

A
PARAPHRASE
AND
NOTES,
ON THE
EPISTLE
TO THE
HEBREWS.

By the late Reverend and Learned

Mr. *JAMES PEIRCE*, of *Exon.*

Author of the *Paraphrases* and *Notes* on the Epistles
of St. Paul to the *Colossians* and *Philippians*.

L O N D O N,

Printed for J. NOON, at the White Hart, near Mercer's Chapel,
Cheapside; and J. CHANDLER, at the Cross Keys in the Poultry.

M. DCC. XXVII.

T H E

P R E F A C E.

THE Paraphrase and Notes on the Colossians and the Philippians met with so good a reception, that the learned author was thereby encouraged to design a commentary in the same way on all the other epistles which are universally acknowledged, or generally reputed to be wrote by St. Paul, excepting those which had been before paraphrased by Mr. Locke.

The greater obscurity and difficulty of understanding this epistle to the Hebrews determined him to make this his next attempt. He did not live to finish it; while he was conscientiously, and with great labour endeavouring to add some light to this part of the sacred oracles, it seemed good to his great Master, the sovereign and all-wise disposer of all things, to call him away to receive the reward of his faithfulness and well improved talents.

If this Paraphrase and the Notes had been published as the others were, without a name, there are in my judgment some marks of a peculiar diligence and penetration which would have discovered the author, though they had not the advantage of his last review.

But in the nature of the thing it seems highly reasonable, that when posthumous works are published to the world, besides these internal marks and evidences, there should be the testimony of some one or more concerned in the publication, to satisfy the world that such papers were wrote by the person whose name they bear, or to whom common fame ascribes them. Accordingly, I do hereby assure:

The P R E F A C E.

assure the reader, that he has these papers just as Mr. Peirce left them; they being all printed from his own hand-writing.

In this respect they differ a little from many other posthumous works; they are published by the author's desire in his last sickness.

I have chosen to leave off abruptly both in the paraphrase and notes on the 34th verse of the xth chapter, rather than I would suppress or add any thing to what he left wrote upon it.

It will probably be a surprize to some persons at the first sight, to find a paraphrase and notes on the five last verses of the xiith chapter while the end of the xth is not finished, and the whole xith, and the first 24 verses of the xiith chapter are left untouch'd: Of which this is the true account.

Mr. Peirce was firmly persuaded, that in the latter end of the xiith chapter the author of this epistle did design to resume, and farther urge the same argument which he had mentioned in some verses of the first chapter, and therefore he finished his paraphrase and notes on these five verses, while the subject was fresh and warm in his mind, and sent them up to me, just as the reader now has them, some months before he died.

Besides this performance, this truly great man has left behind him some Dissertations on particular passages of scripture; and an Essay on a very uncommon subject, which he designed should see the light.

I cannot say that he gave the same intimations of his mind with respect to any of his sermons: but as there are a few of them wrote in long hand, hereafter they may probably be published.

Benjamin Avery.

Feb. 16,
1727.

Speedily will be published,

* * Dissertations on some particular Passages of Scripture, by the same Author, in the same Form with this Paraphrase.

THE
EPISTLE
TO THE
HEBREWS.

*Written
from
Rome in
the year of
our Lord
62. of
Nero 9.*

SECT. I.

CHAP. I. 1—3.

CONTENTS.

IT being the general design of this epistle to confirm and establish the *Hebrews* in their adherence to Christ, and the profession of his holy religion, the author of it very skilfully adapts his discourse to the raising in their minds the most noble and honourable apprehensions of him: and intending to show how vastly he was to be prefer'd to any of those messengers from God whom they most highly valued, he here looks back to his original character, that was antecedent to his incarnation; and then insensibly falls in upon his advancement above the angels at his resurrection.

B

PARA-

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

1. **G** O D who in several parts (*a*), and in divers manners (*b*) uttered his mind, under the former dispensation, to the ancestors of the
2. *Jews*, by the prophets, has now in this last dispensation, or in the times of the Messiah (*c*), spoken unto us by his Son (*d*), whom he hath constituted the Heir and Lord of all things

G O D who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things,

N O T E S.

1 (*a*) Πολυμερῶς. *At sundry times.*] If we regard the etymology of the word, the sense will rather seem to be, That God discovered his will anciently by the prophets in several *parts* or *parcels*; so that one part was to be learnt from one prophet, and another part from another: but now he had by his Son given a full and intire revelation of his whole will.

(*b*) *In divers manners.*] God spake sometimes by a *dream*, or a *vision*, or a strong *impulse* upon the minds of the prophets, and sometimes by angels, who were sent by him in the shape and appearance of men to make known his will.

2 (*c*) Επ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τέτων. *In these last days.*] This or the like phrase is often met with in the Old Testament, *Gen.* xlix. 1. *Num.* xxiv. 14. *Deut.* iv. 30. *Isa.* ii. 2. *Mic.* iv. 1. *Jerem.* xxiii. 20. *Ezek.* xxxviii. 16. *Dan.* ii. 28. *Hos.* iii. 5. And the like we find in the New Testament also, *Acts* ii. 17. *1 Tim.* iv. 1. *2 Tim.* iii. 1. *1 Pet.* i. 20. *2 Pet.* iii. 3. These last days were understood by the *Jews* to signify the days of the king Messiah. And that this is the meaning of such phrases, may easily appear to such as will consult the learned Mr. *Jos. Mede* upon this argument, in his *Apostacy of the Latter Times*, Chap. xi, xii, &c.

(*d*) Εν υἱῷ. *By his Son.*] It has been the common opinion of the ancient Christians, as well as 'tis of the generality of the modern writers upon the scriptures, that in many, or at least in some of the appearances of the angels recorded in the Old Testament, the λόγος, the Son himself was one of the number. If this be supposed to be true, an emphasis must be understood to be laid upon the manner in which God speaks to us in these last days by his Son, *viz.* that it is by him as incarnate and dwelling in flesh. But it may be question'd whether that opinion has any solid foundation. I know not of any place of scripture where 'tis expressly asserted: and the arguments brought to prove it, are so very slight, that it seems at best to be a mere conjecture. There is at least nothing in this epistle to favour it, but the contrary. What I have before suggested as the only way to make the text before us consist with that opinion, may seem a strain; whereas it is very easy and plain, if rejecting that conjecture, we judge that God never employed his Son as a messenger to men before his incarnation. And we have two passages in this epistle which look very much the same way, *Chap.* ii. 2, 3. *If the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward; how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord?* 'Tis agreed on all hands, I think, that by the word spoken by angels, we are to understand the law that was given at Mount Sinai, which we are sure was given by their ministry, *Deut.* xxxiii. 2. *Psal.* lxxviii. 17. *Acts* vii. 53. *Gal.* iii. 19. But if the Son was the speaker at the giving of the law, which is pretended with as much probability as his speaking on any other occasion, the force of the argument will be lost: for it was easy for the *Hebrews* to reply, that their law was at first spoken by the Son, as well as the gospel, and therefore there was no reason to infer in the manner this writer does, that the punishment was more to be dreaded in the latter case than in the former. The other passage in this epistle, which seems not to agree with this notion, is *Chap.* xiii. 2. *Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.* If the λόγος was one of the angels who,

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

by whom also he made things (e), by whom he also made the worlds (f),

NOTES.

who appeared to *Abraham*, *Lot*, or any other of the ancient patriarchs, our author has not made so much of his argument as he then might have done. For it must have been much stronger in case he had said, "That thereby some had entertained angels, and not only angels, but the Son of God himself unawares." Nor is it reasonable to suppose that he would include the Son under the general term of *angels*, in an epistle wherein he had been so industriously contradistinguishing and preferring him to them. But I would not be thought positive in rejecting that opinion, concerning which I have offer'd my suspicions.

(e) Οὐ ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων. *Whom he hath appointed heir of all things.*] In the common acceptation, an *heir* is one who succeeds another after his decease in the enjoyment of his honour or estate. But it being impossible that the immortal God should ever have any heir in such a sense, 'tis necessary we should take the expressions more loosely, when we read of christians being heirs of God, or of Christ's being constituted heir of all things. By *Gal. iv. 1.* we learn what was principally intended by a person's being said to be heir. *Now I say, that the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, [or rather, as Mr. Locke says, from a bondman] tho' he be lord of all.* If our author's expression be explained from hence, two things will be denoted by it, 1. That he is possessor of all things, or in *St. Peter's* stile, That he is *lord of all things*, *Acts x. 36.* 2. That this lordship and possession is by the grant or gift of the Father, as the same apostle says, *Acts ii. 36. God hath made him Lord of all.* Hence it being natural and customary to make the first-born or eldest son heir, that title is equivalent to an heir, *Psal. lxxxix. 27. Also I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth.* 1 *Chron. xxvi. 10. Also Hosah of the children of Merari, had sons; Simri the chief, (for tho' he was not the first-born, yet his father made him the chief) Hilkiash the second, &c.* That is, his father settled upon him the chief honour, that which belong'd to the eldest son, tho' he was not really eldest. It is a pleasant mistake of a late writer, who would translate this text, *Because his father had no eldest son, he made him chief, as tho' there must not be an eldest son, when a man has several children.*

'Tis not necessary that he who is heir, or who is said to have the possession, should always be vested with the same right, as he from whom he derives it; or that the original lord should alienate his own right. Were this necessary, there could be no inheritance or possession among men; since whatever their claim is, there is a higher and more absolute possessor than they. For however God has given the earth to the children of men, yet he does, and cannot but remain possessor of the earth as well as heaven. Hence notwithstanding God's gift to his Son, he is said to *inherit* all nations, and his people are frequently declared to be his inheritance. So that in this case, the right of the possession or inheritance by grant, is to be understood to be subordinate to, and limited by the right of the original giver. And thus an earthly father may give a Son the possession, that is, the free use of his estate, without giving up his own right, according to what the father in the parable says to his obedient son, *Luke xv. 31. Son, thou art ever with me; and all that I have is thine.* The word κληρονόμεν will thus answer to נַחֲלָה or אֲחֻזָּה. I think the words of the emperor *Justinian* are remarkable, whereby he shows that the ancient *Romans* used *heres* in this manner. *Instit. lib. ii. tit. 19. § ult. Pro herede gerere, est pro domino gerere. Veteres enim heredes pro dominis appellabant.* And so *Festus*: *Heres, apud antiquos pro domino ponebatur.* And *Glossæ Philoxeni*: *Heres, κλῆρονόμος.* Hence *Vossius* thinks that *heres* comes from נַחֲלָה, and *herus* from *heres*. See his *Etymol. Magn. in voce heres*. There is another passage which may deserve to be compared with this, *Rom. iv. 13. For the promise that he should be heir of the world, was not to Abraham and his seed thro' the law, but thro' the righteousness of faith.* Where his being appointed to be the father of the faithful, not only among his natural posterity, but among the *Gentiles*,

3. (f), who being a ray of his glory (g), and the worlds. Who being
the

N O T E S.

is expressed by his being *heir of the world*, the faithful being thus given as it were to him as his children. And he was promised to be the heir of the world, tho' he liv'd not to see the fulfilment, just as he was promis'd to *inherit* the land of *Canaan*, *Gen. xv. 7.* In like manner *all things* being put into our Saviour's hands, and he being appointed Lord of all, he is said to be constituted heir of all things. And these *all things* must be understood in the largest sense, the Father only being excepted, whose dominion over all things is in the most absolute sense unalienable, and cannot but be superiour to that he has delegated to the Son. And this seems the sense of our Saviour's Words, *John xvii. 10. And all mine are thine*, [Thou hast a sovereign and supreme right to whatever belongs to me; nor does thy giving them to me deprive thee of it] *and thine are mine*, [because thou hast given them to me.]

Let it be farther observed, that our author here lays down the assertion he undertakes to prove, *viz.* That God has constituted him Heir or Lord of all things. Having mention'd this, he just gives a hint or two of the greatness of his character; and then manifestly returns to his great assertion, and pursues it closely in the latter part of the chapter, showing that the angels themselves, the highest order of beings, are not exempted from his jurisdiction and dominion. By this therefore as his great design, we are to be guided in explaining the arguments or testimonies he alleges.

(f) *Δι' ἧς καὶ τὰς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν.* By whom also he made the worlds.] The sense may seem doubtful. If we render the words, *By whom also he appointed the ages*; the sense will fall in with *Eph. iii. 11.* See Mr. *Locke* upon that verse. But I prefer our own translation, for these two reasons: 1. Because I see no reason why we should doubt of this sense of the word *αἰῶνας*, since it is plainly thus used, *Heb. xi. 3. Thro' faith we understand that the WORLDS were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.* Where the worlds are the same as the things which are seen. Compare *Rom. i. 20.* And tho' *ποιεῖν* does sometimes in this epistle signify to ordain or appoint, yet there can be no question that it most commonly signifies to make. 2. As from other places it appears, that Christ was imployed in making the world, so this seems most agreeable to our author's scope. His intention appears to be to give the loftiest and most noble account of his greatness and dignity, abstractly from that which he proceeds to afterwards, the honour confer'd upon him at his resurrection. Now since he so expressly mentions that which may seem a less instance of his greatness, that he *upholds all things*, it is not probable he would omit that which is greater, *God's creating the worlds by him.* And if *St. Paul* be supposed the author of this epistle, the comparing his discourse here with *Col. i. 15—17.* will be a considerable confirmation of this interpretation. For there is manifestly a great resemblance between what is mention'd in both places to set forth the transcendent excellency of Christ. 1. His being appointed the heir of all things, may be thought in some degree parallel to what is there said, that he is the first-born of every creature. 2. His upholding all things, answers to that we have there, *By him all things consist.* 3. In like manner, why should not God's making the worlds by him be understood of the same thing there express'd, his creating all things that are in heaven and in earth, &c? The parallelism leads us rather to this than to the interpreting the passage before us of his appointing and ordering the different ages and dispensations.

3 (g) *Ὁς ὡς ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης.* Who being the brightness of his glory.] Our translators seem not amiss to have supplied the word *his*, as the next clause of the verse directed them. The word *ἀπαύγασμα*, which we render *brightness*, signifies that *splendor* or *ray* that proceeds from a luminous body. The words therefore represent, 1. The Father as *light*, which is agreeable to other places of scripture. *God is light, says St. John, and in him is no darkness at all, 1 John i. 5.* But to raise their thoughts of the matter, he sets forth this light by

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

the brightness of *his* glory,
and the express image of his
person, and upholding all

the very image of his substance (*h*), and up-
holding

NOTES.

by which he describes him, under the title of *glory*; the design of which is to express the purity, perfection and lustre of all his attributes. 2. Suitably to this account of God the Father, he represents the Son, as a splendör or ray derived or proceeding from the Father. God, by reason of his immensity, is in his own nature invisible; but his glorious perfections shine forth in the clearest manner in his Son. With this we may well compare that of the evangelist, *John* i. 14. *We beheld his [the word's] glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.* Somewhat farther will be said of this under the next note.

(*h*). *Kai χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.* *And the express image of his person.*] The word ὑπόστασις, which we translate *person*, signifies *substance* or *being*. Thus 'tis well render'd, *Chap.* xi. 1. *Faith is the substance of things hoped for.* And in this sense Mr. Locke seems to have taken it, *2 Cor.* ix. 4. & xi. 17. where he renders it *matter*; tho' there can be no doubt that it has sometimes that signification which our translators have there given it, of *confidence*. For thus it is used, *Heb.* iii. 14. *We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end.* But in the place under consideration, it doubtless is used for *substance* or *being*, as the *Syriac* and *Vulg.* render it. And it seems clear from this text, that the *being* or *substance* of the Son must be distinct from that of the Father, since the one is the *character* or *express image* of the other. If our translators did not intend to convey by the word *person*, an idea of somewhat different from the being of God, their use of that term here might not be amiss; as neither is their rendering *χαρακτήρ*, the *express image*. For as that is derived from *χαράσσειν*, to *grave*, it seems to denote an *image*, as the figure impress'd by a seal, is the image of the seal by which the impression is made. And thus the sense may be, that he is the *impress'd image of God's being*.

In both the expressions here used, our author may, perhaps, design to distinguish Christ from all other beings, and to show, agreeably to his chief aim, how much he transcends them. To this purpose he represents him as immediately derived from God, that is, the Father. Thus in the first expression he is a ray or splendor from the Father's glory immediately, no one intervening as the minister or means of that derivation; which is not true concerning any other being whatever, they being all derived from him by the Son. The glory of the divine perfections shines forth in other beings, and particularly in the noblest of them, the angels; but not as they do in the Son, since they are not immediately created by the Father, but mediately, the Son being the agent employed by, and ministering to the Father in the making them. Now this must of necessity make a vast difference between him and them, and bespeak his being vastly superiour to them. To illustrate this by an easy allusion; the light we have from the moon is originally from the sun, and the rays of light we have thence are really the rays of the sun: but yet as we have not that light immediately and directly from the sun, the rays of the sun being reflected to us from or by the moon, we perceive a vast difference between that light and the other which is directly and immediately from the sun it self. Thus as God is light, the more near and immediate the derivation of light is from him, the more glorious it may well be supposed to be.

In like manner, as to the other expression; man was made in the image of God, and the nobler rank of creatures, the angels, more resembled him than we do: but this image was impress'd neither upon them nor upon us, immediately from the substance or being of the Father, as was his image in his son. And as an image may be taken either from the original seal it self, or from that which was taken from it; so it is easy to imagine the former must be the most exact and perfect.

PARAPHRASE,

TEXT.

holding all things by his Father's power (*i*),
when he had by himself alone, and by the
shedding of his own blood, made expiation
for our sins (*k*), sat down at the right hand
of

things by the word of his
power, when he had by
himself purged our sins, sat

NOTES.

Let the attentive reader consider, whether our author's bringing in the mention of these things presently upon his asserting that God made the worlds by him, does not direct us thus to understand his design. His discourse seems thus to carry a great deal of strength in it. 'Tis as tho' he had said; "I intend to prove the superiority of Christ to the angels from what I have mentioned, the constitution of God who has appointed him heir of all things. Upon this I will presently insist. But I may briefly hint some other arguments, as particularly that God made the worlds, and all things in them by him; and 'tis very natural to suppose, that the creatures which God employed him to make, must be in their nature inferiour to him who was their immediate author, that is, the Son, in whose production or generation no intermediate agent was employed, he being immediately from God himself, a ray emitted directly and only from his glory, and an image formed from his own substance, and nothing else." The account here given may be transfer'd to what is said under the note (*f*), to compleat the parallelism between this place, and Col. i. 15—17. His being the image of the invisible God, answers to what is here said, that he is the express image of God's substance or being; and his being the first-born of every creature, may refer not only to his lordship, but be parallel to the design of both expressions here used, to set forth his immediate derivation from God.

(*i*) Φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. And upholding all things by the word of his power.] The same thing seems design'd, Col. i. 17. By him all things consist. Nor is it easy to admit the forced interpretations of those who apply these texts barely to those communications which were made by him after his appearing in the world. If they are read without a bias from prejudice, and a fondness for an hypothesis, they naturally offer this sense, that as the Son gave being to all the creatures, so he maintains them all in being. In both places the same works are attributed to him: but here we have it more strongly and expressly asserted, that in these works he was an agent under God, or employed by him.

The common way of expounding the expression, is, that the Son upholds all things by the word of his own power. And accordingly our printed copies have here αὐτοῦ, and not αὐτῷ. And 'tis urged that the MS. copies, which have accents added, read it with an aspiration. But none of the ancient MSS. having any accents at all, every reader is at liberty to affix such spirits as appear most agreeable to the scope of any text. And it is easy to observe that our author in this verse distinguishes αὐτῷ and ἐαυτοῦ; and therefore as αὐτῷ just before relates to the Father, it is reasonable to judge it does so here also. The sense given by any of the ancient Greek commentators, can signify little in this case, because as they lived after these matters were warmly controverted, they would adapt the spirits to the serving of their own hypothesis: so that their reasons, and not their authority, can only be of any moment in the case.

(*k*) Δι' ἐαυτοῦ καθαρισμὸν ποιήσας τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. When he had by himself purged our sins.] There seems to be no room to doubt that hereby is meant, that he made expiation for our sins by his death, which is often spoken of as a purging of our sins, or a purging our conscience from sin, or a washing us from our sin, and so must relate to the pardon of sin. There is one place where the LXX have used the same phrase to import the pardon of sin, as the expression with which it is joined plainly shows, Job vii. 21. Why dost thou not pardon my transgression, and take away mine iniquity? Which they have thus render'd: Διὰ τί ἐν ἐποίῳ τῷ αἵματι
αἱ οἰκτιρᾶς

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. of the *Shechinah*, in the most honourable place, among the highest angels (1).

NOTES.

ἀνομίας μου λήθην, καὶ καθάραισμον τῆς ἁμαρτίας μου. Nor can there be any question that our author refers to the death of Christ, considering what is said here to have immediately followed upon his purging our sins, that he sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high. Compare *Chap.* ix. 26. It seems to me that those words, *by himself*, are not here added without some special design, but that a particular emphasis is to be laid upon them. And as *Chap.* ix. 12, 26. Christ is spoken of as making expiation by himself and his own blood, and not by the blood of bulls and goats; so here he seems to intend that Christ alone, without any assistance or concurrence of the angels made a perfect expiation of our sins.

(1) Ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλῶσυνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς. *Sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high.* The right hand being most used in giving or receiving any thing, the most honourable place has been always reckon'd to be on the right hand of princes and great personages. See *1 Kings* ii. 19. *Mat.* xxv. 33. Agreeably hereunto the exaltation of our Saviour is frequently represented to be to the right hand of God. This is here express'd by the *right hand of the majesty on high.* The immensity of God will not suffer us to think there can be, properly speaking, any right or left hand of God, or consequently any placing on the one or the other. But as God, who is in his own nature invisible, was then said to appear, or to be seen on earth, when there was a *Shechinah*, or an illustrious display made of his glory, by some bright and glorious beings who represented him; so it seems that he is said in like manner to be in heaven, as there he makes a more illustrious, and to us, in our present state, as to the manner of it, an inconceivable manifestation of his glory. This is called here the *majesty*; and hercof we may easily conceive there is a right and left hand, or side, *Acts* vii. 55, 56. and on the right hand of this glory is our exalted redeemer seated. The expression is somewhat varied *Chap.* viii. 1. *Who is set down on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens*: which naturally leads us to conceive of some such visible representation of the divine glory. By comparing this text with that under consideration, we are led to interpret the ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, *on high*, as importing the same as ἐν τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς, *in the heavens*, that is, *in the high or heavenly places*; which otherwise might well enough be render'd *among the high beings*, that is, the *angels*, by whom the display of the divine glory used to be made on earth, and very probably is made in heaven. And indeed tho' we should follow our own translation, yet here must be denoted the advancement of Christ to the highest dignity, above all the glorious beings who reside there, that is above all the most bright and illustrious angels. This is perfectly agreeable to other places of scripture, where the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God is spoken of. *1 Pet.* iii. 22. *He is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God, angels and authorities, and powers, being made subject unto him.* *Eph.* i. 20, 21. *God 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.* The supposing this to be pointed at here by our author, makes his transition to his subject of Christ's being appointed heir of all things, and made far superiour to the angels, appear to be extremely handson and agreeable.

S E C T. II.

C H A P. I. 4—14.

C O N T E N T S.

OUR author having briefly hinted the original and native greatness and honour of our Saviour, comes here more directly to establish that assertion he had advanced *v. 2.* and which he had chiefly in his eye, That God had *appointed him heir of all things.* This appointment he manifestly considers as closely joined with his resurrection and exaltation. And as he here passes to prove his assertion, he, *v. 4.* repeats it in somewhat different words, which plainly carry in them the same sense. And as the first word, *v. 5. For,* shews that he proceeds here to his proofs, all the texts that are alleg'd by him are to be consider'd as brought upon this design, to shew that Christ at his resurrection was constituted superiour to the angels. This amounted to a full proof, both according to the nature of things, and the notions which the *Jews* entertained of the angels. For it being certainly true, and believ'd to be so by the *Hebrews*, that the angels are vastly superiour in their nature to other creatures, it must of necessity follow, that as he is superiour to them, he must be superiour to all below them. And since the highest order of creatures were made subject to him, it might reasonably be supposed that the others were so too. Besides, as the *Hebrews* gloried in the revelations which had been made to them by angels, and were apt upon that account to set light by Christ, and be wavering in their regard to him, nothing could be more pertinent to the general design of the epistle, than the discourse here upon this argument. This I take to be the key of all the proofs here brought from the Old Testament. They must all be understood as serving to prove the great point laid down, *v. 4.* That Christ at his resurrection is made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. And unless we thus understand them, our author will not appear to write with so much coherence and consistence. All such interpretations of any particular texts as do not refer them to this end, are in course to be rejected.

T E X T.

T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

4 Being made so much better
than the angels, as he hath
by inheritance obtained a
more excellent name than
5 they. For unto which of
the angels said he at any
time, Thou art my Son, this
day have I begotten thee ?

This high dignity belongs to him, because
he is so much better and more honourable
than the angels, as he does upon his resur-
rection inherit a more excellent name and
authority than they. And that he then inhe-
5. rited a more excellent name than they, is
manifest from what God says to him upon
that occasion, as particularly by what he says
to him, *Psal. ii. 7. Thou art my Son, this
day have I begotten thee (m).*

N O T E S.

5 (m) *For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee ?*] Unless these words in the second psalm, from whence they are cited, are understood to be spoken of and to Christ, I can't see how the inspiration of this epistle can be maintained. And I must own, that it is my opinion, that the passage relates not to *David* at all, but to Christ only. A stress seems here manifestly to be laid upon the greatness of the thing that is spoken of in the passage of the psalm ; that 'tis too great to have been said at any time to any, even the highest, of the angels. But in my apprehension, the citation must have appeared not very pertinent, and the proof not full and cogent, in case such a reply as this could, with any truth, have been made to our author's argument : " This same thing, and these very words were spoken by God to, or concerning *David* ; and therefore they cannot be too great to be used concerning the angels, who are vastly superiour to him." They seem to me therefore best to consult the reputation of our inspired author, who understand the passage in the psalm, to relate to Christ only. And since the enemies of christianity have taken occasion to insult our Saviour, and the writers of the new testament, for such kind of citations, it cannot be thought foreign to the design of these papers, if I endeavour to justify these citations as they come in my way, and to show that the use that is made of such texts, is exactly according to the original design of the writers of the old testament.

It may be a strong presumption in favour of the writers of the new testament, who have here, and in other places, applied the second psalm to Christ, that it has been generally owned by the ancient *Jews*, who were well versed in the old testament, that the psalm related only to the Messiah, and not to *David*, who is the only person pretended to be the subject of the psalm by those who deny it to belong to the Messiah. Those later *Jewish* writers, who have interpreted it of *David*, have been forced to own they herein went contrary to their own writers. Thus *David Kimchi*, who lived in the latter end of the 12th century, in the conclusion of his comment on this psalm, wherein he had applied it to *David*, says : " There are some who expound this psalm of *Gog and Magog*, and Messiah, that is the king Messiah : and thus our Rabbis of blessed memory, have expounded it. And if the psalm be thus explain'd, the sense will be clear. But 'tis more likely, that *David* composed this psalm concerning himself, as we have explained it." Rabbi *Solomon Yarchi*, who was cotemporary with him, owns the same thing, but honestly gives this remarkable reason why he differed from their ancient writers. " But, says he, in order to the better answering the hereticks [he means the Christians] " it is more adviseable to understand the psalm of *David*." Certainly when the contents of the psalm are thoroughly considered, it will appear,

pear, that these two Rabbis had very little reason to recede from the opinion of their predecessors.

One thing may be here premised for the better understanding of the psalm, and that is, the whole of it should be considered as uttered in the person of the Messiah; and whatever are the words of God the Father to him, are here related by the Messiah as his. This way of expounding the psalm avoids the frequent change of the speaker, which must otherwise of necessity be allowed. Nor can I perceive the least difficulty in keeping to this rule, through the whole psalm. I shall now briefly go over the psalm, as far as I think is necessary to justify the application which the writers of the new testament make of it.

In the three first verses of the psalm, Christ represents the conspiracy and contrivances of the *Jews* and *Gentiles* against God and himself. 1. *Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?* 2. *The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying,* 3. *Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.* The two first of these verses are interpreted by St. Peter, to relate to the united attempts of the *Jews* and *Gentiles* against Christ, Acts iv. 25—28. According to whom אֲדָמִים here signify the *heathen*, which is ordinary and common, and אֲמֹלִים the *people* of Israel, which seems to me the only plausible objection that lies against this interpretation, because that is frequently used to signify the *heathen* also. But as the word signifies *people* in general, it might be spoken of the *Jewish*, as well as any other people; as I think it is in Gen. xxv. 23. and by the psalmist himself, Psal. vii. 7. *So shall the congregation of the people compass thee about: for their sakes therefore return thou on high.* And more expressly by the prophet Isa. li. 4. *Hearken unto me my people, and give ear unto me, O my nation, אֲמֹלִים.* And provided the *people* are thus understood here for the *people* of Israel, it is not easy to perceive how the two first verses of the psalm can be understood otherwise than St. Peter applied them. For though the *Philistines* were *heathens*, and they waged war against David; and David Kimchi endeavours to explain the psalm by that, 2 Sam. v. 17. *When the Philistines heard that they had anointed David king over Israel, all the Philistines came up to seek David:* yet it is remarkable that the heads or chiefs of the *Philistines* are never, in the Scripture, called *kings*, but only *lords*. Kimchi takes notice of this objection, and endeavours thus to answer it. “He calls them, says he, *kings* and *princes*, although we never find them called otherwise than *lords* of the *Philistines*, because from their pride they reckoned themselves *kings*, although they really were not: or perhaps this is because the *kings* of neighbouring nations joined their forces with them.” This seems a very poor evasion. Besides, the *Philistines* never joined with the *Jews* in a conspiracy against David. They were not concerned in the rebellion of Absalom, or in any conspiracy of his subjects against him. But nothing can be more exact than the accomplishment of these words of the psalmist, if they are understood to relate to Christ; and especially if we explain ver. 2. by ver. 1. and suppose the *kings of the earth* to signify the *heathen* kings, and the *rulers* to be the *Jewish* rulers. Christ was himself put to death by the authority of the one, and at the instigation of the other: and these concur’d afterwards in their attempts to overthrow his kingdom. Nor can I easily believe, that the expressions here used, are to be limited to the opposition made against Christ, while here on earth; but that they extend to what was done against him afterwards. The 9th and 10th verses seem plainly to carry the design of the psalm thus far. I will however own, after all I have said, that the expression of the *people*, ver. 1. might well enough be taken to be exegetical of the *heathen*: and the best evidence that St. Peter was in the right when he took it otherwise, is to be gathered from the scope of the psalm: for if it appears to be concerning Christ, the interpretation will be easy and natural to us who understand the particular circumstances of his history, however obscure it might have been before the accomplishment.

In the three next verses Christ declares that God would frustrate all the attempts of his enemies, and establish and secure his kingdom. 4. *He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision.* 5. *Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure, saying,* 6. *Yet have I set [or anointed] my king upon my holy hills.*

N O T E S.

hill of Zion. The 6th verse is a considerable argument against the psalm's relating at all to *David*. 'Tis true, *Zion* is called the *city of David*, because he took it, 2 *Sam.* v. 7. But we never read of *David's* being *anointed*, or *inaugurated* in *Zion*. The *Vulg.* and *LXX.* translate it as though they had read *נִסְכְּתִי* instead of *נִסְכְּתִי* as it is in our *Hebrew* copies. For thus they render this and the next verse. *But I am constituted king by him, upon Zion his holy hill, declaring his command. The Lord hath said to me, Thou art my Son, &c.* In like manner they render what is *מֶלֶכִּי* *my king*, in the *Hebrew*, as though it were *מֶלֶךְ בְּיָדֵי* *king by him*; and so *קִדְשִׁי* is turned as though it were *קִדְשֵׁוֹ* *his*, instead of *my holy hill*. I can't perceive any design could be much served, let the corruption be on which side it will. But I must own, the sense seems to me to be most easy and natural, if we follow the *Hebrew* rather than the *LXX.* which is here closely copied by the *Vulg.* But should we adhere to the *LXX.* the expression is singular, if understood of *David*, who is never, that I remember, said to be king in *Zion*. His reign is always spoken of in different terms, and reckoned to be either in *Hebron*, or in *Jerusalem*. See 2 *Sam.* v. 4. 1 *Kings* ii. 2. 1 *Chron.* xxix. 26, 27. But there is nothing more frequent in the language of the prophets, than to set forth Christ as reigning in *Zion*, as every one knows who is at all vers'd in their writings.

Next Christ proceeds to declare the decree of God, *ver. 7.* from whence our author takes his citation: *I will declare the decree, The Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee.* To whomsoever the words are applied, the decree must signify the resolution, purpose, or determination of the Lord: and his *declaring* it must import his making this known to the world, or rather more especially to his church. Compare *Psal.* xxii. 24, 25. The decree seems not to be wholly comprehended in this verse; but to take in what follows, *ver. 8, 9.* if not all the rest of the psalm. The Lord, whose decree this is said to be, can be no other than God the Father, who made him both Lord and Christ, *Acts* ii. 36. *Philip.* ii. 9. The time of this decree's taking place, is said to be *this day*. Some would understand this of *eternity*, wherein there is no succession of duration, but a perpetual *now*: and so they understand this as denoting an eternal generation of the Son. But this interpretation should be owned to be a mistake by all who acknowledge the inspiration of the author of this epistle, since he never gives the least intimation of any such sense of the word *הַיּוֹם* *this day*. Nay, we may, in my opinion, from what he says on another occasion, borrow a clear confutation of this interpretation. Chap. iv. 7. *Again he limiteth a certain day, saying, by David, to day, after so long a time, as it is said, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts,* cited from *Psal.* xcv. 7. If then the word *הַיּוֹם* *to day*, does limit a *certain day*, in *Psal.* xcv. why should not the same word as well limit a *certain day* here, *Psal.* ii. 7. The question however still remains, what is that certain limited day, here designed? This should, in my opinion, be answered from the foregoing verse. *Tet have I anointed my king upon my holy hill of Zion. This day* then will be the time wherein God's king, the Lord Jesus, was anointed in *Zion*. And when the enemies of Christianity can show that the Scripture ever uses such language, concerning *David*, they may more plausibly apply the words to him. In the mean while, since 'tis notorious that this suits the stile of the prophets, concerning Christ and his kingdom, 'tis but reasonable to understand the words thus, "That this decree relates to that particular time, wherein Christ received his kingly power and authority from the Father." Nor can *this day* then denote any other than that of our Lord's resurrection from the dead. Many places, if there were need for it, might be mentioned, to prove that his kingly power, in the full extent of it, bears date from his resurrection. See *Mat.* xxviii. 20. *Eph.* i. 20-22. *Philip.* ii. 9. 1 *Pet.* iii. 21, 22. with many others. But there is one text to our purpose, of which it may be proper to take notice, because 'tis thought to be difficult, and is indeed by many misunderstood: *Mat.* xix. 28. *Jesus said unto them [the apostles] Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.* Where our translation refers those words, *in the regeneration*, to the time wherein the apostles fol-

followed him while he was here on earth. But they ought to be joined to the succeeding clause; *In the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory*; and the sense of them is this: "As to you, who are my apostles, and have forsaken all to follow me; you shall by no means lose your reward. For when the time of the regeneration comes, that is, when the Son of man shall be begotten again, or be begotten from the dead, and shall, as he then shall, sit in the throne of his glory, then shall ye also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of *Israel*; that is, you shall have the administration and government of my church committed unto you." And to make our translation exact, nothing more is needful, than barely to remove the comma put after *regeneration*, a little backward, and place it after *me*. And thus, according to these words of our Saviour, his advancement to his throne, or his being anointed or constituted king, commences with his *παλιγγενεσία*, his being regenerated, or raised from the dead. As Christ was the Son of God upon other accounts, so particularly upon this of God's communicating a new life to him upon his resurrection, (for it was God the Father, who raised him from the dead, *Gal. i. 1.*) and therefore is his resurrection spoken of as a clear proof of his Sonship, *Rom. i. 3, 4.* Concerning his Son *Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh, and declared [or determined] to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.* And if a Son, then, according to St. Paul's rule, an heir of God. *Gal. iv. 7.* *Rom. viii. 17.* and the more eminent the relation, the more glorious the inheritance. Hence are those two things joined together concerning him, *Psal. lxxxix. 27. I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth.* And as the mention of his inheritance immediately follows, here in this second psalm, his being declared to be the Son of God, begotten by him; we must understand the life then communicated to him, to be a life suited to the inheritance promised; that is, that it must be such a glorious and endless life as that which was bestowed upon him at his resurrection. Let any one compare the interpretation *David Kimchi* gives of this verse, he will see that nothing can be more jejune, after all he has done to wrest and strain it. Thus upon these words, *This day have I begotten thee*, he says **היום שנתמנה הוא היום שלקחו האל לו לבן** "The day when he was anointed, was the day when God took him for his Son." But how can this be, since his anointing is just before said to be upon *Zion*?

It will probably be here objected, that the Sonship of Christ, according to the explication now given, relates to his being made King and Lord, whereas our author, *Chap. v. 5.* applies it to his priesthood, *Christ glorified not himself to be made an Highpriest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.*

In answer to this we may say, That when Christ is consider'd as a priest, it is not as a priest of the common sort, but of a very peculiar and distinguished order, which is frequently asserted in this epistle. He is a priest after the order of *Melchizedec*, and what a priest he was is declared, *Chap. vii. 1, 2.* He was by interpretation king of righteousness, and king of Salem, which is king of peace, at the same time that he was priest of the most high God. Such must Christ also be understood to be, a royal or kingly priest, or a priestly king. It was not unusual among the Heathen for these two offices to be conjoined in the same person;

Rex Anius, rex idem hominum, Phœbiq; sacerdos;

And so the Roman Emperours were likewise *pontifices* or high-priests. Nor were the *Gæws* unacquainted with this manner of expression, *Exod. xix. 6. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, βασίλειον ἱερέτευμα*, in the LXX, which is followed by the apostle, *1 Pet. ii. 9.* compare *Rev. i. 6. v. 10. xx. 6.* These offices which we consider as two, are so conjoined in Christ, as to become, as it were, one in his executing them. His kingship relates to his power over us and all things: but his priesthood relates to his transacting matters with God for us. Now these offices may be consider'd as thus connected in him, that what he does as a king in his administration, he first obtains as a priest from God. This perfectly agrees with what follows in the psalm, where after the mention of his Sonship, which implies his being heir, it is immediately added, *Ask of me, and I shall give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy pos-*

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?

And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son (n)?

So

NOTES.

possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel, v. 8, 9. And this, our Saviour tells us, *he received of his Father, Rev. ii. 27.* Hence, notwithstanding Christ's kingly power, he promises his disciples, that upon his departure he would pray the Father for them, *John xiv. 16.* And he is represented as *making continual intercession* for all them that come to God by him, *Heb. vii. 25.*

Let me briefly take notice of some expressions in the rest of the *Psalms*, which seem plainly applicable to Christ, but not to *David*. Such particularly is that *ver. 8. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* Had this been a direction and promise to *David*, certainly we should have had some hint of his asking accordingly, and of the accomplishment of the promise. But *David's* conquests among the Heathen were too inconsiderable to answer to such magnificent expressions, nor were ever the uttermost parts of the earth his possession.

Again; how was it true of *David*, That he broke [or as the LXX, *fed or ruled*, where our Saviour does follow the LXX, *ποιμανεῖς, Rev. ii. 27.*] *them* [the Heathen, and the uttermost parts of the earth, particularly their kings and judges] *with a rod of iron, and darest them in pieces like a potter's vessel, ver. 9?*

Again; where are the Heathen kings and judges required and commanded to submit to *David* as God's son? Or, where have we any such intimation of the terribleness of *David's* anger, as we have here of the Son's? Or, in fine, where do we find that God required men, and particularly the Heathen kings and judges, to *trust* in *David*, or pronounced those *blessed* that did so, *ver. 12.* These things are easily accounted for when understood of Christ, and the sense of the *Psalms* is thus clear, as *David Kimchi* is forced to own: but the expressions must be racked and tortured to make them suit *David*, or any person whatever beside the Messiah. Upon the whole therefore, there appears not any reason why we should doubt of the justness and pertinence of this citation.

(n) *And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son.* This citation has been thought by many to be a strong argument to prove the double sense of prophecies; it being generally supposed, that the words were first uttered concerning *Solomon*, and that they are in a more famous sense accommodated by our author to Christ. Nor can it be doubted, that there is a prophecy concerning *Solomon* that has expressions very like to those which are here cited as relating to Christ.

This argument has been largely consider'd and answer'd by Mr. *Whiston*, in his *Accomplishment of Scripture prophecies*, p. 247, &c. And to him the reader is refer'd, who desires to see the matter handled more fully than can be well expected in such short notes as these. I shall endeavour to abridge as much of what he has offer'd, as I think is sufficient to justify our author, and shall intersperse some observations of my own.

To set then this matter in a clear light, 'tis to be observed that there are two prophecies in which we have a great likeness in the expressions. One of these is set down, *2 Sam. vii. 4—17.* and is again related, *1 Chron. xvii. 4—15.* The other is related, *1 Chron. xxii. 7—10.* and is many times refer'd to in other places. For distinction and shortness sake, I shall, according to the order in which they stand in the sacred history, call the former the *first*, and the other the *second prophecy*.

Now here I would have it remembred, that the text under consideration, is a citation out of the first prophecy, and not out of the second. This observation is founded upon a comparison of our author's words with the two prophecies. The words cited are, *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son.* And the words stand exactly in the same order in the first

pro-

H E B R E W S.

N O T E S.

prophecy, 2 Sam. vii. 14. 1 Chron. xvii. 13. whereas the order of the two parts of that sentence which seems parallel to this, is inverted in the second prophecy. Thus 1 Chron. xxii. 10. *He shall be my Son, and I will be his Father.* And the like order is observed, when this second prophecy is referr'd to, 1 Chron. xxviii. 6. What the reason is of this different order in the two prophecies will be afterwards consider'd. At present the reader is to observe that the citation of our author appears to be taken out of the first prophecy, with which it exactly agrees; and that the inspired writer warrants that only to be a prophecy of Christ; and that he has no concern with the second prophecy at all, nor does he by way of accommodation apply it to Christ.

Having observed this, I shall now, for the justification of the writer of this epistle, show that these two prophecies are intirely distinct, and that the first relates intirely to the Messiah, as the second does intirely to *Solomon*, and his posterity. Now, for the clearing this distinction of the two prophecies, let it be remarked,

1. That these two prophecies were delivered by God to two different persons. The first was revealed to *Nathan*, 2 Sam. vii. 4. *The word of the Lord came to Nathan.* In like manner, 1 Chron. xvii. 3. whereas concerning the second prophecy 'tis said, *That the word of the Lord came unto David*, 1 Chron. xxii. 8. xxviii. 3, 6. 1 Kings v. 5. vi. 12. viii. 15, 18, 24, 25. ix. 5. 2 Chron. vi. 15 — 17. vii. 18.

2. The two prophecies, according to the order in which they stand in the history, were delivered at different, and, probably, at considerably distant times: the first soon after his being made king over all *Israel*, the second toward the conclusion of his reign, and, perhaps, but a little before the birth of *Solomon*.

3. However positive many are, that the first prophecy related to a temple which should be built within a few years, by a son of his who should next succeed him in his kingdom; yet 'tis not very likely that *David* himself so understood it. 'Tis much more probable that he thought it was concerning a house that should be built in the latter ages by the Messiah, who should descend from him. He might therefore, upon this account, imagine that the prophecy related not to the ark of God that dwelt in curtains, nor amounted to a prohibition of his building a house wherein he might place it: and being unwilling to quit his design and desire, he might inquire of God, whether he should, notwithstanding that prophecy, build such an house for the ark; and this might be the occasion of the second prophecies being revealed to himself. If it was as clear and certain, as some now pretend, that the first prophecy was to assure *David*, that his son, who should immediately succeed him, should build such a temple, it is very strange that *David* himself should have been in the least doubt, whether he should himself wholly forbear building; or, that he should need any farther revelation concerning that matter.

4. 'Tis highly improbable that the two prophecies should relate to one and the same subject, because the second mentions *Solomon* by name, who is never mentioned in the first. They each, indeed, speak of a son of *David* who was to build an house for God; but there is a remarkable difference in the manner in which the two prophecies describe that son of *David*. The second prophecy speaks thus of him: *Behold a son shall be born to thee, who shall be a man of rest; and I will give him rest from all his enemies round about; for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quietness unto Israel in his days. He shall build an house for my name*, 1 Chron. xxii. 9, 10. But 'tis quite another account that is given of the son of *David* in the first prophecy, 1 Chron. xvii. 11, 12. *And it shall come to pass, when thy days are expired, that thou must go to be with thy fathers, that I will raise up thy seed after thee, which shall be of thy sons, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build me an house.* Compare 2 Sam. vii. 12, 13. The son therefore mentioned in this first prophecy, was to be raised up after *David's* death; but what raising up can be intended, if this is spoken of *Solomon*? He was not only born, but raised to the throne, and crowned king before *David's* death; and consequently he could not be the son of *David* mentioned in the first prophecy, who was to be raised up after *David's* days were expired.

5. We may argue the two prophecies are intirely distinct, and do not both of them refer

N O T E S.

to the same son of *David*, who was to build God an house, from the very different reasons which are given in each, why the house was to be built by *David's* son, and not by himself. In the second prophecy we have this reason assigned for it, Because *David* had shed blood abundantly, and made great wars, but his son *Solomon* should be a man of rest, and God would give him rest from all his enemies round about, 1 Chron. xxii. 8, 9. xxviii. 2, 3, 1 Kings v. 3. which reason was very pertinent in the case of *Solomon*; and no doubt it would have been taken notice of in the other prophecy in one of the two places where 'tis set down, had that also related to the same matter. But supposing the first prophecy refers only to an house to be built by the Messiah many ages after *David's* death, the mention of *David's* wars and shedding blood abundantly, could be nothing to the purpose. And accordingly, in the first prophecy we never meet with the least hint of this reason: but the only reason specified, why *David's* son should build God an house, is the regard God bore to *David*, and his resolution to build him an house, and to reward him for his piety, in designing to build an house for God. To assure *David* of this, he lets him know that the Messiah should descend from him; and that thus in him, who should indeed build a glorious house for God, *David's* house and throne should be established. See 2 Sam. vii.

6. There is this remarkable difference between the two prophecies, that in the second concerning *Solomon* mention is only made of *establishing his throne for ever*, 1 Chron. xxii. 10. xxviii. 7. which would be accomplished in a race of kings descending from, and through all ages succeeding him; whereas in the first prophecy we have mention made, not only of *establishing his throne for ever*, 1 Chron. xvii. 12. but what is vastly more, the *establishing* this son of *David* for ever in God's house or kingdom, which argues the prophecy to belong to Christ. Thus ver. 14. *I will settle him in mine house, and in my kingdom for ever, and his throne shall be established for evermore.* Upon which we have this comment of the angel who appeared to the blessed virgin, Luke i. 32, 33. *The Lord shall give unto him the throne of his father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.* This was never designed concerning *Solomon*; nor have we the least intimation of any conditional promise, that he should be exempted from death, to which his father *David* was subject, but death would as certainly put an end to his reign as to his father's. This circumstance seems to me to determine the first prophecy wholly and solely to belong to the Messiah.

7. These two prophecies appear to be intirely different, because the promise contained in the second is only conditional, but that contained in the first is absolute and unconditional. That the promise in the second prophecy is conditional, is plain from its express words, 1 Chron. xxviii. 7. *Moreover, I will establish his kingdom, if he be constant to do my commandments and judgments, as at this day.* And accordingly *David*, with this consideration, urges *Solomon* to serve the Lord, ver. 9. *If thou seek him, he will be found of thee: but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off for ever.* Compare, Chap. xxii. 11—13. On the other hand, the promise in the first prophecy, is absolute and unconditional, Chap. xvii. 11—15. Hereby the relation of this prophecy to the Messiah seems abundantly confirmed, all the other prophecies concerning him being of the like nature; whereas all the promises that were not concerning him, always implied, if they did not express, a condition. In the case of *Solomon* the condition is plainly expressed; and accordingly there was no breach of promise in God's putting an utter end to *Solomon's* kingdom, at the *Babylonish* captivity, he having broken the condition of the promise. But the promise of the Messiah's kingdom being absolute, and it being impossible that he should fail of any thing the Father requires of him, his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and will continue to the end of the world.

Let it here be added, that this seems to be the reason why the expression *he shall be my Son*, is always in the second prophecy put before the other, *I will be his Father*; namely, because the condition is not before express'd; hereby is intimated, that God's being a Father to *Solomon*, and his dealing with him as such, depended upon *Solomon's* behaving himself as a Son, as the condition of the promise: whereas in the first prophecy, according to what was observed before, the order of the expressions is inverted, and God's absolute engaging himself to be a Father to him always stands first.

The

NOTES.

The two characters likewise mentioned by Mr. *Whiston*, p. 253. are very remarkable, and seem to me clearly to show that the time spoken of in the prophecy cannot be that of *Solomon*. The first is contained in those words: *I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more.* 2 Sam. vii. 10. 1 Chron. xvii. 9. which can't belong to *Solomon's* time, when they had never been removed out of their own land, all their removals and captivities having happened since. The like is the other character, *Neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as in the beginning, and as since I commanded judges to be over my people Israel*; whereas the greatest part of their oppressions, miseries, and persecutions, have fallen out since *Solomon's* time.

A plausible objection is urged against what has been said, from 2 Sam. vii. 14. *I will be his Father, and he shall be my son: if he commit iniquity I will chastise him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men.* Now, say they who understand this of *Solomon*, how can you allow that such language could be used of the Messiah, who did no iniquity, and in whose mouth no guile was ever found? And truly, if there were a necessity of understanding and rendering the words in the same way with our own and other interpreters, I can't see but that this objection must be unanswerable, unless we should have recourse to the salvo which has been offered, that as this clause does not appear in *Chronicles*, 'tis to be look'd upon as interpolated in *Samuel*. But since the LXX and the *Hebrew* agree in reading this passage, it seems to me unreasonable to reject it, without the utmost necessity, upon a bare conjecture not warranted by so much as one ancient copy or version. And indeed, when the passage is rendered as it ought to be, there will be no reason to suspect any corruption in the place, either from the negligence or presumption of transcribers. Now, to put this in a clear light, it will be proper to set down the original words of that part of the sentence which has been mistaken, **אשר בהעונו והוכחתיו** which our translation renders, *If he commit iniquity I will chastise him*, referring to the son of *David* spoken of: but it seems plain to me, that the words should be translated, *Whosoever shall commit iniquity I will chastise him with the rod of men, &c.* The *whosoever* is to be understood of those who belonged to the Messiah, and were his people or subjects. To justify this way of rendering the place I offer these two considerations.

1. That the word **אשר** may be thus rendered in this place, because this is perfectly agreeable to the manner in which it is used elsewhere: nor is it uncommon in other languages for the demonstrative pronoun to be omitted before the relative, as *ille* in *Latin* before *qui*, or in *Greek* *ἐκεῖνος* before *ὃς*, and so **הוא** may be easily implied in **אשר**, or the ellipsis may be supplied by **איש** or **כל** which use to be followed by **אשר**. I will here mark a few places where we have **אשר** used just in this manner, which the reader may compare, *Exod.* ix. 21. **ואשר לא שם לבו אל דבר יהוה ויעזב את עבדיו ואת מקנהו בשדה** *And he that [that is whosoever] regarded not the word of the Lord, left his servants and his cattle in the field.* So *Josh.* xv. 16. *Judg.* i. 12. *He that smiteth Kirjath-sephar, and taketh it, to him will I give Achsah my daughter to wife.* In all which places the LXX, *Vulg.* and our own translation agree in rendering **אשר** in the sense I contend for in this place. Compare also, 1 Sam. xi. 7, 8. and many other places. The not translating the word thus does sometimes spoil the sense of the sacred writers. I will mention one text which I take to be a plain evidence hereof, *Psal.* lxxviii. 1. *Give ear, O my people, to my law, incline your ears to the words of my mouth.* 2. *I will open my mouth in a parable: I will utter dark sayings of old.* 3. *Which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us.* Where our translation by the *which*, ver. 3. connects that and the foregoing verse together, as though what follows in the *Psalms* were the *parable* or *dark sayings* refer'd to ver. 2. although there is not in all the rest of the *Psalms* any thing that looks like a *parable* or *dark saying*; but it is all a plain and easy relation of the past works of God in a way of confession or thanksgiving. And therefore, as there is no connection in the nature of the subject treated of in the two first verses, and that which runs through the rest of the *Psalms*; a new sense should have been begun ver. 3. which should have been render'd, *Whatsoever things we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us, we will not hide them, &c.* I have the rather mentioned this, because ver. 2. is cited by the *Evangelist* as a prophecy of Christ's speaking in parables, *Matth.* xiii. 35. which I can't perceive to be true

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

6 And again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith,

So far is he from speaking in such a manner to any of the angels, that on the contrary, when he brings again his first begotten into the world, raising him from the dead, he says,
And

6.

N O T E S.

true in case our translation is right. But when the two first verses of the *psalm* are understood as an intire discourse, and quite distinct from the rest of the *psalm*, there is nothing in them that does not suit our redeemer; and indeed, the language of them seems more proper to be spoken by him than by *David*. How those two verses come to stand thus alone, and whether there be any dislocation of them is not the matter of our present inquiry. All that is asserted concerning them will, I imagine, appear plain to him who carefully reads the rest of the *psalm*. So far, I hope, my way is clear, that **וְאֵל** may be rendred the way now proposed.

2. The other thing which may be here urged is, that the sentence not only may, but really must be thus rendred. Now this appears from the comment which we have upon this famous prophecy in *Psal.* lxxxix. where we have this matter fully expressed, and this sense is given of the passage, which, by the way, shows that it originally belonged to the prophecy. *Ver.* 30—33. *If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments: then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless, my loving kindness I will not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail.*

It will be here objected, that supposing the first prophecy, and consequently that clause of it, *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son*, relates solely to Christ, yet how could the author of this epistle lay such a stress, as he does upon it, to prove that Christ has a more excellent name or authority than the angels? For seeing the same expressions are confessedly used in the second prophecy, why may it not as well be argued from them as they stand there, that *Solomon* had a more excellent name and authority than the angels?

To this it may be answered; that though the persons spoken of in the two prophecies are different, yet the things signified concerning them are, in some respects, alike, and therefore 'tis not strange that the expressions used concerning them should be alike also. But then 'tis obvious, that the expressions are used in a very different latitude concerning the one and the other. As to *Solomon*, what is said can only relate to what God would give him and his posterity in that temple he was to build at *Jerusalem*, or rather in that comparatively small kingdom which he had then among the *Israelites*. To this purpose are the words of the second prophecy, *1 Chron.* xxii. 10. *He shall build an house to my name, and he shall be my son, and I will be his father, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom over Israel for ever.* Now so long as *Solomon* perform'd the condition of this promise, he was intitled to a greater name, that is, to a greater authority over God's church and people *Israel*, than the angels, who were not constituted rulers in the kingdom of *Israel*, *Michael* being then their prince. But 'tis a vastly greater throne, kingdom, and authority, which is spoken of in the first prophecy, which relates to the Messiah: for it extends to the whole World, and is there absolutely promised to him. This may farther appear by comparing the other prophecies which treat of the same matter, such as *Psal.* ii. and lxxxix. 27. which is a comment upon this first prophecy. This was such an authority as was never committed to any of the angels, the world to come having never been made subject to them as 'tis to Christ.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

And let *all* the angels of God be subject to him. (o).

And let all the angels of God worship him.

And

N O T E S.

6 (o) Όταν ὁ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸ πρῶτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκεμένην, λέγει, καὶ προσκυνήσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ. *And again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.* Our margin much better refers the *again*, to God's bringing his first begotten into the world, rendring it, *When he bringeth again his first begotten*, &c. The order of the words in the original lead to this sense, and they cannot, without violence offer'd to them, bear the other translation. Besides, our common reading recedes from the more ordinary use of the particle ὅ, as adversative, and renders it *and* instead of *but*, which does not at all suit this writer's discourse. For thus it stands: "Christ has a more excellent name than the angels at his resurrection; for God never spake in that manner to any of them that he then did to him; but instead of that, he then commanded them to be subject to him." The verse therefore ought to be thus rendred: *But when he again bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.*

According to what was said before, our author speaks here of the time of Christ's resurrection, *when he had by himself purged our sins*. He was once brought into the world at his incarnation. At his death he *left the world and went to the Father*, John xvi. 28. And therefore at his resurrection God is said *again* to have brought him into the world. Our author seems very properly to have express'd himself when he says, God brought him again into the world, εἰς τὴν οἰκεμένην, and does not add, (as Chap. ii. 6.) τὴν μέλλεσαν, *to come*. For his incarnation was not a bringing him into the world to come; and so his resurrection could not be a bringing him *again*, or a *second time* into the world to come. And indeed that world to come commenced at our Saviour's resurrection, there being then an intire change made in the state and government of the world. Now if this be the case, our author's assertion is fully proved, that Christ had at his resurrection a more excellent authority conferr'd upon him, than can be pretended to belong to any of the angels.

But for the vindicating our author in this citation, it seems very necessary that we should consider two difficulties which here offer themselves.

1. 'Tis matter of doubt whence this citation is taken; nor are the learned agreed in their sentiments concerning it; some thinking that *Psal. xcvi. 7.* is the passage here quoted, and others judging that those words are cited, which we meet with in the LXX's translation of *Deut. xxxii. 43.* and which are not found in our present *Hebrew* copies. It must be owned that our ordinary copies of the LXX have in *Deut.* exactly the same words which are set down by our author; whereas in the *Psalms* there is a difference, προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ. Where the first word καὶ is wanting, there being nothing also to answer it in the *Hebrew*, and προσκυνήσατε is instead of προσκυνήσάτωσαν, and αὐτῷ instead of Θεῷ. I must own it does not seem probable to me, that the LXX met with this passage in the *Hebrew* copies of *Deut.* from which they made their translation, because they are singular herein, there being no other version that reads this clause there, no not the *Samaritan*. I am rather apt to suspect, that this clause was inserted into that place by some person, who did not perceive that as it stood in the *Psalms* it was much to our author's purpose, and who was officious, by a method never to be justified, to help him out by clapping it into a place where it might seem more pertinent, and to cover the matter the better, he perhaps inserted the same words exactly which are set down here in this epistle. And truly I can't see that supposing the citation is taken from the *Psalms*, that any more liberty is taken by our author, than is used by all writers in their quotations. Nor does the author of this epistle appear to have been very solicitous to set down the very words of the LXX. Thus Chap. ii. 12. he uses ἀπαγγελῶ instead of διηγέσονται,

N O T E S.

as 'tis in the LXX. *Pf.* xxii. 22. The reader may likewise compare *Chap.* viii. 8.—11. with the LXX translation of *Jerem.* xxxi. 31—34. And in my mind the difference between the epistle and the psalm is too inconsiderable, to be made an evidence that the citation is not from the psalm. For instance, what does it signify that the epistle reads Θεῷ of God, instead of αὐτῷ his in the LXX, when 'tis manifest that by his must be meant God's angels? and especially is this not material, since neither the one nor the other are in the *Hebrew*, it being there only, *all ye Gods*; and when the LXX and this writer agreed in understanding this of the *angels*, certainly he had as much right by way of explication to add Θεῷ, as they had αὐτῷ. The addition likewise of καὶ, *and*, supposing it not to have been ever in the *Hebrew*, is of as little moment as the other. And farther, if with some we could suppose, that the *Hebrews* in opposition to Christ, and the writers of the new testament, have corrupted the LXX, it may not be unlikely that they read προσκυνήσάτωσαν in the psalm, as well as αἰχμυθήτωσαν in the same verse; at least the *Hebrew* will bear this rendering, and therefore nothing can be charged upon our author for choosing it. For ἡμεῖς may as well be the third person plural of the *præteritum*, as the *imperative*: and then Buxtorf's rule, *Theaur.* p. 91. will take place: *Frequentissima est temporum commutatio & enallage, ut præteriti pro futuro, & futuri pro præterito: & in continuata sententia sequens tempus trahitur plerumq; in naturam præcedentis.* But to speak my mind freely, as I cannot easily fall in with the supposition of the citations being taken from *Deut.* it seems probable to me that our author's copy of the psalm had a ἰ conversivum prefix'd, and that he read ἡμεῖς which would turn the *præteritum* into a *future* sense, and account for his καὶ also. But this I submit to better judgments.

They who are positive in determining that the citation is from *Deut.* would do well to consider, how uncertain the reading of the LXX there is. In our present copies we read: Εὐφρανθήσεσθε μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ προσκυνήσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ· εὐφρανθήσεσθε ἔθνη, μετὰ τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνισχύσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, ὅτι τὸ αἷμα κ. τ. λ. *Rejoice, ye heavens, with him, and let all the angels of God worship him: rejoice, ye nations, with his people, and let all the sons of God be strengthen'd [or comforted] in him: For he will avenge the blood, &c.* Where Nobilius tells us, "that the first part, *Rejoice, ye heavens, with him, and let all the angels of God worship him*, is wanting in the *Hebrew* and *vulgate* version; as on the other hand, that which follows, *Rejoice, ye nations, with his people, and let all the sons of God be strong for him*, is wanting in some *Greek* copies." Farther, an ancient MS. of *University College* in *Oxford* leaves out from Εὐφρανθήσεσθε μετ' αὐτοῦ το Θεῷ; see the *Polyglot*. And the *Alexandrian* MS. instead of πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ reads πάντες υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, and instead of αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ Θεοῦ has αὐτὸς πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ. And *Epiphanius* *Hær.* LXIX. quæ est *Arian.* Sect. 60. confirms partly this reading, quoting it thus: *Let all the sons of God worship him, let all the angels of God strengthen him*: so he understood the words. This is confirm'd likewise by *St. Austin* in fine *lib.* V. *Locutionum*; where having set down the words according to the common reading of the LXX, *And let all the angels of God worship him*, he adds, "Other copies read, *Let all the sons of God worship him.*" Now if this be the true reading, the verse in the psalm is as near to our author's citation as the LXX.

'Tis very likely that this account may be less satisfactory to others, who will be apt to insist upon the punctual agreement between this text and the place in *Deut.* and perhaps hope to improve this to the disadvantage of this and the other writers of the new testament. Let us therefore, to remove all occasion of cavilling, state the matter upon this supposition. And then we must allow one of these two things: either, 1. That the passage which now appears in the LXX translation of *Deut.* was originally in the *Hebrew*, and consequently that 'tis omitted in our present copies only through the carelessness of transcribers. If this be granted, 'tis perhaps no more than must be allowed to have happen'd in some other places, as is owned by the most hearty and learned advocates for christianity. Nor can the thing be any great cause of wonder, considering how few MSS. we have of the *Hebrew* to compare, and through how many ages the pentateuch has been handed down to us. Or, 2. We must allow that the passage in *Deut.* was not originally in the *Hebrew*, but has been inserted since by the LXX. But then it must be added, that the LXX took the inserted clause from another place in the old testa-

NOTES.

testament, and particularly *Psal.* xcvi. 7. And all that can be made of this supposition is, that our author has cited a passage which the *Jews* who used the LXX translation, did esteem the testimony of *Moses*, but which is undoubtedly elsewhere the testimony of some inspired writer. Nor could there be any fallacy in this, since the testimony of any inspired writer of the old testament was readily received by the *Hebrews*, to whom the epistle was directed, and any such testimony was allowed by them to be a full and authentick proof. And this he might the rather do, because he might imagine the *Jews* would more easily perceive by the other expressions with which 'tis joined in *Deut.* that it related to the times of the Messiah and the world to come, than they would do in the psalm, although I doubt not it there relates to the same matter. I can't see that either way the citation can be urged as an argument against the inspiration of our author, or to the prejudice of christianity.

If it be inquired, How came the LXX to take such a liberty as they did according to this latter supposition? It may be answered by those who go this way, That though it may be hard to guess sometimes at the reasons they might have, yet there is one that may be alleged with some probability. They might imagine that the psalm it self from whence they borrow'd the passage was writ by *Moses*, and that therefore by inserting it in the pentateuch they attributed nothing to him but what was his. It was the opinion of some of the ancient *Jews*, that as the title of the xc psalm is *A prayer of Moses the man of God*, and we have no title of any of the following psalms before the ci, so all these intermediate psalms were composed by *Moses*: And the same might have been the opinion of the LXX, in case they really inserted this clause of their own heads. 'Tis true we Christians cannot allow this, because this inspired writer, *Heb.* iii. 7. ascribes one of these intermediate psalms, the xcvi, to *David*: but the LXX may easily be supposed to have been in a contrary opinion.

2. The other difficulty which deserves our consideration is, how the words, from whence so ever cited, are a proof of that matter for which our author alleges them. And truly they appear to me to be very pertinently alleged, whether they are supposed to be taken from *Deut.* or from *Psal.* xcvi. Let it be supposed that the passage is cited from *Deut.* xxxii. 43. according to the LXX, the things with which it there stands joined, evidence that it must relate to the time spoken of in the epistle. This may well be argued from that passage which is read in the verse both by the LXX and in the *Hebrew*. *Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people.* Nor do I here argue barely from St. *Paul's* having applied that passage to this purpose, *Rom.* xv. 10. but from the thing which every impartial reader will judge to be there designed. If any object against that interpretation of the passage, that St. *Paul* often speaks of God's calling the *Gentiles* as a mystery: I grant that it was so as to the manner in which they were called to be the people of God, without being required to become subject to the *Mosaick* law. This was indeed a mystery hid from ages and generations; nor had the *Jews* any expectation or notion of it, at our Saviour's coming, and when the *Gentiles* were first received into the church. But as to the thing in general, that the *Gentiles* were to be admitted to be the people of God, and that the Messiah was to be a light to lighten the *Gentiles*, 'tis so frequently asserted by *Isaiah* and other prophets, that it was next to impossible that the *Jews* who received and were very conversant with their prophecies should be ignorant of it. Accordingly the thing in general has been acknowledged both by the ancient and modern *Jews*, who from the direction of their old prophets have universally expected this event in the days of the Messiah. Nor can there be any reason to doubt, that wherever this fact is foretold, the times of the Messiah are spoken of. And if men will allow that there are any true prophecies at all in the old testament relating to the *Gentiles*, they will not be able to evade this. For when were those prophecies to be accomplished if not in the Messiah's time? At what other time but that of the setting up the kingdom of God, and enlarging his church under the Messiah, had the *Gentiles* such special reason to rejoice? This therefore seems to determine the place in *Deut.* to belong to the time to which our author refers it. 'Tis natural to suppose that it was one and the same time wherein the heavens were to rejoice, and all the angels of God were to worship or to subject themselves to Christ, and wherein the nations were to rejoice with his people. And since the latter, according to all the accounts of the old prophets, is always reckoned to be at the setting up the king-

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

7 And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spi- rits, and his ministers a 8 flame of fire. But unto	And concerning the angels he saith (<i>p</i>), Who maketh his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire (<i>q</i>). Whereas con- cerning	7. 8.
---	---	------------------

NOTES.

kingdom of God under the Messiah, the former must be so too : and consequently it must be at our Saviour's resurrection, the kingdom of the Messiah then properly commencing.

The same argument will really fix the time refer'd to in *Psal.* xcvi. in like manner, and by consequence shew, that our author did not impose upon his readers, supposing he cited that psalm, or a passage which the LXX. borrowed from it, and which they inserted into *Deut.* xxxii. 43. I will here take notice of two passages in the psalm, to this purpose : *ver.* 1. *The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoyce : let the multitude of isles be glad thereof.* And whether we render the place *many isles*, or *great isles*, what can they signify but the *isles of the Gentiles* ? *Gen.* x. 5. Again, *ver.* 6. *The heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people [or rather peoples, a stile familiar when the Gentiles are intended] see his glory.* But it may be farther urged concerning the psalm, and consequently concerning the place in *Deut.* whether it be considered as parallel to that in the psalm, or as borrowed from it by the LXX. that when 'tis said, *The Lord reigneth*, that expression seems evidently to denote the setting up God's kingdom in the earth. It may be here farther alleged, that *ver.* 2—5. of the psalm, do exactly suit the other prophetick descriptions we have of the circumstances of our Lord's resurrection in the psalms, as particularly *Psal.* xviii. 7—15. concerning the sense of which, the reader is refer'd to a dissertation upon *Rom.* xv. 9. soon to be published.

I only add, that the word here used, whether in the *Hebrew* or the *Greek*, seems to denote especially the angels subjecting themselves to Christ as their Lord and King. See *Gen.* xxvii. 29. xlix. 8. in both the *Hebrew* and the LXX. and many other places.

7 (*p*) Καὶ πρὸς μὲν τὰς ἀγγέλους λέγει. *And of the angels, he saith.*] There is no room to doubt of the goodness of this translation, and its preferrableness to that of our margin ; *And unto the angels he saith.* For however that is agreeable enough to the *Greek*, yet whoever looks into *Psal.* civ. 4. whence the following citation is taken, will see plainly that the discourse is not address'd to the angels, but is only *of*, or *concerning* them.

(*q*) Ὁ ποιοῦν τὰς ἀγγέλους αὐτῶ πνεύματα, καὶ τὰς λεῖψας αὐτῶ πνεῖς φλόγα. *Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.*] The words ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ and πνεῖς, do both signify either *winds* or *spirits*. The former rendering [*winds*] seems to me, preferable to the other [*spirits*] because it appears more agreeable to the place whence the citation is taken ; and that upon two accounts. 1. The comparing the angels to a *flame of fire*, in the last clause of the verse, naturally leads us to apprehend them as compared to winds in the first : Nor is it easy to imagine, that the inspired psalmist would, contrary to all the rules of oratory, sink so strangely in his discourse, and first compare the angels to *spirits*, the most noble order of beings, and then set them out by somewhat much inferior thereto, a *flame of fire* ; that he would first commend them as *immaterial* beings, and then as *material*. Besides, 2. The verse immediately preceeding, directs us to this interpretation : *Who maketh the clouds his chariot, who walketh upon the wings of the wind. Who maketh his angels winds, &c.* All these passages seem to speak of the angels, who are God's *chariots*, *Psal.* lxviii. 17. and for their swiftness, are compared to *clouds* or *winds*. And here *Psal.* civ. 3. they seem to be set out according to the representation of the *cherubim* in the holy of holies, with *wings stretched out*. And as God is here said to *walk* [or rather to *go*] *upon the wings of the wind*, so *Psal.* xviii. 10. he is described as *riding on a cherub*, and *flying*, as *flying upon the wings of the wind*. And if we keep to our translation, *the wind*, both in *Psal.* xviii. 10. and in *Psal.* civ. 3. what reason can we have to recede from it in the passage here cited, *Who maketh his angels winds* ?

H E B R E W S.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

cerning the Son he speaks very differently, (r) saying, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever (s): a right sceptre is the sceptre of thy kingdom: Thou hast extraordinarily loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore, O God, thy God hath anointed thee to a vastly greater regal authority and power than ever belonged to the angels, who before thy inauguration were partners with thee in the government of the world (t).

the Son *he saith*, Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness *is* the sceptre of thy kingdom: Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, *even* thy God, hath anointed thee with the oyl of gladness above thy fellows.

And

N O T E S.

Farther, this citation was very much to our author's purpose: for however noble and lofty the description is which it gives of the angels, yet it falls vastly short of what he had said before, and what he immediately adds in the two next verses concerning the Son. And the stress of the argument seems not to me so much to rest upon their being called *angels* [*i. e.* messengers] or *ministers*, as upon their being compared to *winds*, and a *flame* of fire.

When he compares the angels to a *flame of fire*, he seems to mean that they move with the utmost swiftness, and penetrate with an irresistible force like lightning. The LXX. have rendered this exactly according to the *Hebrew*, a *flaming fire*, πῦρ φλέγον. But our author did not tie himself up to the very words of that translation, even when they were sufficiently exact, and therefore we may observe that he renders it πῦρ φλόγα. This description of the angels, as a *flaming fire*, may illustrate the account which the psalmist gives of the judgment of God upon the *Egyptians*, when the lightning was mixed with the hail, particularly that 'tis attributed by him, *Psal.* lxxviii. 48, 49. to his *sending angels of evils among them*. Compare therewith *Exod.* ix. 23, 24. *Psal.* cv. 32.

8 (r) Πρὸς ᾧ ἔστη. *But unto the Son he saith.*] This rendering will not make any alteration in the sense, it being certain that the words of *Psal.* xlv. 6, 7. here cited, are directed to the Son. But as πρὸς μὲν in the former verse, and πρὸς ᾧ in this answer to one another, and what is cited in the former verse can't be understood to be spoken to the angels, but only concerning them, it seems necessary to render the πρὸς ᾧ in like manner, *But of the Son he saith.*

(s) Ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ Θεός, εἰς ἃ αἰῶνα τῶ αἰῶν. *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.*] 'Tis doubtful how ὁ Θεός is to be here understood. The common way of pointing our *Greek* testaments, which comma it in, supposes it to be put for the vocative case; and so our translators have rendered it, O God. But the way in which the LXX. translation is pointed, leaving out both the commas, makes it the nominative case. Taking it thus, the sense would be, *God is thy throne* [that is, the establisher of thy throne] *for ever and ever*; which is very agreeable to other places, which speak of the same matter. See 2 *Sam.* vii. 13, 16. 1 *Chron.* xvii. 12, 14. *Psal.* lxxxix. 4. 'Tis not easy positively to determine which is the true sense of the place, the *Hebrew* being as ambiguous as the *Greek*: nor is there any great necessity that this should be determined, neither sense carrying any thing inconvenient or disagreeable in it. If we keep to our own version, we need not wonder that Christ should have the title of *God* given to him in a psalm, whereof his royal dignity is the chief subject.

8, 9 (t) For the explaining this passage, let the following things be observed.

N O T E S.

1. That we have here such another ambiguity as that just mentioned in the preceding note. For what our translation renders, *Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee*, might consistently, both with the *Hebrew* and the *Greek* be translated, *Therefore, O God, thy God hath anointed thee*; as indeed our translators have turned it in the margin of the psalm. But which way soever this, and the former passage are translated, 'tis manifest that Christ in the highest and most exalted state, in which he is set out in that *xlv Psalm*, had one to be a God to him. So that no argument can be brought from any thing in the psalm to prove that he was ever equal, or not subordinate to the Father. And this is farther confirmed by another observation;

2. That the advantages here asserted to belong to Christ, were bestowed upon him in the nature of a reward. Thus *ver. 9. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity, therefore thy God hath anointed thee*. This is a clear evidence, that an eternal, natural right of the Son, antecedent to his conduct and behaviour is not here intended, but only an adventitious one bestowed upon him as a reward by the Father. And it seems very reasonable that the former clause should be explained to the same purpose as the latter, and that we should understand the same thing in the main to be designed in each. And thus the sense may be expressed: "God is the establisher of thy throne for ever and ever, or thy throne, O God [O Christ, who art constituted a God and a ruler by the Father] is for ever and ever, because the sceptre of thy kingdom is a righteous sceptre: for thy extraordinarily loving righteousness, and hating iniquity, is the reason why thy God hath anointed thee, &c.

3. The *anointing with oyl* denotes the conferring regal power and authority, as kings used to be anointed. So *Psal. ii. 6. Yet have I anointed my king upon Sion my holy hill*. Now as the anointing a king was a solemnity of great joy and triumph, so the vastness of the authority bestowed upon Christ at his being anointed, or his being *made Lord and Christ*, or the anointed Lord, *Acts ii. 36.* must render the joy of it more abundant. Whence the *oyl of gladness* is here mentioned, and the gladness of the solemnity is spoken of as extraordinary.

4. His *μέτοχοι fellows*, or *partners*, must here mean the angels, or else the citation is nothing at all to our author's purpose, which is to show his superiority to the angels.

5. The reason why the angels are called his *fellows*, or *partners*, must be fetched from what they were before, and not what they were after his being anointed, or inaugurated. After his being anointed, they were no longer his *fellows*, but his *subjects*: but before it, they were *partners* or *sharers* with him in the government of the world, they presiding over their respective provinces, as he did over *Israel*.

6. He was anointed with the oyl of gladness *above, or more than* his fellows, because he then received such an authority, dominion, or kingdom, as was never conferred upon any one of them, he being then made prince, not of a small province, but of the whole world.

7. When the Son's *loving righteousness*, and *hating iniquity*, are assigned as the reasons of his being anointed with the oyl of gladness *more than* his fellows, we must understand the psalm to refer to the *extraordinary* degree of these virtues in him. 'Tis not implied that his fellows did not love righteousness or hate iniquity, but only that Christ vastly excelled them herein.

But still it may be inquired, wherein did Christ's love of righteousness, and hatred of iniquity, here intended, appear? Some may, perhaps, think, that this was discovered in his death, when he laid down his life to make atonement for sin, and to set us the noblest example of, and to give us the greatest encouragement to righteousness. St. Paul's testimony may be thought to serve very much to establish this account, *Philip. ii. 8, 9. Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. WHEREFORE God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name*. Nor can there be any doubt, as to the thing it self, that Christ's love of righteousness, and hatred of iniquity, did very signally appear in his death, and were one great reason of the reward afterwards bestowed upon him. But it may yet be doubted, whether the passage under consideration speaks of this. And if there be any strength in what was hinted before, that

N O T E S.

that the 8th and 9th verses, each of them, express the same sense in the main, and that as the sceptre of his kingdom's being a right sceptre, was the reason why his throne was for ever and ever; so his loving righteousness and hating iniquity is the reason why he is anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows: I say, if there be any strength in this, then his loving righteousness and hating iniquity, must be consider'd as discovered before in his administration as a king: for it must then be tantamount to that, *A sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.* And indeed, if we only consider, that the righteousness of his sceptre is mentioned as the reason of the reward confer'd, this must evidence, that a regard was had to the justice of his regal administration that was prior to his being anointed. So that, if I am not mistaken, a comparison is made in this text between the administration of Christ, and of his fellows, the angels, in their respective provinces, antecedently to his being advanced above them. If any one imagines that this implies what is not to be supposed, concerning the angels, that they did not discover a love of righteousness, or a hatred of iniquity in their administration, he is requested to consider how he will clear any other interpretation, which he prefers, of the same objection, provided only that the interpretation, he espouses, be pertinent to the scope of our author. But I offer two things farther:

1. That though the angels cannot be supposed to have been unrighteous in what they did in their respective governments, yet an extraordinary regard appears to have been shown to righteousness in the province assigned to our Saviour among the *Israelites*, in the equity of those laws and statutes which were given them, and the temporal rewards and punishments which were nationally dispensed among them.

2. We understand little, and can hardly do more than guess at the manner of the angels administration in their provinces. We know not how particular the instructions were, which it pleased God to give them, nor how much might be left to their mere prudence and discretion, nor how far they might be subject to mistake, while they never the less loved righteousness, and hated iniquity. I forbear enlarging upon this matter of which I have spoken elsewhere. It seems not an unreasonable supposition, that notwithstanding their holiness and integrity, they might be liable to such mistakes, as Christ was not; and that this may serve possibly, to account for what is here said, in comparing the son with them. And by the way, may not this give light to some other places of scripture, as *Job* iv. 18. xv. 15. of which I shall have occasion to take some farther notice?

There is yet one thing more that needs to be cleared, concerning this citation; and that is the evidence we have that the psalm, here quoted, relates to Christ, and not to *Solomon*, to whom some are very fond of applying it.

Now here let it be observed that there is nothing in the *Hebrew* title of the psalm, that leads us to apply it to *Solomon*. 'Tis indeed stiled שִׁיר יְדִידָהּ but יְדִידָהּ is very different from יְדִידָהּ *Jedidiah*, the name given to *Solomon*, 2 *Sam.* xii. 25. The *Jews* render it as we do, *A song of loves*, and understand the Psalm to relate to the Messiah. The *LXX.* have Ωδὴ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀγαπῆτης. *A song for, or concerning the beloved.* Whence it should seem that they read in their copies יְדִידָהּ instead of יְדִידָהּ. The *Vulg.* agrees with the *LXX.* *pro dilecto.* And since there is no express mention made of *Solomon* in the psalm, מְשֻׁלִּים in the title which denotes it to be a psalm *for instruction*, as the *LXX* render it, εἰς σὺνέσιον, and the *Vulg.* *ad intellectum* seems to lead us not to understand it of *Solomon*, by an account of whose loves the church of the *Jews* were not like to gain much instruction.

They who imagine this psalm is an *Epithalamium* upon *Solomon's* marrying *Pharaoh's* daughter, must, one would think, suppose that 'tis here foretold that *Solomon* was to have a numerous progeny by her, whom he should set up for princes and rulers up and down the world, and by one of whom he should be succeeded. *Instead of thy fathers, shall be thy children, whom thou mayst make princes in all the earth*, ver. 16. But this cannot be true: for beside that we read not of any children *Solomon* had by *Pharaoh's* daughter; 'tis certain, that *Rehoboam*, who succeeded him, was the son of *Naamah* an *Ammonitess*, 2 *Chron.* xii. 13. and so far was he from being able to set up his sons to rule over other countries, that it was with

T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

10 And, thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foun-

And concerning the same beings, the angels, of whom I am speaking (u), he saith, Thou,

10.

N O T E S.

great difficulty that his successors kept two tribes of the twelve steadfast to them. And if the *daughter of Tyre*, mentioned *ver. 12.* is taken for one of *Solomon's* wives, though not particularly named in his history, we must then suppose the psalm composed toward the latter end of his life, when he had taken many wives, who perverted him to idolatry. But who can read the psalm with any attention, and yet give into that supposition? The whole tenour of the psalm directs us plainly to understand it of some excellent prince, who was highly favoured by God, and not of such a degenerate one as *Solomon* then was, God also having testified his displeasure against him. Farther, how unlikely is it, that *ver. 2.* should be understood of *Solomon*? Nothing could be more suitably said of Christ, than what we there meet with, *Grace is poured into thy lips, therefore God hath blessed thee for ever.* But was such language fit to be used concerning a man who was become a most notorious idolater? Was not the promise conditional that was made to *Solomon* of blessedness? and had he not forfeited it by breaking the condition? Nor do *ver. 3, 4, 5.* seem to suit *Solomon*, who seems not to have been any great warrior, but to have been fond of peace all his days. The last verse of the psalm seems also very unlikely to belong to *Solomon*; *I will make thy name to be remembered in all generations: therefore shall the people praise thee for ever and ever.* Certainly a greater than *Solomon* is here: and the primitive Christians were much in the right, who universally agreed in applying the psalm to Christ and to him only. But if there were no other argument, one would think the two verses cited by our author, should be sufficient to fix the scope of the psalm. *Solomon* neither loved righteousness, nor hated iniquity, in the latter part of his days; nor was it absolutely promised him, that his throne should be for ever and ever; nor did it so continue, but was utterly overthrown after a few ages. I think therefore we have very good reason, with our author, to apply this passage to our Lord Jesus Christ.

10 (u) And.] That we may understand both the order of our author's discourse, and the pertinence of the citation which follows, 'tis necessary to fix what this *and* does here connect: Concerning which, let these three things be observ'd.

1. That this word *and* is our author's own, and not any part of the citation he brings; as it plainly is, *ver. 6.* This seems evident, because neither the *Hebrew*, nor the *LXX.* have any *and* in the place quoted, *Psal. cii. 26.*

2. As the *and* is our author's own word, and not the psalmist's, it must connect this citation with some of his preceding citations.

3. This *and* cannot be understood to connect the present citation with the immediately foregoing, *ver. 8, 9.* that is, it cannot be understood to assert that the Son, whose *throne is for ever and ever, laid the foundations of the earth*, and that the *heavens are the work of his hands*; for these several reasons, (1.) Because, though the thing be indeed true and certain, that God, who *laid the foundations of the earth*, and whose *hands* made the *heavens*, did both by his Son; yet this is what he had fully asserted before, *ver. 2.* previously to his entering upon this argument. (2.) If the citation were thus to be understood, it would be wholly foreign to our author's purpose. His business is to prove, that the Son at his resurrection inherited, or obtained a more excellent name or authority than the angels. See *ver. 3, 4.* But if the words are taken in the sense and connection which is by some pretended; this citation is no proof at all of any right or authority bestowed upon him at his resurrection, but of an inherent, eternal, necessary, and unchangeable right, that belonged to him: and accordingly is the citation insisted on as a proof of such a right, by those who taking the words in this sense, have no manner of regard to the scope and design of our author. (3.) The citation, when understood according to the account of such interpreters, will assert no-

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

Thou, O Jehovah [God the Father] (*w*)
didst anciently appoint earthly or human ru-
lers, and heavenly or angelical rulers were
11. ordained by thee. They shall all perish,
as to their dominion and authority, but thou
shalt continue (*x*), and they shall all come to
an

dation of the earth ; and
the heavens are the works
of thine hands. They shall
perish, but thou remainest :
and they all shall wax old

N O T E S.

thing particularly of the angels, or of their subjection to the son, which yet it is natural to expect from the scope of his discourse, and the argument he is pursuing.

I conclude therefore that we are to go farther back for the connection, and that the *and* here in the beginning of *ver.* 10. joins it with *ver.* 7. and that the intermediate 8th and 9th verses are an incidental citation, brought in upon the mention of somewhat considerable, that is said concerning the angels, to show how much greater things are spoken of the Son at his advancement upon his resurrection. And his discourse seems to me to stand thus : *ver.* 7. " And concerning the angels [whom I have undertaken to prove inferior to the " raised and exalted Son] he saith, Who maketh his angels winds, and his ministers a flame " of fire. 8. (Whereas of the Son he saith, [speaking, agreeably to the case, in much more " magnificent and lofty terms] Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever ; a sceptre of " righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. 9. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated " iniquity ; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness a- " bove thy fellows.) 10. And [concerning the same beings, the angels, we have the fol- " lowing passage, *Psal.* cii. to our purpose] Thou, Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the " foundations of the earth, &c.

To all this it may be added, that this account is very much confirmed by what immediately follows upon this citation, *ver.* 13. *But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool ?* Where the adversative particle *δὲ*, *But*, leads us to suppose he had just before asserted the abolishing of the authority of the angels ; and that he here takes notice, that nothing is said of them any where else, that may seem inconsistent with that assertion ; that nothing is said of them, or of any one of them, that is like to what is said of the Son, whose case, when advanced to the right hand of God, was to be so vastly different from theirs. This citation from *Psal.* cii. thus understood, may be thought the more pertinent, because he had just before, in another from *Psal.* xlv. called the angels Christ's *fellows* or *partners* : for hereby he shows they were not designed always to continue such.

(*w*) *Κύριε. Lord.*] The LXX. and *Vulgate* versions both read this : and since our inspired author agrees with them therein, I think we have reason to conclude it was originally in the *Hebrew*, however our present copies leave it out. The sense is the same, whether it were, or were not originally in the *Hebrew*, because it seems plain that the *Lord* or *Jehovah*, is there addressed. And as the words can hardly be applied to the Son, without offering violence to the psalm, so when they are applied to him, they suit not the design of our author.

11 (*x*) *Σὺ δὲ διαμένεις. But thou remainest.*] I think that both here in this place, and in the LXX's version of the psalm we ought to read *Σὺ δὲ διαμένεις, Thou shalt remain.* This is agreeable to the other future verbs in the context, and to the *Hebrew* *וְאַתָּה תִּשְׁתָּבֵר*. *But thou shalt endure*, as 'tis well rendered by our translators. And however the *Vulg.* has in the psalm, "*Tu autem permanes,*" *But thou remainest* ; it renders it here in the epistle *permanebis, shalt remain* ; which is confirmed by the *Clement* and *St. Getmains* copies.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

12 as doth a garment ; And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed : but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.

an end like an old garment ; or as an upper vesture which is easily put off, thou shalt change them (y), and they shall be changed : but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail. In which meditation upon the divine immutability the psalmist foretels the change that was to be made in all those governments which were formerly appointed (z).
But

NOTES.

12 (y) ΕΛΙΞΕΙΣ ΑΥΤΗΣ. *Shalt thou fold them up.*] There can hardly be any doubt that the true reading is ἀλλάξεις, *thou shalt change*, instead of ἐλίξεις, *thou shalt fold up*. For this best suits the *Hebrew* word of the psalm, פִּלְגָּם and indeed the next word, according to the usual stile of the *Hebrew*, seems to imply, that it was this, and not any other verb that was used before וְהִנֵּה and *they shall be changed*. 'Tis highly probable, the LXX. translated it ἀλλάξεις, since the *Vulg.* has in the psalm, as well as the place before us, *mutabis, thou shalt change*. The same is confirmed by the *Clermont*, *St. Germain's*, and *New college* copies, and by *Velesius's* lections. So it was read by *Irenæus* lib. iv. c. 6. where the old translation has *mutabis* : and by *Tertullian*, adv. Hermog. c. 34. 'Tis therefore probable, as *Grotius* thought, that the LXX. translated it ἀλλάξεις, and that this was afterwards altered to ἐλίξεις, from *Isa.* xxxiv. 4. Dr. *Grabe*, upon the place in *Irenæus* before refer'd to, tells us, that some copies of the LXX. read ἀλλάξεις, and accordingly is it since printed in his edition of the LXX.

10, 11, 12 (z) Having in the foregoing notes cleared some of the expressions, I shall now endeavour to give the full sense of the whole citation. And if what shall be offered, appears different, in some measure, from what is commonly said upon the place, I hope I may avoid censure, provided it appears to agree with the stile of the holy scriptures, and with the scope and design of our author. Now to set this matter in a true light, let it be observed,

1. That our author, for the greater clearness, has set down more than was absolutely necessary for him to have done ; that is, more than the very words upon which his argument is built. Nor is this unusual with all writers in the citations which they think fit to use. Our author's sense seems to be this : “ In order to shew you that the Son, at his resurrection, “ obtained a more excellent name and authority than the angels, I have taken notice of what “ is said of them to their honour, That God makes his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of “ fire ; which is vastly short of what is said of the Son, though they were once his fellows : “ I now add concerning these angels, that however they were once his fellows, yet it was “ God's original design, not to let them always continue possess'd of that power they once “ had ; but to put an end to it (which very well agrees with what I have before advanced, “ that they were to be put in subjection to him, who were once his fellows.) Now this “ change which was to be made in their condition, is declared by the psalmist, when he “ says, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations, &c.*

2. What is here said of the *unchangeableness* of God, and of his *laying the foundations of the earth*, does not properly relate to the argument here pursued : but these things are therefore here set down in the citation, because, being intermixed with the others, they could not well be left out, without mangling and spoiling the noble and beautiful passage which is here quoted.

N O T E S.

3. There does not appear any necessity, that by the *earth* and the *heavens*, we should understand the same things to be here spoken of, that are Gen. i. 1. *In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.* Though the thing be unquestionable, that God *laid the foundations of the earth of old*, and the *heavens were the works of his hands* in this sense; yet there is no necessity that that truth must be asserted in the place under consideration. I confess, the words, at first sight, seem to refer to the proper creation of these things; nor should I be fond of contending with any, who appear resolved to understand the text in that manner, provided they allow the heavens and the earth are here considered as places to be inhabited, and that the changes mentioned, relate not so much to the places themselves, as to the inhabitants of them. For my own part, I acknowledge I don't apprehend that a proper creation is here, in the least, intended: but the intire sense seems to me to be given in the paraphrase, and that all that is here asserted, is, that God did of old appoint earthly and heavenly rulers and governours.

Such an interpretation is like to incounter abundance of popular prejudice; but in order to abate or remove it, let the reader carefully consider whether the *heavens* and the *earth* are not spoken of in the same figurative sense elsewhere in the old testament. Thus Isa. li. 16. *I have put my words in thy mouth, and have covered thee in the shadow of my hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Sion, Thou art my people.* Where the phrase of *laying the foundations of the earth*, is the same with that used in the psalm. And for a farther illustration of the phrase, it may be proper to observe, that magistracy and government, rightly managed, is considered as the *foundations of the earth*, in as much as the happiness and comfort of those who dwell upon the earth, is built and does rest upon this; and there can be nothing but the utmost confusion and ruin, where this is out of order. Nothing can be fuller to our present purpose, than what we meet with, Psal. lxxxii. which wholly relates to God's regard to magistrates, and contains an admonition and reproof to them. Now of them, whom, ver. 1, 6. he calls *Gods* upon the account of the authority committed to them, he speaks thus, because of their injustice, ver. 5. *They know not, neither will they understand, they walk on in darkness: all the foundations of the earth* מוסדי ארץ *are out of course.* And though a different word is used, yet the same thing seems designed, Psal. xi. 3. *If the foundations are destroyed, what can the righteous do?* And again; Isa. xxiv. 18, 19. *The foundations of the earth do shake. The earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean dissolved, the earth is moved exceedingly.* Again: The *heavens* and the *earth* are thus figuratively mentioned, Isa. lxy. 17. *Behold I create new heavens, and a new earth.* And Chap. lxvi. 22. *As the new heavens and the new earth which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed, and your name remain.* And this last text may the rather be considered as parallel to what our author cites out of Psal. cii. because that last clause, *so shall your seed and your name remain*, does so exactly answer to what immediately follows the passage cited in the last verse of the psalm: *The children of thy servants shall continue, and their seed shall be established before thee.* Perhaps, some may think this may give light to some other passages, both in the old and new testament. But as I avoid the digression, into which a careful consideration of that matter might lead me; I proceed to mention another text, which is, I think, home to my purpose. 'Tis a passage in the prophet Haggai, Chap. ii. 6. but I shall transcribe it, as it is afterwards quoted by our author, Heb. xii. 26—28. together with his interpretation of it. *Now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shall shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are made [or, that had been appointed] that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be shaken, &c.* For the fuller explication of which passage, as it stands in the prophecy, and as 'tis cited by our author, the reader is refer'd to what will be said upon Chap. xii. 26. Let us now only take notice of what is to our purpose as to the text under consideration. Now 'tis evident, that according to our author's gloss, by the *heavens* and the *earth* in the prophet, we are to understand *kingdoms*, rules or governments; and by the *shaking* the heavens and the earth, is meant the dissolving some kingdoms, to make way for the setting up another. And where-

N O T E S

as in the prophet the words run thus, *I will shake the heavens and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land*; our author says nothing of the *sea* or the *dry land*, they not being, I suppose, to his purpose, as perhaps the people governed are signified thereby rather than their governours. But by the *emphasis* he lays upon the *heavens* in his manner of citing the passage, *I shake not the earth only, but also heaven*, he makes a distinction of two kinds of powers or administrations: and as by the *earth* he probably means *earthly rulers*, so by the *heavens*, which he implies to be higher and greater, he may well be thought to intend *heavenly* or angelical rulers. That by the *heavens* and the *earth* we are to understand in general *rulers*, may be very well argued from another passage of the same prophet, and need not rest upon the sole authority of our author's explication. The passage I refer to, is *ver. 21, 22. Speak to Zerubbabel governour of Judah, saying, I will shake the heavens and the earth, and I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen, and I will overthrow the chariots, and those that ride in them, and the horses and the riders shall come down, every one by the sword of his brother.* Where the *overthrowing the throne of kingdoms*, and the *destroying the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen*, explain what is before called the *shaking of the heavens and the earth*. I forbear inquiring, whether as the *throne of kingdoms* answers here to the *heavens*, thereby be intended the *government of angels*, who are called *thrones, principalities, and powers*, and as the *strength of kingdoms* answers to the *earth*, thereby be meant the visible and *earthly* strength of those kingdoms. This I leave to the consideration of the careful reader. I think the shaking of the *heavens and the earth* in both, *ver. 6*, and *ver. 21*. must be the same: for indeed otherwise it could not be said, *ver. 6. Yet once I will shake the heavens and the earth*, if there were to be two distinct shakings of them after the time of this prophecy. And therefore to me their attempts seem to be vain, who would apply *ver. 21, 22.* to what happened under the kings of *Persia*. But this will be farther consider'd, when we come to our author's citation out of *Haggai*, Chap. xii. 26, 27.

I hope upon the whole the interpretation given of the prophetick sense of the *heavens* and the *earth* is sufficiently established. Let us now go over the rest of the citation.

It follows: *They shall perish, but thou remainest, or shalt remain.* By their *perishing* we are to understand their losing their authority, their *perishing* as rulers, and so it implies the intire change that was to be made in their administration. They who imagine that by the *heavens* and the *earth* we are to understand the material visible heavens and earth, don't suppose that these shall perish by an annihilation, but only that they shall be vastly changed and altered. And indeed this *perishing* seems presently to be thus explained and limited: for if they are *changed* they shall not be utterly destroyed. See *Tertull. adv. Hermog. c. 34.* To this purpose it follows: *They all shall wax old as doth a garment.* The meaning is, that with regard to their rule and government, they shall be laid aside as an old uselefs garment. This interpretation of *waxing old* may seem warranted from our author's gloss upon another occasion, Chap. viii. 13. *In that he saith a new covenant, παλαιάωκε τὸ πρῶτον, he hath made the first old.* Now that which decayeth and waxeth old [τὸ ὁ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον, two words of the same import, and the former that which is used in the place under consideration] is ready to vanish away. And when 'tis said, *They ALL shall wax old*, the meaning seems to be that all governments, whether angelical or humane, shall certainly do so. This *St. Paul* assures us will be the consequence of *Christ's* ruling, *1 Cor. xv. 24, 25.* That he shall put down all rule, and authority, and power, for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. And exactly to the same purpose our author, *Heb. ii. 8.* For in that he put all things in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. This power and authority of our Lord is to be dated from his resurrection, when all power was given him both in heaven and earth, *Matth. xxviii. 18.* that is, a power over angels and men, and indeed over all beings whatever, according to the more full expression, *Phil. ii. 8, 9.* no one being excepted but he who gave him this power, and put all things under him, who must manifestly be excepted, *1 Cor. xv. 27.* And then it was that the power and authority of these rulers waxed old as a garment, ready to be left off, and laid aside.

H E B R E W S.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

13. But unto which of the angels (*a*) said he at any time, what he said to the Son, Sit thou on

But to which of the angels 13 said he at any time, Sit on

N O T E S.

He goes on : *And as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed.* Περὶ ὧν αἰών which we render *vesture*, seems to mean a light upper garment, which was easily put on or off, like the womens vails, to signify which St. Paul uses the same word, 1 Cor. xi. 15. and so they shall be put off or laid aside as such a garment is, when a person has no use to make of it. The rest of the citation, *But thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail*, is an expression of God's unchangeableness, and more especially, I think, with regard to his dominion ; upon which there is no need to say any thing more.

If this citation is thus understood, our author may be the rather justified in his making use of it, by considering to whom his epistle is directed. The *Gentiles* might well be supposed to be less acquainted with these figurative expressions of the prophecies, and might therefore be more backward to give into such interpretations, till they were better versed in the stile of the old testament. But this was familiarly known and acknowledged among the *Hebrews* ; and therefore our author in writing to them might be the more free in arguing from it. Thus the *Chaldee* paraphrase frequently interprets the *heavens* to signify the *angels*. So upon those words, Job xv. 15. *Behold, he putteth no trust in his saints ; yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight*, it says, " Behold, he trusts not in his higher saints, and the glorious angels are not clean before him." Again, upon Psal. l. 4. *He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth that he may judge his people*, thus it paraphrases, " He shall call his glorious angels above, and the just of the earth beneath, that he may, &c." Again, upon ver. 6. *The heavens shall declare his righteousness*, " The glorious angels shall declare his purity." In like manner does it explain Psal. xcvi. 6. Nor does there appear any thing disagreeable in this manner of interpreting these and many other like passages of the old testament. When the *heavens* and the *earth* are summon'd to give attention, why should we think that only the inanimate parts of the creation are by a *prosopopoeia* address'd as persons, rather than that the inhabitants of both, angels and men, are required to attend and regard, and that an appeal is made to them who are really capable of judging concerning the case ? Thus when God is said to *ride upon the heavens*, Psal. lxxviii. 4. why may we not explain it from Psal. xviii. 10. *He rode upon a cherub, and did fly ?* Perhaps, we have somewhat of this stile in a few places in the new testament also. 'Tis manifest that what is called *joy in heaven*, Luke xv. 7. is called, ver. 10. *joy in the presence of the angels of God*. What can be meant by Christ's being *made higher than the heavens*, Heb. vii. 26. or his *ascending up far above all heavens*, ὑπερέβη πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, Eph. iv. 10. but that he is *exalted far above all principality*, ὑπερέβη πάσης ἀρχῆς, and *power, and might, and dominion*, Eph. i. 20 ?

13 (*a*) Πρὸς τίνα ὃ τῶν ἀγγέλων. *But to which of the angels.*] This verse seems to confirm the interpretation of the foregoing citation. The adversative particle ὃ *but* shows that this is connected therewith. But unless that interpretation be admitted, what account can be given of any connection at all, nay, the very citation it self will seem to come in at random, and be nothing to the purpose. But the connection is perfectly easy and natural, allowing that interpretation, and it stands thus : " God declared by the inspired psalmist, that he would change the government he once appointed, and put down these heavenly and earthly rulers, as appears by the testimony now produced ; and the authority that was placed in any or all of them, was to be transferr'd to the Son, and this universally and without the least exception. For there is nothing said concerning any one of the most noble of these rulers, the angels, that in the least implies he was ever to be vested with such an authority as that committed to the Son, an authority that was to continue till all his enemies were subdued to him." The

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

my right hand, until I make
thine enemies thy footstool?

14 Are they not all ministring
spirits, sent forth to mini-

on my right hand, till I make thine enemies
thy footstool (*b*) ? Nor will their present con- 14.
dition suffer us to think, they could ever be
thus address'd: for are they not now all of
them ministring spirits (*c*), sent forth to mi-
nister

NOTES.

The manner of our authors speech here seems to deserve our observation. He does not say, *Προς τίνες ὁ ἀνίστων*, But to which of them; but *Προς τίνες ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἀγγέλων*, But to which of the angels. Had he spoken in the former manner, it might have related both to the heavenly and earthly rulers referr'd to in the citation; whereas now by his expressly naming the angels, he limits his argument to that which was the main drift and design of his discourse.

(*b*) This passage is cited from *Psal.* cx. 1. nor is there any difficulty in it that needs to be cleared. The citation here, and *Matth.* xxii. 44. *Mark* xii. 36. *Luke* xx. 42, 43. and *Acts* ii. 34, 35. exactly agrees with the translation of the LXX. as that also does with the *Hebrew*. Nor can I see any reason we have to question, whether the words were originally intended only in that sense in which Christ and his apostles understood them. As the *psalm* was penned by *David*, so there is no other Lord of *David* beside the Messiah, to whom Jehovah can be understood to speak such words. This being spoken to the Son, and nothing like it being ever said to the angels, or to any one of them, is a clear proof of our author's great assertion which he undertook to establish, that Christ at his resurrection, or when he was seated at the right hand of God, obtained a more excellent name and authority than was ever conferr'd upon any of them. And 'tis with great unanimity that both Christian and *Jewish* interpreters apply this to the Messiah alone. Concerning the *Jews* see Dr. *Whitby* on the place.

14 (*c*) *Δεικνύσιν αὐτῷ πνεύματα.* *Ministring spirits.*] The word *πνεύματα* having been explained at *ver.* 7. to signify *winds*, it may be thought that we ought here to take it in the same sense, and the rather, because it may be supposed our author had here in this place an eye to that 7th verse. And then this should be rendred, *Are they not all ministring winds, sent forth; &c?* But as there is nothing in this verse that leads us to understand *πνεύματα* to signify winds (as there is plainly *ver.* 7.) so it may be doubted whether our author had such an eye to the fore-mentioned passage. And indeed, if I am not mistaken in my conjecture, he seems rather to gloss upon the name given them, *אֲנִיִּים*, or *ἄγγελοι*, *angels* or *messengers*; to which purpose he speaks of them as *ministring*, and *sent forth to minister*. It may therefore seem most proper to keep to our own rendring [*spirits*] as it better suits with the character under which they are here consider'd. And we may the rather prefer this sense, and suppose that this verse has not any proper relation to *ver.* 7. because the argument here appears not to be built upon the passage cited *ver.* 7. or indeed upon the nature of those beings, but upon the present actual state of things; *viz.* that now upon our Lord's advancement all the angels are made subject to him, and are all as his ministers imployed by him for the good of his church, as he sees cause. This may be aptly illustrated from *Eph.* i. 22. *God hath put all things under his [Christ's] feet, [And in these all things the angels are certainly included, as we may learn from the foregoing verse] and gave him to be head over all things to the church.*

Thus then I understand our author, *q. d.* " I asked to which of the angels God said at any
" time, *Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?* And I am well satisfied
" that no passage can be alleged, wherein God is ever represented as using such language to,
" or concerning any of them. The description given of them is quite contrary to this: And
" instead of being set out as exalted to such an high state of dignity and authority, as sitting
" at God's right hand, they are represented as *ministring spirits*, whose proper posture is *stand-*
" *ing,*

nister for the sake of those who should afterward belong to the Christian church (d)?

ster for them who shall be heirs of salvation?

N O T E S.

“ing, and not sitting.” See 1 Kings xxii. 19. Zech. iii. 5, 7. iv. 14. vi. 5.

The account given of this matter is much confirmed by looking forward to Chap. ii. 5. which is to be connected with the last verse of this first chapter, the four intervening verses being a practical digression. There he says, *For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak.* And his argument, I think, stands thus: “The government of angels over the old world, was to be abolished at the change that was foretold should be made, Chap. i. 10 — 12. Nor was it intimated, that the regency of any one of those princes and presidents was to continue till all his enemies should be subdued to him, ver. 13. On the contrary, not only the angels who were employed by Christ as his ministers before, but all the angels in general, the princes of the old world, as well as others, are now *all* in their present state put into the condition of ministers under the Messiah for the good of his church, ver. 14. And this is certain, because the world to come was not design’d in any part of it to be left in subjection to the angels, Chap. ii. 5.”

(d) *Διὰ τὰς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν.* *For them who shall be heirs of Salvation.* There are many passages up and down in the epistles, which seem, and by the generality of ordinary readers are understood, to speak of persons as internally sanctified, and having a title to everlasting happiness, which yet only speak of them as professed Christians, as injoying the gospel, and as being the subjects of Christ’s visible kingdom or church here on earth. Thus when St. Paul writes to whole churches under the title of *Saints*, Rom. i. 7. Eph. i. 1. the *sanctified in Christ Jesus*, 1 Cor. i. 2. he does not mean those whose lives were pure and holy, but such as were separated from the common state of mankind, to be the people of God. See Mr. Locke upon the several places refer’d to. In like manner he expounds Rom. xi. 26. *And so all Israel shall be saved*, that is, “Be converted to the christian faith, and the whole nation become the people of God.” And so when he speaks of God’s making the *Colossians meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light*, Col. i. 12. he means, that he had called them to share in that light which is vouchsafed to his church by the gospel. See my notes upon that and the next verse. And ’tis in this sense I suppose our author is to be understood, when he speaks here of those who should be *heirs of salvation*. To clear which we may observe how St. Paul speaks of all the *Galatians*, because they were of the visible church, baptized into the Christian faith, and still made a profession of it, although it can’t be thought that they were *all* of them such as should be saved in the other world, and he has himself dropt some severe passages in that epistle concerning them. Yet thus he speaks of them, Gal. iii. 26. *Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* — *And if ye are Christ’s then are ye Abraham’s seed, and HEIRS according to the promise.* So that he supposes the whole visible church to be *heirs*. Herewith we may likewise compare what he says of God’s design of calling the *Gentiles*, Eph. iii. 6. *That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs [viz. with the Jews, whose whole nation were heirs before] and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel.* So that the whole body of the *Gentiles* who came into the Christian church, were consider’d as *heirs*, and *partakers of the promise in Christ by the gospel.* And the expression of *heirs of salvation* seems to me to carry no more in it, than is there said of the converted *Gentiles* in general. And to confirm this let the reader observe, 1. How our author presently uses the same word *Salvation*, Chap. ii. 3. *How shall we escape if we neglect so great Salvation [such a glorious gospel] which began to be spoken by the Lord [which was first preached by Christ himself] and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him [preach the gospel?]* And it may farther appear, that by *Salvation* he there means the *gospel*, because it stands in opposition to the *word spoken by angels*. The *heirs* then

N O T E S.

of salvation are the *heirs of the gospel*, or of the *promise in Christ by the gospel*. 2. Observe farther, that these *heirs of salvation* are presently after called the *world to come*, Chap. ii. 5. *For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak*. And what is this world to come but the new state of the kingdom or church of God in the world under the Messiah? And to what other verse of this first chapter can we so properly suppose him to refer, as to this last verse, between which and Chap. ii. 5. there is a plain connection? And if he speaks here in the verse before us of the *world to come*, it must be in these words, *For them who shall be heirs of salvation*. And by his using the word μέλλοντας, our author seems to have intimated thus much, it agreeing so exactly with ἡ οἰκουμένην ἣ μέλλουσιν. If St. Paul was the writer of this epistle, such a *paronomasia* was very agreeable to him. But however that be, there seems to be some design in his using this phrase, διὰ τὰς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν, *for them that were to inherit*, instead of διὰ τὰς κληρονομίας. And unless I am mistaken 'tis this: he considers the angels as made, at our Lord's resurrection, ministering spirits, under him in his kingdom; but the foundations of this kingdom being then hardly laid, or at least not among those of whom it was chiefly to consist, he speaks of the angels as appointed to minister for those who should afterwards become subject to the gospel; and so this μέλλοντας seems to speak of what was to be subsequent upon their being put under subjection to Christ.

If it be asked, why does this writer express himself in so dark and obscure a manner? I think we may be able to give a satisfactory answer. I make no doubt, that though the *Jews* are not excluded from being *heirs of salvation*; they were so before, and continued so till they cut themselves off by unbelief; yet he has here, at least chiefly, a respect to the *Gentiles*, who at the time when the angels were subjected to Christ, were not, but should in a little time become the heirs of salvation, and be of the same body with the believing *Jews*. Now as our author was writing to the *Jews*, who were so very tender in this point, and could not indure to hear of the *Gentiles* being set upon an equal foot with themselves, he seems to have chosen such a dark and obscure description of the converted *Gentiles*, that he might avoid, as much as might be, the giving the *Jews* offence. This same design I hope to show runs through the latter part of the next chapter; and I am perswaded that every careful and attentive reader will be forced to admire the great dexterity and skill with which he manages his discourse upon so nice a point, which he thought it necessary for him to handle, but was concerned to do it so as not to provoke those who were like enough to be displeased, if he had spoken in the plainest terms. And I can hardly think how unprejudiced persons, who compare this epistle with St. Paul's in this respect, can doubt of his being the author of it. Let me add, that if the *Gentiles* who were to be brought into the christian church are those who were to be heirs of salvation, then here he indeed speaks of the world to come, the calling of the *Gentiles* being always represented as brought about in the world to come, or under the kingdom of the Messiah.

Let none object, that according to this interpretation, hypocrites in the church have as much benefit by the ministry of angels, as any sincere christians. There can be no question, that as God knows the hearts of all, so he has a special favour to good men above all others. They therefore are in a peculiar manner the objects of his care, and they may have much greater advantages even by the ministry of angels, than others have. But though this be true, yet it seems not to be the sense of this place, which considers the angels not so much as ministering to particular persons, as to bodies and societies of men. Nor does it appear at all inconsistent, that a truly holy and good man, should have an angel to attend him in his particular person, and that great multitudes of angels should be employed in ministering more generally to whole societies and churches of christians. The primitive christians thought that every good man had his angel to attend him, and upon that account, very probably, spake in that manner, when they could not believe that Peter was at the gate, Acts xii. 15. *Then they said, It is his angel*. And that opinion seems to be countenanced by our Saviour himself, Matt. xviii. 10. *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven*. Maldonate upon this latter place has shown this was the common opinion of the fathers. On the other hand, that many good angels may be employed in good offices in a more general way for the service of whole societies,

N O T E S.

may perhaps be hinted afterwards in this epistle, where among the advantages that belonged to such as were in the christian church, this is reckoned as one, *Ye are come to an innumerable company of angels*, Heb. xii. 22. By their thus ministering to christian societies, they must unavoidably acquire a thorough knowledge of the members thereof, and so be well qualified for the office they are at last to perform, *Matth. xiii. 41, 42. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire.* And, ver. 49. *The angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just.*

S E C T. III.

C H A P. II. 1—4.

C O N T E N T S.

OUR author having establish'd the superiority of Christ to the angels, in the foregoing section, he here makes a digression, practically applying what he had said to the great design of his epistle, *viz.* to press upon the *Hebrews* a steadfast adherence to Christ, and a continuing in the religion which he had taught.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

I.

AND because Christ is so much superiour to angels, as I have already proved, therefore (*e*) we ought the more to attend to the things which we have heard (*f*), lest at any

Herefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time

N O T E S.

I. (*e*) *Διὰ τῆτο.* *Therefore.*] Or, *upon this account*, that is the account which he had in the foregoing chapter given of Christ's being advanced far above the angels. There appears not any reason to doubt that this and the three next verses are together a practical digression, the like to which we often meet with in this epistle, as likewise in those which were undoubtedly written by St. Paul: which is a considerable confirmation of the opinion of the ancients, who reckon'd this to have been one of his epistles.

(*f*) *Τοῖς ἀκηκοένσι.* *To the things which we have heard.*] That is the *gospel*, the great salvation publish'd by Christ, ver. 3. It might be understood of *persons*, and be rendred, *to those persons who have been heard by us*, and so these persons will be the same with those mentioned ver. 3. who having heard Christ preach, confirmed the account of his preaching to others, and particularly to the *Hebrews*, God bearing them witness by the Holy Ghost; or in the stile of

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

we should let *them* slip. any time we should forget them (g). For if 2.
For if the word spoken by the law which was given by the ministry of
angels was steadfast, and angels (b) was steadfast, and every transgression

NOTES.

of St. Peter, those who preached the gospel to them with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, 1 Pet. i. 12. The sense will be the same in effect, which ever of these two ways the words are rendered. Our own, perhaps, may therefore be thought preferable, because of what follows, *lest at any time we should let them slip*: for though the *them* is not in the original, but is supplied, yet it seems natural to suppose that he speaks rather of the slipping away of *things* than of *persons*; though, I confess, considering the sense of the word *παρρησιάζομαι*, this argument is not absolutely conclusive.

Some have argued from what is here said, that St. Paul was not the author of this epistle, because of his joining himself with these *Hebrews*, saying, *The things which WE have heard, and was confirmed unto US by them that heard him*; which 'tis thought was not proper, considering that he himself received the gospel which he preached by special revelation, and was not taught it by man, Gal. i. 12. nor were the other apostles, when he afterwards conferr'd with them, able to teach him any thing which he had not before learn'd of Christ, Gal. ii. 6. But notwithstanding this, as he had long before the writing of this epistle to the *Hebrews* conferr'd with the other apostles, there could be no impropriety in his speaking of himself as hearing these things, and the exact agreement of their account with that which he had received by immediate revelation, may be consider'd as a confirmation of the doctrine preached, not only to the *Hebrews*, but in some sense likewise to himself. But that which most effectually takes of the force of this argument is, that it is not unusual for St. Paul to join himself in this manner with those to whom he writes, when the things of which he speaks relate wholly to them, and not to himself. Thus Eph. ii. 3. *Among whom also WE all had OUR conversation in times past, in the lusts of OUR flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh, and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, even as others.* Where considering himself as the apostle of the *Gentiles* he joins himself with them; and in the terms *we* and *our* he speaks of the converted *Gentiles*. See Mr. Locke upon that place. In like manner I think he is to be understood, Tit. iii. 3. *For we our selves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another.* And with as little impropriety might he here in writing to the *Hebrews* join himself with them, upon the account of his being also an *Hebrew*. And the rather might he do this, because as the gospel of the circumcision was committed to St. Peter, he was not now writing to those who properly belonged to his province, and to whom he accordingly never makes mention of his apostleship.

(g) *Μή ποτε παρρησιάζομεν.* *Lest at any time we should let them slip.* Our margin renders it, *Lest at any time we should run out as leaky vessels.* Nor can it be doubted that the expression is allusive to such vessels which were not able to retain the liquids that were put into them. In an allusive sense somewhat like this is the word *perfluo* used by Terence, Eunuch. Act. 1. Sc. 2. *Plenus rimarum sum, hac atq; illac perfluo.* And so is *effluo* by Cicero, Lib. vii. *ad fam. epist.* 14. *Sin nostri oblitus es, dabo operam, ut istuc veniam ante quam plane ex animo tuo effluo.* The LXX. seem to use the word in the same manner our author does, Prov. iii. 21. *Υιὲ μὴ παρρησιάζῃς, τήνισον ὃ ἐμὴ βεβλήν κ' ἐννοίαν.* *My son, be not forgetful, but keep my counsel and instruction.* Compare ver. 1. of that chapter.

2 (b) *If the word spoken by angels.* If ever God spake by his Son under the old dispensation; one would imagine it was as likely to have been at the great solemnity of giving the law, as at any other time whatever: and yet the opinion of the ancient christians, that Christ

3. fion of and disobedience to it was justly punish'd as it deserved ; how certain and severe will our punishment be if we neglect so great salvation. (*i*), the publication of which was begun (*k*) by the Lord himself, who is constituted the Lord of angels as well as of men, and was confirmed and ascertained to us by the testimony

every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward ; How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was con-

N O T E S.

was the immediate giver of the law does not seem probable, since it is here in this place so expressly attributed to the angels ; as it is likewise in other texts, *Acts* vii. 53. Where St. Stephen tells the *Jews*, That they had *received the law by the disposition of angels, and had not kept it.* And so St. Paul says of the law, *Gal.* iii. 19. *It was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.* Compare *Deut.* v. 5. *Lev.* xxvi. 46. In the place before us the manner of giving the law is manifestly opposed to that of publishing the gospel ; and this latter is not more expressly attributed to the Lord or to Christ, than the former is to the angels : and therefore we ought to have very clear proofs before we attribute both to our Lord, or suppose him to be the immediate publisher of both. Besides, this opinion seems to enervate the force of the argument here used : for as that proceeds wholly upon the difference of the persons, there can be no strength at all in it, if they are supposed to be the same. It might have been then reply'd to our author, There is no reason at all why the punishment of such as neglect the gospel should be more certain or severe than of those who transgress'd the law. The gospel was indeed publish'd by the son : but so was the law also, however he made use of the ministry of angels in ordering some of the circumstances that attended its publication. Nor can I see how this objection could be answered, supposing the ancient christians not to have been mistaken in their opinion.

3 (*i*) *Τηλικαύτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας.* *If we neglect so great salvation.*] Commentators are pretty well agreed that by *salvation* we are to understand the doctrine of *salvation*, that is the *gospel*. This is called the *word of salvation*, *Acts* xiii. 26. The *gospel of salvation*, *Eph.* i. 13. The *power of God unto salvation*, *Rom.* i. 16. The *grace of God that brings salvation*, *Tit.* ii. 11. And the *salvation*, *τὸ σωτήριον*, of God, *Acts* xxviii. 28. And as this stands opposed to the *word spoken by angels*, it seems natural to understand it of the word or doctrine published by Christ, and all the expressions here used of Christ's *beginning to speak it*, of men's *bearing it*, of its being *confirmed*, and that God *attested it*, all these, I say, lead us to understand the place in the sense given.

(*k*) *Ἦτις ἀρχὴν λαβῶσα.* *Which began.*] This phrase is not unusual in profane authors. Thus *Ælian*, Var. Hist. lib. ii. c. 28. Πόθεν ὃ τ' ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν ὁδε ὁ νόμος, ἔρῳ. " I will now relate whence this law took its rise or beginning." So again lib. xii. c. 53. Nor should it be thought any difficulty that this great salvation, or the gospel, should be represented as *begun* to be spoken by the Lord. For whatever the intimations were which were given by the old prophets, they were so obscure as not to be understood by themselves. *1 Pet.* i. 10—12. And therefore the *grace of God* is said to be *now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light, through the gospel.* *2 Tim.* i. 10. This is said to be *begun* to be spoken by him, because there were some things which belong'd to this gospel, as the resurrection and ascension of Christ, and the pouring out of the Spirit, which were to be more fully published by his apostles after his death.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

4 firmed unto us by them that
heard *him* ; God also bearing
them witness, both with
signs and wonders, and
with divers miracles, and

ny of those who heard him publish it (1),
and not only by their testimony, but by the
testimony of God himself, who bore witness
to the truth of what they preached (m), both
with signs and wonders, and with divers mi-
racles,

4.

NOTES.

(1) *Confirmed unto us by them that heard him.*] Matters of fact, which were transacted before our own time, and whereof we could not be our selves eye-witnesses, are believed upon the report of others. And when the reporters are persons of credit and reputation, and relate nothing but what they declare themselves to have seen, and certainly known, and they are likewise many, and exactly concur in their testimony, and nothing is alleged against them by any others, and particularly such as were concerned to invalidate their account, if possible, we think we have all the reason in the world to receive their testimony. All which circumstances do evidently concur in the confirmation of the gospel. Particularly it is confirmed to us by such as were eye and ear-witnesses of the things they reported, as by St. *Matthew* and St. *John*, in the gospels written by them, and by those from whom St. *Luke* published his account, *Luke* i. 2—4. by St. *Peter*; 2 *Pet.* i. 16—18. as well as in many passages attested by him in the *Acts*. Compare *John* i. 14. 1 *John* i. 1—4.

4 (m) *Συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ Θεοῦ.* God also bearing them witness.] The miracles which were wrought by the first preachers of the gospel, after our Saviour's leaving the world, were an attestation from God of the truth of what they deliver'd. And indeed, we must entertain very strange and unworthy apprehensions of the blessed God, if we can suppose that he would countenance a mere lye and a notorious imposture, by enabling those who published it to the world, to perform in confirmation of it, so many miracles as they did, things that were vastly above the power and ability of men, as is very evident to all who carefully and impartially consider these matters. 'Tis true, there were other confirmations of our Saviour's character, and commission, particularly the concurrence of all that was foretold by the old prophets concerning the Messiah: but this does, by no means, hinder these miracles to be an attestation from God, and accordingly to deserve our utmost regard. Nay, it was foretold that the Messiah, when he came, should perform such things; and therefore, God's enabling Jesus of *Nazareth* to do them, was an attestation which concur'd with the old prophets, that he was the Christ, and consequently that the doctrine he published was from God. Nor were the miracles wrought by him in his life time, the only ones which the ancient prophets may be understood to foretel he should accomplish; but those also may well be included, which, while he was yet alive, he promised to work by the ministry of his servants after his death, and which they always profess'd to perform in his name. It seems to have been, in a manner, absolutely necessary that such a sensible attestation from God should accompany the first preachers of the gospel, considering that they were sent to all nations, and that the gospel was then more especially propagated among the *Gentiles*. For though the translation of the old testament had been made by the *LXX.* a considerable time before, yet that was in the hands of very few comparatively of the *Gentiles*, to whom the apostles preached; and besides, an utter unacquaintedness with the *Greek* tongue rendred that translation of no use in many heathen countries. So that however wisely the apostles acted in appealing to the old testament, when they preached to the *Jews*, or *Jewish* proselytes, or to other *Gentiles*, after they had, for some time, made a profession of christianity; yet it must have been a vast hindrance to their success, if in their first preaching to such as were utter strangers to the old testament, they must have waited for their acquainting themselves with it, before they could expect to make converts of them to christianity. That they might not therefore be strained by having
nothing;

racles, and gifts of the holy Ghost (*n*), according to his [God's] own will (*o*)? gifts of the holy Ghost, according to his own will?

N O T E S.

nothing else to appeal to but the ancient prophecies, God gave them, by these miracles, such credentials as they might every where carry with them, and were easy to be discerned by all who would vouchsafe carefully to examine them.

(*n*) Σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν, καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσιν, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς. *With signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the holy Ghost.*] I confess I am at a loss nicely and exactly to distinguish the four things here mentioned. As our author is comparing the publication of the law and the gospel together, he seems to me, by the two first things here mentioned, to intimate, that the gospel was not inferior to the law with respect to them; but that as we read of *signs and wonders* wrought by *Moses*, so there were such also performed not only by Christ, but by his apostles. In the two last, his design seems to be to show, that the gospel was superior to the law, it being attested by such gifts of the holy Ghost, as the law was not. So far seems highly probable. But what the precise difference is between *signs* and *wonders*, I cannot positively assert. These two words are frequently joined together in the new testament, as they are in the old by the LXX. properly answering to the *Hebrew* words מִוִּפְתֹּת and מִפְּתִיחִים. They seem to me to be used as synonymous; or if they are not, the *signs* seem to be of a more general signification, and the *wonders* to be added as a limitation. I am the rather inclined to reckon these two synonymous, because they appear to be so used, not only in the sacred, but also in profane authors. *Raphelius*, in his *Annot. Philolog. in nov. test.* upon *Mat. xxiv. 24.* has furnished us with a passage out of *Polybius*, lib. iii. c. 10. which, I think, is to be thus understood: Σημείων ὃ καὶ τεράτων πάντων μὲν ἱερῶν, πάντα δ' ἦν οἰκία πλήρης. "Every temple, and every house was full of *signs and wonders.*" To which, I think, I may well add this from *Ælian's Var. Hist.* lib. xii. c. 57. Ἡνίκα Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Φιλίππου ἐπὶ τὰς Θήβας ἦγε τὴν δύναμιν, οἱ μὲν Θεοὶ σημεῖα αὐτοῖς καὶ τέρατα αὐτῶν ἐπέλαυνον, προσημαίνοντες τὰς περὶ αὐτῶν ὅσον ἐδέπω τύχας. "When *Alexander*, the son of *Philip*, led his army against *Thebes*, the gods sent signs and wonders among them, signifying before hand the greatest calamities that were coming upon them."

If this account of the two first things be admitted, it may direct us in interpreting the two last also. I can't perceive any certain evidence we have, that the *δυνάμεις* relate only to such miracles as casting out devils, making the blind to see, and the lame to walk, and healing all manner of diseases, and that the *μερισμοὶ*, *gifts or distributions* of the holy Ghost, consisted only in the internal gifts of wisdom, knowledge, faith, the gifts of tongues, and the interpretation of them. And therefore I apprehend these are joined together in much the same manner as the two former, and that the meaning is as though it had been said, ποικίλαις δυνάμεσιν ἃ δια πνεύματος ἁγίου μεμερισμέναις, *divers miracles which were distributed by the holy Ghost.* By this means indeed the four things, here mentioned, are reduced to three, or to two: but that instead of being a material objection against the interpretation, is rather a confirmation of it. For thus they are reduced to three, 2 *Cor. xii. 12.* ἐν σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν. *In signs and wonders, and mighty deeds.* Compare *Acts ii. 22.* where the order of the three is quite inverted. At other times they are reduced to two, *Acts viii. 13.* See also *Rom. xv. 19.*

(*o*) Κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν. *According to his own will*] Whether we read αὐτοῦ or αὐτῷ, it must be refer'd to Θεῷ and not to the holy Ghost. It is indeed true, that the holy Ghost makes these distributions according to his will, 1 *Cor. xii. 11.* But as God is the principal subject of the discourse, 'tis most natural to understand the *his* to belong to him. And besides, 'tis contrary both to the nature of things, and to the stile of the holy scriptures, to say, that God bore witness according to the will of the holy Ghost, which yet we must do, unless we refer *his* to God.

S E C T. IV.

C H A P. II. 5—III. 2.

C O N T E N T S.

TW O things were especially matter of offence and scandal to the *Hebrews*, with respect to our blessed Saviour, and his gospel : 1. The mean and suffering condition in which he appeared here in the world, which did not seem to consist with the account before given, of his being so far above the angels. 2. The undertaking of Christ for the *Gentiles*, and the receiving them upon equal terms with the *Jews* ; of which, an intimation had been given in the last verse of the foregoing chapter ; with which this section stands connected, the four first verses of this chapter being a practical digression, in a sort of parenthesis. To take off both these objections is the principal design, as I apprehend, of this section : wherein our author shows, that the *Jews* had no reason to be offended upon either account, the suffering condition of our Lord, for only a little time, being ordered for the advantage of the seed of *Abraham*, and the *Gentiles* being now, by faith, become the seed of *Abraham*, it was but reasonable they should share in the same advantages by the Messiah, as the *Jews* themselves did. To avoid as much as possible the irritating or giving offence to the *Jews*, he forbears expressly to mention the *Gentiles*, and speaks of them only in a covert manner, which however carries in it a sufficient vindication of the method which God had taken now under the dispensation of the gospel. And having given a noble description of the Messiah, he recommends him to the consideration of the *Hebrews*.

N O W

5. **N**OW that the angelical government was, as I said, to cease, and the angels, instead of being rulers, were to become ministring spirits in the kingdom of the Messiah, may appear from hence, that we nowhere read that God has put the world to come, whereof we speak, or the new state of things, into which he brought his Son at his resurrection (*p*), in subjection to the angels.
6. But the contrary is testified by an inspired writer,

For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak. But one in a certain place testified, saying,

N O T E S.

ς (*p*) Τὴν δικοιμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, περὶ ἧς λαλῶμεν. *The world to come, whereof we speak.*] This expression plainly shows, that this verse is to be connected with the end of the first chapter, and not with the four preceding verses of the second. And we have here a confirmation of the interpretation before given of the first chapter: that what he had before said of the angels must be understood as referring to their state upon our Lord's resurrection. For though 'tis doubted by some, what he refers to of his former discourse, when he says, that he is *speaking of the world to come*; yet the whole of his discourse, Chap. i. 4—14. seems to be intirely upon this subject. Certainly 'tis in the *world to come*, that Christ obtained by inheritance a more excellent name than the angels, after he had, by himself purged our sins, ver. 4. it was then he was brought again into the world, and the angels were required to be subject to him, ver. 6. it was then he was anointed with the oyl of gladness above his fellows, and his throne was established for ever, ver. 9. it was then the change was made in the angelical government, ver. 11, 12. and then the angels became ministring spirits to the Gentiles, who should be converted to christianity, ver. 14. And if there were a necessity to suppose that our author had a respect to one passage more than the rest, I should be apt to think the 14th verse must more especially be the passage, both because 'tis the last, and stands nearest to the verse, the intermediate verses making, as has been said, a parenthesis, and because there seems to be a hint of this connection in the use of the same participle, the μέλλοντες κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν seeming to me, to be those who inhabit τὴν δικοιμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν.

Farther, the transition here in our author's discourse, is admirably adapted to his design. His intention is to remove an objection of the *Hebrews* against what he had said of our Saviour's being exalted far above the angels; and the objection is this: "It does not look at all likely that he should be better and more honourable than the angels, since he was in a state here on earth so much inferiour to theirs, since he was subject to, and confessedly underwent death, from which the angelical nature is exempted." Now instead of formally proposing this objection, he imperceptibly passes from his former subject, and takes occasion from a passage he cites from *Psal. viii.* to fall upon the answer to it: but 'tis in such a manner, that his readers find themselves surprized with the account of their own advantage, at the very time when the thing, against which they objected, comes to be expressly mentioned. Nor could any method be more likely than this to abate their prejudices, and reconcile them to, and fix them intirely in the christian doctrine. The transition is indeed so insensibly made, that 'tis hardly to be expected, that any but very attentive readers will now perceive it: but I hope to

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

What is man that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him

writer, who says (q), "What is man that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man that thou visitest him (r)? Thou madest him for a little time lower than the angels, by putting him into such a mortal state here in the world, as the angels are not subject to (s), thou crownedst him with

7.

NOTES.

to all such, it will appear sufficiently plain. The reader may likewise consider whether it was not with an eye to this objection, and the answer he intended to make to it, that Chap. i. 3. he takes such notice of the Son's first by *himself purging our sins*, antecedently to his advancement.

6 (q) Διευμαρ[ύ]σε[το] ὁ π[ρ]ο[φ]η[τ]ὰς, λέγων. But one in a certain place testified, saying.] The passage cited, is *Psal. viii. 4, &c.* But the true design of the psalmist, and the pertinence of the citation has been much contested. If the psalmist intended to speak of Christ, there can be no question that the passage is very much to our author's purpose. Whether this was the psalmist's intention or no, will be inquired as we go over the parts of the citation. In the mean time it seems proper here to consider the opinion of some learned writers, who imagine that our author never designed to bring the words quoted as a proof of any thing he had said concerning Christ. Now one would think that these words here, *But one in a certain place testified, saying*, were sufficient to let us know what apprehensions the writer of this epistle had of the design of the psalmist. For unless he understood him to speak of Christ, what can he mean by citing his words? Was it his design to bring a testimony from *David*, that mankind in general is inferior to angels? What need was there of any proof at all in such a case? Who, and especially among the *Hebrews* to whom the epistle was written, made the least doubt of it? Again, if our author thus understood the psalmist, how could his argument at all lead him to mention his words? Could the words of the psalmist, when understood of mankind in general be any proof that God had not put the *world to come* in subjection to the angels. If it proved any thing, it proved that God never put the world in any state at all in subjection under them; nor was there any occasion for his speaking with such caution, and denying this subjection to belong only to the world to come; by which he seems really to imply, that the *וָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה* or *this world*, that stood in opposition to the *world to come*, was put in subjection under them, which is I think clear from other texts. It seems therefore evident, that our author understood this testimony intirely to belong to Christ; and that he mistook not the psalmist, will, I hope, appear presently.

(r) *What is man that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man that thou visitest him?* There can be no difficulty in supposing that Christ may very properly be meant by *man*, and by *the Son of man*. When he came and dwelt in flesh, he was truly a *man*, and a *Son of man*. And under the latter of these two titles, he often chose to speak of himself while he was here on earth, as we are assured by many places in the gospels: which he might, perhaps, therefore do, because the prophet had given him that title, *Dan. vii. 13*. Nor can his speaking of himself in so low and abject a manner, be an objection of any moment against this, considering what we meet with of the same strain in other psalms which were prophetic of him; as particularly where he says, *Psal. xxii. 6. I am a worm, and no man. Psal. xvi. 2. My goodness extendeth not to thee, &c.*

7 (s) Ηλα[τ]ώσα[ς] αὐ[τ]ὸν ἑλαχ[ύ]τερον τῶν ἀγγέλων. Thou madest him a little lower than the angels.] I have already intimated my agreement with those who choose to render the words

8. " with glory and honour, and didst set him
 " over the works of thy hands: Thou
 " hast put all things in subjection under his
 " feet." By which testimony it appears,
 that the subjection under which all things
 are put, is not to angels, but to man, or the
 Son of man. And so full an expression as
 that, *Thou hast put all things in sub-*
jection under him, leaves no room for any
 exception, he therefore must have left no-
 thing

with glory and honour, and
 didst set him over the works
 of thy hands: Thou hast
 put all things in subjection
 under his feet. For in that
 he put all in subjection un-
 der him, he left nothing

N O T E S.

words thus, *Thou madest him a little while inferior to the angels*, which is the marginal rendering also of our translators. There can be no doubt that *βεαχύ τι* will bear this rendering: for it must necessarily be taken in this sense, *Acts v. 34. He commanded to put the apostles forth*, *βεαχύ τι* a little space, as we justly translate it. And that the Hebrew *לְיָדָא* is used in the same manner is obvious to him who compares *Isa. x. 25. Jerem. li. 33.* and many other places. Now if this be the best rendering, it seems more natural to understand the psalm of Christ, than of Adam, or of mankind in general. For it was but for a few years that Christ was made inferior to the angels, by being put into this mortal state, whereas Adam, and all mankind with him, were not at first made inferior to angels, by being subjected to mortality; and when sin had let in death upon our race, we see this state of mortality was not at first so short, the ancientest ancestors of mankind living near a thousand years.

The explaining the inferiority to angels, by a being subject to death, is justified, as I apprehend, by the words of our Lord himself, *Luke xx. 35, 36. They who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.* Now if this be the sense of the words, *Thou madest him for a little time inferior to the angels* by making him mortal, the whole passage will not suit Adam, as it does our Lord Jesus Christ. For the crowning Adam with glory and honour, and the setting him over the works of God's hands, and the putting all things under his feet, should then, according to the natural order, have been first mentioned; and after that should have followed his being made lower than the angels; since 'tis certain he did not become mortal, till some time after God had given him dominion over the creatures. For he became mortal at his fall, whereas the dominion over the creatures was given him in his state of innocence. See *Gen. i. 26, 28.* But these things stand in the most nice and exact order, when understood of Christ. He was first made subject to death for a short space, the few years he lived here on earth, and so was lower than the angels: immediately after that, at his resurrection, when he could die no more, and death could have no more dominion over him, *Rom. vi. 9.* followed his being crowned with glory and honour; he had then all power given him both in heaven and earth; *Mat. xxviii. 18.* God then set him at his own right hand, far above all principality and power, and might, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, and put all things under his feet. *Eph. i. 20—22.* But he was made not a little, but a great deal lower than the angels, by being made mortal.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

that is not put under him.
But now we see not yet all
9 things put under him. But we

thing unsubjected to his dominion (t). But
whatever the grant made to the Son was,
at present we don't yet see all things actu-
ally subdued to him; nor has he as yet
vanquished all his enemies (u). But we
see

9.

NOTES.

8 (t) *Εν ᾧ τῷ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, εἰδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον.* For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him.] It will make no great difference, whether we keep to our own translation, or render the words, *In putting* [that is, when he put] *all things in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him.* Either way, the argument is founded upon the extensiveness and unlimitedness of the *τὰ πάντα* all things; that if any thing was left unsubjected to him (he only, who put all things under him being excepted, as 'tis manifest he must be excepted, 1 Cor. xv. 27.) the expression could not be true concerning him. And if this argument will hold, 'tis evident the words of the psalm are only true of Christ, but were never true of *Adam*; or of mankind in general; to whom God did never subject *all things*, and particularly the angels.

(u) *Νῦν ὃ ἐπεὶ ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα.* But now we see not yet all things put under him.] The meaning of this passage is somewhat doubtful, and must be fixed according to what we suppose the *him* refers to, either *mankind* in general, or Christ. If we take the first supposition, the argument will stand thus: "God, according to this declaration of the psalmist, puts all things under subjection to *man*, or the *Son of man*; which must be understood either of man in general, or of Christ. Of man in general it cannot be spoken, because the thing is manifestly false concerning *him*: for we see plainly that all things are not put under him: And therefore it must be understood of Christ." And it must be owned, that the next words seem to favour this sense, wherein 'tis not said, *But we see him who was made a little while lower than the angels*; which would have looked as though the same person were spoken of in both places: but 'tis said, *But we see Jesus, who was made a little while lower than the angels*, as though *Jesus* was distinct from the *him* before mentioned. If the passage be thus understood, it establishes the grand conclusion at which I aim, that the words of the psalm relate to Christ, and not to man in general: they are not true, if considered as an historical narration of the case of man from the creation; but they must be prophetic of somewhat to be accomplish'd after the psalmist's time. And since we have no intimation given us, that all things were ever intended to be put under an absolute subjection to mankind in general, any more than they are at present, they must be prophetic of that intire subjection, under which all things were to be put to Christ.

But I must own the other sense seems most agreeable to me; and that by the *him* here we are to understand *Jesus* mentioned in the next sentence. What most confirms me in this interpretation, is the word *yet*, which is here added, *We see not yet all things put under him.* This seems to imply, that a time was coming, though it was not yet fully come, wherein all things should be put under him. Now if this be allowed, we must, by the *him*, necessarily understand *Jesus*.

It will, perhaps, be here objected, that all things were put under Jesus at the resurrection, *Mat. xxviii. Eph. i. 21. Philip. ii.* how then could this author say that *we see not yet all things put under Jesus*?

The answer to this objection is not difficult. At our Saviour's resurrection all things were given into his hands, and he was invested with a right to, and dominion over them all; but the actual subduing them, and the bringing them into an intire subjection under him,

see that same person, even Jesus, who by suffering death, was made, for a little time, lower than the angels (we see him) crowned with glory and honour (w), that so his having died may be effectual to save
10. all that belong to him (x). For this was

see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. For it be- 10

a

N O T E S.

was to be a work of time, not to be compleatly finished till the conclusion of his reign, and just before his delivering up the kingdom to God, even the Father; as is manifest by comparing other places of scripture, where the same thing is spoken of. So when God raised him, and set him at his own right hand, he said to him, *Psal. cx. 1. Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.* And therefore he must reign, till God hath put all things under his feet, *1 Cor. xv. 25. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all, ver. 28.* Compare *Dan. ii. 35, 44, 45.*

9. (w) Τὸν ὃ βραχὺ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τὸ θανάτου, δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐσσηλωμένον. *But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour.* This rendering seems to imply, that these words, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τὸ θανάτου, for the suffering of death, are to be joined with the following; and that the sense is, that Jesus upon the account, and as a reward of his suffering death, was crowned with glory and honour. Nor is it at all disagreeable to other places of scripture, to suppose his exaltation and glory is spoken of as a reward of his suffering death. See *Philip ii. 8, 9.* But notwithstanding this, the version of our margin, *By the suffering of death,* which joins that clause with the foregoing, That he was made a little while inferior to the angels, by the suffering of death, seems to me equally to suit the use of the preposition διὰ, and it much confirms the explication before given of Christ's inferiority to the angels, that it was by his becoming mortal.

(x) Ὅπως χάριτι Θεῷ ὑπὲρ πάντος γεύσεται θανάτου. *That he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man.* The *Vulgate* version confirms the reading which our translators followed χάριτι Θεῷ by the grace of God, and the sense runs smooth and easy in this reading, the death of Christ being frequently attributed to the love of the Father, *John iii. 16. 1 John iv. 9, 10.* but the other reading χωρὶς Θεοῦ, without God, though it be ancient, is very harsh, and disagreeable to the stile of the new testament, in which ever of the three ways, mentioned by *Dr. Mills*, we attempt to explain it. Nor is the *Syriac* version much better; *For God himself, by his grace, tasted death for every man;* which no way suits our author's argument, and particularly what he immediately adds, *ver. 10. For it became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.* Where the *for* shows that he is giving a reason of what he here says, and consequently, that in both places he resolves the death of Christ into the grace and will of the Father.

The phrase of *tasting death* signifies *dying*; whence when our Lord had said, *John viii. 51, 52. If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death,* the *Jews* presently, in their reply, use this as an equivalent expression, *Thou sayst, If a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death.* Nor need we here to have recourse to the custom of some heathen countries, who used to put condemned persons to death, by giving them a cup of poison to drink, in which way *Socrates* was put to death: the language and stile of the *Jews* does easily account for this.

N O T E S.

this expression, as it was familiar with them to set forth the condition and circumstances of men by a *cup*, and afflictions are often represented as the *portion* of a person's *cup*, whence our Lord himself speaks of his approaching sufferings under that allusion, *Matth.* xxvi. 39, 42. It may possibly deserve to be observed, that our author here chooses the word *taste*, which is less than to *drink*. He might do this as suiting his discourse, that he was made only for a *little while* lower than the angels. He does not deny that he died, but seems to hint that the time, during which he continued under the power of death, was but short: he *tasted* and underwent death, but it could not detain him as it does other men.

There are farther two difficulties in the words which deserve our consideration.

i. Who are meant by *every man* for whom he tasted death. I own I have not the least doubt of the truth of that doctrine, that Christ died for all mankind, for the proof of which this text has been commonly alleged. I am satisfied that *Christ gave himself a ransom for all*, *1 Tim.* ii. 6. that he is the *propitiation for the sins of the whole world*, *1 John* ii. 2. and that God shewed his *love to the world*, that is, to all mankind, *in giving his only begotten Son* to die for them, *John* iii. 16. But still as he died for the whole world, he did it to save them only in a way of believing, *That whosoever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life*. And therefore as believers only shall share in the final advantages of his death, he may very properly, and consistently with the foresaid extent of his death, be said to die for them. And hence, which brings the matter nearer to my purpose, he is spoken of as shewing a particular regard to his church in his death, *Eph.* v. 25. *Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it*. And to say the truth, it appears most natural to me from the context and scope of this writer to understand *every man* in this place under such a limitation. Nor will it be easy for a man to avoid seeing this, who attentively considers what follows in our author's discourse. In the next verse he thus goes on with his argument: *For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings*. The nature of his argument requires us to understand the same persons to be spoken of in both verses; and consequently *every man*, ver. 9. must not relate to all mankind, but only to the *many sons* who were to be brought to glory, ver. 10. Again, these persons are called the *sanctified*, and Christ's *brethren*, ver. 11. and these *brethren* are spoken of as the *church*, ver. 12.

It will be objected, that however plausible this may appear from what follows in the context, yet 'tis hard to think that the inspired author would speak of *every man* in such a limited sense, without having before made some mention of these persons.

This objection would, I confess, be very considerable, in case it were true in fact, and we could meet with nothing to our purpose in the preceding part of his discourse. But he who observes carefully the stile of this epistle, and how distant sometimes the things are to which the author refers, will not think it hard to explain this *every man* from the last verse of the former chapter. And thus *every man* is the same as all *they who shall be heirs of salvation*. And indeed the things here connected don't stand so remote from each other, as they do in some other parts of the epistle, and especially when omitting the practical parenthesis in the four first verses of this chapter, we join in sense the 5th verse with the end of the first chapter. And here the reader should observe the skill with which our author enervates the objection, which was apt to hamper the *Hebrews*, and shews that Christ's death was no cause for their cavilling against him as being still inferior to the angels, since this was an illustrious instance of divine grace in order to their benefit. And as *Chap.* i. 14. he seems to have a principal regard to the *Gentiles* who were to be brought into the church, when he speaks of them who *were to be heirs of salvation*, so I imagine that he has here a regard to them, when he says Christ *tasted death for EVERY MAN*, designing to show that the favour was not intended to be confined to the *Jews*, but was to be extended to the *Gentiles* also. And that he had the *Gentiles* in view will appear by what follows. So that he here begins to obviate the other objection of the *Jews*, which was upon the account of the *Gentiles* being received into the church.

2. The other thing which needs explication is, why 'tis said, *Jesus was crowned with glory and honour*, *THAT* he by the grace of God *should taste death for every man*. This looks as if his being crowned with glory and honour was antecedent to his *tasting death*, whereas we are sure

a method which well suited the wisdom and holiness of God the Father, the ultimate end, as well as the first cause of all things, when he intended to bring many sons to glory (γ), to make the captain of their salvation (α) perfectly

came him, for whom *are* all things, and by whom *are* all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation

N O T E S.

it was consequent to it. See *Chap. i. 3.* I forbear to take notice of the interpretations which have been given of this text by many who have been puzzled with the difficulty. I apprehend the true sense to be this, "Jesus was crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God having tasted death he might save every man." Such an *ellipsis* or *Syllepsis* is to be met with both in profane and sacred writers. See *Gatak. advers. Miscell. post. c. 31.* where he has produced a great many instances of this kind. I shall only mention two from him, which stand together, 2 *Tim. ii. 25, 26.* *Εν πραότητι παιδεύοντα τὸς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, μήποτε δῶ αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς μετάνοιαν.* In meekness instructing those who are of a contrary mind, whether [that is, trying whether] God will give them repentance. Καὶ ἀνανήλωσεν ἐκ τῆ τῆ διαβόλης παγίδος, which literally translated is, That they may come to themselves [or repent] out of the snare of the devil; but the sense must be thus supplied, "That repenting they may extricate themselves from the snare of the devil." The design therefore of the text under consideration is this, "That God crowned Jesus with glory and honour, that so he might be qualified to pursue the ends of his death, and effectually save those who believed in and obeyed him." And thus it carries in it much the same sense with, *John xvii. 2.* Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he might give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.

10 (γ) Πολλὰς υἱὸς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα. In bringing many sons to glory.] The *vulgate* has, *Qui multos filios in gloriam adduxerat*, "Who had brought many sons to glory." With which the *Syriac* and *Arabic* agree. I see no need of this, but prefer our own translation. Farther, all these versions as well as our own refer this to God, and suppose him to be said to bring many sons to glory. And indeed, though the *Greek* will allow of a different construction by joining ἀγαγόντα with ἀρχηγόν, thus, "It became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, to make the captain of their salvation, who was to bring many sons to glory, perfect by sufferings:" yet the former sense seems preferable, as it so well suits what was said in the foregoing verse, where the same thing is attributed to the grace of God.

Farther, though the sons here spoken of are undoubtedly the sons of God; yet it may be doubted whether they are here denominated sons upon that consideration formally or principally. I rather think that our author here in his covert way speaks of them as the sons of *Abraham*. But the reader will be better able to judge of this when he shall have farther considered the following part of his discourse.

(α) Τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆ σωτηρίας αὐτῶν. The captain of their salvation.] The word ἀρχηγός signifies a captain, as we have here rendered it, or a prince, as *Acts iii. 15. v. 31.* and sometimes the first inventor or publisher of any thing, or the adviser, or in general the procurer of it, in which sense we render it *Heb. xii. 2.* the author. In this last place he calls him τῆ πίστεως ἀρχηγόν, the author of the faith, that is of the religion they professed: and were there any necessity for it this expression might be understood in the same manner, and the rather considering how σωτηρία is used *ver. 3.* of this chapter, and the author of their salvation may import the author of the gospel of their salvation. Compare *Eph. i. 13.* But there is no great need of this, and especially if we compare *Heb. v. 9.* which is very parallel to this place: Being made perfect, he became ἀιτίος the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him.

Com-

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

on perfect through suffer-
ings. For both he that san-
ctifieth, and they who are
sanctified, are all of one :

fectly qualified for, and consecrated to his of-
fice (*a*) by sufferings. And there was good
reason for this, because both Christ who is
the sanctifier, or who does away the sin of
those whom he saves, and they who are thus
sanctified by him (*b*) are all of them of one
father

II.

N O T E S.

Compare also *Acts* iii. 15. where St. Peter styles him ὁ ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς, the *author of life*.

(*a*) Τελειῶσαι. To *make perfect*.] We can't fail of the chief design of this, the context leading us so plainly to it. In general it must import the same as his *crowning him with glory and honour*, ver. 7, 9. There are two senses in which the word is used, both which are inserted in the paraphrase, as either of them will suit the scope of the text.

1. 'Tis used in the sense given by our translators, to *make perfect*. And however some have doubted of this sense, yet there are many places in the new testament which vouch for it. To go no farther than this epistle, *Chap.* vii. 19. *The law made nothing perfect*. ix. 9. *Gifts and sacrifices could not make him that did the service perfect*. x. 1. *The law can never with those sacrifices make the comers thereunto perfect*. If we take the word in this sense here, the argument will stand thus: "As God thought fit to put his Son into our circumstances, and place him in the relation of a brother to us whom he was to save; so did it appear decent and fitting, that in particular his way to happiness and glory should be the same as ours, through sufferings." This sense is fully expressed, *Rom.* viii. 29. *Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son* [in suffering first, and being glorified afterward] *that he might be the first-born among many brethren*.

2. The other sense of the word is to *consecrate* to an office, or to *invest* in it. In this sense our own translators have rendered it, *Chap.* vii. 28. *The Son, who is consecrated for evermore*. This sense will include the former; and seems very agreeable. The thing spoken of answers to what is said before, that he was *crowned with glory and honour*, which was in order to his saving us, and so he is considered as vested in an office. And this rendering seems to be confirmed by the words that immediately follow, where he is spoken of as executing his office, *For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified* [by him] *are all of one*.

II (*b*) Ο, τε ὁ ἁγιάζων, καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι. For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified. There can be no doubt that Jesus is meant by him that sanctifieth, since he is said to be one with the sanctified, and they are called his brethren. Nothing therefore here needs to be consider'd but the sense in which *sanctification* is to be taken. It seems evident that in many passages of this epistle, 'tis used in a different way from what 'tis in some other places of the new testament; and that Christ being considered in his death as a sacrifice, this sanctification is to be explained in an allusion to the old sacrifices. Let the reader consider the following places, *Chap.* ix. 13. *The blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh*. x. 10. *By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all*. Ver. 14. *By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*. Ver. 29. *He hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing*. xiii. 12. *Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate*. As the ceremonies and sacrifices under the old dispensation, cleansed the Jews from the defilements to which they were then subject, and qualified them for the service then prescribed, so the blood of Christ which cleanses from all sin, qualifies Christians now for the service of God, and by reason of that they are not unclean but holy.

- father *Abraham* (c) : upon which account he is not ashamed to call them brethren, as he does (in that prophetick psalm wherein he is personated) saying, “ I will declare thy name
 12. “ unto my brethren (d), in the midst of the
 13. “ church will I sing praise unto thee.” And again,

for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. And again, I 13

N O T E S.

(c) Εξ ἐνὸς πατρὸς. *Are all of one.*] The missing the true meaning of these words has made some expressions in the context dark and obscure, which will be very easy, when this is rightly understood. I am apt to think that somewhat more is intended by the *all* here than interpreters seem to have observed. They take the *πατρὸς* to be all one as ἀμφοτέρω, and suppose it to mean only this, that Christ and the sanctified are both of one. The thing is indeed true : but if this were all intended, the *all* might as well have been left out. I conceive that the *all* is added with a special regard to those who are sanctified, and that these being of two sorts, *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and the former objecting and cavilling against the favour shown to the latter, our author here, the more strongly to assert their right, uses this term ; but yet in a manner that would give as little offence as possible to the *Jews* to whom he was writing. And does not this look very like the spirit of the apostle of the *Gentiles*, who had the calling of them so much at heart, that he could not avoid mentioning it when he was writing to those of the circumcision ? 'Tis worth the readers while to compare this with *Rom.* iv. 11--16. *Gal.* iii. 26 — 29. upon the account of both the argument and the emphasis laid upon *all*.

The only thing that farther needs clearing in the text is, who that *one* is of whom all are said to be. Some refer this to God the Father, as though it had been said that Christ and Christians are all of one and the same God and Father. But 'tis not usual in the scripture to set forth the relation that is between God and Christ, and between Christ and Christians, in one single and common expression, as taking in both. When our saviour speaks to his disciples, he never says *our Father*, to express God's relation to himself and them in common ; but always, as far as I remember, he either says *my Father*, or *your Father*. And when he speaks of his relation to both, he chooses to do it under two distinct expressions, rather than a single one. Thus *John* xx. 17. *Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God.* Some may perhaps think that by this expression we are to understand that Christ and christians are *all of one*, as they are all of *one blood*, descendants from *Adam*, the common parent of mankind, according to that passage, *Acts* xvii. 26. *He hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.* But neither this nor the former interpretation will suit the scope and reasoning in the context. The true sense therefore of the place is, I think, express'd in the paraphrase : *Both he that sanctifieth; and they who are sanctified, are all of one*, that is of one father *Abraham*. This interpretation is confirmed by *ver.* 16, 17. *For he laid not hold of the angels, but of the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it becometh him to be made like unto his brethren,* [the seed of *Abraham*.]

12 (d) *Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren.*] That Christ was not ashamed to call his disciples *brethren*, we may learn not only from the present citation, but from some passages in the new testament, particularly *John* xx. 17. *Matth.* xxv. 40. xxviii. 10. The passage here cited is taken from *Psal.* xxii. 22. And the whole psalm seems to me to belong entirely and solely to Christ, every thing in it fully agreeing to him, and some things in it being such as manifestly can relate to no other person. I cannot therefore readily concur with those who would suppose the psalm has a double sense, or that these words are applied to Christ only

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

will put my trust in him. again, which proves he was a son of *Abraham*, in another prophecy he is brought in as saying, "I will put my trust in him (*e*)."
And

NOTES.

ly in a way of accommodation. Christ's *brethren* here are the same as his church, as the latter part of the citation informs us, *In the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee*. It may be farther remarked that our author, though he gives the same sense of the psalmist's words, as the LXX. yet he does not tie himself up to their express terms; but uses ἀπαγγελαῖ instead of δινυήσομαι in their translation.

13 (*e*) Καὶ πάλιν· Εγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ. *And again, I will put my trust in him.*] There are two things which need to be consider'd concerning this citation.

1. Its pertinence to our author's purpose. Interpreters have been much puzzled to give a satisfactory account of this matter; nor do I think it possible to be done, till the true sense of *ver. 11.* is first perceived. For what proof is it that Christ is *not ashamed to call them brethren*, because he says, *I will put my trust in him*? But when his discourse before is rightly taken, this testimony appears to be to his purpose. Thus then this is to be understood. He had asserted that Christ and those whom he sanctifies are all of one father *Abraham*; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, as he is brought in speaking of the church under that title, in the passage cited in the 12th verse. The *Hebrews* according to their fleshly mind were not likely to be displeased with this, but would readily catch at it as making much for them; they would conclude that theirs was the only church spoken of in the place cited, because Christ was of the same descent with themselves, and it was of the *Jews, as concerning the flesh, that Christ came*, Rom. ix. 5. and so as to a fleshly descent, the *Jewish* nation only were his *brethren*. And since the prophecies of the old testament assured them that the Messiah when he came was to be the son of *Abraham* and the son of *David*, they had a plausible reason for appropriating to themselves this honour of being alone that church which the Messiah should call his brethren. Nothing could be more contrary to our author's design, than to let them run away with such a notion as this: for by this means the privilege and honour of the believing *Gentiles* would be dropt, the asserting of which I take to have been his principal aim. Against this turn therefore he seems to guard in this citation, wherein he shews, that there was another reason and foundation for Christ's being consider'd and spoken of as a son of *Abraham*, that would prove the believing *Gentiles* were as much his brethren, as any of the *Jews*. However true it was, according to what has been said, that Christ was a son of *Abraham* by a fleshly descent from him, yet that is not what he at all indeavours to prove; nay, he takes it for granted, when he says, 'Tis evident our Lord sprang out of Judah, Chap. vii. 14. But his argument here is, that Christ is a son of *Abraham*, because he had the same faith with *Abraham*, and trusted in God as did the father of the faithful, that great pattern of believing. And as this was a foundation of the converted *Gentiles* being related to *Abraham* as his children, this brings his proof home to his design, and shows that Christ and the converted *Gentiles* were all of one father *Abraham*. And thus stands his proof: "All that believe in God, whether they are *Jews* or *Gentiles*, are the children of *Abraham*. Christ, as appears by this testimony, believed in God. And consequently he must himself be a son of *Abraham*, and all believers, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, must be his brethren, as being all of the same father with him: and Christ by describing himself as a believer in this passage, shows that he is not ashamed to own himself as a son of *Abraham*, or as a brother to all the children of *Abraham*." The reader may here compare the discourse of St. Paul, 2 Cor. iv. 13. *We having the same spirit of faith, according as 'tis written, I believed and therefore have I spoken; we also believe and therefore speak*. Where he speaks of Christ and himself as *believing*, and as having the *same spirit of faith* (as I have shewn in a dissertation on that text not yet published) and therefore we have the less reason to wonder at our author's discourse in representing Christ as a son of *Abraham* by believing.

H E B R E W S.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

And again elsewhere, (*Isa. viii. 18.*) he is brought in as speaking thus: Behold, I, and the children which God hath given me (f).
For-

And again, Behold, I, and the children which God

N O T E S.

2. The other thing to be consider'd is, whence this citation is taken. Some suppose it is taken from *Isa. viii. 17.* which we render, *I will look for him*, where the LXX. have Πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ. But there are two objections against this account which cannot easily be removed.

1. That this rendring of the LXX. is not agreeable to the original *Hebrew*, it being there וְקִוִּיתִי לוֹ which should more properly be rendred *I will expect* [or as our translation, *look for*] *him*. And since this author does not tie himself up to the version of the LXX. in his citations, 'tis likely he refers to some other place where the *Greek* is agreeable to the *Hebrew*.

2. Another objection against this account is, that our author in the very next words subjoins another citation, and by his way of citing the latter he shows that he makes this and that to be two distinct citations. *And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me.* Now in case he cited the former of these from *Isa. viii. 17.* 'tis hardly probable he would have made such a distinct citation of the latter, since the latter passage does in the prophet immediately follow the former, without so much as a word's coming between. *I will look for him. Behold I and the children whom the Lord hath given me, Isa. viii. 17, 18.* It seems therefore most reasonable to think this citation is taken from that song which we have in two places, *Psal. xviii. 2 Sam. xxii.* where *ver. 3.* in each place we have these words in the *Hebrew*, אֶחָסֶה בּוֹ which properly signify as we render them, *I will trust in him.* Or if any one thinks our author in his citation paid a regard to the LXX, he may suppose the passage is cited from their version of *Samuel*, where they have Πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ, rather than from the psalm, where they have Ελπιδὴ ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

(f) *And again, Behold I, and the children which God hath given me.*] This passage, as I observed before, is cited from *Isa. viii. 18.* and is by many modern interpreters understood concerning the prophet *Isaiah* and his children, as it was also by one of the ancients of whom *St. Jerom* upon the place in *Isaiah* speaks, but without mentioning his name. This interpretation of the prophet seems to me to derogate from the inspiration and authority of the epistle, which gives it quite another meaning. Much use has likewise been made of this text by the enemies of christianity, in order to expose it, and the writers of the new testament. This will be an excuse for me, if I am somewhat long in my attempt to clear this matter, which must be own'd to be attended with difficulties, and in offering an explication of the passage in the prophet which will better accord with the use which our author has made of it. And if I can't demonstrate from the prophet, that it can relate to no other but Christ; yet if I can only make it appear that there is no absurdity in understanding it of Christ, I am perswaded the ingenuous reader, who is not violently prejudiced against christianity, will for the sake of our author be ready to receive it, and to reject the other interpretation, however specious and plausible it may seem to be at the first reading. In order hereunto I shall first set down the whole context, as I think it ought to be rendred and understood, and then shall endeavour by some remarks to confirm my interpretation.

And first the context stands thus, *Isa. viii. 5. The Lord also spake unto me again, saying, 6. For as much as this people [of Israel] despise the waters of Shiloh [the people of Judah] that go softly [are in a low and weak condition] and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son: 7. Now therefore behold the Lord bringeth upon them the waters of the river [viz. the people that live by the river Euphrates] strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory [all his armies]: and he shall come up over all his chanel, and go over all his banks. 8. And he shall pass through Judah,*

N O T E S.

Judah, *he shall overflow and go over, he shall reach even to the neck*, [so as to bring them into the utmost danger and distress, but not utterly to drown or destroy them] *and the motion of his wings* [his flight] *shall be over the whole breadth of thy land, O Immanuel.* 9. *Associate yourselves, O ye people* [of Israel and Syria] *and ye shall be broken in pieces; and give ear, all ye of far countries* [ye Assyrians, and such as joyn your selves for their assistance] *gird your selves, and ye shall be broken in pieces; gird your selves, and ye shall be broken in pieces.* [Though God will suffer you to go far, yet not utterly to overthrow Judah: but when you shall attempt Jerusalem, the capital city thereof, he will miserably destroy you. See Chap. xxxvii. 36.] 10. *Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought; speak the word, and it shall not stand: for Immanuel* [will frustrate your counsel and word.] 11. *(For thus the Lord spake to me* [Isaiah] *with a strong hand, and instructed me that I should not walk in the way of this people, saying,* 12. *Say ye not, 'Tis a conspiracy, concerning every thing of which this people shall say, 'Tis a conspiracy,* [Don't upon the apprehension of danger conclude your capital city is betrayed, or through despair think of surrendring,] *neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid,* [as though God's promise would fail.] 13. *Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.)* 14. *And he* [Immanuel, ver. 10.] *shall be for a sanctuary* [hereafter to the Gentiles who shall believe in him] *but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence* [through the offence they shall take at his cross] *to two of the houses of Israel* [viz. Judah and Benjamin] *for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.* 15. *And many among them shall stumble and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken.* 16. [And he shall say] *Bind up the testimony, seal the law* [hide the sense and meaning of the Jewish dispensation] *among my disciples.* 17. *And I* [Immanuel] *will wait upon the Lord that hideth his face from the house of Jacob* [while he makes himself known to the Gentiles] *and I will look for him.* 18. *Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me, are for signs and wonders in Israel, from the Lord of hosts, who dwelleth in mount Sion.*

2. Having thus set down the context, with some brief hints of the manner in which it may be interpreted, which carries nothing absurd or disagreeable in it, as far as I can perceive; I shall now make some remarks tending either to illustrate or confirm what has been offer'd.

1. Let it be observed, that though this prophecy may have some things common to it, and some preceding prophecies, 'tis it self a distinct prophecy from those concerning *Shear-jashub*, the birth of *Immanuel*, and *Mahershalal-hashbaz*, Chap. vii. 3. viii. 4. This is evident from its being given after those prophecies, as we are assured by the preface of it, ver. 5. *The Lord spake also unto me again, saying.* Where there are two words used, either of which would have expressed the thing, אֵלֹהִים and יְהוָה, as though the prophet would have us take special notice of this prophecy's being so distinct.

2. The *waters of Shiloh*, ver. 6. seem much better understood to signify the people of *Judah* and *Jerusalem*, than of the temple as the true place of worship, because this is not only more agreeable to the prophetick stile in general, but to the stile of *Isaiah* in this very place. Thus in the next verse he uses the *waters of the river* or of *Euphrates* to signify the *Assyrians* who dwelt by that river, and therefore in all reason the *waters of Shiloh* should in like manner signify the people that lived by *Shiloh*; and as these waters are opposed one to another, unless they are understood to be both of the same nature, much of the elegancy of the *antithesis* will be lost.

3. I have chosen at ver. 8. to represent the *Assyrian* as a *bee*, which is the prophet's own comparison, Chap. vii. 8. and as flying like a *bee* over all the country of *Judea*, rather than to have recourse to our *European* phraseology, to explain the *Assyrians wings*, as though the *wings* did properly signify the *wings of an army*. I can't find that אֵלֵּיךְ is ever used in that manner, though the sense at last will not be very different.

4. As I make no doubt that Christ is meant by *Immanuel*, Chap. vii. 14. so it seems natural to judge he is the person called by that name here, ver. 8. And when *Judea* is said to be *Immanuel's land*, who else can be so well meant by *Immanuel* as Christ? what other person was there whose land *Judea* could so properly be said to be, but he whose people and subjects the inhabitants of that country properly were?

H E B R E W S.

N O T E S.

5. As *Immanuel* is a proper name, *Chap.* vii. 14. viii. 8. 'tis highly reasonable it should be taken in the same manner *Chap.* viii. 10. and therefore our translators ought not to have obscured this by rendring the words there, *For God is with us*. The *Hebrew* has no more than *לִי עִמּוּנֹה* *For Immanuel*. But if what has been offer'd be allowed, 'tis evident that the expression is abrupt, which is not unusual in that language, and that the sense must be supplied either that way I have taken, or some other of the like nature. Perhaps the regent substantive is here omitted, of which many instances might be produced, and that 'tis to be supplied from *ver.* 8. where the land of *Judea* is called the *land of Immanuel*: and so the sense of *ver.* 10. will be, *For 'tis the land of Immanuel*, that land which he has not yet rejected and disown'd.

6. I take *ver.* 11, 12, 13. to be a parenthesis, wherein the prophet seems to relate an instruction which God had given him at some other time.

7. The parenthesis ending with *ver.* 13. we must join *ver.* 14. with *ver.* 10. and consequently *ver.* 14. must be understood of *Immanuel*, according as we find that verse is applied to him, *Rom.* ix. 33. 1 *Pet.* ii. 8. Nor can I see to whom, beside *Immanuel* or Christ, it can reasonably be applied. It will be very hard for the *Jews* to give an account how *Hezekiah* was such a *stumbling stone*, or *rock of offence*, as is here described: nor will it be more easy for those to account for the expression who suppose *Immanuel* to be the prophet *Isaiah's* son. But if this be understood of Christ, every one sees how exactly and punctually it was fulfilled. Moreover,

8. It seems natural to suppose, that since *Immanuel* was to be a *stumbling stone*, and a *rock of offence* to *Israel*, they must be different persons to whom it is declared that he should be a *sanctuary*. And this most admirably suits the history of our saviour, who, while the generality of the *Jews* were offended at him, and rejected him, became a sanctuary to the believing *Gentiles*, and a small remnant of the *Jews*.

9. I choose to render *לְשְׁנֵי בְתֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל* *To two of the houses of Israel*, rather than with our version, *To both the houses of Israel*. The original will indeed well enough bear this latter construction; and it will as well bear the former. See 1 *Kings* ii. 39. v. 23. The reason why I prefer the former rendring, is because I don't see how what is said can be understood of the two kingdoms of *Israel* and *Judah*, if they are taken for *both the houses of Israel* here spoken of, as I believe they are universally so understood by those who so render the words. For whoever is supposed to be the *Immanuel*, it would be very improper to say of *Israel* one of the houses, *ver.* 15. that *many among them shall stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken*, if this was to be the case of the whole nation, as it must be, if the captivity of the ten tribes be here referr'd to. Farther, I think the last clause in *ver.* 14. *To the inhabitants of Jerusalem*, is exegetical of what we render, *To both the houses of Israel*, and consequently hereby are meant those *two tribes* or *houses of Israel*, whose metropolis *Jerusalem* was. When the prophecy is thus understood, the fulfilment of it is very obvious, Christ was a stumbling stone and a rock of offence to *Judah* and *Benjamin*, two of the tribes or houses of *Israel*.

10. The greatest liberty I have taken is at *ver.* 16. where I have supplied these words, [*And he shall say*] where by the *he* I mean *Immanuel*. I submit the reasons I have for this to the judgment of the reader. (1.) Such omissions are frequent in the *Hebrew* stile, and left to be filled up by the reader. (2.) I have taken no greater liberty than the LXX. have done. They have inserted of their own *Kαὶ ἐρεῖ*, *And he shall say*, at the beginning of *ver.* 17. though there seems to me to be vastly more reason why they should have made that insertion here at the beginning of *ver.* 16. For, (3.) The stile is manifestly changed at *ver.* 16. Before, *Immanuel* is spoken of in the third person: but here he is brought in as speaking himself in the first person, *Among MT disciples*; which is also continued in the two next verses. As therefore such a supply seems necessary, there can hardly be any doubt which is the properest place wherein it ought to be made.

11. That expression, *ver.* 16. *Among my disciples*, does not well suit any other than Christ. We don't find that any of the religious kings, or other good men among the *Jews* ever used such

N O T E S.

such a stile, or that the prophets used it concerning them, or themselves. Nay, though the *Jews* very much gloried in being the disciples of *Moses*; yet we find not that either *Moses*, or any of the prophets ever called them his disciples. But this stile was proper for, and often used by *Immanuel* or Christ in the gospels.

12. The sense of those two expressions in the same verse, *Bind up the testimony, seal the law*, must be owned to be obscure. I have offer'd the meaning, which seems to me most probable. "Let the testimony be bound up, and the law be sealed from the understanding of the *Jewish* nation, let them now be deposited with my disciples, as such, whether they be *Jews* or *Gentiles*, that they may have the free use, and attain the true knowledge of them." The event answer'd exactly to this account. If our blessed Lord himself understood the law of *Moses*, there were *things written* therein, as well as *in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning him, which were to be fulfilled*, Luke xxiv. 44. And the *Jews who dwelt at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew not him, nor yet the voices of the prophets, which are read every sabbath day, they fulfilled them, in condemning him*, Acts xiii. 27. Blindness then happen'd to the natural *Israel*; and while they were ignorant of the design of their law, the disciples of Christ became apprized of it. And to establish this interpretation, let these things be consider'd. (1.) That when the *testimony* and the *law* are thus joined together, ver. 20. *To the law, and to the testimony*, interpreters are agreed that hereby is meant the *Mosaic* law. And what reason can there be why they should not bear the same sense here in ver. 16. of the same chapter? Besides, the two tables of stone, whereon the law was written, are called the *testimony*, *Exod. xxv. 16*. And though the word there be somewhat different, yet 'tis of the same import with that in this place; and when the *law* and the *testimony* are thus joined together, there is the less reason to doubt that they signify the law of *Moses*. See *Psal. lxxviii. 5*. (2.) As the *testimony* and the *law*, so likewise the verbs, *bind* and *seal*, seem to be exegetical; and therefore, if we can fix the sense of the one, we may be pretty secure of the other. Now by comparing other places in the prophets, it seems plain, that *sealing* is used in this sense. Thus *Dan. xii. 4*. *But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, until the time of the end*. And ver. 8, 9. *And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end*. Compare *chap. ix. 24*. But I think there is a passage that is yet more remarkable, and serves to illustrate the text under consideration, because it seems to refer to the very same event: *Isa. xxix. 10, 11*. *The Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes: the prophets and your rulers the seers hath he covered. And the vision of all is become unto you, as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee, and he saith, I cannot, for it is sealed. And ver. 14*. *The wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid*. Thus the book sealed with seven seals, is put for one that could not be opened, or the contents of it known, *Rev. v*. There is one place, where I think, the word *binding*, has likewise a signification somewhat like to this, *Hos. xiii. 12*. *The iniquity of Ephraim is bound up: his sin is hid*. Other senses are indeed given of it: but the latter clause seems to lead us to the interpretation given by the judicious *Castellio*, *Ephraimite arctum crimen, intimum peccatum est*. "The wickedness of *Ephraim* is close, his sin is inward," viz. that cannot be seen. And though there the word כִּסְּ is used instead of כָּסַף here, that will not make any great difference, the words being near akin, and the latter, when 'tis put to signify *binding*, being acknowledged to borrow that signification from the former. (3.) This interpretation may seem confirmed by the [next verse, where 'tis said, *I will wait upon the Lord that hideth his face from the house of Jacob*: which may denote to whom the *testimony* was bound up, and the *law* sealed, or from whose knowledge and understanding, God in just judgment, concealed the testimony and the law, viz. the house of Jacob. (4.) Nothing could be more proper upon this interpretation, than to speak of the testimony and law, as sealed among, or with, Christ's disciples; because to them they were now committed, as they had been anciently to the *Jews*, *Rom. iii. 2*. The expression appears to be allusive to the custom of committing

NOTES.

mitting writings or evidences of a man's title to an estate to a person's custody. And however interpreters have overlooked it, yet the *sealed* book, and the *open* book in the *Revelation*, are to be interpreted from that custom, as the reader will easily see by comparing *Jer.* xxxii. 7—14. See the LXX. And this, by the way, shows there is no need to search for a different subject for each of those books, since both the sealed and the open evidences, rendered by the LXX. βιβλίον, related to the same subject. (5.) If the words are thus understood, there will be good reason why the *children* should be mentioned, *ver.* 18. they being then the same with the disciples spoken of here, in *ver.* 16.

13. The 17th verse seems to be mistaken by those who explain it of his expecting in general, that God would own and succeed him. If that were the whole of his design, it will not be easy to account for that clause, *Who hideth his face from the house of Jacob*. I think therefore, a respect is here had to the calling of the *Jews*; and that the sense is this: "Though God, at present, hides himself from the house of *Jacob*, upon the account of their sins, yet I will not despair of his hereafter making himself known unto them: and therefore I will wait for the time when his promise concerning them shall be fulfilled."

14. The 18th verse, whence our author takes his citation, seems to belong most naturally to that to which he applies it. According to what I observed before, he is speaking of the children of *Abraham*, not by a natural descent, but by faith; and this with a more especial relation to the *Gentiles* who believed. And nothing could be more to his purpose, than this citation, supposing that the prophecy is to be understood in like manner. Now this appears to me a reasonable supposition. For as the *children* look very likely to be the same with the *disciples*, *ver.* 16. so both seem to stand opposed to the *house* of *Jacob*, *from whom the Lord hid his face*, that is, they both stand opposed to the natural *Israel*: and who then can be meant by the *disciples* or *children*, but those who are considered as such, merely upon the account of their faith? Nor is this disagreeable to the stile of the prophet, who speaks of the converted *Gentiles*, as the *children* of *Abraham*, *Isa.* liv. 1. Compare *Gal.* iv. 21, &c. And as the disciples of the Messiah are called his *children* and *seed*, *Psal.* lxxxix. 29, 30. so it is very remarkable, that the *Jerusalem Talmud*, *tit. de Synedr.* should thus explain this text in *Isaiah* viii. 18. as *Grotius* tells us it does. See him *De Verit. Rel. Christ.* lib. v. §. 19. not. 15.

The reader also may compare St. *Jerom's* comment upon *Isa.* xxix. 22—24. The text I forbear to transcribe, because the settling the translation would be tedious. By the way, may we not suppose, that from this passage our Lord took that expression, he so often used, of *God's giving persons to him*? Nay, may not his calling his disciples *children*, *Mark* x. 24. be in conformity to this? 'Tis not improbable that he might do this much oftner in his life time than the gospels relate; and therefore, chose to use that term after his resurrection, when he design'd to discover himself to his disciples, who did not know him, *John* xxi. 5. The application is easy of what is said of these, *Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me, are for signs and wonders in Israel, from the Lord of hosts*. If we should take the sense thus, *We are for* [the working of] *signs and wonders*, every one knows how this was accomplished. But taking the words the common way, which may be confirmed from several other places of the like nature, we shall need no other explication of them than what the following texts will easily afford us, *Luke* ii. 34. *1 Cor.* iv. 9. *1 Thes.* ii. 15, 16. I know of only one objection that may be made against this from the prophet, and that is, from the 19th verse, *And when they shall say unto you, seek unto them that have familiar spirits, &c.* But this instead of weakening, is rather a confirmation of the interpretation given: such forceries and witchcrafts being much in vogue with the *Jews*, in and after our Saviour's time; for the proof of which, the reader is referr'd to Dr. *Lightfoot's fall of Jerusalem*, Sect. ix. Vol. I. p. 371.

Upon the whole now, since every part of the vision will exactly suit Christ, and some part of it, as *ver.* 14—16. will not agree to any other person, at least not without some violence offered to the words, why should we doubt of the justness of the use which our author makes of this clause?

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

14 hath given me. Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same : that through death he might destroy him that had the

Forasmuch (g) then as the children were 14. partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself in the same manner, partook of flesh and blood (h), that so he might be capable of dying, and in the way that seemed so agreeable to God the Father, he might defeat him in his design, who had by his subtilty brought them

NOTES.

For the sake of his argument, that their being called *children*, and being said to be *given* to *Immanuel* or Christ, bespeaks them to be the children of *Abraham* ; it may not be amiss to remark how exactly this agrees with St. Paul's sentiments, and way of reasoning, *Rom. ix. 7, 8. Neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children : but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh*, [by only a natural descent from *Abraham*] *these are not the children* [of *Abraham*, as the father of the faithful, and so the children] *of God : but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.* Chap. iv. 11, 12. *He* [*Abraham*] *received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised ; that righteousness might be imputed to them also : and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised,* ver. 16—18. *Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace ; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all, (as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were : who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations ; according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be.* And that they who are given and belong to Christ are the children of *Abraham*, he declares, *Gal. iii. 7. Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.* And ver. 29. *If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed.* Christ therefore having with all believers one and the same father *Abraham*, they are his brethren, and he is not ashamed to own them as such.

14 (g) To understand the connection of this verse, 'tis necessary to go back to ver. 10. where our author says, *That it became the Father, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.* To show the fitness or becomingness of this he proves, ver. 11, 12, 13. that he and they were brethren. And here he appeals to matter of fact, that Christ and his brethren were made alike in sufferings ; and because they were partakers of flesh and blood, he partook of the same, in order to his suffering and dying.

(h). Καὶ αὐτὸς ὡσαύτως μετέχευε τῶν αὐτῶν. *He also himself likewise took part of the same.* The word ὡσαύτως is well rendred *likewise*, or *in the same manner*. Nor does it here import a faint likeness or resemblance, but a proper and exact conformity. For he as properly partook of flesh and blood, as any of the children do. 'Tis farther to be observed, in what manner the conformity of Christ to the children is spoken of here, as well as continually in the holy scripture. It is not said that he took part of any thing that belonged to the children, but *flesh and blood*. These only are here mentioned as assumed by the λόγος, who was made flesh and dwelt among us, *John i. 14.* but not the least hint is ever given of the word's assuming any pre-existent soul.

15. them to be subject to death, that is, the devil (i); and so might deliver them, who from among the *Gentiles* should believe, and so become the children of *Abraham*, from that inflaving fear of death to which they had

power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver 15 them who through fear of death were all their life-

N O T E S.

(i) *ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου καταργήσῃ τὸ κρείττον ἐχόντα τὸ θάνατον, τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ διαβόλου.* *That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.* From hence some have imagined that the devil, as God's executioner, is the inflicter of death. But the truth of so general an assertion may well be called in question. However by divine permission he may be the more immediate cause of some distempers and sad accidents that may issue in death; yet that he should have the power of all mortal diseases does not seem at all probable. And though the murders committed by wicked men might justly be attributed to him, as the great instigator of their malice and wickedness, as *Cain* is said to be of *that wicked one*, and to have *slain his brother*, 1 John iii. 12. yet certainly such casual deaths, as were utterly undesigned by the persons who were the causes of them, and wherein God is said to have delivered a man into the hand of the manslayer, can hardly be attributed to the devil, without being injurious to the providence of God. Besides, death has been often inflicted by good angels, as in the case of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*, and the 185 thousand that were slain in one night, in *Sennacherib's* army, by the *angel of the Lord*, Isa. xxxvii. 36. which is a title that does not use to be given to the devil. And therefore, if I am not mistaken, the devil is here spoken of as having the power of death, not so much for the sake of any power that was continued to him to inflict death, as upon the account of what he did to our first parents, inducing them by his temptations to sin, and so to bring death upon themselves and their posterity; by reason of which he was, as our Lord calls him, *John* viii. 44. *A murderer from the beginning.* Nor is it improbable that our author here intended an *antithesis*, and that this character of the devil, as the author of death, stands in opposition to that of Christ, as the captain or *author of Salvation*.

Farther, this sense may, perhaps, be confirmed by considering the import of the word *καταργήσῃ*, which we have rendred *destroy*. But 'tis not obvious what other destruction our interpreters could mean beside what has been mentioned. 'Tis certain he was not by the death of Christ destroyed as to his being; for that still remains; nor as to the happiness of it, he having been ever since his first apostacy under condemnation, or rather reserved to it. The word should rather be rendred, that he might *defeat*, or *bring to nought*. Thus the same word is used, 1 Cor. i. 28. *To bring to nought the things that are.* ii. 6. *Nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought,* xv. 24. *When he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power.* And thus the place is to be understood: "Christ by dying has made atonement, has abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light, and so through death has baffled the design of the devil, who thought to have intailed death irrecoverably upon the whole humane race." This may be one thing that is comprehended in that passage, 1 John iii. 8. *For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.* However, 'tis expressed by our Lord himself when he speaks of his death, *John* xii. 31. *Now is the judgment of this world: Now shall the prince of this world be cast out.* Farther, an emphasis should be laid upon these words *through death*, there being a great elegancy in the expression. "Christ *through his death* vanquished him who had prevailed to bring death upon men, and so spoiled him, as it were, by his own weapon."

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

time subject to bondage.
16. For verily he took not on
him *the nature of angels*;
but he took on him the seed
17 of Abraham. Wherefore
in all things it behoved him

had been always subject in their Gentile state
(*k*). And there was good reason why he should 16.
take part with the children of *Abraham* in
flesh and blood, because he did not take hold
of, or undertake to help the angels; but he
undertook to help believers, the seed of
Abraham (*l*). And therefore it behoved him 17.
to

NOTES.

15 (*k*) He that compares the account St. Paul gives of the case of the *Gentiles*, will not much wonder that I understand this verse to relate intirely to them. Thus Rom. viii. 15. *For we have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear.* This spirit of bondage they were under before their conversion to christianity, as is imply'd in the word *again*. And we may see by ver. 21. what kind of fear it was that inflav'd them, and caus'd in them such a spirit of bondage, it was a bondage arising from a dread of *corruption*, that is according to the expression here in this place, from a *fear of death*. And how indeed could they be free from such inflaving fears, since in their unconverted estate, they *were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and being without God in the world.* As their expectations of another state, and especially a state of happiness were weak, their fears of death must have been more strong and inflaving. For want of a revelation, they were uncertain whether death did not render them insensible; and death may well be dreaded, supposing it to have that effect upon men: but where they expected a future state, their guilty consciences would be apt to distress them for want of a knowledge of the way to obtain forgiveness.

I have already hinted the reason why our author chose rather obscurely to describe, than expressly to name the *Gentiles*. Mr. Locke upon the *Romans* has taken notice of the like tenderness of St. Paul toward the *Jews*, and his care to give them as little offence as possible; which is to me an argument that he was the author of this epistle.

16 (*l*) Οὐ γὰρ δι' ἑαυτῶν ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται. *For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham.*] Our translators probably were led to this rendring, by what goes before, ver. 14. *For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.* But this use of the verb is not to be met with: and to help it out, they have been forced to supply the sense by adding these words of their own, *the nature of*, in the first clause, which ought to have been as well repeated in the second, to make the two parts of the verse appear the more uniform. The version of our margin is to be prefer'd: *For verily he taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold*; wherewith the *Vulgate* agrees: *Nusquam enim angelos apprehendit; sed semen Abrahæ apprehendit.* The word is used several times in the new testament with a genitive case, as in this place, but 'tis always in the sense of *taking hold*. The reader may compare the following texts, Mat. xiv. 31. Mark viii. 23. Luke ix. 47. xx. 20, 26. xxiii. 26. Acts xvii. 19. xxi. 30, 33. xxiii. 19. 1 Tim. vi. 12, 19. and in this epistle Heb. viii. 9. Farther, when the context is thoroughly consider'd, it will rather recommend this sense to us, than the other. For the reasoning stands thus: Christ took part in flesh and blood, because his design was to lay hold of, that is, to save the seed of *Abraham*, and not the angels; and upon that account it was highly requisite that he should be made like unto the seed of *Abraham*, his brethren, in sufferings; in order to which it was necessary for him to take part with them in flesh and blood, ver. 17. But the reasoning does not appear

to be made like to his brethren, the seed of *Abraham*, in all things, that so he might be a merciful and faithful high priest for them in all affairs he was to transact with God for them (*m*), in order to his making atonement for the sins of the people whom
 18. he undertook to help (*n*). For wherein
 so

to be made like unto his brethren ; that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things *pertaining* to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people ; For in that he is

N O T E S.

appear so easy and strong the other way, when we suppose it to lye thus : “ Forasmuch as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same : “ for he did not take upon him the nature of angels, but the nature of the seed of *Abraham*. “ Wherefore it behoved him in all things, to be made like unto his brethren.” The discourse, thus understood, seems confused : the assertion that he took part of flesh and blood, and the argument urged for the proof of it, that he took on him the nature of the seed of *Abraham*, and the conclusion, that he ought to be made like to his brethren in all things, are the same, and so his proof would be that faulty one, which is called *Idem per idem*.

17 (*m*) Τα πρὸς τὸ Θεόν. *In things pertaining to God.*] Christ is here spoken of as an high priest in divine things for men, for his brethren, the seed of *Abraham* ; and therefore his *mercifulness* and *faithfulness* must be understood to relate to his office for them in divine things. Had our author design’d, according to the imagination of some, to make a distinction with reference to the parties between whom he acts, and to speak of his *faithfulness* with reference to God, and his *mercifulness* with reference to *men*, he ought to have put *faithful* in the first, and *merciful* in the last place. But as the words now stand, the *mercifulness* and *faithfulness*, both respect his brethren, and the discharge of his office for them : that he is both merciful and faithful in all his transactions for them as an high priest. This appears farther by what is added, *To make reconciliation for the sins of the people*.

(*n*) Εἰς τὸ ἱλασθῆναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ. *To make reconciliation for the sins of the people.*] The *people* here are evidently the seed of *Abraham*, his brethren, before mention’d. And though there is some difficulty in the manner of the expression, yet the design of our author seems sufficiently secured by comparing him with himself. In order to the clearing this, let it be observ’d,

1. That he is here treating of Christ as an high priest ; and consequently ’tis reasonable to suppose, that he speaks of him as doing somewhat which belonged to the office of the high priests under the law. His discourse being intirely address’d to the *Jews*, he may well be thought, as in the rest of the epistle, so here also, to borrow his descriptions from what was familiarly known among them. Now what the business of the high priest was, he declares, *Chap. v. 1. Every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins.* And from his using that expression *in things pertaining to God*, it appears probable that he had the same thought in his mind in both places, where he speaks of Christ as an high priest : And accordingly the *offering gifts and sacrifices for sins* there mentioned, must be equivalent to what is here called a *making reconciliation for the sins of the people*.

2. This may be farther confirmed from the context. His taking part of flesh and blood was that he might dye, and through death destroy him that had the power of death ; and therefore was it requisite, that he should be made like to his brethren, that by virtue of his death he might make reconciliation for their sins ; and that this reconciliation was in conse-

T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

himself hath suffered, being so ever he himself suffered (o), when he was tried

N O T E S.

quence of his death, may appear probable from what is immediately added in the next verse, where he speaks of his suffering. So that the same thing seems to be spoken of here, and 1 John ii. 2. *He is the propitiation for our sins*, *Αὐτοῦ ἱλασμός ἐστι περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*. 'Tis true such *appeasing* or *propitiating* must necessarily be consider'd as terminating upon some offended or angry person; and 'tis usual in profane authors to speak of the person appeased, and not of the offence, in the accusative case, as *ἱλάσκειν Θεόν*, and so it may seem strange that no such person should be here mentioned, and that the phrase should sound as though Christ propitiated sin it self. But there being no sense in such an expression, 'tis manifest the meaning must be, that *he might appease God*, or render God propitious, *with reference to the sins of the people*, or in proper Greek, *ἱλάσκειν Θεόν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ*. The LXX. have used the compound of this verb just in the same construction, *Dan. ix. 24. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and the holy city*, *τὸ συνέλθῃναι ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ τὸ σφραγίσαι ἁμαρτίας, καὶ ἀπαλεῖψαι τὰς ἀδικίας, καὶ τὸ ἐξιλάσθαι ἀδικίας, τοῖς ἁμαρτίαις*. There is nothing in the Hebrew to answer to that expression, *καὶ ἀπαλεῖψαι τὰς ἀδικίας*, and blot out iniquities, and therefore if the LXX. really added it, they did it by way of explication of the foregoing expression, *to seal up sins*: but I rather suspect from the difference of this expression from all the rest, both in leaving out the *τὸ* and adding *τὰς*; I say, I hence suspect that it was not inserted originally by the LXX. but that 'tis an explication that has crept out of the margin into the text. This I mention to shew, that that expression *καὶ τὸ ἐξιλάσθαι ἀδικίας*, does alone answer to the Hebrew *וְיַכְפֹּר* *to make reconciliation for iniquity*.

And if our author here uses *ἱλάσκειν* to express the Hebrew *כָּפַר* what room can there be to doubt that he speaks of his making reconciliation for sins by his death, or by what he does in consequence of it? For to say the truth, it does not seem improbable, that the allusion here is not to the killing the sacrifice, and offering it upon the altar, but unto the atonement that was made by the high priest in the holy of holies once a year. So that then hereby will be signified the reconciliation Christ makes for us, as our great high priest that is passed into the heavens, and now appears in the presence of God for us. But then this supposes the expiatory sacrifice to be first offer'd: for as the high priest went not into the holy of holies without the blood of the sacrifices; so Christ by his own blood entred in once into the holy place, that is heaven.

I shall only add, that the figure would not appear more harsh, than is to be met with in some other texts, if we should suppose the expression to be elliptical, and the sense was to be supplied in some such manner as this, *εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκειν καὶ ἐκδικεῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας*.

18 (o) *Εν ᾧ ὃς πέπονθεν αὐτός*. *For in that he himself hath suffered.*] This rendering may be understood so as to express the sense given in the paraphrase, which I take to be the sense of our author: but 'tis so ambiguous, that it easily may, and perhaps commonly is mistaken. 'Tis ordinarily, I imagine, thus understood. *For in that* [that is, *in as much as*] *he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted*. This sense passes easily, it being really good: but it hardly gives a full view of the connection of the discourse. The best way therefore of translating the verse seems to be this, *For wherein* [or, *in that which*] *he himself hath suffered, being tried, he is able, &c.* Our author seems to me to have his eye to what he had said in the verse before, *that it behoved him to be made like to his brethren IN ALL THINGS, that he might be a MERCIFUL and FAITHFUL high priest*. And why *in all things*? Because in whatever trials and sufferings he was made like

- tried (*p*), he must be the more inclined and willing to help those who are tried (*q*).
 I. Wherefore (*r*), holy brethren (*s*), who partake of, though you do not wholly ingross the

tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted. Wherefore, holy brethren, I

N O T E S.

like to them, he would be the more effectually engaged to pity and succour them, and so to act the part of a merciful and faithful high priest for them.

(*p*) Πειραδείς. *Being tempted.*] As the sufferings of Christ are here spoken of, the word would have been better rendered *being tried*, especially considering the sense in which the *English* word *tempted* is ordinarily taken.

(*q*) Δύναται τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθῆσαι. *He is able to succour them that are tempted.*] His discourse shows that he does not speak barely of a strength and power to succour, but of an inclination and readiness to do it. Thus *Chrysostom* explains that of our Saviour, *John* viii. 43. *Why do ye not hear my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word.* Εὐλαῦθα, τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι, τὸ μὴ βέλεσθαι ἔστιν. “Here, says he, not to be able is not to be willing.” And he confirms his interpretation by the next words; *Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.* Οὐκ ἔστι ὅτι τὸ, ἐ δύνασθε, τὸ μὴ θέλειν λέγει; “Do you see, says he, he means by *ye cannot*, that they would not.”

It is evident, that persons sufferings dispose them to be compassionate, and inclined to help such as are in distress, and 'tis of that our author here speaks. And this may be farther confirmed by what he adds, when he resumes this subject, after a long digression, which begins with *ver.* 3. of the third chapter, and is continued to *Chap.* iv. 13. Thus then he goes on, *ver.* 14. *Having therefore a great high priest — let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest μὴ συνάμενον συμπάσῃσαι ταῖς ἀδυναμίαις ἡμῶν πεπειρασμένον ὃ that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted — Chap.* v. 2. *Who can συνάμενος have compassion on the ignorant, and them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity.*

I (*r*) Οθεν. *Wherefore.*] The reason of this illative particle's being here used, seems not to have been observed by interpreters. But it will appear to be very proper, when the following expressions are rightly understood, and when it is observed that our author here begins a practical application of the matter he had been upon in the two foregoing chapters. This will be farther cleared in the following notes.

(*s*) Ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι. *Holy brethren.*] 'Tis very familiar with the apostles to stile their fellow christians *brethren*, and *saints* or *holy*: and *St. Paul*, in two other places, joins both these together, *Col.* i. 2. *To all the holy and faithful brethren.* See the note upon the place. *1 Thes.* v. 27. *I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read to all the holy brethren.* It may therefore be thought that there is no peculiar aim in our author's speaking to them in the same manner in this place. But I remember not any instance wherein christians are directly address'd and spoken to under this character; and perhaps, considering that he here begins an inference from his foregoing discourse, there may not be any thing unreasonable in the following conjecture, which I offer to the reader, merely as such, being not very confident of it my self. Our author then had described christians in the foregoing chapter, as the children of *Abraham*, for which cause he shows that Christ, who was also a son of *Abraham*, was not ashamed to call them *brethren*. Of him he speaks under the title of *he that sanctifieth*, them he describes as *those who are sanctified*. Why then may he not be here understood to address himself to them as the *brethren of Christ*, and *sanctified* by him in the sense before given?

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the apostle and high priest of our profession, Christ Jesus; who was faithful to him that ap-

the heavenly calling (*t*), in order to your rightly improving the advantage you are favoured with, be careful to consider (*u*) Jesus Christ, whom I have been representing to you as the apostle and high priest of our religion (*w*), who was faithful to God the Father who appointed him, exactly executing the commands he gave him (*x*), and

2.

NOTES.

(*t*) Κλήσεως ἐπερανίε μέτοχοι. *Partakers of the heavenly calling.*] In *Phil.* iii. 14. we read of τῇ ἄνω κλήσεως, *the high calling of God in Christ Jesus*: with which this text uses to be reckoned parallel. Nor would I much contest it, and especially considering the tenor of the discourse in the two preceding chapters, compared with *Chap.* xii. 25. But if there be any strength in the conjecture offer'd in the preceding note, the κλήσις *calling* here may be expounded by what is said of Christ, *Chap.* ii. 11. *He is not ashamed to call them brethren, ἀδελφὸς ἀνθρώπων καλεῖν.* And so the sense would be, "Partakers of this heavenly denomination of the brethren of Christ." But if that conjecture be disallowed, we must yet have recourse to the former chapter for the explaining the word *partakers*. There he represents the undertaking of Christ to have been for the seed of *Abraham*, whereby he avoids the expressly mentioning the *Gentiles*, that he might not give offence, but he plainly implies that those of them who believed were part of the seed of *Abraham*. And this I suppose is the design of his expression here, that as the *Jews* who believed were partakers of the heavenly calling, so they were only partakers, since the believing *Gentiles* did likewise partake of the same. Nothing can be more agreeable than this to the temper of *St. Paul*, if he was the writer of this epistle: for as he was the apostle of the *Gentiles*, they always lay near his heart; nor would he ever give up their claim or right, however cautious he might be to give as little offence as possible to those of his own nation.

(*u*) Κατανοήσατε. *Consider.*] After so particular a discourse concerning Christ, as that in the foregoing chapters, 'tis hardly to be thought that the only direction he intended to infer from it was that they should *consider* him. This therefore is to be regarded as the beginning only of that direction which he intended, and from which he makes a digression, *ver.* 3. which ends with *ver.* 13. of the next chapter, after which he returns to what he had begun, as will easily appear to any one who attentively compares what he there says with the latter end of the second chapter.

(*w*) Τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμερῆς. *The apostle and high-priest of our profession.*] In these words our author refers to what he had said of Christ in the two former chapters. Christ is the *apostle* of our profession, as he was sent of God to institute the christian profession, and God spake to men by him, *Chap.* i. 2. the gospel began to be spoken by him, *Chap.* ii. 3. And that he is the *high-priest* of our profession is asserted in the two last verses of the foregoing chapter. And the accounts given of him as to both these characters, may well recommend him to our consideration. So that the *wherefore* here is most pertinent, the duty of considering Christ being wholly inferr'd from what had been before delivered concerning him.

2 (*x*) Τὸ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν. *To him that appointed him.*] These words were improved by some zealots for orthodoxy among the ancients, as an occasion of cavilling against this epistle; because they thought it spake of Christ as *made*, as the word more commonly imports, and is indeed rendred in our margin; and they could not relish an author who said that God *made* Christ.

and of whom the same may be said, which God testified of his servant *Moses*, That he *was faithful in all his house* (y). pointed him, as also *Moses* *was faithful* in all his house.

N O T E S.

Christ. This gave no uneasiness to those more ancient and learned fathers who lived before those warm debates, and who did not stick to speak of Christ as *ποίημα, κτίσμα, γέννημα*, &c. *the workmanship, creature, off-spring*, &c. of the Father. But to say the truth, the objectors needed not to have been disgusted at the epistle upon this account, since there is no necessity of taking the word in the sense they did, as though it must unavoidably import a proper creation: for it often imports no more than what our translators have expressed, *viz. appointed*. So *Mark* iii. 14. *Ἐποίησε δώδεκα*. He ordained [or appointed] twelve. See below the note upon *Chap.* xii. 27. But however needlessly they imagined our author to speak of Christ as made or created by the Father; yet it must be owned that the notion of Christ's being equal to the Father, does not very well consist with his being subject to the Father's appointment. But if men will be displeased with this epistle upon such an account, there will be perhaps no book of the new testament left that will not offend them.

(y) These words are taken from *Numb.* xii. 7. where God speaks in this manner concerning *Moses*. Farther, this passage seems to me to be therefore mentioned, that he might the more handsomely introduce the comparison he proceeds to make between Christ and *Moses*, than which nothing could be more to his purpose.

S E C T. V.

C H A P. III. 3.—IV. 13.

C O N T E N T S.

OUR author having before compared Christ with the angels, in whom as the messengers of God to their ancestors the *Jews* used to boast, and that not without cause, and having argued how much superior Christ is to them, he here takes occasion, from the mention made of *Moses* in the verse before, to run out in a long digression, which fills up this section, and is to be consider'd as a parenthesis, to make a comparison between him and *Moses*, in being whose disciples the *Jews* exceedingly trusted, and upon that account highly valued themselves. He had given a hint before that Christ was superior to all the old prophets who had been sent to the *Jews*, in as much as God had reserved the last, fullest,

fullest, and most noble discoveries of his will to be made known by him ; and he that had spoken to the fathers by the prophets, had now in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, *Chap. i. 1.* Now none of the old prophets were equal to *Moses*, *Deut. xxxiv. 10--12.* Nor was any one of them in so great esteem with the *Jews*. And therefore if he proved that Christ was preferable to *Moses*, the necessary consequence must be that he excelled all the prophets, nor could the *Jews* avoid this consequence upon their own principles. Besides, nothing could better suit his design of establishing the *Hebrews* in their christian profession, in which they were very apt to waver, from the great regard they paid to the old law, than to compare together the two authors and publishers of those two religions. Having done this, *ver. 3—6.* he borrows an example from what befel the *Israelites* soon after the publication of the law by *Moses*, and the severity with which God punished their unbelief after he had done so much for them, and made them a promise of, and was actually conducting them to a rest, and thereby he dissuades them from the like unbelief with reference to Christ ; arguing at the same time that in case of their believing and being steadfast in their profession, they had as certain an assurance of obtaining a happy rest, as the *Israelites* had.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

3 FOR this *man* was counted
ed worthy of more glory
ry than *Moses*, in as much
as he who hath builded the
house, hath more honour
4 than the house. For every

(F)OR this man Christ Jesus was intitled
to more honour and glory than *Moses*,
in as much as he is much more nearly related
to the head and founder of the family, who
must be supposed to have the greatest honour
of the family (2). For every house or fa-
mily

NOTES.

3 (2.) Καθ' ὅσον πλεονεκτήμην ἔχει ὁ οἰκοδομῶν αὐτόν. For as much as he who hath builded the house, hath more honour than the house.] The common way of explaining this is by representing *Moses* as being himself a part of the house, and Christ as the builder of the house; who must by virtue of his building it have more honour than the house, and much more than *Moses* who was only a part of it. But however plausible this may seem in expounding this verse by it self, it will not be very easy to make the interpretation agree with what follows. For what can then be meant by the next verse; For every house is builded by some man: but he that built all things is God? I know 'tis pretended, that hereby is asserted, that Christ

5. mily has some founder or head ; but he who is the original founder and supreme head of the church and all families and societies is God the Father. Now *Moses* was indeed related to him,

house is builded by some man ; but he that built all things is God. And *Moses* 5

N O T E S.

Christ is God, because he built all things ; and consequently he must be worthy of greater glory than *Moses* who built them not. But there is little reason to think this to be our author's argument. For had it been so, he would doubtless have stopt here, nothing farther being necessary to support his assertion, when once it appeared that Christ was God, the creator of all things. But that this is not his argument appears plainly by his adding that Christ was faithful as a *Son*, and not as a *Servant*, which would be very impertinent after his declaring him to be God the creator of all. The stress therefore of his argument, as appears by the conclusion of it, lies upon his being *faithful as a Son*, and not upon his being God.

The common explication being very unlikely, we are to seek for a better. Now here I observe that the *vulg.* renders the place otherwise, and in my mind much better than our translators. *Amplioris enim gloria iste præ Moyse dignus est habitus, quanto ampliorem honorem habet domus, qui fabricavit illam.* "This man was counted worthy of more glory than *Moses*, in "as much as he hath the greater honour of the house, who builded it." This construction of the words is every whit as exact as the other : nor has our author determined us to the sense given by our translators, by using either *ἢ*, or *παρὰ*, which he uses in the former clause of the verse. And truly had he meant what our translation expresses, 'tis not improbable that he would have here repeated the preposition *παρὰ*, as well as he does the word *πλείων*. 'Tis farther to be remarked, that the comparative degree is here used instead of the superlative. This is not unusual in the Greek language. So in the new testament *μείζων* is put for *μέγιστος*, *Matth.* xviii. 1, 4. xxiii. 11. *1 Cor.* xiii. 13. And thus our own translators have rendred *πλείων* by *most*, *Luke* vii. 42, 43. 'Tis very proper likewise here to add the observation of *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond*, that *οἶκος* in this place is to be understood of an house, as that signifies a family, rather than a material edifice ; and so the building here spoken of must be consider'd as the building of a family. And this is very agreeable to the Hebrew way of speaking, not only as to the signification of the word *בית* but of *בנה* also. See *Ruth* iv. 11. *2 Sam.* vii. 27. And in two places the LXX. have rendred it by *τεκνοποιεῖν*, *Gen.* xvi. 2. xxx. 3. He that builded the house therefore is the same as the father, head, or master of the family ; and the sense is evident, that the head of the family has the greatest honour of the family, or of any that are in it. The next verse is to be understood in like manner : *For every house is builded by some man* : that is, every family, every kingdom or society has some founder, and some head : but he who built all things is God : that is, the original founder, and supreme head of all families and societies is God himself.

But still it will be demanded, how is this a proof of the author's assertion, that Christ is counted worthy of more honour than *Moses* ? Now our author seems to me to have omitted one part of his argument, leaving it to be supplied by his readers, it being not very obscure when all things are consider'd. Thus then I understand his reasoning : "The nearer the "relation is in which any one stands to the head of the family, who has the greatest honour "in the family, the greater honour must that person have in the family by virtue of that relation. But Christ, as a Son, is more nearly related to God, the head of the church which is "his family, than was *Moses* as a servant. Therefore Christ is worthy of more honour than "Moses." Nor is it unusual for authors in this manner to leave out one proposition of their argument ; which is then called an *enthymem*. The next verse confirms this account : *For every*

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

verily *was* faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after ; But Christ as a Son over his own house : whose

him, but it was only as a servant (*a*), and he was faithful in that relation for a testimony of the things that were afterwards to be revealed (*b*). But Christ was faithful to him as a Son (*c*) appointed by him to be over his [God's] house,

6.

NOTES.

every house is builded by some person ; but he who built all things is God : that is, " As every house has some head who is the most honourable in it, so God, who is the supreme head and founder of the church, and all other families and societies, is the most honourable of all ; and the nearer the relation is in which any stand to him, the more honourable they must be.

5 (*a*) *Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant.*] Our author here refers to the same text he did before, *ver. 2.* for that speaks of *Moses* under this very character, *Numb. xii. 7.* *My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house.*

(*b*) *Εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων.* *For a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after.*] The meaning seems to be, that *Moses* was designed to prepare God's church to receive the message which Christ was to bring ; and that by his writings he so testified of Christ, as that they who duly attended to what he said, might come to a certain knowledge of the truth of what Christ should deliver when he came. It seems very unreasonable to suppose that the law of *Moses* had little or no relation to Christ. The sense here given is, I think, indisputably warranted by the new testament. Our Saviour himself speaks most expressly to this purpose, *John v. 46, 47.* *Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me : for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words ?* In like manner he tells his apostles after his resurrection, *Luke xxiv. 44.* *These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.* Hence *St. Paul* says of himself, *Acts xxvi. 22.* *That he witnessed both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come.* And we meet with several expressions to the same purpose in this epistle. Thus *Chap. viii. 5.* *The priests who offer'd gifts according to the law, are said to serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things.* Again, *Chap. ix. 7—9.* *By the high-priest's going alone into the second tabernacle, once a year, not without blood, the holy Ghost is said to signify this, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing, which was a figure for the time then present.* Compare *ver. 23.* and *Chap. x. 1.* Compare also the notes upon *Col. ii. 8, 16, 17.* Our author seems to give a farther hint of an argument of the superiority of Christ to *Moses.* For if *Moses* was thus to prepare men for Christ, 'tis but reasonable to think that Christ was superior to him. Besides, *Moses* was in his house, Christ was over it.

6 (*c*) *Χεῖρς ᾧ ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.* *But Christ as a Son over his own house.*] As the relation of a son is the most near and honourable, this bespeaks Christ to be counted worthy of more honour than *Moses*, who was but a servant. And such a stress being laid upon this here, we see the reason why our author in the beginning of his epistle chose to express himself in that manner, *God hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son*, in contradistinction to his speaking by the prophets of old : for hereby he prefers him to all the prophets.

Farther, our rendring this passage is utterly disagreeable to the scope and phraseology of the context, and quite spoils the sense. The words ought to have been translated thus : *But Christ as a Son over his* [that is, God's, or the Father's] *house.* That this is the just and proper rendring of the words, will appear by the following arguments.

house, and we are God's house or family, if we steadfastly retain unto the end of our lives that hope which with boldness and glorying we profess'd at our first embracing the christian religion (*d*). Wherefore

house are we, if we hold fast the confidence, and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end. Wherefore 7

N O T E S.

1. If Christ is here consider'd as the supream head and lord of the church, and the church is said to be Christ's *own* house, the speaking of him as a *Son* was impertinent and foreign to the design of the writer : for he would then be over the house not as a *Son*, but as the *original lord* and *master* of it.

2. The argument requires that Christ should be said to be faithful to the same person, as a *Son* over his house, to whom *Moses* was faithful in his house as a servant. And who can that be but God, or the Father? Compare *ver. 2, 5*.

3. Some, and they such as probably would like well enough of our common translation, have asserted that the church is never said to be Christ's; but is always called the church of God, when the proprietor of the church is mentioned. If they will abide by their own assertion, they ought not to pretend that the church is here called Christ's own house. I confess I can't go the length these writers do. There are at least expressions that are equivalent to the church's being called Christ's. Thus *Eph. i. 22, 23*. *God gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his [Christ's] body.* *Ver. 29, 30, 32.* *No man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church. For we are members of his [the Lord's] body, of his flesh, and of his bones — I speak concerning Christ and the church.* Nay, *Rom. xvi. 16.* 'tis said, *All the churches of Christ salute you.* So the *Syr. Vulg.* and the best MSS. and the ancient fathers read it. Nor is there more than one MS. which reads *God* instead of *Christ*. However 'tis certainly most ordinary and common for the church to be called the *church of God*: and therefore we should not force the other stile upon any text, where there appears not any thing in the text it self to oblige us to it, and 'tis evident there is nothing of that nature to be found here, but the contrary.

4. Our translation is quite contrary to the stile here used. *His house* in every other place in the context, confessedly signifies the house of God, that is the Father. Thus, *ver. 2.* *Moses was faithful in all his [God's] house:* and *ver. 5.* *Moses was faithful in all his [God's] house as a servant:* And this house is therefore spoken of as God's, because he built it, *ver. 4.* And why then should our translation insert the word *own*, as though the church were said to be Christ's *own* house? Or why should we not thus understand the place, "That Christ as a Son, was faithful to God the Father who had appointed him over his [that is, God's] house?"

5. If this be not sufficient, yet the sense seems to be fixed by what immediately follows; *whose house are we.* For as he is here putting the *Hebrews* upon considering Christ as a faithful high-priest, *ver. 1.* he must be understood to speak of him as an high-priest, not over his *own* house properly, but over *God's* house. And this is confirm'd by another place, where he is upon the same argument, and may be thought, perhaps, to have an eye to what he had said here, *Heb. x. 21, 23.* *Having an high-priest over the house of God, — let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering.*

(*d*) *Εαντες ἡ παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα τὸ ἐλπίδος, μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατὰ χάωμεν.* If we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.] As *βεβαίαν* here agrees in construction with *ἡ παρρησίαν*, I take the interjected clause *καὶ τὸ καύχημα*, to be exegetical, and so should choose to render the whole thus, *If we hold fast the confidence (even the rejoicing) of the hope firm unto the end.* Our author seems here to have had a respect to that confession.

TEXT.

P A R A P H R A S E.

8.

as the holy Ghost saith, To day if ye will Hear his voice, Harden not your Hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the

fore (e) (as the holy Ghost says by David (f), to day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as was done by your ancestors in the provocation, in the day of the temptation in the wilderness: where-

N O T E S.

confession which they used to make of their faith and hope at baptism. There are two places in this epistle which deserve to be compared with that before us. The first is ver. 14. of this chapter, where he has manifestly a regard to what he had said here. *For we are made partakers of Christ, εἰς αἰῶνα ἢ ἀρχὴν ἢ ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν καὶ ἀσφαλῆ, if we hold fast the beginning of the confidence firm unto the end.* Which renders it highly probable that the confidence ἢ παρρησία here, and the beginning of the confidence, ἢ ἀρχὴ ἢ ὑποστάσεως there, are the same, since exactly the same thing is said of both. Nor do I see to what we can better refer the beginning of the confidence, than to that confidence, or παρρησία which christians expressed at first, or at their entrance into the christian church, which confidence or hope in Christ they used to express with joy and glorying.

The other place which I think ought to be compared with this, is where he is treating of the same argument, and does most expressly speak of baptism, Chap. x. 22, 23. *And having our bodies washed with pure water, κατέχωντες τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῆς. Let us hold fast the profession of the hope without wavering.* That these two clauses ought thus to be joined together, and not to be separated, as they are in our translation, see the notes upon the place. None I suppose will doubt that the *having our bodies washed with pure water* relates to baptism. Now the expressions that follow are exactly parallel to what we meet with here. *Κατέχωντες ἀκλινῆς, let us hold fast without wavering* is plainly equivalent to *κατέχωντες βεβαίαν μέχρι τέλους, Let us hold fast firm unto the end*; and the *profession of the hope, τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος*, answers very well to *τὴν παρρησίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος*, the confidence of the hope: and therefore since he evidently speaks of the profession of the hope as made at baptism, when their bodies were washed with pure water, I can't see what reason there can be to doubt that the παρρησία or confidence of the hope, is spoken of as express'd at the same time. Let it be here observed, that there is no profession that men make of their hope or faith that can avail them, unless they abide by it, and hold it fast to the end.

7 (e) Διό. *Wherefore.*] None of our commentators seem to have hit upon the true design or connection of this word. They make it fall in, and to be connected with some part of the following citation, which is manifestly absurd. The reader need not be detained with an examination or confutation of the several accounts which others have given, because when the natural and easy connection is suggested to him, he will of himself discard those that are forced and disagreeable. This *wherefore* then connects with the beginning of ver. 12. *Wherefore take heed, brethren; lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, &c.* And the citation from Psal. xcv. 7, &c. which comes between, is to be read in a parenthesis. Nothing need farther be added here, but that having cited that psalm, he dilates upon it, and applies it to his purpose, in the following part of this, and the beginning of the next chapter.

(f) *As the holy Ghost saith, To day, &c.*] God's judgments upon men for their sins, should be a warning to all succeeding ages that they should beware not to commit the like. Accordingly David, or the holy Ghost by him, with good reason cautions those of his time, from the tremendous example of their ancestors in the days of Moses, not to be guilty of such wickedness as they were: and our author might as justly apply the same example as a warning to christians: for as St. Paul says concerning this very case, 1 Cor. x. 6. *These things were our examples,*

PARAPHRASE.

TEXT.

9. wherewith your fathers tempted me (g),
 10. proved me (h), and saw my works forty
 years (i). Wherefore I was grievously offend-
 ed
- wilderness: When your fa- 9.
 thers tempted me, proved
 me, and saw my works for-
 ty years. Wherefore I was 10

NOTES.

to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. And again, ver. 11. All these things happened unto them [the Israelites] for examples, and they are written for our admonition [the admonition of us believing Gentiles] upon whom the ends of the world are come, that is, who live under the dispensation of the Messiah. So that there is no occasion at all to imagine that the history here referr'd to, or that the words of the psalmist, implied any typical prediction or any prophecy concerning Christ. Neither the psalmist, nor our author have made any other use of that history, than any historian or political writer would have made of such an historical matter. The meaning of the passage, as it stands in the psalm, is sufficiently plain; and therefore what I shall say upon it, will be chiefly to compare our author's citation here with the *Hebrew* and the *LXX*.

9. (g) Οὐ ἐπέρασάν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν. *When your fathers tempted me.* The words are exactly the same in the *LXX*. and answer perfectly to the *Hebrew*: but I think they ought to have been translated, *Wherewith your fathers tempted me*. The οὐ, according to the manner of the *Greek* construction, relates to the τὸ πειρασμῶν, *temptation*, mentioned in the verse before, rather than to ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, *in the wilderness*. I grant the translation of the *Vulg.* which has here *ubi*, that is, *where*, has nothing disagreeable to the *Greek* construction: but my reason for preferring the other translation which is followed by the paraphrase, is because it makes the *Greek* exactly agree with the *Hebrew* כִּי־מָסָה בְּמִדְבַּר אֲשֶׁר נִסִּיתִי it being an elegance with them to join to the substantive the conjugate verb with אֲשֶׁר prefixed to it. Thus *Psal.* lxxix. 12. *And render to our neighbours seven fold into their bosom חֲרַפְתָּם אֲשֶׁר חָרְפוּךָ* the reproach wherewith they have reproached thee. The same is common in other places. The *Syriac* seems to have rendred the place just according to my mind, by using ܐܝܢܐ. Instead of the *Hebrew* אֲשֶׁר, however the *Latin* translation of it renders it by *ubi*, which would have been more properly express'd by *אֵינָא*.

(h) Εδοκίμασάν με. *Proved me.* There is somewhat so dissonant both to the *Hebrew* and the *LXX*. and to the sense of the place, in those few copies which read here ἐν δοκιμασία, which the *Coptic* follows, that I suppose few will regard it. If that be set aside, the consent is universal as to the *Greek* copies which read this place in the epistle as we do. And if that be the true reading, our author follows the *Hebrew* which has בְּחִנּוּי, and not the *LXX*. who have left out the με, rendring the place, *They proved, and saw my works*. But it must be confessed that this argument is weaken'd by the *Vulg.* and *Syr.* which both leave out *me*: by which it may be thought it was also omitted in the copies they used.

9, 10 (i) Καὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη. Διὸ προσώχθισα τὴν γενεάν ἐκείνην. *And saw my works forty years. Wherefore I was grieved with that generation.* This part of the citation agrees with neither the *Hebrew* nor the *LXX*. Our present *Hebrew* copies read thus, *They saw my work. Forty years was I grieved with that generation*. Nor have they any thing to answer to our author's διὸ *wherefore*. The *LXX*. exactly agrees with the *Hebrew*, excepting that it has *my works*. It seems natural to me to suppose that our present *Hebrew* copy is somewhat different from that which our author used, which very probably referr'd the *forty years* to the time of their seeing his works, and reading מַעֲשֵׂי my works instead of our present מַעֲשֵׂי my work (which is only the difference of one point, but not of any letter) it ended the verse with the *forty years*: and that then it began the next verse וְאָקוּל and so our author rendred the ו by διὸ. The 1 *conversivum futuri* seems there to be wanting: and 'tis a hard case,

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

grieved with that generation, and said, They do alway err in *their* hearts; and they have not known my ways. So I swear in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest. Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God. But exhort one ano-

ed with that generation, and said, They do alway err (*k*) in their heart, and they have not known my ways. So I swear (*l*) in my wrath, They shall not enter (*m*) into my rest) take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you such an evil heart of unbelief as was in them, that should cause you to depart from the living God (*n*). But as long as

NOTES.

case, if we can't trust this inspired writer, that it was not wanting in the copies of his time. The *Vulg.* and *Syr.* fully confirm this to have been the reading in the epistle. Nor do I see any reasonable doubt can be made of it upon the account of what is said *ver. 17. But with whom was he grieved forty years?* For if they tempted him, proved him, and saw his works forty years, and for this cause he was grieved with them; I cannot perceive why he might not speak of them in the manner he does, as *provoking him forty years.*

(*k*) Αὐὲ πλανῶνται. *They do alway err.*] The *Hebrew* has הָעַם a people erring: but the *LXX.* instead of it, read alway: So also does the *Vulg.* both in the psalm, and here in our author's citation. One might therefore be ready to suspect, upon this view of the case, that הָעַם was a corrupt reading for עַל or עַלֵּם but then on the other hand, the *Syr.* reads our author's citation according to our present *Hebrew* copies, 'Tis a people that errs in their hearts.

11 (*l*) Ως ὅμοσα. *So I swear.*] The *Vulg.* has here *quibus juravi*; and *Velesius* pretends, that he found in the *Greek*, οἷς for ὡς. But as our common reading agrees exactly with the *LXX.* and well enough with the *Hebrew*, so it is confirm'd by the *Vulg.* in the translation of the psalm, where it has *ut juravi*. And which is more, where our author has this passage over again, *Chap. iv. 3.* the *Vulg.* has *sicut juravi*, and *Velesius* pretends not to have found there οἷς for ὡς. The *Syr.* confirms the common reading.

(*m*) Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται. *They shall not enter.*] Our margin renders it word for word, *If they shall enter.* But the sense is the same, this being the form of swearing among the eastern nations. See *Gen. xxi. 23, &c.* and *Dr. Whitby* upon the place before us.

12 (*n*) In departing from the living God.] By the *living God*, in this place, some would understand Christ, though there is no other text wherein it can be pretended that this title is attributed to him. And when the discourse of our author is thoroughly consider'd, I think it will be evident there is as little reason to suppose him called the *living God* in this text, as in any other. In order to the clearing this, let it be remembred, that the *wherefore*, which is the first word of *ver. 7.* is to be joined with this 12th verse, according to what was observed before in note (*e*) upon that verse. Hence then we learn, that this 12th verse is to be consider'd as a direction that is infer'd from somewhat said before *ver. 7.* that is, in short, it is a direction infer'd from the last clause of *ver. 6. Whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence (even the rejoicing) of the hope firm unto the end.* The house he speaks of, as has been shown, is the Father's, over which Christ is as a Son. Now the connection is plain between that 6th verse and this 12th, and it stands thus, "Since you are the house and family of the Father, who is the living God, if you hold fast the confidence, that is, if you continue stedfast in the faith, to the end of your lives; do you upon this account, take heed of an evil heart of unbelief; for thereby you will depart from the living God, and shut your selves out of his house and family."

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

as you are in danger, and yet have opportunity by reason of God's patience, to mind this affair, exhort and stir up one another to your duty, lest any of you should, as your ancestors in the example alleged, become hardened by degrees in your unbelief. (For we have been made partakers of the benefit of Christ's office (o), but yet 'tis upon condition that

ther daily, while it is called, To day; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold

N O T E S.

Parther, it well deserves to be remark'd how proper and agreeable the example here urged was to the case of those *Hebrews*, to whom 'tis applied:

1. In that it is taken from their own ancestors. For as an example of that kind is apt to work upon all men, so it was most likely to have that effect upon the *Jews*, who very little regarded any beside those of their own nation.

2. The evil against which he cautions them, is the same with that of which their ancestors had been guilty: for, as he shows, it is in both cases unbelief.

3. The time when the *Israelites* of old were guilty of their unbelief, might make his admonition to be the more regarded. The ancient *Israelites* were thus unbelieving presently after God had erected a new constitution, religion and government among them: and it concerned those to whom the epistle is written, to beware they did not fall after the same example of unbelief, now that God had just set up a new constitution and religion among them.

4. The consequence in each case was alike, unbelief debarring the guilty in both, from an entrance into God's rest.

5. The unbelief in the present case, was aggravated above the former, by the extraordinary character of the messenger employ'd. It was a less crime that the ancient *Israelites* believed not God when he spake to them by his faithful servant *Moses*, than that with which the *Hebrews* would be now chargeable, if they believed not God when he spake to them by his faithful Son.

6. The vast difference of the two rests heightned the danger in the present case, above that in the former; and so served very much to strengthen the argument here used. In the former case they missed of an entrance into an earthly rest, the land of *Canaan*; in the present, they forfeited by their unbelief, an entrance into a much more glorious, even an heavenly, rest, reserved for them in the other world.

14 (o) Μέτοχοι ᾧ γεγόναμεν τῷ Χριστῷ. For we are made partakers of Christ.] This verse is put in a parenthesis in the paraphrase, the reasons for which will be offer'd to the reader in the note upon the next verse. I prefer our own rendring to that of the *Syr.* and some others, *We are made partakers with Christ*. There is no doubt that christians do partake with Christ in happiness and glory, and that they are *συγκληρονόμοι τῷ Χριστῷ* joint heirs with Christ, Rom. viii. 17. But had our author intended this in the place before us, he would probably have used the like composition, and said *συμέτοχοι τῷ Χριστῷ*. Christ therefore here seems to be consider'd as the *apostle and high priest of our profession*, according to ver. 1. and so to be *partakers of Christ*, will signify the being partakers of the benefit of his office, or the receiving the advantage of belonging to God's house or family from Christ, as a Son set over this house of God.

T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the
15 end; While it is said, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provoca-

that we persevere to the end in that confidence we at first profess'd) (p). Exhort one another, I say, upon this consideration, that 'tis said, To day if ye will hear his voice (q) harden not your hearts, as your ancestors did in the great provocation of which they

15.

N O T E S.

(p) Εάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατέχωμεν. *If we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end*] Upon comparing this with the last clause of ver. 6. the sense seems to be the same; and therefore I prefer the common reading to that of the *Alex. MS.* which has τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, *his confidence*; which reading is countenanced only by the *Vulg.* So that here is express the condition of our receiving the advantage of Christ's mediation, as though he had said, "'Tis with good reason I urge you to use such care every day: for the exhortation in the psalm, in effect, does the same, there being no day in which 'tis not to be understood as speaking to men in this manner, *To-day if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.* It will not suffice us, that at our first conversion to christianity we made a good profession of our confidence in Christ; but this confidence must be maintained every day to the end of our lives. The neglect of it any day may have a sad consequence, beginning such a hardness of heart, as through the deceitfulness of sin may so increase, as that we may lose our part in Christ.

15 (q) Ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, Σήμερον εἰάν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. *While it is said, To day if ye will hear his voice.*] None of the ancient or modern translations seem to make good sense of this place. According to the generality of them, a sentence is here begun, which is not afterwards compleated. Every one expects, that after such an expression, *While it is said, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts,* somewhat should follow, either by way of explication of the passage cited, or of practical direction: but whoever reads on in the context, meets with nothing of this nature; nay, some particle or other cuts off the connection or continuation of the sentence, wherever he indeavours to fix it. Thus for instance, the γὰρ *for*, ver. 16. will not suffer us to supply the sense thus, "While 'tis said, *To day, &c.* 'tis imply'd that some, when they had heard, did provoke." Thus again, the καὶ *and*, will not permit us to join it with ver. 19. thus, "While 'tis said, *To day, &c.* we see they could not enter in because of unbelief." And in like manner the ἔν *therefore*, Chap. iv. 1. hinders our fixing the connection there. Nor do I see how this 15th verse can well be taken for the continuation of a sentence, begun in the 14th. Until a better account be given, than any I have yet seen, the reader will bear with the explication, which I submit to his judgment, not being my self very positive in it. I take then the 14th verse to be a parenthesis, and that the 15th is thus to be joined with the 13th. *But exhort one another daily, while it is called T O D A Y, lest any of you should be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin;—* Exhort one another by or from its being said, *To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.* Thus; as in ver. 13. he had express the time when this exhortation should be mutually used, while 'tis called *To day*; and the end of it, lest any of you should be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin; so here in ver. 15. he declares the ground upon which their mutual exhortation was to be built, viz. Its being said, *To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation.* The 15th verse thus understood, well agrees with the 13th: For as he there cautions them against being hardened, so he here sets down the words of the text, which shows the danger there was of it, by which consideration they were to excite and stir up one another.

How--

16. they were guilty in the wilderness. For some of them, who had heard the promise, did then provoke or exasperate God against them, although there were some few exceptions of those who came out of *Egypt* by *Moses* who did not (r), and accordingly obtained the promise, and enter'd into God's
17. rest the land of *Canaan*. But with whom was he grieved forty years? was it not with them that sinned by their unbelief, whose carcases fell in the wilderness before they
18. reached *Canaan*? And to whom did God swear that they should not enter into his rest,
19. but to them that believed not? So we see (s) they could not enter into God's rest because
1. of their unbelief. Well may we therefore be

tion. For some when they 16 had heard, did provoke: howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he 17 grieved forty years? *was it* not with them that had sinned, whose carcases fell in the wilderness? And to 18 whom swore he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that 19 they could not enter in because of unbelief. Let 1 us therefore fear, lest a

N O T E S.

However this account is followed in the paraphrase, yet it will make no great difference, if our own translation be prefer'd, *While 'tis said*, provided we connect this with *ver. 13*. I say, *exhort one another while it is said*, *To day if ye will hear his voice harden not your hearts*. The sense may then seem to be this: "I have good reason to put you upon exhorting one another *daily*, since God himself did the same by the psalmist: and as long as God may be understood to speak himself in this manner, you must have just cause to use such care, and that is *daily*, or as long as you live." The reader may find the phrase *ἐν τῷ λέγειν*, thus used by the LXX. *Psal. xlii. 3. Ezek. xxxvi. 20*. If this is our author's meaning, he might design to prevent their taking offence at his being so urgent with them: for since God so closely pressed this matter, he might well expect they should not be displeased with him for doing so too.

16 (r) He speaks of this transaction with tenderness, saying only that *some of them* did provoke, but *not all*, although among the adult, there were only two exceptions, *Caleb* and *Joshua*, who in such a vast multitude, were next to none at all. In like manner *St. Paul* is soft in his expression concerning this affair, *1 Cor. x. 5. But with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness*. Nor was it necessary for our author to set forth a case so well known in the harshest manner. Their own reflection would supply what might seem wanting, and bring the matter home upon them, who might learn by this example, that the vastness of the multitude of unbelieving *Jews*, would be no excuse for those who now believed not in Christ, nor would the smallness of the number of those who believed in him, cause them to be overlook'd or to fail of obtaining the promised rest. To which purpose, see what follows in the next chapter.

19 (s) *Καὶ βλέπομεν*. *So we see*.] The sense is good, if we render it, *And we see*: but our translation, which seems to run smoother, is justified by *Dr. Whitby*, who may be consulted on the place.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

a promise being left *us* of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to ² come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them

be concerned, lest, God having left us a promise of entering into his rest, any of you (*t*) should fall short of obtaining it. And such a promise of rest is indeed left us christians: for we have glad tidings brought to us as well as they had (*u*): but the word which they heard, became useless to them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it (*w*); and

2.

NOTES.

1 (*t*) Δοκῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν. *Any of you should seem.*] Some copies here read ἡμῶν *us* for ὑμῶν *you*. And it must be owned, that this reading, at first sight, looks most agreeable to his other expressions, as particularly to that just before, *Let US therefore fear*, and to that which immediately follows, *For unto US was the gospel preached*, ver. 2. Nay farther, this seems well to suit St. Paul's way of writing, if he was, as is very probable, the author of the epistle: for by joining himself with those of whom he speaks, he often softens what might be apt to give offence. But after all, as the common reading is warranted by the most and best MSS. and by the Vul. and Syr. I cannot but judge 'tis safest to adhere to it. And the design of his speaking so expressly to them, seems to be that he might bring the matter more home upon them, and, as it were, force them to consider their danger; and that he might at the same time give them a reason why he was so very urgent with them in the matter. The word Δοκῇ seems to be redundant in this place, as it often is in the new testament, and other Greek authors.

2 (*u*) Καὶ γὰρ ἐσμεν εὐηγγελισμένοι, καθάπερ καὶ αὐτοὶ. *For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them.*] Our own translators have elsewhere rendered the word εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, by *bringing glad tidings*, Luke ii. 10. Rom. x. 15. which is the primary and proper sense of the word; and they would have done better, in my opinion, if they had accordingly rendered it here, when used passively, we have *glad tidings brought to us*. Thus the meaning of our English, or rather old Saxon word, *gospel*, is *good news*; but this, by long use, is become appropriated to that which most eminently deserves to be styled so, the tidings of our Saviour's birth, and the way of salvation by him. And it would be very low and flat for our author to say, that what we commonly mean by the word *gospel* was preached to us christians, as well as to the ancient *Israelites* in the wilderness, since it is so much more fully, expressly and plainly preached to us than it was to them, that no comparison can be made between the two. What therefore is here refer'd to is, that whereas the *Israelites* in the promise made them, had the good news of a rest expressly mentioned, christians were not without such good news, but had an assurance of a rest, and that a more glorious one than theirs was, theirs being a rest in *Canaan*, ours a rest in heaven. And as his preceeding discourse goes so very much upon this *rest*, and the *Hebrews* might be ready to object to it, that the cases were different, and that no mention is made of any rest but that of *Canaan*, he proceeds, ver. 3—10. to prove that a *rest* is truly proposed to christians, who are in danger of missing of it, as well as the *Israelites* were of missing theirs. And this seems to me to be in a great measure the key of his following discourse.

(*w*) Μὴ συγκεκραμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν. *Not being mixed with faith in them that heard it.*] 'Tis very difficult to fix the true sense of this place with any certainty, because 'tis doubtful what is the genuine reading of the Greek. If we follow the reading our tran-

H E B R E W S.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

and in like manner will the word we have heard be unprofitable to us, unless we believe it. For in whatever age God makes to us an offer of rest, we can enter into it only in a way of believing, which shows how necessary 'tis in every such case that

that heard it. For we ³ which have believed do enter into rest, as he said,

N O T E S.

translators did, the sense may be either what they have well enough expressed, or else it may be this; The word preached was not mixed [or incorporated] into those that heard it by faith: and so the word preached is compared to food, which must be digested and turned *in succum & sanguinem*, so as to become parts of our bodies, in order to its doing us good; and then faith is here considered as the means of the word of God's being thus incorporated in the hearers.

But the words have a somewhat different turn, if we prefer the other reading, *μη συνηνεχόμενες*, in the plural, agreeing with *ἐκεῖνοι* *them*; and the sense will then stand thus: "But the word heard did not profit them, who did not mix themselves with [that is, adhere to] those that heard [or obeyed] it by faith." Whence a learned writer gives us this paraphrase, to which his notes shew him most inclined. "Or we must to our hearing God's word, add both obedience and communion with all orthodox christians, or else the word will benefit us nothing." I omit another various reading of *τῶν ἀκούσαντων* for *τοῖς ἀκούσαντι*, which seems a corruption.

To compare now the two readings, either of which seems agreeable enough to the *Greek* language; it must be owned that the latter is supported by very great authorities, viz. by very many of the best MSS. and by all the *Greek* commentators. On the other hand, the very ancient *Syriac* version agrees with our common reading, and may be reckoned the strongest support of it. The *Vulgate*, as it appears at present, *non admistus fidei*, does so too; but 'tis doubtful whether it did so anciently. If we certainly knew in what time the author of the comment upon the *Hebrews*, among St. Ambrose's works, lived, it might give us some light into the ancient reading of that version: for it being thought to be compiled by some person out of the comment of *Chrysostom*, there would be reason to judge that the *Vulgate* read in his time as we do, or else he would not have quitted that reading which *Chrysostom* followed. But this being uncertain, and the authority of such as *Beda* being too late to be of any moment, we must be content to let the *Vulgate* stand neuter in the case. There is one argument from the epistle itself, which appears to me to favour the common reading, however I pretend not that 'tis decisive. Our author seems to be here wholly treating of the necessity of *faith*, and not to be come to that of love and communion, which the other reading brings in. This indeed he mentions afterwards (See *Chap.* vi. 10, &c. x. 24, 25; 32, &c.) but that reading looks most probable which best suits the scope of the context. The matter however is too doubtful for me to determine, and therefore the paraphrase following the common reading refers it to the judgment of the reader.

Farther, to compleat the sense of the verse, somewhat of this nature seems necessary to be understood: "And as the word heard did not profit them of old for want of faith, so nor will the word heard by us profit us without faith, which is a good reason why we should fear, *ver.* 1. or why we should be diligent and careful, as *ver.* 11.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

As I have sworn in my wrath, If they shall enter into my rest: although the

that the word be mixed with faith (x), according to what God, by the psalmist, says of the particular case of the *Israelites*, So I swear in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest (y): and that notwithstanding

NOTES.

3 (x) Εισερχόμεθα ὅς εἰς τὴν καὶ ἀπαύσιν οἱ πιστεύσαντες. For we which have believed do enter into rest.] The *Alex.* MS. which reads εἰσερχώμεθα ἔν, Let us therefore which have believed enter, is therein singular, and seems not to suit the author's design. Nor do I think the reading of *Chrysostom* εἰσελεύσομεθα, with which agrees the *Vulg.* *ingrediemur*, is as pertinent to our author's scope, as the common reading, which is justified by the *Syr.* and all the MSS. beside the *Alex.* The verse has been generally reckon'd obscure and difficult, and especially because it has been thought that the citation in the latter part of it from *Psal.* xcv. is brought as a direct proof of the former; and that the psalmist was therefore understood by our author as speaking in that psalm prophetically of the case of christians; of which 'tis said there is not the least sign: nor can I pretend to allege any. 'Tis submitted now to the careful reader, whether the following account will not remove all the difficulty. By the *we* then I would not understand him to speak solely of christians. I grant, according to the distinction made in the verse before of *us* and *them*, at the first reading of this verse, our thoughts naturally lead us to understand the *we* here as so appropriated: but I don't see any absolute necessity of our abiding by that limitation. Mr. *Locke* in his *Essay for the understanding St. Paul's epistles*, p. 6. has observed, that "his frequent changing the personage he speaks in, renders the sense very uncertain, and "is apt to mislead one that has not some clue to guide him. Sometimes by the pronoun *I* he "means himself; sometimes any christian, sometimes a *Jew*; and sometimes any man, &c. "If speaking of himself in the first person singular has so various meanings; his use of the first "person plural is with a far greater latitude, &c." I judge therefore that the *we* is not to be understood of christians in opposition to *Jews*, but as comprehending all both *Jews* and christians to whom the offer of rest in any age of the world is made. Our common translation which renders οἱ πιστεύσαντες we which have believed, hardly leaves room to the *English* reader to admit this sense: but as the *Aorists* are used uncertainly as to time, it might perhaps have been better to have rendered it, For we believing do enter into rest; that is, believing is always the way wherein we [men] must expect to enter into God's offer'd rest.

(y) Καθὼς ἔειπεν, Ὡς ὥμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν καὶ ἀπαύσιν μου. As he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest.] If what has been offer'd under the preceding note be allowed, there will be no manner of occasion to suppose that our author understood the psalm to be prophetic of christians. The sense will run easily and smoothly thus: "We of whatever age or nation who have a promise made us of rest, enter in- "to it by believing, according as God himself shewed in a particular case, when concerning "the ancient *Israelites* he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my "rest. And we may well imagine that his resolution is the same concerning any other rest, "where there is the like, or even a greater reason for it. So that we may hence take this "for a general maxim in every case, that believers only enter into God's offer'd rest."

But it may be still demanded; how does our author bring in *believing*, upon which he lays the stress of his argument, when there is at least no express mention of it in the psalm?

The answer is easy: that the psalmist briefly relates there a history from the books of *Moses*; and therefore though he does not expressly mention the unbelief of the *Israelites*, yet he points at it plainly enough in the expressions by which he sets out their sin, which brought upon them

- ing God's works were finished from the beginning of the world, and consequently there was a rest of God as old as that time (z).
4. For thus indeed the seventh day is spoken of by God as his rest, particularly where it is said, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works (a). And again in this place in the psalm God speaks of his resolution in the case of the *Israelites*, when they were in the wil-

works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works. And in this place

N O T E S.

them their doom, as particularly when he speaks of them as *hardening their hearts, tempting, provoking, and grieving God*: and the particular manner in which they did this, is to be learned from the *Mosaick* history, and it appears to be by their not *believing*. Thus, *Deut. i. 32—35*. *Ye did not believe the Lord your God, who went in the way before you to search you out a place to pitch your tents in, in fire by night to shew you by what way ye should go, and in a cloud by day. And the Lord heard the voice of your words and was wroth, and sware, saying, Surely there shall not one of these men of this evil generation see that good land, which I sware to give unto your fathers.* Compare also *Chap. ix. 23*.

(z) *Καίτοι ἔργων ἀπὸ κατὰβολῆς κόσμου γενηθέντων.* *Although the works were finished from the foundation of the world.*] I can't see but that our translation has pitched upon that, among the various significations of the word *καίτοι*, *although*, which is most pertinent to the scope of the place. They seem to give the best account of this and the following verses, who suppose our author here designs to remove two objections which the *Hebrews* would be ready to make against his discourse concerning their danger of missing of an entrance into God's rest. 1. That they could be in no danger because the *seventh day* was God's rest, and into this they were entred, in as much as God had given them the law of his sabbath, which they also strictly observed. 2. That the land of *Canaan* was God's rest; and that their fathers had long ago entred into it, that they themselves were now actually in it; and so they were past all danger of coming short of an entrance into it. Both these objections he clearly removes.

I am apt to think, that though the way in which our translation renders the passage under consideration, will bear, yet his discourse might seem somewhat clearer in case we join'd this last clause with the first, and read the intermediate in a parenthesis thus: *For we believing do enter into rest (as he said, So I sware in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest) although the works were finished from the foundation of the world.* Thus it may seem to stand better as an objection started: but if it be thought otherwise, I contend not, being not positive about it.

4 (a) *For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works.*] This is cited from *Gen. ii. 2, 3*. There seems to be a double design in his quoting this passage. 1. To give the utmost strength to the objection which he supposes to be made. For hereby he allows that the sabbath, or seventh day was indeed what the objectors might pretend, God's rest. 2. He hereby makes way for his answer to this objection. For by comparing this text with the others he adds, which speak of a rest to be entred into long after that rest of God on the seventh day, and long after the *Yews* had received and observed the law of the sabbath, he shows that there must be another rest beside that of the seventh day, into which they ought to be solicitous to enter.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

again, If they shall enter
6 into my rest. Seeing there-
fore it remaineth that some
must enter therein, and
they to whom it was first
preached, entred not in be-
7 cause of unbelief: Again,
he limiteth a certain day,

wildernefs, faying, *They fhall not enter into
my reft* ; which fhows that the reft of the fe-
venth day is confiftent with another reft of
God. Therefore becaufe (*b*) there was a pro-
mife made that fome fhould enter into God's
reft (*c*), and they who had the glad tidings
of it firft brought them, becaufe of their unbelief
or difobedience, did not obtain it, [Therefore I
fay] he again (*d*) determines a certain day
for

6.

7.

NOTES.

6 (*b*) *Ἐπεὶ οὖν.* *Seeing therefore.*] Interpreters feem to have mifs'd the connection of thefe words, taking this verfe to contain one argument, and *ver. 7.* another, from whence the conclufion is drawn *ver. 9.* as though his difcourfe were thus order'd : *Seeing therefore it remains that fome muft enter therein, and they to whom it was firft preached entred not in becaufe of unbelief, and feeing he again limiteth a certain day, faying in David, To day after fo long a time, as 'tis faid, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, there muft remain a reft for the people of God.* But againft this account there lie two objections. 1. That 'tis doubtful whether *ἀρα* is ever ufed in this manner as a redditive to *ἐπεὶ*, ftanding at a diftance from it : but in this cafe I am apt to think he would have ufed *εἰ* inftead of *ἐπεὶ*. 2. Had he here ufed two diftinct arguments, there fhould regularly have been a *καὶ* prefixed to *πάλιν*, *ver. 7.* as 'tis ufual in other places. I therefore choofe to connect *ver. 6, 7.* together thus : “ Wherefore feeing, “ or becaufe it remains that fome muft enter therein, &c. he again in the fame pfalm limits “ a certain day, &c.” And then the *ἀρα* wherefore, or fo then, *ver. 9.* will be free from all difficulty.

(*c*) *Ἀπολείπεται τινὰς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτήν.* *It remaineth that fome muft enter therein.*] The fenfe in which our translators took this is, “ It appears as a confequence of what I have “ faid, or it is certain from the premifes, that fome muft enter therein.” But it will not per- haps be eafy to find that the word *ἀπολείπεται* ever has that fignification. Our *English* word *remains* fometimes is a proper rendering of that *Greek* word ; but I doubt whether when we fay *it remaineth*, meaning that it is a logical inference, it would be proper *Greek*, if we fhould exprefs it by *ἀπολείπεται*. 'Tis evident that our author ufes the word in a different fenfe, *ver. 9.* *There remaineth (or is left) therefore a reft for the people of God :* and as far as I can perceive, *ἀπολείπεται*, *ver. 9.* and *καταλείπεται* *ver. 1.* have exactly the fame fignification : nor will there be any difficulty in underftanding the word in this fenfe in the 6th verfe, only allowing an eafy ellipfis to be fupplied from *ver. 1.* thus *Ἐπεὶ ἐν ἀπολείπειν ἐπαγγελία τινὰς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτήν.* *Seeing then a promife is left that fome fhall enter therein.*

7 (*d*) *Πάλιν.* *Again.*] This, as has been hinted, is not defign'd as a mere introduction of a new citation, but it imports the reiteration of fomewhat mentioned as done before, and the fenfe would, I think, be more clear and plain, were it rendred thus : “ He again limits or “ determines a certain day ; ” that is, a day of reft is determined by him after that other reft before mentioned. Nothing feems more natural and plain than thefe two verfes thus under- flood, which ufed to appear very difficult and perplexed : “ Therefore becaufe there is a pro- “ mife left, that fome muft enter into God's reft, and they who had the firft glad tidings of it “ brought them, entred not in upon the account of their unbelief or difobedience, [therefore I “ fay, to fhew that was not the only or principal reft defign'd] he again [after that reft was “ ob-

8. for the seeking an entrance into rest, saying by *David* (*e*), *To day*, after they had been so long settled in the land of *Canaan* (as 'tis said) *To day* if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts. For if *Joshua*, who conducted them into the land of *Canaan*, had compleatly given them all that rest that was intended in the promise, God would not then afterward by *David* have spoken of another day. There does therefore remain another rest (*f*) for the people of God. For whoever

9.
10. is

saying in David, *To day*, after so long a time; as it is said, *To day* if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts. For if Jesus 8 had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day. There remaineth therefore a 9 rest to the people of God. For he that is entred into 10

N O T E S.

“obtained, and the *Israelites* were settled in *Canaan*] determines a certain day for the seeking
“an entrance into God's rest.”

(*e*) *Ἐν Δαβὶδ*. In *David*.] Or rather by *David*, as our translators have well rendered the same preposition twice, *Chap. i. 1.* And certainly there is great strength in our author's reasoning. For it can't be thought that God would by *David* call upon the *Israelites* then to take care to enter into his rest, if that rest only signified the rest in *Canaan*, into which they had entred several ages before. Compare *ver. 8.*

9 (*f*) *Ἀρα ἀπολείπειται σάββατισμός*. There remaineth therefore a rest.] However our author has changed his term, yet *σάββατισμός* must evidently mean the same thing here as *κατάπαυσις*, and so both are justly rendred *rest*. And indeed otherwise his argument would be very faulty: for there would be somewhat in the conclusion that was not in the premises. The word is not properly *Greek*, but derived from the *Hebrew* שבת or שבתון from whence the *Greek* formed the word *σάββατον*, *Sabbath*, and *σάββατιζεν* to keep a *sabbath*, viz. as a day of holy and joyful rest. Hence *σάββατισμός* signifies the keeping or celebrating such a joyful rest. The reason why this word is here used seems to be, because that it was familiar with the *Jews*, to whom the epistle is directed, to speak of the happiness of good men in the other world, under the title of a *sabbath*, and to explain several passages in the old testament that mention the *sabbath* as prefiguring that happiness. Nor will it be easy to prove they were mistaken in their apprehensions. St. Paul very expressly reckons *sabbaths* among those things which were a shadow of things to come, *Col. ii. 17.* And the author of this epistle often represents the things that belong'd to the *Jews* as patterns, figures, and shadows of heavenly things. He seems to have chosen this word *sabbatism* upon the account of what he had said before concerning the seventh day's being God's rest, *ver. 3, 4.* Nor do I perceive any thing unreasonable in supposing that *Canaan* was a type or figure of a heavenly rest. This notion the *Jews* had as *Ainsworth* shows upon *Gen. xii. 5.* And to this purpose does our author discourse elsewhere, *Chap. xi. 10, 15, 16.* And certainly the words of the psalmist point at such a future and heavenly rest. For when he warns them from the example of their doom, *So I swear in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest*, 'tis natural enough to suppose him to imply, “And in like manner God will swear or resolve against you, that you shall never enter his rest, if you behave your selves toward him as they did.” They violently strain the words of our author, who from this place would argue that christians are to observe a weekly sabbath, there being really nothing at all said of that matter in this place.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as
11 God *did* from his. Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example
12 of unbelief. For the word of God *is* quick, and pow-

is entered into God's rest, hath himself obtained such a compleat and perfect rest as men cannot in this world. For he has wholly finished, and therefore ceased from his works, even as God when he had finished the creation ceased from his works (*g*). Let us therefore be careful to avoid every thing that would prevent, and to do whatever is necessary to secure our entrance into that heavenly rest, lest any of us imitating their unbelief and disobedience, should intail the like heavy judgments of God upon our selves. This we may easily do, for now as well as then the word of God is quick (*h*) and powerful

I 1.

I 2.

N O T E S.

10 (*g*) Ο ὅς ἐστις εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν κατ' ἀπαύσειν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτοῦ κατέπαυσεν ὡς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐπαύσατο ὁ θεός. *For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his works, as God did from his.*] A very forced interpretation they give, who by *he that is entered into his rest*, understand our blessed Saviour: for though the thing be true that he is entered into his rest, yet that is foreign to the scope of this place. He does not once speak of any other's entering into rest than of those who were in danger of missing it. So Chap. iii. 18, 19. *To whom swear he in his wrath that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? so we see they could not enter in because of unbelief.* To such the promise of entering into his rest is left, Chap. iv. 1. *We believing enter into his rest, ver. 3.* Compare also ver. 5, 6. *This rest remains not for Christ, but for the people of God, ver. 9.* And a proof is brought hereof in this tenth verse, *For he [every good man] that is entered into God's rest, hath himself ceased from his own works, as God did from his*; the meaning of which is, that every good man that obtains the heavenly state is freed from all labour; he then *rests from his labours*, Rev. xiv. 13. as God having finished the work of creation ceased from working. And by this account he distinguishes the rest he speaks of from the two other rests which he supposes to be objected to him; that this is compleat and perfect as the others were not. There is therefore no need at all to imagine that he interpreted the psalm as a prophecy particularly of the times of the Messiah. 'Tis true indeed, that now he was come, and had actually offer'd this rest, it was only to be obtained by him, and there was the utmost danger in rejecting him: but what he goes upon is this, that in general an heavenly rest was prepared for good men after this life, which had been always the hope of such. Now into this rest no man could be said to have entered till his work was over, which it never is while he continues here in the world.

12 (*h*) Ζῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. *For the word of God is quick.*] By the word of God some understand our Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can there be any doubt that his power may be consider'd as a very proper motive to enforce the caution and diligence before recommended. But this sense does not appear very probable, partly because this use of the expression seems to have been peculiar to St. *John* among all the sacred writers, however familiar it might be among the *Hebrew* writers; and partly and especially because it seems not so well to suit with the dis-

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

ful (*i*), and more sharp than any two edged sword (*k*), in so much that it can effectually de-
erful, and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing

N O T E S.

discourse of our author in this place. I can't find that in applying the words of the psalm he gives the least hint, that it was a prophecy of Christ; all that he goes upon is the severity of God's vengeance, in swearing they should not enter into his rest, which he supposes design'd as a warning and threatening in all succeeding ages. If therefore we interpret the *word of God* from his foregoing discourse, it should signify rather the word that was spoken by God, and more especially his threatening in this case. A learned commentator imagines that this is a periphrasis of God himself, and illustrates it from the stile of the *Chaldee* paraphrast, who often puts the *word of God* for what in the original is only *God*, or the *Lord*. But certainly there is no great strain in supposing the *word of God* is said to do that which God himself does according to his word. And it will appear upon going over the things here attributed to the word of God, that they are the same with those we meet with elsewhere, or however not so unlike to them, as that we should be hindred from understanding the *word of God* in the sense before declared. Thus when the word of God is here said to be *quick* or *living*, the same seems to be said of it, 1 Pet. i. 23. *Being born again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.* I am sensible this might be rendred *who liveth and abideth for ever*, meaning God whose the word is: but that rendring seems to be prevented by ver. 25. *But the word abideth for ever; and this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.* This seems to prove that the assertion at the 23d verse was not that God, but that the *word of God abideth for ever*, and consequently the other attribute of *living* which is there joined with *abiding for ever*, must be understood as belonging also to the word of God. Compare Isa. xl. 8. And thus as Christ, when God sent him, *spake the words of God*, John iii. 34. he says of them, Chap. vi. 63. *The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.*

(*i*) Καὶ ἐνεργής. *And powerful.*] It is not unusual in scripture to ascribe an efficacy to the word of God. Thus 1 Thess. ii. 13. *When ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but (as 'tis in truth) the word of God; ὅς κ' ἐνεργεῖται, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.* Or if it should be doubted whether the ὅς, there should not be rendred *who* referring to God, rather than *which* relating to the word, that place 2 Cor. x. 4. will be more express, *The weapons of our warfare are not carnal [that is weak] but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds.* Thus again, Isa. lv. 11. *My word that goeth out of my mouth shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.*

(*k*) Καὶ τομώτερος ὥσπερ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίσομον. *And sharper than any two edged sword.*] We have the like comparison Prov. v. 4. but that not being used concerning the word of God, is not so much to our purpose. The expression of *Phocylides* approaches nearer to that of our author, especially if we remember how applicable what he says of *reason* is to the *word of God*, which always carries the highest reason with it, v. 117.

Οπλον τοι λόγος ἀνδρὶ τομώτερόν ἐστι σιδήρε.

Reason is a weapon that penetrates deeper into a man than a sword.

The word of God is called the *sword of the spirit*, Eph. vi. 17. And thus the word of Christ seems to be called *a sharp two edged sword that proceeds out of his mouth*, Rev. i. 16. And he threatens to *fight against some with the sword of his mouth*, Chap. ii. 16. I think we may here- with well compare Isa. xl. 4. *He [the Messiah] shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth.*

The

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joynts and marrow, and *is* a discerner of the

destroy us, being able to reach so far as to separate and disjoin the sensitive from the rational soul, and those parts of the body which are most firmly united (/), and it judges the thoughts

NOTES.

The LXX. render it Τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ῥήματος αὐτοῦ, *with the word of his mouth*. And that in general seems to be the sense, though perhaps the passage might better resemble those in the *Revelations* in case שֶׁבֶט were rendered *dart* instead of *rod*, as 'tis, and very justly, 2 Sam. xviii. 14. Compare 2 Thess. ii. 8.

(1) Διῃκνύμεν ὁ ἄχει μερισμὸς ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνέματός, ἀρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν. *Piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joynts and marrow.*] The meaning of both these expressions in the general seems to be this, that the word of God is able to bring death, whence some have explained our author from the severe judgments inflicted at St. Peter's word, upon *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, Acts v. If the soul and spirit, or the joynts and marrow are separated from one another, 'tis impossible that life can remain. 'Tis farther to be observed, that our author in the former of these expressions goes upon the notion which very much prevailed among the ancient philosophers, and which many of the ancient christians did imbrace, that man consisted of three parts, a body, a sensitive soul which he had in common with the brutes, and a rational spirit. This division is now acknowledged by several of our modern philosophers, as it was undoubtedly by St. Paul, 1 *Thess.* v. 23. Upon which Dr. Hammond and Dr. Whitby may be consulted.

One general remark upon the foregoing expressions of this verse has been purposely omitted, but it shall now be submitted to the reader's judgment, whether it has any thing of weight or probability in it. Our author, as is evident, is before arguing from a tremendous judgment of God upon the ancient *Israelites*, the ancestors of those to whom his epistle is directed; and in this verse to press upon them that care and diligence he had been recommending, he sets before them the efficacy and virtue of the word of God, connecting this verse with the former by a *or*, or *for* in the beginning of it: is it not natural then to suppose, that what he says of the *word of God* may have a relation to somewhat remarkable in that fore punishment of which he had been speaking? It may be observed that the *word of God*, upon the account of the effect it has in punishing the disobedient, is sometimes compar'd to *fire*, Jerem. v. 14. *Behold I will make my words in thy mouth fire, and this people wood, and it shall devour them.* Chap. xxiii. 29. *Is not my word like as a fire?* There is nothing more penetrating and irresistible than *fire*: but especially is lightning of that nature which is called the *fire of God*, or *from the Lord*, &c. May not then our author in the account he here gives of the word of God, have a respect to that fore judgment of God, by which many of the carcases of the *Israelites* fell in the wilderness? Thus in the punishment that was inflicted upon *Nadab* and *Abihu*, Lev. x. 2. 'tis said, *And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord.* Nor can there be any doubt that this *fire from the Lord* was lightning, the effect answering so exactly thereto: for though it killed them it hurt not their coats, as appears by *ver. 5.* that they were *carried in them out of the camp.* Now this judgment was inflicted by or according to the word of God, *ver. 3.* *Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and in all the people I will be glorified.* So again, Numb. xi. 1—3. *When the people complained it displeased the Lord, and his anger was kindled, and the fire of the Lord burnt among them and consumed them that were in the uttermost parts of the camp. And the people cried unto Moses, and when Moses prayed unto the Lord, the fire was quenched. And he called the name of the place Taberah, because the fire of the Lord burnt among them.*

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

13. thoughts and intents of the heart (*m*). And there is no creature whatever that is not manifest in his sight (*n*): but every thing, without disguise, and just as it is, lies open and obvious (*o*) to the eyes of that God with

thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any 13 creature that *is* not manifest in his sight: but all things *are* naked, and opened unto the eyes of him

N O T E S.

To this the psalmist refers, *Psal.* lxxviii. 21. *The Lord heard this and was wroth, so a fire was kindled against Jacob, and anger also came up against Israel.* Thus again at the destruction of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, we read, *Numb.* xvi. 35. *There came out a fire from the Lord, and consumed the two hundred and fifty men that burnt incense.* Concerning this the psalmist says, *Psal.* cvi. 18. *A fire was kindled in their company, the flame burnt up the wicked.* I need not say much to show how well this notion will suit the several expressions here used. If the word of God be here put to signify this severe judgment which is the effect of it, it might well be said to be *quick* or *living*, that term being applied in a great latitude to things that are active, and seem to have a spontaneous motion. Thus our Saviour speaks of *living water*, *John* iv. 10. vii. 38. which is to be explained as an allusion to *springing water*, which is called *living water* in the *Hebrew*, *Gen.* xxvi. 19. And as nothing moves more swiftly, so nothing is more *powerful* and irresistible than lightning, of which every age furnishes us with sad instances. 'Tis likewise *sharper than any two edged sword*, as it does in the shortest moment we can imagine make its way through all obstacles, and pierces to what part God pleases. For it seems to me that the two edged sword is here consider'd as piercing into the flesh by the point, which is facilitated by the two edges, rather than as hewing and cutting with the edge, for which one edge might perhaps serve as well as two. Nor can any doubt that it often pierces to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, that it strikes men dead in an instant.

(*m*) Καὶ κελίης ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας. *And is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.*] If what is said in the latter end of the foregoing note be admitted, the sense may rather seem to be, that the word of God is a judge to censure and punish the evil thoughts and intents of the heart. This brings the matter home to the exhortation with which he began, *Chap.* iii. 12, 13. That they should beware lest there was in any of them an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God, and lest they should be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. For under whatever disguise they might conceal themselves, yet from such tremendous judgments as God executed upon their fathers they might learn to judge as *Moses* did, *Numb.* xxxii. 23. *If ye will not do so, ye have sinned against the Lord: and be sure your sin will find you out.*

13 (*n*) *Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight.*] They seem to be much mistaken, who judge this a strong argument to prove that the *word of God* mentioned in the verse before, is to be understood of the word that is properly a person, that is of Christ. The *his* here may altogether as well relate to *God*, whose the word (in the commoner sense) is said to be.

(*o*) Πάντα ὅ γυμνὰ καὶ τελεγχηλισμένα. *All things are naked and open.*] The former of these two terms pretty well secures us of the sense of the latter, which *Hesychius* explains by *πεφανερωμένα*, *manifested*. 'Tis agreed that the term is metaphorical, and taken from the sacrifices, to which purpose *Chrysostom* says, " 'Tis a metaphor from the skins that were pulled off from the sacrifices; for as when any one flays and flays their skin from the flesh, he lays open what is in the inside of them, and makes it visible to our eyes, so all things are clear and plain to God." Mr. *Gataker*, in *Marc. Antonin.* lib. xii. sect. 2. thinks that here is an allegory taken from the custom of butchers, or, those who killed the sacrifices, by whom the

beasts.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

with whom we have to do. with whom we are concern'd (p).

NOTES.

beasts to be offered were said τεταχηνλίζεσθαι, not only when they were hung up by the neck and flayed, but when they were laid upon their back and cleaved asunder through the back bone, so that every thing both without and within was laid open to view.

(p) Πεὶς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος. With whom we have to do.] Beside the sense given by our translators, and which is followed by the paraphrase, there are two others which expositors have offer'd. Chrysostom and several others think this to be the meaning, To whom we must give an account. The Syr. seems anciently to have rendred the place in like manner, though at present it reads יְהוֹיָהּ for יְהוֹיָהּ To whom THEE [all things] give an account, instead of, To whom we give an account. The repetition of the same letter in the end of the word might easily occasion the dropping of one of them: nor can it be doubted whether it be a corruption since no version or MS. countenances it. The other sense is Concerning whom we speak, which seems espoused by the Vulg. Ad quem nobis sermo; & Castellio, De quo loquimur. Oecumenius joins both these together. The reader may take his choice: the phrase being somewhat unusual which ever way it is rendred, makes it hard to be positive about it, our own translators seem to me to have fixed upon that sense that best suits the context.

S E C T. VI.

C H A P. IV. 14. — V. 10.

CONTENTS.

OUR author having finished the digression which is contained in the foregoing section, here returns to the subject he had been upon just before, where he had begun to urge upon the Hebrews, the duty which naturally resulted from the dignity and office of our blessed Saviour. This will be cleared in the notes. The duties he presses are two, a steadfastness in their profession, and a diligent application to the throne of grace, to both which they had very great encouragement from the consideration of the priesthood of Christ. Hence he takes occasion to inlarge upon our Saviour's priesthood, setting forth the very great advantages which were peculiar to it, and rendred it far superior to the priesthood appointed under the law.

14. **L**ET us therefore, who are christians, and have so great an high-priest (*q*), who is ascended into the heavens, even Jesus the Son of God, be careful to continue in our profession

Seeing then that we have 14 a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast *our* profession.

N O T E S.

14 (*q*) ΕΧΟΝΤΕΣ ΕΝ ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΙΑ ΜΕΓΑΛΗ. *Seeing then we have a great high-priest.*] They seem to labour in vain who would understand this verse as connected with any part of the foregoing section, wherein nothing at all is said of Christ's being an high-priest, of his compassion, &c. It seems very evident that at *Chap. iii. 1.* he had begun to argue the duty of the *Hebrews*, with respect to Christ, from what he had said of him in the two first chapters, and that his discourse being interrupted by the long but pertinent digression that ends with the 13th verse of this chapter, he here resumes what he had before begun, his expressions bearing a manifest relation to what he had said in the two first chapters, and the beginning of the third, as will easily appear to the reader if he will attend to the comparing of them, in the following instances, which shall be set down in distinct columns.

Chap. iv. 14.

Seeing then we have a great high-priest,

that is passed into the heavens,

Jesus the Son of God,

let us hold fast our profession;

Chap. iv. 15.

For we have not an high-priest that cannot *μὴ δύναμενον* be touched with a feeling of our infirmities,

but was in all points tried, like as we are, *καθ' ὁμοιότητα*,

without sin.

He calls him an high-priest, *Chap. ii. 17.* & *iii.* and the addition of the character *great* appears very just, when 'tis consider'd that he had proved him to be *greater* than the angels, *Chap. i. 4-14.* and worthy of more *glory* than *Moses*, *Chap. iii. 3-6.*

Chap. i. 3. Having by himself purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high.

Chap. i. 1. God has in these last days spoken to us by *his Son*. *Ch. iii. 6.* Christ is faithful as a *Son* over God's house.

Because, *Ch. iii. 1.* Christ Jesus is the apostle and high-priest of our profession: and *ver. 6.* we can't belong to God's house, unless we hold fast our profession.

Chap. ii. 17. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest, *ver. 18.* Wherein he hath suffered being tried, he is able *δύναται* to help them that are tried.

Chap. ii. 17. It behoved him in all things to be made like *ὁμοιωθῆναι* to his brethren, *ver. 18.* He suffered being tried.

This is not expressly mentioned before, but may be supposed included in his being said to be faithful as a Son over God's house: or if there be any difficulty about that, it may be consider'd as an additional and very material circumstance of our Saviour's trials.

In like manner the two first verses of the next chapter deserve to be compared with *Chap. ii. 17, 18.* there being expressions in each place which do much resemble one another: but as they are there used by way of confirmation, rather than as a resumption of the grounds of his inference, they are here omitted.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

15 For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.
16 Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy,

fession of christianity, in spite of all the persecutions and temptations to which it may expose us. We might indeed well be discouraged, if we had an high-priest who was not much concern'd for us: but that is far from being our case, our high-priest being one that can and will sympathize with us, he having been himself exercised with the like trials as we are in all things, though not with the same effect, they having never prevailed on him to commit the least sin (r). Let us not therefore be discouraged by the sense of our guilt, or the violence of the temptations wherewith we are assaulted: but let us repair with freedom to the throne of God's grace (s), that so we may obtain God's mercy.

15.

16.

NOTES.

15 (r) *Χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.* Without sin.] One design of his mentioning this circumstance, beside that expressed in the paraphrase, seems to be, to show how vastly preferable Christ the high priest of our profession is to the ancient high priests, in as much as they were subject themselves to sin, as he was not. This rendered it necessary for them to offer for their own sins, as well as the peoples, Chap. v. 3. whereas Christ being free from sin, had no occasion to offer for himself; but only for the sins of the people. That this was very proper and expedient is declared, Chap. vii. 26. *Such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners.* And in like manner when another apostle would set forth the advantage Christ has for the management of his advocacy, he takes particular notice of this, 1 John ii. 1, 2. *We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.*

It might be objected, that the Aaronical high priest's consciousness of his own guilt, might be apt the more to move his compassion for the people: and therefore this might be consider'd as some disadvantage to us in the priesthood of our Saviour. But that is well prevented, by taking notice that though he was without sin, yet he was not without such an experience of the trials we meet with, as would effectually engage him to exercise the tenderest compassion toward us.

16 (s) *Προσερχώμεθα ἔν μὲν παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος.* Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace.] I see no reason with some to suppose that this throne of grace is the Son's and not the Father's. Christ is manifestly here consider'd as an high priest, and consequently as making himself application to God for us: and therefore it seems much more natural to suppose that God is upon this throne of grace, whether we are to come as supplicants, and at which Christ appears as a great high priest in our behalf. This is agreeable to what we read Chap. ix. 24. *Christ is entered into heaven it self, now to appear in the presence of God for us.* We may therefore come with freedom to this throne of grace, not because 'tis Christ's, but because he, as our compassionate high priest, is there ready to act in our behalf. This account is confirmed by the ὅθεν therefore here in the beginning.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

cy for the pardon of our sins (*t*), and may find favour with him in affording us seasonable help to carry us through the temptations and trials with which we encounter (*u*).

And this we may reasonably expect, when we consider Christ as discharging the office of an high priest. For every high priest taken from among men (*w*) (provided he is rightfully taken, and has a due warrant for the office) is appointed to act for men in things

and find grace to help in time of need. For every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to

N O T E S.

ning of this verse, which shows this is an inference from what he had said before. We may therefore come boldly to the throne of grace, because our high priest is not one unconcerned in our case, but having been himself tried as we are, is inclined to execute his office for our advantage when we come. The same likewise appears from the *ᾧ* for, in the first verse of the next chapter. *For every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins.* The *for* here would be impertinent, and not at all connect the two verses, unless it were implied that Christ is ordained for men in things pertaining to God (See Chap. ii. 17.) and consequently our encouragement to come boldly to the throne of grace, is grounded not upon its being his own, but his being appointed by God to act as an high priest for us in things pertaining to God, at this throne of grace, which therefore must be his.

(*t*) *ἵνα λάβωμεν ἔλεον.* *That we may obtain mercy.*] One might be inclined, upon reading this verse with the preceding, to imagine that this *obtaining mercy* is the the same with the *finding grace*, and that they both relate to the *help in time of need*. But upon farther comparing what he adds, *ver. 1, 3.* of the next chapter, it seems more reasonable to allow that this *obtaining mercy* refers to the pardon of sins, in order to the procuring whereof he offered himself.

(*u*) *Καὶ χάριν ἐν καιρῷ εἰς ἑκούσιον βοήθειαν.* *And find grace to help in time of need.*] Although the rule here given is never, in any case, improper to be observed, yet the scope of the writer shows at what he here more especially aims. He considers the *Hebrews* as compassed with infirmity, and as violently tempted by persecution to apostatize from their holy profession, in which circumstances help was most necessary and *seasonable* for them. Hence he encourages them to come freely to the throne of grace for it; and to expect it through this great high priest, as the effect of grace and favour, and not of their own desert.

1 (*w*) *Πᾶς ᾧ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος.* *For every high priest taken from among men.*] However, *ver. 4, 5.* and the scope of the epistle may suggest to us that a principal regard is here had to the high priests of the house of *Aaron*, yet the expression is so general, that it may well comprehend any others that were not of that order, such as *Melchizedec*, and perhaps *Noah*, *Job*, and others. Farther, these high priests, who are said to be taken from among men, are thereby distinguished from our great high priest Jesus Christ. They were mere men, but Christ, though he was man, was much more, being the Son of God. This interpretation is confirmed by comparing the place with *Chap. vii. 28.* *For the law maketh MEN high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the SON, who is consecrated for evermore.* Compare also *Exod. xxviii. 1.*

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins:
 2 Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity: And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself,

things pertaining to God (x), that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins. Who can be moderate (y) toward those who are guilty of sins of ignorance and not of wilfulness (z), since he himself is of the same frailty with them, and liable to be guilty of the like mistakes. And every such high-priest taken from among men, ought upon the account of this his own infirmity, to offer gifts and sacrifices, not only for the people, but

2.

3.

NOTES.

(x) Ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸ Θεόν. *Is ordained for men in things pertaining to God.*] There is another sense beside that of *ordained*, in which the word καθίσταται may be taken, as it is in this place by *Castellio*, who renders the words thus, *Pro hominibus præest rebus divinis*, ‘Manages divine things for men.’ But our own translation is here prefer’d as more agreeable to *Chap. viii. 3.* where he is upon the same argument. *Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices*, where *Castellio* renders καθίσταται *constituitur* is appointed.

2 (y) Μελειοπαθεῖν συνάμεν. *Who can have compassion.*] Our marginal reading comes nearer to the sense of the word here used, *Who can reasonably bear with them that are ignorant*, &c. The word is derived from the use that the Platonists, and Peripatetics made of it, in declaring the opinion they held in opposition to that of the Stoics. The latter earnestly contended that a wise man was ἀπαθής not subject to anger, fear, pity, and the like affections: but the Platonists and Peripatetics on the contrary held, Τὸν σοφὸν μελειοπαθεῖν μὲν εἶναι, ἀπαθὴν δὲ ἔκ εἶναι, ‘That a wise man is moderate in these affections, but not destitute of them.’ Accordingly *Budeus* explains this, and renders μελειοπαθεῖν *modice affici*. So that the sense is, that however those high priests might be offended and displeased with such as were ignorant and out of the way, yet they had reason to moderate their anger, and not be rigorous toward them, considering their own circumstances, that they (as it follows) were themselves compassed about with infirmity.

(z) Τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις. *On the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way.*] There hardly seems to be sufficient ground for the interpretation that is by many given of these words, as though they described two sorts of persons. I understand the words rather as used with a common *Hendiades*, and that the meaning is, Those who err (that is sin) thro’ ignorance. And this seems to be the sense of the words ἁγνοεῖν and ἁγνοεῖσθαι which are therefore rendered in the LXX. translation by ἀγνοεῖν: and considering that the discourse is here concerning the high priests who were to make atonement for these sins of ignorance, the interpretation of the place is rather to be fetched from what is said in the law concerning that matter, than from any other passage which has no relation to it. This is the case, *Psal. xcvi.* cited before *Heb. iii. 10.* *They do alway err in their heart, and they have not known my ways.* And indeed the sins there spoken of are not sins of ignorance, but wilfulness; and it was very improper for our author to speak of the high priests as bearing with, or having compassion on those who were guilty of such, they being order’d by God to be cut off, and they died without mercy, *Chap. x. 28.* And indeed these two words here used, seem only to answer to that one in the *Hebrew*.

4. but also for himself (*a*). Nor can any man assume a right to the honour of this office, or with any success execute it, but he, who is by God called to it as *Aaron* was (*b*).
 5. In like manner also Christ did not arrogate to himself the honour of being an high priest, but this was bestowed upon him by God, who, *Psal.* ii. 7. spake thus unto him, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee* (*c*). As he saith, also in another place, *Psal.* cx. 4. *Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec* (*d*). Who before

to offer for sins. And no 4 man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as *was* Aaron: So also, Christ glorified not himself, to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee. As he saith 6 also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec. Who in the days of his 7

he

N O T E S.

3 (*a*) Περὶ ἑαυτοῦ προσφέρειν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν. *For himself to offer for sins.*] This being spoken only of the high priests taken from among men, in contradistinction to the high priest of our profession, and it being so expressly required that the high priests under the law should offer for themselves as well as the people, *Lev.* xvi. 6, 17. 'tis very unreasonable to assert from this text that Christ offer'd for his own sins, or infirmities. But of this more will be said on *Chap.* vii. 27.

4 (*b*) God not being obliged to accept of every one who shall of his own head take upon him to offer gifts and sacrifices for himself or others, the honour of this great office, however it may be presumptuously invaded and assumed, cannot rightfully belong to any person but to him who has received a commission and authority from God himself for it; nor can there be any reasonable expectation of any advantage from what he does in the office, while he is not called of God to execute it.

5 (*c*) See upon *Chap.* i. 5. note (*m*).

5, 6 (*d*) By these two verses the priesthood of Christ appears plainly to bear date after his resurrection; which is very contrary to the opinion which has been commonly received, that he was a priest, and acted as such, in his death. The common opinion must be owned to have some plausible arguments to support it: and therefore I would not be understood to be very positive in asserting the other, which at present seems to me to be preferable. I shall endeavour to set before the reader the best account I can of this matter, from the holy scriptures, and more especially from this epistle. And,

1. I can't find that any where in the scriptures, Christ is expressly said to be a priest in his death, or in his laying down his life.

2. There seem to be many things delivered in the scriptures, which are utterly inconsistent with the opinion of his being a priest in his death. As (1.) The commencement of his priesthood is perpetually through this epistle reckon'd to be at his resurrection, and going into heaven. So *Chap.* iv. 14. vi. 20. vii. 23, 26. viii. 1. ix. 11, 12. x. 10—12, 19—21. (2.) Our author expressly says, *Chap.* viii. 4. *If he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests who offer gifts according to the law.* Now if this reasoning be valid, it will equally prove that Christ while he was here on earth, that is, before his resurrection, was not a priest, seeing there were then priests who offered gifts according to the law. (3.) Had he been properly a priest in his death, he must have been a priest after the order

T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

flesh, when he had offered he was constituted such an high-priest, even while he dwelt here on earth in flesh (e), showed

N O T E S.

order of *Aaron*. He speaks only of two orders, that of *Melchizedec*, and that of *Aaron*; the former of which without dispute bore not date till after his resurrection; and therefore if he were a priest before, his priesthood must have been of the order of *Aaron*. But this seems very inconsistent with many things in this epistle. For he then must have been made a priest after the law of a carnal commandment, as the *Aaronical* priests were, which is absolutely denied, *Chap. vii. 16.* He must then have been of the tribe of *Levi*, and of the family of *Aaron*, whereas our Lord was of the tribe of *Judah*, *Chap. vii. 13, 14.* And besides it is expressly said, that he was *not called after the order of Aaron*. And had he been a priest of that order, there would be no room for a change to be made in the priesthood, which yet is asserted, *Chap. vii. 11.* the consequence of which is a change in the law.

3. The proper offering which Christ as an high-priest made of himself, seems to be spoken of as only made in heaven. The attentive reading of *Chap. viii. 1—4.* will hardly suffer us to doubt of this. *We have such an high-priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true [that is the heavenly, in opposition to the earthly] tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high-priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore 'tis of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer [viz. now that he is an high-priest in heaven, as the next words evidence] for if he were on earth he should not be a priest, &c.*

4. The consequence of this is, that properly speaking there was no one at all who officiated as a priest in the death of Christ.

But, 5. It must be owned that the death of Christ is sometimes spoken of as a sacrifice, which, it may be pleaded, supposes the agency of a priest to offer it. Now it seems to me, according to what has been already advanced, that Christ is represented in his death as a sacrifice, not so much upon the account of what his offering was at the time when on earth he made it, as upon the account of what it was intended to be, and actually became, when he presented it to God in heaven. Under the law, the beast that was brought for an offering did not become a sacrifice immediately upon its being slain, but upon its being offered to God by the priest. In like manner, when our Saviour died, he brought his offering, then giving himself to die for our sins, and by his death he was qualified for the office of an high-priest, as by this means he had somewhat to offer; but till as a priest he presented this his offering to God, it seems not to have had the proper and intire nature of a sacrifice. This may perhaps receive some illustration from what we meet with in the law; according to which in some cases the person who brought the offering might himself kill it, though he were no priest at all, but in order to its being accepted as a sacrifice, it was necessary that the priest should afterwards present it to God: and thus Christ may be consider'd in laying down his life, in giving himself, &c. not to have acted as a priest, which character he did not then sustain, but only to have then brought his offering, which became a proper sacrifice when he himself, being constituted an high-priest, presented it to God. This appears to me the scripture notion; wherein if I am mistaken, I should be glad to be set right. I assure the reader, I have no intention to depreciate the virtue of Christ's death, my notion in the upshot ascribing as much to it, as theirs who earnestly contend that he acted the part of a priest in dying. If I herein err, I do it not wilfully, and desire to be thankful that I have such an high-priest as will bear with the ignorant, and those who are out of the way.

7 (e) *Ος εν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.* *Who in the days of his flesh.]* There can be no doubt that by the *days of his flesh* is meant the time while our Saviour was on earth, he being then

H E B R E W S.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

showed that he was tried like as we are, by his being subject to such fear as caused him to offer prayers and supplications to God, who was able to save him from death, and offered them with great trouble and concern, which appeared by the vehement crying and tears that were joined with them (f), and was heard

up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death,

N O T E S.

then *made flesh*, in order to his *dwelling among us*, John i. 14. The vast alteration that is made now in his body in his exalted state renders it improper to speak of it now as being *flesh*. We are assured by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 50. that *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God*. A change is necessary to be made in our bodies to qualify us for the heavenly state: and since this change is that our bodies may be *fashioned like to his glorious body*, Phil. iii. 21. it follows that the change made in him must be as great, and that his flesh no more than ours in its present state does inherit the kingdom of God. Compare 1 Pet. iv. 1, 2. This therefore must be understood as opposed to the condition in which Christ now is, as an high-priest after the order of *Melchizedec*, of which mention is made just before. This seems sufficient to justify the paraphrase.

There is yet another thing which may deserve our consideration, and that is, how these verses come in, and are connected with the foregoing discourse; a just account of which perhaps has not been given by any commentators, who endeavour to connect them only with somewhat that is said in this chapter. But the connection may possibly appear much more natural and easy, if we go a little farther back to the two last verses of Chap. iv. where the *Hebrews* are urged from the consideration of Christ's being touched with a feeling of our infirmities, and his being tried in all points as we are, but without sin, they are urged I say to come boldly to the throne of grace. What follows in the six first verses of this 5th chapter is an incidental passage, wherein he compares Christ with other high priests, shewing that they were appointed to their office as persons who might reasonably upon the account of their own infirmities be thus qualified for the office. Now unless I am much mistaken, he here in the place before us returns more expressly to his subject, and gives a particular instance of Christ's being tried as we are, and so shows that it might well be thought that he is touched with a feeling of our infirmities, and is therefore well qualified in this respect for discharging the office of an high priest. This account may seem to be justified by observing that he had asserted the same thing, Chap. ii. 17, 18. and though he presently after drops it in his long digression, yet he presently after that returns to it again, Chap. iv. 14—16. which shows he was so far from forgetting it, that he had it much upon his mind. Farther, the careful reading of this 7th verse with the three which follow it, and the comparing Chap. viii. 1. may confirm this account of the order of his discourse.

Farther, considering the accounts given in the new testament of his death, as that he gave his *flesh* for the life of the world, John vi. and was put to death in the *flesh*, 1 Pet. iv. this phrase, *the days of his flesh*, may be thought to signify the time of his weak and mortal state.

(f) Δεήσεις τε καὶ ἰκετηρίας πρὸς τὸ δυνάμενον σῶζειν αὐτὸν ἐν θανάτῳ, μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων πρῶσενέγκας. When he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death.] The same two words are joined together by *Isocrates* in his oration *De pace*, near the end. Εφ' ἡμᾶς ἀπαντες οἱ δεδιότες καὶ κακῶς πάσχοντες καταφεύξονται, πολλὰς ἰκετηρίας καὶ, δεήσεις ποιέμενοι. “All that are afraid,

“ and

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

and was heard, in that he
8 feared ; Though he were

heard in that he feared (g). However he
stood in the relation of a son, yet he became
through-

8.

NOTES.

“ and that are injured will flee to us, and make many supplications and prayers to us.” That Christ offer’d up prayers and supplications to God while he was here in the flesh, and that with great concern, is evident from the account which the gospels give of his behaviour toward the latter end of his life, particularly in his agony in the garden, and when upon the cross: but whatever is wanting in the gospels concerning his strong crying and tears, may easily be supplied from the clear prophecies of the old testament, particularly, *Psal.* xxii. 1, 2. xviii. 4—6. cxvi. 1—4.

(g). Καὶ εἰσακουθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας. *And was heard in that he feared.*] This I have left in the paraphrase just as I found it in our translation, because to say the truth I am very doubtful about the true meaning. The sense which our rendering gives it is received by many; but it may be question’d very much, whether if the original will bear it, it be agreeable to truth. For if his being heard signifies, as they suppose, his being answer’d, and so deliver’d from the evil he feared, it must denote that he was saved from death, that being plainly the evil feared, according to what is said just before: but from this he was not delivered, as appears by his actually dying upon the cross. Our margin furnishes us with another rendering: *And was heard for his piety.* This sense suits well enough the use of the word εὐλαβεία elsewhere; as *Chap.* xii. 28. And had the preposition been ἐφ’ instead of ἀπὸ, there would have been little room to except against this interpretation. But the passages produced to justify this sense of the word ἀπὸ as referring to the meritorious cause, however it does frequently denote the efficient, as in these places, *Matth.* xiv. 26. *They cried out for fear,* ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου. xviii. 7. *We be to the world because of offences,* ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων. *Matth.* xiii. 44. xxviii. 4. *Luke* xxii. 45. xxiv. 41. do hardly come home to the purpose for which they are brought. The *Syriac* takes quite another course (which shows how anciently the difficulty of the place was perceived) and joins ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας with the next verse thus: *And was heard. and though he were a Son, yet by fear and the sufferings he underwent he learn’d obedience.* Such trajections are never to be allowed, but upon the utmost necessity. And this has not the least countenance from any one *Greek* copy, there being none that inserts any copulative between *fear*, and *the things he suffer’d*, and yet there ought regularly to be one in case that were the sense here intended.

In a matter so very obscure as this is, I hope I may without offence propose my own conjecture; nor will I pretend to bestow a better name than that upon what I have to offer. Our author then, according to what has been suggested a little before, note (e) seems to be here treating of the afflicted state of our Lord here in the world, wherein he had experience of our difficulties and trials, in order to his being the better qualified to commiserate and help us under ours. This is likewise evident from what follows, *ver.* 8. Now this clause, which ever way it be rendred, seems to me wholly foreign to that design: for to be *heard in that he feared*, or to be *heard for his piety*, or reverence of God, was no suffering or trial at all. I would therefore consider this as an incidental passage brought in not as subserving his main subject, but only as guarding against an objection which might be made against what he had said in the former part of this 7th verse. And so I would in sense join all the rest of this verse with *ver.* 8. and consider this as a parenthesis, the design of which is not properly to show that he was tried like as we are, but to prevent any one’s suspecting that such prayers and supplications as Christ’s, joined with strong crying and tears should be unanswered; and therefore he here asserts that they were *heard* and answer’d, and as I apprehend his meaning, they were answer’d quickly after his fear, that is, though he was not saved from death by not being suf-
fer’d

throughly acquainted with the difficulty of our obedience by the things which he himself suffered in his obedience to God in his death (*b*).
 9. And being thus perfectly qualified to execute the office of an high-priest (*i*), he became the author of eternal salvation and happiness (*k*) to

a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered: And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salva- 9

N O T E S.

fer'd to die, yet he was presently after [the thing he feared befel him, recovered from death, and so his prayers appeared to be heard and answer'd. This use of the preposition *ὅτι*, as referring to time, is frequent in the new testament and all other authors, so that there is no need to produce any examples of it. The sense now will run thus: "Christ in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears to him who was able to save him from death (and was heard and answer'd soon after the thing he feared befel him, being quickly recover'd from death) though he were a Son yet learned he obedience by the things he suffer'd, &c." Let the reader consider with himself whether this does not give a better account of the order and connection of our author's discourse than either of the other interpretations.

8 (*b*) *Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffer'd.*] It seems very improper that our author should speak of Christ's learning to obey by his sufferings, as though he had been unaccustomed to obedience before his sufferings. This therefore must be understood agreeably to the scope of his discourse, wherein he is designing to show that he acquired a sympathy with us, and so was well qualified to be a high-priest for us. If we look back to Chap. iv. 14, 15. we find there he speaks of our high-priest as the Son of God, who could be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, being tried in all things like as we are, but without sin. This made a vast difference between him and the priests under the law, who might be moved to a compassion toward their brethren by considering their own sinful infirmities, Chap. v. 2, 3. Now Christ not being capable of being moved to compassion by this, being himself always perfectly free from sin, he here seems to me to suggest that he was yet as effectually moved to it another way, even by his own sufferings in the course of his obedience, and especially when he became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. The sense of the place therefore I take to be this, "That by his sufferings he learnt how difficult obedience was, and by this means was as effectually engaged to pity and succour us, as the high-priests of old were to pity and act in the behalf of the people, from the experience they had of their own infirmity and guilt."

9 (*i*) *Καὶ τελειωθείς.* And being made perfect.] There appears not any necessity of understanding any more by this expression, than that he was intirely freed from all his sufferings, or perfectly qualified to be an high-priest. They who suppose his death to be a consecrating him to this office, seem to do it without sufficient warrant, it more properly belonging to his resurrection. 'Tis true Christ speaks of his sanctifying himself, *John* xvii. 19. which seems rightly to be explained of his separating or yielding himself as an offering to God in his death: but that seems not much to our purpose, being his own act, whereas herein, as appears by the expression, he was passive; and had he been otherwise, it would not have been true that he glorified not himself to be made an high-priest; but he that said to him, Thou art my Son, &c. ver. 5.

(*k*) *Ἀλλος σωτήρας αἰώνιος.* The author of eternal salvation.] Nothing can be juster than this rendering. Vain is the criticism of those who would here render *ἄλλος* the guilty author,

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

tion unto all them that
to obey him; Called of God
an high-priest after the or-
der of Melchizedec.

to all them that obey him, being spoken to by 10.
God himself under the title of an high-priest
(1), after the order of *Melchizedec*.

NOTES.

as though herein a respect were had to his bearing our sins in his death; whereas nothing is more common than for it to signify barely the being the cause of a thing without any respect to guilt at all. 'Tis hardly worth while in so plain a case to allege examples, however as one happens particularly to offer it self, I will just refer the reader to it, *Ælian*. Var. Hist. lib. xiii. c. 11. Nor can I see how they can explain this verse, who imagine the word *σωτηρία*, salva- tion, never in the new testament signifies the happiness of the future state.

10 (1) *Προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς*. Called of God an high-priest.] Our English version is the same here as 'tis ver. 4. *He that is called of God as was Aaron*: but in the Greek the phrases differ; and *Ὁ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, ver. 4. plainly signifies that he was invested with or commissioned to this office: whereas this is not the import of the word *προσαγορευθεὶς* here, but it barely imports that he was by God called, that is named, stiled, or spoken to under this title of a priest; though this necessarily implies that he must have been invested in the office.

SECT. VII.

CHAP. V. 11.—VI. 20.

CONTENTS.

THE mention made of Christ's being a priest after the order of *Melchizedec*, ver. 6, 10. naturally led to the saying somewhat concerning that person and his order of priesthood. This our author intended, and he accordingly has done it, *Chap. vii.* But before he comes to that part of his discourse he makes a large digression which fills up this section; at the end of which he brings in again the mention of Christ's being made an high-priest for ever after the order of *Melchizedec*, Chap. vi. 20. and so both handsomely concludes his digression, and introduces the account he gives of *Melchizedec* in the next chapter.

The design of this digression seems to be,

1. To reprove the *Hebrews* for their not attending to, and not better understanding the things spoken of in the old testament. His reproof

reproof being brought in upon the occasion of their not understanding the things spoken concerning *Melchizedec*, does in a manner fix this to be the ground of the reproof, and so may serve in some measure as a key to a good part of his discourse. This is very pertinent to the grand aim of the epistle: for a thorough acquaintance with the old testament would have been very useful to establish them in their adherence to Christ.

2. Another design of this digression seems to be to warn the *Hebrews* of that to which they were very prone, to dote upon the legal institutions, by reason of which they were apt to be indifferent to Christ, and to quit their hope in him, and the profession of his religion. For this cause he sets before them their danger in the most lively and moving terms.

3. He however qualifies his reproof, by the commendation he gives of some of them for their past behaviour, for which he encourages them to expect a reward from God. But,

4. He wishes the same might be more general; and that they would all of them guard against negligence and sloth, and press after perfection, imitating the faith and patience of other good men, and particularly of *Abraham*, for whom they had the highest veneration, and whose example was therefore likely to have the greatest effect upon them.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

11. **C**ONCERNING which *Melchizedec* (*m*) we shall have occasion for a large discourse, which yet it will not be easy for you to understand
- O**F whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered; seeing ye

N O T E S.

11 (*m*) Περὶ ᾧ. *Of whom.*] Had this been meant of Christ, the expression might be thought strange. It could be no wonder he should have much to say of him, the author of our religion, and to whom every thing he had to say bore a reference, and of whom he had already said so much in the former part of the epistle. There seems therefore no room to understand this of any other than *Melchizedec*, of whom there needed many things to be said in order to explain his priesthood, which was a pattern of that of our Saviour. And there being so very little said of him or his priesthood in the old testament, there was the more likelihood of the matter's being obscure, and needing many words to explain it; and accordingly he uses many when he comes to treat of it, *Chap. vii.*

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

12 are dull of hearing. For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and

derstand (12); seeing you are slow in perceiving such things. For whereas according 12. to the time of your having had the advantage of being in the church of God, ye ought to be masters and instructors of others (o), you have need to begin all your learning again, and that some body should teach you the elements of the first oracles of God (p), and are so

NOTES.

(12) Καὶ δυσσεμνέυτος λέγειν. *And hard to be uttered.*] The phrase is somewhat unusual: but *Grotius* appears best to account for it, by supposing λέγειν to be put for ἐν τῷ λέγειν, and so the sense will be, "That when what we have to say is uttered, it will not be easy to be understood." This is taken by many to be a good argument that *St. Paul* was the author of this epistle, these being some of the *δυσνόητα*, things hard to be understood, which *St. Peter* says were to be met with in his epistles, 2 *Pet.* iii. 16. However the difficulty is not so much attributed to the things themselves as to the want of attention, as appears by comparing the two places together.

12 (o) Καὶ ὅ δὲ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸ χεῖρον. *For when for the time ye ought to be teachers.*] Of what they might reasonably have been expected to be teachers, we may see by the following part of the verse, viz. the first principles of the oracles of God. What these were will be presently consider'd. If these shall appear to be rightly explained, there can be no just exception against his saying that this might be expected from them. For the epistle being directed, not to the *Gentiles*, who were but lately come to be acquainted with the ancient oracles of God, or the old testament, but to the *Hebrews*, who from their infancy had been brought up in the knowledge of them, a greater proficiency might well be expected from them, than from the *Gentiles*.

(p) Πάλιν χρεῖαν ἔχετε τῶν διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τίνα τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God.*] It may perhaps be more agreeable to take the τίνα here for the accusative case singular, than for the nominative plural; and then the proper rendering would be, *You have again need that some one should teach you the first principles* [or elements] *of the oracles of God.* By the oracles of God we are to understand the revelation which God made of himself and his will by miraculous voices, angelical messengers, and especially by inspiring the prophets in their writings. See *Acts.* vii. 38. *Rom.* iii. 2. The ἀρχὴ τῶν λογίων may signify the beginning of the oracles, or the first oracles, and so be put to contradistinguish the oracles deliver'd under the old dispensation, to those afforded under the new. So the beginning of the confidence, Chap. iii. 14. may be the same as our first confidence. Our translation supposes here an Hendiades, making τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς to be equivalent to τὰ πρῶτα στοιχεῖα. And thus *Theophylact* explains this expression, as he does the other, Chap. vi. 1. τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Χριστοῦ λόγον, τέλει, τὰς πρώτας ἀρχὰς τῆς πίστεως. See him upon the latter place. But there's no reason why that figure may not rather be admitted in the way here taken, making τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων to be equivalent to τῶν πρώτων λογίων. The τὰ στοιχεῖα are the elements or first rudiments that persons learn in any art, as preparatory to their learning more and greater things, which very well suits with the doctrine of the old testament, which might have served to prepare the *Hebrews* to receive the doctrine of the new.

so weak as to need such a low diet as milk, but to be unfit for and unable to digest any stronger and more manly food (*q*). For every one who uses milk and can only relish such food, shows that he is very much unacquainted with the more noble and principal design of the law (*r*), (for indeed he is but as a babe).

But

are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk, is unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe.

N O T E S.

(*q*) Καὶ γεγόνατε χρεῖαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος, καὶ οὐ στερᾶς τροφῆς. *And are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat.*] The allusion is easy and natural, and is used by St. Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 1, 2. and being taken from an universal custom, is to be met with in other authors, as in Arrian's comm. upon Epict. Lib. ii. c. 16. p. 217. Lactant. lib. v. c. 4. Philo, de Agricul. p. 188. The design is to represent the Hebrews as children and not grown men in understanding, according to what follows in the two next verses; that as children had an inclination to, and could only digest a small and weak food, milk, &c. and not those more solid and stronger meats by which the adult are nourished, so the Hebrews relish'd only the flightier matters of the old testament, without attending to and discerning the chief design of them, and of other things that were more abstruse, as the priesthood of Melchizedec, &c. Had they been more careful to inform themselves thoroughly herein, they would have been better prepared to receive the oracles which God gave by Christ and his apostles, and would have been more fixed and settled than they generally were in the christian profession.

When they are said to be such as had need of milk, and not of strong meat, it can hardly be thought that he meant that they had no need of or occasion for strong meat; but only that through their weakness and unpreparedness they had no inclination or appetite to it; they did not crave or make use of it: and so χρεῖαν ἔχειν γάλακτος will answer to μέλειχεν γάλακτος in the next verse.

13 (*r*) Ἀπειρος λόγος δικαιοσύνης. *Is unskilful in the word of righteousness.*] For the explaining this phrase it will be proper to have recourse to St. Paul's stile, whose epistle this seems to be. Now according to him there were two things considerable in the law of Moses. 1. A description of a righteousness by the deeds of the law, that is a righteousness by complying with the ceremonial institutions of the law. Of this he speaks Rom. x. 5. *Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man that doth these things shall live by them.* 2. There was a description of the righteousness of faith, or of the way of being justified by faith, in opposition to the other which was by the works of the law. This he shows was spoken of by Moses, Rom. x. 6—8. *But the righteousness which is of faith, speaketh on this wise, say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend, &c? — that is the word of faith which we preach.* The latter of these was by far the most considerable. And indeed the former was principally design'd to be subservient to this, as he says, ver. 4. *Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.* In like manner, Gal. iii. 24. *The law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.* This righteousness, that is, this way of being justified, he says is attested both by the law and the prophets, Rom. iii. 21, 22. *The righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe.* Upon comparing these texts, it seems to me that the word of righteousness in the place before us, is the same with the righteousness of faith, or the word of faith, and that his reproof is of this nature, “ You Hebrews are very fond of the ceremonial injunctions of the law of Moses, which



T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

14 But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil. Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of

But strong meat is fit for those who are come to maturity, and grown up to be men (*f*), who by reason of a long custom and habit have their faculties inured and fitted to distinguish good and evil (*t*). Wherefore I shall wave to discourse concerning the first and more obscure discoveries that were made of Christ under the old dispensation (*u*), and shall go on

14.

1.

N O T E S.

“ which are mean things when compared with the way of becoming righteous by faith,
 “ which that law recommends, and as much inferior to it as a low milk diet is to that of
 “ stronger food; and while you relish only the former, you shew your selves inexpert and
 “ little acquainted with the latter, which is much more excellent and noble. Hereby you de-
 “ grade and unman your selves, as though you were babes and infants, whose proper food
 “ milk is.

14 (*f*) Τελειών. *Them that are of full age.*] This rendring is very just, the *adult* being most properly opposed to *babes*. Thus *Philo De Agricult.* p. 188. uses both terms in the same manner. And thus *St. Paul* speaks of the τέλειοι, 1 Cor. xiv. 20. *Brethren be not children, παιδία, in understanding: howbeit in malice νηπιόζεις be ye children; but in understanding be ye τέλειοι, men.* This discourse suits well with the account, which he also gives of the *Jeaus* while they were under the law, that they were children νήπιοι, Gal. iv. 1—3. and the same must be as justly applicable to those who retained their old *Jeauish* temper and fondness for the law, after they had been instructed in the christian religion.

(*t*) Τῶν διὰ τὸ ἔξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν καλῆ τε καὶ κακῆ. *Those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.*] Our margin renders ἔξιν an *habit* or *perfection*. The former of these is proper enough in this place; and the meaning seems to be, that they had their senses, that is those of their minds, their rational faculties, exercised to discern both good and evil, by having long habituated and accustomed themselves to consider and search into them. He that would form a true judgment of things ought to be thoroughly vers'd in the rule he is to judge by. For want of this the *Hebrews* understood but little of their own law, and continued very *childish* in their notions of things.

The expression of *having the senses exercised to discern both good and evil*, seems only to refer to the metaphor he had used before, and to mean that they were not still children who were not capable of this. By thus enlarging he might perhaps design to keep them the longer attentive to the censure he passes upon them. I think the expression is plainly borrowed from the *Hebrew* manner of describing children. Thus *Jonah* iv. 11. *Wherein [in Nineveh] are more than One Hundred and Twenty Thousand Persons [that is children] that cannot discern between their right hand and their left.* Deut. i. 39. *Your little ones, which ye said should be a prey, and your children which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil, they shall go in thither, &c.* *Isaiah* vii. 15, 16. *Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land shall be forsaken, &c.*

1 (*u*) Διὸ ἀφέντες τὸ τὸ ἀρχῆς τῶ Χριστοῦ λόγον. *Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ.*] The connection stands thus, “ Since strong meat is proper for such as are adult
 “ and arrived at some perfection in age, I will therefore endeavour to entertain you with this
 “ more noble food.” He seems to speak here in the plural, when he means only himself, a way

on to offer you somewhat more solid and fit for you as adult persons, rather than feed you with milk as children, like the *Jews* of old (*ω*); I forbear therefore to lay again the *Mosaic* foundation of repentance from dead works,

Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repen-

N O T E S.

way very familiar with St. *Paul* in his epistles. If any one thinks that this is to be understood as a direction, and that he joyns himself with the *Hebrews*, the better to avoid giving offence, I own I should be of the same mind were it not for *ver.* 3. which seems to determine the other to be his design, and that his meaning is that he would forbear or wave the treating of that matter.

But there is a great deal of obscurity in the expressions here used, which have exceedingly puzzled interpreters. Nor would I be understood to say positively what is the meaning of them, but only to offer my conjectures to be examined, improved, or confuted by others. I begin now with this first expression, which our margin renders *verbatim*, *The word of the beginning of Christ*, with which the *Vulg.* agrees, *Inchoationis Christi sermonem*: but our common text supposes an *Hypallage* in the words, and that τὸ τὸ ἀρχῆς τῆς Χρυστὸς λόγον is put for τὸ τῆς λόγου τῆς Χρυστὸς ἀρχήν, which is in like manner rendred by the *Syriac*, *אוריאל דמלתה דמשיחא*, the beginning of the word of Christ. I see no hurt in either of these rendrings, provided we understand *the word* aright in each rendring respectively; that is according to our margin thus, *Therefore leaving the word* [that is the discourse, and so the sense is *forbearing to discourse*] *of the beginning of Christ*: but according to that in the common text, *Therefore leaving the beginning of the word of* [that is the doctrine concerning] Christ.

It seems to me very reasonable to understand the τὰ σοιχεῖα τὸ ἀρχῆς τῆς λογίων τῆς Θεῶ, *The first principles of the oracles of God*, Chap. v. 12. and τὸ τὸ ἀρχῆς τῆς Χρυστὸς λόγον, the *first principles of the doctrine of Christ* here, Chap. vi. 1. and the θεμέλιον, *foundation*, and so the several particulars of that foundation that are enumerated, being taken together, to signify all of them one and the same thing. The opinion of the ancient *Greek* commentators, that by these *first principles* are meant the *humanity of Christ*, is sufficiently confuted by Dr. *Whitby* on *Heb.* v. 12. Nor can I perceive any better way of explaining these things, than that which has been hinted before. I consider the old testament, and particularly the law, as a more obscure representation of Christ, but that therein a *foundation* was laid, and preparation made for the fuller discovery which was to be afforded of him at his appearing in the world, and in the *Jewish* religion there was a rough draught or imperfect rudiments and elements of Christianity, which is agreeable enough to many passages of scripture. The insisting upon these, when the meaning of them was set in a full and clear light by the coming of Christ and the mission of the Holy Ghost, was not so necessary, and is therefore waved by our author. If the following expressions in the account given of the *foundation*, may be in like manner explained, it will much confirm this interpretation.

(*ω*) *Επὶ τῇ τελειότητι φερώμεθα.* *Let us go on unto perfection.*] He seems to have an eye to what he had said in the last verse of the foregoing chapter, that *strong meat* τῆς τελείων ἐστίν, belongs to them that are perfect or adult. By his *going on unto perfection*, he must then mean, his going on to make them perfect men, that they might no longer be as children; which exactly agrees with the design and end of his office, and the various gifts he had received. To this purpose we may compare his discourse, *Eph.* iv. 11—15. *He gave some apostles, &c. for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the son of God, εἰς ἀνδρα τέλειον, unto a perfect*

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

2 tance from dead works, and
of faith towards God, Of
the doctrine of baptisms,
and of laying on of hands,

works (x), and of faith towards God with-
out an explicit, distinct and clear regard to
Christ (y), and of the doctrine concerning
the various washings that were prescribed
among the *Jews* (z), and of laying on of
hands

21

NOTES.

perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, &c. See also Col. i. 28.

(x) Μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον κατὰ βάλλοντες μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων. *Not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works.*] The dead works mentioned here and Chap. ix. 14. do certainly mean *sins*, which are said to be dead upon the account of the death which they deserve, and without pardon will intail upon us. 'Tis evident from the law of *Moses*, and from the other writings of the old testament, that repentance was necessary under that dispensation. Nor is it necessary to quote particular places in so plain a case; and especially since I apprehend this does not so properly relate to repentance in general, as to that which was prescribed on the great day of atonement, concerning which we read, Lev. xvi. 21, 22. Aaron shall put both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness. And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities, &c. And, ver. 29, 30. This shall be a statute for ever unto you: that in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and do no work at all, whether it be one of your own country, or a stranger that sojourneth among you. For on that day shall the priest make atonement for you to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord. This repentance is certainly most proper to be reckon'd among the σοιχέια or first rudiments of the oracles of God; and very pertinently is it alleged here by our author in this digression which is brought in upon the mention he had made of Christ as an high-priest. This foundation for repentance our author would not lay again, nor was there any occasion for his dwelling upon the subject, because in case of the *Hebrews* returning to it, they made their repentance impossible, as he argues afterward, ver. 4—6.

(y) Καὶ πίστεως ἐπὶ Θεόν. *And of faith towards God.*] He speaks of the faith towards God, and not towards Christ; which seems very well to agree with the supposition of his speaking here of the principles of the *Jewish* religion. For whatever respect those elements really had to Christ, yet since the *Jews* themselves, and particularly those who relapsed from *Judaism* to christianity, did not so understand them, their faith must be consider'd as only towards God, they not believing in God by Christ, 1 Pet. i. 21. The foundation therefore of this faith towards God seems to be the old testament, and especially the *Mosaic* institutions, of which the *Hebrews* were so excessively fond.

2 (z) Βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς. *Of the doctrine of baptisms.*] Interpreters have been at a loss to give a plausible account of the different baptisms which must be here referr'd to; as may be seen in *Pool's Synopf.* upon the place. Some have thought that by baptisms he means the trine immersion: but it may well be doubted whether that was then in use; and if it were, 'tis strange that in no other place but this christian baptism should be spoken of in the plural. Others have fixed upon this distinction as intended, the baptism of water, of the spirit, and of blood, or martyrdom: but it may seem strange that metaphorical and real and proper baptism should be thus joined together; beside that the doctrine of the baptism of blood will not well belong to the first principles of christianity. For this reason perhaps some talk only of the baptism of water and the spirit. But even then if this be understood of the miraculous gifts of the Holy



P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

hands on the sacrifices (*a*), and of the resurrection of the dead (*b*), and of the ancient judgments

and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal

N O T E S.

Holy Ghost, we have a proper and metaphorical baptism comprized under one general name ; or if we understand it of the common operations of the spirit that accompanied the baptism of water, 'tis evident St. *Paul* reckon'd these to make but one baptism, *Eph.* iv. 5. The *Syriac* indeed reads the *doctrine of baptism*. But as that is contrary both to the *Vulg.* and the *Greek MSS.* it seems rather to be owing to their opinion of the meaning of the place, than to any different reading in the copy from which they translated. If we consult the new testament, and observe in what cases it speaks of *baptisms*, in the plural, we shall find that 'tis only when the *Jewish* baptisms or washings are intended. And as 'tis of them only I understand the place before us, this observation may serve in some measure to confirm the way here taken to interpret the several particulars here mentioned. Thus *Mark* vii. 4. And many other things there be, which they [the Pharisees and all the *Jews*] have received to hold, as the baptisms of cups, and pots, brazen vessels and beds. And *ver.* 8. Ye hold the tradition of men, as the baptisms of pots and cups. Thus again our author *Heb.* ix. 10. speaks of divers baptisms and carnal ordinances, manifestly referring to the washings or baptisms which were prescribed in great number in the law of *Moses*.

And farther, there is one observation I have lately made, which for ought I know has been universally overlook'd hitherto, and which very much confirms the interpretation I have given. I observe then that the places I have mention'd are the only ones where the word βαπτισμός, or rather βαπτισμοί is used, and that 'tis never used but of the *Jewish* washings ; but when a proper initiatory baptism is intended, or a metaphorical baptism that is a kind of initiation (as in that of our Lord, *Luke* xii. 50. I have a baptism to be baptized with. Compare *Matth.* xx. 22, 23.) that then the word βάπτισμα and that in the singular number is constantly used. So that though the ancient christian writers use these two words promiscuously, yet the penmen of the new testament do not. Now according to this observation, it will appear that the βαπτισμὸς διδασχῆς the doctrine of baptisms is intirely to be understood of the *Jewish* washings. And if this be one article of the *Jewish* religion, I think all must readily grant that the other articles here mention'd, must in all probability be of the same nature.

(*a*) Ἐπιθέσεως τε χειρῶν. And of laying on of hands.] Dr. *Whitby* has observed, “ That imposition of hands was used in ordination, healing of the sick, and absolution of penitents : but this imposition of hands was not common to all christians, nor joined with baptism, nor was it to be reckoned among the principles or initiatory doctrines of christian faith.” Farther, the most plausible interpretation hitherto offer'd, does not seem to me very probable, that hereby is intended the imposition of the apostles hands after baptism for the giving the Holy Ghost ? 'Tis hardly credible that our author would wave such a principle as this, upon which so great a stress is laid in the new testament. And indeed he had before insisted upon it, *Chap.* xi. 4. and does again presently after this, *ver.* 4, 5. It seems therefore most likely to me, that this is a principle of *Judaism*, of the same nature with the former, and that it relates to the priests laying their hands upon the beasts offer'd in sacrifice, to lay their iniquities upon them.

(*b*) Ἀναστάσεως τε νεκρῶν. And of the resurrection of the dead.] This, together with the next or last article mention'd, has, I doubt not, inclined many to suppose that the principles of proper christianity are here spoken of. But if it should be granted that their interpretation of these two is every way just, it may yet be doubted whether these be principles peculiarly and properly of christianity ; they may rather seem in common to belong to that and *Judaism*, it being plain that the best and most numerous sect of the *Jews*, the *Pharisees*, believed both.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

3 judgment. And this will judgments of God (c). And this I propose 3
to

NOTES.

both these principles ; and therefore as *Judaism* was prior to christianity, they might well be mentioned as the foundation of that. But to say the truth, the meaning of these two seem to me to have been mistaken ; and that in both of them our author aims at the confirmation which was given to *Judaism*. Particularly by the *resurrection of the dead*, he seems not to intend the final resurrection, but rather the raising of some dead persons, as the widow's son at *Zarephath* raised by the prophet *Elijah*, 1 Kings xvii. 20 — 23. and the *Shunamite's* son raised by *Elisha*, 2 Kings iv. 32 — 36. To which instances our author seems to refer very briefly, Chap. xi. 35. where he is setting forth the great virtue and excellency of faith in God ; and consequently such examples must have a great tendency to confirm the *Jews* in their faith in God. And this effect we find it had upon the mother of the child whom *Elijah* raised from the dead, who thereupon said unto him, 1 Kings xvii. 24. *Now by this I know that thou art a man of God, and that the word of the Lord in thy mouth is truth.* And whatever tends to promote mens faith toward God, may very well promote their repentance from dead works.

There is yet another interpretation which may be given of this expression, and may perhaps please some better than that already mentioned ; and therefore may deserve to have some brief notice taken of it. By the *dead* then sometimes we are to understand those who though they are not actually dead, yet are as it were under the sentence of death, and whose danger of it seems such as cannot be avoided. Thus God says to *Abimelech*, Gen. xx. 3. *Behold, thou art a dead man.* 2 Sam. xix. 28. *All my father's house were but dead men before my lord the king.* And remarkable is the passage of St. Paul, 2 Cor. i. 8 — 10. *We would not brethren have you ignorant, of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life : but we had the sentence of death in our selves, that we should not trust in our selves, but in God which raiseth the dead. Who deliver'd us from so great a death, and doth deliver : in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us.* Again, Rom. xi. 15. *If the casting away of them [the Jews] be the reconciling of the [Gentile] world ; what shall the receiving them be but life from the dead ?* If such a death and resurrection may be here understood, there can be nothing more pertinent than the great miracle which God wrought for the deliverance of the *Jews*, when he first set up the *Mosaic* institution. The people being hemm'd in between the sea on the one side, and *Pharaoh* and his army on the other, could look upon themselves as no other than dead men, and therefore, *Exod. xiv. 11. They said unto Moses, Because there were no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness.* And if the restoration of *Israel* is described as a raising dead and dry bones to life, *Ezek. xxxvii. 1 — 14.* why may not such an eminent deliverance as God then gave them from *Pharaoh* and his army, be spoken of in like manner ? This had the effect which might well be expected to promote their repentance and faith towards God, as we read *Exod. xiv. 31. And Israel saw that great work which the Lord did upon the Egyptians, and the people feared the Lord, and believed in the Lord, and in his servant Moses.*

(c) *Kai neiμαλος αἰώνιου.* And of eternal judgment.] The common interpretation makes this to refer to the final judgment. And were this granted, what was said in the preceding note might easily be here apply'd to show that this principle was held by the *Jews*, as well as 'tis by christians. But farther is it likely that our author would pretend to wave this, when he really in the progress of his epistle insists considerably upon it, Chap. ix. 27, 28. x. 27 — 37. Besides I don't find that ever the final judgment has this epithet given to it. The life the righteous shall go into is said to be *αἰώνιος* everlasting, as is also the punishment of the wicked, *Matth. xxv. 46.* and the fire wherewith they shall be tormented, *ver. 41.* There is no difficulty therefore about the words being applied to the effects and consequences of the
sen-

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

to do in this epistle, if God permits me to we do, if God permit.
 have an opportunity for it, and you don't fru-
 strate my expectations by your apostacy be-
 fore it reaches you (*d*). For your apostacy
 would

N O T E S.

sentences that will then be passed ; but the time in which the trial is made and the sentences passed is always supposed to be limited and have an end, and that after this follows the actual retribution according to the sentences respectively passed upon those who are judged ; nor is that *judgment* ever, that I remember, said to be *eternal*. I think therefore that the words are to be understood in a very different manner, and *κείμενα* here seems to me to be put for temporal judgments. Thus the word is used 1 *Pet.* iv. 17. *The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God*, where the context will not suffer us to take it in any other sense. Compare *ver.* 16, 18, 19. So again, 1 *Cor.* xi. 29. *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the Lord's body*. What this judgment was appears by the next verse : *For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep*. See also *ver.* 34. The word *αἰώνιος* which we have render'd *eternal*, I take to respect not the time to come but the time past, and to signify *ancient* or *past long ago*. That the word is thus used without any respect to eternity, we may see *Rom.* xvi. 25. 2 *Tim.* i. 9. *Tit.* i. 2. See also these places in the LXX. *Psal.* lxxvii. 5. *Prov.* xxii. 28. *Jer.* xviii. 15. *Ezek.* xxxvi. 2. According to this account of the words, we may consider the *Jewish* religion as established by the ancient and tremendous judgments, of the execution of which the books of *Moses* give an account, such as the deluge, the destruction of *Sodom* and *Gomorrab*, and more especially the drowning of *Pharaoh* and his host in the red sea, and perhaps the judgments of God upon the *Israelites* in the wilderness for their impenitence and unbelief. Of this last he had indeed treated before, but not as a foundation of the *Jewish* religion, but as an example by which christians might be warned. I submit the foregoing interpretations of this dark passage to better judgments, being ready to embrace any others that may be offer'd, if they appear more satisfactory.

3 (*d*) Καὶ ὅτε ποιήσομεν, ἔαντες ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ Θεός. *And this will we do, if God permit.* Two very learned commentators understand this verse as though our author put off for the present the instructing the *Hebrews* in the rudiments or first principles of christianity, encouraging them to expect that he would, as he design'd, do it some other time. But it looks very unlikely that if they were so wretchedly ignorant in the first principles of proper christianity, that he would put off giving them immediate instruction ; nothing could be more necessary for them than to be as soon as possible thoroughly instructed and established in them : and for him to go about to teach them the higher and greater things of christianity, before they had well learned these first principles, was, to use his own comparisons, as improper, as it would have been to go to raise a superstructure before a foundation was laid, or to go about to feed children with that strong meat which only adult persons were capable of digesting. This is an argument with me against the common interpretation of the elements or first principles mentioned before, and a confirmation of the explication just given : for if the first principles were intirely judaical, the insisting on them was not necessary, and he might therefore well apply himself immediately to acquaint them with that which suited adult persons, and would render them perfect, that is proper christianity. I take therefore those words, *And this will we do*, to refer strictly to what he had said before, *Let us go on unto perfection*, and that he proposed to himself the doing this in this very epistle, wherein he indeavours to represent christianity in its greatest beauty, usefulness and glory. The latter expression *If God permit*, I understand as in the para-
 phrase,

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

4 For *it is* impossible for those who were once enlightned, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made

would put an end to my expectation of doing any good upon you, it being impossible (*e*) for those who have been once thoroughly enlightned in the christian faith (*f*), and have tasted of the heavenly gift (*g*), and have been

4:

NOTES.

phrase, that is, if God will give me an opportunity, and I am not prevented by your apostatizing from christianity, before my epistle comes to your hands. When this verse is thus understood, the connection of it with the immediately following verses is admirably good, which otherwise is very obscure. For by those verses he shows in what case he thought God would not permit him or give him an opportunity for this, or reason to expect success in his attempt.

4 (*e*) *Adύνατον γάρ*, For *it is impossible*.] I have nothing to add to what is said in the preceding note concerning the connection of this verse. 'Tis thought by some that we ought in the explication to soften that term *impossible*, and understand no more by it than this, that *'tis extremely difficult*. But this interpretation may well be called in question, since when our author speaks of the same case, without using the word here render'd *impossible*, he describes it in terms equivalent, setting it forth as desperate and remediless, *Chap. x. 26, &c.* Besides, if the foregoing connection be allowed, his discourse supposes that God in suffering men to fall into the sin here mention'd, did not leave room to his apostles to attempt their recovery. And withal, the circumstances of the sin were so very peculiar, that we need not wonder that it should be as remarkably distinguish'd in its dreadful consequences.

(*f*) *Τὲς ἀπαξ φωτισθέντες*. Those who were once enlightned.] There can be no doubt that *Justin Martyr*, and some other very ancient writers of the christian church, used to speak of baptism under this and the like terms; whence many have thought that they took it from the age of the apostles themselves, and therefore explain the term both here and *Chap. x. 32.* concerning baptism. But it may be question'd whether that interpretation be very certain. The *Apostolical Constitutions* (as they are called) *Lib. viii. c. 7.* and some later authors, use the word to signify such as were preparing for baptism, having not yet received it. And if we suppose the term here and *Chap. x. 32.* is used in the same sense, which is certainly reasonable enough, it should seem that there it does not precisely refer to baptism, but is to be explained from *ver. 26.* to signify those who had received the knowledge of the truth. And if we compare *St. Paul's* use of this word, *Eph. i. 18. iii. 9.* and of *φωτισμός*, *2 Cor. iv. 4, 6.* I think our common rendring with that of the *Vul.* is to be preferr'd to the *Syr.* which refers it in both places to baptism.

(*g*) *Γευσαμένους τε τὸ δωρεᾶς τὸ ἐπερχόμενον*. And have tasted of the heavenly gift.] The word *tasted* both here and in the next verse seems to be used by our author with a particular regard to the metaphor he had used before of food or strong meat. Our translation makes a difference in rendring the expression in the two places, reading here *tasted of the heavenly gift*, and *ver. 5. tasted the good word of God*; for which I perceive not any sufficient foundation, the word *γεύσασθαι* being followed sometimes by an accusative, as well as more frequently by a genitive case. I am more uncertain about the meaning of the *heavenly gift*. They who interpret this, as well as the following expressions, concerning the Holy Ghost, may very plausibly allege many places of scripture in their behalf, wherein the Holy Ghost is said to be sent from the Father, and wherein he is said to be sent down from heaven, *1 Pet. i. 12.* I am far from being positive in rejecting this interpretation, though it seems more agreeable to me to understand Christ himself to be meant in this place by the expression. Nothing is more frequent than

- been made partakers of the gifts of the Holy Ghost (*h*), and have tasted the comfortable word of God, the gospel (*i*), and had experience of the extraordinary miracles wrought in this age of the Messiah (*k*), if they forsake Christ and fall back to their old religion (*l*), to change and renew them so as that they
- partakers of the holy Ghost, And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come; If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto

N O T E S.

than the speaking of Christ as the *gift of God*, and as sent and coming down from heaven; so that the words may as well be applied to him as to the Holy Ghost. But that which most inclines me to this interpretation, is the particular notice which he presently takes of Christ, *ver. 6.* where he lays a stress upon their *crucifying the Son of God afresh, and putting him to open shame*; which may incline us to suppose he had made some mention of him before. In like manner he discourses *Chap. x. 32.* where he aggravates the guilt from persons *treading under foot the Son of God, &c.* which he distinguishes from their doing *despite to the spirit of grace.* The reader is left to his own judgment in the matter.

(*h*) Καὶ μετέχουσιν γεννηθέντος Πνεύματος ἁγίου. *And were made partakers of the Holy Ghost.*] There can hardly be any doubt that the common operations of the Spirit, which true christians in all ages receive, are not here intended. The only thing needful to be consider'd, is, how their being *partakers of the Holy Ghost*, differs from what is mentioned in the next verse, their *tasting the powers of the world to come*, which *powers* must certainly import some extraordinary operations of the Spirit. The best account of this seems to be, that however all these extraordinary operations were owing to the Spirit, yet they were not all *δυνάμεις*. So *St. Paul* distinguishes the ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων from a multitude of other gifts of the Spirit which were then bestowed, *1 Cor. xii. 10.* the whole context there, *ver. 7—11.* deserves regard. According to this account, the being *partakers of the Holy Ghost* may signify such gifts as there follow, *prophecy, discerning of spirits, several kinds of tongues*, and the *interpretation of tongues*, and the *δυνάμεις* or *powers of the world to come*, will import some miracles that were yet greater and more extraordinary. It may be needful perhaps to add, that he seems not here to speak of a bare seeing such extraordinary events, but of their being themselves enabled to perform them.

(*i*) Καὶ καλὸν γευσάμενες Θεοῦ ῥήμα. *And have tasted the good word of God.*] The *good word* seems to answer to דְּבַר הַטוֹב in the *Hebrew*, *Job. xxi. 45. xxiii. 15. Jer. xxix. 10. Zec. i. 13.* or טוֹב דְּבַר *Psal. xlv. 1.* See *Dr. Whitby* upon the place: and so *good* signifies *comfortable*. In general this *good word* must mean the *gospel*, which they might be well said to have tasted, who heard it when it began to be published, and when it was in the most satisfactory manner confirm'd by unquestionable and glorious miracles.

(*k*) Δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. *And the powers of the world to come.*] *Tertullian, De Pudicit. c. 20.* seems to have read this passage in his copy thus, δύναμις ἥδ' ἐν μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, for he renders it, *Occidente jam ævo.* But he is therein singular: nor is there any thing in the scope of the discourse that can incline one to suppose this to be any other than a corrupt reading. The *world* or *age to come* is a *Hebrew* phrase, and signifies the times of the Messiah עוֹלָם הַבָּנָיָה. They who not only saw those great miracles whereby christianity was confirm'd, but were themselves impower'd to work them, could not desire fuller evidence of the truth of it.

(*l*) Καὶ ἀπεσόντας. *If they shall fall away.*] Two things are here to be observed, 1. That he speaks of such only as fell away from the very profession of christianity. This ap-
2
pears

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

repentance: seeing they crucified to themselves the Son

they should repent (*m*); because by their practice they in effect repeat the crucifixion of the

NOTES.

appears from what he presently adds to set forth the aggravations of their guilt; That *they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to open shame.* 'Tis therefore very unreasonable for persons to give way to despair themselves, or to drive others to it, by applying this text to other, and even the grossest sins, which only relates to apostacy. 2. As the same thing is spoken of again, Chap. x. 26, &c. it can't be improper to compare the two places together in order to our fully understanding his design. And therefore from the other place I would explain this, *If they shall, ἐκκρίως, wilfully fall away.* But of that see more upon the place.

(*m*) Πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν. *To renew them again to repentance.*] Our translation is sufficiently exact; nor is the sense so current and good which others give who understand the word here used to import to *dedicate* or *devote*, and so refer it to baptism. But since 'tis not certain that our author before spoke of baptism, nor does he mention it, Chap. x. 26, &c. where he is upon the same subject, it may be most agreeable to take the word in the sense our translators do, to signify to *renew*, that is to convince them again of the truth, and bring them afresh to change their minds, and repent of their wickedness in forsaking Christ. 'Tis observable that this is brought in upon his mentioning what he would do, *if God did permit*, ver. 4. that is, if God would give him an opportunity for it. Rebaptizing was what God did not permit: but to renew christians more and more was the proper end of ministerial exhortations, reproofs, &c. and this he would endeavour in case he was not prevented by their apostacy, which would render his endeavours fruitless.

This interpretation is confirm'd by the like use of ἀνακαινίζειν which is synonymous with ἀνακαινίζειν, Col. iii. 10. *And have put on the new man, & ἀνακαινέμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν, which is renewed in [or to] knowledge, after the image of him that created him.* See also, Rom. xii. 2.

I cannot here but offer my conjecture, that πάλιν may perhaps be better joined with ἀπαρτίστους, and the meaning be, *if they shall again fall back, or relapse* to their old religion. The word πάλιν, when 'tis joyned with what follows, may seem superfluous, since the sense of it is really contained in the preposition ἀνὰ that follows in composition. I own this is not a full proof, because in other places πάλιν may be found so redundant: but since it is so proper and significative the other way, I see no reason why it may not be admitted. I was pleased when I look'd into the Syriac to find it exactly answer my conjecture רחוב נחטון דמן דריש נחחרתון לתיבותא where the רחוב answers to πάλιν, but ריש דמן does not, it being only the rendring of ἀνὰ, as the same is used in rendring ἀνὰ in ἀνασταυρώσας in the latter part of the verse.

But it may be inquired, why our author speaks so severely of the condition of such apostates. Now the reason of this may be taken partly from the nature of the evidence which they rejected. The fullest and clearest evidence which God ever design'd to give of the truth of christianity, was these miraculous operations of the Spirit, and when men were not only eye-witnesses of these miracles, but were likewise themselves impower'd by the Spirit to work them, and yet after all rejected this evidence, they could have no farther or higher evidence whereby they should be convinced; so that their case must in that respect appear desperate. This may be partly owing to their putting themselves out of the way of conviction. If they could not see enough to settle them in the christian religion, while they made a profession of it, much less were they like to meet with any thing new to convince and reclaim them, when they had taken up an opposite profession, and joined themselves with the inveterate enemies of christianity. And finally, this may be resolved into the righteous judgment of God against such men for the heinous and aggravated wickedness of which they are guilty. If where men have not had

- the Son of God, and expose him to infamy (*n*).
 7. For that earth, which sucks in the rain which
 often falls upon it, and brings forth herbs that
 are useful to those by whom 'tis tilled, par-
 takes of the blessing from God (*o*): But that
 8. which instead of bringing forth such herbs,
 bears only thorns and briars, is useless (*p*),
 and

of God afresh, and put *him*
 to an open shame. For the
 earth which drinketh in the
 rain that cometh oft upon
 it, and bringeth forth herbs
 meet for them by whom it
 is dressed, receiveth blessing
 from God: But that which
 beareth thorns, and briars,
 is rejected, and is nigh

N O T E S.

the advantage of this highest evidence (as I conceive that is the case referr'd to, 2 *Theff.* ii. 10.) but barely have *not received the love of the truth, that they might be saved*, God may justly send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness, certainly there must be good reason for such a judicial proceeding of God against those who apostatized in the apostolic age, seeing their sin was so very great. And our author grounds this severe sentence upon the greatness of their sin, because they *crucify the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame*, and in the other place, because they *do despite unto the spirit of grace*.

(*n*) Ανασταυρῶντας ἑαυτοῖς ἢ ὑδὲν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἀποδεδειγματοῖς. *Seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.*] The Syriac leaves out ἑαυτοῖς, to themselves; but the *Vulg.* and all MSS. retain it; and therefore we have reason to think it genuine. Nor can our translation then be liable in any respect to censure. Apostates by forsaking Christ, and disowning his character, abetted the action of those who put him to death, and averr'd the justice of his persecutors; and so in effect crucified him afresh themselves, as they hereby declared how ready they would be to join in treating him in the same manner. And thus they *exposed him to infamy*, and in that sense is the word ἀποδεδειγματοῖς used *Matth.* i. 19. and *Stephens* in his *Thesaur.* brings a passage from *Plutarch*, where 'tis so used concerning *Archilochus* the poet, who is said by his obscenity ἑαυτὸν ἀποδεδειγματοῖς to render himself infamous.

7 (*o*) Μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Receiveth blessing from God.*] I should rather render it, *Partaketh of the blessing from God*, and suppose that this refers to the ancient blessing of God by which the earth at first became fruitful, *Gen.* i. 11. *God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in it self, upon the earth: and it was so.* Of this blessing the earth that was fruitful did partake. The next verse may perhaps in some measure confirm this. But if any think it too far fetched, he may have recourse to other places, as *Gen.* xxvii. 27. which the LXX. and *Vulg.* render thus, *See, the smell of my son is as the smell of a full field, which the Lord hath blessed.* Which ever way we take, the effect is attributed to the *blessing* of God, and not barely to the external means. And accordingly we must supply the application of the similitude which is not here express'd. "Like as the rain often descending upon the earth will not render it fruitful, without the blessing of God upon it, so nor will all our indeavours to renew you be successful, but as God is pleased to prosper our attempts; and this there can be no reason to expect in the case of apostates, to whom God will not afford his blessing. You ought therefore, as ever you would obtain his blessing, to take care not to be out of the way of receiving it, and consequently to keep clear of the guilt of such."

8 (*p*) Ἀδόκιμος. *Is rejected.*] The word seems here to be equivalent to ἀχρηστος, and to signify *useless* and *unservicable*, in which sense it may well be taken, *Tit.* i. 16. and in some other places.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

unto cursing; whose end
9 is to be burned. But be-
loved, we are persuaded
better things of you, and
things that accompany sal-
vation, though we thus
10 speak. For God is not

and is nigh to the curse (*q*), whose end will
be that it shall be burned (*r*). But beloved, 9.
notwithstanding this earnest warning I give
you, yet from the behaviour of the generality
of you I am far from concluding that this is
your case, but hope that better things, even
such as accompany salvation, are to be thought
of you (*s*). For God is not unfaithful to his 10.
pro-

NOTES.

(*q*) Καὶ κατὰρας ἐγγύς. *And nigh unto cursing.*] As I conjecture that the *blessing* in the former verse refers to God's blessing the earth at first before the fall; so I am inclined to interpret the *curse* here mentioned to be that which was the consequence of the fall, *Gen. iii. 17, 18. Curled is the ground for thy sake, in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee.* Where the LXX. use the same words we meet with here, ἀκάνθας καὶ τειβόλους. As he here compares them to the earth, water'd with the rain, the *thorns* and *briars* must be understood of those things which instead of being useful, were noxious and hurtful, such as unbelief and hardness of heart against which he had before caution'd them. It may be objected against this interpretation that the word ἐγγύς will then seem to be improperly used: for this would bespeak them to be actually *under* the curse, rather than *nigh* to it. But as those to whom he writes had not yet apostatized, and he was endeavouring to prevent it, being very sensible of their danger, he seems here to warn them of what was like to lead them into it. The too great prevalency of such things among some of them, appeared very threatening, and yet that he might not speak of their case as already desperate, he may be thought to soften his expression, and to say only that they were nigh unto the curse.

(*r*) Ἡς τὸ τέλος εἰς καὺσιν. *Whose end is to be burned.*] Compare herewith *John xv. 6. Matth. xiii. 40—42.* Farther, as apostates are here compared to a very bad soil, and their evil works to thorns and briars, it must be supposed that this burning is for the destruction of both; and though it here manifestly refers to torments of the damned in hell, yet the comparison here used may deserve to be compared with *Isaiah xxiv. 5, 6. The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof: because they have transgressed the law, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant. Therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate: therefore are the inhabitants of the earth burned, and few men left.*

9 (*s*) But beloved, we are persuaded better things of you.] This is very like St. Paul's way of closing and softning any thing he had said that sounded terrible and dreadful. Thus after a fearful account of the man of sin, and of the severe judgment of God upon such as were deceived by him, that God would send them strong delusions that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness, he immediately turns his discourse, *2 Theff. ii. 13. But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth, &c.* So after he had described in the most moving terms the deplorable wickedness of the unbelieving Gentiles, he presently adds, *Eph. iv. 20. But ye have not so learned Christ.* Compare also, *Rom. viii. 9.* The ground of such a persuasion we may learn from *Philip. i. 6.*

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

- promise, that he should neglect to reward your work, and the love (*τ*) which ye have shewn for his sake to his saints in formerly ministring to them, and still continuing to do so.
11. But (*υ*) however I can speak in this manner concerning many of you, yet not of all; wherefore my desire is, that every one among you would manifest the same diligence (*ω*), that you may have such an assured hope as shall continue to the end of your lives (*κ*):
12. that you may not any of you be slothful (*γ*), but

unrighteous, to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have shewed toward his name, in that ye have ministr'd to the saints, and do minister. And we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence, to the full assurance of hope unto the end: That ye be

N O T E S.

10 (*τ*) Καὶ τὸ κόπον τ' ἀγάπης. *And labour of love.*] The *Vulg. Syr.* and *Ethiop.* versions, some of the best MSS. and all the ancient *Greek* commentators leave out τὸ κόπου, and read here only *and love*. And accordingly is it left out in the paraphrase, Dr. *Mills's* opinion seeming very probable that 'tis not the genuine reading, but was inserted by some body from 1 *Thess.* i. 3. What the *love* was they shewed, he more fully declares, *Chap.* x. 33, 34. And a very skilful way he takes here to commend the kindness they had shown him, by representing it as done out of respect to God himself. Compare *Philip.* iv. 18.

11 (*υ*) Επιθυμῶν ὃ. *And we desire.*] I can perceive no reason why our translation here puts *and* instead of *but*, which is the more ordinary signification of the word ὃ, and seems here to be most pertinent.

(*ω*) Τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν. *Do shew the same diligence.*] Some think that by *the same*, he means the same they had shown formerly. But as the emphasis seems to lie upon *every one of you*, it may perhaps be more agreeable to imagine the sense to be this, "I desire that every one of you would shew the *same diligence* which many among you do."

(*κ*) Πρὸς τὴν πληροφροσίαν τ' ἐλπίδος ἀχρεὶ τέλους. *To the full assurance of hope unto the end.*] By the course mention'd in the former verse a hope was to be obtained according to God's promise, and the more diligent they were in that course, the more assured and certain would their hope be. And without this their hope was not likely to hold out unto the end, as our author was very solicitous it should. The firmness and continuance of our hope depends upon our persevering care and diligence in the discharge of our duty. *Unto the end* signifies to the end of our *lives*. The same thing is meant here, and *Chap.* iii. 6. *If we hold fast the confidence, even the rejoicing of hope firm unto the end:* and *ver.* 14. *If we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end.*

I see no inconvenience, if we take ἐλπίς here to denote the object rather than the virtue of hope. Thus is it used *ver.* 18. *Acts* xxviii. 20. Thus Jesus Christ is said to be *our hope*, 1 *Tim.* i. 1. and to be the *hope of glory*, *Col.* i. 27. If this be admitted, the sense will be, "That you may every one of you show the same diligence to the end of your lives, that you may be fully persuaded, and constantly own Jesus to be the Christ, the hope of *Israel*." Thus this will fall in with what he says, *Chap.* x. 23. Κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τ' ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῶς. *Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering.*

12 (*γ*) ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένηθε. *That ye be not slothful.*] As he had used the same word in the beginning of this digression, *Chap.* v. 11. it seems probable that there as well as here he speaks only of some among them.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

not slothful, but followers of them, who through faith and patience inherit the 13 promises. For when God but imitators of the *Gentile* converts who through faith and perseverance inherit the promises (2). And that the *Gentiles* should become 13.

NOTES.

It must be own'd that the discourse here and in the seven following verses, is considerably dark; and therefore the reader is desired to look upon many things that will be offer'd, as conjectural, rather than as interpretations concerning which I pretend to be positive.

(2) Μιμηταὶ ὅς τῃ δια πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομήσω τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. *But followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.*] These are generally understood of *Abraham*, the patriarchs, &c. but it seems to me much more likely that hereby are meant the *Gentile* converts to christianity. The chief and indeed only argument for the former interpretation must be taken from the mention of *Abraham*, ver. 13 ——— 15. of which an account will be given presently. That which inclines me to the other interpretation, is that according to the scope and coherence of the discourse, these three following descriptions must all belong to the same persons, *They who through faith and patience inherit the promises*, ver. 12. *The heirs of promise*, ver. 17. And *We who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us*, ver. 18. The second of these, *The heirs of promise*, is a description in it self equally applicable to the patriarchs and to the *Gentiles*. That 'tis applicable to the patriarchs appears by *Chap.* xi. 9. where *Isaac* and *Jacob* are said to be συκληρονόμοι heirs together with *Abraham* of the same promise. And that it is used concerning the *Gentiles* is very certain. See *Eph.* iii. 6. *Rom.* iv. 14. viii. 17. *Gal.* iv. 7. iii. 29. *Tit.* iii. 7. I grant therefore that this description alone would not help us much to determine who are spoken of. But if this is supposed to be the description of the same persons who are spoken of in the other two expressions, they may perhaps determine us to the sense I have chosen. *We who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us*, must be understood of christians, and be limited to those of our author's time; and who can they be but the *Gentiles*? If *St. Paul*, as is highly probable, was the writer of this epistle, nothing can be more likely than that he here as the apostle of the *Gentiles* joins himself with them, and so speaks of himself together with them under the title *we*. Besides, what he says in the first expression wherein he urges the *Hebrews* to be followers, or rather imitators, of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises, will perfectly agree with his manner of writing elsewhere; as particularly when he speaks of God's provoking the Jews to jealousy by them that were no people, that is that were *Gentiles* in time past, and not the people of God, *Rom.* x. 19. and applies the words of *Moses*, *Deut.* xxxii. 21. to that purpose; and again, *Chap.* xi. 11. where he says, *That through their [the Jews] fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them [the Jews] to jealousy;* and ver. 13, 14. *For I speak to you Gentiles, in as much as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office: if by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save some of them.* Nothing therefore could be more agreeable, than that in writing to the *Hebrews* he should stir them up to an emulation by the living examples of the *Gentile* converts who were more steadfast in the christian profession. And farther, though the patriarchs might be called κληρονόμοι or συκληρονόμοι heirs or fellow heirs of the promise, yet it seems to me very doubtful whether they could be said κληρονομῆν to inherit the promise; which seems to denote the actual possession of the thing promised, and especially the participle of the present tense-being here used. This may be illustrated from our own language, we say of a person that he is heir to such an estate, when we mean that as the nearest relation, or as nominated and design'd by the proprietor and lord of it, he will succeed him in the possession; but we don't say that he inherits the estate, till he is actually put into the possession of it. And accordingly I understand our author to speak of such as were actually vested in the possession of the things

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

come the seed of *Abraham*, and inherit the promises, we may learn from a most noble promise relating to them: for when God made that promise to *Abraham*, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself (*a*), Saying, Surely (*b*) *blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee (c)*. And so after he had patiently endured,

made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself, Saying, Surely, ¹⁴ blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying, I will multiply thee. And so after he ¹⁵

N O T E S.

thing promised ; and therefore though he avoids the express naming of the *Gentiles*, that he might not give offence to the *Hebrews*, yet his expression is manifestly such as may well be understood to include, and perhaps principally to respect them. And by the way, this covert manner of speaking of the *Gentiles*, may be one cause of the obscurity of this place, as it was before of the latter part of the second chapter. I will only add, that I don't any where in the new testament find the word *κληρονομεῖν* used otherwise than as I have supposed 'tis here. Nor perhaps would our author be consistent with himself, should he here be thought to speak of *Abraham*, &c. as *inheriting* the promise. He is said indeed to *have the promises*, Chap. vii. 6. ἔχοντα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, and to be *heir of the promise*, as was said before : but that he inherited the promises, or was put into the actual possession of the things contained in the promises was not true, and is denied by our author, Chap. xi. 13. *These all* [comprehending *Abraham* just before mentioned] *died in faith, not having received, μὴ λαβόντες, the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them.* And ver. 39. *These all having obtained a good report through faith received not, οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο, the promise.*

13 (*a*) *He swore by himself.*] This passage relates to the promise that God made upon *Abraham's* offering up his son *Isaac*. For it was on that occasion God spake to him in that manner, Gen. xxii. 15, 16. *And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said, By my self have I sworn, saith the Lord, that because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee, &c.*

There is a passage in *Philo*, lib. ii. Allegor. legis, p. 98. which is so very like this, that I think it well deserves the readers notice. " God, says he, well confirm'd the promise by an oath, and that such an oath as became him. For you see he does not swear by any other, for there is nothing better than himself, but by himself who is best of all.

14 (*b*) *H μὲν.* *Surely.*] The *Alex.* and some few other copies read here ἐν μὲν, and Dr. *Mills* thinks the *Vulg.* did so too, because they render it *Nisi*. But as the other copies here agree with the version of the LXX. and the *Hebrew* has not 𐤏𐤍 but 𐤏, I see no need of departing from the common reading. Nor was it uncommon with the *Greeks* to use this expression in swearing ; though I conceive this rather declares the matter of the oath, than the form of it, that being to be taken from the words in *Genesis* cited under the former note.

(*c*) *Εὐλογῶν ἐυλογήσω σε, καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ σε.* *Blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee.* Two things seem here to deserve our inquiry, 1. To what purpose our author brings in here the mention of this promise made to *Abraham*. 2. Why he so curtails and shortens it in his citation.

As to the first of these ; he seems to me to refer not so much to the satisfaction, which God intended hereby to give to *Abraham*, as to the satisfaction of those to whom, and in whose time the promise was to be fulfilled. However certain 'tis, that when God swore by himself,

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

had patiently endured, he
16 obtained the promise. For

dured, he obtained that part of the promise
which related to himself personally, that blef-
sing God would bless him (*d*). And as cer- 16,
tainly

NOTES.

he intended to establish *Abraham's* faith, and to assure him of an event that was to be brought about so many ages after his decease, yet that seems not to be the thing here chiefly design'd by our author. This oath of God relates to *Abraham's* seed, and so might be an encouragement to them, and a means of confirming their faith, as well as *Abraham's*. And that our author alleges this principally with this view seems pretty plain from *ver.* 17, 18. I take therefore the sense of *ver.* 13, 14. to stand thus: "I have exhorted you to be imitators of the *Gentile* converts who through faith and patience do actually inherit the promises, *ver.* 12. and you have no reason to think otherwise of them, if you look into the promise it self, wherein they are plainly mention'd. For when God made a promise to *Abraham*, they were included in it, as *Abraham's* spiritual seed, and so the solemn confirmation which God gave when he swore by himself belongs to his seed among the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews*." I can't see how the *ἔτι*, *for*, in the beginning of *ver.* 13. can easily be accounted for in any other way than this.

2. I come to the other inquiry, why our author curtails the promise in the manner he does. That the reader may be the more sensible of this, it will be proper to transcribe the whole promise as set down in the foremention'd place in *Genesis*. Surely, in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. This now is the promise at length: but how very briefly has our author epitomized it, mentioning no more than this, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee? Where what is in the *Hebrew* and in the *LXX.* I will multiply thy seed, is in our author only I will multiply thee. There can, I think, no variation of copies be pretended as the reason of his differing thus from the text he cites. Nor do I suspect that here was any casual omission through a failure of memory, or the like: but this seems to be done by him designedly. I don't think the main sense, so far as he goes in his citation, is alter'd: for to multiply *Abraham* must be the same thing with multiplying his seed. But he had certainly some view in changing the phrase; nor will it be easy to imagine any other than that before suggested. He industriously avoided the mentioning the *Gentiles*, that he might give the *Jews* as little offence as possible; and therefore he forbears to speak expressly of the seed that was promised to *Abraham* which was to be from among the *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*. And this he might the more safely do, because he was writing to the *Hebrews*, who were well acquainted with the book of *Genesis*, and whose thoughts would naturally lead them to consider the rest of the promise; and so they might more easily of their own accord fall in with his design, than if he had openly and directly avowed and earnestly endeavour'd to press it. It will not be amiss for the reader herewith to compare the use *St. Paul* makes of the same promise, *Gal.* iii. 8, 16, 18. And farther supposing that the account is just which has been before given of our author's design in avoiding the express mention of the *Gentiles* to whom the promise related, 'tis no wonder that this should cause a great obscurity and difficulty in his discourse.

15 (*d*) Καὶ ἔτι μακροθυμήσας ἐπέτυχεν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. And so after he had patiently endured he obtained the promise.] This verse has seem'd to me to carry as much difficulty in it as any in the context. Had any of the ancient versions, or MSS appeared to have read ἔτι instead of ἔτι, and so the sense had been, "That waiting patiently he did not yet [i. e. as long as he lived] obtain the promise;" or had any of them retaining the common reading of that

NOTES.

that word, appeared to have read ὁ μακροθυμήσας, and the sense had been, "And therefore he [*i. e.* every one] that patiently endures obtains the promise;" I say had there been any footsteps of such different readings, I should have been formerly inclined to fall in with one or t'other of them. But as there is a general consent in the present reading, I do not suggest any alteration.

It may be proper here, before any thing is said of the meaning of this verse, to observe, that let the meaning of it be what it will, it cannot much affect the context, because they seem evidently to be in the right who suppose the whole verse to be a parenthesis. There can be no doubt of this to him that observes, that *ver.* 16. is closely connected with what he had said before when he first began to mention the promise. *For men verily, says he, swear by the greater.* The *for* here cannot relate to this 15th verse, but intirely refers to what he had said *ver.* 14. *When God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself, saying, &c.* so that the sense of the context is intire, if the parenthesis being omitted, we join *ver.* 16. to the end of *ver.* 14.

This being premised, let us consider what is the meaning of this 15th verse. Now there are two senses suggested, which seem both of them to be mistakes. One is what I suppose our translators aimed at, "That after *Abraham* had patiently indured, he obtained the grant of "the promise." But this will by no means satisfy. For the grant of the promise is supposed to be made before he patiently indured, and was indeed the reason and ground of his patient expectation of it. And besides, the promise referr'd to being evidently that made to *Abraham* upon his readiness to offer his son *Isaac*, what other grant can be intended? The same thing in effect had been promised before, though not with the like confirmation, *Gen.* xii. 2, 3. But this promise, *Gen.* xxii. 16, &c. was the last made to *Abraham*, of this kind; and so no farther grant is to be sought after it. The other sense is, that *Abraham* had this promise fulfilled to him in his life time: and much pains does a learned commentator take to shew that *Abraham* lived to see the promise fulfilled to him in his posterity by *Keturah*, in the sons of *Ismael*, and in the birth of *Jacob* and *Esau*, concerning whom it was said to their mother *Rebecca* before they were born, *Two nations are in thy womb*, and after whose birth *Abraham* lived fifteen years. But this interpretation does not well agree with the words of the promise, *That in his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed*; and especially if we follow *St. Paul's* interpretation of it, *Gal.* iii. 8. *The scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.* And if *St. Paul* there cites another promise, 'tis evidently of the same tenor with this, and the calling of the *Gentiles* must be understood to be contained in it. And it seems hard to make the birth of *Jacob* and *Esau*, or even the posterity he had in *Ismael* and the sons of *Keturah* to be during *Abraham's* life a fulfilling of the promise, since they then could in probability be but few. And yet on the other hand we must take care so to explain this verse, as not to make it contradict what is elsewhere asserted, particularly *Chap.* xi. 13, 39. Nor can I perceive that we can have much help from any critical sense of the word ἐμὴν γένειν, as though that were less significative than λαμβάνειν or κομίζεσθαι. The interpretation therefore I would offer of this verse, is that our author here follows the distinction which *St. Paul* makes, *Gal.* iii. 16. *To Abraham and his seed were the promises made.* And they both are the subjects of the promise to which he here refers. The former part of the promise, *Surely, blessing I will bless thee* relates to *Abraham* in his own person: but the latter part, *And multiplying I will multiply thee* concerns the seed of *Abraham*, as appears by comparing the account of it in *Genesis*. Our author therefore, however his great aim was at the latter part of the promise, which concern'd *Abraham's* spiritual seed, yet here in this parenthesis, does in a manner very much to his purpose take notice of the fulfilment of that part of the promise, of which *Abraham* personally consider'd was the subject, *Blessing I will bless thee*; And so having patiently indured he obtained the promise, *i. e.* that part of it which belonged to him, according to what we read concerning him after the making this promise, *Gen.* xxiv. 1. *The Lord had blessed Abraham in all things*; and again his servant speaks thus, *ver.* 35. *The Lord hath blessed my master greatly, and he is become great: and he hath given him flocks, and herds, and silver, and gold, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and camels, and asses.*

T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation *is* to them an
17 end of all strife. Wherein God willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, con-
18 firmed *it* by an oath: That

tainly will that part of the promise which relates to his seed be fulfilled also. For men indeed swear by one greater than themselves, and an oath being the utmost assurance they can give, uses to satisfy and to put an end to all contest and contradiction (*e*). Wherefore 17.
(*f*) God resolving to give to the heirs of promise, a higher evidence than his bare promise of the unchangeableness of his purpose, included his promise in an oath (*g*): That so by 18.
these

N O T E S.

asses. There is a passage in *Josephus, Antiquit. lib. 1. c. 14.* which I would here take notice of, not only because he applies this to *Abraham*, which cannot seem strange, but because he uses almost our author's phrase. *Ἀβραμὸς τε τὴν ἰδίαν εὐδαιμονίαν ἐν μόνῳ τέτρῳ ἢ καὶ ἀλλοτρῶν, ἐξελεῖν τῷ ζῆν ἐτίθετο. Τέτρα μὲντοι κατὰ τὴν Θεῷ βέλησιν ἐτυχεν.* "*Abraham* was willing to die, leaving what wealth he had got to this his only Son. And this he obtained according to the will of God." And by mentioning this our author not only suggested to the *Hebrews* an example which they were most likely to regard, but imply'd too, that the like patient induring is expected from his seed in order to their obtaining the other part of the promise, the blessing that belonged to them. And as this was done by one part of *Abraham's* spiritual seed, the *Gentiles*, it ought likewise by the other the *Jeaus*; and therefore the *Jeaus* ought to be imitators of the *Gentiles* in this respect. He seems to forbear the express mention of this upon the account hinted before; but that his chief aim is at this may reasonably be imagined from the manifest connection of *ver. 13, 14.* with *ver. 16.* and by his dilating upon this subject, *ver. 16, &c.* And by the way, if this text is thus understood, *Abraham's* obtaining the promise may not only refer to the worldly blessings God bestowed upon him, but to that happiness to which he was admitted when he left the world.

16 (*e*) *An oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife.*] This was esteemed the highest assurance men could give, nor could any thing farther be expected from them who had given this. And as *Dr. Whitby* observes, this being spoken of promissory oaths, such may lawfully be taken by christians, only with this proviso, that the thing thus promised be evidently and unquestionably just and good in all respects, and that it be what is in our own power.

17 (*f*) *Εν ᾧ. Wherein.*] *Theophylact* has, I think, given the best sense of this, making it equivalent to *διὸ* or *διὰ τούτο*. And so it should be rendred *Wherefore*. *Greek* writers use the phrase in this sense, which seems to be most natural and easy in this place. Thus the *Syriac* has rendred it.

(*g*) *Εμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ. Confirmed it by an oath.*] We cannot easily miss the sense in general, it being obvious that our author must have a respect to the confirmation which God design'd to give. And *Philo's* expression concerning this matter fully agrees with this general account. *Εὐ καὶ τῷ ὅρκῳ βεβαιώσας τὸ ὑπόχεσιν.* "He well confirmed his promise with an oath," *pag. 98.* And so the *Vulg.* and *Castellio* interposuit *jusjurandum*, "interposed an oath," do not miss the sense, and that phrase is very proper *Latin*. See *Livy, lib. xxxiv. c. 25.* But however this may hit the sense, it seems to make the construction hard, it being not *ὅρκον* but *ὅρκῳ*. Our translators were not insensible of this; and therefore have given us this marginal reading, *He interposed himself by an oath*; with which the *Italian, French, and Low Dutch* translations

[19.] these two immutable things, viz. the promise and oath of God, by which it was impossible for God to deceive, we *Gentiles* might have strong consolation, who have to escape danger fled to lay hold of Christ who is the hope proposed to us (*b*). And him, who is our hope, we have to be as a safe and firm anchor of our souls, he being entred within the

vail.

by two immutable things, in which *it was* impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us: Which *hope* we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entreth into that

NOTES.

tions do agree. *Chrysostom* and other *Greek* commentators hint this sense, and talk strangely of God's being a mediator. *Beza* renders it *fide jussit jure jurando*, i. e. "He undertook for it by an oath." But the *Syriac*, perhaps, has given a better rendring than any of them. It uses here the word **ܫܒܬ** which signifies elsewhere to shut up, as persons in prison, *Acts* xvi. 24. *Gal.* iii. 22, 23. *Luke* iii. 20. or any way to inclose, as fishes in a net, *Luke* v. 6. So that the sense will be, that God willing more abundantly to shew to the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel included it [i. e. his counsel or his promise] in an oath, placed it as it were in the middle of an oath. Nor does the word *μεσίτευεν* necessarily refer to the part of a mediator, but is used concerning things as well as persons; and so it may import God's putting his counsel or promise in the midst of somewhat, as here his oath, without supposing it to be used reciprocally to signify his interposing himself.

18 (*b*) *Οἱ καὶ ἀφυγόντες ἀρτίῳ τῷ παρρησιάζοντι ἐλπίδι*. Who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us.] Our author here speaks in the first person, *WE* might have strong consolation who have fled, &c. and who are design'd hereby has been already declared in considering the 12th verse. See note (*x*). All therefore that is farther design'd in this note, is to inquire what we are to understand by the hope set before us. Now there are but two ways in which this can be understood. One is that in which 'tis commonly taken to denote hope the virtue in us. But this seems not at all agreeable. The virtue of hope is internal, whereas all the metaphors here used consider this hope as external. 'Tis a hope set before us, what we flee to, and lay hold upon. And in the next verse 'tis compared to an anchor which holds the ship, which is not in the ship, but is fastened in the earth at some distance from it. Besides, 'tis said to be the anchor of the soul, which would be a very improper comparison, if it were hope the virtue, that being in the soul it self. This should rather be compared to ballast than to an anchor. The other therefore seems the truer interpretation, which makes hope here to be put for the object of hope. But then this may be differently taken, and import either the happiness which is the matter of our hope, or the person in whom we place our hope. I can't see how the former can be here well admitted, because of that expression, *Which entreth into that within the veil*: for then the sense would run thus, "We have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope of heaven, which hope of heaven is entred into heaven:" which is manifestly absurd. It remains therefore most probable, that Christ is here meant by the hope set before us. And this is very agreeable to several places of the scripture which call him our hope, *1 Tim.* i. 1. *Acts* xxviii. 20. This will indeed connote the future state of happiness, as Christ is the person by whom we hope to obtain it, *Col.* i. 27. but still it will be Christ who is called the hope set before us.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

20 within the vail. Whither the forerunner is for us entred, *even* Jesus, made an high-priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.

vail (*i*). Whither Jesus the forerunner is for us entred (*k*), he being made an high-priest for ever after the order of *Melchizedec* (*l*).

NOTES.

19 (*i*) Καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ εἰσώτερον τοῦ ἁγίου ὁμοῦ. *And which entred into that within the vail.*] This seems very much to confirm the interpretation just given of the hope set before us. For he here speaks of it in terms borrowed from the high-priests under the law. I think the words should rather be rendred, *And is entred within the vail*, as we have rendred εἰσῆλθεν, *is entred*, in the next verse. That all the terms are here borrowed from the law concerning the high-priests is plain: Lev. xvi. 3. Οὕτως εἰσελεύσεται Ααρὼν εἰς τὸ ἅγιον. *Thus shall Aaron come into the holy place.* And this holy place is thus described in the immediately preceding verse, εἰς τὸ ἅγιον εἰσώτερον τοῦ ἁγίου ὁμοῦ, *into the holy place within the vail.* The high-priest only entred within the vail, and since our author is speaking of Christ under that character, it seems most natural to understand him here as saying that our high-priest Christ who is our hope, is entred within the vail, that was signified by the holy of holies, heaven it self. Hardly any tolerable account can be given of his words, unless they be considered as carrying in them this allusion, of which he makes frequent mention throughout his epistle. And there was the more reason perhaps for his doing it here, because he is considering Christ as a priest after the order of *Melchizedec*, concerning whom we read of no such thing: whence the *Hebrews* might be supposed to object. "Our confidence is in the atonement made once a year by the high-priest, when he enters into the holy of holies; and that is of much more importance to us than what is done by a priest after the order of *Melchizedec*, who had no such holy place into which he could enter." In answer to this he lets them know, that however this high-priest of christians did not enter into the holy place, whether the high-priests under the law went; yet he was gone into that which was much more noble, and of which the other was but a shadow, as he shews in other places.

20 (*k*) Ὅτι ὡς ἄρχιεὺς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς. *Whither the forerunner is for us entred, even Jesus.*] Perhaps some may think this don't suit the account given before of our hope's being entred within the vail, seeing the same thing will seem then here to be repeated. But such should observe, that here is no *likewise* or *also*, or any the like particle to hint to us that an intirely different thing is here mentioned. Nay this addition seems most pertinent, the former interpretation being supposed; and that in these respects, 1. That it specifies and expressly names the person *Jesus* who is the hope set before us, which had not been fully and clearly done before in the context, and so was here the more necessary. 2. He hereby declares what sanctuary or holy place within the vail he intended in the foregoing verse, not that of the temple at *Jerusalem*, but that holy place into which they knew Christ was ascended. 3. He hereby assigns another very material difference between the high-priest's entring within the earthly sanctuary, and Jesus our high-priest's entring within the heavenly sanctuary. The Aaronical high-priests did not enter the sanctuary as forerunners of the people, who were utterly debarred an entrance into it at any time, but Jesus is entred for us as a forerunner, and who will take care that we shall come after him into it.

(*l*) *Jesus made an high-priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec.*] Our author upon the occasion of his mentioning Christ's being called by God an high-priest after the order of *Melchizedec*, Chap. v. 10. began his large digression, so having brought his discourse round to that, he here handsomly ends his digression, and immediately proceeds to the more distinct consideration of him as a priest after that order.

S E C T. VIII.

C H A P. VII. 1—28.

C O N T E N T S.

OUR author here comes to treat directly of *Melchizedec*, of whom he had made mention in the last verse of the foregoing chapter, as likewise *Chap. v. 6, 10.* and concerning whom he tells them he had many things to say, and hard to be explained; which are, I suppose, set down in this section, which evidently contains many things of that nature concerning *Melchizedec*. His aim seems to be to abate the confidence of the *Hebrews*, and to shew them that they were mistaken in imagining that the utmost perfection belong'd to the priesthood of *Aaron*, and that therefore it was a vain thing for them to expect help from any high-priest who was not of his order, as Christ confessedly was not, being not of the sons of *Aaron*, or of the tribe of *Levi*, but being of the tribe of *Judah*. He proves therefore here that their own law gave an account of a more noble priesthood than that of *Aaron*, and that it was foretold by the psalmist, that the Messiah should be an high-priest of that more excellent order: and he embellishes his discourse by a great variety of instances and allegations, which might very much establish them in their adherence to Christ, and especially after he had in such tremendous terms represented the danger of apostatizing from him in the foregoing chapter.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

I. **F**OR (*m*) this *Melchizedec* (after whose order God calls Christ an high-priest) **F**OR this Melchisedec king of Salem, priest king

N O T E S.

[*(m) For.*] This seems to relate to *Chap. v. 10.* and to introduce the reason why God calls Christ an high-priest after the order of *Melchizedec*, viz. because of the superior honour and excellency of *Melchizedec* above the high-priests under the law, as he goes on to prove. If any think this rather connects with the last verse of the foregoing chapter, I will not contest it.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the ² kings, and blessed him: To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all: first being by interpretation king of righteousness, and after

king of *Salem*, priest of the most high God (*n*), who courteously met and entertained *Abraham*, when he returned from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; to whom also *Abraham* gave a tenth part of all the spoils he had taken in the war (*o*): being first king of righteousness, or a righteous king, according to the signification of his name *Melchizedec* (*p*), and after that also king

22

NOTES.

it. Only I think the chief thing he must then be understood to refer to is the word *for ever*. And thus he here proves, provided we follow the sense of our translators, which seems not very certain, that *Christ is made a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec*, because this *Melchizedec abideth a priest continually*, ver. 3. for so far, even to the end of the sentence, must we then go for his proof.

(*n*) *Ἰερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψίστου.* *Priest of the most high God.*] This is expressly taken notice of in the short history we have of this person, *Gen. xiv. 18—21*. And though the word *יהויד* there used signifies sometimes a *prince*; yet the *Jews* are very unreasonable in affixing this sense to it in that place, since they, many of them, acknowledge that it signifies a *priest*, *Psal. cx. 4*. As our author's design is to magnify the priesthood of our Saviour after the order of *Melchizedec*, in order thereto he shews the greatness and excellency of *Melchizedec's* priesthood; and with this view he joins the regal and priestly offices, which both concurr'd in *Melchizedec*, whereas the priestly only belong'd to *Aaron* and his sons. Thus to set out the dignity of christians, they are said to be a *royal priesthood*, *1 Pet. ii. 9*. And *Christ* is said to have made us *kings and priests* to his God and Father, *Rev. i. 6*. I am inclined to think our author had yet a farther aim in speaking of *Melchizedec* as priest of the most high God, *viz.* 1. To put the *Hebrews* in mind of the priority and greater antiquity of his priesthood. He was a priest of the most high God several ages before the priesthood of *Aaron* was appointed. 2. He seems to give them occasion to consider with reference to whom he was priest of the most high God; it was not for one single people, as *Aaron* and his sons were high-priests for *Israel*; but he was a priest in a larger extent, a priest as it were to the whole world, being authorized to act as such, and to bless (as that belong'd to the priest's office) not only *Abraham*, the root and head of that people for whom the legal high-priests were appointed, but to discharge his office in the place where he lived, *i. e.* among *Gentiles*; for such they were among whom he lived, and over whom he reigned. This marvellously suits our great high-priest who acts as an high-priest for all that believe in him without distinction, whether they are *Jews* or *Gentiles*. The nice care our author took to avoid giving offence to the *Hebrews*, will account for his not mentioning this expressly, supposing that he aimed at it.

2 (*o*). *Ὡς καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέλεισεν Ἀβραάμ.* *To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all.*] Not of all that *Abraham* possessed; but only of the spoils which he had taken from his enemies, as 'tis clearly explained *ver. 4*. And so *Josephus* explains it only of the tenth of the spoils, *Antiq. lib. i. c. 11. p. 18*.

(*p*) *Πρῶτον ἔρμηνευόμενον βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης.* *First being by interpretation King of righteousness.*] This is the meaning of his name *Melchizedec*. It was agreeable to the *Hebrews* thus to take notice of the signification of names. Thus *Josephus* in the place just now cited says,

says,

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

3. king of *Salem*, that is king of peace (*q*),
was without any priestly descent either by his
father or mother's side (*r*), having not any
end at all of his days or life (*s*). But
made

that also, king of Salem,
which is, king of peace;
Without father, without
mother, without descent,
having neither beginning
of days, nor end of life;

N O T E S.

says, that "*Melchizedec* signifies a righteous king, as he certainly was, and therefore was ho-
noured to be the priest of the most high God." And since God intended him to be (I will
not say a type of Christ, though I think I very justly might) a pattern to whom Christ in his
priesthood should be conform'd, I can perceive no absurdity in supposing that there might be
some special direction of providence in fixing his name. And such as succeeded him in his re-
gal, but not in his priestly office, seem to have retained the termination of his name *zedec*,
which signifies *righteousness*, when they had lost the thing; as we read *Josbua* x. 1. of *Adoni-
zedec*, which name is of much the same import with *Melchizedec*, and who most probably reign-
ed in the same place.

(*q*) Επεΐτα ὃ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ· ὃ ὅτι βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης. And after that also king of
Salem, which is king of peace.] As I produced before *Josephus* agreeing with our author in his
gloss upon the name *Melchizedec*, so here we have *Philo* agreeing with that before us, Lib. ii.
Allegor. leg. p. 75. "God made *Melchizedec*, the king of peace, or *Salem*, (for so is it interpre-
ted) his priest." Their opinion seems most probable, who make this *Salem* to be the same
with *Jerusalem*. We find it called *Salem* long after this time, *Psal.* lxxvi. 2. Compare also
Josbua x. 1, &c. And *Josephus* also makes *Salem* to be the same with *Jerusalem*, in the place
before cited.

3 (*r*) Απάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος. Without father, without mother, without de-
scent.] The common interpretation of these expressions is, that nothing is recorded in the
book of *Genesis*, or any where else, of his father or mother, or his pedigree; to which I think
should be added, that this is to be understood concerning his priesthood; that is, that we find
not that he was of a priestly race either by his father or his mother's side, and so had no priestly
descent or pedigree. And indeed, since our author's design is to run a sort of parallel between
Melchizedec and Christ, this seems absolutely necessary. For these things are in no respect true
concerning Christ; who with respect to his divine nature was not without father, being the
Son of God, and with respect to his human nature had the virgin *Mary* to be his mother, and
whose genealogy we have delivered to us in the gospel. But this is certain, that he had no
priestly descent as to either nature, and so obtained not this office by virtue of it. And our
author seems to explain what he here says to this very purpose, when he says, *ver.* 6. *But he
whose descent is not counted from them*, [the sons of *Levi*] *received tithes*, &c. Nor am I able
to go any farther, or to offer any thing farther, if this does not satisfy; but should be glad of
more light by the help of others.

(*s*) Μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν, μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων. Having neither beginning of days nor end
of life.] If the opinion which has prevailed among the *Jewish* writers, and has been embraced
by many christians were certain, that this *Melchizedec* was *Shem*, it would flatly contradict
our author, or at least our translation. For *Gen.* xi. 10. assures us at what time *Shem* was
born, *viz.* ninety eight years before the flood, and when he died, *viz.* five hundred and two
years after the flood. Besides, the *Mosaic* history would not then be silent as to his father and
his descent. But to say the truth, I very much doubt of the exactness of our translation, though
perhaps I may not be able to mend it. No one who supposes *Melchizedec* to be a man, will
imagine that absolutely speaking he had no *beginning of days*; and therefore this uses to be li-
mited to the beginning of the days of his *priesthood*. But this also seems to me too much: for

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually. Now consider how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils. And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood,

made like unto the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who abideth a priest continually (*t*). Now observe how great this *Melchizedec* was, to whom even the patriarch *Abraham* gave the tenth of the spoils he had taken in the war. And indeed the tribe of *Levi*, to whom the office of the priesthood was committed (*u*), are

4.

5.

NOTES.

as in the next clause with an adverbative particle he adds, *but made like unto the Son of God, he abideth a priest continually*, he seems to me only to speak of the continuance of his priesthood after it was begun. Nor would it be proper to say, that he was made like to the Son of God, in not having a beginning of the days of his priesthood, because we certainly know when the days of Christ's priesthood began, viz. upon his resurrection. See Chap. v. 6. I will venture here to offer my conjecture; and the rather that I may put others upon the search, being very desirous of some better solution than what I propose. Suppose then we should understand ἀρχὴν to be used adverbially, as every one knows it sometimes is, signifying *prorsus, plane, omnino*; and so should render the words thus, *Having plainly neither an end of days, nor of life*. This will free the words from the objection just mentioned: for thus *Melchizedec*, of the end of the days of whose priesthood, or of the end of whose priestly life the scripture is wholly silent, will well answer to our Lord Jesus Christ, who being once vested in his office, is a priest forever, or after the power of an endless life. It may perhaps seem strange that both expressions, *days* and *life* should be used, since they are tantamount in this case. But I think that may easily be accounted for by the stile of the *Hebrews* to whom this epistle was written, to whom such a variety of expression was agreeable. An instance of this we have very much to our purpose, *Psal.* xxxiv. 13. where the *Hebrew* runs thus, *Who is the man who desires life, and loveth days, that he may see good?* Compare *Eccles.* vi. 12.

(*t*) Ἀφωμοιωμένον ὃ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ συνενεκές. *But made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually.* It cannot but seem strange that our author should speak of *Melchizedec* as still continuing to be a priest. I cannot therefore but think that this may be here avoided; and that we may do it without any great difficulty by supposing there is an ellipsis of the subjunctive article ὃς, and that the words should then be thus rendered, *But made like unto the Son of God, who [the Son of God] abideth a priest continually.* It seems most natural to think this great thing should be asserted concerning the Son of God, in whom it was literally and exactly true, rather than of him who was only made in some small circumstance to be a shadow and resemblance of it. The first chapter of the *Revelation* will furnish us with several the like *ellipses*; ver. 5. Καὶ ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, ἰ. ε. ὃς ὅτι ὁ μάρτυς. So again, ver. 6. Καὶ ἐποίησεν is put for ὃς καὶ ἐποίησεν. And this best accounts as I think for the construction of ver. 4. Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὃς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀν. ἰ. ε. ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὃς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀν. If this construction be allowed, there will be a necessity of supplying the verb substantive ἦν at the beginning of this third verse, there being nothing more frequent than the omission of it in all authors.

5 (*u*) Καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ Λευὶ, ἃ ἱεργείαν λαμβάνουσιν. *And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood.* I don't think that *Aaron* and his sons who were in the strictest and most proper sense priests, are here intended: but the sons of *Levi* seem to mean in general the tribe of *Levi*. My reasons for this are, because the tithing of the people was not committed to *Aaron* and his family, but to the *Levites* in general, who gave to this

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

- are impowered by the law to take tithes of the people, that is of their brethren (*ω*), though they come out of the loins of *Abraham* (*κ*). But *Melchizedec* who descended not from them, received tithes of *Abraham*, and have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham: But he whose descent is not counted from them, received tithes of

N O T E S.

the priests a tithe out of their tithe. See *Numb.* xviii. 24—30. *Neh.* x. 37, 38. And therefore our author's expression would hardly be proper if it were understood strictly of the priests. Again this seems determined to be the meaning of the place, by *ver.* 19. where 'tis said that *Levi* [not *Aaron*] *who received tithes, paid tithes in Abraham.* If it be inquired, how did the tribe of *Levi* receive the priesthood; the answer is easy from *Josh.* xviii. 7. *The Levites have no part among you; for the priesthood of the Lord is their inheritance.*

(*ω*) *Εντολῷ ἔχουσιν ἀποδεκᾶσθαι τὴν λαὸν κατὰ τὸ νόμον, τῆς ἐστὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ.* Have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is of their brethren. A learned commentator would have that clause, *according to the law*, refer not to the *having a commandment to take tithes*, but to the *people*, and the sense to be of the *people who are under the Mosaic law.* Nor would this interpretation have been disagreeable, provided he had confirm'd it by some parallel instances of that use of *κατὰ*; but till they appear, this must be join'd with the other part of the sentence, and what is added, *that is of their brethren*, is an explication only of the word *people.* It may, perhaps farther deserve consideration, whether it be so proper to render the word *ἐντολῷ* *commandment* rather than *permission.* In this latter sense it seems used *John* x. 18. *This commandment [i. e. this permission, or power of laying down my life and taking it again] have I received of my father.* And the same may be confirmed by comparing *Matth.* xix. 7, 8. and *Mark* x. 4, 5. In the former we read thus, *They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?* *Ενείλετο* here is expressed in *Mark* by *ἐπέτρεψεν.* *Moses suffer'd to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away.* Again in our Lord's answer, what *Mark* expresses thus, *For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept,* τὸ ἐντολῷ ταυτὶ, is thus related by *Matthew*, *Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you; ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν, to put away your wives, &c.* Our author does not speak of any commandment that *Melchizedec* had to require tithes of *Abraham*, and therefore he may the rather be thought in his comparison to refer to the permission granted to the *Levites.*

(*κ*) *Καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τοῦ σπλάγχνου Ἀβραάμ.* Although they come out of the loins of Abraham.] Our author's design is to magnify the priesthood of *Melchizedec*; in order whereunto he magnifies the dignity of the *Levitical* priesthood, and then shows that the other of *Melchizedec* was to be preferr'd to it. And thus stands his argument: "It was a great honour conferr'd on the *Levitical* priesthood, that they were impower'd to receive tithes of the whole nation who were their brethren; and this honour appears yet the greater, when 'tis consider'd that these their brethren came out of the loins of *Abraham*, the friend of God, for whom and whose posterity God had a particular regard, as appears by his promises; and who therefore it might be expected should be exempted from such a burden: but *Melchizedec* appears to have had yet a much more honourable priesthood, because he received tithes of one who was not of his brethren, even of *Abraham* himself (which shows him to be greater than *Abraham*) and with a priestly authority blessed him; and hereby in effect he received tithes of *Abraham's* posterity, even of *Levi*, and that tribe that descended from him." This gives a satisfactory account of the word *although*, which at first reading seems obscure.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

Abraham, and blessed him
7 that had the promises. And
without all contradiction,
the less is blessed of the bet-
8 ter. And here men that
die receive tithes : but there
he *receiveth them*, of whom
it is witnessed that he liveth.
9 And as I may so say, Levi
also who receiveth tithes,

and by virtue of his office as priest of the most
high God, blessed *Abraham* to whom the
promises were made. And without all dis-
pute the less is blessed of the better. And
here among the *Jews* the *Levites* who receive
the tithes are dying men, but there he re-
ceived them of whose death we read nothing,
it being only attested that he lived (*y*).
And if I may use the expression (*z*), *Levi*,
and consequently the tribe which descended
from him, to whom the tithes were given,
payed

7.

8.

9.

NOTES.

8 (*y*) Ενεῖ ὧ, μαρτυροῦντο ὅτι ζῇ. But there he receiveth them, of whom it is witness-
fed that he liveth. The adverbs ὧδε and ἐκεῖ, generally, if not constantly, are to be under-
stood of some place, and therefore it seems most agreeable to understand the text thus, “ Here
“ among the *Jews* the *Levites* who receive the tithes are dying men, who succeed one ano-
“ ther in their office ; but there where *Melchizedec* met *Abraham*, he received tithes of whom
“ ’tis witnessed that he liveth.” A very ingenious author has given these words a different
turn ; “ Here men that die receive tithes [i. e. are priests, as the tithes belonged to the priests]
“ but there [viz. within the veil where Jesus is entred, Chap. vi. 19, 20.] he [Christ] is, of
“ whom it is witnessed that he liveth.” The words *receiveth them* are not in the latter clause,
but are supplied by our translators ; and therefore he thinks he may as well supply ὧδε, is, as
δεξιὰς λαμβάνει, *receiveth tithes*. But from the following verses it appears that our author
is still comparing the *Levitical* priesthood with that of *Melchizedec*, and therefore that interpre-
tation, which looks forced, will not easily be admitted ; especially considering that it does not
remove the difficulty for the sake of which it is principally intended. For could we evade it
in this verse, yet the same thing, or tantamount to this will remain asserted, ver. 3. where *Melchi-
zedec* is said not to have had any end of life. I cannot therefore see that any better account is
yet given of the words than that which has been commonly received, that *Melchizedec* received
the tithes of whose death the scripture is wholly silent, the only thing it witnesses of him, be-
ing that he lived, that there was such a priest in the days of *Abraham*. Nor do I think that
this witness concerning him is so properly to be taken from *Psal.* cx. 4. as from the history of
Genesis. At least those words, *Thou art a priest for ever*, belong intirely to Christ, and can be
no proof of the continued life of *Melchizedec* ; though after the order of *Melchizedec* is a proof
that such a person there once was, from whom this order received its denomination. I can’t
say that I have got the key of this discourse, or that my account gives me an intire satisfaction.
I offer the reader the best sense I could meet with.

9 (*z*) Καὶ ὥς ἐπ’ ἐπιπείν. And as I may so say.] The expression he uses concerning
Levi’s paying tithes, before he was born, and reckoning him to do it in *Abraham*, being some-
what harsh and improper, he does by these words soften it, and they were commonly used by
the *Greeks* in like manner, just as the *Latines* used, *ut ita dicam*. See *Grotius* upon the place ;
and to the authors quoted by him may be added *Polybius*, in whom *Raphelius* refers to a great
many passages to the same purpose.

10. payed tithes in *Abraham*. For as *Levi* was not born till a long time after *Melchizedec* met *Abraham*, he could then have no other existence than what he had in the loyns of *Abraham*. If therefore perfection were by the *Levitical* priesthood (*a*), (for concerning that priesthood the people of the *Jews* had a law given them) (*b*), what farther occa-

payed tithes in *Abraham*. For he was yet in the loyns 10 of his father when *Melchizedec* met him. If there- 11 fore perfection were by the *Levitical* priesthood, (for under it the people received the law) what further need.

N O T E S.

11 (*a*) Εἰ μὲν ἐν τελείωσις διὰ τῆς Λευϊτικῆς ἱερωσύνης ἦν. *If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood.*] There are two senses in which the word we render *perfection* may be taken. The one is, that wherein our translators seem to have understood it, as signifying the same with τελείωσις, Chap. vi. 1. The *perfection* spoken of this way will relate to persons, and import that the *Levitical* priesthood did not, as he says of the law, Chap. x. 1. *make the comers thereto perfect*, or Chap. ix. 9. *could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience*, i. e. could not afford the *Jews* a perfect absolution from all guilt, or intirely free them from the burdensome sense of it in their own consciences. It freed them from legal defilements, but not from crimes of an enormous nature. This sense appears agreeable enough to our author's discourse in other parts of his epistle. But the word τελείωσις being only used once more in the new testament, it may not be amiss to consider in what sense 'tis there taken. Now there it plainly signifies a fulfilment of somewhat spoken before; and accordingly our translation renders it, *There shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord*, Luke i. 45. This sense will suit the place equally with the other. "If a full accomplishment of the things promised had been made by the *Levitical* priesthood, there would have been no need of any other priesthood to come after it." The difference is not very material, and the reader is left to take his choice.

(*b*) Ο λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῇ νομοθέτησεν. *For under it the people received the law.*] If we retain this rendering, with which most translations agree, it will be necessary to follow the *Alex.* and some few other MSS. which read ἐπ' αὐτῆς. But if we keep to the common reading, which is perhaps the best, this parenthesis must then be thus turn'd: *For concerning it* [the *Levitical* priesthood] *the people received a law*. The office of the priesthood, the family that was to officiate in it, and all the particular services that belong'd to it, were exactly deliver'd in the law of *Moses*; and to the priests were the people referr'd. *Mal. ii. 7. The priests lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts.* And that their authority was great we may see by *Deut. xvii. 8—12. xxiv. 8.* and many other places. The common reading taken in the manner before expressed seems much more apposite to our author's purpose than the sense our translation, and the aforesaid MSS. give it. For what did it signify under whom, or under what priesthood, the law was given, in order to prove that perfection was not by the *Levitical* priesthood? If any part of the law was given, not under, but before the *Levitical* priesthood, as for instance, the law of the passover, it did not upon that account imply *perfection*. But the allegation is most pertinent and strong the other way. For our author then supposes that every rightful priesthood must have some peculiar law to authorize and establish it, Chap. v. 4—6. and he here asserts that such a law indeed there was for that priesthood, as he again brings in the mention of it, ver. 16. where he says: *Christ was not made a priest after the law of a carnal commandment, viz. as the Levitical priests were.*

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For he of whom these things are spoken, pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For *it is* evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda;

occasion could there be that another priest should arise after the order of *Melchizedec*, and who should not be called a priest after the order of *Aaron*? For the priesthood being altered'd, there must of necessity be an alteration also of that law that appointed it. And that an alteration is indeed made of the priesthood is certain, because Christ who is declared to be a priest after the order of *Melchizedec*, was not of the same tribe with *Aaron*, but of another, to none of which it was allowed by the law, to minister at the altar, or perform any priestly functions. For 'tis unquestionable that our Lord was of the tribe of *Judah* (c),
of

NOTES.

were; and this commandment concerning the *Levitical* priesthood he speaks of as disannulled, *ver.* 18. and again, *ver.* 28. he speaks of the *law* as *making* men high-priests who have infirmity. Now nothing can be more clear and strong than his reasoning here; "If perfection were by the *Levitical* priesthood, which was appointed by a peculiar law concerning it, there would have been no occasion at all for any priesthood of another kind, but the law and the priesthood would have continued unchangeably the same. But it is evident by *Psal.* cx. that there was to be another priest who was to be of a different order from those priests: whence it necessarily follows, that his priesthood must likewise have a peculiar law to establish it, and that that law which confined the priesthood to the tribe of *Levi*, and to the family of *Aaron*, must be changed." The careful reading of the eight following verses will probably satisfy any one that our author's argument here is thus to be understood.

14 (c) *Πρόδηλον ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν.* For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah.] The connection of the discourse ought here carefully to be observed. What our author undertakes to prove is, that *perfection was not by the Levitical priesthood*; and his argument is, that if perfection had been by that, there would have been no occasion for any other priesthood, *ver.* 11. This he proves was not true, because a change is certainly made of the priesthood, and consequently of the law concerning it, *ver.* 12. And this he confirms by two reasons, 1. Because Christ who was the priest spoken of, was not of the tribe of *Levi*, but of *Judah*, *ver.* 13, 14. And, 2. Because he is described as a priest of quite different circumstances from those legal priests, *ver.* 15—17. The former of these reasons he lays down in more general terms, *ver.* 13. asserting only that Christ belonged to a tribe of which no one gave attendance at the altar, that is, no one could be a priest according to the law of the *Levitical* priesthood. And here *ver.* 14. he confirms his reason, by alleging that he was of the tribe of *Judah*; of which tribe *Moses* spake nothing concerning priesthood. The many *for*s with which he connects the verses are thus clear and easy.

Interpreters take no notice of any difference between *πρόδηλον* here, and *κατάδηλον* in the next verse, but seem to make them intirely the same. Perhaps they may be in the right, though I have been apt to suspect otherwise, and that the preposition *κατά* may here, as well as in many

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

15. of which *Moses* makes not the least mention as having the priesthood belonging to it. And 'tis yet farther evident by *Psal.* cx. (*d*), that (*e*) after the likeness of *Melchizedec* (*f*)
16. there ariseth another priest, who is made a priest, not according to the law of *Moses*, the commands of which were of a carnal nature, and in appointing the priesthood consider'd men as carnal and mortal, and therefore provided a succession in the office (*g*); but according

of which tribe *Moses* spake nothing concerning priesthood. And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of *Melchizedec* there ariseth another priest, Who is made, not after the law of a carnal com-

N O T E S.

many other compositions, retain its proper signification *before*. So it does in the word *μεγαλέως*, *ver.* 18. and in many other words; and particularly in *μεδέσθην*. Nay, our own translators have thus rightly render'd the word *μεδέσθην*, *1 Tim.* v. 24, 25. If we admit this, our author appeals to what was not only certain in it self, but by the *Jews* always own'd and acknowledged as such, that Christ was to be of the tribe of *Judah*, and of the lineage of *David*, according to the old prophecies. The only objection against this seems to be his using the preter-perfect tense *ἀνατέταλκε*. But Grammarians observe that that is sometimes used for the present: and thus our translators several times translate *ἐλήλυθα* as though it were the present tense, *I am come*. So *Isocrates*, in the beginning of his *Oratio ad Demon.* Πολὺ ὃ μεγίστην διαφορὰν ἐλήλυθας, (*i. e.* λαμβάνεις) ἐν ᾧ πρὸς ἀλλήλους συνηθείαις.

15 (*d*) Καὶ περαιότερον ἔτι κατὰ δὴλόν ἐστιν. *And it is yet far more evident.*] What is here said, is to be consider'd as a proof of the assertion at *ver.* 12. That the priesthood, and consequently the law concerning it, is changed. And the argument stands thus: "Christ is actually spoken of as a priest, but his priesthood is described in such terms as will not fit the legal priests. He is said to be of another order, and to be the perpetual manager of the office without any to succeed him in it.

(*e*) *Ei. For.*] The word must be taken to signify *that*, or *because*. See *Dr. Whitby* on the place; and the notes on *Phil.* iii. 11.

(*f*) Καὶ ὅμοιότητά Μελχισεδέκ. *After the similitude of Melchizedec.*] This shows in what sense the word *τάξις*, *order*, so often used before and afterwards in this matter, is to be understood. There was no such order of men to manage the *Melchisedechian* priesthood, as there was for the *Aaronical*, wherein one succeeded another. This is contrary to the whole strain of our author's discourse. Nor can our Lord be consider'd as succeeding *Melchizedec* in his priesthood. All that is meant is, that there was a great resemblance in the priesthood of these two. See *ver.* 3. And such a resemblance there was in many respects. The priestly and kingly offices were joined together in both; they neither of them came by the priestly office, as being descended from any in that office; nor had they either of them any to succeed them therein; besides other things that might be mentioned. Whence the *Syriac* uses the same word ܐܬܡܕܬ, which signifies *similitude*, not only here, but in rendring of *τάξις* *order* also.

16 (*g*) Οὐκ ἔστι νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς γέγονεν. *Who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment.*] The sense is, who is made a priest not according to the law of *Moses*, the commands of which were of a carnal nature; and particularly the law that appointed the priesthood was *carnal*, because it consider'd those whom it made priests as dwelling in mortal flesh; and therefore prescribed a succession of them one after another. Christ was not a priest of

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

mandment; but after the power of an endless life.
 17 For he testifieth, Thou art
 18 a priest for ever after the or-
 der of Melchisedec. For
 there is verily a disanulling
 of the commandment going
 before, for the weakness
 and unprofitableness there-
 19 of. For the law made no-
 thing perfect, but the bring-
 ing in of a better hope did;
 by the which we draw nigh
 20 unto God. And in as much
 as not without an oath
 21 he was made priest, (For

according to that power and ability that he has
 perpetually to execute the office himself, by
 reason of his endless or indissoluble life. For 17.
 thus God testifies by the psalmist, *Thou art a*
priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec.
 For (b) there is an abrogation of the former 18.
 commandment concerning the *Levitical* priest-
 hood upon the account of the weakness and
 unprofitableness of it (for the law made no- 19.
 thing perfect) but there is a bringing in of a
 better hope by a more perfect priest, by rea-
 son of which we christians draw nigh to God.
 And in as much as he was not made a priest 20.
 without an oath (i), wherein his case differs 21.
 from

NOTES.

of this nature, that is, he was not appointed a priest only for so short a time as mens lives are. The opposition in the next part of the verse secures us, that this in the general is our author's aim; *But after the power of an endless* [or indissoluble] *life.* He is made a priest who by reason of his never dying can always himself execute his office, and needs no one to succeed him in it.

18, 19 (b) The true construction of these verses seems to have been wholly mistaken by all commentators. That clause in the beginning of the 19th verse they join with the rest of it, and imagine the opposition to lie between the two parts of the verse. Thus our translation, *The law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did,* where they supply the word *did,* meaning that it made things perfect, but the first clause of that verse is manifestly brought in by way of illustration. He had said that there was a *disanulling of the commandment* [viz. concerning the *Levitical* priesthood] *going before, for the weakness or unprofitableness of it.* Now to clear and confirm this weakness or unprofitableness of that particular law concerning the priesthood, he inserts a general assertion concerning the law, *That the law made nothing perfect;* and if it made nothing perfect, it could not make the priesthood so, or confer those advantages which were to be expected by the office. This clause therefore being of such a nature, it ought manifestly to be read in a parenthesis as in the paraphrase. And then the ἀθέτησις μὲν, and the ἐπεισαγωγή ἡ δὲ appear to be exactly placed according to the Greek usage, and so the only supply needful in the 19th verse is to understand the word γίνεσθαι to be repeated, and leaving out the parenthesis, the sense stands thus, *There is verily a disanulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness of it; but there is a bringing in of a better hope.* By *hope* here I understand Christ, as I did in the latter end of the foregoing chapter, and that the rather because of what is added, *By which* [hope] *we draw nigh to God.* Compare, ver. 25. and many other places.

20 (i) Καὶ καθ' ὅσον ἢ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας. *And in as much as not without an oath he was made priest.* Our translation has very justly supplied the sense by adding, *he was made priest,* and this ἐπεὶ γέγονεν is to be fetched from ver. 15, 16. And as it deservedly reads ver. 21. in a parenthesis, this stands connected with ver. 22.

- from that of the priests after the order of *Aaron*: for they were made priests without an oath, but Christ with an oath by him who said unto him, *The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec*) by so much was Jesus made a surety of a better covenant (*k*). And the priests under the law were
22. those priests were made without an oath: but this with an oath, by him that said unto him, The Lord swear and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec) By so much was Je- 22
23. sus made a surety of a better testament. And they 23 truly were many priests,

N O T E S.

22 (*k*) Καὶ ὡς τοσούτον κρείττονος διαθήκης γέγονεν ἔγγραπτον Ἰησοῦς. By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.] There are several things which deserve to be consider'd in these words.

1. In what sense the word διαθήκη is here used, that is, whether it is here to be taken for a testament or a covenant. And as the word is oftentimes used in this epistle, and other places, manifestly signifying a covenant, it seems most natural to understand it so here. I know of but one place where there appears any necessity of supposing it to signify a testament, and that is Chap. ix. 16—20. which will be consider'd when we come to it. Besides the word ברית which our author has a respect to on all occasions, and in this place, when he says Jesus was made a surety of a better covenant, that is, better than the first covenant, I say this Hebrew word never signifies a testament, but always a covenant. Nor is it easy to understand what can be meant by a sponsor or surety of a testament.

2. The next thing to be consider'd is, how Jesus is the sponsor or surety, or mediator, of a better, that is of the new covenant. A testament had no sponsor belonging to it; but covenants frequently had in the civil law, and still have among all nations. So in contracts persons were sponsors who undertook for the performance of them; and when men were candidates for offices there were sponsors who undertook for them that they had not sought them by any corrupt practices. As to the word ἔγγραπτον, there can, I think, be no doubt of the propriety of our translation. The word is used only in this place in the new testament, but 'tis in the Apocrypha, Eccles. xxix. 15, 16. 2 Macc. x. 28. and its conjugates are several times found in the LXX's version of the Proverbs, and in other authors. The Greek interpreters explain it by μεσίτης, a mediator. And indeed that seems to be the sense of it; and accordingly he is called by our author the mediator of a better covenant, Chap. viii. 6. the mediator of the new covenant, Chap. ix. 15. xii. 24. And 'tis in this sense the word μεσίτης is used Gal. iii. 19, 20. 1 Tim. ii. 5. Perhaps it may be thought a too curious inquiry, why our author should here instead of it, use a word not elsewhere to be met with in the new testament, instead of that which was more common? I am apt to think that he was led to this by his having just before, ver. 19. used the word ἐγγίζομαι, we draw nigh, and that he did it for the sake of the paronymasia; which appears to have been very agreeable to St. Paul. And perhaps this may be some little confirmation of his being the author of this epistle. Christ is commonly understood to be here spoken of as a surety in his death, as therein he undertook to make atonement for our sins: but that hardly seems agreeable to the scope of the place, because he is here represented as a priest when he was a surety, whereas his priesthood did not properly commence till after his resurrection, as was before observed. His priestly mediatorship does indeed presuppose his death, and is founded upon it, according to 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all: but he did not according to the scripture account, actually become a mediator till he was made an high-priest after

N O T E S.

after the order of *Melchizedec*; and his being a surety or mediator relates to his acting in the behalf of God towards us, and to his assuring us of the divine favour, and to his bestowing the benefits promised by God. If it be asked, What need was there of a mediator to assure us of the fulfilment of the promises made by the God of truth who cannot lie or deceive us? I answer, the same objection might be made against God's adding his oath to his promise, whereby he intended to give us the greater security of the accomplishment of his promise.

3. It farther deserves to be consider'd, to what purpose this is mentioned by our author, when he is comparing Christ as a priest with the *Levitical* priests. He is arguing from the oath of God whereby Christ was made an high-priest, that his priesthood excelled that of the high-priests under the law; and the conclusion is thus expressed, *By so much was he the surety of a better covenant.* This conclusion is not just, unless his being a surety is equivalent to his being an high-priest. And besides 'tis necessary to inquire, how the high-priests under the law were sureties of that old covenant. That they were so is here sufficiently implied: for this must be the sense of the verse, *By so much is he the surety of a better covenant,* than that of which they were the sureties. With reference to the former of these difficulties I conceive, that his being an high-priest and a surety are truly equivalent, in as much as being constituted by God an high-priest, he is actually intrusted with, and empower'd to dispense, the blessings and benefits of the new covenant, and so he is by his office necessarily a surety from God to us. And as to the other difficulty, the like considerations may without violence be applied to the *Aaronical* high-priests, to shew that they were sureties or mediators of the old covenant. Christ our great high-priest is represented as a mediator or a surety from God to us, when he passed into the heavens, and having all things committed to him, does now assure us of God's being propitious to us, and his readily dispensing the benefits of the new covenant to us. If we would now understand how the high-priests were mediators or sureties of the old covenant, we must compare that part of their office wherein they were, according to our author, a resemblance or shadow of this priesthood of Christ, and wherewith he continually compares and illustrates our Saviour's priesthood. And the comparison, as far as I understand it, stands thus: Christ having shed his blood, entred into heaven the holiest of all, and as an high-priest there presented it to God, whereby he rendred God propitious to us, and being there continually exercising his office he secures us of favour and reconciliation with God: in like manner the appointed offerings being first slain and rightly order'd, the high-priest alone once a year, without any of the priests or people accompanying him, went into the holy of holies, and by sprinkling the blood upon the mercy seat, &c. (See *Lev. xvi.*) he made atonement. Now herein he was a surety from God to them, as upon his care and faithfulness alone they could depend that the atonement was made, and that God was pacified: for since no one was to be with him when he went into the holy of holies, or could be a witness of what he did there, they could have only his own word for it, and that they must be forced to take, that all things were rightly and effectually managed. I am verily perswaded that this is what our author aims at in other places as well as this; and that this was the reason why it was so expressly required in the law, that the high-priest should enter alone into the holy of holies. But there is one place in the writings of *St. Paul*, which seems to me very much to confirm my account, and I shall the rather take notice of it, because it has in my opinion been universally mistaken by expositors, the best of all not excepted. *Gal. iii. 19. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come, to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.* This mediator is generally thought to be *Moses* by whom God gave the law to *Israel*: but the text seems rather to speak of the law as left by the disposition of angels, to remain in the hand of a mediator till the promised seed should come. Now such a mediator *Moses* was not who lived but a few years after the giving of the law: whence it seems more natural to understand here a succession of mediators which should remain till Christ should come; and who then can these be but the high priests under the law? These were sureties or mediators of the old, as Christ is of the new covenant: but agreeably to the stile of the scripture in the like successions, they are spoken of but as one, because there was but one at a time. It may be some kind of confirmation of this, that as our authors speaking of them under this character, would naturally lead him to

take

24. were many, succeeding one another, because they were by death hindered from continuing in their office ; but Christ our high-priest, because he continues and lives for ever, has a priesthood which he continually executes himself without transmitting it to any successors. Whence also he is perpetually able to save those who come unto God by him (l), because he ever lives to make intercession for them. For such an high-priest did our case require, as was holy (m), harm-

because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: But this *man*, 24 because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an high-priest became us, *who is ho-*

N O T E S.

take notice that this mediatorship was not managed by one single person, but by a succession of one after another, so he actually proceeds to mention that in the very next verse, *And they truly were many priests*, &c. where he is still upon his argument from the oath with which he was made a priest, as appears from the last verse of the chapter. This is offered as what appears to me highly probable, and not unworthy to be diligently examined by the reader.

4. The last thing to be here consider'd, is the force of our author's argument, that because the ancient high-priests were made without an oath, and Christ was made with an oath, that therefore he is the surety of a better covenant than they were. And the whole stress lies evidently on this, that an oath being a most solemn thing, and not used by God but upon great and extraordinary occasions, the priesthood which is conferr'd with an oath must be look'd upon as of a much more noble and important nature than that which is committed to men in a more common and less solemn manner.

25 (l) Οθεν κ) σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελές δύναται τὸς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ πρὸ Θεῶ. *Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come to God by him.* 'Tis doubtful whether εἰς τὸ παντελές, which we render *to the uttermost*, is to be joined with δύναται, *he is able*, or with σώζειν, *to save*. If we understand the phrase with our translators to signify *completely*, it may seem to relate to his *saving*, and accordingly to be well render'd by them. But if we take it to import *perpetually* or *for ever*, it may look more likely that it should be join'd with his *being able*. This latter sense is perhaps the most probable, as best suiting his argument, that because he has a priesthood which does not descend from him to any successors, but which he ever lives to execute himself, therefore he must for ever be able to save. And this well suits his expression, *ver. 3.* and especially if it be taken in the sense before given. (See upon the place note (t)) Μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ συνεχές. *Abideth a priest continually.* The *Vulg.* leaves it as uncertain as the *Greek*, *Unde & salvare in perpetuum potest*: but the *Syr.* by altering the situation of the words, *And he is able to save for ever*, seems to go the other way. The consequence is not very great, which ever interpretation the reader shall prefer.

26 (m) Οσιος. *Holy.* The properties here mentioned, are to be understood to belong to him as an high-priest, and consequently after his resurrection. The two last manifestly refer to this, and the three first may well be taken to do so, however true they are of him with respect to the life he lived here on earth. It may be difficult perhaps, to affirm with any certainty how these characters differ. I shall offer what seems to me most probable. They may by some perhaps be thought to give the best account of the first of these characters, *holy*, who explain it by his being separated for, and devoted to the use and service of God. And thus this

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

ly, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; 27 Who needeth not daily, as harmless (*n*), undefiled (*o*), separate from sinners (*p*), and made higher than the heavens (*q*); who has no need, like the high-priests 27.

NOTES.

this will well agree with the inscription that was ordered to be upon the mitre of the high-priest, *Holiness to the Lord*, Exod. xxviii. 36. xxxix. 30. It was in this sense that all the utensils of the tabernacle and temple were *holy*: and in this sense our Saviour may be understood to speak of his sanctifying himself, *John* xvii. 19. And had the word used here been the same with that used by the evangelist, or by the LXX. in the places refer'd to, viz. *ἀγιάζειν* or any of its conjugates, there would have been less room to doubt of this interpretation. But since the word *ῥεῖος* is never as far as I can find so used, we must rather take it here to refer to what is commonly meant by *holiness*, an internal disposition of mind; and so if we will distinguish it from the other characters, it may be consider'd as having God more particularly for the object of it. Nor can there be any doubt that such an holiness was absolutely necessary in our great high-priest. Had he not always been thus holy, even in his life, he had not been qualified for the office. Or else, which I most incline to, we may understand this word to answer to the Hebrew *יָדוּן*, which is often rendred in the LXX. by *ῥεῖος*, and then it will import his being *merciful*; which is a very necessary qualification in our high-priest, *Chap.* ii. 17. *Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren; that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest.* Compare also *Chap.* iv. 15. v. 2.

(*n*) *Ἀκακος*. *Harmless.*] Some understand this of a freedom from evil, grief or suffering. But no instance is as yet produced of this use of the word; and therefore 'tis not easily to be admitted. Our own translation seems to be very just. If the former character be understood to express his respect to God, this may then be taken to import his innocence toward men. Otherwise it may be joined with mercifulness, as signifying that he is one who will not deceive or frustrate the hopes placed on him, as there is no malice, guile or deceit in him, *1 Pet.* ii. 22.

(*o*) *Ἀμίαντος*. *Undefiled.*] If the explication of the two foregoing characters be allowed, this will be a more general one, and import his absolute freedom from all manner of sin; and this was necessary in our great high-priest, that however he had been tempted in all points as we are, he should have kept himself intirely free from sin, *Chap.* iv. 15. This is analogous to what was prescribed for the high-priests under the old law, who were above all others to avoid all legal defilements, and more especially when on the great day of expiation they were to go into the most holy place. And though in order to the successful discharge of his office it was necessary he should be righteous, just and sinless, *1 John* ii. 1. yet 'tis possible that is not so much here regarded as the place into which he was to enter, and in which he was to execute his office. He was to pass into the heavens, the most holy place of all, there to appear for us as our great high-priest: but had he been himself defiled he could not have been admitted there, since nothing unclean and polluting can enter there.

(*p*) *Κεχωρισμένον ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν*. *Separate from sinners.*] As he was to be undefiled, and intirely free from sin himself, so he was to be separate from sinners, in as much as the place to which he was to go, would not admit of the presence of sinners.

(*q*) *Καὶ ὑψηλότερον τῶν ἐρανῶν γενόμενον*. *And made higher than the heavens.*] If the *heavens* here are put for the inhabitants thereof, the angels, as I think I have shown they are, *Chap.* i. 10. nothing can be more pertinent than what is here said. We may easily observe that our Saviour's advancement is frequently set out to the same purpose. See *1 Pet.* iii. 22. *Eph.* i. 10, 20—22. *Philip.* ii. 10, 11. *Col.* i. 20. *Heb.* i. 3, 4. And this may seem confirmed by what he presently adds, *Chap.* viii. 1. *Now of the things which we have spoken this is the*

28. priests under the law, from time to time (*r*), to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins, and after that for the people's (*f*). For this latter he did once for all when he offered up himself. And as to the former he had no occasion to do it all, he being so vastly different from those high-priests. For the law maketh men high-priests who are subject to sinful infirmities, and so need to offer for themselves; but the word of the oath spoken since the giving the law, makes the son an high-priest who is perfected for evermore.

those high-priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people: for this he did once, when he offered up himself. For the law maketh men 28 high-priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.

N O T E S.

sum: We have such an high-priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens; which bespeaks his being exalted above the angels, to any of whom God never said, *Sit on my right hand*, Heb. i. 13. But if any prefer the other sense, and understand the heavens properly, yet that will in effect fall in with this interpretation, when the end of this his exaltation is consider'd according to St. Paul's account, Eph. iv. 10. *He ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.*

27 (*r*) Καθ' ἡμέραν. *Daily.*] The Greek word is often used for time. See Gatak. adv. Pfochen. c. 25. and Grabii notas in Irenæi fragment. p. 465. not. 4. So that the proper rendering here, and Chap. x. 11. would be *from time to time*; for in both places the great day of atonement seems to be intended. This being only one day in the year, the expression will be equivalent to κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν, *year by year*, Chap. x. 1.

(*f*) Πρῶτον ὑπὲρ ἑωυτοῦ ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν θυσιάς ἀναφέρειν, ἔπειτα ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ. *To offer up sacrifice first for his own sins, and then for the peoples.*] 'Tis a strange interpretation which some very learned commentators here give, as though Christ in analogy to the Aaronical high-priests, offered sacrifice for his own sins as well as the peoples, since 'tis certain from all the accounts given of him by our author, and all the other penmen of the new testament, that our Saviour was always perfectly free from sin. And to make ἁμαρτιῶν signify *sinless infirmities* is very unreasonable, the word being never, that I can find, used in that sense. And indeed if it were, what occasion could there be to offer sacrifice for sinless infirmities? This interpretation appears to me inconsistent, not only with the current doctrine of the new testament, but with the scope of this place, and the argument here used. To set this in a full light let us consider,

1. Upon what occasion this is brought in; and that seems to be upon the mention he had made of his being *harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners*. These qualifications are a good evidence that he needed not, as the high-priests under the law, to offer sacrifice for his own sins: but it will not, to say the least, sound well, that he should speak of him as *harmless and undefiled*, and immediately subjoin that he offered sacrifice for his own sins.

2. Let us consider how his argument stands in this and the following verse. Two things he here asserts that Christ had no need to do which were done by those high-priests, 1. To offer sacrifice from time to time for his own sins; and, 2. To offer sacrifice from time to time for the sins of the people. The reason and evidence of the former he declares in the next verse, *For the law maketh men high-priests which have infirmity, but the word of the oath which was since the law, makes*

N O T E S.

makes the Son high-priest who is perfected for evermore. The *for*, *ᾧ*, here must connect this with somewhat that went before, which cannot be the last clause of *ver. 27.* *This he did once, when he offered up himself.* It must therefore, as indeed the nature of the argument shows, relate to his not needing to offer sacrifice for his own sins: for it is an assertion that he had none. *The law made those high-priests which have [sinful] infirmity* [and consequently had need to offer sacrifice for it] but the word of the oath [*Psal. cx. 4.*] *which was* [in *David's* time, and so since the giving of the law] *maketh the Son, who is perfected for evermore*; and consequently needs not to offer sacrifice for himself. This connection seems very clear. But then the question will be, What we are to make of that clause, *For thus he did once when he offered up himself?* I answer, that our author designing to treat again of his offering for the sins of the people, *Chap. ix. 12. x. 10—14.* he here passes it over more slightly; and when he says, *THIS he did once*, *this* refers intirely to the nearest antecedent, the offering for the sins of the people, and the clause should be read in a parenthesis, and then the 28th verse will well connect with the remoter antecedent, and show he had no need to offer for his own sins. Or else the sense of the 28th verse must be elliptical, and be thus supplied; “And as to the other thing mentioned, his offering for his own sins he had no need, as those high-priests, to do that, because the law maketh men high-priests which have infirmity [and so stand in need of an offering to be made for themselves] but the word of the oath which was since the law maketh the Son an high-priest, who is perfected for evermore [and therefore needs no such offering up on his own account.]”. And as the word *τελειωμένον* stands opposed to *ἔχοντας ἀδυναμίαν* *having infirmity*, that is sinful infirmity, for which there was need to offer sacrifice, I think it is better rendred *perfected*, as in the margin, than *consecrated*, as in our common text.

S E C T. IX.

C H A P. VIII. 1—6.

C O N T E N T S.

OUR author having finished his argument from a comparison of the priesthood of *Melchizedec* with that of *Aaron*, he here inculcates strongly upon the *Hebrews* the grand thing he had had all along in view, and that is to demonstrate the great excellency of Jesus Christ as our high-priest. For this end he compares him now only with the priests under the law, and argues that his ministry must needs be of a more excellent nature than theirs.

1. **N**OW this is the chief thing of all that I have been discoursing (*t*), we have such a great high-priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens (*u*); a minister of the true sanctuary (*w*), and of the true tabernacle which was built by God himself, and not by man (*x*). And his being an high-priest in heaven is

NOW of the things which we have spoken, *this is the sum*: We have such an high-priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and

NOTES.

1. (*t*) Κεφάλαιον ὃ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις. *Now of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum.*] There is another sense of the word κεφάλαιον, as it signifies the *chief* or principal thing. And thus the Vul. and Syr. Chrysostom and Oecumenius understood it in this place. And to say the truth, this seems most agreeable upon the account of what it is join'd with. Had it been said κεφάλαιον ὃ πρὸ λεγομένων, or in Isocrates's phrase *Ad Nicocl.* in fine, κεφάλαιον ὃ πρὸ ἐιρημένων (though he seems there to use it to signify the *principal* rather than the *sum*) our rendring would have been more clear: but κεφάλαιον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις seems a little more harsh. Whereas if we take here ἐπὶ to signify *after*, as it does sometimes with a dative case, the sense is easy and plain, "After all that has been said, this is the chief thing." Or if we should read with the Alex. MS. ἐν instead of ἐπὶ, there could be no difficulty, "This is the chief in or among all the things that have been said."

(*u*) *Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens.*] The same thing is thus expressed Chap. xii. 2. *He is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.* And again, Chap. i. 3. *He is set down at the right hand of the majesty on high.* Some *Shechinah* or glory, an illustrious token of the divine presence, at the right hand of which Christ is placed, seems hereby intended. Compare Acts vii. 55, 56.

2 (*w*) Τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός. *A minister of the sanctuary.*] This version seems preferable to that of our margin, *A minister of holy things*, because the next clause shows that he rather compares the places wherein Christ and the high-priests under the law ministred, than the services they each perform'd. And from that clause we are to borrow the word ἀληθινῶν, and to understand him to speak of Christ's being a minister of the *true*, that is the heavenly sanctuary, of which that *worldly sanctuary* the Jews had, Chap. ix. 1. was but a *pattern* or *shadow*, Chap. viii. 5. And indeed the *sanctuary* and *tabernacle* among the Jews signify the same thing, as we may see by Chap. ix. 2. We may farther observe, that 'tis familiar to speak of the earthly and heavenly sanctuary under this title of ἁγία in the plural. See Chap. ix. 8, 12, 24, 25. x. 19, xiii. 11.

(*x*) Καὶ τὸ σκηνῆς τὴν ἀληθινῆς ἣν ἐπηξεν ὁ Κύριος καὶ ἐκ ἀνθρώπου. *And of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man.*] The first καὶ, *and*, must, I think, according to what has been already observed in the preceding note, be exegetical, and so might be rendred, *Even of the true tabernacle.* The argument here used is, That as God is infinitely more wise and powerful than men, so his works must necessarily transcend and excel theirs. And by consequence, since the Jewish sanctuary was a structure erected by men it must fall vastly short of the heavenly sanctuary, of which God himself is more immediately the author. We may observe this way of reasoning does several times recur in this epistle. Thus Chap. ix. 11. He argues that *Christ is come an high-priest of future good things to be obtained by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, because 'tis not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building:* and ver. 24.

Christ

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

3 not man. For every high-priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore *it is* of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things,

is an evidence of his being a minister there: for every high-priest (*y*) is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices: whence there is a necessity that this high-priest, Christ Jesus, should have also somewhat to offer. For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, there being priests, who offer gifts according to the law (*z*). And these do service to the tabernacle, which was a draught or shadow of heavenly things (*a*), as *Moses*, who was to build

3.

4.

5.

NOTES.

Christ is not entred into the holy places [the Jewish sanctuary] made with hands, — but into heaven it self. Thus Chap. xi. 10. He looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. And again, ver. 16. having asserted that the ancient patriarchs desired a better, that is an heavenly country; he presently mentions that which is a proof not only of God's not being ashamed to be called their God, but likewise that the country they desired was a better country, namely, that it was of God's preparing. For he hath prepared for them a city.

3 (*y*) *Πᾶς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς.* For every high-priest.] The *for* here may perhaps incline some to think that the first words of the foregoing verse should rather be rendered *a minister of holy things*, and so overthrow the interpretation before given. But I think the connection stands thus: "We have an high-priest who is set on the right hand of the majesty in the heavens. But when I speak of him as sitting there, I would not have you think that he is unactive there; no, he acts there as a minister in a more noble sanctuary, and his being an high-priest *there* betokens nothing less: for every high-priest is ordained, &c." 'Tis manifest that all this is spoken concerning his being an high-priest in heaven, and not of any such office executed by him here on earth. And when 'tis said, *It is of necessity that this man* [rather, this high-priest] *have somewhat also to offer*, I think a regard is only had to his presenting himself to God in heaven. This is much confirmed by the next verse.

4 (*z*) If there is any strength in our author's reasoning, as no doubt there is a great deal, I can't see how it can consist with the assertion that Christ was a priest in his death. For if therefore he could not be a priest if he were on earth, because there were priests who offered gifts according to the law, the same reason must hold good while he actually was upon the earth, and the priests continued to offer gifts according to the law. To which might be added, that if he was a priest while here on earth, he must be either after the order of *Aaron*, or after the order of *Melchizedec*: after the order of *Aaron* he could not be high-priest, as our author has shown before, because he was of a different tribe; of the order of *Melchizedec* he could not be an high-priest while on earth, since beside that that priesthood is never spoken of as taking place till after his resurrection, it does not consist with the oath of God whereby he was constituted an high-priest of that order. For when once he became an high-priest after the order of *Melchizedec*, he was to continue so for ever, whence he is said to be made a priest after the power of an endless life, Chap. vii. 16.

5 (*a*) *Ὁσιν ἐξ ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιά λατρεύουσιν ὡς ἐπεφάνη.* Which serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things:] This translation easily deceives English readers, who I believe generally understand it, as though it were said, "Who serve for this purpose, that they may be an example and shadow of heavenly things." But the word *λατρεύουσιν* will by no means

build the whole tabernacle, was admonished of God. *For see (saith he) that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount (b).* But now hath he ob-

as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle. For see (saith he) *that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.* But now 6

NOTES.

means bear any such sense; and the words therefore ought to be rendred, "Who serve [or do service to] the example and shadow of heavenly things." Thus have our translators rightly rendred the same word, *Chap. xiii. 10. Οι τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες, Which serve the tabernacle;* as likewise in all the other places where 'tis used in the new testament, they render it either to *serve* or to *worship*. This was not, as some perhaps will be apt to imagine, inconsistent with our Lord's words, *Matth. iv. 10. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*: nor was there any danger of idolatry in the priests *serving* the tabernacle, when they had God's direction for it, and the service terminated ultimately upon himself.

(b) Καθὼς κεχρημάτισαι Μωσῆς, μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνὴν. *Οὐρα γὰρ, φησὶ, ποιήσης πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει.* As Moses was admonished of God, when he was about to make the tabernacle. For see, saith he, *that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.* The *Alex.* and several other valuable MSS. and the *Greek* commentators read here *ποιήσεις*, which agrees with the *LXX. Exod. xxv. 40.* but this, or the leaving out γὰρ makes no great alteration. Nor need our author's adding *πάντα, all things*, which is neither in the *Hebrew* nor the *LXX.* cause any difficulty: for *all things* are there necessarily implied, though they are not expressly mentioned; and besides, the *all* is expressed *ver. 9.* of that chapter. What may seem of more consequence, is how we shall account for the expression, That *Moses* was admonished of God, when he was about to finish the tabernacle. This looks as though he had already made a good progress in the work, and was just upon finishing it, when he received this admonition from God; whereas 'tis certain that he had not then done the least thing towards it. Our translators seem to have been sensible of this, and have therefore turn'd ἐπιτελεῖν, *to make*, departing from the more ordinary sense of the word. I think the easiest solution of this is by supposing the word μέλλων here to mean no more than the *Latin esse*, and that the infinitive mood which follows it, is to be rendred by a future participle. This is not an unusual sense of that word; and we have several instances of it in the new testament, where our own translation has prefer'd this rendring. So *Matth. xi. 14. This is Elias, ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι, which was for to come*; and in many other places. Nor need it be any objection that the article is not here prefix'd to μέλλων, since we have instances of the like nature, *Acts xx. 7. ὁ Παῦλος διελέγετο αὐτοῖς, μέλλων ἐξίεναι τῇ ἐπαύριον.* Paul preached unto them being to depart on the morrow. And *ver. 13. But we going before to ship sail'd to Assos, being there to take in Paul, ἐκεῖθεν μέλλοντες ἀναλαμβάνειν τὸν Παῦλον;* for so he had order'd, being himself to go a foot, μέλλων αὐτὸν περὶεῖν. And accordingly the place before us might perhaps be better translated, "As *Moses* who was to finish the tabernacle" was admonished of God." This sense seems most to suit our author's purpose. The high-priests, he says, under the law attended the service of the tabernacle, which was an example and shadow of heavenly things; and this he proves that it was only such an example and shadow, because *Moses* who was to overlook and take care of the whole work, had it all, that is the whole tabernacle, and the several things relating thereto, represented to him as an example and shadow in the instructions he received from God concerning the making it, before he set about it. This makes the πάντα, *all things*, appear very emphatical, and gives the reason why he adds it.

But it may be the greatest difficulty of all is yet behind, how the text here cited is a proof, that the tabernacle, and so the service belonging to it, was an example and shadow of heavenly things.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

hath he obtained a more excellent ministry.

obtained a more excellent ministry than those priests under the law (c).

NOTES.

things. Now though I am not positive in my opinion, I will suggest it to the readers consideration. I think then the chief mistake, which has created all the difficulty, has lain in the sense of ἐπεργαίων, *heavenly things*. These are commonly understood of the advantages that accrue to the christian church, or else of the happiness of good men in the other world. Now though I am far from denying that the tabernacle was an example or shadow of these things, nay, and think that somewhat equivalent is declared in other places of the new testament, and of this epistle in particular, yet I can hardly believe that either of these is intended in the cited admonition to *Moses*; and therefore can't easily fall in with any such interpretation. The heavenly things here mentioned seem to me to be nothing else than the *pattern shown to Moses in the mount*. This is called *heavenly*, as being of a heavenly formation, in contradistinction to that which was *earthly* or *humane* being formed by men, as the tabernacle among the *Jews* was. Now that *pattern*, that is, *original platform* (for so τύπος must here signify, and not a *type*) could not but be celestial, neither *Moses* nor any other man could have a hand in the forming it; nay, it was shown to *Moses* perfectly formed, when in all probability he had no thoughts or expectations of any such thing. But the tabernacle which *Moses* was to finish was a delineation or draught taken from the other, in comparison of the exquisite exactness and perfection of which it was but as a faint representation, or a mere shadow. See Mr. *Le Clerc's* supplement on the place for the sense of the words ὑπόδειγμα and σκιά. And this interpretation of our author's argument appears very well to comport with his design. For as it shows that the high-priests under the law did serve the tabernacle which was only a representation of somewhat heavenly, their service and office must be inferior to Christ's, who ministers in heaven it self, and about the things in heaven. This he pursues in the next verse, as also in the next chapter. 'Tis observable that there was a wonderful niceness and particularity in the prescription of every thing belonging to the tabernacle erected by *Moses*, and the utensils and service thereof, nor was there less afterwards at the building of *Solomon's* temple. It may be worth while for the reader to compare what is said of this latter, 1 Chron. xxviii. 11 — 19.

6 (c) Νυνὶ δὲ διαφορώτερος τέτευχε λειτουργίας. *But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry.* This *now* is, I think, to be explained from ver. 1. Now that he is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens. The ministry he has obtained is as he is the minister of the sanctuary, even of the true tabernacle, ver. 2. He acts still as a minister though a most excellent one. The more excellent ministry, is that which is more excellent than that of the high-priests under the law, who served the example and shadow of heavenly things, as appears by ver. 4, 5.

HEBREW S.

SECT. X.

CHAP. VIII. 6—13.

CONTENTS.

THIS section appears to be a digression, or an argument brought in by our author incidentally upon his having said, that Christ had obtained a more excellent ministry than the priests under the law. It was a natural inference enough, that if his ministry was more excellent than theirs, that covenant of which he was mediator was more excellent than that under which they ministered. But the thing being of great importance to his subject, he does not content himself with the bare mention of the inference, but expatiates in the distinct proof and confirmation of it; showing that God during that covenant spake of it as very defective, and of another more perfect one which was to succeed it. It will not be very easy to account for the *εἰς τὴν* in the first verse of the next chapter, or indeed for the connection of his discourse there without allowing such a digression here as is pretended: for that verse connects very well with what preceeds the supposed digression, but not so well, I apprehend, with the digression it self.

PARAPHRASE.

TEXT.

BY how much also he is a mediator of a better covenant (*d*), our conformity and obedience to which is enforced and encouraged

BY how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was

NOTES.

(*d*) Οσῶ καὶ κρείττονός ἐστι διαθήκης μεσίτης. *By how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant.*] Although the καὶ *also* is left out in some copies, yet being retained in others, and particularly the *Alex.* and being acknowledged by the *Vulg.* and *Syr.* 'tis deservedly to be accounted the true reading. Farther, it being obvious that our author had been comparing Christ our high-priest with the high-priests under the law, the full sense of the place must, I think, stand thus, "That Christ is a mediator of a better covenant, than that of which the high-priests under the law were mediators." This ought to be compared with *Chap.* vii. 22. and serves very much to confirm the interpretation there given. See note (*k*).

T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

7 established upon better pro-
mises. For if that first co-
venant had been faultless,
then should no place have
been sought for the second.
8 For finding fault with them,
he saith, Behold the days
come (saith the Lord) when
I will make a new covenant
with the house of Israel, and
with the house of Judah:

7. raged by promises of a more excellent nature,
than were contained in the first covenant (e).
For if that first covenant, had been perfect
and blameless, then should no place have been
sought for a second. And yet there plainly
is: For God himself finding fault with the
first, speaks of a second, when by the pro-
phet *Jeremy* he says to the *Jews* who were
under the first covenant (f), “Behold the
“days come, saith the Lord, when I will
“make a new covenant with the house of
“*Israel*, and with the house of *Judah* (g):”
which

N O T E S.

(e) *Ἡτις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται.* Which was established upon better pro-
mises.] That which is frequently called a *law* is often likewise called a *covenant* under the old
dispensation, importing the whole body of the *Jewish* laws. And this law or covenant inclu-
ded both the preceptive part, that is the conditional duties of the covenant, and the promises
of it, which were the motives and encouragements to perform the duties required. Hence our
author chuses to render the words of *Moses* in that manner, *Chap. ix. 20. This is the blood of the*
covenant, which God hath enjoined ἐνετείλατο unto you. And in like manner does he here speak
of the new covenant as formed into a law, but upon better promises, that is upon promises
which related chiefly to spiritual and eternal, and not to temporal advantages.

8 (f) *Μεμφομένῳ ὃ ἀντοῖς λέγει.* For finding fault with them he saith.] I don't per-
ceive that the passage here cited from the prophet *Jeremy* is chiefly intended to express the fault
God found with the *Jews*, though it be past doubt that at that time, and at their coming out of
Egypt, they gave him occasion enough for it. Nor does indeed the word *μεμφομένῳ* thus
understood well suit our author's scope. For he is not proving that the *Jews* were defective,
and such as deserved to be blamed upon that account, but that the covenant it self was so de-
fective as to give God occasion to find fault with it, and to design and promise another and bet-
ter covenant. If *St. Paul* was the author of the epistle, he is so exact in the choice of his words,
which have each of them their distinct weight and importance, that 'tis not easy to imagine he
would here put in a word of his own that should be so foreign to his purpose, as this seems to
be, if we understand it in the sense given by our translators. I think therefore the words ought
to be rendred as in the paraphrase, “For finding fault [*viz.* with that first covenant] he saith
“to them [*i. e.* the *Jews* who were then under that covenant.]

(g) *Behold the days come (saith the Lord) when I will make a new covenant with the house*
of Israel and with the house of Judah.] The difference between the *Hebrew*, the *LXX.* and our
author's citation, is very inconsiderable, except in the last clause of *ver. 9.* and therefore of
that only will any notice be taken.

'Tis much more material for us to inquire, 1. What the covenant is which God here promi-
ses to make. And, 2. How this passage is to our author's purpose.

As to the first, it appears to me that this covenant was to be national. The mention of the
house of Israel, and the *house of Judah*, with whom God promises to make this covenant is very
express. And he that will compare the terms here used with the history of *Israel* and *Judah*
since

9. which new covenant shall not be ineffectual, as that covenant was which I anciently made with their fathers, the children of *Israel*, when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of *Egypt*; for they continued not stedfast in that covenant, and thereupon I also regarded them not (*b*), saith the Lord.

For

Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of *Egypt*; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not,

N O T E S.

since *Jeremiah's* time, will easily see that hitherto there has been no accomplishment of the things here promised, to this very time. It seems therefore to be a covenant which is still future, and is to take place at the restoration of the *Jews*, when, as *St. Paul* says, *Rom. xi. 26. All Israel shall be saved.* And again, that this covenant is national may be farther argued from our author's comparing it with that which was certainly such, *viz.* that he made with *Israel* when he brought them out of *Egypt*.

But then, 2. We are to inquire how this passage thus understood was to our author's purpose. To which I answer, that if we make this only to refer to *ver. 7.* 'tis a most full proof that place was sought for a second covenant, and consequently that the first that was made in *Moses's* time was not faultless or defective, and that is the main thing he aims at. Besides, the time here spoken of being that wherein the *Jews* should be converted to the christian faith, and become subject to the *Messias*, this covenant must for substance be the same with the gospel-covenant, however 'tis here consider'd as then made nationally with the *Jews*. This seems plain from *Rom. xi.* and from such other places in the old prophets which speak of this covenant which God promised to make in after times with *Israel* and *Judah*.

9 (*b*) Καὶ γὰρ ἠμέλησα αὐτοῖς. And I regarded them not.] The words in the prophet, *Jer. xxxi. 32.* are, ואנכי בעלתי בם which our translation renders, *Although I was an husband unto them*, but are rendered by the LXX. And I regarded them not; and their translation our author has here followed. It has deservedly exercised the study of the critics, to find out a way to reconcile this citation of our author with the sense of the *Hebrew*. A very learned and judicious writer about an hundred years ago offer'd at an emendation of the *Hebrew* text by reading געלתי instead of בעלתי, and it must be owned that this correction was very ingenious, and would fully solve the difficulty. For the word געל is used just in this way with the prefix ב added to the substantive that is govern'd by it; as in that place, אם בציון געלה נפשך Hath thy soul loathed *Sion*? *Jer. xiv. 19.* Nor is the change of the letter ג to ב very strange, considering by how little an alteration the former may pass into the latter. Others have thought that the LXX. in their copy read neither בעלתי nor געלתי but בחלתי which word is used in the same construction, *Zech. xi. 8.* וגם נפשם בחלה בו And their soul also abhorred me. I remember this conjecture very much pleased me many years ago, before I had observed that any one had ever suggested it. And indeed the construction with the prefix ב exactly agrees with the place under consideration: and besides the two letters ג and ח being both gutturals, and very probably near akin in sound, might easily be put one for t'other, and especially considering that the verb בחל is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον it might easily be changed by the transcriber into בעל which is very frequent and common. And this will the rather hold good if the observation of some be admitted (and that not without some good colour) that the letters of the same organ, and particularly the gutturals, are thus frequently put one for the other. Thus the *Keri* puts a ג for a ח, 1 *Sam. xviii. 25.* Either of these two conjectures at the ancient *Hebrew* reading afford me a satisfactory account how the LXX. came to give us so different a sense,

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

10 faith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, faith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. 12 For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities

For this is the covenant I will make with the house of *Israel* after those days are come, faith the Lord, I will put my laws into their mind and write them in their hearts (i): and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And as their God will I deal with them: for I will so make known my self unto them, as that comparatively they shall have little occasion to teach every man his neighbour (k), and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for they shall all know me from the least to the greatest. Nor shall their sins, or those of their ancestors, prevent this: For I will be merciful in pardoning their unrighteousness, and their sins and

NOTES.

sense, as they have done; it seeming to me very natural to suppose that one way or t'other the *Hebrew* copies they used differ'd from ours. I confess there is yet another solution of this difficulty by Dr. *Whitby* from one of our very learned country-men, that the word בעל signifies to refuse, despise, and nauseate.

10 (i) *I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts.*] It seems to me unreasonable that these metaphorical expressions should be earnestly urged for the deciding any doctrinal controversies, as I believe these have been. As the blessing here promised is national, it can hardly be supposed that the whole nation to a man should become sincerely good and internally holy. I think therefore, that hereby is intended, (1.) That the whole nation of the *Jews* shall receive and make profession of the christian religion, and become again God's people, and stand in a visible covenant relation to him. See Mr. *Locke* upon *Rom.* xi. 26. note (x). (2.) That true holiness and godliness shall then become more general and prevailing than ever, through the abundant effusion of the Holy Spirit. God, who takes this work to himself, effects it by his Spirit, 2 *Cor.* iii. 3 — 6. and accordingly a great effusion of the Spirit is promised to accompany that dispensation, *Ezek.* xxxvi. 26, 27. *Isa.* lix. 21. *Zech.* xii. 10.

11 (k) *And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, &c.*] It cannot be imagined that the common methods of instruction, and particularly of educating youth, will then be laid aside; and all will be done by an immediate inspiration. The expressions therefore here used, must be understood not absolutely but comparatively: and hereby is intended the vast increase there shall be among them of the true knowledge of God. And we meet with several passages of the like nature in the holy Scriptures, and in all other authors. Thus when God says, *I will have mercy, and not sacrifice*, *Matth.* ix. 13. the meaning is not, that he would not have sacrifice at all, that being then a prescribed duty; but he would have mercy rather than sacrifice. Thus *Isa.* xliii. 18, 19. when God bids his people *not remember the former things, nor consider the things of old*, he does not intend that they should forget them, or be unthankful for them; but only

13. and iniquities I will remember no more. By saying, *A new covenant*, he manifests the first covenant to be old and growing out of date (*l*). Now that which waxeth old and feeble with age is ready to be abolished and put out of sight (*m*).

will I remember no more. In that he saith, *A new co-¹³venant*, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away.

N O T E S.

only that they should have less occasion to take notice of them by reason of that *new* and vastly greater thing which God would do for them. Compare *Jer.* xvi. 14, 15. xxiii. 7, 8.

13 (*l*) *Εν τῷ λέγειν καινὴν, πεπαλαίωσε τὴν πρώτην.* In that he saith, *A new covenant*, he hath made the first old.] Our author here refers to what he had cited, *ver.* 8. from the prophet. And considering that this covenant is spoken of in opposition to the *Mosaic*, and set forth as taking place of it, the expression, *A new covenant*, must denote that the former is consider'd as old, and what was to be antiquated. And when he says, *He hath made the first old*, the meaning is, that he represented the first as old.

(*m*) *Τὸ ὃ παλαιέμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐσγύς ἀφανισμῷ.* Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.] St. Paul calls the *Hebrew* law, *WEAK* and *beggarly elements*; and our author, *Chap.* vii. 18. says there is a *disanulling* of that commandment for the *WEAKNESS* and *UNPROFITABLENESS* thereof. And agreeably to this he here speaks of it as *waxing old*; in which case things become weak and useless, and so are ready to be laid aside, or *put out of sight*. So 'tis with an *old garment*, as he uses that similitude, *Chap.* i. 11. or with men worn out with old age, who are just dropping into the grave. Which ever allusion he might intend, they seem to be in the right who think he here points at the speedy destruction of the temple at *Jerusalem*, whereby an end was put to the far greatest part of the service prescribed by the law of *Moses*.

S E C T. XI.

C H A P. IX. 1—14.

C O N T E N T S.

OUR author having finished the digression which takes up the foregoing section, he here returns to what he was upon before, in the first part of the eighth chapter, with which his discourse here in the beginning of this chapter must be understood to be connected. He had asserted that Christ our high-priest is a minister of the true sanctuary and tabernacle which was

was pitched by God and not by man, *Chap. viii. 2.* in comparison Chap. IX.
of whom the high-priests under the law served but the example
and shadow of heavenly things, *ver. 5.* upon which he concludes
that Christ had obtained a more excellent ministry than they, *ver. 6.*
This he pursues in the section before us, wherein he argues the su-
perior excellency of the tabernacle in which Christ ministers, and
shows from the nature of the *Mosaick* services, that they prefigured
a more perfect service which was to take place after the dissolution
of the first tabernacle. And withal he magnifies the atonement
Christ has made by his own blood, when he entered into the hea-
venly tabernacle, above that which was made by the high-priest
once a year when he entered into the holy of holies.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

1. **T**HEN verily the first
covenant had also or-
dinances of divine service,
and a worldly sanctuary.
2. For there was a tabernacle
made, the first wherein

THEN verily the first tabernacle (*n*) 1.
had, as well as the second in which
Christ ministers, ordinances prescribing the
service to be done in it (*o*), and it had a
worldly sanctuary (*p*). For this tabernacle 2.
was divided into two parts or tabernacles;
and so the first or outward tabernacle was
made,

NOTES.

1 (*n*) Εἶχε ἡ εἰς τὴν πρώτην. *Then verily the first covenant.*] There are many copies
which leave out the substantive with which *πρώτη* agrees, and these our translators follow,
who therefore have inserted the word *covenant* in *Italic*. Our printed *Greek* testaments read
πρώτη σκηνή, the *first tabernacle*, which is agreeable to other copies. If that is not the true
reading, yet I can't but think with *Dr. Whitby*, that the sense would be best so supplied, ac-
cording to the order of his discourse, of which notice has been before taken. And 'tis consi-
derable that no *Greek* copy here reads *ἡ πρώτη διαθήκη*. But the reader is refer'd to the Do-
ctor upon the place.

(*o*) Δικαιώματα λαλείας. *Ordinances of divine service.*] It should seem that these ordi-
nances relate wholly to the offices of the priests, and what they did in the sanctuary. See
ver. 10. But what I especially would take notice of here is the word *καὶ* which we have ren-
dered *also*. Hereby seems intended that as Christ is a minister *λαλῶν* of the true tabernacle,
he is subject to ordinances and appointments of God in the discharge of his ministry, as the
priests also were in their services in the tabernacle.

(*p*) Τό, τε ἄγιον κοσμικόν. *And a worldly sanctuary.*] This *worldly* is to be considered in
opposition to *ἐπερὶνιον* or *heavenly*, *Chap. viii. 5.* because it was made by men, whereas the
other was of God's making. See below, *ver. 11.* The attempts therefore of learned men,
who would force another meaning upon the words, seem to be vain.

PARAPHRASE.

TEXT.

made, wherein was the candlestick (*q*), and the table, and the shew-bread (*r*), and this 3. first tabernacle is called holy (*f*). But within the second vail (*t*) was the tabernacle which is called the holy of holies; which

was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second vail, the tabernacle, which is called the holiest 3

NOTES.

2 (*q*) Σκηνή ὃν κατέσκευάσθη ἡ πρώτη, ἐν ᾗ ἦτε λυχνία. *For there was a tabernacle made, the first-wherein was the candlestick.* The English would have run much more easy and smooth to our common readers had this been rendered, *For there was the first tabernacle made, wherein was the candlestick, &c.* The whole building is frequently spoken of as one tabernacle, and so 'tis by our author, Chap. viii. 5. and in the immediately preceding verse, and elsewhere: but here he speaks of two distinct tabernacles, upon the account (as I conceive) of the holy place, and the holy of holies being separated from one another, and serving intirely distinct purposes. When he calls the former of these the *first* tabernacle, he has a respect only to its situation, in as much as it presented it self first to him who entred into the tabernacle, and must necessarily be passed through by him who would go into the holy of holies. The form of this *candlestick* we have related, Exod. xxv. 31, &c. and the place of it, xxvi. 35.

(*r*) *And the table, and the shew-bread.* The table here can be no other than that upon which the shew-bread was set. See Exod. xxv. 23—30. and for the place where it stood, xxvi. 35.

(*f*) Ἡτις λέγεται ἁγία. *Which is called the sanctuary.* 'Tis doubtful whether we are to take ἁγία to be plural, and so to render it the sanctuary, or whether we should read it in the singular ἁγία, and so turn the place with our margin, *Which [first tabernacle] is called HOLT.* A learned commentator takes it for granted, that the word is here plural, and so renders the passage, *Which is called HOLIES.* “Because, says he, the most holy place was called the *Holies of Holies*, ἁγία ἁγίων, by those that spake Greek: for in Hebrew the former is called the *sanctuary* or *Holiness* מקדש or קדש never in the plural number; the latter the *Holiness of Holinesses* קדש קדשים. Hence, he thinks, 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.*” As his inference is contrary to my opinion, that *St. Paul* was the writer of this epistle, I shall here examine a little his reasoning. Now for ought I can see, he might as well have argued that the *LXX.* interpreters were *Grecians* and did not understand Hebrew, because though they sometimes translate קדש קדשים by τὸ ἅγιον ἢ ἁγίων, as Exod. xxvi. 33, 34. yet they at other times render it ἁγία ἢ ἁγίων, as 1 Kings viii. 6. 2 Chron. iv. 22. v. 7. Nor is it unusual for them to translate both קדש and מקדש by ἁγία in the plural number, as these and several other places may prove; 2 Chron. v. 11. xxix. 5, 7. Isa. xliii. 28. Ezek. v. 11. viii. 6. xxiii. 38, 39. xxiv. 21. xxv. 3. xxxvii. 26, 28. xlii. 20. xliii. 12, 21. xlv. 1, 5, 7, 8, 9. and considering how much the phraseology of that translation is imitated in the new testament, and that by *St. Paul* himself, I can't think that this is any evidence that he was not the writer of this epistle.

3 (*t*) Μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον καὶ ἀλλήλοισμα. *And after the second vail.* The first vail was that which opened into the holy place, whither the priests went daily performing their service. This is spoken of Exod. xxvi. 36, 37. xxxvi. 37. The other here called the *second vail* parted between the holy place and the holy of holies. See Exod. xxvi. 31—33. xxxvi. 35.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

4 of all: Which had the golden censer, and the ark of which had the golden censer (26), and the ark

4.

NOTES.

4 (u) Χρυσῶν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον. *Which had the golden censer.*] Of this we read Lev. xvi. 12, 13. 'Tis not there expressly said that the censer was made of gold, as is here asserted: but the thing is highly probable, considering that it was used in the most holy place: and herein the *Jews* agree with our author, it being *Maimonides's* observation; "Every [other] day he whose duty 'tis to use the censer, putteth the coals in a censer of silver, &c. but this day [of expiation] the high-priest putteth coals in a censer of gold." See *Ainsw.* on Lev. xvi. 12. 'Tis more difficult perhaps to account for what is here said, that the *second tabernacle which is the holiest of all had this golden censer.* We don't read that this censer was kept always in the holy of holies: and they who think that it was kept all the year round in the outward sanctuary, near to the entrance into the holy of holies, give a very forced interpretation of these words, making them to signify only that the holy of holies had this utensil design'd for its use, but that it was never there except when the high-priest carried it with him on the great day of atonement. They who give this interpretation will not like to have it carried farther, as though the holy of holies had only in the same manner the *ark of the covenant*, although the ἔχουσα equally belongs to both. And indeed by the same way of interpreting they may make the holy of holies to have had all the things that were in the outward or first tabernacle. This difficulty would be still greater, if that were true which some have with much assurance affirmed, that the high-priest took both the golden censer and the sweet incense from the altar of incense, and having taken the coals from off the altar of burnt offerings, and put them in the golden censer, he began to burn the incense before he was actually past the vail and entered into the holy of holies. For if this were true the golden censer could not be kept in the holy of holies, because the high-priest could not then have been in to fetch it out. But this seems to be a mistake. The *Jews* do not allow that the high-priest burnt incense but in the holy of holies, as *Maimonides* assures us in opposition to the *Sadducees*, who pretended the incense was to be put upon the fire in the temple without the vail. See *Ainsw.* as before cited. I will venture here to submit my conjecture to consideration. This golden censer seems to me to have been kept just within the vail, at the entrance into the holy of holies, and that the high-priest when he was about to go in thither, went first to the altar of burnt-offerings and took from thence as many burning coals as would fill a censer (whether he took them in one of the ordinary censers which belong'd to the altar of incense, or in any other vessel, is not said, and much less is it said that he took them in the golden censer) then he took as much sweet incense as would fill both his hands, (but it appears not that he took this from the altar of incense, nor is it very probable he did, if the *Jews* account be true, that they beat this incense small the evening before the day of atonement; see *Ainsw.* on *Exod.* xxx. 34.) These burning coals and the sweet incense, I imagine, he carried into the holy of holies, at the very first entrance into which I suppose he found the golden censer into which he emptied the coals, and then put incense thereon. Thus I understand those two verses, Lev. xvi. 12, 13. *He [Aaron] shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the vail.* I hardly think that hereby was enjoined that he should actually measure the burning coals by a censer, or the incense by what he could hold in his hands, but that he was to guess at this and take as much as he thought amounted to these quantities, and therefore should rather render the latter, *And two handfills of sweet incense.* If he filled both his hands with the sweet incense, and so carried it into the holy of holies, how could he carry the burning coals? It seems more probable, as the *Jews* affirm, that he carried the sweet incense in a pot. See *Ainsw.* on *ver.* 13. And the word נָחָה used here in both places, is to be understood in the same manner, 1 Kings

PARAPHRASE.

TEXT.

ark of the covenant overlaid within and without with gold (ω), wherein was the golden pot which contained an omer of the manna wherewith God fed the *Israelites* in the wilderness (α), and *Aaron's* rod

the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein *was* the golden pot that had manna, and *Aaron's*

NOTES.

xvii. 11. and in other texts for a quantity not precisely measured by the hand; nor is the same way of speaking unusual in our own language. However so far is clear, that the coals and the incense are here spoken of as brought within the vail, before any mention is made of burning the incense, for that follows *ver. 13. And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord* [i. e. in the holy of holies] *that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not*, viz. for beholding the *Shechinah* there. I know of but one antient testimony (besides that of the *Sadducees* before mentioned) that runs counter to this opinion, and that is in *Philonis* lib. ii. *De Monarch.* p. 821. c. where speaking of this matter he says, Πυρρῶν καὶ ὀσμυρῶν πλῆρες καὶ θυμιάματα ἐισκομίζει. *He brings in a censer full of burning coals and sweet incense.* The whole stress of the objection must lie upon the word ἐισκομίζει, which if taken in the most proper sense, and with the utmost strictness, must make him to take part with the *Sadducees* in their opinion, which is not probable. I purposely wave the farther prosecution of this matter (which I would refer to the judgment of the reader) and the mystical meaning of this and the other things here mentioned, any farther than as our inspired author has plainly declared it: for I am sensible that mens own fancies may easily mislead those who indulge them in such interpretations.

(ω) *And the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold.* Concerning this see *Exod.* xxv. 10—16. xxxvii. 1—5.

(α) *Εν ᾗ ἔαμυνεν χρυσῷ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα.* *Wherein was the golden pot that had manna.* See *Exod.* xvi. 32—34. where the *Hebrew* makes no mention of the metal of which the pot was made, but the *LXX.* expressly call it a *golden pot*, *ver. 33.* And considering where it was placed, there can be little reason to doubt of its being of gold. But 'tis more difficult to determine what ἐν ᾗ here refers to. Some think 'tis to the ark of the covenant just mentioned before, and the rather, because the tables of the covenant are presently said to be in the same; and there can be no doubt that those tables were in the ark it self; beside that in the next verse the Cherubims of glory are said to be over it, that is, as they interpret it, the ark of the covenant, and consequently all the things that come between, that is this golden pot and *Aaron's* rod must be thought to be ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ. But against this opinion 'tis objected from *1 Kings* viii. 9. *That there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone.* To which some answer that that speaks only of *Solomon's* time at his placing the ark in the temple, but that it was otherwise in the tabernacle built by *Moses*. But that solution seems insufficient, because the text seems to speak of the ark as containing the same it did from *Moses's* time. *There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt.* So also *2 Chron.* v. 10. The ark therefore seems to have been in the same state in *Solomon's* time, that it had been in from the days of *Moses*. Compare *Exod.* xxv. 21. *Deut.* x. 2, 5. Others seem so sensible of this difficulty in that scheme, that they choose rather to explain ἐν ᾗ, so far as it refers to the golden pot and *Aaron's* rod, from the *Hebrew* ׀, and so they would render it by *which*, or *near to which*, *was the golden pot*: but this construction seems to be very hard, since they will not allow it to hold on to the tables of the covenant. And indeed 'tis natural to imagine, that ἐν ᾗ being only once used, with a general respect to the three following particulars,

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

rod that budded, and the
5 tables of the covenant: And
over it the cherubims of glory
shadowing the mercy-seat:
of which we cannot now

rod that blossom'd and bore almonds (*y*);
and the tables of the covenant which God
wrote, and which were put in the ark. But
over this (*z*) were the cherubims of glory,
which with their wings stretched out covered
the mercy-seat (*a*): of all which I have not
now

5.

NOTES.

particulars, should be used in the same sense concerning them all. It seems therefore more easy to understand the ἐν ᾗ to relate to the second tabernacle, and so the words are exactly true: for all these things were in that second tabernacle or in the holy of holies, and particularly this golden pot was there, *Exod.* xvi. 33, 34. This may perhaps receive some confirmation from the ἐν ᾗ, *ver.* 2. which refers to the first tabernacle, just as the other is here supposed to refer to the second tabernacle. If any object that it would have been more proper upon this supposition for our author to have mention'd the ark and the tables of the covenant together, without the intervention of the two other articles; it may be replied that though this might be so in case he had intended to treat exactly and particularly of these things, yet since he expressly says he could not now speak particularly of these things, *ver.* 9. no such niceness or exactness was necessary; for which reason also he does not reckon up all the things that were in each tabernacle.

(*y*) *And Aaron's rod that budded.* Concerning this see *Numb.* xvii. 1 — 10. and by the 10th verse it appears it was put into the holy of holies.

5 (*z*) Ὑπεράνω ᾧ ἀβύσσος. *And over it.*] That the two cherubims were upon or over the ark appears by *Exod.* xxv. 22. But the reason of this note is to obviate an argument against the interpretation before given of ἐν ᾗ *wherein*, in the foregoing verse. For from hence some infer that that *wherein* must relate to the *ark*, and not barely to the *second tabernacle*, because what is here said must be connected therewith, *And over it*, that is, over the ark of the covenant were the cherubims of glory. If there were any absolute necessity for such a connection, all that has been pleaded against that sense must be given up. But I apprehend there is no such necessity. For the ἀβύσσος it here may well enough agree with διαθήκης *covenant*, just before mentioned. To clear this let it be observed, that the tables that were in the ark contained only the ten commandments. These were God's *testimony* to *Israel*, and his *covenant* with them; and accordingly the two tables are called indifferently the tables of the *testimony*, and the tables of the *covenant*. Now as the mercy-seat is said sometimes to be *upon the ark of the testimony*, *Exod.* xxvi. 34. and sometimes *upon the testimony*, for that being in the ark what was over one was necessarily over t'other; so there is exactly the same reason why the mercy-seat might be said to be over the *covenant*, which is the same thing with the *testimony*. And the same reason will hold good for the *cherubims* of glory, as well as for the *mercy-seat*. So that without any impropriety our author might say, *Over the which* [covenant laid up in the ark] *were the cherubims of glory*.

(*a*) Χερουβὶμ δόξης καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἱλασθῆναι. *The cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy-seat.*] Concerning these read *Exod.* xxv. 17 — 22. xxxvii. 6 — 9. The ark being placed exactly in the middle between the north and south sides of the tabernacle, upon it was the mercy-seat, which is by many thought to have been the only covering of the ark; upon each side was a cherub with wings stretched out, so as that one wing of each cherub touched the side of the tabernacle on which it respectively was placed, and the other wings met together over the middle of the ark and the mercy-seat. This propitiatory or mercy-seat was consider'd as the seat of God himself. It was here that the atonement was made, and that God was rendred
U
pro-

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

6. now leisure to treat particularly. Now when these things were thus order'd, the ordinary priests went continually into the first tabernacle performing the services which belong'd to their offices. But within the second vail went the high-priest only, and he only once in the year, not without blood which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people, the Holy

6. speak particularly. Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God: But into the second *went* the high-priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people.

N O T E S.

propitious by the high-priests sprinkling the blood upon it, and before it, *Lev. xvi. 14, 15.* From hence he appeared, and gave forth his oracles, and so met with his high-priest, and by him with his people. There is one place in our translation which I think needs to be corrected, as it tends to puzzle the common reader, and did me till I look'd into the *Hebrew*; and the rather do I take notice of it, because the *LXX.* agree with our translation, *Exod. xxv. 22.* *And there I will meet with thee, and commune with thee, from ABOVE the mercy-seat* [*LXX. ἀνωθεν τῆς ἱλαστικῆς, Heb. מעל הכפרת*] from between the cherubims, &c. I think this should be rendred *verbatim*, *From upon the mercy-seat*, that is *from the mercy-seat*. For ours and the *LXX.* translation seem to imply that God was not seated upon but above the mercy-seat. This mercy-seat, according to the account before given, was between the cherubims. Whence God is said to *sit between the cherubims*, *Psal. xcix. 1.* and *2 Kings xix. 15. Psal. lxxx. 1. Isaiah xxxvii. 16.* in all which the same phrase *שֹׁב הַכְּרֻבִּים* is used; as also *2 Kings xix. 15.* That these things were shadows, emblems and patterns of heavenly things, seems past doubt from what we meet with in this epistle. Nor does it appear difficult to understand of what the mercy-seat was an emblem, since *St. Paul* so expressly speaks of Christ under that notion, *Rom. iii. 25. Whom God has set forth as a propitiatory, or mercy-seat:* for so it ought to be rendred. See *Mr. Locke* upon that place. However uncertain the application of such things may seem, yet this appears liable to very little objection. The cherubims by the account before given must have overshadow'd the mercy-seat, or covered it, since their wings join'd together over the middle of it. These cherubims are commonly, and I think with good reason, thought to be sensible representations of angels, and they are called cherubims of glory, not barely upon the account of the matter or formation of them, but as they were emblems of that *Shekinah* or glorious presence of God, which used to be afforded by the intervention of angels, and which certainly attended the ark and the mercy-seat in the tabernacle.

There is one thing which I would refer to the consideration of such as are inquisitive into the sense of the holy Scriptures; and that is, whether we have ordinarily fixed upon the true notion of the mercy-seat. We seem ordinarily to take it for a stately and fixed throne whereon God as it were continually sits without any variation or change of it; but there is one passage which seems to represent this as a seat in a chariot, *1 Chron. xxviii. 18. He gave gold for the pattern of the CHARIOT of the cherubims, that spread out their wings, and covered the ark of the covenant of the Lord.* Let the reader consider whether this will not account for the lofty expressions used of the *chariots of God*, *Psal. lxviii. 17.* and his *riding upon a cherub*, *Psal. xviii. 10.* and some places in the prophecy of *Ezekiel*. But I purposely forbear to enlarge upon these matters, however satisfied I may be in my own mind concerning the application that is to be made of them to our Lord Jesus Christ.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

8 The Holy Ghost this signify-
ing, that the way into the
holiest of all, was not yet
made manifest, while as the
first tabernacle was yet
9 standing: Which *was* a
figure for the time then pre-

Holy Ghost hereby shewing, that the way
into the holy of holies was not made manifest
to the priests or people (*b*), while the first
tabernacle retained its primitive situation and
use (*c*). Which first tabernacle was an im-
perfect delineation of the things of this pre-
sent time (*d*), in which were offer'd both
gifts

8.

9.

NOTES.

8 (*b*) Μήπω πεφανερῶσαι τὸ ἅγιον ὁδόν. *That the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest.*] If the ἅγια which we render the *holiest of all* were to be understood of heaven, it could not be hence concluded that heaven was inaccessible to those good men who lived under the old dispensation. All that could be then inferr'd would be only this, that they got thither by a way which they did not themselves clearly understand. But it does not appear that he means heaven here: but only the immediate presence of God; which he sets out by the *holy of holies* in which there was such a presence. This is plain from the manner in which he speaks of the same thing, Chap. x. 19—22. Nor does this imply that good men had not before Christ's time access to God; but only that the way or ground of that access was not clearly perceived by them, the intimations that were given of it in the typical service being too obscure to deserve to be called a manifestation.

If it be asked, How did the Holy Ghost signify thus much? 'Tis easy to answer from the foregoing verse; that the people and all the priests were debarred coming into the holy of holies, where God was in such an eminent manner present, this being allowed to the high-priest only, and not to him constantly, but only once a year. To which we may farther add, that when he went in there, he was bound under pain of death to keep burning incense, that by the cloud it made his view of the divine glory might be intercepted.

(*c*) Ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ σκηνῇ ἐχέουσιν εἰσελθόντες. *While as the first tabernacle was yet standing.*] The *first tabernacle* is generally interpreted to signify the whole building, and 'tis thought to be called the *first* in opposition to the tabernacle of Christ mentioned, ver. 11. But it seems to me more reasonable to understand this of the court of the priests for two reasons. 1. Because this expression of the *first tabernacle* does nearest in the context signify that court, see ver. 2, 6. 2. Because this does so well suit our author's argument. For as that court led to the holy of holies, and it was necessary to pass through it in order to enter therein, as long as that remained in its ancient state and use, the holy of holies must be inaccessible to all the people who might not so much as come into that first tabernacle or the court of the priests, and likewise to the priests who were not permitted to go any farther. So that 'tis plain from hence that the way into the holiest was not then made manifest.

9 (*d*) Ἦτις παραβολὴ ἐστὶ τῷ καίρῳ τῷ ἐνεσσηκόντῳ. *Which was a figure for the time then present.*] Our translators have inserted the word *then*, which is not in the original, and contrary to their usual method have not given notice of it by putting it into a different character. And to say the truth, the sense seems to me better if *then* be here left out. For *this* [or as some copies read *this first*, i. e. tabernacle] was properly a figure παραβολή [that is, as Theophylact says, τύπος καὶ ἀκρίβεια, a type or imperfect delineation] for the present time, viz. to represent obscurely the advantages of the present time, now Christ is come. To which purpose we may observe that in *Beza's* readings it runs thus, Παραβολὴ ἐστὶ τῷ καίρῳ ἐνεσσηκόντῳ, with which the *Vulg.* agrees. *Quæ parabola est temporis instantis.* And if we follow the *Complut.* copy, that will seem to determine it to the sense I have given, Παραβολὴ ἐστὶ τῷ καίρῳ

PARAPHRASE.

TEXT.

10

gifts and sacrifices (*e*), which could not, with reference to the conscience, make perfect the worshiper (*f*), who only worship'd with meat and drink offerings, and various washings, which were carnal ordinances laid upon the *Jews* until the time of reformation (*g*). But

sent, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience, *Which stood only in meats* and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation.

NOTES.

καὶ ἐν τῷτον ἐνεσηκότα. This he calls in the next verse the *time of reformation*.

(*e*) Καθ' ὃν δῶρον τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται. *In which were offered both gifts and sacrifices.*] I follow here the reading of the *Alex. Clermont*, and other MSS. together with the *Vulg.* and *Oecumenius*, Καθ' ἣν sc. πρῶτην σκηνήν, or else καθ' ἣν, sc. παρεσολήν. So that *in which*, or *according to which* I understand to relate to the *first tabernacle*, and not, with our translators, to the *time*.

(*f*) Μὴ δύναμεναι καὶ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι καὶ λαβεύοντα. *That could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience.*] This rendering looks as though the priests only who did the service in the first tabernacle, were here designed. It would have been freer from ambiguity to an *English* reader, if it had been rendered here as *Chap. x. 2.* the *worshiper*, that is him who brought the gift or sacrifice. The limitation *as pertaining to the conscience*, is agreeable to many other passages in this epistle. Ceremonial impurities were done away by these gifts and sacrifices, but moral evils which burdened the conscience, upon which a sense of guilt was left, could not be removed hereby. So that the sense here is much the same with what is thus express'd, *Acts xiii. 39.* By *Christ* all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.

10 (*g*) Μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι, καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς, καὶ δικαιώμασι σαρκὸς, μέλει καὶ ἐν διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα. *Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation.*] The construction in this verse is considerably obscure. Our translators have inserted *which stood*: but 'tis not easy to guess what they mean by *which*: nor can I perceive what it can relate to in the *Greek*, except it be the *first tabernacle*, or the *figure*, neither of which seem well to suit. Again, if we follow the common reading of the original, which I have set down, ἐπικείμενα cannot agree with δικαιώμασι, and therefore there must then be an ellipsis, such as ἅτινα ἦν, or the like. The reader will bear with me in offering a somewhat different account of the meaning of so obscure a passage. And here in the first place I join the beginning of this verse with the latter end of the former in this manner. *Those sacrifices could not, as pertaining to the conscience, make perfect him that worship'd [God] only with meats and drinks, and divers washings.* And so ἐπὶ will be instead of ἐν. In the next place, there being nothing to favour the present *Vulg.* but *Relesius's* various readings, which seem adapted to serve that translation, I don't think it very necessary to regard his putting ἐπικείμενοις instead of ἐπικείμενα, and especially since the old *Italick* version, before it was corrupted, seems to have read ἐπικείμενα, as may be judged from the *Latin* copies of *St. Germain* and *Clermont*. Farther, instead of καὶ δικαιώμασι I chose to follow the *Alex.* and other MSS. and to read δικαιώματα. And as the sense is elliptical, I chose to fill it up before that word rather than after, and understand it as though he had said, ἅτινα ἦν δικαιώματα σαρκὸς — ἐπικείμενα. *Which were carnal ordinances imposed, &c.* So that here our author, as in other places, brings in this clause to disparage and lessen those ordinances upon which the *Hebrews* were apt to set a great value. If this interpretation so far be admitted, it may perhaps help us to understand what is meant by *meats and drinks*. This has exceedingly puzzled interpreters, who take it for granted, that by *meats* here we are to un-

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

11 But Christ being come an high-priest of good things

But Christ, an high-priest of good things to be afterward bestowed, being come (*b*), through

a

NOTES.

understand such meats as were clean, that is, which they were allowed to eat. But I must needs say, it seems very strange that this should be mentioned presently after *gifts and sacrifices*, which could not make the worshipers perfect as pertaining to the conscience. For though the abstaining from unclean and forbidden meats was an act of *obedience*, yet it was not properly an act of worship; nor does this at all help out the proof of his assertion, that those gifts and sacrifices could not make perfect. However, since such abstaining from forbidden meats would keep them free from some defilement, though it would not remove or take away any other, let it be supposed that their interpretation of *meats* is just, yet what will they then make of the *drinks*? They are sensible of the difficulty here, and acknowledge there was no uncleanness in *drinks* as well as meats; and therefore a poor shift they make to get over this, and explain it from the law concerning the *Nazarites*, to whom wine and strong drink were forbidden, and from the law that forbade the priests to drink wine when they were to minister in holy things. But how unlikely are these things? and especially when we consider with what these *meats* and *drinks* are here joined, and that is *divers washings*, which were in order to purify them? It seems therefore highly reasonable to suppose that the *meats* and *drinks* mean somewhat of the same nature: and accordingly I understand both to be spoken concerning the sacrifices which consisted of both meats and drinks; the sacrifices are called the meat of God's house, and wine was to be used in all their drink offerings. There can be nothing more to our author's purpose than the words he uses when taken in this sense.

Nothing farther in this text needs explication, except it be what is meant by the *time of reformation*. In the general it must mean the time of the Messiah, as seems plain by the next verse. By this *reformation* is intended that change that Christ made of the way and manner of serving God, putting an end to the *Jewish* pedagogy and ceremonial service, and appointing another of a more noble and spiritual nature. Nor were the *Jews* themselves without an expectation of somewhat of this kind to be effected by the Messiah when he came, as Dr. *Whitby* has shown upon the place. The asserting of this seems to have been the reason why the *Jews* were so exasperated against St. *Stephen*. For thus the witnesses deposed against him, *Acts* vi. 14. *We heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us.* There is nothing in this which the holy martyr might not well have said; nor does it appear unlikely to me that he should deliver himself to that purpose. I therefore imagine that when they are called *false witnesses*, it is merely upon the account of the invidious turn they gave to his innocent words. *We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and against God, ver. 11.* And again, *ver. 13. This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law.*

11 (*b*) Χεῖρς ἡ ἀγαγενόμηνος ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν. *But Christ being come an high-priest of good things to come.* Some would have the ἡ here to be a redditive to χεῖρ in the first verse. But that seems hard to be allowed, since 'tis not only so remote, but the comparison is rather made between the *Jewish* high-priest mentioned *ver. 7.* and Christ.

The word ἀγαγενόμηνος is obscure as here used, and seems to have puzzled interpreters. One owns it is never elsewhere taken in the same sense it is here. It signifies to come to a person or place, or to be present any where. They seem to be mistaken who understand this of the incarnation of Christ; nor do I find that any pretend he acted as a priest before his death. The interpretation therefore that seems most probable to me, however overlook'd by interpreters is, that ἀγαγενόμηνος is to be joined in construction with εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἁγία in the next verse, and that the sense is this: That being as an high-priest come to the holy

12. a greater and more perfect tabernacle, that was not (as the *Jewish* tabernacle) made with hands or fashioned by men (*i*), *being come, I say*, to the holy of holies, he entred once thereinto, not indeed with the blood of goats (*k*) and calves as the high-priest did (*l*), but with his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption (*m*). For if the blood of
- to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entred in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us*. For if the

N O T E S.

holy of holies he entred thereinto. That *ἄρχινεσθαι* and *ἰσέλθειν* are thus joined together we may see by *Acts* xxiii. 16. And if I mistake not, this will make the construction easy in this place.

Farther, however some may think light of the interpretation of *τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*, yet I can't but prefer that which refers this to the good things which were to be brought about by Christ, and that the *μελλόντων* has here a respect to the age of the Messiah, who was according to the LXX. to be the *father of the age to come*. And accordingly I don't consider this as having so much a respect to the future heavenly felicity (though I would not affirm that that must be wholly excluded) as to the advantages we have by Christ in this present world.

(*i*) *Διὰ τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τελειότερας σκηνῆς, ἢ χειροποιήτης, τῆς ἐκ τούτης τῆς κτίσεως.* By a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building.] These words, as they stand in the original, may be thought to belong to the *good things to come*, and so our author should be understood to say those good things were to come, or to be conveyed to us by a greater and more perfect tabernacle. And thus our translators seem to have taken them. But it seems to me more natural to join the words with *ἰσῆλθεν* in the next verse, and so the sense will stand thus, But Christ a high-priest of good things to come, came and entred by or through a greater and more perfect tabernacle into the holy of holies.

This greater and more perfect tabernacle is, I think, to be interpreted from *Chap.* x. 20. to signify the flesh of Christ, which very well agrees with the context in this place. This is said *not to be made with hands*, in opposition to the tabernacle or temple which were the work of men; and so 'tis explained, *that is to say, not of this building*, not of such an human or earthly structure.

12 (*k*) *Οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων.* Neither by the blood of goats.] The meaning of *οὐδὲ* here is *ne quidem*; and so the proper rendring would have been, *Not indeed by the blood of goats and calves*, [as the high-priests under the law] *but by his own blood he entred once into the holy of holies*.

(*l*) *Καὶ μόσχων.* And calves.] In *Lev.* xvi. 3. the *Hebrew* has *בקר בן* which we render a *young bullock*. The distinction the *Hebrews* make is that *בן* signifies a calf of the first year, and *בקר* one of the second year; so that being so young it might be reckon'd a calf. Accordingly the LXX. in rendering that place in *Lev.* continually translate it by *μόσχον*, and then our author follows, as does also the *Vulg.* which uses the word *vitulus*.

(*m*) *Αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.* Having obtained eternal redemption for us.] St. Paul has told us what we are to understand by *redemption*, *Eph.* i. 7. *In whom* [Christ] *we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins*. Compare *Col.* i. 14. This he attributes to the blood of Christ as does St. Peter also, *1 Pet.* i. 18, 19. And in like manner does our author here speak of it as obtained by the blood of Christ as an expiatory sacrifice. Compare *ver.* 14. The reason why he here calls this *eternal* redemption, is that he might show that

T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

14 blood of bulls, and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

of bulls and goats, and the water of separation mixed with the ashes of the red heifer, being sprinkled upon those who were under a ceremonial uncleanness (*n*), sanctifies to the cleansing of their flesh (*o*), how much more 14. shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit (*p*) offer'd himself a spotless offering to God, be effectual to purify your conscience from sins (*q*), that so you may be at liberty to serve the living God (*r*)?

N O T E S.

that his entering into the holy place as our high-priest needed not to be more than once; it being of that complete virtue as perfectly to expiate all the sins of all that should believe in, and obey him to the end of the world, there could be no occasion for its ever being repeated.

13 (*n*) Concerning the *ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean*, read Num. xix.

(*o*) Ἀγιάζει πρὸς τὸ ἁγιαῖς καθαροῦν τὴν σάρκα. *Sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh.*] The legal impurities debarr'd the *Jews* an attendance upon the publick service: from these they were freed by the sacrifices, washings, and sprinklings appointed by the *Mosaick* law, which are called *carnal ordinances*, ver. 10. and so became qualified again for publick worship. And of this our author speaks under the notion of sanctification. That this sanctification or purifying is to be consider'd with respect to the divine service appears by the next verse, wherein he represents the advantage we have by the blood of Christ, *viz.* to be qualified to *serve the living God*.

14 (*p*) Ὁς διὰ Πνεύματος αἰωνίου. *Who through the eternal Spirit.*] There are so many *Greek* copies which read here αἰών instead of αἰωνίου, the *holy* instead of the *eternal* spirit, with which the *Vulg.* agrees, that it can't easily be determined with any great certainty which is the true reading, especially since the ancient *Syriac* version agrees with the common reading, *Who through the Spirit which is for ever*. The nature of our author's argument seems to leads us to consider this *spirit* as signifying the λόγος or divine nature of our Lord, since he is setting forth the intrinsic worth and excellency of his offering; though it must be own'd that a good sense may be given of the words, when they are interpreted of the Holy Spirit.

(*q*) Καθαροῦν τὴν συνείδησιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων. *Shall purge your conscience from dead works.*] By *dead works* we are evidently to understand *sins*. See Chap. vi. 1. The blood of Christ is said to *purge* or purify from these, as it makes atonement for, or obtains the forgiveness of them; the consequence of which is, that the conscience is hereby freed from the distressing sense of guilt, and a person acquires a freedom in the service of God. The conscience is here mentioned to shew the great difference in the effects of the blood of Christ, and of the legal purifications, that whereas the latter only purified the flesh, the former purified the mind and conscience.

(*r*) The reason why our author speaks here of God as the *living* God, seems to be that he might the more plainly intimate the necessity of the conscience's being purged from dead works in order to the serving him. Considering him as a God of life and almighty power, guilt on the conscience would affright men from his service.

S E C T.

HEBREW S.

SECT. XII.

CHAP. IX. 15—28.

CONTENTS.

THIS section seems to be in a good measure a digression in our author's discourse. In the former he had, by comparing the ancient tabernacle and the service thereof with Christ, shown the weakness of it; and to this he returns in the beginning of the next chapter. But here, upon his having asserted the great virtue of the blood of Christ, he enlarges in showing how necessary the shedding of his blood was, partly upon the account of his office as mediator, partly from the nature of God's covenant with men, as appears by what was done under the first covenant. And he argues from the different natures of the things to be purified with sacrifices, that the blood of a more excellent sacrifice was necessary under the second than under the first. And in the four last verses he has a respect to what he had before said of Christ's dying and entering into the holy of holies but once, proving that that was every way sufficient. By all these things 'tis evident, that though I look upon this as a digression, yet 'tis a most pertinent and useful one.

PARAPHRASE.

TEXT.

15. **A**ND in order to Christ's accomplishing this (*f*), he is the mediator of the new covenant (*t*), that his death intervening for

AND for this cause he is ¹⁵ the Mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the re-

NOTES.

15 (*f*) Καὶ διὰ τῆς αἰτίας. *And for this cause.*] I take this to refer to the last clause of the foregoing verse, and that the sense stands thus: "And for this end that he might purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God, he is the mediator, &c."

(*t*) Διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν. *He is the mediator of the new testament.*] 'Tis observed before that this is the only place where the word διαθήκη can be thought to be put for a testament rather than a covenant. See on Chap. vii. 22. note (*k*). It shall now be inquired whether there be any necessity of taking it so in this verse and its context. This is the rather

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

for obtaining the forgiveness of the transgressions that were committed against the first covenant, those who being called submit to the new covenant, might receive the promised eternal inheritance (*u*).
For

NOTES.

ther to be consider'd, because some have imagined that our author plays as it were with the ambiguity of the *Greek* word, which signifies either a *testament* or a *covenant*, and that there is very little strength in his way of reasoning; which others judge to be an injurious reflection upon him. Now whatever the difficulties are which may attend the rendring it here a *covenant*, there are others not inferior to them that lie on the contrary rendring a *testament*. For however ambiguous the *Greek* word is, yet the *Hebrew* ברית invariably signifies a *covenant*. And this our author had in his eye. See *ver.* 18—20. Again, a testament has no mediator belonging to it, as a covenant has; and therefore the *mediator of a testament* must be an improper, and perhaps unintelligible expression. Besides, as much of the plea used for the taking a *testament* to be rather spoken of, than a *covenant*, rests upon the word διαθέμῳ, which we render the *testator*, *ver.* 16, 17. it will be hard to account for what is there said of the death of the *testator*. For the testator must be God the Father who makes the testament, and gives the blessings of it, who could not possibly die. But of that under the next verse.

(*u*) ὡς θανάτῳ γενομένῳ εἰς πολλύβωσιν ἢ ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ ἡμετέρας, ἢ ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆ αἰωνίου κληρονομίας. *That by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.* This passage appear'd to me very difficult, and well deserves to be more exactly consider'd than I think it has yet been: for I pretend not to speak with any great certainty of the interpretation I shall offer. Our translation of θανάτῳ γενομένῳ by means of death, does not miss the sense: for he speaks of the death of Christ as the means of procuring redemption. Whence some choose to supply the word *his*, and render the place *his death intervening*. And the *Syriac* takes a yet greater liberty, rendring it, *Who by his death is the redeemer of those who transgress'd against the first covenant*. That translation seems likewise to have fixed upon the proper sense of ἐπὶ which they turned by ὑπὲρ or *against*: for that rather than *under* is the signification of this *Greek* preposition when 'tis joined with a dative case. I imagine our author has here a respect to what he frequently asserts in this epistle, that the sacrifices prescribed in the law were not of sufficient value to expiate the sins which were committed by the *Jews* against it, and that therefore a more perfect sacrifice was necessary upon their account, and that this expiation was accordingly made by the death of Christ, in regard to which good men had granted to them that redemption or remission which the law could not procure them. And hence I understand the last clause thus, That they who are called, that is so called as to be prevailed upon and effectually engaged to become the people of God, whether they were such as were under the former dispensation or covenant before our Saviour's coming, or those who were effectually called now after the new covenant took place, whether they were *Jews* or *Gentiles* might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance, that is the eternal inheritance that was promised. By the *eternal inheritance* I understand eternal life, to which the law could not intitle men: whence it must follow that those who under that dispensation obtained it, did it by virtue of some promise (as particularly that to *Abraham*) which belonged to the new covenant properly, and consequently that their right depended upon Christ who was to be the mediator of that new covenant. Unless our author be thus understood, I confess

16. For in every such covenant which God makes with sinful men, there must also of necessity be the death of the pacifier (ω). For where a testament is, 16. there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.

N O T E S.

fess I do not see what relation or connection there is between the two things mentioned, viz. his death for the redemption of the transgressions against the first covenant, and the called's receiving the promise of the eternal inheritance. A better account of this verse will be very agreeable to me: however I can't but observe that there is nothing in it that leads us to determine the sense of διαθήκη in the context to a *testament* rather than a *covenant*.

16 (ω) Οπερ γὰρ διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τῷ διαθεμῶ. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. It must be own'd that if this and the next verse were to be consider'd without relation to the context, nothing could be more agreeable than the interpreting them of a proper *testament*, the word διαθεμῶ frequently signifying in other authors a *testator*, as our translation renders it. But when the reasoning in the context is carefully minded, it seems to determine the discourse to be of a *covenant*. Our author in this verse is giving a reason of what he had said in that before, as the connecting of this verse by the word *for* plainly shews. Now that which he refers to in the foregoing verse is, that being the mediator of the new covenant, he was by his death to obtain the promised eternal inheritance for such as were called, whether under the first or last dispensation, provided they had complied with the terms insisted on. This promised inheritance could not be obtained without redemption or forgiveness; nor this forgiveness without the death of the mediator, the legal sacrifices not being sufficient to purify from sin. There was therefore a necessity that his death should intervene upon the account of such as lived under the law as well as for those who lived under the gospel. Hence he asserts, that where a covenant is there must also of necessity be the death of the testator, as we render τῷ διαθεμῶ. This shows that the διαθεμῶ must be the same as the *mediator* beforementioned; and consequently that he must be consider'd as acting in a *covenant*, and not in a *testament*, there being no such thing as a *mediator* of a *testament*. The question then will be, in what sense we must understand διαθεμῶ, that it may agree with the scope of the context. Now though διαθεμῶ is often put for a *testator*, yet as 'tis a participle of διατίθεσθαι, it may well be supposed to take its signification from it. And as that word sometimes denotes to *appease* or *pacify*, διαθεμῶ may here denote the *pacifier*, which well accords with the character of a *mediator*. This sense is taken notice of by Lexicographers, who furnish us with an instance of it which I judge very much to our purpose, and which I shall therefore here present to my reader. 'Tis in Appian, lib. ii. De Bello civili, where he says that Caesar having obtained the province of Spain was detained by his creditors, whom he was not able to pay ——— however, says he, διαθεμῶ τῶν ἐνοχλῶντας ὡς ἐδύνατο, he pacified his creditors who troubled him as well as he could. And thus I understand the word here, though I own I can't find any the like use of it in the new testament, or the LXX. If it be objected, that our author here argues from the general nature of a διαθήκη, and that this will hold good of a testament, but not of a covenant; I answer that 'tis indeed true, that this will hold good as to a *testament*: but then there are other reasons which have been, and which shall be alleged against that sense. But that which satisfies me in the case is, that though the expression may seem to be absolute, yet it may well be restrained by the scope of the writer. And therefore however true 'tis, that some covenants between man and man were anciently confirmed by blood, that is by sacrifice, yet that never having been esteem'd absolutely necessary, and it being necessary to suppose that some covenants or contracts were always transacted between them without the intervention of any sacrifice at all,

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>17 For a testament <i>is</i> of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all whilst the testator liveth.</p> <p>18 Whereupon, neither the first <i>testament</i> was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every</p> | <p>For the covenant is made upon the condition of death, and is confirmed thereby (x); because the pacificator has no power at all while he liveth (y). Whence neither was the first covenant initiated and established without blood (z). For every precept according to the law</p> | <p>17.</p> <p>18.</p> <p>19.</p> |
|---|---|----------------------------------|

being

NOTES.

all, it may not perhaps here be unreasonable to imagine that he only has a reference to such covenants as God was pleased ever to make with sinful men. And accordingly he here mentions none but such covenants, viz. that of the law, and that of the gospel. I can't perceive our translation of *φέρεσθαι* is much amiss, *There must be*, that is, *There must intervene the death of the pacifier.*

17 (x) Διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία. *For a testament is of force after men are dead.* Not to repeat that this can't be apply'd to the immortal God, who must be consider'd as the testator, I take Διαθήκη here as in the verse before, for any covenant God makes with sinful men, and ἐπὶ seems to be used to express the condition of such a covenant, and ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, where γίνεται or ὅτι must be supplied, means that the covenant becomes valid or ratified (Compare Gal. iii. 15.) upon condition of the death of the pacifiers. And most certainly if death be insisted on in the condition of the covenant, the great confirmation of it must be when that condition is fulfilled. Nor do I perceive any thing unreasonable in supposing that here the *concrete* is used for the *abstract*, and that ἐπὶ νεκροῖς is the same as ἐπὶ θανάτῳ. Thus it seems used in other places, and particularly Rom. xi. 15. *If the casting them away be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving them be but ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν, life from the dead, i. e. from death?*

(y) Ἐπεὶ μὴ πῶς ἔχει ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος. *Otherwise 'tis of no strength at all whilst the testator liveth.* That is, the condition of the covenant not being perform'd by the pacifier's death, the covenant it self is not confirm'd and ratified. But to speak freely, I doubt whether Διαθήκη is the nominative case to ἔχει, and the rather, because then the proof and the thing proved do too much coincide. I should therefore choose rather to take ὁ διαθέμενος to be understood to precede ἔχει, and so the construction will stand thus: "Because the pacifier can do nothing as long as he [the pacifier] liveth." Whoever considers the scheme of the gospel, and of this epistle in particular, must be sensible how exactly this interpretation agrees with both. But I refer this to the judgment of the careful reader. Only it may be proper to add, that in case this explication be allowed it may not be amiss to suppose this clause to be a parenthesis, as the connection then between the first part of the verse and ver. 18. will be more easy and obvious.

18 (z) ὅθεν ἔδ' ἢ πρῶτη χρεὶς αἱμάτων ἐγκαινίσαι. *Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood.* However our translators have here again inserted the word *testament* as answering to Διαθήκη, which must be understood in the Greek; yet this seems a clear argument that the word is used by our author to signify a *covenant*. For the old dispensation had nothing of the nature of a *testament* at all, but was purely a *covenant*: and there is little connection in his discourse, or strength in his reasoning, if we suppose the word is put for a testament in the preceding verses, and used for a covenant in this. For what sense will there then be in the ὅθεν whereupon or whence? But the reasoning is clear, if we understand him to assert that all the covenants God makes with men are upon condition of death; and that this appears by the first covenant wherein the same thing may be observed.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

being spoken by *Moses* to all the people, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop (a), and

precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop,

N O T E S.

As to the word ἐγχεκάλινσαι which our common translation renders *was dedicated*, but the margin *purified*, less agreeably to the import of the word, though not foreign to the sense, as appears by *ver.* 23. The *Vulg.* renders with us *was dedicated*, and the *Syr. confirmed*: the true sense of it seems to be, that it was *initiated, dedicated or renewed*; to which purpose the LXX. use it in translating וָיָחַ and וָיָחַ several times: but in the last sense of *renewed* it often answers to וָיָחַ which carries in it that signification. It may seem doubtful which sense we should here prefer. If we take the latter, that the *covenant was renewed*, it may seem to refer to the continual renovation of it by the sacrifices they offered; but what follows in the next verses seems wholly to refer it to what was done at the first promulgation of it by *Moses*, which will rather lead us to the sense of *initiated or dedicated*. And to this purpose *Chrysostom* explains it, βεβαία γέγονεν, ἐκυρώθη, *it became valid, or was confirmed*.

19 (a) Λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τράγων καὶ ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου καὶ ὑσσώπου. *He took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop.*] What our author refers to in this place, is to be found *Exod.* xxiv. But 'tis observed by commentators that no express mention is there made of the *blood of goats*, of *water*, *scarlet wool* or *hyssop*, but only of the *blood of calves*. They seem to give a satisfactory solution of this difficulty, who suppose that our author might have this, as well as some other things he mentions, from the received traditions and interpretations of the *Jews*, especially all circumstances joining together to confirm it. And from the words of *Moses* it seems highly probable that he took the blood of *goats* as well as calves. For *Exod.* xxiv. 5. 'tis expressly said that they offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen [or calves, the LXX. here using the word μόσχα] unto the Lord. These calves were the peace-offerings, but what the burnt-offerings were is not expressed: they might as well be goats as of any other kind; and the rather, because goats were frequently used in the sin-offerings. Nay, some say, that when ever burnt-offerings and peace-offerings were to be offer'd together, goats were always a part of the burnt-offering. See *Lev.* ix. And indeed *Josephus*, *Antiq. lib.* iii. c. 10. seems in one or two places to speak as though one or more goats were always a part of the burnt-offerings. The *Syriac* translators therefore seem to have taken too great a liberty in omitting the mention of *goats*, which the *Vulg.* with all the ancient MSS. acknowledge to belong to the text. And if they did it, because they could not find the *goats* taken notice of in the story, *Exod.* xxiv. they might as well have forgotten to translate the other words which follow, *With water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop*: for neither is any express mention made of them there. And yet considering the great quantity of blood that was used on that occasion, it does not appear unreasonable to suppose that those things were then used. One half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar, and one half he put in basins for sprinkling the people, *Exod.* xxiv. 6, 8. Now when such a large quantity of blood was to be sprinkled, it seems necessary that some course should be taken to prevent its congealing, and to keep it fit for its design'd use: And what course can be thought to have been more likely to have been observed by him than this to mix the blood with water? And when the blood was thus mixed, as it would thereby be in some measure diluted and lose its colour, the *scarlet wool* might perhaps contribute in some measure to make the colour more vivid: however, as it would suck up the blood and water in a considerable quantity, it might be of great service in performing the ceremony. The bunch of *hyssop* might likewise be of use in order to the sprinkling of the water and blood. 'Tis not likely when God was so punctual in his prescriptions of the old ceremonial service, that he would fail to give *Moses* a particular direction.

T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

and sprinkled both the book
20 and all the people, Saying,
This *is* the blood of the te-
stament which God hath
21 enjoined unto you. More-
over, he sprinkled likewise
with blood both the taber-

and sprinkled both the book and all the peo-
ple (*b*), Saying, This is the blood of the co- 20.
venant which God hath enjoined you to ob-
serve (*c*). And in like manner afterward 21.
(*d*) he sprinkled with blood both the taber-
nacle.

N O T E S.

rection in so necessary a case, or that *Moses* would venture to act without it. And if this be allowed, what can we look upon as a more reasonable supposition, than that God now pre- scribed to *Moses* the same method which he did afterwards expressly in the like cases? See *Lev.* xiv. 4—6, 49—52.

(*b*) *Αὐτὸς τε τὸ βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὰ λαὸν ἐρρόαντισε.* And sprinkled both the book and all the people.] There being no mention in *Exod.* of his sprinkling the book, some commentators have imagined that our author does not say that he sprinkled the book, but that he took the book; and so they join the first clause here with *λαβὼν*. But this interpretation seems harsh as it makes the *καὶ* and of the last clause redundant. The account given by others looks more probable, that the book was laid upon the altar *Moses* built, and consequently could not but be sprinkled when the whole altar was sprinkled.

Further, when 'tis said that he sprinkled all the people, the word *all* is added by our author, not being found in the *Hebrew* or *LXX*. But this must necessarily be understood, since the covenant was made with all the people. They must all therefore be intended in that sprinkling, however unlikely or impossible it be that every individual person in so great a multitude should be actually sprinkled. This might be consider'd as done to the whole body when it was done to such as represented them, whether they were the twelve pillars *Moses* built according to the twelve tribes of *Israel*, *Exod.* xxiv. 4. or the seventy elders of *Israel*, *ver.* 1. or perhaps those who happen'd among the people to stand nearest to *Moses* when he sprinkled the blood.

20 (*c*) *Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you.*] Our author in these words follows neither the *Hebrew* nor the *LXX*. but only gives the sense of them, as he does in other parts of this epistle. 'Tis plain from hence that he uses the word *διαθήκη* for a covenant, and not for a testament, not only from the *Hebrew* word *ברית* which he here translates, but from the thing it self, the old law having nothing of the nature of a testament in it: and our translators would have done better to have translated it a covenant in this verse.

21, 22 (*d*) What is here said cannot be understood as though *Moses* sprinkled the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry, at the same time he sprinkled the people, of which mention is made in the three preceding verses. For neither was the tabernacle, nor the vessels of the ministry then made, as appears by the history in *Exodus*. I think therefore they give the best account of this matter, who suppose that our author having finished what he intended of the first dedication of the covenant, here passes on to show what was the constant practice from time to time under the law, whence he does not say that all things were then at that first dedication purged with blood, but that almost all things are by the law purged with blood, [speaking of it as a continued standing custom under the law] and without shedding of blood [repeatedly as the law required] is no remission. Hence when 'tis said, He [*Moses*] sprinkled with blood in like manner, *ὁμοίως*, both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry, it does not imply that *Moses* did this with his own hands, but only that he appointed and order'd it to be done.

But still it remains to be inquired, when this may be said to have been done, or to what in particular it refers. And there seem to be only two probable conjectures that can be made concerning this. 1. That this was done at the first erecting of the tabernacle. Of this *Moses* gives

22. nacle and all the vessels and instruments that were used in that service. And there was hardly any thing which the law required to be purified and cleansed, but it was to be done with blood (*e*); and without the shedding

nacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost 22 all things are by the law purged with blood; and

N O T E S.

gives an account, *Exod.* xl. where he only expressly mentions the anointing, but not the sprinkling of blood upon the tabernacle and all that was in it, *ver.* 9—11. *And thou shalt take the anointing oil, and anoint the tabernacle, and all that is therein, and shalt hallow it, and all the vessels thereof, and it shall be holy. And thou shalt anoint the altar of the burnt-offering, and all his vessels, and sanctify the altar: and it shall be an altar most holy. And thou shalt anoint the laver, and his foot, and sanctify it.* Now though here is no express mention of sprinkling these with blood, yet it seems to me to be intended by the word קִדְּשׁ which we render *thou shalt hallow*, and *thou shalt sanctify*, which may very well be understood to be done by sacrifice, as well as by the anointing oil; and the rather may we take it thus, because 'tis so often mentioned as distinct from the anointing. And this may perhaps receive some confirmation from what immediately follows in that chapter concerning Aaron and his sons, *ver.* 12, 13. *And thou shalt bring Aaron and his sons unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and wash them with water. And thou shalt put upon Aaron the holy garments, and anoint him, and sanctify him, that he may minister unto me in the priests office, &c.* Now if we compare this with the prescribed manner of consecrating and sanctifying Aaron and his sons, *Exod.* xxviii. 40. xxix. 1—21. we find that this was done not only with anointing, but with sprinkling of blood. Particularly let the 20 and 21 verses be considered. And if the sanctifying of the tabernacle and the vessels of the ministry was to be done by sacrifice, it seems necessary that it should be done by the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifice, since this sanctifying was not to be performed at once for all in general, but was to be applied distinctly to each of the things mentioned; and how then could it be done but by sprinkling the blood of the sacrifice distinctly upon each? To all which may be added the testimony of *Josephus*, who speaks in like manner of this dedication of the tabernacle and the vessels thereof. *Antiq.* lib. iii. c. 10.

2. The learned Dr. *Owen* understands what is here said to relate to the service prescribed on the annual day of expiation; nor does our author's account thus taken at all differ from what was ordered to be done on that day. See *Lev.* xvi. 14—20. There are two things which rather incline me to prefer this interpretation. 1. That our author seems plainly by *ver.* 22. to have left that part of his subject, which concerns the first beginning of the ceremonial service, and to be here treating of the ordinary and standing practice according to the law. And, says he, *almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission.* 2. It appears evidently that our author is very much upon this argument, and especially in this chapter, and seems to take a peculiar pleasure in comparing what Christ has done with the service of the high-priest on the great day of expiation. See to this purpose how he proceeds in his discourse, *ver.* 23—26. The Doctor has, in my apprehension, given good light into these two verses.

22 (*e*) Καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν ᾧματι πάντα καθαρῶσαι καὶ ὁ νόμος. *And almost all things are by the law purged with blood.* The *almost* is designed to except such things as were purified by fire or water. See *Num.* xxxi. 23. The interpretation of the ancient Greek commentators, *that all things were almost purified by blood*, because the blood of their sacrifices could not intirely purify, suits not the scope of the place. But that which is more important is to inquire what is meant by this *purging* or *purifying*: for the same word is thus differently rendered in this and the

T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

without shedding of blood
23 is no remission. *It was*
therefore necessary that the
patterns of things in the
heavens should be purified
with these; but the hea-
venly things themselves with
better sacrifices than these.

ding of that no forgiveness was to be obtain-
ed. There was therefore a necessity that 23.
these patterns and resemblances of the heaven-
ly things should by virtue of these sacrifices be
rendred fit for their use (f) : but the heaven-
ly things themselves which were more excel-
lent in their own nature, and of which the
other were only patterns, should be fitted
and prepared for us by the means of some
more excellent sacrifices than these (g).
For

N O T E S.

the next verse. Now though the *all things* may be a general expression, yet it must certainly include, if not primarily intend, the things he had just mentioned, the *tabernacle*, and *all the vessels of the ministry*. And by *Lev. xvi. 16—20.* it appears that the altar, and even the holy of holies, were to be thus purified. But it may seem strange that these things, and particularly the holy of holies, where God especially dwelt, should need to be *purified*. The purifying of the worshipers might be needful, but what occasion could there be to purify such a holy place as the sanctuary, into which the people or priests were never to come, except the high-priest once a year? In answer to this I think we must understand the purifying of these things to be of the same import as the purifying the persons. For the purifying of the things was upon the account of the uncleanness of the persons, as 'tis said over and over in that place in *Leviticus*; and particularly *ver. 19.* *He shall sprinkle of the blood upon it [the altar] with his finger seven times, and shall CLEANSE it, and shall hallow it from the UNCLEANNESS of the children of Israel.* Where the LXX use the same word as our author does here, *καθαίρει*. The end therefore of cleansing or purifying these things was to remove the uncleanness of the worshipers, who were by reason of their uncleanness unfit to use these things, and by using them as it were polluted them, which is applicable even to the holy of holies and the mercy-seat, in as much as they had a respect to, and always directed their worship toward these. So that the purifying of these things seems to mean no more than the rendering them fit and lawful to be used. 'Tis to this purpose the same word is used, *Acts x. 15. xi. 9.* *What God hath cleansed καθαίρει that call not thou common.* And that our author is to be taken in this sense, seems evident from the words that immediately follow : *And without shedding of blood is no remission ; there is no remission of the uncleanness of those who use these holy things.*

23 (f) *Ανάγκη ἐν ταῖς καθάραις ταῖς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ταῖς καθαρῖζεσαι.* *It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these.* He calls the ancient tabernacle, &c. the *patterns* or *examples* of the heavenly things, because they were a delineation of them taken from the heavenly pattern shewed to *Moses* in the mount. In this sense is the word used elsewhere in this epistle, particularly *Chap. viii. 5.* where 'tis joined with a *shadow*, and the tabernacle is called the *PATTERN* and *SHADOW* of heavenly things. The necessity here spoken of seems wholly to be attributed to the prescription and command of God concerning that dispensation.

(g) *Αἱ δὲ τὰ ἐμπόδια καὶ ἑαυτὰς διὰ τὰς ταύτας.* *But the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.* The ancient Greek commentators were certainly mistaken, when they interpreted these *heavenly things themselves*, as meaning the church under the gospel. And this is evident from the next verse, where our author brings his proof of what

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

24. For Christ is not entred into an earthly sanctuary that was built by men, which was a pattern or resemblance of the true sanctuary (*b*), that is of heaven it self into which he is gone, that he might there appear before God for us. Nor indeed was it necessary that he should offer several sacrifices, or himself more than once (*i*), as the high-priest under the law went yearly into the holy of holies with fresh sacrifices every time: (For then he must have
- For Christ is not entred in-²⁴ to the holy places made with hands, *which are* the figures of the true; but into heaven it self, now to appear in the presence of God for us: Nor yet that²⁵ he should offer himself often, as the high-priest entred into the holy place, every year with blood of others: (For then must he²⁶

N O T E S.

what he had advanced. For, says he, *Christ is not entred into the holy places* [the sanctuary, or holy of holies] *made with hands*; but *into heaven it self* [not the church under the gospel, but the proper heaven] *now to appear in the presence of God for us*. Now these heavenly things are spoken of as purified by better sacrifices in the same manner in which we before consider'd the patterns of heavenly things as purified by the legal sacrifices. See note (*e*). By Christ's sacrifice presented to God atonement is made for our sins, and heaven is rendred accessible and fit for us. The use that has been made of our author's using the plural number here, and speaking of *better sacrifices*, is altogether unreasonable. There is no need from hence to search after any other sacrifice than that of Christ. The sense stands thus: "It was necessary that these patterns of heavenly things should be purified with these sacrifices of calves and goats, &c. but as the heavenly things themselves are unspeakably more noble and excellent, so if they are to be purified by sacrifices they must be more excellent and noble than those legal sacrifices were. Such a sacrifice is Christ, who though but once offered effectually answers this purpose." And it seems to me, that our author from his speaking thus in the plural number in this verse, takes occasion in the four last verses of the chapter to shew, that this one sacrifice of Christ was all that was needful; whereby he in a manner guarded against that ill use which some, notwithstanding his caution, have made of his words.

24 (*b*) *Ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν*. *Which are the figures of the true.*] We have in like manner render'd the same word in the other place; in which and in this it only occurs in the new testament, 1 Pet. iii. 21. And the rendering seems unexceptionable. The *holy places made with hands* were not what we commonly call antitypes of the heavenly sanctuary; nor can I perceive that christian baptism is the antitype of Noah's being saved at the flood. Were the holy places made with hands in this sense the antitypes of heaven, then heaven it self must be the type, or that which was design'd to foreshew and prefigure what is accomplish'd in the sanctuary made with hands; which is very absurd. Heaven therefore is consider'd as the true sanctuary, and the perfect exemplar or original platform, *τύπον*, and the earthly sanctuary as *ἀντίτυπον*, a draught or copy taken from it; and thus the same thing is meant by this word, and *ὑποδείγματα*, *patterns*, ver. 23.

25 (*i*) *Οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρει ἑαυτὸν*. *Nor yet that he should offer himself often.*] The word *ἵνα* seems to be here used in the same manner as in ver. 12. See note (*l*) *not indeed*. There is an ellipsis in this place which our translators ought to have supplied; for want of which their rendering is hardly good *English*. I think we are to supply the ellipsis from ver. 23. thus: *Nor indeed was it necessary that he should often offer himself*. However I must own,

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

often have suffered since the foundation of the world) but now once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the
27 sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this
28 the judgment: So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation.

have often suffered since the beginning of the world) but now once has he been manifested in the last age of the world (*k*) to expiate and abolish sin by the sacrifice of himself. And for as much as the dying once (*l*), and then after that the judgment are appointed for men; Christ who conforming himself to their condition died once, being offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear at his second coming to them that duly expect him, in glory without any sufferings (*m*) to their salvation.

27.

28.

NOTES.

own, that according to the common use of the word ἀνάγκη both in sacred and profane authors, it ought rather to be followed with the infinitive mood προσφέρειν, than with the subjunctive προσφέρη, and the word ἵνα prefixed.

26 (*k*) Ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος. *In the end of the world.*] Or in the last of the ages. According to the learned Mr. Joseph Mede's observation, a distinction is to be made between the συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος and τοῦ αἰῶνος. The former, which is several times used by St. Matthew, xiii. 39, 40, 49. xxiv. 3. xxviii. 20. signifies the precise time of the end of the world; but the latter a continued time, or that age of the world that was the last; in which sense it is most true, that then Christ appear'd to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. See his apostacy of the latter times, ch. xi, xii.

27, 28 (*l*) *And as it is appointed, &c.*] Our author had several times asserted that Christ was made like unto us in all things; and this consideration he seems to me to allege in this place, in order to clear what he says of Christ's only dying once. By dying once he submits to the condition they were in for whom he died; but being freed from death he has no more occasion than they to die any more.

28 (*m*) Ἐκ δευτέρου χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας ὀφθῆσεται. *He shall appear the second time without sin.*] He was as truly without sin in his first appearance, as he will be in his second. Sin therefore here is put for the consequence of sin, that abasement and suffering he submitted to when he appeared the first time, and was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, Rom. viii. 3. and made an offering for sin. So that hereby is meant that then he shall appear with the utmost magnificence, splendor, and glory.

S E C T. XIII.

C H A P. X. 1—18.

C O N T E N T S.

OU R author having finished his digression, here returns to what he was upon. His design was to prove from the nature of the service under the law, that it was not sufficient to perfect the worshipers with respect to the conscience; and therefore could be supposed to be prescribed only for a limited time. See *Chap. ix. 1—10.* and especially the three last of those verses. Hereupon he argues the far greater dignity and virtue of the high-priesthood of Christ, *ver. 11—14.* He now goes on again with the same design in this section, and argues the ineffectualness of the legal sacrifices from the nature of the law which had only a shadow of good things, from the prescribed frequent repetition of the sacrifices themselves, and from the small worth of them, which showed they were not what God principally aimed at. This he confirms by the testimony of the psalmist; from whence also he infers that they were required till Christ should become our high-priest, and by his one offering perfect them that are sanctified. This he farther confirms by the testimony of *Jeremiah* before cited, which spake of God's remembering the sins and iniquities of his people no more, when once the new covenant took place, which shows, that after that there could be no occasion for any farther offering for sin.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

1 **F**OR the law having a shadow of good things to come, *and* not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect.

FOR the law had yearly on the day of expiation a shadow of the heavenly good things which were to be bestow'd (not the very original of the things themselves) and therefore it could never by the sacrifices, which it ordered to be continually repeated, make the worshipers perfect (n).
For

NOTES.

1 (n) Σκιαν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, ἐκ αὐτῶν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, καὶ ἐνιαυτὸν τῶν αὐταῖς θυσίαις ὡς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, ἐδέχθη δύναμις τὰς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι. *For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect.*] The whole verse is transcribed from the original, as well as our translation, because there is somewhat intricate and obscure in the order in which the Greek words are placed; which is accordingly taken notice of by interpreters, who commonly allow a trajection in the placing the words, and have several ways whereby they account for it. They mostly favour the construction which our translators have given to the text. It cannot be denied that some trajections are to be met with in the new testament: but as all commentators endeavour as much as they can to avoid allowing them, so that which is here taken for granted may seem a very harsh one to those who can compare the original and our translation together; and it cannot be disagreeable to such if it be made appear that there is no necessity of allowing it. This therefore I shall first aim at, and try whether without any alteration of the order of the words, but only of the punctuation, they will not admit of a more easy rendering. The alterations I propose are only these two. 1. That ἐκ αὐτῶν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, or else ἐκ αὐτῶν τὴν εἰκόνα, should be read in a parenthesis; if this latter is preferred, the τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν will be joined in construction with τῶν πραγμάτων, but this is very indifferent, both of them coming to the same thing. 2. The other alteration is that I would have καὶ ἐνιαυτὸν joined with what precedes the supposed parenthesis, and so the comma to be put after ἐνιαυτὸν, and then there will be no need to allow any hyperbation or trajection at all. For the construction and sense will then stand thus: *For the law having a shadow of the good things to come (not the very image of the things) yearly, can never with the same sacrifices which they continually offer, make the comers thereunto perfect.* And by this means the *and* which our translation supplies, *and not the very image of the things*, appears to be much better omitted by our author. The *yearly* seems thus exactly placed, for the law had the *shadow* yearly, but the *very image* it had not *yearly*, or indeed at all.

This being supposed the proper pointing of the verse, we are next to consider the meaning of the several things contained in it.

And, 1. As to the γὰρ *for* in the beginning of the verse, it has been already intimated that it connects the discourse here with the former part of the foregoing chapter; wherein our author speaks of the earthly or worldly sanctuary, or holy of holies under the law, as a figure, *ver. 9*. Nor need we confine the connection merely to what is there said, but refer it more generally to what he has in any part of his epistle before concerning this matter, as particularly *Chap. viii. 5. ix. 23, 24*.

2. The *good things to come* may hence be very well interpreted to signify the heavenly sanctuary, into which Christ is gone, and whither his people are to follow him, that they may be happy for ever in the divine presence, of which heavenly sanctuary the holy of holies under the law

2. For if they could have made the worshipers perfect, they would have ceased to be offered again For then would they not

N O T E S.

law was but a mere and very imperfect shadow. I am sensible that in this interpretation I differ from all the expositors I have consulted; and that some of them think St. Paul has fully warranted their explaining the *good things to come* to signify Christ, and in general all the advantages we have by him, by so expressly saying of the ceremonial service, without any special regard to the holy of holies (which he does not there mention) *which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ*, Col. ii. 17. Now, though I readily allow their interpretation of that text in the *Colossians*, that the whole ceremonial service was a shadow of future things, and that Christ is the body and substance of them; and though it may collaterally be inferr'd from what is here said by our author, that the law had a shadow of Christ, as having entred into the heavens, and made way for us, and so it may take in the other advantages we have by Christ as preparatory to that final happiness; yet I can't see that the text in the *Colossians* will oblige us to explain the place under consideration, as directly speaking of any thing but heaven. The reason is, because 'tis of the holy of holies, and the yearly service performed therein, that he is particularly treating; and all along before in his argument he considers the holy of holies as a *pattern* and *shadow* of heavenly things, as taken from the heavenly original and platform shewed to Moses in the mount, Chap. viii. 5. See also, Chap. ix. 7—12, 23, 24. And that he here speaks with a special regard to the holy of holies, and the service therein perform'd, appears by his mentioning only the yearly and not the daily sacrifices. See also *ver.* 3.

It may be objected, that the holy of holies being a standing thing, and being designed for a shadow of the heavenly sanctuary, 'tis not very proper to speak of it as a *shadow* only yearly. But to this it may be replied, that the only or chief use that was made of the holy of holies was yearly upon the great day of expiation. Then only was it entred into, and so was a yearly shadow of Christ's entring into heaven, the true sanctuary, for us.

3. The next thing to be consider'd is, what our author means by denying that the law had the *very image of the things*. The *Syriac* renders it *not the substance of the things themselves*. *Chrysostom* explains it, *not the very truth*. In this sense I take the words, and consider *εἰκόνα* here as importing the original from whence a delineation or draught is made. The draught or shadow was that made by Moses when he built the tabernacle, the original was the heavenly pattern shewed him in the mount, according to which he was to frame the whole. It may be thought that this sense of the word is unusual and hard. But beside that it has such vouchers as I mentioned, I don't see how it can be well avoided. And I may perhaps be countenanced in this interpretation by a somewhat like use of the word, *Rom.* i. 23. *They changed the glory of the incorruptible God, ἐν ὁμοιωμάτι εἰκόνος φθαστῆς ἀνθρώπου into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and four footed beasts, and creeping things*. What can *εἰκόνος* the *image* here signify but the *original* from whence the likeness was taken, whether it were in sculpture or painting? Nor can it well be taken otherwise, *Rom.* viii. 29. *2 Cor.* iii. 18.

4. The *same sacrifices which they offered continually*, signify here only those which were yearly repeated on the great day of atonement, according to the prescription of the law, as appears by *ver.* 3, 4.

5. The *comers thereunto* *οἱ προσερχόμενοι* are the same as the *οἱ λατρεύοντες* the *worshipers* in the next verse. And indeed the term is frequently used in this epistle in that sense. See *Chap.* vii. 25. x. 22. xi. 6.

6. The *making them perfect*, appears plainly from the context to mean, the freeing them so intirely from their guilt, as that they should be qualified for heaven.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

have ceased to be offered?
because that the worshipers
once purged, should have
had no more conscience of
3 sins. But in those sacrifices
there is a remembrance again
made of sins every year.
4 For it is not possible that
the blood of bulls and of
goats should take away sins.
5 Wherefore when he cometh
into the world, he saith,

again after the first time (*o*); because atone-
ment being once made by them for the wor-
shipers, their consciences would have been
easy without looking for any farther atone-
ment for their sins (*p*); whereas by the ap-
pointment of God a yearly remembrance was
made of sins in those sacrifices; as it was very
just there should, considering the nature of
them: for 'tis impossible that the blood of
bulls and goats should take away sins.
And to this purpose, when Christ came into
the world, he said (*q*), (*Psal. xl. 6—8.*)

3.

4.

5.

Sa-

NOTES.

2 (*o*) *Ἐπεὶ ἔκ ἀν ἐπαύσαντο προσφέρειν;* For then would they not have ceased to be offered?] If the words are read, as in many copies, with the *ἐκ* inserted, they must be understood interrogatively, as *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius* observe, and our translators have rendered them. But if the *ἐκ* be omitted, as 'tis by many copies, wherewith the *Vulg.* and *Syr.* agree, the translation in our margin must then be received, *They would have ceased to be offered.* Dr. *Mills* prefers this latter reading, which indeed seems the most natural and easy. However the sense is at last the same which ever reading we choose. Our author's argument is either way, that the ancient sacrifices could not make the worshipers perfect, because then there would have been no need they should be repeated from time to time: for when the end of them, the making atonement, was once perfectly obtained, there could be no farther occasion for the offering them over again. Now either reading will accord with this argument. Of a little moment is another difference in the copy used by the *Syriac* translator, which seems to have read *προσφερόμενοι*, and so to make this refer to the worshipers, that *they would have ceased to offer these same sacrifices repeatedly.* But the worshipers ceasing to offer the sacrifices, or the sacrifices ceasing to be offered by the worshipers, are really the same thing.

(*p*) *Διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰς λαλῶντας, ἀπαξ κεκαθα-
ρῆς.* Because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins.] It seems indifferent whither we read *κεκαθαρισμένοι* purged, or with others, *κεκαθαρισμένοι* purified; because the effect of sacrifices being here consider'd, both readings will carry the same sense.

The argument used seems to be this: " That if the legal sacrifices offered on the day of
" atonement, could have availed to justify the worshipers and make them perfect, the offering
" them once would have been enough, the worshipers would have had no need to distress
" themselves for want of more, or to have had any concern that those sacrifices should be re-
" peated. They might have been assured that God required no more, and their consciences
" might have been secure and easy. But that this was not the case appears from hence, that
" the people were solicitous for the yearly repetition of those sacrifices, wherein according to
" God's own appointment a remembrance was made of sins.

5 (*q*) *Ὡρὴν ὅτε ἐλθὼν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, λέγει·*] The following passage is a cita-
tion from *Psal. xl.* and the use made of it plainly enough leads us to understand the words as
uttered in the person of the Messiah; which is agreeable to other places in the psalms. And in-
deed :

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

6. *Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not; but a body hast thou prepared me (r). In burnt-offer-* Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not; but a body hast thou prepared me: In 6

N O T E S.

deed the citation may seem impertinent, and the proof brought to be none at all, unless we consider the words as uttered by Christ. Now for the clearing this I would observe two things, 1. That the passage here cited cannot well belong to any other than Christ. Who else can be understood to say that he came to do that which sacrifices, &c. could not accomplish? This in general is the sense of the words, which will not suit *David*, or any other person, as it admirably does our blessed Saviour. 2. There is nothing in the whole psalm, but what may without difficulty be interpreted concerning Christ. The only passage that can be objected is *ver. 12. Mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up;* whereas we are sure that he was perfectly free from all iniquity. But the word there used signifies *punishments* as well as *iniquities*: and so we have rendered it *Gen. iv. 13. My punishment is greater than I can bear.* Compare *2 Kings vii. 9. Gen. xix. 15.* It may farther be observed that our author's asserting that Christ said this *when he was coming into the world*, depends upon two passages in the words cited, his saying, *a body hast thou prepared me*, which shows it was spoken by him before his coming, and with relation to it, and his saying, *Lo I come to do thy will, O God.* The *Hebrew*, LXX. and *Vulg.* read in the psalm, O my God. And there is one copy mentioned by Dr. *Mills*, which here in this epistle reads agreeably to the *Hebrew* and LXX. *τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σε, ὁ Θεός μου, ἐβλήθην*, as does the *Ethiopick* version. 'Tis possible this might have been the original reading, and that it might be alter'd by the officiousness of some who could not very well digest Christ's calling the Father *his God* antecedently to his coming into the world, although the thing be clear in the *Hebrew* and LXX. not only in that, but also in the verse before. Compare also *ver. 17.*

(*) Σῶμα ὃ κατήρτισα μοι. *But a body hast thou prepared me.*] This clause is exactly taken from the LXX. our present *Hebrew* copies giving it a quite different turn, *Mine ears hast thou opened*, or as our margin says, *digged*. I can't easily question whether the authority of the LXX. and of our inspired author, should weigh more than our *Hebrew* copies; which therefore should be corrected by them. The sense is easy and obvious if we follow the LXX. but hardly can any thing be made of the *Hebrew*. It can't easily be thought that our author would here follow the LXX. in case it had differed from the *Hebrew*, since he was now writing to the *Hebrews*, who would have been ready enough to object against such a citation. It seems therefore no unreasonable supposition that the *Hebrew* and the LXX. did then agree, however the alteration in the former has since happen'd. The words in the *Hebrew* in our present copies are *לִי אָנִים כְּרִית לוֹ* and they who seem to offer fairest at accounting for them, make them to be an allusion to the law given to the *Jeus*, *Exod. xxi. 6. Deut. xv. 17.* that if a servant chose not to go out free at the seventh year, then his master should *bring him to the judges, and should bring him also to the door, or unto the door post, and should bore his ear through with an aul, and he should serve him for ever.* They think therefore that this is intended by the expression, *Thou hast made or engaged me to be thy servant for ever.* This interpretation carries very little probability in it. For beside that it may seem disagreeable that our Saviour should speak of the Father's boring his ears before he came into the world, or having taken a body, or that he should then speak of himself as then becoming first of all his servant or minister, it may farther be consider'd that the expressions do not here suit that allusion. The master, according to that law was only to bore one of the servant's ears, whereas here *both ears* are spoken of in the dual number. Again, the proper word for boring in the *Hebrew* is not *כָּרַת* but *רָצַע* as *Exod. xxi. 6.* or when a more general verb is used 'tis *נָתַן* as 'tis in *Deut.* *וְלָקַחְתָּ אֶת הָאֵזָא וְנָתַתָּהּ בְּאָזְנוֹ וּבִדְלָתָּ* *Thou shalt put the aul in his ear and the door.* Now 'tis

N O T E S.

'tis highly probable that had the psalmist design'd any such allusion, he would have chosen terms that better accorded with that custom. And perhaps it may be thought, that if the *Hebrew* reading were the right, the allusion should not be to the boring servants ears, but to the digging of the ears in order to open them, that so persons might be quicker in hearing, that is, in obeying. Mr. Gataker upon that passage, *Isa. l. 5. The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back*, gives us a hint, as though he apprehended the passage in the psalm was to be understood to this purpose.

The only difficulty that remains is to give some probable account how this corruption in the *Hebrew* text happen'd. I can't find that learned men have ventured to publish their conjectures concerning this: they seem rather to have spent their pains in endeavouring to reconcile the *Hebrew* and *Greek* expressions in sense, wherein I apprehend they have been unsuccessful. It seems more proper to attempt from the *Greek* such an emendation of the *Hebrew*, as will show the occasion and manner of the corruption. And I shall the rather offer my conjecture, that I may provoke those who are more skilled in such matters to offer such as may be better. And for the reader's more convenient viewing at once the change, I will set down the present *Hebrew* reading in one line, and what I suppose it was originally under it.

The present reading

אוֹנִים כְּרִית לִי

The supposed original reading

אוֹנוֹף כְּרִית לִי

'Tis hardly to be thought that the first corruption was wilfully made, or that it happen'd otherwise than casually, through the carelessness of some transcriber. For had it been wilful, doubtless the authors of it would have left us a better sense than they have done in their copy. Nor indeed can I see any great service the *Jews* could imagine they could do their cause by the alteration, unless they had corrupted all the passages in *Psal. xxii.* and other places in the prophets, which speak plainly of Christ's having a body, and of his dying in it for our sins. Let us then examine whether such a corruption might not casually happen in the manner before mentioned. I leave the two last words כְּרִית לִי unchanged, the only alteration I suppose is of אוֹנוֹף to אוֹנִים where I make no change in the two first letters, only imagining that some transcriber placing the latter word too close to the former, made the two appear as though they were but one word together. Instances may be produced from the *Hebrew* of the like changes, when one word is divided into two, or as in the present case when two words are jumbled into one: nay, in other places the change of this sort is greater, by reason of the dropping of a letter. Thus for instance, *Gen. xxx. 11.* the *Jews* for בָּגַד have put two words in the *Keri*, בָּא גָד but since it may be questioned whether they were not therein mistaken, I shall mention another place which is very plain. In *Isaiab. iii. 15.* which is well translated, *What mean ye that ye beat my people?* of two words, as 'tis in the *Keri* מַה לַּכֶּם what mean ye? or, what have ye to do? the *Cethib* or the common reading have made but one מַלְכֶם which signifies *their king*; which carries no sense at all in it, as any one will easily perceive who tries to join it with the rest of the sentence. And in thus jumbling the words together the ך is dropt, and so the alteration is really greater than that which I have proposed in the psalm. Let me add here, before I leave this, that there appears to me somewhat in the words of the psalmist that leads us to consider ׀ as a distinct word by it self. 'Tis evident that these two clauses are equivalent, *Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire*; and, *Burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required*: and accordingly our author when he had first cited these distinctly according to the *Hebrew*, immediately ver. 9. joins them together as making as it were but one sentence. Above, when he said, *sacrifice and offering, and burnt-offerings, and offerings for sin thou wouldst not*. Now it seems very natural to me that the clauses that are respectively adverbative, should each be introduced in the same manner; and therefore as the last begins with ׀ Then I said אֲמַרְתִּי ׀ it looks not improbable that the other did so too, according to the conjecture before proposed. 'Tis true the LXX. have used ὅ, whereas in some places where the word ׀ recurs they render both by τότε, as they do that ver. 7. See *Psal. li. 19. Job. i. 8.* But as there is nothing in the *Hebrew* to which their ὅ can answer but upon my supposition, so they are not

con-

N O T E S.

constant in their rendring of that word : for beside $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ they render it by $\gamma\delta$, *Prov.* i. 28. and they might therefore as well render it here by γ , overlooking the corresponding of the use of it in the two places, which they might the more easily do, if they observed not the likeness of the two clauses which respectively preceeded it. And this not being material our author might not stick to follow them in it. So that there seems to be here a poetical disjunction and dislocation of the parts of the same sentence, and the making two sentences of one, which may be consider'd to stand thus, "Sacrifice and offering, and burnt-offerings, and offering for sin, thou didst not desire or require : then thou preparedst me a body ; then I said, I come to do thy will, &c."

But to go on with the conjecture ; if $\aleph$ be imagined to be the original reading, the change of $\aleph$ into $\beth$ might easily happen, there being so very little difference between the two letters. For the transcriber might easily mistake in reading one for the other ; and indeed a man had need now both of a fair copy and good eyes to distinguish them ; especially if he reads by candle light, as the transcriber who first made the mistake might possibly do, when he transcribed this place. And supposing him to have read ever so right, yet unless he were a very exact scribe indeed, he might make his $\beth$ so like to $\aleph$ as to be without difficulty taken for it, especially if when his copy came to be used, the writing in this place happened to be in some measure worn and defaced, which seems not unlikely.

The next alteration supposed is, that $\daleth$ is changed into $\beth$. This is as easy as the former, the two letters differing only in their length. And hence we may observe that these two letters are frequently by mistake put for one another in the common *Hebrew* reading, nor is there any thing with which the *Keri* more abounds than the correcting these mistakes, as every one knows who has in reading his bible compared the *Chetib* and *Keri* together. The only remaining alteration I have supposed, is that of $\aleph$ into $\beth$. Now in case the long stroke of the $\aleph$ were worn out in that part that is below the line, the remainder of it, especially if the lower cross stroke were brought very near to the right side of the letter, might pass well enough for a *mem clausum* or *finale*, $\beth$. I have here supposed that the word $\aleph$ was used by the *Jeus* anciently, which is not unlikely, though we have now no instance of it in the bible, which reads in other places $\aleph$, but it might be $\aleph$ here, as is the more probable, since the Rabbins often use $\aleph$. However if that be disliked, we need only read $\beth$ which we meet with *Job* xx. 25. where the LXX translate it by $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$. And the other alterations being presupposed it will not be hard to imagine that to make the best sense they could of the place, they might change the $\aleph$ into $\beth$ there being little wanting to make it very like to it. And in all such cases one alteration makes way for another, or helps it forward. I have all along consider'd only the *Chaldee* letters, and not those we call the *Samaritan*, because I doubt not the corruption happen'd after the former were substituted in the room of the latter ; nor could it be otherwise in case this was done presently after the return from the *Babylonish* captivity, or even supposing it was done, as some think, in the second century.

I have left $\aleph$ as it was, however unusual it is for that verb to signify the same as $\aleph$, because I find Lexicographers express one sense of it by *comparare*. And it seems used to signify barely to *get* or to *possess*, where we render it to *dig*. Thus *Gen.* i. 5. *In my grave which I have digged for me in the land of Canaan, there shalt thou bury me.* I think which I have got for my self had been more proper than our rendering. For the cave of *Machpelah* was digged long before. See *Chap.* xlvii. 29, 30. xlix. 29 — 32. Thus must it be understood, 2 *Chron.* xvi. 14. *They buried him [Aha] in his own sepulchres, which he had made [margin digged] for himself in the city of David.* Here also $\aleph$ should I think be rendered, which he had got or possessed. For these sepulchres were not made by himself, since they were the sepulchres of his fathers, 1 *Kings* xv. 24. And in this sense is it most true, that God had got, that is, provided a body for our Saviour. We have likewise render'd it *prepared*, 2 *Kings* vi. 23. 'Tis hoped what has been now offered will be consider'd, as 'tis designed, barely as a conjecture ; and whether it be a probable one or no, is submitted to the judgment of those who are better skilled in these matters,

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

burnt-offerings and sacrifices
for sin thou hast had no plea-
7 sure: Then said I, Lo, I come
(in the volume of the book
it is written of me) to do thy
8 will, O God. Above, when
he said, Sacrifice and offer-
ing, and burnt-offerings,
and offering for sin thou
wouldst not, neither hadst
pleasure therein (which are
9 offered by the law;) Then
said he, Lo, I come to do

offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had
no pleasure. Then said I, Lo I come (in
the roll of the book 'tis written concerning
me) (f) to do thy will, O God, in offering
such a sacrifice as thou dost require and wilt
accept. In this forecited passage, by saying,
Sacrifice and offering, and burnt-offerings, and
offering for sin thou wouldst not have, nor
tookest any pleasure in them, (which are offer-
ed according to the law, and consequently
were in a sense agreeable to the will of God,
who required them, but not as expiatory)
Then said I (t), Behold I come to do thy
will,

7.

8.

9.

NOTES.

7 (f) *Εν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ.* In the volume of the book 'tis written of me.] Interpreters are divided concerning the meaning of this expression. Some imagine that by the volume of the book we are to understand, the writing, bill, or contract, whereby our Saviour was engaged thus to come. But others (and, as it seems, with more reason) reckon that by the book is meant, so much of the bible as was then written, and particularly the book of the law, which contained many things concerning Christ and his sufferings. See Luke xxiv. 44. John v. 46. Acts xxvi. 22, 23. But then there is yet another question, what is meant by κεφαλὴς βιβλίου. And some render this in the head or beginning of the book, which agrees well enough with the Greek, the LXX. and *vulg.* And they who go this way think that the words point to some place in the beginning of the law, where Christ is spoken of, as Gen. iii. 15. which was in the first great section of the law which reached from the beginning of Genesis to ver. 8. of the 6th chapter. This would indeed do well enough to answer the Greek; but I don't perceive how it will accord with the Hebrew *במגלת ספר* which denotes nothing of the beginning. They therefore seem best to interpret the passage, who take מגלה to signify a roll, according to the custom of that time, which is still retained among the Jews in reading the law of Moses in their synagogues. They wrote not in leaves of books which were sewed together, as our custom is, but in long parchments, which after they had read they roll'd up to preserve them from dust. And hence we have elsewhere rendered the same word by roll, which is very proper, it being derived from a root which signifies to roll up a thing. Whence is that expression, Isa. xxxiv. 4. And the heavens shall be rolled together as a scrole, or book: with which may be compared, Rev. vi. 14. Thus we have rendered the two words in the psalm, The roll of a book, Jer. xxxvi. 2, 4. and in many other places is מגלה translated a roll. Now this I prefer because it does not only suit the Hebrew, but also the Greek of the LXX. which is followed by our inspired author. For Suidas makes κεφαλὴς to be the same as ἔλημα, the folding of a book. And so Aquila and Symmachus rendered it.

9 (t) *Τότε εἶπεν.* Then said he.] Chrysostom reads τότε εἶπον, then said I, and the *vulg.* agrees with him, *tunc dixi*; and so they take this to be a part of the citation, according to ver. 7. I could wish this reading had more authorities to confirm it. However I can't but fall in with it, because the sense seems imperfect without it. The ἀνώτερον λέγων in the be-
Z
ginning

10. will, O God, he abolisheth the former will and prescription of God concerning legal sacrifices, that he may establish the latter concerning the sacrifice of Christ (*u*). By the which latter will of God, we are cleansed from our guilt (*w*) through the offering once of the body (*x*) of Jesus Christ. And indeed under the old law, every high-priest continued (*y*) ministering from time to time

thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest standeth daily mini-

N O T E S.

ginning of *ver.* 8. must of necessity be join'd with some verb. that follows, which is ἀναρῶν, which comes in immediately after the citation. And unless we take this clause as a part of the citation, and read, *Then said I*, 'tis not easy to perceive how λέγων can be joined with ἀναρῶν. Had our author design'd to express what our translators do, it seems to me he should rather have said καὶ τότε εἰπὼν, or ἐξῶν. They therefore seem to me mistaken who think the argument is here built merely upon the order of the words: 'tis upon the things themselves, that Christ who knew the mind of God, declared that he was not satisfied or propitiated by the legal sacrifices, even when he had order'd them to be used, and therefore then when he was coming into the world, he said he was coming to do that which the prescribed sacrifices could not. Hence the paraphrase does not explain those words ἀνώτερον λέγων, as some choose to do. That first he says sacrifice and offering, &c. thou wouldst not, and afterwards says, Lo, I come to do thy will.

(*u*) Αναρῶν τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον σήσῃ. *He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.*] 'Tis surprizing that any doubt should be made what the substantive is to which the *first* and *second* refer. Certainly this can be no other than the θέλημα Θεοῦ, the *will of God* just beforementioned. He had shown that it was the will of God that the legal sacrifices should be offered, that they were offered according to the will of God, because they were offered by the law, *ver.* 8. and that which Christ came to do is expressly called the will of God, and spoken of as a thing that was to take place after the other. It seems therefore unreasonable to imagine that any thing else can be intended than the first and second will of God. And if the same substantive is to be understood as referr'd to by the *first* and the *second*, one would think our author has put it past all doubt what that is by the words which immediately follow; wherein speaking of the second he says, Εν ᾧ θελήματι, *By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.*

10 (*w*) ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμεν. *We are sanctified.*] The *sanctification* here spoken of relates to such a cleansing or purifying as is obtained by expiation and atonement. The word is used in this sense perpetually through this epistle, as is shown by Dr. Hammond, and Dr. Whitby, who may be consulted by any who make any doubt of it.

(*x*) Τὸ σῶμα. *The body.*] The *Clermont* and *St. Germain's* copies read τὸ αἷμα the *blood*. But since the authority is much greater for the common reading, I think we ought to prefer it, and the rather, because it seems better to suit the passage cited, wherein express mention is not made of the *blood*, as there is of the *body* prepared for him.

11 (*y*) Καὶ ὡς ᾧ ἱερῶς ἔστηκε. *And every priest standeth.*] The ὡς ᾧ and the αὐτῷ in the next verse are opposed according to the common use of those particles ᾧ and ὅ in the *Greek* language. The *Syriac* version, and the *Alex.* and other *MSS.* read here ἀρχιερεὺς, and every

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

string and offering oftentimes
the same sacrifices which can
12 never take away sins: But
this man after he had offer-
ed one sacrifice for sins, for
ever sat down on the right
13 hand of God; From hence-
forth expecting till his ene-
mies be made his footstool.
14 For by one offering he hath
perfected for ever them that
15 are sanctified. *Whereof* the
Holy Ghost also is a witness
to us: for after that he had
16 said before, *This is the co-*
venant that I will make
with them after those days,
saith the Lord; I will put
my laws into their hearts,
and in their minds will I

time (z), and offering oftentimes the same
sacrifices which can never expiate sins. But 12.
Christ after he had offer'd only one sacri-
fice for sins, sat down for ever at the right
hand of God; from thenceforth waiting till 13.
God shall according to his promise (*Psal.*
cx. 1.) subdue all his enemies, and make
them all his footstool. Nor is there any 14.
need, that he should ever leave the right
hand of God to offer himself afresh, since by
his one offering he hath made an expiation
that avails perpetually to render all those who
partake of the virtue of it completely qualified
for the worship of God. And even the Holy 15.
Ghost bears us witness, and attests what has
been said (a). For after he had first said,
(*Jer. xxxi. 33.*) *This is the covenant that I* 16.
will make with them after those days, saith
the Lord, I will put my laws into their
hearts, and in their minds will I write them,
[He

NOTES.

every high-priest. This is followed in the paraphrase, it being supported by such good authori-
ty, and being best suited to the argument of the place, and indeed to the comparison which
runs through the whole epistle of Christ our high-priest with the high-priests under the law.
And if any prefer the common reading, yet still they must, as I imagine, suppose that the *high-*
priest is meant by the term *priest*.

(z) Καθ' ἡμέραν. *Daily.* 'Tis possible this might incline some to understand the place
concerning the common priests rather than the high-priest, because the high-priest was not re-
quired every day to minister in his office. But we need not suppose that the *Greek* expression
denotes more than is expressed in the paraphrase, *from time to time*; and accordingly we have
the same thing asserted undoubtedly of the high-priest, *Chap. vii. 27.*

15 (a) Μαρτυρεῖ ὃ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. *Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness*
to us. This translation is ambiguous; and is I believe commonly understood that the Holy Ghost
bears witness to Christians in general; which though it be true, and the certain consequence of
what is said, yet seems not to me the primary meaning of the expression, which I take to be
concerning our author himself. The proper rendering is, I suppose this: *But the Holy Ghost also*
bears us witness, that is, confirms what I have said; *q. d.* "You need not barely rely upon
" my asserting this matter, since the Holy Ghost manifestly concurs with me in his testimony,
" and has clearly declared the same." The *whereof* added by our translators is needless when
the words are thus understood.

17. [He then adds] (*b*), *And their sins and*
 18. *iniquities will I remember no more.* Now
 where there is such a remission of these as that
 they shall be remembered no more, there can
 be no occasion for any farther offering for
 sin.

write them: And their sins 17
 and iniquities will I remem-
 ber no more. Now, where 18
 remission of these *is*, *there*
is no more offering for sin.

N O T E S.

17 (*b*) *He then adds.*] This, or somewhat equivalent, is read in some copies mentioned by Dr. *Mills*, who gives us the judgment of *Estius*, that 'tis an addition to the text, and by his not contradicting him seems to be of the same opinion himself. Whether it be an addition I will not say, but if it is, 'tis such an one as must necessarily be understood to supply the ellipsis. For our author's sense is imperfect without it, as every one must see who reads the place with care.

S E C T. XIV.

C H A P. X. 19—39.

C O N T E N T S.

THE argumentative part being now finished, and the great point fully proved, that the legal sacrifices could never make atonement for sins, though ever so often repeated, and particularly those which were offer'd yearly by the high-priest when he went into the holy of holies on the great day of expiation, but that Christ had fully and effectually done this by his once offering himself; now follows the practical application, which is infer'd from the foregoing discourse. The great thing here urged is that which manifestly runs through the whole epistle, that upon this account christians should be stedfast in their profession, and their dependance on Christ, without expecting to obtain by the legal sacrifices that advantage which could only be had by Christ. In treating of this our author takes occasion to set forth in the most terrible terms the danger of apostacy, which was very needful for the

the *Jewish* converts, who above all others were very prone to it. Chap. X.
 However, according to the tenderness wherewith he treats them upon the like occasion (as *Chap.* vi. 9, 10.) he softens the severe things he says by mixing some commendations of them, that so he might give them the less offence. There is yet another thing which he seems to have in his eye, and may be perceived by those who read this section with a close attention, but may be easily missed by careless and hasty readers, because our author (as before) thought it not proper directly to mention it, but only obscurely to hint it, that so he might not disgust and provoke the *Hebrews*. What I mean is, that since the forgiveness of sins appeared to be obtained not by the legal sacrifices, but by the sacrifice of Christ, the *Gentiles* who had nothing to do with the former were now upon the same terms with the *Jews*, and so the same privileges and advantages equally belong'd to both; and therefore they should both unite heartily in using them, and though the caution was most necessary for the *Hebrews* who were apter to quarrel with the *Gentiles*, than the *Gentiles* with them, yet that he might not take off from the edge of his caution where it was most needful, he speaks of their exciting one another mutually to their duty, and particularly that of love to one another, together with the good fruit that would be produced thereby.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

¹⁹ **H**AVING therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the

HAVING therefore, brethren, liberty ^{19.}
 granted us to enter into heaven, the true holy of holies (c), by the blood of Je-

NOTES.

¹⁹ (c) Εχοντες εν, αδελφοι, παρρησίαν εις τὸ εἰσοδόν τῆς ἁγίας. *Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest.* As *heaven* is before compared with the *holy of holies* under the law, it seems necessary that *heaven* it self should here be intended by the τὰ ἁγία, the *holiest*. The *boldness* or liberty we have for an entrance into heaven is grounded upon Christ's taking away our sins by his blood, they being the things that debarred mens entrance before. According to the way of reasoning here used, it should seem that this *liberty of entering into heaven*, answers to the expression used before, *ver.* 14. and elsewhere, that Christ has *perfected them that are sanctified*; and so it confirms the interpretation before given of that *perfecting*; that it means a perfectly qualifying them for heaven. See *ver.* 1. note (n). The εχοντες *having* seems to refer both to *Jews* and *Gentiles*. This is indeed but darkly hinted in this place; but the next verse may considerably confirm it.

20. Jesus (*d*), which way of entrance, a new and living way to us, he initiated or first went (*e*) passing through the veil, the veil I mean of his own flesh (*f*). And having now Jesus as
- 21.

blood of Jesus, By a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; And *having*.

N O T E S.

(*d*) *Εν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ.* By the blood of Jesus.] The allusion is to the manner of the high-priests entering into the holy of holies, that it was *ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ*, with the blood of others, Chap. ix. 25. whereas Christ's entrance was with his own blood, by reason of which we have an entrance granted to us also.

20 (*e*) *Ἦν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πνεύματος καὶ ζωῆς.* By a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us.] Our translators have been forced to insert the word *by* here which is not in the Greek. I should rather think that the *ἦν* here refers to *ἔσοδον* just before, and that the sense is, *Which entrance he initiated.* The words *ἦν ἐνεκαίνισεν* seem to be well explained by Chrysostom, who gives us this sense of them, *τέλειται, ἢν κατεσκευάσε, καὶ ἥς ἤρξατο.* *Ἐγκαίνισμός γὰρ λέγεται ἀρχὴ χρήσεως λοιπῶν.* *Ἦν κατεσκευάσε, φησὶ, καὶ δι' ἧς αὐτὸς ἐβόησεν.* "That is, which he prepared, and which he himself began. For *ἐγκαίνισμός* is the beginning of the use a thing is afterwards put to. This then is what he says, that Christ prepared, and went himself this way." Thus therefore the sense will stand according to this interpretation, Having therefore, brethren, boldness or a liberty for an entrance into heaven, which entrance he began himself, making it a new and living way. There seems to be a particular reason for his speaking of it as a *new way* to put the *Hebrews* upon considering that there was no such way appointed under the law, that this was wholly owing to Christ and what he had lately done; and therefore they might well think that this belong'd to such as had not been under the law, and was design'd as much for their use, as for the *Jews* themselves. Nor perhaps will it be impertinent to observe, that he speaks of it as appointed *for us*, to distinguish the case of Christians in general from that of the *Jews*, to none of whom, but to the high-priest once a year, an entrance into the holy of holies was granted. This may seem to be designed by the word *ζωῆς*, a living way. This entrance gave life, but an entrance into the holy of holies would, I suppose, have been punished with death in any other than the high-priest, and in him also, except it were once a year. So that *ζωῆς* is, as Grotius observes, put for *ζωοποιῶσαν*, but then I think this is to be understood as opposed to *θανατῶσαν*.

(*f*) *Διὰ τῆς καταπετάσματος, τέλει τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.* Through the veil, that is to say, his flesh.] The *Syr.* and *Arab.* translations, Dr. Mills says, read here as does the *Clermont* copy, *Διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, through his flesh.* But the common reading that leaves out *διὰ* in that part of the verse is perhaps to be preferred, since it has much better authority to support it. And if *τῆς σαρκὸς* be taken not as govern'd by the preposition *διὰ*, but as following *τῆς καταπετάσματος*, which it may not be unreasonable should be understood to be in sense repeated from the clause before, thus *τέλει τῆς καταπετάσματος τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, through the veil, that is to say, the veil of his flesh;* the sense may seem to run more smooth and easy. But still we must inquire why the *flesh* of Christ is compar'd here to a *veil*. The veil in the tabernacle and the temple was a curtain at the entrance into the holy of holies, which parted it from the holy place or the court of the priests. It was necessary when the high-priest went into the holy of holies, that he should pass this way, in order to which the veil was to be turn'd aside, and without that he could have no entrance: in like manner, when Christ came into the world, and received that body God had prepared for him, that he might do that will of God which sacrifices and offerings could not, it was necessary that he should *once suffer for sins*, and

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

an high-priest over the house
22 of God: Let us draw near
with a true heart, in full
assurance of faith, having
our hearts sprinkled from
an evil conscience, and

as an high-priest over the house of God; let 22.
us draw near to God in his worship (*g*) with
an upright heart (*h*), in a certain and assured
persuasion of the efficacy of his sacrifice (*i*),
having our hearts freed by the pardoning
grace of God in regard to the sacrifice of
Christ from such moral guilt as tends to make
the conscience evil and burdensome (*k*); And
having

NOTES.

be put to death in the flesh, 1 Pet. iii. 18. or suffer for us in the flesh, Chap. iv. 1. whence he himself speaks in that manner, Luke xxiv. 26. Ought not Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory? Compare 1 Pet. i. 11. Till this was accomplish'd he was not to be restored to the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, John xvii. 5. So that his flesh, till it was given for the life of the world, was as it were a vail that hindred his entering into heaven the true holy of holies: but by his death this vail was removed, and a way was laid open for him to enter into heaven. And this seems to have been the meaning of the vail of the temple's being miraculously rent in twain from the top to the bottom just at the time of his death, Matth. xxvii. 51.

22 (*g*) Προσερχώμεθα. Let us draw near.] This word is several times used in the epistle when the coming to God, or the worshipping him is spoken of. See Chap. iv. 16. vii. 25. xi. 6. And in one place 'tis used alone in the same manner as here, Chap. x. 1. The law — can never — make the comers perfect; which comers are called, ver. 2. the worshippers. It may perhaps be thought that this does not well consist with the interpretation given of the holiest, ver. 19. For it may seem that it is to the holiest we are encouraged to come by the tenor of the discourse; whence some have expounded the holiest by the immediate presence of God. But there is no necessity for this, the duty here urged being strongly inferr'd from the privilege, q. d. "A way is now laid open for us into heaven itself, and since God has granted us so great an advantage, it can't be thought that he debars us an access to himself while we are in our way thither, or that he does not expect from us now a suitable and thankful homage, and therefore let us be conscientious in our attending upon him.

(*h*) Μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας. With a true heart.] The phrase seems to be taken from Isa. xxxviii. 3. where the LXX have ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀληθινῇ, with a true heart, instead of what we render with a perfect heart, as they also sometimes render it, 2 Chron. xxviii. 9. 1 Kings viii. 61. xi. 4. xv. 3. and other places. So that ἀληθινὸς answers to טָהוֹר and the true heart is the same that is called elsewhere the pure heart or the pure conscience, 2 Tim. i. 3. ii. 22. Christ has not opened a way into heaven for those who neglect to worship God, or do not worship him in sincerity, with a clean and upright heart.

(*i*) Ἐν πληροφoρίᾳ πίστεως. In full assurance of faith.] This must be understood, I think, of a full and stedfast persuasion of the efficacy of Christ's once offering himself, whereby he has obtained an entrance for himself as our forerunner, and consequently for us, into heaven. Or if faith be here taken for the christian religion in general, a full persuasion of the truth of that will not make any great difference in the sense.

(*k*) Ἐρραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ὑπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρῆς. Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.] There is an allusion herein to the sprinkling the blood of the sacrifices under the law in order to cleanse from legal uncleanness. These uncleannesses did not, in many;

23. having our bodies washed with the pure water of baptism (*l*), let us in spight of all dangers hold on immoveably in that profession and promise we then made, in which case we may depend upon God's faithfulness to fulfil the promises which he has made to us as baptized persons, and which were then confirmed to us (*m*). And let us so observe and con-

our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the ²³ profession of our faith without wavering (for he *is* faithful that promised.) And ²⁴

N O T E S.

many cases at least, affect the conscience: for they were often contracted by mens discharge of their duty without any sin at all, as in touching the dead, which was necessary to be done by some body, or else the dead could not be buried. And in many the like cases men needed according to the law to be cleansed when they had no evil conscience, that is when their conscience did not burden them with the sense of any guilt they had contracted, or any moral evil they had done. In case of such guilt the old sacrifices could not ease them, *Heb. ix. 9. They could not make the worshiper perfect, as pertaining to the conscience. They sanctified to the purifying of the flesh*; but somewhat better was requisite to the *purging the conscience from dead works* in order to mens acceptably serving the living God, ver. 13, 14. This was the blood of Christ, with which therefore our author, in his allusion in this place, considers them as having their hearts sprinkled, when they acceptably draw nigh to God. Compare *1 Pet. i. 2. Heb. xii. 24.* that is, that by virtue of that blood they were freed not from a ceremonial defilement, but a real one, by reason of such actions as are in their own nature evil and sinful.

23 (*l*) *Καὶ λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ. And our bodies washed with pure water.*] Our translators were doubtless in the wrong in joining this clause to the end of ver. 22. which most of the printed Greek testaments I have seen make the beginning of ver. 23. according as 'tis placed in the paraphrase. They, who following the pointing of our translation, understand our author as saying, "Let our actions be washed and pure also," will not easily produce any place of scripture wherein τὸ σῶμα, *the body*, is put for the *actions*. If this had been design'd I doubt not he would have said τὰς χεῖρας instead of τὸ σῶμα, according to that, *Jam. iv. 8. Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you: Cleanse your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts, ye double minded:* and the rather would he have done this in writing to the *Hebrews*, because this stile was so familiar with them. See *Psal. xxiv. 4. lxxiii. 13. xxvi. 6.* and many other places. But nothing can be more exact than this expression when understood of baptism, which is literally a washing of the body, a *putting away of the filth of the flesh*, *1 Pet. iii. 21.* and is called the washing of regeneration. Nor can any thing be more pertinent, than to urge men to a steadfastness in their profession of the christian religion, from their baptism, because of the ingagement they were laid under thereby.

(*m*) *For he is faithful that promised.*] As the rest of the verse is most naturally explained of baptism, so this parenthesis seems to me here to relate to the same thing. The promises made to such as were baptized and continued true to their baptism, were confirm'd and sealed by that sign, and God's faithfulness in making them good might well be a strong motive to constancy and perseverance in their profession, since without that they could have no right to the things promised, *1 Pet. iii. 21.*

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

let us consider one another
to provoke unto love, and
25 to good works : Not for-
faking the assembling of our
selves together, as the man-
ner of some is ; but exhort-
ing one another : and so
much the more, as ye see
26 the day approaching. For

consider one anothers temper and disposition
(*n*), as that we may by our example and all
good offices provoke one another on each side
to love, and such good works as are the ge-
nuine effects of it. This will be a good means 25.
to further us in our duty, and to prevent that
neglect which many now fall into, while they
forsake the assembling of themselves together
in the congregations of christians, made up
of a mixture of *Jewish* and Gentile con-
vers (*o*). And you have so much the more
reason for this, by how much you may plain-
ly perceive, that the time of the great de-
struction of *Jerusalem*, and the *Jewish* po-
lity is nearly approaching (*p*). For in case 26.
we

NOTES.

24 (*n*) *And let us consider, &c.*] This verse is very happily translated ; our *provoking*, being a
word of a middle signification, just as *παροξυσμός* is. Our author seems in this exhortation
to point at some defect and neglect of the *Hebrews*, in not promoting love and the good works
which flow from it ; which appears to me to be most likely to respect their temper toward the
Gentile converts. However, according to his usual tenderness for them, he expresses the mu-
tual duty, *Let us consider ONE ANOTHER*.

25 (*o*) *Μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἐαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τισίν.* *Not for-
saking the assembling of our selves together, as the manner of some is.*] He may well be suppo-
sed here also to tax the behaviour which was too common at that time among the *Jewish* con-
verts, who from their old and rooted prejudices had been so disgusted at the *Gentiles* be-
ing received into the christian church, without subjecting themselves to the ceremonial law,
that they were every where prone to shun them, and so to forsake the christian assemblies,
upon the account of their being admitted into them. Doubtless the words, *As the manner of
some is*, have a particular aspect upon them ; however it may be thought that this stiff behavi-
our of the *Jewish*, might have some influence upon the *Gentile* converts, and might beget (as
is natural) a shyness on their side also. The reader may consider whether this may not have
been the reason why the word *ἐπισυναγωγὴ* used no where else in the new testament, but 2 *Thes.*
ii. 1. is here used rather than *συναγωγὴ*, that the *Jews* might not have any pretence from
that word to return to their old synagogues, and forsake the christian assemblies. It may be
observed that St. Paul chooses to vary his phrase when he was speaking of somewhat peculiar
to *Judaism*, and calls their circumcision by the name of *concision* *κατατομή*, designing to de-
ny they had the true circumcision, *Philipp.* iii. 2, 3.

(*p*) *Ὅσῳ βλέπετε ἐγγίξουσιν τὴν ἡμέραν.* *As ye see the day approaching.*] Our Saviour,
Mat. xxiv. had assured his disciples, that the destruction of *Jerusalem* should be accomplished
before that generation should be dead, which were alive at the time of his speaking ; he
had likewise foretold them what should be the signs of the approach of that heavy judg-
ment.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

- we deliberately and wilfully apostatize (*q*) after we have been convinced of the truth of Christianity, and have embraced it, no other sacrifice to atone for our sins is left
27. us (*r*). The only things left for them, are a dreadful expectation of judgment, (which they might, upon fairly considering their case, see they have reason enough for, since the other thing left for them is a good ground for it) and fiery indignation which shall devour
28. the adversaries. Nor can it be difficult for you to perceive this: for if any man presumptuously and wilfully broke any part of the positive law which God gave by *Moses* (*s*), he

if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, But a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses law, 28

N O T E S.

ment. And it was easy for every one to perceive, from the number of years that were past at the time when this epistle was written, and from the circumstances in which the *Jews* then were, and other things mentioned by our Lord, that that destruction could not be far off. This seems to me a confirmation of what I observed before, that our author speaks with a principal regard to the *Hebrews*, this being a proper motive for them, while the *Gentiles* were less concerned in it.

26 (*q*) *Ἐκσίσως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν.* For if we sin wilfully.] An emphasis is deservedly laid upon that word *wilfully*; by which a wide difference is made between the case of those who are born down for a time, and forced contrary to their own inclination, by the violence of their sufferings, to disown the truth, and those who deliberately and wilfully apostatize from Christianity. Of this latter only does he use such sharp expressions in this place (with which we may compare *Chap.* vi. 4—6. 2 *Pet.* ii. 20, 21. And certainly, not only *Novatian*, and those who fell in with him, but the other christians, in those ancient times, deserve censure for not having treated the other sort with more tenderness and commiseration.

(*r*) *Οὐκ ἔστι οὐδὲ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία.* There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.] To comprehend the full strength of this argument, we must remember what was before fully proved, that the legal sacrifices, upon which the *Jews* were so prone to depend, could not possibly make an atonement for sin, and consequently no reasonable hope could be left the *Jews* by reason of them. There was no other sacrifice that could avail for sins but the sacrifice of Christ; and therefore if they had no part in that, there could remain no other sacrifice for them. Now that such wilful apostates could have no part in the sacrifice of Christ, and therefore must be left in the most deplorable and remediless condition is what he further argues in the following verses.

28 (*s*) *Ἀθετήσας τὸν νόμον Μωσέως.* He that despised Moses law.] The law of *Moses* seems here to be taken in a more restrained sense than it sometimes is. It often takes in whatever is contained in the five books of *Moses*; whereas here it probably relates to only that part of those books which express not the law of nature but the positive law which God gave by *Moses*.

T E X T.

P A R A P H R A S E.

died without mercy, under
29 two or three witnesses: Of
how much forer punish-
ment, suppose ye, shall he be
thought worthy, who hath
troden under foot the Son
of God, and hath counted

he was without mercy to be put to death,
when the matter was proved against him by
the testimony of two or three witnesses; How 29.
much severer punishment must you think he
shall deserve, whose guilt is so much more
aggravated, since he treats the Son of God
with the greatest indignity, treading him, as
it were, under his feet (t), and counts the
blood

N O T E S.

Moses. Should the contrary be supposed, it will not be easy to understand how our author could argue (as he seems evidently to do) from the less to the greater: for the directly blaspheming the supreme God could not be a smaller crime than the indignity here mentioned as offer'd to the son of God. But when the *despising the law of Moses* is taken in the limited sense before proposed, that is the despising the ceremonial law given by *Moses*, the reasoning is strong and convincing: for if they who contemn'd or broke with a high hand the law of *Moses* in the matter of a ceremony, were so severely punished, no wonder that such as treat the Son of God himself with the utmost contumely and disgrace, should receive a more severe and terrible recompense. As the case is put before of mens sinning or apostatizing *ἐκείως* wilfully, it will not be disagreeable to understand that word to be repeated here, as *ἀπὸ κοινῆς*, and that what is here said relates to mens sinning not through ignorance and mistake, but *presumptuously* and wilfully, in which case, they by consequence *reproached* the Lord, and despised his word; and therefore such an one was order'd to be cut off from among his people, *Num.* xv. 30, 31. compare *Deut.* xvii. 12. And in all such cases they were not to proceed after the manner of our modern inquisitions, but by the testimony of *two or three witnesses*, as our author here says agreeably to what we find in the *Mosaick* law, *Deut.* xvii. 6. Compare *xix.* 15. *Num.* xxxv. 30. The force of the argument is strong and plain, when thus understood, both from the difference of the persons imploy'd in the two dispensations, and from the nature and aggravating circumstances of the respective guilt of each, whence our author might very well appeal to the judgment of the *Hebrews* themselves, as he actually does in the next verse.

29 (t) Ο τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατήσας. *Who [hath troden under foot the Son of God.]* Two things seem to be intimated in this expression. 1. That such wilful apostates treat Jesus Christ, the Son of God, with great contempt and scorn, as men do the most insignificant and vile things. Thus, *Isa.* xxvi. 5, 6. *He bringeth down them that dwell on high, the lofty city he layeth it low, he layeth it low, even to the ground, he bringeth it even to the dust. The foot shall tread it down [LXX. Πατήσουσιν αὐτὲς πόδες] even the feet of the poor, and the steps of the needy.* In like manner the prophet speaks of persons being put to shame, *Mic.* vii. 10. *Then she that is mine enemy shall see it, and shame shall cover her who said unto me, Where is the Lord thy God? mine eyes shall behold her: now shall she be troden down as mire in the streets.* Where the last clause is rendered by the LXX. *Νῦν ἔσαι ἐς καταπάτημα, ὡς πηλὸς ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς*, which is *verbatim*, according to the *Hebrew*, and our marginal reading, *She shall be for a treading down, as the mire in the streets*; wherein the contempt she should meet with is set forth. And again, in like manner, *Mal.* iv. 3. *Ye shall tread down the wicked [LXX. καταπατήσετε ἀνόμους.] for they shall be ashes under your feet.* With this sense does the expression before used of the same persons exactly agree, *Chap.* vi. 6. *that they put the son of God to an open shame.* 2. Another thing which seems intended in this expression is that apostates



PARAPHRASE.

TEXT.

blood of Christ, which is the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified and admitted into the body of God's covenant people, to be but the common blood of an ordinary malefactor (u), and reproaches that

the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and

NOTES.

treat the Son of God with the utmost rage and fury. We look upon it as a sign of a person's being in a great rage with another, when he treats him in this manner, trampling and stamping upon him. And thus we find such expressions are used, concerning those that act with great wrath and fury. So *Isa.* lxiii. 3. *I will tread them in mine anger* [LXX. κατεπάτησα αὐτοὺς ἐν θυμῷ μου] and trample them in my fury. See also, *ver.* 6. where the LXX. have again the same word that is used by our author. Compare *Isa.* xiv. 25. And remarkable to our purpose is that passage concerning the little horn, that is *Antiochus Epiphanes* as is generally thought, *Dan.* viii. 10. *It waxed great, even to the host of heaven, and it cast down some of the host, and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them.* And this rage of apostates against the Son of God will be answerable to the account given of them before, *Heb.* vi. 6. *They crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh.* 'Tis easy to understand how apostates are guilty both of such contempt of Christ, and rage against him, since they make a jest of the history of him, and particularly his sufferings, and insult him as an impostor, and a vile malefactor who suffer'd no more than he deserved. But the pursuing that matter, is not proper in these papers; and therefore the reader is refer'd to practical writers for it.

(u) Καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγοσάμενος, ἐν ᾧ ἡγιασθῆν. *And hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing.* The blood of the covenant undoubtedly signifies the blood of Christ, which is called the blood of the everlasting covenant, *Chap.* xiii. 20. And accordingly in the Lord's supper concerning the cup 'tis said, *This is my blood of the new covenant, Mat.* xxvi. 28. *Mark* xiv. 24. which St. Paul thus expresses, *This cup is the new covenant in my blood, 1 Cor.* xi. 25. Compare *Luke* xxi. 20. When 'tis said, the apostate counts this blood an unholy or common thing, the meaning is, that he puts no difference between it and the common blood of men, but treats the Son of God as though his death was no more than that of an ordinary malefactor; and this is the meaning of that expression concerning unworthy receivers of the Lord's supper, that they *discern not the Lord's body, 1 Cor.* xi. 29. that they put no difference between that sign and memorial of our Lord's Body and common bread. The only doubt that can remain is concerning those words, ἐν ᾧ ἡγιασθῆν, *wherewith he was sanctified.* Now the doubt here may be either, 1. Whether these words belong to the Text. They may seem to stand a little out of their natural order; and besides both the *Alex.* copy, and *Chrysostom* leave them out. However, there being such a general consent otherways in owning them, and the trajection such as is easy, I should by no means advise the omitting them. And therefore the other doubt is, 2. How the words are to be understood, supposing them to be genuine. Some learned writers think we ought to take them thus, *Hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he [that is Christ] was sanctified, as an unholy thing.* They apprehend the word here is used in the same sense as *John* xvii. 19. *For their sakes I sanctify myself.* But if we compare the other passages in this epistle wherein this term is used, we shall find that it relates wholly to the effect of the sacrifice upon the persons for whom it was offered, and not to its effect upon the sacrifice, or the sacrificer. It seems therefore most probable that our author here shows the aggravation of the guilt of apostates from the horrid ingratitude and baseness wherewith they were chargeable; that they vilified that precious blood of Christ, whereby they had themselves been sanctified and admitted into the covenant, and taken to be God's people, distinguished from the rest of the world.

(w) Καὶ.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

hath done despite unto the
 30 Spirit of grace? For we
 know him that hath said,
 Vengeance *belongeth* unto
 me, I will recompense,
 saith the Lord. And a-
 gain, The Lord shall judge
 that Spirit which God has graciously given
 us to afford us the fullest evidence of the gos-
 pel (*ω*)? For we know who has told us, 30.
*Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recom-
 pense, saith the Lord (x).* And again, *The
 Lord*

NOTES.

(*ω*) Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ χάριτος ἐνυβείσας. *And hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace.*] The hopeless case of the same sort of sinners is set out Chap. vi. 4—6. where we have some expressions which deserve to be compared with what is here said. And doubtless a respect is had in both places, to the extraordinary operations of the holy Spirit; by which the strongest confirmation was given of the truth of the gospel to the world, and more especially to those who had themselves been made partakers of these miraculous gifts of the Spirit. They therefore, who having received them, did afterwards renounce christianity, must be understood to give up this evidence, and to attribute these extraordinary operations to some other cause, as the Scribes and Pharisees did during our Saviour's life, who attributed them to *Beelzebub*, the prince of devils; than which, what greater injury, reproach, or despite could be offer'd to the holy Spirit, or to God, who freely and graciously gave this Spirit, which upon that account is called the *Spirit of Grace*?

30 (*x*) Οἰδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι εἰπὼν ἡ Εὐαγγέλιον, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος. *For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, saith the Lord.*] Several things need to be considered in this citation from *Deut. xxxii. 35*.

1. The manner in which it is introduced, *For we know him that hath said*, which a learned commentator interprets to be *Moses*. And indeed, considering that clause that is added, *saith the Lord*, that interpretation seems not to be much amiss. This in sense will agree very well with the reading of *St. Chrysostom*, who brings in the passage only thus, *Γέγραπται γὰρ*, *For it is written*. But therein he is singular: and 'tis not unlikely that this was an oversight in him, that might be occasioned by his comparing the place with *Rom. xii. 19*. where the same passage is in that manner alleged, *For 'tis written, Vengeance belongeth to me, &c.* rather than that it was owing to any real difference he found in the copy he used.

2. Another thing to be observed, is, that those words, *λέγει Κύριος*, *saith the Lord*, are wanting in the *Vulg. Syr. Æthiop.* and *Copt.* versions, and in both the *Greek* and *Latin* in the *Clermont*, and in the *Latin* (and *Dr. Mills* thinks in the *Greek* also) *St. Germain's* copy. It must be farther own'd that they don't appear either in the *Hebrew* or *Greek* in the verse in *Deut.* here cited. However, I can't easily assent to those who are for leaving them out in this place. My reason is, because we meet with them in the citation of the same passage, *Rom. xii. 19*. where the genuineness of them is not in the least contested. Nor is there any thing unfair in inserting these words in the citation from the context, it being manifest that the Lord is there the speaker, and the words are his, which is really express'd, *ver. 19, 20*. where *Moses* passes from speaking of the Lord in the third person, and brings him in speaking of himself in the first person: where observe the transition. *And when the Lord saw it, he abhorred them, because of the provoking of his sons and his daughters. And he said, I will hide my face from them, &c.* This is not unusual in citing authors, as suppose any part of a speech which they have recorded, to add, "The words were spoken by such a person." This renders the passage alleged more easy and plain. I have observed two instances of this nature, and 'tis likely there may be several more, in *St. Paul's* writings, which, in some measure, confirm me in my opinion of his being the author of this epistle to the *Hebrews*, since we here find the same thing in this place. The first of these is *Rom. xiv. 11*. *For 'tis written, As I live,*

31. *Lord shall judge his people (y). And considering that he is the God who lives for ever, and has always an almighty power, it must ap-*

his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands

N O T E S.

live, SAITH THE LORD, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. But those words, *saith the Lord*, are neither in the Hebrew nor the LXX. Isa. xlv. 23. whence the citation is taken. The other instance is, 2 Cor. vi. 17. *Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, SAITH THE LORD, and touch not the unclean thing.* Which is taken from Isa. lii. 11. where neither the Hebrew nor the Greek read those words, *saith the Lord*.

3. It may be thought yet more material to consider how the words are here set down, *Vengeance is mine, I will recompense.* Our author comes nearer to the Hebrew **לִי נֶקֶם וְשָׁלוּ** which we render, *To me belongeth vengeance, and recompence*, than to the LXX. which thus translates it, *Ev hēmera endiknseōs anlapodōσω.* In the day of vengeance I will recompense. But in one thing they, St. Paul, Rom. xii. 19. and our author all agree, viz. in making **שָׁלוּ** to be a verb and not a noun, and so render it *anlapodōσω, I will recompense*, as does also the Vulg. *Mea est ultio, & ego retribuam eis.* And St. Jerom cites the place thus, *Comm. in Ezek. xxv. 15. Cumq; Dominus dicat, Mihi vindictam, & ego retribuam.* Farther neither does our author, nor St. Paul acknowledge the *and*, which should answer to the Hebrew **וְ**. And since the Vulg. in rendring both places where 'tis cited leave it out, it seems not improbable that their true ancient version of Deut. did exactly agree with what we find in the epistles, and that it stood thus, *Mihi vindictam, ego retribuam.* As to the first part St. Jerom seems to vouch for it, and as to the leaving out *&*, let the authorities alleged be duly weighed against his and the Syr. which owns it in this place, but rather paraphrases than translates Rom. xii. 19. The question now is, how to make the Hebrew in Deut. and in the Greek, in the two citations agree. Now 'tis plain that **שָׁלוּ** is the third and not the first person, and therefore if we retain the **וְ** it should be read, **וְשָׁלוּ** but that alteration does not so well comport with the place: for beside that it retains the copulative which in the two epistles is left out, 'tis it self too great, provided we can do as well with a less. What I would therefore offer is, that we should read in the Hebrew **שָׁלוּ**, as in ver. 40. which makes the Hebrew exactly agree with the Greek citations. Nor is the change hard to be supposed, if we imagine the middle stroke of the **ש** to remain tolerably plain while the two side strokes were obliterated. I am the more confirm'd in this, because if we take the word to be a noun, and read according to the present punctuation **שָׁלוּ** that must be as far as I can remember ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, and to be only found in this place. Is it not therefore much more probable that St. Paul, and our author (if he was not St. Paul) read the Hebrew as I have conjectured?

4. It may be farther inquired how this passage is applied here to those who profess'd themselves christians, since in Deut. it evidently relates to the idolatrous Gentile adversaries of Israel. But the answer to that is easy. For beside that such as apostatized from the christian religion, declared themselves to be avowed enemies to the institutions of God by Jesus Christ, which were much more sacred and important than those by Moses: I say, beside that, the assertion that, *Vengeance belongeth to God, he will recompense*, is to be consider'd as a general maxim; and therefore equally applicable in all cases wherein vengeance and a penal recompense is due.

(y) Καὶ πάλιν, κύριος κρινεῖ τὸ λαὸν αὐτοῦ. And again, The Lord shall judge his people.] This passage may be taken either from Psal. cxxxv. 14. or from Deut. xxxii. 6. for in both places we have exactly the same words. If we suppose the latter of these cited, the reason why he represents it as a distinct citation by saying, *And again*, though it is in the very next verse to

that

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

of the living God. appear to be much more dreadful to incur his vengeance than any punishments which men can

NOTES.

that before cited, the reason, I say, is because he had left out the several clauses in the latter part of *ver.* 35. and so the two passages are not immediately joined together.

But then it will be objected, that the words as they are in *Deut.* are not to our author's purpose. For 'tis manifest that the *judging* here signifies *punishing*, whereas in *Deut.* it may seem to mean the *pleading the cause* of his people, and taking vengeance on their enemies for oppressing them.

In answer to this it must be owned, that the passage in *Deut.* might at the first cursory reading seem naturally to admit this interpretation. *For the Lord shall judge his people, and repent himself for his servants, when he seeth that their power is gone, and there is none shut up, or left.* And if his *repenting himself for his servants* were necessarily exegetical of his judging his people, I don't see how the objection could be removed. But there is no necessity at all so to understand the words. There seem rather to be two distinct things spoken of in that place. (1.) That God will *judge*, that is, *punish*, his own people. And this is first mentioned, as 'tis common for God first to deal with his own people; and *judgment* uses to *begin at the house of God*, 1 Pet. iv. 17. And that, (2.) He will then *repent himself for his servants*. That is, when by reason of the power and rage of their enemies they are brought very low, and thereupon repent, he will repent himself for them and deliver them. This appears to be the case there put, from those words, *When he seeth that their power is gone, and there is none shut up, or left*, which plainly supposes them to be sorely chastised and punish'd by God before he repents for them. Here is then God's *judging* his people by delivering them for their sins into their enemies hands; and then as a distinct thing his recovering and delivering them out of their enemies hands, and taking vengeance on those enemies. This is much confirmed by the following verses down to *ver.* 43. And should we translate the first clauses, *THOUGH the Lord will judge his people, YET will he repent himself for his servants*, as ו and י are frequently so used, this interpretation of the passages would be still more clear. I foresee two objections that will yet be made against this account.

1. It will be said, that this may seem to abate the terribleness of God's judgments, which our author design'd to display in the most lively manner. For this represents him as punishing indeed, but as afterwards repenting and removing the punishment. But it must be here consider'd that the judgment is set forth as most severe, as destroying utterly the far greatest part of his people, who dying in their sins could have no benefit by God's afterwards repenting for his servants, who are consider'd as only a small remnant of the great body, and who at last by God's tremendous judgments were brought to repentance. And besides this, our author had by his discourse before cut off all encouragement from apostates by showing their case to be past remedy, and that there was no hope of their repentance.

2. It may be thought that God's *judging his people* in this sense could signify nothing with regard to apostates, who by renouncing their holy religion ceased any longer to be his people. But this objection will vanish when we remember to whom the epistle is directed. The *Jews* could not persuade themselves that the relation between God and them should ever cease: and the *Jewish* converts to christianity, when they relapsed to *Judaism*, did it because they thought by that course they conformed to the *Mosaick* covenant, whereby God was engaged to be their God and to take them for his people: So that nothing could be more proper than to argue with them according to their own supposition, and to mind them of the tremendous judgments which God executes upon his own people for their sins.

32. can inflict (*z*). But beside the tremendous judgments of God, I may press my exhortation upon you by your own example. Remember then the former times, in which after you were inlighten'd in the christian faith (*a*), ye indured a great combate (*b*) of sufferings; partly whilst you were exposed as upon a theatre (*c*), by reproaches and afflictions, and partly whilst ye were made partakers with those who lived under such hardships. For ye sympathized with those who were in bonds (*d*), and joyfully suffer'd the
- lofs

But call to remembrance ³² the former days, in which after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions: Partly whilst ye ³³ were made a gazing stock, both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly whilst ye became companions of them that were so used. For ye had compas- ³⁴ sion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling

N O T E S.

31 (*z*) 'Tis a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.] To fall into the hands of God imports the being punished more immediately by him. 2 Sam. xxiv. 14. 1 Chron. xxi. 13. though in those places God is spoken of as a God graciously correcting, whereas here he is consider'd as a righteous and angry judge taking vengeance on his adversaries. And his being the *living God*, or the God who lives and can take vengeance for ever, may justly add to the consideration of the terribleness of his vengeance. See *Matth.* x. 28. It seems to me that this verse refers to the just punishments inflicted by men for the breach of the law of *Moses*, and to the unrighteous persecutions christians indured from their enemies, and that our author intended to put them in mind that the divine vengeance was incomparably more terrible than both.

32 (*a*) *Illuminated.*] See *Chap.* vi. 4. note (*f*).

(*b*) Πολλὴν ἀθλήσιν. *A great fight.*] 'Tis the note of *Chrysostom* upon this, Οὐκ εἶπε πειρασμούς, ἀλλὰ ἀθλήσιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐγκωμίῃ ὄνομα, καὶ ἐπαίνων μεγίστων. "He does not say *trials*, but a *combate*, which is a word that denotes great praise and commendation." And *Theophylact* says, "That by this term he declared their courage and bravery." And doubtless when he was encouraging them to hold out by their own example, it was very proper for him to choose a word that carried in it praise and commendation.

33 (*c*) Θεαλειζόμενοι. *Made a gazing stock.*] Compare 1 Cor. iv. 9.

34 (*d*) Καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμοῖς με συνεπαθήσατε. *For ye had compassion of me in my bonds.*] Were it certain that this is the true reading of the place, there would be little room left to doubt of the epistle's being written by St. *Paul*. But the *Alex.* and other MSS. of the best note read here δεσμίῳ instead of δεσμοῖς με. And the same is confirmed by ancient versions, *Vulg.* *Syr.* and *Copt.* and by *Chrysostom* and *Theophylact*. The paraphrase therefore follows that reading. Compare *Chap.* xiii. 3. Further it may be here observed, that our author having mentioned two things, *ver.* 33. to set forth the sufferings of the *Hebrews*, he here proceeds in this verse to give a proof of both, but does not proceed in the order wherein he had before placed them: the first clause of *ver.* 34. their sympathizing with those in bonds relating to the latter in *ver.* 33. their being partakers with them who were thus treated: and in like manner the last clause of *ver.* 34. is a proof of the first in *ver.* 33.

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

of your goods, knowing in your selves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.

lofs of your earthly substance, being persuaded that you have in heaven (e)

NOTES.

(e) Γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἐν ἐαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὑπαρξιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ μόναν. *Knowing in your selves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.*] The paronomasia in ὑπαρχόντων and ὑπαρξιν seems very like St. Paul's way of writing. There is a considerable difficulty in settling the true reading, and so the exact sense of this passage. Our translation, by an unusual trajection joins the ἐν ἐαυτοῖς with γινώσκοντες, *Knowing in your selves*: and yet that seems preferable to the rendring of others, *Knowing that you have in your selves a better substance in heaven.* It sounds strangely that he should say in the same sentence, that they had it in *themselves*, and that they had it *in heaven*. And if neither of these interpretations are agreeable, there will be a necessity to have recourse to some different reading.

S E C T. XV.

C H A P. XII. 25—29.

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

25. **T**AKE care that you don't refuse or disobey (*a*) him that speaketh (*b*): for if they did not escape the divine vengeance and displeasure, who refused to obey God after he had spoken to them on earth at mount *Sinai*, much more shall not we escape, if we neglect or contemn him, now he speaketh to us from heaven (*c*): Whose voice then
26. caused

SEE that ye refuse not him that speaketh: For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven: Whose voice then

N O T E S.

25 (*a*) Μὴ ἀρσίσσησθε τὸ λαλῆναι. *Ye refuse not him that speaketh.*] Some seem inclined to fetch the sense from *ver.* 19. where our author uses the same verb, *Which voice they that heard, intreated παρετήσαντο that the word should not be spoken to them any more.* According to which interpretation the sense would be this; "See that you don't deprecate God's speaking to you, as the *Israelites* did of old, who when God spake to them in a terrible manner at mount *Sinai*, said unto *Moses*, *Speak thou with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us lest we die,* *Exod.* xx. 19. Compare *Deut.* v. 25. xviii. 16." But our own translation seems here preferable. For as our rendring perfectly suits the sense of the word, so we seem to be directed to it by the last clause of the verse, where the *turning away from him that speaketh* seems to be equivalent to *refusing him that speaketh*, and to be used as explicatory of it.

(*b*) *Him that speaketh.*] A question is moved by some, who the person is who is here referred to as speaking. Some think hereby is meant Christ: I think on the other hand God the Father is hereby designed. It is manifest from *ver.* 26. that the person speaking is he whose voice, at mount *Sinai*, shook the earth, and who had promised by the prophet *Haggai*, *Tet once more, I shake not the earth only, but also heaven.* Now if we consult that prophet, *Chap.* ii. 6, 7. we can't reasonably doubt that God the Father is the person who there makes the promise. For not to insist upon his being called over and over the *Lord of hosts*, which title appears to me peculiar to the Father; he that speaketh there is he who promises that the *desire of all nations should come*: and I suppose all will grant that according to the stile of the old testament, the Father is the person who promises his people that Christ should come.

(*c*) Εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι ἐκ ἔφυγον, τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ γῆς ἀρσίσσησάμενοι χρηματίζοντα, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς οἱ ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἀποσσεφόμενοι. *For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven.*]

As

N O T E S.

As the expression in the *Greek* is *elliptical*, I don't see how the *ellipsis* can be better supplied than 'tis by our translators. Farther, the word *κηρυατίζειν* and its conjugates, always in the old and new testament signify divine oracles or admonitions. See Dr. *Whitby* upon the place. Now though it may import a person's delivering such oracles from God; and therefore some have taken the expression, *him that spake on earth* to be a *periphrasis* for *Moses*, as they take also the latter, *him that speaketh from heaven*, to be a *periphrasis* of *Christ*; yet our author's words hardly seem capable of this interpretation. For then the next words must import, that it was *Moses's voice which then shook the earth*, which has not the least foundation in the history of God's giving the law at mount *Sinai*, nor does it well accord with what is just before mentioned here in the context, *ver. 19.* where he says christians were not come to the *voice of words*, *which they that heard intreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more*, which could not be the *voice of the words* of *Moses*; for they desired that *Moses* might speak to them, and only deprecated God's speaking to them, lest they should die, *Exod. xx. 19.* And besides, our author brings in *Moses* himself as *exceedingly quaking and trembling*, *ver. 21.* which he would not have done, if his own voice had caused those terrible signs. It seems therefore evident, that he who *spake on earth* is God the Father, the same with him whose voice then shook the earth, and who promised to shake not only the earth but the heavens also.

The question then is, how we are to account for the argument here used, if we understand God the Father to be the speaker in both cases. And 'tis evident that the stress of the argument lies in the different manner of his speaking, his speaking *on earth*, and his speaking *from heaven*. Now here his speaking *on earth* seems to intend his speaking not barely upon the earth, but his speaking in a way that was agreeable thereto, accompanied with earthly signs and wonders, fire, thunders, lightnings, a sound of a trumpet, an audible voice, and the shaking of the earth: and the speaking *from heaven* may import his speaking to us by his Son who came down from heaven, and suitably to the place from whence he came declared heavenly things, *John iii. 12, 31, 32.* Or rather I am inclined to explain this by his speaking to us by his *holy Spirit*, according to that *1 Pet. i. 12.* *Unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you, by them who have preached the gospel unto you, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.* And the force of the argument lies in this, that this dispensation is much more glorious in its nature, than that of the law, and consequently the sin of despising it, and the punishment that will follow it, must be greater also. *St. Paul* will bear me out in making such a difference between the giving of the law and the giving of the Spirit, *2 Cor. iii. 6 — 11.* *God hath made us able ministers of the new testament, not of the letter, but of the Spirit: for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious, had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. If by the Spirit we here understand with Mr. *Locke* *Christ*, it will then make no considerable difference as to the purpose for which this text is alleg'd. Only we should then rather fix upon the first sense, and suppose that our author means not his speaking by his Spirit sent down from heaven, but that he speaks to us by *Christ*, or as he expresses himself, *Chap. i. 2.* *He hath spoken to us in these last days by his Son.* Either way the reasoning of our author appears to be just. And if instead of rendering *ἀποστολῆς*, if we turn away, we should render it *if we despise*, as *Budaus Comm. G. L.* shows it has that sense, it might add somewhat to the force of the argument: but there being good authority for our own translation, I don't insist upon it; nor is there any need I should, since the argument will do without it.*

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

caused a proper shaking of the earth at mount *Sinai* (*d*): but since that by the prophet *Haggai* he hath promised another kind of shaking which takes place under the present dispensation (*e*), which promise is contained in those words, Yet once more I shake not the earth only (*f*), but also heaven (*g*).
And

shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also hea-

N O T E S.

26 (*d*) See *Exod.* xix. 18. *Judg.* v. 4. *Psal.* lxxviii. 7, 8.

(*e*) נֹכַח. *But now.*] As the *טֹכֶת* then refers to the time of giving the law at mount *Sinai*, and the *נֹכַח* *but now*, stands in opposition to it, I think it must be understood in this sense, and *but now* is as much as *but concerning the present dispensation*.

(*f*) There is a *paronomasia* in our author's use of the phrase of shaking the earth, compared with the prophet's: for he uses it himself properly, but cites the prophet as using it metaphorically. This is very agreeable to St. *Paul's* style.

(*g*) I have already had occasion to say somewhat concerning our author's discourse in this place, in explaining *Chap.* i. 10 — 12. See note (*2*). But it seems necessary here more fully to consider it. This I shall do under the three following heads, 1.) The manner in which the passage is cited. 2.) The explication given of it. 3.) The vindication of our author in that explication.

1.) As to the manner in which our author sets down the words of the prophet. Now here it will be proper to set down the words of the prophet, that the reader may compare them with the citation. Thus then they stand, *Hag.* ii. 6, 7. *For thus saith the Lord of hosts, Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations.* Our author in citing the prophet has made some variation, but 'tis only such as is common in all writers; and therefore he cannot be liable to any censure upon that account. Thus he has left out, *It is a little while*, because, as I apprehend, the mention of it was not much to his purpose. He design'd to speak of this as *now* put in execution, and so he brings the matter closer upon the *Hebrews*, though otherwise the passage might serve to show that the thing promised could not be supposed vastly remote from the prophet's time. I am sensible that this clause is omitted by the LXX. which I am apt to attribute either to their own, or their transcriber's carelessness, or else to the officiousness of some christians, who endeavour'd to accommodate that translation to our author's citation. For it seems highly improbable that if the clause did not originally belong to the text, the *Jews* would have inserted it in their *Hebrew* copies, since it makes so much against them.

Again, in the citation is left out, that God would shake *the sea and the dry land*, and that he would shake *all nations*. I hinted in the note before referr'd to, a reason why he may be thought to omit the mention of the *sea* and of the *dry land*, as signifying rather the people governed than the governors, the change of the latter being what he designed chiefly to inculcate, and the same may be the reason why he omits to mention his shaking *all nations*.

Finally, instead of setting down the words of the prophet, *I will shake the heavens and the earth*, he says God had promised, saying, *I shake not the earth only, but also heaven*. Now as God by the prophet promises both, no fault can be found with our author, that by this manner of citing the words he lays a very particular *emphasis* upon that part of the citation, which was most to his purpose, and upon which his argument is founded.

N O T E S.

2.) As to the sense in which our author explains this promise, I think it is manifestly this ;
 “ That God would shake, dissolve and put an end to earthly and heavenly authorities or king-
 “ doms, and set up himself a kingdom under the Messiah, that should prevail against all
 “ others, and should not be abolished, but continue to the end of the world.” He shows this
 to be the sense of the place, when he immediately adds, according to our translation, *And this*
word, Yet once more signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are
made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. Now what *those things* are *which*
cannot be shaken he shows plainly in the next words, *Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which*
cannot be moved. And what kingdom can that be which christians receive, but the kingdom
 of the Messiah ? And if this kingdom that cannot be shaken, is set up upon the shaking of the
 things that are made, that is the heavens and the earth, must not the heavens and the earth
 signify some kingdoms that are removed or put down ? And since our author so expressly di-
 stinguishes the heavens and the earth in this case, and by his manner of expression shows that
 the heavens were considered as much greater than the earth, if by the earth he means earthly
 rulers, he must by the heavens mean some superior, that is angelical rulers. The reader will
 consider whether these things don’t much strengthen the interpretation given of Chap. i.
 10—12.

3.) Let us now examine whether the interpretation of this place given by our author, does
 not appear to be agreeable to the original design of the prophecy. Now here let it be con-
 sider’d,

1. That the prophet himself has explained the *shaking of the heavens and the earth*, by the
overthrowing and destroying kingdoms, and therefore has so far justified our author. This seems
 plain enough by ver. 21, 22. of the same chapter. *Speak to Zerubbabel governor of Judah, say-*
ing, I will shake the heavens and the earth, and I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and
I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen, and I will overthrow the chariots and
those that ride in them, and the horses and their riders shall come down, every one by the sword of
his brother.

2. We have good reason from the prophet likewise to judge that this shaking was to be at
 the setting up God’s kingdom under the Messiah, because the prophet there so plainly mentions
 him **וְבָאוּ חֲמַדָּת כָּל הַגּוֹיִם** which we have rendred, *And the desire of all nations shall*
come, which seems to me a hard construction. The easiest seems to be this, *And they* [the na-
 tions] *shall come to the desire of all nations* : where nothing is supplied but **לָא** or **לְךָ** or some
 like particle, the omission of which is not unusual after the word **בָּיָא**. See Gen. xiii. 10.
 xxxiii. 18. xlv. 25. According to either of these two rendrings, the Messiah is spoken of under
 that character of the *desire of all nations*, and so either of them will confirm our author’s inter-
 pretation. And the order in which this clause stands in the prophecy will show that it cannot
 be meant of our Saviour’s incarnation, that being previous to the shaking of the heavens and the
 earth, whereas this *coming* is subsequent upon it. But if we follow the translation of the LXX.
 who seem to have read in the copies they used **חֲמַדָּת** instead of **חֲמַדָּת** and therefore rendred
Καὶ ἔξει τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ πάντων τῶν ἔθνων. *The elect of all nations shall come* ; it is true then the
 Messiah is not there called the *desire of all nations* : but even that rendring will justify our au-
 thor, since the *coming in of the Gentiles* must be upon the setting up the kingdom under the
 Messiah.

There is an objection against this interpretation which to some may appear plausible, and
 therefore ought to be consider’d. And I shall the rather speak to it because it will lead me to
 explain some parts of that prophecy which I have long thought to be misunderstood by com-
 mentators.

The objection is taken from the last verse of the prophecy, *In that day, saith the Lord of*
hosts, will I take thee, O Zerubbabel my servant, the son of Shealtiel, saith the Lord, and will
make thee as a signet : for I have chosen thee, saith the Lord of hosts. And that I may not con-
 ceal any thing of the strength of the objection ; ’tis to be observed that this relates to the very
 same time spoken of ver. 6, 7. as appears by ver. 21. where we have the expression over
 again, *I will shake the heavens and the earth.* Now the *shaking* promised, ver. 21. cannot be
 diffe-

N O T E S.

different from that *ver. 6.* because then there would be two such shakings, whereas *ver. 6.* assures us there was to be but one. Since therefore *in that day* God would take *Zerubbabel* and make him as a signet, it may be argued that this *shaking* was to happen in his time, and consequently could not be at the setting up God's kingdom under the Messiah. Whence some would willingly interpret this by what happened under the kings of *Persia*; and interpreters have put themselves to much trouble to devise how what was promised to *Zerubbabel* was accomplished in his time. It seems not difficult to give a full answer to this objection. Let it therefore be observed that the prophet *Haggai* was sent to encourage *Zerubbabel* in building the house of the Lord, or the temple at *Jerusalem*; and that in order hereunto he insists upon three things.

1. That however mean and contemptible the house of the Lord might seem to them in its present condition, yet he had resolved to make it more glorious than ever it was before. To this purpose he alleges what has been before considered, *I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come*; and then adds, *And I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts.* This is generally understood as though the Messiah should come while the second temple continued, and that his presence in it in the days of his flesh should be a greater glory to the second temple than any that ever belonged to the first. But this interpretation may well be contested. For in fact the thing is not true. Our Saviour did not come while the second temple was standing; the temple in his time being really the third which was built by king *Herod*, who took up the very foundations of the second temple, and erected another in the stead of it, not only of a greater height, but of a larger circumference, as we are assured by *Josephus*, *Antiq. lib. xv. c. 14.* It is indeed pleaded that the *Jews* called this the second temple, which they seem to have done upon this account, that the temple built by *Zerubbabel* was not destroyed in a hostile manner, but was in a friendly way taken down by *Herod*, to be rebuilt with more state and magnificence: and therefore as they speak only of two destructions, so they speak only of two temples, and consider *Herod's* temple, which was really a third, as only a continuation of the second temple which was built by *Zerubbabel*. But these little quirks and fetches of the *Jews* may easily mislead us, if we follow them in expounding the prophecies. Nor is that of more strength which has been urged by many both formerly and of late, that the prophet speaks of it under such a title, calling it *This house*, as though that must of necessity denote the structure raised by *Zerubbabel*, whereas it appears from the prophecy itself, that that means no more than the house or temple built in *this place*. Hence when the prophet speaks of the first temple which had so many years before been utterly destroyed by the *Babylonians*, he calls it nevertheless *this house*, *Chap. ii. 3.* *Who is there among you that saw THIS HOUSE in her first glory?* nay, when there was nothing in the place but rubbish and a ruinous heap, before the second temple was begun to be built, it is spoken of in the like terms, *Chap. i. 4.* *Is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your cieled houses, and THIS HOUSE lie waste?* and therefore *this house* is explained, *Chap. ii. 9.* as importing *this place*.

There is yet another thing that makes me not so readily fall in with the common interpretation; and that is, that however I do most readily allow the presence of our Saviour to have been a vastly greater glory than any that belonged to the first temple; yet that seems not to me to be the glory to which the prophet refers. Nay, the words are placed in such an order as does in a manner constrain us to understand them of an outward splendor and glory. Observe how he proceeds in his discourse. *I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts, and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts.* To what purpose can we imagine he mentions the *silver* and the *gold's* being his, if it was not to signify that as these things were at his disposal, he could never be at a loss for them, and would most certainly take care that this house should be filled with a glory and splendor that should result from them? and when after his mentioning the *silver* and the *gold*, he immediately returns to speak of the glory of this house, does not this lead us to interpret this *glory* as meaning such an outward splendor and glory? If any one thinks this too mean a thing to be mentioned upon such an occasion, let him compare, *Isa. lx. 13.* *The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir-tree, the pine-tree, and the box together;*

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

27 ven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the And when the prophet uses this expression, 27.
Yet once more, he signifies thereby (*b*) the change

NOTES.

together, to beautify the place of my sanctuary, and I will make the place of my feet glorious. Interpreters have been much perplexed about those words, *Haggai* ii. 9. *The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former*, and especially because Christ did not come while that second house stood. But they might have made their own interpretation less difficult, if they had rendered the words as they ought according to the *Hebrew*, and as the *LXX.* have done, *The latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former*, [or than its first glory]. If any object, that the glory neither of *Zerubbabel's* nor of *Herod's* temple was equal to that of *Solomon's*; I have only this to reply, that my account is grounded upon the words of the prophecy it self, and that perhaps the thing is to be explained from some of the last chapters in *Ezekiel*.

2. The next encouragement given to *Zerubbabel* is, that however God had blasted and sadly disappointed them while they had neglected his house, he would now bless them from this time wherein they heartily set about the building of it, *ver.* 10—19. which verses have no difficulty in them.

3. The last encouragement is that which more peculiarly concerned *Zerubbabel* himself, and is the ground of the objection, *ver.* 23. *I will take thee, O Zerubbabel — and will make thee as a signet: for I have chosen thee.* Where *Zerubbabel* appears to me to be spoken of personally and properly, and not mystically or typically. I think therefore that somewhat is promised to *Zerubbabel* himself, as 'tis not unusual for God to promise peculiar rewards to those whom he employs, and who are diligent in his service. Thus a special promise is made to *Ebed-melech*, *Jer.* xxxix. 16—18. And *Josua* the high-priest, *Zerubbabel's* partner in building the temple, is encouraged in the work by a promise like to that before us, *Zec.* iii. 7. So that in the general this may be look'd upon as a promise of a reward made to *Zerubbabel* himself, which reward was to be bestowed upon him after his death, and it may be understood in much the same manner as that to *Daniel*, *Chap.* xii. 13. *But go thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.* And as a *signet* was an ornament men were then fond of, and which must have been continually remembred by them, since they wore it upon their breasts or their arms, *Cant.* viii. 6. the meaning of the allusion seems to be this, that God had a special value for him, and would remember to reward him: And since this was to be in that day when God would shake the heavens and the earth, it may possibly mean that he should be one of those who should then be raised from the dead, or as though God had set a seal or mark upon him that he should be redeemed from the grave at that time, according to that expression, *Eph.* iv. 30. *Ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.*

27 (*b*) *And this word, yet once more signifieth.*] 'Tis the shaking of the heavens and the earth that properly signifies the alteration mentioned by our author; and the word, *Yet once more* only imports that there should after the prophet's time be but one more such alteration. This therefore is the sense of his words: "The shaking here spoken of betokens a vast alteration that shall be made in the things said to be shaken: but when he says, he will shake them yet once more, he means that he will make but one such alteration; and consequently that the things which succeed upon that shaking shall continue unshaken, since such a shaking was to be but once after the promise."

It may here perhaps be objected, that this interpretation does not accord with history, from whence we are to learn the accomplishment of the prophecy: for the change that was made in affairs at the destruction of the *Persian* monarchy, and under the *Grecian* which came in the room of it, and especially under *Antiochus*; and likewise the change that was after that, when the

Roman

P A R A P H R A S E.

T E X T.

change that should once, and but once, be made of those things that are shaken (*i*), as of things which had been formerly appointed (*k*), that so the things which are not then shaken may remain unchanged (*l*). Wherefore

removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. Where- 28

28.

N O T E S.

VSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

Roman empire succeeded the Grecian, and the Jews were subdued by them, may seem to import there were more such shakings than one between the time of the prophet, and the setting up the kingdom under the Messiah.

It seems to me a satisfactory answer to this objection, that none of these alterations come up to the words of the prophet. For, 1. Here was no *shaking of the heavens*, no change of the heavenly or angelical governors, they continued princes or presidents over their respective provinces as they were before. 2. Though there was in these indeed a *shaking of the earth*, and a change of earthly monarchies and governments; yet it was not such an one as issued in the *coming of the desire of all nations*, or in the calling in of the elect *Gentiles*. These kingdoms stood as much in opposition to God, the one as the other, the last as the first. But here such a kingdom is foretold to be the result of this shaking, which God himself would make, as never should be shaken or overturned. This account therefore ought to be compared with that of another prophet, *Dan. ii. 44. In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever.* Compare also *Chap. vii.*

(*i*) *Τῶν σαλευομένων ἢ μετὰθεσιν.* *The removing of those things that are shaken.* Though our translators might possibly understand *μετὰθεσιν* in the same sense I do, when they render'd it the *removing*, yet their rendering, especially, as it stands here, *the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made*, seems ambiguous. I should therefore choose to translate it *the change*. Thus they have turned the same word before, *Chap. vii. 12. For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity also a change of the law.*

(*k*) *ὡς πεποιημένων.* *As of things that are made.* This being a participle of the preterperfect tense, ought to have been accordingly render'd. Farther, I hardly think that our translation fixes the true sense of the verb in this place. For though *ποιεῖν* often signifies to *make* or *create*, yet it does not always do so. The words therefore should have been translated, *As of things that had been appointed*; that is, that had been appointed only for a time, at the end of which they were to be shaken, and undergo a great change. We have thus translated the word, *Chap. iii. 2. Who was faithful to him that appointed him, τὸς ποιήσαντι αὐτόν.* To the same purpose, *Mark iii. 14. Καὶ ἐποίησε δώδεκα.* *And he ordained twelve.* Many other examples may be brought of this sense of the word, *Matth. iv. 19. Luke xv. 19. John iv. 1. vi. 15. Acts ii. 36. Heb. i. 7. Rev. i. 6. iii. 12. v. 10.*

(*l*) *ἵνα μείνῃ τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα.* *That those things which cannot be shaken may remain.* The paraphrase seems to give the true sense free from all ambiguity. When 'tis said that these things may remain, 'tis not meant remain in being; for so did the other things that were shaken: but remain in their new state, and continue unchanged as the others did not. And the *μὴ σαλευόμενα* seems less properly rendred *the things that cannot be shaken*. This is indeed what he says in the next verse, mentioning *βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον*, *a kingdom that cannot be moved*; but that I conceive is inferr'd from what he here says, that these things not being shaken were to remain unchanged: and as he seems to distinguish between *μὴ σαλευόμενα* and

TEXT.

PARAPHRASE.

fore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear. For our God is a consuming fire.

fore as we christians do now receive a kingdom which we know shall be unshaken and unmoveable (*m*), let us be stedfast in embracing and adhering to the gospel (*n*), which will direct us (*o*) how we may serve God acceptably, even with a holy reverence and fear of him. And this is highly necessary for us, because our God is a consuming fire (*p*).

NOTES.

and ἀσάλευτα, our translation should have preserved that distinction, and not have rendered the first *the things that cannot be shaken*.

28 (*m*) Διὸ βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον ὡδλαμβάνοντες. *Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved.*] The phrase ὡδλαμβάνειν βασιλείαν, *To receive a kingdom*, is not unusual in profane authors: but is never, that I have observed, used except concerning such as became kings. It seems therefore not so agreeable to me to explain this expression as importing christians becoming the subjects of the Messiah's kingdom, though that is in it self most true, but that this is rather to be explained from the places of scripture wherein that dignity and honour is set forth to which they are advanced, such as Rev. i. 6. *Christ hath made us kings and priests unto his God and Father.* Ver. 10. *Thou [Christ] hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.* With which may be compared the title St. Peter gives them, 1 Pet. ii. 9. *But ye are a royal priesthood.* Again, our Saviour speaks thus to his disciples, Luke xii. 32. *Fear not, little flock; for 'tis your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.* Which suits with the language of the prophet Daniel, Chap. vii. 18. *The saints of the most high shall take the kingdom* [ὡδλήψονται τὴν βασιλείαν, LXX.] *and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.* Ver. 22. *The time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.*

'Tis farther to be observed, that our author infers this our *receiving a kingdom* from the expression of God's *shaking the heavens and the earth*, that is his overthrowing some kingdoms that he might set up another. And this I think very much confirms the interpretation before given of Chap. i. 10—12.

(*n*) Ἐχωμεν χάριν. *Let us have grace.*] *Grace* being understood in different senses by interpreters, the meaning of the place must be fixed according to that sense of the word which we think to be preferable. Some by *grace* understand a holy disposition and temper; which without all doubt is absolutely necessary in order to our acceptably serving God. But 'tis at least doubtful whether the term is ever used in this sense in the scripture. Others understand by *grace* the *favour of God*, in which sense the word is frequently used. But this hardly suits the design of our author. And therefore I think *grace* is by an easy metonymy put for the effect of grace, that is the gospel. It is obvious that *grace* is spoken of in this sense, 2 Cor. vi. 1. Gal. v. 4. Col. i. 6. and in many other places. If we understand him thus, it will perfectly agree with the great design of the epistle, and what he is perpetually inculcating, that they should be stedfast in their profession of the gospel, or the christian religion: and ἔχωμεν will be the same as κατέχωμεν, which is frequently to be observed elsewhere. See Dr. Whitby upon the place.

(*o*) Δι' ἧς. *Whereby.*] That is by which *grace* or *gospel* you are taught how you may serve God acceptably.

28, 29 (*p*) The reason why our author mentions our being taught by the gospel to serve God with *reverence* and *godly fear*, and why he mentions his being a *consuming fire*, seems to be

HEBREW S.

NOTES.

because he had before, *ver.* 18 — 21. set forth the terrible circumstances which attended the giving of the law, which might well strike the children of *Israel* with dread and horror. Now, says he, though the gospel was not delivered in any such terrible manner, yet it teaches us, that in order to our serving God acceptably we must do it with reverence and godly fear, nor does it less inforce the matter upon us; nay it assures us, that the God whom we serve is no less now than he was at that time, a *consuming fire*. God is represented by the gospel as resolved to take vengeance on his enemies, and as having prepared everlasting fire to torment and consume them. So that nothing could be more proper than for him to exhort them to adhere stedfastly to the new covenant, by that very consideration, by which they were urged to be obedient and faithful to the first covenant, *Deut.* iv. 23, 24. *Take heed unto your selves, lest ye forget the covenant of the Lord your God, which he made with you, and make you a graven image, or the likeness of any thing which the Lord thy God hath forbidden thee. For the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God.*

FINIS.





BOOKS printed for J. NOON, at the White Hart
in Cheapside; near the Poultry.

A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle of St. Paul to the *Colossians*. With an Appendix upon *Ephes. iv. 8.* Price 2 s.

A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle of St. Paul to the *Philippians*. To which are added, Two Dissertations, one on *Gal. iv. 21.* — v. 1. The other on *Matth. ii. 13, 14, 15.* By the Author of the Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle to the *Colossians*. Price 3 s.

Mr. Lowe's Latin Grammar: Being the shortest, plainest, fullest, and best contriv'd; as well for the Ease of Teachers, as for the rational and expeditious Improvement of Learners; of whatever Age, Capacities, or Attainments. Price bound 3 s. 6 d.

———— Grammars of the *French* and *English* Tongues. Price 2 s.

———— Complete Table of *Greek* Characters. Price 4 d.

———— Vocabulary *Latin* and *English*. Price 1 s. 6 d.

———— Sententia Pueriles *Latin* and *English*. Price 1 s. 6 d.

———— Protestant Family Piece: Or, A Picture of Popery. Price 2 s. 6 d.

Sermons on several Subjects, by the late Reverend and Learned Dr. John Gale. To which is prefix'd, An Account of his Life. In 4 Vols. Price bound 1 l.

A Defense of Human Liberty, in Answer to the Arguments which have been alleg'd against it; particularly to *Cato's* Letters on that Subject. By John Jackson, Rector of *Roslington*, in the County of *York*, and Prebendary of *Wharwell* in the County of *Southampton*. Price 3 s. 6 d.

A true Narrative of the Controversy concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, being a Reply to Doctor *Berriman's* Historical Account. Wherein the Partiality and Misrepresentations of that Author are fully shown. By the Author of the Reply to Dr. *Waterland's* Defenses. Price 1 s. 6 d.

The Anatomy of the Human Body, with Thirty Four Copper Plates. By W. Cheselden, Surgeon to St. *Thomas's* Hospital, and Fellow of the Royal Society. The Third Edition. Price 5 s.

The Peace and Happiness of this World the immediate Design of Christianity. A Discourse on *Luke ix. 56.* With an Address, in the Close, to the Deists, or those who deny the Christian Revelation. By Thomas Bott, Rector of *Whinbury*, in *Norfolk*. In Two Parts. Price 3 s.

Eight Discourses upon the Mystery of Godliness, from 1 *Tim. iii. 16.* By John Platts. Price 2 s. stitch'd.

The uninterrupted Succession of Bishops, prov'd not necessary to the Conveyance of the Ministerial Office, and the Validity of Ordinances in the Church: Wherein is consider'd the Nature of the *Sanhedrim*, the *Synagogue*, and the Rights of Societies, before the Writings of the Sacred Books, and since they were written. Price 1 s.

An Answer to Mr. *Watts* concerning the Trinity. Being a sober Appeal to a *Turk* or an *Indian*. Price 2 s.

A Letter to a Dissenter at *Exeter*, occasion'd by the Heats in those Parts concerning the Trinity. The Second Edition. Price 6 d.

Plain Christianity defended. Being an Answer to *Arius* detected; and others. In Four Parts. Price 2 s. By the Author of the Letter to a Dissenter at *Exeter*.

An Essay towards a Demonstration of the Scripture Trinity. By *Philanthropos Londin.* To which is added, A Letter to Dr. *S. Clarke*, concerning the Difficulty of reconciling Prescience and Free-Will. By another Hand. Price 1 s.

A Defense of certain Queries relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity. Being a Reply to two Letters in Answer to those Queries. By a Layman. Price 1 s. 6 d.

The Acceptableness of Sincerity to God: And the Unprofitableness of a mere speculative Faith to any Man's Salvation. Considered in a Sermon preached by J. Ball. Price 6 d.



BOOKS *printed for, and sold by* JOHN CHANDLER, *at* *the Cross Keys in the Poultry.*

A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle of St. *Paul* to the *Colossians*. With an Appendix upon *Ephes.* iv. 8.

A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle of St. *Paul* to the *Philippians*. To which are added, Two Dissertations, one on *Gal.* iv. 21. — v. 1. The other on *Matth.* ii. 13, 14, 15. By the Author of the Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle to the *Colossians*.

N^o. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, of, A new Version of all the Books of the New Testament, with a literal Commentary on all the difficult Passages. To which are added, 1. An Introduction to the Reading of the Holy Scriptures, intended chiefly for young Students in Divinity. 2. An Abstract or Harmony of the Gospel History. 3. A critical Preface to each of the Books of the New Testament, with a general Preface to all St. *Paul's* Epistles. Written originally in *French* by Messieurs *De Beausobre* and *Lenfant*, by the Order of the King of *Prussia*. Done into *English* with additional Notes.

The Christian Oratory: Or, The Devotion of the Closet display'd. By *Benjamin Bennett*, 8v^o

Miscellanea Sacra: Or, A new Method of considering so much of the History of the Apostles as is contained in Scripture: In an Abstract of their History; an Abstract of that Abstract, and four critical Essays. With a Preface as an Introduction to the whole. 2 Vols. 8v^o

One Hundred and Ninety Sermons on the Hundred and Nineteenth *Psalms*, preached by the late Reverend and Learned *Thomas Manton*, D. D. With a complete Alphabetical Table, Folio. The Second Edition, very much corrected. To which are prefix'd, Memoirs of the Life and Character of the Author. By *William Harris*.

The Credibility of the Gospel History: Or, The Facts occasionally mention'd in the New Testament confirmed by Passages of ancient Authors who were contemporary with our Saviour, or his Apostles, or lived near their Time. With an Appendix, Concerning the Time of *Herod's* Death. In 2 Vols. 8v^o. By *Nathaniel Lardner*.

The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit in every Age, with reference to particular Persons. Consider'd in several Sermons on *John* iii. 6. and *Gal.* v. 25. 8v^o. Published by the Reverend Mr. *William Harris*.

The Prosperous State of the Christian Interest before the End of Time, by a plentiful Effusion of the Holy Spirit. Consider'd in Fifteen Sermons on *Ezek.* xxxix. 29. Publish'd by the Reverend Mr. *John Evans*.

The Obligations from Nature and Revelation to Family Religion and Worship, represented and pressed in Six Sermons, 8v^o. Published by the Reverend Mr. *John Evans*. These Three last by the late Reverend and Learned *John Howe*, M. A. sometime Fellow of *Magdalen College, Oxon.*

Memoirs of the Life of the late Reverend Mr. *John Howe*. Collected by *Edmund Calamy*, D. D. 8v^o

A Second Edition of practical Discourses concerning the Christian Temper. Being Thirty Eight Sermons upon the principal Heads of practical Religion, especially as enjoined and enforced by Christianity. In 2 Vols. 8v^o. Design'd for the Use of Families. By *John Evans*.

REFLECTIONS on the Conduct of the modern Deists, in their Writings against Christianity, occasioned by Two late Books; A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons, &c. And the Scheme of literal Prophecy consider'd. With a Preface containing some Remarks on Doctor *Rogers's* Preface to his Eight Sermons lately publish'd. By *Samuel Chandler*.

In the Press, and will speedily be publish'd, a Second Edition of

A Vindication of the Christian Religion. In Two Parts. 1. A Discourse of the Nature and Use of Miracles. 2. An Answer to a late Book intituled, A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion. By *Samuel Chandler*.