΟΝ ΑΝΑΚΑΙΝΟΥΜΕΝΟΝ, which is renewed to knowledg, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν, &c. That renovation the same Apostle calls ἀνακαίωσιν τοῦ, *Rom. xii. 12.* and πνεύματος, *Tit. iii. 3.* Nor let it be said that the word here used is ἀνακαινίζειν, for ἀνακαινίζειν and ἀνακαινῆν signify just the same: See the former in the Version of the *Septuagint*, *Psal. cii. 5.* & *ciii. 31.* *Lament. v. 21.* And the *Old Glosses* have, Ἀνακαινίζει, *innovat*, & ἀνακαινίσις, *innovatio*. So *Suidas*: Ἀνακαινίσις, ἢ ἀνανέωσις λέγεται ἢ ἀνακαίωσις· καὶ ἀνακαινῆ. I believe it should be: ἀνακαινώω καὶ ἀνακαινίζω; the repetition of like words was the cause why one of them was omitted, and the decay of a Letter corrupted the last; which is observable in many places of that and other *Lexicons*.

II. This being supposed the genuin and proper signification of the Verb, the series of the Discourse is clear, which otherwise is something intricate. The Apostolical Writer saith, that the Jews needed to be instructed in that part of the Christian Doctrin, which was proposed to Profelytes; which yet he says he would not now set before them, deferring it to another time; then he subjoins the words ἀδυνατὸν ᾧ, &c. as if he had said, “ I will not propose again that Doctrin, “ whereby Profelytes use to be converted to the Christian Faith, that “ so I may reduce those Jews who have apostatized from it; for this “ they know as well as other things, which I might say to that purpose. By such a Discourse Men who have been once enlightned “ with divine Light, who had received the heavenly Gift of a quiet “ Mind, who had been endued with a power to work Miracles, who “ have had forecasts in the Church of the promised Happiness of another Life, and nevertheless have revolted from Christ; by such a “ Discourse, I say, I cannot renew again such Men so as that they “ should repent. But why is it ἀδυνατὸν ἀνακαινίζειν, impossible to renew again such Men? viz. because whatever could be said or done in order to that end, had been done and said already. They had heard all, and had been sensible of all that was naturally apt to fix and engage them for ever to Christ. And yet they had not adhered to him, because of Persecutions. There was nothing more could be done to reduce them to a better Mind, unless those things which they already perfectly understood, and perceived the efficacy of, were again repeated to them, which would have been to no purpose. The same  
is



is the sense of the following comparison, and of that which is said Chapter VI.  
about this matter in *Chap. x.*

III. Now if any one enquire concerning the thing it self, if he throughly consider it, he will easily see that it is not without reason that the Apostolical Writer affirmed it to be *asurativ*, that is, if not absolutely *impossible*, as we now speak with the Vulgar Interpreter, yet at least extremely difficult, and the hardest thing possible. The reason I before intimated, because such Men have abused all the Reasons and Arguments which might have inseparably united them to Christ. They are that *Vine of God* for which he had done all that could be done to make them bring forth good Fruit, and yet had brought forth wild Grapes: For which reason some of the Antients plainly affirmed that it was in vain to expect the Repentance of such Men. As *Hermas* in Lib. iii. Simii. 6. *His non est, saith he, per pœnitentiam regressus ad vitam; quoniam quidem adjecerunt ad reliqua peccata sua, quod nomen Domini nefandis insectati sunt verbis; hujusmodi homines morti sunt destinati. These Persons cannot return by Repentance to Life; because they have added to the rest of their Sins, that of blaspheming the Name of the Lord; such Men as these are appointed to Death.* See also *Clemens Alexandrinus* in his Book entitl. *Quis dives salvetur.*

IV. *Metánoia* is no where in the Holy Scriptures taken for those Church-Penalties which were imposed upon Penitents before they were admitted again to Communion. Our Author should have produced but one place to make himself believed. For it is not safe to reason about what was done in antient times from the stile of the Fathers, because together with new Customs there were new Names also invented, and new significations given to old ones. We have no reason to suppose that the manner of a publick Repentance was the same in the Apostles times, as afterwards. The English or German Articles are vainly alledged in this place: But our Author should have cited the viith *Can.* of the *Neocæsarean* Council, in which the phrase he sets down is, not the lii, for there are only xv *Canons* in all of that Council. Such another mistake I have already elsewhere observed.

V. Of the *Gnosticks* here, there is not the least mark or footstep. The Apostolical Writer only makes mention of some that had revolted from Christ, whether to the *Heathens* or the *Jews*. And such Men joining themselves to the persecutors of the Christians, which had formerly crucified Christ, did, as much as in them lay, the same; because they approved the fact, and despitefully used Christ's Members. This agrees no more to the *Gnosticks*, than to any Apostates.



VI. I don't think the Church of *Rome* or others, rejected this Epistle, because of this place, as contrary to their Custom; but rather because the Author of it was not certainly known. Nor was it admitted because this Passage began to be better understood, but because at length the most judicious Persons easily observed that the stile and reasonings of this Epistle were agreeable to the Apostles times; in which also and no other there could be an Epistle written to the Jewish Brethren, apart from the *Gentiles*; for in the following Age there was no difference between the Members of the Christian Church, nor any remembrance of Circumcision and Uncircumcision. In the antient Church of *Rome*, as appears from *Herma*, there was the same opinion about the difficulty of Repentance, in those who after they had been thoroughly instructed in the Christian Religion, and been zealous for it, shamefully apostatized from it. Besides, that manner of Repentance which was afterwards instituted, not having been known in the Primitive times, not to say that there is no mention made of it in this place, an Epistle could not be rejected as contrary to a Custom which had not yet prevailed.

VII. It is very true that ἀδύνατον often signifies what it is not lawful to do, but here it seems to signify that which is very difficult; for which reason a very antient Greek and Latin Copy of the New Testament, kept at *Paris* in the Library of *St. Victor*, has in this place, *difficile*, tho the Translation is usually literal: So ἀδύνατον is taken in *Mat. xix. 26*. I shall not add any thing about the *Gnosticks*, whom our Author here seeks for, because I have often confuted him.

Verf. 7. Note c. Our Author here thinks that in this place the ἀπόδοσις & ἀνταπόδοσις of a Similitude are confounded; for which reason the Apostolical Writer speaks of the Earth, as he would speak of Men. And indeed there seems to be some ground for this supposition, if the words μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ be rendred, as usual, *receiveth a blessing from God*. But that mixture of the parts of a Similitude being very improper, I had rather interpret μεταλαμβάνειν so, as that the consequent should be expressed by the antecedent, and that the Verb μεταλαμβάνειν should not signify *to receive*, but to *use* the blessing received from God, that is, Rain, Sunshine, &c. So the sense will be very proper: *for the Earth which drinketh in the Rain that cometh often upon it, and bringeth forth Herbs meet for them for whom it is dressed, uses the Blessing which it receives from God; but that which beareth Thorns and Briers, is reprobate and near a Curse, whose end is to be burnt; that is, which is of no use, except that the Briers and Thorns which grow upon it are burned, or serve to make Fires.* It is common for the antecedent



cedent to be taken for the consequent: See *S. Glassius* Rhetor. Sac. Chapter VI. *Tract. 1. c. 1. de Metonymia Cause.* I might otherwise interpret these words, *is said to have received a blessing from God.*

Verf. 20. Note e. I. I don't understand what our Author means when he says that *it was perhaps taken into the Heathen Oracles from the Prophets, that about that time among the Romans the dignity of the Pontificate was joined with the Imperial.* What Oracles are those? When and where deliver'd? Was there any need of inferring from the Jewish Prophets, contrary to all the rules of Logick, that a thing was done at *Rome*, which every one knew? But perhaps he meant to speak of the time to come, tho his words signify a thing past. However that be, either those Oracles were none at all, or only counterfeited; and our Author dared not, or could not produce them.

II. Even from the time of *Julius Cæsar*, it was decreed, that if he begat a Son, he should be High-Priest. Of which see *J. Andreas Bosius*, de Pontificatu Max. *Imp. Rom.* cap. 1. who will inform us more exactly in such matters than our Author, who spent but little time in studying the Heathen Antiquities, but mostly employed himself in the study of Ecclesiastical.

III. He should have added the *Chapter* of the Life of *Augustus*, as well as of *Galba* and *Claudius*. But we have no reason to be sorry he did not, for all this should have been blotted out, because the places marked in *Suetonius* are nothing to the purpose; which I should have wondred at, if I had not often observed a great many more such things in the *Doctor*: The place in *Tacitus* is shamefully corrupted. It is taken out of the Oration of *Servius Maluginensis* Priest of *Jupiter*, *Annal. Lib. iii. c. 58.* who desiring to have the Province of *Asia* given to him, said this among other things: *Privatis olim similitatibus effectum, ut a Pontificibus Maximis (Flamines Diales) ire in Provincias prohiberentur; nunc, Deum munere summum Pontificum etiam summum hominum esse, non amulationi, non odio, non privatis affectionibus obnoxium.* Through private grudg it came to pass in former times, that they (viz. the Priests of *Jupiter*) were not suffer'd by the Chief Priests to go into the Provinces; but now by the bounty of the Gods the Chief of the Priests was also the chief of Men, and not subject either to envy, or hatred, or private Passion. The Latins did not say *summus Pontifex*, and perhaps *Tacitus* would not have used the word *summus*, but only for the following ἀντίθετος, opposition.

Verf. 4. **A** Πάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ.] See *Grotius* on these words, and add to the examples which he alledges these words of *Horace*, in *Lib. 1. Sat. vi.*

————— *Persuades hoc tibi vere*  
*Ante potestatem Tulli, atque ignobile regnum*  
*Multos sæpe viros, NULLIS majoribus ortos*  
*Et vixisse probos, amplis & honoribus auctos.*

Where *nulli majores* are such, whose Names and Exploits through length of time are forgotten. And such were the Parents of *Melchisedek*, for which reason he is said to have been *without Father* and *without Mother*, &c. If we consider this attentively, we shall easily perceive that before the time of Christ no Man could, without a revelation, have imagin'd from the Story of *Melchisedek*, there would hereafter come an Eternal Priest, who was to be Successor to none, nor have any to succeed him. Nor could any Man after the Coming of Christ, gather by mere reasoning, grounded upon critical Rules, that *Melchisedeks* Parents and Death were omitted in the Scripture with this design, that by such a silence he might be an Image of Christ. Whoever should have pretended this, might have been confuted by a bare Negation. Why therefore, you will say, did the Apostolical Writer insist so much upon that Story with the *Jews*? For it's plain he does not say here he had any revelation made to him of that matter, nor require credit to be given to his bare Affirmation. I answer, the Allegorical Writers of the *Jews* at that time, accommodated innumerable places to the *Messias*, not relying upon any Grammatical Interpretation, but a certain old Custom of explaining the Scripture in that manner. So because they interpreted *Psalms* cx. of the *Messias*, the Sacred Writer makes use of that Interpretation to his purpose; and because they acknowledged the *Messias* ought to be like *Melchisedek*, he reasons against them from their own Concession; not against other Men who might have denied what he assumed. And he used this way of disputing with the *Jews* so much the more willingly, because nothing followed from such an Interpretation contrary to those things which he knew were true concerning Christ; yea he might, according to the Jewish Custom, compare *Christ* to *Melchisedek*. Otherwise, if the thing be consider'd in it self,



self, no strong or Grammatical Argument could be drawn against others from that History; and therefore such things are not to be too much urged now, because that way of explaining the Scripture is grown out of use.

Verf. 4. Note a. I. The true original of the word ἀκεθίνα is well observed by our Author out of *Phavorinus*. It may be further added, that the Fruits gathered out of Fields, and the Spoils taken from Enemies, were piled up in heaps, before the owners of the Fields made use of the Fruits, or those who had taken the Spoils divided them; and then from the tops of those heaps, ἐξ ἀκρῶν τῶν θιῶν, before they were disposed of, were taken the First-fruits which were offer'd to the Gods; whence any First-fruits came to be called ἀκεθίνα. I do not deny but the best part was consecrated, but I do not think ἀκεθίνα signifies here *the choice*. It is plain ἀκεθίνα is used to signify Fruits, not as if *chosen* from Trees, but because they are on the extremities of Boughs, or on the tops of Trees. However I wonder our Author should quote pag. 110. of *Phavorinus*, when what he alledges out of him is in *Column* 100. and no where else.

II. But I more wonder he should produce only in *English* the words of *Philo*, out of Lib. 11. *Alleg. Legis*, which are no where to be found in that Book. *Philo* has only this passage that can belong to this place, in pag. 57. Ed. Genev. Ἄρτος γὰρ καὶ οἶνον προσφέρει, ἀπὸς Ἀμμωνίται καὶ Μοαβῖται τῶν βλέποντι παρασχῆν ἐκ ἐθέλησαν· ἔχαιεν ἐκκλησίας ἐργονται καὶ συλλόγους θεῶν: *for he offer'd Bread and Wine, which the Ammonites and Moabites would not give, for which reason they are kept out of the Assembly and Congregation of God.* Then he enquires, why he gave Wine and not Water, and that he interprets Allegorically.

III. It is strange also that our Author, in this pious liberality of *Abraham*, should see a sufficient Example and Testimony of the Customs in *Abraham's* time, of paying Tithes to the Priest of ALL our increase, of what kind soever it is. For he himself has observed two things contrary to this Inference: First, that *Abraham* gave Tithes only of the spoils of the War, which is no Evidence that the Antients used to pay Tithes when ever their Possessions were increased; for an universal Proposition, as Logicians speak, cannot be concluded from a particular. Secondly, that those Tithes were extraordinary, as being paid to a Priest, to whom that tract of Land, wherein *Abraham* dwelt, did not belong; which surely cannot be an example of a perpetual Custom of paying Tithes to Priests of the same Country.

Verf. 5. Note b. It is very barbarously, and without example, that Dr. *Hammond* here joins λαὸν with κατὰ νόμον for, as to think that is

Chapter VII. a *periphrasis* of the Jews. The reason he alledges for this Interpretation is of no moment, because here is not a mere repetition. The sense is: "They have received a Commandment to require Tithes of their Countrymen, in that manner which is prescribed by the Law."

Ver. 11. Τελείωσις.] This word our Author interprets in his Paraphrase, of a *perfect expiation of Sin*; but he ought to have produced examples of that Notion. *Grotius* thinks it signifies *id quod in genere sacerdotii perfectissimum est, That which is most perfect in the kind of Priesthood*; but that this might be said the thing should have been expressed thus, εἰ ἂν ἐν τελείωσις ἐν τῇ Λευϊτικῇ ἱεροσύνῃ ᾦν, if therefore there were perfection in the Levitical Priesthood, and not διὰ τὴν Λευϊτικῆς ἱεροσύνης, by the Levitical Priesthood. I believe therefore that here τελείωσις is taken for *Consecration*, whereby not the Priests themselves, but private Persons who offer'd Sacrifice, were by the hands of the Priests so consecrated to God, as to become acceptable to him. So the Heathens thought themselves by their Priests διὰ τῶν τελεπῶν τελειωθῆναι, to be through Sacrifices initiated and consecrated to their Deities, so as to be upon that account the more pleasing to them, as is well known of the *Mysteries of Ceres*. Hence the Christians used τελείωσις to signify a *Consecration*, whereby we are rendred more acceptable to God: See *J. Casp. Suicerus* his *Thesaurus* on this word. In the same manner I understand the Verb ὀτελείωσεν in ver. 19. Of the τελείωσις of Priests, see on Chap. ii. 10.

Verf. 19. Note c. I am apt to think ἐγγίξειν has a reference to the mystical signification of the Verb τελείων, that is, to consecrate, to initiate in certain Rites. For as those that were initiated drew nearer than others to the Images of the Gods, and entred into the secret places of their Temples: so the consecrated Priests among the Jews enter'd into the Sanctuary, which was nearest that place where God was thought in a special manner to reside; and among Christians any one whatsoever, as initiated by the most Holy Rites, betakes himself to God in Prayer without the intervention of any mortal Priest. See Note on verf. 11.

Verf. 27. Ἦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ.] This must be referred only to the last words ὑπὲρ τῆς λαοῦ, and is not to be understood so as if Christ had offer'd not only for the sins of the People, but also for his own; as *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond* understood it. For there is no such thing in any other place suggested by the Apostles, and what those learned Men here say is violent. These Writers are not to be examined so by the Rules of Rhetoricians, as always to be thought to intend what



a Rhetorician would have meant by the same words. It's true, accurately speaking τῆς should be referred to the whole verse, but the former part of it not agreeing to Christ, it must be supposed only to belong to the latter. Chapter VIII.

C H A P. VIII.

Verf. 1. **E**ἰν ἀξιά τῆ θρόνου τ̄ μεγαλοσύνης.] See my note on *Mark* xvi. 19.

Verf. 2. Τῆς σκηνῆς τ̄ ἀληθινῆς.] That is of *Heaven*, in which Christ exercised the chief part of his Priesthood, when he carried into it his blood, as into the most holy place. Our Author misunderstood this of the Church, in which Christ did not execute his Priestly Office, but in Heaven. In the words of the Apostle, after the true Tabernacle we must supply Θεῶ, of God, which is called true because God there shews himself in a peculiar manner present, by an inaccessible light, with which his inhabitation of the Mosaical Tabernacle can no more be compared, than the malignant and as it were false light of the reflex rays of a Torch, with the true light of the Sun. See what I have said about this phrase on *John* vi. 55. and about the *Tabernacle of God*, on *Rev.* xxi. 13.

Verf. 4. Εἰ μὲν ὡς ἐπὶ γῆς, ἢ δ' ἀν ὡς ἐξ οὐρανό.] I don't think we ought to supply here *only*, after the words *on earth*, with *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond*; for the reasoning of the Apostle is not at all cleared by that Supplement. But *to be a Priest on earth*, is to be understood so as if he had said, *by the Mosaical Law*, which appointed only the race of *Aaron* to be Priests, and that to offer up brute Sacrifices in the Temple, whose blood they alone, according to the Law of God, might pour out at the Altar, and carry into the Sanctuary. For Christ was of the Tribe of *Judah*, as the Apostolical Writer of this Epistle elsewhere observes.

Verf. 5. Ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λαλοῦσιν ἡμῶς ἐπισημίαν.] Ὑπόδειγμα and σκιᾷ here can by no means signify a prefiguration of something future; for Heaven was a great while before the Tabernacle and Temple; but some faint and obscure Image of a thing extraordinary beautiful and glorious. For ὑπόδειγμα is, as painted Images are, an imitation, as it is used in this very Epistle, Chap. iv. 11. *Let us labour to enter into that rest, lest any man perish in the same imitation of unbelief; that is, in the imitation of the same unbelief; ἐν ὑποδείγματι τ̄ αὐτῆς ἀπειθείας.* It comes from the Verb ὑποδεικνύω, which *Phavorinus* interprets thus: ὑποδεικνύει ἐν τῷ ὑποζωγραφεῖ, ὑποδείξει βέλομαι τῷ λόγῳ καὶ διὰ τὸ ὅτι πνθ γραφῆς: he represents

Chapter presents for he paints; I will shew a thing by discourse, as by some picture.  
 IX. So that *κατασκευάω* is sometimes the same with *κατασκευάζω*, which is, to delineate, or to draw the first and rude lineaments of things; from whence *κατασκευή* is a rude draught or delineation. And *σκιά* here is the same with *σκιάσασθαι*, that is, a dull or rough Picture, like the representation of a body by its shadow. Then the Phrase to serve to the delineation and shadowing of heavenly things signifies to minister to the Sanctuary, which was a delineation, &c. as was done by the Jewish Priests. What our Author says here in his Paraphrase, is besides the scope of this place.

Verf. 9. Note a. I. What Dr. Hammond here says about the mistakes of Transcribers, is very true; as *Lud. Cappellus* in his *Critica Sacra* has shewn: in which Mr. Pocock has confuted indeed a few ces, but left the foundations untouch'd; tho he ever now and then has a stroke at them, both in his *Notes ad Portam Mosis*, and elsewhere. Yet they cannot be overturned, because they are undeniably true. But it is true also, before any place be thought to have been differently read by the *Septuagint*, the neighbouring Languages ought to be consulted, which was not always done by *Cappellus*. In this place our Author might have added, that *בַּעַל* and *בַּחַל* are one and the same root, but differently written; the Letters of the same Organ in the Eastern Languages, and especially the Guttural, being very often confounded.

II. I wonder our learned Author thought the *Septuagint* pointed otherwise the word *מִלְמַדָּה*; for *melammedah* is of the Feminine Gender, and cannot be joined with what goes before. The words may be literally render'd thus: *Fuit tō timere eorum me præceptum hominum edoctum, their fearing me was a precept taught by men*. If any thing else were to be changed by the Version of the *Septuagint*, we should read *מִלְמַדִּים* *melammedim, teaching*. But that is needless, the sense being the same in the Hebrew words as they are now, as it is in the Greek.

III. Our Author mistranslates *אֲשַׁלֵּיךְ* by *I have given or sent*. He confounds this Verb with *שָׁלַח* *he hath sent*, in his Explication of *Zachar. xi. 13*.

#### C H A P. IX.

Verf. 15. " **A** *Τὸν κοσμικόν.*] The word *κοσμικόν* here does not seem to signify an Image of the whole World, as *Grotius* and Dr. Hammond explain it, but rather *earthly*; for *κοσμικός* is often taken both for this lower World and for Men. "*Ἀγίου κοσμικόν* is opposed to *ἐπυργήσιον*. This *Beza* observed; whom the learn-



ed Doctor and *Grotius* should have followed in this matter.

Verf. 2. [Ἡ τις λέγειαι ἅγια.] *Which is called Holies*, in the plural number, because the most holy place was called the *Holies of Holies*, ἅγια ἁγίων, by those that spake Greek; for in Hebrew the former is called the *Sanctuary* or *Holiness*, מקדש mikdasch, or קודש kodesch, never in the plural number; the latter the *Holiness of Holinesses* קדש קדשים. By this and what I shall observe afterwards of the word διαθήκη, it may seem probable that the Writer of this Epistle was a Grecian, or at least one that did not well understand Hebrew, and therefore cannot be thought to have been *St. Paul*.

Verf. 4. Θυμιασίων.] *Grotius* understands by this word the Golden Censer which had fire put into it out of the Altar by the High Priest, who afterwards threw *Incense θυμίαμα* into it, on the day he entred into the most holy place. That Vessel used to be kept in the outward Sanctuary; but *non est*, saith he, *difficile intellectu, cur dicat hic scriptor interius illud tentorium habuisse batillum, non quod ibi semper esset, sed quod semper Arcam, quæ erat in Adyto, respiceret, & in illo die maxime solemnæ expiationis, in tentorium interius, id est, in Adytum transferretur. Habere enim dicimus quod est in nostrum usum.* It is easy to understand why this Writer says that inward Tabernacle had the Censer, not because it was always there, but because it always had a respect to the Ark which was in the most holy place, and on that most solemn day of Expiation was carried into the inward Tabernacle, and into the most holy place. For we are said to have what is for our use. By the same reason every thing which was in the outward Sanctuary might be said to have been in the most holy place, because they had a respect to it. It might have been said to have the Fire and the Incense before they were carried into it, because they were for its use, and were to be carried into it. Which things as they cannot be said, according to the ordinary use of Speech, so they are by no means agreeable to the Stile of this Writer. For when he says, *wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread*, that must undoubtedly be understood properly; and we cannot otherwise understand what is said here, *which had the golden Censer, &c.* I am apt to think therefore, that this was a Jewish Tradition of that Age, by which they supposed that the Censer used on the day of Expiation was kept in the most holy place. See on the following words.

Ibid. Note b. It's certain *Isaac Abarbanel* on 1 Kin. viii. 9. says there is a Tradition to that purpose. See what *Joan. Buxtorfius* has collected about this matter out of the *Rabbins* and other Interpreters, in his *Arca Fæderis*, cap. 5.

Chapter  
IX.Vers. 5. *Note d.* See also what I have said on *Rom. iii. 25.*

Vers. 7. *Note e.* All the Sins that were expiated by Sacrifices, were not involuntary, but only the most, as appears from *Levit. vi. 1. & seqq.* and the greater number gave the denomination.

Vers. 13. *Note f.* In this place *ἀγιαζέει* does not signify *washes, abluat*, but *lustrat, purifies* or *purges*, that is, according to the Institution of the Law, makes one that was before judged *unclean* with an Uncleanness, not properly so called, but legal, to be accounted *clean*; tho neither his Mind was made more holy, nor his Body, properly speaking, more clean. For the sprinkling of Blood and Ashes rather defiles than washes the body. It is a plain case. Why therefore did the Apostolical Writer say, that it *sanctified the flesh*? I answer, It is all one as if he had said, the Body of such a man was accounted *holy* or *clean*, and might be touched without Pollution: for those that were accounted unclean were thought to pollute every one that touched them.

Vers. 16. [Ὁπερ διαθήκη.] Here is as it were a playing with the Ambiguity of the word *διαθήκη*, which in these Writers constantly signifying *ברית*, that is, a *Covenant*, was used by those that spake the best Greek for a *Testament*. It is true indeed, a Testament is ratified by the death of the Testator, and Christ is dead. But Christ was not *the Mediator of a Testament*, for Testaments do not want Mediators; and if it should be granted that he was, he could not be thought at once a Mediator and a Testator, by whose death alone a Testament was confirmed. The Testator here is God the Father, whose *heirs* men are, in *conjunction* with Christ; but God the Father can in no sense be said to die. See Dr. *Hammond's* Annot. on the Inscription of the New Testament. So that this Discourse is to be look'd on merely as the play of an *Hellenistical* Writer, who because he saw that *διαθήκη* was used for that Covenant whereof Christ is the Mediator, and signified also a Testament, and Christ was dead, thence deduced Consecratories which are true indeed consider'd in themselves, but here rely upon weak Principles, rather to set off his Discourse, according to the custom of that Age, than to convert the unbelieving Jews to the Christian Faith by force of reasoning.

They who think every thing said in these Writings is mathematically demonstrative, are greatly mistaken, and have not read them with due Attention. Nor does this lessen the Authority of this Epistle, the Writer of which no where says that he would bring nothing but Demonstrations. All the Heads of the Christian Doctrine which he prosecutes are very true, and may be demonstrated by other  
places



places of Scripture; but the manner in which he illustrates them, is plainly like the custom of those times, as we may see by *Philo*; in whom there are often such *accommodations*, as Divines speak, of places of Scriptures, and consequences deduced from them, in which no regard at all is had to Grammar, and the only thing observed is, that the thing it self, illustrated by them, be true. That was the way of that Age, which we ought no more to wonder at, than at our own present Customs.

Chapter  
X.  
~

Verf. 18. Οὐδ' ἢ παρόπι, &c. The similitude between the Old Covenant and a Testament, which is here urged, is that in both there is a *Death* observable, in a Testament, of the Testator, in the Covenant of a Sacrifice; and that by that Death both are confirmed, tho not in the same manner. This is but a slight Similitude, from which nothing can be philosophically inferred: but considering the Custom of that Age, an elegant way of reasoning. I know that *Grotius* would have διαθήκη to be taken in a more general Notion, for an explication of the import of the Testator διαθεμένος his Will. Which is true, where the Hebrew word כְּתוּבָה *brith* is translated, and nothing is added to shew there is a respect had to a Testament properly so called; but where there is mention made of *the death of a Testator*, the Discourse is about the last signification of his Will, as in this place.

Verf. 24. Αντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν.] That is, fashioned according to the πύργος τῶν ἀληθινῶν. The Sanctuary of Heaven is the Pattern, or πύργος, in the likeness of which the Tabernacle was made: See my Note on 1 Cor. x. 7. But wherein consisted that likeness? In this, that as God in a special manner is thought to dwell in Heaven, so he dwelt in the Mosaical Sanctuary. This Similitude is certain; what is further added out of *Philo*, or others, are mere Conjectures, and for the most part vain λεπτολογία, niceties.

C H A P. X.

Verf. 1. Τελεῶσαι.] That is, by its τελεται so to reconcile and render them acceptable to God, as that they might hope for eternal Happiness from him. See my Note on Chap. vii. 11.

Verf. 26. Note b. I. That it is a defection or falling away from Christianity which is here meant, there can be no doubt; but that we are to understand it of a defection to the *Gnosticks* rather than to the *Heathens* or *Jews*, our Author has not proved: for there is nothing said in this place, which does not exactly agree to those who had revolted

Chapter volted to the *Syrians* or *Jews*, after they had known the truth of the  
X. Christian Religion.

II. What our Author here adds, about the contempt of the Governors of the Church, I do not see upon what ground it relies; for Men did not ordinarily revolt from the Christian Faith, out of a contempt of the Governors of the Church, but rather of the Gospel it self. They forsook the Assemblies of the Christians, not to shew they despised their Bishops, but to secure their Lives and Possessions for which they had so high a value, that for their sakes they *trod under foot the Son of God*, accounted the *Blood of the Covenant as a profane thing*, and reproached the *Spirit of Grace*. Παρκαλιῶν indeed is the Office of Bishops, but private Men also may *exhort* one another, and there is no mention here of the Governors of the Church.

III. What is meant by ἀθετεῖν the Law of *Moses*, I shall afterwards explain. But it is strange that Councils are here appealed to, and such examples brought out of them, to shew what it is to *reproach the Spirit of Grace*; which is to speak contumeliously of the Spirit vouchsafed under the Gospel, to the Apostles.

Verf. 28. Ἀθετήσας τις νόμον Μωσέως.] The Verb ἀθετεῖν is not simply to *violate*, but by words and deeds to declare a Man will not observe the Law, and does not think it ought to be observed, or scornfully to reject it. And for that wickedness among the *Jews*, there was no Sacrifice of Expiation, as we are told in *Num. xv. 30.* where see my Notes: add also *Deut. xxvii. 26. & xxix. 19.* The Verb ἀθετεῖν signifies to *reject* in *Luke vii. 30. & x. 16. John xii. 48. Jude 8.* and elsewhere. So the *Old Glosses*: ἀθετῶ reprobō, to reject; ἀθετεῖ refellit, disapproves. *Hesychius*: Ἀθετεῖ, ἀτιμάζει, ῥιπτάζεται. Ἀθετεῖται, ὑβείζεται, κατὰφρονεῖται.

Verf. 34. τοῖς δεσμοῖς μὲν.] Dr. *Hammond* observes in the Margin of the English Translation, that the Alexandrian Copy reads here τοῖς δεσμοῖς συνεπαθήσατε. So does also the *Vulgar*: vincētis compassi estis, ye have sympathised with the bound; which reading is countenanced likewise by the *Syriack* Interpreter. So also it was read in two Copies of *R. Stephanus*. And I doubt not but that is the true reading, which was changed by those who rashly supposed *St. Paul* was the Author of this Epistle.



Verf. 1. I. **I**N the place cited out of *Ezekiel*, in the *Chaldee Paraphrast*, מְחַצְפִּין must not be rendred *ausi sunt, they took Confidence*, but *impudenter confirmant, they impudently confirm*, viz. *sermonem suum ratum fore, That their word should be made good or come to pass*. The Hebrew Verb יִחְלוּ must be rendred *they have made others to hope, that the thing should be accomplished*. But supposing this, our Author's conjecture is nevertheless good.

II. ὑποσῆ in the *Septuagints* Version of *Mich. v. 7.* must not be translated to *subsist*, but to *hope*. The Hebrew has: *The Remnant of Jacob shall be among the Nations, and in the midst of many People, as a dew from the Lord, as showers upon the Grass; which does not wait for any Man, nor stay for the Sons of Men*, where the *Septuagint*, who yet have very ill translated these words, have right enough ὑποσῆ, that is, *nor waits for the Sons of Men*, or puts Confidence in them. For those Interpreters must often be understood by the Hebrew words, which they endeavour'd to illustrate in their Translation. Now ἵκη never signified to *subsist*.

III. Our Author in his Paraphrase interprets the word ἐλεγχοι, a *Conviction* or *Perswasion*; but he should have brought us an example wherein it appeared that ἐλεγχοι signified a certain disposition of Mind, and I cannot tell whether any can be found. But till such an instance be alledged, I chuse rather to interpret this word according to its usual signification, that is, *argumentum, an Argument*, as it is rendred in the *Vulgar*. The firm and constant Faith of wise Men, has that weight and influence upon others, as to be an *Argument* for which they believe with them, the reality of things which they do not see. So St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. to prove the certainty of the Resurrection, to those who had not seen it, argues from his own and the rest of the Apostles, and Christians Faith: *Else what shall they do, saith he, who are baptized for the dead? If the Dead rise not at all, why are they then baptized for the Dead? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour? — If after the manner of Men I have fought with Beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the Dead rise not? &c.* These things may be called ἐλέγχοι τῶν μελλομένων, that is, *arguments* proving the truth of the Resurrection of the Dead; it being not at all probable that wise and good Men would have rashly, and without reason, submitted to such things. The same may be said of those examples of Faith, mentioned in this Chapter of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*.

Chapter XI. *Verf. 4. Πλείονα θυσίαν.* Our Author in his Paraphrase rightly interprets the word *πλείονα* here *the base*, for this Verse is taken out of the Greek Translation of *Genes. iv. 7.* where *Cain* is said to have offer'd indeed rightly, but not to have divided rightly, that is, to have kept to himself what was Gods. See my Notes on that place.

*Verf. 10. Τὴν τῶν Σεμελίης ἔχουσαν.]* This *Grotius* rightly refers to *Jerusalem*, which our Author interprets in a mystical sense, I know not for what reason; for if we read *Genesis*, we shall be perfectly of *Grotius* his Mind, nor does the series of the Discourse here require any other interpretation.

*Verf. 16. Κεῖττον ὀρέγεται, ταύτην ἐπιφανίᾳ.]* These words are rightly understood by *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond* so, as if the Apostolical Writer had said: *Κεῖττον ὀρέγεται, ἢ ἢν ἀνίπτων ἐξουίᾳ, they desired a better Country, which was an antitype of Heaven*, that is, the Land of *Canaan*. For it appears from *Gen. xxiii. 7.* & *xlvi. 9.* that the only meaning of the Patriarchs, in saying *they were strangers and sojourners in the Land*, was that they had no ground of their own in the Land of *Canaan*, but dwelt in it merely by the courtesy of the *Canaanites*.

*Verf. 20. Note d.* What our Author says in this Note is very ingenious, and if not true, seems highly probable, as far as the last period, beginning with, *and this perhaps.* Because that which follows is plainly forced; for who would say that the *Edomites* were *Lords of the Jews*, because when their Commonwealth was overthrown by the *Chaldeans*, they did no longer obey them. Is it all one to be any Mans *Lord*, and *not to serve him*? I think not. So that this last remark should have been blotted out, or rather not at all written.

*Verf. 21. Note e.* See my Notes on *Gen. xlvii. 31.* We had better here acknowledg the hand of a Writer who did not understand *Hebrew*, and followed without examination the *Septuagint*, than endeavour to reconcile inconsistencies. Our Author commits here another great mistake, in seeking in *Gen. xlix.* for that which is in *Gen. xlvii.* and joining the words of *Chap. xlix.* belonging to another Story, with the words of *Chap. xlvii. 21.* See the places, and you will think it strange that our learned Author, who so diligently studied the Scripture, should commit such an error.

*Verf. 29. Note f.* This also is a Dream, plainly contrary to the History, and owing to the false reasoning of Interpreters, as I have shewn in a Dissertation *de Maris Idumæi trajectione*, added to my *Commentary* on the *Pentateuch*, Numb. iv.

*Ibid. Note g.* All this is true, but had been observed before by *Grotius* and others. See also *Davidis Clerici Quæst. Sacr. x.*

*Verf.*



Verf. 35. Note h. I. Mr. *Gataker* has treated largely concerning Chapter this word in *Adversar.* cap. xlvi. who may be consulted. From the XI. places by him alledged, it sufficiently appears that *τύμπανον*, where the Discourse is about an instrument of Torment, was properly a *Club*, so called from *τύπτειν* to beat; and secondarily the place or torment itself of *τυμπανισμός*. From *τύμπανον* was deduced *τυμπανίζειν*, that is, to strike with a *τύμπανον* or *Club*, till the Person accused made Confession, or else died; which Verb was afterwards used to signify any kind of painful Death. But here where there are particular kinds of Death mention'd, I think it is to be understood properly, of those who were beaten to death with Clubs. So that what our Author conjectures of I know not what Engine, that was called *τύμπανον*, and on which Malefactors were hanged, is vain. Mr. *Gataker* also very truly observes, that *Lexicographers* often attribute to words those significations, which either precede or accompany the thing signified; and that shews the reason why *τυμπανίζεσθαι* is said by *Hesychius* and *Suidas* to signify to be *sla'd* or *hanged*.

II. I do not see why *κόφων* and the *Yoke*, mention'd in *Jerem.* xxviii. 14. should be reckoned the same. For from the beginning of the foregoing Chapter it appears that those *Yokes* are consider'd as representations of *slavery*, which the Prophet foretold to several Nations, not of *Torment* or a *Prison*. The only similitude between them, we have any certain knowledg of, is that they were both put upon the Neck.

III. Tho in the *νεκρομαντεία* of *Lucian*, *κόφωνες* and *τεροχει* are joined together, it does not follow that *τεροχει* is the same with *τύμπανα*; tho *tympanum* sometimes signifies a *Wheel* among Architects. It is sufficient that the *Wheel* was an instrument of Torture, as appears by the Fable of *Ixion*, that in the description of Hell there might be mention made of *κόφωνες* and *τεροχει*. It is not safe to deduce Confectaries from the order of words. See *Lucian* Tom. i. p. 334. *Ed. Amstel.*

IV. *Ἐπὶ τύμπανον ἔρχεσθαι*, may very fitly be rendred *to come to the torment of the Club*, or if you please, to the place in which that Torment was inflicted, because that is *abusively* called *τύμπανον*. *Celsus* also improperly said *τυμπανίζεσθαι* for that which is to die a painful Death; nor is it necessary he should have thought of a *τύμπανον*, or of hanging, as we shall afterwards see, on the place in *Eusebius*, which Dr. *Hammond* last of all alledges.

V. The pulling off the Skin, or cutting off the Members, signify nothing to a *τυμπανισμός* properly so called; nor was it necessary that those who suffer'd this kind of Torment, should also have their Skin pulled off,

Chapter off, or be dismembred: But all these severities might improperly be  
 XI. called *τυμπατισμὸς*, in the sense that this word is taken for any sort of  
 Torment.

VI. They who have been a long while beaten with Clubs in all the parts of their Body, may truly be said [as in *Aristotle*] *δεινὸν πάντα πεπονθέναι*, and *ἀνεψυχμένοι εἰς τὸ μέλλον*: but it does not follow that *τυμπατισμὸς* properly so stiled, was a capital Punishment; for there might be a *τυμπατισμὸς* of fewer or more blows, either for Chastisement, or to Death, as the Judges thought fit, or the Crime deserved.

VII. It is a strange citation of *Eusebius*, which we have here in our Author, after the place in the *Maccabees*. First, there is no such thing in *Lib. iv.* of *Eusebius*, but the passage is in *Lib. ix. c. 40.* Secondly, it is not taken out of *Polyhistor*, but out of *Berosus* himself, or rather out of a fragment of his, which we find in *Josephus*, out of whom *Eusebius* cites it, as appears by the very Inscription of the Chapter. The same fragment has been published by *Jos. Scaliger* out of *Josephus*. So that the comparison the Doctor makes between *Alexander Polyhistor* out of *Eusebius*, and *Berosus*, is vain; because one and the same Writer is cited in both places, in whose different Copies, especially in a barbarous name, there might be a various reading.

VIII. The place in *Daniel* is in *Chap. vii. i i.* as was well noted by *Jos. Scaliger* in *Not. ad Fragm. p. 11.* and not in *Chap. v.* But this I should not observe, if the foregoing and following things did not shew that our Author, in collecting this medly, was extremely careless beyond what he uses to be, and did not think it worth while to look into the places in the Writers themselves. He says afterwards, "*Megasthenes* out of *Abydenus* calls the King of *Babylon* *Δαβαϊσάραχος*. On the contrary, *Abydenus* produces the words of *Megasthenes*, in *Eusebius Lib. xi. c. 41.*

IX. I easily believe the punishment of the Club, even to Death, was used among the *Greeks* and *Babylonians*. But our Author's *τυμπατισμὸς*, as he describes it, was no where used; nor can any thing be alledged in his favour out of *Justin*, who subjoined a synonymous Verb to the Verb *ἀντιέθην*, thinking there was no difference between them; after which manner both he and other Fathers often cite the Scripture. The place is in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, p. 248.

X. Nothing could have been more impertinently alledged by the Doctor, to prove that his *τυμπατισμὸς* was in use among the *Romans*, than the passage of *Eusebius*, or rather of the Churches of *Vienna* and *Lyons*, out of *Lib. v. c. 1.* of *Eusebius*. For after he had said that the Emperor had written word, that those who professed the Christi-



an Religion ought *τυμπανίζῃναι*, describing the manner how the Prefi-Chapter  
 dent had executed the Emperors orders, he says: *ἔστι γὰρ ἔδδκεν πολιτείας XI.*  
*Ρωμαίων ἐργάσαι, τῶτων ἀπέτεμε τὰς κεφαλὰς, τὰς ὃ λοιπὸς ἔτεμπερ εἰς θυσία:*  
*all that were judged to have been made free of the City of Rome, he cut off*  
*their Heads, and the rest he sent to the wild Beasts. Where is here our*  
*Author's τυμπανισμός? Christopherson misled him; who had rendred the*  
*word tympanis torqueri, which is justly censured by H. Valesius, with*  
*whom yet I should not render it gladio cædi, for those who were*  
*condemned to be devoured by wild Beasts, ἐτυμπανίσθησαν as well as*  
*those who were beheaded.*

XI. Not only our Author, but also the great *Grotius* did not know  
 what *τυμπανίζεσθαι* signified in this place, who on *2 Maccab. vi. 19.*  
 conjectures that the *τύμπανον* was *fidicula quibus pellis humana ita tende-*  
*batur, quomodo bubula in tympano, & qui sic cruciabantur dictos τυμπανίζεσθαι,*  
*little Cords whereby a Mans skin was stretched so, as the Skin of an Ox on a*  
*Drum, and those who were so tormented were said, &c.* But both the  
 reason of the word and use are plainly against him, as will appear  
 to any one that reads *Gataker*, whom I will not transcribe. I shall  
 only add, that in the Old Glosses *τύμπανον* is rendred *sirimpio*, which is  
 a corrupt Writing for *scipio*, a Staff.

Verf. 37. Note i. I wonder our Author here cites Copies which no  
 one else has mention'd. I mistrust they are Conjectures, which he  
 imposes upon us for various Lections. *Beza* affirms that it is so read  
 in all his Copies, and there is no variety of reading observed in the  
*Oxford Edition*, but of one Copy in which this word is wanting. The  
 same *Beza* conjectures that we might read *ἐπεσώθησαν*, they were burnt;  
 and *Tanaquillus Faber* in *Ep. Crit. Lib. ii. Ep. 14.* *ἐπεσώθησαν*, they were  
 maimed or dismembred, which kind of punishment was common among  
 the Eastern People. The Reader may chuse which of these he pleases,  
 either of them being better than the received reading.

Verf. 40. Note k. I. If we should admit the reasonings of *Dr.*  
*Hammond*, about the signification of the words *καὶ τὸν π*, so as to  
 grant they signified tranquillity in this World, and the perpetual  
 duration of the Christian Church; yet we could not allow him, that  
 this may be referred to the times of the Apostles. For what tran-  
 quillity did the Christians enjoy for three Ages, greater than the  
*Jews*, from the beginning of their Commonwealth to this time? It's  
 true, the *Jews* in so many Ages suffer'd various Calamities, but they  
 had also long intervals of Rest and Prosperity, such as the Christi-  
 ans for 300 Years never enjoyed, as the Scripture informs us; as in  
 the reigns of *David* and *Solomon*, and other Kings. Did the Christi-

Chapter off, or be dismembred: But all these severities might improperly be  
 XI. called *τυμπατισμὸς*, in the sense that this word is taken for any sort of  
 Torment.

VI. They who have been a long while beaten with Clubs in all the parts of their Body, may truly be said [as in *Aristotle*] *δεινὸν πάντα πεπονθέναι*, and *ἀνεψυχμένοι εἰς τὸ μέλλον*: but it does not follow that *τυμπατισμὸς* properly so stiled, was a capital Punishment; for there might be a *τυμπατισμὸς* of fewer or more blows, either for Chastisement, or to Death, as the Judges thought fit, or the Crime deserved.

VII. It is a strange citation of *Eusebius*, which we have here in our Author, after the place in the *Maccabees*. First, there is no such thing in *Lib. iv.* of *Eusebius*, but the passage is in *Lib. ix. c. 40.* Secondly, it is not taken out of *Polyhistor*, but out of *Berosus* himself, or rather out of a fragment of his, which we find in *Josephus*, out of whom *Eusebius* cites it, as appears by the very Inscription of the Chapter. The same fragment has been published by *Jos. Scaliger* out of *Josephus*. So that the comparison the Doctor makes between *Alexander Polyhistor* out of *Eusebius*, and *Berosus*, is vain; because one and the same Writer is cited in both places, in whose different Copies, especially in a barbarous name, there might be a various reading.

VIII. The place in *Daniel* is in *Chap. vii. 11.* as was well noted by *Jos. Scaliger* in *Not. ad Fragm. p. 11.* and not in *Chap. v.* But this I should not observe, if the foregoing and following things did not shew that our Author, in collecting this medly, was extremely careless beyond what he uses to be, and did not think it worth while to look into the places in the Writers themselves. He says afterwards, "*Megasthenes* out of *Abydenus* calls the King of *Babylon* *Δαβακωταγγουός*. On the contrary, *Abydenus* produces the words of *Megasthenes*, in *Eusebius Lib. xi. c. 41.*

IX. I easily believe the punishment of the Club, even to Death, was used among the *Greeks* and *Babylonians*. But our Author's *τυμπατισμὸς*, as he describes it, was no where used; nor can any thing be alledged in his favour out of *Justin*, who subjoined a synonymous Verb to the Verb *ἀνεψυχέθαι*, thinking there was no difference between them; after which manner both he and other Fathers often cite the Scripture. The place is in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, p. 248.

X. Nothing could have been more impertinently alledged by the Doctor, to prove that his *τυμπατισμὸς* was in use among the *Romans*, than the passage of *Eusebius*, or rather of the Churches of *Vienna* and *Lyons*, out of *Lib. v. c. 1.* of *Eusebius*. For after he had said that the Emperor had written word, that those who professed the Christi-



an Religion ought τυμπανίζονται, describing the manner how the Prefident had executed the Emperors orders, he says: ἐπι μὲν ἐδόξαν πολιτείας Παρμαίων ἐργάσθαι, τέτων ἀπέτεμεν τὰς κεφαλὰς, τὸς δὲ λοιπὸς ἔτεμεν εἰς θηρία: all that were judged to have been made free of the City of Rome, he cut off their Heads, and the rest he sent to the wild Beasts. Where is here our Author's τυμπανισμός? Christopherson missed him; who had rendred the word *tympanis torqueri*, which is justly censured by *H. Valesius*, with whom yet I should not render it *gladio cædi*, for those who were condemned to be devoured by wild Beasts, ἐτυμπανίζοντο as well as those who were beheaded.

XI. Not only our Author, but also the great *Grotius* did not know what τυμπανίζεσθαι signified in this place, who on 2 *Maccab.* vi. 19. conjectures that the τυμπανον was *fidicula quibus pellis humana ita tendebatur, quomodo bubula in tympano, & qui sic cruciabantur dictos τυμπανίζεσθαι; little Cor's whereby a Mans skin was stretched so, as the Skin of an Ox on a Drum, and those who were so tormented were said, &c.* But both the reason of the word and use are plainly against him, as will appear to any one that reads *Gataker*, whom I will not transcribe. I shall only add, that in the Old Glosses τυμπανον is rendred *scimpio*, which is a corrupt Writing for *scipio*, a Staff.

Verf. 37. Note i. I wonder our Author here cites Copies which no one else has mention'd. I mistrust they are Conjectures, which he imposes upon us for various Lectiōns. *Beza* affirms that it is so read in all his Copies, and there is no variety of reading observed in the *Oxford Edition*, but of one Copy in which this word is wanting. The same *Beza* conjectures that we might read ἐπεσώθησαν, they were burnt; and *Tanaquillus Faber* in *Ep. Crit.* Lib. ii. Ep. 14. ἐπιεσώθησαν, they were maimed or dismembred, which kind of punishment was common among the Eastern People. The Reader may chuse which of these he pleases, either of them being better than the received reading.

Verf. 40. Note k. I. If we should admit the reasonings of *Dr. Hammond*, about the signification of the words κρείττον π, so as to grant they signified tranquillity in this World, and the perpetual duration of the Christian Church; yet we could not allow him, that this may be referred to the times of the Apostles. For what tranquillity did the Christians enjoy for three Ages, greater than the Jews, from the beginning of their Commonwealth to this time? It's true, the Jews in so many Ages suffer'd various Calamities, but they had also long intervals of Rest and Prosperity, such as the Christians for 300 Years never enjoyed, as the Scripture informs us; as in the reigns of *Davjd* and *Solomon*, and other Kings. Did the Christi-



ans enjoy so great tranquillity after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, that there never had been any tranquillity in the Jewish Commonwealth, than which that short rest (if it were any) was not *κρείττον τι*? But who does not know that the Christians from that time were often grievously persecuted, tho not by the *Jews*, yet by the *Heathens*, till the time of *Constantine*? If therefore we would interpret *κρείττον τι* of a quiet Profession of the Christian Religion, that were not to be referred, at least principally, to any time, which preceded the Reign of *Constantine*, but to *his* age, and the following ages hitherto; because since that time the Christian Religion has flourished so, that nothing like it was ever seen in the Commonwealth of the *Jews*. See my Note on *Luke* i. 73.

II. The *ε'παγγελία*, which the antient *Jews* had not received, I chuse rather, with *Grotius* and others, to understand of the resurrection of the Body, and the entire and *τέλεια* perfect Happiness of the whole man; which none had yet enjoyed, except *Enoch* and *Elias*, and perhaps *Moses*, and a few others that were risen with Christ. That Promise is contained in these words, *I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, as Christ shews. God provided better for us Christians, than to raise them, whose Faith is commended in the Old Testament, from the dead, and make them completely happy, *χαρις ἡμῶν*. So that *κρείττον τι πρὸς ἡμῶν προσβλέψασθαι*, is not so much to provide better things for us, than for the *Jews*, as if we were to receive any thing which they are not to receive as to the substance of the thing; but to have a greater regard to us Christians than to the *Jews*, whom God would not raise from the dead, and make perfectly happy, before the Christians. Those are said *τελειωθῆναι*, who are made happy both in Soul and Body, when such whose Souls only are made happy, enjoy but an *ἀτελής* imperfect Happiness in comparison with them.

## C H A P. XII.

Verf. 1. I. **T**O understand what the word *ὑπείστασις* signifies, it must in the first place be observed that the Verb *πεύσασθαι* very often signifies *circumstare*, to stand about, and passively *circumsisti*, *circumveniri*, to be surrounded, or beset. And hence comes *πεύσαστος*, *circa quem statur*, one who is surrounded. So *Suidas*; *Πεύσαστοι*. *Ἰσχυροίτις ἐν τῷ πρὸς ἀντιδόσεως; Θαυματοποιῆται ταῖς ἰδὲν ὠφελείαις, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀνοήτων πεύσαστοις γινόμεναις ἀντὶ τῶν πρὸς ὧν κώκλω ἴσανται οἱ δεινόμενοι*: *Isocrates in his Oration about retribution: Juggling tricks that are of no use,*



ise, but are surrounded by a company of Fools; For, which the spectators Chapter  
stand about in a ring. This Harpocraton has, and adds: τὸ ὄνομα καὶ ἐν XII.  
'Αρχιδάμω ἐστὶ καὶ παρ' Εὐπύλιδι ἐν κόλαξι. And on the word *περίστασις* he says, *περίστατον μεταποιεῖν*. If we  
add a privative, *ἀπερίστατος* will be one that no body stands about, such as  
those who have no Friends or Relations, nor any to assist them in the  
management of their Affairs. This *Hesychius* had expressed, but his  
words are corrupted: 'Απερίστατον, μωρὸν, ἀφορμὰς μὴ ἔχον. It should be *μόνον,*  
*ἀφορμὰς μὴ ἔχον,* alone, not having assistance or means. So it must be rendred,  
not as it is by our Author, who translates these words absurdly. In  
which sense the word *ἐπιείσατο* is taken in the words of *Georgius A-*  
*lexandrinus* alledged by our Author; and that Notion ought not to have  
been confounded with the Rhetorical Notion, which *Dr. Hammond*  
mentions. These things supposed, *εὐπείσατο* will be properly one  
whom others easily stand about or encompass; and because *πείσειμαι* sig-  
nifies metaphorically to be circumvented, that is, to be deceived or pres-  
sed with difficulties, *εὐπείσατο* is one that is easily circumvented. So *Sui-*  
*das*: *Εὐπείσατον, μωρὸν, τυχῶς πειτρειπόμενον* a foolish man who is easily turn-  
ed or wound about, that is, deceived. He adds the words of the A-  
postle. So *Hesychius*: *εὐπείσατον, εὐκόλον, εὐκερῆ,* easy, viz. to be circum-  
vented and overcome. *Phavorinus* also interprets it *τὴν εὐκόλως πειτρειπο-*  
*μένην,* her that is easily deceived. So that in this place, where agoni-  
stical words are used, I am apt to think that *εὐπείσατον* signifies,  
which is easily circumvented, that is, overcome; because all that ran,  
and suffer'd themselves to be easily circumvented, were by that means  
sure to be overcome; for they who had circumvented them came first  
to the end of the race. And Sin is called *εὐπείσατον*, because those  
who are infected with it, are easily conquer'd, and terrified by diffi-  
culties, from persisting constantly in their Christian Course.

II. It is true indeed that *περίστασις* signifies sometimes a case wherein a  
man is in great danger of his life [as in the place cited out of *Dio-*  
*genes Laertius*] and that among Rhetoricians a *ζήτημα* or question is  
called *εὐπείσατον* which is proposed without any circumstances; but all  
this is nothing to this place, and is a mere medly of undigested  
Learning, or rather of a man groping as it were in the dark, and  
seeking for the signification of a word, where it was not to be sought  
for. In the place of *St. Chrysoptom*, *εὐπείσατο* is clearly taken in an  
Active sense, not in a Passive: for *ἰσαδοῦν* has an Active signification as  
often as a Passive; and that an Active one must be assigned to it in this  
place, appears evidently by the following Active Participle *καταβάλλ-*  
*ασσα.* But *St. Chrysoptom* is mistaken; for almost all such Nouns have

Chapter a Passive signification, because they are derived from the third person  
 XII. of the Preterperfect tense Passive. So εὐπίσσευτο, easily passable, εὐποίη-  
 ντο, well done, εὐπίταστο, which is easily expanded, ἀπεπίτερετο, which is  
 easily subverted, ἀπεπίστετο, easy to be beheld, ἀφαιρέσσετο, which is ea-  
 sily taken away, and innumerable others, which may be found in any  
*Lexicon*. St. Chrysostom interpreted this Passage in the Epistle to  
 the Hebrews by Conjecture, not by Grammatical Rules.

Verf. 2. Ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ.] That is, on the right side of that  
 inaccessible Light, which is a Symbol of the presence of the most high  
 God. See Note on *Mark* xvi. 19.

Verf. 3. Note b. κόμην is properly to be tired, and metaphorically  
 to faint or languish, because when a man is excessively tired, his strength  
 fails him. So in the *Apothegm* of *Coriolanus*, κόμην is to have his  
 strength fail him, or to do that which fainting persons use to do; for  
 when those who stood by him besought him ἰσὸς τὴν καμῆτα βαρὺν ὄντα καὶ  
 τελευτήτων, ἀναχωρεῖν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον, that being burden'd with labours and  
 Wounds, he would retire into the Camp: εἰπὼν δ' ἑκάλετο, ὅτι νικούντων ἔκ' ἐστὶ τὸ  
 κόμην, ἐφάπετο τοῖς φεύγουσι: he saying that it was not the part of Con-  
 querors to be overcome by weariness, pursued them that fled. These  
 Words are found in *Plutarch* in the Life of *Coriolanus* p. 218. Ed. *Wec-  
 chel*. T. 1. I cannot tell whether our Author read them in the Writer  
 himself, it's certain he sets down the saying of *Coriolanus* otherwise  
 than *Plutarch*. However that be, κόμην signifies, as I said, to be tired;  
 secundarily to do that which tired persons use to do, as in this place  
 of the Epistle to the Hebrews; as to desist from running, to quit the  
 Field, that is, to betake ones self to another Course of Life.

Ibid. Note c. For *Jerem.* xxxv. we must read *Isai.* xxxv. which  
 place had bin cited by *Grotius* and others.

Verf. 4. Note d. Here our Author confounds σκιμαζία, that is, a  
 vain fighting with ones own Shadow, with skirmishing, or ἀνεσβολισμὸς,  
 which are not the same among the antient Greeks.

Verf. 16. Note f. That which is here produced out of the *Rab-  
 bins* I have shewn to be vain on *Gen.* xxv. 31. *Esau* was certainly  
 profane in this, that he despised the last Benediction of his Fa-  
 ther, as thinking it to be of less value than a Mess of Pottage.

Verf. 23. Note h. There may also be an allusion here to *Exod.* iv.  
 22. where *Israel* is said to be God's Firstborn, because of the peculiar  
 benefits which God had conferred upon him. For the *Christian*  
*Church* succeeded in the place of *Israel* according to the flesh.



Ibid. *Note i.* This is a figurative expression, of which I have spoken Chapter XII. on *Exod.* xxxii. 32. God is represented to have as it were a Book, in which he writes down his peculiar Favourites: as Kings have Registers of the names of those whom they imploy in their service, or upon whom they confer any benefits.

Ibid. *Note k.* I easily believe this phrase was taken from the use of the *Jews*; but our Author who looks here besides for I know not what Agonistical sense, ought to have produced at least one place, in which τελευτήμην signified a Conqueror in the Games; which he could not do. And therefore he ought to have been contented with what he had borrowed from *Grotius*, about the use of the *Jews*.

*Verf. 24. Note l.* I. Our learned Author would have done much better if he had followed *Grotius*, what he here says being either wrested or affirmed without reason. To begin with his last words, I will not say that the authority of the Writers of Liturgies, whoever they be, is of little moment to the explication of particular places of Scripture; because they had scarce any tincture of Critical Learning, as every one knows. But I will say that our Author supposes here two things, which may be called into question. First, that a bloody Sacrifice was offer'd up by *Abel*, which is uncertain, as I have shewn on *Gen.* iv. 4. Secondly, that all the Sacrifices were *Types*, that is, in the language of our modern Divines, Prefigurations of the Sacrifice of Christ; which if denied, can be proved by no Argument: tho I acknowledg there was some likeness between them, in which sense they might be called *Types* and *Shadows* of the Sacrifice of Christ, because of their Similitude, not because of a design to prefigure one by the other, which no one knew of. Yet our Author, in his Paraphrase, attributes his own opinion to the Writer of this Epistle, who has nothing at all here about that matter. See my Note on *1 Cor.* x. 3.

II. The efficacy of *Christ's* Sacrifice is not compared here with the efficacy of *Abel's* Sacrifice; but the thing which *Abel* called for (whether by his own, or the Blood of Sacrifices) with the thing which Christ demands. And therefore the word is κείτ'ῶν better things, which cannot be referred to efficacy, and respects nothing but what Christ obtained. But it is said, the design of this Epistle is to shew the preeminence of the Gospel above the Law. I do not deny it, but every particular word does not tend to that design; for there are also a great many things intermix'd in it foreign to that design. So that I had rather with most Interpreters, look upon these words as an allusion to what is said of *Abel* in *Chap.* xi. 4. which opinion is manifestly confirmed by the Verb λαλῶν used in both places. For as there *Abel* is said

Chapter said ἀπεθανὼν ἔτι ΛΑΛΕΙΣΘΑΙ, because of his Blood, which in *Gen. iv.* XIII. 10. is said to *have cried unto God from the Earth*: So here the Blood of Christ κρείττονα ΛΑΛΕΙΝ than *Abel*, or than the Blood of *Abel*.

Verf. 25. Τὸν ὄντι τῆς γῆς — χρηματίζοντα, — ἢ ἀπ' οὐρανῶν.] I. The ὁ ὄντι τῆς γῆς χρηματίζων is undoubtedly a Periphrasis of *Moses*, but he is not to be thought to have spoken from *Mount Sinai*, when he ἐχρηματίζε, gave *Oracles*, from which he himself said nothing; but in the *Camp*, when he heard the Responses of God from the Sanctuary, which he afterwards declared to the People.

II. The ὁ ἀπ' οὐρανῶν docs not seem to be *Christ*, who for the most part taught the Gospel upon *Earth*; tho sometimes also, but rarely, he revealed himself to the Apostles from Heaven after his Resurrection. I rather think it is to be understood, with *Grotius*, of those Voices which came from Heaven on the behalf of *Christ*, mention'd in *Mat. iii. 17.* & *xvii. 5.* and elsewhere.

### C H A P. XIII.

Verf. 4. **D**es. *Erasmus* and *Nicol. Zegerus* had gone before our Note a. Author in this Interpretation, but *Beza* objects against it the following words: πόνους ὃ καὶ μοιχὰς κενεῖ ὁ Θεός, where if that interpretation be allowed, εὖ must be taken for εἰ, in this manner: *Let Marriage be honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled, for Fornicators and Adulterers God will judg.* I am of opinion the Antients read εἰ for εὖ, as it is in a Greek and Latin Copy, and in the *Vulgar* Translation which has *enim*; and that this was changed into εὖ by those who did not think these words were an Exhortation.

Verf. 9. Note d. When our Author made this collection, he does not seem to have looked into *Acts xv. 40.* where *to be commended or deliver'd to the Grace of God*, is without doubt to be recommended by Prayer to the divine Goodness. Besides, the words which he produces as following, are in *Acts xiv. 26.* But he seems to have fallen into a mistake, because there is also the same expression in this latter place of the *Acts*, immediately preceding them: *And thence sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, for the Work which they fulfilled.* But here παραδιδόσθαι τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ, is not to be sent to preach the Gospel, but to be recommended by Prayer to the divine Grace; tho this had been done, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* might preach the Gospel with success.

Verf. 10. Ἐξ ἧς φαρσίν ἔκτερον ἐξέσταν οἱ τῆ σκηνῆ λατρεύοντες.] He alludes to the Sacrifices offer'd up on the day of Expiation, as every one sees.

But



But to make the series of the Discourse clear, he should have expressed Chapter what is here to be understood, and upon which that which follows XIII. depends. Christ is an expiatory Sacrifice, which we must eat, that we may have an interest in the efficacy of it, as we are taught by Christ in *John* vi. 50. and *seqq.* But by the Mosaical Rites, no Man tasted of such a Sacrifice, so that they who desire to be dealt with by God according to that Law, cannot partake of the Expiation made by Christ. This is the reasoning of the Writer of this Epistle, of which he has only expressed the two last Propositions, by which omission the series of the Discourse is made obscure. But it will be said perhaps, that there is an ambiguity in this reasoning in the word *φάγω*, because the Christians did no more eat of the Flesh of Christ, properly speaking, than the Jews of the expiatory Sacrifices. I acknowledg there is that ambiguity; but the Sacred Writer did not urge this Argument as a demonstration. It is a reasoning which properly proves nothing against Men of other Sentiments, but illustrates only the Christian Doctrin after the Jewish manner; of which kind there are a great many in this Epistle, as I have already elsewhere observed. That which follows in this place, is of the same kind.

Verf. 11. [*Ὁτι γὰρ εἰσφάγεσθαι ζῶον, &c.*] Our Anthor in his Paraphrase says that *the Jews themselves acknowledged* that the expiatory Sacrifices *typified* or prefigured the *Messias*. I wish he had produced a passage out of some Antient Jew, in which that was affirmed; for no one will believe him saying this rashly. For my part I cannot persuade my self that the Jews had any such Thoughts; whose greatest Argument against Jesus his being the *Messias*, was his Death; and the Gospels sufficiently shew they imagin'd no such thing of the *Messias*.

Verf. 15. Note c. I. It being undeniable by all learned Men, that the *Septuagint* very often read the Hebrew otherwise in their Copy, than we do now in ours, what need is there with Mr. *Pocock*, of inventing forced interpretations, rather than acknowledg what is easy and plain? There is much more probability in their opinion, who think the *Septuagint* read (with a difference in the division of the Letters) פִּרְי מִשְׁפַּת יָדוֹ, *fruit out of our Lips*, or blotting out *is the fruit of our Lips*. Nor must it be thought, that because *κατασπαράσσει* and *κατασπαράσσεται* are derived from the root *κατασπαρῶ*, therefore those words may be confounded. For *κατασπαράσσει* & *κατασπαράσσεται* are immediately deduced from *κατασπαρῶ*, which is properly to be *gathered*, and is applied to *Fruits*; then, because Fruits after they are gathered are consumed, it signifies *to consume*, by which signification we are to explain the two former words, as al-

Chapter so their Compounds ἐλοχάσπισ & ἐλοχάσπιμα, which are often in the XIII. Version of the *Septuagint* used for whole Burnt-offerings. The same Interpreters render the Verb אכל *to eat* κασπέσαι in *Jos. v. 12*. So also they render the Verb בער *to burn* in *Deut. xxvi. 12*. So that κασπῖσις & κασπίμα may signify a whole Burnt-offering, tho the word κασπῖς do not occur in that signification; because that word is not deduced from κασπέσαι, as the two former are.

II. The Rabbinical reason, why some Holocausts should be called קיי *summer Fruit*, I do not value a rush, because it is not certain that it is an antient Phrase. For that giving of thanks is here called κασπῖς, signifies nothing to the name of Holocausts, which elsewhere are always called by other names. Besides, it is utterly false that Holocausts, which were the chief and daily Sacrifices, never to be omitted, as appears from *Num. xxviii.* could be look'd upon as a Banquet over and above the prescribed Feast. In fine, who will believe that in this one place of *H. s. xiv. 2.* κασπῖς is used for an Holocaust, which is constantly called κασπίσις and κασπίμα, or by other names; and that this happen'd accidentally in a place where we may reasonably suppose the *Septuagint* read the Hebrew word פרי *phri*, which properly signifies Fruit? They who can believe such things, after due examination, must either have spoiled their judgment with a continual reading of *Arabic* or *Rabbinical* Trifles, as some have done; or else be naturally dull.

III. And therefore our Author, not willing to rely upon Mr. *Pococks* conjecture, turns himself to other things; but 1<sup>st</sup>, he is certainly mistaken in thinking the *Septuagint* used the single word κασπῖς, only because it yielded the same sense with κασπίμα, as sufficiently appears by what I have already said: 2<sup>dly</sup>, he is mistaken in thinking that זכה תורה is Praise expressed with the Mouth. It was a kind of Sacrifice, in which a Victim was offered no less than in others. 3<sup>dly</sup>, it is a mistake that the *Septuagint* have thrice rendred the word אשם so as he says; for that word is twice only found in *Levit. vii. 1, 2.* Besides, our learned Author was deceived by a false distinction of the Chapters in the Version of the *Septuagint*, which do not answer the Hebrew in the *Polyglot* Bibles. The Version of the three first Verses of *Chap. vii.* of *Leviticus*, in the Hebrew, is in that Edition of the *Septuagint*, *Chap. vi. 31, 32, 33.* where אשם is rendred rightly κείνς τῶ πλουμείας. That which is in the same Edition in *Chap. vii. 1, 2, 3.* answers to *vers. 11, 12, 13,* of *Chap. vii.* in the Hebrew, and we do not there find the word אשם *ascham*, but the words עלמים and תורה *salutaria & celebratio*, which bring *Salvation*, and *celebrating*. The *Septuagint* have nowhere rendred אשם by καπίσις.

IV. The



IV. The Offerings joined with the celebration of the *Eucharist* are without doubt pious, and the practice of the Christian Church in that particular, both heretofore and now, very commendable; but I do not think there is any reference here had to those Oblations, which cannot but very harshly, and if I may so speak, *ἀποπροσίνως*, in the dialect of *Dr. Hammond*, be called *the fruit of the lips*. But in the following Verse there is mention made of *Liberality*. What then? Can't that be a new Precept? By all this it appears to how little purpose *Dr. Hammond's* Collection is in this place.

# A N N O T A T I O N S

## ON THE

### General Epistle of St. *James* the Apostle.

**A**T the end of the *Premou.*] I. I am apt to think the title of *Ἀπόστολος* was not added to the name of *James*, in the Apostolical times; wherein no one was called an Apostle simply and without any addition, besides Apostles properly so stiled, that is, men called by Christ himself; as appears by the constant use of *St. Paul*. The use of following Ages I do not regard, nor the judgment of *Theodore*, which is confirmed by no antient Example. So that I think this Inscription to be of a later date than the Age of the Apostles.

II. It is much more probable that *St. James* was killed in the Year of *Christ* LX. as *Art. Pagus* on that year has shewn, in *Epieriji B. I. roniand.*

III. The passages in this Epistle, which our Author understands of the *Gnosticks* and the destruction of the *Jews*, are as fitly interpreted by others, of any bad men whatsoever, or any other Judgments of God. Of which matter, it will be more proper to speak on those passages themselves.

Verf. 3.  $\Delta$  *Ὀκίμῳ ὑμῶν ἡ πίστις κατεργάζεται εἰς ὑμᾶς ὑπομονήν.*] This is generally interpreted, *the trying of your faith*, as if it were ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; but it is harsh to transpose the Pronoun ὑμῶν; and without any Transposition these words will have the same sense, if they be rendered thus: *the tryal of you worketh patience of faith*, that is patience proceeding from faith, as *ὑπακούσις πίστεως* is *obedience proceeding from faith*. Yet there is a like transposition observable in 1 Pet. i. 7. in this very Phrase, unless perhaps in both places for ὑμῶν ἡ we ought to read ὑμετέρας.

Verf. 6. Note a. I have a suspicion that Dr. *Hammond*, when he first set about the explication of the New Testament, began with the explanation of this Epistle, because his stile is harsher and more intricate than ordinary, which yet is every where very much neglected; and because besides there are a great many things here violently and by straining deduced from the words of St. *James*. In his Paraphrase he represents him speaking what he pleases, because he departs far from his words, and in his Annotations he wrests them with forced conjectures.

I. It is false that in *vers. 9.* the discourse is about sufferings; and tho' that should be granted, it would not follow that the four antecedent Verses belong to the same matter, because in this Epistle there are divers Precepts often set one after another without any order or connexion, as well as in other Apostolical Epistles. These holy men speak those things which they thought would be useful to those whom they wrote to, without observing any method, which is not necessary in such Writings and Admonitions.

II. If the Apostle had intended to say what our Author would have him, he would have expressed his mind thus; *αἰτέτω ἐν πίστι ὁ θεός*, and not said simply *αἰτέτω ἐν πίστι*, which is, *let him ask with faith*; that is, believing that God can and will do good to us, and grant us every thing that is necessary; or not doubting concerning the divine Promises. This is properly that Faith which is to be joined with our Prayers.

Verf. 8. *ἡ διδουχία.*] That is, doubting concerning the divine Promises. *Clemens*, in *Epist. 1.* to the *Corinthians*, cap. xi. says, that *Let's Wife* disagreeing with her Husband, was changed into a Statue of Salt, *εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν εἶναι πᾶσιν. ὅτι αἱ διδουχίαι καὶ αἱ ὑποκρίσεις αὐτῆς τῆς Θεοῦ δύναμεις εἰς ἄβυσσον καὶ εἰς ὑπερηφανίαν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἰσχυροῖς ἵεροῖς: that all might know, that double-minded persons, and such as doubt concerning God's Power,*





are for a *condemnation and sign to all generations*. The same *Clemens* uses the Verb *διψυχίειν* in the same sense with *διστάζειν*, cap. 23. *Μὴ διψυχῆσθε, μηδὲ ἰνδυναλλέσθε ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐπιβραβεύσεσιν καὶ ἐνδοξοῖς δωρεαῖς αὐτοῦ. Πλὴν γινέσθω ἀπὸ ἡμῶν ἡ γρηγορὴ αὐτῆ, ὅπως λέγει· ταλαίπωροί εἰπὼν εἰ διψυχεῖ, εἰ διστάζετε τὴν ψυχὴν, &c.* *Let us not be double minded, and let not our Soul be fixate about his excellent and noble Gifts. Far be from us that Scripture where it is said: Miserable are the double minded, they that are of a doubtful Heart, &c.* The same Verb is used by *Barnabas* cap. xix. in the way of Light: *Οὐ μὴ διψυχίσης πότερον ἔσαι, ἢ ἔ:* *do not doubt whether it shall come to pass, or not.* *Hesychius: Διψυχία, ἀπορία, doubting.* In the same sense we more than once meet with the word *dubius* in *Herma's Pastor*. See *Lib. iii. Simil. ix. §. 21.*

Verf. 9. Note b. I. Tho *joy and boasting* are usually joined together, yet those words ought not to be confounded, as if they had the same signification, which really differ; because there may be joy without boasting, and this place manifestly requires the notion of *boasting* properly so called; which is opposed to *ταπείνωσις*, *humiliation*, and is joined with *ὑψὺς* *height*. For if we may mix things which have an affinity with one another, we shall make strange confusion; and here the elegance of *St. James* his saying will be all lost. *Let the Brother that is low boast in his height*; that is, that he is a Christian, than which nothing can be more honourable, if we rightly consider the thing: but on the other hand rich Men, whose confidence in their Riches generally makes them proud, ought *ἐρυθραῖν καὶ ἀιοχύνεσθαι ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτῶν*, *to blush and be ashamed in their humility*, that is, because of their low and base disposition, in putting confidence in earthly and fading things. There is a double *Antithesis* here observable; for first the *ὑψὺς* of the poor Man is opposed to the *ταπείνωσις* of the rich, and secondly the *καύχησις* of the former to the *ἀιοχύνω* of the latter. For tho there be no Verb joined with *ἐν ταπεινώσει*, the manner of the opposition shews that some such thing must necessarily be understood, as *Crotius* and other Interpreters have well observed. And nothing can be better opposed to *boasting* than shame: So that we must supply, with *Oecumenius, ἀιοχύνεσθαι*. To this sense which necessarily arises from the very words of *St. James*, our Author's Paraphrase makes nothing; in which he expresses his own forced conceptions, and not the mind of *St. James*.

II. What is here said of the dispositions of poor and rich Men, has not any special relation to persecution for the sake of Religion, but may be said of them at any time. For as poor Men ought always, to keep themselves from being cast down, to think how honourable a Condi-  
tion

Chapter 10. it is to be a true Christian, and to *boast in the Lord*; so rich Men, if they are conscious to themselves of putting confidence in their Riches, ought at all times to be ashamed of the vileness of such a disposition.

III. But the particle  $\delta\epsilon$ , if Dr. Hammond may be judg, shews these words must be connected with what goes before. But  $\delta\epsilon$  here is put for  $\eta$ , because there follows another  $\delta\epsilon$ , and the words are to be rendered thus: *Let the Richer indeed that is low, boast in his height; but the Richer shall be ashamed in his being low.* We meet with a great many examples in the best Writers, where when  $\delta\epsilon$  occurs twice, the first is taken for  $\eta$ , as the manner of the opposition shews. See *Hebr. Septuagint.*

Verf. 17. *Note c.* If there were any thing here to be alter'd, I should chuse to read  $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ , *in his Riches*, that is, together with his Riches.

Verfes 16, 17.  $\alpha\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ , &c.] Our Author in his Paraphrase obtrudes his *Gnosticks* here upon us, of whom there is not the least mention or scotie, in *St. James*. So Men see in the Clouds what they please.

Verf. 21.  $\alpha\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$   $\delta\epsilon$   $\epsilon\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\omega$   $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omega\upsilon$ .] Here again our learned Author forces his *Gnosticks* upon us, as if there were none that could be charged with *superbia* and *peccata carnalis*, but the *Gnosticks*. *St. James* alludes to Circumcision, in which the filthy and superfluous Skin was cast away, not to any peculiar practices of the *Gnosticks*.  $\text{Ὁ ἐμμενῶς ἄλγος}$  is a word which is ingrafted in the Minds of its Hearers, that is, takes as it were root in them, if they receive it with *Meekness*, that is, with a teachable Mind. This word is used also, in the same sense, by *Barnabas* Epist. cap. ix.  $\text{Ὁς ἐστὶν ὁ τὴν ἐμμενῶν, εὐαγγέλιον ἢ διδασκίαν αὐτῷ δέμενῶς ἐν ἡμῶν: he knows, who has put into us the ingrafted Gift of his Doctrin. Where the old Interpreter mistranslates the word  $\epsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\varsigma$  by *naturale*, which he has also in the beginning of that Epistle, where the Greek is wanting.$

Verf. 23. *Note e.* Without doubt the former interpretation is the more probable, if not also true. But I had rather,

I. Understand  $\alpha\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$  of a *natural Countenance*, not as it is opposed to a *Mask* or *Mask*, but as opposed to a painted face. For Maskers do not use to behold their *Masks* in a Glass, but their *Faces*. I might say that Dancers, and other effeminate Men, corrupted the natural colour of their Countenances with Paint; but  $\alpha\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$  seems to be taken here for  $\alpha\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$  *lomo*, as it is often in Poets, so as to comprehend also Women.



II. I do not think St. *James* speaks as well of that which is *usually* Chapter done, as of that which *might* be done. For he compares them who II. having heard the Word, retain the Vices which the Word condemns, with those who seeing the stains of their countenance in a Glass, should not wash them off; which being accounted a piece of Madgeis and Absurdity, they must also necessarily be accounted Fools and Madmen, who when they observe their Vices represented and condemned in the Doctrin of the Gospel, do not think of forsaking them. The former is very seldom done, the latter too frequently; because Men take more care of their Bodies, than of their Souls. They are offended with the spots of their Face, but they are not offended with the blemishes of their Minds.

Verf. 27. *Note f.* This might all be admitted, if it were certain that none but the *Gnosticks* thought Religion to consist rather in Faith than in Practice. But who told Dr. *Hammond* that, among those who lived in the *Apostolical Churches*, there were none who turned the *Grace of God into lasciviousness*?

## C H A P. II.

Verf. 1. *Note a.* **I** Do not think there is a respect here had to the *Shechinah*, for the *Glory of Christ* signifies rather in this place his Kingdom, as Dr. *Hammond* himself seems to have observed. So that I take the meaning of this Verse to be this: “Ye who believe that Christ reigneth in Glory, ought not to have respect to Persons; because he promised to make the Poor, as well as the Rich, provided they believed and obeyed him, partakers of his Kingdom. See *vers. 5.*”

Verf. 2. *Note b.* I. To begin with this last remark, our learned Author ought to have told us where we might find the Jewish *Canon* he speaks of, and alledged the words of it themselves; but I am apt to think he had it only from the Mouth of some Jew, or learned Man that affirmed he had read it in the writings of the *Rabbins*. Where are the Christians, who having Controversies with *Jews*, and those of mean Condition, think fit to refer them to the judgment of a *Chacham*? Namely in the Kingdom of *Utopia*. Yet there is, I confess, a Jewish Canon to this purpose, tho not such as our Author speaks of, set down by *J. Henr. Hottinger*, out of *R. Levi Barcinonensis*, in *Leg. cxlii. Sæcis Hebraici*: *Let not one sit down, and the other stand; but let them both stand, because when they are before the Council, it is fit they should stand as if they were in the presence of the divine Majesty* ——— *let the Rabbins say that*

Chapter that if [the Council] will permit the contending parties to sit down, they may, which words must be understood of the time during which the Cause is continued; but *when* Sentence is pronounced, they are obliged to stand — but because it became the Custom in all the Consistories of the Israelites, that after the decision they were commanded to sit down, to avoid contention, tho' they were only Witnesses, they command them now also to sit down. *Heringer* lets down the Hebrew words, and refers the Reader to other places in the *Rabbins*.

II. I don't think that *καθημερι* in *v. s. 6.* signifies the seats of Christian Judges, or places in which they assembled; for a rich Man drawing a poor Christian before Christian Judges, could not be said *καθημερι* to oppress him, because it belonged to the Judges to restrain the rich Man's Anger. Besides, it is a mistake that *καθημερι* in *1 Cor. vi. 4.* signifies a Tribunal, as I have shewn on that place.

III. What our Author alledges, does by no means prove that *καθημερι* signifies Consistories of Christian Judges. For *first* none were Judges properly so called, but *Roman* Magistrates, or those of privileged Cities. *Secondly*, respect of Persons may have place not only in publick Judgments, but in any other; as when we entertain poor Men with scorn, whatever Gifts and Vertues they are endued with; and treat the rich with all kind of respect, because they are rich. *Thirdly*, if we suppose that the Controversies which arose between Christians, according to the advice of *St. Paul* in *1 Cor. vi.* were decided by Christian Judges; we must not dream here of Tribunals and Footstools set for those Judges. These were the appurtenances of Magistrates, not of private Men; unless perhaps it should be thought that Bishops, in that Age, pronounced sentence from some high place, like Magistrates; which none, I suppose, who understand these matters will say in good earnest. *Fourthly*, we become *καθημερι* or Judges of the dignity of Men, when we assign them Seats, as we think their Dignity requires; and when we have only a regard to Riches in this matter, then we imitate corrupt Judges. So that any may be called *καθημερι*, who do something like them. *Fifthly*, *καθημερι*, as I have said, did not belong to Christian Judges, but to Heathens; and therefore that word does not prove that the Discourse is here about Judges. *Lastly*, a variety of Seats does not belong so much to an assembly of Judges, as to a Congregation of many private Men, such as Ecclesiastical Meetings.

IV. So that it is much better to understand these words, with *Grotius* and other Interpreters, of a Church Assembly, in which *St. James*  
not



not without reason complains that the poorer sort were treated with too much contempt, and the rich with too much honour; for in those Assemblies at that time, when there were no Magistrates, who, upon the account of their Office, justly have the most honourable Seats allotted to them, it was absurd to have a regard merely to Riches. Those who sat there, were estimated by nothing but the name of Christians, and were admitted into those Assemblies because they were Christians, and not because they were Rich. And therefore no difference should have been made between Men as to the place of their sitting, barely upon the account of their possessions.

Verf. 4. Note c. I. To begin *ὑστερον προτερον*, *preposterously*, our learned Author is mistaken, when he says that the Verb *διακρίνεσθαι* is in the *middle voice*, which dropt from him before he was aware; for any Child knows that *διακρίθητε* is the first Aorist passive.

II. *Και* & might easily be a Hebraism for & interrogative, or *whether or no*, because in that Language the Particle *And* often abounds. It is plain, it is prefixed to interrogations in *Mat. xviii. 21.* and *Acts xxiii. 3.* from which it might be absent, without any prejudice to the sense. But I had rather in this place blot out *κὶ*, with the *Alexandrian Copy*, to which we may join perhaps the *Vulgar Interpreter*: *κὶ* here seems to have been added by some Transcriber, who did not sufficiently understand the series of the Discourse.

III. Nothing could have been invented more harsh, than that the *ὑπόθεσις* of the period should begin in *vers. 5.* *If ye have a respect, &c. — bear, my beloved Brethren, hath not God chosen? &c.* Besides, our Author without necessity fastens a Solecism upon St. James; for after five Verbs in the Subjunctive Mood had gone before, which are govern'd by the conditional Particle *εἰ*, he supposes that *διακρίθητε* and *ἐγένεθε* are subjoined in the same construction. *If any one come in, εἰσέλθῃ, having a gold Ring; and there come in also, εἰσέλθῃ δὲ, a poor Man; and ye have respect, ἐπιβλέψετε, to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say εἶπατε to the poor, Stand thou there; which words, according to Dr. Hammond's opinion, would be followed by these, and ye have not doubted in your selves, and are become judges, &c.* But to avoid a Solecism, St. James should have said *διακριθῆτε*, and *γένεθε*, in the Subjunctive Mood, whereas we have here two Indicatives, which I wonder our Author could join with the foregoing in the Subjunctive.

IV. *Διακρίθῆναι*, tho in the Passive voice, seems to be taken in an Active sense, as innumerable other Passives, in Greek Authors. So in *Herodian Lib. iv. c. 6.* *Οἱ στρατιῶται ὅτι βιάζεσθαι τε καὶ ἀρπάζειν λαβόντες ἕξασίαν ἕκαστι διακρίνοντο τίνες ἦσαν οἱ περιπεπίστερον φεγγαμένοι:* the Soldiers ha-

Chapter III. *ving obtained permission to exercise Violence and Rapine, did no longer distinguish who they were that had spoken insolently.* Accordingly the Apostle's meaning is this; *do not ye put a distinction within your selves,* between a rich and a poor Man, merely for the sake of Riches, with which one abounds, and the other is destitute? In a Church consisting of Christians, which at that time were all private Persons, there ought to have been an equality in seats, not a difference made according to Mens Estates; as if it had been the business of the Governors of Churches to take an account of Peoples Possessions, and according to their several Estates, to distribute them into several Classes. The thing it self requiring this sense, there is no need of seeking any other.

Vers. 24. *Ἐξ ἔργων δικαιῆται ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἔκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον.*] That is, no one is look'd upon by God as a good Man, merely because he believes the Christian Religion to be true; but besides that, its Precepts must be obeyed, that we may be accounted good Men, and become acceptable to God. St. James here opposes those who did not join a vertuous Life with the profession of Christianity. And St. Paul in his *Epistle to the Romans*, opposed the Jews who pretended that Men might become good and pleasing in the sight of God, by the mere observati- on of the Law of *Moses*; and shews that those who believe in God, and live piously, might be accounted just, and be in favour with God, without the performance of legal Works. See my Notes on *Rom.* iii. and iv.

### C H A P. III.

Vers. 1. *Note a.* **T**HE interpretation of *Grotius* seems to me to be much more natural, according to which St. James here forbids every one indifferently to aspire to the Office of a Teacher; because a severer account will be required of him that undertakes to teach others, and would have himself believed by the more ignorant, than if he were content to be wise for himself, or err alone, without endeavouring to make Profelytes of others. *Μεῖζον κῆμα λαμβάνειν* is not to have a greater Judg, but to receive the greater Judgment, that is, the greater Condemnation if we offend. So *λαμβάνειν πειωότερον κῆμα* is taken in *Mat.* xxiii. 14. *Luke* xx. 47. *Mark* xii. 40. see also *Rom.* xiii. 2. It concerns indeed every one to bridle their Tongue, lest they should condemn any rashly, but especially those who teach others; because their Judgments are most valued, and have the worst consequences attending them, if they are unjust. This makes both Pages in Ecclesiastical History, and a more wholesom Precept than this could



not have been given to Christians, which I wish they had suffer'd to Chapter  
sink down into their Minds! But there neither was of old, nor is at III.  
this day any thing more common than the rash judgments of διδάσκαλοι  
*masters.*

II. That long and nice Comparison of this place with others, in which either the same thing is not spoken of, or at least the Discourse is no more about the *Gnosticks* than the *Jews*, too much addicted to Judaism, or about other Men no better than they; that nice Comparison, I say, of those places does not prove that St. *James* here has a respect to the *Gnosticks*. Nay, I do not think, here and elsewhere, where the Apostles address themselves to Christians, living under Christian Bishops in Apostolical Churches, that Schismatics are referred to. See *vers.* 10. & 13.

*Verf.* 5. *Note b.* Οὕτω is certainly the beginning of an ἀπόδοσις here, and the Particle ἰδὲ of the ἀετίσσις. The sense is: As Horses are governed by a small Bridle, and a Ship by a small Stern, so the Tongue which is a little member, rules whole Societies. I do not see why we should depart from the natural signification of the particle οὕτω. But it is no wonder that our learned Author, whose stile is full of intricacies and windings, should make a difficulty where there was none.

*Verf.* 6. *Note c.* Our Author here follows *Grotius*. But the *Syriack* Interpreter seems rather to have rendred the place, corrupted, as he thought it should be understood, than as he read it, because all the Copies contradict him. Besides, he rendred it otherwise than the *Doctor* says, for he has: *and the Tongue is a Fire, and a world of Iniquity is like a Wood.* *Grotius* had not carefully enough look'd into that Interpreter, and Dr. *Hammond* rashly followed him. When I read this place, I can hardly forbear thinking that a Gloss out of the Margin crept into the Context; and if it be cast out, both a useless repetition will be avoided, and the series of the Discourse very proper thus: Ἰδὲ ὀλίγον πῦρ ἢ λίαν ὕλην ἀνάπτει; καὶ ἕτως ἡ γλῶσσα καθίσταται ἐν πῖσι μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, ἢ σπιλῆσα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα, καὶ φλογίζουσα τὴν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως: *behold how great a matter a little Fire kindleth; and so the Tongue is among our Members, which defileth the whole Body, setting on Fire the wheel of our Generation (genituræ nostræ.)* As there is nothing wanting in this sentence, so there is nothing superfluous. *First*, the word ἕτως shews that thence we must begin the ἀπόδοσις of the comparison, as in the foregoing Similitudes; in which the ἀετίσσις is begun with the Particle ἰδὲ, and the ἀπόδοσις with the Conjunction ἕτως, as it is here. *Secondly*, the words which signify the same thing, and have no coherence with one another,

Chapter ther, being unnecessarily interposed between the parts of the Similitude, are cast out; for ἡ γὰρ ὅλη ὁμοίωσις signifies the same with the whole Similitude, and καὶ οὕτως ἀδύνατος plainly spoils the connexion of the Discourse.

But how should these words come to be written in the Margin? *τοῦτο*, in this manner. Some body had expressed the substance of the whole Similitude in these two words ἡ γὰρ ὅλη ὁμοίωσις, and added them to the Margin of his copy; as many do, who to find out any thing the more easily, set down by way of Abridgment the subject spoken of in such or such a place, in the Margin of their Books. Then as an interpretation of *ὁ κόσμος*, he had added *ὁ κόσμος, the World, namely, is meant*; and had subjoined *τὴν ἀδύνατον*, to explain the word *τὴν γένεσιν*, understanding the *wheel of Generation* to signify the *wheel of Iniquity*; that is, a wicked and unregenerate Life, or such as the Life of Men *born*, but not *born* again. And these things having, not without some reason, been set down in the Margin, were rashly inserted into the Context.

Ibid. *καὶ ὁμοίωσις.*] This word I render *is*, according to its usual signification in good Authors. What a spark of Fire is, put among combustible matter, that the Tongue is among our Members.

Ibid. *Note d.* I have observed on *Mat. i. 1.* that the word *γένεσις* does not signify every event, and I must not repeat here what I have there said. I had rather understand by *τοῦτο γένεσις, the Wheel, or Chariot of Life*, so called, because at our *Nativity* we enter into that Chariot, and with restless *Wheels* run hastily, till we come to the *Grave*.

*Τοῦτο ὡς ἄμαρτος ἡ δὴ  
ὁμοίωσις τὴν γένεσιν ὁμοίωσις.* For like the Wheel of a Chariot  
Life runs rolling.

They are the words of *Anacreon* Od. iii. on himself.

*Verf. 17. Note f. I.* I have shewn on *Chap. ii. 4.* that our learned Author is mistaken, in the signification he attributes to the Verb *διανέμωμαι*. But tho' what he there says were true, it would not follow that the word *ἀδύνατος* ought to have a signification deduced from the middle Voice, because it comes from the third Person of the Preterperfect tense Passive *διανέμεται*, as every one knows.

II. But because the Passive conjugation of this Verb is taken both in a Passive and Active sense, *ἀδύνατος* may be taken also in either of these senses, according as the thing spoken of requires. Thus *Hesychius* first interprets *ἀδύνατος, μη ἕρπετα διάνατον, which has no difference,*

or



or makes no difference, in an active Notion. And then ἀδιάκευθ Chapter (not ἀδιάκοθ as it is commonly read) ἀδιαχώειθ, undistinguished, in IV. a Passive signification, as it is expounded also in the *Old Glosses*. So *Suidas*: ἀδιάκευθ, ἀδιαχώειθ · λαμβάνεται ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ γνωσκόντων τὰ δεόντα, ἢ ἀφρονῶς ἐλυθέντων: it is taken also for those who do not know what they ought to do, or that talk triflingly and foolishly. Here it is taken in an Active sense, but in a good one, for him that does good to all without distinction. For that other signification put upon it by Dr. *Hammond* is without example, and has no foundation in any ancient Grammarian.

Verf. 18. Note g. I do not think there is here any ἀντανόκλασις, for it is a Greek phrase which may be expressed in Latin thus: *Qui faciunt pacem illi serunt in pace fructus justitiæ, those that make Peace sow in Peace the fruits of Righteousness*; that is, they who promote Peace or Christian Concord, whilst they follow after Peace, sow as it were that Righteousness, the fruit of which they shall hereafter reap. For to sow the fruit of Righteousness, is all one as to do righteous Works, which shall be rewarded in their proper time. But St. *James* express'd himself somewhat harshly, when he said to sow Fruit for that which is ordinarily called sowing Seed, whence a Plant or Tree is produced, which afterwards brings forth Fruit. But he could not say to sow Fruit, that is, a Reward, without speaking very improperly.

## C H A P. IV.

Verf. 5. Note a. **H**OW forced what our Author here says after other Interpreters is, every one sees. I had rather say here what is sufficiently evident from several places of the New Testament, and of two very ancient Writers, *Barnabas* and *Clemens*, that in those times the Jews used to produce, as out of Scripture, not only the sense of places without regarding the words, but also a Jewish Tradition, or interpretation of places of Scripture. So that I should no more look for what is here said, in the Old Testament, than what is alledged in *Heb. xii. 21.* as spoken by *Moses* of himself, *I exceedingly fear and quake*, or what is said in *Barnabas* of the Scape Goat cap. vi. or in *Clemens* cap. xvii.

Verf. 6. Note b. It was a long while since Dr. *Hammond* had read *Virgil*, when he alledged his words in such a manner. He describes the Manners of the *Romans*, and not the part of Kings, *Aeneid. Lib. vi. l. 851. & seqq.*



*Tu regere Imperio populos Romane memento,  
Hæ tibi erunt artes, pacisque imponere morem,  
Parcere subiectis & debellare superbos.*

## C H A P. V.


Verf. 3. **I**F this Epistle had been written to the Jews, who lived in *Palestine*, Dr. Hammond's interpretation might be admitted; but what he says here does not agree to those of that Nation that were dispersed through the Roman Empire, for all the Jews every where were not killed by *Vespasian*. Those only who lived in *Palestine*, and the neighbouring Countries, and had risen up in Arms against the Romans, were destroyed by them. So that I rather think St. James here speaks of that day, which is much more truly called *the last*, and that his admonition is more general.

Verf. 7. Note b. Seeing the Jews, who in *Italy*, or in *Greece*, and other Provinces remote from *Judæa*, had embraced the Gospel, received no harm by the standing of *Jerusalem*, and the Jewish Commonwealth, nor any benefit by their Destruction; I do not see why they should be commanded to wait for this with patience. And therefore I rather think what the Apostle here says is to be understood of the last Judgment, which he speaks of as near at hand, because it was unknown when it was to be, and therefore every Age ought to look upon it as nigh. And it's certain as to particular Persons, Christ may truly be said to come, when he calls them by Death to Judgment.

Verf. 9. Note c. Seeing St. James does not speak here to the Jews who had embraced the Christian Faith in *Palestine*, but those who were ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ scattered abroad; I am apt to think he does not so much respect here the Vices of the Jewish Zealots, as of those Jews who lived in other places; which yet I do not deny to have followed the Example of the Zealots in *Palestine*.

Verf. 15. Note g. It is much better to understand here after ἀφεθίσεται αὐτῷ, his Sins by the Lord; that the Phrase may be entire thus: καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἢ πεποικωῶς, ἀφεθίσεται αὐτῷ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου: if he has committed Sins, his Sins shall be forgiven him by the Lord: There is no mention here of Ecclesiastical Punishments, but only of the miraculous curing of a Disease, and obtaining pardon from God, not from the Priest. So that what our Author here says about the Absolution of the Church, is foreign to this place. Whoever seriously endeavours to reform his past Life, and to make continual progress in Holiness, does not need the forgiveness of a Priest; on which Christ has no  
where



where taught that the Hope or Salvation of a Christian depends. Chapter  
 And whoever does not amend his sinful practices, would in vain re- V.  
 ceive all the Absolutions and Benedictions of all the Priests in the   
 World.

Verf. 16. *Note h.* Notwithstanding what our Author says, the word *ἀλλήλοις* shews the Discourse to be about a mutual confession of Faults between equals, or those who are reckon'd equals. *That* is the perpetual use of the Greek Language without any exception, as to the word *ἄλληλοις*; nor does the place alledged out of *1 Pet. v. 5.* prove the contrary, as I shall there shew. It is ridiculous to say that the Prayers of an Elder praying *ex officio*, are more effectual, than the Prayers of any good Man whatsoever that fears God; as if God granted the thing requested of him, for a Mans Office, and not for his Piety. And there is the same absurdity in saying that a Priest particularly laying open the Sins of his Brother to God, is the more likely by that means to prevail with him; as if God did not know what a Sinner stands in need of, or had promised more to such Prayers than to general ones. And little better is that which is added about *direction*, as if it were certain that Elders use to give better or more faithful advice in this matter, than any other pious and learned Men; when experience teaches us that they have no more discretion than others, and often use Religion only as a means to enrich themselves, or encrease their Authority.

---

ANNO.



# ANNOTATIONS

On the first Epistle General

Of *St. Peter* the Apostle.

**A**T the end of the *Prenon.*] I. I will not deny that *St. Peter* wrote this his first Epistle in that Year which *Baronius* affirms, for there is nothing said in it from which any certain judgment can be made of the time wherein it was written. But that *St. Peter* was then at *Rome*, is a mere invention of those who thought the falsehoods of the *Clementine Homilies* to be a true History. He seems not to have gone thither before the reign of *Nero*, as *Dr. Pearson* acknowledges in chap. viii. Diss. 1. concerning the Succession of the *Roman Bishops*. We may consult also about this matter *Lud. Cappellus* in *Append. Historiæ Apostolicæ*, and *Ant. Pagus* in *Baron. Epicyr.* on the years of Christ xliii. num. 2 & 3. and liv. num. 3. Yet I had rather say that this Epistle was written later, after *St. Paul* had preached the Gospel round about *Asia*; for before that time there do not seem to have been so many Christian Churches, to which *St. Peter* might write.

II. That by the name of *Babylon* we are not to understand *Rome*, but a City properly called by that name, is granted by *Dr. Pearson*, who also shews that the *Chaldean Babylon* was at that time desolate, and so that it is the *Egyptian Babylon* that is here meant. Those who desire to be fully satisfied in this matter, may consult *Dr. Pearson* himself.

## CHAPTER I.

Vers. 2. **E**ΙΣ ἁγιασµὸν καὶ ῥαντισµὸν.] Seeing there is a change here made in the form of the expression, and after these words ΕΝ ἁγιασµῷ τοῦ πνεύματος by sanctification of the Spirit, the Apostle immediately subjoins ΕΙΣ ἁγιασµὸν unto obedience, I am apt to think the difference of these Propositions must be observed, so as that this should be the sense; elect by Sanctification of the Spirit, that they might



might perform obedience, and that they might be sprinkled with the Blood of Christ. They are said here to be *elect*, who are separated from the rest of Mankind, not by some unknown Decree, but by the Spirit of Sanctification, whereby their Lives are amended, that they may become the People of God. Chapter I.

In the mean time I wonder here at Dr. *Hammond*, who compares ὑπακοὴν and ῥαντισμὸν with one another, as if they were both joined with αἵματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and were taken in a Passive sense. For ὑπακοὴ, when the Discourse is about one that obeys, is always taken Actively, and cannot here be taken otherwise. Besides, ὑπακοὴ is not joined with αἵματι, but stands alone; but ῥαντισμὸς is connected with αἵματι, and is taken in a Passive sense, for we do not sprinkle the Blood of Christ, but are our selves sprinkled with it. The thing is clear, and no one here could have stumbled, but our Author; who in these Annotations on the General Epistles, has surpassed himself in barbarousness of stile.

Verf. 4. Εἰς ὑμᾶς.] In this place I shall remark what is elsewhere often observable in these Writings, *viz.* that the Apostles frequently begin a sense without continuing it, and no otherwise connect their Discourse, than with the last words of the former Period, and the beginning of the next; so as on occasion of the last word to begin a new sense. For the better understanding of which, I have subjoined some of St. *Peter's* words, in which those are printed in Capital Letters, which connect the Discourse.

Verf. 4. *To an Inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in Heaven for YOU; 5. WHO are kept by the power of God through Faith unto Salvation, ready to be revealed in the last TIME: 6. WHEREIN ye greatly rejoice, tho now for a season (if need be) ye are in heaviness through manifold TEMPTATIONS: 7. That the TRIAL of your Faith being much more precious than of Gold that perisheth, tho it be tried with Fire, might be found unto Praise, and Honour, and Glory, at the appearing of JESUS CHRIST; 8. WHOM having not seen, ye love; — 9. Receiving the end of your Faith, even the SALVATION OF YOUR SOULS; 10. Of WHICH SALVATION the Prophets have enquired and searched diligently.*

Verf. 5. Σωτηρίαν ἐπίμνω ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἕσχατο.

] Here St. *Peter* speaks only of *eternal* Salvation, as the foregoing words manifestly shew: See *ver.* 4. Nor was there any Salvation *revealed* to the Christian *Jews*, scatter'd through *Asia Minor*, by the destruction of *Jerusalem*. Our Author speaks every where as if *Proconsuls* and *Pretors* had been sent from *Jerusalem*, not from *Rome*, into the Provinces of the


Chapter *Roman Empire*, who had persecuted the Christians. But certainly the  
 I. Christians had reason to fear only the Heathen Magistrates, not a few  
 contemptible *Jews*, to whom no part of the Administration of the  
 Provinces belonged.

Verf. 10. Σωτηρίας.] That is, of the *Salvation of Souls*, of which he  
 spake in the Verse before; or of eternal Happiness, which will then  
 only be conferred, when Christ returns from Heaven. Of *this* Sal-  
 vation the Prophets enquired; not of a deliverance of the Christians  
 from the fear of the *Jews*, whom they had no reason to be much a-  
 fraid of, unless perhaps in *Judæa*. Yet some may object in favour of  
 Dr. *Hammond*, the following Verse, in which the Discourse is prin-  
 cipally about things that happen'd in the time of the Apostles, whence  
 he inferred that σωτηρία signified a Deliverance which happened in the  
 same Age. But the learned *Doctor* did not observe, that the Pro-  
 phets, who desired to know the time of the last Judgment, did at  
 once covet to know when were to be the *sufferings for the sake of Christ*,  
 because after them, and not before, Christ was to come to Judgment.  
 And hence St. *Peter* calls all those things which had already followed,  
 and were afterwards to follow, τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας, that is, *the glorious*  
*things that after them should come to pass*; not immediately and all toge-  
 ther, but at several intervals, which not only the Apostles, but also  
 the Angels themselves were ignorant of.


Verf. 11. Τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα.] This *Beza* renders, *eventuras Christi*  
*perpessiones*, *The future Sufferings of Christ*, which *Grotius* follows, and  
 says that ἀποβησόμενα is understood, and so εἰς ὑμᾶς is taken in the fore-  
 going Verse. But εἰς ὑμᾶς does not signify *your*, but *to you*: who prophe-  
 sied of the *Grace εἰς ὑμᾶς to you*, that is, to be conferred on you; or  
 which God was about to bestow on you. So also in *ver. 4. Salvation*  
*reserved in Heaven εἰς ὑμᾶς*, is either *until you*, or *for your sakes*. And  
 agreeably, τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα must signify the sufferings of good Men  
 for the sake of Christ; which the Prophets obscurely foresaw, and  
 the Glory of Believers that should follow; but of which they knew  
 not the times, only it was revealed to them that they were not to  
 come to pass in their Age. This excellently agrees with the series of  
 St. *Peter's* Discourse, who speaks of the Afflictions which Christians  
 endured for Religion sake.

Verf. 12. Εἰς δὲ ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἄγγελοι παρούμενοι.] This I understand of the  
 time of the last Judgment, which the Angels do not know. Other-  
 wise, if St. *Peter* had spoken of a thing already past, he would have  
 said ἐπεθύμενον, *desired*.



Verf. 20. Πρεγυρωσμένους.] That is, whom God had purposed in him- Chapter  
 self, before the Creation of the World, to send at this time. The II.  
 Apostle does not say πρεσημειωμένους *presignified*, which makes me wonder  
 why Dr. Hammond here speaks of *Types and Images*. At this rate,   
 the Apostles may be made to say any thing.

C H A P. II.

Verf. 1.  Πεθέμενοι, &c.] *Grotius* rightly observes that *St. Peter* here  
 means those Vices which had been very common among  
 the Jews, and with which those to whom he writes had  
 been infected. But our Author, without reason, would have the Vices  
 of the *Gnosticks*, to be intended; which yet at that time, wherein he  
 supposes this Epistle was written, could hardly have infected so many.  
 Besides, the Verb ἀποθέσθαι *to lay aside*, shews that the Discourse here is  
 about Vices, with which those to whom *St. Peter* writes, had been  
 corrupted, in Judaism it self; and not about unknown Vices, against  
 which they were only to fortify themselves.

Verf. 4. Λίθον ζώντι.] By a Metaphor taken from Plants, which stick  
 yet fast to their Roots, and are nourished by juice ascending from them,  
 Stones which remain still in the Quarry are said to be *living*. By  
 which Epithet here, I suppose, is meant the firmness of that thing  
 which is signified by the name of a *Stone*; because nothing is firmer  
 than Stones, still growing in a Quarry, or cleaving fast to a Rock by  
 their Roots. For which reason a steady and inflexible purpose of  
 Mind is compared by *Ovid* to such a Stone, in *Metam.* xiv. where he  
 speaks of *Anaxaretes* :

*Durior & ferro, quod Noricus excoquit ignis,  
 Et saxo quod adhuc VIVUM radice tenetur.*

*Hermas* in his *Vision of the Tower*, thus describes Christ, *Lib.* iii. Sim.  
 9. §. 2. *In medio campo candidam & ingentem mihi petram ostendit, quæ  
 de ipso campo surrexerat; In the midst of the Field, he shewed me a white  
 and huge Rock, which had risen out of the Field it self.*

Verf. 12. Note f. I. In *St. Peter's* words there is an *Ellipsis*, com-  
 mon in all the best Greek Writers, who expressing only the Relative  
 Pronoun, leave the Demonstrative to be understood. Thus there-  
 fore we must Grammatically explain this Phrase, where the Pronoun  
 to be supplied is expressed in great Letters: ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλάβουσιν ὑμῶν,  
 ὡς κακοποιῶν, ΤΟΥΤΟ ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ὑμῶν ἐπιπτεύσαντες, δεξάσασι τὸ Θεόν:

Chapter II. that wherein they speak against you, as evil doers, understanding THIS more thoroughly, by your good Works, they may glorify God. In the same manner we must resolve the Phrase, occurring about the same matter in Chap. iii. 16. ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ καταλαλώσιν ὑμῶν, ὡς κακοποιῶν, ΕΝ ΤΟΥΤῳ, καταμυθηῶσιν ἐπιμαρτυροῦντες: that wherein they speak evil of you, as of evil doers, IN THIS they may be ashamed, that falsely accuse your good Conversation in Christ.

II. It is true that ἐποπτεύειν signifies more than εἶδεν, to see, for it is properly to look into, or understand thoroughly; for this Verb is immediately derived from ἐπόπτης, which signifies a Judge or Witness of the more secret Rites used in Holy Mysteries; the sight of which not only the profane Multitude, but also the *Mystæ* themselves were debarred; which we may learn as from others, so especially from *J. Meursius* in his *Eleusinia Sacra*. I shall produce but one Testimony out of *Suidas*: Ἐπόπται, οἱ τὰ μυστήρια παραλαμβάνοντες· λέγονται ἐν ἀρχῇ ἰδὲ μύσαι, μετὰ ἐνιαυτὸν δὲ ἐπόπται καὶ ἐφοροί: were those who took part of the Mysteries; they were called at first *Mystæ*, and the next Year *Epoptæ* and *Ephoroi*. Afterwards it follows: Ἐποπτεύειν, διαφέρει μύσης καὶ ἐπόπτης, in which words he seems to intimate that there is the same difference between ἐποπτεύειν and to know, viz. superficially or externally, as between an *Epopta* and *Mystæ*. The same Author hath: ἐπόπτης, ἐπισκεψίς, consideration. Therefore I believe we ought to correct the *Old Glosses*, in which ἐποπτεύω is rendred *prospicio*, to look forward, whereas it signifies rather *perspicio*, to look through, as I suppose it should be read. This signification being supposed, there results an excellent sense; for by the words of the Christians, denying that they were κακοποιῶν, the truth could not be understood, which false pretenders to Vertue carefully conceal by deceitful words; but by their good Works, whereby the thing it self is thoroughly discerned. For it could not but be a good Doctrin which made such good Men. Christ shewing his Disciples how they might distinguish Hypocrites from good Men, saith, beware of false Prophets which will come unto you in sheeps Clothing, but inwardly they are ravenous Wolves: Ye shall know them by their Fruits, Mat. vii. 15. For tho they cunningly dissemble their Wickedness, it is not long before it discovers it self. But on the other hand, when we see any Man live well, and that for many Years, we easily perceive that Man cannot profess a Doctrin which favours Wickedness.

III. Our Author therefore, without necessity, recurs to *Hesychius*, and suspects there is a mistake here committed by some Scribe, or that ἐποπτεύειν is the same with ἐποπίζειν, contrary to all Copies, and the Analogy of the Greek Language. But it is the greatest Absurdity imaginable,



ginable, what he says about the Verb *καταβλέπειν*, which never signified *inspicere*, but only *susplicari*, to suspect, for which signification there is here no place. Besides, the Latin *susplicere* is not to look upon the ground, but as it were from some low place to look upon another as above us, or reverence him. Our Author was scarce awake when he wrote this, and it does not seem to have been written by the same hand with the rest of his Annotations. Chapter II.

Ibid. Note g. I. No Body will doubt but פקודאב, *phkoudab*, *ἑπισκοπή*, *visitation*, signifies very often *Revenge*; but it is as well known that this word *ἐπαμφοτερίζει* is *ambiguous*, and signifies also God's Benefits. So that we may as fitly understand *the day of Visitation*, of the time in which God favourably *visits* the Heathens, when he converts them to the Christian Religion; and so the meaning of *St. Peter* will be: By your Conversation, so reconcile the Minds of the Heathens to the Christian Religion, as that they may at last acknowledg its truth, when God shall more fully set it before their Eyes. The *day of Visitation* signifies κατ' ἐξοχῶν the time when the Gospel is more fully and clearly revealed, as manifestly appears from *Luke* xix. 44. where Christ, speaking to *Jerusalem*, foretels all those evils which afterwards came upon her; because thou knewest not, saith he, the time of thy Visitation, ἢ ἐπισκοπῆς σου, that is, wouldst not understand that God called thee, by my Ministry, to Salvation.

II. The fame of the Christians flight out of *Jerusalem*, does not seem to have so much as reached the Ears of the Heathens who lived in *Asia Minor*, or the Roman Magistrates, and those that attended them through the *Asiatick* Provinces; much less to have been taken notice of by them as a remarkable Deliverance. For a great while after the most learned Men among the *Romans*, did not distinguish *Christians* from *Jews*; as sufficiently appears by *Tacitus* and *Suetonius*. The *Halcyonian days*, which our Author tells us the Christians enjoyed throughout the whole Roman Empire, after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, are mere Dreams.

Verf. 20. Ποῖον γὰρ κέρδι ἐν ἀμαρτάνοντες καταβλέψετε;] *Aeschylus*, in his *Seven Captains that went against Thebes*, says something very much like this:

Εἴπερ κακὸν φέρη τις, αἰσχύνῃς ἀτερ,  
Ἔστω μόνον γὰρ κέρδι ἐν τεθνηκόσι.  
Κακῶν ἢ κ' αἰσχρῶν ἔπιν ΕΥΚΛΕΙΑΝ ἐρεῖς.

if any one suffer evil, without infamy, well and good; for this is only gain among the dead. But for wicked and vile Men [to suffer] cannot be reckon'd

Chapter III. reckon'd any Glory. Αἰσχρῶν here signifies wickedness, the punishment of which is suffer'd, not without Shame and Infamy by him that commits it.

W Vers. 24. Note h. If the Apostles words had been, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ τῷ ξύλῳ ἠνεγκεν ἀμαρτίας, who being upon the Tree, bare our Sins, there would have been some place for Dr. Hammond's Interpretation. But when St. Peter says, ἀνήνεγκεν, ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, he took them up with his Body upon the Tree, it is clearly not so much the expiation of Sins, as the Mortification of them, as the Apostles speak, that is here signified. For St. Peter's meaning is, that our Sins were as it were fastened to the Cross, that is, mortified, when Christ was lifted up upon it: See Rom. vi. 6. Ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ I render with his Body, because as ἐν and ׀ in Hebrew is frequently so taken, so the Phrase it self will not bear to be otherwise rendred.

### C H A P. III.

Verf. 4. Note a. **O**UR subtil Author sees here two Hebraisms, where others cannot see so much as one. Τὸ κρυπτόν τῆ καρδίας, may be said as well in Greek as in Hebrew; and ὁ ἔξω or ἔξω ἀνθρώπου is so true a Greek Phrase, that it was used by Plato, as *Henr. Stephanus* in *Schediasmatibus* has long ago observed.

Ibid. Note b. I. If St. Peter had made mention of ἀπλότης, perhaps there would have been some place for what our Author here says, of the corruption of compounded things; but because he mentions no simplicity, it is nothing to the purpose. Instead of Ἡμίονες, he should have written Οὐσίνας, the word used by *Homer* *Iliad*. i. vers. 50. on which Verse the *Scholiast* makes that remark which Dr. Hammond sets down.

II. The incorruptibleness of a meek and quiet Spirit, wherewith St. Peter would have Women to be adorned, seems to be opposed to two things which are easily corrupted; viz. to the comeliness of the Body, whereof a part is the Hair, which the Apostle had mention'd in the foregoing Verse; and to Apparel, which is a thing much more liable to corruption than Gold, and which he likewise makes mention of. It is plain this Verse is oppos'd to all the foregoing.

Verf. 7. Note c. I. If the alledged place of Scripture were said to signify any thing κατὰ γνώσιν, I should not doubt but that γνώσις was taken for some secret Sense, which the Jewish Allegorists sought for in the Scripture. But it being said that Husbands ought συνικεῖν κατὰ γνώσιν, to dwell with them according to knowledg, giving honour unto the Wife as the weaker Vessel; κατὰ γνώσιν is to manage the dispositions of Women skillfully and prudently.

II. The



II. The examples, which our Author produces, are nothing to the Chapter purpose; for they do not contain any mystical interpretation of the III. places in *Genesis*, but confectaries deduced from the nature of Matrimony it self, and the plain words of *Moses*. The place in *Ephes. v. 31. 32.* I have interpreted, contrary to Dr. *Hammond*, and I shall not repeat what I have there said.

III. Συμμεῖν properly signifies *to dwell together*, or to live in the same House, whence it was applied to all the Duties belonging to married Persons; whether the Discourse be about Procreation, or any other conjugal Office. So that the place in *Moses* concerning *multiplying*, is no more to the purpose, than *Plato's* Fable about the Antient *Hermaphrodites*. Other things here might be corrected, which I pass by, but shall afterwards touch upon.

Ibid. Note d. Ἀπνέμεν τιμῶν γυναικί, where the Discourse is about the Duty of a Husband towards his Wife, never signified, *to afford her Maintenance*; and tho' τιμῶν sometimes comprehends rewarding, it does not signify that alone. It may much more naturally and truly be interpreted *to honour* her, as who, being the *weaker Vessel*, is extremely offended even with the bare appearance of Neglect.

Ibid. Note e. There is no doubt but χάρις signifies a Benefit, but some of the places alledged by our Author might a little otherwise be explained, as of *John i. 14.* I have shewed in a particular Dissertation, [inserted in this Volume.] In this place also χάρις ζωῆς, is *vivifying Grace*, or the Gospel, of which the Wife is said to have been made partaker no less than the Man, as *Grotius* has observed. But I had rather read with the *Vulgar* Interpreter συγκληρονομοῖς ζωῆς, for here the Apostle extols not the Man, but the Woman, which in this respect is made equal to the Man. This the series of the Discourse seems to require.

Verf. 15. Ἀγάθετε θεὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.] That is, know that God is Holy, or a lover of Sanctity. For this is often the signification of the Hebrew Conjugation Hiphil בִּקְדִישׁ bikdish, which is ordinarily rendered ἀγιάζεν. See my Notes on *Gen. ii. 3.* This sanctifying God in the Heart is the cause of our Sanctification before Men, spoken of in the following Verse, whereby we openly shew how Holy we esteem God. See *Levit. x. 3.* and *Num. xv. 12.* and my Notes on those places.

Verf. 19. Note f. I. On this place, our learned Author has collected a great many things, all which I have neither leisure to examine, nor is it worth my while, especially having interpreted the place here explained, in my Commentary on *Genesis*. And therefore in a few words I shall say, that the Apostle does not seem here to have


Gen: 6.3.

Chapter a respect to the place in *Genesis*, cited by our Author. It is truly indeed rendered *my Spirit shall not abide in man*, and the thing is to be understood of the Soul of Man, as I have shewn on *Genesis*. But the Souls of those that lived before the Flood cannot therefore be called *Spirits in prison*, nor can יָדוֹן or יָדִין, in *Hebrev*, be by any means deduced from יָדֵן, which signifies *a sheath*. It should be read יִידוֹן, to be deduced from the Root יָדַן, which Dr. *Hammond* does not seem to have observed.

II. The πνεῦμα, by which Christ was raised, is truly understood of the Divinity which was afterwards in him, and was with God before *Abraham* was, and so in the beginning of all things, as St. *John* teaches us in the beginning of his Gospel. But πνεύματι ἐν φυλακῇ signifies *Spirits keeping guard*, that is Angels who φυλάττουσιν keep men, as we are told in *Psal.* xci. 11. The same are called חִירִיּוֹת *hirim, watchers*, in *Dan.* iv. 13. which may properly be rendered οἱ ἐν φυλακῇ, for *watchers and keepers* are all one. So that the Divinity is said to have called the Men that lived before the Flood to Repentance, together with the Angels, who admonished *Noah* to exhort them to a better Life. I should render this place thus: *and being quickned by the Spirit, by which he went with the Spirits that watch, and preached to the unbelieving, &c.* When God is about to do any thing among men, he is represented as coming down from Heaven attended with a guard of Angels, of which I have spoken on *Gen.* i. 27. and xi. 7. and *Exod.* xx. 1. For this reason coming down with the Angels, to admonish *Noah* and command him to call men to repentance, he is said to have gone with the *Spirits that watch*: and besides, to have done that which *Noah* did in his name and by his command. The Example out of St. *Paul* in *Eph.* ii. 17. clearly shews, that St. *Peter* might speak in this manner.

Verf. 20. Note g. I. All that is here said by our Author are vain Conjectures, which have no foundation either in things themselves, or in the use of Scripture; tho he often repeats them, and that as very probable. (1) The Verb ἀπειθεῖν signifies, *not to believe, not to obey*; which is a heinous sin, where the thing to be believed or done is of great importance; and a small one where it is a matter of little moment. Here it signifies a great sin, because the men of the old world would not obey God, calling them by the Ministry of *Noah* to a better life. (2) Tho we can say nothing particularly of the sins of the men who lived before the Flood; yet we may deny that it can be gather'd from the words of *Moses* that they were corrupted with the sin of παιδεραστία *Sodomy*, and other such like. Tho they are joined with the *Sodomites* for their wickedness and παρανομία, it does not



not therefore follow that they were both guilty of the same kind of Chapter  
 Impieties, different sorts of wicked men being often joined together, III.  
 and the same punishments suffered for divers crimes. ( 3 ) The Hebrew  $\text{רָבָה}$  *rabah*, and the Greek  $\text{πονηρία}$ , signify any sort of vice,   
 and therefore it might be put by St. Luke for  $\text{ἀνεγσία}$ , *intemperance*,  
 because it is a more general name which comprehends under it the par-  
 ticular, not that those words are ordinarily confounded. ( 4 ) It is  
 true that  $\text{φθώρα}$  and  $\text{φθώρασις}$  sometimes have those significations, which  
 Dr. Hammond attributes to them, as also the Hebrew  $\text{שִׁבְבַת}$  *schibbeth*,  
 used by *Moses*; but they likewise signify in general any kind of depra-  
 vation, or change for the worse, in which sense I shall take the word  
 in *Moses*, till it be evidently proved that a general signification, in  
 him, can have no place. ( 5 ) The word  $\text{דָּמָה}$  no more signifies *Violence*  
 than any other sort of Injustice, as I have shewn on *Gen. vi. 13*. So  
 that what our Author builds upon that signification is vain, as all the  
 rest of his Conjectures which rely upon this foundation. Our learned  
 Author often forges an Interpretation, by heaping together a parcel  
 of very slight Conjectures; afterwards he raises what Superstructure  
 he pleases upon that interpretation; and then lastly speaks of the  
 Confectaries he thence deduces as so many certain Truths. But we  
 ought not only to set bounds to our Conjectures, but especially to the  
 Consequences we deduce from them, if we would not be in perpetual  
 danger of erring. That danger no body here will be in, who shall  
 suppose that the men of the old World were very wicked men; there  
 being in that no conjecture, because it is affirmed by *Moses* in  
 plain words: but whoever shall attempt particularly to explain what  
*Moses* has said in general, and give way in this matter to Conjectures,  
 will find himself in the dark. And this may suffice to have been  
 said briefly against a way of interpreting Dr. Hammond too of-  
 ten takes.


II. It had been better to observe, that from the very Expression of  
 St. Peter it may be gather'd that  $\text{πνεύμασι ἐν φυλακῇ}$  is not to be joined  
 with  $\text{ἀπειθήσασιν}$ ; for thus he speaks:  $\text{ἐν ᾧ (το wit, πνεύμασι) καὶ ταῖς ἐν φυ-}$   
 $\text{λακῇ πνεύμασι,}$  where after  $\text{καὶ}$  we must repeat  $\text{ἐν,}$  by which, and by the spi-  
 rits that watch be preached; to whom? Namely,  $\text{ἀπειθήσασιν ποτε,}$  to them  
 who were sometime disobedient, &c.

Verf. 21. Note h. I. I think  $\text{ὧ}$  is the true reading, not  $\text{ἧ}$ ; and it  
 might easily be, that some Transcribers not having another Copy to  
 write after, but setting down the words from the mouth of a Promp-  
 ter might confound  $\text{ὧ}$  with  $\text{ἧ}$ .  $\text{Ἀντίτυπον βόπτισμα}$  is used just in the same  
 sense as if it were said  $\text{ὅμοιον}$  like, as the Word is manifestly taken in

Chapter *Heb.* ix. 24. on which place see my Note. A pattern is called ἀντίτυπον, IV. from the similitude which it has with the πύπθ or ἀεθτυπύπθ; whence the vulgar Interpreter translates it *similis forma*. The other interpretations Dr. *Hammond* gives of this place are forced.

II. He says indeed truly, that ἀντίτυπον sometimes signifies *contrary*, which might be proved from several places in *Xenophon*, but not that which he alledges out of *Hiero*; where ἀντίτυπον is not simply *contrary*, but *dura, hard, severe*, that is, *severe*, as it is rightly rendered by *J. Leunclavius*.

#### C H A P. IV.

Verf. 1.  OUR Author here says that Saint *Peter's* phrase in Note a. verf. 6. of this Chapter is *hard*, and I do not deny it; but I say also that he is a *hard* Interpreter, if ever any one deserved that name. For here, as one said, *lapides loquitur, he speaks stones*, not words to mollify hard phrases. The whole sense of this verse depends upon a particular Elegancy arising from the ambiguity of the phrase πόνειν σαρκί, *to suffer in the flesh, or to the flesh*; which being used of Christ, signifies *that he suffered and died in his humane nature, or for the sake of our humane nature, i. e. of men*. But when we are said to *die or suffer to the flesh*, we are understood to be no longer devoted to the flesh, or to the vices of the flesh: and accordingly St. *Peter's* meaning is this; seeing I say that Christ *has suffer'd to the flesh*, ye also who ought to imitate him as far as ye are able, know that *you must suffer to the flesh*, in a sense which is agreeable to you, to wit, wholly renounce it: for he that *has suffered to the flesh, has ceased from sin*. Just such another sort of reasoning we have in *Rom.* vi. 10, 11. in the place parallel to this. *For in that he died* (instead of which St. *Peter* here says *suffered*) *he DIED UNTO SIN once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God*. Likewise reckon ye also your selves to be *DEAD indeed UNTO SIN, but alive unto God*. Instead of *to die unto sin*, here is *to suffer to the flesh*; but both these phrases have the same ambiguity in them. These places should have been compared, not *verse 6.* with this, which have no affinity with one another.

Verf. 3. [Ἀβιμίτις ἐξ ἰδωλαγωγείας.] *Grotius* on this place says it is *idololatriæ quædam species adesse sodalitiarum conviviis, de quibus profecta falsis Diis dantur, & in hac maxime re credibile est Judæos antequam Christiani essent, accommodasse se Gentium moribus: a sort of Idolatry to be present at such common feasts where part of the meat is offered in sacrifice to false Gods; and in this particular especially, it is probable the Jews, before they were Christians, conformed themselves to the manners of the Heathens.*

And



And I do not deny but this might be done by them, but there having been among the Jews every where a great number of Profelytes, of which many embraced the Christian Religion, I rather think St. Peter has a respect here to these, who had formerly been Idolaters. Chapter IV.

Verf. 6. "Ἰνα κριθῶσι ἢ καὶ ἀνθρώπων σαρξί, ζῶσι δὲ καὶ Θεῶν προδουλίῃ." None but Dr. Hammond could have thought that κριθῶσι σαρξί was the same as to die to the flesh, who could digest any impropriety, tho never so great, in his own stile. But it is much more natural to interpret it; so that they were condemned indeed in the flesh, according to men; that is, put to death by the judgment of men, as to the body; but live according to God in the Spirit, that is, their Souls were made partakers of eternal life by God. This is the usual signification of the words, which ought not to be changed without reason.

Verf. 14. Note f. This is all forced, the meaning is evidently this: If ye are reproached for the name of Christ (that is, because ye will be called Christians) happy are ye; because the Spirit of glory and of God resteth with you; that is, those reproaches are so far from being a sign that the Spirit hitherto bestowed upon you by God, and which has brought so much glory to the Gospel, departs from you, that on the contrary it so much the more resteth, or will more constantly abide with you, as long as ye stedfastly profess the Christian Religion. The Spirit of glory and, as it is in the Alexandrian Manuscript, of power, καὶ δυνάμεως, is the Spirit of Miracles, which was conferred upon Christians. Δυνάμεις often signifies Miracles, and δόξα the same. See my Notes on Exod. xvi. 7. and John i. 14.

Verf. 15. Note g. As I do not scruple disagreeing with our Author, when the matter seems to require it, so I am ready to commend his inventions when they are such as this interpretation. Ἀλλοτριεπιστομίας is in all probability the same with ἀλλοτριεπιπραγμάτων, that is, who does or takes care of other mens business; by which word the Greeks signify those who usurp other mens offices in a Commonwealth. Pisto lib. iv. de Repub. where he at large proves that all Orders of men in a Political Society have a certain and determinate business, which they ought to take care of, and that therein consists the justice and peace of a Commonwealth, towards the end says, that the contrary is injustice. Οὐκ ἔν, saith he, εἰσὶν τινὰ αὐτῶν ὄντων τέτων, καὶ πολυπραγμοσύνην, καὶ ἀλλοτριεπιστομίας, καὶ ἐπανάστασιν μέρος τινὸς τῆς ὅλων τῆς ψυχῆς ἢ ἀρχῆς ἐν αὐτῇ ἢ πρῶτον. ἀλλὰ τοιαῦτα ὄντα εὖσε ὅτις πρέπειν αὐτῶν δαλῶν τῶν ἀρχῆς γένεσ ὄντι: Igitur seditionem quandam horum trium hanc esse oportet, & afflictionem quandam qua nimis multa aggreditur, alienaq; munera invadit, & rebellat pars quæpiam animi a l-versus totum, ut in illo imperet id quod non par est, quippe quod est ejus nature

Chapter V. *ut deceat id servire ei qui est ex profapia imperantium. Suidas: ἀλλοτειοπραγείν, ἐχθρῶς βελδέειν, to take spiteful counsels.* Then he produces these words out of an ancient Writer. Ἐσημειῶντο μηδὲν αὐτὸν ἀλλοτειοπραγείν, μηδὲ κεινοπραγείν: they observed him *not to meddle with other mens business, nor to endeavour alterations.* Budeus in *Comment. Ling. Græc.* gives us also other examples. And it is easy to discern that ἀλλοτειοεπισκοπία is all one with ἀλλοτειοπραξιοσύνη; because the chief word, of which these names are compounded, is the same. So that what Dr. Hammond observes, is very pertinent in this place.

Verf. 17. Note h. The sense of the Hebrew words is this: *Behold the righteous use to be punished on earth, how much more the unrighteous and the sinner?* For the verb **שָׁלַח** is ambiguous, and signifies either to reward or punish. But the *Septuagint* thought Solomon had a respect to that signification of the verb **שָׁלַח** which is, *to be safe*, and instead of **בְּאֵרֶץ** read **בְּאֵרֶץ** *beats*, which signifies *in straits*, or *in haste*, and which they render *μόλις*, because they that escape out of any danger by a hasty flight, or are brought into great straits, *hardly save themselves.*

#### C H A P. V.

Verf. 1. **Σ**τρυμπεσοβύτερος.] Thus St. Peter calls himself, out of modesty, not because he executed any where the Office of a Bishop, who was invested with a much higher, viz. that of an Apostle. Bishops or Elders, properly so called, had the oversight but of one Church, from which they were not to depart; but the Apostles were Bishops and Elders of all the Churches in the World, and could not be confined to one particular place. Besides, he did not write this Epistle from *Rome*, but from *Babylon* a City of *Egypt*, as learned men have shewn, and I have observed at the end of the Premonition to this Epistle.

Verf. 3. Note b. I. The Verb *ποιμαίνειν* to feed, is indeed truly here used to signify the Office of a Bishop, and *ποιμνίον* flock, to signify the Church; but it does not therefore follow that the rest of the words here used are taken from *Shepherds*. No body ever said that *Shepherds*, properly so called, are *πάντες* of the Sheep, when he going before, they follow him, except Dr. Hammond. No body would say that *ἐκασίως* and *παραδύμως* are applicable to Sheep, properly so called, which belong to reasonable Creatures; not at all to Sheep, which are forced to follow with blows, unless they go along with the rest by natural instinct.

II. It is true indeed that, whilst the Roman Commonwealth stood, the Roman Magistrates chose their Provinces by lot, which therefore might



might be called their *lots*, to whom they fell by lot. But I can't tell Chapter whether, among Latin Writers, or those Grecians that have writ- V. ten about the Roman Affairs, *sors*, or κλήεις, are ever used for a *Province*; at least as I never read any such thing, so I could not find any example of it in the Writings of Learned men, who do not use to omit such things. I dare also affirm, that no Greek Writer ever said καλακνειδεν κλήεις, for that which is, to vex Provinces by Tribute or Extortion.

III. Our Author seems to have believed a Fable, which some Writers of no repute formerly divulged, about the division that was made of the World by Lots among the Apostles; which even *Baronius* himself did not absolutely give credit to. Κλήεις Ἀποστολῆς, in *Acts* i. 25: is *part of the Apostleship*, not a Province which *Matthias* obtained by Lot. See *Dr. Hammond* himself on that place. He had much better here have followed *Grotius*, whom the Reader may consult.

Verf. 5. Ἀλλήλοις ὑποτασσόμενοι.] Ye younger, saith he, be subject to the elder; and all be subject one to another: that is, let the younger give way to the elder, and comply with their Admonitions; and the elder, on the other hand, shew themselves courteous to the younger, not scrupling to yield to them, and comply with them, when there is a just occasion. Here the discourse is about an ὑποταγή which is a consequent of Meekness and Courteousness, and whereby we easily yield and comply with one another; not about that Obedience which is due to Church-Governors, from those who bear no Office in the Church. Therefore the Apostle says, A L L be subject one to another; which shews him to speak of a thing that belongs to every one, and which is a mutual duty. See my Note on *Jam.* v. 16. and *Eph.* v. 21.

Verf. 13. Note d. See what I have said about this matter on the *Premonition*.

## A N N O T A T I O N S

## O N T H E

## Second Epistle General of St. Peter.

**A**T the end of the *Premom.*] For my part, as I profess my self to be of Dr. *Hammond's* Opinion as to the Apostle *Peter's* being the Writer of this Epistle; so I cannot forbear saying that our learned and pious Author deals a little unfairly with *Hugo Grotius*. I. He suspects here and elsewhere, without reason, that the Posthumous Annotations of *Grotius* had not past his review before they were published, as also that there were some things mixed with them by another hand, contrary to his real sentiments. But it appears both by *Grotius* his Epistles, lately published, and others, that the learned *J. Mercer*, a man of unquestionable integrity, received all these things from *Grotius* himself, and his Widow, to be set forth, and published them as he had received them. But *Grotius* is here and elsewhere mistaken. As if that Learned man had been exempted from all danger of error! It's plain all these things have one and the same style, and are written in the same strain; and I do not think it would have been an easy matter in *France*, or elsewhere, to find a man that could have obtruded his own works instead of *Grotius's* upon the more judicious sort of Readers. II. Besides, why did Dr. *Hammond* not take notice that there are other reasons, for which both ancient and later Writers have suspected this Epistle, drawn from the stile, which is not like that of the former Epistle? Did not he know that *Jos. Scaliger* also, who was afterwards followed by *Cl. Salmasius*, thought this Epistle to be supposititious? Methinks all this may much extenuate *Grotius* his error, who only studied for new arguments to confirm the opinion of those great men. III. What our Author alledges out of Chap. iii. 1. to prove that this is a second Epistle of *St. Peter*, is of no force, if that Chapter it self be a second Epistle of *Simon*, as *Grotius* conjectures, whom he ought to have confuted. IV. The comparing of *Grotius* his Annotations on *Mat. xvii.* with those he has on *Chap. i. 17.* of this Epistle, does not prove that



that these were written by another hand; because *Grotius* might have changed his Opinion, as he plainly here acknowledges. If Dr. *Hammond* had lived longer, and carefully reviewed his own Annotations, I doubt not but he would have alter'd a great many things which I have corrected in him. V. They that have rejected this Epistle as falsely attributed to *St. Peter*, have not stuck to say that the Person of that Apostle is here ill represented, *Sealiger* having adventured to affirm that it is *commentum veteris Christiani otio suo abutentis*, The invention of some antient Christian who did not know how to employ his time better. VI. *Grotius* did not infer from *Simeon* Bishop of *Jerusalem's* writing this Epistle, as he supposed, that it was written after the destruction of *Jerusalem*; but on the contrary, from its being written after the destruction of that City, that we must find out some Writer who survived it, to whom this Epistle might be attributed, and whom he thought to be this *Simeon*, because of the likeness of the name. VII. It cannot be denied that the Christians, who had read *Mat. xxiv.* did not expect the consummation of all things before the destruction of *Jerusalem*; but it did not therefore follow that the last Day of all the World was immediately to follow that Destruction. So that tho the Christians were here commanded to wait patiently for the last Judgment, it would not follow that this Epistle was written after the demolishing of *Jerusalem*. This I had rather say, than deny there is any mention here made of the last Judgment, as Dr. *Hammond* does with the greatest confidence, in opposition to most other Interpreters. VIII. Our Author followed, as he ordinarily does, *Cæs. Baronius*, as to the year of Christ in which *St. Peter* suffer'd Martyrdom. But *Ant. Pagus* contends that it happen'd in the year of Christ LXV, and Dr. *Pearson* in LXVIII, whom I chuse to follow. But if we suppose *St. Peter* died at *Rome*, in the Year which Dr. *Hammond* thinks, and that he wrote this Epistle a little before his Death, it cannot be said that the Jewish War was then approaching, which began in the xiith of *Nero*, and in the iud of *Cestius Florus* President of *Judea*, and of Christ LXVI, and in the Month of *May*. See Dr. *Pearson's Annals Pauline*.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 3. **I**Nstead of *διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς*, the *Alexandrian* Copy and others read *ἰδία δόξα καὶ ἀρετῆ*, by his own Glory and Vertue, *propria gloria & virtute*, as the *Vulgar Latin* also hath it. Which way soever of these we read it, the sense will be the same. Christ, namely, hath called us *διὰ δόξης*, or *ἰδία δόξα*, by the extraordinary

Chapter I.   
 many Miracles which he wrought, as Dr. *Hammond* well observes; and by his *Virtue*, that is, by his most holy Example, whereby we are as much affected, as by his preaching; nay without which all his preaching would be vain and insignificant. They are mistaken who by *ἐπιπέμω* here understand God the Father, because it is to be understood of Christ, who himself called the Apostles and first Disciples; whom he won to himself not only by the excellency of his Doctrine, but by the Miracles he wrought, and the Sanctity of his Life. Besides, *ἐπιπέμω* where signifies *Divinus, power*.

Verse 4. *Μίση*. By the Miracles and Virtue of Christ are said to be given unto us great and precious Promises; because they accompanied the Word he preached, and added weight to it; without which it would have had no greater influence upon Men than the Doctrins of Philosophers, which did not work upon many, because there were no Miracles wrought in confirmation of them, and they themselves often contradicted them in their Lives.

Ibid. Note b. I. No one will doubt but that *ἐπιθυμία* often signifies a desire of unlawful fleshly Pleasures, and, if the Discourse be about that, of those which are contrary to nature; but that it may be thought to have those extraordinary significations, the circumstances of the place must require it. Otherwise it may be reasonably thought that word is taken in general for any *Desire* or *Lust* whatsoever. The same may be said of the word *φθορά*, which signifying any corruption of Manners, does sometimes peculiarly denote what our Author here supposes to be refer'd to. But I see in this place no circumstance which should oblige us to take those words in any other than a general sense. For the Apostle speaks of that amendment of Life to which Christ called all Men; and therefore it is probable that *the Corruption through Lust, which is in the World*, signifies any sort of Vice which Christ would have us renounce.

II. *To corrupt a Youth*, where the Discourse is about a Man, and unnatural Lust, signifies what our Author says; but when young Men are said to corrupt a Maid, all we can think is meant by it, is the deflowering her, as in the Passage cited out of *Palladius*. The corruption which *Socrates* was accused of, was nothing but a depravation of Manners and Temper, not that peculiar Wickedness which our Author speaks of. This appears from the Apology of *Socrates*, written by *Plato*. And in the same sense we must understand the words of the counterfeit Epistle of *Heracitus* to *Hermodorus*, as appears only by the Passive voice used by the false *Heracitus*; for such an abuse could not be put upon *Heracitus*, who was then well steep in Years. In the places



ces of the New Testament, there is no reason why we should depart from the general signification of Corruption. So that it would have been better if Dr. *Hammond* had here followed *Grotius*.

Verf. 5. *Τὴν ἀρετὴν.*] Our Author, after *Grotius* and others, seems to have rightly interpreted *ἀρετὴν* here by *ἀνδρεία* in his Note on *vers. 3*. But he did not carefully enough read the place of *Euripides* in *Stobæus* his *Florileg.* Tit. vii. for the first Verse is produced out of his *Bellerophon*, the last out of *Euripides* his *Ægeus*, and should be divided into two Dimeters, as it is in *Grotius* his Edition.

*Ibid.* Note c. Because our learned Author often speaks of this *γνώσις*, and the *Gnosticks*, to whom I have shewn that he refers a great many things without necessity, and in this place sets himself more particularly to explain the original of their Name; it will not be amiss, if I also treat here of that matter in a few words.

I. I cannot deny but *γνώσις*, which is a general name for any sort of *Knowledg* or *Learning*, is sometimes taken properly for *Christian Knowledg*, and where the Discourse is about the *Mystical sense* of *Scripture*, for the understanding of *Mysteries*. It is used several times in this sense in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, as I have thereon observed. But I should not compare the Gift of the Holy Ghost, by which the Minds of the *Evangelical Prophets* were fitted to understand obscure places of *Scripture*, with the *Jewish Cabbala*. For this without any regard had to the literal sense, taken from the proper or metaphorical signification of words, and the series and occasion of the Discourse, deduces any thing out of any place of *Scripture*, and relies either upon trivial reasonings to prove what it asserts, or very uncertain Tradition; so that if any deny it, there is no means left to convince them, and those that believe it do so upon insufficient grounds, and may be made to believe any thing, tho never so unreasonable. But the *Christian Prophets*, who received their *Knowledg* from the *Spirit of Truth*, alledged nothing out of *Scripture* that was not in it, and could not be deduced out of it by *Grammatical Reasons*. Otherwise *Prophecies* must have been explained by *Prophecies*, and the new *Prophets* attested to by *Miracles*, to make it believed, that such a thing was contained in the *Old Prophets*, because they affirmed it to be so, which otherwise no Man could have seen in them; which method of acting does not seem worthy of the *Spirit of God*, as I have shewn out of a learned Man on *Matt. i. 22*. I acknowledg that in the *Writings of the Apostles*, there are several interpretations of places of *Scripture* more like *Cabbalistical* than *Grammatical* ones; but wherever we find them, they are used only as Arguments to con-

Chapter I. vince the Jews, and in compliance with their Opinions and Practices, not as demonstrations to Persons of different Sentiments.

II. It is very true that the word *γνώσις* sometimes signifies a profound knowledg of the Christian Religion, and so is taken in a good sense, as manifestly appears from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who often so uses that word, both elsewhere, and in *Strom. Lib. vi.* out of which I shall produce a few words, so much the rather, because from them we may gather the reason why the Apostle here joins *Knowledg* with *Faith* and *Vertue*. Now he in pag. 648. speaks thus: *Τολμῶμεν φαίμεν (ἐν τοῦθ' αὖ γὰρ ἡ πίστις ἢ γνωσικὴ) πάντων ὅτι ἄμωρα εἶναι καὶ πάντων ἀκατάληπτον βεβαία κατὰλήψια κερχημίον, καὶ ὅτι ἐστὶν ἡμῶν ἀπόρων, ἢ ὄντι γνωσικόν· ὅποι' ἔ· ἐν Ἰακώβ' ἔ, Πέτρ' ἔ, Ἰωάννης, Παῦλ' ἔ, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἀπόστολοι: we dare say (for here is the Faith enlightned with Knowledg) that a true Gnostick knows all things, and understands all things, having a firm comprehension, even of those things whereof we doubt; such as were James, Peter, John, Paul, and the rest of the Apostles. Then he adds, *γνώσεως γὰρ πλήρης ἢ κερχημία, ὡς ἂν ᾤσθ' Κυρίε δοθείσα, καὶ δια Κυρίε πάλιν τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις σαφηνισθεῖσα: καὶ μή τι ἢ γνώσις ἰδιώματι φύσῃς τυγχάνει λογικῆς, ἐς τὸτο ἀσκησίης ἵνα δια τὴ γνώσεως εἰς ἀθανάσιον ὀπιγροσθῆ: for Prophecy is full of knowledg, as having been given by the Lord, and by the Lord again manifested to the Apostles. And is not Knowledg a property of a reasonable Soul, trained up to this, that by Knowledg it may be entitled to Immortality? Afterwards he shews that Action must be preceded by Knowledg; and contends that nothing is ἀκατάληπτον incomprehensible; which is true, if we speak of things necessary. For whatever it is necessary for us to understand, to attain Salvation, we can undoubtedly understand. At length he thus describes a Gnostick: Ὁ γνωσικὸς ὃ ἐκείν' ἔ, ἀεὶ ἔ λέγω, τὰ δοκῶντα ἀκατάληπτα εἶναι πῖς ἄλλοις αὐτὸς καταλαμβάνει· πσεύσας ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀκατάληπτον πρὸ ἡμῶν τὸ Θεῶ, ὅθεν ἐδὲ ἀδίδακτον—Εἰ δὲ καὶ πολυπειρίαν ποθεῖ τις, οἶδε τὰ ἀρχαῖα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἐκείν' ἔ· ὅπισται σροσὰς λόγων καὶ λύσεις ἀινιγμάτων, σημεῖα ὃ καὶ τέρατα κερχημιώσις, καὶ ἐκβάσεις καιρῶν καὶ χρόνων ὃ τῆς σοφίας μαθητής: And the Gnostick, of whom I speak, comprehends those things which seem to others to be incomprehensible, believing there is nothing incomprehensible to the Son of God, and therefore nothing which cannot be taught — If any desire the knowledg of many things, he knows what past of old, and conjectures what will be hereafter. A Disciple of Wisdom can discover the deceitfulness of words, and unfold Riddles; he foreknows also Signs and Wonders, and the events of Times and Seasons. So that *γνώσις* is taken for a more exquisite degree of Knowledg, and *γνωσικὸς*, a Person profoundly knowing. Hence St. Peter exhorts Christians to join to their Faith *γνώσιν*, that is, the highest degree of Knowledg possible.**

III. It appears indeed, from the Writings of the Apostles, that

*γνώσις*



*γνώσις* signifies such a Knowledg; but I don't know whether it hence follows that the Disciples of *Simon* were by an *Antonomasia*, called even at that time *Gnosticks*, or assumed to themselves that name. There is no place alledged from whence this can be concluded. Besides, I don't know whether all that *Epiphanius* says of the later *Gnosticks* be true, much less do I believe him in every thing concerning the Antient. *Epiphanius* is not a Person whose affirmation should easily be credited, where he accuses and inveighs against the antient Hereticks. Yet I do not take upon me to defend the cause of these Men, of whom there are no Records come to our hands: But I leave the matter undecided.

Chapter  
I.  
W.

IV. It is true indeed that in the Epistle of *Barnabas* many places of the Old Testament are explained Allegorically, and several Mysteries unfolded, which otherwise no one would have discerned in them. But they are interpretations much more like the Jewish *Cabbala*, and the greatest part of them undoubtedly vain, if not also false; but yet fit for the *Jews* of that Age, according to whose Opinions rather than to Truth, *Barnabas* reasons. So that I should not account this *γνώσις* of his, the same with that Christian Knowledg which is so highly extolled by *Clemens*. I would alledg some examples out of him, but that the Epistle of *Barnabas* was this last Year M.DC.XCVII, published at *Amsterdam*, with all the Annotations of all Interpreters upon it.

V. In many places indeed *St. Peter* opposes the Errors, which in his time were spread among Christians, and the evil Practices of some Men; but whether those Errors sprang from *Simon Magus*, and were defended by some particular Sect, who were notorious for their Wickedness, is to me uncertain.

Verf. 16. Note e. I. The first circumstance, from which our Author gathers that the Transfiguration shadowed out the coming of Christ to punish the *Jews*, and deliver the Christians who dwelt in *Palestine*, is altogether vain; because there were at least *six days* interval between the Discourses he mentions, and the Transfiguration, as will appear by *St. Mark* Chap. ix. 2. if we compare his words with *Luke* ix. 28. It is not likely that Christ spent so many days silently, without teaching his Apostles any thing all that while, or inculcating upon them what he had already said; which if he did, there will be no force in *Dr. Hammond's* reasoning, which is grounded only upon this, that the forementioned discourses were made by Christ, immediately before his Transfiguration.

II. Secondly, what he here says about the *Exodus* of Christ, and his comparing


Chapter paring it with the *Exodus* of *Moses* are mere niceties, as easily rejected  
 I. as they were invented. I have shewn on *Luke ix. 31.* that ἐξόδος there  
 signifies a warlike expedition against the obstinate Jews.

Verf. 17. Note f. Our learned Author trifles, when he subtilly distinguishes the μεγαλειότης, *Majesty* or *Greatness* of Christ, from the Voice that was heard. For that Voice was no small part of the μεγαλειότης of Christ, because thereby he was pronounced the *Son of God*, and commanded to be heard. This is clear from the very order of the Discourse: we were witnesses of his Majesty. Δεῶν ΓΑΡ, FOR he received from God the Father, Honor and Glory, such a Voice coming to him. By this very Voice, Majesty, Honour and Glory were conferred on Christ. St. Peter says they were ἐπόπται and ἀκούςαυται, because in the Transfiguration they had seen some things, and heard others. I had rather with Grotius, after λαβὼν understand ἵν' was, than look here for a Hebraism, were it only for the Particle γάρ, which in such an order of words cannot be joined with an absolute Case.

Verf. 19. φαίνοντι ἐν ἀσχυμῆσιν τόπων ] In the first place, I would have φαίνοντι here to be understood in the Preterimperfect Tense; as if St. Peter had said λυγρὴ ὡς ἔφαινε, a Candle which shined, that he may be thought to speak of the Time which preceded the Coming of Christ. Secondly, I should render ἀσχυμῆσιν τόπων, with the *Vulgar* and *Beza*, caliginosum, a dark, or obscurum locum, an obscure place, not that ἀσχυμῆσιν properly signifies obscure, which primarily signifies dry and nasty; but because Dungeons which are nasty, are also dark, therefore ἀσχυμῆσιν here is not nasty, but dark. And the time which preceded the Coming of Christ is fitly called dark, compared with that which succeeded it; as the Knowledge which Men had of Religion under the Old Testament, is aptly resembled to the light of a Candle, in comparison of the Sun of Righteousness Christ Jesus, which being then actually risen, I should render the words of St. Peter thus: Until the Day dawned, and the morning Star arose in your Hearts. St. Peter here tells the Christians, they did well that they read the Prophets, not as the only Rule of Faith, and a perfect and full Revelation of the Will of God; but as Books which they formerly, when they had nothing more clear and full, made use of with great Advantage, till Christ came and taught them all things. Our Author strains this place in his Paraphrase, whilst he applies it to the destruction of Jerusalem.

Ibid. Note g. I. It is true that νοῦς signifies the Mind in Scripture, but it is not opposed here to Heaven, than which nothing could have been said more flat; when the thing it self shews, to any one of common sense, that the morning Star is to be understood in a metaphorical



cal sense. The *morning Star*, and the *Day* here signifie, the Doctrin Chapter  
of the Gospel, compared with the Old Testament; which is said to I.  
be *risen in our Hearts*, when it is not only heard, but sinks down into   
our Minds, so that we heartily believe it.

II. To encourage the Christians to bear patiently the Persecutions which they suffer'd in *Judæa*, in expectation that their Persecutors should be destroyed, it had been improper to propose to them the Prophecies of the Old Testament about that matter, which were very obscure; when they had clear ones deliver'd by Christ, recorded in *Mat. xxiv.* and the parallel places of the other Evangelists.

III. Tho I will not deny but the *Day of Christ*, and *the Day*, are used for a time of Vengeance; yet wherever these Phrases occur, we ought not presently to apply them to that time, as our Author too often does. Because he had interpreted some places of the New Testament not unhappily, about some vile Men whom he calls *Gnosticks*, there is scarce ever any thing said about Impostors, or wicked Men, where he does not think the same Persons to be spoken of. The like fault he commits almost wherever the Discourse is about *the Day*, or about *the coming of Christ*, which he strains to the Vengeance taken upon the *Jews*, overlooking all Circumstances. For tho in his Paraphrase the series of the Discourse seems to have a respect theretô, that is of no moment, because he adds to the words of the Apostles what he pleases. In this place the *morning Star* and *the dawning Day*, are the Gospel, until which the Law and the Prophets continued in force, which were like a *Candle* in the greatest darkness wherein Mankind lay. Afterwards as the light of a Candle is quite obscured by the light of the Sun, they were not of so great use, but yet not to be despised. The Gospel is often compared to Light, as in *Mat. iv. 16.* and *John i. 5. & seqq.* The condition also of the *Jews* before the Gospel, is compared to darkness in the same places. All which clearly enough shew that the Interpretation commonly received, is better than Dr. Hammond's.

Verf. 20. Note h. As ἀφ᾽ ἑπεία signifies the place from whence the Rascals started, not ἐπιπεία, the Apostle should have said ἀπόλυσις sending out, and not ἐπιλυσις sending in, if he had had a respect to that Agonistical Exercise. I had rather interpret ἐπιλυσις as it were a loosening of the Tongue or Mouth; for as they are said to have their Tongues tied who cannot speak, so the Mouth or Tongue of those that speak are said to be loosened, ἐκλύεσθαι. *Rob. and Henr. Stephani* will supply us with examples to this purpose in their *Thesauri*. So that the meaning of St. Peter will be this, that the Prophets did not open their Mouths, ora resolvere, or σῶμα ἐπιλύεσθαι, of their own accord, but by the Will of God.

Verf. 1. [Ἔσονται ψευδοδιδασκαλοὶ.] If the *Gnosticks* had been already every where spread, as our Author both in his Paraphrase and his Annotations often inculcates; St. Peter would never have used the future Tense, *there shall be, shall bring in, &c.* I wonder Dr. Hammond did not observe this.

Verf. 3. [Ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ.] The following Verb, ἐμπρεύσονται, *they shall make Merchandise* of you, clearly shews that πλεονεξία here signifies *Covetousness*, tho our Author, carried away by prejudice, interprets it *Filthiness*. But I have already confuted him on *Rom. i. 29.*

Verf. 5. Note a. This observation our Author owed to *Sam. Bochart*, who treats of the same things more fully in his *Phaleg. Lib. i. c. 3.*

Verf. 10. [Τὸς ὀπίσω σαρκόσ.] This Verse is thought by Dr. Hammond to belong to the *Gnosticks*, whom he supposes to have been by birth *Heathens*; but it as fitly agrees to those wicked *Jews*, who took the ready way to destroy themselves and their Nation by their Seditious, whom *Josephus* exactly describes in many places of his *History of the Jewish War*. From this Writer, who was an Eyewitness of what he relates, it certainly appears that there were such Men as those; but it does not appear from any credible Author, that there were in *Judaea* at that time Dr. Hammond's *Gnosticks*.


Verf. 12. Note b. Our Author is mistaken when he interprets the words ἀλώσις and φθορὰ actively, as appears by the very last word of the Verse. *But these as living Creatures, void of Reason, made by nature εἰς ἀλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν to be taken and destroyed, speaking evil of the things which they understand not, shall perish καταφθαρέσονται in their destruction.* For therefore it is said of them that καταφθαρέσονται, *they should be corrupted*, not that *they should corrupt*, because they were like living Creatures, designed by nature to be taken by men and killed. See *Grotius* on this place.

Verf. 13. Note c. Seeing our Author had begun to borrow from *Grotius* what he here says, he ought with him to have added that it was read so by the *Vulgar Latin Interpreter*.

Verf. 14. Note d. Our Author should not have cited, *Plutarch de Verecundia*, for there is no Book of *Plutarch's* which has that Title; but *de Vitioso Pudore, ὡς Δυσωπίας*. That Rhetorician or Orator was called *Amphicrates*, as we are told by *Longinus de Sublim. cap. iv.* on which see Interpreters.

Verf.



Verf. 15. *Note e.* I. Our Author does not speak accurately, when Chapter. he says that the *Chaldeans* pronounced *Ain y* like *S*, for that is not III. true, and whenever they wrote that Letter, they pronounced it like  the *Jews*. But his meaning was that *Tfade* is changed into the Gut-tural *y Ain*, and therefore it was possible the former might be some-times written for the latter; whence it came to pass that *בעור*, which is expressed in Greek by *βόσος*, was written for *בעור* *behor*.

II. If *St. Peter* here has a reference to the *Gnosticks*, as our Au-thor thinks, and the *Gnosticks* had already crept into most Christian Churches, as the *Doctor* contends; I don't understand why *St. Peter*, in the beginning of the Chapter, should use the Future Tense. But if we understand him to speak of the wicked *Jews*, who had not yet joined themselves to the Christian Assemblies, but yet would join them-selves to them after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, there will be no such difficulty.

Verf. 19. *Ως ὅτι πρὸς ἡττήσεται τῆτοι καὶ δεδύλωται.*] The Apostle here has a re-spect to the first original of Bondage, which was the effect of Victory, and is thus expressed by *Justinian* in *Instit.* Lib. 1. Tit. 3. de Jure Per-sonarum; *Servi ex eo appellati sunt, quod Imperatores captivos vendere, ac per hoc servare, nec occidere solent. Qui etiam mancipia dicti sunt, eo quod ab hostibus manu capiuntur. Servi — fiunt, aut jure gentium, id est, ex captivitate; aut jure civili, cum liber homo, major viginti annis, ad pretium participandum sese venum dari passus est. Servants were so called, because it was the Custom of Commanders to sell their Captives, and to that end servare to keep them, and not kill them. Which were called also Mancipia Slaves, because manu capiuntur, they were taken captive by the Enemy. Men become Servants, either by the Law of Nations, that is by Captivity; or by the Civil Law, when a Free-man above twenty years of Age, to enjoy part of the price, suffers himself to be sold.*

Verf. 22. *Note g.* This Etymology is given by *Sam. Bochart* in *Hie-roz.* Part 1. Lib. ii. c. 57. but he adds others altogether as likely.

## C H A P. III.

Verf. 1. *Ταύτω ἡδὴ, ἀγαπητοὶ, δευτέρην ὑμῶν γράφω ἐπιστολήν.*] *Grotius*, lest these words should be thought to shew that *St. Peter* wrote two Epistles, of which this was the second, contends that *this is the beginning of a new Epistle of the same Simeon*, and that the for-mer was comprehended in two Chapters. But it was never the Custom to send Epistles without any Inscription, tho they were written to those to whom others had been sent before. This appears from the second Epi-  
tles

Chapter III. stles to the *Corinthians*, to the *Thessalonians*, to *Timothy*, &c. So that there is no sufficient reason why we should think this to be the beginning of a new Epistle.

Verf. 2. *Τῶν εἰρημένων ῥημάτων.*] That is, of the Doctrin of the Prophets and Apostles, which our Author without reason interprets only of the destruction of *Jerusalem*; who on this Chapter has out-done himself in straining the Scripture, to prevent our thinking that the Apostle here speaks of the end of all things. But a faithful Interpreter ought not to apply general words to a peculiar sense, unless the thing it self, or the series of the Discourse, requires it; which cannot in this place be pretended.

Verf. 3. *Ἐπ' ἐρχίτε τ' ἡμερῶν.*] That is, as *Grotius* well observes, *hereafter*, which I have already elsewhere suggested: see my Note on *Gen.* xlix. 1. But our Author interprets it of the last Age of the Jewish Commonwealth, which was present at that time wherein he supposes this Epistle to have been written. So that, according to *Dr. Hammond's* Hypothesis, *St. Peter* ought not to have said, *ἐλεύσονται* but *ἦλθον* *came*; for those wicked Men which the *Doctor* thinks are here meant, must have been already come, or they never would come. Besides, who can bear that *ἐμπίπται* *Scoffers*, should be said to signify a mighty defection from the Christian Religion? And what defection happen'd between the XIIth year of *Nero*, in which the *Jewish* War began, and *Jerusalem* was first besieged by *Cestius Gallus*, and the second and last Siege of that City? When the *Jews* were reduced to great straits by the *Romans*, and there were evident Tokens of their approaching Destruction, there was no reason why any should revolt to them; nor do we read that the *Romans* at that time in *Judæa* compelled the *Jews*, or the Christians, to renounce their Religion, and worship the *Roman* Gods. Nay when the Christians had seen the Prophecy of Christ fulfilled, concerning the first Siege of *Jerusalem*, and after that was raised, had retired to *Pella*; there was no reason left to doubt concerning that Coming of Christ which our Author here speaks of. And this happen'd in the XIIth year of *Nero*, from which time the *Jews* suffer'd innumerable Calamities; for in the beginning of the next Year *Vespasian* came with an Army. Our Author had not well consider'd this, when he thought there might be *Scoffers* in the XIIth year of *Nero*, when the *Jews* were to be destroyed, and all the signs of their Destruction were then present. Nay the most discerning part also of the *Jews* themselves had a great while before begun to think that their Affairs were in a bad Condition, as we are told by *Josephus* in *Lib. vii. of the Jewish War*, cap. 12. and elsewhere.

Ibid.



Ibid. *Note a.* I: I shall say nothing about the signification of the word *letsim* in the Old Testament, but whether St. Peter has a respect to that I do not know. Yet however that be, the *Scoffers* mentioned by St. Paul were no better than those of old. I am apt to think they were some of the Sect of the *Sadducees*, or such a sort of men, who denied the resurrection of the dead, and the future judgment; and derided those that believed them. That which follows will shew the Apostle had some such thing in his thoughts.

II. Such men must necessarily, unless they disagreed with themselves, *walk after their own lusts*. For those that expect nothing after death ought in reason to indulge themselves in any sort of pleasure, at least as far as it can do them no hurt in this life.

III. The Apostacy spoken of by St. Paul in *2 Thess.* ii. 3. may more fitly be understood of the defection of the Jews from the Romans, against whom they took up arms; than of the Apostacy of the Christians to any other Opinions, as I have shewn on that place. The passage also in *1 Tim.* iv. 1. is not necessarily to be understood of those times, because it may very fitly be interpreted of any time after that of the Apostles; for *ἕσπερι χρόνοι* signifies any *after times*. Tho there is some similitude between the deception of these, and those spoken of by Christ in *Mat.* xxiv. it does not follow they were the same. Nor are there wanting Hereticks, to whom what St. Paul says may very properly be applied.

IV. I will not deny that St. Peter here speaks of the *Gnosticks*, provided we understand him of those that were after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, whom the Antients describe. *Ἠσθίον* here signifies not *first* in time, but *especially*, as *Grotius* well observes.

Verf. 4. Πᾶ ἔστι ἢ ἐπαγγελία ἢ παρησυχία αὐτῶν.] That in this place the Apostle has a respect not to the coming of Christ to punish only the Jews, but to judg all mankind, appears by the following words, where these *Scoffers* say that all things continue as they were *from the beginning of the Creation*; which does not belong to the Jews, but to all Mankind, whose several Ages had succeeded one another from the beginning of the World. I know our Author thinks there are two objections in this verse, but doubtless he is mistaken; for it is but one, conceived in these words, *Where is the promise of his coming?* which is confirmed by the following: *ἐφ' ἧς ΓΑΡ, Ι ΟΚ* *since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the Creation.* Which words do not contain a new objection, but an enforcement of the former; for because no change had happened among mankind, generally considered, tho the Prophets were thought to have often foretold the last Judgment,

Chapter therefore the Scoffers said, *Where is the promise of his coming?* The Apo-  
 III. stles had spoken much more clearly of that coming, and oftner inculca-  
 ~~~~~ ted it than the Prophets; whereby it came to pass, that the objection  
 was with greater shew of strength renewed against them. For  
 which reason St. Peter here gives a particular and full solution to it.

Ibid. Note b. I. Our Author ought in the first place, to have pro-  
 duced an example, by which it appeared that *ἐξ ἧς* signifies, *except*  
*that*, or something like it; for no body will believe him barely affirm-  
 ing what no one perhaps before ever observed.

II. Secondly, those wicked men derided the promises of the divine  
 Judgment, and so of the Resurrection; because since those *Fathers*, to  
 whom that promise was made, whoever they were supposed to be, not  
 excepting *Adam*, were dead, there had been always the same successi-  
 on of men dying and being born, and no Generation hitherto, from  
 the beginning of the World, had been ever raised from the dead, and  
 called to Judgment. That perpetual succession for so many ages had  
 persuaded them, as they said, that it would always be so, and that the  
 coming of Christ to judg Mankind was promised in vain. To that ob-  
 jection St. Peter first answers, that as the Earth had been of old crea-  
 ted, with the water, which was mixed with it, and whereby wicked  
 men had been punished in the time of *Noah*: so it would once be that  
 the Earth being dissolved by means of Fire, which is in nature, bad  
 men should be punished thereby. Which is just as if he had said, that  
 the change which will hereafter be made with fire, ought as easily to  
 be believed, as that which had been of old made with water. This is  
 clearly the sense of this place, which shews the discourse to be about the  
 end of the whole World, not of the Jewish Commonwealth only.

III. If the Unbelievers, St. Peter opposes, had rejected only that  
 which was said concerning the ruin of the Jewish State, they would  
 not have used such an argument as this, that there had no change hap-  
 pened since the beginning of the World; because no one was so sens-  
 less as to deny that both many other Commonwealths had been de-  
 stroyed, and the Jewish State had been overthrown in the time of *Ne-  
 buchadnezzar*, to omit other calamities that beset it. All, except a  
 few furious Jews, were afraid of the destruction of that Common-  
 wealth by the Roman Power, which at that time not only lay  
 heavy upon its neck, but was also an enemy to it. St. Peter likewise  
 would not have recurred to the Deluge to prove that the Jewish  
 Commonwealth was to be destroyed, but to the History of that Com-  
 monwealth, and to the power of the Roman Empire, and the actions  
 of the Romans. I need say no more: in so clear a case.



Verf. 5. *Note c.* I had rather, with *Grotius* and others, interpret Chapter *III.*  
*σελότως* of wilful ignorance; for they who objected such things against the Apostles, were not unacquainted with the story of the Flood, because that story was known by the Heathens themselves. Nor could our Author think it was unknown to the Jews or *Gnosticks*, to whom he attributes the foregoing objection. And therefore he interprets *λανθάνει* in his Paraphrase, not of ignorance but of carelessness, or want of consideration. But I prefer the former interpretation, for the fore-mentioned reason.

Verf. 7. *Note e.* I. It is true that the *whole* is sometimes expressed by *all* or *some* of its parts, by which no more is signified, than by the single name of the whole. But I don't think that the *heavens and the earth* any where signifies either the earth alone, or this sublunary region. At least no place ever occurred to me in which these words were so taken. See also my Note on *Col. i. 20.*

II. Our Author in his Annotation says, that the words, *heaven and earth*, signify *Jerusalem*, but in his Paraphrase he makes no mention of their having any such signification. Which yet he ought to have done, if that were true which he had observed on the foregoing verses concerning the objection of the *Scoffers*. For if *St. Peter* here speaks of the conclusion of the whole World, he spake before of the same. But if he spake before of the destruction of *Jerusalem*, he discourses of the same also here. So that the 7th verse, as it is explained in the Doctor's Paraphrase, has no connexion with the foregoing.

Verf. 8. *Μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίου ὡς ἡμέρα ἔστιν.*] If our Author's mind had not been prejudiced and taken up with a false interpretation, he would easily have seen that *St. Peter* in these words had a respect to the delaying of the *last judgment*. For that which he aims at in them is, that a delay perhaps of many ages might not seem long, and that no one might therefore cry out, *Where is the promise of his coming?* No such thing could be said about the destruction of *Jerusalem*, which *St. Peter* certainly knew would shortly happen, because of Christ's prediction, and which, when the Jewish War began, discerning Persons might almost foresee. It is absurd to speak of a thing that is to come to pass in a short time, as if it were at the distance of several thousand years, as *St. Peter* here would speak, according to *Dr. Hammond's* opinion. If he had thought of the extinction of the Jews, he would have said undoubtedly that the thing would come to pass in a little time, and that there was no need of any long patience.


Chapter III. Vers. 10. *Note f.* This interpretation of our Author is false in all respects. *ῥοιζέω* is properly *sibilo, strideo, to hiss, to gnash or rattle*; and *ῥοιζουδὸν* is not simply *with a noise*, but with a rattling. This is the proper signification of it, which ought not, without reason, to have been forsaken. Besides, *σφοδρῶς* is not *swiftly*, but *vehemently*, in *Phavorinus*. The reason also, taken from the comparison of a Thief in the night, is of no force: for it is not said that the day of the Lord will come *ῥοιζουδὸν, as a thief in the night*; but that *the Heavens will pass away with a rattling noise*, when that sudden and unexpected day comes as a Thief. The coming of the Lord is compared to the coming of a Thief, because both are sudden, not because the Lord will punish the Wicked without noise.

II. It is utterly false, that the Destruction of the Jews was so sudden and unexpected: for certainly after *Vespasian* had entred into *Judea*, it was not difficult to conjecture that there was an end of the Jewish Commonwealth, to those who were able to compare the strength of the Jews with that of the Romans. Even before, under the Government of *Gessius Florus*, and when *Cestius Gallus* came into *Judea*, the Anger of the Romans was loudly enough proclaimed against the Jews.

*Ibid.* in *Note g.* Col. 2. Lin. 2. after the words, *testified by Predictions.*] By the way here I shall advertise the Reader, that the *Chapters* of *Josephus* are to be understood according to the Latin Division, and that there is a fault in the citation of the Passage where *Josephus* speaks of the burning of the Temple, which is said to be in *lib. 3. c. 9.* when it is in *lib. 7.* which seems to be a mistake in the Print. Besides, what *Dr. Hammond* here says about *the fatal day*, as out of *Josephus*, is grounded only upon the Latin Translation of *Sig. Gelenius*, which runs thus: *Evolutisque temporibus, aderat fatalis dies, qui erat decimus mensis Augusti.* But in the Greek the thing is otherwise worded; to wit, *μαρτῶ ἡ ἡ ἀναστροφῆς, ἡ ἡμέρα δεκάτη τοῦ μηνὸς Λοῦς*: *And their fate came, in the revolution of times, in the tenth day of the month Lous.* Which shews that *Dr. Hammond's* observation is vain. But let us hear him straining the words of *St. Peter* to the Destruction of *Jerusalem*.

*Ibid.* At the end of that *Note.*] I. When our Author refers us to his Premonition, for proof that *St. Peter* here speaks of the excision of the Jews, and not of the end of the World, he makes a mere circle; for what he says there is grounded upon these violent Interpretations, which if false, what he affirms in his Premonition must of necessity be false also. It is true indeed, that the Prophets, when



when they describe a great change in the Affairs of an Empire or Commonwealth, make, if I may so speak, *Heaven and Earth meet together* (*caelum terra miscent*) and use such like Phrases. But here the circumstances of the place shew that the Discourse is about the end of all things. See my Notes on *Vers.* 7. and 8. Chapter III. 

II. I acknowledg the word *στῆλαι* frequently signifies the Planets, and the signs of the Zodiack, as is at large shewn by *Æg. Menagius* on *Lib. vi. S. 102.* of *Diogenes Laertius.* But it being added here to the *Heavens*, there can be no doubt but we are to understand the starry Heaven, in which those elements are. The word *ἄνω*, when it is alone, is ambiguous, and may be understood as well of the lower regions as of the upper: but when it is joined with the Planets, or the Stars, it ceases to be ambiguous, and signifies the starry Heaven; as on the contrary, when it is said *the birds of heaven*, the word *Birds* shews it to signify the air. But it is the greatest absurdity imaginable, because the *στῆλαι* are in the starry heaven, to say that that word signifies what is in the Air, the Clouds, Birds, &c. Which can neither be made out by reasoning, nor confirmed by any use of the Greek Language, or of the sacred Writers.

III. Nor is there any better ground for what our Author says about the distinct signification of *the heavens* and *the earth*; for the style of the Prophets in this matter is such, as he himself observes on *vers.* 7. that every word has not a particular signification, but the whole discourse one general meaning. But *Dr. Hammond* when he has any thing to prove, often takes up every thing that lies in his way, not excepting those things which elsewhere he himself has confuted.

*Vers.* 16. *Note h.* I. I agree with *Dr. Hammond* in keeping here to the ordinary reading. But the rest of what he says is so forced, that I wonder so learned a man could satisfy himself in that wherein he will satisfy no one else. It is a mistake that *St. Paul* in most of his Epistles speaks of the destruction of the Jews, as I have shewn against our Author in several places; on the contrary, nothing is more true than that he ordinarily speaks of the last judgment. It is false that in the destruction of *Jerusalem* there was any thing *δυσνόητον*; for what was there in it hard to be understood? Was it strange that a sinful nation should be punished by God, or that *Jerusalem* should be demolished, which had formerly suffered the like under *Nebuchadnezzar*? Was it difficult at that time to understand that the Jews were oppressed by the Romans, whose subjects they then were? To none certainly but Fools or Madmen. It is needless to confute what our Author here says, about the series of *St. Paul's* discourse from *vers.* 3. which I have already shewn that he misinterprets.

Chapter II. As it is improbable, considering the thing it self, that Christ did  
 III. not know the point of time in which *Jerusalem* was to be destroyed;   
 so it is yet more improbable, that that Destruction was so very unexpected at the time when this Epistle was written, and the whole Jewish Nation had broke out into Rebellion, and divided themselves into several Factions. Whoever reads *Josephus* of the Jewish War, will easily see that Dr. *Hammond* invented what he thought would serve to confirm his Hypothesis, and did not take it out of History. Of the place in *Acts*. i. 7. consult *H. Grotius*.

III. Our Author perpetually speaks of the Destruction of the *Gnosticks*, as a concomitant of the destruction of the Jews; which would be tolerable, if the discourse were only of those that were in *Judea*, and feigned themselves to be Jews: But what was this to the *Gnosticks* that dwelt in other Provinces of the Roman Empire? What did the Calamities which beset *Judea* concern also the Christians that lived elsewhere, except that they saw the Prophecies of Christ accomplished in them? There was no need likewise of their being carefully admonished, that the particular point of time was unknown wherein *Jerusalem* was to be burnt, because from the disturbances that were in *Judea*, they might easily conclude that it was near at hand. The only thing the Apostles could then do in this matter, was to admonish the Jews that had embraced the Christian Religion, and lived elsewhere, that they should not go into *Judea*, nor enter into *Jerusalem*, unless they would incur the same danger as threatned *Palestine* and that City.

IV. Many might abuse those Passages of *S. Paul*, in which he describes the last Judgment, as if it were near at hand, because the time of it was uncertain. See *1 Thess.* c. iv. and v. *1 Cor.* xv. and *2 Cor.* v. It was now ten years, or more, since he had wrote in that manner to the *Thessalonians*; from whence some might conclude that he was deceived, and so revolt from the Faith they had received from him. But this was not properly *δυσνόητος*, but other circumstances of the Judgment, of which the greatest part are *δυσνόητα* to those who judg of them by humane experience. Such things might more easily *σεβλάσθαι* be wrested, than those which Dr. *Hammond* speaks of; tho it's true what might not be wrested by ignorant and wicked men; when our learned and pious Author, serving an Hypothesis, has so strangely wrested both this Chapter and many other places of the New Testament, contrary to all the Rules of Grammar, and Accounts of History.



## A N N O T A T I O N S

O N T H E

First Epistle General of St. *John*.

**A**T the end of the *Premom.*] Of the *Gnosticks* and the *last Hour* I shall speak on the places where Dr. *Hammond* treats of them.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 1. **O**<sup>s</sup> *Ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.*] That which had been said and done by Christ from the beginning of the Gospel, is here opposed to the new Doctrines of false Prophets. Besides this, we have an indirect intimation here of the Writer of this Epistle, who was from the beginning with Christ, which was necessary to make an Apostle. See *Acts* i. 21, 22.

Verf. 5. *Note a.* I will not affirm, with our Author, that the Apostle here has a respect to the *Gnosticks*, the disciples of *Simon*; who did not, as those to whom St *John* speaks, hope to attain Salvation by Christ, seeing, if what the Antients say be true, *Simon* opposed his Apostles, and said that he himself was Christ, as we are told by *Irenæus* lib. i. c. xx. who also says that *Simon* affirmed in so many words *secundum ipsius gratiam salvati homines, that men were saved by his grace.* If St. *John* had been to oppose *Simon*, he would in the first place have shewn, that he lied in calling himself Christ. But they seem to be bad Christians, who abused the Gospel which the Apostles preached; which they pretended to have embraced, and whose errors the Apostle here confutes. *Light*, in the style of the New Testament, signifies holiness; and *darkness* wickedness. See the Epistle of *Barnabas* towards the end, where he discourses of the *way of light*, and the *way of darkness.*

Verf. 10. *Note b.* That the *Gnosticks*, that is the followers of *Simon's Magus*, who did not believe in Christ but *Simon*, are here referred to;

Chapter I do not think : for these refused to be accounted the disciples of the  
 I. Apostles, nor did the Apostles join themselves to them ; and therefore  
 St. *John* would not have confuted them, as he here does, for it is suffi-  
 ciently manifest that he confutes men that lived among the Christians. I  
 rather think he has a respect to some Jews, who were not throughly  
 sensible of the sins they had committed whilst they were Jews, and in  
 which they still lived after their conversion to the Christian Religion.  
 These ought to acknowledg that they *had sin*, that is, as St. *John* af-  
 terwards speaks, that they *had sinned*, and so had deserved punishment  
 for their past sins ; which unless they did, *they made Christ a liar*,  
 because they denied they stood in need of his Redemption, when he  
 had taught that he came to redeem all the World ; for he that has  
 not sinned, is liable to no punishment for sin, and needs not a Redeem-  
 er. Besides, upon that confession of their sins, it was consequent that  
 they should renounce them, if they would *have fellowship* with Christ,  
 as he speaks in *verse 7.* that is, be his true disciples, whom he would  
 make partakers with himself of eternal happiness. By this we may  
 understand why St. *John* says he writes these things to Christians, *that*  
*they sin not.* But tho he uses this phrase *γινώσκοντες χριστόν*, *to know Christ*,  
 it does not presently follow he alludes to the *Gnosticks*, because all who  
 professed to embrace the Gospel, said that they therefore embraced it,  
 because they *knew* that Jesus came from God. Such allusions must not  
 be recurred to, but when the thing cannot well be understood with-  
 out an allusion. Otherwise whenever the Apostles use the Verb *γινώσκοντες*,  
 where the discourse is about the knowledg of the Christian Religion,  
 or those things which concern it, we must always recur to the *Gnosticks*,  
 who it is not certain in the Apostles age were so called. Besides, to  
 find out Dr. *Hammond's* conceptions in St. *John*, innumerable things  
 must be supplied, and added ; than which way of interpreting, no-  
 thing can be imagined more uncertain.

## C H A P. II.

Vers. 1. ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΙΣ ἑξ ἑλίου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.] What our Author says in  
 his Paraphrase about the Prayers of the Church, is in-  
 deed true, but does not belong to this place, in which St. *John* does not  
 speak the least word about the Church. And therefore I had rather he  
 had omitted it, and reserved it for a fitter place ; for it is a deceitful Pa-  
 raphrase, which assumes things that are neither expressly contained in  
 the words of the Apostle, nor necessarily deduced from them. Our  
 Author every now and then imposes his own conceptions upon the  
 Reader



Reader instead of St. *John's*. This by the way, lest I should seem to Chapter  
approve of Dr. *Hammond's* insertions, if I had taken no notice of II.  
them.

Verf. 18. *Note b.* I. I had rather our Author had contented himself with a more general Assertion, and said that St. *John* here had a respect to divers *false Christians*, which at that time had revolted from the Christian Church, and the Doctrin of the Apostles, whether they were *Simon's* Disciples, or others. For this only being affirmed, there would have been no need of interpreting several words of this Chapter, not so much as they truly signify, as according to the signification which he would have to belong to them, that he might find in them his own Opinion. Read what he says of the five things foretold by Christ, which he supposes to be spoken of in this Chapter as fulfilled; and compare it with St. *John's* own words, and it will appear that a great many things must be supplied in them, to make out Dr. *Hammond's* interpretation.

II. *Polycarpus* is said by *Irenæus* Lib. iii. c. 3. to have saluted *Marcion* when he met him once at *Rome*, *primogenitum Satanae*, *The first-born of Satan*. And to him, or rather to any Hereticks who did as he says, he seems to have had a respect, not to the *Gnosticks* only.

*Ibid.* *Note e.* I. I will not exclude indeed *Simon* and his followers out of the number of these *Antichrists*; but that name signifying, as is well observed by our Author after *Grotius*, both those that oppose Christ directly, whilst they deny that *Jesus of Nazareth* is the *Messias*, or was a true Man; and those who take upon themselves to be *Christs*, or put themselves in the place of Christ, I don't see why we should think the Apostle here to have a respect to the *Gnosticks*, more than to any others, who did either of those things. It's true, those *Antichrists* are said to have gone out of the Christian Assemblies; but who knows whether others, besides the *Gnosticks*, that were half *Jews*, did not depart from the Christian Churches? There being no historical Records of the Christians of those times, we cannot certainly determin any thing about this matter.

II. Our Author thought that *ἀντιπικίω* signified that which is called in English to counterfeit, in French *contrefaire*; but his Memory failed him, for *ἀντιπικίω* signifies only *contra facio*, *adversarius sum*, *altercor*, *par pari reddo*, *aggredior*, *vindico*, *rependo*; To counterwork, to resist, to contend, to return like for like, to set upon, to revenge, to repay. Yet it is true that the Preposition *ἀντι*, as when alone, so in Composition signifies that which Dr. *Hammond* affirms; for it signifies *loco*, *in the place of*, and *pro*, *for* as well as *contra*, *against*; so that the name *ἀντιχριστός*

Chapter III. may truly be applied not only to him who directly opposes Christ, but also who puts himself *in the place of Christ*, tho he denies nothing concerning Jesus. So ἀνταλλάξω is to *exchange*, that is, to give and receive one thing *for another*; ἀνταρθεῖν is *one that comes in the place of another Man*; ἀντιθέσθαι is to *substitute*; ἀνταρθεῖν, to *compensate*; ἀνθύπατος, *A Proconsul*, &c.

## C H A P. III.

Verf. 19. I. **O**F this word Dr. *Hammond* has treated on *Gal. i. 10.* Note e. and interpreted it in the same sense as he does here; but I have shewn on that place that he is mistaken. Here also the expression is *Elliptical*, for πείσομεν τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν, *we shall persuade our Hearts*, is a doubtful Phrase, for the understanding of which, we must repeat out of the foregoing words, ὅτι ἐκ τῆ ἀληθείας ἐσμεν; that is, we shall be conscious to our selves, *before God*, that we are truly Christians. St. *John* teaches us that he is a true Christian, who helps his Neighbour not in Words, but in Deeds; and from that true Beneficence only can conclude himself to be a good Man, and rest thoroughly perswaded of it in his own Mind. But he that assists his Neighbour only in words, when he is able indeed to relieve him, if he deceives others, yet he cannot deceive himself, but is conscious to himself before God of Uncharitableness. And St. *John* adds ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, *before him*, to wit, God, because God only is witness of the Judgment which we secretly pass upon our selves. Hence that noted expression in Scripture, *to be just before God*, to signify a true and sincere Vertue, because God alone is the true and infallible judg of it. See *Luke i. 6.* and Interpreters on that place.

II. Τελεῖσθαι καὶ συνείδησιν, is to be purged so by a *τελετή*, as to be conscious that God is propitious to us. See my Notes on *Heb. ii. 10.* & *vii. 11.*

## C H A P. IV.

Chapter IV. Verf. 2. **Π**ᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ ἐμολογῆ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐστίν.] The words ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα must be rendred, as Dr. *Hammond* well observes in the Margin of the English Translation, not *that [Jesus Christ] is come in the Flesh*, but *which is come in the Flesh*. But besides, this whole Period is to be understood thus: *every Spirit that confesses Jesus, who is come in the Flesh, to be the Christ, is of God.* Such another Expression there is in St. *John's Gospel chap. xvii. 3.* where see my Note. So also St. *Paul*, *1 Cor. xii. 3.*

Οὐδὲὶς



Οὐδὲς δύναται εἰπεῖν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, εἰ μὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, that is, *no Man can say that Jesus is the Christ, but in the Holy Ghost.* In St. John's words there are three things contained, *first*, that Jesus the Son of *Mary*, who was called a *Nazarene*, was the *Messias*, which the *Jews* denied; *secondly*, that *Jesus* was come in the *Flesh*, that is, was truly a *Man*, and subject to the inconveniencies of human Life, which many of the first *Hereticks* denied, if we believe the *Antients*; *thirdly*, that they could not be rejected as *Impostors*, who said that *Christ* was the true *Messias*, and a *Man* like us. But it may be enquired whether there could not be *Impostors* who confessed both, and yet maintained other pernicious *Errors*? There might without doubt, but at that time all the *Impostors* offended in one or other of these points, and to them St. *John's* marks must be referred; not to all *Impostors* which might be, or which afterwards appeared.

Verf. 12. Τετελειωμένη ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν.] That is, it appears by the love which we have for one another, that our love to God is most perfect, which otherwise is not *τετελειωμένη*, but *ἀπλήρης*, when we have some degree indeed of *Piety* towards God, but do not heartily enough love our *Neighbour*. Such were the *Jews*, who professed to love none but those of their own *Religion*, and were not sincere even in that: see *Cap. ii. 5.* Our Author in his *Paraphrase* of this and the following *Verses*, is very harsh, and scarce knows how to speak his own *Thoughts*, so far is he from happily expressing the mind of the *Apostle*.

## C H A P. V.


Verf. 6. I. **I**F I should undertake to examine particularly all the *Note a.* foregoing medly, I should be obliged, instead of short *Additions*, to write a long *Dissertation*. And therefore I shall touch only upon the chief things. I do not disagree with our Author about the interpretation of the 6th *verse*, but I wonder he spends so many words in endeavouring to make out the *Connection* of *vers. 7.* with that, and the meaning of the words *are one*, or *are to one*, before he had shewn, or endeavoured to shew that this *Verse* and those words are *genuin*. Of such an order in discoursing it may be said, *ἀνω ποταμῶν χωρῆσι πηγαί.* But to pass by this, Dr. *Hammond* does but wrangle with all the most learned *Interpreters*, who interpret *are one* of consent. And the reason why they understand those words of consent, is, first, because they are so taken in *John x. 30.* & *xvii. 21.* secondly, because here the *Discourse* is about a *unity* of *Testimony*, and not about a *unity* of *Nature*. But why is this consent other-

Chapter wise expressed in the following Verse? I answer, for variety sake, or  
 V. also by mere accident; for in this simple stile words must not be so subtilly scanned or watched. All our Author here alledges besides, is  
 ~~~~~ foreign to the purpose, and the scope of the Apostle.

II. As for his saying that tho the *Alexandrian*, and many other antient Manuscript Copies, omit the 7th Verse, yet it is read in many other Manuscripts, and all the printed Copies except one; that, to say no worse of it, is not accurately said. For in the old Greek Copies, that is, which were written seven or eight Ages ago and older, it is nowhere read, and seldom in those that are later. In the most antient Latin Copies likewise it is not read, tho frequently in the New. *Beza* alledges a British Greek Copy, mention'd by *Erasmus*, and a Spanish Complutenian Edition, and several Copies of *R. Stephanus*, which have this place. But besides that these do not sufficiently agree with one another, they are by no means to be equal'd with the most antient Copies, which with great consent reject this Verse; and are confirmed by the Authority of all the Greek and Latin Fathers until *St. Austin*, who never used this place against the *Arians*, or other antient *Antitrinitarians*; tho they often make mention of the three Witnesses on Earth, as learned Men have long since observed. For as for our Author's objecting *St. Cyprian*, *Jerom*, and *Ambrosius*, that is to no purpose, as we shall presently see. There are more printed Copies than one, which omit this place; but tho they all had it, their Authority would signify nothing against the Manuscript Copies, and the consent of Antiquity.

III. The conjecture about the omission of some *Scribe*, because of the repetition of the like words, as it takes place elsewhere, so it cannot here be allowed; *first*, because it must be supported by another Conjecture; and *secondly*, because it opposes all Antiquity. For who will believe that such an omission was admitted in all the Copies, which the Christians used privately and publickly for several Ages; and afterwards was discovered by I know not whom, without the help of any antient Copy? Who but those who have no regard to truth, and think that Truth may be defended by the help of Falshood? Our Author's reasonings against the suspicion of this place being supposititious, are insignificant, because they cannot be opposed to the joint Authority of the antient Copies, Fathers, and Interpreters. Besides, who does not know, that tho Truth may be well defended, and relies upon solid grounds, yet the Orthodox, as well as others, invented innumerable falshoods to support it? Whence came so many supposititious Books in antient times, but from this perverse practice? But here it  
 is



is to be observed, that it might easily be that these words were insert- Chapter  
ed into the Context, not out of any design to deceive; but some Bo- V.  
dy having in the Margin of his Copy, over against the 8th Verse, no-  
ted that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was signified in this place,   
others afterwards put that into the Text; as is conjectured by Ric.  
*Simon*, who has set this matter in a clear light, in his *Critical History*  
*of the New Testament* P. 1. c. 18. and his *Dissert. concerning the Manu-*  
*script Copies of the New Testament* added to the 3d Part, to whom I  
refer the Reader. The places our Author here alledges to prove the  
Doctrin of the Trinity, might have been found in any Theological  
System, and in greater number: nor do they make any thing to con-  
firm the ordinary reading, for every thing which is agreeable to the  
Christian Faith, is not presently the true Reading. Whereas he adds,  
that if this place had been corrupted by the Orthodox, the *Arians*  
would have taken notice of it; tho that should be admitted as a forcible  
Argument, it would signify nothing to this place; which seems to have  
been inserted very lately, seeing none of the ancient Fathers, Greek  
or Latin, till the time of St. *Austin*, ever alledged it against the *Arians*.  
Consult the foremention'd Monsieur *Simon*.

IV. The passage cited out of St. *Cyprian*, does not prove that he  
read this place, as we read it in the printed Copies, but only that he  
understood the words of the 8th Verse, of the Father, Son and Holy  
Ghost; which is so clearly demonstrated by Mr. *Simon*, that a Man  
must be very obstinate, after reading his reasons, to assert the contra-  
ry. Our Author produces a place out of *Tertullian* in Lib. *Contra Prax-*  
*eam*, without adding the Chapter or Page; which is a very bad Custom,  
in a thing especially of such great Moment. So that I was forced to  
read the greatest part of that Book, to find out the place, which is in  
*Cap. xxv. p. 515. of the Paris Ed. An. 1675.* But *Tertullian* has not  
a respect to this place in the 1st Epistle of St. *John*, but to *John x. 30.*  
For these are his words: *Connexus Patris in Filio, & Filii in Paraclito,*  
*tres efficit coherentes, alterum cum altero; qui tres unum sunt, non unus,*  
*quomodo dictum est: ego & pater unum sumus; ad substantiae unitatem;*  
*non ad numeri singularitatem.* The conjunction of the Father with the  
Son, and of the Son with the Comforter, makes three cleaving together  
one upon another; which three are (*unum*) one thing, not (*unus*) one  
as it is said; I and my Father are (*unum*) one thing; as to unity of Sub-  
stance, not as to singularity of number. He no where alledges this place  
in 1 *John*, which yet in that disputation he ought to have alledged, if  
it had been read at that time, as it is now; seeing he often alledges  
the place in *John x.* which is not so express to his purpose. *Praxeas*

was

Chapter V. was of the opinion of *Sabellius* or *Photinus*, who thought that there was but one Person in the Godhead; so that perhaps he might have abused this place in *St. John*, and so have alledged it; or if this place had been thought to be contrary to him, it would have been alledged against him. *St. Jerom's* name is prefixed indeed to the Preface to the Catholick Epistles; but that it is not his Preface has been shewn by *Mr. Simon* in the 2d Part of his *Critical History* of the New Testament, c. ix. and the Benedictine Monks, who have lately begun to set forth the Works of *St. Jerom* at *Paris*, tho very great Adversaries to *Father Simon*, have confirmed his Arguments, so that they seem to have stopped the Mouth of Obstinacy it self; which *Dr. Hammond* also would have acknowledged,

*Si foret hoc nostrum fato dilatus in ævum,*

*If he had lived to this day.* As for *St. Ambrose*, it is not without intolerable Negligence that his words are not set down; because *Dr. Hammond* knew that he would not be believed in this matter. But really there is no where any such thing in the true *St. Ambrose*. And if such a fault had been committed by *F. Socinus*, our Author would not have spared him so easily, as he forgave himself.

V. He would have done much better, towards the confirmation of the Truth, to adhere only to the Scripture, and not to recur to the Fathers, whose opinion was quite different from that which is now received; as who, properly speaking, affirmed that there were three consubstantial Gods, as has been shewn by *Dyon. Petavius*, *Steph. Curcellæus*, *Dr. Cudworth*, and others. Our Author had read the Fathers upon this Head with a mind full of Prejudice, as it is very common for Persons to do; and with little care, as appears by the choice of places which he produces. I should not think it safe to cite *Clemens* upon the Authority of *St. Basil*, because he might have taken the alledged words out of an Apocryphal and supposititious writing of *Clemens*, of which kind there were a great many of old, and are some still at this day. For it is notorious that the Antients, neglecting all the rules of Criticks, often confounded supposititious Writings with genuin. And our Author imitates them, whilst he alleges Passages out of the manifestly spurious Writings of *Justin Martyr*, as his, or at least as if they were of some moment; for why otherwise did he produce them? Of the rest I have nothing to say, but that *Dr. Hammond* could not stand by the Faith of the Fathers which he cites; who, to speak the truth, were Tritheists rather than assertors of the present



present Opinion. For they believed *the unity of Substance*, not *the singularity of number*, as *Tertullian* speaks, that is, that the substance of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost was specifically one; but numerically three; as the learned Men, I before mention'd, have clearly shewn, and might much more largely be demonstrated. Those that do not think fit to anathematize the Fathers, ought also to be charitable to other erroneous persons, for a great many reasons, to every one obvious. Besides, whoever considers these things seriously, will not be so apt to boast of the consent of Antiquity, or complain so loudly of Hereticks as *Dr. Hammond* here does; who, I believe, acted therein sincerely, but without due consideration, and not very much like a Christian, which I do not speak out of a censorious Humor, but only by way of Admonition.

Verf. 16. *Note c.* I. I rather think that ἀμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον is a Metaphor taken from Diseases, which are said to be πρὸς θάνατον, when they are mortal; as appears from *John xi. 4.* I wonder *Dr. Hammond* sets down *St. John's* words, as if he had said ΕΙΣ θάνατον, when all Copies have πρὸς. Did not that false reading induce him to seek here for Excommunication?

II. I don't know why our Author makes mention here of the Prayers of the Church, when the Apostle speaks of this matter so, as to mention nothing about the Church or its Governors. The *Power of the Keys*, which was too much in the *Doctor's* thoughts, made him look for those things which belong to it, even where there is no foot-step of them.

Verf. 21. Ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων.] Our Author in the Margin of the English Translation, remarks that the *Alexandrian* Copy adds θύει, which the *Vulgar* Interpreter also read. And indeed if it be omitted, it must be understood. See *Grotius* on this place.

Verf. 21. *Note d.* But I don't know why the Idols of the Heathens themselves may not here be understood, whose Worship the Christians were no less obliged to beware of, than the Idolatry of the *Simonians*. Nay, there was a much greater care necessary to be taken, in order to keep themselves from the worship of the Heathens, because Heathens had the government of the World, and compelled the Christians by Torments to join with them in their Idolatry; whereas the followers of *Simon* had no Authority either in the Roman Empire, or else where.

## ANNOTATION

ON THE

Second Epistle of St. *John*.Verf. 1.  
Note a.

**I** Wish our Author had given us better reasons for thinking that some of the Primitive Christian Churches had a twofold Bishop, one a *Jew*, and the other a *Gentile*. For I can see a great many Objections, to which that supposition is liable, and which I do not understand how he could have satisfactorily answered. There might that also be said against the Notion he affixes to *weia*, which would be sufficient to overthrow it, but which for brevity sake I pass by. I rather think the Apostle here addressed himself to some *Christian Matron*, whose name, for the reason mention'd by Dr. *Hammond*, he concealed. It's known that the word *Elect* is often used to signify all Christians, as *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond* have several times proved.

## ANNOTATIONS

ON THE

Epistle of St. *Jude*.Verf. 4.  
Note a.

**I** Had rather understand *πρὸ γράφειν* according to the common use of the Preposition *πρὸ* in Composition, for *before*; for *πρὸ γράμμα* also does not seem so much to signify, if we urge the proper Notion of the word, that which is *set forth*, as that which was *before written*, but with a design that afterwards it may be publicly set forth to be read. For an Edict, or an Advertisement, was first written on Paper or a Board, before it was exposed to be read publicly, and to that end fixed up in some  
open



open *cc.* So likewise in *Gal. iii. 1.* I chuse to render *αἰνεῖται*, *hath been more delineated*, rather than *set forth*. St. *Jude* here alludes to *Laws*, which *αἰνεῖται* punishments to Malefactors, as a means to deter Men from transgressing. His meaning is that such Men as he speaks of, were already expressly condemned by the divine *Laws*, because Punishments were clearly *prescribed* to their Crimes. So that I do not think there is a respect here had to any prediction of Christ.

II. I don't see the necessity of interpreting what St. *Jude* here says of none but the Followers of *Simon*, when we may very well understand him of any wicked Men whatsoever, who had joined themselves to the Christians, both *Jews* and others, such as afterwards was that *Peregrinus*, spoken of by *Lucian*. For the great Charity of the Christians, who suffer'd none that joined with them in their Worship, to want necessaries; and their frequent *ἀγάπαι* *Love-feasts* drew to them not only those that were good, but also many wicked Men. If Dr. *Hammond* will call these *Gnosticks*, I shall not be against it, because I won't contend about a name; but wonder from what credible Author he came to understand, that all the bad Christians of those times espoused the opinions of *Simon Magus*.

III. He thinks that *καίρια* here signifies the destruction of *Jerusalem*, which that it may be true, he must suppose that this Epistle of St. *Jude* was directed only to the Christians of *Judaea*; for these alone were destroyed with the *Jews*, who had joined themselves with them in taking up Arms against the *Romans*. But I see no sign in this Epistle, by which it may appear that it was written to the Christians of *Judaea*, rather than to others. And then if it be not evident that in this Verse *Condemnation* signifies the destruction of the *Jews*, it will not be certain that the *common Salvation*, spoken of in the Verse before, is the deliverance of the Christians out of the hands of the *Jews*, by whom they were persecuted. I had rather understand, both *Salvation*, of eternal Happiness, and *Condemnation*, of everlasting Punishment, which God was about to inflict upon them. And so Men *prescribed to this Judgment*, are Men condemned by the divine *Laws* to suffer perpetual Misery, for the Sins which St. *Jude* enumerates.

*Ibid. Note b.* I don't believe the Apostle here speaks of a positive and open *denying* of the points of Faith mention'd; for how would the Christians have endured in their *Agapæ*, Men who had denied God the Father, or Jesus to be the Christ? He could not be accounted a Christian, that denied those Doctrins. But he means a denying of them before the Heathens, in case they were vehemently urged to it; so that it was only to avoid Persecution that they denied themselves to be

Christians; which they thought they might very lawfully do: They no more believed *Simon*, or the Priests of the Heathens, than they did Christ, nor opposed him any more than others; but, according to the time and place they were in, feigned themselves to believe what it was their Interest to appear to believe.

Verf. 7. *Note c.* But there is another more proper, if, namely, we understand these Punishments of that *Fire*, with which, in St. *Jude's* time, all the Coast of *Sodom* did still burn; for which reason it is called eternal, because it continued burning for so many Ages. Upon this account the *Sodomites* will be said *αὐκείδαι δειγμα*, that is, *before set to be an example*, and still so to be. See what I have said about this matter in a *Dissert. de subversione Sodomæ*.

Verf. 8. *Note d.* Tho I prefer the Apostles before all the lesser or greater Powers of the Roman Empire, yet I do not think they are here respected, who are no where else called by that name; for as for their being said to be stiled the *glory of Christ* in 2 *Cor. viii. 23.* that is foreign to this place, because it is a quite different thing. Besides, *δοξα* being very frequently used among Greek Writers, to signify *Honours* and *Empires*, or *Magistrates*, it is better to follow here that notion. And so I am apt to think the Apostle has a respect not so much to the *Gnosticks*, as to the *Jews*, who bore the Yoke of the Roman Magistrates very impatiently, and said that it was unlawful for a *Jew* to serve any but God, whom they called *the only Lord and Ruler*. This was the Opinion of the fourth Sect of the *Jews*, founded by *Judas Gaulonita*; of whose followers *Josephus* speaks thus, *Lib. 18. cap. 2. Antiq. Jud.* Ταῦτ' ἔτι λοιπὰ πάντα γνώμη τῶν φαρισαίων ὁμολογεῖσι, δυσκίνητον δὲ τὸ ἐλευθέρως ἕξασ ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς, μόνον ἡγεμόνα καὶ δεσπότην τὸ Θεὸν ὑπολαμβάνουσι. Θανάτων δὲ ἰδέας ὑπομένειν παρελλαγμένας ἐν ὀλίγῳ πίνονται, καὶ συγγενῶν πικρίας, καὶ φίλων ὑπὲρ τὰ μηδένα ἀνθρώπων ὑπεραγαρεύειν δεσπότην: *in all other things they agree with the Pharisees, but they have an unmoveable love for Liberty, thinking that God alone is their Lord and Ruler, and reputed it a small matter to suffer various kinds of Death, and the Punishments of their Kindred and Friends, for refusing to call any man Lord.* This Doctrin was by many greedily embraced, as we are told by *Josephus*, in the beginning of the same Book; and indeed if not openly, at least in their Thoughts it was favoured by most of the *Jews*; and that some such Men as these had joined themselves to the Assemblies of the Christians, is not at all strange.

Verf. 9. *Note e.* I. The words here attributed to *Michael*, being the very same that are found in *Zachar. iii. 2.* it is with reason thought by Dr. *Hammond* in concurrence with other Interpreters, that St. *Jude* alludes to that Vision. And because the Angel there is represented as disputing



disputing with *the Adversary*, about the restoring of the Jewish Commonwealth, it is consequent that the same is here signified by *σῶμα Μωσῆος*, *the body of Moses*, in *St. Jude*; which Phrase *St. Jude* took from the use of the Apostles, who ordinarily call Christians *the body of Christ*.

II. But what *Dr. Hammond* says afterwards of the Magistracy of the Devil, whose Dignity the good Angel revered, even in an evil Spirit, tho' *Grotius* and others say the same, that I confess I cannot digest. For it's true, among Men, not only Subjects honourably bespeak their Rulers; but Princes also themselves shew a mutual respect to each other; the Law of Nations requiring it should be so, for many weighty reasons between Nations enjoying an equal Power, lest they should be at perpetual variance among themselves, constituted, like the Civil Law among Citizens. But there seems to be no such Law between good and bad Angels, who are irreconcilable Enemies; the bad having rebelled against their common Lord, by whom *being put in Chains they are reserved unto the Judgment of the great Day*. So that the *Δόξαι*, which the Angel would not rail at, are some others; nor does *Satan* signify the Prince of the Devils. If we consult the History of the times, to which the Vision seen by *Zachariah* refers, we shall find that the Governors of *Persia*, who had the oversight of the Provinces situated on the West of *Euphrates*, vehemently opposed the design of *Joshua* about restoring the Temple. And of these the chief were the *Thatthenai* and *Schetharboznai*, whose Enterprises and Calumnies are recorded in *Esd. Chap. v.* Now these things were represented to *Zachary* the Prophet in a Vision, by which he understood that the *Jews* had indeed powerful Enemies with the King of *Persia*, but that God by the Ministry of his Angels render'd their Calumnies and Attempts ineffectual. So that *Satan* are the *Thatthenai* and *Schetharboznai*, and other Adversaries of the *Jews*, that were represented to the Prophet under the person of one Accuser. So in *Psal. cix. 5.* *Satan standing at his Right hand* is manifestly an Accuser, and that word often signifies any Adversary who endeavours to frustrate any ones designs. The same is meant by the word *Διάβολος*, which is used by the *Septuagint*; for *διαβάλλω* is as well to resist (*adversari*) as to calumniate. And the same Persons that are called *Satan* in the Prophet *Zachary*, and here the Devil, were *Δόξαι*, or Magistrates sent from *Persia*, to rule over *Syria*, and other Countries on the West side of *Euphrates*, subject to the King of *Persia*; for which reason the same that are signified in this Verse by the word *Διάβολος*, are in the foregoing and *St. Peter*, stiled *Δόξαι*. And in the disputation of the Angel with those Men, men-

tion'd in *Zachariah*, the Angel being represented as modestly rebuking the enemies of the *Jews*, the *Persian* Rulers, because of their Dignity; hence *St. Peter* and *St. Jude* with great reason infer that the *Jews* did very ill in reviling the Roman Governors, who stood at that time in the same relation to the *Jews*, as formerly the *Persians*. This interpretation seems to me much more natural and agreeable to History and things themselves, than any other; and I doubt not but the *Jews* in the Apostles times did so interpret the place in *Zachariah*.

Verf. 10. "Οσα ἢ οἶδασι.] I do by no means think that the Apostle here has a respect to Angels, but to general Notions, concerning the necessity of the distinction of Men into Magistrates and Subjects, and about the necessity of obeying those whom the divine Providence has set over us, tho they do not always behave themselves as they ought; lest Wars should ensue, which are much more pernicious than that obedience.

Ibid. *φρασεως.*] That is, without a Master. See my Note on 1 Cor. xi. 14.

Verf. 11. Note f. I should render the words; *effusi sunt errore Balaami, mercedis causa, Were poured out in the error of Balaam, for Reward*; which perfectly agrees with the place in *St. Peter*, which is undoubtedly parallel to this, not *Rom. i. 27.* but in the harsh Conjecture of *Dr. Hammond.* Ἐξεχρίθησαν ἐν πλάνῃ is exactly the same with ἐπλανήθησαν; for ἐκχρίναι, where the Discourse is about Men, signifies to be spread abroad, or wander, by a Metaphor taken from Liquor poured out. So *Judith* Chap. xv. 2. about the flight of the *Assyrians*, which the *Jews* pursued, some running one way, and some another: and there was not a Man which stayed before the face of his Neighbour, but ἐκχρίντες being poured out, they fled every way ——— and then the Children of Israel, every warlike Man among them, ἐξεχρίθησαν were poured out upon them. This is what was meant by *Hesychius* and *Phavorinus*, when they interpreted this word by ἠφανίσθησαν, because they that thus fly away, run out of others sight; nor must any thing be alter'd in *Phavorinus*, of whom we have no Manuscript Copies, because he himself first printed his own Lexicon in the time of *Leo X.* Our Author seems to have thought that he wrote before Printing was found out: But in *Hesychius* we must read ἠφανίσθησαν.

Verf. 12. Note g. I prefer the latter interpretation, so as to think, it is not a Tempest, called φθινόπωρον, but the signification of the word that is here referred to, which comes from φθίνειν τὸ ὄπωρον, to corrupt Fruit, as it is in the *Etymologicon Magnum*; because tho, towards the end of the φθινόπωρον Trees are destitute of Leaves and Fruit, yet principally



principally during that Season, the fruit of Trees ripen and are gather'd.

Verf. 16. *Note i.* I. I acknowledg that the Phrase here used by St. Jude, is taken from *Daniel*, but it does not therefore follow it must be understood in the same sense; for what is more common either among Jewish or Christian Writers, than to take Phrases out of the Scripture, tho not to be understood just in the same sense? It is sufficient if they can but with some fitness be applied to those things which are spoken of. Besides, when the whole place is not alledged, no body will say that the whole place is referred to, unless the thing require it.

II. Therefore by *great swelling words*, I am apt to think is meant the boastings of the wicked *Jews*, who pretended to defend the Cause of God, against the Tyranny of the *Romans*; and promised their Associates Victory, and declared that they could not be subject to any. To these Men, and not to the *Gnosticks*, St. Paul seems to have had a respect in *2 Thess. ii.* as I have shewn at large, against Dr. Hammond, on that place. I have shewn also on *Rom. viii. 20.* that *ματαιότης* does not signify Idolatry.

Verf. 22. *Note m.* Διακρίνομενοι is a Participle of the Passive, and not of the Middle Voice, and must be rendred *making a difference*; namely according to mens Dispositions and Offences. For some must be dealt with more tenderly, and others more severely, as Dr. Hammond observes: See what *Pricæus* has collected on this place, and my Note on *James ii. 4.*

---

A N N O . . .

# ANNOTATIONS

## ON THE

### Revelation of St. *John* the Divine.

**A**T the end of the *Premor.*] Tho I think Dr. *Hammond's* Interpretation of the *Apocalypse*, may as easily be defended as any other; yet some things he says here which seem to need correction, and which I shall briefly take notice of.

I. He represents to us the Christians of *Asia Minor*, as being as much afraid of the *Jews* and *Gnosticks*, as if they had sent Proconsuls into *Asia*; or at least the Roman Magistrates were so entirely in their Interest, that the least complaint they made of them would be pernicious to the Christians. For unless this be true, the Christians would have had no reason to be so much afraid of the *Jews*, or to think they were delivered from Persecution by the Calamities of that People. But that the *Jews* had so much Power, or were in so great favour with the *Roman* Magistrates, that at their instigation they dealt cruelly with the Christians, does not appear by any History. We find indeed in the *Acts* that the *Jews* exasperated the Heathens as much as they could, and raised Seditions, and went to the Magistrates to accuse the Christians; but we find also that they were but derided by them: see *Acts* xviii. 12. & *seqq.* The Christians that lived in *Asia Minor* had most reason to fear the Statuaries, Painters, Priests, and other Men who made a gain of Idolatry, and any superstitious Persons whatsoever; but not the *Jews*, who were as much hated by them as the Christians: see the Story of the Tumult at *Ephesus*, which is in *Acts* xix. So that what is foretold of the destruction of the *Jews*, belongs primarily to them that lived in *Judea* and the neighbouring Countries, who were really to be delivered from the Persecutions of the *Jews*; and secondarily also to others, especially those which had gone over from Judaism to the Christian Religion, and who would be glad to see the Prophecies of Christ and the Apostles fulfilled, and be confirmed in their Faith by that means.



II. I don't know why our Author thought the Edict of *Claudius*, about expelling the Christians or Jews out of *Rome*, reached as far as *Ephesus*. For they that were only expelled out of *Rome*, were not forced to go out of other Cities of the *Roman* Empire, unless it was so order'd in the Edict. By the word *Rome*, no body ever understood the rest of the Cities of the *Roman* Empire: see Interpreters on the place in *Suetonius*, and on *Acts* xviii. 2. If therefore *St. John* was banished at that time, and transported from *Ephesus* to *Patmos*, it was not because of the Edict of *Claudius*, but for some other reason. But the Chronology of those times, the accounts of which are not taken out of the Writings of the Apostles, is very uncertain.

III. Our Author does not speak accurately, where he says that *Domitian* was Governor of *Rome*, whilst *Vespasian* was in *Judæa*; he should have added, either in *Egypt*, or whilst he was upon his Journey; for *Vespasian* did not stay long in *Judæa*, after he was saluted Emperor.

IV. There being nothing not only more uncertain, but even more false, than the Menology of the *Greeks*, and the Martyrology of the *Romans*, as those learned Men who have touched upon them have shewn: I don't see what made *Dr. Hammond* scruple to disparage their Authority. This I am sure would have been much better than to wrest every thing, that he might not seem to contradict them, as to the time when *Antipas* suffer'd Martyrdom. But I shall say something of that on *Chap. ii. 12*.

V. What he says here of the sudden destruction of the *Gnosticks*, is false, as I have shewn on *2 Thess. ii. 8*.

## C H A P. I.

Verf. 4. I. **T**HERE is no doubt but *Asia* here signifies the *Proconsular Asia*. But according to the Roman Custom, the Neighbouring Cities no otherwise depended upon a *Metropolis*, than as they resorted to it, when a Roman Magistrate sat in Judgment; for they were not governed by Provincial Magistrates of Corporations. Which being so, I cannot see why the Bishops of these Cities are supposed to have ruled over them with a Metropolitan Power; not to say it is very uncertain whether there was in the beginning any Hierarchy constituted, according to the pattern of a Civil Government. For what later Writers say of that Age, is not sufficiently certain; because they speak of it in the words of their own times, and call those *Metropolitans* and *Archbishops*, which were stiled simply Bishops. Such a way of speaking is deceitful, and may be

Chapter be apt to perswade the unwary, that not only these Names, but also  
 I. the Power that was joined with them in the following Ages, were  
 known in the Apostles times. I had rather our Author, in his Para-  
 phrase of the New Testament, had abstained from them.

II. Dr. *Hammond* had not look'd into the *Digg. Lib. i. Tit. xvi. Leg. 4. S. 5.* where *Ulpian* does not speak himself, but alledges the words of *Antoninus*, and somewhat also otherwise: *Our Emperor Antoninus Augustus, at the desire of the Asians, wrote back, that a Proconsul was obliged to go by Sea to Asia, καὶ τὴν μητροπόλεων Ἐφεσον*, that is, *and among the mother Citics to touch first at Ephesus.* The place also in *Pliny* is false quoted out of *Lib. vi.* instead of *Lib. v.*

Verf. 6. Note d. I. I wish Dr. *Hammond* had alledged some Edict of the Roman Emperors or Magistrates obtained by the *Jews*, whereby the Christians were forbidden to meet together, before the destruction of *Jerusalem*; for I do not remember that I ever read any in Ecclesiastical Writers, or others: which yet if it be uncertain, or false, as I verily think, some of those things which he says in the foregoing Annotation must needs be false, or at least uncertain. And from the destruction of *Jerusalem*, to the reign of *Adrian*, the *Jews* were too odious upon the account of their Seditions, to prevail with the *Roman* Emperors or Magistrates to persecute the Christians, as our Author well proves in what follows.

II. That Dr. *Hammond* might shew that the Christians *reigned*, as he speaks, after all the hopes and power of the *Jews* were taken away, he is forced to extenuate those ten noted Persecutions; which it's certain some of the Antients too much aggravated, as has been solidly proved by Mr. *Dodwell* in his *Dissert. de Paucitate Martyrum.* But tho I do not deny but that in the fourth and following Ages, the number of Martyrs was very much encreased; yet I do not see how the condition of the Christian Church, in the second and third Centuries, could be represented under the similitude of a *Kingdom*, unless that *Kingdom* be very faintly understood. I had rather this had been referred to later times.

Verf. 10. [Ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ ἡμέρῃ.] This day, which in the words of *Andreas Casariensis*, alledged by our Author in the Margin of his Paraphrase, is ἡ ἡ ἀναστάσεως Χριστοῦ μνημόσυνον πέμπτη, *Barnabas* in *Ep. Cathol. cap. xv.* calls the *eighth*. For after he had said, that the six days of the Week signify six thousand Years, during which the World was to continue, and the seventh the last thousand, in which God would put an end to it, he speaks thus: Ὁμοίως πῶς λέγει· ἡ τὰ νῦν σάββατα ἐμοὶ δεκά· ἀλλ' αὐτὸ πεποίηται, ἐν ᾧ καταπαύσας τὰ πάντα ἀρχὴν ἡμέρας ὀχθῆς ποιήσω, ὅ ἐστιν ἄλλα κόσμος ἀρχὴν:



ἀρχῶν: mind how he speaks: The present Sabbaths are not acceptable to me, Chapter I. but those which I have made, when putting an end to all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is, another World. Διὸ καὶ ἀρχομένου τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆν ὀγδόην εἰς διαφερόμενον, ἐπὶ ἧ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς τὰς οὐρανούς: Wherefore also we spend the eighth day in expressions of Joy, in which Jesus both arose from the Dead, and having shewn himself ascended into Heaven.

Verf. 11. Ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἕξαρτος.] That is, before whom no Man ever was that which I am, nor ever shall be; who neither had any Predecessor, nor shall have any to succeed me. This is a Phrase taken out of *Isa. xli. 4.* where it is used of God the Father. It is explained in the same Prophet, *Chap. xliii. 10.* in these words: *before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me; and Chap. xliv. 6.* *I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God.* God seems to have had a respect to the Opinion of the Heathens, who feigned Successions of Gods, of which some came and dethroned others, and reigned in their stead, and which seems to have prevailed among the Eastern Nations, as it did among the Greeks, whose sentiments are thus expressed by *Prometheus, in Æschylus:*

Διὸς τε γέννησεν ἐκπεσόντας ἠΐδόμενος,  
 Τρίτον δὲ καὶ τὸ νῦν τε γέννηεντ' ὀφθαλμοῖς  
 Αἰετὰ καὶ Τάχιστα.

Which *Grotius* thus interprets:

————— *Annon hos duos*  
*Ego ipse conspexi evolutos arcibus?*  
*Brevi videbo tertium, & facde quidem,*  
*Et derrepente.*

Verf. 20. Note h. It were to be wished that our Author had reconciled what he says here of single Bishops, in the Churches of *Asia,* with that which he elsewhere says of a twofold Bishop; of which one was set over the *Jewish,* and another the *Gentile* Christians: see his *Premonition* to the 2d Epistle of *St. John.* Did he think that these Epistles were written only to the Assemblies of the Circumcised?

Verf. 2. **I**T is not necessary we should know who these Impostors were of which St. *John* speaks there being so many other things in antient Ecclesiastical History of much greater moment as the Travels and Martyrdoms of most of the Apostles, altogether unknown to us; either because none committed them to writing, or because the Records of them are lost. And therefore I had rather confess my ignorance in this matter, than violently bring in here the *Gnosticks*. I might with more probability say that the Apostle has a respect to some Jewish Deceivers, who boasted that they had been familiar with Christ; and therefore said that they were Apostles. It is not certain that *Cerintbus* called himself an Apostle, or pretended to have received what he asserted from a great Apostle. It is said indeed by *Gaius* in *Eusebius* Lib. iii. cap. 28. that *Cerintbus* proposed his Doctrins δι' ἑνεκαλύψεων, ὡς ἔτι ἀπὸ Ἀποστόλου μεγάλης γέσεως, by revelations, as written by a great Apostle. But this may be only the Judgment of *Gaius*, and not *Cerintbus* his own words.

Verf. 4. Note b. I. What our Author here says about *Elxai*, out of *Eusebius*, shews that some of the Jews (for *Elxai* was a Jew) were possessed with an Opinion, before the Apostles time, that it was lawful to dissemble their Religion, yea to renounce it, to avoid Persecution. So that whenever that Doctrine is opposed by the Apostles, we need not presently think they have a respect to the *Gnosticks*, the Followers of *Simon Magus*, as our Author often inculcates, not without tiring his Reader.

II. Our Author seems to have thought that *Elxai* was a Christian Heretick, but he was rather an *Essene*, which was the name of a Jewish Sect, as we are told by *Epiphanius*, and took a great many more things from Judaism than from Christianity. Dr. *Hammond*, whilst he makes him to be a Christian, changes the words of *Epiphanius*; for instead of that which he calls, to worship Idols, εἰδωλα προσκυνῆσαι, he writes in English to abjure the faith; and adds, as out of the same Author: From these came the *Helkesaitæ*, &c. Which I could not find him, nor do I believe they are *Epiphanius* his words.

Verf. 13. Note i. I do not commend Mr. *Brightman*, but I wonder Dr. *Hammond* should so easily assent to the *Menology*, which *Grotius* has shewn to be unfit to be here credited.

Verf. 26. Note o. I. I have shewn on 2 *Thess.* ii. 3. that it is erroneously thought that *Simon* was look'd upon as a God by the *Romans*. I have  
alleged



alleged also on the same place, a passage out of *Eusebius*, in which he affirms that the followers of *Simon* were alive in his time. And that we ought to believe him rather than any other, the thing it self shews, seeing the *Valentinians*, and other *Gnosticks* flourished under the *Antonini* and afterward, as we are told by the same *Eusebius* out of *Irenæus*, *Hist. Ecclesiast.* lib. iv. cap. 2. Chapter III.

II. It is not necessary that the name *Jezabel* should be thought to signify any Sect, whereas it might be the name of some Woman that took upon her the title of a Prophetess at *Thyatira*. Considering the great scarcity of Records of that Age, is is no wonder there are many things which we cannot understand in such kind of allusions.

CHAP. III.

Verf. 14. **I**S there then any difference between *μεγαλομαρτυρα* and *μέγαν μαρτυρα*; none certainly. But these are the false and vain subtilties of I know not whom, which our Author collected on this Chapter that he might not seem too short. See the verses about *Antipas* alledged by him on *chap.* ii. 13. in which a Bishop is called *καλλιμαρτυρα*.

Verf. 15. *Note d.* I. Tho the *Gnosticks* might justly be charged with lukewarmness and pride, if they were such as the Antients describe them; yet we must not therefore think that all the primitive Christians that were guilty of those vices were the Disciples of the *Gnosticks*. I am sorry our Author should recur to those Hereticks without any certain marks of their being here referred to.

II. Lukewarmness here is not the opposite to gold tryed in the fire, or a white garment, but to poverty which the *Laodiceans* are upbraided with in the verse immediately foregoing. But our Author, who never took any care to speak properly, confounds every thing.

Verf. 20. *Καὶ ἂν τις μετ' ἐμῶν.*] That is, as he entertains me at his house and table when I knock at his door, so I will receive him when he comes to me. Otherwise it would be an idle *tautology*, if these words were understood of the same Supper; for if we sup with any one, he cannot but sup with us. But he is said to sup with us, whom we entertain; and we to sup with him that entertains us. The meaning of this figurative Expression is, that if any one in this life, with that sincerity which he ought, embraces the Christian Religion, he shall be received by Christ into the Mansions of eternal Happiness. Our Author did not understand this place.

Verf. 2. **I** Δὲ ἑστὶν, &c.] This Vision, as almost all the rest, has many things in it resembling the Visions of the Prophets of the Old Testament; and the Apostle often uses Words and Phrases borrowed from them: for the manner of God's revealing himself to men, was, to use Phrases to which they were accustomed, rather than any other. And so because the Christians were used to the reading of the Old Testament, God describes future things under the New by the same Images and Expressions by which he had represented them to the antient Prophets. This every one must have in his eye that undertakes to explain these Prophecies, that by the accomplishment of the antient Predictions he may judge of the New; which if he does not, he will be apt to fall into very great mistakes. For instance, we read this Prophecy in *Joel* ii. 30, 31. *I will shew wonders in the heavens above, and wonders in the earth beneath, blood and fire, and vapour of smoke. The Sun shall be turned into darkness, and the Moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.* Whoever should understand these words properly, and according to the present way of speaking, would be mightily deceived, and ready to think that they were yet to be fulfilled. But *St. Peter*, in *Acts* ii. has told us, that they are to be understood figuratively, of a spiritual change which the Gospel was to make in the earth. And so when we read the like in this Book, we must have a care of thinking that the changes which are described as future, both in Heaven and Earth, before some things here foretold came to pass, were really and literally to be accomplished.

*Ibid.* Note b. If it were certain that the privileges of Metropolitans were known in that age, that the Apostles sat in a lower place than the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and the Christians at that time were as observant of that external order, as they were afterwards; *Dr. Hammond's* conjecture might be born. But now to speak in the softest terms, all those things being uncertain, it will not easily be believed by judicious persons, that *St. John* here alludes to the Church of *Jerusalem*, rather than any other Assembly.

Verf. 4. Note c. The Sanhedrim of the Jews sat in the form of a half circle; as is largely shewn by *Mr. Selden de Synedrims*, lib. ii. c. 6. and the Head of the Council in the middle seat. And hence I rather think that the form of the heavenly Council represented to *St. John* was taken, both because the Sanhedrim was an Assembly of Judges,  
and



and because it is not certain that in the Apostles times Christians meet- Chapter  
ing together secretly and in a private house, did so carefully observe IV.  
that order in sitting. Our Author often takes it for undoubted that  
the customs of the second or third Century, or also later Ages were  
Apostolical, which he ought not to have done: Of the Episcopal seat  
in Churches, see *Beveridge* his Notes on *Can. xi.* of the first *Nicene*  
*Council.*

Ibid. Note d. I. Our Author before [ in Note on v. 2. ] rejected  
their opinion, who thought this Image of a Court presented to St. *John*,  
was taken from the Great *Sanhedrim*, because the number was not in  
both the same, and it is strange he was not afraid lest it should be object-  
ed to him, that it was altogether as unallowable to feign a certain num-  
ber of Bishops, without the authority of antient Records. But tho  
this Image be said to be taken from the Great *Sanhedrim*, it is not  
necessary there should be a perfect similitude between them. But, you  
will say, why are there only four and twenty, and not lxxii here re-  
presented as sitting in Council? If I should say I don't know, Dr. *Ham-*  
*mond's* conjecture will not be therefore at all more probable. But it  
may be said, that to describe this Court, four and twenty Heads of  
the priestly Order were chosen out of the *Sanhedrim*, because they  
were in a special manner consecrated to God; besides that the Priests  
only were of divine institution, not the rest of the members of the  
*Sanhedrim*.

II. The High Priests of the Jews cannot be said to have worn *golden*  
*Mitres*, because they were made of linen, and had no gold belong-  
ing to them, but only a thin plate hanging over the Forehead. See  
my Note on *Exod. xxviii. 4.* Much less do I think there is any respect  
here had to the *Mitres* of Bishops, which I no more imagin to have been  
in that age than the rest of the ornaments at this day used by them.  
They had the thing then without the Ornaments; and now we have the  
Ornaments without the thing.

Vers. 5. Note e. I see here nothing that looks like a respect to  
the Deacons of the Church of *Jerusalem*, unless it be the number  
of seven; which seems rather to be taken from the number of Lamps  
used in the Sanctuary, and that was otherwise common in holy Solem-  
nities among the Jews and other Nations. See my Notes on *Exod.*  
*xxix. 29.* and *Levit. xiv. 7.*

Vers. 6. Note f. I. It is a mistake that *ἐν μέσσω* signifies in the former  
part, because where the discourse is about men, to be in the midst of them,  
is all one as to be before them. The places in the *Acts* are in vain al-  
ledged, for in them it is not properly the middle part or centre that

is

Chapter is signified by the words ἐν μέσῳ, nor properly the former or hinder part; but ἐν μέσῳ is simply *before the rest*, or *among the rest*, in Acts i. 15. and iv. 7. for in the other places those words are not found. So that ἐν κόλπῳ here will not signify *behind*.

II. The Interpreter our Author confutes is *H. Grotius*, who interprets ἐν μέσῳ δεξιῆ properly over against the midst of the Throne, placing one living Creature upon the steps before the Throne, and another behind; which is much more probable, because he takes ἐν κόλπῳ here, as κόλποθεν is taken in *vers.* 4. according to *Dr. Hammond's* own Opinion. Yet I had rather place two living Creatures before the Throne, not on the Steps, but even with the ground, over against the middle of the Throne, and two on the sides; for this reason, because afterwards, in *Chap.* v. 6. it is said, that *a Lamb stood in the midst of the throne, and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the Elders*; by which it appears that there was some space between the Throne and the living Creatures. From this place our Author disputes indeed against *Grotius*, but so, as it appears that he did not know what himself meant.

*Ibid.* Note g. 1. He that sits upon the Throne is represented as much greater than the four living Creatures, as being God himself, whom the living Creatures praise and worship, which are undoubtedly the Angels. I am apt to think, if it were to be enquired, who resembled them in the Sanhedrim; the only persons that can be likened to them are the Officers that waited upon the Sanhedrim. But between these Ministers of God and the Ministers of the Sanhedrim, there was almost as much difference as between God and the Prince of the Sanhedrim; and therefore there is no similitude to be sought for between them, but in this, that they might both be called Ministers.

II. This is much more likely than what is said by our Author, who, to find out his own meaning, makes Apostles inferior to a Bishop, which is utterly false: for the Apostles having received their Commission from Christ himself, had an equal Authority over all Nations, and in all Cities; and therefore wherever they were, had the privilege of the first Seats, if any order was to be observed in sitting. And they ought not to yield to the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, whom they themselves had ordained. What *Clemens Alexandrinus* says of the Bishoprick of *Jerusalem*, just as if the Apostles out of modesty had not aspired to it, is, with that learned Writer's leave, not agreeable to things themselves. It was not lawful for the Apostles to take upon them the Bishoprick of any one City, because  
they



they were to spread the Gospel through the whole World, according to the Command of Christ; nor could they, without disparaging themselves, seek a Dignity less than their own. Yet our Author several times alledges these inconsiderate words of *Clemens*, as if they were of some moment. But you will say, *St. James* having heard the rest, at length in *Acts xv.* sums up the Judgment of the Council, after all were agreed, which is the Office of a President. But it does not therefore follow that he did that as President, and so as a thing which of right belonged to him; but rather by the impulse of the Holy Spirit, who might have pronounced that Decree by the mouth of any that were there present. Those holy men were not ambitious of the *περιουσία* or *περιουσιότητα* like the Pharisees; and therefore among Friends, and those acted by the same Spirit, every thing doubtless was done without standing upon Order or Ceremonies, the effects of mens Pride and Contention. Nor do I any more think that *St. James* here acted as a President, than that he sat on a high Throne, with some four Apostles attending on him as *Metropolitan* and *Archbishop*, as our Author calls him, and the Bishops of *Judea* sitting round about: which yet must have been done, if this representation of the heavenly Court was taken from thence; otherwise it has no more resemblance with the Council of *Jerusalem* than with any other Consistory of Judges.

III. The Objection our Author proposes to himself is of no moment, and might have been solved in one word, from what he says towards the end of his second Answer: for it is visible, that the *Antiochians* sent to enquire at *Jerusalem*, because there were there a great many Apostles, and other Disciples, who had conversed with Christ on earth, and had received spiritual gifts from him from Heaven; who if they had been in the most obscure Village in all *Judea*, would nevertheless have been there consulted. They had no respect therefore to the Metropolitan Dignity of the City, which our Author here, without reason, makes a shew of, and which was a piece of Grandure not known in those times. Of after Ages I say nothing, in which it was lawful for Bishops to enter, as it were, into Covenant with one another, and attribute a greater dignity to some seats than to others; which Constitution seemed useful, and ought not to be changed where it has obtain'd, because it may be beneficial to the ordinary sort of Christians.

Verf. 7. *Note h.* I. These things are not only Conjectures, but most extravagant Fancies, in which I wonder our learned Author could acquiesce. There is not here so much as the least indication

Chapter of the Standards or Standard-bearers of *Israel*; nor any ground to  
 V. imagin them alluded to, besides that which is said by the *Rabbins*, who  
 are less acquainted with what was done of old than we, and whose in-  
 ventions are justly said by our Author to be absurd. But why then did  
 he believe them? I confess I don't understand.

II. On the contrary, here is a manifest allusion to the Cherubims, who are the Ministers of God, not God himself. And so it is they which are describ'd, and not God; of whom see what I have said on *Exod. xxv. 18*. They are the Officers and Ministers of God in executing his Judgments, which best of all agree to this place; and not Apostles, whose Office was not to punish obstinate Offenders. What our Author here says out of *Eusebius*, and about some particular Apostles, is as absurd as the fictions of the *Rabbins*.

Verf. 8. Note i. But if we understand the Attendants of God to be signified by those living Creatures, which seems to be more probable; those Eyes will denote the watchfulness of the Angels, in guarding those whom God commits to their care. Such another Image presented it self to the fancies of the Poets, when they described *Argus*, as set by *Juno* to watch her Rival:

*Centum luminibus cinctum caput Argus habebat, &c.*

which may be read in *Ovid. Metam. Lib. 1.*

## CHAP. V.

Verf. 1. Note b. **S**criptus & in tergo, makes nothing to the length of the Roll, which tho' short, might be written on the backside; but to the abundance of matter contained in it, which was so much that it could not be all written on the fore side of the Parchment; as the *Orestes* of a certain unknown Poet, mention'd by *Juvenal, Sat. 1. 5.*

————— *Summi plena jam margine libri,  
 Scriptus & in tergo, nec dum finitus Orestes.*

Verf. 8. Note c. It is indeed the Office of Bishops to offer Prayers and Praises to God, in the name of the Churches over which they are set; but this Assembly held as in Heaven, is not a representation of things done on Earth; but as a Celestial Court, to set out which there are some colours taken from earthly things. So that the four and twenty Elders are rather Angels of the highest Dignity, which are as it were  
 God's



God's *παρθενοὶ* assistants in this Council; which Angels having the Patronage of the Christian Religion assigned them, it is no wonder if they are said to present the Prayers of Christians to God, and to speak in the name of Christians. An Angel is in like manner represented as performing this Office, afterwards in *Chap. viii. 3, 4.*

## C H A P. VI.

Verf. 2. **K** *Αὐτὸς ἔβη νικῶν, καὶ ἴσα νικῶν.*] That is (the words being inverted) he went out to conquer, and did in effect conquer from his very going out. That which is meant is, that the Coming of Christ, whether to reform Men, or to punish them if they were obstinate, was neither vain, nor casual.

Verf. 4. *Note a.* I. It was worth observing that *Eusebius* makes mention of two Famines, under the reign of *Claudius*, one foretold by *Agabus*, and to be referred to the second year of *Claudius*, tho he mentions it on his fourth; another in *Greece* and at *Rome*; which he refers to the ninth and tenth Years of that Emperor. I know that *Joseph Scaliger* thinks that the latter was foretold by *Agabus*, and refers it to the fifth Year of *Claudius*; but he gives no reason for his Assertion; expecting, as is common with him, to be believed without proof.

II. *Suetonius* does not expressly say what our Author attributes to him, but only: *Judeos, impulsore Christo, assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.* The unbelieving Jews endeavour'd to raise a Tumult against the Christians, upon the account of Religion, for which reason both the Jews and Christians were expelled out of *Rome*. *Suetonius* says that Christ was *impulsor*, the cause or mover of those Tumults, out of Ignorance, when he should only have said that he was the occasion of them.

III. Whereas our Author affirms, that those who were by the Emperor's Edict expelled out of *Rome*, were expelled also out of the rest of the Cities of the *Roman* Empire, he ought to have proved it, and not have supposed it as certain. But it is false, as every one knows that has read any thing of the *Roman* History. Of this I have spoken already on the Premonition prefixed to this Book.

Verf. 6. *Note b.* The learned *Dr. Bernard* thinks that the *Syrian Chænix*, when full of Wheat, weighed something above four English Pounds, and that one of *Tiberius* his *denarii*, current in the time of *John*, was worth a little more than seven English Farthings. By which calculation it appears that Wheat was dear, when four Pounds cost seven Farthings; but that our Author is mistaken, who supposes that

Chapter a *Chenix* of Wheat was spent by one Man in a day. But I leave these  
 VI. things to the examination of those who are curious about such mat-  
 ters.

Verf. 8. Note d. I. *Θνητιον* cannot signify *Cattel*, but only *wild Beasts*, except improperly: and therefore I prefer the ordinary reading before that of the *Alexandrian Copy*.

II. There are two faults here in the Citations of *Josephus*; one in the Margin, where Lib. vi. c. 8. *Bell. Jud.* is set instead of Lib. vi. c. 28. and the other, where *Josephus de Captiv.* L. vi. c. 44. is cited instead of the same Book *de Bell. Jud.* Lib. vi. c. 45.

Verf. 9. Note c. I. Our learned Author thought St. *John* here alludes to the *fourth*, as it is called, Book of *Esdras*, extant only in Latin. But his Publishers, knowing this Book to be Apocryphal, cited the second of *Esdras*, in which there is no such passage. [This must be in a different Edition from that which I use, where *Esdras 4.* is referred to.] In the Epistle of *Barnabas* Chap. xii. there is a place produced out of the same Book. But this might also be added in *Barnabas* his Epistle; and he that wrote the 4th Book of *Esdras*, who seems to have been some Christian, imitated this place in the *Revelation*.


II. *Ψυχαι ἐσφαγμένων*, the Souls of them that were slain, may, according to the use of the Hebrew Language, which these Writers often follow, signify their *dead Bodies*; for *שׁוּפָה* Soul is frequently taken for a dead Body. But tho' the Soul is taken for the Life, and the Life be in the Blood, it does not therefore follow that in the use of Scripture the Blood is ordinarily called the Soul. The use of words must be shewn by examples, and not by reasonings. He might have produced that Passage in *Virgil Æneid.* ix. v. 349.

*Purpuram vomit ille ANIMAM, & cum sanguine mista  
 Vina refert moriens.*

But it is better to understand by *Ψυχαι* here the Souls of Martyrs, which being admitted into the heavenly Sanctuary, did by their Presence put God in mind of taking Vengeance upon the Jews. For the *loud Voice* here does not signify praying, or desiring Revenge, but the greatness of the Crime, which is said to cry unto God, because the thing itself does as much implore the divine Justice, as if the injured Person called upon him with a loud Voice. This appears by the example of the Blood of *Abel*, and the Story of the *Sodomites*, in *Gen.* xviii. 20.

Verf. 12. Note g. I. There is no doubt but great numbers of dead Bodies send forth exhalations into the Air; but that Clouds have been made.



made by them, and visible Meteors, whereby the Sun has been made Chapter  
black, and the Moon bloody, was never, I believe, by any one observed: VI.  
And therefore the propheticall Expressions, in which great Calamities  
are represented under such Images, are not taken from what really is,   
but are rather a *Prosopopeia*, whereby the Sun is said to refuse to be-  
hold the impieties of Men, and the Moon upon that account to blush  
and become red with shame, when they are very great. There are a  
great many such figurative Expressions in the Poets, as in *Ovid. Me-*  
*tam. v.* where speaking of the prodigies that preceded the death of  
*Julius Cæsar*, he says,

————— *Picebi quoque tristis imago*  
*Lurida sollicitis præbebat lumina terris.*  
————— *Sparsi Lunares sanguine currus.*

II. I do not think we ought, in the representation of those Miseries  
that beset *Judæa*, under the Similitude of the Sun becoming black, and  
the Moon red, and the Stars falling, to consider the several parts distinct-  
ly, but all these things together; which without doubt signify very  
great Calamities, but must not be examin'd particularly as if they  
had each a special signification, which can be proved by no place of  
Scripture: see on the contrary *Isa. xiii. 10.* where all these things sig-  
nify one thing conjunctly, and nothing at all separately. Add also the  
place in the same Prophet, alledged by our Author.

Verf. 15. Note i. I. The *φωνὴ ἀθεοῦ* in *Josephus* should not have been  
rendred *the promiscuous Noise or Voice*; for what is a promiscuous  
Noise, but *the sudden Voice*, as it is translated by *Sigism. Gelenius*?  
The Passage which the *Doctor* afterwards cites as out of *Josephus*, with-  
out naming him, in these words, *the seditious go to the Palace where*  
*many had laid up their Wealth, drive out the Romans thence, kill eight*  
*thousand of them, four thousand Jews that had gotten thither for Shelter,*  
*plunder the place,* is not exactly translated from the Greek, which is thus,  
*Lib. vii. cap. 37.* according to the Greek division: *Οἱ συσιασαὶ ἐπὶ τὴν*  
*βασιλικὴν ὀρμήσαντες αὐλὴν, εἰς ἣν δὲ ὀχυρότητα πολλοὶ τὰς κτήσεις ἐπέθεντο, τὸς τε*  
*Ρωμαίους ἐπ' αὐτὸς τρέπονται, καὶ τὸ συνθηροισμένον αὐτόθι τῶ δῆμος πᾶν φονδύσαντες, ὄντας*  
*εἰς ὀκτακισχίλις καὶ τετρακοσίους τὰ χρήματα δήμευσαν:* that is, *the Seditious went*  
*into the Palace, in which, because it was a safe place, many had laid up*  
*their Possessions, and put the Romans to flight; and killing all the Inhabi-*  
*tants that were there gather'd together, to the number of eight thousand and*  
*four hundred, plunder'd their Riches.* Some difficulty there is in the  
words, *Ρωμαίους ἐπ' αὐτὸς τρέπονται*, which seem to be corrupted.

Chapter VII. II. I don't know why our Author should recur to the Walls of the Temple, to explain *πίστεως ἡ ὀρέων*, when, besides the Mountain of the Temple, there were two other Mountains contained within the Walls of the City, under which there had been Vaults made, where the Jews hid themselves, as he himself relates out of *Josephus*. When there is a natural and literal interpretation ready at hand, what need is there of recurring to a violent one? However he interprets here *πίστεως* in *Mat. xxvii. 51. Walls* better than by *Sepulchres*. See my Note on that place.

## C H A P. VII.

Verf. 4. I. **I**T is not to be thought that the Priests of the Jews were so Religious, as in a matter which made for the Glory and Safety of the Jewish Nation, not to exceed at all in their account of the number of the Paschal Sacrifices. And therefore I should not suppose it as certain which *Josephus* says about this matter, who is otherwise very profuse in magnifying every thing which belonged to his own Nation. Nor indeed could *Palestine* contain so great a Multitude, in which besides Jews, there were a great many *Syrians*, as *Josephus* in several places affirms.

II. The Paschal Feast was eaten by all the Jews which at that time were in *Jerusalem*, and not only by the Inhabitants of *Palestine*. For there is no doubt but many that were scattered abroad into other Countries, went thither about that time; tho' all the Males went not, nor any one perhaps every Year, besides those that were near. So that if we compare the Christians of *Judæa* with the unbelieving Inhabitants of the same Tracts, they will be more than our Author thought. The calculation which he speaks of is made by *Josephus, de Bell. Jud. Lib. vii. c. 41.*

## C H A P. VIII.

Chapter VIII. Verf. 1. **I** Will not deny but the figures here used in the description of that which St. *John* saw done in Heaven, are taken from the Temple of *Jerusalem*: but I do not think that the things done in that Temple are by way of Vision here described, as Dr. *Hammond* says; who yet undoubtedly meant that St. *John* saw something, I know not what, done in Heaven, like those things which were done in the Temple; for he never so much as dreamt that the Priest who went into the Sanctuary, offer'd up the prayers of the Christians. But a habit of speaking improperly made him express himself



himself very awkwardly ; and I doubt not but his Conceptions themselves were a little dark and perplexed, for otherwise he would never have spoken so harshly. But by this means, instead of giving light to the Writer we attempt to explain, we render him more obscure. Our Author here several times mentions the High Priest, whom he describes as offering up the daily Incense ; which it's true he might sometimes do, but he did not do it daily. For that Office was for the most part executed by the ordinary Priests. See *Luke* i. 9.

Verf. 12. *Note g.* Many things might have been said against the former Interpretation, which is certainly very violent, unless our Author had preferred the latter ; and therefore I shall speak only to that, which to me does not seem at all more probable. For that prophetic words may be said to signify any thing particularly, it must either plainly appear by the event, or be shewn it is the Custom of the Prophets. But *Dr. Hammond* here does neither. And therefore I had rather say, that as the darkning of the Sun, Moon and Stars, in the Prophets signifies very great Calamities, even such as end in utter Destruction ; so proportionably the darkning of a third part of them signifies lighter distresses. This is the only probable interpretation of this place, all others being made up of pure Fancy and Conjecture.

## C H A P. IX.

Verf. 11. *Note e.* **W**HAT is this to the *Jems*, who did not worship *Apollo*? Or why should the Devil be called *Apollo* rather than *Jupiter*? I rather think this Title is to be applied to *John* the Captain of the *Sicarii*, who is called here himself *the Angel of the bottomless pit*, as his Soldiers, like so many Locusts, are said to have come out of its smoke, in *verse*. 2. the meaning of which expressions is, that this *John* and his Soldiers were stirred up and assisted by the Devil in contriving those Villanies which they executed with so much fury : see what *Dr. Hammond* himself says on *vers.* 1. out of *Josephus*, or rather *Josephus* himself in *Lib.* iii. *de Bell. Jud.* *Cap.* x. & *seqq.* in the Greek.

Verf. 17. *Note g.* I chuse to interpret what is here said simply, and in gross, omitting all niceties which are very uncertain, about an exceeding formidable Army, which should bring very great Calamities, among which the principal are burnings and slaughters, upon *Judaea*. This is what is meant by the colour of the Armour, and the Fire proceeding out of the Mouth of the Horses. This only seems to be certain, every thing else is but conjectural. Of the Discipline  
of

Chapter of the *Roman Armies* it may be worth our while to read what is said  
 X. by *Josephus* in *Lib. iii. de Bell. Jud. Cap. 5.* in the Greek.

## C H A P. X.

Verf. 9. **T**H'ν κοιλίαν.] The *Alexandrian* Copy reads καρδίαν, but it is a manifest Error. Κοιλία here, as *יִבֵּט* beten, in *Ezekiel*, is not taken for the Belly, but for the Stomach: For the Meat descends out of the Mouth immediately into the Stomach, and those things which remain still in the Stomach may cause a bitterness in the Mouth, but not those which have passed into the Bowels. If any should doubt whether κοιλία signifies the Stomach, he might be referred not only to the Greek Physicians, but also to *Alian Variar. Hist. Lib. I. C. I.*

## C H A P. XI.

Chapter Verf. 3. I. **I**F these *Witnesses* are to be sought in *Judæa*, I had rather  
 XI. Note b. say that two of the famous Churches of *Judæa*,  
 in two distinct Cities, as *Jerusalem* and *Cæsarea*, are signified by that name, than go to explain the uncertain meaning of an obscure place, by a very uncertain Conjecture. Our Author builds conjectures upon conjectures, and is not afraid lest a structure that leans upon such weak props, should fall to the ground. But it is the part of a careful Interpreter to be very sparing in Conjectures, and in doubtful matters to abstain from Conjectures; for the more uncertainties are heap'd together, the more that which is said appears to be false, or at least the Conjecturers are in greater danger of erring. But I confess ingenuously I do not understand these Prophecies; and tho I easily see what there is wanting in the conjectures of learned Men, to make them seem probable, I can my self propose nothing better. For which reason I have in many places forbore to confute *Dr. Hammond's* interpretations, because I did not think it worth my while to shew that others were unfortunate in their Conjectures, when I my self could produce nothing more certain. But here I thought fit to say something about the Conjecture of *Dr. Hammond* concerning two sorts of Bishops in the Apostles time, in single Cities; because that may make for the illustration of Ecclesiastical History.

II. It appears indeed by *Acts xv.* and other places, that there was some disagreement between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, and that these latter had a Letter sent them, which is there set down. But that there were two distinct Churches, and two sorts of Bishops, can be



be gather'd from no sign. Nor is it at all probable, that after this Chapter Apostolical Decree, the Jewish Christians refused to unite with the Gentiles; especially *Jerusalem* being destroyed, and *St. Paul* having written so many Epistles about the unprofitableness of the Mosaical Rites. There are no credible Records by which it may appear that *Evodius* and *Ignatius* were together Bishops of the *Antiochian* Churches. In the Apostolical Constitutions *Lib. vii. c. 46.* it is said indeed, that *Evodius* was ordained by *St. Peter* (not by *St. John*, as it is said by the *Doctor*) and *Ignatius* by *St. Paul*. But not to say that we cannot easily believe that Writer, as being a notorious Impostor; he does not say that they were made Bishops at the same time, and of several Congregations, as is well observed on that place by *J. Bapt. Cotlerius*, who has also other things worth reading about this matter.

III. What is said here about *St. John's* ruling the Jewish Churches in *Asia*, while *St. Paul*, and after him *Timothy* ruled the *Gentiles*, is a mere invention of our Author. There is no footstep of a twofold Episcopacy in those places; and that *Timothy* was first Bishop of *Ephesus* is also very uncertain, because he might be left there by *St. Paul* as an Evangelist, not as a Bishop: for the late Catalogues are not worthy our regard, which reckon up the Bishops of antient times, according to the opinion of the Age in which they were written, and not according to any certain knowledg. They tell us indeed that the Apostles themselves were Bishops, which is absurd, tho *Dr. Hammond* also speaks in the same manner. But granting him that *Timothy* was Bishop of *Ephesus*, still there are two things that remain doubtful: One is, that *John* was at *Ephesus*, or somewhere near it, when *Timothy* was left there by *St. Paul*. And secondly, that both of them performed the Office of Bishop in different Congregations; and that *St. John* did not come thither after *Timothy's* Ordination, and exercise only the Office of an Apostle, not of a Bishop. It's plain the Writer of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, whose Authority the *Doctor* elsewhere makes use of, says that *Timothy* was constituted Bishop of that City by *St. Paul*, and *John* by *St. John*.

IV. What is said here of the Church of *Rome* was, I believe, invented by *Dr. Hammond*, to reconcile the Antients that disagreed among themselves about the first Bishop of *Rome* after the Apostles; but he never found in any credible History, that two Apostles were Bishops of the *Roman* Church, and had each their Deacon, whom they left in their place. The Apostles could not be Bishops of any particular Church, and they are mere Dreams which are related concerning the Deaconship of *Linus* and *Clemens*. Whoever desires to be informed about

Chapter about those beginnings of the Church of *Rome*, may consult Dr. Pearson, and Mr. Dodwel's *Dissert.* about the first Bishops of that City. I wonder our Author, who had such sharp adversaries to deal with, ventured to propose such things without proof. The conjunction of two Churches at *Rome* under *Clemens*, is also another Fiction, of which there is nothing at all said by any of the Antients. The Author of the *Apostol. Constit.* affirms, that *Linus* was ordained by St. Paul, and *Clemens* μετὰ τὴν θάνατον αὐτοῦ, after the death of *Linus*. On which place see *Cotelcrius*.

V. That after the restoring of *Jerusalem* by *Adrian*, or a little before, there were two Bishops of *Jerusalem*, none of the Antients ever said. *Eusebius*, in *Hist. Eccles.* lib. 4. c. 5. where he sets down the succession of the Bishops of *Jerusalem*, tells us, that the time during which they were Bishops was unknown, but that fifteen sat till the Siege of *Adrian*, which were all Jews by descent. Then he adds, συνεστῆναι τότε αὐτοῖς τῶν πατρῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ἕξ Ἑβραίων πατρῶν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἢ εἰς τῶν τότε διαρκετέων περιουσίαν; that all the Church under them was made up of believing Jews, who had continued from the Apostles to the Siege which then happen'd. By this it appears, that there were not two Congregations at that time in *Jerusalem*; nor indeed does *Eusebius* mention those fifteen Bishops, as if some of them had been Bishops together, but all one after another. That there were many Bishops within a short compass of time, may as well be attributed either to their being of a great age when they were elected, or the sudden death wherewith some of them were overtaken, as to a multiplicity of Bishops in one City. The same Historian, in the next Chapter, after he had spoken of the Calamities which befel the Jews under *Adrian*, and related how *Jerusalem* was restored, and called *Ælia*, in honour of *Ælius Adrian*, subjoins; Καὶ διὰ τὴν αὐτῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐκ ἐθνῶν συγκεκλιθείσης, πρῶτον, μετὰ τὴν ἐκπέλασιν τῶν Ἑβραίων ἐπέχειν ἐξ ἐξουσίας Μάρκον; and the Church of the same place being composed of Gentiles, Marcus first, after the Bishops of the Circumcision, undertook the Priesthood over them that were there. He does not say συγκεκλιθείσης Ἐκκλησίας ἐξ Ἑβραίων τε ἢ ἐθνῶν, the Church being composed of Jews and Gentiles, as he ought to have said according to Dr. Hammond's Opinion.

VI. Diversity of languages could be no reason for the Jewish and Gentile Christians keeping up distinct assemblies, because the Jews of old, as also now, understood the languages of the places in which they lived; or at least the Greek, which obtained in all *Asia* as well as in *Greece*: and for that reason there were so many Greek Translations made of the Old Testament for the sake of the Jews, that of the  
Septuagint,



*Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, &c.* And whatever were the Customs of the Jews, there are extant no Records whereby it appears, that after the Apostles times they refused to meet in the same Assemblies with the Gentiles; nor can any such thing be gather'd from the writings of the Apostles, as that they were forced in every particular Town or City to constitute two Bishops and two Churches: For all Differences are not open Schisms. So that there is no reason why we should assent to *Dr. Hammond*, obtruding upon us a raw Conjecture, almost for a certain Truth. It would be easy to find any thing in ancient History, if we might be allowed to reason after the same rate, and interpret the Antients by supplying what is wanting in them with Conjecture, as if they said in so many words what we infer only by guessing from doubtful signs.

Chapter  
XII.

## C H A P. XII.

Verf. 6. **O** U R Author owes what he says here to *Cæsar Baronius*,  
 Note c. as many other things, which he took and set down out of him without examination, which made him judg amiss of the place in *Tacitus*; for *Tacitus* does not give the least intimation of his thinking that the Christians were guilty of firing the City. For after he had said, in *Annal. lib. xv. c. 44.* that the scandal of the City's being burn'd by the Emperor's order, could not be wip'd off by any humane endeavours, nor by the Princes gifts, nor by imploring the Gods, he subjoyns: *Ergo abolendo rumorì Nero subdidit reos*, where the Verb *subdere* is all one as *loco veri auctoris alium supponere*, to substitute another in the place of the true Author; and *reus* does not signify one convinced of any crime, but only one that is accused, as all know that understand Latin. Afterwards he describes the rise and progress of Christianity from *Judæa* as far as *Rome*, and at length relates the Torments endured by the Christians, in these words: *Igitur primo correpti qui fatebantur*, first those were taken up who confessed, namely, that they were Christians, not those that set the City on fire, as *Baronius* misinterprets it, and after him *Dr. Hammond*, which the following words clearly shew: *Deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens, HAUD PERINDE in crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis convicti sunt*: then by their discovery a great multitude was convicted NOT SO MUCH of the crime of having set on fire the City, as of hatred to mankind. If they had confessed it, they would have been found guilty, by their very own confession. I do not vindicate *Tacitus* for his hatred against the Christians, and his shameful ignorance in the business of Religion; but only from the Lye which he is falsely charged with.

O O O O

Verf.

Chapter XIII. Vers. 7. Καὶ ἐγένετο πόλεμος, &c.] Here our Author, in his Paraphrase, after *Grotius*, entertains us with a nauseous Fable about the contention of *Simon* with *St. Peter*; which I have confuted on *2 Theff. ii.* They that believe such Stories, either have not examin'd them, or believe what they please, not what they are sure is true.

Vers. 10. Κατεβλήθη ὁ Καπίργος.] Of the casting down the Devil from Heaven, see my Note on *Luk. x. 18.* As this casting down from Heaven is to be understood metaphorically, of loss of power; so also the War which went before it, of the attempts of the Jews and superstitious Heathens against the Preachers of the Gospel, which Attempts it is prophesied should be vain; not of the fabulous Conflict of *Simon Peter* with *Simon Magus*.

### C H A P. XIII.

Vers. 1. I. **I**T was not worth the while to cite *Ausonius*, a Christian Poet, when there were Heathen Poets ready at hand. And besides, the last Verse is not rightly quoted, which is;

*Hæc erit æternæ series ab origine Romæ,*

not *mundi.* See the four Epigrams, which are at the end of the *Epigr.* of *Ausonius.* There are a great many Medals in which *Rome* is stiled ETERNAL. See *Numism. Imp. Præstant.* collected by *J. Valentius.*

II. *Martial* in *Epigr. lib. xii. Ep. 8.*

*Terrarum DEA, gentiumque Roma;*  
*Cui par est nihil, & nihil secundum.*

*Car. Patinus* in the beginning of his Collection *Numism. Ær. Imp.* mentions 4 pieces of Coin, in which over the figure of a Womans head, with a Tower or Helmet upon it, there is this inscription, ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ. And those pieces were coined by the *Synnadenses, Temenothurita, Amoriani,* and *Ancyрани.* He also speaks of other pieces of Coin inscribed thus, ΙΕΡΑ ΣΥΤΚΛΗΤΟΣ, and ΙΕΡΟΣ ΔΗΜΟΣ, which are all names of Blasphemy attributed to *Rome* and the *Romans.*

Vers. 3. Note b. I shall add some things here at the end of this Note, which will partly confirm, and partly confute what *Dr. Hammond* says.

I. It's



I. It's true that *ἓν* one may by a Hebraism signify that which is first in Chapter order, or number; but as the Hebrew word *אֶחָד* *ebhad*, which is ren- XIII.  
dred *ἓς*, never signifies first in dignity, so neither can *μία κεφαλῶν* signify the *chief of the heads*. Nor is it necessary that this Phrase should be so understood, that *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond's* interpretation may stand. It is sufficient if *μία* do but signify *one*. So that *Dr. Hammond* had no reason to enlarge *Grotius* his Note with this false Interpretation.

II. It is true indeed that *Livy* affirms, *caput humanum aperientibus fundamenta Templi apparuisse*: that a mans head was found by those who dug up the foundations of the Temple, but is false that the Oracle was consulted. They consulted an *Etrurian* Prophet, as we are told by *Dionysius Halicarnassensis* lib. iv. Ed. *Wechel.* pag. 257. and he answered: *ὅτι κεφαλὴ εἰσαρῆαι γρόδαι συμπάσης Ἰταλίας ἢ τόπον τῆτον ἐν ᾧ κεφαλὴν εὔρεσαν*: that the Fates had determined, that that place, in which they had found the Head, should be the Head of all Italy. Which is expressed in this manner by *Livy* lib. 1. c. 51. *Quæ visa species haud per ambages, arcem eam Imperii, caputque rerum fore portendebat; idque ita cecinere vates, quique in urbe erant, quosque ad eam rem consultandam ex Etruria acciverant.* Which sight clearly portended that that place should be the chief strength of the Empire, and the Head of the World; and so it was interpreted by the Prophets, both those that were in the City, and those that were sent for out of *Etruria* to be consulted about that matter.

III. That the deadly wound here given to the Beast may be rightly understood of the burning of the *Capitol*, appears, not only by what is said by *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond*, but also by the opinion which the Records of the Heathens shew them to have had about such an Event. For here we are not to consider the thing it self, but the mens opinion, from which the Christians might rightly argue against the Heathens. It was ordinarily therefore look'd upon as a Prodigy, if a Temple was touched from Heaven; and that Prodigy was so much the greater, by how much more magnificent or venerable the Temple was thought to be. *Livy* will supply us with a great many such Examples, but see particularly lib. xxvii. c. 4. where among other Prodigies it is related, *Jovis ædis culmen fulmine ictum, ac prope omni tecto nudatum*: that the top of *Jupiters* Temple was struck with a thunderbolt, and almost stript of all its covering. So also *Cicero* in the second Book about his Consulship, among the Prodigies portending *Catilines* Conspiracy, made mention of this, as appears from lib. 1. de *Divin.* c. 12.



*Nunc ea Torquato quæ quondam & Consule Cotta,  
Lydius ediderat Tyrrhenæ Gentis aruspex,  
Omnia fixa tuus glomerans determinat annus.  
Nam pater altitonans, stellanti nixus Olympo,  
Ipse suos quondam tumulos ac Tempia petivit,  
Et Capitolinis injecit sedibus ignes.*

All those things which were heretofore under the Consulship of Torquatus and Cotta, foretold by Lydius the Etrurian Prophet, are now ratified, and accomplished; for Jupiter has sometime since smitten his own Hills and Temples, and thrown fire into the Capitol. And therefore the burning of the Capitol under Vespasian was counted a very great calamity, as we may see by these tragical words of Tacitus in *Hist. lib. iii. c. 72.* *Id facinus post conditam urbem, luctuosissimum, fœdissimumque populo Romano accidit; nullo externo hoste, propitiis, si per mores nostros liceret, Deis; sedem Jovis Opt. Max. auspicato à majoribus pignus imperii conditam, quam non Porsena dedita urbe, neque Galli capta, temerare potuissent, furore principum excindi. Arserat & ante Capitolium civili bello, sed fraude privata; nunc palam obsessum, palam incensum. Quibus armorum causis, quo tantæ cladis pretio pro patria bellavimus? &c.* This Action, since the first building of the City, was the most dismal and shameful that ever happen'd to the People of Rome; that when we had no foreign enemy at our gates, and the Gods, for any thing we had done to provoke them, were propitious to us; the seat of the great and excellent Jupiter, ominously erected as a pledg of Dominion, which neither Porsena, when the City was delivered to him, nor the Gauls, who took it by Assault, had been able to break into, should be destroyed by the fury of our own Princes. Once also before, the Capitol was burnt, during a Civil War, but it was then by secret fraud; now it was openly beset, and openly set on fire. Was it for this, and that so great a Calamity might befall us, that we have been engaged in so many Wars, and fought so long for our Country? How great the fame of this Accident was among neighbouring Nations, and how they interpreted it as a Prodigy, the same Writer tells us in *Hist. l. 4. c. 54.* where having made mention of the Commotions that were in Gaul and Germany, he saith, *Nihil æque quam incendium Capitolii, ut finem Imperii adesse crederent, impulerat. Captam olim à Gallis urbem; sed integra Jovis sede, mansisse Imperium. Fatali nunc igne, signum cœlestis iræ datum, & possessionem rerum humanarum Transalpinis gentibus portendi superstitione vana Druidæ canebant.* Nothing had so much inclined them to think that the end of the (Roman) Empire was come, as the burning of the Capitol. That the City had been formerly



formerly taken by the Gauls, but Jupiter's Seat standing safe, the Empire Chapter  
had continued. Now that by this fatal fire it appeared the Gods were incensed XIII.  
against the Romans, and designed to confer the government of the World  
upon the Nations beyond the Alps, was the superstitious tone of the Druids.  
So that these Commotions being appeased, and the Capitol rebuilt,  
it might be said that the deadly wound was healed.

Verf. 8. Note e. It should have been added, with *Grotius*, that the word *ἄρχεται* is understood, in the book of life of the Lamb slain, written from the beginning of the world; that is, in which God from the beginning of the World, until this time, began to write the names of the Confessors and Martyrs for the Truth, whom wicked men had persecuted or killed for its sake: for of a man that is alive it cannot be said, his name was not written from the beginning of the world, instead of never; for it could not be written before he was born, supposing the Discourse to be about a Catalogue only of those who have begun to live, as it is here, which *Dr. Hammond* acknowledges.

Verf. 10. Note f. I do by no means think; that *S. John* here has a respect to *Passive Obedience*, as our Author's Countrymen speak, but to the Persecutors themselves; to whom it is foretold, by this Proverb, that it should be their lot to suffer the same things they inflicted upon others. See *Grotius* on this place. To this purpose is the Subject of *Lactantius* his Book *de mortibus Persecutorum*. So that in this place their Opinion is neither approved nor condemned, who think it lawful to oppose force by force, provided there be a prospect of doing it successfully, and without too much bloodshed. Nor is there any thing said about this matter in the places which the Doctor cites; and it is a thing which it's probable he would not here have thought of, unless he had lived in the days of *Cromwel*. But those things which please us, we bring to mind upon the least occasion.

Verf. 15. Note m. Excepting the place in the *Maccabees*, all our Author here says is taken out of *Hugo Grotius*, who treats of the same matter more largely and accurately. I have alledged a more antient example to this purpose on *Numb. xxxv. 6.* than any alledged by either of them. See also what *Spencer* has collected about this Subject, *de Rit. Mos. Legg. l. 2. c. 14.*

Verf. 17. Note n. What our Author here says, of the several ways whereby sacred marks were received, and what follows as far as the citation of *Martianus Capella*, he took for the most part out of *Grotius*, but excepting these words: *Of these Servius and Virgil makes frequent mention,* [perhaps it may be so printed in that Edition of *Dr. Hammond* which *Mr. Le Clerc* used; but in the second Edition of it, it is,

Of

Chapter XIII. Of these Servius ON Virgil, &c. which if Mr. Le Clerc had known he would not have made this remark ] which are a manifest corruption of these words of Grotius : *Talia mystica nomina etiam aliis Diis fuisse ex Servio discimus : that other Gods also had such mystical names we may learn from Servius.* Virgil himself no where makes mention of such names, much less does he frequently mention them, and perhaps it is but in one place they are mentioned by Servius.

II. They that had received the mark of *Bacchus*, were not for that reason called *βακχικοφῶνται*, but because when they danced at *Bacchus* his Feasts, they really carried in their hands a bunch of *Ivy*, or a *βάκχινξ*.

III. I wonder that our learned Author, who interprets the first Beast of the Idolatry of *Rome*, and especially of the *Capitol*, did not seek for the number of the Beast in the names of the Gods of the *Capitol*. I myself, supposing what is said by Grotius and Dr. Hammond to be true, and conjecturing that the mark of the name, or of the number of the Beast, must contain the number made by the letters of the names of *Jupiter* and *Juno*, who were chiefly worshipped in the *Capitol*, and signify that he who bore that mark, was a worshipper of those Gods, found the number of the Beast,  $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ , in these words :

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| Δ | 4     |
| Ι | 10    |
| Ο | 70    |
| Σ | 200   |
| Ε | 5     |
| Ι | 10    |
| Μ | 40    |
| Ι | 10    |
| Κ | 8     |
| Η | 8     |
| Ρ | 100   |
| Α | 1     |
| Σ | 200   |
|   | <hr/> |
|   | 666   |



So that he who had these Letters  $\chi\xi\varsigma'$  written on his wrist, which made 666, it was the same as if he had had written upon him  $\Delta\iota\acute{o}\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\mu\acute{o}\nu$   $\hat{\alpha}\iota\prime\ \text{H}\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$ , *I am of Jupiter or of Juno*; whereby they professed themselves to be worshippers of the Gods of the *Capitol*. This or some such thing seems to be signified, not that it was always done, or that the Christians were forced to receive such marks upon them, for fear of being barred all commerce with the rest of mankind; but that which is signified is the publick profession of Idolatry, of which the bearing such marks was a notable token. This Conjecture I do not propose as certain, for I confess there are few things in these Prophecies which I clearly understand, but as better agreeing with the rest of the interpretations of Learned men, than that which is said by *Grotius*, who sought for the number of the Beast in the name  $\text{O}\tau\alpha\pi\iota\omicron\text{C}$ , which was that of *Trajan*. For the name of the Beast cannot be the name of a Prince, unless that Prince be counted a *Beast*; which *Grotius* did not think, who interprets the beast *Idolatriam ferino more Jævientem, Idolatry raging like a wild Beast*, on *verse 1.* in his *Explic.* of this Chapter, first printed with the Gospels, as also in his last Works, afterward published with his Annotations on the Epistles.

*Verf. 18. Note o. I.* As I was rendring the foregoing Annotation into Latin, I thought of a reason of the obscurity that is in these Prophecies; which upon thorow consideration I looked upon to be very probable, and therefore I shall here propose it, which is, that a great part of these Predictions being about things that were shortly to be fulfilled by the *Romans*, and *St. John* speaking of these as the enemies of God, by whom they were also suddenly to be destroyed, it was not safe either for himself, or for others to whom he communicated these Prophecies, that the matter of them should be more clearly represented; lest the Book falling into the hands of the *Romans*, should be a means to enrage them. But how could they be understood, you will say? and of what use were they, if they were not understood? To this I answer, I doubt not but *St. John* himself very well knew what every thing in them meant, and explained the contents of them to the Bishops of *Asia*, and the wisest part of ordinary Christians, so far as it was necessary for them to understand the accomplishment of these Predictions. But their meaning not being thought fit to be indifferently communicated to all, lest the imprudence of some persons should bring the Apostle and the Churches into danger; the memory of their secret signification, especially upon the intervening of Persecution, was in a little time lost, and it is no wonder that it did not descend to *Irenæus*.

Chapter II. The distance of so many Ages is no hindrance at all to our understanding these Prophecies, considered in it self; but the want of Historical Records, that were perhaps heretofore written both by Christians and Heathens, out of which, if they were extant, we might undoubtedly come to know many of the circumstances which are here referred to. We should make out the sense better than the Antients themselves, who did nothing by rule and method; for which reason most of their Interpretations of Scripture are impertinent, and do not suite with their great reputation. I wonder that our learned Author rejects the Judgment of *Irenæus*, about the way of explaining this place, for such silly reasons; but perhaps after he had searched a great while and could find nothing himself, he had a mind to deter others from an enquiry, which he thought would be to no purpose. It is a mistake that the custom of expressing a name by numbers was not known to the Greeks of that age, for what else can be meant by *the number of the name*? Does not *Irenæus*, who lived almost in the time of *St. John*, as he himself speaks, mention it as a thing which was known? in lib. v. c. 3. Is there not some such thing in the *Books of the Sibyls*, as *Dr. Hammond* himself has before observed, which most Learned men suppose to have been counterfeited in the second age? Does not also *Irenæus* in lib. 2. c. 40, and 42. expressly affirm that the *Valentinians* used the art of numbering the letters of names, for their numeral signification? But granting *St. John* to have taken what he says from the custom of the Jews, yet why might not he apply to the Greek letters what was usual in the Hebrew, seeing he wrote in Greek? For to suppose a man writing in Greek, and that to men who understand only that language, to think of the Hebrew names of the Idolatry of the Romans, is, in earnest, too much to indulge Conjectures, and to consider only what is possible, and not what is probable. So, 'tis certain, *Barnabas* searched for an Arithmetical mystery in the Greek letters, in cap. ix. of his Epistle. What our Author says about two ways of expressing numbers among the Greeks (to grant now that the thing is well expressed by him) is nothing to the purpose. For however numbers are expressed, it is all one, if that number be but found in the name which is written with its letters. We may express DC. LXVI. in Greek thus,  $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ , or by two H, of which the first shall be within a great  $\Pi$ , which signifies  $\pi\epsilon\pi\tau\epsilon$ , a  $\Delta$  inclosed in the like figure, and another  $\Delta$  alone, and then last of all the letters  $\text{III}$ . But neither way are the letters of the name expressed otherwise than by their numeral signification. *Dr. Hammond* does not seem to have well understood what he meant, when he argued from a twofold way of expressing numbers against *Irenæus*.

III. As



III. As he rashly affirmed that the Greeks, in that Age, were not acquainted with this way of expressing a name, by the number of the letters; so without reason he attributes the invention of it to the Rabbins, who perhaps borrowed it themselves from the Greeks. Doubtless *Gematria* is a mere corruption of the Greek word γεωμετρία; and it is probable that that custom would not have had a Greek name, if it had not been derived from the Greeks. I acknowledg indeed that the Rabbins did more frequently use this way of signifying names than the Greeks. [It should seem by this that Mr. Le Clerc misunderstood Dr. Hammond, for the Doctor does not say, as he represents him, that the custom of expressing names by numbers was not known at that time by the Greeks, but that it was not ordinary among them, and that it was very usual among the Rabbins of that age, unless not ordinary, inusitatum, as he translates him, and not known, ignotum, be the same.] But this was owing to the vain fancies of the Jews, who made too much use of it. So that our Author had no reason to slight the forementioned way of finding out the name of the Beast, if he had not taken some pains himself about this matter to no purpose.

Ibid. 'Αειθως ἂν ἀνθρώπου ἐστ.] Grotius interprets this in his first Explication of this Chapter, *nomen viri principis ex quo, post exutam libertate Rempublicam, tempora maxime cognoscebantur: the name of a Prince, by which, after the Commonwealth was deprived of its liberty, the times were especially known; and the same he expresses in other words in his last Explication of it. But first, the question here is, what is the number of the name of the Beast, not of a Man, as I have already said. Secondly, St. John would rather have said ἀνδρῶν than ἀνθρώπων. Lastly, it is nothing to this place, that the times were signified by the names of Emperors; for St. John does not speak about the time when the Beast was to shew it self, but about his name expressed in numbers. What is then the number of a man? I answer, a small number, or one not so great that a man cannot count it. So μετῶν ἀνθρώπων is used afterwards in Chap. xxi. 17. where see my Note.*

C H A P. XIV.

Verf. 2. 'Υδάτων πολλῶν.] This is rightly understood by Grotius and Dr. Hammond, of multitudes of converted Gentiles. Ovid twice uses the same comparison, speaking of a tumult of people, *Metam. lib. v. Fab. 1.*

*Adsimilare freto possis quod sæva quietum  
Ventorum rabies motis exasperat undis.*

You may compare them to the Sea, which the fierce rage of the Winds makes rough with Waves. And Metam. xv. Fab. 49.

— *Qualia fluctus*

*Aquorei faciunt siquis procul audiat illos,  
Tale sonat populus.*

Such a noise as the waves of the Sea make, when they are heard of far off, was made by the people.

Verf. 10. Note d. I have already on *Matt. xxvii. 34.* rejected Dr. Hammond's interpretation of this place, because θυμός θεῶ is no where used to signify the bitterness, or poison of God, which is an absurd phrase. We must render this place thus: of the Wine of the wrath of God, which is without mixture poured into the cup of his indignation, for κερυννύειν frequently signifies to pour in, as Mr. Gataker had shewn at large in *Advers.* cap. v. where he has collected a great many things about this, and the like phrases.

Verf. 13. Τα δέ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν.] It is said that riches do not follow rich men, because it is of no advantage after death, to have been rich in this world: but on the contrary, here it is said of good men, that their works follow them, because they receive the reward promised to them, from God. To this purpose are the verses of *Euripides* in *Temeno.*

Ἀρετῇ ὃ καὶν διαδόνῃ τις ἐκ πολλῶν  
Ζῆ δ' ἐκ ἔτ' ὄνησ' σώμασ', κακοῖσι δὲ  
Ἀπύσια φρεῖδα συνδανόνθ' ὑπὸ χθονός.

*Virtue when any one dies, is not destroyed,  
But lives even after the dissolution of the body; but when a bad man  
Dies, all he possesses perishes, and descends with him under the earth.*

Which are in *Florileg. Stobæi Tit. 1.* So the Rabbins in *Pirke Aboth* cap. penult. In the hour wherein a man departs out of this life, אֵין מַלְיָין לֵו neither Silver, nor Gold, nor precious Stones, nor Pearls stick by a man, but only the Law and good Works.

Verf. 20. Note h. Our Author did not well understand *Grotius*, who does not say these slaughters happen'd in *Judea*, but interprets ἐπὶ συνόρων γῆλιων ἑξακταίων, extra *Judææ terminos*, without the limits of *Judea*.



dea. *Ingens hæc, faith he, effusio sanguinis Judæorum & Gentilium facta est, Trajano imperante, non in Judæa, sed in locis Judææ vicinis, id est, Syria, Ægypto, Cyrenaica, & Cypro.* This great effusion of blood, both of Jews and Gentiles, was made in the reign of Trajan, not in Judea, but in places near Judea, that is, in Syria, Egypt, Cyrenaica, and Cyprus. Yet Dr. Hammond puts a more probable sense upon this whole Chapter than H. Grotius. Chapter XV.

C H A P. XV.

Verf. 3. **Δ**ίκαια καὶ ἀληθινὰ.] That is, just and righteous (æquæ) are thy ways; for among the Greeks ἀληθὴς, and words properly signifying the same thing, are often taken for æquus, righteous. So ἐπίπικρος, in Homer and Hesiod, is frequently used for righteous: whence Hesychius hath, Ἀληθὴς, δίκαια ἢ δίκαιος, just. It is a noted Verse of Horace, which is the last of *Epist.* vii. lib. i.

*Metiri se quemque suo modulo ac pede verum est.*

That is, say the old Scholia, *Æquum est, ac decet, it is just and fit.* To the same purpose is the Observation of Priscian, in lib. xviii. fol. 115. Ed. Badianæ: “Sophocles in his *Ajax* says, δίκαιος γόνος for verus, true. And our Latins also often put verus for justus, and justus for verus. As Virgil, *Æneid.* xii.

*Quæcumque est fortuna, mea est, me verius unum  
Pro vobis fœdus luere & decernere ferro.*

“By verius he means justius.

C H A P. XVI.

Verf. 12. I. **W**Hat Dr. Hammond says about the treacherous Bridg of Maxentius, is false, and grounded upon a Misinterpretation of Eusebius, who says indeed that Maxentius had made that Bridg *μηχανὴν ὀλέθρου κατ’ ἐαυτῆς*, for an engine of his own destruction. But that came to pass accidentally, not that the Bridg was so contrived as to fall in pieces of its own accord; for Maxentius would not have been such a Fool, as to make use of that Bridg himself. Chapter XVI.

II. It is false that Eusebius says these things happen’d to Constantine according to the prediction of the divine Oracles, or thought that

Chapter S. *John* had a respect to them in this Vision. He only compares this XVII. Event with the ancient Miracles, and applies some places of Scripture to it.

Verf. 17. *Note i.* St. *John* indeed seems to have taken this Phrase from the Style of the Greeks and Latins; but that it is usual in Prophecies to express sad events covertly, as by an *Euphemismus*, I leave them to believe who never read them, or have forgotten them.

C H A P. XVII.

Verf. 3. *Note b.* **D**R. *Hammond* sometimes alledges the words of Writers so carelessly, that he does not so much as set down a perfect sense, as here in the words of *Tertullian*, which are in cap. 7. Ed. Rigaltianæ. *In quem enim aliam universæ Gentes crediderunt, nisi in Christum qui jam venit? Cui enim & aliæ Gentes crediderunt; Parthi, Medi — tunc & in Jerusalem Judæi, & cætera Gentes, ut jam Getulorum varietates, & Maurorum multi fines; Hispaniarum omnes termini & Galliarum diversæ nationes, & Britannorum inaccessa, &c.* For in whom else have all Nations believed, but in the Christ who is now come? For whom have other Nations also believed, the Parthians, Medes — then also the Jews in Jerusalem, and the rest of the World, as now the several Nations of the Getuli, and many Countries of the Moors; all the People of Spain; and divers Nations of France, and the places, &c. But who will believe that *Tertullian*, according to the custom of zealous Declamers, did not make the thing more than it really was? It's certain there were but few Christians, if any, among those Nations, when they invaded the Roman Empire, and they did not receive the Christian Religion till they had fixed themselves in it. I shall say nothing about the counterfeit *Lucius* in England.

Verf. 5. *Note c.* The word *μυστήριον* considered in it self, signifies nothing shameful, nor could it be used by *Achilles Tattius* in the sense our Author here mentions, but improperly. I do not deny but in the *Eleusinia sacra* there were some indecent Rites used; but I do not think they were so very unclean and abominable as the Doctor supposes, nor will any one else think so that has read *Meursius* his *Eleusinia*, or is otherwise at all versed in Greek Writers. They concealed rather some Secrecies about the Gods, than any Lusts which they there indulged. And that the religious Solemnities of the Romans were commonly joined with Fornication or other such unclean Actions, nobody will believe who is not a stranger to their History. There is no doubt indeed, but the strange Rites which were brought to Rome, were for  
that



that reason sometimes forbidden, as the *Orgia* of *Bacchus*, in *Livy*, lib. Chapter xxxix. and the Rites of the *Egyptians* in *Tacitus*, Annal. lib. ii. cap. 85. XVII. But this very thing shows that the *Roman* Worship was not generally accompanied with Uncleanness, as our Author frequently affirms. It is fally also said by him, more than once, that Idolatry was propagated in other Countries from the City of *Rome*, when the Idolatry of the *Egyptians*, *Syrians*, and *Grecians*, was much more antient than the *Roman*. But *Rome* may be said to have made the Kings of the earth drunk with the wine of her Fornication, because she resolutely adhered to Idolatry, and confirmed it by her example, tho the Jews and Christians had for some time upbraided her with it; and because also she went before many others in the Worship of the City of *Rome*, as a Goddess, and her Emperors.

Verf. 8. Note d. Our learned Author does not seem to have well understood what it was in the time of *Vespasian*, *Cæsarem salutari*; for he thinks it was just the same as to be called *Augustus* and *Emperor*, which it is not; for at that time the Sons of the Emperors were called *Cæsars* as soon as ever their Fathers came to the Throne, but they were not therefore *Augusti*. *Domitian*, in his Father's absence, was indeed, at least in shew, invested with the Government, because the state of Affairs requir'd it, no other daring to take upon him to be Emperor whilst the Prince his son was present; but he was not therefore accounted *Augustus* [his Majesty] or made Partaker of the supreme Power. So that no one could wonder if that unsettled Authority of *Domitian* ceased at his Father's Return, who had not intrusted him with the Empire. Yet that which our Author meant, might be said, but in the words of *Grotius*, which he corrupted.

Verf. 14. Note e. I. Our Author sets down somewhat largely this Story, but without necessity, because *Orosius*, who lived in those times, often affirms that the *Goths* were at that time Christians, in lib. 7. The latter place cited out of him by our Author, I was a great while before I could find, for it is not in lib. 11. c. 10. as it is absurdly set in the Margin, when *Orosius* wrote only seven Books in all; but I met with it at last accidentally in lib. 2. c. 3. *Et Christiani fuere qui parcerent, & Christiani quibus parcerent, & Christiani propter quorum memoriam, & in quorum memoriam parceretur.* The same Author has also the Story related by *Rubeus*, in lib. 7. c. 37.

II. But it is true that the neighbouring barbarous Kings often fought against the Lamb. *Austin* de Civ. Dei lib. 18. c. 52. where he confutes those who thought that after the Accomplishment of the ten Persecutions which had already been, there was none to come but

Chapter  
XVII.

the eleventh, which was to happen in the very time of Antichrist, among other things says this; *Nisi forte non est persecutio computanda, quando Rex Gotthorum, in ipsa Gotthia, persecutus est Christianos persecutione mirabili, cum ibi non essent Catholici, quorum plurimi martyrio coronati sunt; sicut à quibusdam fratribus, qui tunc illic pueri fuerant, & se ista vidisse incunctanter recordabantur, audivimus.* Unless perhaps it is not to be reckon'd a Persecution when the King of the Goths strangely persecuted the Christians in Gothia it self, because there were not there any Catholics, of whom a great many were crowned with martyrdom; as we have heard from certain Brethren that were there when Children, and well remembered that they saw those things. See also Orosius in lib. 7. c. 32. Then of the Conversion of those Northern People, after their Entrance into the Roman Empire, and there settling themselves, Orosius speaks thus in lib. 7. c. 41. *Quaquam si ob hoc solum barbari Romanis sinibus immixti forent, quod vulgò per Orientem & Occidentem Ecclesiae Christi, Hunnis, Suevis, Vandalis, & Burgundionibus, diversisque & innumeris credentium populis replentur, laudanda & attollenda Dei misericordia videretur; quandoquidem, etsi cum labefactione nostri, tantæ gentes agnitionem veritatis acciperent, quam invenire utique, nisi hac occasione, non possent.* Tho if it were only for this, that the Barbarians should have been sent into the Roman Borders, that generally the Eastern and Western Churches are filled with Huns, Suevians, Vandals, Burgundians, and a multitude of other different sorts of people, who have embraced the Christian faith, yet we ought to praise and extol the mercy of God; considering that, tho with the weakning of the Empire, so great Nations receive the knowledg of the Truth, which they would never have attained if they had not had this opportunity.

Verf. 16. Note f. There are some faults in this Annotation, which I must correct. I. It is absurdly said by Dr. Hammond of *Genfericus*, that he robb'd the Temple of *Jupiter Capitolinus* OR *Olympius*. For nobody ever called *Jupiter Capitolinus* at Rome *Olympius*, nor is there any such thing in *Procopius*. The Temple of *Jupiter Olympius* was at *Olympia*, not at *Rome*. I might perhaps also say that this is a Fable, and that it is not likely that the Capitolian Temple had stood untouch'd, under so many Christian Emperors. But I leave the matter undecided. II. Our learned Author, having reckon'd *Illyricum* among the provinces which the Barbarians possessed, mentions also *Dalmatia*, which should have been left out; because every one knows that *Dalmatia* is the same Country, which was before called *Illyricum*. III. After he had spoken of *Totilas*, and referred us for what he had said about him, as one would think, to *Sozomen*, lib. ix. c. 6. where that Author speaks of *Alaricus*, he immediately adds: *This being done in the time of Honorius*, making, as the Reader



der might suppose, *Bellisarius* contemporary with *Honorius*, which he knew to be false, but designed by the word *THIS*, tho no body would think so, to refer to what he had said before the mention of *Totilas* and *Bellisarius*; for the burning of part of *Rome* by *Totilas*, was after the time of *Honorius* and *Innocentius*. IV. A little after he says, that *Innocentius* was not at *Rome* (after the first taking of it before the second) but he would have said *Siege* of it, for he knew that *Alaricus* twice besieged *Rome*, and took it but once. V. I have set down the place cited out of *Orosius* Lib. vii. c. 38. more at large in my Latin Translation, than it is in the English; because the words which *Dr. Hammond* omits make more to his purpose, than those which he alledges. [And they are these:] *Rhadagaiso Romanis arcibus imminente, fit omnium Paganorum in urbem concursus, hostem esse cum utique virium copia, tum maxime praesidio Deorum potentem; urbem autem ideo destitutam & maturè perituram, quia Deos & sacra perdidit. Magnis querelis ubique agitur, & continuo de repetendis sacris celebrandisque tractatur; fervent tota urbe blasphemiae, vulgo nomen Christi, tanquam lues aliqua, praesentium temporum probris ingratur.* When *Rhadagasus* drew near the *Roman Towers*, all the *Pagans* ran together into the *City* (crying out) that an *Enemy* was come against them, who besides a powerful *Army*, had also the *Gods* to assist him; and that the *City* was destitute of all hope, and would soon be destroyed, because they had lost the *Gods*, and forborn to do sacrifice to them. There were heavy *Complaints* made in all places, and presently they enter'd offering them; all the *City* was filled with loud *Blasphemies*, and the name of *Christ* was reviled and inveighed against as some present *Plague*.

C H A P. XVIII.

Verf. 2. **I**T is much more natural to think that the *Jews* groaning under the *Roman Tyranny*, and believing they should be deliver'd from all manner of *Evils* by the *Messias*, did upon that ground conclude that the *Romans* should be destroyed by him, that being agreeable to their most noted sentiments; than to suppose, against all probability, that they learned it from the *Revelation*. For nothing is more certain than that the *Christians* and their *Writings* were detested by the *Jews*. So that what is here said of the persuasion of that *People*, being nothing at all to *St. John*, might have been omitted without any loss to the *Reader*.

Verf. 8. Note b. I. If the desolations that were brought upon *Rome* by *Alaricus Gensericus* and *Totila* be all put together, without doubt the misery of that *City* will be the greater; but all these are not comprehended

Chapter hended in the Testimony of *Palladius*, who speaks only of the sacking XVIII. of *Rome* by *Alaricus*, which happen'd *An. Chr. CCCCX.* when *Gensericus* took it in *An. Chr. CCCCLV.* and *Totila An. Chr. DXLVII.* Which times our Author should have distinguished, and not spoken of them confusedly.

II. It is true what he says about the sense of prophetic Expressions, of which see the Examples I have alledged on *Rev. iv. 2.* and elsewhere. But he ought not to have said, that after the Prophecies of *Jeremiah*, the Dominion of *Babylon* was translated to the *Medes*, but to the *Persians*, as every one knows: but the confused Memory of the four pretended Monarchies put him out.

Verf. 13. Our Author took almost all this out of *H. Grotius*, as many other things, without ever looking into *Julius Pollux*; by whom he would have seen that *Grotius* his Animadversion was false. *Pollux* in *Lib. iii. c. 8. S. 2.* where he reckons up the names of Slaves, says that those were called *δύλα σώματα* which were *πρὸς ἀργύριον ἀντικαταλλάσσόμενα*, changed for Money; and a little after he says: *σώματα ἢ ἀπλῶς ἐκ ἀνείποις, ἀλλὰ δύλα σώματα: we must not say Bodies simply, but servile Bodies.* In which he corrects the common, but barbarous Custom of those who called a Slave *σῶμα*; but he does not say that *σώματα ἀπλῶς* signifies Freeman which hire themselves for Money. It is true indeed that *σῶμα* is used of any Man, whether a Freeman or a Slave, as Lexicographers will shew. But when the Discourse is about Wealth, or buying or selling Slaves, then *σῶμα* signifies a Slave, not from the proper Notion of the word, but because of the Circumstances. Examples are alledged by *Is. Casaubon* on *Athenæus Lib. v. c. 10.* A hireling was never called *σῶμα*, and therefore the reason of that Appellation, invented by *Grotius*, is groundless. But Slaves are stiled *Bodies*, when in reckoning up Possessions men are opposed to other things, which do not use to be called by that name. They are stiled also *Souls* by the *Jews*, and by the *Greeks*, because as many Slaves as there are, so many Souls there are, or, as the Lawyers speak, *Persons*. Nor is it any thing against this signification of the word *σώματα*, that there are *Souls of Men* afterwards mention'd, which are *Slaves*; for such repetitions are not avoided by these Writers.

Verf. 23. Note d. As our Author before rashly followed *Grotius*, whom he transcribed without examination, so here he rashly forsakes him. For it is the wealth of the *Romans*, and not that of Strangers, which is extolled in this place. *Grotius* had produced a Passage out of *Isa. xxiii. 8.* where there is the like Phrase, whom the Reader may consult.



CHAPTER XIX.

Verf. 8. **I**T is a mistake that δικαιώματα is used in these Books for the Ordinances of the Mosaical Law, as I have shewn on Rom. viii. 4. In this place δικαιώματα ἁγίων are the *Saints righteous Actions*, or κατορθώματα, which are aptly described by a white Garment, whiteness being a Symbol of Innocence. Nothing could be devised more violent than Dr. Hammond's interpretation.

Verf. 20. Εἰς τὴν λίμνην τῆς πυρὸς τὴν καιομένην ἐν πυρὶ θείῳ.] I have said in my *Dissertation about the destruction of Sodom*, that these Phrases are taken from the Lake *Asphaltites*, which is a *Lake burning with Fire and Brimstone*. Which seems to have been observed also by Dr. Hammond, as may be gather'd from his Paraphrase. So it is usual with the *Rab- bins* to banish any thing that is abominable, and the use of which they think to be profane, to the *salt Sea*, ἡ θάλασσα ἡ ἁλμύρα, as is observed by Mr. Lightfoot Cent. Chorog. on Mat. Cap. v.

CHAPTER XX.

Verf. 5. **I** Confess indeed ingenuously I do not understand the sense of this Prophecy, concerning the Persons here mention'd, *reigning a thousand Years*: But notwithstanding that I could, if I pleased, confute what is here said by Dr. Hammond. He will never perswade any one who believes that Christ and his Apostles were the only *arbitrary* (ἀνυπεύθυνοι) founders and interpreters of the Christian Religion, that for a thousand Years after *Constantin* the Church was purer than it was before; or that there were fewer false Doctrins by publick Authority, establish'd in many Churches. In that interval of time there were not only many Heresies, which created almost perpetual differences, but very great Errors crept in among Christians, which were openly approved by the Governors of Churches; so that the Church-Discipline which our Author so much boasts of, was used only to confirm those Errors, and with the consent of Princes, to kill, or at least abuse those who dared to oppose them. So that if this Kingdom be to be extended to the thousand following Years, it must not be thought consist in sanctity of Life, and purity of Doctrin; but only in the Liberty which the Christians should enjoy, in the greatest part of the Roman Empire, so that they might be good and pious Men, without being envied or persecuted by the Heathens.

Chapter  
XX.

Chapter XX. Verſ. 7. *Note e.* I. I wonder our learned Author here took ſo much pains to confute very weak Objections, and yet took no notice of the Heresiſs which diſturbed the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches at the time when he ſuppoſes the Chriſtians reigned; as I have before obſerved.

II. He takes it for certain that not only *Aiaricus* ſpared the Chriſtians, and deſtroyed none but Heathens, but alſo that *Genſericus* and *Attila* did the ſame, which he does not prove. This ſhould have been ſhewn, and not that which he proves of *Julian* in ſo many words, when no one can deny it, who has read any thing of the Hiſtory of thoſe times.

III. I confeſs I don't approve of the opinion of the Millenaries, but I wonder Dr. *Hammond* here objects againſt them the condemnation of the Church, and gives them the odious name of Hereticks. For as that is but a ſmall Error, if the reſt of the Doctrins of Chriſtianity be retain'd, as they were by *Irenæus*; ſo the Church had not received any Revelation about that matter from the times of the Apoſtles.

Verſ. 8. *Note f.* I. That *Gog* and *Magog* ſignify the People who dwelt about the Mountain *Caucasus*, has been ſo clearly ſhewn by *Sam. Bochart* Geogr. Sacr. Lib. iii. c. 12. that it is impoſſible to doubt of it. And the *Turks* having invaded *Asia* from thoſe places, our Author might hence have confirmed his Interpretation; which I wonder he did not, ſeeing he alledges that Writer elſewhere. For what is ſaid here by *Grotius*, cannot in the leaſt be compared with what we may learn from *Bochart*, as to this matter.

II. It is true indeed that *Gyges* was ſometime Ruler of *Lydia*; but the Kings which ſucceeded him were not therefore, as I remember, called *Gygæ*; tho' it be affirmed by *Grotius*, and after him by Dr. *Hammond*, who abſurdly deduces it from this place, whereas *Gyges* and his Poſterity were in part antienter than *Ezekiel*, and partly his Contemporaries: and therefore ſure that name could not be taken from the *Revelation*.

III. If the Empire of the *Turks* be here referred to, I had rather interpret *the beloved City*, and *the Camp of the Saints*, of all the Eaſtern Church, than *Constantinople* alone. But *verſ. 9.* ſeems to oppoſe it, in which a ſudden Victory over *Gog* and *Magog* ſeems rather to be promiſed, than the taking of that City by thoſe People threatned. Yet this, and all other things of that kind, I leave undetermin'd.



## C H A P. XXI.

Verf. 4. **O**  $\tau\pi\pi\upsilon\theta$ .] Cicero Tuscul. Quæst. Lib. ii. c. 15. having defined *labor* and *dolor*, *Labour* and *Sorrow*, adds: *hæc duo, Græci illi, quorum copiosior est lingua quam nostra, uno nomine appellant*; These two things, the Grecians, whose Language is more copious than ours, call by one name. He means the word  $\pi\upsilon\theta$ , as what he says afterwards, as well as the thing it self shews. So in *Epictetus* Enchir. Cap. xiv.  $\text{Ἐὰν πόνθῃ προσφέρηται, εὐρήσεις καρτερίαν}$ : If Sorrow present it self, you will find patience. In this place also Sorrow seems to be intended.

Verf. 12.  $\text{Ἀγγέλους δώδεκα}$ .] These words seem also to signify the Apostles, as may be gather'd both from the number here specified, and from this, that by them all Nations enter'd into the Church. If this and the like things be to be applied to the Church in later times, as Dr. Hammond thinks, it must be remember'd that the praises here given to it, must be understood comparatively, so as for that Church to be opposed to the Jews and Heathens, in comparison of which it is not unworthy of these Commendations. But we must not measure its Doctrins or Practices by the perfect Rule of the Gospel, from which Dr. Hammond himself did not think but it had departed, tho he would not acknowledg it.

Verf. 16.  $\text{Τὸ ὕψος}$ .] To wit, from the bottom of the Mountain on which the City stood, to the top of its Walls; for the Walls themselves were not so very high. It is somewhat uncertain whether all the sides of this Square were twelve thousand Furlongs in length, so as that the whole Circuit was forty eight thousand Furlongs; as also the height of the Mountain joined with the height of the Walls; or whether a fourth part only of that number is to be assigned to each of the sides, that is, three thousand Furlongs. The former is most likely, so as that an exceeding great City should be described, nothing but what is great and spacious being here to be thought on.

Verf. 17. Note f. By a *man's Cubit* here, I rather understand an ordinary Cubit, as in *Deut. iii. 11.* where without doubt *Moses* speaks of a Cubit of six handbreadths. In *Ezekiel* also the Discourse is not about a Cubit of a Foot, but of six handbreadths, as is evident from *vers. 5. Chap. xl.* where the Angel is said to have had in his hand a *measuring Reed of six Cubits, by the Cubit, and an handbreadth*, that is, six Jewish, not Babylonian Cubits. See Dr. Cumberland of the Jewish Measures.

Verf. 1. **I**T was sufficient to say, that by the Authority of the Lamb sitting upon his Throne, Baptism was instituted; which is very true, and is here signified, granting that the Water in Baptism is meant by the *Water proceeding out of the Throne*. The rest Dr. *Hammond* adds of his own Invention, to find out here the power of the Keys, as he does in other places, where no one else would think them referred to. The same he does afterwards, but being in hast to make an end of this tedious work, I shall not particularly examin what he says, nor would it be worth while. For who but he could here mistake? He describes to us, for instance, the happy Condition of the Christians from *Constantin*, to the Year MCCC. living under the Discipline of Church-Governors, and a most pure Church during that interval, and most worthy of Christ. Which that we might believe, either the New Testament must have been many Ages ago lost, or no footsteps at all of the History of those times remained. Our learned Author was taken up about something else when he wrote this, and whilst he served an Hypothesis, committed to writing what was inconsistent with his stated Sentiments.

Verf. 3. Note e. If *allegorical Divinity were argumentative*, as the Schoolmen speak, possibly some or other might be deceived by these allegorical Interpretations, and think that Christ approved of all the Excommunications that were denounced by Church-Governors, from the time of *Constantin*, for ten Ages; but that Axiom of the Schoolmen being very well known, I shall not spend time in confuting our Author's Fictions, which the thing it self also abundantly confutes.

---

F I N I S.



# An INDEX

Of the Greek Words and Phrases, newly or more largely explained in the Supplement to Dr. Hammond's Annotations.

## A.

- Α** Γαθός, bountiful, Rom. v. 7.  
 Δια τῆς Ἀγγελίας, perhaps for δια τῆς Ἀγγελίας, 1 Cor. xi. 10.  
 Ἄδης, whether it signifies the state of the Dead, or rather a place? Mat. xi. 23.  
 Ἀδιάκειτ'⊕, whether one that doth not doubt, or one that makes no difference, Jam. iii. 17.  
 Ἀδύκμ'⊕, in an Active sense for one that cannot try things, 2 Cor. xiii. 5.  
 Ἀδύνατον, for that which is very difficult, Heb. vi. 6.  
 Ἀθετεῖν νόμον, to reject the Law, Heb. x. 28.  
 Αἰμαλός, for a sandy, or gravelly Shore, Acts xxvii. 39.  
 Αἰρετικός, properly, who? Tit. iii. 10.  
 ἀντοκατάκειτ'⊕, who. Ibid. 11.  
 Αἰδητήρια γυμνασμίνα, a Phrase borrowed from the Stoicks, Heb. v. 14.  
 Αἰῶνες of the Gnosticks, whence so called, 1 Tim. i. 15.  
 Αἰῶνι'⊕, for eternal, and for antient, Tit. i. 2.  
 Αἰῶν'⊕ συντέλεια, the different senses of which that Phrase is capable, Mat. xxiv. 3.  
 Ἀχαθαρτ'⊕, applied to the Heathens, signifies, their being out of God's Covenant, 1 Cor. vii. 14.  
 Ἀκέραι'⊕, whether one that does no hurt, or that is sincere, Mat. 10. 16.  
 Ἀκερασία, & Ἀκερατής, one that has no command over himself, 1 Cor. vii. 5.  
 Δι' Ἀκερυσίας, among the uncircumcised Gentiles, Rom. ii. 27. and iv. 11.  
 Ἀκερθίνια, the first fruits taken off the tops of spoils, or any other things heaped together, Heb. vii. 4. p. 551.  
 Ἀλάσασθον, whence derived and what? Matt. xxvi. 7.  
 Ἀλγίω, not to be cold, but to grieve, 2 Cor. iv. 8. Eph. iv. 19.  
 Ἀλίζομαι, to be salted, and to be consumed, in Mar. ix. 49.  
 Ἀλλοτειοεπίσκοπ'⊕, for a seditious Person, 1 Pet. iv. 15.  
 Ἀλλότειον, for what cannot always be enjoyed, or belongs not to the Mind, in a Philosophical sense, Luke xvi. 12.  
 Ἀλωσις, whether to be taken actively, or passively, 2 Pet. ii. 12.  
 Ἀμαρτία πρὸς θανάτον, what, 1 Joh. v. 16.  
 Ἀναγκάζειν, to compel, by example or entreaty, Gal. ii. 14.  
 Ἀναγκοραζία, of the Athleta, what, 1 Cor. ix. 25.  
 Ἀνανιίζειν, to renew, not to dedicate, Heb. vi. 6.  
 Ἀναλογία πίστεως, the measure of Faith, Rom. xii. 6.  
 Ἀναλύειν, to return, Philip. i. 23. ἀναλυτική, a method so called, which, Ibid.  
 Ἀνάστασις, whether it ever signifies in Scripture, simply a second state, or only the resurrection of the Dead, Mat. xxii. 31. Luke xx. 27.  
 Ἀνθρωπινὸν λέγω, what, Rom. vi. 19.  
 Ἀντ', signifies a Substitution, where the Discourse is about the Death of Christ, Mat. xx. 28.  
 Ἀντιποιεῖν, to resist, not to imitate, 1 John. ii. 18.  
 Ἀντίπτ'⊕, what, Heb. ix. 24.  
 Ἀντίχει'⊕.

## An Index of

- Ἀντίχεις Θ, what it signifies, 1 John ii. 18.  
 Ἀπύξασαι, whether it signifies a suffocation arising from Melancholy, or only violent strangling, Mat. xxvii. 5.  
 Ἀπύχασμα ἡ δόξης, the brightness of the glory of God, how Christ is said to be so, Heb. i. 3.  
 Ἀπειθεῖν, to disobey, applied either to small or heinous Sins, 1 Pet. iii. 20.  
 Ἀπλότης, liberality why so called, Rom. xii. 8.  
 Ἀπλός, liberal, applied to the Eye, Mat. vi. 22.  
 Ἀπληγρότες, who, Rom. i. 29. Eph. iv. 19.  
 Ἀπό, to be understood, Gal. i. 1.  
 Ἀπό κτίσεως κόσμου, from the Creation of the World, Rom. i. 20.  
 Ἀποδέχεσθαι, to approve, 1 Tim. i. 15.  
 Ἀποδοχή, approbation, Ibid.  
 Ἀποκαρτοδοκία, the expectation of the Gentiles, of what kind, Rom. viii. 19.  
 Ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, the restitution of all things, Acts iii. 19.  
 Ἀποστασία, a departure, a revolt, signifies the rebellion of the Jews against the Romans, 2 Thess. ii. 3.  
 Ἀποστερεῖν, to defraud, Mar. x. 19.  
 Ἀπόστολος, whether the name imports any Authority or Dignity, Luke vi. 13. who were so called, Prem. to James.  
 Ἀποσυνάγωγος, cast out of the Congregation, John ix. 22.  
 Ἀρξὸν ῥήμα, a word either reproachful, or which tends to corrupt the Manners of Men, Mat. xii. 36.  
 Ἀργός, Idle, not Unclean, Tit. i. 12.  
 Ἀρεσκόν, that which pleases, John viii. 29.  
 Ἀρειόπατος, whence so called, Acts xvii. 19.  
 Ἀρμόσσειν, to espouse, 2 Cor. xi. 2.  
 Ἀρπιξ, who, 1 Cor. v. 10.  
 Ἀρπαγμαὸν ἠγάσασθαι, what, Phil. ii. 6.  
 Ἀρπὸς & ἀρτίζειν, what, 2 Cor. xiii. 11.  
 Τὴν Ἀρχὴν, the meaning of that Phrase, John viii. 25.  
 Ἀρχισυνάγωγος, who, Mar. v. 22.  
 Ἀσάειν, of Tiberius, how much, Mat. x. 29.  
 Ἀδενεῖν & ἀδενής, to signify a Disease of the Mind, 1 Cor. viii. 7.  
 Ἀτακτῶς περπατεῖν, what, 2 Thess. iii. 6.  
 Ἀτοπος, wicked, 2 Thess. iii. 2.
- Ἀυσεθής, covetous, Luke xix. 21.  
 Ἄφ' ἧς, whether it signifies except that, 2 Pet. iii. 4.  
 Ἀφανίζεν, what, Mat. vi. 16.  
 Ἀφίεως to be joined with λατρεύειν, Luke i. 73.  
 Ἀφροσύνη, not boasting, but imprudence, Mar. vii. 22. several significations of that word, Ibid.  
 Ἄχρον, not the straw of Corn, but the Husk, Mat. iii. 12.
- B.
- Ἐν Βάσει εἶναι, whether it signifies, to be severe, 1 Thess. ii. 6.  
 Βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων, why God is so called, 1 Tim. i. 17.  
 Βδέλυγμα, an abominable thing, 1 Cor. v. 10. p. 316.  
 Βραχύ τι, whether it signify a little while, in Heb. ii. 7.
- Γ.
- Γαστριμαργία, intemperance in eating, its derivation, Tit. i. 12.  
 Γίνεσθαι, applied to a Law, signifies its continuing in force, Mat. v. 18.  
 Γένεσις, the origin of a thing, not taken for any event, Mar. i. 1.  
 Γλώσσαι, for strange Languages, 1 Cor. xii. 28.  
 Γνώσις, for a profound sort of Knowledge, and in a good sense, 2 Pet. i. 5.  
 Γνώσις Ψευδώνυμος, whether it has any reference to the Gnosticks, 1 Tim. vi. 20.  
 Κατὰ Γνώσιν, prudently, or skilfully, 1 Pet. iii. 7.  
 Γράμμα, for the literal sense of the Law. Mat. v. 17.
- Δ.
- Δαιμόνια, not always evil Spirits, 1 Cor. x. 20.  
 Δὲ for ἢ, Jam. i. 9. p. 574.  
 Δέχεσθαι, to assent to, 1 Cor. ii. 14.  
 Διὰ for in, 1 Tim. ii. 15.  
 Διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as a Disciple of Christ, Rom. i. 8.  
 Διάβολος, an Adversary or Hater, Mat. iv. 1.



## the Greek Words and Phrases.

Διέθρηκ, an ambiguous word, Annot. on the Tit. of the New Testament, and Heb. ix. 16. where there is an Argument grounded on the ambiguity of it.

Διάκονοι, from διακονεῖν, who. Luke viii. 2.

Διάκονος, spoken of a Woman, what. Rom. xvi. 1.

Διακείναι σῶμα Κρείν, what. 1 Cor. xi. 29.

Διακρίνεσθαι, to distinguish, James ii. 4.

Διαλογισμοὶ, Thoughts and Counsels, Mat. xv. 19. Opinions in Rom. xiv. 1.

Διανύειν πλῆν, to finish a Voyage, Act. xxi. 7.

Διαπρίεσθαι, to gnash with the Teeth, Acts v. 33.

Διψοχεῖν, to doubt: and Διψυχος ἀνὴρ, a Man that doubteth, James i. 6, 8.

Διδάσκαλοι, under the New Testament, who, and how they differ'd from Prophets, 1 Cor. xii. 28.

Δικαιῶν, St. Paul's sense of it, Rom. iii. 4.

Δικαίωμα, any divine Precept, Rom. ii. 26. and viii. 4.

Δικαιώματα ἀγίων, what, Rev. xix. 8.

Δίκη, the same with Nemesis, Acts xxviii. 4.

Δοκιμάζω, to examine and approve, Rom. ii. 18.

Δόξα, for Miracles, John i. 14. and the Power of working them, Ib. xvii. 22. whether taken for a Beam in 1 Cor. xi. 7.

Δόξας βλασφημεῖν, what, Jude 8.

Δῦλοι, for Servants of a free Condition, in opposition to Slaves, Mat. xviii. 23.

Δυσωπεῖν Θεόν, to prevail with God, Luke xviii. 5.

### E.

Εγχεσίμυθος, what Woman, Acts xvi. 16.

Εγγίζω, in Holy things, what, Heb. vii. 19.

Εγκράτεια, a power over a Man's self: ἐγκρατής, one that is master of his Passions: ἐγκρατεύεσθαι, to be Temperate, 1 Cor. ix. 25. p. 319.

Ἐθελόθησεία, used in a bad sense by St. Paul, Col. ii. 19.

Ἐθνη, for the Inhabitants of several Territories in the same Country, Mat. xxiv. 7.

Ἐιδωλα, the Gods of the Heathens, whence so called, 1 Cor. viii. 4.

Ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα, whether it signifies to

excommunicate, Luke vi. 22.

Ἐκκλησία, the use of the word in the Primitive Times, 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

Ἐκλεκτή, whether taken for a Church, 2 John 1.

Ἐπιθεσθαι, to declare, Act. xxviii. 23. p. 243.

Ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων, by or from many, 2 Cor. i. 11.

Ἐκχεῖσθαι ἐν πλάγι, what, Jud. 11:

Ἐλεγχο, whether a Persuasion, or an Argument, Heb. xi. 1.

Ἐμπυρον, a burnt Sacrifice, Mark ix. 49.

Ἐμφανίζω, to accuse, Acts xxiv. 1.

Ἐμψυτῶ λόγῳ, a word which sinks down into the minds of its Hearers, Jam. i. 21.

Ἐνεργεῖσθαι, taken both Actively and Passively, Gal. v. 6. where the Doctor's Opinion about the use of it in the New Testament is examin'd.

Ἐξαπορεῖσθαι, to despair utterly, 2 Cor. iv. 7.

Ἐξοδῶ, to signify the Coming of Christ to take Vengeance upon the Jews, Luk. ix. 31.

Ἐξουολογεῖν, to agree about the price of a thing, Luke xxii. 6.

Ἐξοσία, for a Veil, 1 Cor. xi. 10.

Ἐπίλυσις, whether to be rendred, sending out, or loosing, 2 Pet. i. 20.

Ἐπιθυμία, any Lust whatsoever, 2 Pet. i. 4.

Ἐπίεσις, that which is necessary for the future, Mat. vi. 11.

Ἐπισκοπή, visitation, either in Mercy or in Vengeance, 1 Pet. ii. 12. p. 589.

Ἐπισθεύειν, to look into, or understand throughly, 1 Pet. ii. 12.

Ἐργάζεσθαι βρώσιν, to get his Living by Labour, John vi. 27.

Ἐρῶπι ἡμέρα, the same as hereafter, 2 Pet. iii. 3.

Ἐτεροζυγεῖν ἐπίστις, what, 2 Cor. vi. 14.

Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, to receive a gracious Promise, Heb. iv. 2.

Εὐγένεια, what disposition of Mind, Acts xvii. 11.

Εὐπερίστασις, that is easily circumvented, not joined with Temptations, Heb. xii. 1.

Εὐρέθη, happened, Mat. i. 18.

Εὐερεκλύδων, for Εὐερεκλύδων, Acts xxvii. 14.

Εὐτεταπλία, a cleanly word for obscene Discourse, Eph. v. 4.

# An Index of

Ἐχθρὸς ἀνθρώπου, not the Devil, but a Man, in *Mat.* xiii. 28.

Ἔως, used as an Adversative, *Mat.* v. 18.

## Z.

Ζημιῦσθαι, with an Accusative case, no Elliptical Phrase, *Mat.* xvi. 26.

Ζῶα γεγεννημένα εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν, what, *1 Cor.* v. 10.

## H.

Ἡ, when a Negation goes before it, the same as *not*, *Eph.* v. 3.

## Θ.

Θέλω, for *I would*, *Rom.* vii. 15. for *I had rather*, *1 Cor.* vii. 6.

Θεμέλιον, the same as *Κεμήλιον*, and perhaps to be so read, *1 Tim.* vi. 19.

Θεοφύλακτος, preserved by God, not, one that defends God, *1 Tim.* ii. 1.

## I.

Ἰδιώτης λόγῳ, how *St. Paul* confesses himself to be so, *2 Cor.* xi. 6.

Ἰλασθήσιον, what, *Rom.* iii. 25.

Ἰλεῶς σοι, the meaning of that Phrase, *Mat.* xvi. 22.

Ἰμάτιον, a Cloak, *Mat.* v. 40.

Ἰσα Θεῷ εἶναι, to be made equal with God, *Phil.* ii. 6.

## K.

Καθαίρεσις, alone, not properly *Excommunication* but *degrading from Office*, καθαίρεσις ὀχυρώματός, the destroying a Fence, not the *excommunicating an obdurate Sinner*, *2 Cor.* x. 4.

Καιρὸς σύκων, what, *Mat.* xi. 13.

Καιρὸς ἐθνῶν, which, *Luke* xxi. 24.

Κακὸς κακῶς ἀπολλύειν, a Proverb, *Mat.* xxi. 41.

Κάμηλος, a Cable, *Mat.* xix. 24.

Κάμνειν, properly to be tired, metaphorically, to faint or fail, *Heb.* xii. 3.

Καρπὸς, whether it ever signifies a *Burnt-offering*: καρπὸς χειλέων, whether applicable to the *Oblations of Christians at the Eucharist*, *Heb.* xiii. 15.

Κατὰ ἔργα, whether by *Works*, or in the judgment of *Man*, *Rom.* iv. 1.

Καταβραβεύεσθαι, to be deceived, *Col.* ii. 18.

Καταγινώσκειν, whether it ever signifies to discover, *Gal.* ii. 11.

Καταλαμβάνειν, whether an *Agonistical* term, *Phil.* iii. 12. p. 458.

Καταλύειν, to bait or lodge, *Luke* ix. 12.

Καταναρξάν, to be burdensome, how so, *2 Cor.* xi. 9.

Κατάνυξις, *compunctio*, and *slumbering*, *Rom.* xi. 8.

Καταργεῖν σῶμα ἁμαρτίας, to mortify Sins arising from the Body, *Rom.* vi. 6.

Καταρτίζειν, how variously taken in the New Testament, *2 Cor.* xiii. 11.

Καταρτίζειν, to mould or form, and καταρτίσεις, forming, *2 Cor.* xiii. 11.

Κατάστημα, whether the Rank of such as are ordained Ministers, or rather a dress of any sort, *Tit.* ii. 3.

Κατατομή, applied by way of contempt to those who boasted of *Circumcision*, ἀπειτομή, *Phil.* iii. 2.

Τὸ Κατέχον, what, *2 Thess.* ii. 6.

Κατισχύειν, to overcome by force, *Mat.* xvi. 18.

Κενὸς, whether it signifies false, *1 Thess.* ii. 1.

Κεραυνύειν, for to pour in, *Rev.* xiv. 10.

Κεχαριτωμένη, whether full of Grace, or singularly favour'd by God, *Luke* i. 28.

Κλαίειν, whether to cry out, *Mat.* viii. 12.

Κλητὸς, the Doctor's Opinion of the use of that word in Scripture examin'd, *Mat.* xx. 16. πολλοὶ εἰσι κλητοὶ, spoken of whom, and what it signifies, *Ib.* xxii. 14.

Κοιλία, for the Stomach, *Rev.* x. 9.

Κοινὸς, Unclean, *Mark* vii. 2.

Κοινωνία πνεύματος, what, *2 Cor.* xiii. 14.

Κοσμικὸς, for earthly, *Heb.* ix. 1.

Κόφινος & σπυρίς, words signifying the same thing, *Mat.* xvi. 10.

Κρέμασθαι [ἐκ πινός] to hang upon a thing, spoken of the Law, the ground of the expression, *Mat.* xxii. 40.

Κεῖθῆναι σαρκί, what, *1 Pet.* iv. 6.

Κεῖμα μείζον λαμβάνειν, what, *Jam.* iii. 1.

Ὁ Κρίνων, one that judgeth of Good and Evil, *Rom.* ii. 1.

Κριτήριον, for a Judgment, *1 Cor.* vi. 2.

Κριθῆναι πάντα, how they are said to have been so by Christ, *Col.* i. 16.

Κυβεία, Divination by Lots, *Eph.* iv. 14.



# the Greek Words and Phrases.

## Λ.

- Λαλεῖν ῥήματα*, what, *Jude* 16.  
*λέγει*, set simply where *γενῆ* is understood, *Eph.* v. 14.  
*λόγια*, Oracles, whence so called, *Rom.* iii. 2. *λόγια ζῶντα*, what, *Ibid.*  
*λόγος*, the Divine Reason, prem. to *John* i. for Knowledge, *1 Cor.* i. 5. for Report, *1 Thes.* ii. 5. for the Gospel, *Luke* i. 2. joined with *θεῶς*, for God himself in *Heb.* iv. 12.  
*λοιδόρος*, whether it signifies *Lusful*, *1 Cor.* v. 11.  
*λυπεῖσθαι*, to be grieved, so as to become disaffected to Christianity, *Rom.* xiv. 15. whether it ever signifies *Excommunication*, *2 Cor.* vii. 8. 9.

## Μ.

- Ματαιότης*, whether it signifies *Idolatry* or *Vanity*, *Rom.* viii. 20.  
*Μελετᾶν*, to mind, or take care of, *1 Tim.* iv. 10.  
*Ἐν Μέσῳ ἕρτης*, what, *Col.* ii. 16.  
*Μερίζω*, to distract, *1 Cor.* vii. 34.  
*Ἐν Μέσῳ Θρόνου*, for, over against the midst of the Throne, *Rev.* iv. 6.  
*Μεταλαμβάνειν δόλοιας*, for to use a Blessing, *Heb.* vi. 7.  
*Μετάνοια*, whether ever taken in the New Testament for Church Penalties, *Heb.* vi. 6.  
*Μοιλάλος*, whether it signifies *Dumb*, *Mar.* vii. 35.  
*Μορφή θεῶν*, and *μορφή δέλου*, what, *Phil.* ii. 6. 7.  
*Municipium & Municipatus* in Lat. what, *Phil.* iii. 20.  
*Μυσῆς*, who, *1 Tim.* ii. 1.  
*Μυσῆριον*, whether it signify any thing indecent, *Rev.* xvii. 5.  
*Μωμοσκόπος*, his Office among the Jews, *Heb.* iv. 13.  
*Μωρολογία*, for obscene Discourse, *Eph.* v. 4.

## Ν.

- Νάρθηκς πισκῆ*, Nard faithfully prepared, *Mar.* xiv. 3. p. 115.  
*Νεωκόρος*, a common title of the Cities in *Asia*, *Acts* xix. 35.  
*Νεώτεροι*, whether applied to Christians that have no Office in the Church, *Luke* xxii. 26. and *Tit.* ii. 2.

- Εἰς Νίκην*, in victory, not for ever, *1 Cor.* xv. 54.  
*Νομῶς ἐπέων*, a profusion of words, *2 Tim.* ii. 16.  
*Νῆς*, for the meaning or sense of words, *1 Cor.* xiv. 14. for quickness of Wit, or Understanding, *Phil.* iv. 7.

## Ο.

- Οικία τῶ σκηνῆς*, a House in the likeness of a Tabernacle easily dissolved, *2 Cor.* v. 1.  
*Κατ' Οἶκον*, from house to house, *Acts* ii. 46.  
*Ὅκνησις*, whom it grieveth to do any thing, *Phil.* iii. 1.  
*Ὅλως*, an Adverb of affirming, or in few words, *1 Cor.* v. 1.  
*Ἐν Ὁμοιωματι ἀνθρώπων γενέσθαι*, to carry himself like a common Man, *Phil.* ii. 7.  
*Ὁνομα*, for a Person, *Acts* i. 15.  
*Ὁμοιωθῆναι ὑπὸς Θεῶν*, how Christ is said to have been so, *Rom.* i. 4.  
*Ὁσέκωνα σκευῆ*, earthen Vessels, *2 Cor.* iv. 7.  
*Ὅτι*, whether an Expletive, *Mat.* vii. 23. for how, *Mar.* vi. 2.  
*Ὁυτω*, the beginning of an Apodosis, *Jam.* iii. 5.  
*Ὁφελον*, for Ὁφειλον, *Gal.* v. 12.

## Π.

- Παγκράτιον*, what sort of Exercise, *1 Cor.* ix. 26.  
*Παιδίον*, for a Servant, *Luke* xi. 7.  
*Παλιγγενεσία*, a Philosophical word, signifying the restoration of all things, *Mat.* xix. 28.  
*Πανοπλία*, heavy Armour, *Eph.* vi. 11, 15.  
*Παροδειγματίζεν*, to punish, among the ancient Greeks; to traduce, among the later, *Mat.* i. 19.  
*Παρομιεῖσθαι*, whether it signifies to excommunicate, *Tit.* iii. 10.  
*Παράκλητος*, in what sense used by Christ, *John* xiv. 16.  
*Παρασκευῆ*, Friday, *Mar.* xv. 42.  
*Παραπρεῖν*, in an ill sense, *Luke* xx. 20.  
*Πάρεσις*, Remission, *Rom.* iii. 25.  
*Πάχειν σαρκί*, an ambiguous expression, *1 Pet.* iv. 1.  
*Πείθειν*, whether it ever signifies to pacify, *2 Cor.* v. 11. and *Gal.* i. 10. *πίθειν καρδίαν ἑαυτῷ*, an Elliptical Phrase, *1 John* iii. 19.  
*Πσειδισμι*, to avoid, *2 Tim.* ii. 16.

## An Index of the

- Περαθάρμα*, the offscouring, a contemptible Person, 1 Cor. iv. 13.  
*Περιοχή*, a period, Acts viii. 32.  
*Περίφημα*, i. q. *περαθάρμα*, q. v.  
*Πέτρα & Πετρῶν*, the same, Mat. x. 2.  
*Πίστις*, Faith, sever. | Notions of it, Mat. viii. 10. for a certain knowledg, Rom. xiv. 23. and 1 Thess. iii. 10.  
*Πισθεῖν eis τὸ ὄνομα*, what, John ii. 23.  
*Πλεονεξία*, whether it signifies unatural Lust, Rom. i. 29.  
*Πληροφορία*, several sense, Rom. i. 21.  
*Πλήρημα*, a fullitude, Rom. i. 12.  
*Πρόμα*, for the design of the Law, given in opposition to the Letter of the Law, Mat. v. 17. Rom. ii. 27. and vii. 5. 2 Cor. iii. 6. for the miraculous Gifts of the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. ii. 4. for the mind of Man distinct from the Body, 1 Cor. xiv. 14. *π. Δύο δουλίας*, what, Rom. viii. 15. *π. Δύο τι λαλῶν*, what, 1 Cor. xiv. 2. p. 356. *πνεύματα ἐν σουλαῆ*, the Spirits that watch, 1 Pet. iii. 19.  
*Πνευματικός*, for supernatural, 1 Cor. x. 3.  
*Πρῆξεν*, to drag along by head and shoulders, Mat. xviii. 28.  
*Ποίημα*, a work, Rom. i. 20.  
*Πολιτεία*, the privilege of Citizen, Phil. iii. 20.  
*Πολίτευμα*, a City, Ibid.  
*Πόνος*, Grief, Rev. xxi. 4.  
*Προπόειον*, what, Phil. i. 13.  
*Πρεσβύτης & πρεσβύτερος*, used promiscuously, to signify either Dignity or Age, Tit. ii. 2.  
*Προβάλλειν*, to push forward, or lead to Judgment, Acts xix. 33.  
*Προγγραμμένοι εις κῆριμα*, who, Jud. 4.  
*Προγγραμμα & προγγράφειν*, what, Jud. 4.  
*Πρόθεσις*, a purpose of Mind; *κατὰ πρόθεσιν*, agreeably to such a purpose, Rom. viii. 28.  
*Προσβῆξασθαι τῶ νοῶ*, what, 1 Cor. xiv. 4.  
*Προσκυνῆν* signifies both divine and civil Worship, Mat. ii. 9.  
*Προσφορὰ & θυσία*, whether they differ, Eph. v. 2.  
*Προσφάγιον*, for that which may be converted into Food, John xxi. 5.  
*Πρόσωπον γενέσεως*, the natural Countenance, James i. 23.  
*Πρόφασις*, a Cause true or pretended, 1 Thess. ii. 5.  
*Προφουτεύειν*, Dr. Hammond's opinion about the various senses of that word examin'd, Luke i. 67.  
*Πρωτῶν*, superior, John i. 15.  
*Πρωτοτύπος πάσις κτίσεως*, what, Col. i. 15.  
*Πτωχὸν αἰχλίαν*, how the Law of Moses is so called, Gal. iv. 9.  
*Πυγυῶν βαπτισθῆναι*, among the Jews, what, Mar. vii. 2.  
*Πύλαι ἔδου*, what, Mat. xvi. 18.  
*Πνεύμα Πύθωνος*, what, Acts xvi. 16.  
*Ῥαδιουργία*, Deceit, Acts xiii. 50.  
*Ῥοιζήσεν*, with a rattling noise, 2 Pet. iii. 10.  
*Σέβασμα*, a very fit word to express the Hebrew *Elohim*, 2 Thess. ii. 3.  
*Σεσσωδῆ*, a concussion in the Air, Mat. xxviii. 2.  
*Σημεῖον*, whether it signifies to brand by Excommunication, 2 Thess. iii. 14.  
*Σκία*, a rough Picture, Heb. viii. 5.  
*Σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί*, what, 2 Cor. xii. 7.  
*Σοφείων*, what, Luke xix. 20.  
*Σπένδεσθαι*, to be slain, applied to a Sacrifice, 2 Tim. iv. 6.  
*Στέλλεσθαι*, whether to excommunicate, or only to withdraw himself, 2 Thess. iii. 6.  
*Στοιχεῖον*, for a Shadow, Col. ii. 9.  
*Στολαί*, long Robes, Luke xx. 46.  
*Στρατεύειν*, whether it be to serve, Luke xviii. 11.  
*Στρατιῶν ἱερέων*, of two sorts, Luke xxii. 52. Acts iv. 1. and v. 24.  
*Συγκεκρωμένον λόγον*, what word, Heb. iv. 2.  
*Συμπρεσβύτερον*, why St. Peter calls himself, 1 Pet. v. 1.  
*Συνείδησις εἰδωλή*, what, 1 Cor. viii. 7.  
*Συνοικεῖν*, sometimes signifies all conjugal Offices, 1 Pet. iii. 7.  
*Συντηρεῖν*, to preserve, Mar. vi. 20.  
*Συντεῖβεν σκεῦον*, to break a vessel, not to shake it, Mar. xiv. 3.  
*Στραγίς*, a sign, Rom. iv. 11.  
*Σχημα*, an outward appearance, Phil. ii. 8.  
*Σώζω*, taken for several things, Luke xiii. 23.  
*Σῶμα μὲν*, whether it signifies my self, Rom. vi. 6. 1 Cor. ix. 27.



## Greck Words and Phrases.

Σῶμα ἀμαρτίας, whether *Sin*, or a Body obnoxious to *Sin*, *Rom.* vi. 6.

Σῶματα, for *Slaves*, not *Hirelings*, *Rev.* xviii. 13.

Σωτηρία, for *eternal Salvation*, not a temporary: *Deliverance* from Persecutions, *Heb.* ii. 3.

### Τ.

Ταμίαι, *secret Chambers*, *Mat.* xxiv. 26.

διὰ Τεκνογονίας σωθῆναι, what, *1 Tim.* ii. 15.

Τελειότης, for a sort of *Perfection*, which is only ornamental, *Heb.* vi. 1.

Τελειῶν, to *consecrate*, not to *make perfect*, *Heb.* ii. 10.

Τελειῶσθαι, whether an *Agonistical* term, *Phil.* iii. 12.

Τελειωθῆναι, to enjoy perfect *Happiness*, *Heb.* xi. 40.

Τελείωσις, the *Consecration* of any one that offer'd *Sacrifice*, *Heb.* vii. 11.

Τελῶναι, of two sorts, *Mat.* xi. 19.

Τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, who, *Acts* xiii. 48.

Τετράρχης, what, *Luke* iii. 1.

Τετράγωνος, one of *just Stature*, *Mat.* vi. 27.

Τιμὴ, *Honour* and *Reward*, *1 Tim.* v. 17.

τιμὴ σέβας, what, *Col.* ii. 15.

Τέχος γενέσεως, the *wheel* of *Generation*, what, *James* iii. 6. p. 580.

Τυμπανίζειν, what sort of *Torment*, *Heb.* xi. 35.

Τύμπανον, whether a *Wheel*, or a *Club*, *Ibid.*

Τύπος, several significations of that word, *1 Cor.* x. 7.

### Υ.

Υπακῆσαι, to *hearken* if any body *knocks* or *calls*, *Acts* xii. 13.

Υπὲρ ἐν πλεονάζειν, *superabundantly*, *1 Thess.* iii. 10.

Υπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, in the *room* or *stead* of those that are *dead*, *1 Cor.* xv. 29.

Υπερβαίνειν, whether it signify *unnatural Filthiness*, *1 Thess.* iv. 6.

Υπερέχειν, whether it signify the *supreme Power*, *Rom.* xiii. 1.

Υπερώον, in which the *Apostles* met together, whether in the *Temple*, *Acts* i. 13.

Υπόπιον & ὑποπάζειν, what, *Luke* xviii. 5.

Υπόδειγμα, an *imitation*, *Heb.* viii. 5.

Υπερήματα εὐφραν Χριστῶ, what, *Mark* xii. 44.

### Φ.

Φελόνης, no *Greek* word, *2 Tim.* iv. 13.

Φθισοπωριὰ δένδρον, whence so called, *Jud.* 12.

Φθορά, signifies sometimes *Filthiness*, sometimes any *Corruption*, *2 Pet.* i. 4.

Φρονεῖν ὡς ὁ γέγραπται, what, *1 Cor.* iv. 6.

Φρόνησις δικαίων, the *mind* of the *Just*, *Luke* i. 27.

Φύσις, for *natural Light*, in opposition to *Instruction*, *1 Cor.* xi. 14.

Φωνεῖν, for *προσφωνεῖν*; to *speak to*, *John* ii. 9.

### Χ.

Χαρά, *joy* for a *Fest*, *Mat.* xxv. 21. and xxvi. 7. for a *Christian Virtue*, *Rom.* xiv. 17.

Χάρισμα ἱερῶν, what, *Rev.* xiii. 15.

Χάρις, for the *Gospel*, in opposition to the *Law*, *John* i. 14. p. 183.

Χάρις Χριστῶ, whether it be the *Charity* of *Christ*, *2 Cor.* xiii. 14.

Χάρις ἀντὶ χάριτος, what, *John* i. 16.

Χειροτονεῖν, what properly, what *metaphorically*, *Acts* xiv. 23.

Χιτῶν, a *Coat*, *Mat.* v. 40.

Χρησά ἡθῆ, whether *good Dispositions* or *good Manners*, *1 Cor.* xv. 33.

Χρηστός, of a person, *bountiful*; of a thing, *profitable*, *Mat.* xi. 30.

### Ψ.

Ψεύδεσθαι τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, what, *Acts* v. 3.

Ψυχαὶ ἐσθλαγμένων, may be the *dead bodies* of the *Slain*, *Rev.* vi. 9.

Ψυχικός ἀνθρώπος, a *brutish sensual Man*, *1 Cor.* ii. 14.

# An INDEX

OF THE

Memorable things contained in these Remarks.

A.

**A** *Bortive*, in a Metaphorical sense, what, 1 Cor. xv. 8.

*Abraham* went from *Charran* during his Fathers Life, *Acts* vii. 4. whether his paying Tithes to *Melchisedek*, can be thought an example of the present Custom of paying Tithes of all that a Man possesses, *Heb.* vii. 4.

*Adoption of Sons*, what in *Rom.* viii. 23.

*Adramyttium*, a Town in *Mysia*, *Acts* xxvii. 2.

*Adultery*, the Story of the Woman taken in the Act, whether Genuin, *John* vii. 53. and viii. 3, 6, 7, 9, 10.

*Age to come*, which, *Luke* i. 70.

*Agnetæ*, their Heresy.

*Agonistical terms*, often used by *St. Paul*, as *Rom.* ix. 15. 1 Cor. ix. 24, &c. 2 Cor. iv. 8. 2 Tim. iv. 7. *Phil.* iii. 12. but not so often as *Dr. Hammond* thought, *Phil.* iii. 12. p. 457, and 458.

*Alabaster box*, out of which *Christ* was Anointed, whether broken or not, *Mat.* xxvi. 7. *Mark* xiv. 3.

*Alexander the Copper-smith*, where he did so much evil to *St. Paul*, 2 Tim. iv. 14.

*Allegorical interpretations of Scripture*, used as Arguments; *ad hūminem*, to convince the Jews; *Gal.* iii. 16. and iv. 21, 25. cited for the very words of Scripture, *James* iv. 5. *Mat.* ij. 23.

*All*, put for *some*, or *the most*, 1 Cor. xiii. 28. p. 348.

*Ambiguity of an expression*, improved into an Argument, 1 Pet. iv. 1.

*Angels*, their *Tongues*, 1 Cor. xiii. 1. appointed to offer up the prayers of Christi-

ans, *Rev.* v. 8. *Guardian Angels*, the opinion of the Jews and Heathens about them, and what respect *Christ* might have to either of those Opinions; *Mat.* xviii. 10. *Angel of the bottomless pit*, who, *Rev.* ix. 11.

*Anger*, several degrees of it mention'd by *Aristotle*, whether they were referred to by *St. Paul*, *Eph.* iv. 26, 31.

*Antecedent* put for the *Consequent*, *Heb.* vi. 7.

*Antichrists*, more than one, 1 *John* ii. 18. who, *Ibid.*

*Antitype*, what, 1 Cor. x. 6.

*Aerist*, in Greek, expressive of a Custom; *Mark* xv. 6. *Rom.* viii. 30.

*Apostles*, whether the name it self implies any Authority, *Luke* vi. 13. who were properly so called, *Prem.* to *James*.

*Apolthm*, who, *Rev.* ix. 11.

*Arabians* circumcised, but not in imitation of the Jews, *Gal.* iv. 25.

*Areopagus*, whence so called, *Acts* xvii. 19.

*Archippus*, whether Bishop of *Colosse* in *St. Paul's* time, *Col.* iv. 17.

*Arguments for the truth of Christianity*, taken from Prophecies, what we are to think of them, *Mat.* ii. 15. and 1 Cor. ii. 4. Arguments of the Apostles not always demonstrative, *Heb.* ix. 16. and xiii. 10.

*Armillus*, of the Jews, *John* xi. 48.

*Athletæ*, their Diet, 2 Cor. ix. 25.

B.

*To be Baptized into Christ*, is to be baptized to the end that we may become Christians, *Rom.* vi. 8. for the dead, what, 3. Cor.



## Memorable things.

- 1 Cor. xv. 29.* into any ones name, what, *Mat. xxviii. 19.* into *Moses*, *1 Cor. x. 2.* in the Cloud and in the Sea, spoken of the *Israelites*, what, *Ib. ver. 1.* p. 332.
- Barnabas*, his Cabbalistical way of reasoning, *2 Pet. i. 5.*
- Battology*, an instance of it, out of some prayers of the Jews, *Mat. vi. 7.*
- Better thing*, how God is said to have provided some better thing for us Christians than the Jews, *Heb. xi. 40.*
- Bishops*, whether included in the commission given by Christ to his Apostles, *Mat. xvi. 19.* how they differ'd from Presbyters, *Phil. i. 1.* when it is a Sin for a Bishop to desert his Office, *1 Tim. iii. 1.* whether in the Primitive times there were two at once in the same City, one over the *Jewish*, and another the *Gentile* Christians, *2 John*, and *Rev. i. 20.* and *xi. 3.* Bishops and Deacons, why not mention'd by *St. Paul*, in the Inscriptions to all his Epistles, *1 Thess. i. 1.*
- Body of Sin*, what, *Rom. vi. 6.*
- Bodily exercises*, in what sense profitable or unprofitable, *1 Tim. iv. 8.*
- Bond of Perfection*, why Charity is so called, *Col. iii. 14.*
- Bread*, taken both for Food and Raiment, *Mat. vi. 11.* OUR Bread, in the Lord's Prayer, what, *2 Thess. iii. 12.*
- C.
- Cæsarea Philippi*, where, *Mat. xvi. 13.*
- Called*, its several acceptations in Scripture, *Mat. xx. 16.* Many are called but few are chosen, the ground and meaning of that expression, *Ibid.* and *xxii. 14.*
- Capital Causes*; whether the Custom of the *Romans* in Capital Causes, was observed among the Jews, *John viii. 29.*
- Captains of the Temple* of two sorts; *Luke xxii. 52.*
- Capitol of Rome*, whence so called, *Rev. xiii. 3.* the burning of it under *Vespasian* reckon'd a very great Calamity, *Ibid.*
- Carnal for weak*, *2 Cor. x. 4.*
- Censures of the Church*, when to be inflicted upon Hereticks, *Tit. iii. 10.*
- Choenix*, how big a Measure, *Rev. vi. 6.*
- To Choose in Christ*, what, *Eph. i. 4.*
- Christ*, his Eirth, by what means known to the wise Men, *Mat. ii. 2.* the time of it, whether in the publick Records in *Justin* and *Tertullian's* time, *Luke ii. 8.* why he would not have it divulged that he was the *Messias*, *Mat. viii. 4.* and withdrew himself from the Multitude that would have made him a King, *John vi. 15.* the time of his Death, *John xix. 14.* his Coat of what sort, and in what manner wrought, *Ibid. 23.* what it is to be in *Christ*, *2 Cor. xii. 2.*
- Chronology of the Ancient Jews* faulty, *Acts vii. 4.*
- Church*, the use of the word in the Apostles times, *1 Cor. xvi. 19.* Church of God and of Christ, why the Christian Church is so called, *1 Thess. i. 1.* p. 478.
- Churches Apostolical*, whether all regularly formed, when *St. Paul* wrote to them, *Ibid.*
- Circumstance*, omitted in the former part of a story, to be gather'd from what follows, *Acts xxviii. 22.*
- Circumcision*, why instituted, *Rom. i. 26.*
- Citations out of the Old Testament*, for Ornament sake, not as proofs, *1 Cor. i. 20.* places of Scripture often cited without Connexion, *Rom. ix. 28.* and *xv. 3.* the inconveniences of citing Authors upon trust, *Ephes. v. 32.*
- Cloud*, that went before the *Israelites*, how they are said to have been under it, and baptized in it, *1 Cor. x. 1.*
- Coming of Christ*, to signify his punishing the Jews, *John xx. 22.*
- Communion of the Holy Ghost*, what, *2 Cor. xiii. 14.*
- Community of Goods* enjoyed among some Nations, *Acts iv. 35.*
- Compel*, how God may be said to compel Men to Piety, *Luke xiv. 23.* compelling by entreaty or example, *Gal. ii. 14.*
- Conjugal Love*, compared to the Love of Christ and his Church, *Eph. v. 32.*
- Consummation of the Age*, what, *Mat. xxiv. 3.*
- Council of the Roman Presidents*, *Acts xxv. 12.*
- Crown of Righteousness*, for a Crown bestowed in Justice, *2 Tim. iv. 7.*

## An Index of the

*Cubit of a Man*, for an ordinary Cubit, *Rev.* xxi. 17.

*Curse*, in what sense Christ is said to have been *made a Curse*, *Gal.* iii. 13.

*Cymbals*, their form, use, and matter, *1 Cor.* xiii. 1.

### D.

*Day of Christ*, not always to be understood of the Destruction of the Jews, *2 Pet.* i. 19.

*Daily Bread*, what, *Mat.* vi. 11.

*Darts fiery*, what, and why so called, *Eph.* vi. 16.

*Deacons* in the Church, whence so called, *Luke* viii. 3.

*Delivering to Satan*, not to be confounded with the ordinary Censures of the Church, *1 Cor.* v. 5. *2 Cor.* vii. 8. and x. 4, 5. whether it has any reference to Satan's desiring to have Men deliver'd to him, *1 Cor.* v. 5.

To *Deny himself*, what, *Mat.* xvi. 24.

*Devil*, whether any reverence be due to him as a Prince, *Jude* 9.

To *Die unto Sin*, an ambiguous expression, *1 Pet.* iv. 1.

*Diogenes Cynicus* his Character, *Luke* i. 67.

To be *born of God*, what, *John* vi. 41.

*Drowning*, not us'd as a Punishment among the Jews, *Mat.* xviii. 6.

### E.

*Earnest of the Spirit*, what, *2 Cor.* i. 22. and of the *Inheritance*, *Eph.* i. 14.

*Ebionites*, what Hereticks, and whence so called, *Gal.* iii. 1.

*Ellipses* many in the Apostles stile, *Heb.* iv. 8. how they are to be supplied, *Ibid.* examples of Elliptical expressions, *Gal.* i. 10.

*Elxai*, a Jew, his Heresy, *Rev.* ii. 4.

*Epimenias*, why cited as a Prophet, *Luke* i. 67.

*Epistles of Recommendation*, from one Bishop to another, their original, *2 Cor.* iii. 1.

*Epistle to the Hebrews*, why rejected for some time, but afterwards admitted, *Heb.* v. 6. p. 548. whether written by *St. Paul*, or another, *Ibid.* ix. 2. and x. 34. and xi. 21.

*Eternal*, why the Gospel so called, *Luke* i. 70.

*Evangelists* relate the same thing variously,

and why, *Mat.* v. 1.

*Excommunication* ordinary, not to be confounded with the Punishments inflicted by the Apostles, *1 Cor.* v. 5. *2 Cor.* vii. 8. and x. 4, 5.

*Excommunicate Persons*, whether debarred all kind of Commerce with the rest of Christians, *Gal.* i. 8.

*Eye*, how said to be *evil*, i. e. covetous, or single, i. e. liberal, *Mat.* vi. 22. *opening the Eyes*, the meaning of that Phrase, *Luke* xxiv. 16.

### F.

*Faith*, taken in several Notions, *Mat.* viii. 10. the object of it, *John* xxi. 29. to *ask in Faith*, what, *James* i. 6.

*Famine* foretold by *Agabus*, when it happen'd, *Rev.* vi. 4.

*Figs*, at what time ripe in *Judea*, and of how many sorts, *Mark* xi. 13.

The *First and the Last*, why Christ is so called, *Rev.* i. 11.

*Flesh*; according to it, what, *Rom.* iv. 1. to be in the *Flesh*, what, *Rom.* vii. 5.

*Fulfilled*, in what sense places of Scripture are sometimes said to be so, *Mat.* iv. 14.

*Future rate*, upon what grounds believed by the Heathens, *1 Cor.* xv. 19.

### G.

*Gates of Hell*, what, *Mat.* xvi. 18.

*Genealogy of Christ*, why defective in *St. Matt.* and how *St. Matt.* came to divide it into three fourteens, *Chap.* i. 8. *Genealogies of the Valentinians*, owing to whom, *1 Tim.* i. 4.

*Gentiles*, their vocation unknown to the Angels before the event, *Eph.* iii. 5.

*Glory of Kingdoms* what, *Mat.* iv. 1. *glory for miracles*, *Joh.* i. 14. *glory of God*, for God himself, *Rom.* i. 23. why the *Man* is so called, and the *Woman the glory of the Man*, *1 Cor.* xi. 7.

To *Glorify God*, is to confess the Truth, *Luke* xxiii. 47.

*Gnosticks*, whether they had any reason to fear the Jews out of their own Country, *1 Cor.* iii. 15. and *Prem. to Galat.* whether they were the troublers of the Churches in *Galatia*, *Gal.* i. 7. whether they



## Memorable things.

they were all suddenly destroyed with the rebellious Jews, *2 Thess. ii. 8.* whether they abstained from Wine, or forbid others the use of it, *1 Tim. v. 22.* or attempted to draw away Servants from their Masters, *Is. vi. 2.* whether there was any one Sect in the Apostles times peculiarly so called, *Ibid. 20.*

Gog and Magog signify the *Turks*, *Rev. xx. 8.*

Grace for Grace, what, *John i. 15.*

Great God, whether he be so called, with a respect to the *Cabiri*, or great Gods of the Heathens, *Tit. ii. 13.*

Grotius, his Posthumous Annotations without reason suspected by Dr. Hammond, *Rom. xiv. 23.* and *Prem. to 2 Pet.*

Guardian Angels, see *Angels.*

Gyge, whether the Kings of *Lydia* that succeeded Gyges, were so called, *Rev. xx. 8.*

### H.

Happiness of Heaven, why represented under the similitude of a Feast, *Mat. viii. 11.*

Head, the Custom of *Mens* having it bare, when they appeared in publick, and *Women*, veil'd, *1 Cor. xi. 4, 7.* head of the *Beast*, which had received a deadly wound, to be understood of the burning of the Roman Capitol, *Rev. xiii. 3.*

Heart, how the Law is said to be written in it, *Rom. ii. 15.*

Heaven, whether it can be taken for a name of God, *Mat. xxi. 25.* how it is said to have opened, *Mat. iii. 16.* to fall from it, what, *Luke x. 18.* *Rev. xii. 10.* the Phrase *Heaven and Earth*, whether it signifies only this Earth, or sublunary Region, *2 Pet. iii. 7.* all things in *Heaven and Earth*, whether they signify Men, *Col. i. 20.*

Hellenists, who, *Acts vi. 1.*

Heretick, properly who, *Tit. iii. 10.* of what sort to be avoided, *Ibid.* how said to be condemned of himself, *Tit. iii. 11.*

Herodes Antipas, Tetrarch of *Galilee*, not Procurator of *Judaea*, *Mat. xxii. 16.* *Luke iii. 1.*

Holy, why the Infants of Christians are so reputed, *1 Cor. vii. 14.*

Hours, how counted by the Jews and the

Romans, *John xix. 14.*

Humanely, to speak so, what, *Rom. vi. 19.*

Husband of one Wife, in what sense it is said a Bishop ought so to be, *1 Tim. iii. 2.*

### I.

St. James reconciled with St. Paul, James ii. 21.

Idiotick or rude stile, what, *2 Cor. xi. 6.*

Idle word, which, *Mat. xii. 36.*

Idolatry, whether always joined with unnatural Lusts, *1 Cor. v. 10.* *2 Cor. xii. 21.*

Jerusalem, when taken, *Mat. xxiv. 17.* whether the Destruction of it was so very sudden and unexpected, as is supposed by Dr. Hammond, *2 Pet. iii. 16.*

Jezebel, whether it need be understood of any Sect of Hereticks, *Rev. ii. 2.*

Jews, their zeal to make Proselytes became a Proverb, *Mat. xxiii. 15.* acknowledg'd their Destruction to be from God, *Mat. xxiv. 3.* the Vengeance taken on them by Christ represented by his going out to battel against them, *Luke ix. 31.* how they hoped for Justification by the Law, *Gal. iii. 10.* whether they were in so great favour with the Roman Magistrates, as to be able to put them upon persecuting the Christians, *2 Thess. i. 5.* and *Prem. to Rev.* whether they were so numerous as *Josephus* affirms, *Rev. vii. 4.*

Image of the invisible God, how Christ is said to be, *Col. i. 15.* and the express Image of his Person, *Heb. i. 3.*

Immortality of the Soul believed by the *Platonists*, *1 Cor. xv. 29.*

Impostors, how they were to be known in St. John's time, *1 John iv. 2.*

Impossible, for what is very difficult, *Heb. vi. 6.*

Interrogation, equivalent to a Negation, *Mat. iii. 7.*

Joseph of Arimathæa, one of the *Sanhedrim*, *Mar. xv. 43.*

Joy for a Feast, *Mat. xxv. 21.*

Judas his indignation against the Woman that anointed Christ, what pretence for it, besides his Covetousness, *Mat. xxvi. 7.* the manner of his Death, *Mat. xxvii. 5.* p. 92. *Judges,*

# An Index of the

*Judges*, among the Jews, whence they took their name, *Mat.* iii. 2.  
*To Justify*, what in *St. Paul's* dispute with the Jews, *Rom.* iii. 4.  
*Justin Martyr*, his Authority not much to be regarded, *2 Thess.* ii. 4.

## K.

Kabbalistical interpretations of Scripture, of what kind, *2 Pet.* i. 5.  
*Key of David*, what, *Mat.* xvi. 9.  
*Kingdom*, whether the condition of the Christian Church could be called such, after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, *Rev.* i. 6.  
*Kingdom*, which a Nobleman went into a far Country to receive, how to be understood, *Luke* xix. 12.  
*Kings Manuscript*, whether properly a different Copy, or rather a Paraphrase of the New Testament, *Mat.* xx. 29. *Acts* x. 25.  
*Kiss Holy*, with which the Christians saluted one another, *Rom.* xvi. 16.

## L.

*Labour of Love*, what, *1 Thess.* i. 2.  
*Lake burning with Fire and Brimstone*, whence the Phrase is taken, *Rev.* xix. 20.  
*Laodiceans*, whether *St. Paul* wrote to them, *Col.* iv. 16.  
*Last days*, which, *Acts* ii. 17.  
*Law*, taken in a larger or stricter Notion, *John* x. 35. *Law of Sin*, and the Spirit, what, *Rom.* viii. 2. *Law of Moses*, in what sense possible or impossible to be kept, *Gal.* iii. 10, 11. the Jews only freed from the Curse of it, not the Heathens, *Ib.* v. 13. how it was a Pedagogue to bring us to Christ, *Gal.* iii. 24. why called *Elements of the World*, and *weak and beggerly Elements*, *Ibid.* iv. 3.  
*Letter of the Law*, what, *Mat.* v. 17. *Mar.* xii. 14. *Rom.* ii. 29. *2 Cor.* iii. 6.  
*Levi the Publican*, whether the same with *St. Matthew*, *Luke* v. 27.  
*Light*, in a metaphorical sense, what, *1 Job.* i. 5.  
*To Live with Christ*, whether it signifies to be in Prosperity, *1 Thess.* v. 10.  
*Lord of Hosts*, why God is often so stiled, *1 Tim.* i. 18.

## M.

*Malchus*, a Syrian name, *John* xviii. 10.  
*Martyrs*, their several denominations for distinction sake, trifling, *Rev.* iii. 14.  
*Man of Sin*, whether the *Gnosticks*, or the rebellious Jews, *2 Thess.* ii. 3.  
*Melchisedek*, how said to have been without Father or Mother, and to have represented Christ, *Heb.* vii. 4.  
*Messenger of Satan*, what, *2 Cor.* xii. 7.  
*Metropoles*, their Privileges as to Civil Government, *Rev.* i. 4.  
*Metropolitans*, whether any in the Apostles times, *Phil.* i. 1. *1 Tim.* iii. 15. *Rev.* iv. 4, 6.  
*Morning Star*, for the Doctrine of the Gospel, *2 Pet.* i. 19.  
*Mystery of Iniquity*, whether the secrets of the *Gnostick* Sect, or the hidden Counsels of the seditious Jews, *2 Thess.* ii. 7.

## N.

*Nard*, an Herb or Ointment, and why of great Price, *Mark* xiv. 3.  
*Name above every Name*, what, *Phil.* ii. 9. to ask in the name of Christ, what, *Job.* xiv. 14.  
*Nature*, for that which is opposed to instruction, *1 Cor.* xi. 14. by nature Children of Wrath, spoken of the Jews, what, *Ib.* and *Eph.* ii. 3.  
*Neapolis in Palestine*, confounded by *Dr. Hammond* with that in *Macedonia*, *Acts* xvi. 13.  
*Number and name of the Beast*, what, *Rev.* xiii. 18. number of a Man, what, *Ibid.*

## O.

*Oaths*, why said to be paid to the Lord, tho made to others, *Mat.* v. 33.  
*Offering* might be said to be sanctified two ways, *Rom.* xv. 16.  
*To Open the Eyes or Understanding*, what, *Luke* xxiv. 16, 45.  
*Oracles*, whence so called, *Rom.* iii. 2. living, what, *Ibid.* counterfeit Oracles cited by *Dr. Hammond*, *Heb.* vi. 9.  
*Outward darkness*, what, *Mat.* viii. 12. and xxv. 30.



## Memorable things.

### P.

*Palestine*, whether subject to *Syria*, in *Herod the Great's* time, *Luke ii. 1.*

*Parables*, of *Christ*, whether before vulgarly used by the *Jews*, *Mat. xx. 15.* do not always allude to a Custom, *Chap. xxii. 2.* nor observe a perfect decorum, *Chap. xxv. 24.* everything in them not allegorical, *Luke xv. 22.*

*Parents*, whether Magistrates are included in that word, *Eph. vi. 1, 4.*

*Passions* evil, hinder Men from acknowledging Truth, *John iii. 19.*

*Passive Verbs* often used in an Active sense, *James ii. 4.*

*St. Paul*, how a Roman Citizen, *Acts xxii. 25.* whether a single Man, *1 Cor. ix. 5.* some of his Writings may be lost, *1 Cor. v. 9.* whether conversant in Heathen Writers, *1 Cor. xv. 33.* whether Eloquent, *2 Cor. xi. 6. Gal. ii. 6.* disputes with the *Jews* upon their own principles, *Gal. iii. 10, 16, 24. Chap. iv. 3, 12.*

*St. Peter*, how it is said the Gates of Hell and Death should not prevail against him, *Mat. xxvi. 18.* whether he prophesied of the destruction of *Jerusalem*, *2 Pet. iii. 3, &c.* the time of his Death, *John xii. 18. Prem. to 2 Pet.*

*Phenice*, a part of *Syria*, whose Inhabitants were therefore called *Syro-Phanicians*, *Mat. xv. 22.*

*Philippi*, a Roman Colony, and Metropolis of *Macedonia*, *Phil. i. 1.*

*Pilate* could have put *Christ* to Death without the consent of the *Jews*, *Mat. xxvii. 15.*

*Platonists* thought the Devils roved about Mens Sepulchres, *Mat. ix. 28.* believed the Immortality of the Soul, *1 Cor. xv. 29.*

Plural number, put for the Singular, *Mat. xxi. 7. and xxvii. 44.*

To Pray in any ones name, what, *Joh. xiv. 14.*

Preexistence of Souls, believed by the *Jews*, *John ix. 2.*

High Priesthood, when joined with the Dignity of Emperor, *Heb. vi. 9.*

Prisoners, the Custom of releasing them on Festival days, *Mat. xxvii. 15.*

*Prophecies* antient of two kinds, *Mat. ii. 15.*

of the Revelations, like the Antient, *Rev. iv. 2.* why so obscure, *Rev. xiii. 18.*

To Prophesy of any one, for saying what may be fitly applied to him, *Mat. xv. 7.*

*Prophets*, cited instead of an allegorical Interpretation of some Passages in them, *Mat. ii. 23.* whether they commonly express dismal things covertly, *Rev. xvi. 17.* among the Heathens, whether they taught the People Vertue, *Luke i. 67.* many false Prophets during the Siege of *Jerusalem*, *2 Thess. ii. 9.*

Prophetical expressions, not always to be understood in a proper sense: nor every particular Phrase to have a special meaning assigned it, *Rev. iv. 2. and ix. 17.*

Propositions universal, for particular, *1 Cor. xii. 28.*

*Publicans*, of two sorts, *Mat. xi. 19.*

Purifying, by Fire and Water, common among the Heathens, to signify the cleansing of the mind. *Mat. iii. 11.*

*Python*, Spirit of *Python*, what, *Acts xvi. 18.*

### R.

*Redeeming of time*, for delaying, *Rev. v. 16.*

*Regeneration*, the Stoicks notion of it, *Mat. xix. 28.*

To Remit and retain Sins, spoken of the Apostles, what, *John xx. 23.*

Repetitions for emphasis sake, *2 Cor. xi. 22.*

*Resurrection of the dead*, whether it ever signifies no more than a second State or Subsistence, *Mat. xxii. 31.*

*Rest of God*, under the Law, the Land of *Canaan*, under the Gospel, Heaven, *Heb. iii. 11.*

Revelation of the Sons of God, what, *Rom. viii. 19.*

Riches whether promised under the Gospel, *2 Cor. ix. 8, 9.*

*Righteous for Merciful*, *Mat. i. 19.*

*Right hand of God*, where mention is made of sitting on it, what, *Mark xvi. 19.*

Rock that followed the *Israelites*, how it is said to have done so, why called *Spiritual*, and how said to have been *Christ*, *1 Cor. x. 4.*

*Rome*, stiled a Goddess, *Rev. xiii. 1.*

*Rude in Speech*, how *St. Paul* so calls himself, *2 Cor. xi. 6.*

# An Index of the

## S.

Sacrifices under the Law, whether acknowledged by the Jews to be Types of Christ, *Heb. xiii. 11.*

Saints, why Christians are so called, *1 Cor. vii. 14.* why the Jews, *Eph. ii. 19.*

Salt, for wood Ashes, *Luke xiv. 34.*

Salutation, see Kiss.

Sanhedrim of the Jews, set in the form of a Semicircle, *Rev. iv. 4.* from them the form of the Heavenly Council represented to St. John in a Vision, seems to be taken, *Ibid.* and *vers. 6.*

Satan, for a Man, *2 Cor. ii. 11.*

To Save, taken for to heal, *Mar. v. 34.* to preserve, *Luke xiii. 23.*

Saved so as by Fire, what, *1 Cor. vii. 14.*

Saviour of all Men, but especially of them that believe, in what sense God is said so to be, *1 Tim. v. 10.*

Scourging, a servil Punishment among the Romans, not among the Jews, *Acts v. 41.*

Sealed, how Christians are said to be so by God, *2 Cor. i. 22.* *Eph. iv. 30.* how Christ, *Eph. iv. 30.*

To See God, what, *Mat. v. 8.* *Job. i. 18.*

Sepulchres, whited among the Jews, *Mat. xxiii. 27.* adorning them charged on 'em as a Crime, *Luke xi. 47.*

Simon Magus, his fabulous contest with St. Peter, *Rom. i. 23.* *Prem.* to *1 Thess. 2 Tim. iii.* *Rev. xii. 7, 9.* whether defied by the Romans, *2 Thess. ii. 3.*

Sin unto Death, what, *John xi. 4.*

Sins of the Men that lived before the Flood, *1 Pet. iii. 20.*

Solacisms, many in St. Paul's stile, *Gal. ii. 6.*

Son of Man, who, *Mat. xii. 8.* of Perdition, for the wicked Jews, *2 Thess. ii. 3.*

To Speak as a Man, what, *Rom. vi. 19.*

Spirit, for the design of God in the Law, *Mat. v. 17.* *Rom. ii. 29.* *2 Cor. iii. 6, 17.* for a disposition of Mind, *Rom. viii. 15.* *2 Cor. iv. 13.* to be in the Spirit, what, *Rom. vii. 5.* Spirit of Bondage, and of Adoption, what, *Rom. viii. 15.* Spirit of Python, what, *Acts xvi. 16.* Spirit of Faith, what, *2 Cor. iv. 13.*

Spiritual, who so called by St. Paul, *Gal. vi. 1.* spiritual Meat, what, *1 Cor. x. 3.*

Stone, living, whence so called, *1 Pet. ii. 4.*

Strong Meat, how some Doctrins are so called, *Heb. v. 14.*

To Suffer to the Flesh, an ambiguous Expression, *1 Pet. iv. 1.*

Sun becoming black, and the Moon as Blood, and the Stars falling, what those Phrases signify, *Rev. vi. 2.* and *viii. 11.*

To Sup with Christ, and he with us, what, *Rev. iii. 20.*

Swearing by the Head, *Mat. v. 38.* and by the Throne of God, both Heathen Customs, *Mat. xxiii. 22.*

Synecism, a Platonist, *1 Cor. xv. 29.*

Syrian, a name of Reproach, *John viii. 48.*

## T.

Tacitus vindicated from the charge of imputing the burning of Rome to the Christians, *Rev. xii. 6.*

Temple, not profaned with Sepulchres, *Mat. xxvii. 51.* two Garisons placed in it, *Luke xxii. 52.*

Thief on the Cross, whether converted in an instant by an extraordinary efficacy of God's Power, *Mat. xxvii. 44.*

Times of the Gentiles, which, *Luke xxi. 24.*

Tongues, the Gift of them and its use, *1 Cor. xiv. 2, 5, 10, 13, 14.*

Transcribers of the New Testament have sometimes substituted more familiar words in the room of others less known, *Mat. xiii. 35.* *1 Cor. xi. 10.*

True for righteous, *Rev. xv. 3.* the true Bread, Meat and Light, why Christ is so called, *John vi. 55.*

Truth, to do it, what, *John iii. 21.*

Types and typical significations, the common Doctrin concerning them groundless and vain, *1 Cor. x. 3.*

## V.

Vanity to which the Gentiles were made subject, what, *Rom. viii. 20.*

Vespasian, ill compared by Dr. Hammond with Christ, *Mat. xxiv. 3.*

Unclean, why the Children of Heathens are so accounted, *1 Cor. vii. 14.*

Upper room, in which the Apostles met together and prayed, whether in the Temple, *Acts i. 13.*

Urim



## Memorable things.

*Urim and Thummim*, ROM. iii. 2.

### W.

*Warfare*, in a metaphorical sense, for the sacred Functions of the Levites, about the Temple, *Luke xxii. 52.*

*Washing the Hands*, among the Jews, the occasion of it, *Mark vii. 2.*

*Waters*, many compared to a multitude of People, *Rev. xiv. 2.*

*Weary and heavy Laden*, spoken only of the Jews, and in what sense, *Mat. xi. 28.*

*To Will*, set after *doing*, signifies to do a thing heartily or *willingly*, *2 Cor. viii. 2.*

*Will worship*, understood in a bad sense by *St. Paul*, but if taken for a lawful course of Piety not commanded, when acceptable to God, *Col. ii. 19.*

*Wine of the Wrath of God*, what, *Rev. xiv. 10.*

*Wise Men* how they knew the Birth and Dignity of Christ, *Mat. ii. 2.* did not understand that he was the Son of God, and therefore gave him only *civil* Worship, *Ibid.*

*Wisdom of the World, and the Princes of this World*, what, *1 Cor. ii. 6.*

The *Word of God*, for God himself, *Heb. iv. 12.*

Works of supererogation may be done, but are not meritorious, *1 Cor. ix. 17.*  
*work of Faith*, for a Work of which Faith is the cause, *1 Thess. i. 2.*

### Z.

*Zacharias* slain between the Temple and the Altar, which, according to *Mr. Le Clerc*, *Mat. xxiii. 35.*

---

**F I N I S.**