A

PARAPHRASE

AND

NOTES

ON THE

Epiſtles of St. Paul

TO THE

Coloſſians, *Philippians*, and *Hebrews*:

After the Manner of Mr. *LOCKE*.

To which are Annexed

Several Critical Diſſertations on particular Texts of Scripture.

The SECOND EDITION.

By the late Reverend and Learned

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

WITH A

PARAPHRASE and NOTES

ON THE

Three laſt Chapters of the *Hebrews* left unfiniſh'd by Mr. *PEIRCE*;

AND AN

Eſſay to diſcover the Author of the Epiſtle and Language in which it was originally written.

By *JOSEPH HALLETT jun.*

LONDON:

Printed for J. NOON, at the *White Hart* near *Mercers Chapel Cheapſide*.

M.DCC.XXXIII.

To the RIGHT HONOURABLE

Sir PETER KING,

Lord Chief Juſtice of the Common Pleas.

My LORD,

YOUR Lordſhip has the juſteſt title to theſe papers, as a near and highly valued relation of the Great Mr. *Locke*, to whom I am more indebted, than to any man, for what underſtanding I have in St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, and whoſe admirable rules and example, I have, the beſt I could, indeavoured to follow. Beſides, I could not appeal to a more competent judge of writings of this nature than Your Lordſhip, whoſe bright character in Your profeſſion, and the other parts of learning, is eſpecially, in my apprehenſion, embelliſhed by a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, which has been the effect of a critical and diligent ſtudy of them. I fear not the cenſure of the world for profeſſing my veneration for Your Lordſhip: Nor do I doubt, the offence which it might give to Your modeſty, will be prevented by Your goodneſs, which will not ſuffer You to be offended with all mankind who know any thing of You, as yet You muſt be for the ſame reaſon, if You are offended with me. And indeed it is a happineſs almoſt peculiar to Your ſelf, to be beloved of all, and that they who differ ever ſo widely about other matters, do yet very unanimouſly agree in the moſt honourable ſentiments of Your Lordſhip.

That Your Lordſhip may be long continued a ſupport, an ornament, and the delight of Your country, is the hearty prayer of,

My LORD,

Your Lordſhip's
very ſincere Admirer,
and humble Servant.

The PREFACE.

ST. Paul's *Epiſtles have always been eſteemed a noble part of the New Teſtament; but as we are told, and every one who reads them knows, there are in them* ſome things hard to be underſtood, 2 *Pet.* iii. 16. *They therefore have done good ſervice to the Chriſtian Religion, who have by their writings made this part of the Holy Scriptures more eaſy and inteiligible. Mr.* Locke *has, in my judgment, done more this way, than any man; and indeed he had a head admirably turned for the tracing and diſcovering the profound and intricate diſcourſes and intentions of ſo cloſe a reaſoner, who yet abounds with all manner of figures and long digreſſions. I am not the only perſon who have often lamented his not applying himſelf ſooner to this ſtudy, and that we ſhould have his* Paraphraſe *and* Notes *only upon five of the Epiſtles; but we have reaſon to be thankful for them, not only for the light they give to thoſe Epiſtles, but the uſe they may be of in helping us to underſtand all the reſt. I have in the preſent work indeavour'd to imitate this Great Man; nor will any judicious perſon blame me for propoſing to my ſelf ſuch a pattern, however ſhort he ſees at the ſame time I come of it. I have laboured to guide my ſelf by the admirable rules he has given for this ſtudy; wherein I have found much ſatisfaction, though it may perhaps but little ſatisfy the reader.*

The reaſon why I choſe firſt to ſtudy this Epiſtle, was partly becauſe it was not one of thoſe Mr. Locke *had explained, and therefore a comment upon it in his way ſeemed to be wanted; but to be ingenuous, my chief reaſon was, becauſe Mr.* Locke *had admirably cleared the Epiſtle to the* Epheſians, *which being in deſign, method, and expreſſion, very like to this to the* Coloſſians, *I concluded his work would yield me much aſſiſtance in mine; for I reſolved from the firſt to transfer whatever he had ſaid on that Epiſtle, that was to my purpoſe, into my work on this. And that I may not appear a Plagiary in not owning by whom I profit, I acquaint the reader that I have kept to my reſolution, and have often borrowed his words, even where I have not named him; and this I have the rather done, that he may read with the more attention, ſince otherwiſe he may not know whom he is reading, Mr.* Locke *or my ſelf.*

I would not be thought a bare tranſcriber from what I have now ſaid. I have ſtudied the Epiſtle thro' and thro' with the greateſt application I was able; and there were ſome parts wherein I could have no help from Mr. Locke, *or any one elſe, to my ſatisfaction; upon which, at my firſt ſetting about the work, and long after, I deſpaired of ſaying any thing but that I did not underſtand them. I can however now ſay, I have found no great reaſon upon the whole to ſpeak much in that manner; but have ſatisfied my ſelf about moſt of thoſe paſſages that ſeemed moſt difficult. I might aſſign the fifteenth verſe of the ſecond chapter as an inſtance of this nature, and perhaps ſome other places, were it not that I decline the vanity, and the raiſing too great expectations.*

If what I offer at preſent ſhall meet with a favourable acceptance, it will incourage my publiſhing hereafter what I ſhall apprehend will tend to clear the Holy Scriptures; but if it prove otherwiſe, I hope not to be diverted from perſuing my own pleaſure and ſatisfaction, as God ſhall graciouſly pleaſe to give me ability and opportunity.

THE Epiſtle of St. PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.

Written from Rome *by St.* Paul *in Bonds, in the Year of our Lord* 62. *Of* Nero 9.

SYNOPSIS.

COLOSS was a populous, wealthy and large city of *Phrygia*, wherein there was a Chriſtian Church, though it is uncertain by whom it was planted. It ſeems probable that it was not by St. *Paul* himſelf, however he was the Apoſtle of the *Gentiles*, and had ſpent much time at *Epheſus*; for the Epiſtle it ſelf affords reaſon to judge, according to the general opinion of both ancient and modern commentators, that he had never been there, or at *Laodicea*, which was near to it: Of the paſſages which imply thus much, notice will be taken in going over the Epiſtle. Nor is it certain, that the *Coloſſians* were converted to the Chriſtian Faith by any whom St. *Paul* ſent to them to that end. This indeed ſeems probable; for he had ſpent three years at *Epheſus*, Acts xx. 31. and it is not unlikely, that during that time ſome of the *Coloſſians*, having occaſion to go to *Epheſus*, might by him be turn'd to Chriſtianity, and might when they went home be imployed by him to preach the Goſpel to their fellow-citizens. This may be thought the more probable from what St. *Luke* ſays of his ſucceſs,

ſucceſs, when he had been at *Epheſus* but two years, *Acts* xix. 10. *And this* (*Paul*'s diſcourſing daily in the ſchool of *Tyrannus*) *continued by the ſpace of two years; ſo that all they which dwelt in* Aſia, *heard the word of the Lord, both* Jews *and* Greeks. And conſidering how ſtedfaſt the *Coloſſians* appear to have been in the doctrine which was peculiarly taught by St. *Paul*, there is the more reaſon to imagine they might be converted by ſome who went to them from him. *Epaphras* may well be ſuppoſed to be one of this number, if he was not the only perſon at firſt ſo imployed. He was himſelf a *Coloſſian*, Chap. IV. 12. *A faithful miniſter of Chriſt for them*, Chap. I. 7. by whom he intimates they had been chiefly inſtructed. And poſſibly they therefore ſent him as their meſſenger to St. *Paul*, becauſe he had been before ſent to them by him, and ſo was the more likely to be acceptable to him.

Whoever was the inſtrument or occaſion of their converſion, St. *Paul*, who was the Apoſtle of the *Gentiles*, could not but have a great concern for them. As he was ſent with a ſpecial commiſſion to the *Gentiles*, Acts xxvi. 17, 18. ſo he ſeems to have been more fully, than the reſt of the Apoſtles, inſtructed in the great myſtery which related to the *Gentiles*, viz. God's calling them into his church, and taking them to be his people, without ſubjecting them to the ceremonial Law. The *Jews*, who were very tenacious of their old cuſtoms, and concluded that the Law, which God had given by *Moſes*, was never to be alter'd, and that a conformity to it was a term abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, were grievouſly ſcandaliz'd at this doctrine, and at St. *Paul* for preaching and maintaining it. This ſtirred up their rage againſt him, *Acts* xxi 28. which was the occaſion of the bonds he was now in, *Col.* IV. 3. And even the believing *Jews* were very earneſt in inſiſting on the converted *Gentiles* being circumciſed, and keeping the Law of *Moſes*, Acts xv. 1, 5. This gave the Apoſtle much diſturbance, and was a great hindrance to the ſucceſs of the Goſpel; and being the great preacher of this myſtery, he ſtrenuouſly maintain'd it, and the liberty of the *Gentiles*, inſiſting upon it that it was neceſſary for them to ſtand faſt in it, as ever they would expect ſalvation by Chriſt. And as it was a trouble to him when he heard of any of the *Gentile* converts yielding to the importunity of the zealots for *Judaiſm*, and he deals with them ſharply, and takes much pains to convince them by

by arguments; so it was a great pleasure to him to hear of any of them that continued firm in the doctrine he taught; and having received from *Epaphras* a very pleasing account of the *Colossians* in this respect, he writes to them to commend and applaud them, and to testify the great joy and satisfaction he had in the good news; nor is there, perhaps, in all the Epistle, when rightly understood, any thing said of them by way of reprehension. However, as the *Jews* were in great numbers in *Asia*, and many of them were probably proselytes to Christianity, and retained much of their old leaven, St. *Paul* thought it necessary to confirm and establish the *Colossians* in this Epistle, against their endeavours, and more especially of one sect of them, to corrupt them. He insists upon God's having abolish'd the Law, with reference to the *Gentiles*; and as they cried up the Law, he compares Christ with it; that he might show the greatness of the difference. The zealots who were trying to corrupt them, seem to have talk'd much of *Angels*, and urged the respect due to them; and for that reason he sets out the great superiority of Christ to Angels, and the necessity of adhering to him as their head. That part, wherein he speaks most directly against these invaders of the liberty and privileges of the *Colossians*, is but short, being comprized in *Chap.* II. 4—23. *Chap.* III. 1——4. but the preceding part of the Epistle is full of suggestions and hints which it was easy for them to apply, in order to their being establish'd in the apostle's doctrine, and fortified against the subtle insinuations of the advocates for *Judaism*. The scope of the Epistle is much the same with those to the *Philippians* and *Ephesians*, written about the same time, the latter of them being sent by the same messenger, *Tychicus*, *Eph.* VI. 21, 22. *Col.* IV. 7, 8. And indeed as the occasions were so much alike, so are the very expressions which he uses in both: This to the *Colossians* being written as in the same time, so in the same run and warmth of thoughts; so that, as Mr. *Locke* says, the form, phrase, matter, and all the parts quite through of these two Epistles, do so perfectly correspond, that one cannot be mistaken in thinking one of them very fit to give light to the other. And that to the *Philippians*, writ also by St. *Paul* during his bonds at *Rome*, when attentively look'd into, will be found to have the same aim with the other two; so that in these three Epistles taken together, one may see the great design of the Gospel laid down, as far surpassing the Law, both in glory, greatness;

neſs, comprehenſion, grace and bounty; and therefore they were oppoſers, not promoters of the true doctrine of the Goſpel, and the kingdom of God under the Meſſiah, who would confine it to the narrow and beggarly elements or ſhadows of this world, as St. *Paul* calls the poſitive ordinances of the Moſaical inſtitution.

It is farther to be obſerved, that in each of theſe three Epiſtles, he takes care to ſuggeſt ſome conſiderations to prevent their being offended or diſcouraged upon the account of his preſent circumſtances, as he was in bonds for aſſerting and preaching the grace of God toward them.

SECT. I.

CHAP. I. 1, 2.

CONTENTS.

Chap. I. THESE two verſes contain St. *Paul*'s inſcription, or introduction of his Epiſtle: What there is in it remarkable for its difference from what is to be found in his other Epiſtles, ſhall be taken notice of in the Notes.

PARAPHRASE.

1. PAUL an Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, by the declared will and ſpecial appointment of God (*a*) and *Timothy* our brother (*b*), to

TEXT.

PAUL an apoſtle of 1 Jeſus Chriſt by the will of God, and Timotheus *our* brother, to the

NOTES.

1 (*a*) *By the will of God.*] St. *Paul*, in moſt of his Epiſtles, mentions his being an *Apoſtle by the will of God*; which way of ſpeaking being peculiar to him, we may ſuppoſe him therein to intimate his extraordinary and miraculous miſſion, *Acts* ix. xxvi. and his receiving the Goſpel by immediate revelation, *Gal.* i. 11, 12. for he doubted not of the will and providence of God's governing all things. Beſides, he may ſtile himſelf thus, in oppoſition to thoſe who without *the will of God* ſet up againſt him.

(*b*) *Timotheus our brother*] He was brother to St *Paul*, not only as a Chriſtian, but as imployed in the ſame work with him, of preaching the Goſpel, (as this title ſeems uſed ſometimes in that ſenſe) and he was alſo his brother in affliction, he being now in bonds with him, and ſo at hand to join with him in the ſalutation and inſcription here in the beginning of this Epiſtle.

the

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

2 ſaints and faithful brethren in Chriſt, which are at Coloſs: Grace *be* unto you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

the profeſſors of the Goſpel (*c*) who are at *Coloſs*, converts who ſtand firm in the faith of Jeſus Chriſt (*d*): Favour and peace (*e*) be to you from God our Father, and from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. 2.

NOTES.

2 (*c*) *To the ſaints.*] Οἱ ἅγιοι, *the ſaints*, or οἱ ἅγιοι ἀδελφοὶ, *the holy brethren* (as the *Greek* here ſeems to require that conſtruction) do not neceſſarily ſignify perſons internally ſanctified, and in a ſtate of ſalvation, but ſuch as were *ſeparated* from the common ſtate of mankind, to be the people of God, and to ſerve him. The heathen world had revolted from the true God, to the ſervice of idols and falſe gods, *Rom.* i. 18——25. The *Jews* being ſeparated from this corrupt maſs, to be the peculiar people of God, were called holy, *Exod.* xix. 5, 6. *Numb.* xv. 40. They being caſt off, the profeſſors of Chriſtianity were ſeparated to be the people of God, and ſo became holy, 1 *Pet.* ii. 9, 10.

(*d*) *Faithful brethren in Chriſt.*] 'Tis obſerv'd, that this Epiſtle, and that to the *Epheſians*, have all through a very great reſemblance; their lineaments do ſo correſpond, that I think they may be twin Epiſtles, conceived and brought forth together, ſo that the very expreſſions of the one, occurr'd freſh in St. *Paul*'s memory, and were made uſe of in writing the other. This term *faithful*, πιστοῖς, therefore being found in the introduction of both Epiſtles, and no one other of St. *Paul*'s, there is juſt reaſon to think it was a term ſuited to the preſent notion he had of thoſe he was writing to, with reference to the buſineſs he was writing about. I take it therefore, that by the *faithful brethren*, he means ſuch as ſtood firm to Chriſt, which he did not count them to do, who made circumciſion neceſſary to ſalvation, and an obſervance of *Jewiſh* rites, a requiſite part of the Chriſtian Religion. This is plain from his expreſs words, *Gal.* v. 1, 2. *Stand faſt therefore in the liberty wherewith Chriſt has made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I* Paul *ſay unto you, that if ye be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing*, &c. And thoſe who contended for ſubmiſſion to the Law, he calls *perverters of the Goſpel of Chriſt*, Gal. i. 7. and more to the ſame purpoſe may be ſeen in that Epiſtle.

(*e*) *Peace be to you.*] The wiſhing of peace in the ſcripture language, is the wiſhing of all manner of good. As it ſtands here joined with *grace*, it ſeems to be ſpoken of as the effect or conſequence of it.

Chap. I.

SECT. II.

CHAP. I. 3—13.

CONTENTS.

IN this ſection he acquaints them with the ſatisfactory account he had received of their faith and love, aſſuring them at the ſame time, of the great intereſt they had in both his petitions and thankſgivings. In giving an account hereof, he evidently endeavours to raiſe their ſenſe of the greatneſs of thoſe advantages which they partook of by the Goſpel, which were ſuch as the Law could not ſecure them, and which were in a more large and plentiful manner now diſpens'd, being offer'd to the whole world, and not confin'd ſo narrowly as under the former œconomy, to the comparatively ſmall nation of the *Jews*. Hereby he likewiſe ſtirs up their gratitude to God, who had dealt ſo kindly with them, and excites their endeavours to anſwer the obligations he had laid them under.

PARAPHRASE.

3 I Thank the God and Father (*f*) of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt always upon your account (†), in my prayers, having heard of the
4 continuance of your faith in Chriſt Jeſus (you not being diſcouraged at my ſufferings for it) (*g*) and

TEXT.

3 WE give thanks to God, and the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, praying always for you: Since we heard of 4 your faith in Chriſt Jeſus,

NOTES.

3 (*f*) Τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. *To God and the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.*] The rendering in the paraphraſe, *To the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, ſeems moſt proper; though our own rendering may be born, and makes no alteration, as to the ultimate object of his thankſgiving; for the *and* muſt then, as in other places, ſignify *even*.

(†) Πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν. *Always for you.*] Our tranſlators join this with προσευχόμενοι, *Praying always for you.* The *Greek* will bear either that, or the ſenſe expreſs'd in the paraphraſe, which joins it with εὐχαριστοῦμεν. The comparing *Eph.* i. 15, 16. may ſeem to lead rather to the latter. See 1 *Theſſ.* i. 2. 2 *Theſſ.* i. 3.

4 (*g*) Ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν. *Since we heard of your faith.*] It is hardly to be thought that the *Coloſſians*, who had merited the great commendations beſtowed on them in this Epiſtle, were converted to the Chriſtian Religion ſo very lately, as that St. *Paul* ſhould firſt hear of it when he was in bonds; nor is it likely, that he, who had the care of all the churches upon him, 2 *Cor.* xi. 28. ſhould not have heard of it before his confinement, in caſe it happen'd a conſiderable time before, and eſpecially if it was when he was himſelf at *Epheſus*. It is not therefore probable, that hereby he meant that he had received an

NOTES.

account of their being converted from *Gentiliſm*. And ſince this Epiſtle, and that to the *Epheſians* are ſo exactly alike, and he uſes much the ſame Expreſſion to them, *Chap.* i. 15. *After I heard of your faith in the Lord Jeſus, and love unto all the ſaints*, it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe that in both he meant the ſame thing. Now what he means there is ſo fully cleared by Mr. *Locke* upon the place, that nothing more is needful than to tranſcribe his note, which gives much light to the three Epiſtles written about this time.

" St. *Paul's* hearing, *ſays he*, of their faith here mentioned, cannot ſignify his being informed that they had received the Goſpel, and believed in Chriſt: This would have look'd impertinent for him to have told them, ſince he himſelf had converted them, and had lived a long time amongſt them. We muſt therefore ſeek another reaſon of his mentioning his hearing of their faith, which muſt ſignify ſomething elſe than his being barely acquainted that they were Chriſtians: And this we may find in theſe Words, *Eph.* iii. 13. *Wherefore, I deſire that ye faint not at my tribulation for you.* He, as the Apoſtle of the *Gentiles*, had alone preached up freedom from the Law, which the other Apoſtles, who had not that province (ſee *Gal.* ii. 9.) in their converting the *Jews*, ſeem to have ſaid nothing of, as is plain from *Acts* xxi. 20, 21. 'Twas upon account of his preaching, that the Chriſtian converts were not under any ſubjection to the obſervances of the Law, and that the Law was aboliſh'd by the death of Chriſt, that he was ſeized at *Jeruſalem*, and ſent as a criminal to *Rome* to be tried for his Life, where he was now a priſoner. He being therefore afraid that the *Epheſians*, and other convert *Gentiles*, ſeeing him thus under perſecution, in hold, and in danger of death, upon the ſcore of his being the preacher, and zealous propagator and miniſter of this great article of the Chriſtian faith, which ſeem'd to have had its riſe and defence wholly from him, might give it up, and not ſtand firm in the faith which he had taught them, was rejoiced when in his confinement he heard that they perſiſted ſtedfaſt in that faith, and in their love to all the ſaints, *i. e.* as well the convert *Gentiles*, that did not, as thoſe *Jews* that did conform to the *Jewiſh* rites. This I take to be the meaning of his *hearing of their faith* here mentioned, and conformably hereunto, *Eph.* vi. 19, 20. he deſires their prayers, that he may with *boldneſs preach the myſtery of the Goſpel, of which he is the ambaſſador in bonds.* This *myſtery of the Goſpel*, 'tis plain from *Eph.* i. 9. —— iii. 3——7. and other places, was God's gracious Purpoſe of taking the *Gentiles*, as *Gentiles*, to be his People under the Goſpel. St. *Paul*, whilſt he was a Priſoner at *Rome*, writ to two other Churches, that at *Philippi*, and that at *Coloſs*: To the *Coloſſians*, Chap. i. 4. he uſes almoſt *verbatim* the ſame Expreſſion that he does here, *Having heard of your faith in Chriſt Jeſus, and of the love which ye have to all the ſaints*; he gives thanks to God for their knowing and ſticking to the Grace of God in truth, which had been taught them by *Epaphras*, who had inform'd St. *Paul* of this, and their affection to him; whereupon he expreſſes his great concern, that they ſhould continue in that faith, and not be drawn away to *Judaizing*, which may be ſeen from *Col.* i. 14. to the end of the ſecond chapter." [It may be here farther remarked concerning this place in the *Coloſſians*, that he afterwards explains what he means by faith, *v.* 23, 25, 26. *the hope of the Goſpel*, or a faith in the *myſtery among the* Gentiles, *viz. Chriſt among them, as* Gentiles, *the hope of glory.* And *v.* 24. he tells them, *he now*, i. e. upon the account he had received of their ſteadineſs, *rejoiced in his ſufferings for them*; and that which was the occaſion of his rejoicing, was likewiſe of his thankſgiving to God.] " So that the hearing of their faith, which he mentions both to the *Epheſians* and *Coloſſians*, is not his being told they were Chriſtians, but that they continued in the faith they were converted to and inſtructed in, *viz.* that they became the people of God, and were admitted into his Kingdom only by faith in Chriſt, without ſubmitting to the Moſaical inſtitution and legal obſervances, which was the thing he was afraid they ſhould be drawn to, either through any deſpondency in themſelves, or importunity of others, now that he was removed from them, and in bonds, and thereby give up that truth and freedom of the Goſpel which he had preached to them. To the ſame purpoſe he writes to the *Philippians*, Chap. i. 3——5. telling them, &c.

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

and of your love to all (*h*) chriſtians. And this continuance and ſtedfaſtneſs of your faith and love, is for the ſake of that happineſs,
5. which you hope for (*), and which is laid up for you in heaven, of which you have heard already from the true account which is given
6. of it by the Goſpel: Which is come unto you, as it is to all the world (*i*); and bringeth forth fruit in all the world, as it hath alſo among you, ever ſince you firſt heard it, and knew
7. the true grace of God (*k*). (Concerning which you have been well inſtructed by *Epaphras*, who is my dear fellow-ſervant, and a faithful miniſter

TEXT.

and of the love *which ye have* to all the ſaints;
For the hope which is 5
laid up for you in heaven, whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the goſpel: Which is 6
come unto you, as *it is* in all the world, and bringeth forth fruit, as *it doth* alſo in you, ſince the day ye heard *of it*, and knew the grace of God in truth. As ye alſo learned of 7
Epaphras our dear fellow-ſervant, who is for you a faithful miniſter of Chriſt;

NOTES.

(*h*) *All the ſaints.*] One finds in the very reading of theſe words, that the word *All* is emphatical here, and put in for ſome particular reaſon. I can, I confeſs, ſee no other but this, *viz.* That they were not by the *Judaizers* in the leaſt drawn away from their eſteem and love of thoſe who were not circumciſed, nor obſerved the *Jewiſh* rites; which was a proof to him that they ſtood firm in the faith and freedom of the Goſpel, wherein they had been inſtructed.

5 (*) Διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα. *For the hope.*] This verſe is ordinarily connected with *v.* 3. and the 4th verſe being ſuppoſed to be a *parentheſis*, the ſenſe is taken to ſtand thus: *We thank God for the hope which is laid up for you*, &c. But had that been the Apoſtle's deſign, I am apt to think, he would either have ſaid ὑπὲρ τὴν ἐλπίδα, 1 *Cor.* x. 30. *Eph.* v. 20. or, ἐπὶ τῇ ἐλπίδι, 1 *Cor.* i. 4. *Philip.* i. 3, 5. But I find no inſtance of εὐχαριστεῖν being thus followed by διὰ with an accuſative caſe. I therefore chooſe to connect this with *v.* 4. and ſuppoſe he here ſpeaks of the motive or impulſive cauſe; for the ſake of which they perſevered in their faith in Chriſt, and their love to all the ſaints.

6 (*i*) *In all the world.*] It is not to be ſuppoſed that every individual city, or even country through the whole world, had had the Goſpel preached among them; ſuch kind of expreſſions being very familiar, when they are not uſed with the utmoſt ſtrictneſs. The Apoſtle ſeems here to have an eye chiefly to God's ſending the Goſpel to the *Gentiles* in general, without confining it to the *Jews*. This was much to his purpoſe, as it led the *Coloſſians* to obſerve, that God had now put an end to the covenant of peculiarity formerly made with the *Jews*, and by ſending his Goſpel to the *Gentiles*, far and near, teſtified he did not expect they ſhould ſubmit to the *Jewiſh* Law, in order to their being accepted as his people; and by this he likewiſe magnifies the Goſpel-covenant, and the grace of it, above the Law, which reached but to a ſmall canton of the world.

(*k*) *The grace of God in truth.*] This, *in truth*, may be referr'd to their knowledge; and then it ſhould be render'd, *ſince you truly knew the grace of God*: But St. *Paul* ſeems here to mean the *true grace of God*, as the Goſpel is called, 1 *Pet.* v. 12. By the *true grace*, or unmixed Goſpel, *of God*, he probably intends what was chiefly upon his mind, God's great favour to the *Gentiles* in receiving them to be his people, without their ſubmitting

to

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

8 Who alſo declared unto us your love in the Spirit.
9 For this cauſe we alſo, ſince the day we heard *it*, do not ceaſe to pray for you, and to deſire that ye might be filled with the knowledge of his will, in all wiſdom and ſpiritual
10 underſtanding: That ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleaſing, being fruitful in every good work, and increaſing in the knowledge of

miniſter of Chriſt in doing you ſervice; who alſo declared unto me the love you bear to me upon a ſpiritual account (*l*).) And for this cauſe, ſince the day I heard theſe things (*m*), I have not ceaſed to pray for you, and to deſire that you may, with reſpect to the knowledge of his will, and gracious purpoſe toward the *Gentiles*, be filled with all wiſdom and ſpiritual underſtanding (*n*): That underſtanding the great kindneſs of God, you may be the more excited to a worthy and grateful obedience, which will be moſt pleaſing to God (*o*): Being in order hereunto fruitful in every good work,

8. 9. 10.

NOTES.

to circumciſion and the *Jewiſh* Law. This he ſeems eſpecially to call the *truth of the Goſpel*, and the *truth*. Compare *Gal.* ii. 5, 14. —— iii. 1. —— v. 7. *Tit.* i. 14.

8 (*l*) Ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι. *Love in the Spirit.*] Though ſome few copies here add ἁγίῳ; yet it may be doubted, whether the Holy Ghoſt be intended; for it is not unlikely that he means, that their love to him was purely upon a *ſpiritual* account, for the ſake of the doctrine he taught; they not having reaſon to love him upon any inferior conſideration, ſince they had never ſeen him. Compare *Chap.* ii. 1, 5.

9 (*m*) Ἠκούσαμεν. *We heard it.*] Our tranſlators by inſerting *it*, ſhow that they thought this verſe ſtood connected with *v.* 7, 8. whereas thoſe two verſes are rather a parentheſis, and this ninth verſe is to be joined with verſe the ſixth. This ſeems clear from what he ſays, *that ye might be filled with the knowledge of* his *will.* The αὐτοῦ, *his*, here relates to God, mentioned in the end of verſe the ſixth; and conſequently the ſenſe is better ſupplied by *theſe things*, that is, all the good things he had before-mentioned concerning them, *ver.* 3——6.

(*n*) *That ye might be filled with the knowledge of his will, in all wiſdom and ſpiritual underſtanding.*] Comparing this with *Eph.* i. 8, 9. it appears, that in both places is meant a comprehenſive view of the will of God, or as he there calls it, the *myſtery of his will*; that is, that will of God which was kept ſecret before, but was now reveled by the Goſpel; that is, his purpoſe of calling the *Gentiles*, and making out of them a people and inheritance to himſelf, in his kingdom under the Meſſiah. The *ſpiritual underſtanding* is an underſtanding of ſpiritual things, or ſuch things as were reveled by the Spirit, of which the foreſaid myſtery was one. He ſeems to mean the ſame thing, *Eph.* i. 17. where he calls it a *revelation.* See Mr. *Locke* on that place. St. *Paul* ſhows himſelf very deſirous the *Coloſſians* ſhould throughly underſtand, and acknowledge this myſtery, *Chap.* ii. 1, 2.

10 (*o*) Περιπατῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἀξίως τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρέσκειαν. *That ye might walk worthy of the Lord to all-pleaſing.*] As περιπατῆσαι is put for εἰς τὸ περιπατῆσαι, (juſt as καταοικῆσαι is put for εἰς τὸ καταοικῆσαι, *Eph.* iii. 17.) this is well rendered; and what he here mentions is the chief thing he deſired for the *Coloſſians*; the other things, both before and after, being conſider'd as ſubſervient to it. Farther, the *Lord* here, if we follow the ſame reading with

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

work, and increasing in the knowledge of
11. God (*p*); being agreeably to that glorious power which has been already exerted toward you (*q*), strengthned and enabled with joyfulness to exercise patience and long-suffer-
12. ing under your trials; giving thanks to the Father, who hath vouchsafed you to share in
13. that light he affords to his saints, and has freed you from your former *Gentile* darkness, and translated you into the kingdom of his dear Son (*r*).

TEXT.

God; Strengthned with all 11
might according to his glorious power, unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness: Giving thanks 12
unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: Who hath 13
deliver'd us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son.

SECT.

NOTES.

with our translation, will probably denote God the Father, as that term is used concerning him, *Rev.* xi. 15. *The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our* Lord, *and of his Christ*; and in many other places: But as the *vulg. Latin*, the *Syriac*, the *Ethiopic*, and one MS. read here Θεῦ, *God*, instead of Κυρίου, *the Lord*, and the same is confirmed by some ancient writers, that may perhaps be the true reading. Compare the last clause of the verse.

(*p*) Ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφορούντες, καὶ αὐξανόμενοι εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ.] Our translation is here just, only let it be observed, that the καρποφορούντες & αὐξανόμενοι here, the δυναμούμενοι, *v.* 11. & εὐχαριστοῦντες, *v.* 12. are all to be taken to agree with ὑμεῖς, the nominative case understood before πληρωθῆτε, *v.* 9. and so all that is here said in the several clauses, to which these participles belong, is, as was before hinted, to be consider'd as means in order to their being filled with the knowledge of God's will, and so in order to the highest end mention'd, the walking worthy of the Lord.

Farther, Dr. *Mills* alleges many authorities for reading either τῇ ἐπιγνώσει, or ἐν τῇ ἐπιγνώσει. Unless one of them be preferr'd to the common reading, the difference of the manner of expression between ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ and εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν, might incline one to put the *comma* after αὐξανόμενοι, and to render it, *being fruitful and increasing in every good work for the knowledge of God*, i. e. for the acquiring that knowledge. St. *Paul* had thanked God before, *v.* 6. that the Gospel brought forth fruit among the *Colossians*; and it seems natural to suppose, that when he prays here that they might bring forth fruit in every good work, he does not pray barely for what they already did, but for a farther increase of it. See 1 *Thess.* iv. 1, 10. The words thus understood inform us, that a holy conversation is very serviceable to dispose men to acquire the knowledge of God.

11 (*q*) Κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. *According to his glorious power.*] The power of God in converting the *Gentiles* is spoken of by St. *Paul* in very lofty terms, both here and *Eph.* iii. 20. He compares it to that which he exerted in raising Christ from the dead, *Eph.* i. 19. which will serve to illustrate this place.

12, 13 (*r*) The *us* in these two verses, and the *we* in the next, manifestly signify the *Gentile* converts.

Farther, these two verses, beside their reference to the end before-mention'd, may be consider'd as partly occasioned by what he had said, *v.* 11. and so he here shews the *Colossians*, what reason they had to bear their troubles with *joyfulness*, and puts them in a way

SECT. III.

CHAP. I. 14—23.

CONTENTS.

ST. *Paul* having in the 13th verſe mention'd God's dear Son, he here, according to his uſual manner, runs out immediately into a digreſſion concerning him; but it is ſuch a digreſſion as is very much to his main purpoſe, *viz.* to eſtabliſh them in their adherence to Chriſt, and make them ſenſible how unreaſonable their attempt was, who endeavour'd to ſeduce them from him. Nothing could be ſaid more proper for this end, than what he here ſays, to ſhow the pre-eminence and headſhip of Chriſt in all reſpects, even above the angels, whom ſome would have perſuaded them to worſhip, and to ſet forth his tranſcendent excellency, and the greatneſs of the advantages which the *Gentiles* receiv'd by him.

TEXT.

14 IN whom we have redemption through his blood, *even* the for-
15 giveneſs of ſins. Who is the image of the inviſible God, the firſt born of every creature:

PARAPHRASE.

IN this dear Son of God we have redemption by his blood, even the forgiveneſs of tranſgreſſions. And well may his blood be thought to be of ſo great efficacy and virtue, ſince he is the moſt lively viſible image of the Father, who is the inviſible God (*s*); and ſince he was the

14.

15.

NOTES.

way to do it, *viz.* by being thankful to God for his great kindneſs to them, in calling them out of their former *Gentile* ſtate of ignorance and darkneſs, while they were ſubjects of the devil's kingdom, into the kingdom of his dear Son, wherein they had light, being now no longer *darkneſs, but light in the Lord*, Eph. v. 8. and thus they were admitted into the *inheritance of the ſaints*, or of God's people. Compare *Acts* xxvi. 17, 18. And therefore the *light* mentioned in the twelfth verſe, is to be explained from the darkneſs it is oppoſed to in the thirteenth, and ſignifies the *light* which the ſaints have by the Goſpel in this world.

15 (*s*) *The image of the inviſible God.*] The Father alone is repreſented in the New Teſtament as the *inviſible* God. See *John* i. 18. —v. 37. —vi. 46. 1 *Tim.* i. 17. —vi. 16. *Heb.* xi. 27. 1 *John* iv. 12, 20. Chriſt is never repreſented as inviſible, it might ſeem ſtrange if he ſhould, ſince he actually took upon him fleſh, and appeared and was ſeen in the world; which

PARAPHRASE.

the first being that was derived from him (*t*). And that he must be the first derived from him, is from hence evident, that all other beings were derived from God, the primary and supreme cause of all, thro' this his Son, by whom (*u*) as their immediate author all things (*w*) were created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or

TEXT.

For by him were all 16
things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they *be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him. And he

NOTES.

which are things the nature of the Father cannot possibly admit. His being called the *image of God* in this place, and 2 *Cor.* iv. 4. implies his being visible, and that the perfections of God do most eminently shine forth in him.

(*t*) Πρωτότοκ& πάσης κτίσεως. *The first born of every creature.*] This is fairly render'd by our translators, and indeed the word is never used in any other sense in the New Testament. It is true, that πρωτότοκ& is found sometimes used by profane authors in an active sense, as when applied to a dam the first time she brings forth; and accordingly some would render the expression here, *the first bringer forth of every creature*; but it may be question'd whether ever the word is thus used with a genitive case after it, and especially with such an adjective as *all* join'd with that genitive case. Who can find such an expression any where as this, *a dam that is the first bringer forth of* all *her off-spring*? If the word were here to be taken in this sense, St. *Paul's* meaning must be expressed by some such *Periphrasis* as this: "Christ is one, who the first time he brought forth any thing, brought "forth every creature;" which, I suppose, will hardly satisfy any man. But if, according to the constant use of this word in other places of the New Testament, we interpret the expression, that he was *begotten before all creatures*, it exactly agrees with the character Christ gives of himself, *Rev.* iii. 14. that he is ἀρχὴ τ κτίσεως, *the beginning of the creation of God*, that is, the first Being derived from God. St. *Paul's* argument, *v.* 16. is a full proof of his being begotten before all creatures; for he could not be otherwise, if he created them. And by another expression, *v.* 17. he seems to declare the same thing, *and he is before all things*. Farther, St. *Paul's* discourse being intended to establish the *Colossians* in their regard to Christ, and to prevent their being seduced from him by a pretence of the respect due to angels, *Chap.* ii. 18, 19. he acted very prudently, in giving him the highest and most lofty character; but it is not likely, that he would have cloathed this part of his character in an expression, which easily and naturally offers the sense our translators, and perhaps all others have given of it, if he thought that sense was really any disparagement to him.

16 (*u*) Ἐν αὐτῷ. *By him.*] The ἐν αὐτῷ here in the beginning of the verse, is the same with διὰ αὐτοῦ in the latter end; and both are easily explained, by comparing 1 *Cor.* viii. 6.

(*w*) *All Things.*] The interpretation which refers what is here said of our Saviour to the new creation, or the renovation of all things, is so forced and violent; that it can hardly be thought that men would have ever espoused it, but for the sake of an hypothesis. The reader may meet with a confutation of it in most commentators,

(*x*) *Whether*

TEXT.

17 is before all things, and by him all things consist.
18 And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence,

PARAPHRASE.

or dominions, or principalities, or powers (*x*): All things were created by him, and to be in subjection to him (*y*). He therefore must be before all things (*z*), and by him all things are preserved (*a*). And he is the head of the church, which is his body (*b*); and he is the beginning, the first who ever so rose from the dead, as not to die any more (*c*), that in all

17. 18.

NOTES.

(*x*) *Whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers.*] Mr. *Locke*, in his *Notes* upon *Eph.* iii. 10. says, that here, *Col.* i. 16. these signify good angels; nor can there, I think, be any doubt, that they must at least be comprehended as a chief part: But since he himself says the terms are sometimes used for those who are vested with any power, whether men or angels, 1 *Cor.* xv. 24. why may we not suppose St. *Paul* uses the terms here in the same latitude? Why may he not mean the visible and invisible thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers, that are in heaven and earth? It seems most natural to join his expressions thus together. His argument is by this more full, for his design, as appears by *v.* 18. is to prove Christ's pre-eminence to all; and nothing could be more pertinent to his purpose, than what he alleges, if thus understood; it being reasonable to suppose his authority must be superior to any in heaven and earth, since he made all those angels and men, which in either have any authority at all. See him on *Eph.* i. 21.

(*y*) Εἰς αὐτὸν. *For him.*] That is, *to be in subjection to him*, as it is express'd in the paraphrase; which I think is justified by what he says, *v.* 18. *That in all things he might have the pre-eminence.* By this it appears, that when God made all things by Christ, he did it with a design to rule and dispose of them by him. Compare *Heb.* i. 8.

17 (*z*) *He is before all things.*] This I take to be equivalent to what he had said before, that he is the *first born of every creature.* It was *that* he undertook to prove, and having alleged his argument to prove it in verse the 16th, he here draws his conclusion, which must be the same with the position he advanced and undertook to make good.

(*a*) Τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε. *By him all things consist.*] This is a new *medium* or argument, which St. *Paul* uses to prove the pre-eminence and supereminent dignity and authority of Christ, *viz.* That as God made all things by him, so he upholds and preserves all things by him too. The same is asserted, *Heb.* i. 3. where he is said to *uphold all things by the word of his* Father's *power*; for the author of that Epistle seems to distinguish in that same verse αὐτοῦ & ἑαυτοῦ.

18 (*b*) *The head of the body.*] He had proved his superiority to all the creatures by his making and sustaining them; and now by a third argument he confirms his full authority over the church, and that is by God's constitution and appointment at his resurrection. The insisting expressly upon this was very agreeable to his grand design, to confirm the *Colossians* in their regard to Christ, he being apprehensive of some danger of their being drawn off from him, and brought to substitute some other heads in his room. See *Chap.* ii. 19.

(*c*) Ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχὴ, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. *Who is the beginning, the first born from the dead.*] That Christ was the first who rose from the dead, never to die any more, is plain. Compare *Rev.* i. 5. 1 *Cor.* xv. 20, 23, *Acts* xxvi. 23. But the other expression, *who is*

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

all reſpects *(d)* he might be chief, being veſted
19. by God with the higheſt authority. For it
ſeemed good to God the Father (*e*) to inhabit
all

For it pleaſed *the Father* 19
that in him ſhould all
fulneſs dwell. And (ha-

NOTES.

the beginning, is much more obſcure. It ſeems beſide his purpoſe to ſpeak of him here as the *beginning*, with reference to the creatures in general, he having done with that, which he had ſufficiently expreſſed, *v.* 16, 17. It muſt therefore either refer to the Church juſt before mentioned, *q. d.* he is the beginning of that church of which he is the head; or elſe, as ſeems moſt probable, it may be explained from what follows, *the firſt born from the dead*, and ſo it may mean that he is ἀρχὴ τῶν τεθνεώτων [or ἀναστάντων] ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, and the ἀρχὴ will then be the ſame as ἀπαρχὴ. He is the *firſt fruits* of thoſe that riſe from the dead. So 1 *Cor.* xv. 20. *Chriſt is raiſed from the dead, and become the* firſt fruits *of them that ſlept.* It is indeed very poſſible, that we ought in this place to read ἀπαρχὴ, inſtead of ἀρχὴ, which would make all eaſy; for ſo *Chryſoſtom* read it in his Copy, as do alſo two MSS. mentioned by Dr. *Mills*.

(*d*) Ἐν πᾶσι.] This will bear either our common tranſlation, *in all things*, or that in the margin, *among all*, i. e. angels and men; but I prefer the former, as appearing more agreeable to St. *Paul*'s argument. 'Tis reaſonable, according to his former argument alone, to conclude that he muſt have a pre-eminence over both men and angels, becauſe he made them both; but by this new argument from his headſhip over the church at his reſurrection, a juſt occaſion is taken to ſpeak of the pre-eminence he has *in all things*, that is in all reſpects, not only as the Maker of all things, but as the Mediator, raiſed from the dead.

19 (*e*) *The Father.*] This not appearing in the *Greek*, but being only ſupplied by our tranſlators, has given a handle to ſome to find fault with them; but I think they may be eaſily defended. It is indeed true, as ſome pretend, that the *Greek* would bear another rendering; that is, it would truly do ſo, provided this verſe were to be conſider'd by it ſelf, without any relation to the context. But as it now ſtands in connection with the next verſe, it ſeems neceſſary to render it as our tranſlators have done; for as ἀποκαταλλάξαι, *v.* 20. is in conſtruction to be join'd with εὐδόκησε, *v.* 19. the things that are mentioned, *v.* 19, 20. muſt be underſtood to be all of them repreſented as pleaſing the ſame perſon; and who can that perſon be but God the Father? I find ſome of my learned friends are of opinion, that it ought to be render'd, *For it pleaſed him*, i. e. Chriſt, &c. Nor do I think it any material objection againſt their interpretation, that they read αὐτῷ for αὐτῷ, and *v.* 20. αὐτὸν for αὐτὸν, &c. for as the *Spirits* are not in any ancient MSS. they are at their liberty to chooſe either of them, as they judge it will beſt ſuit the Apoſtle's deſign. But this ſeems an unanſwerable objection againſt that interpretation, that St. *Paul* is here giving a reaſon of the headſhip and dominion of Chriſt, and that this interpretation reſolves that reaſon into the will and pleaſure of Chriſt, which is contrary to the whole ſtrain and tenor of the ſcriptures, that always reſolve it into the will of the Father. It is urged, that our tranſlators are forced to go as far back as *v.* 12. for this nominative caſe to εὐδόκησε, which they have inſerted, which is not to be allowed, unleſs the intermediate verſes were a parentheſis. But this nominative caſe may be fetched from αὐτῷ in *v.* 13. nor does any violence ſeem to be offer'd to the text, if we ſuppoſe St. *Paul*, upon his having mention'd *God's dear Son*, v. 13. to expatiate as he uſes to do, concerning Chriſt; and having at laſt aſſerted the headſhip of this dear Son of God, to bring in his proof of it in this manner. His being *God's dear Son*, is to be carried through all the things ſaid of

TEXT.

20 ving made peace through the blood of his croſs) by him to reconcile all things unto himſelf, by him, I ſay, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And

PARAPHRASE.

all fulneſs by Chriſt *(f)*, and it pleaſed him, when he had made peace by the blood of Chriſt's croſs, by Chriſt to reconcile all things to one another, for his own glory, whether they are things on earth, or things in heaven *(g)*. And 20.

NOTES.

him, *v.* 14—18. and the headſhip and dominion conferred upon him is a ſignal inſtance of it, and brings the readers thoughts back to the very place at which the digreſſion began, He hath *tranſlated us into the kingdom of his dear Son*; and thus it ſeems natural to ſupply the nominative caſe, as our tranſlators have done.

(*f*) *That in him ſhould all fulneſs dwell.*] If our tranſlators have rightly render'd the place, the *fulneſs* here ſpoken of will be the ſame with that mentioned, *Chap.* ii. 9. and will be there conſider'd. But the paraphraſe follows the tranſlation of *Caſtellio*; *Quoniam per eum viſum eſt patri omnem univerſitatem inhabitare.* His reaſon for this rendering is, that whenever an infinitive verb is in the New Teſtament joined with εὐδόκησε, it always denotes the action of him who is ſpoken of as pleaſed. This obſervation ſeems to be very juſt, and when *Beza* cenſured his tranſlation of this place, he very judiciouſly defended it. See his *defence* at the end of his tranſlation, in *fol. p.* 464, &c. He ſeems not to have hit the true ſenſe of πλήρωμα, but otherwiſe nothing can be truer in it ſelf, or more to St. *Paul*'s purpoſe, than this rendering. For he then muſt be underſtood to aſſert, that God therefore appointed Chriſt to be the head of the church, that he might *in* or *by him* inhabit *all fulneſs*; that is, the whole church or body of Chriſt. Nothing can more ſuit the language of St. *Paul* elſewhere, *Eph.* ii. 21, 22. *In* or *through whom* [Chriſt] *all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy* temple *in the Lord.* A *temple* is an houſe for God to inhabit, as therefore he in the next words explains himſelf; *In*, or *through whom* [Chriſt] *you alſo are builded together for an* habitation of God, *through the Spirit.* Nor can it ſeem ſtrange, that the church ſhould here be called *fulneſs*, ſince it is ſo called, *Eph.* i. 23. *The* fulneſs *of him that filleth all in all.* Mr. *Locke* underſtands that expreſſion to be uſed of Chriſt, and it is no doubt in a ſenſe true of him; but conſidering the lofty terms wherein he had juſt before ſpoken of God the Father, deriving all things from him even that were in Chriſt himſelf, and comparing this expreſſion with what he ſays of the Father, *Eph.* iv. 6. *One God and Father of all, who is above all, and* through *all, and* in you *all,* and with 1 *Cor.* xii. 6. *It is the ſame God who worketh all in all:* I ſay, conſidering theſe things, I am inclined much rather to underſtand the Father to be meant by *him that filleth all in all.* But to return to the Text before us, if this interpretation be allowed, a very good account may be given why the *all* is here added, and it is ſaid that it pleaſed the Father to inhabit *all fulneſs* by Chriſt, becauſe there was a double fulneſs for him to inhabit; namely, a fulneſs of the *Jews*, and a fulneſs of the *Gentiles*, which are both mentioned, *Rom.* xi. 12, 25.

20 (*g*) *Things in earth, or things in heaven.*] If the hint Mr. *Locke* gives in his notes upon *Eph.* i. 10, 20. were certain, that by the *things in earth, and in heaven*, were meant the *Gentiles* and the *Jews*, there would be no difficulty in explaining this verſe to this purpoſe: "When the Father had made peace between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, by the Blood of his Son's "croſs, it pleaſed him to reconcile them both to himſelf by his Son." There are two things that might incline one the rather to admit that interpretation. (1.) That it nicely agrees with St. *Paul*'s ſubject, for he is now treating of Chriſt's headſhip over the church,

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

21. And particularly you, who were ſometimes alienated from (*b*), and enemies to his church, in your mind thro' wicked works (*i*), hath
22. he now reconciled in the body of Chriſt's fleſh thro' his death (*k*), that ſo he might preſent you

TEXT.

21 you that were ſometime alienated, and enemies in *your* mind by wicked works,
yet now hath he reconci-
led, in the body of his fleſh 22
through death, to preſent
you holy and unblameable,

NOTES.

v. 18. (2.) He has fully declared the ſame thing in the parallel Epiſtle, which gives ſo much light to this, *Eph.* ii. 14, 15, 16. *He is our peace, who hath made both* [Jews and Gentiles] *one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having aboliſhed in his fleſh the enmity, even the law of commandments, contained in ordinances, for to make in himſelf, of twain, one new man, ſo making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the croſs, having ſlain the enmity thereby*, &c. But after all, as that great man is not poſitive in his interpretation, and the texts he alleges ſeem not ſufficient to ſupport it, it will not be amiſs to try, whether we can upon another foot give a good account of the verſe. So much of the former interpretation is to be taken in here, that the *things in earth* may well ſignify the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and theſe he has reconciled to one another; and the only difficulty is how he hath reconciled both theſe with the *things in heaven*. By the *things in heaven* I underſtand the good angels, between whom and himſelf God could not make peace by the blood of Chriſt's croſs, becauſe they had never revolted, or broken peace with him. The only reconciliation therefore that could be made as to them, is the reconciling them to us; and this was done by the blood of Chriſt, as thereby our peace was made with God, and the cauſe of their diſpleaſure againſt us, as the enemies of God, thereupon ceaſed; ſo that God, by the death of his Son, has made them of enemies to become our friends, and they are ready to perform all friendly offices towards us, *Heb.* i. 14. And as our Lord declares upon his reſurrection, that *all power was given him in heaven, and in earth*, Matth. xxviii. 18. and we and they are now both under one head, we are ſpoken of as making one ſociety with them, and therefore we are ſaid, *Heb.* xii. 22. to be *come to an innumerable company of angels*. Now all this God is ſaid to have done, εἰς αὐτὸν, *to himſelf*, which I think may very well be expreſſed more fully in his own words, *Philip.* ii. 11. *to the glory of God the Father*; where he is treating likewiſe of this headſhip of Chriſt over all things in heaven, and in earth. This ſeems to be what the Apoſtle means in this place, and that *Eph.* i. 10. which may be compared with it: *That in the diſpenſation of the fulneſs of times, he might gather together in one all things in Chriſt, both which are in heaven, and which are in earth, even in him.*

21 (*b*) *Alienated.*] That is from that body he had ſpoken of before, *v.* 18. The ſame thing he expreſſes, *Eph.* ii. 12. *Being aliens from the commonwealth of* Iſrael.

(*i*) *Enemies in your mind by wicked works.*] That is, the *Coloſſians*, as other *Gentiles*, were enemies to the church of God, τῇ διανοίᾳ, in their underſtandings and judgments, being zealous for idolatry; and as they did not like his worſhip, God gave them up to commit the moſt enormous crimes. See *Rom.* i. 21——32. The great cauſe of the enmity and diſtance between them and the *Jews*, was the ceremonial Law; and Chriſt, by aboliſhing this in his death, ſlew the enmity, and reconciled them together, *Eph.* ii. 15, 16.

22 (*k*) Νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, διὰ τοῦ θανάτου. *Hath he now reconciled in the body of his fleſh, by death.*] Two things may appear ſtrange in reading this. 1. The expreſſion, *the body of his fleſh*, which I think is not to be met with elſewhere, and leaves commentators at a loſs for a good explication; it ſignifying his *fleſhy body*, as oppoſed to his myſtical body, ſay ſome; or as oppoſed to his *glorified body*, ſay others. 2. The

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	
and unreproveable in his	you holy and unblameable, and unreproveable	
23 ſight: If ye continue in the	in his ſight. And ſuch I am perſwaded you	23
	ſhall	

NOTES.

joining that expreſſion, *in the body of his fleſh*, with that which immediately follows it, *through death*: For it is evident the former, as it is commonly underſtood, ſignifies the very ſame thing with the latter. I own St. *Paul* does ſometimes expreſs the ſame thing ſeveral ways, but it is not eaſy to imagine, what end or deſign could be ſerved by it in this place. Theſe things may occaſion an inquiry, whether he might not perhaps mean ſomewhat very different from what has been commonly ſuppoſed. It ſeems reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the reconciliation ſpoken of here, and *Eph.* ii. 16. are the ſame, and upon comparing the two texts together one cannot but obſerve, that ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι cloſely follows ἀποκαταλλάξῃ there, juſt as ἐν τῷ σώματι follows ἀποκατήλλαξεν in this place. Now nothing can be more agreeable than to ſuppoſe thoſe two expreſſions, ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι, and ἐν τῷ σώματι mean the ſame thing, provided any good account can be given of τ σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, which is added to the latter. If way be given to this interpretation, this expreſſion of *his fleſh* muſt ſome way or other ſignify his church, which naturally brings to mind the repreſentation he makes of the church, *Eph.* v. 23——32. as the ſpouſe of Chriſt, and conſequently as his fleſh: *No man*, ſays he, *ever yet hated his own fleſh, but nouriſheth and cheriſheth it, even as the Lord the church; for we are members of his body, of* his fleſh, *and of his bones. For this cauſe ſhall a man leave his father, and mother, and ſhall be joined unto his wife, and they two ſhall be* one fleſh. *This is a great myſtery, but I ſpeak concerning* Chriſt *and* his church. It is hence plain, that he repreſents the church as Chriſt's fleſh. Now this having been much upon his mind in writing that Epiſtle, as appears from his inlarging upon it in ſo many verſes, though it came in only incidentally, the thought may be ſuppoſed to have remained ſtrong and lively, when he wrote this Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*; and that might lead him to ſpeak of the church, as the *body of Chriſt's fleſh*, that is, to ſpeak of the whole church, comprizing all, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, as making up that one body which is Chriſt's ſpouſe or wife. It adds ſome degree of probability to this interpretation, that this paſſage is joined with the very ſame thought he had expreſſed in uſing that compariſon, in his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*; and therefore it is the more likely, that that compariſon did then actually occur to his mind. Let me ſet down the two places, that I may compare them together for the farther clearing this matter.

Eph. v. 27.

Ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἔνδοξον τ ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ἔχουσαν σπίλον ἢ ῥυτίδα ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων, ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ ἄμωμος.

Col. i. 22.

Παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους, καὶ ἀμώμους, καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.

I have followed the vulgar *Latin*, the *Alexandrian*, *Clermont*, and many other copies, and ancient commentators in reading in the *Epheſians*, αὐτὸς, inſtead of αὐτῷ; by the way I doubt not, that αὐτὸν, meaning Chriſt, though not expreſſed, is to be underſtood as preceding παραστῆσαι in the *Coloſſians*. And then nothing can be clearer than the correſpondence and reſemblance of the two places. Ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τ ἐκκλησίαν, anſwers to παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, that is, ἑαυτῷ. Again, ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ ἄμωμος in *Epheſians*, anſwers to ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους in *Coloſſians*. The reſt that is ſaid to the *Epheſians*, *a glorious church, not having ſpot or wrinkle, or any ſuch thing*, is all ſummarily compriſed in the ſhorter Epiſtle, that to the *Coloſſians*, in that one word ἀνεγκλήτους, *unreproveable*. So that the thoughts, and many of the words, are the ſame in both places.

After

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

shall be found, since (*l*) you continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and are not moved away from the hope, which, as *Gentiles*, you have by the mystery of the Gospel, in which you have been already instructed, and which has been every where preached; and in preaching of which I *Paul* have been more eminently employed (†).

faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, *and* which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister.

NOTES.

After all, I am not positive in this interpretation; but leave it to the considerate reader, to compare it with the other accounts that are given of the place.

23 (*l*) Εἴγε ἐπιμένετε. *If ye continue.*] If this had been St. *Paul*'s design, I believe he would rather have used the future tense; and therefore I choose to render εἴγε by *since*, as it often signifies. St. *Paul* was persuaded that the *Colossians* would be presented holy and unblameable, and unreproveable in his sight, *since* he saw how firm they continued in the faith. A parallel kind of reasoning he uses, *Philip.* i. 6, 7. I think this rendering is necessary, because of the νυνὶ in the next verse; and because of what he says of them, *Chap.* ii. 5. Thus *Ælian* uses the word, *Var. Hist. Lib.* xii. *c.* 25. where he gives this as a reason why he thought himself obliged to speak of the *Romans*, εἴγε Ῥωμαῖός εἰμι, that is, *since*, or *for*, *I am a* Roman.

(†) *Whereof I* Paul *am made a minister.*] St. *Paul*, as the Apostle of the *Gentiles*, was especially intrusted with a revelation from God, concerning the calling them; and as this was what he preached more than any other of the Apostles did, he calls it *his Gospel*, Rom. xvi. 25. And when he speaks so much of his being a minister hereof, as *v.* 25. and in many other places, he does not do it out of vanity or boasting; but this was of great use to his present purpose, as carrying a strong reason with it, why the *Gentiles*, and particularly the *Colossians*, should rather believe him, to whom, as their Apostle, this doctrine was made manifest and committed to be preached, than the *Jews*; from whom it had been concealed and kept as a mystery, and was not it self to be discover'd but by a divine revelation. See *Eph.* iii. 7, 8, 9. and Mr. *Locke*'s notes thereupon.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

CHAP. I. 24. — II. 3.

CONTENTS.

ST. *Paul* having received, by a ſpecial revelation, the myſtery of God's calling the *Gentiles*, and a commiſſion to publiſh it, had by his zealous preaching it now brought himſelf into bonds, thro' the great malice and rage of the *Jews* againſt him upon that account; as may be ſeen *Acts* xxi. 27, &c. Being in this caſe, he was apprehenſive that the *Coloſſians* might be offended and diſcouraged, and ſo be more liable to impreſſions from the *Jewiſh* converts, who might make an ill improvement of his trouble, and take a handle from thence to urge them to ſubmit to the bondage of the ceremonial law. To prevent this is the deſign of this ſection, wherein he ſhows them what account he made of his ſufferings, and how much, notwithſtanding whatever he had met with, he was ſtill concern'd to ſpread and maintain that doctrine which he had taught.

TEXT.	*PARAPHRASE.*	
24 WHO now rejoice in my ſufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the	NOW (*m*) I rejoice in my ſufferings, upon the account of you *Gentiles* (*n*); and I who formerly procured affliction to Chriſtians,	24

NOTES.

24 (*m*) Νῦν χαίρω. *Who now rejoice.*] Some ancient MSS. read ὃς νῦν χαίρω, with whom the vulgar *Latin* agrees, as do our tranſlators, rendering it, *who now rejoice*; but the greater and better part of the MSS. and ancient commentators leave out the ὃς, which alſo is not render'd by the *Syriac*; and following theſe which ſeem to me to give the better reading, I have here begun a new ſection. Farther, the meaning of this *now* is to be learned from the foregoing verſe, and is plain enough, if we render it, *ſince ye continue in the faith*; that is, St. *Paul* rejoiced in his ſufferings for them *now* he ſaw they continued in the faith. But the reader is hinder'd from perceiving what *now* ſignifies, when the foregoing verſe is render'd, *if ye continue*, &c.

(*n*) Ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. *For you.*] Nothing could be more adapted to anſwer St. *Paul*'s deſign, than the conſiderations he alleges. His deſign is to prevent their being diſcouraged at his afflictions; and to prevent it, he lets them know that he rejoiced in them himſelf; and ſo implies that they ought alſo, following his example, and concluding there was ſome-

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

Christians, do now my self suffer persecution, and I am now filling up the measure, and enduring what is behind of the afflictions allotted me in this life, in the cause of Christ (*o*), for the sake
25. of his body which is the church: Of which church I am made a minister, according to the trust which God has committed to me for the sake of you *Gentiles* (*p*), that I might fully preach and make known the word of
26. God: I mean the mystery which has been kept secret from former ages and generations (*q*), but is now made manifest to his saints:

TEXT.

afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for his body's sake, which is the church.
Whereof I am made a 25
minister, according to the dispensation of God, which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God: *Even* the mystery 26
which hath been hid from ages, and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints:

To

NOTES.

somewhat honourable in them; and especially should they take heart and rejoice, since his sufferings were for them, and so were a glory to them, as he tells the *Ephesians*, Chap. iii. 13. *I desire that you faint not at my tribulations, which are your glory.* In like manner he speaks to the *Philippians*, Chap. ii. 17, 18. *Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all. For the same cause also do ye joy, and rejoice with me.*

This *for you* can't be understood as though his sufferings were in any peculiar manner upon the account of the *Colossians*, among whom he had probably never been, but only as they were *Gentiles*, and so together with all other *Gentiles*, were alike concerned in the doctrine he preached, and for which he suffered; whence *Eph.* iii. 1. he stiles himself *the prisoner* (so we render δέσμιος for want of a proper *English* term; for in the publick prison he was not, but only in bonds in his own house with a keeper, *Acts* xxviii. 20, 30. compared) *of Jesus Christ for* you Gentiles.

(*o*) Καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου. *And fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my body.*] The *afflictions of Christ* in this place, are the afflictions which are indured in the cause of Christ. Thus 2 *Cor.* i. 5. *As the* sufferings of Christ *abound in us, so our consolation aboundeth also by Christ.* Compare *Philip.* iii. 10. 1 *Pet.* iv. 13. The ὑστερήματα therefore of these must be whatever afflictions Christ should still see fit to lay upon him in his cause, or for his name; as St. *Paul* knew from the words of Christ himself, that a large share was appointed him, *Acts* ix 16. Farther, the word ἀνταναπληρῶ is understood to intimate that St. *Paul* did now himself suffer, as he had formerly, before his conversion, made others suffer for Christ; and that this is the import of ἀντὶ many times in composition, to signify *vicissim*, cannot be doubted. Thus *Budæus, Comm. L. G.* explains ἀντιγυμνάζω, ἀντιλαμβάνω, ἀντιδωρέομαι, and ἀντιλογίζομαι. I owe this excellent interpretation to Monsieur *Le Clerc*, vid. *Art. Criticæ*, Part. II. Sect. 1. c. xii. p. 396.

25 (*p*) Compare herewith, *Eph.* iii. 2. 1 *Tim.* i. 11, 12.

26 (*q*) *The mystery which hath been hid from ages and generations.*] The expression of τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων is render'd by our translators, *Eph.* iii. 9. *The mystery hid from the beginning of the world*; but it is manifest from this place, where it

is

TEXT.

27 To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this myſtery among the Gentiles; which is Chriſt in you the hope
28 of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wiſdom; that we may preſent every man perfect

PARAPHRASE.

To whom God would make known how abundant the glory is of this myſtery (*r*) among the *Gentiles*, *viz.* That Chriſt is to you *Gentiles* become the procurer of glory, and the cauſe of your expecting and hoping for it. And him it is I preach, warning every Man, *Gentiles* as well as *Jews* (*s*), and teaching every man in all that wiſdom that is made known

27. 28.

NOTES.

is joined with ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, that it is rightly tranſlated here *hid from ages*, and that it ought to have been ſo tranſlated in that place alſo. The ſame thing is meant when he ſpeaks of the *revelation of the myſtery* χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, which we tranſlate, *kept ſecret ſince the world began*; but Mr. *Locke* better renders it *in the ſecular times*, that is, the times under the law. I ſhall here tranſcribe his remark upon the words, *Rom.* xvi. 25. becauſe it gives much light to this matter. " Why the times, *ſays he*, under the law, were called " χρόνοι αἰώνιοι, we may find a reaſon in their *jubilees*, which were αἰῶνες, *ſæcula*, or " ages, by which all the time under the Law was meaſured: And ſo χρόνοι αἰώνιοι is uſed, " 2 *Tim.* i. 9. *Tit.* i. 2. And ſo αἰῶνες are put for the times of the Law, or the *Jubilees*, " *Luke* i. 70. *Acts* iii. 21. 1 *Cor.* ii. 7. —— x. 2. *Eph.* iii. 9. *Col.* i. 26. *Heb.* ix. 26. And " ſo God is called *the Rock* עולמים αἰώνων, *of ages*, Iſa. xxvi. 4. in the ſame ſenſe that " he is called the *rock of* Iſrael, *Iſa.* xxx. 29. *i. e.* the ſtrength and ſupport of the *Jewiſh* " ſtate; for it is of the *Jews* the prophet here ſpeaks. So *Exod.* xxi. 6. לעולם εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, " ſignifies not as we tranſlate it *for ever*, but to the *Jubile*; which will appear if we compare " *Lev.* xxv. 39——41. and *Exod.* xxi. 2. Now that the times of the Law were the times " ſpoken of here by St. *Paul*, ſeems plain from that which he declares to have continued " a myſtery during all thoſe times, *viz.* God's purpoſe of taking in the *Gentiles* to be " his people under the Meſſiah; for this could not be ſaid to be a myſtery at any other " time, but during the time that the *Jews* were the peculiar people of God, ſeparated " to him from among the nations of the earth. Before that time there was no ſuch name " or notion of diſtinction, as *Gentiles*. Before the days of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, " the calling of the *Iſraelites* to be God's peculiar people, was as much a myſtery, as " the calling of others out of other nations was a myſtery afterwards. All that St. " *Paul* inſiſts on here, and in all the places where he mentions this myſtery, is to ſhew, " that though God had declared this his purpoſe to the *Jews*, by the predictions of his pro- " phets amongſt them, yet it lay concealed from their knowledge, 'twas a myſtery to " them, they underſtood no ſuch thing; there was not any where the leaſt ſuſpicion " or thought of it, till the Meſſiah being come, it was openly declared by St. *Paul* to " the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and made out by the writings of the prophets, which were now " underſtood.

27 (*r*) *The riches of the glory of this myſtery.*] This manner of ſpeaking concerning God's calling the *Gentiles*, is very familiar with St. *Paul*. Compare *Rom.* ix. 23. *Eph.* i. 7, 18. ——ii. 7. ——iii. 16. *Philip.* iv. 19.

28 (*s*) Πάντα ἄνθρωπον. *Every Man.*] This occurring no leſs than three times in the compaſs of this one verſe, ſhows that St. *Paul* laid a great ſtreſs upon it; and I think there can be no doubt he means, that he made no diſtinction between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, but applied himſelf indifferently to both.

Chap. II.

PARAPHRASE.

known by the Gospel (*t*); that so I may present (*u*) all to whom I preach without difference perfectly instructed in the doctrine and laws of Christ Jesus (*w*). And this is what I endeavour to accomplish, earnestly striving, according to his working, which powerfully and effectually worketh in me (*x*). For I would be very glad you should be informed how great my concern (*y*) is for you, and those of *Laodicea*, and such other *Gentiles* as never yet have had an opportunity of seeing me (*z*): That

TEXT.

in Christ Jesus; Whereunto I also labour, striving, according to his working which worketh in me mightily. For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and *for* them at Laodicea, and *for* as many as have not seen my face in

NOTES.

(*t*) Ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ. *In all wisdom.*] This may be understood of the manner in which he behaved himself in his preaching, that he did it *with all* the *wisdom* he was master of; but it seems rather to relate to the matter of his preaching, as it has that turn in the paraphrase. See *v.* 9.

(*u*) Παραστήσωμεν. *We may present.*] The meaning is, I labour that my ministry may have that effect upon all my hearers, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, as that every one of them may appear perfect in the sight of God. Nor need it seem strange, that he should speak of this *presenting* as his own act, since he uses a somewhat like expression elsewhere, 2 *Cor.* xi. 2. *I have espoused you to one husband, that I might* present *you as a chast virgin to Christ.* Farther, the expression here seems used in allusion to the offerings presented to God under the Law, and agrees with his manner of speech, *Rom.* xv. 16. *That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the* Gentiles, *ministring the Gospel of God, that the* Offering up *of the* Gentiles *might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.*

(*w*) *Perfect in Christ Jesus.*] Thus *Christ* elsewhere signifies the Doctrine or Laws of Christ, *Eph.* iv. 20. *Heb.* xiii. 8. He here hints, that they had not this perfection by the *Mosaick* Law.

29 (*x*) *According to his working, which worketh in me mightily.*] This might import the many signs and wonders, which God enabled him to perform, for the confirmation of the doctrine he preached. Compare *Gal.* ii. 8. 2 *Cor.* xiii. 3. or else the divine influence upon himself, whereby he was excited and enabled with such vast diligence, industry, and success, to preach the Gospel. Compare *Rom.* xv. 19. 1 *Cor.* xv. 10. The next verse seems to lead us rather to prefer the latter of these.

1 (*y*) Ἡλίκον ἀγῶνα. *What great conflict.*] Hereby is signified the great solicitude and concern St. *Paul* had upon his mind for them. Compare 2 *Cor.* xi. 2. The pains he took to preach the Gospel, and to assert their liberty against such as opposed it; the troubles and difficulties he now underwent upon this account, being actually in bonds for that cause, *Chap.* i. 24. —— iv. 3. and withal herein is comprehended the earnestness with which he prayed for them, *Chap.* i. 9.

(*z*) *As have not seen my face in the flesh.*] This alone seems sufficient to determine the matter, that St. *Paul* had never yet been at *Colosse*, *Laodicea*, and the parts thereabouts.

TEXT.

2 the flesh: That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ:
3 In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

PARAPHRASE.

That their hearts might be comforted, they being all firmly joined and compacted together in love (*a*), and for the attaining the highest and fullest assurance of this doctrine which I preach (*b*), and the acknowledging this mystery of God, even the Father, and of Christ (*c*): In whom are laid up all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. 2. 3.

NOTES.

2 (*a*) *Knit together in love.*] St. *Paul* thought, that the hearty love which Christians bore to one another, whereby they were joined together in a mutual concern for one another, would be a good means to fortify them against any ill impressions from seducers. Compare *Eph.* iv. 14, 15, 16. and by this he thought their comfort would be best secured, and they be able more easily to edify in Christian knowledge.

(*b*) *Unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding.*] The manner in which he speaks of this mystery, and heaps up expressions concerning it, shews how necessary he apprehended the knowledge of it to be. The sense is, that they might all concur in a full and certain persuasion, and publick profession of this doctrine.

(*c*) *The mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ.*] The only mystery here intended, is that mentioned before, *Chap.* i. 26, 27. in the belief of which he shews himself on all occasions so solicitous to establish the *Gentiles*. Had he here meant any other than that, he would have certainly told us what it was. This mystery is called the *mystery of God the Father*, as it well may be, since it was *hid in God*, Eph. iii. 9. and he made it known, *Eph.* i. 9. *Col.* i. 27. It is also called the *mystery of Christ*, *Col.* iv. 3. *Eph.* iii. 4. nor is it strange it should be denominated from him, who is himself the subject matter of it, it being *Christ among the* Gentiles, *the hope of glory*, Chap. i. 27. and who is the more immediate reveler of it, *Eph.* ii. 17. The Apostle here joins both together, as he might very properly do; though perhaps the chief reason why he chose here to add, *and of Christ*, was that he might the more handsomely fall into the following discourse concerning him.

COLOSSIANS.

SECT. V.

CHAP. II. 4—19.

CONTENTS.

HERE St. *Paul* comes directly to treat of that matter, which he chiefly designed in writing this Epistle. Tho' he was well pleased with the *Colossians* continuing hitherto so stedfast in the doctrine he had taught, and in maintaining the liberty they had by Christ, and had therefore bestowed very great commendations upon them; yet he was apprehensive of their being in danger from some of the *Jewish* converts, who were endeavouring to seduce and corrupt them. The points in which he judged them most liable to be deceived, were the pretended obligation of the *Gentiles* to submit to the *Mosaick* Law, and the *Jewish* Traditions, and to yield a worship to angels; against which with much earnestness he cautions them, showing them that they had in Christ all that they could pretend to seek for elsewhere, and that by having recourse to the Law, they forsook the substance, and embraced shadows only; that Christ had abolished the obligation to observe the Law, that was pretended; and they were obliged by their baptism, to refuse the submission urged upon them; and that by paying the respect to angels, which was recommended to them, they in effect renounced Christ as their head, upon whom alone their hopes ought to depend, as all their supplies were only derived from him. His discourse, tho' short, is yet admirably adapted to his subject; and sets forth with much magnificence the glorious advantages they had by Christ, above what could be expected from the Law.

PARAPHRASE.	*TEXT.*
4. AND the reason why I express such a concern for you, and represent all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge as laid up in Christ, is to prevent your being deluded by the plausible pretences	AND this I say, lest 4 any man should beguile you with enticing

TEXT.

5 words. For tho' I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit, joying, and beholding your order, and the stedfastness
6 of your faith in Christ. As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so
7 walk ye in him; rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.

PARAPHRASE.

pretences of such as would divert you from Christ. Nor would I have you think that I am over officious in giving you this caution, and that I write about a matter of which I am wholly ignorant, as having never been amongst you; for tho' it is indeed true, that I am absent in the flesh, and so cannot see with my bodily eyes what is done amongst you; yet I am as it were present with you in my spirit (*d*), and have a thro' insight into your affairs, as you may easily perceive by the commendations I give of your orderly behaviour, in maintaining your Christian liberty, and the stedfastness of your faith in Christ (*e*); whereby I testify the joy I have in my knowing this of you. As you have therefore already acknowledged Christ Jesus as your Lord, and submitted your selves to his instruction and government, persevere herein, ordering your whole course as he has directed, being firmly and closely united to him, as a tree is by its roots to the earth, and the parts of a building to its foundation; and being well established in the belief of the mystery of God, in calling the *Gentiles*, according as you have been instructed already by *Epaphras*; and in this manner improving in the belief of the love of God to you, offering thanksgivings to him. But take care that no

5.

6.

7.

NOTES.

5 (*d*) Ἐν πνεύματι. *In the Spirit.*] As this stands opposed to ἐν σαρκὶ, *in the flesh*, it seems most reasonable to understand it of St. *Paul*'s own spirit, and not, as some have thought, of the Holy Ghost. Compare 1 *Cor.* v. 3. 2 *Kings* v. 26.

(*e*) *Stedfastness of your faith in Christ.*] Considering that St. *Paul* did not esteem those *Gentiles* to be stedfast in the faith of Christ, who submitted to the ceremonial Law, *Gal.* v. 1, 2. it is but reasonable to understand him here, as commending the stedfastness of their faith in Christ in that respect, agreeably to what follows in this chapter. In like manner is faith to be understood, *v.* 7.

mall

Ch. II.

PARAPHRASE.

8. man make a prey of you, and seduce you from this your faith, thro' the vain deceit of philosophy, following the tradition of men, and the rudiments of the world, and not following Christ (*f*). And such care you had
9. need use, because by leaving Christ you will lose

TEXT.

Beware lest any man spoil 8
you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ: For 9

NOTES.

(*f*) Many are of the opinion, that St. *Paul* has here a respect to the Heathen philosophers, as well as the *Jewish* doctors, apprehending that both of them would use their endeavours to seduce the *Gentile* converts at *Colos*: But it hardly seems probable, that he thought the Christians there would be in much danger from the Heathen philosophers, who despised the Christian Religion for the sake of that little they knew of it, counting the doctrine concerning Christ crucified to be *foolishness*; and whose pride and stateliness made them disdain to dispute with such as had not the reputation of being themselves philosophers, and would much more make them shun any free conversation with such despicable people as the christians were in their eyes. And though an *Athenian* curiosity might make them willing to hear somewhat of it; yet, as we may see from the usage St. *Paul* himself met with, scorn and contempt were thought sufficient to serve instead of a formal dispute and grave confutation, *Acts* xvii. 18, 32. Nor were those philosophers likely to work much upon professed Christians, if they attempted it; for their avowed enmity to Christ, and his religion, would have been an antidote against the mischief which they might endeavour to do by their persuasions and arguments. What has been said of the heathen philosophers, is in a great measure applicable to all those *Jewish* doctors, who were professed enemies to Christ and his religion: Nay, *they* look'd upon themselves as bound, by their religion, to shun the conversation of uncircumcised *Gentiles*, Acts x. 28. John iv. 9. I think therefore it is most reasonable to suppose, that the seducers he would arm them against, were such *Jews* as made a profession of the Christian Religion, but yet retained a great fondness for their old religion, and therefore earnestly press'd the *Gentile* converts to join the Laws of *Moses* and Christ together. The respect these men pretended to have for Christ, would procure them much regard from Christians; and so render them the more fit instruments to seduce and pervert them. These were the greatest hinderers of the progress of the Gospel, and gave St. *Paul* the most trouble; and against these he takes much pains in most of his Epistles, to guard and fortify the *Gentile* converts. And if whatever we meet with in this chapter, relating to seducers, can be shown to be applicable to them; I suppose every one will allow that it is wholly superfluous to seek for any others as intended. There can, I think, be no doubt, that in speaking of the *tradition of men*, and the rudiments, στοιχεῖα, of the world, he had a respect to the things about which the *Jews* were exceeding zealous. This is true, whether we understand the *tradition of men*, and the *rudiments of the world*, to relate to one and the same thing, the Law of *Moses*; or whether we understand, as I think we rather ought, two distinct things to be intended. By the *tradition of men*, thus consider'd as distinct, are meant those rules which were devised by Men, by the *Jews* of former times; and which were not to be found in the written Law, though they pretended they were handed down to them from *Moses*. These they reckoned the hedge and fence of the Law, and made the observing them as necessary as the observing the precepts of the written law. Our Saviour severely condemned them

NOTES.

them upon this account, *Matth.* xv. 1——8. And St. *Paul* was himſelf, before his converſion, a great inſtance of zeal for theſe traditions; which, as his words ſhew, he judged of the higheſt account in the *Jewiſh* religion, *Gal.* i. 14. *I profited*, ſays he, *in* Judaiſm *above many of mine own age in my nation, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers.* And among theſe I would rank their worſhiping of angels, and any auſterities they any of them practiſed upon themſelves, which had no foundation in the *Moſaick* Law.

By the στοιχεῖα of the world he certainly means the ceremonial Law, both here and *v.* 20. as may appear by comparing *Gal.* iv. 3, 9. It may perhaps be thought a ſtrong objection againſt the making theſe two diſtinct heads of diſcourſe, that St. *Paul* muſt then be thought, in treating of them in his following diſcourſe, to have inverted the order in which he here ſets them down. But in anſwer it may be ſaid, that though that nicety is ſometimes preſcribed among the rules of oratory; yet a neglect of it may be found in all authors, and particularly in the ſacred writers. See *Matth.* xii. 22. *Philem. v.* 5. Mr. *Le Clerc*, in his ſupplement to Dr. *Hammond*, has ſhewn that the word στοιχεῖον ſignifies ſometimes a *Shadow*, which ſenſe does admirably ſuit St. *Paul*'s deſign, as any one muſt ſee, who carefully examines the context; for the σωματικῶς in the next verſe will then ſtand moſt exactly oppoſed to ſhadows. See the note upon it. And to the paſſages which he has produced for this uſe of the word στοιχεῖον, I would add this paſſage out of *Lucian*'s *Cronoſolon.* Νόμοι συμποτικοί· Λέγεις μὲν ὁπόταν τὸ στοιχεῖον ἐξάπαν ᾖ. Upon which there is this *Scholion* in *Grævius*'s edition, Τὸ ἀπὸ τῆ ἀκλίνῳ τῶ ἡλίκ τῶν σωμάτων ἀπεγραφομένην λέγει σκίαν, ὅτω γὰρ αὐτῶν στοιχεῖον ἐκάλουν. *He ſpeaks of the ſhadow of bodies, which was circumſcribed by the rays of the ſun, for that they called* στοιχεῖον. Beſides, this well agrees with the concluſion of his argument, *v.* 16, 17. *Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in reſpect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the ſabbath days* (which all belong to the ceremonial Law) *which are a ſhadow of things to come, but the body is of Chriſt.* One would gueſs, from his concluſion, that he had ſomewhere in his argument ſpoken of theſe things as ſhadows, as well as of Chriſt as the body or ſubſtance: But he has not done it at all, unleſs in the place under conſideration. So that the 17th verſe may well be taken for an explication of *v.* 8, 9. which would determine the στοιχεῖα to ſignify *Shadows*; which ſeems to be farther confirmed by this, that after he had expreſly called them ſo, uſing another word, σκία, he preſently, *v.* 20. returns to his former expreſſion: *If ye then be dead with Chriſt,* ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων, *from the ſhadows of the world.*

I know of only one objection againſt this interpretation, and that is, that though it is true, if St. *Paul* had only uſed this phraſe here and *v.* 20. the interpretation would have been eaſy and natural enough; yet it can hardly be ſo now, ſince he had uſed the ſame before in writing to the *Galatians*, Chap. iv. 3. where he is treating of the ſame thing he is here, *viz.* the ceremonial Law; and ſince there the στοιχεῖα are the firſt rudiments of inſtruction, or as we call them, the A. B. C. therefore in like manner we ſhould underſtand the ſame phraſe here.

I own the objection is very conſiderable, and kept me a good while in ſuſpence. All that I have to reply to it, is, that in the other Epiſtle, he treats indeed of the ceremonial Law, but it is under a quite different alluſion: There he repreſents the *Jews* as *minors*, or as little children put to ſchool; and Chriſtians, as grown men, come to a maturity in underſtanding and knowledge. See *Gal.* iv. 9. Whereas in the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, there is not the leaſt hint of any ſuch thing; but his diſcourſe evidently turns upon a comparing the Law to ſhadows, and Chriſt to the body or ſubſtance, as appears by *v.* 17. and therefore, ſince στοιχεῖα will allow this ſenſe, it ought to be embraced. We may obſerve, that he many times uſes the ſame phraſe in quite different ſenſes: So ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, *Eph.* i. 20. and vi. 12. muſt be differently underſtood: In like manner ἐν σαρκὶ has various ſenſes in ſeveral places. Mr. *Locke*, in his note on *Gal.* iv. 3. gives a good reaſon why he ſpeaks of theſe things as being *of the world*; "Becauſe, *ſays he*, the obſervances and diſcipline of the Law, led them not beyond the "things of this world, into the poſſeſſion or taſte of their ſpiritual and heavenly inheritance.

This

Chap. II.

PARAPHRASE.

lose all divine blessings; for all those blessings which proceed from the Godhead, and wherewith we are filled (g), dwell in Christ truly and

TEXT.

in him dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead.

NOTES.

This being now supposed, that the tradition of men, and the rudiments, or rather shadows of the world, are intirely *Jewish*; the *philosophy* and *vain deceit* here mentioned must intirely belong to them also: For that *philosophy* and *vain deceit*, by which he feared lest any one should make a prey of them, was *after*, or *according to that tradition, and those elements or shadows*; and consequently was used by such as were fond of those things. That many of the *Jewish* converts might be acquainted with the Heathen philosophy, is easy to be believed, since this was then common among the *Jews*, who blended it with their religion; as may be seen by many passages in *Josephus*, and many more in *Philo*. These converts from *Judaism*, St. *Paul* thought most dangerous to those who from among the *Gentiles* believed, as one may perceive by many passages in his Epistles, *Tit.* i. 10, 14. —iii. 9. 1 *Tim.* i. 4, 6, 7. —vi. 20. Nay, the chief design of the Epistles to the *Romans*, *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, and *Philippians*, is to arm them against such seducers; and so it is likewise of this Epistle to the *Colossians*, as I hope more fully and clearly to shew under the next section. This place, as it stands with the context, deserves to be compared with *Eph.* iv. 14, 15, 16.

9 (g) Πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆ θεότητος. *All the fulness of the Godhead.*] This expression does not signify *all the perfections that belong to the Godhead*; nor is that sense countenanced by any the like expression, that I can remember, in the whole Bible. Indeed, the term *fulness* connotes some vessel wherein that fulness is contained, and that the fulness is somewhat different from the vessel which contains it; which may, for ought I know, be the reason why no such *fulness* is ever attributed to God; but always when a fulness is ascribed to him, it is that *fulness* wherewith he *fills* other beings. The *fulness* therefore *of the Godhead*, I think, is not to be understood of any immanent fulness of the Godhead, but of that abundance of blessings wherewith the Godhead fills us; just as we have a somewhat like phrase, v. 19. *increaseth with the increase of God*; surely not with any increase in the blessed God himself, but with that increase which he effects and produces in us. It is the same thing which he calls, *All the fulness of God*, Eph. iii. 19. *That ye might be filled with all the fulness of God*, i. e. all such fulness as God is wont to bestow, a fulness not of one single gift, but of all the gifts which are needful for Christians. In like manner, *Eph.* i. 23. the church is called the *fulness of him that filleth all in all*, which I understand, as I said before, of the Father; but supposing it meant of the Son, it is still such a fulness as I speak of, not an immanent, but a transient fulness, such a fulness wherewith he fills the church: And thus the *fulness of Christ*, Eph. iv. 13. is to be explained in the same manner. The *fulness* then *of the Godhead*, is that plenty of excellent gifts, which from the Godhead was communicated to Christ, by him to be imparted to us, in order to the filling us; it is, according to the Evangelist, a *fulness of grace and truth*, such *grace and truth* as *came by Jesus Christ*, and are *received* by us, *John* i. 14, 16, 17. And thus this expression is much the same in sense, with what he had used just before, v. 3. *In him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.* I can't tell, but that some may regard the judgment of St. *Jerom*; and therefore I will here take notice, that he certainly had no apprehension, that the *fulness of the Godhead* necessarily implied any such sense as some have put upon it; nay, he must have allowed that sense in which I have explained it; for these are his words upon *Gal.* iii. 13. *Ille se de plenitudine & de forma Dei evacuavit, formam servi accipiens, ut in nobis habitaret plenitudo divinitatis, & demini fieremus e servis*, i. e. "Christ emptied himself of the fulness and

"form

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

10 bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality
11 and power. In whom alſo ye are circumciſed with the circumciſion made without hands, in putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh, by the circ-

and ſubſtantially (*b*). And accordingly you have been filled by him, who is the head of all principality and power (*i*), and whom therefore you ought not to forſake out of a pretended reſpect to them. By whom alſo you have obtained the true ſpiritual circumciſion (*k*), by putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh (*l*),

10 11

in

NOTES.

" form of God, taking upon him the form of a ſervant, that the *fulneſs of the Godhead* might " dwell in us, and we of ſervants might become lords." Moſt agreeably to the explication I have given of the *fulneſs of the Godhead*, that dwelt in Chriſt, does St. *Paul* immediately add, Καὶ ἐστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, which we have render'd, *And ye are complete in him*; but it would have led the *Engliſh* reader much better into the Apoſtle's thought, had it been render'd, *And ye are filled by him.*

(*b*) Σωματικῶς. *Bodily.*] i. e. really and ſubſtantially, and not after the manner of types and ſhadows. The *Antitheſis* is very agreeable, when στοιχεῖα in the foregoing verſe is explained by ſhadows. St. *Paul* ſeems to repeat at the 17th verſe, what he had ſaid here, and by his uſe of the word σῶμα there, ſhows how σωματικῶς is to be underſtood here: Which [*Jewiſh* obſervances] *are a ſhadow of things to come; but the body is of Chriſt.* Compare *Heb.* viii. 5. —ix. 23. —x. 1. In like manner is truth to be underſtood, *John* i. 17. *The Law came by* Moſes; *but Grace and Truth came by Jeſus Chriſt:* Where truth can't be underſtood as oppoſed to falſhood, but to the types and ſhadows of the law. St. *Auſtin* intirely concurs in this interpretation, for in his notes upon *Pſal.* lxvii. or, after our numbering, the lxviii. he thus explains this place: " *In ipſo quippe inhabitat omnis plenitudo divinitatis, non umbraliter* " *tanquam in templo a rege* Salomone *facto, ſed corporaliter, id eſt ſolide atque veraciter.*" " In " him dwells all the fulneſs of the Godhead, not *like a ſhadow*, as in the temple built by King " *Solomon*, but *bodily*, that is, *ſubſtantially* and *truly.*

10 (*i*) *The head of all principality and power.*] He here lays in a caution againſt their being drawn from Chriſt to the worſhiping of angels, of which he ſpeaks afterwards, *v.* 18.

11 (*k*) *Circumciſion made without hands.*] He diſtinguiſhes the external circumciſion made with hands, from the internal and ſpiritual, which could not be made with hands, *Rom.* ii. 28, 29. while the *Jews* had the former, St. *Paul* claims the latter, as now wholly belonging to Chriſtians. Hence, when he cautions the *Philippians*, Chap. iii. 3. againſt *Jewiſh* deceivers, he vouchſafes them not the name of circumciſion. *Beware*, ſays he, *of the* conciſion; *for we are the* circumciſion. And when the *Jewiſh* converts urged the *Gentiles* to ſubmit to circumciſion, he here ſhows they had no need of it, having already received the true circumciſion.

(*l*) *In putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh.*] He ſpeaks of the vices of the unregenerate, and the virtues of the regenerate, under the figure or notion of a man; calling the former the *old man*, and the latter the *new man*, Chap. iii. 9, 10. *Eph.* iv. 22, 24. the former we put off, the latter we put on; as though a man ceaſed to be, as it were, the ſame *ſelf* he was before; whereby is only ſignified an intire change of habits. Thus mens vices are ſet out as a *body*, and ſuch a body as is to be crucified and deſtroyed, or of which we are to be intirely diveſted. Thus *Rom.* vi. 6. *Knowing that our old man is crucified*

Chap. II.

PARAPHRASE.

in baptiſm, which is the circumciſion of Chriſt or the Chriſtian circumciſion; and ſo can have no need of the *Jewiſh* circumciſion in the
12. fleſh. And this putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh, was ſignified to you at your baptiſm (*m*); wherein, as perſons dead, you were in a manner buried, being put under the water: In which baptiſm is alſo repreſented your reſurrection, together with him to a new life, thro' a belief of the great power of God,
13. who raiſed him from the dead (*n*). And you, when you were in your forlorn condition as *Gentiles*, dead in your ſins (*o*), and

TEXT.

cumciſion of Chriſt. Buri- 12
ed with him in baptiſm, wherein alſo you are riſen with *him*, thro' the faith of the operation of God, who hath raiſed him from the dead. And you being 13
dead in your ſins, and the uncircumciſion of your fleſh, hath he quickned together with him, having forgiven you all treſ-

NOTES.

with him, that the body of ſin *might be deſtroyed, that henceforth we ſhould not ſerve ſin.* When he here calls this body, *the body of the ſins of the fleſh*, he has a reſpect to the ſource from whence theſe ſins ſprang; to which purpoſe he ſpeaks of the fleſh, *Rom.* viii. 4, 5, 6, 12, 13. ——xiii. 14. and in many places.

12 (*m*) This verſe is in purſuance of what he had ſaid in the former, *viz.* to ſhow that the *Coloſſians* had obtained the true circumciſion by baptiſm, in as much as thereby they made a profeſſion of being dead with Chriſt, and of being raiſed together with him to a new life.

(*n*) Διὰ τ πίςεως τ ἐνεργείας τ Θεᾶ τ ἐγείραντ]ος αὐτὸν ἐκ τ νεκρῶν. *Through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raiſed him from the dead.*] Though our tranſlation may be juſtified, yet being ambiguous, it is apt to miſlead the reader. I believe few, who only read the *Engliſh*, think of any thing elſe, but a faith which is wrought in men by God; but this ſeems not to have been St. *Paul*'s thought, who, if I miſtake not, ſpeaks of a belief of the power of God, exerted in raiſing Chriſt from the dead. The *operation of God* is not ſpoken of as the cauſe, but the *ſubject matter* of their faith. The *Syriac* is expreſs for this ſenſe. And as our riſing here to a new life, is attributed to the belief of God's power in raiſing Chriſt; ſo St. *Peter* ſpeaks of God, as *begetting us again to a lively hope, by the reſurrection of Chriſt from the dead*, 1 Pet. i. 3. And again, *v.* 21. *Who by him do believe in God that raiſed him up from the dead, and gave him glory, that your faith and hope might be in God.* Moreover, it is to be obſerved, that the happy change made in their condition, is attributed to their faith in the power of God, in raiſing Chriſt; and not to any reſpect they had paid to the Law of *Moſes*: Which is farther inculcated in the next verſe.

13 (*o*) *Dead in your ſins.*] The like we have *Eph.* ii. 1, 5. and in both is meant the deplorable condition they were in as *Gentiles*; which is deſcribed in very moving terms, *Eph.* iv. 17——19. *That ye henceforth walk not as other* [unconverted] Gentiles *walk in the vanity of their mind, having the underſtanding darkned, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, becauſe of the blindneſs of their heart; who being paſt feeling, have given themſelves over unto laſciviouſneſs, to work all uncleanneſs with greedineſs.*

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

14 passes; blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross:

when you were uncircumcised *(p)*, hath God the Father *(q)* quickned together with Christ, forgiving you all your trespasses. Blotting out 14.
and vacating the hand-writing that was contained in positive institutions and ordinances, which was a disadvantage to us *Gentiles*, separating us from his people and kingdom *(r)*; this he removed

NOTES.

(*p*) *In the uncircumcision of your flesh.*] As God had called the *Colossians*, when uncircumcised *Gentiles*, and had without any previous circumcision quickned them with Christ; this was a clear evidence that circumcision, and a conformity to the Law of *Moses*, were not required by him as terms necessary for their obtaining his favour, and their being admitted into his church.

(*q*) The agent spoken of in this, and the two next verses, is God the Father, who *quickned the* Colossians *together with Christ, forgave their trespasses, blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances, nailed it to the cross, divested principalities and powers*, &c. This is so very obvious, according to the grammatical construction of the *Greek*, that I should not have thought it needful to have mentioned it, were it not generally over-look'd by commentators.

14 (*r*) Ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν. *Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us.*] We cannot well miss the general design of this place, and especially, if we compare it with *Eph.* ii. 14, 15. *He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself, of twain one new man, so making peace.* But it is still a doubt how we are to explain the χειρόγραφον, or *hand-writing* here. The proper sense of that word is a writing subscribed by a person, whereby he obliges himself to another; thus the bill which a debtor gives to his creditor, whereby he owns himself indebted to him, and promises him payment, is his *Chirographum*: And though the word is not there used, St. *Paul* properly gave his *Chirographum* to *Philemon*, *v.* 18, 19. But the difficulty is how to accommodate this to the ceremonial Law, or to the ordinances, and merely positive observances, wherein the hand-writing lay. Now this must be explained, according to the party whose hand-writing this is supposed to be. If it be supposed to be the hand-writing of the *Jews*, the sense will seem to be this; that they by observing the prescribed services of the Law, did bind themselves to God, and make an open profession of being his peculiar people, renouncing fellowship with all *Gentiles*, as excluded from that privilege. And as long as the obligation to that service lasted, this must be understood to be not only the intended, but the real and true declaration of such observances, which may well be said to be *against*, *and contrary to the* Gentiles; but when once the obligation to that service ceased, as it did at the death of Christ, the state of the case was quite alter'd: And though the *Jews* might continue those services with the same intention and design they did before; yet the *Gentiles* could not properly be affected thereby, since the mistake of the *Jews* could not make any real alteration in the case of the *Gentiles*. God therefore, at the death of Christ, blotted out the hand-writing of the *Jews* in those ordinances, making that service, from that time, to be no farther to the prejudice and disadvantage of the *Gentiles*; the hand-writing of the *Jews* was thenceforth as useless and insignificant, as a cancelled writing.

Chap. II.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

removed from between us and them (s), and
15. nailed it to his Son's crofs. And having ta-
ken from the good angels their authority (t),
he ſubjected them to Chriſt, and propoſed them
publickly as an example of cheerful obedience
to,

And having ſpoiled prin- 15.
cipalities and powers, he
made a ſhew of them
openly, triumphing over

NOTES.

On the other hand, this may be conſidered as the *hand-writing* of God himſelf, which he gave to the *Jews*; and then the matter is to be explained to this purpoſe: God had been pleaſed to erect his kingdom among the *Jews*, and he obliged and ingaged himſelf to take them for his people; to teſtify and declare this he gave them the Law, which prefcribed circumciſion, and other ceremonial ſervices, by which he diſtinguiſhed them from all people that were upon the face of the earth; he declared moreover, that he intended in due time to put his kingdom into the Meſſiah's hands, when he would inlarge it, and then the *Jews* ſhould belong to it, in caſe they ſubmitted to the Meſſiah's rule. This obligation under which God ſo peculiarly laid himſelf to the *Jews*, was, while that covenant laſted, contrary to the *Gentiles*, ſeparating them like a middle wall from God's people and kingdom, but when the *Jews* obſtinately refuſed to be ſubject to the Meſſiah, and even crucified him, they thereupon ceaſed to be his peculiar kingdom and people, and the obligation on God's part ceaſed to them as a people; and they ſeverally ſtood upon the ſame terms with the reſt of the world; the obligation was cancelled, and as they nailed the Meſſiah to the croſs to deſtroy him, God, as it were, nailed the hand-writing he had given them to his croſs alſo, that is, utterly deſtroyed or vacated it. The difference is but ſmall, which ever way it is taken, and the reader is left to take his choice.

(s) Αυτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τῦ μέσυ. *He took it out of the way.*] That is, he did not ſuffer it to continue ſtill between us and the *Jews*, to ſeparate us from one another. The Apoſtle had the ſame thought here that he had in writing *Eph.* ii. 14. where he ſpeaks of the *breaking down the middle wall of partition between us*, viz. *Gentiles* and *Jews*. The reader ought to obſerve the reaſon why this is mentioned, and that is, to ſhow that the *Coloſſians* were not to ſubmit to the Law, in order to their being accepted as God's people; and it is from this that he makes his inference to that purpoſe, *v.* 16, 17. as the next, that is, the 15th verſe is in order to his drawing another inference, *v.* 18, 19.

15 (t) Ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας. *Having ſpoiled principalities and powers.*] The ſenſe given of this verſe in the paraphraſe, is ſo wholly different from what has been ever ſaid by any commentators upon it, that it will not be ſtrange if the reader be at firſt ſhock'd at it: And it will be the more neceſſary to take ſome notice of the explications which uſe to be given, and hint the miſtakes they carry in them. They then moſt certainly are much out of the way, who are for rendering the words thus, *Having put off* [viz. his fleſh] *he openly made a ſhew of principalities*; for they do not obſerve what is yet very plain, that this ἀπεκδυσάμενος is not predicated of Chriſt, but of God the Father. See *v.* 13. and note (q). Now it is too evident, that nothing of this nature can be affirmed concerning God the Father. Again, they who avoiding that miſtake, do with our tranſlators underſtand what is here ſaid concerning the evil angels, and ſuppoſe they are ſpoken of as ſpoiled, and expoſed to publick ſcorn and contempt at the death of Chriſt, ſeem to build intirely upon the expreſſions here uſed, which they think will bear ſuch a ſenſe as they put upon them; but they do not ſo much as attempt to ſhow how they come in, or

NOTES.

what relation they have to, or connection with any part of the context; which carries in it an insinuation, as though St. *Paul* were a very careless writer; than which nothing can appear more unreasonable to any one, who has read his Epistles with attention, and has observed how close a reasoner he always shews himself to be. The way to discover St. *Paul*'s meaning, in any particular passage, is to observe the chief design he is driving on, which he never loses sight of, though his reader without much attention easily may. In this way the several steps he takes, and the advances he makes in his arguments toward what is his chief aim, may be more easily discern'd; nor is this more necessary in any place, than that before us. Now to lead the reader into St. *Paul*'s true meaning, let him observe that the 16th and 17th verses are deliver'd as an inference from what he had said at *v.* 14. *Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ.* This is well and justly inferred from *v.* 14. where he says: *God has blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, and took it out of the way.* But *v.* 15. now under consideration, and which comes between the foundation or ground of the inference, and the inference it self, has not the least relation to one, or the other. There must certainly be some reason for this procedure, that a matter so intirely foreign to his subject should be inserted between things so closely connected, as are *v.* 14, 16, 17. The only reason I can perceive for this is, that as he lays down *v.* 14. the foundation of one inference, *viz.* that which he delivers *v.* 16, 17. so in this *v.* 15. he lays down the foundation of another inference which he designed to draw; and which he accordingly actually delivers, *v.* 18, 19. *Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility, and worshiping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puft by his fleshly mind; and not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment, ministred and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.* The reader may try if he can devise any other reason, but this now assigned, why *v.* 15. is placed in the middle between two parts of an argument, to which it has not the least shadow of any relation. This then being supposed, that *v.* 15. is the foundation of the inference drawn *v.* 18, 19. it is manifest that they must both belong to the same subject; and that as the worship he cautions them against, *v.* 18. is the worship of the good angels (for certainly the *Colossians* were in no danger of being drawn in to worship the devil, and his angels, and therefore did not need to be cautioned against it) so the *principalities* and *powers*, mentioned here in this 15th verse, must be the good angels also; for otherwise this can be no foundation for the inference he makes. This will be farther confirmed by looking back to *v.* 10. where the Apostle had what he here says in his eye, and is paving his way to the caution he design'd to give them. *And*, says he, *ye are complete in* (or ye are filled by) *him, who is the head of all principality and power.* Christians are filled by Christ, as from him they *derive nourishment, whereby they increase with the increase of God*, v. 19. And why does he say they are filled by him, who is the *head of all principality and power*, but to hint to them that they were not filled by any *principality* or *power* that was in subjection to him? And must not then *all principality and power*, there mentioned, signify the good angels? Could he suspect they imagined they were filled by the evil angels? And does not this clearly lead us to expound the *principalities and powers*, v. 15. where he resumes that subject, of the good angels? So far the matter seems clear, the only thing farther necessary, is to show how the several expressions, here used, will bear to be applied to the good angels. The whole verse may be thus rendered: *And having divested principalities, he proposed them publickly as an example, making them to triumph in him.* The word ἀπεκδυσάμενος here rendered, *having divested*, is used in much the same sense, *Chap.* iii. 9. Compare also *Chap.* ii. 11. What is meant by this rendering, is that whereas the angels, before our Saviour's time, seem plainly to have had provinces and dominions allotted them, one presiding over one country, and another over another country, &c. (To which purpose, see *Dan.* x. 13, 20, 21.) this power was taken from them at our Lord's resurrection, and the commencement of the *world to come*; and they being all divested of their dominion, were placed

PARAPHRASE.

to him *, causing them to triumph † in Christ ‖.
16. Since then God has quickned you *Gentiles*, when you were dead in sins and uncircumcised,

TEXT.

them in it. Let no man 16 therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in

and

NOTES.

placed in a subjection to him. This is the perpetual representation of the Holy Scriptures, *Heb.* ii. 5. *Unto the* Angels *hath he not put in* subjection *the world to come.* Heb. i. 6. *When he again bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith: And let all the angels of God worship him.* 1 Pet. iii. 21. *Who 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. *He raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named.* Philip. ii. 9, 10. *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and in earth, and under the earth.* And it may deserve remarking, that tho' the angels are several times called *gods* in the Old Testament, which was very proper in that situation of things, wherein they had a proper dominion and authority committed to them; yet after their dominion ceased, and the world to come began, at our Lord's resurrection, they are never called gods, that is, they are never called so in the New Testament; not so much as in those citations out of the Old Testament, wherein they were stiled so. See *Heb.* ii. 7. What is in the *Hebrew*, *Thou hast made him a little lower than the* gods; is, in the Apostle's citation, *Thou hast made him a little lower than the* angels. Compare *Heb.* i. 7.

* Ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ. *He made a shew of them openly.*] The paraphrase renders it, *he proposed them publickly as an example*, that is, an example of subjection and obedience to Christ. I question whether the word is ever to be found in any author, except such as comment upon, or refer to this place; and as the meaning of it is to be gather'd from δεῖγμα, from whence it is derived, there is no necessity of taking it in an ill sense; nay, when the *exposing to contempt and disgrace* is designed, we find the word παραδειγματίζειν is used, *Matth.* i. 19. *Heb.* vi. 6. And yet even παράδειγμα is used in a good sense by *Isocrates* in *Evagor. p. m.* 378. where he has κάλλιστα καὶ μέγιστα παραδείγματα, and much more may δεῖγμα and its derivatives be so understood.

† Θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς. *Triumphing over them.*] The rendering in the paraphrase is justified by our translators, who have in that manner translated the same expression, 2 *Cor.* ii. 14. Thanks be to God, τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ χριστῷ, *who always* causeth us to triumph *in Christ.* The other sense here given of this word of *triumphing over*, or of *leading in triumph*, is not disagreeable to either of the two places, wherein St. *Paul* uses it. *Plutarch* in *Romulo* thus uses the word, ἐθριάμβευε βασιλεῖς. The *Latin* word *triumphare* is used in the same manner, whence *Virgil. Georg.* iii. *v.* 33. has, *bisque triumphatas gentes.* And *Ovid. Amor.* i. *Eleg.* xv. *v.* 26. *triumphati orbis.* And *Aurelius Victor de Viris illustr. in Metello Macedon. Achæos triumphandos.* And *Lactantius*, Lib. vi. c. 23. *Hic terram triumphabit.* It seems the vulg. *Latin* took the word in both places in this sense, rendering it here *triumphans illos*, and 2 *Cor.* ii. 14. *qui nos semper triumphat.* Upon which place St. *Jerom*, *ad Hædib. quæst.* xi. thus comments: *Triumphat nos, pro eo quod est triumphat de nobis, sive triumphum suum agit per nos; qui in alio loco dixerat, spectaculum facti sumus mundo, & angelis, & hominibus.* If the word is taken in this sense, and we render it, *he led in triumph by him*; the passage will marvellously agree with that which is reckoned parallel to it, *Eph.* iv. 8. *He led captivity captive:* Concerning which see the *Appendix.*

‖ Ἐν αὐτῷ. *In it.*] Our translators have here referred the αὐτῷ to the cross, which is utterly disagreeable to the Apostle's scope, as is the reading ἐν ξύλῳ or ἐν σαρκῷ. The

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of 17 the sabbath-days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of 18 Christ. Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility,

and cancelled the hand writing of ordinances; let no man take upon him to pass sentence upon you, that you belong not to the church of God (*u*); because you do not observe the same ordinances with themselves about meats, or drinks, or feasts, or new moons, or sabbath-days; which things were only a shadow or 17. type of things that were to come, but are now actually come, Christ being the real and substantial blessing, which they obscurely shadowed forth; and while you retain the substance, you will not need the shadow (*w*). And since he has divested principalities and 18. powers, let no man take upon him to condemn (*x*) you, while he pleases himself with an

NOTES.

rendering in our margin is yet worse, *in himself*, because it goes upon the mistake that Christ is spoken of as doing these things; whereas it is evident, it is the Father who is said to do them by him. Upon the whole, the only proper and true rendering, is *in*, or *by him*, that is, *Christ*.

16 (*u*) Κρινέτω. *Judge.*] The sense is sufficiently expressed in the paraphrase, which is grounded upon a parallel place, *Rom.* xiv. 3. *Let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth; for God hath received him.* The meaning of which is, let not the *Jew*, who scruples the indifferent use of all meats, judge the *Gentile* to be out of the church of God, because he puts no difference between meats, but freely and indifferently uses all; let him not, I say, judge thus of the *Gentile*, since God has received him into his church. See more there in what follows in the context.

17 (*w*) Τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ χριστοῦ. *The body is of Christ.*] As the *body* stands opposed to the *shadow*, it must signify the reality, truth, or substance of the future things; and so confirm the interpretation before given of σωματικῶς, *v.* 9. This body or substance, he says, is of Christ; that is, belongs to him, is his, is only to be found or sought in him, and not in the Law.

18 (*x*) Καταβραβεύετω. *Beguile.*] The word is used by *Demosthenes*, *adv. Meid.* to signify *condemning*, and so καταβραβεύειν is explained by *Phavorinus* by καταψηφίσεσθαι, as well as by καταλογίζεσθαι. I am sensible, that *Chrysostom*, and the *Greek* commentators, who follow him, and *Zonaras* on *Can.* xxxv. of the Council of *Laodicea*, have affixed the other sense to the word, which our translators seem to embrace. They tell us that it imports, that one gets the victory, and another obtains the reward; but I don't see how this can be applied here, since it was impossible any one should lose the reward, who did not lose the victory. And therefore *Oecumenius*, after he had given that sense, following *Chrysostom*, subjoins the other. Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω. Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταψηφίσασθω. And as this makes the best sense, so it seems to be confirmed by *v.* 16.

(*y*) Θέλων

Chap. II.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

an humility (*y*), and worſhiping of angels (*z*) of his own deviſing, boldly prying into, and dictating about matters which he knows nothing of; and this he is led to by his *Jewiſh* temper,

and worſhiping of angels, intruding into thoſe

NOTES.

(*y*) Θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ. *In a voluntary humility.*] It is reckoned ſomewhat doubtful, with what θέλων is to be connected, and ſo not eaſy to determine certainly the exact ſenſe of the verſe. If it is to be joined with μηδεὶς, it might be rendered either, *Let no one, whoever he be, condemn you*; or, *let no one who has a mind, or is forward to do it, condemn you*: But if we join it with what follows, the ſenſe runs thus, *Let no man condemn you, pleaſing himſelf in his* (ſuppoſed) *humility, and his worſhiping of angels.* In this ſenſe is the word uſed, 2 *Sam.* xv. 26. Οὐκ ἠθέλησα ἐν σοὶ, *I have no pleaſure in thee.* 1 *Sam.* xviii. 22. *The King hath delight in thee.* This ſenſe ſeems agreeable enough to the deſign of the Apoſtle. And indeed, that θέλων is rather to be joined with ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, and ſo to be interpreted of an ungrounded humility, may appear, becauſe this beſt reconciles it with the appearing oppoſition of the word φυσιούμενος, which follows; ſuch conceited humility being very conſiſtent with pride and affectation. Beſides, *v.* 23. ſeems to determine this to be the ſenſe, for the θέλων ἐν θρησκείᾳ here, anſwers to ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ there; and therefore as hereby is meant a worſhip that proceded from their own will, and not from any divine appointment; ſo the θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, muſt ſignify their chooſing and affecting an humility of their own deviſing, without any preſcription from God. Only let it be noted, that what St. *Paul* here reduces to two heads, *viz. voluntary in humility*, and *worſhiping of angels*; he has, *v.* 23. expreſſed by three, *viz. Will-worſhip, humility*, and *neglecting of the body*. This, perhaps, ſhews that he includes the *neglect of the body* under the general term of *humility*, in this 18th verſe. So that *humility* here will then ſignify two things, the pretence they went upon in introducing the *worſhiping of angels*, concerning which ſomewhat will be ſaid in the next note; and the *neglecting of the body*, which will be explained when we come to *v.* 23. If any one diſlikes this, he may conſider the *neglect of the body* as a new head added there, though not mention'd before; nor will this make any odds, provided only that the Apoſtle be underſtood to ſpeak of the ſame perſons.

(*z*) Θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων. *The worſhiping of angels.*] If I have made it plain, that what St. *Paul* ſays *v.* 8. may relate wholly to the *Jewiſh* converts; I hope to do the ſame concerning what we meet with here, and in the reſt of the chapter: And then there will appear to be no need of any aſſiſtance from the notions of the *Gnoſticks*, or of the Heathen philoſophers (any farther than as the *Jews* borrowed ſome opinions from their philoſophy) in order to explain any one part of this Epiſtle.

The phraſe it ſelf is capable of three ſenſes, and no more, that I can think of. 1. It may ſignify *angelical worſhip*, or that worſhip which is paid to God by angels; and ſo it would intimate, that theſe perſons pretended to refine their worſhip, by affecting an imitation of the angels in theirs. This ſenſe ſeems not to ſuit well here, becauſe it does not carry in it any ſhew or pretence of humility, which yet St. *Paul* ſeems to imply it did, while he joins it with humility. Every one ſees this had the quite contrary appearance of pride. 2. This might ſignify the *worſhip taught* or *preſcribed by angels*, which might be by ſome particular inſtruction they pretended they had received from them; as *Tertullian adv. Marcion. Lib.* v. *c.* 19. thus explains the place: *Aliquos taxat, qui ex viſionibus angelicis dicebant cibis abſtinendum, ne attigeris, ne guſtaveris*, i. e. "He reproves thoſe, who from angelical vi-

"ſions

NOTES.

"sions required the abstaining from meats, *touch not, taste not*;" but such a pretence to communion with angels, and to the receiving private instructions from them, carried in it rather the appearance of pride than of humility. Or again, hereby they might labour to establish the obligation of the old Law, because it was given by angels, *Acts* vii. 53. *Gal.* iii. 19. *Heb.* ii. 2. but neither can this sense be allowed, because as this was a certain truth, that the Law was so given, he could not, upon such an account, have taxed them with *intruding into the things they had not seen*. And therefore, it is necessary to fix upon the other sense yet behind, which is, 3. That this signifies the *worship paid to the angels*. The Doctrine which the *Jews* had received, and which the converts from among them brought along with them, was borrowed in a great measure from the Heathen philosophers, and especially from *Plato*, or *Pythagoras*; which probably gave St. *Paul* occasion to caution the *Colossians* against the deceit of philosophy, *v.* 8. The Doctrine which they thus received, they endeavoured, as it is very natural to men to do in the like case, to confirm by the holy Scriptures. We may learn what this doctrine was from *Philo* the *Jew*, who speaks of it in more places than one. I will translate one passage he has much to my purpose, in his treatise *de Somniis*, p. 586. "There are other souls that "are most pure and good, who have a greater and more divine judgment and understanding, "and desire nothing at all that is earthly; these are the presidents or princes of the Almighty, "like the eyes and ears of some great king, beholding, and hearing all things; these the philosophers call *Demons*, but the holy Scriptures use to call them, and that most properly, Angels; for they carry the Father's commands to his children, and the childrens wants to the "Father; and therefore the Scripture represents them as ascending and descending. Not that "he needs such intelligencers, who before-hand knows all things; but because it is expedient "for us mortals to make use of such mediators and arbiters, that we may the more *admire and* "*reverence* the supreme Governor, and the great power of his government." [*N. B.* How exactly does this agree with the pretended *humility*, which St. *Paul* joins with the worshiping of angels?] "From a sense hereof we sometime desired a mediator, *Speak thou to us, but let not* "*God speak to us, lest we die*; for we can't bear, not only his chastisements, but even his ex"ceeding great and pure favours, if he should immediately himself bestow them upon us, "without the intervention of such ministers."

If we look into the Old Testament, we find by many histories recorded therein, that the angels are employed by God in ministring to his people; and the same is confirmed by several passages in the New Testament also. The prophet *Zachary*, Chap. iv. 10. informs us, that there are *seven* of them that are the *eyes of the Lord, that run to and fro through the whole earth*; with which we may compare, *Rev.* i. 4. —iv. 5. —v. 6. This doctrine was carried farther by the *Jews*, who looked upon these angels as mediators between God and his people, in carrying their prayers to him. This appears by the passage just now cited from *Philo*, who perhaps, in comparing them to the *eyes and ears of a great king*, alludes to what *Zachary* says. The same may be confirmed by the book of *Tobit*, Chap. xii. 12. where the angel *Raphael* is brought in as saying: *I did bring the remembrance of your prayers before the holy one.* And *v.* 15. *I am* Raphael, *one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and which go in and out before the glory of the holy one.* Mr. *Jos. Mede, Discourse* x. *p.* 41. observes, that neither St. *Hierom*, who translated *Tobit* out of the *Chaldee*, nor the ancient *Hebrew* copy, set forth by *Paulus Fagius* (and in likelihood translated out of the same *Chaldee* original) read the 15th verse, as do the LXX, the translation of which I have given; but only say, *I am* Raphael, *one of the seven angels, which stand and minister before the holy blessed One.* This is true, but it ought farther to be remarked, that what they have not expressed at *v.* 15. they seem both to have done at *v.* 12. *Hierom*'s translation has: *I offered thy prayer to the Lord. Fagius*'s edition: *I introduced your tears before the holy blessed One.* It was a natural consequence of this doctrine, that if the angels were such mediators, a worship was due to them, *viz.* that the saints should offer up their prayers to God by them, offering them up to them, that they might present them to God. This carried in it a shew of reverence and humility, which is *Philo*'s plea for it, and confirms the account given of the Apostle's meaning in this place. I think the same is confirmed by what is added in the next verse, concerning those who main-

NOTES.

tained this worſhip of angels, that they did *not hold the head*; that is, by appointing and making uſe of other mediators, the angels, they virtually diſowned Chriſt as the one and only mediator.

This gives light to the two firſt chapters of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, for as that is directed to the *Jewiſh* converts, we from hence learn the reaſon why the author ſo laboriouſly proves, that Chriſt is ſo vaſtly ſuperior to angels, *viz.* that he might take them off from giving mediatorial worſhip to the angels, which they were very much inclined to, and fix them in their regard to Chriſt as the only mediator; nor can I doubt, that in the Epiſtles to the *Epheſians*, and *Philippians*, written about the ſame time, he had this in view (though he does not there expreſly mention it) in aſſerting, and that very often in the former of them, the advancement of Chriſt above all the angels; which might be alſo the deſign of St. *Peter* in ſpeaking of the ſame thing, 1 *Pet.* iii. 22.

What I have hitherto ſaid relates to the *Jews* in general, I mean all but the *Sadducees*, who denied there were any angels, *Acts* xxiii. 8. I would now add, that St. *Paul* ſeems to me to have here a more eſpecial regard to one particular ſect of them, the *Eſſens*. As what he mentions, v. 23. of the *neglecting of the body*, will be ſhown preſently to ſuit them; ſo they had ſomewhat peculiarly among them relating to the angels: For thus *Joſephus*, *De bello judaic. Lib.* ii. *c.* 7. *ſect* 12. aſſures us, that when they received any into their number, they made them moſt ſolemnly ſwear, "That they would keep or obſerve the books of their ſect, and the "names of the angels with like care." If any one ſhould inquire why St. *Paul* makes ſuch expreſs mention of this cuſtom only in his Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, I queſtion whether a better anſwer can be given than this, that he underſtood ſome were then buſy to introduce this practice, and foreſaw that it would afterwards prevail in thoſe parts; and therefore he thought it the more neceſſary to caution them againſt it. It is a remarkable note that *Theodorit* has upon this place: "They, *ſays he*, who defended the Law, taught men to worſhip angels, ſaying, "the Law was given by them. This miſchief continued long in *Phrygia* and *Piſidia*. Hence "the council that met at *Laodicea* in *Phrygia*, made a law againſt praying to angels; and to "this very day are to be ſeen among them, and in the neighbouring parts, the oratories [houſes of prayer] of St. *Michael*." It may not be amiſs here to ſet down the 35th canon of that council, which probably was held about the middle of the 4th century. Thus then runs the canon: "Chriſtians ought not to leave the church of God, and go, and name angels, [compare this with the paſſage juſt cited from *Joſephus*, and with *Philip.* ii. 9. *Eph.* i. 21. *Heb.* i. 4.] "or gather aſſemblies; if therefore any one is found to practiſe this ſecret idolatry, let him be "*anathema*, becauſe he has left our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, and has turned to idolatry." I can't but here take notice, that it may ſeem probable, that it is for the ſame reaſon our Saviour in the Epiſtle to the *Laodiceans*, Rev. iii. 14. ſpeaks of himſelf to the ſame purpoſe, as St. *Paul* does here to the *Coloſſians*, and ſtiles himſelf the *beginning of the creation of God*, anſwering to *Col.* i. 15. *The firſt-born of every creature.* And as St. *Paul* repreſents them as *deceiving themſelves with a vain ſhew*, and as *vainly puft up by their fleſhly mind*, Col. ii. 18, 23 ſo Chriſt in like manner ſpeaks of them as miſtaking their caſe, *Rev.* iii. 17. *Thou ſayeſt, I am rich, and increaſed with goods, and have need of nothing; and knoweſt not that thou art wretched, and miſerable, and poor, and blind, and naked.* St. *Paul* taxes them for *not holding the head*, Chap. ii. 19. repreſents all *bleſſings as in Chriſt*, v. 3, 9. and therefore preſſes their adherence to him, v. 6. So Chriſt, v. 18. *I counſel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire*, &c. *of me*, and not of ſuch as they were by that time prevailed upon to have recourſe to; and who can they more probably be than the angels?

N. B. After I had finiſhed this note, and indeed all my papers, I had the curioſity to conſult Dr. *Hudſon*'s edition of *Joſephus*; where upon the paſſage I have cited, I was agreeably ſurprized with this note of Dr. *Aldrich*: *Difficile dictu eſt, cur* Eſſeni *Angelorum nomina cuſtodierint; an quod iis ad morborum remedia in carminibus ſuis uterentur? An quod angelis cultum aliquem exhiberent, quem nempe damnat Apoſtolus, in* Col. ii. 18? *Certe reliqua quæ ibidem damnantur,* Eſſenorum *ſunt, &* Eſſenis *conveniunt præter cæteros.* "'Tis hard to ſay why the *Eſſens* took ſuch "care of the names of angels. Was it that they made uſe of them in their charms to cure "diſ-

TEXT.

things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by
19 his fleshly mind; And not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministred, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.

PARAPHRASE.

temper, which puffs him up with a vain conceit, that he knows, and is fit to judge of every thing (*a*). But while he pays worship to angels, he does not adhere to Christ, who is the head from whom all Christians, which are his body, derive supplies of influence, (just as the natural body by joints and bands has nourishment ministred from the head, and is united to it) (*b*), and so increase with the increase of God. 19.

NOTES.

" diseases? Or did they pay them any such worship, as the Apostle condemns, *Col.* ii. 18?
" The other things there condemn'd, are certainly theirs, and agree to the *Essens* above all
" others.

(*a*) Εἰκῇ φυσιώμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. *Vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind.*] I think I have truly expressed the Apostle's sense in the paraphrase, nor will this, I believe, be much questioned by those who consider how he often uses the terms σὰρξ and σαρκικὸς, particularly in the following texts, *Gal.* iii. 3. 2 *Cor.* xi. 18. (Upon both which see Mr. *Locke.*) *Philip.* iii. 3, 4. *Heb.* vii. 16. —— ix. 10. The *Jewish* temper might well be called a *fleshly mind*, because they prided themselves so exceedingly in *fleshly* matters, as in their fleshly extraction, their descent from *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, and in their fleshly law and observances, in the mark they had in their flesh by circumcision, in their washings and sacrifices, which only purified the flesh, and were only moved by the fleshly, that is, present temporal rewards and punishments, spoken of in their Law. Their minds were fleshly, while they magnified themselves upon the account of such things as these; and where men are thus swell'd with a great conceit of themselves, it is natural to them to pretend to great things, and to be dogmatical and domineering. Farther, by what he here says, that they were *vainly puffed up*, it appears, that the *humility* he mentions was not true and real, but only affected and pretended. Upon the whole, the thing he cautions against is the *worshiping of angels*; the pretence by which this was endeavoured to be usher'd in, was, that this was most agreeable to *humility*; what St. *Paul* says of their *intruding into things they had not seen*, their being *puffed up by a fleshly mind*, and *not holding the head*, is his censure upon their conduct, and when he says: *Let no man judge or condemn you* in this respect, he means, that the *Colossians* should not be moved with, or at all regard any such judgment. Compare *v.* 16.

19 (*b*) Compare *Eph.* iv. 16.

COLOSSIANS.

SECT. VI.

CHAP. II. 20. —III. 4.

CONTENTS.

ST. *Paul* had hitherto directed his discourse intirely to the *Gentile* converts to Christianity, who were at *Colos*s; but in this section, he applies himself to the converts from *Judaism*, reproving, and arguing with them. His great design is to convince them of the unreasonableness of their imposing upon the *Gentiles* the observation of the *Mosaick* Law; and of the obligation they were under to mind much higher and more important matters: The former he argues from the character of Christians, that they are dead with Christ, from *v.* 20. to the end of the chapter; the latter from their being risen with Christ, which was another part of the character of all Christians, in the four first verses of the third chapter. The not observing this change of address, in his discourse, has made the last verses of the second chapter exceeding difficult, not to say unintelligible, to expositors.

PARAPHRASE. *TEXT.*

20. AND as to you *Jewish* converts, who invade the liberty of the *Gentiles*, let me expostulate the matter with you; if you own Christ as the head of the body, and your selves to belong to his body, you must own your selves to be both dead, and risen together with him; if then, you are dead with Christ from the rudiments or shadows of the world (*c*), why as tho' you were not dead with

20 WHerefore, if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of

NOTES.

20 (*c*) It will doubtless be thought by many, at the first sight, that too great a liberty is taken in making St. *Paul* here intirely change the persons to whom he directs his discourse; but I hope to satisfy all considerate and attentive readers, who will weigh the reasons I shall allege for my supposition.

Now

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

the world; why, as though living in the world, are ye ſubject to ordinances

with him, but were ſtill out of his kingdom, and living in the world (*d*), do ye ſtill dogmatize, that is, require ſuch a compliance as you do with the injunctions, and ritual precepts of

NOTES.

Now here I deſire it may be obſerved, that this is not the only inſtance, in St. *Paul's* Epiſtles, of ſuch a change. We have juſt ſuch another, *Rom.* vii. 1. He had all along thro' the latter end of *Chap.* vi. from *v.* 11. to the end, addreſſed himſelf to the *Gentile* converts in the *Roman* church, in the ſecond perſon: *Likewiſe reckon ye your ſelves to be dead*, &c. and then in the firſt verſe of *chap.* vii. continuing ſtill to uſe the ſecond perſon, he directs his diſcourſe to the converts from *Judaiſm* in that church: *Know ye not*, &c. concerning which Mr. *Locke* ſays thus: "That his diſcourſe here," [*Rom.* vii.] "is addreſſed to thoſe converts of this "church, who were of the *Jewiſh* nation, is ſo evident from the whole tenor of this chapter; "that there needs no more but to read it, with a little attention, to be convinced of it, eſpeci-"ally *ver.* 1, 4, 6.

It will be here objected, that St. *Paul* does in that place give warning of his changing his addreſs, by the clauſe which he adds: *Know ye not brethren (for I ſpeak to them that know the Law) how that the Law*, &c. I anſwer, that there are two things occur in the place before us, which plainly require us to allow the like change. 1. That this renders his diſcourſe conſiſtent, which otherwiſe I can't ſee how it can be. He had all along before commended the *Coloſſians* for their ſtedfaſtneſs, in maintaining and defending their liberty; ſee *Chap.* i. 4, 6, 7, 23. *Chap.* ii. 5, 6, 7, 10. nor does he, in any one place I have obſerved, paſs the leaſt cenſure upon them in this reſpect; it is not therefore to be eaſily ſuppoſed, that, quite contrary to the commendations before beſtowed on them, he would here blame them for being ſubject to *Jewiſh* ordinances; as yet he really does, if he here ſpeaks to the *Gentile* converts, and the δογματίζεσθε is uſed in a paſſive ſenſe concerning them, according to the mind of our tranſlators, rendering it: *Why are ye ſubject to ordinances?* This difficulty in the common interpretation offered it ſelf at firſt ſight to me, before I obſerved the change of addreſs; and it put me upon examining whether there were no copies that read it in the ſubjunctive δογματίζησθε, *why* ſhould *you be ſubject to ordinances*? But I don't now wonder that I could find nothing to countenance ſuch a reading. 2. St. *Paul* gives in this place as plain a hint that he ſpeaks to the *Jewiſh* converts, as he does in the other to the *Romans*; nor will what he here ſays ſuit any other perſons. The expreſſion I now inſiſt on, is that which ſtands, as it ought, in the very beginning of the new addreſs: *And if ye are dead with Chriſt, from the rudiments* [or ſhadows] *of the world.* Where does he ever uſe ſuch an expreſſion concerning the *Gentile* converts, who were never under thoſe rudiments, and ſo could have no occaſion to die to them? This wholly belongs to the *Jewiſh* converts, concerning whom he uſes much the like, *Rom.* vii. 4. *Gal.* ii. 19.

(*d*) For the underſtanding theſe metaphorical expreſſions, a regard is to be had to St. *Paul's* ſtile, in which the rudiments or ſhadows of the world are the ſame thing as the ceremonial Law; and to be dead to the Law, ſignifies to be diſcharged from the Law: Compare *Rom.* vi. 14. ——vii. 4. He ſuppoſes that the Law had power over men only till death, *Rom.* vii. 1. and that death freed men from all obligation to it; and conſequently, if the *Jewiſh* chriſtians were dead with Chriſt, as their baptiſm declared them to be, their obligation to the Law ceaſed, and it was an intirely new life they were thenceforth to live; which he expreſſes thus, *Rom.* vii. 6. *Now we are delivered from the Law, that being dead wherein we were held, that we ſhould ſerve in newneſs of ſpirit, and not in the oldneſs of the letter.*

21. of the Law (e)? The precepts I mean, are such as these: Eat not (f), taste not, nor so much as touch with a finger such or such
22. meats; which were yet all made by God, to be consumed by our use of them (g): And why do you require those things, which are only according to the doctrines and com-
23. mandments of men (h)? Which things having

(Touch not, taste not, han- 21
dle not; which all are to 22
perish with the using) af-
ter the commandments and
doctrines of men? Which 23
things have indeed a shew

NOTES.

letter. Now, says he, if this be the case, why do you act inconsistently with this your profession, and as though you continued just as you were before your conversion; and still lived in the world, under a dispensation that is of a worldly nature, *Heb.* ix. 1. as though you were still in the world, not called out of it, and brought into the kingdom of God, which is the kingdom of heaven, and not of this world? Compare *John* xv. 19. — xvii. 14, 16. I say, *why do ye dogmatize?*

(e) Δογματίζεσθε. *Are ye subject to ordinances?*] This seems not to be true concerning the converted *Gentiles* at *Colos*, as I observed before; nor would our translators perhaps have render'd this passively, as they have done, had they perceived that he is bespeaking now the *Jewish* converts. Δογματίζειν is explained by *Diogenes Laertius*, *Lib.* iii. *c.* 51. to signify to deliver an opinion as a certain maxim or axiom. Τὸ δογματίζειν ἔστι δόγμα τιθέναι, ὡς τὸ νομοθετεῖν, νόμους τιθέναι. To dogmatize is to injoin opinions, as νομοθετεῖν is to injoin laws. If δογματίζεσθε be used passively, it may be predicated of the opinion, but properly it cannot, I believe, of the person who is subjected to it. I own the Apostle takes a great deal of liberty in his use of *Greek* words, not tying himself up to the strictest propriety in the use of them; and so the harsh use of the word, in which our translators have taken it, might perhaps be justified, if there were an absolute necessity for it, and it could not conveniently be taken in any other; but it is far otherwise here, when the proper sense of it best suits the design of the writer.

21 (f) Μὴ ἅψῃ. *Touch not.*] It is render'd in the paraphrase, *Eat not*; which sense of the word is to be met with in lexicographers, and best suits this place, where there is a gradation: *Don't eat, no nor yet taste; nay, nor so much as touch such and such things.* These things relate wholly to meats. See *Lev.* xi. 8, 11, &c.

22 (g) Ἅ ἐστι πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει. *Which all are to perish with the using.*] The expression, which ever way understood, determines that St. *Paul* in the words before only speaks of meats and drinks, and that they are mistaken, who would interpret μὴ ἅψῃ from 1 *Cor.* vii. 1. *The sense set down in the paraphrase seems to me to be the best.* Compare herewith 1 *Tim.* iv. 3, 4, 5.

(h) *after the commandments and doctrines of men.*] These words are commonly joined in construction to the end of v. 20. thus: *Why are ye subject to ordinances, after the commandments and doctrines of men?* But I must own that that construction seems very precarious to me. I can hardly think that the Apostle would say, that these ordinances were imposed, or submitted, to as the commandments and doctrines of men; when it is plain, they were once the *commandments and doctrines of God*; and whoever imposed or submitted to them, did it under that notion. If we compare *Isa.* xxix. 13. *Matth.* xv. 9. *Mark* vii. 7. we shall find, that the expression is used of such things as were never prescribed by God, but were

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

of wiſdom in will-worſhip, and humility, and neglecting of the body, not in any honour to the

(*) having indeed a ſhew of wiſdom (*i*), in will worſhip (‖), and humility, and neglecting of the body (†), ſerve to the diſhonourably gratifying

NOTES.

were only deviſed by men. And therefore I chooſe to refer this intirely to the *worſhiping of angels*, and ſuch other deviſed methods of worſhip, which were truly after the commandments and doctrines of men, God having never given any rule at all for them; and ſo I would underſtand him to ſay: *Why do ye dogmatize about the worſhip of angels*, &c. *after the commandments and doctrines of men; which things having indeed a ſhew of wiſdom*, &c. See the laſt note upon *Chap.* iii. 4.

23 (*) This verſe has always been eſteemed very obſcure and difficult. For my own part, I could never meet with any explication of it that ſeemed tolerable. The *Ethiopick* tranſlators tranſlated only the beginning of it, *which things have a ſhew of wiſdom*, but left out all the reſt, as Dr. *Mills* ſays, becauſe they did not underſtand it. That which perhaps cauſed the greateſt obſcurity in it was, that it was not obſerved that ϖρὸς πλησμονὴν τ σαρκός at the end of the verſe, was to be joined in conſtruction with ἅτινά ὅτι in the beginning, which ſeems to make all eaſy. What he aſſerts therefore is, that *theſe things, while they carry in them ſome appearance of wiſdom, do ſerve only for the pleaſing a carnal mind.* What made me firſt look the more carefully for a different conſtruction of the words, from that which our tranſlators followed, was the odd poſition of the μὴ, as it appeared to me, there being no ἢ that follows it. I thought it ſtood too remote from the beginning of the ſentence, in caſe it was to be underſtood according to our tranſlation, and that it ſhould have been ἅτινά μὴ ὅτι, whereas it now ſtands exactly in its proper place, in caſe we join together ἅτινά ὅτι ϖρὸς πλησμονὴν τ σαρκός; for it is then put after the firſt word of the intermediate explicatory clauſe, λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ, καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος. This being obſerved, the conſtruction of the verſe may ſeem eaſy and plain.

(*i*) Λόγον ἔχοντα σοφίας. *Have a ſhew of wiſdom.*] I think the ancient commentators, and our own tranſlators, did not miſtake in the ſenſe of λόγος here; but as I underſtand the place to have a relation more peculiarly to the *Eſſens*, it will appear from what I ſhall preſently ſay of them, that nothing could more ſuit them than what is here ſaid; ſince they made great pretences to wiſdom, and to philoſophy, and imployed much of their time in the ſtudy thereof.

(‖) Ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ. *In will-worſhip.*] This anſwers to what he had ſaid, *v.* 18. θέλων ἐν θρησκείᾳ τ̃ν ἀγγέλων, *voluntary in the worſhiping of angels*, and certainly ſignifies a worſhip of their own deviſing, and which owed its riſe to their own wills, and not to the will of God; as the worſhiping of angels was doubtleſs of that nature.

(†) Καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος. *And in humility, and neglecting of the body.*] The *humility*, conſidered as diſtinct from the *neglecting of the body*, has been explained already. See notes on *v.* 18. The *neglecting of the body* is therefore what I ſhall now give an account of. And as I obſerved before, that St. *Paul* ſeems here in his diſcourſe to have a more particular regard to that ſect of the *Jews* that was called *Eſſens*; I ſhall now give ſome deſcription of them, that the reader may ſee how exactly their character agrees with what is here ſaid. *Joſephus* gives a brief account of them, *Antiquit. Lib.* xviii. *c.* 2. but a much more diſtinct and large one, *De Bell. Judaic. Lib.* ii. *c.* 7. *ſive* 12. where he tells us, they ſhun pleaſures as wickedneſs; they eſteem continence, and the not yielding to their affections to be virtue; they deſpiſe marriage, and riches, and have a commu-

Chap. III.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

gratifying perſons of a fleſhly or *Jewiſh* diſ-
1. poſition (‖). Again, if according to your bap-
tiſm, ſatisfying of the fleſh. If ye then be riſen with

NOTES.

nity of goods, and count the uſe of oil to be filthineſs; in ſo much, that if any one againſt his will is anointed with it, his body is cleanſed from it. When they travel they take nothing with them, only they go armed for fear of robbers, and repair in every city to thoſe of their own ſect, who always entertain them with whatever they have; they don't change their garments or ſhoes, till quite worn out and ſpoiled; they are ſingularly religious towards God, and ſpeak nothing vain before the ſun is up, but offer their accuſtomed prayers to him, praying that he may riſe; from his riſing till eleven a clock, they work diligently in thoſe arts they underſtand, then they come and waſh their bodies with cold water, and then dine moderately, and repair to their work again till evening; they diligently ſtudy the writings of the ancients, collecting out of them ſuch things eſpecially as are profitable for the ſoul and body; whence they, in order to cure diſeaſes, inquire after medicinal roots, and the properties of ſtones; they are ſtricter than any of the *Jews* about the ſabbath, for they not only prepare their meat the day before, but will not ſuffer any veſſel to be removed on that day; they deſpiſe adverſity, and conquer torments, *&c.* Beſides theſe things, *Joſephus*, *Antiq. Lib.* xviii. *c.* 2. tells us, that though they ſent gifts to the temple, yet they offer'd no ſacrifices; with whom alſo *Philo* agrees, *Lib. Quod omnis probus liber*, *p.* 876. If the next book of *Philo*, *De vita contemplativa*, is to be underſtood to treat of the *Eſſens*, or rather of another ſort of them, as *Joſephus* teſtifies they were of two ſorts; it would thence appear, that they uſed little for food, beſide bread and water; and that they were great pretenders to philoſophy and wiſdom, which may give the reaſon, why St. *Paul* warns the *Coloſſians* againſt being *beguiled by enticing words*, v. 4. by *philoſophy and vain deceit*, v. 8. and that he ſpeaks of *a ſhew of wiſdom*, v. 23. I can't but take notice of one expreſſion of *Joſephus* concerning them; where, after he had ſet forth their opinions to the beſt advantage, he adds: "Thus they ſet an "unavoidable bait for thoſe who have once had a taſte of their wiſdom." I avoid mentioning any thing from that treatiſe of *Philo*, *De vita contemplat.* becauſe *Valeſius* is very poſitive in aſſerting it relates not to the *Eſſens*, though *Euſebius*, *Joſ. Scaliger*, and *Petavius*, thought it did. I think I have produced enough to clear the reaſon of ſeveral of St. *Paul's* expreſſions, and particularly that of *neglecting of the body*. *Euſebius* has preſerved a fragment of *Philo's* apology which is loſt, relating to the *Eſſens*, which the reader may meet with, *Præpar. Evang. Lib.* viii. *c.* 11. For a more large and particular account of them, the *Engliſh* reader is referred to Dean *Prideaux's Connection*, Part II. Book V. p. 343——361. of the octavo edition.

(‖) Οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι πρὸς πλησμονὴν τ σαρκός. *Not in any honour to the ſatisfying of the fleſh.*] By the fleſh, I underſtand the fleſhly diſpoſition of theſe *Jewiſh* dogmatizers; who valued themſelves for theſe carnal ordinances, but had no reliſh or taſte of things of a more noble and ſpiritual nature. And ſo the *fleſh* here will be the ſame as the fleſhly mind, *v.* 18. and the expreſſion there, *vainly puft up by his fleſhly mind*, does well ſuit what we have here, πρὸς πλησμονὴν τ σαρκός, for the *ſatiating*, *ſurfeiting*, or *glutting of the fleſh*; for ſo that word ſignifies, as in that expreſſion of *Iſocrates ad Demon.* πλησμονὴ χρημάτων. And it ſeems but reaſonable, that we ſhould compare theſe two expreſſions, as well as the reſt of the two verſes, which are manifeſtly concerning the ſame thing, and throw conſiderable light upon one another. The other expreſſion render'd *not in any honour*, carries in it a reflection upon theſe *Judaizers*, while it declares what kind of gratifi-

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

Chriſt, ſeek thoſe things which are above, where Chriſt ſitteth on the right
2 hand of God. Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth;
3 For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Chriſt in

tiſm, you are riſen with Chriſt, ſeek the things that are above, where Chriſt ſitteth on the right hand of God; mind, I ſay, 2.
thoſe excellent and glorious things that are in heaven, and not ſuch poor matters as meats and drinks, which are upon the earth (*k*); for you are dead to them, and ſo freed from 3.
an obligation to mind them; and your life (*l*) is hid or laid up (not with angels, but with him with whom you are riſen, even) with Chriſt in God (*m*): But it ſhall not always be

NOTES.

eation thoſe things gave them. And as τιμὴ admits of two ſenſes, either of which will ſuit St. *Paul's* deſign, this is to be explained, according to which of them we chooſe. It ſometimes ſignifies, as it is here tranſlated, *Honour*; and ſo the meaning would be, that thoſe things, whatever they might think of them themſelves, ſerve for no *honourable* ſatisfying the fleſh; and thus the expreſſion amounts to the ſame with that, *v.* 18. *Vainly puft up of his fleſhly mind*; or is equivalent to that uſed of ſuch kind of perſons, *Philip.* iii. 19. *Whoſe* glory *is in their* ſhame, *who mind* earthly *things*. Again, the word ſometimes ſignifies the *price*, *worth*, or *value* of a thing; and taking it ſo here, the meaning is, that theſe things ſerve for no *profitable* ſatisfying of the fleſh; and for a comment we may apply that paſſage, *Heb.* xiii. 9. *It is a good thing for the heart to be eſtabliſhed with grace, not with* meats, *which have not* profited *them that have been occupied therein.*

2 (*k*) *Not on things on the earth.*] The ſubject St. *Paul* is upon, naturally leads to the interpretation given in the paraphraſe. And by giving this account of them, he caſts a contempt upon the things they ſo highly valued. Compare *Rom.* xiv. 17. *Heb.* xiii. 9.

3 (*l*) *Your life.*] It may be thought that his ſpeaking thus, and ſo again in the next verſe, *Ye ſhall appear with him in glory*, are inconſiſtent with the reckoning that he ſpeaks here to the *Jewiſh*, and not the *Gentile* converts; but I think this is a miſtake, becauſe he all along goes upon the ſuppoſition of their being Chriſtians, and their being dead, and riſen with Chriſt; and tho' he elſewhere ſpeaks very ſeverely of the *Gentiles*, who ſubmitted to the *Moſaic* Law, and repreſents them as *fallen from grace*, *Gal.* v. 4. yet I remember not that he does, with the ſame ſeverity, ſpeak of the ſtate of the *Jewiſh* converts, who continued to obſerve the law themſelves; nay he ſeems to ſpeak in a contrary manner, 1 *Cor.* iii. 12—15.

(*m*) *Your life is hid with Chriſt in God.*] Chriſt is repreſented as *ſitting at the right hand of God*, *v.* 1. and ſince he was there and out of ſight, and was *their life*, as he ſays, *v.* 4. their life as well as, and together with Chriſt, muſt be hid from them. The ſpeaking of Chriſt as our life, is agreable to other places of ſcripture, particularly *John* xiv. 6. — xi. 25. 1 *John* v. 11, 12. I would add, that St. *Paul* ſeems to me, in this place, not barely to ſpeak of their life as *hid*, that is, *out of ſight*; but as *hid*, that is, ſafely laid up as perſons jewels and treaſure are hid; and when he ſays your life is *hid with Chriſt in God*, he ſeems to refer to the double ſecurity they had for it; it was hid with Chriſt, the immediate beſtower of it, and in God the higheſt ſecurity of all. The words therefore of St. *Paul* may be illuſtrated

Chap. III.

PARAPHRASE.

4. be hid, for when Chriſt, who is our life, ſhall appear, then ſhall ye alſo appear with him in glory (*n*).

TEXT.

God. When Chriſt who 4 is our life ſhall appear, then ſhall ye alſo appear with him in glory.

NOTES.

by thoſe of Chriſt himſelf, *John* x. 28——30. *I give unto them* [my ſheep] *eternal life, and they ſhall never periſh, neither ſhall any pluck them out of my hand. My father which gave them me, is greater than all, and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one.*

4 (*n*) Being now come to the end of the argumentative part of the Epiſtle, I can't but requeſt the reader to look back upon the unuſual order and method of St. *Paul*'s diſcourſe, the careful obſerving and following which led me into ſome of the explications I have given, and may perhaps ſatisfy others of the juſtice of them.

The great deſign he had in view, was the eſtabliſhing the *Coloſſians* in their adherence to Chriſt; which he declares in general, *Chap.* ii. 4 —— 7. In order to this, he thought it neceſſary to caution them againſt two particular dangers, he apprehended them expoſed to; which are, 1. The being drawn in to ſubject themſelves to the *Jewiſh* rites and ceremonies. 2. The being led away to worſhip angels. By either of theſe, they in effect forſook Chriſt. In cautioning them againſt theſe, he does not firſt treat ſingly of one, and having fully diſpatched it, proceed to the other; but he jointly purſues both together. And thro' the whole of this interchangeable diſcourſe, the ſeveral parts belonging to each argument are to be joined together, juſt as tho' nothing had come between them. He goes over theſe no leſs than five ſeveral times, and it is worth while to obſerve how he treats of both, in each of theſe ſeveral times, to the ſame purpoſe.

1. In order to prevent their being deceived and drawn away from Chriſt, in either reſpect, he lays down his two poſitions, which he undertakes to prove, and by which he would eſtabliſh his caution. 1. That all bleſſings, wherewith Chriſtians are to be filled, dwell in Chriſt, and are not derived to us by the *Jewiſh* ceremonies, *v.* 8, 9. 2. That they received all from Chriſt, who is the head of all the angels, *v.* 10.

2. He next proves each of his poſitions. 1. That we are filled by Chriſt, and receive all bleſſings from him without the law, *v.* 11 —— 14. 2. That Chriſt is the head of all the angels, becauſe they are all by God willingly ſubjected to him, *v.* 15.

3. He draws his inference or concluſion of each kind, that the *Gentile Coloſſians* were not to be moved by the cenſures and ſentences of men upon them, for neglecting the *Jewiſh* ordinances, and for not worſhiping angels; and one ſingle οὖν, or *therefore* is here prefix'd, but muſt be underſtood to belong to each inference, and joined with its foregoing reſpective argument. And it is likewiſe to be obſerved, that in theſe references he runs back to his firſt poſitions. Theſe inferences are, 1. With reference to the Law, *v.* 16, 17. 2. With reference to angels, *v.* 18, 19.

4. Having drawn his inferences concerning the *Gentile Coloſſians*, he next proceeds to infer the abſurdity of the *Judaizers*, who would impoſe upon the *Gentiles* in either of theſe caſes. And he argues from their being dead with Chriſt, and one οὖν or *wherefore*, ſerves again to connect each inference to its reſpective argument. 1. It was abſurd for them to impoſe the *Jewiſh* ceremonies, *v.* 20, 21. and former part of 22. 2. It was abſurd for them to impoſe upon them ſuch things as never were the laws or doctrines of God, but only of men, as in the worſhiping of angels, latter part of *v.* 22, 23.

5. He infers, in like manner, with a ſingle οὖν, or *then*, the duty of theſe *Judaizers*, from their being riſen with Chriſt, and that in both Caſes. 1. As to the Law, that they had greater Things to mind than thoſe ceremonies, *Chap.* iii. 1, 2. and former part of the 3d. As to angels, he implies, that ſince they were riſen with Chriſt, and ſo their life was hid in him, and not in angels; they were not to worſhip them, latter part of *ver.* 3, 4.

NOTES.

I think it can't be amiſs to give the reader an intire view of the Apoſtle's management, through the ſeveral parts of this alternate diſcourſe, putting the reſpective parts of each by themſelves, without mixing them with each other.

Thus then he purſues the firſt ſubject, *Chap.* ii. 8. *Beware leſt any man ſpoil you thro' philoſophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the ſhadows of the world, and not after Chriſt* —— 9. *For in him dwelleth all the fulneſs of the godhead bodily* —— 11. *In whom alſo ye are circumciſed with the circumciſion made without hands, in putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh, by the circumciſion of Chriſt* —— 12. *Buried with him in baptiſm, wherein alſo you are riſen with him, thro' a belief of the power of God, who hath raiſed him from the dead* —— 13. *And you being dead in your ſins, and the uncircumciſion of your fleſh, hath he quickned together with him, having forgiven you all treſpaſſes* —— 14. *Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was againſt us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his croſs* —— 16. *Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in reſpect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the ſabbath days* —— 17. *Which are a ſhadow of things to come, but the body is of Chriſt* —— 20. *If therefore ye be dead with Chriſt from the ſhadows of the world, why, as tho' living in the world, do ye dogmatize* —— 21. *Eat not, taſte not, touch not* —— 22. *Which all are to periſh with the uſing* ——. Chap. iii. 1. *If therefore ye be riſen with Chriſt, ſeek thoſe things which are above, where Chriſt ſitteth on the right hand of God* —— 2. *Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth* —— 3. *For ye are dead.*

The other ſubject, relating to the worſhiping of angels, the ſeveral parts of it being brought together, will ſtand thus, *Chap* ii. 10. *You are filled by Chriſt, who is the head of all principalities and powers* —— 15. *God has diveſted principalities and powers, and openly propoſed them* [as an example of ſubjection to Chriſt] *cauſing them to triumph in Chriſt* —— 18. *Therefore let no man condemn you, being voluntary in his humility and worſhiping of angels, intruding into thoſe things which he hath not ſeen, vainly puft up by his fleſhly mind* —— 19. *And not holding the head, from which all the body, by joints and bands, having nouriſhment miniſtred and knit together, increaſeth with the increaſe of God* ——, 22. *Why, therefore,* if ye are riſen with Chriſt, do ye dogmatize *after the commandments and doctrines of men* —— 23. *Which things having indeed a ſhew of wiſdom in will-worſhip, and humility, and neglecting of the body, are for the ſatisfying of the fleſh, without any honour* —— *Chap.* iii. 3. If therefore ye are riſen with Chriſt, *your Life is hid* [not with angels, but] *with Chriſt in God* —— 4. [And] *when Chriſt, who is our life, ſhall appear, then ſhall ye alſo appear with him in glory* [there can be no reaſon, why you ſhould forſake Chriſt to worſhip angels.] The purſuing two ſuch ſubjects alternately, may well be allowed to leave room for taking in under the latter ſome few things, ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, from the former and larger. I can't think this a blemiſh in St. *Paul's* diſcourſe, for however he has interwoven theſe things one with another, yet he has done it very handſomely, and there is a good reſemblance between the two, in the ſeveral ſteps he takes. Somewhat of this nature Mr. *Locke* has obſerved, in the Epiſtle to the *Romans*. See his note on *Rom.* vii. 4. And others have thought the like may be diſcerned in 1 *Theſſ.* iv. 3—8. whether juſtly or no, I ſhall not now inquire. In the diſcourſe under conſideration, I can't ſee any reaſon to doubt, that he does not leſs than five ſeveral times go over the two points I mentioned together; perhaps ſome may think that I ought to have made them ſix inſtead of five, dividing the ſecond into two, the former contained in *v.* 11, 12. and the latter in *v.* 13, 14, 15. I own I am not averſe to this, though it does not ſeem ſo clear and eaſy as the reſt. I refer the whole to the careful and attentive reader of St. *Paul.*

COLOSSIANS.

SECT. VII.

CHAP. III. 5—7.

CONTENTS.

ST. *Paul* having diſpatched the principal deſign of his writing, comes now, according to his uſual manner, to give the *Coloſſians* ſome rules and directions for their Chriſtian behaviour and converſation. Theſe rules are of four kinds. 1. Such as concerned themſelves perſonally, and their own purity, in abſtaining from ſenſual luſts, *Chap.* iii. 5—7. 2. Such as concerned them as Chriſtians in ſociety, and were to be obſerved by them with regard to, and in converſing with one another, *v.* 8——17. 3. The duties reſulting from the ſeveral relations men ſtand in to one another, *v.* 18——25. ——iv. 1. 4. Such as had a reſpect to their enemies, among whom they lived, *Chap.* iv. 2.——6. Thro' all theſe he is to be conſider'd as applying himſelf to the whole church at *Coloſs*, both *Jewiſh*, and *Gentile* converts. In the firſt of theſe, taken into this ſection, he recommends purity, and an abſtaining from ſenſual and more groſly fleſhly luſts; inferring his advice from what he had before deliver'd.

PARAPHRASE.	*TEXT.*
5. AND ſince you are all dead and riſen with Chriſt, as I obſerved before [*Chap.* ii. 12.] mind to mortify thoſe luſts which proceed from your earthly members, ſuch as fornication, uncleanneſs, inordinate affection, evil concupiſcence, and exorbitant deſires in venereal matters (*n*), which are Idolatry.	MORTIFY therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanneſs, inordinate affection, evil concupiſcence, and covetouſneſs, which is idolatry. 5

Theſe

NOTES.

5 (*n*) Τὴν πλεονεξίαν. *Covetouſneſs.*] Mr. *Locke* has, after Dr. *Hammond*, fully explained St. *Paul*'s meaning, in uſing this word, whoſe note I ſhall therefore here tranſcribe. "*Cove-*" *touſneſs*," ſays he upon *Eph.* iv. 19. "in the common acceptation of the word, is the "letting looſe our deſires to that which by the law of juſtice we have no right to. But

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

6 For which things ſake, the wrath of God cometh on the children of diſobedi-

Theſe are things highly offenſive to God, for which he will bring the Heathen world, who will not come in and ſubmit to the Law of Chriſt (*o*), to judgment (*p*); among which 6.

NOTES.

" St. *Paul*, in ſome of his Epiſtles, uſes it for intemperate and exorbitant deſires of car-
" nal pleaſures, not confined within the bounds of nature. He that will compare with
" this verſe here, *Chap.* v. 3. *Col.* iii. 5. 1 *Theſſ.* iv. 5. 1 *Cor.* v. 10, 11. and well conſider
" the context, will find reaſon to take it here in the ſenſe I have given it, or elſe
" it will be very hard to underſtand theſe texts of ſcripture. In the ſame ſenſe the
" learned Dr. *Hammond* underſtands πλεονεξία, *Rom.* i. 29. which, though perhaps the *Greek*
" idiom will ſcarce juſtify, yet the Apoſtle's ſtile will, who often uſes *Greek* Terms in
" the full latitude of the *Hebrew* words, which they are uſually put for in tranſlating,
" though in the *Greek* uſe of them they have nothing at all of that ſignification; particu-
" larly the *Hebrew* word בצע, which ſignifies *covetouſneſs*, the *Septuagint* tranſlate μιασμὸς,
" *Ezek.* xxxiii. 31. in which ſenſe the Apoſtle uſes πλεονεξία here. And again, in his
" note upon *Eph.* v. 3. he ſays: the word in the *Greek* is πλεονεξία, which properly
" ſignifies covetouſneſs, or an intemperate ungoverned love of riches; but the chaſte
" ſtile of the ſcriptures makes uſe of it to expreſs the letting looſe of the deſires to
" irregular venereal pleaſures, beyond what was fit and right. This one can hardly
" avoid being convinced of, if one conſiders how it ſtands joined with this ſort of ſins, in
" thoſe many places which Dr. *Hammond* mentions, in his notes on *Rom.* i. 29. and *Eph.*
" iv. 19. ——v. 5. compared with this here [*Eph.* v. 3.] they are enough to ſatisfy one what
" πλεονεξία, *covetouſneſs* means here. But if that ſhould fail, theſe words: *Let it not be once*
" *named amongſt you, as becometh ſaints*, which are ſubjoined to *covetouſneſs*, put it paſt
" doubt; for what indecency or misbecomingneſs is it amongſt Chriſtians to name *covetouſ-*
" *neſs*? Πλεονεξία therefore muſt ſignify the title of ſins, that are not fit to be named
" amongſt Chriſtians. ——— That fornication, or all ſorts of uncleanneſs were the conſe-
" quence, and concomitants of idolatry, we ſee, *Rom.* i. 29. and 'tis known were favoured
" by the Heathen worſhip; and therefore, the practice of thoſe ſins is every where ſet down
" as the characteriſtical Heathen mark of the idolatrous *Gentiles*; from which abo-
" minations the *Jews*, both by their law, profeſſion, and general practice, were ſtran-
" gers: And this was one of thoſe things, wherein chiefly God ſevered his people
" from the idolatrous nations, as may be ſeen, *Lev.* xviii. 20. And hence, I think,
" that πλεονεξία, uſed for licentious intemperance in unlawful and unnatural luſts, is
" in the New Teſtament called idolatry, and πλεονέκτης an *idolater*; ſee 1 *Cor.* v. 11.
" *Col.* iii. 5. *Eph.* v. 5. as being the ſure and undoubted mark of an heathen and
" idolater.

6 (*o*) *The children of diſobedience.*] Theſe, in this place, and *Eph.* ii. 2. ——v. 6. are plainly the *Gentiles*, who refuſed to come in and ſubmit themſelves to the Goſpel; as will appear to any one who will read theſe places, and the contexts with attention.

(*p*) The reaſon why he ſo particularly inculcates the danger of theſe vices, was the enormity of them, and the commonneſs of them among the *Gentiles*, who thought light of them. Beſides, the *Coloſſians* had been themſelves formerly guilty of them, and they are ſome of them vices to which the temptations are ſtrongeſt, and from which ſuch as have been once guilty, are hardly and ſeldom reclaimed.

children

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

7. children of disobedience, you also sometime had your conversation, when being unconverted you lived in the commission of those sins (q).

ence. In the which ye also 7 walked some time, when ye lived in them.

NOTES.

7 (q) The paraphrase shows how I should choose to render the verse, and avoid the tautology, which our translation seems to carry in it; for what difference is there between *walking* in those vices, and *living* in them?

SECT. VIII.

CHAP. III. 8——17.

CONTENTS.

IN this section he directs them how as Christians they ought to converse with, and to be disposed towards one another.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

8. BUT since God has called you from among them, do you put away not only those earthly members or vices I have already mentioned, but in general all of them (r): And therefore put away these that follow; anger,

BUT now you also put 8 off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communica-

NOTES.

8 (r) τὰ πάντα. *All these.*] Our translators seem to have taken this, as though he had said τὰ πάντα ταῦτα, *all these things that follow*; but however it makes no difference as to the main sense, his words seem to me to refer to what he had said before, τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν τὰ ὄντα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, v. 5. *your Members which are upon Earth.* Compare *Matth.* v. 29, 30. *Mar.* ix. 43——48.

(s) Ἀπόθε-

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

tion out of your mouth.
9 Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his
10 deeds; And have put on the new *man*, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that
11 created him. Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, scythian, bond *nor* free; but Christ *is* all, and in all.
12 Put on therefore (as the elect of God, holy and beloved) bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suf-

anger, wrath, malice, evil speaking, and filthy communication out of your mouth (*s*).
Lie not one to another, seeing you have aban- 9.
doned your old conversation and practices (*t*);
and are as it were new men, not living in your 10.
former ignorance, but being well informed and instructed, you are become like him who formed you to this, and who cannot lie or deceive.
In which new creation it makes no difference 11.
with him whether a man is a *Gentile* or a *Jew*, circumcised or uncircumcised, a *Barbarian*, or a *Scythian*, a slave or a freeman (*u*);
but the whole turns upon mens belonging to
Christ, whoever they are (*w*). And since God 12.
equally

NOTES.

(*s*) Αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν. *Filthy communication out of your mouth*] Dr. *Whitby* says: "This is usually referred to obscene and impure words. But *Hesychius*, *Phavorinus*, "and *Julius Pollux*, *l.* 2. *c.* 4. have informed us, that the word signifies *reproachful words*, "such as tend to put a man to shame; and to this sense the words preceding make it most "proper to refer it; *wrath*, *anger*, and *malice*, or evil machinations of the heart, being "the inward dispositions which render us disaffected to, and prone to do evil to others; "railing and opprobrious speeches, which tend to render our brother infamous to others, "being the usual effects of these evil dispositions." But as the Apostle here gives rules for our speech, the other sense may not be disagreable; and the rather, since in the parallel Epistle to the *Ephesians*, he expressly forbids such filthy communication, and would not have it proceed *out of their mouth*, or *be once named among them*. See *Eph.* iv. 29. —— v. 3, 4. αἰσχρολογία therefore here may be the same as αἰσχρότης, and λόγος σαπρὸς there.

9 (*t*) See the note on *Chap.* ii. 11.

11 (*u*) St. *Paul*'s main design, in this Epistle, was to establish the *Colossians* in their adhering to the Gospel mystery of the calling of the *Gentiles*, and their maintaining their freedom against the *Jewish* dogmatizers; and tho' he had already concluded that matter, yet having it very much upon his heart, he takes an occasion here, in the midst of quite other things, to drop a word with relation to it.

(*w*) Ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι Χριστός. *But Christ is all and in all.*] The sense is, that in the point of obtaining acceptance with God, our regard must be paid solely to Christ, upon him alone we must depend, and not upon the *Mosaick* Law; that faith in, and obedience to Christ, are all the terms God insists upon; and that this is the case *in all*, or *among all* men, let them be *Jews*, or let them be *Gentiles*, of whatever nation, or whatever condition, it matters not; upon these terms alone they should be received, without submitting to the ordinances, which the *Judaizers* would gladly obtrude upon them. The reader by this easily perceives in how vastly different a sense it is, that the same expression is used concerning God the Father, 1 *Cor.* xv. 28.

13 (*x*)

equally accepts all men upon the ſame terms, do you, as the peculiar people of God, holy and beloved, imitate him, and put on bowels of compaſſion, kindneſs, humility, meekneſs, 13. long ſuffering; bearing with one another, and forgiving one another, if any of you have a matter of complaint againſt another; as Chriſt hath forgiven you *(x)*, do ye alſo forgive one 14. another. And upon all theſe put on love *(y)*, 15. which is the bond of perfectneſs *(z)*. And in order

fering; Forbearing one a- 13
nother, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel againſt any; even as Chriſt forgave you, ſo alſo *do* ye. And above 14 all theſe things, *put on* charity, which is the bond of perfectneſs. And let 15

NOTES.

13 *(x) Chriſt hath forgiven you.*] In the parallel Epiſtle, *Eph.* iv. 32. he expreſſes himſelf thus: *God by Chriſt hath forgiven you:* But this neceſſarily implies what he here ſays, for if God forgives by Chriſt, then Chriſt muſt forgive in his name, and by his authority.

14 *(y)* Ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις ἀγαπᾶτε. *Above all theſe things, put on charity.*] Our tranſlators have very well inſerted *put on*, fetching it from *v.* 12. but it is doubtful how the other expreſſion is to be taken. The *Syriac* renders it *with all theſe*, the *French beſide all theſe*, the *Italian for all theſe*, the *Dutch* and our *Engliſh above all theſe*; which is what St. *Peter* expreſſes by περὶ πάντων, 1 *Pet.* iv. 8. The *vulg. Latin*, *Beza*, and *Caſtellio* rendering it *ſuper hæc omnia*, have left the ſenſe as ambiguous, as it is in the *Greek*. In the paraphraſe the rendering *upon all theſe* is prefer'd, becauſe the verb uſed by the Apoſtle carries in it an alluſion to a garment; and the Chriſtian virtues are repreſented as clothing and adorning perſons, 1 *Pet.* iii. 3 —— 5. —— v. 5. 1 *Tim.* ii 9. and ſo he may be underſtood to direct them here to put on charity *over* or *upon* all the other virtues, before mentioned.

(z) *The bond of perfectneſs.*] This may ſignify either, 1. That love is the moſt *perfect bond*, which will be an hebraiſm not uncommon in the New Teſtament. Or, 2. That love is ſuch a bond as ties together all thoſe virtues, which are the perfection of Chriſtians; and therefore was very proper to be put over them all. Compare 1 *John* iv. 12, 18. Or, 3. Very agreably to the ſubject of his diſcourſe, and particularly to what he mentions in the next verſe of Chriſtians being one body; he may here call love that bond, which ſo unites and faſtens them all together, as that they become as it were one body, and are perfect. To this purpoſe we may obſerve how he ſpeaks of the whole church. *Eph.* iv. 11, 12, 13. *He gave ſome Apoſtles —— for the perfecting of the ſaints —— for the edifying of the body of Chriſt, till we all come to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a* perfect [τέλειον] *man, unto the meaſure of the ſtature of the fulneſs of Chriſt.* And how we attain this perfection he declares, *v.* 15. *But being true in love, we may grow up into him in all things, who is the head, even Chriſt; from whom the whole body —— maketh increaſe of the body, to the ediſying it ſelf in love.* And what he here calls the *bond of perfectneſs*, he there calls the *bond of peace*, Eph. iv. 3. That he was deſirous of this perfection among the *Coloſſians*, appears from what he ſays, *Chap.* ii. 2. *That they might be knit together in love.* I prefer this latter ſenſe, and ſo conclude this to be his meaning, "Put on love, which is the bond "of that perfect union there ought to be in the body of Chriſt; and whereby the whole "church becomes perfect."

TEXT.

the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thank-
16 ful. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, in all wisdom; teaching and ad-

PARAPHRASE.

order to your exercising such love, let the peace of God *(a)* influence your hearts, into the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful. Farther, it would be of good 16.
service, to prevent the sins from which I have dissuaded you, and to promote the love I have recommended, if in your conversing together, you would take care that your discourse and talk should be much of Christ in all wisdom *(b)*; and

NOTES.

15 *(a) The peace of God.*] This phrase is only to be found here, and *Philip.* iv. 7. and since these two Epistles were written about the same time, we may well imagine that the same peace is meant in both; and especially considering how alike it is spoken of in both places. I shall therefore endeavour to clear the meaning of this place by comparing it with the other, which runs thus: *The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds thro' Christ Jesus.* There can be no question, I think, that the *peace of God* may as properly signify that peace we have with God, *Rom.* v. 1. as that peace which God injoins us to cultivate with one another. And tho' there is a great satisfaction which accompanies a peaceable temper and behaviour, yet it seems most likely to me, that such an high expression, as that of *passing all understanding*, should be used concerning the peace we have with God; which appears the more astonishing and unfathomable, the more we set our selves to consider of it. Farther, when it is said, this peace of God shall keep our hearts and minds *thro'* or *by* Jesus Christ, it seems to be a farther confirmation of this interpretation; for as the peace we have with God is thro' Christ, so the Apostle may well be understood to speak of it, as having its effect upon us thro' him; since all blessings are derived to us thro' him. Besides, in that place to the *Philippians*, I see nothing that should incline us to understand him to speak of any other, than this peace of God with us, and our sense of that great blessing. Nor do I see any difficulty there is in applying this sense to the place under consideration, but this rather confirms our interpretation of the other in this manner; for we may without any violence thus explain it: "Let a sense of that peace, "which you have with God, always affect and influence your hearts, so that you may find your "selves constrained by it to an imitation of him, and to be at peace with others, as he "has been pleased to be at peace with you; and the rather, because you were called into "this state of reconciliation in one body or society, with all those with whom I now "urge you to live in peace and love; for which you ought to be very thankful: And when "you are truly thankful for the peace you have with God, you can't be backward to be at "peace with your fellow Christians, who must needs have far less offended you, than you "have him." I am not peremptory in determining this to be the sense of the place, but it seems the most easy and natural to me; tho' I own a plausible account may be given of the text, according to the other interpretation.

It may be here again observed, that as this one body relates to the *Jews* and *Gentiles* being made one church and people by the gospel; so it appears St. *Paul* was still mindful of the great subject of his Epistle, when he thus gives a hint of it.

16 *(b)* Ὁ λόγος τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐνοικείτω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως. *Let the word of Christ dwell richly in you.*] Whether the true meaning of this verse be given in the paraphrase, must be left

Chap. III.

PARAPHRASE.

and that you entertain one another in converſing together in a Chriſtian manner, teaching *(c)* and admoniſhing one another in pſalms, and hymns,

TEXT.

moniſhing one another in pſalms and hymns, and ſpi-

NOTES.

to the judgment of the reader, when he has heard the reaſons for it. It is taken for granted, becauſe I believe no one would doubt of it, that the phraſe ὁ λόγ☉ τ☧ χεισ☧, may as well be rendered, *The diſcourſe of*, or *concerning Chriſt*, as any other way; and that it ought to be ſo, and we ſhould underſtand him as ſaying, *Let the diſcourſe concerning Chriſt dwell richly among you, in all wiſdom*, may appear, 1. From the place where this rule ſtands; and that is among other rules given to Chriſtians to obſerve in their converſing together. 2. From what St. *Paul* joins with this, *teaching and admoniſhing one another, in pſalms, and hymns, and ſpiritual ſongs*; which ſhews he is directing them how they ſhould converſe together; the *ſinging* here preſcribed being not for their publick aſſemblies, but their private converſation. 3. This is much confirmed by the parallel place, *Eph.* v. 18—20. *And be not drunk with wine, wherein is exceſs; but be filled with the ſpirit, ſpeaking to one another* [ſo it ſhould be render'd] *in pſalms, and hymns, and ſpiritual ſongs, ſinging and making melody in your heart to the Lord, giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father, in the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Whoever compares the 19th and 20th verſes of that chapter, with the verſes under conſideration, together with that which follows, will ſee they agree exactly in matter, and very much in words alſo; and therefore will not doubt of their relating to the ſame duty. Now his bringing in the duty there in oppoſition to their being *drunk with wine*, leads us to underſtand the duty as relating to Chriſtians converſing together. To which purpoſe, I will tranſcribe Mr. *Locke's* paraphraſe of *v.* 18, 19. which gives a very eaſy and natural account of the words: "And be not drunken with wine, wherein there is exceſs, ſeek "not diverſion in the noiſy and intemperate jollity of drinking; but when you are diſpoſed "to a chearful entertainment of one another, let it be with the gifts of the holy Spirit, "that ye are filled with, ſinging hymns, and pſalms, and ſpiritual ſongs, among your ſelves; "this makes real and ſolid mirth in the heart, and is melody well pleaſing to God himſelf." Let it be added here, that this is moſt agreable to that rule of St. *James*, *Chap.* v. 13. *Is any merry? let him ſing pſalms.* 4. This verſe being thus underſtood, that which follows will excellently well agree with it; for as he here recommends to them the diſcourſing concerning Chriſt, he there enlarges his exhortation: *And whatſoever ye do in word* [that is, *in diſcourſe*, ἐν λόγ☧, and the *And* in the beginning of that verſe ſhows that it is thus to be connected] *or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jeſus*, &c. *q. d* "I would not that "you ſhould pay a regard to Chriſt only in your diſcourſe, no, but refer every action in "like manner to him, and do all in his name."

(*c*) Ἐν ὑμῖν, διδάσκοντες.] Concerning the ſolœciſm in theſe words, ſee Mr. *Gataker*, in his notes upon *Mar. Antonin. Lib.* iii. *Sect.* iv. The ſolœciſm might be avoided, by beginning a new ſentence with διδάσκοντες, and leaving out the καὶ in the beginning of the next verſe (as it is left out by the *vulgate Latin*, the *Clermont*, and *St. Germain's* copies, and by two old *Latin* commentators) and by ſupplying what muſt otherwiſe be here ſupplied, ποιεῖτε. Or it may much eaſier be avoided by beginning a new ſentence at the latter end of *v.* 15. καὶ εὐχάριστοι γίνεσθε, joining thereto in conſtruction, διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτούς, &c. and including the intermediate ſentence in a parentheſis: And then, in this paſſage, the Apoſtle firſt directs to a duty, then mentions the means neceſſary for the right performance of it, in the words contained by the parentheſis; and laſtly, preſcribes the manner of exerciſing it. And the words εὐχάριστοι, χάριτι & εὐχαριστοῦντες ſeem to favour this con-

nection,

TEXT.

ritual ſongs, ſinging with grace in your hearts to the
17 Lord. And whatſoever ye do in word or deed, *do* all in the name of the Lord Jeſus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him.

PARAPHRASE.

hymns, and ſpiritual ſongs *(d)*, ſinging with grace *(e)*, ſincerely and heartily to the Lord *(f)*. And whatſoever you do, whether in diſcourſe, 17.
or in your other actions, do all in the name and authority of the Lord Jeſus, giving thanks to God the Father by him; and as long as you keep to this, you can never break in upon thoſe rules I have given you for Chriſtian converſation.

NOTES.

nection, as they may refer to the ſame ſubject, and are capable of the ſenſes here given them. The firſt and laſt are the ſame with our common verſion, and χάεις is deſcribed by *Heſychius*, ἀμοιβὴ καλὰ διεξαγεσίαν, that is, *gratitude* or *thankfulneſs*. But, perhaps, there is no neceſſity of avoiding a thing that may be obſerved in other authors: eſpecially, ſince St. *Paul* pretended not to *wiſdom of words*, 1 *Cor.* i. 17.

(*d*) I am doubtful about the exact diſtinction that is to be made between *pſalms*, and *hymns*, and *ſpiritual ſongs*. I know nothing better than what Dr. *Whitby* has ſaid upon the matter, who may be conſulted on *Eph.* v. 19. To which it may be added, that theſe three words may ſeem to anſwer to three *Hebrew* ones ψαλμὸς to מזמור *Pſal.* iii. *tit.* ὕμνος to תהלה tho' I do not find it ſo rendered, *Pſalm* cxlv. *tit.* yet it is in other places, and ᾠδὴ or שיר *Pſal.* cxx. 1. but what the difference of theſe was I pretend not to gueſs. Nor have I any thing to ſay, concerning the manner in which Chriſtians uſed to ſing at home, or in their aſſemblies in the Apoſtle's times. Perhaps, ſome light might be given to it, if we could diſcover what the cuſtom was in the ages that were neareſt to them; but that ſeems hitherto to be as dark and uncertain as the other; and 'tis great pity, that ſome able hand has not hitherto undertaken to give ſome clear account of a thing, which we are ſo much concerned to know.

(*e*) Ἐν χάειτι ᾄδοντες. *Singing with grace.*] The ſenſe is doubtful, and therefore I have left the rendering of our tranſlation in the paraphraſe; only I have avoided what our tranſlation ſeems to ſuggeſt, that this grace is to be in the heart; whereas, if we would render it ſtrictly, it ſhould be *ſinging with grace, with the heart.* Compare *Eph.* v. 19. where he has not *with grace.* The expreſſion may ſignify *with thankfulneſs*, which is very ſuitable to ſuch an action; or elſe it may ſignify *with gracefulneſs* or *decency*. I moſt incline to this latter ſenſe, in which the phraſe is uſed, *Chap.* iv. 6. *Let your ſpeech be always with grace*, i. e. with gracefulneſs. Thus he ſeems to mean the ſame thing, *Eph.* iv. 29. *Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the uſe of edifying, that it may miniſter* grace *unto the hearers*; ἵνα δῷ χάειν, "ſuch," ſays Mr. *Locke*, "as may have a becoming "gracefulneſs in the Ears of the hearers."

(*f*) Τῷ Κυείῳ. *To the Lord.*] Who this Lord is, the Apoſtle declares in the next verſe, even God the Father: Compare *Eph.* v. 19, 20. where the ſame is very eaſy to be obſerved.

COLOSSIANS.

SECT. IX.

CHAP. III. 18—IV. 1.

CONTENTS.

IN this ſection he gives rules concerning the duties ariſing from the ſeveral particular relations which Chriſtians ſtand in to one another. Thoſe which he inſiſts on are theſe three, husbands and wives, parents and children, maſters and ſlaves; in treating of all which he delivers the duties of the inferior relation before thoſe of the ſuperior.

PARAPHRASE.

18. WIVES, ſubmit your ſelves unto your own husbands, as it is fit for Chri-
19. ſtians to do. And on the other hand, ye husbands, love your wives, and be not ſevere and churliſh toward them.
20. Children, obey your parents in all thoſe things to which the parental authority reacheth (*); for this is well pleaſing to the Lord.
21. And on your part, ye fathers, do not by the auſterity of your carriage, the rigour of your commands, and the ſeverity of your diſcipline, provoke them; leſt they be diſcouraged in their endeavours to obey and pleaſe you.
22. Ye that are ſervants and ſlaves, obey thoſe who are your maſters, according to the laws of men, in all things wherein they have a right to command you; and in ſerving them don't only mind to do ſuch things as will come

TEXT.

WIVES, ſubmit your 18
ſelves unto your
own husbands, as it is fit
in the Lord. Husbands, 19
love your wives, and be
not bitter againſt them.
Children, obey *your* pa- 20
rents in all things; for
this is well pleaſing unto
the Lord. Fathers, pro- 21
voke not your children to
anger, leſt they be diſ-
couraged.
Servants, obey in all things 22
your maſters, according to
the fleſh; not with eye-
ſervice, as men pleaſers,
but *in ſingleneſs of heart*,

NOTES.

20 (*) This muſt be underſtood under ſome ſuch limitation, and there can be no hurt in ſupplying the ſenſe from v. 18. with ἐν Κυρίῳ, and ſo it is expreſſed, *Eph.* vi. 1. *i. e.* as the Lord requires you, and as far as is conſiſtent with your duty to him.

under

TEXT.

23 fearing God: And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and
24 not unto men; Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve
25 the Lord Christ. But he that doth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons.
1 Masters, give unto *your* servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a master in heaven.

PARAPHRASE.

under their observation, as tho' you were only, or chiefly, seeking to please men; but act herein with that simplicity of heart, that becomes men fearing God. And whatsoever you do in 23.
their service, do it from your very hearts, in obedience to Christ, and not to men only; Knowing that from him you shall receive the 24.
reward of his heavenly kingdom, which is the inheritance of his servants: For tho' you are servants to men, yet you are also, upon your becoming Christians, the servants of Christ, who will not fail to recompense the obedience and faithfulness of them that serve him. But if 25.
any professing themselves his servants, shall injure and wrong others, they shall suffer for it; and that without respect of persons, whether they are bond or free; and therefore, if you servants wrong your masters, you must expect he will punish you for it; and if they wrong you, you may depend upon his recompensing you, and punishing them. On the other side, you, 1.
who are masters, give to your servants that which is just and equal, as to food, clothing, *&c.* Exact not more work of them than they are able to perform, nor with-hold from them the rewards they deserve, nor punish them with a severity beyond the desert of their faults: And this do, as men who know you have yourselves a great master in heaven, who will punish your injustice and cruelty, and will deal the same measure to you, which you now do to your servants.

SECT.

Chap. IV.

SECT. X.

CHAP. IV. 2——6.

CONTENTS.

IN this ſection he ſets before the *Coloſſians* the duties which were incumbent on them, with reſpect to ſuch as were not Chriſtians, and among whom they lived. The duties urged are three. 1. Perſeverance in prayer, and here he commends himſelf particularly to their prayers. 2. Prudence and inoffenſiveneſs in their conduct. 3. The due ordering of their words and diſcourſe with them.

PARAPHRASE.

2. AND as you have ſo many enemies, who will do all that lies in their power to drive you from your religion, and to hinder the ſpreading of the Goſpel *(g)*, you had need be

TEXT.

CONtinue in prayer, and watch in the ſame with thankſgiving;

NOTES.

2 (*g*) If any one thinks, that too great a liberty is taken in making this rule to relate ſo peculiarly to the circumſtances of Chriſtians and Chriſtianity at that time, by reaſon of the unconverted enemies thereof; let him conſider the following reaſons for it. 1. It is manifeſt, that the two other duties may well be underſtood in the ſame manner; at leaſt, it is neceſſary the former of them muſt be ſo, becauſe he expreſly declares it: *Walk in wiſdom toward them that are without*; and ſince he had before given directions for the ſpeech and diſcourſe of Chriſtians with one another, it is but reaſonable to think, that the latter of thoſe two had a regard to their diſcourſe with ſuch as were not Chriſtians, with ſuch as were *without*, juſt mentioned before. Now if this be ſuppoſed, that the other two duties are of this ſort, it will look very likely that this is ſo too; or otherwiſe, we muſt take this for a duty placed by it ſelf, not reducible to any one of the forementioned heads of his diſcourſe; and ſo a great deal of the order and concinnity of this part of his Epiſtle would be loſt. 2. The ſubject matter of the praying, which he recommends to them, ſo far as does appear from any thing here expreſſed, was publick. It is manifeſt, that he mentions not their praying for himſelf upon any other, than a publick account, *v.* 3, 4. It is uſual with him, to deſire the prayers of Chriſtians upon this account. Compare *Rom.* xv. 30, 31. 2 *Theſſ.* iii. 1. and it might ſeem not unlikely, that with that deſign chiefly he might here mention that duty. 3. That which confirms this more eſpecially, is the fuller and larger expreſſion, which we have of this ſame thing in the parallel Epiſtle, *Eph.* vi. 18, 19. 20. Where let it be obſerved, that the direction is given with reference to the very ſame caſe that I ſuppoſe in the place before us. This appears from *Eph.* vi. 11, 12, 13. *Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to ſtand againſt the wiles of the devil. For we*

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

3 Withal, praying alſo for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to ſpeak the myſtery of Chriſt, for which I am
4 alſo in bonds; That I may make it manifeſt, as I
5 ought to ſpeak. Walk in wiſdom toward them that are without, redeeming
6 the time. Let your ſpeech *be* always with grace, ſea-

be frequent and inſtant in prayer, attending and watching therein with thankſgiving *(b)*. And when your own caſe, and that of Chri- 3.
ſtianity, engages you in this duty, I deſire you would particularly pray for me, that God would give me an opportunity to preach and declare the myſtery of Chriſt, (the calling the *Gentiles* into his church, without ſubjecting them to the Law of *Moſes)* for which I am alſo at this time in bonds: That I may 4.
declare it as plainly and fully, as it becomes me to do, who have been ſo peculiarly intruſted with the revelation of it, and a commiſſion to preach it. Behave your ſelves with wiſdom 5.
and prudence toward ſuch as are not chriſtians, that giving them as little offence as poſſible, you may gain the more time of reſpite from perſecution, and for the ſpreading of the goſpel *(i)*. Let your ſpeech be always graceful 6.
and

NOTES.

we wreſtle not againſt fleſh and blood (that is, men are not the only perſecutors, with whom we contend) *but againſt principalities, againſt powers, againſt the rulers of the darkneſs of this world, againſt ſpiritual wickedneſs in high places. Wherefore, take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withſtand in the evil day* (the time of perſecution) *and having done all to ſtand.* This is exactly what I ſuppoſe he conſider'd, as calling the *Coloſſians* to ſuch diligence in prayer. Now obſerve how he brings in there the ſame exhortation, with reference to that caſe. He commends to them, upon the account of the circumſtances, the danger and oppoſition of that time, that they would take to themſelves the whole armour of God, and concludes thus: *Praying always with all prayer and ſupplication in the ſpirit, and watching thereunto, with all perſeverance; and ſupplication for all ſaints; and for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the myſtery of the goſpel; for which I am an ambaſſador in bonds; that therein I may ſpeak boldly, as I ought to ſpeak.* How exactly do theſe three verſes anſwer to *Col.* iv. 2, 3, 4. only the firſt of them is here more ſhortly expreſſed. And who then will doubt, whether St. *Paul* had not exactly the ſame deſign in both?

(*b*) *With thankſgiving.*] I am inclined to think the Apoſtle the rather mentions this, becauſe as he refers in the words before to their perilous ſtate, he was not willing they ſhould be diſcouraged, or ſink under the thoughts of it; and therefore to raiſe their ſpirits, he here puts them in mind of the great occaſion they had for thankſgiving. Compare *Philip.* iv. 5, 6.

5 (*i*) Τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι. *Redeeming the time.*] i. e. Gaining as much as you can, prolonging your own tranquility, and the opportunity of ſpreading the goſpel. The *Co-*

loſſians:

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

and modeſt *(k)*, and temper'd with wiſdom and diſcretion *(l)*, that ſo it may appear you underſtand how to anſwer ſuch as would queſtion you concerning your religion *(m)*.

ſoned with ſalt, that ye may know how ye ought to anſwer every man.

NOTES.

Ioſſians, by their Chriſtian converſation, would reprove and ſhame thoſe among whom they lived for their enormous crimes: This was likely to bring upon them their rage and fury, and ſo to deprive the miniſters of the goſpel of an opportunity of freely preaching it: For this reaſon, the Apoſtle recommends a prudent behaviour toward the unconverted *Gentiles*, that they might be as little exaſperated as poſſible. This phraſe is taken from the LXX. who, *Dan.* ii. 8. thus exactly render the *Chaldee*, Ἐπ' ἀληθείας οἶδα ἐγὼ ὅτι καιρὸν ὑμεῖς ἐξαγοράζεσθε. *I know of a certainty that you are buying*, or *redeeming the time*; that is, you endeavour to ward off the danger by delays. And that this is St. *Paul*'s meaning, appears by the reaſon he gives to preſs the ſame rule, *Eph.* v. 15, 16. *See then that ye walk exactly, not as fools, but as wiſe, redeeming the time, becauſe the days are evil.*

6 (*k*) *With grace.*] See the note on *Chap.* iii. 16.

(*l*) Salt is put for wiſdom, both in ſacred and prophane authors.

(*m*) St. *Paul* has here a reſpect to heathen magiſtrates, who had it in their power to call them in queſtion for their religion: and ſo this is much to the ſame purpoſe, with what St. *Peter* ſays, 1 *Pet.* iii. 15. *Be ready always to anſwer every man that asketh you a reaſon of the hope that is in you* (*i. e.* of your religion) *with meekneſs and fear.*

SECT. XI.

CHAP. IV. 7—18.

CONTENTS.

IN this ſection, the concluſion of his epiſtle, he refers the *Coloſſians* to *Tychicus* and *Oneſimus*, for a particular account of his affairs; and ſending his own and others ſalutations, concludes with his uſual benediction.

Tychicus

Chap. IV.

TEXT.

7 ALL my ſtate ſhall Tychicus declare unto you, *who is* a beloved brother, and a faithful miniſter, and fellow ſervant in
8 the Lord; Whom I have ſent unto you for the ſame purpoſe, that he might know your eſtate, and com-
9 fort your hearts: With Oneſimus a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you. They ſhall make known unto you all things which *are done*
10 here. Ariſtarchus my fellow priſoner ſaluteth you, and Marcus ſiſters ſon to Barnabas (touching whom ye received commandments; if he come unto you
11 receive him.) And Jeſus,

PARAPHRASE.

Tychicus, a Chriſtian (*n*) beloved brother, faithful miniſter, and fellow ſervant, ſhall give you a full account how matters ſtand with me: Whom I have ſent unto you with this deſign, that he might know how things are with you (*o*), and that he might comfort your hearts: I have ſent him together with *Oneſimus*, a faithful and beloved brother, who is of your city. They ſhall acquaint you with all things that are done here. *Ariſtarchus* (*p*), my companion in bonds, ſalutes you; and ſo does *Mark*, nephew to *Barnabas* (concerning whom you have already received a meſſage (*); if he come unto you, receive him kindly) And *Jeſus* who is alſo called *Juſtus*. Theſe are of the *Jewiſh* nation, and the only perſons there-

7. 8. 9. 10. 11.

NOTES.

7 (*n*) *In the Lord.*] This ſeems to me to relate to each of the three characters given of *Tychicus*; and therefore, rendering it Chriſtian, I have prefixed it to them all, to intimate as much.

8 (*o*) The *Alexandrian*, and many other good MSS. read this verſe exactly as *Eph.* vi. 22. *Whom I have ſent unto you for the ſame purpoſe, that ye might know* our *affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts.* This may be the true reading; but ſince the thing wherein the difference of the two reading lies, is expreſſed, *v.* 9. I have choſen to follow the ſame copy our tranſlators did, which declares his deſire, both that he might know their affairs, and that they might know his.

10 (*p*) *Ariſtarchus* was a *Macedonian* of *Theſſalonica*, *Acts* xix. 29. —— xx. 4. but, as we are here told, a *Jew* by deſcent. He went with St. *Paul* into *Aſia*, and was ſeized by the mob at *Epheſus*; and afterwards accompanied him to *Rome*, *Acts* xxvii. 2. and was his fellow labourer, *Philem.* 24. and his companion in bonds, as it is ſaid here.

(*) Ελάβετε ἐντολάς. *Ye have received commandments.*] The word ſeems uſed, not in the moſt common ſenſe of it; but in that wherein *Cicero* often uſes *mandata*, where perſons had no authority to command. Thus he writes to *Appius Pulcher*, *Epiſt. Fam. Lib.* iii. *Epiſt.* 10. *Tullius, cui mandata ad me dediſti, non convenerat me.* "*Tully*, by whom you ſent a meſſage "to me, had not come to me." To this purpoſe is the word uſed, *Acts* xvii. 15. *They that conducted* Paul, *brought him to* Athens, *and* receiving a commandment *to* Silas *and* Timotheus *for to come to him with all ſpeed, they departed.* Where the *Syriac* has tranſlated it *receiving a letter*, אגרתא. So the *Italian*, *Receiving a commiſſion.* Civility teaches us to eſteem the reaſonable deſires of friends, as carrying in them the force of commands, tho' they pretend not to uſe any authority; and hence the ſame manner of ſpeech is familiar in the modern languages.

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

of (*q*), who joined with me to ſpread the kingdom of God; and they have been a com-
12. fort to me. *Epaphras* alſo ſalutes you, who is one of your city, a ſervant of Chriſt, and who is always very earneſt in his prayers, that ye may ſtand perfect and complete in the whole
13. will of God (*r*). For I can witneſs for him, that he hath a warm affection and hearty concern for you, and the Chriſtians of *Laodicea*,
14. and *Hierapolis*. *Luke*, the beloved phyſician,
15. and *Demas* ſalute you. Salute the Chriſtian brethren that are in *Laodicea*, and *Nymphas*, and the church which uſes to meet in his
16. houſe. And when this Epiſtle has been read among you, take care, that it be read alſo in the church of the *Laodiceans*, and that you read
17. that from *Laodicea* (*s*). And ſay to *Archippus*, Take heed to the miniſtry which thou

TEXT.

which is called Juſtus, who are of the circumciſion. Theſe only *are my* fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort unto me. Epa- 12
phras, who is one of you, a ſervant of Chriſt, ſaluteth you, always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may ſtand perfect and complete in all the will of God. For I bear him 13
record, that he hath a great zeal for you, and them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis. Luke the be- 14
loved phyſician, and Demas greet you. Salute the 15
brethren, which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his houſe. And when this Epi- 16
ſtle is read amongſt you, cauſe that it be read alſo in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewiſe read the epiſtle from Laodicea. And ſay to Archip- 17
pus, Take heed to the miniſtry which thou haſt received in the Lord, that

NOTES.

11 (*q*) *Theſe only are my fellow-workers.*] That is, the only ones of the circumciſion; for *Luke* and *Demas* were with him.

12 (*r*) *In all the will of God.*] He has here a reſpect more eſpecially to that part of the will of God, which was ſo much upon his heart, their maintaining their Chriſtian liberty, and not ſubmitting to the *Jewiſh* ordinances.

16 (*s*) The Epiſtle from *Laodicea* could not be written by St. *Paul* from thence, ſince he had never been there, *Chap.* ii. 1. It ſeems probable, it was ſome Epiſtle written to him by ſome of the *Laodiceans*, giving an account of their own caſe, and that of their neighbours at *Coloſs*; and he judging it to contain ſomewhat worthy to be conſidered by the *Coloſſians*, was deſirous it ſhould be read among them. Or elſe, as is the conjecture of an ingenious and learned friend, he may here mean ſome letter he had written to thoſe of *Laodicea*; of which, when the *Coloſſians* ſent a copy of their letter, the ſame meſſengers were to bring a copy ἐκ Λαοδικείας from *Laodicea*. Whatever the letter was, it is loſt; that which has appeared in the world, being too contemptible a forgery ever to be taken for the writing of St. *Paul*, by perſons of the leaſt degree of ſenſe and judgment.

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

18 thou fulfil it. The ſalutation by the hand of me Paul. Remember my bonds. Grace be with you. Amen.

haſt received in the Lord, that thou may'ſt fully diſcharge it. The concluding ſalutation, I *Paul* write with my own hand. Remember my bonds. Grace be with you. *Amen.* 18.

A N

APPENDIX,

EXPLAINING

Eph. iv. 8. and *Pſal.* lxviii. 17, 18.

WHAT is here offered, was deſigned to have been added at the end of the note upon *Col.* ii. 15. till it ran out to ſo great a length, as to be like to prove an interruption to perſons in ſtudying that Epiſtle; whence, it has been thought more adviſeable to place it in an *Appendix* by it ſelf. Nor can there be a fitter occaſion to treat of this matter; Mr. *Locke*'s admirable *Paraphraſe and Notes* upon the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians* having rendered it needleſs, at leaſt for me, to think of ever writing upon it; and it being only propoſed to ſupply what is perhaps a defect in him, who has ſaid nothing to fix the ſenſe of the expreſſion here conſider'd. Beſides, the ſubject is ſo near akin to what has been treated of upon the foreſaid text in the *Coloſſians*, that there can hardly be expected a more proper place, wherein the following explication ſhould appear.

The words to be conſider'd, are *Eph.* iv. 8. *Wherefore, he ſaith, When he aſcended up on high, he led captivity captive.* Several commentators obſerving the great reſemblance between the two Epiſtles to the *Epheſians* and *Coloſſians*, have thought that St. *Paul* had his eye to the ſame thing in this paſſage, and in that of *Col.* ii. 15. which has been commonly underſtood in the ſenſe expreſſed by our tranſlators: *Having ſpoiled principalities and powers, he made a ſhew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.*

The reſemblance between the two Epiſtles is moſt certain; and it does not ſeem improbable, that theſe two paſſages, as they have imagined, deſerve to be compared; and relating both to the ſame ſubject, may give light to one another. Whether they, who have thought theſe two texts to be parallel, have not univerſally miſtaken the ſenſe of one of them, is referred to the judgment

of the reader, who has impartially consider'd what has been said upon that in the *Colossians*. His patience is now requested in attending a modest inquiry, whether there be not equal evidence, or at least great probability, that the common interpretation of the other text in the *Ephesians* is a mistake also; and that it really treats of the same thing with *Col.* ii. 15. according as that has been before explained.

The common explication of the words is, that when Christ ascended into heaven, he led captive the devil and his angels, death, sin, the law, the curse, *&c.* that these are to be considered as enemies, whom he conquered at his death, and who then became his captives; and that, when he ascended up on high he carried them as it were bound, along with him, in a pompous and triumphant shew of his victory; so that his ascension and entry into heaven, was like a *Roman* general's going up in triumph to the *capitol*, with his captives in their chains attending him.

There are few among our modern expositors, who leave out the devil and his angels in accounting for this captivity; a friend of Mr. *Le Clerc*'s, mentioned by him in his *Supplement to Dr. Hammond*, is the only one I have observed; and he understands it of the dead saints, who arose at the time of our Lord's resurrection. Among the ancients there are more. St. *Austin*, a commentator on the *Psalms* falsly supposed to be St. *Jerom*, *Beda*, *Oecumenius*, and perhaps some others understand it of men; wherein *Justin Martyr* went before them, who says: *Dial. cum Tryph. p. m.* 57. "That it was foretold, that after Christ's return to Heaven, he should "lead us captive [*i. e.* free us] from our mistakes, and bestow Gifts "upon us:" And then he cites the words of the prophecy just as St. *Paul* does, except that he reads ἀνέβη for ἀναβὰς, and leaves out the copulative καὶ before ἔδωκε.

Little need be said to shew how improperly sin, the law, and the curse, are brought into the number of the captives. The *prosopopœia* may be elegant enough, upon other occasions; but such feigned persons seem very unsuitable for the adorning a real and stately triumph. Besides, there being nothing said of them in either of the parallel texts, or their contexts, the introducing them may be judged wholly arbitrary, and a mere imagination which needs no formal confutation.

The other enemies may seem in this latter respect to be much upon the same foot, there being nothing expressly said of them in the texts or contexts; but, in the other respect, as they are not such

ſuch feigned and merely figurative perſons, they may ſeem much more likely to be intended. Nevertheleſs this interpretation, ſo far as it relates to the evil angels, ſeems to overthrow it ſelf; or at leaſt it does not look very probable. The reaſon is, becauſe it repreſents our Saviour as carrying the devil and his angels with him into heaven; which has not the leaſt countenance from any other place of ſcripture, and does it ſelf look ſo unlikely, that no one would care to aſſert it from one ſingle and very obſcure expreſſion. Nor can this I think be avoided by having recourſe to the *Roman* triumphs, in which the captives were no farther led in triumph than to the *Forum*, from whence, without aſcending to the *Capitol*, they were order'd to priſon, or to execution. (See *Cicer. Lib.* v. *in Verr. Num.* 77.) for beſide that there is nothing in the courſe of our Saviour's triumph to anſwer to the *Forum*, the exception ſeems to be precluded by the Apoſtle's expreſſion; *and his leading captivity captive* is determined to be *when he aſcended up ON HIGH.*

It will probably be objected, that Chriſt's aſcenſion here imports more than is commonly ſignified by that term; and that it takes in the whole time from his reſurrection to his completed aſcenſion, as may be judged from *v.* 9, 10. and that ἀναβὰς being an *Aoriſt*, does not denote any fixed and certain time; and that therefore his leading the evil angels in triumph, might be preſently after his reſurrection, without ſuppoſing them to attend him into heaven at his proper aſcenſion.

But it may be anſwer'd, 1. That this ſeems wholly to ſpoil the alluſion, and the ſuppoſed beauty of the interpretation; for then Chriſt's aſcending into heaven will be without the attendance of his captives, or the having them led after him in his retinue. 2. Tho' his *aſcending up on high* ſhould be allowed to comprehend the whole of his exaltation, from his reſurrection to his proper aſcenſion; yet it muſt chiefly denote the latter, as St *Paul's* words, *v.* 10. ſhow; *He that deſcended, is the ſame alſo that aſcended up* far above all heavens, *that he might fill all things*: So that according to his own interpretation, Chriſt's aſcenſion was that which was *far above all heavens.* And indeed however he draws an argument from ſomewhat implied in the words, upon which he deſcants; yet the words themſelves relate only to our Saviour's proper aſcenſion: *Wherefore he ſaith, when he aſcended* up on high, *he led captivity captive.* This *aſcending up on high*, however it implies his coming out of the grave, as he firſt deſcended into it,

and

and that might be called an aſcenſion in ſome ſenſe; yet the coming thence to the ſurface of the earth, would not be called an aſcending up *on high*. This therefore muſt ſignify his aſcending up *far above all heavens*, as St. *Paul* explains it; and it truly relates to that only. 3. Tho' ἀναβὰς does not expreſs any definite time, yet it ſeems reaſonable to ſuppoſe it relates only to one time, whatever that be; and conſequently as two things are ſaid to be done by him aſcending, they ought both to be done when he was about to aſcend, or both to be done in his aſcenſion; but the former cannot be, becauſe tho' he ſhould be ſuppoſed to *lead captivity captive* when he was about to aſcend, yet his *receiving* or *giving gifts to men* is certainly in his aſcenſion, as Generals uſed not to beſtow their donatives before they triumphed.

It may perhaps be farther alleged, that tho' the paſſage may not ſo well ſuit the leading the devil and his angels captive, in his triumphant aſcenſion; yet it may well enough ſuit the other enemy, *Death*, in as much as it is certain that *the graves were opened, and many bodies of the ſaints which ſlept, aroſe, and came out of the graves after his reſurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many*, *Matth.* xxvii. 52. 53. Now theſe, who had been before captives of death and the grave, may be thought to have been taken up by Chriſt into heaven, at his aſcenſion; and ſo he may be ſaid, with reference to them thus reſcued, to have *led captivity captive*.

But tho' this, at firſt ſight, may ſeem plauſible; yet upon farther inquiry it hardly will ſatisfy. For, 1. This is wholly a conjecture, nor have we, in any place of the New Teſtament that I know of, the leaſt hint that theſe ſaints then aſcended; and yet one would expect ſome hint of it, if that had been the thing ſo expreſly foretold by the pſalmiſt. 2. Nor does the thing ſeem to anſwer the greatneſs of the expreſſion, or the vaſt ſolemnity of the occaſion; that is, theſe ſaints appear not to have been numerous enough, to make up ſuch an auguſt retinue, as would ſuit the glorious triumph of our aſcending Lord. It is ſaid indeed, *Many bodies of the ſaints aroſe*: But *many* is a very equivocal term, and often denotes no more than *ſeveral*; and to look no farther than that text, we have there perhaps an inſtance of this uſe of it, when it is ſaid of theſe ſaints, that they *went into the holy city, and appeared unto* many. Here the *many*, as is probable, were comparatively but few; it being not likely, that theſe raiſed ſaints appeared to the unbelieving *Jews*, to whom our Lord would not vouchſafe to ſhow himſelf after his reſurrection:

And

And if they appeared only to Christ's disciples, they were then but about an hundred and twenty, *Acts* i. 15. nor does there any considerable addition appear to have been made to their number till after our Saviour's ascension, and the pouring out the Holy Ghost. Nor need we think this was a favour granted to the eminent and extraordinary saints, who had lived under the old dispensation, as a singular reward of their distinguished virtue and piety. *David*, who uses to be ranked among those saints, was certainly not of the number of those who were raised, and are supposed to have ascended with Christ, *Acts* ii. 34. And indeed it seems probable, that had this been the case, some of their names would have been expresly mentioned, that we might the more take notice of the regard God pays to the extraordinary holiness of his saints: as we find *Moses* and *Elias* are named as appearing with Christ at his transfiguration. Besides, even thus the train of his attendants would have been too few to grace his triumphant entry into heaven. But indeed as the thing was probably designed for the fuller assuring our Lord's desponding disciples of the truth of his resurrection, it is likely they were some of the saints who died but a little before, and so were well known to those to whom they appeared; and therefore, if we understand the *many* saints that arose in the same manner, as we do the *many* to whom they appeared, they in likelihood were but few, too few to be the only ones taken notice of in the account of our Lord's retinue in his triumphant ascension. 3. This seems not well to agree with the Apostle's account, *v.* 10. that he *ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things*. These *all things* seem not to relate to the wicked angels, whom I remember not that he is ever said to fill; but only to men, and good angels; men, for whom he received gifts; and good angels, who all of them belonged to, and most of them frequently were in those heavens, above which he ascended, in order to the filling all things. So that upon the whole, we cannot perhaps so commodiously understand the expression concerning any other but the good angels; and they truly seem to be the *captivity* which he then led *captive*.

To confirm this interpretation, the reader is desired to consult carefully the place whence the Apostle takes his citation; where he will find the good angels are just before spoken of; but not the least notice is taken of the evil angels, that should incline us to understand the expression of his *leading captivity captive* concerning

ing them. I will ſet down the two verſes as they are in our tranſlation, *Pſal.* lxviii. 17, 18. and make ſome remarks upon them. *The chariots of God are twenty thouſand, even thouſands of angels; the Lord is among them, as in* Sinai, *in the holy place, thou haſt aſcended on high, thou haſt led captivity captive, thou haſt received gifts for men.* There is nothing here to make us think of the evil angels, nor will the ſtricteſt examination of the words at all incourage the explaining the captivity concerning them. But let us diſtinctly view the expreſſions.

The chariots of God are twenty thouſand.] Or *the chariot*, it being ſingular in the *Hebrew*. As the pſalmiſt is foretelling the aſcending of Chriſt into heaven in triumph; ſo in theſe words he deſcribes the triumphant chariot in which he aſcended. This always uſed to be as ſtately and grand, as it could poſſibly be made; but the fineſt chariot made with hands, could have no glory, in compariſon of that which was conſtituted of the moſt excellent order of beings, the angels themſelves; and without all doubt theſe angels, of which the chariot of God conſiſted, were the good angels, and not the bad ones, or a mixture of both. No one doubts that the good angels only were the *chariot of fire*, and the *horſes of fire*, wherewith *Elijah* went up to heaven, 2 *Kings* ii. 11. And from the account given of his being taken up to heaven, we may well learn the deſign of what is here mentioned of the *chariot of God*, at the time of our Lord's aſcenſion. It may give ſome light to this paſſage, and the ſubject under conſideration, if we compare ſome other texts herewith, *Pſal.* civ. 3, 4. *Who maketh the* clouds *his* chariot, *who walketh upon the wings of the wind. Who maketh his angels winds* [ſee this rendering fully juſtified by the learned Dr. *Hammond*, in his notes on the Pſalm, and on *Heb.* i. 7.] *his miniſters a flame of fire.* Why ſhould we not take all this to be ſpoken with a peculiar regard to the angels, who are compared to the clouds and winds; not barely for their ſwiftneſs, but likewiſe as they exert their power in the winds and clouds ſwiftly moving them? Hence, when *Elijah* was taken up to heaven with a *chariot of fire*, and *horſes of fire* (*i. e.* by the miniſtry of angels) yet it is expreſly ſaid that he *went up by a* whirlwind *into heaven.* 2 *Kings* ii. 11. And the *making the clouds his chariot*, and *walking upon the wings of the wind*, are thus expreſſed, *Pſal.* xviii. 10. *He rode upon a cherub, and did fly; yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind.* And again, *Iſa.* xix. 1. *The Lord rideth*

upon a ſwift cloud. Now theſe angels, who are God's *chariot*, can be only the good ones, becauſe the Apoſtle having cited that paſſage, *Pſal.* civ. 4. ſoon after adds, *Are they not all miniſtring ſpirits, ſent forth to miniſter for them who ſhall be heirs of ſalvation? Heb.* i. 7, 14 God frequently uſed their miniſtry, imploying them in ſuch a ſenſible manner, 2 *Kings* vi. 17. Nor is it unlikely, that they, as God's chariots and horſes, cauſed the *Syrians* to hear the *noiſe of chariots and horſes, even the noiſe of a great hoſt,* 2 *Kings* vii. 6. It does not ſeem likely that the *Syrians* were deceived, and that they heard nothing at all, and that all was their own pure imagination. It is more reaſonably thought they actually heard the noiſe of God's chariots, God then going forth with his angels to ſave his people; compare 2 *Sam.* v. 24. *Ezek.* i. 24. By what has been ſaid, I hope it appears plain, that the good angels are repreſented by the pſalmiſt as attending and miniſtring to our Lord, in his triumphant aſcenſion. Nor does it ſeem abſurd to ſuppoſe the prophet *Daniel* ſpeaks of the ſame thing, in thoſe ſomewhat like terms, *Dan.* vii. 13. *I ſaw in the night viſions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven* (*i. e.* according to *Pſal.* civ. 3. with the angels) *and came to the ancient of days* (*i. e.* aſcended to God) *and they* (*i. e.* the clouds, or the angels) *brought him near before him.* That this belongs to his aſcenſion, the next words ſeem to ſhow, as they ſpeak of that which was certainly then done: *And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages ſhould ſerve him. His dominion is an everlaſting dominion, which ſhall not paſs away, and his kingdom that which ſhall not be deſtroyed.* From ſuch paſſages of the Old Teſtament, we learn the manner of our Lord's aſcenſion, which is more obſcurely hinted in the New. For I think it is no where expreſly ſaid in the New Teſtament, that the angels attended our Lord at his aſcenſion; but hints of it, I believe, we may find there, as *Luke* xxiv. 51. *And it came to paſs, while he bleſſed them, he was* parted *from them, and* carried *into heaven.* The expreſſion *parted from them* is like that of *Elijah*, and the thing may well be thought owing to the ſame agents: *Behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horſes of fire, and parted them both aſunder.* And if he was *carried* into heaven, by whom ſhould it be but by the holy angels? Is it likely that *Elijah* ſhould be thus attended, and that our Lord ſhould aſcend ſolitary, and without any attendants? No doubt he was able to aſcend by

his own power, without their aſſiſtance, or miniſtring to him; but was this agreable to the ſolemnity of a triumph? The generals who triumphed, were able to go a foot themſelves; but for the greater ſtate and pomp were they always carried. The term *carried* ſeems to ſpeak our Saviour to be paſſive, and if he was carried by an external power, it is moſt reaſonable to ſuppoſe it was by the angels, whom God uſes to imploy for ſuch purpoſes. So again, *Mark* xvi. 19. and *Acts* i. 2, 11. He is ſaid to be *received* or *taken up*. And *Acts* i. 9. *When he had ſpoken theſe things, while they beheld, he was* taken up, *and a* cloud *received him out of their ſight*. This *cloud* may be underſtood of a cloud of angels, who might alſo uſe and manage a material cloud for ſuch a purpoſe. St. *Chryſoſtom* therefore ſeems to be miſtaken, when he thus comments upon thoſe words, *Pſal.* xlvii. 5. *God is gone up with a ſhout:* "He does not "ſay, he was carried up, but he is gone up, that he might ſhow "that he went up this way himſelf, without any one to conduct "him. *Elijah* indeed, tho' he went not ſo far as Chriſt, was "conducted by another power; for the human nature was not able "to travel that ſtrange path; but the only begotten aſcended by "his own power. Hence *Luke* ſpeaks thus: *And they looked up* "*ſtedfaſtly, as he went* (πορευομένου αὐτοῦ) *to heaven.* He does "not ſay when he was *received* or *carried up* (οὐκ εἶπεν ἀναλαμβανομένου αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ βαστζομένου) for what was done was his own "proper act." This may ſeem ſtrange, ſince St. *Luke* twice, and St. *Mark* once uſes the former of theſe words in the places juſt now referred to; and it is ſaid *Acts* i. 9. *He was* taken or carried up (ἐπήρθη). This gives us a fuller account of thoſe words of the two angels, *Acts* i. 11. *Ye Men of* Galilee, *why ſtand ye gazing up into heaven? This ſame* Jeſus *which is taken up from you into heaven, ſhall* ſo *come* in like manner *as ye have ſeen him go into heaven.* Now nothing can be more expreſs, than that he will, at his ſecond coming, be thus attended with the holy angels, *Matth.* xvi. 27. —xxv. 31. 2 *Theſſ.* i. 7. *Jude* 14. And in all probability, it is the ſame thing that is meant, when he is ſaid to come in a *cloud*, or in the *clouds*, *Matth.* xxiv. 30. —xxvi. 64. *Mark* xiii. 26. —xiv. 62. *Luke* xxi. 27. 1 *Theſſ.* iv. 17. *Rev.* i. 7. —xiv. 14. And as the *clouds* ſignify the *angels*, ſo it is remarkable, that they are not in any of the foregoing places, or in any other I remember, mentioned both together, which is ſome confirmation of this interpretation: To which let it be farther added, that as the *Shechinah*,

nah, or glory of God that uſed to appear, is commonly called a *cloud*; ſo this was reckon'd to conſiſt of an hoſt of angels. And agreably to the foreſaid account, the prophet *Ezekiel* gives us a lofty deſcription of God's chariot, as a *whirlwind*, a *great cloud*, a *fire*, and *brightneſs*, *Chap.* i. 4. the living creatures are repreſented with *wings*, *v.* 9. the chariot with *wheels*, *v.* 15, 16. whoſe *ſtrakes* were of a vaſt circumference, *v.* 18. their *noiſe* as the noiſe of a great hoſt, *v.* 24. And it is ſaid, *v.* 28. *This was the appearance of the likeneſs of the glory of the Lord.* And that they were angels ſeems plain from *Chap.* x. 20. Theſe ſcriptures being well conſider'd, there can hardly any doubt remain, that this chariot of God belongs wholly to the good angels, and that the bad have nothing to do with it. I go on with the words of the pſalmiſt:

Even thouſands of angels.] This paſſage muſt be owned to be very obſcure, by reaſon of the word שנאן which is render'd *angels*, but is not to be found in any other place of the bible. I will briefly mention all the ſenſes put upon the words, and it will appear that, which ever is choſen, it relates not to the evil angels. 1. If we underſtand it as our tranſlators, and the *Targum* do, it is but reaſonable to ſuppoſe they are ſuch angels as were referred to before, in thoſe words: *The chariot of God is twenty thouſand.* 2. If we take the word, with others, to ſignify *falcatos currus*; or chariots with ſharp hooks or ſcythes; this will beſt ſuit the power and terror of good angels, as conſtituting a formidable army; which can't be ſuppoſed, according to the common interpretation, of diſarmed and captive devils, led in chains after the triumphant conqueror. 3. If we follow the LXX. in their ordinary reading χιλιάδες ἐυθηνούντων, and render it *thouſands of proſperous ones*, or the reading of other copies, mentioned by *Kircher* in his *concordance*, χιλιάδες ἐυθυμούντων, with which the *vulg. Latin* agrees, *millia lætantium*, together with the *Æthiopic*, *thouſands of ſuch as rejoice*, [They ſeem to have read in their copies שאנן by an eaſy tranſpoſing of the א] This can't belong to the evil angels, who have no cauſe of joy, and eſpecially had none at our Lord's aſcenſion. 4. If with the *Syriac* we render it, *The Lord rode with myriads, and thouſands of* (his) *hoſt*, or *army*; the evil angels are no part thereof. 5. If we underſtand the word to ſignify *doubled*, *reiterated*, or *repeated*, i. e. *many*: Or, 6. If we render the whole thus, which perhaps is as agreable as any of the reſt, *The chariot of God is twenty thouſand times a thouſand doubled*,

or, *ſeveral times repeated* (as indeed they muſt be often repeated, to reach the number expreſſed by the prophet, *Dan.* vii. 10.) there can be nothing ſaid of the devil and his angels; but, according to the latter rendering, they muſt all be ſuppoſed of a ſort.

The Lord is among them as in Sinai, *in the holy place.*] The expreſſion of the *Lord's being among them*, is perhaps a demonſtration, that he ſpeaks only of good angels; and that conſequently we have nothing hitherto to lead us to think the evil ones are at all referred to in the context. But it muſt be owned that the conciſeneſs of the *Hebrew*, renders the ſenſe in other reſpects obſcure. The *Lord's being among them* may ſeem fully enough expreſſed; but after that we have nothing in the *Hebrew*, but *Sinai in holineſs*. Now tho' my argument does not neceſſarily oblige me to it, and what is clear and expreſs in the original, is ſufficient for my purpoſe; yet, that I may explain the pſalmiſt, or excite others to attempt it, I will offer my own conjecture, and a better title I pretend not to give to what I can ſay concerning ſo obſcure a paſſage. I think then, that by verſe 18, where he ſpeaks to Chriſt in the ſecond perſon: *Thou haſt aſcended*, we are led to take אדני in *v.* 17. in the *vocative*, rather than the *nominative* caſe; and ſo I would render the place thus: *Oh Lord, in them* [was thy chariot] Sinai *being in holineſs* [i. e. when *Sinai* was a holy place, by reaſon of the *Shechinah*] in them as thy chariot (which I underſtand to be repeated ἀπὸ κοινοῦ) *thou haſt aſcended up on high, thou haſt led captivity captive*, &c. Nothing looks more natural, than that as the pſalmiſt had repreſented the angels as the *chariot of God*, he ſhould preſently add two famous inſtances of their being made uſe of as ſuch; nor is it eaſy to imagine for what other purpoſe they are ſpoken of as a chariot, or how we can any other way diſcover a connection in the ſeveral parts of the pſalmiſt's diſcourſe. It will not be needful to ſay much, to ſhow that what this interpretation goes upon is matter of fact; and that the angels were at mount *Sinai* at the giving of the Law. See *Acts* vii. 53. *Gal.* iii. 19. *Heb.* ii. 2. and eſpecially *Deut.* xxx. 2. *The Lord came from* [or *to*, as commentators uſually expound it, and the particle ſometimes ſignifies] Sinai, *and roſe up from* Seir *unto them; he ſhined forth from mount* Paran, *and he came* with ten thouſands of his ſaints, or his holy ones, *i. e.* his angels.

I think every thing hitherto makes for this interpretation. All that remains is to ſhow, that both the *Hebrew* and *Greek* expreſ-

ſions

ſions will bear the ſenſe put upon them. It is agreed on all hands, that the abſtract is here uſed for the concrete; and that by *captivity* we are to underſtand *captives*; nor would it be ſtrange, if this *captivity* ſhould ſtand for ſuch an intire *ſubjection*, as is the ordinary conſequence of captivity; and then we ſhall have the ſame ſenſe expreſſed, 1 *Pet.* iii. 22. *Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God, angels, and authorities, and powers being made ſubject unto him.* Compare *Eph.* i. 20—22. *Philip.* ii. 9—11. And if St. *Auguſtine*'s gloſs will juſtify the uſe of the expreſſion when explained of men, it will do it as well when it is underſtood of angels. His words are remarkable, and deſerve tranſcribing: "*Ipſos itaque homines qui captivi tenebantur, appellat* "*captivitatem.* —*Cur enim non ſit captivitas felix, ſi & ad bonum* "*homines poſſunt capi? Unde &* Petro *dictum eſt*; Ex hoc jam ho- "mines eris capiens. *Captivati ergo quia capti, & capti quia ſub-* "*jugati, ſub lene illud jugum miſſi.*" It is true, if we were entirely to be guided by the etymology, the words ἀιχμαλωτεύειν, ἀιχμαλωτίζειν, ἀιχμαλωσία, ἀιχμάλωτος, &c. would relate to perſons taken captive in *war*; but nothing is more common, than for words to come to be taken in a much laxer ſenſe than their etymology will account for; and this I think is evidently true of theſe *Greek* words. It may not be diſagreable to the reader to obſerve how *Ælian, Var. Hiſt. Lib.* xii. *c.* 38. uſes the word ἀιχμάλωτος. Again St. *Paul*, three ſeveral times, uſes the compound συναιχμάλωτος, for a fellow-captive, tho' the *captivity* was not at all the effect of *war*. The places are *Rom.* xvi. 7. *Col.* iv. 10. *Philem.* 23. Thus he ſays the *law in his members brought him into captivity to the law of ſin*, Rom. vii. 23. where ἀιχμαλωτίζοντα muſt import a *captivating*, not by abſolute force, but with his own conſent. In like manner he uſes the ſame word, 2 *Cor.* x. 5. *Bringing into captivity*, ἀιχμαλωτίζοντες, *every thought to the obedience of Chriſt.* But if his alluding in theſe places to *war* ſhould be thought to render theſe examples leſs proper; yet that in *Judith* xvi. 9. is full to my purpoſe: *Her ſandals raviſhed his eyes, her beauty* captivated *his ſoul*, ἠχμαλώτιζε ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. And thus St. *Paul*, 2 *Tim.* iii. 6. *Of this ſort are they who creep into houſes, and lead captive*, ἀιχμαλωτίζοντες, *ſilly women*, not by conſtraint, but by perſuaſion and their own conſent. And in like manner, *Juſtin Martyr*, in the place referred to before, muſt uſe this word for ſuch a *captivating* as is with the conſent of thoſe who are made cap-

captives; when he ſays: "It was propheſied, that Chriſt ſhould lead "us captive from our errors, ἀιχμαλωτεύσαι αὐτὸν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης.

As to the *Hebrew*, I obſerve that the *Chaldee* paraphraſt thought the expreſſion would bear ſuch a ſenſe as I put upon it; for he, ſuppoſing very ſtrangely, that *Moſes* was the perſon ſpoken of in the pſalm, gives this for the ſenſe: *Thou haſt led captivity captive, thou haſt taught the words of the law*; where he muſt make the *Iſraelites*, the *captivity led captive*; and certainly the phraſe may, with as little harſhneſs, be uſed concerning the good angels. But I would farther obſerve, that the *Hebrew* שבה the *Syriac* שבא and the *Arabic* سبى have all the ſame ſignification; and accordingly is the *Hebrew* rendered in both thoſe tranſlations, and ſo is the *Greek* in *Eph.* iv. 8. We may therefore judge from the ſenſe of theſe words in thoſe tranſlations, in what latitude the *Hebrew* may be uſed. Now, both the *Syriac* and the *Arabic* thus render St. *Paul*'s ἀιχμαλωτίζοντες, 2 *Tim.* iii. 6. *Leading captive ſilly women*; as they do likewiſe both of them, *Rom.* vii. 23. To the ſame purpoſe the *Syriac* renders his συναιχμάλωτος in all the three places referr'd to above. Finally, As the evangeliſt uſes the word ἀιχμάλωτος, *Luke* iv. 18. *To preach deliverance to the captives*, where the captives muſt be willing captives; ſo the *Syriac* and *Arabic* render it by the ſame term, as that is alſo uſed in the *Hebrew*, *Iſa.* lxi. 1. And Dr. *Caſtel*, in his *Lexicon*, gives two ſignifications of the *Arabic* verb much to the purpoſe. 1. It ſignifies to enamour; *Rapuit amore, ſc. fœmina cor viri* (juſt in the ſenſe in which ἠχμαλώτιζε is uſed in *Judith* in the place before cited) whence one of the derivatives مسبية (*Masbiyaton*) is render'd by him *captivans corda, ſc. puella.* 2. To remove or carry any thing from one region or city to another. *Ex regione in regionem, ſive ex urbe in urbem tranſvexit, ſc. vinum*; which ſhows in how great a latitude this word was uſed, and ſuits well enough the foregoing account. So that I think, both the *Hebrew* and *Greek* will allow this interpretation.

Give me leave to illuſtrate the whole by an eaſy example. When any great emperor, or general, was ſpreading his conqueſts and inlarging his dominion, it was uſual for him to have many captives who were taken in battle, actually oppoſing him, and making reſiſtance; while others, either from diſcontent under their old government, or from a love to, or the terror of the arms of, the invader, willingly yielded themſelves to be his ſubjects, without making the leaſt oppoſition againſt him. Now, tho' theſe were ordinarily

treated

treated in a different manner, and more favour was eſpecially ſhown to ſuch as appeared to have been moſt free and hearty in their ſubmiſſion; yet both ſorts were in a ſtate of ſervitude and ſubjection, and might be conſider'd as captives. Thus, tho' the *Romans* diſtinguiſhed the *captivi* and the *dedititii*, yet the latter were as truly ſlaves as the former, ſuppoſing the ſurrender was abſolute, and not upon terms ſtipulated between them. And this appears from the form in which the *deditio*, or ſurrender was made. See *Livy*, *Lib.* i. *c.* 38. -vii. 31. and *Plaut.* in *Amphitr. Act.* i. *v.* 69--71, 102, 103. They who were imployed to make the ſurrender, gave up to thoſe to whom they made it, themſelves, their people, city, lands, water, borders, temples, altars, houſes, utenſils, children, and every thing they had, whether divine or humane. And thus among the *Iſraelites*, the *Gibeonites*, who were *dedititii*, were ſervants, and made *hewers of wood, and drawers of water*, *Joſh.* ix. 23. Compare *Deut.* xx. 10--14. It is thus we ſhould conſider the caſe here before us. Our Saviour being raiſed from the dead, was appointed by God to be the univerſal king, and claiming this his juſt authority, was oppoſed by ſome, as by the *Jews*, many of the *Gentiles*, and by all the evil angels; but there were many others, who being convinced of his greatneſs, merit, and right, willingly ſubmitted themſelves to him, and triumphed in their becoming his ſubjects; among theſe were thoſe good angels, who formerly had been his *fellows*, Heb. i. 9. being viceroys in their reſpective provinces; as Chriſt was in *Iſrael*. Theſe quitting all their power, and reſigning it to the raiſed and exalted Meſſiah, now conſtituted king of the world, willingly put themſelves into the ſtate of captives under him, to be poſſeſſed, uſed, ruled, and diſpoſed of by him, as he pleaſed; and theſe not as conquered, forced, and conſtrained, but as his willing captives, he led with him in his triumphant aſcenſion into heaven, a moſt glorious and honourable train, fit for the region to which they were led, and every way qualified to adorn the triumphs of his ſtately entry. And as they ſo cheerfully ſubmitted to him, and became his attendants and miniſters, God propoſed them as an illuſtrious pattern of that ſubjection and obedience, that ſhould be paid by us to Chriſt. Let the impartial reader upon the whole weigh the reaſons here candidly alleged, without pretending to impoſe an opinion upon him. Nor may it be amiſs for him, as he reads ſome other places of ſcripture, to conſider whether the ſame thing may not be intended in them, as particularly, *Pſal.* xlvii. 9.

F I N I S.

A

PARAPHRASE

AND

NOTES

ON THE

Epiſtle of St. PAUL

TO THE

PHILIPPIANS.

To which are added,

TWO DISSERTATIONS:

ONE ON

GALATIANS IV. 21.——V. 1.

The other on

MATTHEW II. 13, 14, 15.

By the AUTHOR of the Paraphraſe and Notes on the Epiſtle to the COLOSSIANS.

The SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

Printed for J. NOON, at the *White-Hart*, near *Mercers-Chapel*, *Cheapſide*.

M.DCC.XXXIII.

To the Right Honourable

PETER Lord *KING*,

Baron of *Ockham*, Lord High Chancellor of *Great Britain*.

My Lord,

MY former attempt of this nature having been addreſs'd to your Lordſhip in a lower character, decency requires an alteration in this, ſince your Lordſhip is now advanced to the higheſt temporal dignity in the nation next to the Royal Family. It is the greateſt pleaſure likewiſe to me to take this opportunity of expreſſing my hearty concurrence in the national applauſe of His Majeſty's wiſdom and goodneſs, in lodging this very important truſt in the Perſon fitteſt for it. Never certainly did any Prince give a

more univerſal and intire ſatisfaction to his ſubjects, than His Majeſty has done by this promotion. The prefixing your Great Name to the *Paraphraſe* and *Notes* on the *Coloſſians*, gave it a conſiderable recommendation to the world; nor can I doubt of an equal advantage from this repeated addreſs; eſpecially ſince I can now ſay, that your Lordſhip was not diſpleaſed with the former performance, nor offended at the liberty I uſed in deſiring your patronage. Wherefore, with the ſame ſubmiſſion, are theſe papers now offered to your Lordſhip by,

My LORD,

Your LORDSHIP's *very humble and devoted Servant.*

THE

PREFACE.

THE reception which the Paraphraſe *and* Notes *upon the* Coloſſians *met with, was much more favourable than I could expect. I have great ſatisfaction in the approbation of ſeveral, whom all the world will allow to be the beſt judges, and who have expreſs'd their deſire of my indeavouring to explain ſome more of* St. Paul's *epiſtles. Upon ſuch incouragement, I have been willing to review, and put in order, the obſervations I had made upon this epiſtle to the* Philippians; *wherein the difficulties do not appear to be ſo many or great, as in that to the* Coloſſians; *and ſo there may be leſs to invite or gratify the curioſity of politer readers.*

This may make it look ſtrange that the Paraphraſe *and* Notes *upon this epiſtle ſhould run out to a greater length than upon the other: And, I own, they might have been contracted into a much narrower compaſs than they are, and had been ſo, if the* Notes *upon the* Coloſſians *had not been complained of, as too obſcure for common readers, whom I would gladly aſſiſt in ſtudying the ſcriptures, as they, more than others, need all the help that can be afforded them. Upon this account, I have given way to a ſomewhat more verboſe ſtile, than I ſhould otherwiſe chooſe, and have, as much as I could, guarded*

againſt

against what might not be level to their capacities; and I wish I could have done it more than I have. Some may censure me as swerving herein from the pattern I proposed to my self to imitate; Mr. Locke's Paraphrase *and* Notes *upon the* Galatians *and* Ephesians *being much shorter, though the epistles themselves are longer: But I have this to plead, that though I proposed to my self to imitate that great man, yet I never suggested the least hope of coming up to him. Such a* Genius *as his is enough for an age to produce: I am sensible of the great distance at which I must unavoidably follow him. However, I believe, those who have read him, have perceived that he too often supposed those things would not be difficult to others, which he found easy to himself; and have therefore wished, that he had here and there interspersed some more* Notes, *and inlarged others, for the better clearing the sense of St.* Paul *to the lowest readers. And to such it may be an advantage, if I my self have been more sensible of the difficulties which would be apt to hamper them; of which little, if any, notice would be taken by those of a quicker genius. I hope, therefore, to be excused by those who may think some of my* Notes *redundant; for I had much rather they should be such for the sake of some readers, than that, by being over-sparing, I should leave any thing in the dark which I am able to make plain to them.*

The Advertisement *at the end is intended to correct a very general mistake, and into which I had fallen my self, by following Mr.* Locke; *concerning which I shall not add any thing more, but barely refer the reader to what is said in it.*

But, I suppose, it may not be amiss to give some account why the two Dissertations *are added, which have no manner of relation to any thing said on the* Philippians. *When I first designed to write upon some of St.* Paul's *epistles, I had no*

design

design of treating on those which Mr. Locke *had explained: But the difficulties which have of late been vehemently urged against the manner in which the writers of the* New Testament, *and* St. Paul *in particular, cite the words of the* Old, *made me look with the more attention into such citations, as might sometime come in my way, and of which I hope to treat, if* God *gives life and health. I could not, however, avoid observing, that though* Mr. Locke *had considered several of these citations to very good purpose, yet he had passed over some of them slightly. And, indeed, by some passages he has dropt here and there, he seems to have thought, that the histories of the* Old Testament *were originally designed as allegories. See his* Paraphrase *on* Gal. iv. 24. *and his* Notes *on* Eph. v. 32. *and upon* Rom. x. 13. *This is, I confess, a way of interpreting scripture, which I avoid as much as possible. I thought therefore it might be of service, if I indeavoured to clear those citations which that excellent writer seem'd to have mistaken, or too lightly examined: And what occurr'd concerning these, I intended to add, by way of* Appendix, *to what I might publish on other epistles. Accordingly I prepared three such* Dissertations *upon three of* St. Paul's *citations: The first of them is what is here offered to the reader, upon what* St. Paul *says of* Hagar, Gal. iv. 21, &c. *This is the only one in that epistle, with which* Mr. Locke *began, that needs clearing. It had many years exercised my thoughts, now and then, to no purpose: But whether I have now hit upon the true key, is submitted to the reader. There were two other* Dissertations *that should have accompanied this; but they being too long, and not to be divided, the publication of them, at the desire of the bookseller, is defer'd. The other* Dissertation *is not, indeed, upon any citation of this apostle; but 'tis upon one of the most difficult citations of the New Testament, wherein the enemies of reve-*

revelation have always, and especially of late, very much triumph'd. So that, I hope, the occasion will vindicate me in my attempting to justify it: And, I hope, I have not wholly failed in my attempt. But of that the reader must judge for himself.

May the Father of lights lead us all more and more into the understanding of his lively oracles, and thereby promote holiness and peace, as well as truth, among us.

THE

THE Epiſtle of St. PAUL TO THE *PHILIPPIANS.*

Written from Rome *by St.* Paul *in bonds, in the year of our Lord* 62. *of* Nero 9.

SYNOPSIS.

PHILIPPI, more anciently call'd *Crenides*, or *Crenidæ*, probably from the ſprings or fountains which aroſe there, it being, as *Appian* tells us, built upon a hill, received its later name from *Philip*, the father of *Alexander* the Great, who very much improv'd it, and increaſed the number of its inhabitants, partly for the ſake of the gold mines there, and partly to make it a good fence againſt the *Thracians*; for ſo *Appian* de Bello civ. l. iv. ſays, Ὡς ἐυρυὲς ἐπὶ Θρᾴκας χωμὶον ὠχύρωσε, *He fortified it as a good fence againſt the* Thracians.

It was a city upon the borders of *Thrace*, and ſometimes is reckon'd to belong to that country; but, by St. *Luke*, it is ſaid to belong to *Macedonia*, and to be a colony, *Acts* xvi. 12. St. *Luke*'s here uſing the *Latin* word κολωνία, inſtead of the proper *Greek* term ἀποικία, makes it very probable that he ſpeaks of it as made a colony by the *Romans*, and not by the *Greeks*, which is farther confirm'd by his bringing in the *Philippians* afterwards, as calling

themſelves *Romans*, v. 21. There is but little to be met with in hiſtory to account for the time of the *Romans* planting a colony there; whence I could only form an uncertain conjecture concerning it, till a learned friend was pleas'd to afford me his aſſiſtance, in whoſe reaſons, I doubt not, the reader, as well as I, will readily acquieſce. He thinks it evident that *Julius Cæſar* planted the firſt colony at *Philippi*, and that other inhabitants were afterwards ſent thither by *Auguſtus*. This appears by the coins of ſeveral *Roman* Emperors, particularly one of *Claudius*, with this inſcription on the reverſe: COL IVL AVG PHILIP. See *Vaillant. Num. ær. imp. in col. Tom.* I. *p.* 160. Which occaſions *Spanheim* to ſay: *Quis jam Philippenſem in Macedonia coloniam a Julio & Auguſto deductam retulit, niſi præclari nummi adhuc ſuperſtites?* Though *Dio*, Lib. li. tells us, that *Auguſtus* ſent the people of thoſe towns in *Italy*, who had fallen in with *Antony*, from thence to inhabit *Philippi*, and other towns abroad. And, as a farther proof that it was firſt made a colony by *Julius Cæſar*, there is an inſcription of an ancient ſtone in *Sponius* with only his name: COL. IVL. PHILIPPENSIS. *Miſc.* p. 173. 'Tis likewiſe called a colony by *Pliny*, Lib. iv. 11. *Intus Philippi colonia*; and frequently in the *Pandects*.

Of the nature of theſe colonies *Agellius* treats, *Lib.* xvi. 13. " They don't, *ſays he*, come from abroad into the city, or grow upon " their own roots; but are, as it were, propagated from the city, " and have all the laws and cuſtoms of the people of *Rome*, and not " of their own making." Hence St. *Luke* brings them in, ſaying, concerning *Paul* and *Silas*, v. 20, 21. *Theſe men, being* Jews, *do exceedingly trouble our city, and teach cuſtoms which are not* lawful for us *to receive, neither to obſerve, being* Romans.

As my ſubject has led me to take notice of that text, *Acts* xvi. 12. I think, it will not be amiſs, before I diſmiſs it, to offer ſomewhat to clear a difficuly in it. It is there ſaid of *Philippi*, Ἥτις ἐστὶ πρώτη τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις, which we tranſlate, *Which is the* chief *city of* that *part of* Macedonia. Now to make τῆς here a relative, and to tranſlate it *that*, ſeems very forced. In the margin we have *firſt* for *chief*; but *Philippi* was neither the *firſt* nor the *chief* city of that part of *Macedonia*, wherein it ſtood. *Livy*, Lib. xlv. 29. tells us, that *Paulus Æmilius*, who conquer'd *Macedonia*, order'd it to be divided into *four regions*, or *parts*; of which " *Unam fore* & " primam partem, *quod agri inter Strymonem & Neſſum amnem ſit*, " *&c.*" And in this *firſt part*, between thoſe two rivers, ſtood *Philippi.*

lippi. But 'twas not the *chief* city of that diviſion; for that was *Amphipolis*, as *Livy* ſoon after informs us: *Capita regionum ubi* " *conſilia fierent, primæ regionis* Amphipolim, *ſecundæ* Theſſaloni-" cem, *&c.*" Nor was it the *firſt* city; for that was *Neapolis*, mentioned by St. *Luke*, v. 11. from whence 'tis there ſaid they went to *Philippi*, which ſtood in the heart of the country, as appears by *Ptolemy*'s maps. My learned friend, before refer'd to, very ingeniouſly conjectures, that theſe difficulties may be eaſily removed, by only ſuppoſing that πρώτη τῆς, through the inadvertency of ſome tranſcriber repeating the laſt ſyllable, crept in for πρώτης. And then the ſenſe will ſtand thus, very plain and agreeable to hiſtory; *which is a city of the firſt part of* Macedonia. And thus *Caſtellio*, according to his uſual accuracy, has turn'd it: " *Quæ urbs eſt primæ partis* " *Macedoniæ.*" This is farther confirm'd by a *Greek* coin in *Golzius*, with this inſcription, ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΩΝ ΠΡΩΤΗΣ *Macedonum primæ, ſcil. regionis* or *partis*. *Num. Græc. Tab.* xxii. Which ſhows, that the *Greeks* themſelves uſed the expreſſion. Nor is what is ſaid of *Philippi*'s being in the heart of the country, contradicted by that expreſſion, *Acts* xx. 6. *They ſailed from thence*; for *Grotius* has well explain'd it, that they ſailed firſt down the river, and then by ſea. If any one diſlikes this conjecture for want of an authority, I will venture to offer my own, that perhaps we may ſafely follow both *Chryſoſtom*, the *Syriac* verſion, and the *Cambridge* MS. in leaving out τῆς μερίδος, and read with the two former, πρώτη τῆς Μακεδονίας; only I ſhould then chooſe to read it in the Dative, πρώτῃ for ἐν πρώτῃ, which will bring it to my friend's ſenſe.

To return now from this digreſſion: It appears by that chapter, *Acts* xvi. that St. *Paul* being in *Aſia*, was, by a viſion, admoniſhed to go over into *Macedonia* to preach the goſpel, *v.* 9, 10. and being with his company, *Luke*, *Silas*, and *Timothy*, arrived at *Philippi*, he ſtaid there *certain*, that is, *many* days, *v.* 12, 18. There ſeems to have been but few *Jews* who then inhabited that city, ſince we find no mention made of any ſynagogue they had in it. Nay, inſtead of St. *Paul*'s going, according to his uſual cuſtom, to the ſynagogue on the ſabbath-day, we read that he went to an *Oratory* or *Proſeucha* without the city: And ſays St. *Luke*, ver. 13. *We ſat down, and ſpake unto the* women *which reſorted thither*. By which it ſeems probable, that the greater part of the aſſembly conſiſted of women, and that there were but few men of that nation at *Philippi*, at that time. It is not unlikely they might be more numerous afterward,

when St. *Paul* wrote this epiſtle; but at that time they ſeem to have been ſo few as not to need, or be able to afford a ſynagogue. Whence it is plain ſome of the ancient *Greek* commentators muſt have been much miſtaken, and have confounded the account of *Philippi* with that of *Corinth*, *Acts* xviii. 8. when they talk, of the chief ruler of the ſynagogue at *Philippi*'s believing.

St. *Paul*, being here, converted *Lydia*, caſt the ſpirit of *Python* out of a damſel, who brought her maſters much gain, by ſouth-ſaying. Theſe being inraged at their loſs, drew *Paul* and *Silas* to the market-place, and accuſed them to the magiſtrates, who treated them ſhamefully, 1 *Theſſ.* ii. 2. and with ſeverity, for they *rent off their clothes, and laid many ſtripes on them, and* then *caſt them into priſon, charging the jayler to keep them ſafely*, Acts xvi, 22, 23. The jayler underſtood their meaning, and faithfully executed their commiſſion, and uſed them with rigour; but was himſelf converted, the providence of God miraculouſly concurring in an extraordinary earthquake, and he and his houſhold were immediately baptized.

The foundation of a Chriſtian church being thus happily laid at *Philippi*, it was afterwards conſiderably increaſed, and was probably favoured with another viſit from St. *Paul*, when he went over *Macedonia*, *Acts* xx. 2. And we read expreſly of his being there afterwards, when he came out of *Greece* and was going into *Aſia*; for he ſailed from thence, *v.* 6.

Their behaviour was very commendable, as appears by the account he gives of them in this epiſtle: And particularly, they had ſhown their zeal for the ſpreading the goſpel, and their affection to St. *Paul*, by liberally contributing to his ſupport and maintenance. This they did more than once, when he was at *Theſſalonica*, where it might be thought he ſhould not have needed contributions to be ſent to him from any other place. Nay, the *Philippians* were the only Chriſtian church of that country, that ſent him any ſupply.

Being now in bonds, they were concerned for him, and ſent *Epaphroditus* to him with a preſent. From him he had an account of their affairs; and by him, now returning home, he ſends this letter to them. The account he received, as we may gueſs from the epiſtle to them, was, That they were much concerned for the trouble he now ſuffered, that they hitherto continued ſtedfaſt in what he had taught them; but that there were ſome who indeavour'd to divide them one from another, and to ſeduce them to a ſubjection to the legal ceremonies. Agreeably hereto, he teſtifies his great affection

to

to them, and the value he had for them, eſpecially upon the account of their ſtedfaſtneſs; and expreſſes the grateful ſenſe he had of the kindneſs they had ſhown him formerly, and in what they had then ſent him. And, to abate their trouble for him, he aſſures them, that his bonds had been very ſerviceable in promoting the goſpel, that he was perfectly eaſy under them, and was confident he ſhould ſpeedily be releaſed from them, and have an opportunity of coming again to them. And, conſidering they were not themſelves free from perſecution, he ſeems to make it his aim to divert them from the dark and melancholy view of ſuch troubles, and to lead them to think of them, as occaſions of joy and thankfulneſs. To prevent the miſchief of diviſions, he urges upon them the ſtrongeſt and moſt moving arguments to be unanimous, publick ſpirited, and concerned for each others good, which would be a great comfort to him, as well as advantage to them. It is probable that they who were ſowing the ſeeds of diviſion among them, were the ſame with thoſe who indeavour'd to ſeduce them to a ſubjection to the ceremonial law, and to a ſeeking juſtification thereby, and not by Chriſt only; and that they attempted the former in order to their being the more ſucceſsful in the latter. See *Rom.* xvi. 17, 18. However that be, it is certain that he earneſtly cautions the *Philippians* againſt the attempts of the *Judaizers*, with whom he compares himſelf, to ſhow them how much more reaſon they had to regard him, than ſuch ſeducers, of whom he alſo ſpeaks in very ſevere terms. And here his deſign falls in with that of his epiſtles to the *Epheſians* and *Coloſſians*, and he ſets forth the great advantages of the goſpel, and the uſeleſſneſs of the law. Thro' his epiſtle, he ſuggeſts ſeveral moral inſtructions; and ſome of them toward the latter end of it, that ſeem to have a peculiar regard to the ſuffering condition in which they now any ways were, or to which they might hereafter be called.

SECT.

Chap. I.

SECT. I.

CHAP. i. 1, 2.

CONTENTS.

THESE two *verſes* contain the inſcription or introduction of this epiſtle.

PARAPHRASE.

1. PAUL and *Timothy* the ſervants *(a)* of Jeſus Chriſt, to all who profeſs themſelves Chriſtians at *Philippi*, with the biſhops and
2. deacons of the church: Favour and peace be to you from God our Father, and from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

TEXT.

PAUL and Timotheus the 1 ſervants of Jeſus Chriſt, to all the ſaints in Chriſt Jeſus, which are at Philippi, with the biſhops and deacons: Grace be unto you 2 and peace from God our Father, and *from* the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

NOTES.

1 (*a*) *Servants.*] St. *Paul*, in the inſcription of moſt of his epiſtles, ſtiles himſelf an *apoſtle*. Of the thirteen which have his name prefixed, there are but four, (*viz.* the two to the *Theſſalonians*, that to *Philemon*, and this to the *Philippians*) wherein he does not expreſly, in the inſcription, mention his being an apoſtle. No doubt, there was ſome reaſon why theſe four differed from the reſt in this reſpect; whereof I propoſe the following account, as that which to me ſeems moſt probable. The two epiſtles to the *Theſſalonians* were written before any of the reſt, as, I think, all do agree: And the reaſon why he mention'd not his apoſtleſhip in them, might be, becauſe when he wrote them he had not met with the oppoſition he did afterwards, when there were ſome who indeavour'd to diſparage him, and undermine his authority. This was evidently the caſe when he wrote his next epiſtle, which ſeems to be his firſt to the *Corinthians*, and ſo when he wrote to the *Galatians*, and the *Romans*; and this might well give him occaſion to be ſo expreſs in aſſerting his apoſtleſhip againſt ſuch detractors, tho' before that oppoſition he did not think it neceſſary to mention it. Next as to his epiſtle to *Philemon*, tho' that was unqueſtionably writ a conſiderable time after he had taken up that cuſtom; yet the nature of the epiſtle may ſuggeſt to us a reaſon why he mentions not his being an apoſtle in the inſcription, *viz.* becauſe he writes rather in the character of a friend to requeſt a favour, than of an apoſtle to injoin any thing by virtue of his office. He ſtiles himſelf therefore *the captive of Jeſus Chriſt*, becauſe he thought that would be a very moving conſideration, in a caſe wherein he pretended not to uſe any authority. To this purpoſe, he therefore again inſiſts upon it, and ſhows the reaſon why he had before mentioned it, *v.* 9. *For love's ſake I rather intreat thee, being ſuch an one as* Paul *the aged, and now alſo the* captive *of Jeſus Chriſt.* But there muſt be a very different reaſon for the omiſſion in this epiſtle to the *Philippians*, which was written about the ſame time, and upon much the ſame occaſion, with thoſe to the *Epheſians* and *Coloſſians*, and wherein he writes with as much authority as in either of the other. The difference, if I gueſs right, is to be fetch'd from the preſent which they had ſent him by *Epaphroditus*, and of which, and ſome former like inſtances of their liberality, he deſigned, in the epiſtle, to make a grateful acknowledgment. As an apoſtle, he had a right to demand maintenance from the

NOTES.

the churches, while he was discharging his office. So he tells the *Thessalonians*, of whom he received nothing, 1 *Thess.* ii. 6. *We might*, says he, *have been burdensome*, i. e. chargeable, *as the apostles of Christ.* Compare also 2 *Cor* xii. 12, 13. He seems therefore to omit the mentioning his apostleship to them, that he might not lessen their generosity and kindness to him, as though he thought what they did flowed not from their bountiful temper, and that he counted himself not obliged to them, while they gave him nothing but what he could claim, as rightfully due to him. Compare 2 *Cor.* viii. 8. ix. 5, 7. He might likewise omit his character, that so they might not imagine he claimed any farther assistance of the like nature from them by virtue of his apostleship. Whoever has observed the generous temper which he discovers in his epistles, must be sensible that what I have said, could not be foreign to it. For the same reason, perhaps, he uses not that expression he does to the *Colossians*, Chap. iv. 18. *Remember my bonds.* Nor does he, through his whole epistle, as in those to them and the *Ephesians*, call himself the *captive of Jesus Christ:* and when he could not well avoid speaking of his bonds, yet he seems to do it rather with a design to abate their concern, than to move their compassion upon the account of them. Nor does he recommend himself, by the consideration of his bonds, to their prayers, as he does to the *Ephesians* and *Colossians*; but as tho' he purposely avoided any insinuation of his farther need of their help, by reason of his bonds, he speaks here more plainly and assuredly of his speedy deliverance; and perhaps, for this reason too, he takes such particular notice in the salutations he sends, of the Christian friends he had belonging to *Cæsar*'s household, *Chap.* iv. 22. who, they might think, would not be backward to assist him.

SECT. II.

CHAP. ii. 3——11.

CONTENTS.

IN this *Section*, he acquaints the *Philippians* with the satisfaction he had in them, and how much he thanked God upon their account, and what was the matter of his prayers to God for them.

TEXT.	*PARAPHRASE.*	
3 I Thank my God upon every remembrance of you, 4 (always in every prayer of	I Thank my God for all your kind remembrance of me *(b)*, always in every prayer of	3. 4.

NOTES.

3 (*b*) Ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μνείᾳ ὑμῶν, *Upon every remembrance of you*] Mr. *Locke*, in his Note upon *Eph.* i. 15. thus explains this passage, that "he gave thanks to God upon every mention that "was made of them, upon every account he received of their continuing in the fellowship and "profession of the gospel, as it had been taught them by him, without changing or wavering at "all." Nor can there be any doubt that μνεία signifies *mention* (as our margin renders it) as well as *remembrance*: But, I confess, the sense expres'd in the paraphrase pleases me best. St.

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

of mine for you all *(c)*, praying with joy, which
5. joy is for your contributing toward the ſpread-
ing of the goſpel *(d)*, as has been your conſtant
practice ever ſince I began to preach among
6. you, till this very time. And I am therefore
thankful to God, and pray to him with joy for
you, becauſe I am perſuaded, that he who has
begun a good work *(e)* in you, will carry it on
until death, that ſo at the day of Jeſus Chriſt
7. you may receive the reward of it *(f)*. Even
as it is juſt and reaſonable I ſhould judge thus
of

TEXT.

mine for you all making
requeſt with joy) for your 5
fellowſhip in the goſpel,
from the firſt day until
now; being confident of 6
this very thing, that he
which hath begun a good
work in you, will perform
it until the day of Jeſus
Chriſt: Even as it is meet 7
for me to think this of you
all, becauſe I have you in
my heart, in as much as
both in my bonds, and in
the defence and confirma-

NOTES.

Paul ſeems to me to thank God, not for his own remembrance of them, or the mention made of them to him; but for their remembrance of him, and the kind ſupplies they had ſent him: And he prayed for them with joy, his joy being upon the account of their contributing to the furtherance of the goſpel. Nor can there be any difficulty in the phraſe, χαρᾷ ὑπὲρ τῆ μνείᾳ, when we compare *Luke* xv. 7, 10. So that *for your fellowſhip in the goſpel*, ſerves to explain *for all your remembrance*. And all the obſcurity of the place ſeems wholly owing to St. *Paul*'s modeſty in ſpeaking of ſuch a ſubject.

An ingenious and learned writer has lately conſider'd this place, which, he thinks, needs an emendation, and accordingly propoſes this as the true reading: Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου (ὑπὲρ πάσῃ τῇ δεήσει μου πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς τὴν μνείαν ποιούμενος) ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, &c. But ſince no ancient copies or verſions agree with this reading, or as far as I can find give the leaſt countenance to it, it ſeems much ſafer to abide by the common reading, which, I think, yields a good ſenſe, as I have explained it. Nor, perhaps, is his alteration ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ δεήσει μου, conformable to St. *Paul*'s ſtile elſewhere, who uſes ἐπὶ with a dative caſe when it ſignifies *for*, or *upon the account of*; but with a genitive caſe when it ſignifies *in*. See *Rom.* i. 10. 1 *Theſſ.* i. 2.

4 (*c*) Πάντοτε ἐν πάσῃ δεήσει μου ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν, *Always in every prayer of mine for you all.*] 'Tis hardly to be ſuppoſed that St. *Paul* never made any prayer to God, either publick or private, wherein he did not expreſly mention the caſe of the *Philippians*. I have therefore given this a turn in the paraphraſe, which the *Greek* will bear, and ſeems indeed to require.

5 (*d*) Ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, *For your fellowſhip in the goſpel*] I apprehend his meaning is, for your communicating or contributing to my ſupport, while I have been employed in preaching and ſpreading the goſpel. Of this he ſpeaks again, *Chap.* iv. 15, 16. Compare 2 *Cor.* xi. 8, 9. And, indeed, his phraſe of κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ſeems to determine this to be his meaning; for had he intended what our tranſlators have expreſſed, he would rather have ſaid τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, for ſo he uſes κοινωνία in that ſenſe, 1 *Cor.* i. 9. *Eph.* iii. 9.

6 (*e*) *A good work.*] St. *Paul* ſeems here to mean what is often ſpoken of in this manner, as being peculiarly and eminently a *good work*, I mean *liberality*. See 2 *Cor.* ix. 8. 1 *Tim.* ii. 10. vi 18. The reſt of this *Section* read attentively, will, I think, ſuggeſt this ſenſe. His attributing to God the beginning this good work in them, is agreeable to truth, and to the ſtile and ſpirit of the ſacred writers; and was very pertinent to the apoſtle's deſign of commending and incouraging the *Philippians*.

(*f*) *Until the day of Jeſus Chriſt.*] Compare *v.* 10. The meaning is, *as long as you live*, or *till death*, that being all one as *till the day of Chriſt*, ſince it is certain that in *that day* men ſhall receive from him a reward, according to what they were at death. Compare *Rev.* ii. 10, 25.

7 (*g*) Δικ

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

tion of the gospel, ye all are partakers of my grace.
8 For God is my record, how greatly I long after you all, in the bowels of Jesus Christ.

of you all; because you have me now in your heart *(g)* in my bonds, being shortly to make an apology for, or defence of the gospel; I say, I judge thus of you all, because you have all been contributors to the gift I have received, in order to my being the better prepared for that my defence *(h)*. Nor can you, on the other hand, have any reason to question my affection to you, since I confirm it by a solemn appeal to God, who knows the hearts of all, and is witness how 8.

NOTES.

7 (g) Διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς, *Because I have you in my heart.*] Men are said to have that in their heart which they *remember affectionately*, as the heart is generally put by the Ancients for the seat of the affections. See *Luke* i. 66. and ii. 51. But the construction of the *Greek* is here ambiguous, and will bear either our common rendering, or that in the margin, which the paraphrase follows, *because ye have me in your heart*: And 'tis therefore by the connection we must judge which is to be prefer'd; which seems to me to carry it for this latter sense. To clear this, let the reader observe, that St. *Paul* had told them, *v.* 3, 4. that he was *thankful to God* upon their account, and that he *prayed for them with joy*: And the reason of this joy he gives *v.* 5. it was because of their κοινωνία, their contributing liberally to the gospel on all occasions. And, *v.* 6. he tells them, he was persuaded that God, who had kept them hitherto in that good disposition, would continue to do so. The immediate ground of this persuasion is contained in this 7th *verse*, which may well be explained to this sense: "As it is reasonable "for me so to hope of you all, because [even now] you have me in your heart in my bonds, in "the state of an apologist, or defender of the gospel, being shortly, as an accused person, to "make an apology for, or defence of it." Then follows the proof of this: "All of you [πάν-"τας ὑμᾶς, answering to πάντων ὑμῶν, you all, just before] having been [each according to "his ability] partners in, or contributors towards my gift, that is, the gift you sent me by *Epa-*"*phroditus*." After this, *v.* 8. as it was very proper, he shows, on the other hand, his great affection to them: And then he proceeds, *v.* 9. to pray not barely for what he had before said he was persuaded of, but that this good disposition might more and more abound in conjunction with other Christian virtues. Thus the connection of his discourse seems just and natural.

(h) Συγκοινωνοὺς μου τῆς χάριτος, *Partakers of my grace.*] I think rather, *Contributors to my gift*, as was said under the former Note. St. *Paul* elsewhere uses χάρις in this sense for a *gift*. See 1 *Cor.* xvi. 3. and especially 2 *Cor.* viii. 4. where he is speaking of another instance of the same thing in these very persons. The greatest difficulty may seem to lie in συγκοινωνοὺς being taken actively. We find κοινωνία so used, *v.* 5. of this *chapter*, as likewise 2 *Cor.* viii. 4. and κοινωνὸς is often used in that sense. *Xenophon* calls virtue ἀρίστην φιλίας κοινωνὸν, the best not *companion*, but *cause* of friendship, according to the notion of the Moralists, that a similitude of virtues is the source of true friendship. And *Plato* De Leg. has κοινωνοὶ πολέμου. And *Herodian*, Lib. v. 1. κοινωνὸς καὶ συμβούλους τοῦ περὶ πραγμάτων διοικήσεως. The apostle designing to exclude none from a share in the praise of that good work, seems to have chosen the compound συγκοινωνοὺς, as more emphatical, though the sense be the same. And may not the word be thus taken, 1 *Cor.* ix. 23. and the sense of that *verse* stand thus: *This I do* [i. e. use all the methods

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

how earneſtly I long after you all in the bowels of Jeſus Chriſt (*i. e.* as Chriſtians tenderly beloved by Chriſt, and who love me as one
9. beloved by him.) And this is the matter of my prayer for you, that your love towards me may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment, upon a thro' conviction that 'tis his cauſe and truth I defend and ſuffer for *(i)*.
10. Now this can never be, if you take things upou truſt, without examination: And therefore my prayer for you is, that you may carefully try the things that differ and are controverted *(k)*; that ſo you may be ſincere, and without

TEXT.

And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and *in* all judgment; that ye 10 may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be ſincere and without offence till the day of Chriſt; being

NOTES.

mentioned in the foregoing *verſes*] *for the goſpel's ſake, that I might* [with the greater advantage] *be in conjunction with others* [after his modeſt way of ſpeaking of himſelf] *a communicater* [or ſucceſsful preacher] *of the goſpel*? And is not this confirmed by his ſaying, he did this *upon account of the goſpel*, or *for the goſpel's ſake*, as we render it? To do this that he might be partaker of the goſpel, was to do it *for his own ſake*: But if his view was that he might render his preaching more ſucceſsful, this was indeed doing it *for the goſpel's ſake*. This ſenſe will well agree with the following part of that *chapter*, in which he repreſents his own behaviour as a pattern; and it is much confirmed by what he ſays, *chap.* x. 32, 33. Concerning the meaning of ἀπολογία, *defence*, ſee *v.* 17.

9 (*i*) *In knowledge and in all judgment.*] St. *Paul* was ſenſible of their love to him, by the evidence they had given of it, both formerly and now lately in the ſupplies they had ſent him; but in this critical juncture, wherein there were ſome who were indeavouring to ſeduce them from the doctrine he had taught them, he was more concern'd for their eſtabliſhment therein, than for their bare affection to himſelf: And therefore he here expreſſes his deſire that their love to him might proceed from a more full and intire ſatisfaction of the truth of that doctrine which he had preached among them; which by the ſtrain of his epiſtle, and eſpecially by the 3^d *chapter*, we may eaſily perceive was the ſame which he inculcated in the epiſtles to the *Epheſians* and *Coloſſians*, *viz.* the myſtery of God's calling the *Gentiles* to partake of the privileges of the goſpel, without taking upon them the yoke of the ceremonial law. This ſenſe ſeems agreeable to his chief deſign, of which he may well be thought here to give a hint; and 'tis very much confirm'd by the next *verſe*.

10 (*k*) Εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα, *That ye may approve things that are excellent.*] Or rather, according to our marginal reading, *That ye may try things that differ.* He was deſirous the *Philippians* ſhould compare his doctrine and courſe of life, and the *Judaizers* together, as may be ſeen, *chap.* iii. Theſe were widely different, and, by comparing and trying both, they might form a good judgment to what they ought to adhere, the doctrine and directions they had received from him, or thoſe ſuggeſted by the *Judaizers*.

This ſhould be compared with that rule he gives the *Theſſalonians*, 1 Theſſ. v. 21. Πάντα δοκιμάζετε, *Prove* [or try] *all things: hold faſt that which is good.* Nor can a man's holding faſt

Chap. I.

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

11 filled with the fruits of righteouſneſs, which are by Jeſus Chriſt unto the glory and praiſe of God.

without offence *(l)* againſt the day of Chriſt, being filled with the fruits of liberality *(m)*, which are by Jeſus Chriſt unto the glory and praiſe of God. 11.

NOTES.

faſt any controverted opinion in religion, be of any advantage, unleſs he hold it faſt upon ſuch a trial; nor is there any other way for men to approve themſelves *ſincere againſt the day of Chriſt*, while they neglect this courſe, as is here plainly intimated.

(*l*) Ἀπρόσκοποι, *Without offence.*] The word is it ſelf doubtful, and ſometimes ſignifies the *not giving offence to others*, 1 *Cor.* x. 32. nor can it be denied that by neglecting the trial St. *Paul* directed them to make, they might be in danger of being perverted themſelves, and by their ill example offend, and lay a ſtumbling-block in the way of others. But, conſidering the word with which it is here joined, *ſincere*, I rather think we are to underſtand him thus, That you may do *nothing to offend your ſelves*, to wound or grieve your own conſciences, but may have ἀπρόσκοπον συνείδησιν, *a conſcience void of offence both towards God and man*, Acts xxiv. 16.

11 (*m*) Καρπῶν δικαιοσύνης, *The fruits of righteouſneſs.*] In the paraphraſe 'tis render'd, *The fruits of liberality*; in which ſenſe the word is often uſed, both in the LXX and in the New Teſtament; and in this place 'tis moſt pertinent to the ſubject of the apoſtle's diſcourſe. That righteouſneſs is ſometimes to be thus underſtood, we may ſee by *Pſal.* cxii. 3, 9. 2 *Cor.* ix. 9, 10. *His* righteouſneſs *indureth for ever.* And a reaſon why acts of liberality are ſpoken of under this name, may be fetch'd from *Deut.* xxiv. 13. where it is ſaid of ſuch liberality, *It ſhall be* righteouſneſs *to thee before the Lord thy God:* In which place the LXX read *alms* inſtead of *righteouſneſs*; juſt as ſome copies read *righteouſneſs* inſtead of *alms*, Matt. vi. 1. which Dr. *Mills* thinks the trueſt reading. In this ſenſe, *righteouſneſs* ſeems to be ſaid to *deliver from death*, Prov. x. 2. xi. 4. at leaſt the writer of the book of *Tobit* probably ſo underſtood it, as he ſeems to have borrowed his thought from thence, *chap.* iv. 10. xii. 9. I think many paſſages in the New Teſtament will juſtify this interpretation of thoſe places in the *Proverbs*, as well as the explication of the text under conſideration, that the way to be *ſincere, and without offence till the day of Chriſt*, is to be *filled with the fruits of liberality.* See *James* ii. 13, *Matt.* xxv. 34, &c.

Chap. I.

SECT. III.

CHAP. i. 12——26.

CONTENTS.

THE *Philippians*, according to the great affection they bore to St. *Paul*, being very much concerned upon the account of his preſent ſufferings, he labours in this *Section* to abate their concern, by repreſenting to them how uſeful his bonds had been to promote and ſpread the goſpel, how calm and eaſy he was under all his trouble, and how entirely reſigned he was to the will and ſervice of Chriſt; and withal lets them know he was verily perſuaded he ſhould be freed from his bonds, and have another joyful opportunity of viſiting them.

PARAPHRASE.

12. BUT as you have ſhown your concern for me in my preſent circumſtances as a priſoner, and have ſent your liberality to me, that I might be the better prepared for my defence before the Emperor; it is proper you ſhould know what ſucceſs has attended me: And therefore I now acquaint you, that what has befallen me has turn'd to the furtherance of the
13. knowledge of the goſpel; ſo that my bonds are known to be for Chriſt *(n)*, through all the palace *(o)*, and to all other perſons; and many Chriſtian

TEXT.

12. BUT I would ye ſhould understand, brethren, that the things *which happened* unto me, have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the goſpel: 13. So that my bonds in Chriſt are ma-

NOTES.

13 (*n*) Φανερὰς ἐν Χριστῷ, *in Chriſt are manifeſt.*] It is doubtful whether *in Chriſt* is to be joined with *my bonds*, or with *are manifeſt*. The poſition and order of the words in the *Greek*, ſeem to make the latter more probable; and therefore the paraphraſe is adapted to that ſenſe.

(*o*) Ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ, *In all the palace*] The very learned *Perizonius*, in his *Diſſert. de prætorio*, Sect. 35. pleads, that the word here is to be underſtood of the *camp* of *Pretorian* ſoldiers. But much may be ſaid on the other hand in defence of our verſion. The word is originally *Latin*, and comes from *Prætor*, whoſe houſe, eſpecially in the provinces, or rather perhaps a part of it, the guard-room, and hall where he heard cauſes, with the other apartments annexed, went by that name. So 'tis taken, *Mark* xv, 16. *Tiberius* was the firſt who brought the

Pretorian

TEXT.

nifeſt in all the palace, and
14 in all other *places*; and
many of the brethren in the
Lord, waxing confident by
my bonds, are much more
bold to ſpeak the word
15 without fear. Some indeed
preach Chriſt even of envy
and ſtrife; and ſome alſo of

PARAPHRASE.

Chriſtian brethren take incouragement from the ſatisfaction they perceive I have in my bonds, and from their great uſefulneſs to the cauſe of Chriſtianity, and become more bold and fearleſs in publiſhing the word of God *(p)*. This is a great ſatisfaction to me; but I could wiſh it were done by all as ſincerely as it is by ſome. For there are ſome who preach Chriſt out of envy and contention, *(i. e.* in oppoſition to me *(q)* but others do it out of good-will to me.)

14. 15.

They

NOTES.

Pretorian troops into a camp at *Rome*. So *Suetonius*, in *Tib.* c. 27. *Romæ caſtra conſtituit, quibus prætorianæ cohortes, vagæ ante id tempus, & per hoſpitia diſperſa continerentur.* After this, indeed, we find the ſenſe of the word *prætorium* ſo inlarged ſometimes, as to take in that body of ſoldiers or their camp. So *Suetonius*, *Ner.* c. 9. *Antium coloniam deduxit, adſcriptis veteranis è prætorio.* But, however, after this action of *Tiberius*, the word continued in common uſe to ſignify the pretor's palace; (as appears from the place in St. *Mark*, refer'd to already, and ſome other paſſages which might be mentioned;) and not only ſo, but any magnificent houſes of great men, particularly the *Roman* Emperors. Thus *Suetonius* ſpeaking of *Titus*, c. 8. *Cuncta prætoriorum ſuorum ornamenta operibus ac templis deſtinavit.* To which might be added that in the *Pandects*, and the writers *De re ruſtica*, *prætorium* is generally taken for any large ſplendid houſe, or the chief apartment in it. Farther, *caſtra prætoria* were near the walls of the city *Rome*, as *Pliny* tells us, *Lib.* iv. *c.* 5. a great way from the Emperor's palace, as appears from *Suetonius*, *Ner.* 48. And had St. *Paul* been confined there, as he was in the πραιτωρίῳ of *Herod*, Acts xxiii. 35. the explaining the paſſage under conſideration to refer to the *Pretorian* camp, might ſeem more probable: But he *lived in his own hired houſe*, Acts xxviii. 30. And that his converſation was more with thoſe of the *palace* than the *camp*, may be not improbably conjectured from *chap.* iv. 23. where he tells the *Philippians*, the *ſaints of* Cæſar's houſhold *ſaluted them.* Whence it may be thought moſt likely that he means the *palace* in the place before us; otherwiſe one would have expected to hear rather that ſome of the *camp* ſaluted them. And when he here ſays, *v.* 25. *I know I ſhall abide*, why may it not be ſuppoſed that he had ſome intimations from his friends in the *palace*, how things were like to go with him? This is part of what may be pleaded againſt the interpretation of that learned writer, and the matter is left to the judgment of the reader.

14 (*p*) Τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν, *To ſpeak the word.*] The ancient *Syriac* and *vulgar Latin* verſions, together with the *Ethiopic*, and many of the beſt MSS. as well as the ancient commentators and writers, here add τοῦ Θεοῦ, *of God*; and accordingly is it added in the paraphraſe, it being probably the original and true reading of the place.

15 (*q*) *Some indeed preach Chriſt even of envy and ſtrife.*] It is very proper here to inquire who theſe preachers were; the right ſtating of which may give ſome light to this epiſtle. There can be no doubt they muſt have been profeſſed converts to the Chriſtian religion; for no unconverted *Jews* or *Gentiles* would ever give themſelves the trouble to preach Chriſt. And, in all probability, theſe preachers muſt have been converts from *Judaiſm*. For,

1. By comparing what St. *Paul* ſays in his other epiſtles, it appears that the greateſt oppoſition, diſturbance or hindrance he met with from any who profeſſed themſelves Chriſtians, was from

them.

PARAPHRASE.

16. They who preach Christ with a design to oppose and provoke me, don't do it sincerely *(r)*, supposing *(f)* they shall thereby aggravate the
17. trouble of my bonds: But they who preach Christ with an hearty affection to me, do it as persons assured *(f)* that I lie in bonds in order to make an apology or defence of the gospel *(t)*, and consequently that they do well to adhere
18. to me. But what of that? Let their intentions be what they will, Christ is both ways preached,

TEXT.

good will. The one preach 16 Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds: but 17 the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel. What 18 then? notwithstanding every way, whether in pre-

NOTES.

them. Nor could he, indeed, well be opposed by any others but *Jewish* converts, or such as were seduced by, and fell in with them.

2. Who, beside these, were likely to endeavour to *add affliction to St.* Paul's *bonds*? He continually represents the cause of his bonds to be his preaching and asserting the liberty of the *Gentiles*. Now they who were most displeased with that conduct which brought his sufferings upon him, were likely enough to be most forward in endeavouring to aggravate his trouble under them. And who can they be but the *Jewish* converts?

16 (*r*) Οὐχ ἁγνῶς, *Not sincerely.*] This may refer to the matter of their preaching; it was not sincere, pure, and uncorrupted gospel which they preached: But they adulterated it, by mixing *Judaism* with it, and so they *perverted the gospel of Christ*, Gal. i. 7. Or it may refer to the intentions of the preachers, they acted not sincerely in what they did, but while they pretended their great end was to preach Christ, instead of that, they made it their chief business to preach down the apostle, and to lessen his reputation. The next words, *supposing to add affliction to my bonds*, seem to carry it for the latter sense; that he speaks here of their intentions; and so does what he says of their preaching, *v.* 18. that it was *in pretence*, in opposition to its being *in truth*, that is, in sincerity and uprightness.

17 (*f*) The different way in which he speaks of the two sorts of preachers, deserves to be observed. The one acted upon a *supposition*, (but a mistaken one) οἰόμενοι, *supposing* that they should add affliction to his bonds; and, *v.* 18, 19. he shows that they were deceived in their supposition, and miss'd of their expectation: But the other, who preached Christ out of good will, did not only suppose or imagine, but, upon clear evidence, *knew* and were *assured*, εἰδότες, that St. *Paul* was a prisoner in order to his defending the gospel.

(*t*) Ὅτι εἰς ἀπολογίαν τῦ εὐαγγελίυ κεῖμαι, *That I am set for the defence of the gospel.*] If the words are taken in the sense given by our translators, they will yield another argument to prove that the opposition St. *Paul* met with was from the *Jewish* converts; for he then here shows what sort of preachers he opposes to them; even those who preached Christ out of good will, and love to him, knowing that he was set for the defence of the gospel. They were such as were highly pleased with him for that at which others took offence. If then we can learn what that gospel was for the defence of which he was set, we may from thence judge who they were who preached Christ out of envy and opposition against him. Now this cannot be unknown to such as are versed in St. *Paul's* epistles. It was to him the apostle of the *Gentiles* that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed, and he often speaks of himself as in a peculiar manner the minister thereof, even in contradistinction to the other apostles. See Mr. *Locke* upon *Eph.* iii. 7. and compare *Gal.* ii. 7. and *Col.* i. 23. And that St. *Paul* was set for the defence of this

TEXT.

tence, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will
19 rejoice. For I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the spirit

PARAPHRASE.

preached, whether it be under such dissimulation, or whether it be in sincerity; and I therein rejoice, yea, and I will rejoice. And I have 19.
good reason to rejoice in this; for I know that this preaching of Christ, of which my bonds are the occasion *(u)*, shall turn to my advantage and

NOTES.

this gospel, the calling of the *Gentiles*, may appear by his being so peculiarly intrusted with the revelation of it, his calling it his gospel, *Rom.* xvi. 25. (upon which see Mr. *Locke*) his insisting so perpetually upon it, and his being careful on all occasions to defend it, and that against St. *Peter* himself, *Gal.* ii. 5, 11, 12. Nor can it be doubted that the word κεῖμαι will bear the sense in which our translators have taken it, as it does in that place *Luke* ii. 34. *This child is* set κεῖται *for the fall and rising again of many in* Israel. But considering what 'tis here joined with, the sense given in the paraphrase may seem more agreeable. The proper sense of ἀπολογία is an *apology*, or a *defence upon an accusation*; and so it is used before, *v.* 7. and the sense seems to be this, *I lie* [in bonds] *in order to make an apology* [or defence in a way of apology] *for the gospel* before *Nero*. This was a more moving consideration to others, and would sooner excite their love and tenderness, than barely because he was *set for the defence of the gospel*, as we translate it.

There are two things farther to be remarked concerning the 16th and 17th *verses*. 1. The one is, that our translators seem not to have chosen the best construction of these *verses*; while they render them us, *The one preach Christ of contention,——the other of love*, i. e. preach Christ of love. Hereby they make the *preaching Christ of contention*, and the *preaching him of love*, to belong to the predicates, whereas they seem to me to belong to the subjects of their respective sentences. The apostle had said in the *verse* before, that some preached Christ of envy and strife, and some of good-will: It does not therefore look very likely that he would here assert the same things over again, as he really does, according to our translation; for what difference is there between *preaching Christ of envy and strife*, and *preaching Christ of contention*? or between *preaching Christ of good-will*, and *preaching Christ of love*? I therefore think, that following the distinction he had just made, he here goes over each again, and that οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἐριθείας, *the contentious*, or *those who preach Christ of contention*, is the subject of the first enunciation, and what he asserts of them now, which he had not before, is, that *they preached not Christ sincerely, supposing to add affliction to his bonds*: And again, οἱ ἐξ ἀγάπης, *the affectionate*, or *those who preach Christ of love*, is the subject of the other enunciation, which is elliptical, and to be thus supplied, *they do it as knowing*, &c. or from the preceding assertion thus, *but they of love*, preach Christ sincerely, *knowing that I lie in bonds for the defence of the gospel*.

2. The other thing to be here remarked is, that the order of these two *verses* is inverted, the 17th being placed before the 16th in the *Vulg. Syriac*, *Ethiopic* and *Coptic* versions, in some few *Greek* MSS. and ancient writers. The authority on the other side for the common order of these two *verses*, must be owned to be very considerable, and seems to me to be much confirmed by the context; for both in the *verse* before, and in the *verse* after these, that is, *v.* 15, 18. he speaks of these two sorts; and as he, in both places, mentions those who acted out of envy first, it seems very probable he observed the same order in the 16th and 17th *verses* that come between the other.

19 (*u*) Οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι τοῦτο, *I know that this.*] The reason of the paraphrase, which refers the *this* to Christ being preached upon the occasion of St. *Paul's* bonds, is to be fetched from the foregoing *verse*, where he says, *Christ is preached*, *and* ἐν τούτῳ, *in* this *I rejoice*. And here he

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

and comfort *(w)*, through your prayer for me, and through what will, I doubt not, be the consequence thereof, the affording farther measures of the spirit of Jesus Christ to render my indea-
20. vours successful. And this is agreeable to that earnest hope and expectation which I entertain, that I shall have no reason to be asham'd of any thing which befals me; but that in the most publick manner *(x)* Christ, as he always has been, so he shall be still magnified in my body, either by my life, which, if prolonged, will be for

TEXT.

of Jesus Christ, according to my earnest expectation, and my hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but *that* with all boldness, as always, *so* now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether *it be* by

NOTES.

he gives a reason why he rejoiced *in this*, because he knew that *this* he rejoiced in, would turn to his account.

(*w*) Τοῦτό *μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν, This shall turn to my salvation.*] The same expression is used by the LXX, *Job* xiii. 16. and, as it seems, in much the same sense with that given in the paraphrase. It is not absolutely necessary that the word *σωτηρία* should always be taken in the sense in which it is frequently used in the New Testament, for *eternal happiness*. Mr. *Locke* has observed that it is used otherwise, 2 *Cor.* i. 6. to which we may add *Acts* vii. 25. xxvii. 34. And perhaps we have another place in this epistle where it is used to signify *comfort*, or *advantage*, as that seems to be the meaning of it in this place; and so *σωτηρία* may be consider'd as opposed to θλῖψιν, *v.* 16. This sense seems confirmed by the next *verse*, where he tells them, that this was *according to his earnest expectation and hope, that he should in nothing be ashamed*, that is, that he should have cause to rejoice in all the troubles that befel him: And so he was satisfied his present bonds in particular should issue in his comfort, according to the expectation and hope he had concerning all the providences of God in general, which related to him. If any one should think that the word *σωτηρία* is here used in the more ordinary sense, the difference will not be great, since what was for his present comfort would likewise promote his eternal salvation.

Farther, I would offer it to the consideration of the reader, whether *σωτηρία* here may not signify *safety*, or *deliverance from his bonds*. Perhaps, in this way his discourse may become more easy and plain than in any other; since the progress of the gospel by those who preached out of love, would gain St. *Paul* friends; and the preaching of the *Judaizers* out of envy, would give his friends an opportunity to represent to the Emperor, and those in power, that he was persecuted by the *Jews* out of malice, and not for any real crimes against the state. He might be sensible what good use would be made of this to favour his release. I am not positive in this; but think it may deserve examination.

20 (*x*) Ἐν *πάσῃ παῤῥησίᾳ, With all boldness.*] There is no doubt that the word *παῤῥησία* does often signify *boldness*: But St. *Paul* seems here to speak not so much of his own courage in going thro' his troubles, as of the publickness of them. In this sense our translators have well render'd ἐν *παῤῥησίᾳ openly*, John vii. 4. *There is no man that doth any thing* in secret, *and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things shew thy self to the world*, Colos. ii. 15. So, according to this sense of the word, the phrase here should be render'd *with all openness*, or *publickness*, that is, as it is express'd in the paraphrase, *in the most publick manner*. And this

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

21 life or by death. For to me to live *is* Christ, and to die
22 *is* gain. But if I live in the flesh, this *is* the fruit of my labour; yet what I shall
23 choose, I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two,

for the service of the church, and for spreading the gospel, or by my death, if I should die a martyr in these bonds. For Christ, or the 21.
serving and honouring Christ, is the great gain or advantage I propose to my self in living and dying *(y)*. But if my lot should be to live 22.
longer in the flesh *(z)*, this magnifying or serving Christ will be the fruit of my labour, (and therefore I know it will turn to my comfort) and I know not *(a)* what to choose. For I am 23.
in a strait between the two things I mentioned, life and death, for while my settled inclination

NOTES.

sense seems to me confirmed by what he adds, *in my body, whether it be by life or by death*. Had he intended that Christ should be glorified by his free and couragious speaking in his own defence, I can hardly think he would have said he should be glorified in his *body*, but rather by his discourse: But if this be understood of the publickness of the appearance he should make, all the expressions very well agree.

21 (y) Ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν, Χριστὸς, καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν, κέρδος, *For to me to live* is *Christ, and to die* is *gain.*] The sense given in the Paraphrase seems most adapted to St. *Paul*'s argument. The γὰρ, *for*, shows that he designed, by this sentence, to confirm what he had asserted in the *verse* before, that his *earnest expectation and hope was, that Christ should be magnified in his body, whether it were by life or by death:* But, according to the sense expressed in our translation, he clears only one part of his assertion, and says nothing of the other; he shows his hope was, Christ should be magnified by his life, but his asserting that death was counted by him gain, is not a proving (unless very remotely) that his hope was, Christ should be magnified by his death. The interpretation of the Paraphrase given by Mr. *Airay*, is commended by the learned *Gataker* in *Marc. Antonin.* Lib. ix. *sect. ult.* And if any credit were to be given to *Valesius*'s various readings, this sense would be confirmed effectually; for thus he reads the next *verse*, Εἰ δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκὶ, οὗτός μοι καρπὸς ἔργου, *But if I live in the flesh, he is the fruit of my labour.* But there is no need of having recourse to that reading; for we have much such another construction, *Heb.* vii. 4.

22 (z) Ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκὶ, *But if I live in the flesh.*] The expression in the *Greek* is elliptical, and must be supplied some such way as is taken in the Paraphrase, which in sense is the same with our translation. Farther, there seems here to be some emphasis in the manner of his expressing himself, *to live in the flesh*: and so again, *v.* 24. *to abide in the flesh.* He seems hereby to intend to show the little value he set upon life for its own sake, and therefore to speak of it by way of contempt and disparagement; as though he had said, "If I must yet live longer in "this painful miserable flesh." He thought life valuable and important, considered with respect to Christ and his service, according as he had spoken of it before: But, by this variation of his stile, or his adding *in the flesh*, he may be understood to hint that he was not fond of life, as men commonly are, knowing that his life, if continued, must, as formerly, be a life of labour and fatigue. This may be farther intimated in the next clause, *This is the fruit of my labour*, q. d. of the great toil wherewith my life will be filled up.

(a) Οὐ γνωρίζω, *I wot not.*] The ordinary sense of this verb is to *make a thing known*;

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

clination and desire is to depart hence *(b)* and be with Christ *(c)*, which must be much happier
24. for me, than to be here; I perceive that my continuing longer in the flesh, is more neces-
25. sary upon your account. And this I know assuredly, that I shall live yet longer, and have an opportunity of visiting you all *(d)*, for the further-

TEXT.

having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: Never- 24
theless, to abide in the flesh, *is* more needful for you. And having this con- 25
fidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all, for your further-

NOTES.

according to which he should mean, that he would not plainly tell them what he would choose; but the next verse shows that he was at a loss himself in the matter; nor does he seem to conceal his thoughts from them. It is necessary therefore to understand him as our translators have done: And thus used for *scire, to know*, γνωρίζειν has been reckoned by some Criticks among the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. *Beza* has this remark upon the passage: *Novi pro scio.* And a late writer, in his diligent and useful inquiries into the stile of the *New Testament*, says, he has not observed this sense of the word in the Heathen writers; *Sacred Classicks*, p. 34. However, *Isocrates* had so used it long before St. *Paul*, in his discourse *ad Nicoclem*: Ἄκουε τῶν λόγων τῶν παρ' ἀλλήλων· καὶ πειρῶ γνωρίζειν ἅμα τοὺς λέγοντας, ὁποῖοί καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν, καὶ περὶ ὧν ἂν λέγωσι; *Hear what persons say one of another; and endeavour to know both what and who the speakers are, and of whom they speak.*

And in this sense too the word seems to have been used by the LXX. *Job* xxxiv. 25.

23 (*b*) Εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι, *To depart.*] There is no doubt that hereby St. *Paul* means to die; nor can any fault be found in the translation, which has taken the best notion of the word. If any one desires to see in what other ways it is, or may be used to signify *to die*, he may consult Mr. *Gataker*, *De Nov. Instr. Stylo*, cap. vii. where he has copiously treated of that matter.

It must be own'd that the expression, τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι, is unusual; which has given occasion to the learned author of a late piece, intitled, *Epistolæ duæ ad celeb. Virum T. T. professorum Amstelodamensem scriptæ*, to offer an emendation, and instead of εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι he would read τὸ ἀναλῦσαι. The leaving out the εἰς, is warranted by the *Clermont* and St. *Germains* copies, and, as Dr. *Mills* adds, by *Chrysostom*: And as to the other alteration, he observes, that in old MSS. and ancient inscriptions, we find oftentimes, and almost always, o written for ου. And if an emendation of the place is necessary, I can't see how a more easy and natural one can be devised.

(*c*) *And be with Christ.*] Since St. *Paul* made no doubt of the safety of his state, but was persuaded that Christ should be magnified by his death as well as by his life, he must mean by this that he should immediately, upon his departure or death, be with Christ in a state of happiness. And indeed otherwise what could give occasion to his being in a strait between life and death? If death only put him into a state of insensibility, one would think the case was too plain to leave him at a loss what he should choose; for certainly to so good a man as St. *Paul*, to continue here in the world to serve Christ, and, I add, to be happy with Christ also in a good degree, must appear vastly preferable to a state wherein he should lose all sense and knowledge of him, and all capacity of serving him,

25 (*d*) Ὅτι μενῶ καὶ συμπαραμενῶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν, *That I shall abide and continue with you all.*] Though our translation is exact enough; yet as it is hardly to be supposed that St. *Paul* intended to fix his abode among the *Philippians*, and leave off his custom of travelling up and down among the churches he had planted, I have chosen in the Paraphrase to express his meaning

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

26 ance and joy of faith: That your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me, by my coming to you again.

furtherance and joy of your faith *(e)*; that so you may the more abundantly triumph in Christ Jesus upon my account, when you shall see me again present with you *(f)*. 26.

NOTES.

by *visiting* them, it seeming to be the same thing with his *coming to them again*, mentioned in the next *verse*.

(e) Εἰς τὴν ὑμῶν προκοπὴν καὶ χαρὰν τῆς πίστεως, *For your furtherance and joy of faith.*] Though the construction in the Paraphrase be not absolutely necessary, it is what the *Greek* will bear, and seems most agreeable. The *furtherance of their faith* he might expect would be effected by the exhortations he should give them, and the spiritual extraordinary benefits he should impart to them, whereby their faith would be confirmed and established. See *Rom.* i. 11. How this coming would promote the joy of their faith, he shows in the next *verse*.

26 (f) They who opposed St. *Paul*, and were indeavouring to draw the *Gentile* converts at *Philippi* to *Judaism*, were, probably, very forward to upbraid them with the suffering condition in which the teacher they adhered to, now was: But his coming again among them, would furnish them with a full answer to all such confident insults; and when they saw how God had appeared for him, they would be the more established in the faith he had taught them, and become the more joyful and triumphant in the profession of it. And thus he expected to *give them occasion to glory on his behalf, that they might have somewhat to answer them which gloried in appearance, and not in heart*; as he speaks to the *Corinthians*, 2 Cor. v. 12.

SECT. IV.

CHAP. i. 27—ii. 18.

CONTENTS.

THE design of St. *Paul*, in this *Section*, is to press upon the *Philippians* a perseverance and unanimity in the faith which he had taught them, notwithstanding the opposition they met with upon the account of it; and withal he urges them to be peaceable and condescending to one another, and ready to perform all offices of kindness and service one toward another. This he presses upon them by various moving considerations, and particularly that of the condescension of Christ, and his blessed reward, which he sets out in very strong and lively terms. And to the same end he suggests to them the regard which they owed to himself.

PARAPHRASE.	*TEXT.*
27. HOwever, I expect to see you shortly; yet there is one thing which I cannot but earnestly recommend unto you in the mean while, and that is, that you would behave your selves in such a holy and worthy manner as the gospel of Christ does direct *(g)*; that so, when I come and see you, and, in the mean time, while I continue absent from you, I may have the satisfaction of hearing a good account of your affairs,	ONLY let your con- 27 versation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ: that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one

NOTES.

27 (g) Ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύεσθε, *Let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ.*] The same thing he expresses, *Col.* i. 10. by *walking worthy of the Lord to all pleasing*; and, *Eph.* iv. 1. by *walking worthy of the calling wherewith they were called*; and, 1 *Thess.* ii. 12. by *walking worthy of God who had called them*; which may be all explained from what he says, 1 *Thess.* iv. 1. *You have received of us how you ought to walk and to please God.* Nor can there be any doubt that the *having their conversation worthy of the gospel of Christ*, spoken of in this place, must import, in general, their living according to the direction of the gospel, and answerably to the great favour vouchsafed them: But the latter part of this *verse*, together with the next, shows what he had here principally in view, *viz.* their continuing stedfast in the doctrine he had taught them, concerning the liberty which God had granted them, as *Gentiles*. St.

Paul

TEXT.

spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith
28 of the gospel: And in nothing terrified by your adversaries; which is to them an evident token of per-

PARAPHRASE.

affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit *(b)*, striving together, as it were, with one soul, for that faith of the gospel which I have taught you *(i)*; without being in the least startled, or 28.
frighted out of your way by those *Jewish* converts who oppose you *(k)*, (which conduct of yours they will esteem a certain evidence of your destruction *(l)*: but you may well judge

NOTES.

Paul did not esteem them to do this, who being converts from among the *Gentiles*, were drawn away to *judaize*.

(*b*) Ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, *In one spirit.*] This is rather to be understood of their own spirit or mind, than of the Holy Spirit; for, beside that, no article is here prefixed, the next words, μιᾷ ψυχῇ, *with one temper*, or *affection*, seem to determine this to be the sense.

(*i*) *The faith of the gospel.*] The faith of the gospel, which they were to contend for with one mind, was what was then opposed, *ver.* 28. and it appears evidently, from *chap.* iii. that they who opposed it were such as earnestly pleaded the absolute necessity of circumcision, and a conformity to the ceremonial law: and therefore this faith of the gospel can be no other than that of God's calling the *Gentiles* to be his people, without subjecting them to the *Mosaic* law.

Farther, in this *verse*, St. *Paul* proposes, as it were, the two heads upon which he intended chiefly to insist, they being things about which he was much concerned for them. They are, 1. Their unanimity, of which he treats in this *Section*. 2. Their withstanding and opposing such as were indeavouring to seduce them to a subjection to the *Jewish* law, concerning which he discourses particularly *chap.* iii.

28 (*k*) Μὴ πτυρόμενοι ἐν μηδενὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντικειμένων, *In nothing terrified by your adversaries.*] Mr. *Locke*, in his Note upon *Eph.* i. 15. has very well shown that to be St. *Paul*'s sense which is given in the Paraphrase: "*In nothing startled by those who are opposers*; so the words are, "says he, and not *your adversaries*. Now there was no party at that time, who were in opposition to the gospel, which St. *Paul* preached, and with whom the *Gentile* converts had "any dispute, but those who were for keeping up circumcision, and the *Jewish* rites under the "gospel. These were they whom St. *Paul* apprehended alone, as likely to affright the convert "*Gentiles*, and make them start out of the way from the gospel, which is the proper import of "πτυρόμενοι."

(*l*) Ἥτις αὐτοῖς μὲν ἐστιν ἔνδειξις ἀπωλείας, *Which is to them an evident token of perdition.*] This is by many misunderstood, who think St. *Paul* speaks here of the perdition of the opposers just mentioned: but the constancy of the *Gentile* converts at *Philippi*, could not be an evidence of the perdition of the *Jewish* converts, the only evidence of that must be their own wickedness; and accordingly he lays their destruction upon that, *chap.* iii. 19. The sense therefore is this: These *Judaizers* were very confident they were in the right, and that God did absolutely insist upon circumcision and a submission to the ceremonial law, in order to any persons being accepted by him as his people; and when they saw they could not, by all their indeavours, prevail upon the *Gentiles* to comply with what they took to be the condition of salvation (*Acts* xv. 1.) they would esteem them (the *Gentiles*) obstinate and incorrigible, and as abandon'd of God to everlasting perdition. It is no new thing for men to make such things the conditions of salvation, as God does not, and then unmercifully to damn those who do not submit to them.

(*m*) Καὶ

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

judge it to be an evidence of your ſalvation; and ſuch an evidence this is as can never deceive you, ſince it proceeds not from the prejudices
29. of men, but from God himſelf (*m*); for God has vouchſafed you (*n*) in the behalf of Chriſt (*o*), not only to believe on him, calling you hereto when you were *Gentiles*, but has likewiſe granted you the honour of ſuffering for his ſake)

TEXT.

dition, but to you of ſalvation, and that of God. For 29 unto you it is given in the behalf of Chriſt, not only to believe on him, but alſo

NOTES.

(*m*) Καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, *And that of God.*] According to the common interpretation, this refers to the *ſalvation* juſt mentioned before, and ſo the ſenſe is, *This is an evidence of the ſalvation which God will beſtow upon you:* but the ſenſe given in the Paraphraſe ſeems more agreeable to St. *Paul*'s ſcope and deſign. There was no doubt that *ſalvation* muſt be beſtowed by God, whoever the perſons were who obtained it, even as the *perdition* which the *Jews* expected to be the lot of the *Gentiles*, they expected from him, that is, to be inflicted according to his ſentence and judgment; the aſſerting this therefore was not much to his purpoſe. But nothing could be more pertinent, when he had ſpoken of the different concluſions which the *Jews* and *Gentiles* formed from the ſame facts, than for him, in the ſtrongeſt terms, to aſſert the juſtneſs and ſtrength of the one, whereby he implies the weakneſs of the other. He therefore here declares, that the concluſion the *Gentiles* drew, was warranted by God himſelf, being intirely built upon his proceedings: and he implies, that conſequently the concluſion gathered by the *Jews*, was of quite another nature, that God had not at all warranted it, but it proceeded wholly from their own fond prejudices. And St. *Paul*, in the next *verſe*, appeals to the courſe God had taken with theſe *Gentile Philippians*, and thereby confirms them in their way of reaſoning; and that does farther eſtabliſh this interpretation. In a ſomewhat like manner he writes to the *Theſſalonians*, and reckons their *patience and faith in all the perſecutions and tribulations they indured, to be a manifeſt token of the righteous judgment of God, that they might be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which they alſo ſuffered*, 2 Theſſ. i. 4, 5.

29. (*n*) Τμῖν ἐχαρίσθη, *Unto you it is given*] St. *Paul* very skilfully diverts them from viewing perſecution under its moſt frightful appearance; and leads them to conſider it as a gift and an honour confer'd upon them. The like we may obſerve in the diſcourſe of another apoſtle, 1 *Pet.* iv. 12—16. I muſt own that the proper ſenſe of the word is to beſtow ſuch things as are grateful and agreeable; and that therefore this uſe of it may ſeem harſh. But it is obvious in all languages that words are frequently extended to a ſenſe contrary to what they originally had. So among the *Latins*, *gratiam referre* originally meant to *requite a kindneſs*, but it is likewiſe put to ſignify *requiting an injury*. Thus κερδαίνειν ſignifies properly, as we render it, *Acts* xxvii. 21. to *gain*: But to *gain a loſs*, as it is here uſed, gives it a quite different turn. If St. *Paul* is the only writer, who can be thought thus to uſe the word χαρίζεσθαι in this place, yet, I think, we muſt be content, unleſs we can find a better ſenſe. I only add, that the *Greek* commentators, *Chryſoſtom*, *Theophylact*, and *Oecumenius*, underſtand the word in the ſame manner.

(*o*) Τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, *In the behalf of Chriſt.*] I have left this in the Paraphraſe, juſt as I found it in our tranſlation, becauſe, to ſay the truth, I am at a loſs for the meaning of it. It ſeems doubtful to me to what the τὸ here refers: If we ſuppoſe it to be the ſame with τοῦτο, or that the ſenſe is to be ſupplied by δῶρον, χρῆμα, or ſome ſuch word, the meaning will be that this gift was beſtowed upon them for the ſake of Chriſt, that is, his merit; or perhaps more agreeably

to

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

30 to ſuffer for his ſake; having the ſame conflict which ye ſaw in me, and 1 now hear *to be* in me. If *there be* therefore any conſolation in Chriſt, if any

ſake) *(p)*. And to ſuch ſtedfaſtneſs and conſtancy incourage your ſelves by my example, ſince you meet with the ſame oppoſition and trouble, which you ſaw I did when I was among you *(q)*, and which I have told you I indure now I am at a diſtance from you. If therefore *(r)* there be any mutual Chriſtian conſolation *(s)*, if there be any comfort proceeding from the mutual love, which ought to be between Chriſtians, 30. 1.

NOTES.

to the uſe of the prepoſition, *with relation to Chriſt*. But if we allow of a pleonaſm in the words, and ſuppoſe that the τὸ refers to their ſufferings, and ſo that with it we are to join πάσχειν, mentioned in the laſt clauſe of the *verſe*, the ſenſe will ſtand thus, *To you* it *is given to ſuffer for Chriſt; I don't ſay, only to believe on him, but alſo to ſuffer for him*. This he eſteemed a great addition to the favour, and therefore lays an emphaſis upon it. This latter ſenſe pleaſes me beſt.

(*p*) Unleſs men will needleſly make a ſolœciſm in St. *Paul*'s diſcourſe, it is manifeſt, by looking into the *Greek*, that this *verſe* is to be joined with the former part of *v.* 28. and that what comes between muſt be read in a parentheſis, as it is put in the Paraphraſe.

30 (*q*) Τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχοντες, *Having the ſame conflict*.] If this be underſtood of perſecution in general, ſuch as the *Philippians* indured from the *Gentiles*; then as to his own caſe he may be thought to refer to what he formerly ſuffered from them at *Philippi*, Acts xvi. 19, *&c.* 1 *Theſſ.* ii. 2. and to what he now ſuffered at *Rome*. But, to ſay the truth, I can find no other evidence of the *Philippians* ſuffering perſecution from the *Gentiles* at this time, but what is built upon the text before us. It therefore ſeems more natural to me to explain what he ſays of the conflict he had with the *Judaizers*; and that the *Philippians* met with the ſame, appears from many paſſages in the epiſtle. Of his conflict with them at *Philippi* they had been witneſſes when he was among them; and of that he had with them now at *Rome*, he had given them ſome account in this *chapter*; and to that, I ſuppoſe, he refers in thoſe words, *And now hear to be in me*.

1 (*r*) *Therefore*.] This *therefore* has, I think, a reference to what he had before declared, *chap.* i. 25, 26. of his willingneſs to continue yet longer in the fleſh for their ſakes. And the connection will ſtand thus: "I am contented, as you may perceive by what I have ſaid, to "abide longer in this weariſome and afflicted eſtate, and to be kept from that happineſs, on "which I have fixed my moſt earneſt expectation and deſire; and the reaſon why I am eaſy to "continue thus here, is, that I may be ſerviceable to you in improving your faith, and promoting your joy: and ſince ſuch is my affection to you, do you make me a ſuitable return, and "therefore take care to comply with the exhortation I give you, that you may be a comfort and "joy to me." This his exhortation he ſtrongly inforces in the following *verſes*.

(*s*) Εἴ τις παράκλησις ἐν Χριστῷ, *If there be any conſolation in Chriſt*.] The word παράκλησις, is uſed ſometimes to ſignify *exhortation*, and ſometimes *conſolation*: and where the context does not determine the ſenſe, it is doubtful which way it ſhould be underſtood. It may, perhaps, be thought by ſome that this is the caſe here in this place; and therefore it may not be improper to expreſs what muſt have been his meaning, in which ever way he uſed the word. If then it be taken in the former ſignification, it is as tho' he had ſaid, "If a Chriſtian exhortation "is of any weight with you." If it be taken in the latter ſignification, his meaning is, "If

"Chriſtianity

PHILIPPIANS.

PARAPHRASE.

ſtians, if there be any communion of the Spirit (*t*), if there be any bowels of mercy and
2. compaſſion; let me have a complete joy and ſatisfaction (*u*) in your manifeſting the ſame diſpoſition toward me, which I have declared I have toward you all (*w*); have the ſame love to me and to one another, as thoſe whoſe ſouls are, as it were, united (*x*), and all attend to one
3. and the ſame thing. Let nothing be done by any

TEXT.

comfort of love, if any fellowſhip of the ſpirit, if any bowels and mercies: Fulfil ye my joy, that ye be like-minded, having the ſame love, *being* of one accord, of one mind. *Let* nothing *be done* through ſtrife, or vain glory, but in lowli-

NOTES.

" Chriſtianity affords any conſolation." The other expreſſions here joined with this, ſeem plainly to carry it for this latter ſenſe, wherein our tranſlators have well underſtood it.

(*t*) Ἐι τις κοινωνία πνεύμα]ος, *If any fellowſhip of the Spirit.*] This, by a common hebraiſm, may ſignify, If there be any ſpiritual fellowſhip; or if we ſuppoſe that the Holy Spirit is hereby meant, it is evident that as that Spirit dwells in and animates all Chriſtians, who are all members of the ſame body, of which Chriſt is the Head, there muſt be a fellowſhip and communion between them. Which ever way we take it, ſuch a fellowſhip and communion obliged them to be concern'd for the comfort and eaſe of one another, and of St. *Paul*, even as he was concern'd for them all.

2 (*u*) Πληρώσα]έ μου τὴν χαρὰν, *Fulfil ye my joy*] He had told them, *chap.* i. 25. that his coming again to them would be for the promotion of the *joy* of their faith: now in theſe words he demands of them a ſuitable return, and that they would by their behaviour promote his *joy*. This, I think, confirms the account before given of the relation the firſt *verſe* of this *chapter* has to his foregoing diſcourſe. Compare *Rom.* i. 11, 12.

(*w*) Ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε, *That ye be like minded.*] St. *Paul* appears to thoſe who careſully read him, to be ſo far from writing looſely and at random, that he hardly uſes a word without ſome particular deſign, and that has not ſome weight in it. Hence it ſeems reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that by this expreſſion he means ſomething that is different from what he intends by τὸ ἓν φρονοῦν]ες, *being of the ſame mind*, in the laſt words of the *verſe*. If we refer the τὸ αὐτὸ to v. 25. of the former *chapter*, and underſtand him to exhort them to be *like minded with himſelf*; this may, poſſibly, make all eaſy; for then the τὸ ἓν φρονοῦν]ες, or the *being all of one mind*, will ſignify their agreement with one another.

There is yet another way to account for theſe two expreſſions, *viz.* by underſtanding the firſt expreſſion, as our tranſlators do, to require the *Philippians* to be *like minded*; and by taking τὸ for τοῦτο in the latter, and rendering it, *Attending to this one thing* [eſpecially] *that nothing be done through ſtrife*, as the *Vulgate*, which keeps the *Greek* ellipſis, may fairly be underſtood. If neither of theſe ſhould be ſufficient, I own I do not yet perceive where the difference between the two expreſſions lies; nor am I able to clear his words from a needleſs tautology, tho' I am far from ſuſpecting upon that account that the apoſtle is guilty of any ſuch thing; it being very eaſy to ſuppoſe that another may hit upon that ſolution which has eſcaped my obſervation.

(*x*) Σύμψυχοι, *Being of one accord*] This anſwers to what he had ſaid, *chap.* i 27. Μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦ]ες, ſtriving together *with one mind*, i. e. with the like zeal and affection.

I don't take τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ἔχον]ες and σύμψυχοι to be two different and independent members; but conſider love as the certain conſequence of an union of ſoul; and therefore the Paraphraſe renders it as though ὡς were here underſtood. In like manner our tranſlators have inſerted it, 1 *Pet.* ii. 4.

TEXT.

ness of mind let each esteem
other better than them-
4 selves. Look not every man
on his own things, but eve-
ry man also on the things
5 of others. Let this mind be
in you, which was also in
6 Christ Jesus; who being in
the form of God, thought

PARAPHRASE.

any of you out of a desire of contending and quarrelling, or from a vain affectation of honour and applause, while he indeavours to set up himself above others: but let every one behave himself with modesty and humility, showing an inclination to esteem others as better than himself, and being accordingly ready and forward to serve them *(y)*. Let no one 4.
among you be only solicitous for his own profit *(z)*: but let every one desire, and, as he has opportunity, further the profit of others. For ye ought to be of such a kind and bene- 5.
ficent, of such a humble and condescending 6.
disposition as Christ Jesus himself was, who being in the form or likeness of God *(a)*, was not

eager

NOTES.

3 (y) It can't be imagined, that St. *Paul* required Christians of the longest standing, and the greatest eminence in the church, to count themselves inferior to such as had but just enter'd into it. He certainly can mean no more than that every one should be lowly and condescending, and ready to serve the lowest and meanest Christian. This was the temper of St. *Paul*, 1 Cor. ix. 19. And this was the temper of a greater than he, even our Lord himself, who has made his example a rule for us, *Matt.* xx. 26——28. *Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister: And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant. Even as the Son of man came not to be ministred unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.* Compare *Rom.* xii. 10. 1 *Pet.* v. 5.

4 (z) Τὰ ἑαυτῶν, *On his own things.*] That hereby St. *Paul* means *their own temporal profit*, may appear by comparing *v.* 21. where he again uses the same words, All seek *their own things*. This is the rather inserted in the Paraphrase, that it might not seem to carry in it an insinuation, that St. *Paul* gave any incouragement to a busy and pragmatical temper, which he elsewhere utterly condemns, 1 *Thess.* iv. 11. 2 *Thess.* iii. 11, 12. 1 *Tim.* v. 13.

6 (a) Ος ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων. *Who being in the form of God.*] The meaning of this expression can't be, that Christ had the form of God in the metaphysical notion of a *form*; nor is, perhaps, such kind of language ever to be met with concerning any thing, That it should be said to be in its own form; for the form being essential to every thing, it cannot possibly be without it.

By the *form of God*, we are then to understand the appearance and likeness of God; which will, I believe, be found to be the constant use of the word here render'd *form* in the holy scriptures. Thus the word is again used by St. *Paul* in the very next *verse*, *He took upon him the* form *of a servant*; concerning which more will be said presently. It is used only once more, that I can find, in the New Testament, *Mark* xvi. 12. *After that, he appeared in another* form *unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.* Where no one, I suppose, will imagine that the word *form* is used metaphysically, or that any thing more is intended, than that he appeared in a different figure, shape, garb, or likeness, from what he did before to

Chap. II.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

eager in retaining that likeneſs to God *(b)*:
7. But, on the contrary, he emptied himſelf of that form it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himſelf of no reputation, and took upon him the form of 7

NOTES.

Mary Magdalen, v. 9. who took him for the gardener, *John* xx. 15. The LXX have likewiſe uſed it in theſe ſeveral places, *Job* iv. 16. *Iſai.* xliv. 13. *Dan.* iv. 36. v. 6, 10. and vii. 28. And whoever will take the trouble to examine them, will find that not one of them will admit that ſenſe which ſome would here affix to this word. In *Cicero's* books, *De nat. Deorum*, the queſtion frequently occurs *de forma Deorum*, where, I believe, it always ſignifies the *ſhape*, and is therefore ſometimes explained by *figura*.

If it be here inquired, wherein did this form or likeneſs of God lie? it may be anſwer'd,

1. He was in the form or likeneſs of God, by reaſon of his reſembling God in glory and majeſty. It may, perhaps, deſerve remarking, that the LXX have uſed only this one word, for the two that are in the *Chaldee*, which we have render'd *honour and brightneſs*, Dan. iv. 36. And again, *Dan.* v. 6. where they uſe the word *μορφὴ*, our tranſlators render it in the common reading, *Then was the king's* countenance *changed:* but, inſtead of *countenance*, their marginal reading is *brightneſs*. However this might be accommodated to St. *Paul's* diſcourſe, and he often uſes the ſtile of that tranſlation; yet I do not lay any great ſtreſs upon it. Nor need I, ſince the reſemblance he bore to God in glory and majeſty are ſufficiently declared in other places of ſcripture; as particularly where he is ſaid to be the *image of God*, 2 Cor. iv. 4. the *image of the inviſible God*, Col. i. 15. *the brightneſs of his glory, and the expreſs image of his perſon*, Heb. i. 3. Conſonant hereto is the aſſurance he has given us, that he *had a glory with the Father, before the world was*, John xvii. 5. And it was the general ſenſe of the primitive Chriſtians, that under the old diſpenſation he often perſonated him, making a viſible appearance in his name and ſtead; and they thought no other was ſo fit for this, as he who was the next *Being* to the Father, by whom alſo he made the worlds. But the truth of their opinion I do not aſſert.

2. He is ſaid to have been in the form or likeneſs of God, upon the account of that authority, dominion, and power, with which he was intruſted, and which he exerciſed antecedently to his coming into the world. *God* is a relative term, and denotes authority: whence angels under the old diſpenſation were ſtiled Gods, and ſo are magiſtrates, and ſo *Moſes* was *Aaron's* God, and *Pharaoh's* God. In the higheſt and moſt eminent ſenſe there can be but one God, that is, but one to whom abſolute and ſupreme dominion and authority does belong: But others being veſted by him with authority, may be, and are ſtiled gods, as reſembling him herein. And thus our Saviour, antecedently to his incarnation, having the *Jews* committed to him by God, and being the Prince of that people, or the King of *Iſrael*, was in the form and likeneſs of God. This latter ſenſe appears to me the moſt eaſy and natural, becauſe the *form of God* and *form of a ſervant*, ſeem to be oppoſed; and conſequently as the one imports the likeneſs of a ſlave, the other will ſignify the likeneſs of a ruler or a ſovereign Lord. This may be farther confirmed by the account here given of his *exaltation*, and *the name given him above every name*, viz. that *every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord*, v. 9, 11. *Lord* and *God* are terms of much the ſame import in this caſe; and as his exaltation was a reſtoring to him the honour he had before, but a reſtoring it in a higher degree, the giving him this name, and making him *Lord*, may well be conſider'd as a rendering to him the *form of God*, which, for a time, he had laid aſide.

(*b*) Οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ,] The ſenſe our tranſlators have given to theſe words, is, that *he thought it not robbery to be equal with God*. But it is not eaſy to perceive how this ſenſe can agree to the place. For,

1. The

NOTES.

1. The aſſerting him to be equal to God, muſt of neceſſity carry in it an aſſertion of a plurality of Gods. If there be a God, and another who is equal to him in nature, perfections, and dominion, the latter muſt be as truly a God, in the higheſt and moſt abſolute ſenſe, as the former: and when men have ſaid all they can, a God and a God are as certainly two Gods, as a man and a man are two men. Nor can this be evaded, by pretending that they are not two Gods, becauſe they are one and the ſame Being, and ſo one and the ſame God; for the inſpired writers are utter ſtrangers to ſuch aſſertions, that a Being is equal to it ſelf.

2. Could it be upon any ſubtil invention ſuppoſed, that he was equal to God, yet what occaſion could there be to talk of *robbery* in the caſe? To be equal with God, provided he was ſo, could not carry in it the leaſt reſemblance of *robbery*, or the taking away from God any thing that was his. Such interpreters muſt therefore judge the expreſſion to be elliptical, and that it ought to be thus ſupplied, *He thought it not robbery* for him to aſſume or pretend *to be equal with God.* But it can't be imagined that St. *Paul* would aſſert that he aſſumed or pretended to be equal with God, without appealing or referring tacitly to ſome famous and evident pretenſions our Lord made to ſuch an equality; and could any ſuch be found in the hiſtory we have of him, it might do ſome ſervice to this interpretation: but ſince in fact we meet with nothing of this nature in any of the goſpels; nay, ſince his aſſertions were conſtantly of a directly oppoſite and contrary ſtrain, there can be little reaſon for men to aſſent to ſuch an interpretation. Beſides, if ſuch an equality were to be believed, it muſt reſt wholly upon this one text, ſince it is never aſſerted in any other: and it would be very ſtrange, that ſo important and abſolutely neceſſary an article of faith, as ſome would perſuade us this is, ſhould be delivered in this one place only, and eſpecially ſince the interpretation of this is it ſelf liable to ſo many and ſtrong objections.

3. This expreſſion is wholly ſuperfluous, as it ſtands joined with the former, and as they are both explained by ſuch interpreters. The ſenſe, according to them, muſt run thus: "Who having the ſame nature, and all the ſame perfections with God, thought it not robbery to be equal "with God in nature and perfections." To have the ſame nature, and all the ſame perfections beſpeaks the moſt abſolute equality: what need then could there be of his aſſerting the ſame thing over again in the latter expreſſion, *He thought it not robbery to be equal with God?*

4. I think there is a great deal of ſtrength in Dr. *Clarke*'s reaſoning, *Scrip. Doctr.* Num. 934. "The following words [ΑΛΛΑ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, BUT *emptied himſelf,*] ſhow thoſe immediately "foregoing, not to be part of the *preceding character of Chriſt's greatneſs,* but part of the *conſe-* "*quent* account of his humiliation. For ſo the conſtruction is more uſual and natural, and the "connection plainer; [*Though he was in the form of God,* yet *he was not greedy of being honoured* "*as God,* BUT (on the contrary) willingly *emptied himſelf of his glory.*] But, in the other in- "terpretation, the word [ἀλλὰ, *but*] has not ſo natural a place: [*He thought it not robbery to be* "*equal with God; but* yet nevertheleſs (not ſo properly ἀλλὰ, but rather ἀλλ' ὅμως, or ὅμως ὃ) "*he emptied himſelf,* &c.]

5. Of what was it that Chriſt emptied himſelf, according to this interpretation? The apoſtle's diſcourſe, one would think, naturally leads us to interpret this expreſſion thus: "He emptied "himſelf of that form of God which he had before; and when he emptied himſelf of that, he "took upon him another form, *viz.* that of a ſervant:" But if the *form of God* ſignifies the nature and perfections of God, and an equality with him; how was it poſſible he ſhould empty himſelf of that form, ſince one of thoſe perfections is immutability?

But to come now more cloſely to conſider the import of theſe phraſes themſelves. As to the firſt, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, I do not find any inſtance produced of ἁρπαγμὸς as ever uſed by any author but St. *Paul* in this place, and ſuch as have taken occaſion to treat of it; and ſo no argument can be brought to confirm any interpretation from the expreſs uſe of the word. But if ἅρπαγμα be ſynonymous to ἁρπαγμὸς, as βάπτισμα is to βαπτισμὸς, φώτισμα to φωτισμὸς, μίγμα to μιγμὸς, ἅγνισμα to ἁγνισμὸς, and many others of the like nature, the proper meaning of it ſeems to be a *prey* or *booty*, which is of a middle ſenſe, and may be either juſt or unjuſt. And ſo 'tis uſed by *Joſephus*, *Antiq.* Lib. xi. c. 5. Οὕτως ἅρπαγμα πάντων ἡ λάφυρον γεγόναμεν. Hence becauſe a *prey* or *booty* is what perſons readily imbrace, and

Chap. II.

NOTES.

and eagerly retain, as a thing of which they count it an advantage to be poſſeſſed: agreeably to this notion in all the paſſages produced out of *Heliodorus*, where this word is uſed, it ſeems plainly to denote a *fortuitous advantage*, or, as we ſay, a *lucky hit* put into a perſon's hands, and not to be let ſlip or parted with. This ſenſe is, perhaps, much confirmed by one of thoſe paſſages, οὐχ ἅρπαγμα, ἀλλὰ ἔρμαιον ἡγεῖται τὸ πρᾶγμα, where, beſide the phraſe of ἅρπαγμα ἡγεῖσθαι, the ἅρπαγμα is explained by ἔρμαιον, or *lucrum inſperatum*. *Horace* ſeems to have expreſſed the ſame idea, as if he had in his mind thoſe two *Greek* words, when he ſays, *Serm.* L. ii. *S.* 3. *v.* 67.

——————————*An magis excors*
Rejecta praeda, quam praeſens Mercurius fert?

I think therefore they hardly give us the exact ſignification of ἅρπαγμα, who explain it by a *thing very deſirable*, or *to be coveted*. For a thing may be *deſired* or *coveted* which 'tis not in a perſon's power to obtain. And while 'tis only *deſir'd*, it is not in his power actually: but nothing is properly a *prey* or *booty*, till it be in one's poſſeſſion; or at leaſt in one's power to poſſeſs it. According to this ſenſe therefore the apoſtle may be ſuppoſed to ſay: *Who being in the form of God, was not eager or tenacious in retaining* τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, of which more preſently.

I can't but add what I think is very material, that not one of the primitive Chriſtians, who lived before the council of *Nice*, as far as appears, underſtood this phraſe in the ſame way our tranſlators do. The teſtimonies of the churches of *Lions* and *Vienne* in *France*, in *Euſeb. Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* Lib. v. c. 2. *Origen* on *John*, p. 34. & *Novatian De Trinit.* c. 17. are very clear to this purpoſe. Nor was the common interpretation contrary to the ſenſe of the *Antenicene* Fathers only, but of ſome of the *Poſtnicene* alſo, as is evident from the teſtimony of *Hilary*, a very zealous advocate for orthodoxy, *De Synod.* p. 238. *De Trinit.* Lib. viii. p. 111, 112. and of *Phœbadius*, Tom. IV. Bibl. Patr. p. 178.

This is ſo plainly diſagreeable to the ſenſe of the phraſe, that it has been rejected by *Er. Schmidius*, *Grotius*, Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*, Biſhop *Bull*, and others, whom no man will ſuſpect of being partial in favour of the notion againſt which this text is frequently alleged.

As to the other phraſe, τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, which our tranſlation renders *to be equal with God*, Dr. *Whitby* has, by many examples, clearly ſhown that it often imports no more than *to be like* God. If we ſuppoſe that μορφὴ Θεοῦ and ἴσα Θεῷ denote the ſame thing, it will not ſeem very proper, or indeed conſiſtent to ſay, that while he had the former he did not covet the latter. And if by the μορφὴ Θεοῦ we are to underſtand the *glory which he had with the Father before the world was*, I think it muſt be the ſame as ἴσα Θεῷ, ſince he did not diveſt himſelf of that glory, till he aſſumed the human nature; and then he prays only for the *reſtitution of the ſame glory*, John xvii. 5. Beſides, τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ appears farther to be what Chriſt had actually in poſſeſſion, till ἐκένωσε ἑαυτὸν, *he emptied himſelf*; by the uſe of the preſent tenſe εἶναι. For if it was only ſomething future, and what he had in proſpect, it ſhould rather have been ἔσεσθαι. Nay farther, this ſenſe ſeems neceſſary from the apoſtle's argument. In *v.* 4. he recommends two things to the *Philippians*, 1. *Not to be wholly intent upon their own profit*, [even in thoſe things wherein, ſtrictly ſpeaking, they had a right, and might juſtly attend to it] *but in ſome caſes to neglect it, or recede from it, in order,* 2. To their *indeavouring to aſſiſt and be helpful to others.* Nor does he, in the former member, caution them againſt a purſuit of what they had no preſent right to, though it might be for their profit. In *v.* 5. he inforces his advice from the example of Chriſt. Whom he ſhows *v.* 6. to have relinquiſh'd his own right or profit; and *v.* 7, 8. to have been highly beneficial to others. It may therefore be queſtioned whether that tranſlation is exact: *Who being in the likeneſs of God, did not haſtily covet to be honoured as God*; by which, I ſuppoſe, is meant, *He did not covet it*, till he had accompliſh'd that work, for the doing which, as his reward, *he was to be honoured as God.* But this ſeems not to be a direct inſtance of the apoſtle's precept, in *v.* 4. For he does not caution them againſt *haſtily coveting what they had not an immediate claim to*; but *to omit or relinquiſh their preſent right or profit, and ſuffer it to give way to an opportunity of aſſiſting others.* And to this the example of Chriſt will exactly correſpond,

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

a ſervant, and was made in
2 the likeneſs of men: And
being found in faſhion as a
man, he humbled himſelf,
and became obedient unto
death, even the death of

form of God *(c)*, taking upon him a very different form or likeneſs, even that of a ſervant *(d)*; when he was made in the likeneſs of men *(e)*. And though his becoming man was a great inſtance of his humility and condeſcenſion, yet he did not ſtop at that: But when he was actual- 8.
ly in the ſame condition and ſtate with men,

NOTES.

ſpond, if the ſenſe given of *v.* 6. be juſt. I may add, that τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, can hardly be thought directly to ſignify, *to be honoured as God*, though it may denote that which may be a foundation for ſuch honour. Nor, upon the whole, does it appear that the apoſtle, in this 6th *verſe*, has any view to what Chriſt ſhould receive, as the reward of his parting for a time with his glory; but only that he aſſerts that he did do it. The former, indeed, is declared afterward; *v.* 9—11. as an incouragement to imitate his example. But if any are minded farther to examine this matter, they are refer'd to polemical writers, it not being the deſign of theſe papers to expatiate in controverſies, but only to clear the ſenſe of the ſacred writer.

7 (*c*) Ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, *But made himſelf of no reputation.*] More properly is this render'd, *But emptied himſelf*, which naturally leads the reader to what it was of which he emptied himſelf, *viz.* of that *form of God* he was in before. See the preceding Note. To which may be added, for the ſatisfaction of ſome perſons, that St. *Jerom* ſhows he underſtood the expreſſion as I do; for upon *Gal.* iii. 13. he ſays, refering manifeſtly to this place, *Ille ſe de plenitudine & forma Dei evacuavit, formam ſervi accipiens*, "He emptied himſelf of the fulneſs and *form* of God, taking upon him the form of a ſervant."

(*d*) Μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, *And took upon him the form of a ſervant*] Had this been render'd, *Taking the form of a ſervant*, it would have better expreſſed what ſeems to be St. *Paul*'s ſenſe, that his emptying himſelf of the form of God, was BY taking the form of a ſervant.

Farther, our Saviour, while he was here on earth, was not properly a *ſervant* or a *ſlave*; but he took on him the *form* and likeneſs of one. 1. By his condeſcending to ſuch offices as uſed to be done by ſervants. Hence he ſpeaks thus of himſelf, *Luke* xxii. 27. *I am among you as he that ſerveth.* This his condeſcenſion he propoſes to his diſciples, as an example to be imitated by them, *Matt.* xx. 26—28. as he does one particular and wonderful inſtance of it, his waſhing their feet, *John* xiii. 4—17. And in like manner does St. *Paul* here recommend his example to the *Philippians.* 2. By his ſubmitting to the treatment which ſervants or ſlaves uſed to meet with. Of this nature might be reckon'd all the ſcornful and reproachful uſage he indured, which muſt, by thoſe who were guilty of it, be eſteemed very unfit for an ingenuous perſon, and proper only for one of the loweſt rank and meaneſt condition, or at leaſt for one whoſe crimes had ſo degraded him as to ſet him upon a level with ſuch. If St. *Paul* had not afterwards mentioned it as a diſtinct conſideration, it might be added that the death he came into the world to undergo, was the death of a ſlave, and not of a free-man; and he might very well, in that reſpect, be ſaid to take upon him the form or likeneſs or a ſervant or ſlave. And this account of the *form of a ſervant*, confirms the ſenſe before given of the *form of God.*

(*e*) Ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος. *And was made in the likeneſs of men:*] This I underſtand as refering to both expreſſions before uſed, and ſo ſhould chooſe to render the whole thus: *He emptied himſelf, taking the form of a ſervant, when he was made in the likeneſs of men.* He came into the world with this view.

If it be here inquired, why does St. *Paul* ſay, He was *made in the* LIKENESS *of men*? Was he not truly and properly a man? The anſwer is eaſy, That *men* ſignifies ſuch animated bodies as ours are, inhabited each by a rational ſoul; and ſo as to his body, he was, in all reſpects,

Chap. II.

PARAPHRASE.

men *(f)*, he humbled himſelf yet farther, by becoming obedient to God unto death, and that too the death of the croſs, which was attended with the greateſt reproach as well as torment.

9. And, upon this account, God has advanced him higher than before *(g)*, and freely beſtowed

TEXT.

the croſs. Wherefore God 9 alſo hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name;

NOTES.

ſpects, a man juſt as we are, he having taken part with us in fleſh and blood, and having a body prepared for him. The likeneſs therefore belongs not to that, but to the other part of man, the τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν, the rational ſpirit, wherein he was vaſtly more than man, the *Word*, or Λόγος, that was in the form of God, being ſo tranſcendently ſuperior to the moſt noble ſoul that ever inhabited any other human fleſh.

8 *(f)* Καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος. *And being found in faſhion as a man.*] Εὑρεθὶς is often no more than the *Latin*, *exiſtens*, or *being*; and ſo it anſwers to γενόμενος in the *verſe* before, as does σχήματι, *in faſhion*, here to ἐν ὁμοιώματι, *in the likeneſs* there; and ſo theſe two phraſes appear to me to be exactly of the ſame import; and yet I don't think there is any faulty tautology in St. *Paul*'s diſcourſe: But having repreſented his condeſcenſion in becoming man, he goes on here to ſet forth the moſt amazing inſtance of it, when he was made man, according as the Paraphraſe expreſſes the ſenſe; and, by varying the phraſe, while the ſame thing is intended, he avoids the very ſemblance or ſhow of a tautology.

9 *(g)* Διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε. *Wherefore God alſo hath highly exalted him.*] St. *Paul* having ſet forth the humility of Chriſt, begins here to repreſent the glorious reward of it, that he might, by that conſideration, the more effectually ingage the *Philippians* to an imitation of him; and ſo this well ſuited the particular exhortation he was giving them. But beſide that, as what he here ſays of Chriſt tended to greaten their thoughts of him, it was very pertinent to his grand deſign of eſtabliſhing them in their adherence to Chriſt.

I think our tranſlation hardly reaches his deſign in the word ὑπερύψωσε, which can hardly be expreſſed without a *periphraſis*. I take his ſenſe to be this: "It was a high ſtate of dignity and "honour which Chriſt was in before his incarnation, when he was in the form of God: But "the conſequence of his condeſcenſion is not a bare reſtoration to that former dignity; no, he "is exalted now to a vaſtly higher dignity and honour than he had formerly; for *God has* "*given him a name above every name*, &c. And in like manner you may be aſſured that you "ſhall never loſe by abaſing and humbling your ſelves: This in the end, when God ſhall reward "you, will turn to your exaltation, and procure you a higher degree of glory."

The right ſtating the difference between the dignity of our Lord before his incarnation, and that which followed upon his reſurrection, is of conſiderable importance in order to our underſtanding ſeveral places in the ſcriptures: I ſhall therefore here indeavour to do it as well as I can; and the rather, becauſe I perceive that the ſhortneſs of the hints given upon *Col.* ii. 15. and the not ſetting down the words of the texts ſometimes refer'd to, which, upon ſo unuſual a ſubject, ought to have been done, have render'd the matter obſcure to ſome readers, who may perhaps be convinced, if they will examine it, not by the ſchemes and ſyſtems they have received of men, but merely by the holy ſcriptures, which alone can be our ſure guide in the caſe. I hope I ſhall treat of this with all due modeſty and caution, and not venture a ſtep farther than the ſcriptures clearly lead me.

The ſcriptures then ſeem plainly to repreſent this to have been the ſtate of things antecedently to our Saviour's coming into the world, that God allotted to the angels provinces and dominions, one being appointed to preſide over one country, and another over another. Let me now tranſcribe the places at length, which were only refer'd to before, as evidences of this. The places

are

NOTES.

are all taken out of *Dan.* x. wherein is related a vision of an angel sent to *Daniel*, in the third year of *Cyrus*, king of *Persia*. The description of this angel, and the whole account of him and his message, shows him to be a good angel: And thus he speaks, *v.* 13. *The prince of the kingdom of* Persia *withstood me one and twenty days; but lo*, Michael, *one* [or as in our margin, *the first*] *of the chief princes came to help me, and I remained* [or *was left*] *there with the kings of* Persia. I pretend not to understand the vision; only that it related to the fates of the *Jews*, seems plain from *v.* 14. *Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befal thy people in the latter days; for yet the vision is for many days.* But my argument does not at all depend upon the certain understanding of the whole vision. It is sufficient, for my purpose, to take notice that the angel, by speaking of the *prince of the kingdom of* Persia, means another angel, and not the proper king of *Persia*. This, without mentioning here what we shall meet with afterward in the *chapter*, seems evident from these two considerations. 1. That in his discourse he appears to distinguish between שרים *princes* and מלכים *kings*; and as it is certain that the former is applied by him to the angels, when he calls *Michael one of the chief princes*, it is but reasonable to understand that word in his discourse concerning the angels. 2. This is much confirmed by what he says of the *prince of the kingdom of* Persia, that he *withstood him one and twenty days*, and *that* Michael, *one of the chief princes, came to help him.* By the account we have, *Isai.* xxxvii. 36. of the slaughter of 185000 made in one night by an angel in *Sennacherib*'s army, we may easily learn that the resistance of an earthly prince could signify nothing against an angel: This prince therefore of the kingdom of *Persia* must have been himself an angel, in order to his being able to contest with one who was undoubtedly an angel. And farther, had he not been an angel that withstood him, what need could he have of the assistance of *Michael*, one of the chief princes, in order to his overcoming him? If then an angel was the *prince of the kingdom of* Persia, what I have advanced seems fully established; for we have then an angel intrusted with such a dominion over a particular country as I plead for. This is farther confirmed by the two last *verses* of that chapter, to which also I refer'd, where the same angel says, *Now will I return to fight with the prince of* Persia; *and, when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of* Grecia *shall come. But I will shew thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth; and there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but* Michael *your prince.* So that we have here the prince of *Persia*, the prince of *Grecia*, and the prince of the *Jews* spoken of: And what reason can we have to question whether the like was not the case of other countries, that they had in like manner their respective presidents or princes? This leads us farther to consider the state of our Saviour himself before his incarnation. As the Heathen nations were committed to other angels, so God's peculiar people, the *Israelites*, were committed to Christ, who was the Angel of the covenant, or of God's covenanted people, who was the King of *Israel*, in such a peculiar manner, as he was not the king of any other people on the earth. He is by the angel called *Michael*, and said to be the Prince of the *Jews*; Michael *your* Prince, that is, the Prince of you *Jews*: And again he is thus described, *chap.* xii. 1. Michael *the great Prince, which standeth for the children of thy people.* And to whom can these characters better agree than to our Saviour? St. *Jude* leads us into this interpretation, when he calls him *Michael the archangel*, ver. 9. for however men have devised an order of archangels comprehending many of them, yet the scripture never speaks in any place of more than one archangel. And, indeed, the word ἀρχάγγελος, which we translate *archangel*, being two words joined together, agreeably to the use of the *Greek* language, signifies the *chief angel*, or *prince of angels*; as ἀρχιερεὺς denotes the *chief priest*, or *high priest*, which being always so rendered, every body perceives to have been but one. Nor will it, I suppose, be much doubted, that by *Michael* we are to understand Christ, *Rev.* xii. 7. Michael *and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels*: And as the victory was *Michael*'s, so it is attributed to the power of God's Christ, *v.* 10. which seems plainly to imply, that God's Christ is the *Michael* before spoken of. And here let it be observed, that the angels are said to be *Michael*'s, they being now placed all in a subjection to him, as they were not before our Lord's resurrection. And this is to me an argument, that by *Michael* we are to understand Christ, as the angels are said to be his, *Matt.* xiii. 41. *The Son of man shall send forth* his

PHILIPPIANS.

NOTES.

angels. See alſo *chap.* xxiv. 31. *Mark* xiii. 27. and 2 *Theſſ.* i. 7. which is to be underſtood concerning what they ſhould be at the time ſpoken of, when he ſhould ſend them; for otherwiſe they were not then his. But where ſhall we find in the ſcripture that the angels are ſaid to be the angels of any other than of God, or of Chriſt? For, I ſuppoſe, no one will object againſt this, *Matt.* xviii. 10. it being upon a quite different account they are called the *angels of the little ones*, viz. they are there conſidered as miniſtring for their good, and not as under their direction and rule. The ſame perſon ſeems to be ſpoken of, 1 *Theſſ.* iv. 16. *For the Lord himſelf ſhall deſcend from heaven with a ſhout, with the voice of the archangel.* Where I take what follows after κελεύσματι, which we tranſlate a *ſhout*, to be only exegetical, how and by whom it was perform'd: As if it had been ſaid, *Which* [κέλευσμα] *is made by the voice of the prince of the angels, and the trump of God.* So *John* v. 28. 'tis ſaid, *All that are in the graves ſhall hear his* [Chriſt's] *voice.* And, in *Matt.* xxiv. 31. I take the order of the words to be: And he [the Son of man] *with a great ſound of a trumpet* [that is, the trump of God] *ſhall ſend forth his angels, and they ſhall gather*, &c. Nor need it be any great difficulty, that the *Lord* ſeems to be diſtinguiſhed by St. *Paul* from the archangel; for this is eaſily accounted for by the manner of ſpeaking known among the *Jews*, and often met with in the Old Teſtament; as 1 *Sam.* iii. 21. *The Lord revealed himſelf to* Samuel *in* Shiloh, *by the word of the Lord*, that is, by his own word. This is imitated by St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* i. 7, 8. *Waiting for the coming of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who ſhall alſo confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameleſs in the day of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, that is, in his own day. The opinion of the Ancients was, that he was the angel whom God ſent before the children of *Iſrael*, to keep them in the way, in whom he tells them *his name was*, *Exod.* xxxiii. 20——23. and that he was the ſame perſon who appeared to *Joſhua*, and ſtiled himſelf the *Prince of the Lord's hoſt*, Joſh. v. 14. and by the *hoſt* we may there underſtand God's people *Iſrael*. See *Exod.* xii. 41. He was *Prince* over them, as he was not over any other nation; for, however, the *Gentiles* were promiſed to him, yet they were not given into his hand till after his reſurrection. See *Pſal.* ii. 8. Nor does this relate to ſuch *Gentiles* only as chearfully ſubmitted to him, but to thoſe who were obſtinate againſt him, and whom he was to break with a rod of iron for their diſobedience, *v.* 9.

The ſcripture has very much left in the dark the manner of the adminiſtration of the world under the preſidents that were thus ſet over them. It ſeems probable that they were appointed under ſuch limitations and reſtrictions as God ſaw fit to give them, to act for the good of their reſpective provinces, in which they ſeem to have been ſet as ſo many diſtinct, and, as to one another, independent ſovereigns, who might oppoſe one another, as the intereſts of the countries committed to them might happen to interfere. We are, indeed, accuſtomed to think of them as acting with a kind of infallibility, which would leave no room for any ſuch oppoſition among them; but, however we may ſuppoſe them not liable to fail in holineſs, I can't ſee we have ſufficient reaſon to aſſert they could not fail through a defect of knowledge. What meaſures of knowledge God might communicate to them, or what great and wiſe purpoſes he might bring about by hiding ſome things from them, we know not: but this ſeems to be matter of fact, that they did ſometimes act contrary not only to one another, but to *Michael* or Chriſt alſo. Thus it appears, *Dan.* x. 13. that the prince of the kingdom of *Perſia* oppoſed both the angel that talked with *Daniel*, and *Michael* who came to help him. Nay, by the laſt *verſe* of that *chapter* we learn, that at that time there was none of the princes that ſided with that angel but *Michael*, the Prince of the *Jews*, which was probably the reaſon why that particular angel was ſent to *Daniel* to inform him of what ſhould befall the *Jews*. And, by the way, I am the more perſuaded of the truth of the interpretation given of Chriſt's *leading captivity captive*, (ſee the *Appendix* to the Paraphraſe and Notes on the *Coloſſians*) by conſidering not only the ſovereign authority of which they were diveſted at our Lord's reſurrection, but the oppoſition they once made againſt him, not out of malice, but through miſtake, when they had not had an opportunity of looking into thoſe things, which are now made known to us and them, 1 *Pet.* i. 12. This is reaſon enough for their being ſpoken of as *captivated*, however pleaſed they might be with their captivity.

When

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

10 that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* 11 under the earth; and that every tongue should con-

ed on him an authority *(b)* that is superior to what he ever granted to any other, that, by virtue of the authority of Jesus, all should be constrain'd to submit to God, whether they are heavenly or earthly Beings, or such as are under the earth *(i)*, and that every tongue should 10. 11.

NOTES.

When our Lord came into the world, he laid aside that form of God he was in before, and was made for a little time, that is, till his resurrection, lower than the angels, they still continuing their dominion, while he parted with his. At our Lord's resurrection, an intire change was made in this state of things, and an end was put to this rule of angels; they themselves, together with all nations, were put under one head, even Christ, whose authority and power was then so highly advanced above what it was before; he being intrusted with an universal dominion, and all that were rulers and governors before being made his subjects and ministers. *For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come*, Heb. ii. 5. whereby is implied, that the world had been put in subjection to them, before the commencement of the world to come; but that this world to come was intirely placed in subjection to Christ. Agreeably to this, he is called the *Father of the world to come*, Isai. ix. 6. according to the best copies of the LXX and the *Vulg. Latin.* That this authority was confer'd upon Christ at his resurrection, is clear from *Heb.* i. 6. *Eph.* i. 20, 21. 1 *Pet.* iii. 21.

This notion seems not to have been, in the main, disagreeable to the primitive Christians, who seem to have been led into it by the LXX's translation of *Deut.* xxxii. 8. *He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the angels of God.* This is followed by many both of the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers, and, among others, by St. *Clement* of *Rome*, Epist. I. c. 29. It would be very apposite to my purpose, were not the LXX singular in so translating it. I don't therefore lay any stress upon it, though the sense of our *Hebrew* copies, *according to the number of the children of* Israel, is very obscure.

(b) Ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ὄνομα. *Hath given him a name.*] By *name* we are here to understand dignity and authority, as *Heb.* i. 4. *Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.* Compare also *Eph.* i. 21. This advancement of Christ is here attributed to God's free gift.

10 *(i)* Καταχθονίων. *Things under the earth.*] 'Tis obvious that the dead are herein included, as Christ is made *Lord both of the dead and living*, Rom. xiv. 9. But I see no necessity of confining the expression to them; for the fallen angels may be also comprehended in it. 'Tis true, the ἄβυσσος, or the *deep*, may seem to be spoken of as their proper place, *Luke* viii. 31. where the devils *besought Christ, that he would not command them to go out into the deep.* And it may be thought that the *deep* rather refers to the sea, than to any place under the surface of the earth. But we find that the *deep* is manifestly used to signify a place under the earth, *viz.* the grave, *Rom.* x. 7. *Who shall descend into the* deep? *that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.* Thus *Pluto* is called by *Homer* Ζεὺς καταχθόνιος, Il. 1. v. 457. *Jupiter infernalis*, or *Jupiter Stygius*, as *Virgil* calls him, *Ænead.* IV. *v.* 638. Farther, as the living are frequently said, by *Homer*, to be ἐπὶ χθονὶ, *upon the earth*, so the souls of the dead are represented by him sometimes to be in *Hades*, and sometimes to be ὑπὸ χθονὸς, which shows their opinion to have been, that *Hades*, or the place of separate souls, was somewhere under ground. Thus *Iliad.* Ψ. *v.* 100.

PARAPHRASE.

ſhould acknowledge that Jeſus Chriſt is by this gift of God, Lord of all *(k)*, to the glory of God
12. the Father *(l)*. Wherefore, *(m)* my beloved, as you have always obeyed me with the greateſt humility and concern *(n)*, not only when I have

TEXT.

feſs, that Jeſus Chriſt *is* Lord, to the glory of God the Father. Wherefore, my 12 beloved, as ye have always

NOTES.

Ψυχὴ δ' ὑπὸ χθονὸς ἰοῦτε καπνὸς.
Ὠχετο τετριγυῖα.

But the ſoul went with a murmuring noiſe under ground, *like ſmoke.*

And as St. *Peter* ſeems to ſpeak of *Tartarus* as the place of the fallen angels confinement, 2 Pet. ii. 4. *God ſpared not the angels that ſinned,* ἀλλὰ σειρῇς ζόφου ταρταρώσας, παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τετηρημένους, *but caſting them down to* hell *or* Tartarus, *delivered them to be kept to judgment in chains of darkneſs*; ſo *Homer*'s deſcription of *Tartarus* is very remarkable, when compared with St. *Peter*'s words, and with *Luke* viii. 31. Thus then he brings in *Jupiter* threatning his Gods in caſe any of them ſhould diſobey him, *Il.* Θ. *v.* 13.

Ἤ μιν ἐλὼν ῥίψω ἐς Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα,
Τῆλε μάλ', ἦχι βάθιστον ὑπὸ χθονός ἐστι βέρεθρον.
Ἔνθα σιδήρειαί τε πύλαι, καὶ χάλκεος οὐδός.

Or I will take him and caſt him to dark Tartarus, *that is vaſtly diſtant, where is the deepeſt gulf under the earth, where there are iron gates, and a brazen entrance.*

11 (*k*) *That Jeſus Chriſt is Lord.*] God is here ſaid to have therefore exalted Chriſt, and given him a name above every name, that all might own him as Lord, that is, as made ſo by God. This is agreeable to what St. *Peter* ſays, *Acts* ii. 36. *Let all the houſe of* Iſrael *know aſſuredly, that* God *hath made that ſame Jeſus whom ye have crucified, both* Lord *and Chriſt.* Thus the author to the *Hebrews*, chap. iii. 2. *Chriſt was faithful to him* [God] *who appointed* [or made] *him.*

(*l*) *To the glory of God the Father.*] As God the Father is the author and giver of Chriſt's lordſhip and dominion, whatever praiſe and glory is due upon the account of it, muſt be primarily and chiefly due to the Father; and ſo the acknowledgment of the Son as Lord, muſt ultimately terminate in the glory of the Father, who made him Lord. With this we may compare *Iſai.* xlix. 7. *Thus ſaith the Lord, the Redeemer of* Iſrael, *his Holy One,* [that is, *the Holy One of* Iſrael. See *chap.* xlviii. 17.] *to him whom man deſpiſeth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a ſervant of rulers, Kings ſhall ſee and ariſe, princes alſo ſhall worſhip,* becauſe of the *Lord that is faithful, and the Holy One of* Iſrael, and he ſhall chuſe thee.

12 (*m*) Ὥστε. *Wherefore.*] No wonder that interpreters ſhow themſelves at a great loſs to give an account what this *wherefore* relates to, ſince they ſeem univerſally to take it for granted, that in this *verſe* a new duty is recommended, which had not at all been mentioned before. But if St. *Paul*'s diſcourſe here is read with attention, it will be found, as I imagine, that having diſpatch'd his argument from the example of Chriſt, he comes now to apply it to the purpoſe for which he brought it, namely, to preſs upon them a kind and friendly temper and carriage toward one another, mentioned *v.* 3——5. This is ſtill more plain, if we obſerve that, *v.* 14. he continues his diſcourſe upon this ſubject in the general.

(*n*) Μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου. *With fear and trembling.*] Our tranſlators, together with all commentators,

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence; work out your own salvation with

have been present with you, but more especially since I left you *(o)*, I am the more incouraged to urge upon you, by this example of Christ, the duty I have recommended to you of looking to other things as well as your own, and of

NOTES.

mentators, join this expression with the last clause of the *verse*, as signifying the manner in which they were to work out their own salvation. And many will be apt to think, that this acting with *fear and trembling* does much better suit so important an affair, as that of Christians working out their own salvation, than the regard the *Philippians* paid to St. *Paul*. And it must be granted, that there can be nothing more proper than to urge men to discharge their duty to God, or in general to work out their own salvation, with fear and trembling. Thus *Psal.* ii. 11. *Serve the Lord* with fear, *rejoice* with trembling. But he that observes how this expression stands in the *Greek*, as readily to be joined with the former part of the sentence, according to the Paraphrase, as with the latter, according to our translation; and withal considers how it is used by St. *Paul* in the three other places, wherein alone it is to be found in the New Testament, will soon perceive there is no strength in these objections. These three places shall be presently mentioned, after I have offered what I take to be the meaning of the expression. Now hereby may be designed one of these two things, or rather, as I think, both of them.

1. Humility or meekness; than which nothing more disposes persons to pay a regard and deference to such as have any rightful authority over them. Hence is that direction, 1 *Pet.* iii. 15. *Be ready to give an answer to every man* [magistrate] *that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with* meekness *and* fear. Where the two words, *meekness* and *fear*, serve to illustrate one another. Thus *fear* is put for *humility*, Rom. xi. 20. *Be not* high minded, *but* fear; and for *modesty*, 1 Pet. iii. 2. *While they behold your chast conversation coupled with* fear.

2. This may import solicitude and concern, which is apt to produce *trembling*, and so the effect may be put for the cause. And 'tis obvious that *fear*, which uses to accompany *trembling*, is often used in this sense, *Jude*, ver. 23. *Others save with* fear, 1 *Pet.* i. 17. *Pass the time of your sojourning here in* fear. Compare *Heb.* iv. 1. And since St. *Paul*, in this place, uses two words, *fear* and *trembling*, I see no reason why we may not take in both senses.

Let us now see how the same expression is used by the apostle elsewhere. *Eph.* vi. 5. *Servants be obedient to them who are your masters according to the flesh with* fear and trembling. And if the relation of a master called for fear and trembling, much more were these due to a person vested with the authority of an apostle, and an immediate commission from God. Mr. *Locke* upon the place thus explains the expression: "With great respect and subjection." But I can see no harm in supposing that hereby are intended the two things before mentioned, *viz.* humility and concern. Another place where he uses this phrase, is 2 *Cor.* vii. 15. *And his* [Titus's] *inward affection is more abundant toward you, whilst he remembreth the obedience of you all, how* with fear and trembling *you received him.* And why might he not as well commend the *Philippians*, as the *Corinthians*, for such a behaviour? The third place varies the phrase a little, 1 *Cor.* ii. 3. *I was with you in weakness,* καὶ ἐν φόβῳ, καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ πολλῷ, *and in* fear, *and in much* trembling; that is, says Mr. *Locke* in his Paraphrase, "In humility and fear of offending you." So that upon comparing these places, it cannot be thought that any violence is offered to these words when they are explained in the sense given in the Paraphrase.

(*o*) *As ye have always obeyed not in my presence only, but now much more in my absence.*] The meaning is: "Since you have always shewed your great respect to me, and your readiness to

Chap. II.

PARAPHRASE.

13. of promoting each others welfare *(p)*. And you have good reaſon for this; becauſe in ſo doing you comply with the motion of God himſelf, who works in you to be inclined and to act out

TEXT.

fear and trembling. For it is 13 God which worketh in you both to will and to do of

NOTES.

" ſubmit to my directions; and that not only when I was preſent with you, and ſo you might " have a dread of me upon the account of that miraculous power I have as an apoſtle of Chriſt; " but eſpecially as you have given a more convincing proof of this good diſpoſition, by your " chearfully obeying my commands ſince I left you, I can, from this evidence of your affection " and conſtancy, be the more free in preſſing upon you the duty before mentioned, and which I " have now recommended to you from the example of Chriſt's behaviour, and the reward he " received of it.

(p) Τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε. *Work out your own ſalvation.*] I aſſure the reader, the reaſon why the Paraphraſe does not follow the rendering of our tranſlators, is not the leaſt diſlike to the thing they have expreſſed, it being paſt doubt with me, that 'tis the duty of all men to work out their own ſalvation, and withal to do it with fear and trembling. But, however I like the thing it ſelf, yet I can't think it to be the ſenſe of this place. And a great difference is to be made between the acknowledging a thing to be in general a duty, and the owning it to be urged in this or that particular text of ſcripture. The true ſenſe of the words ſeems to me to be this, " Promote one anothers welfare, proſperity or comfort." It were eaſy to ſhew that the word σωτηρία, here render'd *ſalvation*, has oftentimes this ſenſe in profane authors: but that would not be much to our purpoſe, becauſe 'tis certain the ſacred writers often uſe *Greek* words in a ſenſe peculiar to themſelves; and particularly they ſometimes thus uſe the words σώζειν, σωτηρία, &c. as relating to that eternal ſalvation which the goſpel reveals, and of which no mention could be expected to be found in Heathen writers, becauſe they knew nothing at all of it. That the writers of the New Teſtament thus uſe this word σωτηρία, is to me unqueſtionable from many places. Thus *Acts* xiii. 47. *Salvation* is the ſame as *everlaſting life*, in *v.* 46. Nor can I think any thing elſe can be underſtood by it, when Chriſt is ſaid to be the *Author of* eternal ſalvation *to all them that obey him*, Heb. v. 9. or when mention is made of thoſe who *ſhall be the heirs of* ſalvation, *Heb.* i. 14. Compare alſo *Rom.* x. 10. *Eph.* i. 13. 1 *Theſſ.* v. 9. 2 *Theſſ.* ii. 13. 2 *Tim.* iii. 15. 1 *Pet.* i. 5. I have refer'd to theſe places, becauſe I have reaſon to think that a doubt has been made whether σωτηρία has ever this ſenſe. But however clearly this appears to be the meaning of the word in ſeveral places, it cannot, I think, be denied, that it is ſometimes uſed in the New Teſtament, as well as frequently by the LXX, in the more ordinary and common ſenſe; I mean, as relating to temporal welfare, ſafety or comfort. See upon *chap.* i. 19. Note (*w*). Whether σωτηρία muſt be thus underſtood in this place, is to be judged from the context. If we render ἑαυτῶν, *one anothers*, ſuppoſing it to be put for ἀλλήλων, it is evident the place can bear no other ſenſe. Now this ſeems to me the moſt agreeable from the tenor of St. *Paul*'s diſcourſe, wherein he is giving them directions for their conduct one towards another, in readily performing mutual offices of love and kindneſs, *v.* 3, 4, 5. And having alleged the example of Chriſt to inforce his advice, he returns to the ſame ſubject, as is manifeſt from *v.* 14. *Do all things without murmurings and diſputings*: and it would be very ſtrange that *v.* 12, 13. ſhould be inſerted in the middle of his diſcourſe upon a particular ſubject, without having any relation to it. I grant that ἑαυτῶν is far from neceſſarily ſignifying *one anothers*; nay, though it appears ſeveral times in this epiſtle, yet it is never elſewhere therein to be ſo render'd. But ſtill as it has ſometimes this ſenſe, 'tis only by the context,

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

14 *his* good pleasure. Do all things without murmurings, and disputings: that

out of good will *(q)*. And therefore take care that you do all such good offices chearfully, without murmurings or disputings, as tho' you did 14.

NOTES.

that is, the nature of the duty here urged, that we are to judge whether it should be thus understood in this place. Our own translators have thus render'd that word in the following texts, *Eph.* iv. 32. Γίνεσθε ὃ εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοὶ, εὔσπλαγχνοι, χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς. *Be kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving* one another. Where ἑαυτοῖς seems to be used instead of ἀλλήλοις, to prevent the repetition of the same word standing just before. So *Col.* iii. 16. *Teaching and admonishing* ἑαυτοὺς one another. *Heb.* iii. 13. *Exhort* one another *daily*.

This seems to me to be the easy and natural sense of the place. But if any one should fix upon the other sense of τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίαν, it will make no great difference in the main, provided he makes St. *Paul*'s discourse coherent, and understands him thus: "Since Christ, by abasing "himself, and condescending to act in such a manner for the good of others, obtained a glo- "rious exaltation, do you in like manner indeavour to secure your advancement and salvation "by condescending to perform all offices of kindness and love one towards another."

13 (*q*) Ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλειν, καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας. *Which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.*] The sense is either, "that God works in you to "be willing and to act in this manner, that he may promote good-will among you." Which would be a strong motive why Christians should behave with such good will toward one another, *viz.* because God does so much to promote it: and that ὑπὲρ is used in this sense, may appear by comparing these texts, *John* vi. 51. xi. 4. 2 *Cor.* xii. 19. Or else, which is the sense given in the Paraphrase, "That God works in you to be inclined to, and to act from this prin- "ciple of good-will." Our translation determines this *good will* to be God's, by putting in the word *his*, which is not in the *Greek*: but I see no reason why εὐδοκίας may not as well here, as *chap.* i. 15. be understood of the *good will* of men.

I am sensible a difficulty has been lately made concerning the reading of this text, by a learned writer, who cannot persuade himself, that St. *Paul* would say, ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν——τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, and therefore instead of ἐνεργεῖν, he conjectures we should read ἐπιτελεῖν. This conjecture he thinks confirmed by 2 *Cor.* viii. 11. where θέλειν and ἐπιτελεῖν are in like manner opposed. Ἵνα καθάπερ ἡ προθυμία τοῦ θέλειν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ [*forte* τοῦ] ἐπιτελέσαι ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν. However neat this conjecture may seem, I cannot readily give into it, seeing the author pretends not that 'tis warranted by any one *Greek* MS. There is no need to change τὸ into τοῦ in this passage to the *Corinthians*; for as the verb substantive must necessarily be supplied in the first clause of the *verse*, it may as well also in the last; and then the τὸ is unexceptionable. Nor do I perceive any more reason to scruple the expression of ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν——τὸ ἐνεργεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας, than that of *Luke* iv. 18. ἀπέσταλκέ με——ἀποστεῖλαι τοὺς τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει. And supposing the word ἐνεργεῖν were used in different senses in the two parts of the *verse*, yet such an *antanaclasis* might be justified by other texts where the like is found. So *Matt.* viii. 22. *Let the* dead *bury their* dead, is commonly understood in that manner. And thus the LXX exactly agreeing with the *Hebrew* have render'd *Gen.* xxxix. 22. Καὶ πάντα ὅσα ποιοῦσιν ἐκεῖ, αὐτὸς ἦν ποιῶν. *And whatsoever they* did *there, he was the* doer *of it*: Where ποιῶν and ποιοῦσιν must be understood in a somewhat different sense, and as the former imports only that *Joseph* was the orderer and director only, the latter must signify that they who were with him were the immediate actors or doers of it. But there is hardly any need to suppose we have two different senses of ἐνεργεῖν in this *verse*; for if we render it, *'Tis God who* worketh *in you, both to will and to* work *out of good will*, the sense is good. This *working* what is before willed

PARAPHRASE.

15. did them by conſtraint *(r)*; That ſo you may appear, by a ready compliance with God's will, to be blameleſs and ſincere, the ſons of God that cannot be blamed or reproached *(s)*, in the midſt of ſo crooked and perverſe a generation as the *Jews* now are *(t)*, among whom ſee

TEXT.

ye may be blameleſs and 15
harmleſs, the ſons of God, without rebuke, in the mids of a crooked and perverſe nation, among whom ye ſhine as lights in the

that

NOTES.

willed is the ſame as *doing* it, according to our tranſlation, or *performing* it, as it is well render'd by the *Vulg. perficere.* And it might as well be argued that our tranſlators did not read in their copies as we do, becauſe they tranſlate it, *he* worketh *in you to* do, as it can be argued that the authors of the *Vulg.* did not find in the copies they uſed the word ἐνεργεῖν in the laſt part of the *verſe*, becauſe they there tranſlate it *perficere*, and in the former *operari.* Farther, 'tis a miſtake, when 'tis ſaid the *Vulg.* renders the word in the firſt part *operari in*; for that *in* is not a rendering the ἐν in compoſition, but the ἐν that immediately follows ἐν ὑμῖν. And, to ſay the truth, the ſignification of ἐνεργεῖν ἐν is to incite and quicken others to any thing; but ἐνεργεῖν alone imports to *act*, or *do*, or *perform* a thing, without regard to any influence it may have upon other perſons. Nor does the *Syriac*, as far as I can perceive, give any countenance to the offer'd amendment. 'Tis true, they uſe a different word in their tranſlation in the two parts of the *verſe*, which is agreeable to what I have already ſaid. In the firſt part they have מחפץ which properly ſignifies to *incite*; in the laſt they uſe the word פעל which imports to *act* or *work*: and, which is very remarkable to our purpoſe, by this latter word they often render the *Greek* ἐνεργεῖν: but they never once make uſe of it in the whole New Teſtament to render ἐπιτελεῖν, however near a-kin thoſe two *Greek* verbs are to each other.

14 (*r*) Πάντα ποιεῖτε χωρὶς γογγυσμῶν καὶ διαλογισμῶν. *Do all things without murmurings and diſputings*] This, as has been before obſerved, ſhows that St. *Paul* is ſtill urging the ſame duty in general of courteſy and benignity, which he had recommended in the beginning of the *chapter.* Compare *v* 3. Nothing could be more properly adviſed concerning ſuch offices, than that they ſhould be done heartily and chearfully; *without murmurings*, or *without grudging*, as our tranſlators render the ſame word, where another apoſtle gives the like advice, 1 *Pet.* iv. 9. *Uſe hoſpitality without* grudging, ἀνευ γογγυσμοῦ. And when St. *Paul* adds here, *without diſputings*, or *reaſonings*, he means that they ſhould not indulge frivolous pretenſes or excuſes, which betray a backwardneſs to a good work. We may ſee an inſtance of ſuch diſputings or reaſonings againſt kind offices to our brethren, *Deut.* xv. 9. The rule here given by St. *Paul*, is agreeable to what he delivers elſewhere upon the like occaſions. See 2 *Cor.* ix. 7. *Rom.* xii. 8.

15 (*s*) *That ye may be blameleſs and harmleſs, the ſons of God, without rebuke.*] They who would evidence themſelves to be the ſons of God, muſt do it by reſembling their heavenly Father; in order whereunto it is neceſſary that they be pure and holy, as he is, and particularly that they be beneficent, and as he has manifeſted the greateſt good will to mankind, they ought to be conformed to him, by bearing a good will to all, and eſpecially their fellow Chriſtians. See *Matt.* v. 45.

(*t*) Ἐν μέσῳ γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης. *In the midſt of a crooked and perverſe nation.*] That the *Jews* of that time are here particularly intended, cannot well be doubted, if we obſerve how theſe characters are fixed upon them elſewhere: the former by St *Peter*, Acts ii. 40. *With many other words did he teſtify and exhort, ſaying, ſave your ſelves,* ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς ταύτης, *from this untoward* [or *crooked*] *generation*, meaning plainly the *Jews* of that age;

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

16 world: Holding forth the word of life; that I may rejoice in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain, neither laboured in vain.
17 Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and re-

that ye shine as bright stars in the world *(u)*, holding fast that word of life which I have taught you, and they would now wrest from you, that so you may be a glorying to me against the day of Christ, making it appear that my course and ministerial labours have not been vain and ineffectual. Nay, I will not only glory in my labouring successfully among you; but if it should please God, that for the compleating the sacrifice and service of your faith, as believing *Gentiles*, I should be made as a drink offering, and have my blood shed, I will rejoice in it, and

16. 17.

NOTES.

age; the latter character is fixed upon them by our Saviour, when he thus bespeaks them, *Matt.* xvii. 17. *Luke* ix. 41. Ω γενεὰ ἄπιςος καὶ διεστραμμένη, *O faithless and perverse generation.* And, indeed, this character had been given their ancestors long before by God himself, *Deut.* xxxii. 5. from the LXX's translation of which St. *Paul* seems to have taken his expression; for they have it exactly the same, γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη. Farther, with reference to what he here says of the *Philippians* being *in the midst* of that generation, it is to be observed, that as Christ came and preached first to the *Jews*, and Christianity took its rise from among them, Christians were at first looked upon in the world as belonging to them, and as being a sect of *Judaism*: according to those noted words of *Suetonius*, *Claud.* c. 25. *Judæos, impulsore Chresto, assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.* Where, I think, 'tis agreed that he comprehends the *Christians* under the name of the *Jews*, upon which account *Aquila* and *Priscilla*, who were Christians, were forced to leave *Rome* by virtue of this edict, *Acts* xviii. 2. And, perhaps, by *assidue tumultuantes*, no more is intended than their frequent assemblies for worship, to which the historian has given that invidious turn. It looks more probable that St. *Paul* speaks of the *Philippians* as being in the midst of that generation upon the account now given, than upon the account of any great number of *Jews* that resided ordinarily in their city: for, as I observed in the *Synopsis*, they seem to have been but few at his first preaching there; though it is likely that some zealots of that nation might, at this time, be come from other places, in order to pervert the *Gentile* converts. One may easily perceive the reason why he gives them here such a character; the danger the *Philippians* were in from them, ran in his thoughts, as we may see from *chap.* i. 30. and he hereby lays in a caution against them, before he comes more directly and expressly to dispute against them in the next *chapter.* It is true, those who were likely to seduce them, were themselves professed converts to Christianity: but notwithstanding that, they retained much of the crooked and perverse disposition of that age; and he that observes how severely he speaks of them, *chap.* iii. 18, 19. will not wonder at what he says here.

(*u*) Ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ. *Among whom ye shine as lights in the world.*] I prefer the reading of our margin, which makes φαίνεσθε to be the imperative mood, *Among whom shine ye as lights*, &c. It seems thus better to connect with what follows, *Holding fast the word of life*, which is to be consider'd as a means in order to the shining required of them.

The

Chap. II.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

18. and congratulate you all upon it. And, by way of requital, do you rejoice, and congratulate me on my being honoured to do you this ſervice.

joice with you all. For the ſame cauſe alſo do ye joy, and rejoice with me.

NOTES.

The *Philippians*, by a holy converſation, and adhering to the pure doctrine of the goſpel, would anſwer the end of their being made the people of God; for by this means they would be the *light of the world*. See *Matt.* v. 14, 16.

SECT.

SECT. V.

CHAP. ii. 19——30.

CONTENTS.

ST. *Paul* having declared his readineſs to lay down his life to ſerve the *Philippians*, (among the other *Gentile* churches which were in the like circumſtances) ſeems to have apprehended how tenderly they would take his mentioning ſuch a thing to them: and therefore, to prevent their being over much concerned, he here tells them, that however willing he was to die for them, yet he did not expect to do ſo preſently; that he rather thought he ſhould eſcape now, and in a little time be freed from his preſent bonds. And, that he might teſtify his earneſt and affectionate concern for them, he acquaints them that he look'd ſhortly to ſee which way his affair was like to turn, and that then he ſhould be able to ſpare *Timothy*, whom he would ſend to them, from whom he expected a very pleaſing account of their good eſtate. He farther tells them, that he hoped ſhortly to have an opportunity of viſiting them himſelf: but, in the mean time, while he was not at liberty to come himſelf, nor could well ſpare *Timothy*, he thought it neceſſary to ſend back *Epaphroditus* to them, of whom he gives an excellent character, recommending him to be kindly and courteouſly received by them.

TEXT.

19 BUT I truſt in the Lord Jeſus, to ſend Timotheus ſhortly unto you, that I alſo may be of good comfort, when I know your
20 ſtate. For I have no man

PARAPHRASE.

BUT, however, I have ſaid I ſhould be glad to die to ſerve you; yet I would not have you think I reckon upon this ſpeedily: for I really do not, but am expecting that Chriſt Jeſus will ſo order matters, as that I ſhall ſhortly be able to ſend *Timothy* to you, that he may learn in what eſtate your affairs are, and may bring me ſuch an account, as may prove reviving and comfortable to me *(w)*. And him I chooſe to ſend

19 20

NOTES.

19 (*w*) The great thing which he ſeems concerned to know of their eſtate, was their unanimity in maintaining the doctrine he had taught them, and their not being prevailed upon by

Chap II.

PARAPHRASE.

send rather than any other, because I have none with me to send who is like-affected *(x)*, and
21. will sincerely be concerned for your welfare: for even those who preach the gospel are too much concerned for their own accommodation and conveniency, and too little for promoting the interest.

TEXT.

like minded, who will naturally care for your state.
For all seek their own, not
the things which are Jesus

NOTES.

by the *judaizing* seducers. In receiving an account of this, he promised himself much satisfaction.

20 (x) Ἰσόψυχον. *Like-minded.*] There are two senses given of this word. 1. That of our margin, which renders the place thus; "I have no man so dear unto me:" As tho' he had said, I have no man whom I value as my self, as my own soul, but him. This sense is prefer'd by some, because the LXX seem to have thus used it, *Psal.* lv. 13. Now tho' there be no doubt that the word may properly enough have this signification; yet it hardly seems to me to suit this place, it being joined with a consideration that looks to be of a different nature. The turn of the period seems odd, *I have no man so dear to me, who will naturally care for your state.* One would expect that when things are thus joined, the ἰσόψυχον should signify somewhat of *Timothy*'s temper, that would infer his being so careful for their state; whereas his being dear to St. *Paul* does not, very obviously at least, carry any thing of that nature in it, though it may be forced to have, perhaps, some remote relation to it. Had this been his sense, I am apt to think he would have expressed himself to this purpose; "I have no man so dear to "me; and I know that he will naturally care for your state." But what most overthrows this interpretation, is St. *Paul*'s reasoning in the two following *verses*, of which somewhat will be added presently. 2. The other sense of the word is that expressed in our common translation, *like minded*, or rather *like affected*, which is agreeable enough to the import of ἴσος in the like compositions. But then it may be questioned, to whom does this relate? Is his meaning, I have no man *like affected* to *Timothy*, or I have no man *like affected* to my self? The *English* readers, commonly, I believe, understand it in the former sense: but the latter, upon farther consideration, is perhaps preferable. This is agreeable to St. *Paul*'s way of commending such as he imployed and sent to preach the gospel. Thus he commends *Titus*, 2 Cor. xii. 18. *Did* Titus *make a gain of you? walked we not in the same spirit? walked we not in the same steps?* And thus he commends *Timothy* also, 1 *Cor.* xvi. 10. *Now if* Timotheus *come, see that he may be with you without fear*; for he worketh *the work of the Lord, as I also do.* This sense of the word here, is, I think, much confirmed by the context; for he here gives a reason of what he had said in the *verse* preceding, *viz.* he hoped to be of good comfort when he should have sent *Timothy* to them, and from him should have learned their state, because he had no man so much of his own temper as *Timothy*; and consequently he would make the same inquiry which St. *Paul* himself would have done, if he could have been among them, and he could intirely depend upon his judgment whether their state was such as he could wish or desire. The same appears by the two following *verses*, where he renders a reason why he thought he had no man with him like affected to himself, as *Timothy* was: *For*, says he, *all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's. But ye know the proof of him, that as a son with the father, he hath served with me in the gospel.* This was a proof that he was like affected with St. *Paul*, and consequently would, as he did, sincerely care for their state. But the sense is not so easy or clear, if we take it either of the other ways. It may be farther added, that the *Vulg.* and *Syr.*

both

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

22 Christ's. But ye know the proof of him, that as a son with the father, he hath served with me in the go-
23 spel. Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will

interest of Christ *(y)*. But you have had expe- 22.
rience of *Timothy*'s being just of my temper, that he has prefer'd the publick good to any private advantage, and has carried himself with the respect that a son would to a father, being always willing to be directed by me, and to go and preach the gospel where-ever I thought it proper to send him, and being contented with such treatment as I my self was. Him there- 23.
fore I hope to send to you speedily, as soon as I shall see what my confinement will issue in.

But

NOTES.

both seem to have taken the word in this sense, however the latter is by some alleged to favour another. The *Vulg.* thus renders the *verse*: *Neminem enim habeo tam unanimem, qui sincere affectione pro vobis solicitus sit.* Where they must understand St. *Paul* to mean that he had none so unanimous with himself: and so they took the word to be equivalent with σύμψυχος, which they render also *unanimes*, v. 2. The *Syr.* thus translates it: "I have no other here "who is as my soul, who will sincerely [or *diligently*; for the word signifies either] take care "of your affairs." I have, as the reader may observe, all along prefer'd the expression of *like affected*; whereby I designed to avoid an ambiguity. I don't find St. *Paul* ever uses ψυχὴ for the seat or principle of thought, but often for that of the affections; between which and πνεῦμα he seems to make the same distinction as the *Latins* do between *animus* and *anima*, as 1 *Thess.* v. 23. *Heb.* iv. 12. *Philip.* i. 27. In like manner he seems to use it in composition. Thus 1 *Thess.* v. 14. the ὀλιγόψυχοι, *or feeble minded*, seem to denote those who are under the influence of some passion or affection: for what infeebles persons more than the prevalency of doubt, fear, or the like? And therefore ἰσόψυχον is best render'd *like affected*, or *disposed*. This accounts for the difference between *Timothy* and the other persons refer'd to. They were not ignorant of their duty, but were biassed by their affections to choose their own ease and convenience, as *Timothy* did not. Our translators have render'd γνησίως *naturally*: but the *Vulg.* and *Syr.* better render it *sincerely*, which must infer the doing it *heartily* or *diligently*: and even ours have render'd τὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης γνήσιον, *the* sincerity *of your love*, 2 Cor. viii. 8. Concerning *Timothy*'s sincere affection to them, St. *Paul* might well appeal to the experience of the *Philippians*, as he had, together with him, been before among them.

21 *(y)* It can hardly be supposed, that St. *Paul* intended here absolutely to tax every one of those who were about him, and assisted him in preaching the gospel, with an utter neglect of the interest of Christ, and a seeking themselves wholly. The οὐ, which we render *not*, might, perhaps, better be render'd *rather than*, as 'tis *Matt.* ix. 13. He may be understood to speak comparatively, and to mean no more than this, that the other preachers were defective in their resolution and courage, being too prone to consult their own ease, and decline such work as was fatiguing and hazardous. The case was this: The interest of Christ, at that time, required that somebody should go to *Philippi*: St. *Paul* could not then spare *Timothy*, as is plain from his saying only he *hoped to be able to send him*. But no body else cared to undertake the fatigue of the journey, and to risk such treatment, as they knew the apostle had before met with there.

Chap. II.

PARAPHRASE.

24. But I doubt not that I ſhall be ſet at liberty; and I truſt that the Lord will ſo order matters, as that I my ſelf ſhall come ſhortly and ſee you.
25. In the mean time, while I am not able to come to you my ſelf, nor can well ſpare *Timothy*; I thought it neceſſary to ſend to you *Epaphroditus*, who is my brother, fellow-labourer, and fellow-ſoldier, but your apoſtle, and who
26. is now to act for me with you *(z)*. And this I have done the rather, becauſe he longed after you all, and was troubled upon the account of your

TEXT.

go with me. But I truſt 24
in the Lord, that I alſo my
ſelf ſhall come ſhortly. Yet 25
I ſuppoſed it neceſſary to
ſend to you Epaphroditus,
my brother and companion
in labour, and fellow-ſol-
dier, but your meſſenger,
and he that miniſtred to
my wants. For he longed 26
after you all, and was

NOTES.

This reluctancy he taxes in the preceding *verſe*, as a *not ſincerely caring for the concerns of the* Philippians; and in this *verſe*, as a *prefering their own concerns to thoſe of Chriſt.*

It was probably this temper he ſo highly reſented in *Mark*, *who went not with him and* Barnabas *to the work*, Acts xv. 38. but avoiding the trouble and inconveniencies thereof, returned from *Pamphilia* to *Jeruſalem*, Acts xiii. 13. Nor is it neceſſary to ſuppoſe it was more than this he cenſured in *Demas*, 2 Tim. iv. 10. Demas *hath forſaken me, having loved this preſent world, and is departed to* Theſſalonica, Creſcens *to* Galatia, Titus *to* Dalmatia. 'Tis probable *Demas* was gone to preach the goſpel at *Theſſalonica*: otherwiſe it ſignified ſo very little whither he was gone, that it could hardly be worth St. *Paul*'s while to mention it; and eſpecially he would hardly have mentioned it in the ſame manner as he does the departure of the other two, upon whom he paſſes no cenſure at all. But he ſeems to ſpeak ſo hardly of him, becauſe he did not, as the other two, follow his direction, but went where the apoſtle ſaw there was leſs need of him, and choſe to go to *Theſſalonica* for his own eaſe and convenience. And the like temper (as has been before ſuggeſted) may well be thought to have been the occaſion of his ſpeaking ſo ſharply concerning ſome perſons in this place. Such a temper was very contrary to St. *Paul*'s, who *ſought not his own profit, but the profit of many, that they might be ſaved*, 1 Cor. x. 33.

25 (z) Ὁ δὲ ἀπόστολον, καὶ λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου. *But your meſſenger, and he that miniſtred to my wants.*] This tranſlation does ſo exactly ſuit the errand upon which *Epaphroditus* came, *viz.* to bring a preſent to St. *Paul* from the *Philippians*, that 'tis the leſs wonder that it has generally paſſed current. But when the matter is more cloſely and thoroughly conſider'd, there may perhaps appear good reaſon for our receding from this interpretation, and receiving that in the Paraphraſe. I confeſs, it ſeem'd to me not very agreeable to St. *Paul*'s grateful temper, that he ſhould here bellow upon *Epaphroditus*, the meſſenger, the honour which was certainly and primarily due to his principals, the *Philippians* themſelves; and eſpecially that he ſhould do this in a letter he was writing, not to *Epaphroditus*, but to them. If we compare the mention he makes of this matter, *chap.* iv. 18. we may obſerve that he is careful to ſpeak expreſly of them as the principals, *Having received of* Epaphroditus *the things which were* ſent from you. And, had he deſign'd what our tranſlators have expreſs'd, it ſeems not unlikely he would have ſaid, and *he whom you ſent to miniſter to my wants*. They therefore, who acquieſce in our tranſlation, ſhould perhaps underſtand his *miniſtring to the apoſtle's wants*, not to refer to the preſent

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

full of heavineſs, becauſe that ye had heard that he
27 had been ſick. For indeed he was ſick nigh unto death: but God had mercy on him; and not on him only, but on me alſo, leſt I ſhould have ſorrow upon
28 ſorrow. I ſent him there-

your having heard that he had been ſick (and indeed he was ſo ſick as to be like to die: But God had mercy on him in recovering him; and not on him only, but on me alſo, leſt I ſhould have ſorrow upon ſorrow) *(a)*. I have ſent him therefore the more ſpeedily (†) to you, that when you ſee him again after his dangerous 27. 28.

NOTES.

ſent he brought, but the attendance he gave St. *Paul* when he was come to him. Again: he does not ſay λειτυργὸν τῇ χρείᾳ, or ταῖς χρείαις μυ, which would have determined the ſenſe according to our tranſlation: but for λειτυργὸν τῆς χρείας μυ, the *miniſter of my want*, to ſignify *him that miniſters to my want*, or *a ſupply of my want*, putting the genitive caſe for the dative, is at leaſt uncommon. It ſeems therefore natural to inquire whether all difficulties may not be removed by fixing upon ſome other ſenſe of the place. Now we ſhall have a very agreeable one in all reſpects, if we ſuppoſe the word χρεία in this place does not ſignify *want*, but an *office* or *buſineſs*. Thus we have it render'd, *Acts* vi. 3. *Whom we may appoint over this* buſineſs, that is, to take care of the poor. In like manner the *Vulg. Syr.* and all the modern tranſlations render the word in that place. Taking the word in this ſenſe, *Epaphroditus* was the miniſter of St. *Paul*'s buſineſs, that is, was to act in his behalf, and diſcharge his office to the *Philippians*. And if the arguments before urged are not thought ſufficient to overthrow the common, and eſtabliſh this interpretation; yet there is another which may be fetched from St. *Paul's* deſign in this *verſe*, and ſeems to me deciſive. He is giving ſuch a character of *Epaphroditus*, as might raiſe their eſteem of him, and induce them to honour him. And accordingly, *v.* 29. he bids them *honour ſuch*. Now this character conſiſts of two parts; firſt, what *Epaphroditus* was to the apoſtle; and, ſecondly, what he was to the *Philippians*. The oppoſition is plain by ὴ after ὑμῶν. He was the apoſtle's *brother*, *fellow-labourer*, and *fellow-ſoldier*. All honourable titles. But now to tell them on the other hand that he was *their meſſenger* is no grand character. And then what follows, that he *miniſtred to his wants*, does not intimate ſo much what he was to the *Philippians*, as what he was to the apoſtle; which deſtroys the oppoſition. *Caſtellio* therefore juſtly, I think, renders the words, *Veſtrum autem apoſtolum, & mei muneris vicarium*. The firſt is a high character that called for their regard; and the laſt tells them in what reſpect he ſuſtained that office. St. *Paul* here ſtiles *Epaphroditus* ὑμῶν ἀπόστολον, *your apoſtle*; in like manner as he, in ſpeaking of himſelf, ſays he was ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος, the *apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, Rom. xi. 13.

27 (*a*) *Sorrow upon ſorrow.*] Some think the meaning is, ſorrow for *Epaphroditus*'s death, upon ſorrow for his ſickneſs. This may well be allowed, without excluding the other circumſtances St. *Paul* was in. For the loſs of ſuch an excellent perſon, and eſpecially when his attending and ſerving the apoſtle was the occaſion of it, muſt have been a great addition both to the ſorrow of his confinement, and to the ſorrow he had from the oppoſition made againſt him by the *Judaizers*; of the latter of which we find he could not write to the *Philippians* without weeping, *chap.* iii. 18.

28 (†) Σπουδαιοτέρως. *The more carefully.*] The *Vulg* renders this *feſtinantius*; and this is prefer'd in the Paraphraſe, as beſt agreeing with the apoſtle's ſcope. Nor is it unreaſonable to ſuppoſe this word ſhould reſpect *time*, ſince all its conjugates frequently do.

30 (*b*) Παρα-

Chap. II.

PARAPHRASE.

rous ſickneſs, you may rejoice; and that I may be the eaſier with reſpect to you, when I know you have ſuch an one among you, who will not fail to inculcate the ſame things upon you, which I ſhould my ſelf, if I were preſent
29. with you. Receive him therefore with all gladneſs as a Chriſtian miniſter, hearken to
30. his inſtructions, and honour ſuch as he is; becauſe to do the work of Chriſt he was nigh unto death, expoſing his life to the moſt imminent danger *(b)*, that he might fill up the remainder of your beneficence to me *(c)*.

TEXT.

fore the more carefully, that when ye ſee him again, ye may rejoice, and that I may be the leſs ſorrowful.
Receive him therefore in 29
the Lord with all gladneſs, and hold ſuch in reputation: Becauſe for the work 30
of Chriſt he was nigh unto death, not regarding his life to ſupply your lack of ſervice toward me.

NOTES.

30 (*b*) Παραβολλδσάμ@ τῇ ψυχῇ. *Not regarding his life.*] There can hardly be any doubt that the other reading παραβολλδσάμ@ is the beſt; and conſequently that the meaning is, that *Epaphroditus* expoſed his life to the utmoſt danger, juſt as they did who took care of people infected with the peſtilence, who were called *parabolani*, or *parabolarii*. Vid. *Cod. de Epiſcop. & Cleric.* Lib. i. Tit. iii. l. 18. or as they did who fought with wild beaſts. Vid. *Socr.* H. E. Lib. vii. c. 22.

(*c*) Ἵνα ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑσέρημα τῆς πρός με λειτυργίας, *To ſupply your lack of ſervice toward me.*] The tranſlation in the Paraphraſe ſeems preferable, "That he might compleat [or "fill up] the remainder [or reſidue] of your beneficence to me:" that is, ſupply me with your farther contributions. Ἀναπληροῦν has this ſenſe, 1 *Theſſ.* ii. 16. Εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, *That they might compleat* [or fill up] *their ſins.* The word ὑσέρημα is uſed in this ſenſe, *Col.* i. 24. He calls it the *remainder* or *reſidue*, having before acknowledged their former kindneſs and liberality, *chap.* i. 5. and λειτυργία is uſed for *beneficence* or a *charitable contribution*, 2 Cor. ix. 12. 'Tis not expreſly ſaid how *Epaphroditus* expoſed his life to ſuch great danger; and from this paſſage alone we can form any conjecture about it. Now, according to the ſenſe given of theſe words, *Epaphroditus* muſt have indanger'd his life before he deliver'd the *Philippians* preſent to St. *Paul*. And this he might do probably either thro' a diſorder contracted at ſea, or thro' his over haſte afterward to get to *Rome*, that he might execute his commiſſion, which might occaſion a fit of ſickneſs upon his arrival there. And it may ſeem the more reaſonable to ſuppoſe this, from the account of his illneſs in this *chapter*. For it appears to have been a conſiderable time before the writing this epiſtle, from *v.* 26. where he tells them *Epaphroditus* had been *full of heavineſs, becauſe they had heard he had been ſick*. It ſeems therefore that this news had not only been carried to *Philippi*, but the knowledge of their being acquainted with it, had been brought back from thence to *Rome*. This, conſidering the great diſtance of the two places, muſt have taken up a conſiderable deal of time. And beſides, the apoſtle ſpeaks of this as what had been paſt and over ſome time before. If we add to all this, that St. *Paul* ſent him back to *Philippi ſooner* than he would otherwiſe have done, *v.* 28. that they might have the pleaſure of ſeeing him well again, and he of ſeeing them; and yet that this illneſs muſt neceſſarily be placed ſo long before his return with this letter, it ſeems highly probable, that the occaſion of it was in ſome ſuch manner as has been before repreſented.

This

NOTES.

This is much more probable than the conjecture of those who think his danger was from St. *Paul*'s persecutors, upon the account of his coming to and owning him. For the danger he was in was from *sickness*, and not from confinement, or any threatning of a violent death. And, indeed, though the visiting and owning a sufferer for Christianity, might have been the occasion of a person's confinement and martyrdom at another time; yet it is not likely it could be so now. See *Acts* xxviii. 30, 31. Nor need it be any difficulty, that *Epaphroditus* is spoken of as thus hazarding his life *for the work of Christ*. For his discharging the province of carrying the *Philippians* present to the apostle in his continement, might very justly deserve to be so expressed. Thus when *Servius Sulpicius* was sent by the senate to *M. Antony*, as their ambassador, to indeavour to bring him to terms, but died in the execution of that affair before he reached *Antony*; *Cicero* moved in the senate, that a statue might be erected to his memory, *Cum ob rempub. in legatione mortem obierit*, *Because he died* for the service of the state *in his embassy*. *Philipp.* IX.

SECT.

PHILIPPIANS.

SECT. VI.

CHAP. iii. 1.——iv. 21.

CONTENTS.

THIS *Section* contains the chief argument of the epiſtle. And here it falls in with the main deſign of the epiſtles to the *Epheſians* and *Coloſſians*; which was to arm the *Gentile* converts againſt the attempts of ſome, who from among the *Jews* had embraced and made a profeſſion of the Chriſtian religion. Theſe were very zealous to perſuade the *Gentiles* to ſubmit to the ceremonial law, and mix *Judaiſm* with Chriſtianity. In order to this end they ſeem to have talked big, and to have made a great boaſting in their being circumciſed, and their keeping the law of *Moſes*. St. *Paul* ſeems here to have conſider'd the temper of theſe men, and how much advantage ſuch commonly promiſe themſelves from, and too often make of, their aſſurance and confidence; and therefore in oppoſing them he ſeems to have raiſed his ſtile in ſome meaſure. He very prudently minds the *Philippians*, that theſe men could not pretend that he ſpoke againſt the things they ſo much magnified, out of envy, ſince he could make as great pretenſions to them as any of the *Jews* could do; and poſſibly greater than ſuch as were indeavouring to ſeduce them; but that he was convinced they were miſtaken in their fond opinion of theſe things, and that it was in quite another way, even by Chriſt, and not by the ceremonial law, they were to ſeek for juſtification. And as theſe *Judaizers* ſeem to have indeavour'd to recommend their opinion by their example, he reminds the *Philippians* of what they could not but know his courſe had been; and inſinuates, that, upon comparing his own example and theirs together, they might eaſily judge which was moſt worthy of their imitation. And he particularly and expreſly obſerves, that his thoughts and care were taken up about more noble things than theirs; that they were minding earthly things, but he heavenly. And ſo, upon the whole, he exhorts them to follow the example he had ſet them, and to continue ſtedfaſt in their adherence to Chriſt.

TEXT.

TEXT.

1 FInally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. To write the same things to you, to me indeed *is* not grievous, but for you *it* 2 *is* safe. Beware of dogs,

PARAPHRASE.

NOW to make an end of this matter *(d)*, as I know you will rejoice in *Epaphroditus*'s coming, so I would have you do it in the Lord, showing your respect to Christ, by gladly receiving the instructions I send, and he brings you in his name: And to write them *(e)* down is not very troublesom to me; but it may be useful for you. Beware of those zea- 1. 2.

lots

NOTES.

1 (*d*) Τὸ λοιπὸν. *Finally.*] Thus we have render'd the same phrase, *chap.* iv. 8. which common readers understand as tho' he were just concluding his epistle, altho' in this place he is got but little above half way to the end of it, and he is now entring upon his chief design in it.

It, indeed, sometimes denotes only a transition to a new argument, and so does not so much respect what went before, as what is to follow. Thus *furthermore* in *English* will answer to it. But the expression that follows, *To write the same things to you*, &c. will not easily suffer us to take the words in this sense, it seeming clear that he here treats of the same matter he had before. It seems therefore more natural to take it in the other sense, in which it is used for *in summa*, or *in short*, or perhaps *finally*, as 2 *Cor.* xiii. 11. *Eph.* vi. 10. but then I think it must relate wholly to the matter he had just been upon; and thus it will yield the sense express'd in the Paraphrase; as tho' he had said, "Now to conclude with respect to *Epaphreditus*; as I told you (*chap.* "ii. 25.) I sent him, that you might rejoice at his coming, so I only now add with relation to "that matter, that you should rejoice in the Lord."

(*e*) Τὰ αὐτὰ. *The same things.*] Interpreters are not agreed, with what these things he writes in this *chapter* are said to be the same. Some think he means the same he had formerly taught them, when he was preaching among them. They who are of this opinion might, perhaps, have thought it confirmed by *v.* 18. if they had compared it herewith: *Many walk, of whom* I have told you often, *and now tell you even weeping.* But, I confess, such a manner of bringing in τὰ αὐτὰ, *the same things*, does not appear easy and natural. Others imagine he means the *same things* that he had written to other churches; which would be agreeable enough, if he had before, in the epistle, made any mention of his writing to them upon the like occasion: but, as we meet with no such thing in the epistle, this interpretation is rather worse than the former.

There is yet another way to remove this difficulty, together with that mentioned under the foregoing Note, and that is, by reading in this place ταῦτα instead of τὰ αὐτὰ. For then the sense of the whole would run thus: *Furthermore, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. 'Tis not a trouble to me to* [go on and] *write these things* [which follow] *to you*, &c. Such a mistake might easily be made by a transcriber, and the emendation is very natural. But, however, as there is not one ancient MS. or version that favours that reading, it is much safer to adhere to the common reading, in case a tolerable account can be given of it.

Since there is a difficulty in each of these accounts of the words, the reader, 'tis hoped, will the more easily bear to have another conjecture offered him. St. *Paul* then had sent *Epaphroditus* to the *Philippians*, as has been observed before, to supply his place, till he should be able to come himself, or send *Timothy* to them: and agreeably hereunto he must be understood to have given him some things in charge to them: and as they were to *receive him in the Lord with all gladness*, chap. ii. 29. that is, readily to submit to the Christian instructions he brought

lots for *Judaism* who are fierce like dogs *(f)*, beware of the evil labourers *(g)*, beware of the concision

beware of evil workers, beware of the concision.

NOTES.

them, it may be thought that he refers hereto in speaking here of the *same things*. His sense then will stand thus: "I have, as you may perceive by what I have said already, directed *Epa-*
" *phroditus* what instructions and warnings he should give you: but since the having the *same*
" *things* set before you by my self, in this my epistle to you, may add weight to them, and
" render them the more likely to do you good, and fortify you against the danger you are in;
" and since it will be no great trouble for me to write the things I have told him, and he will
" relate to you, I will readily do it."

2 *(f) Beware of dogs.*] The *Jewish* deceivers were cruel, fierce, and mischievous, as appears by what the same apostle says of them, *Tit.* i. 10——12. And that might be the reason why they are here called *dogs*, as it is why the crucifiers of Christ are so termed, *Psal.* xxii. 16. Dogs *have compassed me, the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me; they pierced my hands and my feet.* But there is one place in the prophet *Isaiah*, which speaks of the watchmen, that is, the rulers or teachers among the *Jews*, and does so exactly agree with what St. *Paul* here, and elsewhere, says of the *Judaizers* who set up for teachers, that he may be imagined to have had it in his thoughts, and from thence to have borrowed the name he here gives them. *Isai.* lvi. 10——12. *His watchmen are blind: they are all ignorant,* [compare 1 *Tim.* i. 7.] *they are all dumb* dogs, *they cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Yea, they are greedy* dogs, *which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand: they all look to their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter. Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine, and we will fill our-selves with strong drink, and to morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant.* Compare with this what St. *Paul* says of them, *v.* 19. of this *chapter*, and *Tit.* i. 11, 12.

It seems most natural thus to interpret St. *Paul*'s expression from the obvious qualities of those creatures, and the comparisons used in the Old Testament, rather than from any proverbial speeches among the Heathens; although if recourse be had thereto, it is more likely that the apostle alludes to the way in which they called to one another to beware of mad dogs in the way, than to such dogs as were set to guard their doors, with an inscription thereon, *Beware of the dog.* Farther, 'tis not unlikely, that as the *Jews* treated the *Gentiles*, and used to speak of them as dogs, St. *Paul* might here intend to turn upon themselves that name of reproach; for which he had good reason, from their conduct and behaviour.

(g) Τὰς κακὰς ἐργάτας. *Evil workers.*] St. *Paul* seems not hereby to mean that they lived wickedly, however that appears to be true from what he says of them afterwards. The word ἐργάτης signifies *operarius*, a *labourer* in any business or occupation. The only place in the New Testament where it can be suspected to have the sense it is commonly taken in here, to signify a man's doing any action or work, is *Luke* xiii. 27. *Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity:* but when the word is thus understood in that place, it will appear to be more emphatical; for hereby will be intended not barely that they committed iniquity, but that they made this, as it were, their trade and business, were industrious and constant in it, just as that phrase is understood by many, 1 *John* iii. 8. Ὁ ποιῶν ἁμαρτίαν, *He that committeth sin.* When therefore St. *Paul* here calls them ἐργάτας, he does not refer to the general course of their actions, but he considers them as *labourers*, who set up to be teachers, as the word is frequently used in that sense. And when he calls them κακὰς ἐργάτας, *evil labourers*, I am apt to think we are to explain his meaning from the sense which κακουργεῖν often carries in it, to *work fraudulently and deceitfully*; as κακουργία, and κακούργημα, and κακοῦργος, are used in like manner for *fraud* or *deceit*. See *Bud.* Comm. ling. Grec.

Perhaps,

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

3 For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have

concision *(b)*. I don't call them the circumcision; for we who believe in Christ, *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*, are the true circumcision *(i)*, who worship God, tho' not according to the letter, yet according to the true design of the law *(k)*, and therefore glory in Christ Jesus, as our greatest honour and advantage *(l)*, and place no con- 3.

NOTES.

Perhaps, we have a somewhat like instance of St. *Paul*'s resolving a compound word into its primitives, *Col.* ii. 18. Θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ being put for ἐν ἐθελοταπεινοφροσύνῃ, καὶ ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ. The latter of these he makes use of, *v.* 23. and the former being not properly *Greek*, he has there expressed barely by ταπεινοφροσύνῃ; but, by his discourse, it is evident it must be understood as tho' thus compounded, and that it imports a *voluntary* or *affected humility*.

If this be allowed, he gives the like account of the same sort of men, 2 *Cor.* xi. 13. *For such are false apostles*, deceitful workers, ἐργάται δόλιοι, *transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ*. Nor is any thing more common with him than to charge, or insinuate a charge against these men, as deceivers, *Rom.* xvi. 18. 2 *Cor.* ii. 17. *Eph.* iv. 14. *Col.* ii. 4, 8. *Tit.* i. 12.

(*b*) Τὴν κατατομήν. *The concision.*] That is, those who rend and divide the church. Compare *Rom.* xvi. 17, 18. They gloried in being the περιτομὴ, *the circumcision*; which name and character St. *Paul* will not here allow them, but claims it for Christians in the next words, and calls them the κατατομὴ, or *concision*, expressing his contempt of their pretenses, and censure of their practices.

3 (*i*) *We are the circumcision.*] That is, we have that which was signified by circumcision. For *that is not circumcision which is outward in the flesh. But——circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter*, Rom. ii. 28, 29. To which may be added, that he consider'd baptism as the Christian circumcision, which availed to all the valuable religious purposes, which the ancient circumcision did. See *Col.* ii. 11.

(*k*) Οἱ πνεύματι Θεῷ λατρεύοντες. *Which worship God in the Spirit.*] If this were to be explained from *John* iv. 21, 23, 24. the sense would be, "We are they who worship God with "our hearts, without regarding the place where the worship is performed." But the true interpretation seems to be, that the *Spirit* here is to be understood as importing the *intent* and *meaning* of the law, in opposition to the *letter* of it, according to the distinction he himself makes, *Rom.* ii. 29. *Circumcision is that of the heart, in the* spirit, *and not in the* letter. The same distinction he uses *Rom.* vii. 6. 2 *Cor.* iii. 6——8. This, I think, best suits with his discourse here. The *Jews* valued themselves upon their having circumcision, which was God's covenant, and upon their having τὴν λατρείαν, the worship or *service of God*, as we render it, *Rom.* ix. 4. Now as the apostle had before claimed the true circumcision for those who believed in Christ, so here he claims for them the true *worship* also, that is, that worship which was agreeable to the design, though not to the letter of the law. The next expression does, I imagine, well agree with this interpretation.

(*l*) Καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. *And rejoice in Christ Jesus.*] It should rather be render'd, we *glory* or *boast* in Christ Jesus, whom he consider'd, if I mistake not, as the *Spirit* of the law, in contradistinction to the *letter* of it. So that this is the sum of what he says, "We are the

PARAPHRASE.

confidence in obſerving the law, in order to our
4. being juſtified and accepted of God *(m)*. And let not any one ſuppoſe I ſpeak thus ſlightly of theſe things, out of envy, and becauſe I want them. I might have ſuch confidence, if I thought theſe things a ſufficient foundation for it. And if the perſon who is come among you, and would perſuade you to *judaize*, thinks he has ſome reaſon to truſt in ſuch fleſhly things,
5. I may ſay, I have more *(n)*. I was circumciſed preciſely, according to the rule fixed in the law; on the eighth day *(o)*; I deſcended lineally from *Iſrael*, and am of the tribe of *Benjamin*, and ſo am a natural *Jew*, and not a proſelyte, being a true *Hebrew* of the *Hebrews*:

TEXT.

no confidence in the fleſh;
though I might alſo have 4
confidence in the fleſh. If
any other man thinketh
that he hath whereof he
might truſt in the fleſh, I
more: Circumciſed the 5
eighth day, of the ſtock of
Iſrael, *of* the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the

NOTES.

true circumciſion, who worſhip God by Jeſus Chriſt, and have our whole dependance upon him; and to this it was the deſign of the law to lead men." See *Gal.* iii. 24. *Rom.* x. 4.

(*m*) Καὶ ὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες. *And have no confidence in the fleſh.*] 'Tis evident from St. *Paul*'s ſtile in ſeveral other places of his epiſtles, and from the things which he afterwards reckons up in this *chapter* as belonging to the *fleſh*; that by the *fleſh* he means the ceremonial law, the ordinances of which were *carnal*, making ſuch diſtinctions as chiefly related to and affected the fleſh. The *Jews* relied on their fleſhly, that is, their natural, deſcent from *Abraham*, and the fathers, upon fleſhly inſtitutions, ſuch as circumciſion, and the various ſacrifices and waſhings preſcribed in the law: but Chriſtians, with St. *Paul*, put no confidence in theſe things, depending intirely upon Chriſt Jeſus.

4 (*n*) *If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might truſt in the fleſh, I more.*] It can't be ſuppoſed, that there were abſolutely none who could pretend the ſame grounds of confidence in the fleſh, which St. *Paul* here mentions. I think therefore his expreſſion is to be underſtood to be limited to ſuch as he had an eye to. If there was but one perſon at *Philippi* who was indeavouring to ſeduce them, no doubt he here ſpeaks of him; if there were more, he may be thought to aim at the principal and chief man among them: for he ſeems here to ſpeak only of a ſingle perſon. His meaning therefore is, "If the perſon who attempts to draw you to "*Judaiſm*, thinks he has ground for confidence in the fleſh, I am able to out-do him, and go "beyond him in all his pretenſes." In ſuch a covert way he uſes to ſpeak of this kind of men. See 1 *Cor.* iii. 10. 2 *Cor.* x. 7, 11. xi. 4, 12, 16, 18, 20, 21.

5 (*o*) *Circumciſed the eighth day.*] Whatever doubt there may be, whether we are to read περιτομὴ or περιτομῇ, there can be none at all as to the ſenſe, which muſt be that given in our tranſlation. This and the following particulars muſt be underſtood to be plain evidences that St. *Paul* had more reaſon to truſt in the fleſh, than the perſon upon whom he reflects; and therefore it ſeems highly probable, that he was only a proſelyte, and not a *Jew* by birth.

(*p*) Of

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

Hebrews; as touching the law, a Phariſee; concerning zeal, perſecuting the church; touching the righteouſneſs which is in the law, blameleſs. But what things were gain to me,

brews (p): and I was of the ſtricteſt ſect of our religion, and which pays the exacteſt regard to the law, a Phariſee *(q)*. Nor was I wanting in a zeal for the law: for ſo great was my zeal for it, that it carried me to perſecute the church *(r)*; and ſo exact was I in that ceremonial righteouſneſs deſcribed in the law, as to be blameleſs *(s)*. But when I became a Chriſtian, I diſclaimed all truſt in thoſe things which I before eſteemed the ſureſt ground of confidence of finding acceptance with God: and this

6. 7.

NOTES.

(*p*) *Of the ſtock of* Iſrael, *of the tribe of* Benjamin, *an* Hebrew *of the* Hebrews.] Compare herewith *Rom.* xi. 1. 2 *Cor.* xi. 22. When he ſays he was *an* Hebrew *of the* Hebrews, he ſeems to mean that he was not an *Helleniſt Jew*, as probably the perſon who indeavour'd to ſeduce them was. See *Acts* vi. 1. where the *Helleniſts* are contradiſtinguiſhed to the *Hebrews*.

(*q*) See *Acts* xxiii. 6. xxvi. 4, 5.

6 (*r*) *Concerning zeal, perſecuting the church.*] St. *Paul* was far from accounting this a virtue, or any ſolid ground of confidence toward God: he freely condemns it elſewhere as a grievous ſin, 1 *Cor.* xv. 9. 1 *Tim.* i. 13. All therefore he can mean by what he ſays, is, That if a zeal for the law were, as the *Jews* thought it, a ground of confidence, he could with a witneſs pretend to it, ſince his zeal had been ſo great for it, as to lead him to perſecute the Chriſtians, becauſe he thought they diſhonoured it.

(*s*) Κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ, γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος. *Touching the righteouſneſs which is in the law, blameleſs.*] The righteouſneſs here ſaid to be ἐν νόμῳ, *in the law*, is, *v.* 9. ſaid to be ἐκ νόμου, *of the law*; and both expreſſions ſignify the conformity he lived in to the ritual or ceremonial part of the *Moſaick* law: and that he means this righteouſneſs only, and not a conformity to the moral part of the law, may appear from the following conſiderations. 1. Becauſe he is here ſpeaking of the righteouſneſs which is in the law, according to the notions of the *Jews*, as his ſubject led him to do, and the tenor of his diſcourſe plainly ſhows he did. Now it was of the ceremonial righteouſneſs of the law that the *Jews* were generally very fond, and upon this they chiefly built their confidence, while they, indeed, paid too little regard to the moral righteouſneſs required by the law. 2. Becauſe he ſpeaks of ſuch a righteouſneſs as was reckoned matter of *confidence in the fleſh*, which is his way of deſcribing the poſitive part of the *Moſaick* law, which was of a carnal nature, related to and affected the fleſh; whereas the moral righteouſneſs therein required, was not *fleſhly*, nor is it, that I remember, ever ſpoken of as ſuch. 3. He oppoſes this righteouſneſs *in* or *of the law*, to that which is *through the faith of Chriſt*, or which is *of God by faith*, v. 9. And he that compares what he here ſays with *Rom.* iii. 16. cannot, I think, be at a loſs to underſtand what part of the law he ſpeaks of in both places. 4. This alone was to his purpoſe. It was only about the ceremonial law that there was any diſpute, whether the *Gentiles* ought to be ſubject to it; for St *Paul* never aſſerted that they ought not to conform to the moral part of the law. 5. Though he has proved elſewhere, that our moral righteouſneſs is not ſufficient to juſtify

PHILIPPIANS.

PARAPHRASE.

this I did for the ſake of Chriſt, and that I might depend wholly on him *(t)*, counting they would be a prejudice to me, if I ſhould any
8. longer depend on them. Nay, I certainly continue of the ſame mind, and ſtill count all thoſe things to be loſs, or damage, for the excellency of the knowledge of Chriſt Jeſus my Lord; for whom I have caſt them all away, as goods are caſt over board, when they bring a ſhip in danger *(u)*, and do account them but dung, or

TEXT.

thoſe I counted loſs for Chriſt. Yea doubtleſs, and I count all things but loſs, for the excellency of the knowledge of Chriſt Jeſus my Lord: for whom I have

things

NOTES.

juſtify us, becauſe it is not perfect, but all, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, are ſinners, to which purpoſe are the three firſt *chapters* of his epiſtle to the *Romans*; yet he could not ſay that he counted that degree of moral righteouſneſs to which he had attained to be loſs, or a prejudice to him. This ſeems not well to conſiſt with the commendation he gives himſelf elſewhere for it; as particularly where he ſays, *I have lived in all good conſcience before God, until this day*, Acts xxiii. 1. *I ſerve God from my fore-fathers with a pure conſcience*, 2 Tim. i. 3. Nor did his integrity turn to his prejudice, ſince he *obtained mercy, becauſe* in perſecuting he acted *ignorantly in unbelief*, 1 Tim. 1. 13. Perhaps ſome may think I ſhould have added another reaſon, namely, that as touching the righteouſneſs in the moral law, he could not ſay he was *blameleſs*, if it were for no other reaſon than what he mentions, that he had *perſecuted the church*. But ſince his expreſſion may relate to the *Jews*, and import no more than that he was blameleſs in their account, and that they found nothing wherewith to reproach or ſpot him, I chooſe not to inſiſt on it. Upon the whole, this is what he here ſays, That he had been a ſtrict obſerver of thoſe fleſhly ordinances upon which the *Jews* depended, and could not be reproached with any neglect of that kind.

7 (*t*) Διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν. *For Chriſt.*] The ſame thing he expreſſes thus in the next *verſe*, Διὰ τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου μου. *For the excellency of the knowledge of Chriſt Jeſus my Lord.* The meaning may be, that the conviction he had of the excellency of the knowledge of Chriſt, made him treat thoſe things with contempt, in compariſon of him, however they were ſet in competition with him: or elſe, That the earneſt deſire he had to know Chriſt as the only Saviour, cauſed him to neglect ſuch things, as diſſerviceable and prejudicial to him, while they tended to divert and weaken his hope in Chriſt.

8 (*u*) Τὰ πάντα ἐζημιώθην. *I have ſuffered the loſs of all things.*] For the underſtanding this paſſage, together with the context, 'tis very proper to obſerve that St. *Paul* here carries on a very handſom and agreeable allegory, in which all the metaphors are taken from traders or merchants. The firſt metaphors he uſes are *profit* and *loſs*, the next lies in the word *caſt away*, the third in the word *refuſe*, and the laſt in the word *arrive*.

As to the firſt of theſe, which here properly falls under our conſideration; Κέρδος has two ſignifications, *gain*, which is the common ſenſe, and as a conſequence, becauſe perſons uſually think ſo, *benefit* or *advantage*. So *Heſichius*, Κέρδος, ὠφέλεια. In like manner ζημία has alſo two ſignifications, *loſs*, and the uſual conſequence of it, *damage* or *detriment*. Hence ζημία is ſometimes oppoſed to ὠφέλεια; as in that of *Xenophon*, Ἐμοὶ ζημία μᾶλλον ἢ ὠφέλειά ἐστιν. The verb ζημιοῦσθαι has alſo two ſenſes, the one to *ſuffer loſs* or *damage*, the other to

part

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win
9 Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith:
10 That I may know him, and

things of no value (*w*), that I may gain Christ (*x*), and may be accepted of God for his sake (*y*), 9.
not as having my former righteousness, which depended upon the ceremonial law, but *that* through the faith of Christ, that is to say, the righteousness which is appointed of God by faith: which righteousness consists in knowing 10.
Christ,

NOTES.

part with, or *throw away*, in order to prevent a greater detriment, as when goods are thrown over board, to save the ship, which the *Latins* express by *jacturam facere*. And thus St. *Paul* willingly *parted with*, or threw away, his advantages and expectations from the law, that he might gain or secure Christ. Perhaps *Matt.* xvi. 26. may be thus explained, where we have the same construction. See *Grotius* upon that place. Our translation, by taking the verb ἐζημιώθην in the sense not applicable to this place, makes St. *Paul* to speak improperly, if not inconsistently.

(*w*) Ἡγοῦμαι σκύβαλα εἶναι. *Do count them but dung.*] Mr. *Gataker*, in his *Adverss. Miscell. posthuma*, c. 43. has treated very largely and learnedly of the signification of the word here used, showing that it is put for *dung*, *dregs*, *dross*, *chaff*, the *beard of corn*, *bran*, the *sprigs* or *leaves* that fall from trees, the *fragments* or *scraps* that fall from the table, or the *bit of bread*, with which they used to clean their hands after meat, and which they then flung to the dogs. It makes no difference, which ever sense we choose, since they all of them were consider'd as things of no value, and so would serve to set forth the chearfulness of the apostle in parting with them upon the account here mentioned. Our translation agrees with the *Vulg.* and *Syr.* And the same way of speaking was in use among the *Romans*. So *Plautus*, *Trucul.* Act. ii. sc. vii. ver. 5. says of a prodigal person, who lavished away what he had in presents to his mistress;

Qui bona sua pro stercore habet, *foras jubet ferri.* "He *counts* his goods but *dung*, and orders "them to be carried out of the house." And thus *Apuleius*, *Florid.* c. 14. speaks of *Crates*, when he turned *Cynic*: *Rem. familiarem abjicit velut onus* stercoris, *magis labori quam usui.* "He casteth away his goods as an heap of *dung*, that was more troublesom than useful."

(*x*) Ἵνα Χριστὸν κερδήσω. *That I may win Christ.*] The Paraphrase prefers the word *gain*, as better suiting with the allusion of the place, and with what he had said *chap.* i. 21. He seems here to consider Christ as the most important and valuable thing, which he was therefore solicitous to secure to himself above any thing: and his meaning is, "That I may attain the true "knowledge of Christ, and faith in him, so as to have him for my Saviour, and be intitled to "all the advantages which belong to those who are found in him." To which purpose is his next expression.

9 (*y*) *And be found in him.*] For the understanding this, I think, we must have recourse to St. *Paul*'s stile, and the manner in which he uses to think and speak of Christ. Two places occur very much to our purpose. *Gal.* iii. 27. As many of you as have been *baptized into Christ*, *have* put on *Christ*. So that, as Mr. *Locke* says on that place, "By taking on them the profession "of the gospel, they had, as it were, put on Christ; so that to God now looking on them "there appears nothing but Christ. They were, as it were, cover'd all over with him, as a "man is with the clothes he hath put on." The other place is *Rom.* xiii. 14. Put *ye* on *the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.* That is, "Be so "intirely conformed to Christ, as that his life may appear to be expressed in yours." St. *Paul*, in the place before us, is speaking of what should commend him to God. The *Jews* thought their

PARAPHRASE.

Chriſt (z), and the power of his reſurrection (a), and the fellowſhip of his ſufferings (b), being made conformed even unto his death (c),
11. that any way, as it ſhall pleaſe him, I may arrive ſafe at my deſired haven, the reſurrection
12. of the juſt (d). And compare now the ſloth and

TEXT.

the power of his reſurrection, and the fellowſhip of his ſufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the reſurrection of the dead: not as though I had already at-

NOTES.

ceremonial righteouſneſs would effectually do this: but the apoſtle was convinced of the contrary; and therefore deſired, that when God looked upon him, he might not appear to him as a perſon depending upon ſuch a righteouſneſs, but as one who had put on Chriſt, and had an intereſt in the benefits obtained by him; that is, he deſired God ſhould accept him as a Chriſtian, and not as a *Jew*.

10 (z) Τὸ γνῶναι αὐτὸν. *That I may know him.*] I take τὸ γνῶναι to ſtand as a *gerund*, or verbal ſubſtantive of the genitive caſe after δικαιοσύνην in the preceding *verſe*. Much ſuch another conſtruction we have *v.* 21. κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν, *according to the working whereby he is able*, &c.

(a) *And the power of his reſurrection*] The reſurrection of Chriſt is one of the ſtrongeſt confirmations of our holy religion; and therefore yields the greateſt incouragement to the hopes and expectations of Chriſtians. Hence, 1 *Pet.* i. 3. God is ſaid to have *begotten them again to a lively hope by the reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt from the dead.* Some may, perhaps, imagine that St. *Paul* had not here a due regard to order in placing his words, becauſe he ſpeaks of his reſurrection firſt, and then of his ſufferings: but, if I am not out in my conjecture, his reaſon for this was, becauſe a lively hope, effected by the conſideration of Chriſt's reſurrection, was abſolutely neceſſary to make men willing to be conformed to him in his ſufferings.

(b) Τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ. *The fellowſhip of his ſufferings.*] 'Tis doubtful to me whether *Chriſt's ſufferings* here ſignify thoſe he indured in his own perſon, or thoſe which he allots to his ſervants in his cauſe and for his ſake. I am inclined to prefer the latter, and to underſtand the apoſtle as expreſſing his hearty willingneſs to have his ſhare of ſufferings in the cauſe of Chriſt, becauſe he knew to what account they would turn to him. This interpretation ſeems to be much favoured by what follows.

(c) Συμμορφούμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ. *Being made conformable unto his death.*] The συμμορφούμενος does, as *Grotius* obſerves, refer to ἀρεθῶ, *v.* 9. And this expreſſion appears very conſiſtent with the reſt of the allegory, and may intimate St. *Paul*'s readineſs to ſubmit to any difficulties that might attend him in his voyage, in order to gain the deſired haven. And tho' a *dying to ſin* is ſeveral times ſpoken of as a conformity to Chriſt in his death, *Rom.* vi. 3, &c. 1 *Pet.* ii. 24. yet the other conformity to his death, by dying for his ſake, ſeems to be more agreeable to the ſcope of this place. See *Rom.* viii. 17. 2 *Tim.* ii. 11, 12. 2 *Cor.* iv. 10—14.

11 (d) Εἴ πως καταντήσω εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν νεκρῶν. *If by any means I might attain unto the reſurrection of the dead.*] Our tranſlation ſeems to imply that St. *Paul* was in ſome doubt concerning his future happineſs. But he ſo often intimates, in his writings, his firm expectation thereof, that 'tis not eaſy to think he deſigns here to inſinuate that he was in any danger of miſcarrying by his uſing the particles εἴπως. For εἰ is not always *dubitative*, but is often put for ὅτι, and may be expreſſed in *Engliſh* by the word *becauſe*, as 1 *Tim.* v. 10. *Well reported of for good works*, becauſe *ſhe has brought up children*, becauſe *ſhe has lodged ſtrangers*, &c. At other times 'tis beſt expreſſed by *that*, as *Acts* xxvi. 23. where our own tranſlators have thus render'd it: Εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστὸς, εἰ πρῶτος. That *Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, and* that *he ſhould be the firſt*, &c.

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

tained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I

and ſecurity of theſe men, with the manner in which I live and imploy my care. Upon a compariſon, you may ſoon perceive the difference, and whom you have moſt reaſon to follow. They place an intire confidence in their ceremonial righteouſneſs, and boaſt of themſelves as perfect, and preſume upon the end, while they don't purſue the proper means. But this is very different from my temper, who don't pretend

NOTES.

&c. where *Oecumenius* ſays, that εἰ is put for ὅτι. See Dr. *Whitby* upon both theſe places, and upon *Heb.* vii. 15. Thus 'tis alſo uſed by *Ælian. Var. Hiſt.* Lib. iv. c. 9. Οἱ ὃ ἐξεπλάγησαν, εἰ τὸν ἄνδρα ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν τοσοῦτον, ἠγνόησαν. "They were amazed, *that* having "had ſo great a man [as *Plato*] in their company, they ſhould not have known him." And *Budæus*, upon the word εἰ, produces ſeveral inſtances of its being uſed in this ſenſe. Nor does the enclitic particle πῶς, by following εἰ, appear to me to limit it to a conditional ſenſe. I grant 'tis more generally conditional when this particle follows, as well as when it ſtands alone: but this does not ariſe from its being any way affected by πῶς. I think, we have a pretty plain inſtance of this in *Homer*, *Odyſſ.* δ. v. 800. where *Minerva* ſends an apparition, repreſenting *Iphthima*, upon this errand.

Ἔι πως Πηνελόπειαν ὀδυρομένην, γοόωσαν
Παύσειε κλαυθμοῖο.

"*That* ſhe might appeaſe *Penelope*'s grief, and lamentation." The meſſage muſt be peremptory, it being unſuitable to the character of *Minerva* to ſuppoſe it dubious and uncertain, as to the event. And accordingly it is ſaid of *Penelope*, upon the vaniſhing of the apparition, *v.* 840.

Φίλον δέ οἱ ἦτορ ἰάνθη.

"She was glad at her heart." I have render'd εἴπως in this paſſage of *Homer* only *that*: but if πῶς ſhould be here tranſlated *ſome way*, it does not render the thing uncertain in the iſſue, but only the manner of it *indefinite*, as left to the prudence of the meſſenger or ſpectre.

And perhaps εἴπως in *Acts* xxvii. 12. may well enough bear this ſenſe, and the words be thus tranſlated: *The greater part adviſed to depart thence alſo*, that *getting to* Phenice, *they might be able to winter* [there.] They could not propoſe to move till the wind would ſuffer them: But ſo ſoon as that ſerved, they appear to have been under no doubt or uncertainty; for then they *ſuppoſed they had obtained their purpoſe.* In this and ſuch-like expreſſions therefore (as 1 *Cor.* ix. 27.) which St. *Paul* uſes concerning himſelf, he may be underſtood to intimate no more than the neceſſity of uſing the means, in order to attain the end.

Farther, Mr. *Locke*, in his Note upon 1 *Cor.* xv. 42. has obſerved, that St. *Paul* muſt neceſſarily be underſtood to ſpeak in the place before us of the reſurrection of the juſt, and not of the reſurrection in general, becauſe he mentions his indeavours to attain it. For ſince he has declared that all men, good and bad, ſhall as certainly partake of the reſurrection, as they ſhall die, there need no indeavours to attain to it. "Our Saviour likewiſe, *as he adds*, ſpeaks of "the reſurrection of the juſt in the ſame general terms of the reſurrection, *Matt.* xxii. 30. and

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

pretend to say, that I have yet attained (†), or am apprehended of Christ

am

NOTES.

" the resurrection from the dead, *Luke* xx. 35. by which is meant only the resurrection of the " just, as is plain from the context." This sense of the place before us may be confirmed by his using the word καταντᾶν, which, in the *Acts*, is often applied to maritime affairs, and signifies to *arrive at a place by sea*, or to *arrive at an harbour*, chap. xviii. 19, 24. xx. 15. xxvi. 7. xxvii. 12. and xxviii. 13. Now this in the allusive sense, in which 'tis here used, is not applicable to the wicked, who can't be said to arrive at the resurrection, as a safe and desired harbour. There is therefore sufficient reason for our understanding the *resurrection of the dead* according to the above-mentioned limitation. Nor is there any need of forcing a distinction between ἀνάστασις and ἐξανάστασις, as tho' the latter were therefore peculiar to the saints, because they shall not only rise, but *ascend* to meet the Lord in the air.

It may not be amiss to take notice of one thing more, which may help us to understand St. *Paul*'s discourse here, and to see how well he has adapted it to the persons with whom he had to do. I think then what he here says ought to be compared with his epistle to the *Colossians*, written much about the same time. 'Tis obvious that in both he is guarding the *Gentile* Christians against the same sort of men, the *Jewish* converts, who were indeavouring to bring them to subject themselves to the *Mosaick* law. In order to his establishing the *Colossians*, he represents the things, of which these *Judaizers* were so fond, as *earthly*, and consequently below the regard of Christians, who had much greater and nobler matters, upon which they should imploy their thoughts and zeal, even the *things above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God*, Col. iii. 1—4. The same thing he is here inculcating upon the *Philippians*. He assures them that the *concision*, or zealots for *Judaism*, who were indeavouring to distract and divide them, were men who *minded earthly things*, and therefore it did not become the *Philippians* to follow them: they ought to mind more excellent things, even those in heaven, whence they expected Christ should come to bestow upon them their reward. See *v.* 19—21. His design therefore appears to be the same in both epistles. But there was a good reason why he should not pursue it in the same method in both. He intended to press upon the *Philippians* a neglect of earthly things, and a minding those which are heavenly, by his own example; which is a very proper and moving way of instruction. And it was very agreeable when he was writing to the *Philippians*, among whom he had sometimes been, and who had been eye-witnesses of his conduct. Somewhat of the same aim he had when he sent *Timothy* to the *Corinthians* to *put them in remembrance of his ways which were in Christ*, 1 Cor. iv. 17. But this would have been very improper in writing to the *Colossians*, among whom he had never been, and who, having never seen his conversation, were less likely to be moved by his example. But, in very lively terms, he sets before the *Philippians* the course he took, and which they could not but have observed. It seems plain, his discourse is to be understood as carrying in it a tacit reflection upon the different conduct of those with whom he compares himself, where they are not expressly mentioned.

12 (†) Οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον. *Not as though I had already attained.*] The apostle here begins a new allegory. Nor is it unusual, with the most correct writers, to pass from one allegory to another. But our *English* version confounds these two allegories, by translating both καταλάβω, *v.* 11. and ἔλαβον, *v.* 12. by the same word *attained*. St. *Paul* here compares himself to a *racer*, and borrows many terms from the Heathen exercises, as he does also in many other places in his epistles. The words λαμβάνειν and καταλαμβάνειν here used, are applied in the same agonistical manner, 1 *Cor.* ix. 24. His design is to show, that he consider'd not himself as having already gained the victory, or obtained the prize which is the reward of it, which the *Jewish* converts seem to have fancied of themselves, but that he was running, and striving, and

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

13 Jesus. Brethren, I count not my self to have apprehended: but *this* one thing *I do*, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before,

am already perfect *(e)*; but I press after that one thing for which I have been apprehended by Christ Jesus, that I may apprehend or obtain it *(f)*. Brethren, I don't reckon my self to have obtained it; but after this one thing *(g)* (neglecting those things which are behind, and 13.

NOTES.

using all proper methods to qualify himself for it. Compare 1 *Cor.* ix. 26, 27. The expression here seems plainly to be elliptical, nor can it be more easily supplied than by λέγω. Ου λέγω ὅτι. St. *Paul* avoided the confident boasting of the *Jews*, which led them into security and a careless in their conversation. Such words as λέγω are often to be supplied. See *Acts* ix. 6.

(*e*) Ἤδη τετελείωμαι. *Either were already perfect.*] This is said in opposition to the *Jews*, and the converts from among them, who flatter'd themselves that barely by being under the law they were made perfect. Hence this apostle speaks in that manner to the *Galatians*, when they were seduced by them, *Gal.* iii. 3. *Are ye so foolish? having begun in the spirit, are ye now* made perfect *by the flesh?* where, by the *flesh*, he means the ceremonial law. Against this vain conceit the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* disputes in several places, showing that *perfection* was not by the *Levitical* priesthood, under which the people received the law, *Heb.* vii. 16. that the law made nothing *perfect*, *v.* 19. that those ceremonies could not make him that did the service *perfect*, as pertaining to the conscience, *chap.* ix. 9. that the law never could make *perfect* the attenders upon the service of it, *chap.* x. 1. This conceit of the *Jews* naturally led them into security, and such carelessness of life as the apostle judged to be most dangerous. In opposition to them, he sets forth his own great solicitude and diligence in the use of all proper means, considering himself as not having yet obtained the prize, or as not yet being perfect. This clears the seeming inconsistence between this and the 15th *verse*. Here he says he was *not made perfect*; there he speaks of himself as *perfect*. *As many of us as are* perfect. The perfection spoken of here in this 12th *verse* relates to the reward; with respect to which, our Saviour himself says, *Luke* xiii. 32. *The third day I shall be* perfected. And thus the *spirits of just men are not* made perfect *till the other world*, Heb. xii. 23. But the perfection which St. *Paul* attributes to himself and other good men, *v.* 15. is a very different thing, and imports a being arrived to a maturity of understanding in Christianity. See *Heb.* v. 13, 14. 1 *Cor.* ii. 6. xiv. 20.

(*f*) Διώκω δὲ, εἰ καὶ καταλάβω, ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ κατελήφθην. *But I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended.*] That εἰ καὶ is render'd in the Paraphrase *that*, agreeably to what is before said of εἴπως, *v.* 11. Note (*d*), and so *Castellio* turns it, *Ut comprehendam.* Ἐφ' ᾧ may seem doubtful: It may signify *since*, as *Theophylact* takes it, explaining it by διότι. *Oecumenius* mentions this sense also, making it equivalent to ἐπειδή. He takes notice likewise of the other sense, which is followed by our translation, the *Vulg.* and *Syr.* *that for which.* Either sense will suit the scope of the place. The Paraphrase keeps to the latter, supposing τοῦτο the demonstrative pronoun to be omitted before the relative, as is common in the *Greek* language. And thus the grammatical construction will be, Διώκω δὲ τοῦτο ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ κατελήφθην ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, εἰ καὶ καταλάβω. But the *paronomasia* is more beautiful, as this clause, which is last in grammatical order, is here inserted; and the double καὶ, as the sentence now stands, gives it an additional elegance, which, I think, our language will scarce admit of.

13 (*g*) Ἓν δὲ. *But this one thing I do.*] Our translation supplies, *I do*; nor can it be doubted that the word ποιῶ is frequently omitted by good writers, where it must be understood.

Chap. III.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

and ſtretching forward to thoſe before) *(h)*:
14. After this one thing, I ſay, I preſs according to the aim I have fixed with my ſelf *(i)*, that I may

I preſs toward the mark, 14 for the prize of the high calling of God in

NOTES.

Inſtead of this, the *Syr.* has *I know.* But, I confeſs, I am rather inclined not to ſupply any thing at all, but to join this with χῆ σκοπὸν διώκω, *One thing, according to my fixed aim, I preſs after.* The apoſtle had expreſſed himſelf very briefly, and in general terms, *v.* 12. But here he again reſumes the ſame matter, and repreſents, very fully and emphatically, both what the τοῦτο ἐφ' ᾧ was, which he ſo eagerly preſſed after, and the manner in which he did it. And the apoſtle having, in the 12th *verſe*, ſpoken of his *following after* one thing (for he ſpeaks of it in the ſingular number) for which he was apprehended of Chriſt Jeſus, it ſeems to me very natural to underſtand him, when he here goes over the ſame matter again, to ſay that he *followed after* this one thing. Let the reader compare the 12th with the two following *verſes.*

(*h*) Τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος, τοῖς δὲ ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος. *Forgetting thoſe things which are behind, and reaching forth unto thoſe things that are before.*] I chooſe to render ἐπιλανθανόμενος by *neglecting* or *not minding*, rather than by *forgetting.* This is a neceſſary conſequence of forgetting. And, I think, racers may more properly be ſaid to *neglect* than to forget thoſe behind them. Compare this with *Horace*'s expreſſion, *Illum præteritum temnens*, which will preſently be cited more at large. I have tranſlated ἐπεκτεινόμενος *ſtretching forward*, which is both agreeable to the ſenſe of the word, and more properly the buſineſs of racers than *reaching forward.* For they did not catch the prize, when they came to the goal; but it was given them by the *praeco* or ἀγωνοθέτης.

Farther, as I hinted before in the Note (*g*), I take this paſſage to be an interjected clauſe, ſhewing the manner in which he preſs'd after one thing, even by neglecting every thing elſe, and ſo in conſtruction I join ἓν δὲ χῆ σκοπὸν διώκω, as though it were left out. I think this is an elegant alluſion to racers, who hinder not themſelves by looking behind them, to ſee how far they are come, or whom they have out-run, but only look to the goal, or to ſuch as have got before them. That paſſage of *Horace*, Serm. Lib. 1. Satyr. 1. is very pertinently cited to illuſtrate this, by Dr. *Hammond.*

Ut cum carceribus miſſos rapit ungula currus,
Inſtat equis auriga ſuos vincentibus, illum
Præteritum temnens, extremos inter euntem.

"When they drive their chariots in a race, the ruler of the chariot preſſeth to overtake thoſe "horſes that are before his, but contemns and never looks after him that is behind, and out-"run by him."

Farther, tho' the τὰ and τοῖς are both in the neuter gender, and are well render'd by our tranſlators *thoſe things*; yet they may well take in *perſons* as well as *things.* See 1 *Cor.* i. 27, 28. The *Syriac* has properly tranſlated this, as we have: but the *Latin* tranſlation, printed in *Treſtius*'s edition, has very wrong turned it, *Eorum quæ ſunt mihi ad latus obliviſcor*, "I forget the "things that are on my ſide." Whoever tranſlated it, ſeems to have miſtook דרבמתרי as tho' it had been דרבמטרי tho' I believe the *Syriac* hardly uſes that word in that manner, but rather keeps to the *Hebrew* uſe of יד ידי in this caſe: however that the *Syriac* ſhould have been turned, *behind me*, is evident from *Matt.* xvi. 23. and ſeveral other places.

14 (*i*) Κατὰ σκοπόν. *Toward the mark.*] I have not met with any good authorities to prove that σκοπὸς ſignifies the ſame as τέρμα, or the *goal*; and therefore I chooſe rather to take

TEXT.

15 Christ Jesus. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal
16 even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have

PARAPHRASE.

may obtain the prize *(k)* of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus *(l)*. Let us therefore, as many of us as are thoroughly instructed in Christianity, mind this, to walk *(m)* by the same rule *(n)*, and to be unanimous with one another *(o)*: and if you differ in your sentiments about any thing *(p)*, God shall reveal it unto you; 15, 16.

NOTES.

it in the sense in which it is commonly used, and so render it, *according to my aim*, or *design*. Nor is it necessary in allegories to be always confined to terms.

(*k*) Διώκω ἐπὶ τὸ βραβεῖον. *I press—for the prize.*] However unusual the phrase may seem as I put it together, ἓν ᾧ διώκω ἐπὶ τὸ βραβεῖον, yet, I think, we have one place in the LXX to justify it, *Prov.* xx. 6. which they thus render, *He that getteth treasures with a lying tongue*, followeth after *vanities* for *the snares of death*, μάταια διώκει ἐπὶ παγίδας θανάτου. Farther, the βραβεῖον was the *prize* or reward bestowed upon him who got the victory; and so St. *Paul* here represents himself as using the greatest eagerness that he might get the victory, and obtain the reward promised.

(*l*) Τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. *The high calling of God in Christ Jesus.*] It is uncertain whether *in Christ Jesus* is to be joined in sense with the *prize*, or with the *high calling of God*. If it is joined with the *high calling of God*, it must be thus understood, that as God was the primary author of his being called, so he did it by Christ, by whom 'tis obvious St. *Paul* was immediately called. See 2 *Cor.* i. 1. and thus these words will be equivalent to what he had said *v.* 12. *I am apprehended of Christ Jesus.* On the other hand, if we join this with the *prize*, the sense will run thus, "One thing I press after for the prize that is in Christ Jesus "of God's high calling." And thus the sense will be the same with that our translators design'd 1 *Cor.* xv. 58. *Your labour is not in vain in the Lord:* or rather this will answer to what he says, *Col.* iii. 3, 4. *Your life is hid* with Christ *in God*, so hid with Christ as to be in him, or to have him to be your life, as he adds, *When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.*

15, 16 (*m*) The reader sees by the Paraphrase that I choose to join the τοῦτο φρονῶμεν, *Let us mind the same thing*, or *let us mind this*, v. 15. with τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν κανόνι, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, *to walk by the same rule, to mind the same thing*, or rather *to be unanimous*, v. 16. What comes between, I take to be a parenthesis; and, to make the sense the easier, I have put it last. See Note (*p*).

(*n*) Τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν κανόνι. *Let us walk by the same rule.*] Or rather, *to walk by the same rule*, (see the preceding Note) that is, the gospel, in which, as *perfect*, they were supposed to be well instructed, the *perfect* being opposed to the *babes*, and the *unskilful in the word of righteousness*, Heb. v. 13, 14. Or the sense may stand thus: "You pretend to be thoroughly acquainted with "Christianity, as well as I; if you are so, let us not have a different rule, but do you walk by "such a rule as, from what I have said, you may perceive I do. You are directed to seek heaven-"ly things, and not to expect advantages by the *Mosaick* law: if then we all pretend to the "same character, let us mind to walk by the same rule, and not by the *Mosaick* law." To this purpose he expressly urges upon them the following his own example, *v.* 17. Compare also *Gal.* vi. 16.

(*o*) Τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν. *Let us mind the same thing.*] Or rather, *To be at unity one with another.* Compare *Philip.* ii. 2. *Rom.* xii. 16. xv. 5.

(*p*) Καὶ εἴ τι ἑτέρως φρονεῖτε. *And if in any thing ye be otherwise minded.*] This seems to be wrong render'd: for what can be the meaning according to this translation, but that St. *Paul*

was

PARAPHRASE.

you, except it be such a matter as he has already fully revealed, and we have attained the knowledge of, wherein you can't expect any
17. farther revelation, if you depart from it. Brethren, do you all imitate me, and not these men who would seduce you, and observe them who walk as I do, as you have me for an
18. example *(q)*. (For these seducers behave themselves in such a manner, as plainly to show they are enemies of the cross of Christ *(r)*, as I have often told you, and now tell you with

TEXT.

already attained, let us
walk by the same rule, let
us mind the same things.
Brethren, be followers to- 17
gether of me, and mark
them which walk so, as ye
have us for an ensample.
(For many walk, of whom 18

NOTES.

was persuaded that God would afford a revelation of his will to such as walked *otherwise* than he had said he did himself, that is, to such as by a wretched security neglected to press after the prize, and minded earthly things? This utterly disagrees with what he says of such men, v. 18, 19. and, indeed, with the whole strain of this epistle. If I am not mistaken, ἑτέρως here signifies *differently from one another*, and that the matters about which he supposes them to think differently, are limited to such things as they had not yet attained to: for so I understand πλὴν εἰς ὃ ἐφθάσαμεν, which I judge to be an exceptive clause, and connecting it with what precedes, should thus render it: "If you think differently from one another, in any matter, "except it be such as we have already been fully instructed in." In those things wherein they had been fully instructed, he thought there was the utmost danger for them to go backward, and to recede from the opinion they had before embraced. If it be asked, Why did he expect God should reveal such things to them? It may be answered, That as he was persuaded they were sincere, so he did not doubt, that if by holding fast the things they had already received, they now approved themselves to be sincere, God would, according to the regard he bears to such, inform them of any other matters wherein they might any of them happen to mistake, and wherein it was of some considerable importance for them to be set right. Compare *Gal.* v. 10. *Philip.* i. 6. And while St. *Paul* was alive, and the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were so common in the churches, it was easy for such an information to be afforded them. Besides, I don't think that *revelation* always necessarily signifies a new inspiration. See Mr. *Locke* on *Eph.* i. 17.

17 (*q*) Here the reason very plainly appears, why he said so much of himself in the foregoing *verses*. And we may observe, that as he was apprehensive of their danger from these *Judaizers*, he labours effectually to discredit them, and shows, from the difference there was between his conversation and theirs, how much reason they had to follow and be directed by him rather than them. Compare 1 *Cor.* iv. 16, 17. However, to take off the seeming ostentation of his discourse, he joins others with himself, as examples to them.

18 (*r*) *Enemies of the cross of Christ.*] That is, enemies to the doctrine of salvation by a dependance upon Christ crucified: for while they directed men to seek salvation by observing the ceremonial law, they took them off from depending solely on Christ crucified, and so made the death of Christ insignificant and useless. See *Gal.* ii. 21. v. 3, 4.

19 (*s*) Ὧν

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, *that they are* the enemies of
18 the cross of Christ: whose end *is* destruction, whose God *is their* belly; and *whose* glory *is* in their shame, who mind earthly
20 things.) For our conver-

with tears. And a faithful and just account of them may well deter you from hearkening to and imitating them: for their end is destruction *(s)*, they make a God of their belly *(t)*, and glory in their shame *(u)*, and they mind earthly things *(w)*; whereas, on the contrary, our 19. 20.

NOTES.

19 (*s*) Ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια. *Whose end is destruction.*] Tho' *the end* they accomplish'd upon such as they seduced, was their destruction, while they drew them off from a dependance on Christ, and so they *subverted their souls*, *Acts* xv. 24. 2 *Tim.* ii. 14. yet that seems not here intended: but he speaks here of the destruction of these seducers themselves, in like manner as he does, 2 *Cor.* xi. 15. *Whose* end *shall be according to their works.* Farther, I am apt to think, he had an eye here to what he had said of these men before, *chap.* i. 28. and so he may be understood as tho' he had said, "These men reckon upon your destruction, but they will certainly "meet with their own."

(*t*) *Whose God is their belly.*] That is, however they pretended to act for the service and honour of God, they are seeking only their own profit, and prostitute all things for the promoting a temporal interest, and so they made a God of themselves, or of their own belly. The like censure he passes upon these men elsewhere, asserting, *Rom.* xvi. 18. That they *serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple*; and, 1 *Tim.* vi. 5. that *they supposed that godliness was gain*, as it should be render'd; and, *Tit.* i. 11. That *they subverted whole houses, teaching things which they ought not for filthy lucre's sake*; and, 2 *Cor.* xi. 20. That they *brought* such as would hearken to them *into bondage, devoured them, and took of them.* St. *Paul*'s aim and behaviour was directly opposite, who did all things for the edification of the churches, without seeking his own temporal advantage and gain, as he often declares in his epistles, and that with a tacit reflection upon these men for their behaviour. See 2 *Cor.* xii. 17—19. 1 *Thess.* ii. 3—6. and 2 *Thess.* iii. 8.

(*u*) *And whose glory is in their shame.*] There is no necessity of supposing this to be confined to one single instance of their glorying: if they did it in several instances that were rather matter of shame than glorying, they may be all comprehended in the expression. This gives us a greater latitude in the application of it. And, 1. Some would, perhaps, be offended, if I should not take notice of the interpretation of several of the ancients, who thought that *in their shame* refer'd to the part wherein the circumcision, in which they so much gloried, was made. But if this should appear less probable, I am persuaded any of the rest I shall mention, if not all of them, will be thought likely enough to be designed. 2. They gloried in their shame while they gloried in their zeal for the law, which was a yoke of bondage, and consisted of weak and beggarly elements. Their glorying in this excluded their glorying in the cross of Christ, *Gal.* vi. 14, 15. and so was a *shame* to them. 3. They gloried in their success upon the *Gentile* converts, in bringing them to submit to the law, *Gal.* vi. 13. Whatever they might think of this, they only thereby *subverted their souls*, Acts xv. 24. and *perverted the gospel of Christ*, Gal. i. 7. and so they gloried in their *shame*. 4. It is not unlikely, from the texts cited under the Note (*t*), that they gloried in the gain they made of their converts, which was an addition to the *shame* wherein they gloried: for thus they gloried in serving their own belly, which they made their God.

(*w*) *Who mind earthly things.*] The *earthly things* here are of two sorts. 1. Their temporal gain and advantage. And this there is the more reason here to include, because he had just before

PARAPHRASE.

our example is moſt worthy of imitation:) for our courſe of life is taken up about heavenly things, in ſecuring and preparing for heaven (x), from whence alſo we expect the Saviour, the

TEXT.

ſation is in heaven, from whence alſo we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jeſus

NOTES.

before ſaid of them, that *their God was their belly.* 2. Theſe *earthly things* include the poſitive ordinances and ceremonies of the law, about which they were ſo much concerned, and which were of an earthly nature. This ſuits well with his diſcourſe, it being obvious, that his aim and indeavour, before deſcribed, was not after earthly but heavenly things, and that what he ſays of himſelf was with a deſign to diſparage the contrary behaviour of theſe *Judaizers*, who were wholly buſied about ſuch low earthly matters. But that which eſpecially ſerves to determine that this ſenſe is to be included, is the comparing what he ſays upon the ſame argument, *Col.* iii. 1—3.

20 (x) Ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει. *For our converſation is in heaven.*] They who have occaſion to make uſe of this text, commonly pretend to mend our tranſlation, aſſerting that the word πολίτευμα ſhould not be render'd *converſation*, but *citizenſhip*. And thus *Beza*, the common *French* tranſlation, and that printed at *Mons*, have render'd it. *Diodati* agrees with ours, but puts *citizenſhip* in the margin. The *Vulg. Latin*, *Syriac*, *Low Dutch*, and *Caſtellio*, render it as we do. And, after all that the criticks have ſaid upon this matter, I muſt own, I rather prefer our own rendering to the other. It muſt be confeſſed, that the word being derived from πόλις, a *city*, it is often uſed to ſignify ſuch actions as relate to the adminiſtration and government of the city or community: but nothing is more common than for words in time to come to be uſed in a laxer and more general ſenſe than their etymology will account for. This is clearly the caſe in the verb πολιτεύεσθε, which, in like manner, related at firſt to a civil adminiſtration, but was afterwards uſed to ſignify any manner of living and converſing; and ſo it is uſed by St. *Paul* in this epiſtle, *chap.* i. 27. *Only let your* converſation *be* πολιτεύεσθε, *as it becometh the goſpel of Chriſt.* And ſo, *Acts* xxiii. 1. *I have* lived, πεπολίτευμαι, *in all good conſcience before God, until this day.* And in this ſenſe, I think, *Tatian* uſes the word πολίτευμα, ſect. 32. of his *Oration: ad Gr.* κόσμος μὲν γὰρ καλὸς καλή· τὸ δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πολίτευμα, φαῦλον. "The conſtitution of the world is good; but the *converſation* of men "in it is bad." Now the rendering in our tranſlation appears to me the beſt, for theſe reaſons. 1. As it ſtands here in oppoſition to the foregoing character, and eſpecially the laſt part of it, *who mind earthly things.* It is moſt agreeable therefore to underſtand him to deſcribe his own character, as one who minded heavenly things, or whoſe *converſation* was about them. 2. This is confirmed by the parallel place, *Col.* iii. 1, 2. For ἡμῶν τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει, *our converſation is in heaven*, will be the ſame as τὰ ἄνω ζητοῦμεν, or φρονοῦμεν, *We ſeek* or *mind the things above.* 3. This ſuits beſt with his deſign, as he is recommending himſelf to them as an example of *walking* or of *converſation*, *v.* 17. *Be* followers *together of me, and mark them that* walk *ſo, as ye have us for an* example: and, in this 20th *verſe*, he gives a reaſon why they ſhould follow his example, becauſe it was a very good one: *for our* converſation, that is, our *walking*, is in heaven. And this 20th *verſe* is cloſely connected with the 17th, as appears by the γὰρ, or *for*, in the beginning of it, *v.* 18, 19. being to be read in a parentheſis. 4. This πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς, or *converſation in heaven*, comprehends briefly all he had ſaid of himſelf, *v.* 10—14. and as in thoſe *verſes* he gives not the leaſt hint of any alluſion to a *citizenſhip*, but his whole diſcourſe is of the manner of his life and converſation, it is but reaſonable to underſtand

TEXT. PARAPHRASE. Chap. IV.

21 Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all 21 things unto himself. Therefore, my brethren, dearly

(y), the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change the low estate of our bodies *(z)*, that so they may become conformed to that glorious body which he now has himself: and this he will effect by that power whereby he is able to bring all things into an intire subjection to himself *(a)*. Wherefore *(b)*, my brethren, whom 1.

21.

I

NOTES.

stand him as speaking of that alone in this *verse*. But I will not contend, if any are for adhering to the other sense of πολίτευμα, which, upon the whole, really amounts to the same thing.

(y) Ἐξ οὗ καὶ σωτῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. *From whence also we look for the Saviour.*] If there were any danger of a soloecism by making ἐξ οὗ to refer to ἐν οὐρανοῖς of a different number, it might easily be avoided, by making it relate to πολίτευμα. And a very good sense might be given of his words thus taken ἐξ οὗ πολιτεύμα]Θ ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. But there is no manner of need of this, there being a not unusual *syllepsis* in the expression, like that *Luke* xxiv. 28. Καὶ ἤγγισαν εἰς τὴν κώμην οὗ ἐπορεύοντο, where οὗ is for ἐφ' οὗ τόπου. And that which very much confirms this sense, is, that it so well agrees with St. *Paul*'s discourse elsewhere upon the same argument. See *Col.* iii. 1—4.

21 *(z)* Ὃς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τ ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν. *Who shall change our vile body.*] As σχῆμα always signifies the *habit*, or *outward form* of a thing, and not the substance or essence of it, I think we are to understand the verb here to denote a change only of the *form*, and not of the *substance* of the bodies of the saints. I think instead of *our vile body*, it would better be translated, *our mean, humble, lowly body*. Flesh and blood in their present state not being fit to inherit the kingdom of God, there is a necessity that the bodies of those who shall inherit it, should undergo a great change. Such a change will be made in the bodies of the dead saints at the resurrection, when they shall be raised incorruptible: but as to the saints who shall be alive at that time, in whose name St. *Paul* here, as likewise 1 *Thess.* iv. 15—17. seems to speak, since they undergo not such a change by the resurrection, there must be somewhat equivalent to it, that is, by the mighty power of our Saviour they shall undergo such a change as shall, in an instant, qualify them to inherit the kingdom of God. See 1 *Cor.* xv. 50—54. The bodies of the saints at present, and till that change shall be made, bear the image of the first *Adam*, and are in a low and mean condition: but they shall then bear the image of Christ, the last, or the second *Adam*, who is the Lord from heaven, 1 *Cor.* xv. 45—49. This is here expressed by our bodies being made conformed to his glorious body.

(a) According to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.] The reason of his speaking in this case of his subduing all things to himself, is to be fetched from 1 *Cor.* xv. 24—26, 54—57. according to which, *death* is to be consider'd as an enemy, and the last enemy to be conquered; and so when this is subdued, all are subdued: and Christ will bestow upon his saints a compleat victory over it, freeing them for ever from being subject and liable to it. This energy and power is here manifestly attributed to Christ, as it is elsewhere to God, even the Father, 1 *Cor.* vi. 14. God *hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by* his own power. Nor is there the least inconsistence in these assertions to them that read the scriptures with any care: for this ample power over all flesh our Saviour received of the Father, in order to his giving eternal life to all his disciples, *John* xvii. 2. Christ therefore does it immediately, the Father does it mediately by Christ, who acts herein by a power and authority derived from the Father; whence St. *Paul* joins these two things together, 2 *Cor.* iv. 14. He *which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also* by Jesus. Compare *John* v. 25—30. St. *Paul* rightly infers his ability to subdue death, from his ability to subdue all things.

1 *(b)* This conclusion of his argument is in effect the same with that he uses on the like subject, 1 *Cor.* xv. 58. and may therefore be compared with it.

(c) Οὕτω

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

I moſt affectionately love and long for, and whom I eſteem as my joy and crown, continue ſtedfaſt in your adherence to Chriſt *(c)*, as I have ſet you an example, and you have done hitherto, my beloved *(d)*.

TEXT.

beloved and longed for, my joy and crown, ſo ſtand faſt in the Lord, *my* dearly beloved.

NOTES.

(*c*) Ουτω στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ. *So ſtand faſt in the Lord.*] *So* muſt, I think, neceſſarily refer to his immediately foregoing diſcourſe, "*So* ſtand faſt as I have exhorted you, follow this my example, which I have earneſtly recommended to you, and be accordingly ſolicitous, in ſpite of all the inſinuations of ſuch as would ſeduce you, to perſevere in your dependance on Chriſt, and to preſs after that ſtate of future happineſs which he will ſhortly beſtow upon his ſaints." But ſince the verb may be ſuppoſed to denote a continued and perſevering poſture, it ſeems not unreaſonable to allow that he may herein have a reſpect to their paſt behaviour, and the ſtedfaſtneſs for which he had before commended them, *chap.* i. 5, 6, 28, 29. ii. 11, 12, 15, 16.

(*d*) Remarkable is the multitude of words he here uſes, *My brethren, dearly beloved, and longed for, my joy and crown*, repeating again one of the terms in the end of the *verſe*, *My dearly beloved*, as though he thought he could never apply words enough to expreſs the greatneſs of his love and tenderneſs for them.

SECT.

SECT. VII.

CHAP. iv. 2——9.

CONTENTS.

ST. *Paul* having diſpatched the principal ſubject of which he deſign'd to treat in this epiſtle, he here, according to his uſual method, proceeds to give them ſome directions, which are addreſſed partly to ſome particular perſons, as *v.* 2, 3. and partly to the *Philippians* in general, as in the reſt of this *Section.*

TEXT.	*PARAPHRASE.*	
2 I Beſeech Euodias, and beſeech Syntyche, that they be of the ſame mind in the 3 Lord. And I intreat thee alſo, true yoke-fellow, help	I Exhort *Euodia*, and I exhort *Syntyche*, that they be unanimous in the Chriſtian doctrine. And I intreat thee alſo, true yoke-fellow *(e)*, to aſſiſt thoſe women [*Euodia* and *Syntyche*] who have, for the furthering of the goſpel, done and	2. 3.

NOTES.

3 (e) Σύζυγε γνήσιε. *True yoke-fellow.*] The ſenſe is left doubtful in the Paraphraſe, as well as in our verſion: many think that the interpretation ſeveral of the ancient Chriſtian writers give of this place, and 1 *Cor.* ix. 5. is not improbable, namely, that St. *Paul* was a married man, and that conſequently he here beſpeaks his wife. They think it likely that it was a woman whom he deſired to aſſiſt the women, *Euodia* and *Syntyche*; and conſequently that he then means by σύζυγε his wife. It ſeems, indeed, highly improbable, that he ſhould here turn his diſcourſe to *Epaphroditus*, who was with him when he wrote the letter, and by whom he ſent it to the *Philippians.* Had he deſigned him by this expreſſion, there can be no reaſon why he ſhould not have mentioned him by name here, as well as before. He that has a mind to ſee the opinions of the ancients in this matter, may conſult the larger epiſtle *ad Philadelphenos*, attributed to *Ignatius*, Sect. 4. and *Cotelerius*'s Notes thereon; as likewiſe *Uſher*'s diſſertation upon his epiſtles, *chap.* xvii. Many indeed think this opinion is contradicted by St. *Paul* himſelf, 1 *Cor.* vii. 7, 8. *I would that all men were even* as I my ſelf: *but every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that. I ſay therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide* even as I. But they who maintain it, imagine he there ſays no more than this, That as he could deny himſelf the gratification of that ſtate, ſo he readily did it for the greater furtherance of the goſpel; and that he wiſhed that others at that time were as indifferent to marriage, as he was to the ſociety of his wife, when the ſervice of Chriſt called him another way. For ſurely it can hardly be thought he ſpeaks of an abſolute ſeparation from her; or that his words imply (ſuppoſing he had one) that he avoided living with her when he happen'd to be at the ſame city where ſhe reſided. Nor is it neceſſary for them to deny that during a good part of his confinement ſhe might have been with him, however now, upon the proſpect of

PARAPHRASE.

and ſuffered very much together with me and *Clement*, and other my fellow-labourers, whoſe names

TEXT.

thoſe women which laboured with me in the goſpel, with Clement alſo,

NOTES.

ſome ſervice ſhe might be able to do among the *Philippians*, and, perhaps, among thoſe women in particular who are here mentioned, he had ſent her to them.

It ſeems probable to me, that St. *Paul* was married before his converſion to Chriſtianity. He was then a great zealot for the *Moſaick* law, and the traditions of the elders. Now according to their traditions, a man was under the command of marrying from his being ſixteen or ſeventeen years old: but if he was paſt twenty, and had not married, he was reckon'd to have violated an affirmative precept. See *Lightfoot*, Vol. II. p. 757. And where nature concurs with a great zeal for ſuch a law, it can hardly be thought marriage would be neglected. It is true, there was one caſe wherein they diſpenſed with this obligation, and that was, if a man was ſtudious in the law, and feared marriage, leſt the care of providing for his wife ſhould prove a hindrance to him in ſtudying the law: but this plea was ſeldom uſed among them; nor does St. *Paul* ever give the leaſt hint that his zeal for the ſtudy of the law had laid ſuch a reſtraint upon him, though it is highly probable that had it been true, he would, ſome where or other, have brought it in among the reaſons he might have alleged why he might more than others place a confidence in the fleſh, or in a regard to the law of *Moſes*. It does not therefore ſeem probable to me, that, contrary to the cuſtom and law of his country, he lived unmarried, till he was thirty years old; and younger than that he can't well be ſuppoſed at his converſion: for in writing to *Philemon*, about the year 62 or 63, he ſtiles himſelf *Paul the aged*, *v.* 9. and men don't uſe to ſpeak of themſelves in that manner before they are ſixty, and the martyrdom of *Stephen* was but about thirty years before; ſo that he could not well be leſs than about thirty years old at his converſion. But whether he was now a widower, I will not determine.

The antiquity of this interpretation may be an apology for my ſaying ſo much concerning it. *Clemens Alex.* ſays expreſly, that St. *Paul*, in one of his epiſtles (referring without doubt to this place) does not ſtick to beſpeak his wife, *Strom.* Lib. III. p. 448. cited alſo by *Euſeb.* H. E. Lib. III. c. 30. It muſt be own'd, that they who embrace this interpretation, muſt have a recourſe to an *Atticiſm*, putting γνήσιε for γνησία; which, whether 'tis to be ſuppoſed in the apoſtle's ſtile, may be doubted.

'Tis but reaſonable I ſhould now offer the reader the beſt interpretation of the words, upon the contrary ſuppoſition. This *true yoke-fellow* then may be underſtood of the husband of one of the two women before mentioned. And as the apoſtle addreſſes to each of thoſe women ſeparately to agree in their ſentiments, it may be thought they had had ſome difference, which is no ſtrange thing. And who ſo proper to reconcile them, and ſet them right, as one of their husbands? The advice he here gives theſe women, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, is the ſame he gives the *Philippians* in general, *chap.* ii. 2. where he oppoſes it to doing things, κατ' ἐριθείαν, v. 3. and taking it thus here, it will favour this account. Or ſhould σύζυγε here intimate ſome perſon whom the apoſtle choſe more particularly to call his *companion* or *partner*, as the word ſometimes ſignifies; the prudence and authority of ſuch a man might be very proper in the caſe. The ancient *Greek* commentators thought this was the husband or brother of one of thoſe women. Or again, when he ſo earneſtly recommends to theſe women τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, he may be thought not to reſpect unanimity with each other, but with the reſt of the church, in oppoſition to the *Judaizers*, who, perhaps, had been tampering with them (as they are elſewhere repreſented to have taken ſuch methods) and might have had ſome influence upon them. And they being women of note and reputation, as may be gathered from the following part of the

Chap. IV.

TEXT.

and with other my fellow-labourers, whose names *are* 4 in the book of life. Rejoice in the Lord alway: *and* again I say, Rejoice.

PARAPHRASE.

names are in the book of life *(f)*. And tho' you *Philippians* in general have many adversaries; who may still procure you trouble and suffering; yet I exhort you all not to be discouraged thereby; 4.

NOTES.

verse, he might be particularly desirous to have them set right. St. *Paul* may seem to touch this matter very tenderly: but by the word *συλλαμβάνε*, which follows with a dative case, 'tis plain he thought they wanted assistance or advice. And in either of the cases above mentioned, it may be thought that a grave, prudent man, and probably too an officer of the church, would be fitter for this province, than a woman.

(f) *Ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς. Whose names are in the book of life.*] The allusion is to the registers which are kept of things or persons in books for that purpose: and the design of a book's being attributed to God, is to set forth the certain and exact care which God takes of his obedient and faithful servants, and that he will infallibly remember and reward them. I think the expression may well be illustrated from *Mal.* iii. 16, 17. *Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another, and the Lord hearken'd and heard it, and a* book of remembrance was written *before him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels*: or as, I think, the LXX have better render'd it: *And they shall be to me, saith the Lord of hosts, for a peculiar treasure, against* (that is, *in*) *the day which I make*, (that is, *appoint.*) From which place we learn two things very much to our present purpose. 1. Who they are whom God registers in his book, even such as fear him, and think upon his name. 2. The end of his registring them, that he may reward them in the day of account. And so when St. *Paul* here says of his fellow-labourers, that their names were in the book of life, he means that he was verily persuaded they were good men, and such as God would reward with everlasting life in the other world. I don't suppose that he pretended to have any special revelation from God concerning their future state in particular; but that he herein declared the judgment which he had formed of them, from the observation he had made of their conduct. When this book is called the *book of life*, as it is frequently in the *Revelation*, as well as here, by *life* we are to understand *eternal life*; and so to have their names in the book of life, is the same thing with being such as shall receive the reward of the heavenly and eternal life; and thus it is equivalent to the having their *names written in heaven*, Luke x. 20. or *their being written in heaven*, Heb. xii. 23. that is, they are inrolled there as persons who shall be admitted to the happiness thereof. 'Tis likely, that against the interpreting this passage of St. *Paul* from that of the prophet *Malachi*, two things will be objected. 1. It may be said that the *book of remembrance* there spoken of, was written upon mens fearing the Lord; whereas the book of life was written from the foundation of the world, *Rev.* xiii. 8. *And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him*, [the beast] *whose names are not written in the book of life, of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.* But as I think they mistake, who suppose Christ is here said to be slain from the foundation of the world, so the true sense of the place I take to be this, *All shall worship him whose names are not written in the slain Lamb's book of life, which book was written from the foundation of the world*: I suppose τῇ γεγραμμένῃ is to be understood, though not expressed, after βίβλῳ ζωῆς. And thus this book is consider'd as a register kept from the beginning of the world, wherein good men, and the heirs of salvation, have from time to time been inrolled; which perfectly agrees with the words of *Malachi*. 2. It may be objected, that this book of life is that according to which men shall be judged, and that *whosoever shall not be found written in the book of life, shall*

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

thereby, but rejoice always in the Lord *(g)*, I will ſay it again (†), Rejoice in theſe things.
5. And however you ſuffer, let your moderation and gentleneſs be conſpicuous to all men, and particularly to thoſe at whoſe hands you ſuffer: and for this you have good reaſon, becauſe the Lord is at hand, and will ſpeedily do you right,
6. and puniſh your adverſaries *(b)*. In the mean time, whatever your danger or wants may be, don't diſtract your ſelves with an anxious care about them: but in every thing, by prayer and ſuppli-

TEXT.

Let your moderation be known unto all men: The Lord *is* at hand. Be careful for nothing; but in every thing, by prayer and ſupplication with thankſgiving, let your requeſts be made known unto God.

NOTES.

ſhall be caſt into the lake of fire, Rev. xx. 15. and therefore it may be thought likely that this book of life ſhould be of another nature. But to that I anſwer, That hereby is ſignified the exactneſs of God's care of all good men, and that he is therefore repreſented as regiſtring *every one* of them in his book of life, ſo that whoever is not found written therein, was not a good man, or one that feared the Lord, and ſo muſt be caſt into the lake of fire. Beſides, when 'tis ſaid, *the books* were *opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of thoſe things which were written in the books*; it is expreſly added, *according to their works*, Rev. xx. 12. If it be inquired, Why is this *book of life* ſaid to be *the Lamb's* in ſo many places in the *Revelations*, ſince, according to *Malachi* and *Exod.* xxxii. 32. it ſhould rather be ſuppoſed to be God the Father's? I think the anſwer is eaſy; *God has committed all judgment to the Son*, John v. 20. and ſo muſt be underſtood together therewith to commit to him the books out of which all men ſhall be judged, and of theſe books, the book of life is one, *Rev.* xx. 12.

4 (*g*) Χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ πάντοτε. *Rejoice in the Lord alway.*] Though the word Χαίρειν is ſometimes uſed by way of ſalutation in the New Teſtament, as *James* i. 1. 2 *Cor.* xiii. 11. yet it is more commonly uſed by St. *Paul* in that ſenſe, in which our tranſlators have here taken it for *rejoicing*. And both the repetition of it, and the addition of *in the Lord*, ſeem to determine it to that ſenſe in which he had uſed it before, *chap.* ii. 18. iii. 1. as an advice. Compare 1 *Theſſ.* v. 16. where, I think, his Χαίρετε πάντοτε is well render'd as an advice, *Rejoice ever more*. And, in the advice he here gives, he ſeems to have a reſpect to the ſuffering condition, in which it appears by other paſſages of the epiſtle he conſider'd them. This is confirm'd by the ſtrain of his advice in the three next *verſes*.

(†) Πάλιν ἐρῶ. *And again I ſay.*] The Paraphraſe follows *Caſtellio*'s rendering, *Iterum dicam*, which is certainly more agreeable to the *Greek* than our own.

5 (*b*) Both the parts of this *verſe* ſhow, that he conſiders them in a ſtate of perſecution. *Gentleneſs* or *meekneſs*, (which is the import of τὸ ἐπιεικὲς) was peculiarly ſuited hereto; and the *Lord's being at hand* was a proper motive to excite them to bear their ſufferings with ſuch temper. And as the adverſaries againſt whom, at leaſt principally, he incourages them, were the *Jews*, or *Judaizing* converts, the *Lord's being at hand*, may well enough be interpreted of the overthrow which the Lord would ſuddenly bring upon the *Jews*, which, by the deſtruction of the temple, and the aboliſhing of the greateſt part of the *Jewiſh* ſervice, would, in a manner, put an end to their conteſt, as well as be a ſignal vengeance taken on the moſt virulent enemies of the Chriſtian cauſe.

6 (*i*) *With*

TEXT.

7 And the peace of God, which paſſeth all underſtanding, ſhall keep your hearts and minds through 8 Chriſt Jeſus. Finally, brethren, whatſoever things are true, whatſoever things are honeſt, whatſoever things are juſt, whatſoever things are pure, whatſoever things are lovely, whatſoever things are of good report: if *there be* any virtue, and if *there be* any

PARAPHRASE.

ſupplication with thankſgiving *(i)*, commend your requeſts to God. And then you will find 7.
that a ſenſe of the great advantage of having peace with God *(k)*, thro' Jeſus Chriſt, which is, indeed, an advantage that exceeds all our underſtanding and comprehenſion, will guard your hearts and thoughts againſt all impreſſions of diffidence and deſpondency. To ſum up all, 8.
brethren, whatſoever things are true and ſincere, whatſoever things are venerable and comely, whatſoever things are juſt and righteous between man and man, whatſoever things are pure and chaſt, whatſoever things are lovely and friendly, whatſoever things are of good report, and generally commended; if there be any

NOTES.

6 (*i*) *With thankſgiving.*] When he directs them to join *thankſgiving* with prayer and ſupplication in their ſuffering condition, he ſeems to have that deſign which has been before taken notice of, even to divert them from the moſt frightful view of perſecution, and to put them in mind, as he does, *chap.* i. 29, 30. that their being called hereunto was a gracious vouchſafement, for which they ought to be thankful.

7 (*k*) *The peace of God*] This expreſſion is only found in this place and *Col.* iii. 15. as is obſerved in the Note upon that text. In both ſome underſtand it of that peace, or peaceable temper, which God has commanded; but it ſeems ſtill moſt eaſy and natural to me to underſtand it of that peace we have with God. St. *Paul* is here arming the *Philippians* againſt perſecution; nor could any thing be a greater ſupport to them under it, than the peace of God thus underſtood; for the ſenſe of it will make the heavieſt afflictions and preſſures ſit eaſy upon us. *Having peace with God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, we may well rejoice in hope of the glory of God, and glory in tribulations; nor will our hope make us aſhamed.* [It will be ſo far from it, that it will fill us with boldneſs and reſolution] *when the love of God* [that is, the ſenſe of his love, which is equivalent to the peace of God] *is ſhed abroad in our hearts*, Rom. v. 1, 2, 3, 5. I grant, a peaceable and quiet temper will be a ſupport and comfort to a man under his troubles, when he conſiders that he has done nothing to provoke men, and that their fury and wrath againſt him is without cauſe: but this is inconſiderable in compariſon of the ſupport we ſhall have from a ſenſe of God's favour, and his being at peace with us. And the commendation here given of the peace of God, that it *paſſeth all underſtanding*, ſeems to ſuit better with this ſenſe than the other. The ſame is, perhaps, confirm'd by that clauſe *through Jeſus Chriſt*, and that whether it be joined with the *peace of God*, or with the *keeping their hearts and minds*. Finally, the connection here may be thought to lead us to this ſenſe. They were under their troubles to caſt their care upon God by prayer and ſupplication with thankſgiving: and when they did ſo, the peace of God that paſſeth all underſtanding would keep their minds; that is, by guarding againſt diffidence and diſtruſt, and committing themſelves to, and relying upon the favour of God,

they

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

any virtue or praiſe that belongs to the Chriſtian inſtitution *(l)*, attend to theſe things.
9. The things you have both learned and received, and heard of me, and ſeen in me, theſe do: and ſo the God of peace ſhall be with you *(m)*.

TEXT.

praiſe, think on theſe things.
9 Thoſe things which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and ſeen in me, do: and the God of peace ſhall be with you.

NOTES.

they would be ſecure of his favour, the ſenſe of which would make them eaſy and happy. I own the other ſenſe of the peace of God might ſeem favoured if we ſhould go back to *v.* 5. for the connection: but that being more remote, the connection with *v.* 6. appears more natural.

8 (*l*) Εἴ τις ἀρετὴ, καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος. *If there be any virtue, and if there be any praiſe.*] In the Paraphraſe 'tis added, *That belongs to the Chriſtian inſtitution.* The *Clermont* copy reads here εἴ τις ἔπαινος ἐπιστήμης, *If there be any praiſe of knowledge*; inſtead of ἐπιστήμης, the *Valeſian* readings have παιδείας, with which the *Vulg. Latin* agrees, reading, *If there be any praiſe of diſcipline, diſciplinæ*; as does alſo the *Ethiopic*, and two ancient commentators mention'd by Dr. *Mills*. And, had the *Syriac* render'd this in the ſame manner, I ſhould have made no doubt that St. *Paul* here added one of thoſe words, and moſt probably παιδείας. But the Doctor was guilty of an overſight that is very unuſual in him, in joining the *Syriac* with the reſt: for thus is this clauſe there render'd, *Whatſoever are works of praiſe and honour*, &c. But ſuppoſing the common reading to be genuine, and that our tranſlation is exact, being agreeable thereto; yet, methinks, the next *verſe* naturally leads us to underſtand the apoſtle in this ſenſe.

9 (*m*) *The God of peace ſhall be with you.*] This title, *The God of peace*, is ſeveral times uſed by St. *Paul*, when he is diſcourſing concerning Chriſtians being peaceable, as very proper to incourage them to mind the things which make for peace: and it may be thought that this ſhould lead us to a different ſenſe from that before given of the *peace of God*, *v.* 7. But why may he not as well be called the *God of peace*, upon the account of his affording us peace with himſelf, as he is ſtiled the *God of all grace*, 1 Pet. v. 10. upon the account of all the favours he beſtows upon us? Nay, does he not ſeem to be ſtiled the God of peace for this ſame reaſon, *Heb.* xiii. 20. 1 *Theſſ.* v. 23? I think, therefore, we may well take *peace* in this ſenſe, both here and *v.* 7.

SECT.

SECT. VIII.

CHAP. iv. 10——23.

CONTENTS.

IN this *Section*, St. *Paul* expreſſes the ſatisfaction he had in the ſupply the *Philippians* had ſent, and declares the content and eaſe of his mind in every condition; and commending them for their liberality, he ſends them his good wiſhes, and, after ſome general ſalutations, concludes with his uſual benediction.

TEXT.

10 BUT I rejoiced in the Lord greatly, that now at the laſt your care of me hath flouriſhed again, wherein ye were alſo careful, but ye lacked oppor-
11 tunity. Not that I ſpeak in reſpect of want; for I have learned in whatſoever

PARAPHRASE.

BUT however I aſſure you of a bleſſed reward from God himſelf, when you do things worthy of your profeſſion; yet I would not have you think that I am inſenſible of your kindneſs. I my ſelf rejoiced in the Lord greatly *(n)*, that now at the laſt you have revived your care for me, as you were alſo careful before *(o)*, but were prevented *(p)*. I don't ſay that I rejoice in the revival of your care for me, on the account of my want, though it really required. 10 11

NOTES.

10 (*n*) *I rejoiced in the Lord greatly.*] He uſes a very skilful way here of commending the generoſity of his benefactors; wherein he ſignifies not only that they had done their duty, but that the Lord had favour'd them by ſtirring them up to it, and that they had given him occaſion of much thankfulneſs to the Lord: which ſhows his pious diſpoſition, who in ſuch things took ſpecial notice of the Lord's hand and kindneſs to him.

(*o*) Ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ ἐφρονεῖτε. *Wherein ye were alſo careful.*] The expreſſion is doubtful, and may ſignify, *For whom ye were alſo careful*; or elſe it may be taken in the ſenſe of our tranſlators, for ἐφ' ᾧ πράγματι ἐφρονεῖτε, *In which matter you* were careful: the Paraphraſe has accordingly left the ſenſe doubtful.

(*p*) Ἠκαιρεῖσθε δέ. *But ye lacked opportunity.*] Some think, with St. *Chryſoſtom*, he means, "You wanted an ability to ſupply me:" others, with our tranſlators, underſtand him, "Ye "wanted an opportunity of ſending me the ſupply you deſign'd me." Either of theſe ſenſes will perfectly ſuit his ſcope: but as we are not acquainted with the *Philippians* circumſtances at that time, it may not be eaſy to determine, barely from the word here uſed, which ſenſe agrees beſt with the matter of fact. It is therefore left doubtful by a general term in the Paraphraſe, though, I confeſs, I incline moſt to the former ſenſe upon the authority of *Chryſoſtom*, who ſays, this was the common way of expreſſing that caſe.

PARAPHRASE.

quired your assistance *(q)*. For I have learn'd to be content with the circumstances I am in,
12. whatever they are. I know how to be in a low condition, and I know how to be in a plentiful one: in every place, and among all men, am I instructed both to be full and to be hun-
13. gry, both to abound and to suffer want. Not that I assume this sufficiency to my self, but I attribute it to Christ, thro' whom strengthen-
14. ing me I can do all things. But my contentment in my circumstances does not at all lessen the commendableness of your behaviour, who have done well in commiserating and supplying
15. me in my affliction. Nor is this the only time wherein you *Philippians* have shown your affection to me: for you can't but remember, as well as I, that towards the beginning of my preaching the gospel among you *(r)*, when I designed to depart from *Macedonia (s)*, no church in your country, beside yours, contributed:

TEXT.

state I am, *therewith* to be content. I know both *how* to be abased, and I know *how* to abound: every where, and in all things I am instructed, both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. I can do all 13 things through Christ, which strengtheneth me. Not- 14 withstanding, ye have well done that ye did communicate with my affliction. Now, ye Philippians, know 15 also, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I de-

NOTES.

11 (q) Οὐχ ὅτι καθ' ὑστέρησιν λέγω. *Not that I speak in respect of want.*] I prefer the rendering of *Castellio*, "Neque propter inopiam dico:" *Nor do I speak upon the account of my want.* Nor is it uncommon for ὅτι thus used to be redundant. He had told them in the *verse* before, that he rejoiced greatly in the revival of their care for him; and here he prevents their mistaking the true cause of his joy.

15 (r) Ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. *In the beginning of the gospel.*] This can't be understood of the beginning of his preaching the gospel any where at all: for that he had done many years before he came to *Philippi*, or they had had an opportunity of showing their kindness to him: it must therefore be understood of his first preaching among the *Philippians*. Compare *chap.* i. 5.

(s) Ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας. *When I departed from* Macedonia.] The next *verse* shows that this should be render'd, *When I was departing from* Macedonia. *Thessalonica* was it self in *Macedonia*, and therefore he was not departed from *Macedonia*, when they sent to him in *Thessalonica*: but he was then about to leave that country, to preach the gospel elsewhere, and so needed assistance in order to it.

It may not be amiss to add here, that ὅτε ἐξῆλθον is put for ὅτε ἂν ἐξῆλθον, and that for ἂν ἐξέλθωμι. I don't find any have taken notice of this instance of ἂν omitted in the N. T. tho' they produce *Acts* xxv. 22. *Rom.* ix. 3.

(t) Οὐδεμία

TEXT.

parted from Macedonia, no church communicated with me, as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only. 16 For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity. 17 Not because I desire a gift; but I desire fruit that may abound to your account. 18 But I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of [Epaphroditus the things *which were sent* from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-

PARAPHRASE.

buted any thing to me *(t)*: and that even in *Thessalonica (u)* you sent once and again a supply to me. Nor do I mention all this, *(viz.* my present joy, your doing well in supplying me now, and the former instances of your kindness) because I am desirous of a gift from you now, or at any time for the sake of the gift it self. But what I desire on all such occasions is, that your religion may produce such good fruits as may turn to account to you, procuring God's blessing upon your worldly store, and may intitle you to a future reward *(w)*. But I have all that I want *(x)*, and I abound: I am full, having received of *Epaphroditus* the things which

16 17 18

NOTES.

(t) Οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνοι. *No church communicated with me, as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only.*] It seems not probable that St. *Paul* had here the thought which the *Greek* commentators suppose, their giving their carnal things, and receiving his spiritual things. I think he only speaks of giving and receiving carnal things, and his meaning is, "None communicated with me by giving on their "part, and by receiving on mine." Like a modest man, he speaks somewhat darkly of his receiving, it being irksom to one of so generous a spirit.

16 (u) *Even in* Thessalonica.] St. *Paul* has deservedly laid an emphasis on this; and 'tis as tho' he had said, "No church in *Macedonia* beside yours, communicated with me; no, not the "church of *Thessalonica*: nay, so far were they from it, that when I was among them, they let "me once and again be supplied by you." As this carries in it a reflection upon the *Thessalonians*, so it heightens the commendation given of the *Philippians*. 'Tis therefore a judicious remark of St. *Chrysostom* upon the place: "This is a great commendation of the *Philippians*, that "when he resided in the metropolis [*Thessalonica*] he should be supported by a little city [*Philippi*]." That St. *Paul* was maintained at *Thessalonica* by his own labour, and not their contributions, appears, 1 *Thess.* ii. 5, 6, 9. 2 *Thess.* iii. 7, 8, 9.

17 (w) *I desire fruit that may abound to your account.*] It may be asked, Was not this to desire a gift? I think not, but that he is thus to be understood, "I am only concern'd for you, "that you may bring forth such fruit as will turn to account to you; for I desire no gift for "my self for its own sake."

18 (x) Ἀπέχω δὲ πάντα. *But I have all.*] I think our translation is good, with which the *Vulg. Latin* agrees, *Habeo autem omnia.* And thus have we render'd the same word, *Matt.* vi. 2, 5. This seems preferable to the rendering of the *Syriac* and our marginal version, *I have received all*, because that is what he mentions afterwards. The sense therefore is, "I have all "that I want, and more than I want: and for this plentiful condition I am indebted to you, "having received from you what *Epaphroditus* brought me,"

 (y) Ὀσμὴν

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

which came from you, which are an odour of a ſweet ſmell, a ſacrifice acceptable and plea-
19. ſing to God *(y)*. But may my God gloriouſly ſupply *(z)* all your need, (according to his riches, or as he is abundantly able to do it)
20. through Jeſus Chriſt. Now to our God and Father *(a)* be glory for ever and ever. *Amen.*
21. Salute all the Chriſtians that are with you. The miniſters *(b)* who are with me ſalute you.
22. All the ſaints ſalute you, chiefly they who are
23. of *Ceſar*'s houſhold. The favour of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt be with you all. *Amen.*

TEXT.

pleaſing to God. But my 19
God ſhall ſupply all your need, according to his riches in glory by Chriſt Jeſus. Now unto God, and our 20
Father, *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen. Salute 21
every ſaint in Chriſt Jeſus. The brethren which are with me, greet you. All 22
the ſaints ſalute you, chiefly they that are of Cæſar's houſhold. The grace of 23
our Lord Jeſus Chriſt *be* with you all. Amen.

NOTES.

(y) Ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, θυσίαν δεκτὴν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ. *An odour of a ſweet ſmell, a ſacrifice acceptable, well-pleaſing to God.*] I think they are too nice, who here ſuppoſe the apoſtle alludes to two things, *viz.* the *odour of incenſe*, and the *ſacrifices*. Nothing is more common than to aſcribe the odour of a ſweet ſmell, ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, to the ſacrifices, *Gen.* viii. 21. *Exod.* xxix. 18, 25, 41. and I think perpetually elſewhere in the LXX; nor can I find ſo much as one place, where that phraſe is uſed concerning the ſweet incenſe. St. *Paul* therefore here compares their liberality to a ſacrifice only, the like compariſon being uſed *Heb.* xiii. 16. And 'tis thus he ſpeaks of the death of Chriſt, uſing both theſe expreſſions, though he has not the leaſt regard to the burning of incenſe, *Eph.* v. 2.

19 (z) Ὁ δὲ θεός μου πληρώσει. *But my God ſhall ſupply.*] This is to be underſtood in the nature of a wiſh, or as expreſſive of what was the matter of his prayer for them. The *Vulg. Latin*, and many ancient copies and ſeveral commentators read it in the optative mood, πληρώσαι, which ſeems to be the true reading. See *Mills* in loc.

Obſerve farther, he ſays not *our God*, but *my God*, becauſe he is ſpeaking of God's recompenſing to them the kindneſs they had ſhown him as his ſervant: it was therefore moſt proper to mention the relation God ſtood in to him, as that would ſecure his regard to thoſe who had done him good.

20 (a) Τῷ δὲ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ ἡμῶν. *Now unto God and our Father.*] The ἡμῶν, *our*, refers to both Θεῷ and Πατρὶ, *God* and *Father*; and therefore it ought to have been render'd as in the Paraphraſe.

21 (b) *The brethren.*] Theſe ſtand contradiſtinguiſhed to the ſaints, v. 22. and ſo muſt ſignify the *brethren in office*, or miniſters, as 'tis render'd in the Paraphraſe.

FINIS.

DISSERTATION I.

ON

GALATIANS IV. 21.—V. 1.

21: TELL *me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?*

22. *For it is written, that* Abraham *had two sons,* &c.

THIS passage has been always esteemed to be very obscure and difficult: nor have the most learned commentators, who have writen upon it, aimed at much more than the abating and lessening some of the difficulties, there being hardly any who pretend to give a full and clear account of the whole discourse. I hope I shall incur the milder censure with the reader who shall think I fail in the attempt, since so many great men have done so before me. Every man who is heartily persuaded of the truth of Christianity, should be concerned to do what he can to clear and defend the rule of it: and if my mite makes little or no addition to the treasury into which 'tis cast, yet my good-will may deserve some acceptance. I am the more inclined to make this essay, because I find the enemies of our holy religion think this passage gives them a brave handle to expose it, and to insult those who imbrace it; though, I think, the most they can pretend is, that St. *Paul*'s discourse has not hitherto been clearly understood by his friends or enemies, which can be no great wonder, since there are confessedly *some things in his epistles hard to be understood.* There is such an exactness and strength of reasoning which runs through his writings,

writings, that one would think modesty should teach men to suppose his argument may be good in a particular place, though they are not able to perceive it. We judge thus of other authors, who appear to write well: why then should the same equity be only denied to St. *Paul*, and the sacred writers? I am persuaded, that indifferent jūdges will not think the worse of such a reasoner as St. *Paul*, because his enemies speak evil of that in his writings, which they confess they do not understand. Particularly, I hardly think a late writer would at all have abated the strength of his reasoning, had he forborn to insult St. *Paul* for this discourse, in the fancied absurdity of which he seems to triumph, and therefore thus closes with it his collection of such passages as he thought would best serve his turn: "But," says he, *p.* 11. "most divine" [he speaks ironically, and means most weak and childish] "is St. *Paul*'s argument "in his epistle to the *Galatians*, to prove Christianity to the *Jews*" [he should have said, to the *Gentile* converts of *Galatia*] "from the "Old Testament. *Tell me*, says he, *ye that desire to be under the "law*, &c. setting down the whole passage at length.

BEFORE I give my interpretation of the place, it may not be amiss to observe the occasion of it. St. *Paul* then had been preaching among the *Galatians*, many of whom he had converted from *Gentilism* to Christianity, and formed into churches, which seemed at first to be very flourishing: but some of the *Jewish* converts had, after his departure, crept in among them, and sadly seduced them, having persuaded them to submit to circumcision, and the other ritual ordinances of the law of *Moses*, and so to corrupt Christianity by such a wretched mixture of *Judaism* with it. The design of the epistle in general is to convince them of their error, and to reclaim them, as the reader may easily see, if he consults what Mr. *Locke* has writen on this epistle. And 'tis evident, that the apostle pursues the same design in the argument he uses in this *Section*.

THE only thing wherein I apprehend Mr. *Locke* is defective, is, that he seems not to have cleared the sense and force of the apostle's argument in this place; and therefore, referring the reader to him for the rest, I shall only indeavour to supply that defect: and this I shall do by a Paraphrase, which I shall labour to clear and confirm by joining some Notes therewith.

TEXT

TEXT.

21 TELL me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the
22 law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons; the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free-wo-
23 man. But he *who was* of the bond-woman, was born after the flesh: but he of the free-woman *was*
24 by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants: the

PARAPHRASE.

TELL me you who would so fain be under the law, do you not acquaint your selves with what is in the law, either by reading *(a)* it, or having it read in your assemblies? For it is written there *(b)*, that *Abraham* had two sons, the one, *viz. Ishmael*, he had by *Hagar*, who was his servant or slave, and became his concubine or wife; the other, *viz. Isaac*, he had by *Sarah*, who was no slave, but free-born, and was *Abraham*'s proper wife. But *Ishmael*, who was born of *Hagar*, the bond woman, was born according to the ordinary course of nature, without any special promise made of his birth, or any extraordinary interposition of divine providence: but *Isaac*, who was born of the free-woman, *Sarah*, was born by virtue of a special promise, when *Abraham* and *Sarah*, according to the course of nature, were past all hopes of having any children. Which things are allegoriz'd *(c)* by the prophet *Isaiah*, whose words I shall

21

22

23

24

NOTES.

21 (*a*) Mr. *Locke*'s Paraphrase on this *verse* is here transcribed. He observes that the *Vulgar* has, after some *Greek* Manuscripts, *read*, instead of *hear*: and accordingly both readings are taken into the Paraphrase.

22 (*b*) *It is written.*] That is, *there*, in the law, *Genesis* xvi. 1, 15. and xxi. 1, 2. And therefore, as Mr. *Locke* observes, the term *law*, in the foregoing *verse*, must comprehend the five books of *Moses*.

Farther, we may hence learn, that when an history of the Old Testament is refer'd to in the New, in this manner, *It is written*, it is not absolutely necessary that the very words set down in the citation should be found exactly and formally in the place refer'd to; 'tis sufficient if the things that are mentioned were really there declared. Thus it is no where writen in the law, that *Abraham* had two sons in those very words: but the thing it self is plainly declared, when we have an account, in one place of the law, of the birth of *Ishmael*, and in another of the birth of *Isaac*. Nor is it unsual to refer to *Livy*, *Herodotus*, or any other historian in like manner, when we give a short account, in our own words, of a matter particularly, and, perhaps, largely related by them. By this instance therefore we may see, that St. *Paul* thought it a fair and just citation, if he gave the true sense, though he did not transcribe the very words of his author.

24 (*c*) Ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα. *Which things are an allegory.*] The mistaking the meaning of these words, has caused the great difficulty and obscurity which has perplexed expositors in

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

shall presently recite, (see *ver.* 27.) and whose applying them as he does may be very instructive to you. Now you are to observe, that in the prophet's allegorizing them, these two women, *Hagar* and *Sarah*, do signify the two covenants

TEXT.

one from mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For

NOTES.

giving an account of St. *Paul*'s argument: and therefore the more care is necessary in fixing the sense of them.

All the translations I have looked into agree with our own in making the history of *Abraham*'s sons to carry in it an allegory, and to be originally intended as such. The *Syriac* has thus render'd it, *These things are allegories of the two covenants*: the *Vulg. Latin*, *which things are spoken by an allegory*: Castellio, *which things signify somewhat else*: with whom *Beza* agrees, *By which somewhat else is represented*: The *Italian* version of *Diodati*, *which things contain an allegory*: the common *French* translation has, *which things must be understood allegorically*: and that of the *Mons* Testament, *All this is an allegory*: the *Low Dutch*, *which are things that have another meaning*. The *Arabic* and *Ethiopic* are not to the purpose.

An allegory is when one thing is said and another thing is intended, as *Quintilian* accounts for it, *Lib.* viii. *c.* 6. *Aliud verbis, aliud sensu ostendit.* And thus *Jotham*'s parable, *Judges* ix. 7. and many of our Saviour's discourses in the gospels are *allegories*. And in case the rendering of our *English* translators, or any of those but now mentioned, were right, the sense of St. *Paul*'s words must be this, "That when we read of these two sons of *Abraham*, one by a bond-woman, "and the other by a free-woman, we are not to suppose that the plain literal or historical mean-"ing was the only or chief thing intended: but we must remember, that there is another more "important sense which this history does mystically couch and contain in it; and that God "originally intended that hereby should be prefigured the two covenants." And thus Mr. *Locke* understood it, whose Paraphrase runs thus, "These things have an allegorical meaning, "for the two women are the two covenants."

Now I must own, that this sense seems very disagreeable to me: nor could I acquiesce in it, when I was not able to discover a better; but concluded that the place was not hitherto rightly understood. I will not deny, that where the things were, in their own nature and principal design, typical, it might well be supposed, that what was said of them might, without any strain or violence, be refer'd to the things which they typified. This seems to have been the nature and design of the sacrifices, and some of the ceremonies under the law: and thus particularly the paschal lamb was typical of *Christ our passover*, who was *sacrificed for us*, 1 Cor. v. 7. and therefore it seems not unreasonable to me to allow that what was said of it, that *a bone of it should not be broken*, *Exod.* xii. 46. *Num.* ix. 12. was to be fulfilled in Christ, which St. *John* (supposing *Psal.* xxxiv. 20. does not relate to Christ) has applied to him, making the *scripture to be fulfilled*, *A bone of him shall not be broken*, when Christ's legs were not broken, as were those of the two malefactors who were crucified with him, *John* xix. 36. But to make plain and historical narrations, such as that of the birth of *Ishmael* and *Isaac*, which neither in their own nature are typical, nor are in the least hinted in the history to be prophetical; I say, to make these to be allegories, that is, (in the most improper sense in which these expositors use the word) to be types; appears to me to be very hard. And though the modesty with which, I think, the holy scriptures ought to be treated, may hinder my saying that such interpretations are never to be allowed; yet, I think, we may safely say, we ought, for the sake of the enemies of our holy religion, to avoid as much as possible the giving the scriptures such a turn by

our interpretations; and nothing but the utmost neceſſity, if there be, as I hope there is not, any ſuch, ſhould ever ſuffer us to admit of that way of explaining any particular texts.

As to the paſſage under conſideration, which is, perhaps, the moſt plauſible of any that have been ever urged in behalf of ſuch kind of interpretations, I do not think the apoſtle in the leaſt deſigned to intimate, that theſe things were originally intended as an allegory, or, to ſpeak properly, as a type of the two covenants. I am ſatisfied that what we have render'd, *Which things are an allegory*, ought to be thus tranſlated, as it is in the Paraphraſe, *Which things are allegorized:* and his meaning is, that the prophet *Iſaiah*, whoſe words he cites, *v.* 27. has, from this hiſtory, borrowed the terms wherein he hath expreſs'd himſelf in a very fine and noble allegory. This rendering is moſt exactly grammatical, as our own is not: for ἀλληγορούμενα being a participle paſſive, it is very properly render'd *allegorized*, but very improperly *an allegory*. Now this alone ſets the apoſtle's diſcourſe in a quite different light, and offers nothing but what is familiar in all languages, and with all authors, *viz.* by way of allegory, to accommodate ancient and famous hiſtories to their own times, even when they were far from imagining that the things allegorized had the leaſt relation to, or were at all typical or prophetical of that to which they applied them. I may borrow an inſtance to my purpoſe from *Quintilian* in the place before cited, where he tells us it was a familiar allegory among the *Greeks*, to ſay, *Dionyſium Corinthi eſſe*, that *Dionyſius* is at *Corinth*; the meaning of which is, that a man is fallen from a ſtate of grandeur to a low and mean condition; and herein they allegorized the ſtory of *Dionyſius*, who having been a king in *Sicily*, and expelled thence for his tyranny, went to *Corinth*, and there, for a ſalary, taught ſchool; though no one can imagine, that they who uſed the allegory ſuppoſed that *Dionyſius*, or the change of his fortune, was a type of, or had any other relation, than that of reſemblance, to the perſon or circumſtances of him to whom they applied it. Thus when they ſaid a man had looſed, or cut the *Gordian* knot, they meant that he had conquered a great difficulty; or a man had daſh'd againſt *Scylla*, while he indeavour'd to avoid *Charybdis*, they meant, that by ſtriving to avoid one danger, he had fallen into another, without thinking the old ſtories were typical or prophetical of the events to which by an allegory they accommodated them. Thus it became a proverb among the *Jews*, *Is* Saul *alſo among the prophets?* 1 *Sam.* x. 11. xix. 24. to ſignify any thing ſudden, unuſual, and unexpected, when they had no thought that *Saul* was a type or prophetical figure of what happened.

It will not, I hope, be accounted improper, if I here add another famous inſtance of an ancient hiſtory allegorized, ſince it tends, unleſs I am much miſtaken, to clear the holy ſcriptures. We have a relation, *Gen.* xxx. 1, 2. of *Rachel*'s great trouble becauſe ſhe had no children, that is, becauſe at that time ſhe had never brought forth any. This is thus allegorized in the prophecy of *Jeremiah*, chap. xxxi. 15. *Thus ſaith the Lord, a voice was heard in* Ramah, *lamentation and bitter weeping:* Rachel *weeping for her children, refuſed to be comforted for her children, becauſe they were not.* Where the meaning is not, that *Rachel*'s having no children for a long time, was typical of the ſore deſtruction, which, at the *Babyloniſh* captivity, befel the poſterity of the children ſhe had afterwards: but, by an elegant figure, ſhe; that mourned becauſe ſhe had born no children, is introduced as bitterly bewailing the ſad ſlaughter that was made among the deſcendents from her, it being a much greater occaſion of grief to bring forth children for deſtruction, than not to have any at all. And as the prophet *Jeremiah* has turned that hiſtory of *Rachel*'s trouble to an allegory concerning the *Babyloniſh* captivity, ſo St. *Matthew*, borrowing the prophet's words, has turned it to an allegory concerning the ſlaughter of the infants at *Bethlehem*, chap. ii. 17, 18. *Then was fulfilled that which was ſpoken by* Jeremy *the prophet, ſaying,* [The expreſſion, *Then was fulfilled*, though it may be uſed concerning a proper prediction of any event, yet it does not certainly import that the words ſo cited were ſuch a prediction: for no more is neceſſarily implied in them, than that the event may be related in ſuch or ſuch a prophet's words; juſt as we ſay of a matter which happens, and may be expreſſed in a common proverb, *The old ſaying is fulfilled*; or, *the proverb is come to paſs*, tho' we ſuppoſe not that it was any prediction of what then happens] *in* Ramah *was a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning,* Rachel *weeping for her children* (ſlain by *Herod*) *and would not be comforted, becauſe they are not.* Now if the relation of *Rachel*'s ſorrow for want of children, *Gen.* xxx. 1, 2. be not purely

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

nants *(d)*; of the which covenants one is from mount

NOTES.

purely historical, but must be looked upon as typical and prophetical, because allegorically applied both by *Jeremiah* and St. *Matthew*, it is evident it must be typical or prophetical of two very distant events, that are already past, and may be, for ought we know, of two, or twenty more; nor can any one tell when it will be fully accomplished: Why may it not as well carry in it a prediction of what befel her posterity in the time of *Vespasian*, *Adrian*, &c.? I can't therefore but think, that the supposing every thing to be originally designed as an allegory, because it may be, or has been allegoriz'd, tends to great confusion, casts a blemish upon the sacred history, opens a door for wild enthusiasm, and tends to harden Infidels in their prejudices against Christianity. Upon the whole, I see no difficulty in allowing, that the history of *Hagar* and *Sarah* may be allegorized by the prophet *Isaiah*, without supposing that either he or St. *Paul*, who took it from him, imagined that it was prophetical of that matter to which it was allegorically accommodated: and indeed the allegorizing it seems to suppose it was not originally so intended. And certainly our translators, by rendering ἅ τινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα, *Which things are an allegory*, and understanding by that expression the history of *Sarah* and *Hagar*, have wrested the sense of the word ἀλληγορία, which is never used in such a signification by any *Greek* or *Latin* writer, except it may be those who have been led to it by their misunderstanding this passage. All allegories are tropical expressions, and nothing is allegorical any farther than it is tropical. Even *Quintilian* himself, who carries the notion of it the farthest of any body, soon after his definition before mentioned, where he says it may consist *sine translatione*, and gives an instance of it from *Virgil*; yet in that passage observes one trope, on which he makes the whole to depend, *Menalcas* for *Virgilius*. Though *Vossius* and others won't allow the expression to be allegorical, because there is not a continuation of tropes. No history therefore, or fact, related in proper terms, and designed to be understood so, can be an allegory, whatever respect it may have to something else; because an allegory is never to be understood literally, but only by way of accommodation and similitude. Besides, there is this difference between a type and an allegory; that the former respects something future, and the latter something past. Had therefore the history of *Abraham*'s two wives in *Genesis* been designed to point out something future, it would not have been an *allegory* there, but a *type*. This distinction between an *allegory* and a *type*, seems to me no small exception against the common explication of this passage. The learned *Vossius* appears very sensible of it, when he says: "Utitur ἀλληγορείας voce apostolus Paulus ad *Gal.* iv. 24. ubi duabus Abrahami uxoribus, Sara & Hagar ἀλληγορικῶς dicit significari Testamentum V. & N. Ait enim: Ἅ τινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα, &c. Sed hic καταχρηστικῶς allegoria pro typo accipitur, quia res veteris Testamenti mystice exponuntur, salva historiæ veritate. At rhetoribus ἀλληγορία nihil aliud est, quam modificatarum vocum continuatio." *Inst. Orat.* L. iv. c. 11. sect. 1. He would not allow this to be an allegory, but misunderstanding the apostle, was obliged to say he had misused the word.

One thing, I conceive, that has render'd the apostle's sense so obscure, is, that the words of *Isaiah* the prophet, wherein he has allegorized these matters, is set at such a distance from the assertion here, that they are allegorized: for the citation comes in at *v.* 27. but in this 24th *verse*, together with the 25th and 26th he gives the meaning of the prophet's allegory, and so prepares his readers for the understanding the words of the citation, which thereupon follow. If this Note seems tedious to the reader, 'tis hoped he will make allowance for the importance and necessary length of it, the sense of the whole *Section* appearing to me intirely to depend upon the true and exact stating of the meaning of these words.

(d) Αὗται γάρ εἰσιν αἱ δύο διαθῆκαι. *For these are the two covenants.*] 'Tis obscure in the *English*, what the word *these* refers to; and, I believe, most of our common readers understand it:

TEXT. *PARAPHRASE.*

25 this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to

mount *Sinai*, (it being there made with the children of *Israel)* and this covenant, like a bond-woman, only produceth slaves *(e)*, accordingly it is in the prophet's allegory signified by *Hagar*. (For that which is allegorized of, 25.
or concerning this *Hagar*, is mount *Sinai* in *Arabia) (f)* and in the allegory answers to the

NOTES.

it thus, that these things which are an allegory signify the two covenants: but the *Greek* determines the *these* to signify the bond-woman and the free-woman just before mentioned. These two covenants are, the one, that of peculiarity with the *Jews*, and the other, the Christian covenant made with all the world who submit to the *Messiah*. By these two covenants were formed two churches or societies, which are spoken of and resembled under these terms.

(e) Εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα. *Which gendereth to bondage.*] St. *Paul* here refers to what he had several times before asserted in this epistle, that to be under the *Mosaick* law was to be in a state of bondage, and consequently that the *Jews*, whose case that was, were in bondage, treated like *minors*, or persons under age, who, though heirs, yet have no power, nor differ from servants. Concerning which, the reader is refer'd to other parts of the epistle, and Mr. *Locke*'s Paraphrase and Notes.

25 (f) Τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ, Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ. *For this* Hagar *is mount* Sinai *in* Arabia.] This passage has been justly esteemed obscure, and has exercised the skill of the criticks. Our own translation is certainly wrong. Had St. *Paul* designed the sense therein expressed, he would probably have said, Ἡ γὰρ Ἄγαρ, but τὸ can by no means be thus joined with Ἄγαρ. Nor do I see how the τὸ can agree with ὄρος, as tho' the apostle had said, τὸ γὰρ ὄρος Ἄγαρ, Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν. For to what purpose can he be understood to mention *Hagar*'s being a mountain? Besides this, instead of solving one difficulty, really raises another; and has accordingly set some upon searching for a mountain that was, or might be called *Hagar*; tho' I apprehend their discoveries of this nature have been able to satisfy few beside themselves.

This passage has tried the skill of our great critick, Dr. *Bently*, who has given his judgment concerning it, *p.* 96. of his letter to Dr. *Mills*, published at the end of *Historia Chronica Joannis Malalæ.* His first conjecture is, that those words, Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ, *is mount* Sinai *in* Arabia, are not the apostle's, but were somebodies comment written in the margin, which afterwards (as it sometimes happens) crept into the text; them therefore he chooses to reject. This conjecture, he apprehends, is much countenanced by four MSS. mentioned by Dr. *Mills*, which tho' they retain the words, yet leave out the δὲ that follows συστοιχεῖ in the common reading, as it must be left out in case the other words are rejected. Then, upon the authority of the *Alexandrian* and other MSS. he supposes, that for τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ, should be read τὸ ᾗ Ἄγαρ, and for δουλεύει ᾗ, should be read δουλεύει γὰρ, and so the ᾗ and γὰρ have mutually changed their situation. Thus then the text will stand according to his conjecture hitherto, τὸ ᾗ Ἄγαρ συστοιχεῖ τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, δουλεύει γὰρ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς. And this so exceedingly pleased Dr. *Mills*, that he says, were it not for the unanimous agreement of the copies in the other reading, he should not doubt to pronounce it genuine. *Prolegom.* p. 137. But this reading being not every way agreeable; Dr. *B.* goes farther, and persuades himself that St. *Paul*'s writing was this, Τῇ ᾗ Ἄγαρ συστοιχεῖ ἡ νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, δουλεύει γὰρ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς, and that the inserting the supposed spurious clause was the occasion of changing τῇ into τὸ and

Chap. IV.

NOTES.

ἡ into τῇ, there being a manifeſt ſolœciſm otherwiſe in the conſtruction. I have given as ſhort an abſtract as I could of that learned writer's conjecture: but the peruſing the whole of what he ſays will be entertaining to the reader, who has any taſte of theſe things. He ſeems not much to have miſſed St. *Paul*'s ſenſe in general; nor would I be averſe to any change of the words that would clear the text, provided it reſted upon the authority of good MSS. and ſo ſhould be very willing that the moſt may be made of the different readings of ὃ and ᾧ. But ſo many alterations as are here made only upon conjecture, and without the concurrence of any one MS. ſeem to me hardly allowable: nor do I think the Doctor himſelf would abide by them, provided a good ſenſe could be put upon the words without them. Whether I have been able to diſcover ſuch a ſenſe, ſhall now be ſubmitted to the reader's judgment.

Thus then I render the two *verſes*: v. 24. *Which things are allegorized*: for theſe *women are the two covenants, the one from mount* Sinai, *which gendereth to bondage, which is* Hagar, v. 25. (*for what is allegorized concerning* Hagar, *is mount* Sinai *in* Arabia) *but ſhe anſwers to* Jeruſalem *that now is, for ſhe is in bondage with her children.* When St. *Paul* ſays, *which is* Hagar, his meaning is, that that covenant is ſet forth or ſignified by *Hagar*, that is, in *Iſaiah*'s diſcourſe: and this he illuſtrates in the paſſage I have included in a parentheſis, *For what is allegorized* (namely, by the prophet *Iſaiah*) *concerning* Hagar, *is mount* Sinai *in* Arabia; and his meaning is, that *Iſaiah*, when he brings in *Hagar* into his allegorical diſcourſe, muſt thereby point at mount *Sinai* in *Arabia*; there being no place beſide that any ways belonged or related to *Hagar*.

I will not deny that this ſenſe of the words would have been made clear and unavoidable, had the apoſtle ſaid, Τὸ γὰρ τῆς Ἁγαρ. But as we are to take things as we find them, the only queſtion is, whether the words will not bear this ſenſe, and whether we have not the like conſtruction elſewhere. I think, we meet with ſuch another, *Heb.* xii. 24. *Ye are come to the blood of ſprinkling, that ſpeaketh better things than that of* Abel. Αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ, κρείττονα, λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν Ἅβελ: or as *Grotius* ſays, the ancient *Greeks* and the *Syriac* interpreter read παρὰ τὸ Ἅβελ. And indeed *Oecumenius* and *Theophylact* both read παρὰ τὸ. Nor is it improbable that *Chryſoſtom*, whom they generally follow, did too: for however the editors have twice repreſented him as reading παρὰ τὸν, yet as he immediately ſubjoins in the laſt place, Τὸ γὰρ αἷμα τοῦ Ἅβελ ἐλάλησε, it ſhould ſeem likely that he wrote παρὰ τὸ. Concerning the *Syriac*, I doubt whether they read τὸ or τὸν; but this is certain, that if they read τὸν, they ſuppoſed it to agree with ῥαντισμὸν, and took Ἅβελ to be the genitive caſe: and in either reading the word *Abel* ſeems to be ſo underſtood, which makes this to be an exact parallel to that in the place under conſideration.

Farther, what he adds, after the parentheſis, is intended to ſhow that mount *Sinai* is not thus refer'd to upon the account of thoſe who afterwards poſſeſs'd it, but only upon the account of the covenant made there with *Iſrael*, and ſo it muſt in the prophet's allegory ſignify the preſent literal *Jeruſalem*, or the *Jews* who by rejecting the new covenant, continued ſtill under the old covenant, made at mount *Sinai*, and ſo might be conſider'd, as it were, as generated from thence. And farther, this *Hagar* fitly repreſents *Jeruſalem*, or the *Jews*: for as ſhe was a bond-woman, and her children followed the caſe of their mother, and were not treated by *Abraham* as free-born, and made heirs of what he had, ſo *Jeruſalem*, or the natural *Jews*, generated from mount *Sinai*, were not heirs of the new covenant, and the great bleſſings promiſed to *Abraham* and his ſpiritual ſeed; but continued ſtill in a ſtate of bondage under the law given at mount *Sinai*.

This account ſeems to me natural, unforced, and eaſy: but before I proceed I would take notice of two things.

1. That ſuppoſing it ſhould be thought harſh for want of a pronoun to take δουλεύει ὅ, (or rather δουλεύει ᾧ, which ſeems to Dr. *Bently* the truer reading, having the authority of ſeveral of the beſt MSS.) as ſpoken of *Jeruſalem*, (though, I believe, inſtances may be given of the like conſtruction) yet this will make no alteration of the ſenſe: for if we join this with *Hagar*, and underſtand him thus, *For* Hagar *is in bondage with her children*, it comes really to the ſame thing, *Hagar* then being conſider'd as the allegorical mother of the *Jews*.

2. The

NOTES.

2. The other thing I would here take notice of, is the reason why the prophet *Isaiah*, and from him St. *Paul*, represent mount *Sinai* by *Hagar*: and when a good account is given of this, I hope, the whole discourse of the apostle, so far, will be clear and easy. This has much exercised and puzzled expositors, who have laboured to very little purpose, beside that of diverting themselves, to discover some footsteps of this name's being given to mount *Sinai*, or some place in its neighbourhood, from whence it might possibly receive its denomination, and be called *Hagar*. This has appeared the more strange to many, because *Hagar* was not of that country, but an *Egyptian*, as we are assured, *Gen.* xvi. 1. The solution of this difficulty seems to me easy. *Hagar*, however she was her self an *Egyptian*, was the mother of *Ishmael*, who, with his posterity, settled in *Arabia*, and particularly in the wilderness of *Paran*, Gen. xxi. 21. which was very near mount *Sinai*: whence the country of her posterity, and mount *Sinai*, as a part of it, is denominated from her; even as her posterity have in scripture their name from her, and are called *Hagarites*. Thus they are certainly called, 1 *Chron.* v. 19, 20. *And they made war with the* Hagarites, *with* Jetur, *and* Nephish, *and* Nodab. *And they were helped against them, and the* Hagarites *were delivered into their hand.* These *Hagarites* were *Ishmaelites*, as appears by the mention of *Jetur* and *Naphish* (for so it should be written, as it always is in the *Hebrew*, and 'tis strange our translators should here write it *Nephish*) which were the sons of *Ishmael*, 1 *Chron.* i. 31. *Gen.* xxv. 15. Our translators have in like manner understood *Psal.* lxxxiii. 6. calling them *Hagarens*: but as the *Ishmaelites* are there distinctly mentioned, and the word may admit a different sense, it not being the same as in the *Chronicles*, I do not insist on it.

Farther, it should not seem strange, that when St. *Paul* makes this *Hagar* to signify a place or country, he should nevertheless represent it as having children: for this is familiar in the stile of the holy scriptures, which set forth the place where men are born, or from whence they spring, as their mother. To give some instances of this nature: *Sion* is represented as a woman, *Lam.* i. 4, 5, 17. nay, as a woman travailing and bringing forth children, *Isai.* lxvi. 8. and accordingly we read of the children of *Sion*, *Psal.* cxlix. 2. *Joel* ii. 23. and of the sons of *Sion*, *Lam.* iv. 2. and of the daughters of *Sion*, *Isai.* iii. 16, 17. and iv. 4. and thus our Saviour calls the women, who bewailed and lamented him, daughters of *Jerusalem*, *Luke* xxiii. 28. Thus *Ezekiel* speaks of *Sodom* and her daughters, and of *Samaria* and her daughters, see *chap.* xvi. 44—55. Thus because man is made of the earth, *Job* speaks of that as his mother, *chap.* i. 21. *Naked came I out of my* mother's *womb, and naked shall I return thither*, that is, to my mother's womb, to the earth: which language was familiar with the Heathens also. I shall mention one instance more; but that is, I think, home to my purpose. *Rachel*, both by the prophet *Jeremiah*, and by St. *Matthew*, in the places before refer'd to, is brought in as weeping for her children. This cannot be meant literally of *Rachel*, who, being dead so many ages before the events spoken of, could not be affected with them: but as *Hagar* is put for the country after her time possessed by her posterity, not for *Egypt* her native country; just so is *Rachel* put allegorically not for the place of her birth (for she was a *Syrian*) but for the country where her posterity settled; and the country's lamentation for the loss of its inhabitants, is set forth by *Rachel's* weeping for her children.

If any one should object against what has been said, that the apostle first speaks of *Hagar* as a woman, and then as a country or mountain; he may easily perceive the answer, that there can be no difficulty in this, when he gives such express notice that in the latter case he speaks allegorically. Though, indeed, if he had given no such notice at all, he might have been justified by examples taken from the old prophets, wherein they speak of as widely different things under the same name, without any warning given but what the nature of the things themselves does carry in it. Nothing can be plainer than this in *Hos.* xii. 2, 3. *The Lord also hath a controversy with* Judah, *and will punish* JACOB, *according to his doings will he recompence him. He took his brother by the heel in* the *womb, and by his strength he had power with God.* Where *Jacob*, in the former *verse*, is the people descended from *Jacob*, the *Israelites*: but, in the latter *verse*, the *he*, which plainly refers to *Jacob*, is put for the proper or literal *Jacob*, and not for the people.

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

the present literal *Jerusalem*, for she is in bon-
26. dage with her children: but the spiritual or hea-
venly *Jerusalem (g)* is signified in the prophet's
allegory by *Sarah*, the free-woman *(h)*; and
this *Jerusalem* is the mother of us *Gentiles* who
27. believe in Christ *(i)*. For to this purpose are the
words

TEXT.

Jerusalem which now is,
and is in bondage with
her children. But Jerusa-
lem, which is above, is free,
which is the mother of us
all. For it is written, Re-

NOTES.

26 (g) Ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ. *But* Jerusalem *which is above.*] 'Tis manifest that this is spoken in opposition to *Jerusalem* mentioned before, *the* Jerusalem *that now is*, that is, the earthly *Jerusalem*, that church or society that was formed by the covenant from mount *Sinai*: and so it must mean the Christian church, which was of a more noble and excellent nature, being from above, and being heavenly; to which that passage does well agree, *Heb.* xii. 18, 22. *Ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire (i. e.* mount *Sinai)* nor unto *blackness, and darkness, and tempest*, &c.—*But ye are come to mount* Sion, *and unto the city of the living God, the* HEAVENLY *Jerusalem*, &c. With which may be compared *Rev.* iii. 12. xxi. 2, 10. And as the two women in the prophet's allegory are the two covenants, and *Hagar* is put for the first at mount *Sinai*, by which the *Jewish* church was formed, so the other must signify the new covenant, by which the Christian church was formed.

(*h*) Ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν. *Is free.*] This rendering spoils St. *Paul's* discourse: for then he has only told us who is meant by *Hagar*, but not who is meant by *Sarah*, which is such an omission as 'tis not easy to suppose he would be guilty of, especially in so nice a discourse as this is: and therefore 'tis necessary the passage should be thus render'd, *But the* Jerusalem *above is the free-woman*, that is, she is meant by *Sarah*. This is very obvious, and has accordingly been observed by Dr. *Whitby*, Dr. *Mills*, &c. and the last *verse* of the *chapter* does farther confirm it, where he draws a conclusion from what he says in this *verse*; *So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free-woman.*

(*i*) Ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν. *Who is the mother of us all.*] Mr. *Locke*, in his Paraphrase, explains it thus, "The mother of us all, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, who believe." Tho' the thing it self be unquestionably a truth; yet I cannot but acquiesce in Dr. *Mills*'s judgment, who, upon the credit of good MSS. of ancient versions, as particularly the *Syriac* and *Vulg. Latin*, and of ancient writers and commentators, is for leaving out the πάντων, and accordingly I have left it out in the Paraphrase: and indeed the discourse seems to me best when it is omitted: for as the apostle is applying himself wholly to converts from among the *Gentiles*, so the prophet *Isaiah*, in the passage refer'd to, and next set down, speaks, at least chiefly, of the calling of the *Gentiles*: it therefore seems most pertinent to his design to assert strongly that the *Jerusalem* above was the mother of the *Gentiles* who believed, which was the thing in question; the other matter, that she was the mother of the believing *Jews*, being on all hands allowed, and acknowledged. And 'tis evident his discourse, after he had cited the words of the prophet, goes on in this strain, the *five*, *v.* 28, 31. and the *six*, *chap.* v. 1. manifestly signifying the *Gentiles* only. The learned and judicious Doctor supposes that the πάντων was at first some person's marginal comment, designed to explain the sense of St. *Paul*, and that thence it crept into the text in those copies which read it. If this be allowed, as it seems probable (for I am not positive in the matter) it may not, perhaps, be unlikely that he that first made that comment, took it from St. *Paul*'s words, *Rom.* iv. 16. where, speaking of *Abraham*, he says, *Who is the father of us* ALL, meaning plainly both *Jews* and *Gentiles*. But I can hardly think that passage can be pleaded to justify the copies

TEXT.

joice thou barren that bear-eſt not; break forth and cry, thou that travaileſt not: for the deſolate hath many more children than the which hath an husband.

PARAPHRASE.

words of the prophet *Iſaiah*, whoſe allegory, what I have now ſaid, is deſigned to clear and explain to you, *chap.* liv. 1. Rejoice thou *Sarah*, who hadſt been barren all that part of thy life wherein alone women uſe to be fruitful, break out into loud acclamations of joy, thou who never, till thou was paſt age, hadſt any travailing pains: for more numerous are the children of *Sarah* who was deſolate and paſt hope, than of *Hagar*, who became *Abraham*'s wife, and bare him a ſon when he was, according to the courſe

NOTES.

that read *all* here in this place in the *Galatians*, becauſe the apoſtle's argument there led him to ſpeak in that manner, as it ſeems not to do here.

It may not be amiſs farther to obſerve concerning this expreſſion, wherein *Sarah* is ſpoken of as the mother of the believing *Gentiles*, that it is very agreeable to other places of ſcripture, which repreſents all the children of God as the children of *Abraham*, and particularly as *Abraham*'s children by *Sarah*. The *Jews*, in our Saviour's time, ſeem to have been ſenſible of this: whence, in their diſcourſe with him, they pleaded that *Abraham* was their father, *John* viii. 39. and that God was their father, v. 41. *We have one father, even God.* Theſe expreſſions ſeem to have been equivalent with them, as they counted themſelves to be certainly the children of God by virtue of their deſcent from *Abraham*, and judged all who were not ſo deſcended to be excluded from this privilege. But then they ſaw there was a neceſſity of ſome limitation, ſince they would never allow the *Iſhmaelites* to be the children of God, tho' they equally with themſelves were the poſterity of *Abraham*; and therefore they plead in effect that they were the children of *Abraham*, by *Sarah*, and not by *Hagar*. This, I think, is their meaning, when they ſay there, *We are not born of fornication*; *we have one father, even God.* So that they really confined the privilege of being the children of God to ſuch as were the children of *Abraham* by *Sarah*. Their miſtake was, that they only conſider'd a fleſhly and natural deſcent from *Abraham*, and regarded not the only thing that was abſolutely neceſſary, that men muſt be the children of *Abraham* by believing. Excepting this miſtake, St. *Paul* plainly goes upon the ſame principles, not only here in the *Galatians*, but likewiſe *Rom.* ix. 7—9. *Neither becauſe they are the ſeed of* Abraham, *are they all children* (for then the *Iſhmaelites* muſt have been ſo too) *but in* Iſaac *ſhall thy ſeed be called. That is, They which are the children of the fleſh, theſe are not the children of God.* (By which it appears that with St. *Paul*, as well as the *Jews*, the children of *Abraham* are the ſame as the children of God) *but the children of the promiſe are counted for the ſeed. For this is the word of promiſe, At this time will I come, and* Sarah *ſhall have a ſon.* That is, they are counted *Abraham*'s ſeed, and ſo the children of God, concerning whom the promiſe is made, as it is concerning all believers among the *Gentiles*, as well as *Jews*. Theſe are his children, not according to the fleſh; but are born to him, as *Iſaac* was, according to the promiſe made of his having a ſon by *Sarah*. The reader eaſily ſees how well this accords with his diſcourſe here to the *Galatians*. I can't but add here a paſſage from St. *Peter*, whoſe epiſtle (as Dr. *Whitby* has proved in his preface to it) being directed to the *Gentile* converts to Chriſtianity, makes it the more to my purpoſe. He thus urges the wives among them to be in ſub-

jection

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

course of nature capable of generating *(k)*.
28. Thus you see how *Isaiah* has allegorized these things, and represented the spiritual seed of *Abraham*, that was by promise, as more numerous than that which was in a course of nature. And now that I may farther pursue his allegory, and bring the matter home to our own case, we are to remember, my brethren, that we *Gentiles* are

TEXT.

Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of

NOTES.

jection to their own husbands from the example of *Sarah*, 1 Pet. iii. 6. *Even as* Sarah *obeyed* Abraham, *calling him lord, whose daughters ye are as long as ye do well.* By which it appears he reckoned the Christian *Gentiles*, the children of *Sarah*, as well as of *Abraham*, as the *Ethiopick* version joins them together, reading here ὧν for ἧς: but it is therein singular: and therefore I do not mention it as though I made the least doubt of the common reading.

27 (*k*) The words cited by St. *Paul*, are to be met with *Isai.* liv. 1. Nor do I apprehend that more is necessary to show how just and pertinent the citation is, than these two things. 1. To prove that *Isaiah* in this passage does allegorize the history of *Sarah* and *Hagar*, as St. *Paul* asserts. 2. To allege the reasons why we should judge, that the prophet's allegorical discourse concerning these two women, is to be understood as pointing to the two covenants. If these two things can be well cleared, the argument here used by the apostle must appear strong and convincing to the persons to whom it is alleged. For as he does not argue from the history of these women as delivered in the law, but from the prophet's allegorizing it, the *Galatians* must be satisfied in the prophet's testimony; nor could the *Jews*, who were indeavouring to pervert them, have any thing to say against it, since they believed *Isaiah* to be a prophet, and received his writings as inspired: and unless we allow his argument here to be good, we must condemn all the appeals that are made in the New Testament, to the testimonies of any of the prophets, I mean of the prophets consider'd as contradistinguished to the law, *Luke* xvi. 16, 29. I shall therefore indeavour to clear both the fore-mentioned things. And,

1. It seems plain, tho' *Sarah* and *Hagar* are not expressly named by the prophet, that yet they are the women allegorized by him in this passage. That such allegorical accommodations of ancient histories are agreeable to the prophetic stile, I think cannot be doubted. I have before had occasion to mention one, *viz.* that of *Rachel* in *Jeremiah*: and there seem to be many in the prophet *Isaiah*. One is very plain in the beginning of his prophecy, *chap.* i. 10. *Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of* SODOM, *give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of* GOMORRAH. Now as this is agreeable to the stile of the prophets, and here appears to be some allegorical accommodation, I think *Sarah* and *Hagar* are the only women who can be meant in the prophet's description. 'Tis true, we meet with instances of women who, in some things, resemble these: but to none except these will all the things here mentioned agree. Thus while *Peninnah* had children, *Hannah* continued a considerable time barren, but afterwards had *Samuel* and other children: and thus she expresses herself in her song, 1 *Sam.* ii. 5. *The barren hath brought forth seven, and she that had many children is waxed feeble.* But 'tis not easy to imagine, that this can be alluded to by the prophet. For if it is, the discourse must either relate to some event about the time of *Isaiah*, or else to that to which St. *Paul* applies it. But to what event in *Isaiah*'s time, or soon after, can we apply it? We know very little either of *Hannah*, or of *Peninnah*'s posterity: nor have we the least hint in the scripture of any distinc-

tion

NOTES.

ction made by the providence of God, with reference to theſe two: only it may be obſerved that however good a man *Hannah*'s ſon *Samuel* was, yet his ſons were far from being like him; and there is no likelihood that their poſterity were any better than their neighbours, or that any ſpecial bleſſing attended them above others at the return from the *Babyloniſh* captivity. On the other hand, ſuppoſing men to apply this to the ſame event St. *Paul* does, the calling of the *Gentiles*, it will be a ſtrange ſpirit of perverſeneſs and contradiction in them to pretend that the *Gentiles* ſhould rather be repreſented as the children of *Hannah*, than of *Sarah*, there being ſo much foundation for the latter, but none at all for the former.

Again, *Rachel* was a long time barren, while *Leah* was fruitful: but then what *Iſaiah* ſays was not literally true of them in his time, or any time ſince. The poſterity of *Leah* were always much more numerous, than thoſe of *Rachel*. *Reuben*, *Simeon*, *Levi*, *Judah*, *Iſſachar*, and *Zebulon*, were all the ſons of *Leah*; and the tribe of *Judah* alone was at leaſt near equal to all *Iſrael*: and if to *Judah* we add the other tribes deſcended from *Leah*, ſubducting them from *Iſrael*; the children of *Rachel*, that is, *Ephraim*, *Manaſſeh*, and *Benjamin* can never be ſuppoſed comparable in number to the children of *Leah*. Nor did any thing happen ſoon after *Iſaiah*'s time that ſhould give occaſion for a contrary account. *Ephraim* and *Manaſſeh* were carried into their long captivity before the prophet's death, from which they never yet returned; and ſhould it be ſuppoſed, that ſome of them might return with the *Jews* at the releaſe granted by *Cyrus*; yet they muſt have been comparatively very few, and far from being more numerous than the children or poſterity of *Leah*. So that, I think, there are no other two women whom the prophet can be thought to allegorize, but *Sarah* and *Hagar*. And, indeed, his allegory is very fine, when thus underſtood of them: *Rejoice thou barren that beareſt not; break forth and cry thou that travaileſt not:* q. d. "How earneſtly deſirous was *Sarah* of being a mother? and "how did ſhe laugh, rejoice, and triumph when at laſt ſhe had a ſon in her old age, after ſhe had "been barren thro' all that part of her life, wherein only ſhe could reaſonably have any hope "or expectation of having children? (ſee *Gen.* xxi. 6, 7.) but behold, here is an occaſion for "a much more abundant joy and triumph, when ſhe is become the mother of ſo vaſt a poſte-"rity. *For the deſolate hath many more children, than ſhe that hath an husband:* that is, She that was with reſpect to the having children, as though ſhe had no husband, her husband *Abraham* being ſuperannuated, and as it were dead, and ſhe her ſelf being paſt age, and her womb as it were dead, *hath many more children*, &c. There are two places which deſerve to be compared with this, the ſame thing being ſpoken of in them. *Rom.* iv. 19. *Being not weak in faith, he* [Abraham] *conſidered not his own* body *now* dead, *when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the* deadneſs *of* Sarah's *womb.* Hence he calls God's giving them a ſon in thoſe circumſtances, his *quickening the dead*, [that is, *Abraham* and *Sarah*, who were in this reſpect as dead,] *and his calling thoſe things which are not, as though they were*, v. 17. The other place is *Heb.* xi. 11, 12. *Through faith alſo* Sarah *her ſelf received ſtrength to conceive ſeed, and was deliver'd of a child when ſhe was* paſt age, *becauſe ſhe judged him faithful who had promiſed. Therefore ſprang there even of one, and him as* good as dead, *ſo many as the ſtars of the ſky for multitude, and as the ſand which is by the ſea ſhore innumerable.* As therefore a dead husband is no husband, and *Abraham* was *as good as dead*, *Sarah* is ſpoken of as *deſolate*, or as having, in a manner, no husband. And this will give light to the laſt words of the *verſe*. *The deſolate hath many more children, than ſhe that hath an husband. Hagar*, however a bond-woman, was *Abraham's* wife, *Gen.* xvi. 3. and he her husband: and whereas *Sarah* is ſpoken of as deſolate and without an husband, when ſhe conceived *Iſaac*, becauſe *Abraham*, in the courſe of nature, was then as good as dead; the caſe with him being quite the reverſe, when he took *Hagar*, and had *Iſmael* by her, there being nothing ſupernatural in that birth, therefore ſhe is ſaid to have an husband. In ſhort therefore, the thing allegorized by the prophet is this: That *Sarah*, who had been ſo long barren, did at laſt, by virtue of the promiſe of God, and his extraordinary bleſſing, bear a child to ſuperannuated *Abraham*, contrary to the courſe of nature, and became the mother of a more numerous poſterity than *Hagar* was, who had a child by him, according to the courſe of nature, when he was yet in his ſtrength. And, by the way, I would here propound

Dissertation on GALATIANS IV.

NOTES.

it to the consideration of such as make the scriptures their study, Whether the light which the apostle has here given us into this passage of the prophet *Isaiah*, does not cast a considerable light also upon *Psal.* cxiii. 9. and so lead us into the true design of that whole *Psalm*.

2. I am next to inquire, what reason we have to judge St. *Paul* has explained this passage according to the original intent and design of it. Christians, who are persuaded of the apostle's inspiration, will make no doubt of this: but as I am to justify him in his interpretation, I must allege other considerations. Now supposing the truth of what has been said under the former head, that the women allegorized are *Sarah* and *Hagar*, it seems reasonable to allow such an analogy as St. *Paul* mentions between these women, and the particular event the prophet refers to; but I cannot imagine any other event than that here assigned, that will bear any such analogy. If *Sarah* be the barren woman allegorized, it is reasonable to suppose that as she rejoiced in a child of promise, so the rejoicing the prophet speaks of should be upon the like account, and that this numerous issue was born by virtue of some promise. This must be owned admirably to fit the calling of the *Gentiles*, which was according to promise. If it be said, that the return from the *Babylonish* captivity was according to a promise, I grant it: but then I can't see how the rest that is said can be applied: for who then can be the children of her that has an husband, who are said to be fewer in number? But, in the apostle's explication, the analogy is exact in both parts of the allegory: for as the *Gentiles* are the children of promise, so the unbelieving *Jews* well answer to *Ishmael*, who was born after the flesh, and not by promise, they being the children of *Abraham* only by a natural or fleshly descent; and the converts from among the *Gentiles* were vastly more numerous than the natural *Jews*.

But what I insist on especially is how this is brought in, and the place where it stands in the prophecy. 'Tis plain, the great event to which the apostle applies the passage, is the calling of the *Gentiles*, and that event in fact followed presently after the death of Christ: and if the passage be understood to speak of the calling of the *Gentiles*, it could not stand in a more proper place in the whole prophecy, it coming in immediately after the liii. *chapter*, which all Christians know is one of the plainest and clearest prophecies of the death of Christ of any that we have in the whole Bible: which is so evident as to force a late writer to acknowledge that it belongs to him only, though he has taken much pains to expound away from him a multitude of other passages in that evangelical prophet, which have been generally understood to be spoken of him. It is remarkable, that toward the close of that *chapter* the prophet mentions his seed, *v.* 10. *When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed; he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travel of his soul, and shall be satisfied.* In some of which expressions the calling of the *Gentiles* seems to be designed; and that the meaning is, that however the *Jews* would hate and despise him, according to what is said before in the *chapter*, yet the *Gentiles* should trust in him. Compare *chap.* xlix. 3—7. And, indeed, the author I refer'd to but now, does not scruple to interpret that passage, *he shall see his seed*, by his seeing "a numerous progeny of faithful believers on his name." And in like manner he expounds the last expression, *He shall see of the travel of his soul, and be satisfied:* "Our Saviour Christ shall be pleased to see so many thousands by his sufferings saved, "and think them abundantly recompensed, though the benefit redound to others." Where, though he does not mention particularly the *Gentiles*, yet I can hardly think he did not intend they should be included in the *numerous progeny of believers*, and the *many thousands that should be saved by his sufferings*. I think therefore I may very reasonably suppose, that the calling of the *Gentiles* is foretold in that famous prophecy. The last words of that *chapter*, after which immediately follows the *verse* cited by the apostle, seem to me very much to this purpose. *He was number'd with the transgressors, and bare the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.* I am sensible his *making intercession for the transgressors* is commonly understood of that stated and continual intercession he makes at the right hand of God for his people: but that interpretation seems not so certain, since the persons for whom he is represented as acting that part, are constantly, as far as I remember, represented under another character, as those who come to God by Christ, *Heb.* vii. 25. as the elect of God, or true and sincere Christians, *Rom.*

viii.

TEXT. *PARAPHRASE.*

29 promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh, persecuted him *that was born* after the Spirit,

(l) are the children of promise, like as *Isaac* was. And from that history which the prophet has thus allegorized, you may receive some farther instruction very pertinent to your own case: for as you see by it, that he who was born after the flesh, persecuted *(m)* him who was born after the Spirit *(n)*, so you cannot 29.

NOTES.

viii. 33, 34. *Heb.* ix. 24. 1 *John* ii. 1. but this is the only place where his intercession is said to be made *for transgressors*. By the transgressors then we ought, perhaps, to understand the *Gentiles*, whom St. *Paul* calls *sinners of the* Gentiles, *Gal.* ii. 15. which opinion of them was both true in it self, and common among the *Jews*: and the intercession here said to be made by him for these sinners of the *Gentiles*, may be explained from *Psal.* ii. 8. *Ask of me, and I shall give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* Having this allowance and direction from the Father, Christ no doubt asked, or made intercession for these Heathen transgressors who knew not God, and served dumb idols, and according to the Father's promise, his intercession was heard, the grant was immediately issued forth, and the Heathen in vast numbers became his people, his inheritance, and possession, which was a noble subject and occasion of joy and triumph to the heavenly *Jerusalem*, or the true church of God, whose members were so very few before: and therefore *sing O barren, thou that didst not bear*, &c.

28 (*l*) *We.*] The *we* here, I think, manifestly relates to the *Gentiles*; and it is as though he had said, *we* Gentiles. St. *Paul* being the apostle of the *Gentiles*, it is very common with him in his epistles to such, to join himself with them, as though he were himself a *Gentile* His meaning is, that as we *Gentiles* are the children of the heavenly *Jerusalem*, signified by *Sarah*, so we are born in like manner as *Isaac* was, by virtue of a divine promise, that is, the promise often mentioned in the Old Testament, that the *Gentiles* should be brought into the church of God, upon which promise St. *Paul* uses frequently to insist. The inference which he couches in what he says, and which he designed the *Galatians* should make, is this; That as the special promise of God concerning the birth of *Isaac*, gave him a mighty advantage, and he was constituted heir, when he that was born after the flesh was rejected from being heir with him; so the *Gentiles*, being made the children of *Abraham* in like manner as *Isaac* was, might expect very eminent advantages, and particularly they might reckon upon it, according to the words of *Isaiah*, that they should become more numerous than those who were his children only by a fleshly descent.

29 (*m*) *Persecuted.*] The only account we have of this persecution is *Gen.* xxi. 9. *And* Sarah *saw the son of* Hagar *the* Egyptian, *which she had born unto* Abraham, MOCKING. Whence we may learn that men may be guilty of persecuting, in the apostle's apprehension, without practising any open force and violence, when they treat others scornfully and abusively. Nor is it hard for men to be really persecutors, when they little imagine they are so: as, no doubt, the *Jews* in the apostle's time little thought they were chargeable with such a crime, when they used violence, but supposed they were doing God service.

(*n*) Τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα. *Him that was born after the spirit.*] As he that is *born after the spirit* in this *verse*, and he that *was by promise*, v. 23. both stand opposed to him that was *born after the flesh*, they may both be understood, in the main, to import the same thing, the extraor-

Chap. V.

PARAPHRASE.

not reaſonably wonder that the ſame thing ſhould now happen, and that the *Jews*, who are the ſeed of *Abraham* according to the fleſh, ſhould perſecute us *Gentiles*, who are his ſpiri-
30. tual ſeed. Now you may judge what will be the conſequence in the preſent caſe, from what you find to have been the conſequence then. Obſerve therefore what ſentence preſently followed upon *Iſhmael*'s perſecuting *Iſaac*. · *Caſt out*, ſaith the ſcripture, *the bond-woman and her ſon: for the ſon of the bond-woman ſhall not be heir with the ſon of the free-woman.* And in like manner you may conclude, that the *Jews*, who now perſecute you, ſhall be rejected and excluded; and you *Gentiles*, who are
31. perſecuted by them, ſhall be the heirs *(o)*. Upon the whole, you ſee by *Iſaiah*, that we *Gentiles* are repreſented not as the children of *Hagar*, the bond-woman, but as the children of
Ch.v. 1. *Sarah*, the free-woman. Since therefore we have obtained ſuch a liberty as this by Chriſt, do you, *Galatians*, continue ſtedfaſt in it, and do not again bring your ſelves into a ſtate of bon-
dage

TEXT.

even ſo *it is* now. Never- 30
theleſs, what ſaith the ſcripture? Caſt out the bond-woman and her ſon: for the ſon of the bond-woman ſhall not be heir with the ſon of the free-woman. So 31
then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free. Stand 1
faſt therefore in the liberty

NOTES.

dinary operation of God in the birth of *Iſaac*; to which God obliged himſelf by his promiſe, and which he executed and accompliſhed by his ſpirit, to whom all miraculous operations are wont to be attributed, 1 *Cor* xii. 7——11.

30 (*o*) Whoever compares the words here ſet down by St. *Paul* with *Gen.* xxi. 10. will ſee that he did not look upon himſelf obliged to tranſcribe exactly the paſſage. The little alteration in the words, not varying at all the ſenſe, makes the paſſage run the ſmoother in his diſcourſe. See the Note (*b*). His meaning here ſeems evidently to be this; The prophet *Iſaiah* has allegorized the hiſtories of *Hagar* and *Iſhmael*, of *Sarah* and *Iſaac*: ſince therefore they muſt be underſtood to carry in them a reſemblance of the things in our preſent time to which he has accommodated them, we may yet farther purſue the matter, and argue the likeneſs of the conſequence from the likeneſs of behaviour in the two caſes. The conſequence of *Iſhmael*'s perſecuting *Iſaac*, was his and his mother's being caſt out of *Abraham*'s family, and his being excluded from ſharing the inheritance with *Iſaac*: it is therefore eaſy to judge, that the *Jeruſalem* which now is, and the children of *Abraham* after the fleſh, the *Jews* of this time, who are by the prophet allegorically ſet forth by *Hagar* and *Iſhmael*, ſhall be cut off from *Abraham*'s family, that is,

from

TEXT. *PARAPHRASE.*

wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

dage *(p)* by putting your selves under that law which was given at mount *Sinai*, which is a yoke of bondage.

NOTES.

from the church of God, since they now persecute the *Gentiles*, who are, according to the same prophet, become the children of *Sarah*, or of the heavenly *Jerusalem*.

Such an arguing, or such a comparing of things as this, is always reckoned allowable: nor does any one imagine that he who uses it, esteems the thing from which the argument is drawn, to have been any prediction or type of that which is infer'd from it: but it is only a reasoning from the like causes to the like effects in different cases, which is certainly strong and convincing.

1 (*p*) The liberty he urges them to maintain, is a liberty from the bondage of the ceremonial law, and this liberty the *Gentiles* obtained by Christ. The *Galatians*, indeed, had not formerly been under the bondage of that law, and so could not again intangle themselves therewith: but they had been in bondage to false gods and to their lusts. His meaning therefore is, that since they were made free from that bondage they were formerly in, as *Gentiles*, they would not now a second time inslave themselves, by submitting to the ceremonial law. See Mr. *Locke*'s Note (*p*) upon *Gal.* iv. 9.

But there is another sense in which πάλιν is used for *retrorsum*, and perhaps that may better suit this place, and *Gal.* iv. 9. and so the meaning here will be, "Don't, by going backward, "intangle your selves with a yoke of bondage."

After I had finished, and indeed sent away my papers on this subject, I met with the critical remarks of a learned writer upon *v.* 24—26. And though upon perusing them I have not perceived any occasion to alter what I had written, yet it may be proper here to take some brief notice of what he says.

I was pleased at first to find a person of his judgment did as little as my self acquiesce in Dr. *B*—'s leaving out by conjecture, Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ, but I was somewhat disappointed afterwards, when I observed that he himself doubted the genuinness both of them and some others. I hope I have shown that he is mistaken, when he says, "The passage, as "it now stands, can neither be defended nor explained; and that it needs to be mended by a "conjecture."

I pass over his two first arguments against the Doctor, because I don't find they at all affect my interpretation. Nor is it much concerned in his third, except in one passage, which seemed very surprizing. "I can't, *says he*, believe the apostle thought or design'd to say that the "*Jewish* nation was in bondage. The *Arabians*, who sprang from *Hagar*, were miserably "inslaved: but the *Jews*, even at that time, boasted that they enjoyed their own laws, and "were governed by their own kings. As therefore he here, *v.* 25. says the *Arabians* were in "bondage, so when he says, in the end of *v.* 26. That Sarah *is the mother of us all*, he, without "doubt, intimates, that no one could deny the *Jews* were free." This is contrary to the strain of the whole *chapter*; particularly to the eleven first *verses*, where he proves that all the unbelieving *Jews* were in bondage under the ceremonial law; and it is with reference to that only that he speaks of the metaphorical *bondage* of the *Jews*, and *liberty* of Christians, in this *Section* concerning *Hagar*: for the proper and literal bondage he carries not, that I can perceive, any farther than *Hagar* and her son *Ismael*. But whatever the boastings of the *Jews* might be, he positively asserts they were in bondage, not under the *Romans*, (tho' that was true also) but under the elements of the law. And certainly it was very little to St *Paul*'s purpose to assert that the *Arabians* were in bondage: for what could that signify to the *Galatians*, whom he censures only for their being desirous to put themselves under the ceremonial

law

Dissertation on GALATIANS IV.

NOTES.

law? They sought not to be in the condition of the *Arabians*, but of the *Jews*, of whose servitude they were not apprehensive, and therefore needed to be convinced.

His fourth argument is, That μία μὲν, v. 24. ought regularly to be followed by ἑτέρα δὲ, or some such word, v. 26. as a reddition to it. But if this proves any thing against Dr. B—t or my interpretation (which I don't grant it does) the utmost will be only this, that here is an inconsiderable inaccuracy in St. *Paul*'s stile: but then it is what this learned author is forced to admit in his own emendation; for he presently himself makes the ἡ δὲ to be the reddition to μία μὲν.

I come now to his way of reading the text, wherein (1.) I agree with him, that the best reading seems to be δουλεύει γὰρ (not δὲ). (2.) He next tells us, that for τὸ γὰρ Ἁγαρ, he chooses to read τόδε γὰρ, from whence he supposes sprang the corruption τὸ δὲ Ἁγαρ, as it is read in the *Clar.* and *Ger.* and *Alex.* MSS. and the *Coptic* version: to which he adds, that the *Vulg. Latin*, *Hesychius* upon *Lev* xix. together with *Jerom*, *Ambrose*, and all the *Latin* commentators, leave out the word Ἁγαρ. But however the present *Vulg. Latin* leaves out the name here of *Hagar*, yet since the *Latin* version of the *Clar.* and *Ger.* MSS. retain it, Dr. *Mill*'s opinion is very probable, that it was in the genuin vulgate version, and that it was at first left out by St. *Jerom*, or by some body about his time. It seems to me much more likely, that it has been omitted by such as did not understand the meaning of it, than that it has been corruptly added to the text; for it is not easy to imagin with what view any one could make the addition. However, I must own the correction is so handsom and easy, that I should be much inclined to admit it, if I perceived a necessity of making any alteration at all: but, I hope, my account has made it manifest that there is no need of any.

(3.) He next in the clause, τῇ νῦν Ἰερουσαλὴμ, leaves out the νῦν, because, as he says, the *Syriac* and *Arabic* versions do so. But the truer reason seems to be, that the retaining it will not consist with his next emendation (4.) of ἡ δὲ ἄπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ for ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ. The omission of νῦν is not countenanced by any one *Greek* MS. the *Vulg. Latin* has it, and, I think, he is mistaken, in saying the *Syriac* version leaves it out. It is true, the *Syriac* has not here the word ואשת [*Hosho*] which properly answers to νῦν, but the reason seems to be, because the language would not bear the use of the adverb in the sense of an adjective; as neither will our own, whence our translators have been forced to render it, Jerusalem *which now is*, instead of *the now* Jerusalem, which would have been very improper *English*. I can make no doubt that the *Syriac* translators found νῦν in the *Greek* copies, from whence they made their translation, because they here use the demonstrative pronoun הדא [*Hode*] instead of it, just in the same manner in which, as far as I can find, they always render νῦν when thus used, either by הנא [*Hono*] when the following substantive is masculine, or by הנת [*Hone*] when feminine. I will only refer to a few places which occur, in none of which is there the least doubt of the genuinness of the *Greek* νῦν. Thus they render ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, *Tit.* ii. 12. just as they do τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος, *Gal.* i. 4. In like manner, *Rom.* iii. 26. viii. 18. xi. 5. 2 *Cor.* viii. 14. *Eph.* ii. 2. 1 *Tim.* vi. 17. and 2 *Tim.* iv. 10. I confess, the *Arabic* version has no word that answers to νῦν, and perhaps though it was in the copy used by the translators, they might not think it necessary to express it, since they might suppose, that every one would perceive, it could be only the literal *Jerusalem*, that was opposed to the *Jerusalem* above, or the heavenly *Jerusalem*, Heb. xii. 22. And if that translation will weigh any thing in the present case, it will establish the common reading ἄνω, and consequently that of νῦν also. (5.) As I allow a parenthesis in this place, the reader may see how, I think, it ought to be order'd, by what is said before in the Dissertation. I say nothing of the sense he puts upon the word συστοιχεῖ, which he renders *conjunctus est*, and thus glosses upon it; "*Judea* is full of continued mountains, and "therefore mount *Sinai*, which began at the red-sea, and extended it self with one perpetual "ridge toward mount *Sion*, might be said to be joined to *Jerusalem*, especially since they to "whom this was said, lived in very distant parts of the world."

Supposing what he here says of the continuance of mount *Sinai* to mount *Sion* were true; yet there needed some instance wherein συστοιχεῖν is used by a *Greek* author in that sense. Had he produced

produced any ſuch it would have been more to his purpoſe, than the bare rendering of the *Vulgate*, which ſeems to be only an odd gueſs at the meaning of a paſſage not underſtood by the tranſlators; and there being no doubt that συστοιχεῖ is the genuin reading in the *Greek*, we muſt only have recourſe to the ſenſe of that word. Now taking it in the way it is frequently uſed for *in eadem ſerie reſpondet*; the queſtion is how *Hagar* συστοιχεῖ to *Jeruſalem*. I think the two ſeries here to be compared ſtand thus, according to St. *Paul*'s diſcourſe:

The hiſtory in *Geneſis*.	The allegory in *Iſaiah*.
1. *Hagar* that hath an husband	1. The preſent *Jeruſalem*, the metropolis, or mother city of thoſe with whom the covenant at mount *Sinai* was made;
2. generates *Iſhmael*.	2. generates *Iſrael*
3. after the fleſh, or according to the courſe of nature.	3. after the fleſh, by a fleſhly deſcent.
4. She and her ſon are in bondage.	4. She and her children (the natural *Iſrael*) are in bondage under the law given at mount *Sinai*.

According to this account *Hagar* in the hiſtory anſwers to the earthly *Jeruſalem* in the allegory. But the ſenſe that author puts upon the paſſage, is ſo forced and unnatural, and ſeems ſo foreign to St. *Paul*'s ſcope, that I am perſuaded it can do him no ſervice in eſtabliſhing his conjecture. Nor does he himſelf ſeem well ſatisfied with it, ſince he preſently expreſſes his doubt whether the whole parentheſis, as he has altered it [τόδε γὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ, συστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ] are the apoſtle's words, or an elucidation crept out of the margin into the text: nor does he appear to be without apprehenſions, that after all he has ſaid, this clauſe does ſomewhat diſturb the ſenſe of the place. This makes it look probable that he has not hit upon the true key to St. *Paul*'s meaning: and whether I have ſucceeded any better, is left to the judgment of the reader.

The account here given ſatisfies me, however I ſhall add the conjecture of a very learned and judicious friend upon the paſſage, which he was firſt led to from reading the criticiſm laſt mentioned. And I do it the rather, becauſe it ſeems to preſerve the ſenſe of συστοιχεῖ, and keeps nearer to the *Greek* copies, by retaining the word νῦν. His ſenſe of the place is this: The two oppoſite parts of the prophet's allegory, as explained by St. *Paul*, may be repreſented thus:

Verſe 24. *Theſe* two women *are the two covenants*:

1. *The one* covenant *from mount* Sinai,	Ver. 26. 1. *But the other* covenant *from* Jeruſalem
2. *gendering unto bondage, which is* Agar; (v. 25. *For this mount* Sinai *is in* Arabia; *and anſwereth*, in one part of the allegory, *to the* city *now* called *Jeruſalem*, in the other)	2. *is* the *free* woman, Sarah,
3. *for ſhe is in bondage with her children.*	3. *who is the mother of us all.*

The apoſtle here propoſing to ſhow that the two women, alluded to by the prophet, were the two covenants, firſt ſhows where the covenants were deliver'd, then to which of the women each of them refer'd, and laſtly how the characters of the women anſwer'd thoſe of the covenants.

The clauſe in the parentheſis, v. 25. may be conſider'd chiefly as hiſtorical, and deſign'd to explain more particularly and fully the different places, wherein the two covenants, alluded to in the prophet's allegory by the two women, were firſt deliver'd. And therefore when the apoſtle has acquainted the *Galatians* where *mount Sinai* was, namely, *in Arabia*; he is no leſs exact

Diſſertation on GALATIANS IV.

NOTES.

with reſpect to the other place, expreſſing it by τὴ νῦν Ἱερυσαλὴμ, *the city now called* Jeruſalem, or (as the words may be turned) *Jeruſalem, as it is now called.* By which manner of expreſſion he ſeems ſtill to have kept in his view the firſt ages of the *Jewiſh* hiſtory. For in *Abraham's* time, if we credit *Joſephus*, this city was the ſeat of *Melchiſedec*, which *Gen.* xiv. 18. is called *Salem*, and by *Joſephus* Σόλυμα, *Antiq.* l. 1. c. 11. And afterward, when the *Iſraelites* got poſſeſſion of *Canaan*, it was in the hands of the *Jebuſites*, and called *Jebuſi* or *Jebus*. So *Joſh.* xviii. 28. *and* Jebuſi, *which is* Jeruſalem. And though perhaps the *Iſraelites*, upon conquering part of it, might then call that *Jeruſalem*; yet we find the name *Jebus* was retained till *David's* time, when he took the caſtle, 1 *Chron.* xi. 4. *And* David *and all* Iſrael *went to* Jeruſalem, *which is* Jebus, *where the* Jebuſites *were, the inhabitants of the land.* 5. *And the inhabitants of* Jebus *ſaid to* David, *thou ſhalt not come hither. Nevertheleſs*, David *took the caſtle of* Sion, *which is the city of* David.

Indeed, the word *called* is not expreſſed in the *Greek*; yet it may very fairly be ſupplied from a like paſſage in *Herodotus*, where that participle is expreſſed. For ſpeaking of *Paris*, upon his carrying away *Helen* from *Sparta*, he ſays: Ἀπικνέεται ἐς τὸ νῦν Κανωβικὸν καλεόμενον στόμα τοῦ Νείλου, *L.* II. *c.* 113. *He arrives at that mouth of the* Nile, *which is now called* Καναβικὸν. The hiſtorian had the ſame reaſon for uſing this manner of expreſſion, as the apoſtle ſeems to have had with reſpect to *Jeruſalem*; becauſe that mouth of the *Nile* had not the name, which he here gives it, till ſeveral years after *Paris* came thither. For this baſe action of *Paris* occaſioned the *Trojan* war, at the concluſion of which the *Spartans* returning home were driven to this place, where *Canobus*, or *Canopus* the pilot of *Menelaus*, dying, they built a town there, and called it by his name, from which that mouth of the river was afterwards denominated. *Strabo* gives this account of the town: Κάνωβος ἐπώνυμος τοῦ Μενελάου κυβερνήτου, ἀποθανόντος αὐτόθι, L. xvii. Canobus *took its name from the pilot of* Menelaus, *who died there.* And *Tacitus* more fully: *Germanicus Nilo ſubvehebatur, orſus oppido a Canopo. Condidere id Spartani ob ſepultum illic rectorem navis Canopum, qua tempeſtate Menelaus, Graeciam repetens, diverſum ad mare terramque Lybiam delatus.* Ann. l. II c. 60. Germanicus *ſailed up the* Nile, *beginning at the town* Canopus. *This town was built by the* Spartans, *upon the account of* Canopus *the pilot, who was buried there, when* Menelaus, *returning to* Greece, *was carried to a different ſea, and the coaſt of* Lybia. 'Tis plain from theſe paſſages, that *Herodotus*, by uſing the words τὸ νῦν καλεόμενον, deſigned to intimate that the mouth of the *Nile*, which he calls Καναβικὸν, had not that name at the time he is ſpeaking of. And afterwards, *L.* II. *c.* 156. he uſes τῇ νῦν in the ſame ſenſe, not as an adjective, but with a participle, to denote *the preſent time* in oppoſition to ſomething before. For ſpeaking of *Latona's* concealing *Apollo* from *Typhon*, he ſays, ſhe hid him, ἐν τῇ νῦν πλωτῇ λεγομένῃ νήσῳ, *in an iſland that is now ſaid to float*, ἐὸν εὔσῃ πρόσθεν πλωτὴ, but *which before did not float*, as he had ſaid juſt before, and that the name of it was Χέμμις. Theſe inſtances ſeem to juſtify the interpreting St. *Paul's* words in the ſame manner.

But now thoſe, who firſt underſtood this expreſſion of the apoſtle in a tropical ſenſe, as meant of an *earthly Jeruſalem*, which might agree with *mount Sinai*, muſt needs be at a loſs to reconcile this interpretation with the words ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ Ἱερυσαλὴμ, at the beginning of *v.* 26. and therefore may reaſonably be ſuppoſed to have changed νῦν into ἄνω, in order to make an *heavenly Jeruſalem*, which might ſtand in oppoſition to it, and render the two parts of the allegory conſiſtent. Though in *Heb.* xii. 18, 22. where the ſame things are refer'd to, the diſtinction is made only between *the mount that might be touched*, or mount *Sinai*, on the one ſide; and on the other, *mount Sion*, which is likewiſe there called the *heavenly Jeruſalem.* There is no mention of two *Jeruſalems*, an *earthly* and *heavenly*; or, what is equivalent, a *legal* and *evangelical*. And this oppoſition between mount *Sinai* and *Jeruſalem*, as the two places where the *Jewiſh* and goſpel covenants were firſt promulgated, is very agreeable to *Iſaiah's* prophecy, *ch.* ii. 3. *Out of* Sion *ſhall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from* Jeruſalem. Which was afterwards accompliſhed both by our Saviour's practice, and what he ſays to his apoſtles, *Luke* xxiv. 47. *That repentance and remiſſion of ſins ſhould be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at* Jeruſalem.

NOTES.

As to the word συσοιχεῖ, those things are said συσοιχεῖν, which are σύσοιχα to one another. Now things are called σύσοιχα in a double respect: first, *simply*, when they follow one another, in the same direct line; as, on the contrary, those are called ἀντίσοιχα, which correspond to each other in two opposite lines. So the several figures, as they stand one under another, in each part of the allegory above mentioned, are σύσοιχα; and those that answer to each other in the opposite parts are ἀντίσοιχα. But things are likewise called σύσοιχα, by way of *analogy*: as when any two parts in opposite lines hold respectively the same rank in their own series; or have the like relation to their proper subject: so that the same things may be both σύσοιχα and ἀντίσοιχα, but under a different consideration. Thus *mount Sinai* and *Jerusalem* are ἀντίσοιχα, as they stand opposed to each other in the two parts of the allegory; but σύσοιχα κατ' ἀναλογίαν, as they have the same order in their own series, and denote the place, where that covenant, to which they respectively refer, was first delivered. 'Tis therefore in this sense the apostle is here supposed to say, that *mount* Sinai *answers to* Jerusalem. And this signification of σύσοιχος is mentioned by *Alexander*, *in prim. Topic.* Tom. XI. where he says: Σύσοιχα μὲν γὰρ λέγεται ἀλλήλοις καὶ τὰ ὁμοίως ἔχοντα πρός τινα, ἃ καὶ κατ' ἀναλογίαν ἔστιν ἂν' ὡς τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἡ ἐπιστήμη καὶ ἡ αἴσθησις· ἑκάτερον γὰρ αὐτῶν ὁμοίως ἔχει πρὸς τὰ ὑφ' αὑτὰ· ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ αἰσθητὸν καὶ τὸ ἐπιστητόν· ἑκάτερον γὰρ αὐτῶν ὁμοίως ἔχει πρὸς τὰ ὧν ἐστι σύσοιχα. *Those things are also called* σύσοιχα *to one another, which have a like respect to some other things, and may be said to be analogous: as* knowledge *and* sense, *because each of these has a like respect to the things under them; and in like manner* sensible *and* intelligible, *because each has the like relation to those things whose* σύσοιχα *they are.*

Upon the whole, which ever of these interpretations is prefered, I must profess that I cannot see that the enemies of Christianity have the least occasion to insult or triumph on the account of this passage of St. *Paul*: on the contrary, his argument appears to me pertinent and strong, and his whole discourse exceeding lively and beautiful. Nor do I doubt but the like will be found to be the case of other, at present, dark and obscure passages in the scripture, when it shall please God men shall discover the true sense of them.

THE END.

DISSERTATION II.

ON

MATTHEW II. 13, 14, 15.

And when they [the wise men] *were departed, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth to* Joseph *in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young Child and his mother, and flee into* Egypt, *and be thou there until I bring thee word; for* Herod *will seek the young Child to destroy him. When he arose, he took the young Child and his mother by night, and departed into* Egypt; *and was there until the death of* Herod: *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying,* Out of *Egypt* have I called my Son.

THE words here cited are found only in the prophet *Hosea* xi. 1. and unless the evangelist cites here that prophet, we must be forced to own that he refers to some passage of the Old Testament, which is lost, or sadly corrupted. And were the difficulty discover'd only in these latter ages, such a supposition might be more easily allowed: but since in *Eusebius*, and probably *Origen*'s time, they could discover no other place in the prophets that could be refer'd to, it is certain that the passage must then have been dropt within the two or three first centuries. This

suppo-

ſuppoſition the friends of Chriſtianity would gladly avoid, and they have therefore deſervedly apply'd their induſtry to diſcover the pertinence of the citation. It is not my buſineſs to ſhow the weakneſs of their attempts, but only to indeavour to advance what may help to ſatisfy in the caſe; and this I ſhall do with all the candour and fairneſs I am able, being willing to own my want of light in ſeveral paſſages of holy writ, which, I think, is no diſparagement to a man who profeſſes only to be a ſtudier thereof: and where I fail I ſhall be thankful for aſſiſtance from others, who are better able to diſcern the ſenſe of the ſacred writers.

There is one thing which I think it but fair to take notice of here at my ſetting out, and that is, that when a text is cited in the manner this is, and it is ſaid, Such a thing was *done*, *THAT it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken*, I always eſteem the paſſage cited to be a direct prophecy of that particular event, and that it belongs to that event, and that only. I acknowledge this fixes upon me a difficulty, which they elude, who take it for granted that ſuch citations are only by way of accommodation.

Now the great difficulty before us is to ſhow how the words of *Hoſea* xi. 1. *When* Iſrael *was a child I loved him, and called my Son out of* Egypt, can be thought to be intended by the prophet concerning Chriſt's being called by the angel out of *Egypt*. The context in the prophet will be conſider'd as we proceed: he that does not remember it, may here in the beginning turn to his Bible and take a brief view of it, before he reads on.

In treating of this argument, I deſign,

1. To inquire whether there be no difficulty in the other ſcheme of explaining the prophet, to ſpeak of the departure of the *Iſraelites* out of *Egypt*, under the conduct of *Moſes*.

2. What may be ſuppoſed to render the application of the paſſage to Chriſt ſo difficult as it has been found.

3. To give as clear and diſtinct an account as I can of the ſenſe of the prophet.

1. I ſhall inquire whether there be no difficulties in the other way of explaining the prophet to ſpeak of the departure of the *Iſraelites* out of *Egypt*, under the conduct of *Moſes*. If there be any ſuch, it is but reaſonable to balance theſe with thoſe of the other interpretation: for the truth only lies between thoſe who apply them ſo, and thoſe who apply them only to Chriſt; in caſe we ſuppoſe St. *Matthew* here cites this paſſage in *Hoſea*, and not ſome other text of the Old

Testament now lost. Now though the difficulties I shall mention are not very great in themselves, yet, I think, they are worth taking notice of.

1. Then I observe the expression of *calling Israel* out of *Egypt*, is, as far as I can recollect, unusual. The expression which is in a manner constant concerning this, is, that God *brought* them out, *Hos.* xii. 13. *Exod.* xx. 2. *Lev.* xxv. 55. *Deut.* iv. 20. v. 15. *Psal.* lxxx. 8. and lxxxi. 10. So he *took them by the hand, to bring them* out of the land of *Egypt*, *Jerem.* xxxi. 32. and in this prophet *Hosea*, chap. xi. 3. he taught *Ephraim* to go, *taking* them by the arms: And the like stile is, I think, perpetual. The reason of this seems to be, because that God is represented as continually attending, and conducting them in their coming out of *Egypt*, the symbol of his presence continually accompanying them; and therefore, as I imagine, he is not said to *call them out*, which is the action of one at a distance, when he invites or exhorts persons to come to him, and not of one who bears and carries another, as God is said to do his people: but the expression will well suit the condition of the infant Christ, when God sent his angel, not to *bring* him out of *Egypt*, but to direct his reputed father *Joseph* to bring him thence.

2. I don't find the word נער which is here render'd a *child*, is ever used to signify the *Israelites* in *Egypt*. That *Israel* is called God's son, is certain; nay, and that a word near a-kin to this נעורה *Hos.* ii. 15. for *youth* is to be found thus applied, is granted: but the other is not, that I have been able to discover, so much as once to be met with. This word very properly signifies a *child*, or an *infant*, and so might well be used of Christ; but till some instance is produced of its being used of the people of *Israel* in *Egypt*, the use of it here may deserve our regard: and the rendering of the LXX is to my purpose, who have Ὅτι νήπιος Ἰσραὴλ. Here are therefore two things in the *verse* that are disagreeable to the stile of all the Old Testament, if it be understood of the children of *Israel*; but are most exact and proper if used of Christ, as St. *Matthew* applies it.

2. I shall next inquire what may be supposed to render the application of those words to Christ so difficult. I do not make much account of the difficulty some may apprehend from the name *Israel* here used, it being clear, as I think, that this is in the prophet *Isaiah*, who was cotemporary with *Hosea*, the name given to Christ. But the greatest difficulty seems to me to arise from the obscurity of the whole prophecy. The prophet *Hosea* lived and prophesied for

a long time together; some reckon fifty years, and, indeed, it must be longer rather than shorter. Now, beside the darkness that is observed in almost all prophecies, there is somewhat peculiar in this, by reason we have no dates of the particular prophecies, nor hardly any distinction whereby we may know where a new vision begins, so that a mistake in this matter may easily puzzle us. Beside these, there is somewhat very obscure and puzzling in the very stile and method of this prophet, the taking notice of two particulars whereof, may be, perhaps, of service for explaining the *verse* under consideration.

1. It seems to me that this prophet does often change the names of places and persons, which must render his discourse hard to be understood, unless much attention be used; and even then, it may not be easy always to be secure what he means. To give some instances of this nature. We find that God, by this prophet, expresses a very extraordinary detestation of idolatry, and even of the very names of the idols and idolatrous places, and shows he would not have them mentioned, *chap.* ii. 16, 17. *And it shall be in that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me* Ishi, *and shalt call me no more* Baali. [There was no harm in the word, and it often has the same signification with *Ishi*, *my husband:* but as it was so like to the name of the heathen god *Baal*, or *Baalim*, in detestation thereof he would not have it used concerning himself.] *For I will take away the* names *of* Baalim *out of her mouth, and they shall no more be remember'd by their* name. Agreeably to this detestation of idolatry, the prophet seems to avoid, as much as may be, the naming of idols, and especially the giving any name to the places where they were worship'd, that imply'd the least honour. Thus *Bethel* being the place where *Jeroboam* set up one of his idolatrous calves, and the prophet having occasion to inveigh against it, does not, perhaps, so much as once call it *Bethel* (which was an honourable name, and signified the *house of God)* when he speaks of it in its idolatrous state: but he calls it *Bethaven*, the *house of iniquity* or *vanity*, chap. iv. 15. v. 8. x. 5. or *Aven*, *iniquity* or *vanity*, chap. x. 8. Compare *Amos* v. 5. or *Beth-arbel*, the *house of the insnaring god*, chap. x. 14. as, I think, the same *Bethel* is meant thereby. There is one place where he uses *Bethel*; but then, it is plain, it is when it was not in its idolatrous state, *chap.* xii. 4. *He* [Jacob] *found him in* Bethel: why he may be thought to use it *chap.* x. 15. will be inquired afterwards.

I am ſenſible there was ſuch a place as *Beth-aven*, which is mentioned *Joſh.* vii. 2. and in ſeveral other texts, and which was not far from *Bethel:* but that has not hinder'd the generality of interpreters from underſtanding *Bethel* to be meant in *Hoſea* by *Beth-aven:* and, indeed, the expreſs mention of the *calves* at *Beth-aven*, chap. x. 5. ſeems to determine that it muſt be ſo. Nor can this ſeem ſtrange, when compared with *chap.* i. 4, 5, 11. ii. 22. where God changes, as it were, the honourable name of *Iſrael*, into that of *Jezreel*, of a ſomewhat like ſound, though that was likewiſe the proper name of a place, *Joſh.* xv. 56.

I am apt to think the prophecy deals in like manner with the names of men. Thus *chap.* x. 14. *Therefore ſhall a tumult ariſe among thy people, and all thy fortreſſes ſhall be ſpoiled as* Shalman *ſpoiled* Beth-arbel *in the day of battel.* The LXX have very ſtrangely render'd this paſſage: "Therefore ſhall deſtruction "ariſe among thy people, and all thy fortreſſes ſhall ceaſe, as "prince *Salaman* [*was deſtroyed*] by the houſe of *Jeroboam* in "the day of battel." But it is not eaſy to conjecture who then this prince *Salaman* was, or what deſtruction is meant. It is likely, as St. *Jerom* ſays, that they wrote *Jerubbaal*, (as it is in *Grabe*'s edition) and not *Jeroboam*, and that they imagined that *Salaman* was the ſame as *Zalmunna*, mentioned *Judges* viii. and *Pſal.* lxxxiii. 11. and that by *Jerubbaal* they intended *Gideon*, to whom that name was given. St. *Jerom*, in the *Vulgate* tranſlation from the *Hebrew*, falls in with them, and ſays, that ארבאל ſignifies the ſame as ירבעל. But that ſeems at leaſt uncertain: for though בל *Bel*, *Iſai.* xlvi. 1. may probably ſignify the ſame idol-god that was anciently called בעל *Baal*, yet I never find his name written באל. Upon the whole, I hardly think that interpretation will be eaſily received.

By *Shalman* many modern interpreters underſtand *Shalmaneſer*, and, I think, with great probability; from what is ſaid of him: but they hardly pretend to conjecture the reaſon why the prophet calls him only by one half of his name. What if it ſhould be what is here ſuggeſted, in deteſtation of ſome idol whoſe name was *Aſar* or *Eſer*, אסר? It was a common practice among the *Jews* to bring in the name of God into their own names, as in all thoſe names that end in *El*; as *Daniel*, *Ezekiel*, &c. or in *Jah*; as *Iſaiah*, *Jeremiah*, &c. The ſame was the cuſtom of the *Babylonians*, as is evident from *Merodach-Baladan*, or *Mardokempad*, and *Evil-merodach*, a

part

part of whose names [*Merodach*] was the name of a *Babylonish* idol, *Jer.* l. 2. from *Nebuchadnezzar* or *Nabocollassar*, as he is called in *Ptolemy*'s canon, from *Nabopollassar*, *Nabonassar*, *Nabonadius*, *Nebuzaradan* and *Nebushasban*, and *Shamgar-nebo*; all which are compounded partly of the name of *Nebo* or *Nabo*, an idol of the *Babylonians*, *Isai.* xlvi. 1. which seems to have been a very ancient idol among the *Moabites*, and other Heathen nations, *Numb.* xxxii. 38. from which probably the mountain where *Moses* died, was denominated; the same is evident from *Belibus*, *Rigebelus*, mentioned in *Ptolemy*'s canon, from *Belshazzar*, and *Beltesshazzar*, which was the name *Nebuchadnezzar* gave to *Daniel*, *according to the name of his God*, Dan. iv. 8. *Bel* being the name of a noted idol. It seems probable that the names which were assumed, were sometimes compounded of the names of more idols than one, which might be owing partly to their fondness for their idols, and partly to their being denominated from their parents, in whose names there was a remembrance of some idol. Thus the names of two idols, *Merodach* and *Bel*, occur in *Merodach-Baladan*; the latter by reason of his father's name, *Baladan*, though it seems to be a part of his own proper name, and therefore he is called *Merodach Baladan*, the son of *Baladan*, *Isai.* xxxix. 1. 2 *Kings* xx. 12.

And if אצר was the name of an idol, as is highly probable, the same is to be seen in the names *Nabonassar*, *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Nabopollassar*, *Belshazzar*, *Beltesshazzar*, and *Nergalsharezar*. It does not seem unlikely that אצר of the *Babylonians* and אסר of the *Assyrians*, were names of the same Heathen god, though somewhat differently sounded, according to their different dialects, and so *Shalmaneser*, *Esarhaddon*, and *Tiglath-pileser*, might receive their names partly from his. It is remarkable, that in *Ptolemy*'s canon *Esar* in *Esarhaddon* is spelt just in the same manner as the termination of the *Babylonian* names אצר; for he is called *Assaradinus*, as the others end in *assar*, as *Nabocollassar*, &c. צ and ס being both *litteræ sibilantes & ejusdem organi*, the sound of them was near a-kin, and they might easily be writ for one another, and it should seem that the *Assyrians* were not utter strangers to the *Babylonian* way of pronunciation in this case: for in the name of one of *Sennacherib*'s sons, *Sharezer*, the termination is אצר; and it is probable he denominated his sons *Sharezer* and *Esarhaddon* from an idol, as well as his other son *Adrammelech*, which was the name of one of the gods of *Sepharvaim*, 2 Kings xvii. 31. Now if we suppose this to be the

caſe, that אסר was the name of an idol, and *Shalmaneſer*'s name is partly compounded of that, it is, perhaps, no unreaſonable conjecture from the ſtrain of the prophecy, that *Hoſea* left out the name of the idol to ſignify his deteſtation of it, and ſo called him only by the beginning of his name *Shalman*.

I have been ready to ſuſpect, that, for the like reaſon, the prophet *Hoſea* has left out one part of the name of *Sennacherib*, and called him only by the latter part of his name *Jareb*, chap. v. 13. x. 6. It is true, there is the *Jod* then wanting in *Sennacherib*: but, if we may judge of the *Aſſyrians* by the *Jews*, that is no great matter, ſince they left out the letter *Jod* ſometimes in the beginning of a proper name. So he that is called *Jeconiah*, 1 *Chron.* iii. 16, 17. *Jerem.* xxiv. 1. is called *Coniah*, *Jerem.* xxii. 24, 28. Nor do I think it any material objection againſt this inſtance, that all the verſions, except the *Targum*, read here *Jeconiah*, and not *Coniah*, ſince 'tis certain that *Jeconiah* is the perſon intended, and the tranſlators might think it enough for them to call him by his more ordinary name. However, that there may be no doubt about their practice, I will add three inſtances more. *Joſhua*, the ſon of *Nun*, is called הושע, *Num.* xiii. 8. and frequently יהושע. It is true, *Moſes* is ſaid to have called him ſo, *Num.* xiii. 16. But it is obſervable that he is called ſo before *Moſes* is ſaid to have done this, *Exod.* xvii. 9. and, what is more to the purpoſe, after *Moſes* had called him ſo; and, a little before his own death, he drops the *Jod* in his name, *Deut.* xxxii. 44. and calls him *Hoſhea*. Thus again, he who is called יעקן, 1 *Chron.* i. 42. is called עקן, *Gen.* xxxvi. 27. Nor do I think this to be any fault of the tranſcriber, it being not unuſual, as I ſuppoſe, to prefix or omit the *Jod*. Thus king *Hezekiah*'s name is commonly written חזקיהו or חזקיה, 2 *Kings* xviii. 1, 10, 14, 15. but very often has it a *Jod* prefixed in the books of the *Chronicles*, and he is called יחזקיהו 1 *Chron.* iv. 41. 2 *Chron.* xxviii. 27. xxix. 36. xxxi. 9, 20. xxxii. 22—26, 30. Nor is this any error of the tranſcriber in thoſe books, ſince we find his name in like manner written *Iſai.* i. 1. and חזקיה, *Hoſ.* i. 1. *Mic.* i. 1. And if a *Jod* was ſo eaſily added or left out in a proper name by it ſelf, much more may we ſuppoſe it might drop in compoſition. However that may be uncertain, there ſeems little reaſon to doubt that *Shalman* is the ſame with *Shalmaneſer*: and that being ſuppoſed, it may well be thought that *Betharbel* is, like *Bethaven*, a feigned name, and uſed by way of reproach, and that it ſignifies the houſe of

the

the inſnaring God, as the calf at *Bethel* was, no doubt, a ſnare to the children of *Iſrael.* Interpreters are at a loſs to find ſuch a place as *Beth-arbel*, or to find any hint of *Shalmaneſer*'s ſpoiling it: but, if we take this method of explaining the prophet, agreeably to his own ſtile, all the difficulty preſently vaniſhes: for there can be no reaſon to doubt of *Shalmaneſer*'s ſpoiling *Bethel*, ſince we find 2 *Kings* xvii. 28. that when the new colony, planted in *Samaria* by *Shalmaneſer*, wanted one to inſtruct them in the manner of worſhiping the God of the country, he thereupon ſent one of the prieſts, who came and dwelt in *Bethel*; and conſequently *Bethel* had before been conquered by him.

2. Another thing which renders this prophet very obſcure, is, that he does not always diſpatch and make an end of one ſubject before he undertakes another, but ſometimes purſues two together, interchangeably and alternately treating of each, much in the ſame manner as I have obſerved St. *Paul* does in part of the ſecond and third *chapters* to the *Coloſſians.* Every one muſt perceive how intricate ſuch a procedure renders any diſcourſe. And as I take this to be an obſervation of great conſequence in fixing the ſenſe of *chap.* xi. 1. under conſideration, I ſhall indeavour to make it plain, by an undoubted inſtance, that this obſervation is juſt. I will not pretend to give the reaſon why it pleaſed God, to direct the prophet to write in this manner; I only appeal to matter of fact that thus it is. All that I ſhall ſuggeſt is, that perhaps as God deſigned the prophecy, of Chriſt's being called out of *Egypt*, ſhould be obſcured by ſuch a method (ſuppoſing the ſame is to be found there, of which afterward) the other which is more plain and clear ſhould ſerve as a key, to that which is of greater importance. I don't think it needful here to make a long diſſertation, or many remarks to prove that the prophet writes in this manner in the place I now refer to, and ſhall ſet before the reader. All that I ſhall do, is to take aſunder what he ſays upon the two ſubjects, and ſet them in diſtinct columns, and leave it to the reader's judgment whether it be not evident that the parts in each column are to be joined together as cloſely as though nothing had intervened. The place of the prophet I ſpeak of, is *Hoſ.* xi. 12. xii. 1.——

The prophet Hosea's *discourse concerning the children of* Israel *and* Judah.

The prophet's discourse concerning Jacob, *personally and not nationally consider'd.*

CHAP. XI.

12. *Ephraim* compasseth me about with lies, and the house of *Israel* with deceit: but *Judah* yet ruleth with God, and is faithful
1. with the saints. *Ephraim* feedeth on wind, and followeth after the east wind: he daily increaseth lies and desolation, and they do make a covenant with the *Assyrians*, and oil is carried into
2. *Egypt*. The Lord hath also a controversy with *Judah*, and will punish *Jacob* [that is, the whole house of *Jacob*, both *Israel* and *Judah*] according to his ways, according to his doings will he recompense him.

He [*Jacob* personally consider-3. ed] took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his strength he had power with God. Yea, 4. he had power over the angel: he wept and made supplication unto him: he found him in *Bethel*, and there he spake with us. Even 5. the Lord God of hosts, the Lord is his memorial.

6. Therefore turn thou to thy God: keep mercy and judgment, and wait on thy God continually.
7. He is a merchant, the balances
8. of deceit are in his hand: he loveth to oppress. And *Ephraim*

said,

Concerning Israel *and* Judah.

said, yet I am become rich, I have found me out substance: in all my labours they shall find no
9. iniquity in me that were sin. And I that am the Lord thy God from the land of *Egypt*, will yet make thee to dwell in tabernacles, as
10. in the day of the solemn feast. I have also spoken by the prophets, and I have multiplied visions, and used similitudes by the prophets.
11. Is there iniquity in *Gilead?* Surely they are vanity, they sacrifice bullocks in *Gilgal*; yea, their altars are as heaps in the furrows of the field.

13. And by a prophet the Lord brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*, [referring to what he had said, *v.* 9.] and by a prophet was he preserv-
14. ed. *Ephraim* provoked him to anger most bitterly, *&c.*

Concerning Jacob *personally.*

And *Jacob* fled into the country of *Syria*, and *Israel* served for a wife, and for a wife he kept sheep. 12.

Let any considerate reader judge whether, as I have represented, his discourse, *v.* 6. is not to be joined with *v.* 2. and so of the rest of each column, and whether there be any tolerable sense or connection, if you join what is in one column with what follows in the other. I avoid making any critical remarks upon the place, and have therefore followed our translation. My business is not to treat of this passage, any farther than barely to show that such a management as I mentioned is certainly to be found in it.

These things being thus premised, I come now, 3. To give as clear and distinct an account as I can of that passage in the prophet

which St. *Matthew* cites. Now as I here take the diſcourſe to be alternate, I ſhall take the parts aſunder, and place them, as before, in two columns, and then add ſome obſervations to confirm this account. I ſhall begin no farther back than *chap.* x. 14.

The part relating to the people of Iſrael *and* Judah.	*The part relating to Chriſt.*
14. Therefore ſhall a tumult ariſe among thy people, and all thy fortreſſes ſhall be ſpoiled, as *Shalman* ſpoiled *Beth-arbel* in the day of battel: the mother was daſhed in pieces upon [or *with*] her chil-	
15. dren. So ſhall *Bethel* do unto you becauſe of your great wickedneſs.	
	In the morning [that is, in his youth] ſhall the king of *Iſrael* be certainly cut off. Becauſe *Iſrael* 1. was a child, and I loved him, therefore out of *Egypt* have I called my Son.
2. As they [the prophets] called them, ſo they went from them: they ſacrificed to *Baalim*, and burnt incenſe to graven images.	
3. I taught *Ephraim* alſo to go, taking them by their arms, but they knew not that I healed them.	
4. I drew them with the cords of a man, with bands of love, and I was to them as they that take off the yoke on their jaws, and I laid meat to them.	
	He ſhall not return into the 5. land of *Egypt*, nor ſhall the *Aſſyrian* be his king. *NB.*

Becauſe

The part relating to Israel *and* Judah.

Because they refused to return,
6. therefore shall the sword abide on his cities, and consume his bars, and devour them, because of their own counsels, *&c.*

It is to be observed, that this prophecy was probably delivered after the captivity of the ten tribes.

If the passage that speaks of *Shalman* means *Shalmaneser*, and the prophet does not speak there, of a future event, but illustrates his threatning by a known judgment, lately executed, and fresh in their memories (as seems most likely) then it is unquestionable that the prophecy must be after that captivity; and there are other passages that may seem to confirm the same thing, *chap.* x. 7. If this be allowed, we may well suppose that some things here mentioned may concern *Judah* and some *Israel*, as they are just before distinguished, *v.* 10, 11. and since the spoiling of *Israel* is spoken of as already past, it may reasonably be thought that *chap.* x. 14, 15. is a threatning particularly against *Judah:* and that God here declares that he would as sorely punish *Judah*, as he had already punished *Israel.* It will be here objected, that the mention of *Bethel*, *v.* 15. will not allow this: *So shall* Bethel *do unto you, because of your great wickedness.* And were indeed *Bethel* to be understood of the city where the calf was worship'd, this objection would be unanswerable. But since this prophet, in speaking of that place, never once vouchsafes to give it the honourable name of *Bethel*, when he speaks of it as a place of idolatry, but always mentions it under some reproachful name; it is not unreasonable that we should inquire whether he may not here design somewhat else by *Bethel.* Now it seems to me most likely that *Bethel* is not here *nomen proprium*, but *appellativum*, and that by *Bethel* we are to understand the house of God at *Jerusalem.* I am sensible, that when the temple is spoken of as the house of God, it is commonly called בית האלהים or בית אלהים, but it may as properly be called בית אל, and so the temple at *Jerusalem* is at least once called, *Zech.* vii. 2. What I conceive is meant by the threatning, is, that the temple at *Jerusalem*, which

which is, indeed, the *house of God*, shall be the occasion of a sore destruction to you, while you rely upon that for safety, crying, *the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord*, and, at the same time, commit the very worst of wickedness.

What follows in that column goes on concerning *Judah* no farther than one *verse*, and is a reproaching them for their great wickedness, their idolatry and incorrigibleness, and may be compared with 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 14—16. *Jerem.* xxv. 4—7. xxxv. 15. *Hosea* goes on in the two next *verses*, 3, 4. to speak of *Ephraim* or *Israel*. And after the next break in his discourse, at the latter end of *v.* 5. he returns to the people, and seems especially to speak of *Judah*, *Because they refused to return*, pointing at their obstinacy before complained of, *v.* 2. But, perhaps, some may imagine that he seems here to change his stile, and return to the singular, by his saying *his* and not *their*; *Therefore shall the sword abide on* his *cities, and consume* his *bars*, and that this does not suit the manner of his discourse concerning *Judah* or *Ephraim*, v. 2 — 4. But, I think, this difficulty may be easily removed; for, in the next words, he evidently uses his former stile, *And devour* them *because of* their *own counsels*: and, if I mistake not, the *his* in those two clauses refers to Christ, spoken of *v.* 5. and who is here consider'd according to the character given him, *chap.* x. 15. as *the King of* Israel, and so these cities and the bars or defences of them, or perhaps the fortresses whereby the country was defended, are stiled *his*.

But it may then be objected, that thus the two columns are mixed together, which are pretended to be so intirely distinct. I answer, that the prophet furnishes us with a key for this, in the first interchangeable discourse, which I set down in two columns, upon which the reader is desired to look back: for there *He*, *v.* 3. is to be explained, and somewhat more harshly too than in the present case, from *v.* 2. which is in a different column: And, by the way, the attentive considering these things can hardly fail to convince us, that this intermixture of different subjects is not to be ascribed to any subsequent casual dislocations of the several parts of the prophecy, but is intirely conformed to the original writing of the prophet himself.

But the other part of the discourse, which is contained in the second column, and which relates to Christ, is what needs most to be cleared. Now in order to that, let it be observed, That it is not easy to imagine that the prophet should prophesy concerning any other

other king in this place as the king of *Israel*, but Christ. The king of *Israel*, as distinguished from *Judah*, was overthrown, and his kingdom destroyed before by *Shalmaneser*, when he led away the ten tribes into captivity; nor had they any king peculiarly over them ever since. Nor was there any king foretold by any of the prophets who was to be over them but Christ. But as this prophet says, *Hos.* iii. 4, 5. *The children of* Israel *shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim. Afterward shall the children of* Israel *return, and seek the Lord their God, and* David [Christ] *their King, and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days*, [*i. e.* the days of the Messias.] It seems therefore plain, that by the King of *Israel* we are here to understand our Lord Jesus Christ, who is spoken of as the King of *Israel* in the old prophets, and as such was expected by the *Jews*, John i. 49. If the King of *Israel* be taken in this sense for Christ, nothing can more exactly agree in the accomplishment: for, after this time, no other King of *Israel* was ever cut off, but he. And farther, he was cut off in the morning of his days, in his youth, about the age of 35.

Having mentioned the King of *Israel*, he goes on thus, *Because* Israel *was a Child, and I loved him*, &c. where there can be no difficulty in understanding Christ to be meant by *Israel*: for thus is he called in other prophecies, as is observed by *Eusebius*, *Dem. Ev. Lib.* ix. *p.* 427. and particularly by *Isaiah*, who was contemporary with *Hosea*, Isai. xlix. 3. which cannot be more strange than that he should be called *David*, as he is by this and several other prophets. And besides, the name may be, and especially in this place, elliptical, and to be filled up from what goes just before; and so the sense will be, *Because the* King *of* Israel *was a Child, and I loved him*, &c. I think, we may observe another instance of this kind, *Numb.* xx. 14. Moses *sent messengers from* Kadesh *unto the king of* Edom, ——*v.* 18. *And* Edom [that is, *the king of* Edom, see *Judges* xi. 17.] *said unto him.* See the rest of the history in that place. I have said enough before to show how proper the words are, if understood of Christ. Every one must perceive, even upon a cursory reading, that in the following *verses* the prophet changes his stile, which, though it is not indeed a certain proof, yet looks fair toward this interpretation.

At *v.* 5. he returns to the stile he had used *v.* 1. in the singular; and, as I suppose, that is to be connected with *v.* 1. I think, we have here a clear proof that he does not speak of *Ephraim* or *Israel*.

For concerning them what is here ſaid, is not, I think, true; nor would the prophet be conſiſtent with himſelf, in caſe he aſſerted it of *Ephraim*, That he *ſhould not return into the land of* Egpyt, as may appear by theſe teſtimonies. *Hoſ.* viii. 11, 13. *Becauſe* Ephraim *hath made many altars to ſin,——now will he remember their iniquity, and viſit their ſins: they* ſhall return *to* Egypt. And can it then be thought, that the ſame prophet would ſay of *Ephraim*, chap. xi. 5. *He ſhall* not return *into the land of* Egypt? Again, *chap.* ix. 3. *They ſhall not dwell in the Lord's land; but* Ephraim ſhall return *to* Egypt, *and they ſhall eat unclean things in the land of* Aſſyria. Nay, they were not only to go into *Egypt*, but to die and be buried there, *v.* 6. Egypt *ſhall gather them up*, Memphis *ſhall bury them.* And again he foretels their being in *Egypt*, chap. xi. 11. *They ſhall tremble as a bird out of* Egypt, *and as a dove out of the land of* Aſſyria. Compare *Deut.* xxviii. 6, 8. It is probable that many of them went into *Egypt* in the reign of king *Hoſhea*, when he ſent meſſengers to *So*, king of *Egypt*, and, depending on his aid, revolted from the king of *Aſſyria*, 2 *Kings* xvii. 4. Nor is this inconſiſtent with their being carried captive into *Aſſyria*; for theſe two things are ſeveral times joined together in the prophecy, as *chap.* vii. 11. ix. 3. xi. 11. and xii. 1. But if we ſuppoſe the 5th *verſe* to be connected with *v.* 1. and that it relates, as St. *Matthew* applies it, to Chriſt, nothing can be more true and exact; for after he was once called out of *Egypt*, when he was a Child, he never again returned thither.

But then the next words, as they ſtand in our common tranſlation, may be objected: for, it may be ſaid, How can the next words ſuit Chriſt, *But the* Aſſyrian *ſhall be his king?* And indeed it is not true of Chriſt, that the *Aſſyrian* was ever his king, or that he ever was under his dominion and government. To this I anſwer, That when two ſentences are connected, whereof the firſt is a negative, the negation is frequently in the *Hebrew* language to be carried down from the firſt to the ſecond, as may be ſeen in the following places, where the obſervation of the ſupply made by our tranſlators, and printed in *Italick* as ſuch, may ſatisfy even the *Engliſh* reader, that the obſervation is juſt, *Deut.* xxxiii. 6. *Job* xxxii. 9. (Where, indeed, our tranſlation does not ſo plainly diſcover what they have ſupplied: and therefore I will tranſlate the words literally as they are in the *Hebrew*; and the rather, becauſe we have there לא in the firſt clauſe, and the copulative ו in the ſecond, exactly as in the place before us:

Great

Great men are not wise, and [that is, *nor*] *do the aged understand judgment.) Psal.* ix. 18. *Prov.* xxv. 27. xxx. 3. and many other places might be alleged to the same purpose. Hence, as the reader may observe, I have render'd the words thus, *Nor shall the* Assyrian *be his king.* In these and the foregoing words, I understand the prophet to speak according to the language of his own time, and of the famous and most eminent oppressors and inslavers that had ever been of the people of God, the king of *Egypt*, and the king of *Assyria*: and he denies that they shall be able to oppress Christ; for when once he left *Egypt*, he should never return thither any more, nor should he have at any time to do with the king of *Assyria.*

I am sensible that an objection will be made against what I have said from the version of the LXX. which renders the place thus, *When* Israel *was a child, then I loved him, and called* his sons *out of* Egypt. By which it may be thought they read in their copies בניו for בני, and this plural reading is confirmed by the *Targum.* But, to speak freely, I apprehend this to have been the explication both of the LXX. and the *Targum*, of a dark place, which neither understood. And certainly these authorities are sufficiently balanced by the consent of our present *Hebrew* copies, of *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, and *Theodotion*, which all express it in the singular, *my son*, and especially by the agreement of St. *Matthew* with them.

I hope, I have offered what is sufficient to abate the triumphs of the enemies of inspiration, upon the occasion of this citation of St. *Matthew.* The method I have ventured upon, to explain the prophet, is indeed new; but it appears to me to be just and well supported in the main. And if I have hit upon the true key, which I submit to the judgment of the attentive reader, I shall very much rejoice to see a better use made of it; or else I shall be pleased to see a better way suggested by a more skilful hand; there being nothing I more desire than to have the holy scriptures explained in a rational and solid way.

THE END.

A N

ADVERTISEMENT

Concerning ſome Things ſaid upon the

Epiſtle to the *COLOSSIANS.*

SINCE the publication of the *Paraphraſe* and *Notes* on the *Coloſſians*, my very learned and good friend, Mr. *Whiſton*, did me the favour to refer me to Dr. *Mills* for an account of the letter from *Laodicea*, which I wiſh I had not over-look'd before. The Doctor's opinion (*Proleg.* p. 8, 9.) is, that the epiſtle to the *Epheſians* (as we call it) is the very epiſtle St. *Paul* ſpeaks of, *Col.* iv. 16. and that it was originally writen by him to the *Laodiceans*. What the Doctor has writen on this argument is, as uſual, with great judgment, and deſerves to be conſider'd. He has, I confeſs, extorted my aſſent to the greateſt part of what he ſays.

He has proved it highly improbable that that epiſtle was at firſt writen to the *Epheſians*. St. *Paul* had reſided among them, and *kept back nothing that was profitable unto them*, but had *ſhew'd them, and taught them publickly, and from houſe to houſe*: he had not *ſhunn'd to declare unto them all the counſel of God*; and, *by the ſpace of three years, he ceaſed not to warn every one night and day with tears*, Acts xx. 20, 27, 31. how then could he write to them as though he had never ſeen or been among them, but only had heard of them? How ſtrange is it that he ſhould uſe the ſame ſtile to the *Coloſſians*, Col. i. 4. with whom he had never been, and to the *Epheſians* among whom he had lived and preached ſo long? *Eph.* i. 15. *Wherefore I alſo, after I* heard *of your faith in the Lord Jeſus, and love to all the ſaints.* Again, is it likely he would refer thoſe to whom he had *declared all the counſel of God* ſo long together, to a bare report of himſelf? *Eph.* iii. 2. *If ye have heard of the diſpenſation of the grace of God which is given me to you ward.* Or would he ſuppoſe that they who had been ear-witneſſes of his knowledge, and had heard him preach a thouſand times, would need to *underſtand his knowledge in the myſtery of Chriſt*, from what he ſaid in a few *verſes*, or even the whole, of that ſhort epiſtle? *Eph.* iii. 4.

I remember when I began to write on the *Coloſſians*, I took notice of *chap.* i. 4. as a clear argument that St. *Paul* had never been among them: but obſerving afterwards that he uſed the ſame ſtile to the *Epheſians* (as I imagined) among whom he had preach'd ſo long, I thought it neceſſary to drop that argument, and ſo took up with Mr. *Locke*'s account, which I tranſcribed. It ſeems now much more pro-

bable

bable to me, that the epiſtle to the *Epheſians* was writen to ſuch as he had never ſeen; nor can I find a ſatisfactory account of the three paſſages, upon which the Doctor inſiſts, in the other ſcheme. And, no doubt, theſe gave occaſion to *Oecumenius* to ſay in his prologue, That St. *Paul* ſent them that epiſtle, having never ſeen, but only heard of them; which muſt be very ſtrange, if he ſent it to the *Epheſians*: for it is certain (as that writer alſo acknowledges) it was ſent by him when in bonds, *chap.* iii. 1. iv. 1. vi. 20. and it is clear, from the *Acts*, that he had ſpent three years at *Epheſus* before his firſt being in bonds.

I may add, that it would be very ſtrange, if this epiſtle were writen to the *Epheſians*, he ſhould never once, through the whole of it, refer either to his preaching among them, or the ſucceſs of it, or the obſervations he had made of them, either as to their behaviour in general, or their kindneſs toward himſelf. This is not uſual with him, when he writes to thoſe to whom he had preached himſelf; to which purpoſe we may compare his epiſtles to the *Corinthians*, *Galatians*, *Philippians*, and *Theſſalonians*. Nor is it likely he would conclude an epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, without taking particular notice of ſome of his ſpecial friends, ſuch as *Oneſiphorus*, who was of *Aſia*, and probably of *Epheſus*, 2 *Tim.* i. 16, 18.

And tho' we have no ancient verſions or MSS. which do not read, as we do, *at* Epheſus, *chap.* i. 1. yet what the Doctor obſerves is very conſiderable, That it appears by the teſtimonies of St. *Baſil* and St. *Jerom*, that ſome ancient copies they met with left out thoſe words, while they were at a loſs what to put in the room of them. The preſent agreement of our copies is to be accounted for by what the Doctor allows, that the change of the inſcription of the epiſtle is very ancient, it being thus quoted by *Ignatius*, which ever edition you chooſe of his epiſtles; in the ſhorter epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, Sect. 12. in the larger *Sect.* 6, 9. Nay, the Doctor ſuppoſes this alteration made before the canon of the New Teſtament was ſettled, which to me alſo ſeems probable. But I can't ſo eaſily aſſent to his conjecture, that it might be made by St. *Paul*'s direction, preſently after the writing of the epiſtle, when *Tychicus* brought the *Epheſians* a copy of it. For the ſame reaſon for which I believe it was not originally writen to them, I believe likewiſe St. *Paul* would not direct the making ſuch an alteration, namely, becauſe he knew there were ſome things in the epiſtle which would not ſuit the *Epheſians*: beſides that by this means he would direct them to darken a paſſage in his epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*. My conjecture rather is, that when St. *Paul* ſent this epiſtle by *Tychicus*, chap. vi. 22. he order'd him to deliver a copy of it to the *Epheſians*; and that they took this as a ſufficient reaſon to conſider, ſpeak of, and glory in it as writen to them, and that their ambition of having it thought that ſuch a noble epiſtle was directed to them, led them, in the copies they diſpers'd, to repreſent it as directed to them; and *Epheſus* being the *metropolis* of the country, and the church there being very numerous and famous, might be the cauſe why the generality of the copies diſpers'd carried this inſcription. So that hitherto there is no material difference of my opinion from the Doctor's.

But I am not ſo clear in the evidence the Doctor produces that this was the epiſtle to the *Laodiceans*. What he alleges concerning the agreement between it and the epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, which render'd it proper that both ſhould be read in each church, is conſiderable: and very plauſible is what he mentions from *Tertullian*, of *Marcion* the heretick's aſſertion, that this was the letter to the *Laodiceans*. But I have one objection which I can't ſo eaſily get over: and were it not for that, I imagine I ſhould fully agree with him. My objection is, that it ſeems highly improbable, that St. *Paul* would ſend his ſalutations to the *Laodiceans*, in the epiſtle he wrote to the *Coloſſians*, in caſe he had ſent that epiſtle to the *Laodiceans* by

the

the ſame meſſenger. The doctor, who does not uſe to overlook any thing that makes for or againſt him, could not but take notice of this: and he conjectures, That, perhaps, after St. *Paul* had ſealed up his epiſtle to the *Laodiceans*, he conſider'd that the ſalutation with which he concluded it [*chap.* vi. 24. *Grace be with all them that love the Lord Jeſus Chriſt in ſincerity*] was too general, and might ſeem, according to the tenor of the words to be directed as much to all the faithful, as to the *Laodiceans*, and ſo might be leſs agreeable to them; and that therefore, in his epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, he added a more diſtinct ſalutation to the *Laodiceans*, which might be every way pleaſing to them. *Salute*, ſays he, *the brethren which are in* Laodicea, *with* Nymphas, *and the church which is in his houſe*, Col. iv. 15. This conjecture carries in it the leaſt probability of any thing advanced by him on the ſubject. For what could be diſpleaſing to the *Laodiceans*, upon their reading ſuch a noble epiſtle directed to them, wherein he had expreſs'd the higheſt reſpect to them, and beſtowed the higheſt commendations upon them? what room could there be for their taking it unkindly that he did not ſalute them particularly in the end of the epiſtle, when he had done it ſo fully in the beginning; Chap. i. 2 *Grace be to you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*? Nay, though the concluſion of the epiſtle is in ſuch general terms as the Doctor mentions; yet the *verſe* before is a ſalutation directed to the *Laodiceans* in particular (in caſe the epiſtle was writen to them) *Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* So that I can't ſee why the ſalutation ſent them in their own epiſtle ſhould not have pleaſed them full as well, as that in the epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*. Here therefore I ſuſpend my judgment, being neither able to acquieſce in the Doctor's ſolution, nor yet to offer a better.

The Doctor's obſervation is very juſt, that ſince there is no doubt about the author of the epiſtle, it is of little importance to us, to whom it was writen, the regard due to what is ſaid in it being the ſame, whether it was writen to the *Laodiceans*, *Epheſians*, or any other church: and ſo this is not more material than a great many other various lections in the New Teſtament.

If any think fit intirely to agree with the Doctor in his opinion, they need not, upon that account, diſlike what is ſaid toward the latter end of the Note (*z*) on *Col.* ii. 18. concerning the agreement between the epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, and Chriſt's epiſtle to the *Laodiceans*, Rev. iii. 14, &c. For, taking the Doctor's notion for granted, though the cenſure paſſed upon the worſhiping of angels might ſeem at firſt ſight more proper to have been inſerted in the epiſtle to the *Laodiceans*; yet, upon ſecond thoughts, perhaps it may not. And ſince St. *Paul* deſigned the two epiſtles ſhould be read in both churches, this may be thought no ſmall inſtance of the skilfulneſs of his addreſs, that in writing to the *Laodiceans* he ſtrongly aſſerts thoſe principles which would neceſſarily overthrow the practice ſome were indeavouring to introduce among them, but avoids the giving them offence while he forbears the expreſs mention of the practice it ſelf, reſerving that for his epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, who had kept themſelves more free from that corruption, though they might not be wholly out of danger.

I think men ought never to ſpeak or write with greater candour than when it is of the holy ſcriptures: and I hope, by what I have ſaid in this advertiſement, it may appear, I am open to conviction, and ready to acknowledge any miſtake into which I may have unwarily fallen, which is all that can be expected from ſuch fallible ſhort-ſighted creatures as we are: and unleſs men can bear with another upon ſuch terms, we muſt at once baniſh all careful and diligent inquiries out of the world.

FINIS.

— Kwith Knowledge

A

PARAPHRASE,

AND

NOTES

ON THE

EPISTLE

TO THE

HEBREWS.

The Second Edition.

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*. With ſeveral Critical Diſſertations on particular Texts of Scripture.

LONDON:

Printed by J. PURSER, for J. NOON, at the White Hart, near Mercers-Chapel, Cheapſide. MDCCXXXIV.

THE PREFACE.

THE *Paraphraſe and Notes on the* Coloſſians *and the* Philippians *met with ſo good a reception, that the learned author was thereby incouraged 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 indeavouring 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 publiſh'd, 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

assure the reader, that he has these [illegible] 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 34*th 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.

Febr. 16,
1725.

THE
INTRODUCTION.

An ESSAY *to discover the* Author *of this Epistle, and the* Language *in which it was originally written.*

IT is *not* a matter of *absolute necessity* to discover these things: since almost all traditions agree in this, that the epistle was the work of a *sacred* writer, upon whose knowledge and integrity we may depend, as upon the other writers of the New Testament. The authors that have been named, are *Paul*, *Barnabas*, *Luke*, and *Clement* of *Rome*. For the same reason as we receive the writings of *Paul* into the canon, we should receive the *genuine* writings of *Barnabas* into the canon also. And we should treat the writings of *Clement* with the same respect as we do those of *Luke*. For they are on a *level*: *neither* was an *apostle*; and *each* was a *companion* and *disciple* of the apostles. Yet it would be a *satisfaction* to us, and of some *use* also, to know the *author* of this epistle, and the *language*, in which *he* wrote it. Wherefore I shall set myself to inquire after these things.

The INTRODUCTION.

I. *Of the* Author *of the epiſtle to the* Hebrews.

AS the author of this epiſtle did not think fit to ſet his name to it, there has been ſome room left for mens forming various conjectures, who he was. The perſons, to whom it was written, were at no ſuch uncertainty, but well knew the author, as appears from his ſaying to them, *Pray for* us.----*And* I *beſeech you the rather to do this, that* I *may be* reſtored to you *the ſooner*, *chap.* xiii. 18, 19. When they had received this epiſtle, and were ſenſible who wrote it, no doubt, they talk'd of it to others: and their poſterity and ſucceſſors were likely enough to convey down the name of the author by *tradition* to others after them. We muſt therefore examine *what tradition* there was in ſucceeding ages relating to the author of this epiſtle.

In the writings of the ancient Chriſtians now extant this epiſtle is not at all quoted till toward the end of the *ſecond* century. It is not cited either by *Hermas*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Juſtin Martyr*, the church of *Smyrna*, *Irenæus*, *Theophilus* of *Antioch*, *Tatian*, *Athenagoras*, *Hermias*, or the church of *Lyon*. Some have adventured to ſay, that it is *quoted* by *Clement* of *Rome* in his firſt epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. But this is a very wrong repreſentation of the matter. The *fact* is this, that *Clement* has two or three thoughts and expreſſions *like* ſome which we meet with in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*: but it is by no means neceſſary to ſuppoſe, that the former were even *borrow'd* from hence. What *Clement* ſays is deliver'd *as his own*, and not introduced with *as it is written*, or any other form that denotes a *quotation*. His words are theſe, " (*a*) Jeſus Chriſt being the brightneſs of the *majeſty* of the Lord, " is ſo much greater than the angels, as he hath by inheritance " obtain'd a more excellent name. For thus it is written, *Who* " *maketh his angels winds, and his miniſters a flame of fire* [Pſal. " civ. 4.] But concerning his ſon, the Lord thus ſpeaks [Pſal. ii. " 7, 8.] *Thou art my ſon, to day have I begotten thee. Ask of me,* " *and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the* " *utmoſt*

(*a*) ——Ιησαν Χειςον,——ος ων απαυγασμα της μεγαλωσυνης αυτε, τοσετω μειζων εςιν αγγελων, ςω διαφοροτερον ονομα κεκληρονομηκεν. Γεγραπται γαρ ετως, Ο ποιων τες αγγελες αυτε πνευματα, και τες λειτεργες αυτε πυρος φλογα. Επι δε τω υιω αυτε ειπεν ο δεσποτης, Υιος με ει συ, εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε· αιτησαι παρ' εμε, και δωσω σοι εθνη την κληρονομιαν σε, και την κατασχεσιν τα περατα της γης· και παλιν λεγει προς αυτον Καθε εκ δεξιων με ες αν θω τες εχθρες σε υποποδιον των ποδων σε. Cap. 36.

" *utmoſt parts of the earth for thy poſſeſſion.* And again he ſaith to " him, *Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy* " *footſtool*". *Clement* here quotes the book of *Pſalms* three times, but not at all the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. Nay he does not give the leaſt hint as if he *borrow'd* any expreſſions from thence. There is a *difference* in the *expreſſions* themſelves, in the *order* wherein they are ranged, and in the *texts* cited from the Old Teſtament, as any one may ſee by comparing this paſſage of *Clement* with *Heb.* i. 3.---7. As to the *thoughts* wherein they agree, it is *poſſible Clement* might *borrow* them from the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*; but it is far from being *certain*; ſince it is *as poſſible*, that *Clement* often *heard* St. *Paul* expreſs them in his *private* converſation and publick *preaching*, and afterward uſed them as his own, the like to which every other writer in the world has done.

Toward the *end* of the *ſecond* century there is expreſs mention made of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* in the writings that now remain of *Clement* of *Alexandria*, and *Tertullian* of *Carthage*. By the ſituation of theſe places with reſpect to *Judæa*, where the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was firſt publiſh'd, one would naturally judge, that *Clement* was more likely than *Tertullian* to have the true account of the author of it: ſince *Alexandria* was not 260 miles from *Jeruſalem*; whereas *Carthage* was above 1400. And it is moſt likely, that the epiſtle came to *Carthage through Alexandria*.

Clement of *Alexandria* often cites the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* as St. *Paul*'s. His words are theſe, " *Paul* writing to the *Hebrews* " ſaith, *Have ye need that one ſhould teach you, what are the firſt principles of the oracles of God, &c.?* " *Heb.* v. 12. (*b*). And *Euſebius* teſtifies, that *Clement* in his *Hypotypoſes* (a book now loſt) ſaid, " The epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was written by *Paul* in " the *Hebrew* language, and that *Luke* tranſlated it into *Greek* (*c*)". On the other hand *Tertullian*, who lived and wrote at the ſame time with *Clement* of *Alexandria*, cites the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* as the work of *Barnabas*, the companion of *Paul*, without any heſitation. He ſpeaks of it thus," There is extant an epiſtle of *Bar-* " *nabas*, intituled, *To the Hebrews*.--Warning the diſciples he ſaith,

(*b*) Παυλ☉———τοις Εβραιοις γεγραφων——— Η παλιν, φησι, χρειαν εχετε τυ διδασ-κειν υμας τινα τα στοιχεια της αρχης των λογιων τυ Θευ, κ. τ. λ. Strom. Lib. vi. p. 645. *Paris* 1641. Vide etiam p. 420, 514.

(*c*) Την προς Εβραιυς επιστολην Παυλυ μεν ειναι φησι [Κλημης], γεγραφθαι δε Εβραιοις Εβραικη φωνη. Λυκαν δε φιλοτιμως αυτην μεθερμηνευσαντα, εκδεναι τοις Ελλησιν. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. vi. cap. 14.

" *It is impoſſible for thoſe, who have been once inlighten'd, and* " *have taſted the heavenly gift, &c.*" *Heb.* vi. 4. (*d*). The queſtion now is, which of theſe two accounts is moſt to be regarded? I own, I cannot but determine in favour of the tradition received by *Clement* of *Alexandria*, both becauſe (as was before obſerved) he lived much nearer to *Judæa* than *Tertullian*; and becauſe *Tertullian* is abſolutely *alone* in aſcribing the epiſtle to *Barnabas*, and is not therein followed by any one writer of the ancient church. The *general* and almoſt *unanimous* and *uninterrupted* tradition is, that St. *Paul* was the author of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*.

Of the ancient eccleſiaſtical writers within the four firſt centuries there are but *three* named (beſides *Tertullian*) who deny it to be St. *Paul*'s epiſtle.

Irenæus is the firſt (placed by Dr. *Cave* in the year of Chriſt, 167) who is ſaid to deny it. *Stephen Gobar*, quoted by *Photius*, is the only author of this ſtory. His words are, " *Hippolytus* and " *Irenæus* ſay, that *Paul*'s epiſtle to the *Hebrews* is not his " (*e*). But this account may well be diſtruſted, becauſe *Jerom* (who lived much nearer the times of *Irenæus* than *Stephen Gobar* did) expreſly ſays that the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* had been received as *Paul*'s by *all* the *Greek* writers (*f*). If *Irenæus*, who wrote in *Greek*, had really denied it to be St. *Paul*'s, *Jerom* could not but have known it, ſince he was well acquainted with the works of *Irenæus*, of which he reckons up many more than what are now extant, in his *catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writers*. And if *Jerom* had known that *Irenæus* denied it, he would have mention'd the fact, and have excepted him, when he ſaid, The *Greek* writers receive it as *Paul*'s. Perhaps the only reaſon, why *Stephen Gobar* ſaid, that *Irenæus* denied it, is becauſe he did not happen to quote this epiſtle at all, in thoſe works of his which *Stephen* ſaw: as he does not quote it in any part of his works now remaining. However it is certain, that he *did* quote it in another work now loſt, intituled, *A Book of various Diſcourſes*, in one word, a *Miſcellany*.

Euſebius

(*d*) Extat enim & Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos.——Moriens itaque diſcipulos—— Impoſſibile eſt enim, inquit, eos qui ſemel inluminati ſunt, & donum coeleſte guſtaverunt, &c. De Pudicitia, cap. 20.

(*e*) Οτι Ιππολυτος και Ειρηναιος την προς Εβραιους επιστολην Παυλου, ουκ εκεινου ειναι φασι. Photii Cod. 232 p. 904. Rothomag. 1653.

(*f*) Vide infra not. (*r*).

Euſebius mentions this Miſcellany, wherein he ſays, *Irenæus* cites ſome paſſages from the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* (*g*).

Caius, or *Gaius* (*A. D.* 210) a presbyter of the church of *Rome*, is cited by *Euſebius* (*h*) and *Jerom* (*i*) as reckoning *Paul*'s epiſtles to be only *thirteen*, and the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* not to be his.

Hippolytus (*A. D.* 220) a diſciple of *Irenæus* is alſo mention'd on this occaſion. *Stephen Gobar*, in *Photius*, tells us, that *Hippolytus* ſaid, that *Paul*'s epiſtle to the *Hebrews* is not his (*k*). And *Photius* himſelf cites *Hippolytus* as ſaying, That the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* is not the apoſtle *Paul*'s (*l*).

Beſides theſe three *particular* men we are informed, that the church of *Rome*, and *many* of the *Latins* did not receive this, as one of *Paul*'s epiſtles. *Euſebius* ſays, "Some reject the epiſtle to "the *Hebrews*, ſaying that the church of *Rome* denies it to be "one of *Paul*'s epiſtles" (*m*). And he adds, "*Some* of the *Ro*-"*mans* to this day do not think it to be the apoſtle's" (*n*). *Jerom* gives us the ſame account, ſaying, "It is not the cuſtom of "the *Latins* to receive the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* among the cano-"nical Scriptures" (*o*). *Philaſtrius* tells us, "There are *ſome*, "who do not take *Paul*'s epiſtle to the *Hebrews* to be his, but "ſay that it was written by *Barnabas* the apoſtle, or *Clement* "biſhop of *Rome*" (*p*). *Auſtin* alſo obſerves, that "*Moſt* ſay, "the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* is the apoſtle *Paul*'s, while *ſome* deny "it" (*q*). Upon theſe teſtimonies it muſt be obſerved, (1) That the

(*g*) Βιβλιον τι διαλεξεων διαφορων, εν ω της προς Εβραιους επιστολης, και της λεγομενης Σοφιας Σολομωντος μνημονευει, ρητα τινα εξ αυτων παραθεμενος. Hiſt. Eccl. Lib. v. c. 26. N. B. the words, διαλεξεων διαφορων are well render'd by *Jerom* (not variarum *diſputatio-num*, as *Valeſius*, but) variorum *tractatuum*, *i. e.* a *Miſcellany*. *Catal. Script. Eccleſ.* ſub voce, *Irenæus*.

(*h*) Γαιος——των τε ιερων αποστολε δεκαδυο μονων επιστολων μνημονευει, την προς Εβραιους ου συναριθμησας ταις λοιπαις. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. vi. cap. 20.

(*i*) Gaius——epiſtolas Pauli tredecim tantum enumerans, decimam quartam, quae fertur ad Hebraeos, dicit non ejus eſſe. *Catal. Script. Eccleſ.* ſub voce, *Gaius*.

(*k*) See before note (*e*).

(*l*) Ιππολυτος——λεγει——οτι η προς Εβραιους επιστολη ουκ εστι του αποστολου Παυλου. Cod. 121. p. 301.

(*m*) Οτι γε μην τινες ηθετηκασι την προς Εβραιους, προς της Ρωμαιων εκκλησιας ως μη Παυλου ουσαν αυτην αντιλεγεσθαι φησαντες, ου δικαιον ηγουμην. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib iii. c. 3.

(*n*) Επει και εις δευρο παρα Ρωμαιων τισιν ου νομιζεται του αποστολου τυγχανειν. Ibid. Lib. vi. c. 20.

(*o*) Latinorum conſuetudo non recipit inter Scripturas canonicas epiſtolam ad Hebraeos. Epiſt. 129. Dardano.

(*p*) Sunt alii quoque qui epiſtolam Pauli ad Hebraeos non aſſerunt eſſe ipſius, ſed dicunt aut Barnabae eſſe apoſtoli, aut Clementis de urbe Roma epiſcopi. Haereſ. 41. apud Biblioth. Patrum, Tom. iv. Col. 22. *Paris* 1624.

(*q*) ——Epiſtola quae inſcribitur ad Hebraeos: quam *plures* apoſtoli Pauli eſſe dicunt, *quidam* vero negant. De Civitate Dei, Lib. xvi. cap. 22. *Lugd.* 1561.

the

the *Latins* according to *Euſebius* and *Jerom* did not attribute it to any other ſacred author, but ſuppoſed it to be no part of canonical Scripture. So that the teſtimony of the church of *Rome* cannot be pleaded as an evidence by ſuch as would now perſuade us, that the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was written by *Barnabas* or *Luke*; (2) That the ſame *Jerom* tells us, that tho' *in his days* the church of *Rome* rejected this epiſtle, yet in the *more early* times of Chriſtianity it was received as St. *Paul*'s by the church of *Rome* in particular among the reſt of the *antient* churches. His words are, "The epiſtle to the *Hebrews* has been received as the apoſtle *Paul*'s "not only by the *eaſtern* churches, but alſo by *all* the *antient* "churches and *Greek writers*.----It is not the cuſtom of the *Latins* "to receive it among the canonical Scriptures: yet we receive it, "becauſe we are not influenced by the cuſtoms of the *preſent* age, "but ſubmit to the authority of the *antient* writers, who fre- "quently cite it as a canonical and ſacred epiſtle" (*r*). When he ſays, *all* the *antient* churches received it, he does not except the *antient* church of *Rome*; and when he makes the ſaid *univerſal* obſervation in oppoſition to the cuſtom of the *modern* church of *Rome* in his days, he does as good as ſay in expreſs terms, that that particular church did *of old* receive it. So that, upon the whole, the evidence produced againſt St. *Paul*'s being the author of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* is, *in itſelf*, very weak. Make the *moſt* of it; it is only the teſtimony of the *more modern Latin* church, and of *four* particular writers of *it*. *Tertullian* was a *Latin* writer: *Gaius* was a presbyter of the church of *Rome*: *Irenæus* lived at *Lyons* in *France*: and *Hippolytus*, as Dr. *Cave* thinks, ſpent the laſt years of his life at *Rome*, and died there (*s*); it is certain however that he died in *Italy* (*t*). But this evidence will appear to be *utterly inconſiderable*, when we conſider the evidence given on the other ſide.

Clement of *Alexandria* (*A. D.* 192) has been already mention'd. The reſt, during the firſt four centuries, who quoted the epiſtle to the

(*r*) Illud noſtris dicendum eſt, hanc epiſtolam, quae inſcribitur ad Hebraeos, non ſolum ab eccleſiis Orientis, ſed ab omnibus retro eccleſiis, & Graeci ſermonis ſcriptoribus, quasi Pauli apoſtoli ſuſcipi.———Quod ſi eam Latinorum conſuetudo non recipit inter ſcripturas canonicas,———& tamen nos ſuſcipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis conſuetudinem ſed veterum ſcriptorum auctoritatem ſequentes, qui plerumque [ejus] abutuntur teſtimoniis, non, ut interdum, de apocryphis facere ſolent——ſed quaſi cononicis & eccleſiaſticis. Dardano, Epiſt. 129.

(*s*) Hiſt. Literar. p. 67.

(*t*) *Du Pin* in his account of *Hippolytus* note (*b*) Vol. I. p. 87.

the *Hebrews* as an epiſtle of St. *Paul*, ſhall be placed in the order wherein Dr. *Cave* names them in his *Hiſtoria Literaria*.

Origen (*A. D.* 230) the diſciple of *Clement* of *Alexandria* often cites this epiſtle as St. *Paul*'s. He expreſſes himſelf thus, "The "ſame *Paul* in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* ſays, *In theſe laſt days* "*he hath ſpoken to us by his ſon, whom he hath appointed heir of* "*all things*," &c. *Heb.* i. 2. (*u*). *Euſebius* tells us (*w*), "That "*Origen* wrote homilies on the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, in which "he delivers his opinion thus, That the ſtyle of the epiſtle to the "*Hebrews* has not the homelineſs of the apoſtle's, who acknow-"ledges himſelf to be homely in his language (2 *Cor.* xi. 6.) where-"as this epiſtle is compoſed in pure *Greek*, as muſt be acknow-"ledged by every one that underſtands the difference of ſtyles.--- "It is my opinion, that the *thoughts* are the apoſtle's, but the "*language* and *compoſition* owing to ſome one who remember'd "the apoſtle's doctrine, and committed it to writing, as a Scholiaſt "does what is dictated by his maſter. If therefore any church "eſteems this to be an epiſtle of *Paul*, it deſerves to be com-"mended for it. For the *antients* have rightly handed it down to "us as an epiſtle of *Paul*. But GOD only knows who *wrote* the "epiſtle [*i. e.* to whom the language and compoſition are owing]. "Some traditions which have reach'd our time, ſay, it was written "by *Clement*, biſhop of *Rome*, others by *Luke* the evangeliſt". The reaſon, we ſee why, *Origen* thought the *compoſition* and *language* were not *Paul*'s was, becauſe he apprehended he obſerved a *manifeſt difference of ſtyle* between this, and *Paul*'s undoubted epiſtles; this being more elegant *Greek* than the language of the reſt. But let the difference as to the language be what it will, there is no need however to embrace *Origen*'s ſuppoſition, *That the* thoughts

(*u*) Εν τη προς Εβραιους ο αυτος Παυλος φησιν, Επ' εσχατων των ημερων ελαλησεν ημιν εν .., &. τ. λ. Comment. in Joann. p. 56. Edit. Huetii. Rothomag. 1668. See alſo p. 22, 8, 416. See Origen contra Celſum, p. 143. Philocal. p. 10. *Cantab.* 1677. De Orat p. 89, , &c. *Oxon.* 1686.

(*w*) Περι της προς Εβραιους επιστολης εν τοις εις αυτην ομιλιαις ταυτα διαλαμβανει [ο Ωριγενης]· οτι ο χαρακτηρ της λεξεως της προς Εβραιους επιγεγραμμενης επιστολης εχει το εν ..γω ιδιωτικον του αποστολου, ομολογησαντος εαυτον ιδιωτην ειναι τω λογω, τυτεστι τη φρασει· αλλα εστιν η επιστολη συνθεσει της λεξεως ελληνικωτερα, τις ο επιστημων γευσεται φρασεως ειτις ομολογησαι αν.---Εγω δε αποφαινομενος ειποιμι' αν, οτι τα μεν νοηματα του απο-στολου εστιν· η δε φρασις και η συνθεσις απομνημονευσαντος τινος τα αποστολικα, και ωσπερει σχολιογραφησαντος τα ειρημενα υπο του διδασκαλου. Ει τις ουν εκκλησια εχει ταυτην την επι-στολην ως Παυλου, αυτη δοκιμαστω και επι τουτω. Ου γαρ εικη οι αρχαιοι ανδρες ως Παυλου αυτην παρεδεδωκασι. Τις δε ο γραψας την επιστολην, το μεν αληθες Θεος οιδεν. Η δε εις ημας διαδεδομενη ιστορια υπο τινων μεν λεγεται, οτι Κλημης ο γενομενος επισκοπος Ρω-μαιων εγραψε την επιστολην· υπο τινων δε οτι Λουκας ο γραψας το ευαγγελιον, και τους πρα-ξεις. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. vi. cap. 25.

thoughts *only were* Paul's, *while ſome other perſon by* memory *committed them to writing*: ſince the ſame difference of ſtyle and language would ariſe from what *Clement of Alexandria* ſaid was the caſe, *viz.* " That the apoſtle wrote it in *Hebrew*, and that it was " afterward *tranſlated* into *Greek* by ſome other hand ". The *traditions* which *Origen* mentions are more to be regarded than his private *opinion* and *reaſonings*. And as he poſitively ſays, the *antients* did in fact hand it down as *Paul's* epiſtle: ſo it is plain, he laid *vaſt ſtreſs* upon this tradition, ſince he would not give it up as falſe, though he had ſtrong *temptations* ſo to do. For he was very hard put to it to reconcile this tradition with the ſtyle of the epiſtle, and with other traditions which named *Clement* or *Luke* as the *writers* of it. But rather than give up the former tradition, *viz. That it was* Paul's *epiſtle*, he would frame ſuch an odd hypotheſis as that juſt now mention'd. It is very certain then, that the churches and writers, who were *antient* with reſpect to *Origen*, had one common tradition, that St. *Paul* was the *author* of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. And their teſtimony to this matter of fact cannot but be of great weight: ſince thoſe Chriſtians, who were *antients* with reſpect to *Origen*, muſt have converſed either with the apoſtles themſelves, or at leaſt with their immediate ſucceſſors.

Alexander of *Alexandria* (*A. D.* 313) quotes the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* thus, " As the apoſtle ſaith, *Jeſus Chriſt the ſame yeſter-* " *day, and to day, and for ever*, *Heb.* xiii. 8. (*x*). There can be no room to doubt, but that he meant St. *Paul*, whom juſt after he calls, *the apoſtle* (*y*). Again he adds more expreſly, " *Paul* " ſays concerning Chriſt, *Whom he appointed heir of all things, by* " *whom alſo he made the worlds* ", *Heb.* i. 2. (*z*).

Euſebius of *Cæſarea* in *Judæa* (*A. D.* 315) delivers his own opinion thus: " The fourteen epiſtles of *Paul* are known and certain. " It muſt be acknowledged however, that *ſome* reject the epiſtle " to the *Hebrews*, alledging, that the church of *Rome* denies it to " be one of *Paul's* epiſtles. But what our predeceſſors have ſaid " of

(*x*) Αλλα ως ο αποστολος, Ιησους Χριστος χθες και σημερον ο αυτος, και εις τους αιωνας. Apud Socratis Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. I. cap. 6. p. 12. *Mogunt.* 1677.

(*y*) Page 13.

(*z*) ——Παυλος φασκων περι αυτου, Ον εθηκε κληρονομον παντων· δι ου και τους αιωνας εποιησεν. Apud Theodoriti Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. I. cap. 4. p. 13. *Mogunt.* 1679.

" of this, we ſhall afterward deliver " (*a*). Accordingly he afterward gives an account of what he had learned from the writings of *Clement* of *Alexandria* and of *Origen* relating to this epiſtle; which has been here already cited. *Euſebius* adds, in another place (*b*) that " *Clement* of *Rome* in his epiſtle to the *Corinthians* " has *borrow'd* many thoughts from the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, " and ſometimes uſes the very ſame words: which demonſtrates, " that it is not a compoſition of later ages: wherefore it is juſtly " rank'd with the other writings of the apoſtle. For while *Paul* " wrote to the *Hebrews* in their native language, ſome ſay that " *Luke* the evangeliſt, others, that *Clement* of *Rome* tranſlated the " epiſtle into *Greek*: the latter of which ſeems the more probable " of the two, becauſe of the *ſimilitude of ſtyle* between the " epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and the epiſtle of *Clement*, and becauſe " the *thoughts* in theſe two epiſtles are not very different.

Athanaſius of *Alexandria* (*A. D.* 326) often cites the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* as St. *Paul*'s in his undoubtedly genuine works. In his book *concerning the incarnation of the divine word*, he ſays, " Which *Paul* alſo meant when he ſaid, *By faith we underſtand*, " *that the worlds were framed by the word of God*". *Heb.* xi. 3. (*c*).

The author of the *Synopſis Scripturæ* among the works of *Athanaſius* is not known, and therefore I cannot determine where he ought to be placed in the order of chronology. But as the work is allow'd to be *antient*, and by ſome learned men has been eſteemed the work of *Athanaſius* himſelf, it may be proper in this place to conſider what evidence it gives relating to the matter before us. The author's words are, " The epiſtles of the apoſtle *Paul* are " fourteen; the firſt is that to the *Romans*---the tenth, that to " the *Hebrews* (*d*).

Cyril

(*a*) Τε δε Παυλε περδηλοι και σαφεις αι διεκδεσεις [επιστολαι]. Οτι γεμιν τινες ηθετησαι την προς Εβραιους, προς της Ρωμαιων εκκλησιας ως μη Παυλε ουσαν αυτην ανθιλεγεσαι φησανδες, κ δικαιον αγνοειν. Και τα περι ταυτης δε τοις προ ημων ειρημενα κατα μικρον παρεθησομαι. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. III. c. 3.

(*b*) Εν η [επιστολη τε Κλημεντος], της προς Εβραιους πολλα νοημαδα παραθεις, ηδη δε και αυτολεξει ρητοις τισιν εξ αυτης χρησαμενος, σαφεσδα παριστησιν, ὁτι μη ξενον υπαρχει το συγγραμμα. Οθεν εικοδως εδοξεν αυτο τοις λοιποις εγκαταλεχθηναι γραμμασι τε αποστολε. Εξαιτις γαρ δια της παδειε γλωττης εγγραφως ωμιληκοδος τε Παυλε, οι μεν τον διαγγελιστην Λεκαν, οι δε τον Κλημεντα τυπον αυτον ερμηνευσαι λεγουσι την γραφην. Ο και μαλλον εστι αν αληθες τω τον ομοιον της φρασεως χαρακτηρα την τε τε Κλημεντος επιστολην και την προς Εβραιους αποσωζειν, και τω μη πορρω τα εν εκδεσεσι τοις συγγραμμασι νοημαδα καδιστασθαι. Ibid. cap. 38.

(*c*) —Οπερ και ο Παυλος σημαινων φησι, Πιστει νοημεν κατηρτισθαι τους αιωνας ρημαδι Θεε. De Incarnat. verbi Dei, Tom. I. p. 55. *Paris* 1627. Vid. Epiſt. ad Serapion, p. 180.

(*d*) Παυλε αποστολε επιστολαι ιδ. πρωτη, η προς Ρωμαιους,——διεκδη, η προς Εβραιους. Apud Athanaſii opp. Tom. II. p. 60, 61.

Cyril of *Jeruſalem* (*A. D.* 350) introduces a citation out of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, thus:---- " As the ſame *Paul* ſaith in ano-
" ther place, *And exhort one another daily, while it is call'd*, To
" *day* ". *Heb.* iii. 13. (*e*).

Hilary of *Poictiers* in *France* (*A. D.* 354) quotes the epiſtle thus:---- " *Paul* ſays to the *Hebrews*, *Being made ſo much bet-*
" *ter than the angels, as he poſſeſſeth a more excellent name than*
" *they* ". *Heb.* i. 4. (*f*).

Lucifer of *Calaris* in *Sardinia* (*A. D.* 354) is another witneſs, who ſpeaks thus, " *Paul* ſaith to the *Hebrews*, *And Moſes verily*
" *was faithful in all his houſe as a ſervant* " &c. *Heb.* iii. 5. (*g*).

Hilary deacon of the church of *Rome* (*A. D.* 354.) ſeveral times cites the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* as the apoſtle's. " The apoſtle
" (ſays he) in order to ſhew whom he meant by *Melchiſedek*, adds,
" *Without all contradiction the leſs is bleſſed of the better* ". *Heb.* vii. 7. (*h*). And that by, *The apoſtle*, he means St. *Paul*, cannot be doubted, in as much as in this ſame manner he quotes the other epiſtles of this apoſtle (*i*).

Victorinus of the church of *Rome* (*k*) (*A. D.* 362) ſays, " We
" read in *Paul*'s epiſtle to the *Hebrews* concerning Chriſt, that he
" is the *expreſs image of God's ſubſtance* ". *Heb.* i. 3. (*l*).

Epiphanius (*A. D.* 368) born and educated in *Judæa*, and while biſhop in the iſle *Cyprus*, holding correſpondence with, and ſometimes viſiting, *Judæa*, tells us of ſome Hereticks, who ſaid, that " *Melchiſedek* was without father, without mother, without
" deſcent, which they would prove from *Paul*'s epiſtle to the
" *Hebrews* ", *chap.* vii. 3. (*m*). The reader will pleaſe to take notice

(*e*) ——ωσπερ αλλαχυ λεγει ο αυτ@ Παυλ@, Και παρακαλειτε εαυτες καθ' εκασην ημεραν. αχρις υ το σημερον καλειται. Catech. xv. prope fin. p. 222. *Oxon.* 1703. Vid. Catech. xiv. p. 203.

(*f*) ——Paulus ad Hebraeos dixerit, Tanto melior factus angelis, quanto excellentius ab his poſſidet nomen. *De Trinitate, Lib.* IV. *p.* 36. *Baſil* 1570.

(*g*) Paulus dicit ad Hebr[illegible], Et Moſes quidem fidelis in tota domo ejus tanquam ſervus, &c. *De non conv. cum Hac[illegible]reticis, apud Bibliothec. Patr. Tom.* IX. *col.* 1054.

(*h*) Et ut apoſtolus ſignificaret quis intelligendus eſſet per Melchiſedech, adjecit, Sine dubio enim, ait, quod minimum eſt a meliore benedicitur. *Quæſt. Vet. & Nov. Teſtament. inter opera Auguſtini, Tom.* IV. *Par.* II. *Quæſt.* 108. *p.* 144. Vid. antea eadem pag. & pag. 145, 147.

(*i*) Ibid. Quæſt. 108. p. 148. Quæſt. 110. p. 152. & paſſim.

(*k*) Auguſtini confeſſion. Lib. VIII. cap. 2.

(*l*) Lectum apud Paulum ad Hebraeos de Chriſto, qui eſt character ſubſtantiae ejus. *Adv. Arium, Lib.* II. *apud Biblioth. Patr. Tom.* IV. *Col.* 220.

(*m*) Περι αυτο δε τυ Μελχισεδεκ φασιν, οτι αμητωρ, απατωρ, αγενεαλογητ@ εκ τις προς Εβραιυς τυ Παυλυ επιστολης παιδευειν βυλομενοι. Hæreſ. lv. Melchiſedecian, cap. 1. p. 468. Tom. I. *Colon.* 1682.

notice, that *Epiphanius* does not in these words intend to contradict the apostle. His meaning is, that those Hereticks *misinterpreted* the apostle's words, and fancied, that *Melchisedek never had a father, or a mother*: whereas the apostle's meaning is, as *Epiphanius* well says, that "there is no mention made of them in "the Holy Scripture" (*n*).

Ephraem of *Syria* (*A. D.* 370) cites the epistle to the *Hebrews* thus, "The same *Paul* saith in another place, *The word of God* "*is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword*". *Heb.* iv. 12. (*o*).

Basil (*A. D.* 370) first educated in *Judæa*, and afterward bishop of *Cappadocia*, does not, that I can find, mention St. *Paul*, or any other person, by *name* as the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews*: but however (which fully answers our purpose) he often cites it as the *apostle*'s. His words are, "The apostle saith, that *Ye are* "*come to mount Sion, and to the city of the living God, the hea-*"*venly Jerusalem,*" &c. *Heb.* xii. 22. (*p*). In this same manner *Basil* generally quotes St. *Paul*'s other epistles, without mentioning his name (*q*). This will suffice to shew, that *Basil* esteemed St. *Paul* to be the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews*. Yet I must not omit to observe, that St. *Paul* is expresly named as the author of the epistle in the fourth book against *Eunomius*, published under the name of *Basil*. The words are, "*Paul* says, *Who being the* "*brightness of his glory* (*Heb.* i. 3.) and, *who being in the form* "*of God*", *Philip.* ii. 6. (*r*). I do not lay any stress on this testimony, because it is much doubted whether the fourth and fifth books against *Eunomius* were written by *Basil*. *Du Pin* thinks them genuine, because they are quoted as such by the *Greeks* and *Latins* in the council of *Florence A. D.* 1439. But Dr. *Cave* reasonably doubts of it, because they are not found in the most antient manuscripts, nor quoted by any that can be call'd, *antients*.

I

(*n*) Το δε απαλωρ, αμητωρ, ϗ δια το μη εχειν αυτον παλερα ϗ μητερα, αλλα δια το μη ειρ τη θεια γραφη καλα το φανερωταλον επωνομαδαι. Ibid. cap. 2.

(*o*) Idemque alio in loco Paulus, Vivus est (inquit) sermo Dei, & efficax, &c. *Confess. Tom.* 3. *p.* 607. *Edit. Vossian. Colon.* 1616.

(*p*) ——Ο αποστολ⊕ λεγει οτι προσεληλυθατε Σιων ορει, και πολει Θεϗ ζωντ⊕, Ιερϗσαλημ επουρανιω, &c. Homil. in Psal. xiv. Tom. I. p. 129. *Paris* 1638. See also Homil. xxvii. p 522. Constitut. Monast. cap. 22. Tom. II. p. 789. Epist 43. Tom. III. p. 68.

(*q*) Comment in Esaiam, Tom. II. p. 63. Constit. Monastic. cap. 1. p. 749. cap. 7. p. 770. & alibi passim.

(*r*) Ο Παυλ⊕ [βοα], Ος ων απαυγασμα τ.ις δοξης· και, Ος εν μορφη θεϗ υπαρχων. Tom. I. pag. 762.

I muſt not conceal, that in another book of *Baſil*'s, *viz. concerning the Holy Spirit*, directed to *Amphilochius*, he *ſeems* to diſtinguiſh the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* from the writings of St. *Paul*. The words are, " *Paul* teſtifies by the Spirit concerning Chriſt, " that he *is at the right hand of God* even the Father, who ſays, " *Sit thou at my right hand*. And the *Holy Spirit* teſtifies, that " he *ſat down on the right hand of the majeſty of God*". (*s*). The firſt paſſage is cited from *Rom.* viii. 34. The laſt is taken from *Heb.* i. 3. It may then be ask'd, why did not *Baſil* cite this as well as the other under the name of *Paul?* Would he not have done it, if he had thought *Paul* to be the author of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews?* I anſwer, this does not neceſſarily follow. There can be no doubt but that *Baſil* thought St. *Paul* to be the author. In this place he does not ſeem to me to contradict it. We may apprehend the Caſe to be thus: *Baſil* quotes theſe texts by *memory*. He remember'd, that the firſt was in the epiſtle to the *Romans*, and therefore he cites it as a paſſage of St. *Paul*'s. Thus he would have cited the laſt alſo, if he had diſtinctly remember'd, that it was in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. But tho' he perfectly remember'd the *words* of the text, yet he ſeems not to have remember'd, juſt at that time, in *what part* of the New Teſtament it was to be found. For this reaſon he cautiouſly avoids naming any particular writer, leſt he ſhould miſtake, and quotes it as a ſaying of the *Holy Ghoſt*, being ſure it was deliver'd by one or other of the apoſtles in the New Teſtament. So that *Baſil* muſt ſtill be reckon'd among thoſe who held the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* not only an *inſpired* epiſtle, but alſo an epiſtle of St. *Paul*.

Gregory of *Nyſſa* in *Cappadocia* (*A. D.* 370) brother of *Baſil* is the next witneſs who attributes this epiſtle to St. *Paul*. His words are,---- " According to the expreſſion of *Paul*, who ſaith, " that *ſtrong meat belongeth to them that are of full age*, even " *thoſe who by reaſon of uſe have their ſenſes exerciſed*". *Heb.* v. " 14. (*t*).

Gregori

(*s*) Παυλος εν πνευματι διαμαρτυρομενος περι Χριστου, οτι εστιν εν δεξια του Θεου και τω Πατρος λεγοντος, Καθου εκ δεξιων μου· και τω Αγιω Πνευματι μαρτυρουντος, οτι εκαθισεν εν δεξια της μεγαλωσυνης του Θεου. Cap. 6. verſ. fin. Tom. II. p 303, 304. *N. B.* Tho' *Eraſmus*, and *Cock* (in his *Cenſura quorund. Script.* p. 126, &c.) imagin'd, that the latter part of this book was not written by *Baſil*, yet it is univerſally allow'd, that the *firſt fourteen* chapters were.

(*t*) ——Κατα την του Παυλου φωνην, ος φησιν, οτι τελειων δε εστιν η στερεα τροφη, τοις δια της εξεως τα αισθητηρια γεγυμνασμενα εχουσιν. Epiſt. de Pythoniſſa, Tom. I. pag. 871. *Paris* 1615.

Gregory of *Nazianzum* in *Cappadocia* (*A. D.* 370) reckoning up the genuine books of Holy Scripture fays, " There are *four-* " *teen* epiſtles of *Paul* " (*v*) ; which are not fourteen without the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*.

Amphilochius of *Lycaonia* (*A. D.* 370) is mention'd on this Occaſion. The words are, " *Paul* wrote fourteen epiſtles to the " churches, one to the *Romans*----one to the *Hebrews*. Some " pretend that this is ſpurious. But they are in the wrong. For the " *Hebrews* were really thus favour'd " (*w*). *Combefis* thinks this to be the genuine work of *Amphilochius* ; but *Billius*, *Cave*, *Du Pin*, and *Mill*, fancy it belongs to *Gregory* of *Nazianzum*. If this be ſo, here is no new witneſs produced. But as their arguments are far from demonſtration, I judg'd it unfair to omit the teſtimony.

Didymus of *Alexandria* (*A. D.* 370) is an unexceptionable witneſs, who ſaith, " *Paul* in the epiſtle, which he wrote to the " *Hebrews*, citing the book of *Pſalms*, declares, it was dictated " by the Holy Spirit, *And as the Holy Ghoſt ſaith, To day, if ye* " *will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, &c.* " *Heb.* iii 7. (*x*).

Macarius of *Egypt* (*A. D.* 373.) cites the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* as written by the author of the ſecond epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. His words are, " *I have eſpouſed you*, ſaith the apoſtle " (2 *Cor.* xi. 2.) *to one husband, that I may preſent* you *as a chaſte* " *virgin to Chriſt* " ; and again, " *Whoſe houſe are we* ". *Heb.* iii. 6. (*y*).

Ambroſe of *Milan* (*A. D.* 374) often quotes the epiſtle as *the apoſtle*'s, and ſometimes names the apoſtle *Paul*. Thus, for inſtance, he ſays, " *Paul* teaches, that *Jeſus Chriſt* is *the ſame yeſterday, and* " *to day, and for ever* ". *Heb.* xiii. 8. (*z*).

Jerom

(*v*) Δεκα δε Παυλε τεσσαρες τ'επιστολαι. Carmen 33. Tom. II. p. 98. *Paris* 1611.

(*w*) Παυλου σοφως γεγραφθαι ταις εκκλησιαις
Επιστολας δις επτα, Ρωμαιοις μιαν,
——και προς Εβραιους μιαν.
Τινες δε φασι την προς Εβραιους νοθην,
Ουκ ευ λεγουσιν· γνησια γαρ η χαρις. Ad Seleuch. apud Beveregii Pandect. Tom. II. p. 180.

(*x*) Paulus in epiſtola quam ad Hebraeos ſcribit, de Pſalmorum volumine teſtimonium proferens ab Spiritu Sancto id dictum eſſe commemorat : & ſicut dicit hic Spiritus Sanctus, Hodie ſi vocem ejus audieritis, nolite obdurare corda veſtra, & *cætera*. De Spirit. Sanct. Lib. I. inſcript inter Hieron. Op. Tom. vi. col. 484.

(*y*) Ημεις γαρ εσμεν, φησιν ο αποστολος, ενι ανδρι παρθενον αγνην παρασησαι τω Χριστω· και παλιν, Ου οικος εσμεν ημεις. Homil. 49. p. 535. Francofurt. 1594. Vid. Homil. 9. p. 110.

(*z*) Paulus dixit, Quia Jeſus Chriſtus heri, & hodie ipſe eſt, & in ſecula. *De Incarnationis Dominicae Sacramento, cap.* 6. *Tom.* II. *p.* 183. *Baſil* 1567.

Jerom (*A. D.* 378) who had ſeveral times viſited both *Rome* and *Judæa*, and ſo could give us an exact hiſtory of the traditions of both places, continually cites the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, as the work of St. *Paul*. In his Catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writers, having reckon'd up St. *Paul*'s other epiſtles, he ſays (*a*), "The epiſtle at "the *Hebrews* is thought not to be his, becauſe of the difference "of the ſtyle and language, but to have been, according to *Ter-* "*tullian*, written by *Barnabas*, or, according to others, *Luke* "the evangeliſt, or *Clement* afterward biſhop of the church at "*Rome*, who, they ſay, expreſs'd *Paul*'s thoughts in his own beau- "tiful language; or rather becauſe, when *Paul* wrote to the *He-* "*brews*, he avoided ſetting his name in the beginning of the epi- "ſtle, upon the account of the grudge they bore him. But he "wrote as a *Hebrew* to the *Hebrews* in *Hebrew*; that is, in his "own language, with great elegance, that what he wrote in polite "*Hebrew* might the more elegantly be turn'd into *Greek*. And "this is the reaſon why the epiſtle ſeems to differ from *Paul*'s other "epiſtles". What he ſays of it in his epiſtle to *Dardanus* has been tranſcribed already (*b*) except his ſaying there, "That it is "the work of a ſacred writer, and is daily read in the churches" (*c*). He adds in another place, that "*Paul*'s epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was "rejected for this reaſon, becauſe in writing to the *Hebrews* he "cites paſſages of Scripture, that are not to be found in the *He-* "*brew* copies" (*d*). The weakneſs of which reaſon will fully appear from what ſhall be ſaid, GOD willing, in theſe papers relating to the *language* in which this epiſtle was written.

Philaſtrius of *Italy* (*A. D.* 380) mentions, as one ſort of *Here-* *ticks*, thoſe "who will not own, that *Paul*'s epiſtle to the *He-* "*brews* is his; but ſay that it was written either by *Barnabas* "the apoſtle, or by *Clement* biſhop of *Rome*" (*e*).

Fauſtinus

(*a*) Epiſtola autem quae fertur ad Hebraeos non ejus (Pauli) creditur propter ſtyli ſermoniſque diſſonantiam; ſed vel Barnabae, juxta Tertullianum, vel Lucae evangeliſtae, juxta quoſdam, vel Clementis Romanae poſtea eccleſiae epiſcopi, quem aiunt ſententias Pauli proprio ordinaſſe & ornaſſe ſermone: vel certe quia Paulus ſcribebat ad Hebraeos, & propter invidiam ſui apud eos nominis titulum in principio ſalutationis amputaverit. Scripſerat autem ut Hebraeus Hebraeis Hebraice, id eſt ſuo eloquio diſertiſſime, ut ea quae eloquenter ſcripta fuerant in Hebraeo eloquentius verterentur in Graecum; & hanc cauſam eſſe quod a caeteris Pauli epiſtolis diſcrepare videatur. *Catal. Script. Eccleſ.* ſub voce *Paulus*. *Tom.* I. *col.* 352.

(*b*) In this Introduction, p. vi. note (*r*).

(*c*) ——cum eccleſiaſtici viri ſit, & quotidie eccleſiarum lectione celebretur. *Epiſt.* 129. *Dardano.*

(*d*) Pauli quoque idcirco ad Hebraeos epiſtolae contradicitur, quod ad Hebraeos ſcribens utatur teſtimoniis quae in Hebraeis voluminibus non habentur. *Comment. in Eſaiae* vi. 9. *Tom.* IV. *col.* 55.

(*e*) See before in this Introduction, p. v. note (*p*).

Fauſtinus of *Rome* (*A. D.* 384) aſcribes this epiſtle to *Paul*, when he ſays, " The apoſtle *Paul* teaches us how Chriſt was " humbled.---*We ſee Jeſus*, ſays he, *who was made a little lower* " *than the angels*," &c. *Heb.* ii. 9. (*f*).

Theophilus of *Alexandria* (*A. D.* 385) quotes the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* thus,---- " *Paul* teaching the ſame as we do, *Jeſus Chriſt* " *the ſame yeſterday, and to day, and for ever*". *Heb.* xiii. 8. (*g*).

Gaudentius of *Italy* (*A. D.* 387) quotes this epiſtle as a writing of the *apoſtle*. His words are, " The old *law*, as the apoſtle " ſaith, was a *ſhadow of good things to come*". *Heb.* x. 1. (*h*). And again,--- " As the apoſtle ſignifies in his epiſtle to the *He-* " *brews*, where he ſaith, *Levi was yet in the loins of his father*". *Heb.* vii. 10. (*i*). In this ſame manner, without mentioning the *name* of *Paul*, *Gaudentius* continually cites his other epiſtles (*k*): ſo that there can be no room to queſtion, but that St. *Paul* was, according to him, the apoſtle that wrote to the *Hebrews*.

Thecla of *Seleucia* (*A. D.* 390) the famous writer of the old *Greek* Bible in the king's library, commonly call'd, *The Alexandrian Manuſcript* (*l*) reckons the epiſtles of *Paul* to be *fourteen* (*m*), and places this to the *Hebrews* immediately after the ſecond to the *Theſſalonians*, before the epiſtles to *Timothy*, *Titus*, and *Philemon* (*n*).

Ruffinus of *Italy* (*A. D.* 390) ſpeaks full to the purpoſe, thus, " *Paul* the apoſtle writing to the *Hebrews* ſaith, *He that cometh* " *to God muſt*, in the firſt place, *believe that he is*, &c." *Heb.* xi. " 6. (*o*).

Paulinus

(*f*) Quomodo minoratus eſt [Chriſtus] exponat apoſtolus Paulus:——Paulo minus, inquit, ab angelis minoratum videmus Jeſum, &c. *De Fide contra Arian. cap.* 4. *apud Biblioth. Patr. Tom.* IV. *col.* 683.

(*g*) —Paulo nobiſcum eadem praedicante, Jeſus Chriſtus heri, & hodie ipſe, & in aeternum *Epiſt. Paſchal.* I. *inter Op. Hieronymi, Tom.* IX. *col.* 422. Vid. Epiſt. Paſchal. III. col. 452.

(*h*) —— Vetus lex, ut ait apoſtolus, umbra erat futurorum bonorum. *Serm.* 13. *apud Biblioth Patr. Tom.* II. *col.* 49.

(*i*) ——Significat apoſtolus ad Hebraeos, Adhuc, inquit, in lumbis patris erat Levi. *Serm.* 2. *ibid. col.* 15.

(*k*) Serm. 1, 2, 13. & paſſim.

(*l*) See Dr. *Grabe's Prolegomena* to the Septuagint, *chap.* 1. ſect. 4, 5.

(*m*) Επιστολαι Παυλε ιδ'. Ibid. ſect. 2.

(*n*) Epiſtolae Pauli (inquit *Grabe*) eodem locatae ſunt ordine [in MS. Alex.] quo in noſtris Bibliis editionibus; niſi quod epiſtola ad Hebraeos proxime ſequatur duas ad Theſſalonicenſes. *Ibid. in margine, not.* (*a*).

(*o*) Paulus apoſtolus ad Hebraeos ſcribens dicit, Credere enim primo omnium accedentem ad Deum oportet, quia eſt, &c. *Symbolum ad Laurentium, inter Op. Hieronymi, Tom.* IX. col. 169. Vide etiam *col.* 169, 181.

Paulinus of *Nola* in *Italy* (*A. D.* 393) reckons the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and the epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, to have been written by the ſame author. His words are, " The apoſtle calls the " word of GOD *the ſword of the Spirit* (*Epheſ.* vi. 17) of which " [word of GOD] he ſays to the *Hebrews*, *The word of God is* " *quick, and powerful, and ſharper than any two edged ſword*", &c. *Heb.* iv. 12. (*p*).

Auguſtin of *Africa* (*A. D.* 396) who had more than once viſited *Rome*, reckons up the epiſtles of *Paul* as we do, ſaying, " The " fourteen epiſtles of *Paul* the apoſtle are, To the *Romans*,---- " to the *Hebrews*" (*q*). Again, he ſaith, " There are many and " great things written concerning *Melchiſedek* in the epiſtle to the " *Hebrews*, which *moſt* look upon as an epiſtle of *Paul*, tho' ſome " deny it" (*r*).

Chryſoſtom of *Conſtantinople* (*A. D.* 398.) has written a Commentary upon the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, in which, without the leaſt doubt or heſitation, he continually ſpeaks of it as St. *Paul's* epiſtle. Particularly in his Preface he debates the queſtion, Why *Paul*, who was the apoſtle of the *Gentiles*, ſhould write to the *Hebrews?* and ſhews, that he had a right ſo to do (*s*).

To the teſtimonies of theſe particular writers we muſt add that of the *councils* in their days.

The Council of *Laodicea* (*A. D.* 364) delivering a catalogue of the books of Scripture, mentions " *fourteen* epiſtles of *Paul*, one " to the *Romans*,----one to the *Hebrews*" (*t*).

The third council of *Carthage* (*A. D.* 397) gives us alſo a liſt of the canonical books of the Bible, among which it reckons " thir- " teen epiſtles of *Paul*, and one of the ſame author to the *He-* *brews?*" (*u*).

Te-

(*p*) Apoſtolus——gladium Spiritus dicit verbum Dei: de quo ad Hebraeos ait, Vivus ſermo Dei & efficax, & penetrabilior omni gladio ancipiti, &c. *Epiſt.* 50. *Tom.* I. *p.* 72. *Paris* 1685. Eandem epiſt. videſis inter Opp. Auguſtini, *Epiſt.* 58. *Tom.* II. *p.* 332.

(*q*) Quatuordecim epiſtolis Pauli apoſtoli, ad Romanos, —— ad Hebraeos. *De Doctr. Chriſt. Lib.* II. *cap.* 8. *Tom.* III. *p.* 29.

(*r*) Melchiſedech——de quo in epiſtola quae inſcribitur ad Hebraeos (quam plures apoſtoli Pauli eſſe dicunt, quidam vero negant) multa & magna conſcripta ſunt. *De Civit. Dei, Lib.* XVI. *cap.* 22. *Tom.* V. *Par.* II. *p.* 209.

(*s*) Ει τοινυν εθνων αποστολος ην [ο Παυλος]——τι κοινον προς Εβραιους ειχε; τι δε αυτοις επεστελλεν; Praefat. in Epiſt. ad Heb.

(*t*) Επιστολαι Παυλου δεκατεσσαρες, προς Ρωμαιους μια——προς Εβραιους μια. Canon. ut apud Juſtelli Bibliothec. Juris Canonic. Vet. Tom I. p. 55.

(*u*) Pauli apoſtoli epiſtolae tredecim, ejuſdem ad Hebraeos una, cap. 47. apud Concilia edita per *Petrum Crabbe*, Tom. I. p. 431.

To these we may add the testimony of the 85th *apostolical* canon, as it is call'd, which mentions *fourteen* epistles of *Paul* among the books of Holy Scripture (*w*). Of what age these canons are I cannot say; but as it is pretty well agreed, that they were composed before the fifth century, I cannot think it proper wholly to omit their testimony.

Thus I have brought down the history of the Traditions relating to the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* to the *end* of the *fourth* century. It is needless to go farther: since the testimonies of later ages must be of less weight in the case relating to a fact that happen'd in the beginning of Christianity. But it must be observed, at the same time, that after the year of our Lord 400, the tradition, That *Paul* was the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews*, was *universal* and *uninterrupted*, till of late.

It must not be conceal'd, that in the *third* and *fourth* centuries there were some authors (whose works are now extant) that do not appear to have ascribed this epistle to St. *Paul*, such as *Minucius Foelix*, *Cyprian*, *Novatian*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Julius Firmicus*, and *Optatus*. But then it must be remember'd too, that it does not appear, they ever attributed it to any other author. Some of them (as *Minucius Foelix*, and *Arnobius*) wrote against the Heathens, and so do not (as they had no occasion to) quote any Scriptures at all. *Julius Firmicus* in his book concerning the *Error of Profane Religions*, does not happen so much as once to quote any one of the *epistles* of the New Testament. For tho' he makes use of that sentence, *O death where is thy sting?* (*x*) yet he seems to have borrow'd it directly from the prophet *Hosea*, xiii. 14. as the place is express'd in the *Greek*, *Syriac*, and *Arabic* versions, and as it is repeated by the apostle, 1 *Cor.* xv. 55. *Lactantius* imploys himself in writing against the *Heathens*, and therefore seldom quotes Scripture, except some prophesies of the Old Testament with a design to shew that they have been accomplished. So that their not quoting the epistle to the *Hebrews* does not so much as seem to be a hint, as if they rejected it.

The

(*w*) Ἕσω ὑμῖν φασὶ——βίβλια σεβάσμια καὶ ἁγία——Παύλου ἐπιστολαὶ δεκατέσσαρες. Apud Beveregii Cod. Canon. Eccles. Primit. vindicat. p. 461, 462.

(*x*) Pag. 48. ad calcem Minucii Foelicis, Oct. *Lugd. Bat.* 1612.

The caſe of *Cyprian* and *Novatian*, in the middle of the third century, it muſt be own'd, is very different. There are many paſſages in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* very pertinent to the purpoſes of their writings. Upon which account it looks very likely, that they were of the ſame opinion with *ſome* others of the *Latin* church at *that* time, who did not (as *Jerom* tells us) receive this as a canonical epiſtle (*y*). It is true alſo, that *Optatus* of *Africa* (*A. D.* 368) does not quote it: but that may have been entirely owing to his not finding an occaſion to do it; juſt as he never once quotes the epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, and *but once* St. *Mark*'s Goſpel. And there is the leſs reaſon to ſuſpect that he look'd upon the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* as not genuine, becauſe *Victorinus*, who was an *African* as well as he, and who lived at the ſame time, and *Auſtin* of *Africa*, a little after, cited it as St. *Paul*'s epiſtle, as we have already ſeen.

The reader poſſibly may wonder to find me reckoning *Optatus* among thoſe Chriſtian Writers, who have *not* cited the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* in their works now extant: ſince *Baronius* (*z*) *Spanheim* (*a*), and father *Simon* (*b*) poſitively ſay the contrary. But let the reader judge, when I ſhall have laid before him the matter of fact exactly as it is. The paſſage refer'd to is this (*c*). "God "ſaith by the prophet, *This is my covenant, which I will make* "*with the houſe of Iſrael, and the houſe of Judah; and after* "*thoſe days, ſaith the Lord, I will put my laws in their heart,* "*and write them in their minds*". It is almoſt impoſſible to avoid ſeeing, that the author, whoever he was, here quotes the *prophet*, and *not* the *apoſtle*. But if he had quoted the apoſtle, it could not have ſerved our purpoſe, ſince the paſſage did not come from the pen of *Optatus*, but has been added to his work by a later hand. Dr. *Cave* ſays, "It is reaſonable to ſuſpect, that the *ſeventh* "book againſt the *Donatiſts* (from which the forecited paſſage is "taken) was not written by *Optatus*, becauſe *Jerom* mentions "only *ſix* books of *Optatus* againſt the *Donatiſts*, and becauſe "*Optatus* himſelf, in the firſt book, where he gives an account of "his

(*y*) See before, p. vi. note (*r*).
(*z*) Annal. ad A. D. 60. No. 50.
(*a*) Operum, Tom. II. col 201.
(*b*) Critical Hiſtory of the New Teſtament, Part I. chap. 16. p. 146.
(*c*) ——Indicavit Deus per prophetam dicens; quoniam hoc eſt teſtamentum meum quod diſponam domui Iſrael, & domui Judae; & poſt dies illos, dicit dominus, dans leges meas in corde eorum, & in mentibus eorum ſcribam eas. De Schiſm. Donatiſt. Lib. VII. p. 108 *Antwerp* 1702. Edit. Du Pin.

" his intended method, propoſed to finiſh his argument in *ſix* books: " beſides that the ſtyle of the *ſeventh* book is vaſtly different from " that of the preceeding, and ſome of the doctrines in it quite con- " trary to thoſe of the firſt ſix books ". *Du Pin* urges theſe very ſame conſiderations in his account of *Optatus*, in his *New Hiſtory of Eccleſiaſtical Writers*. But in his edition of *Optatus* he determines the matter ſomewhat more nicely. He allows, that *Optatus* wrote but ſix books, and that that which is now call'd the ſeventh book (except the interpolation) contains three additions, belonging to his firſt, ſecond and third books, which he wrote after the work was finiſh'd (*d*). But be theſe things as they will, it is very certain, that the long paragraph of the ſeventh book, from whence the forecited paſſage is taken, is an interpolation, " Since it is *not* " *in any one* of the manuſcripts of *Optatus* that *Du Pin* conſulted, " it agrees neither with the foregoing, nor following context (which " perfectly correſpond, if this interpolation be drop'd) does not " agree with the ſtyle of *Optatus*, and is perfectly inconſiſtent " with his doctrine and opinions " (*e*).

I am ſorry there is a neceſſity to admoniſh the reader, that *Spanheim* in his diſſertation on this ſubject, and Dr. *Mill* in his references prefix'd to the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, in his edition of the New Teſtament, have more than once cited books under the names of falſe authors. Both of them quote the ſame individual book under the name of *Gregory* of *Bætica*, and of *Fauſtinus* too (*f*): whereas the book was really written by the latter (*g*). And the title of it in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* is, (*h*) *Fauſtinus the Presbyter's, commonly thought to be* Gregory Boeticus's *book concerning the Trinity, or the Faith. A book now reſtor'd to its author*: which was before they were born, *A. D.* 1624. *Idacius Clarus*

(*d*) Liber ſeptimus non eſt revera liber diſtinctus a caeteris, ſed additamenta ad quoſdam libros (primum ſecundum & tertium) ab ipſo Optato compoſita, opere jam confecto. Ibid. Praefat. cap. 3. ſect. 4.

(*e*) Non extat haec lacinia in ullo e quatuor codicibus MSS. quos mihi videre contigit, nec in prima editione Balduini, nec concinit cum antecedentibus & conſequentibus, quae hac ſiblata optime cohaerent; nec ſtylum Optati ſapit, & ab ipſius placitis, & doctrina prorſus abhorret. Ibid. p. 100. Vid. p. 107.

(*f*) Spahemii Operum, Tom. II. col. 201. No. X, XII. Millii Teſt. Gr. inter Teſtimonia de Epiſt. ad Heb. p. 659, 660. Edit. *Oxon.*

(*g*) See *Du Pin*'s Hiſt. of Eccl. Writers, Vol. II. p. 85, 192. and *Cave*'s Hiſt. Literar. p. 188, 231.

(*h*) Fauſtini Presbyteri, vulgo Gregorii Boetici, ad Gallam Placidiam de Trinitate, ſive de fide contra Arianos. Liber nunc demum auctori ſuo reſtitutus. Tom. IV. col. 680.

Clarus is cited both by *Spanheim* and *Mill* as author of the book againſt *Varrimadus*: and yet *Chifflet*, *Cave* (*i*), *Du Pin* (*k*), and *Oudin* (*l*) agree, that the real author of it was *Vigilius. Tapſenſis. Mill* quotes the ſpurious works of *Titus Boſtrenſis*; and ſeveral Pieces falſly father'd upon *Athanaſius* (*m*), and *Auſtin* (*n*). It was neceſſary for me to obſerve theſe things, that I might not be accuſed of Negligence in not quoting *Optatus*, *Gregory of Boetica*, *Idacius*, *Titus*, &c. I have ſpared no Pains to make this account as perfect as poſſible, have faithfully repreſented facts without the leaſt diſguiſe, and have truſted to no ſecond-hand quotations, but have taken every paſſage of the ancient writers immediately from the original authors themſelves.

And now, upon the whole, we ſee, that there were among the antients only *three* opinions about the *author* of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. One ſingle man, *Tertullian*, fancied, that *Barnabas* was the author of it. Some three or four that are named, and the more *modern* church of *Rome* denied it to be St. *Paul*'s, and at the ſame time denied it to be a canonical epiſtle. But the moſt *general* tradition from the very firſt time we read any thing about the author, to the Year of Chriſt 398, was that St. *Paul* wrote it: and the writers within this ſpace (ſome of *Africa*, ſome of *Judæa*, ſome of *France*, ſome of *Italy*, ſome of *Rome* in particular, and ſome of other countries) are witneſſes to the tradition, That *Paul* was the author of this epiſtle. Their evidence ſeems to be very convincing: for how little ſtreſs ſoever is to be laid on the *opinions* of the fathers, (who, by the way, reaſon'd as well as the old Heathen philoſophers) (*o*) with regard to the *doctrines* of the Goſpel, or the *ſenſe* of

(*i*) *Cave*'s Hiſt. Lit. p. 232, 371.
(*k*) Vol. II. p. 192. Vol. IV. p. 171.
(*l*) Supplement, p. 124.
(*m*) De Paſſione & Cruce De S. Deipara. De Commun. Eſſentiae Patris, Fil. & Sp. S.
(*n*) De Incarnatione Verbi. De Fide ad Petrum.
(*o*) The famous *Cicero*, after *Cleanthes* and *Ariſtotle*, hath (in a very *wiſe* manner!) undertaken to prove, that the *ſtars* are *animals* and *gods*. The admired philoſopher hath repreſented and inforced the argument thus, "There are two ſorts of heat in the world, viz. "that of *fire*, and that of *animal* bodies. The former *conſumes* and diſſipates every thing: "whereas the heat of *animal* bodies *preſerves*, ſuſtains, and improves them. Since then the "ſun does not conſume things like fire, but makes all things flouriſh, it is moſt certainly "an *animal*, as the other ſtars alſo are. As ſome animals are produced on earth, others in "the water, others in the air, it is abſurd to ſuppoſe, that no animals are produced in that "part of the world which is moſt adapted to produce them. The Aether in which the "ſtars are placed, is exceedingly thin, and fine, and always in motion and vigour: where-"fore it is unqueſtionable that animals are produced therein, and thoſe, ſuch as are endued "with the moſt acute ſenſes, and with the ſwifteſt motion. Wherefore, ſince the ſtars are "generated

of Scripture: yet all mankind muſt allow, that they were as capable as any men living of teſtifying to a *matter of fact*, which came under their own obſervation. Since therefore they aſſure us, that tradition handed down the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* as the work of St. *Paul*, we cannot doubt but that this, in fact, was the tradition. And ſince this tradition was *ancient* in the days of *Clement* of *Alexandria*, and *Origen*, about 130 years after the epiſtle was written; it muſt have had its riſe in the days of St. *Paul* himſelf, and ſo cannot reaſonably be conteſted.

Some learned men have attempted to prove this point from what St. *Peter* ſays, 2 *Pet.* iii. 15, 16. If it could be proved, that he here ſpeaks of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, the teſtimony of this apoſtle would fully determine the diſpute. But as I do not think, it can be certainly proved, that he ſpeaks of this epiſtle, without *firſt* proving, that St. *Paul* was the author of it, I cannot argue from this paſſage. Thoſe on the other ſide go upon the ſuppoſition, that St. *Peter*'s epiſtles were written to the *Hebrews*, or *Jews*. But it ſeems to me abundantly more natural to ſuppoſe, that they were written to *Gentile* Chriſtians, if we conſider many paſſages of the epiſtles

" generated in the Aether, it is natural to ſuppoſe, that they have ſenſe and underſtanding, " and from hence it follows, that they are gods. For we may take notice, that thoſe *men*, " who inhabit that part of the earth, where there is the *pureſt* and *fineſt air*, have a *brighter* " genius, and a *better* underſtanding, than ſuch as live in a more groſs and heavy air: and " the food men make uſe of is thought to create a difference in their intellectual abilities. " It is probable therefore, that, as the ſtars inhabit the aetherial part of the world, and " are nouriſh'd by *refined* food, they are endow'd with an *extraordinary* degree of intelli- " gence. But *their* ſenſe and underſtanding are principally diſcovered by their order and " conſtancy. Nor can it be ſaid, that they are moved by any *ſuperior* power: for what can " be ſuperior? The motion of the ſtars is *voluntary*. Their divinity therefore is ſo very " plain, that I cannot ſuppoſe a man to be otherwiſe than ignorant or impious, or out of his " ſenſes, if he ſhall deny it". *Cicero* De Natura Deorum, Lib. II. cap. 15, 16. p. 143, &c. *Cantab.* 1723.

Abundance more of ſuch *ſtupid ſtuff* may be met with in that ſame Book, and in other writings of the old *philoſophers*, than which no arguings in the fathers can be more *weak* and *ridiculous*. *Irenæus* his urging, that *there can be no more than four Goſpels, becauſe there are but four quarters of the earth* is not one jot more trifling. But many will overlook, or even admire a weakneſs in a *Heathen* philoſopher, who will not fail to *magniſy* a ſlip in a *Chriſtian* writer to the utmoſt.

N. B. I am obliged both in *juſtice* and *charity* to look upon *Cicero* as ſpeaking *his own* thoughts in this paſſage: ſince otherwiſe he muſt be reputed an Atheiſt. The ſpeakers in the dialogue are only three, *viz. Velleius* an *Epicurean*, *Lucilius Balbus* a *Stoic*, and *Cotta* an *Atheiſt*. Now in *charity* to *Cicero*, I would not ſuppoſe him to be an *Atheiſt*, or an *Epicurean*, which is much the ſame; but rather believe, that the *Stoic* ſpeaks *his* opinion. And in *juſtice* to *Cicero*, I am bound to believe this, becauſe in the *laſt ſentence* of the book, where he ſpeaks in his own perſon, he ſays, " *Velleius* thought *Cotta* the Atheiſt pretty much in the right: " whereas he himſelf judged the diſcourſe of *Balbus* (from whence the forecited paſſage is " taken) to have the *greater probability*". He repeats the ſame opinion of the diſcourſe of *Balbus* in his book, *De Divinatione*, Lib. I. c. 5. al. 9. p. 1247. *Lugd. Bat.* 1692.

epiſtles themſelves. St. *Peter* repreſents the perſons, to whom he writes, as having been in a ſtate of *ignorance* with regard to God, and religion, 1 *Pet.* i. 14. *As obedient children, not faſhioning your ſelves according to the former luſts in your* ignorance. This is exactly parallel to what St. *Paul* ſays of the *Gentiles*, 1 *Theſ.* iv. 5. *Not in the luſt of concupiſcence, as the Gentiles who* know not *God*; and *Rom.* i. 22, 28, 32. *Profeſſing themſelves to be wiſe, they became fools* (as we juſt now ſaw from *Cicero*) ----*and did* not *like to* retain God *in their* knowledge: ---- *who, tho' they once knew the judgment* (or law) *of God, yet did not* now conſider, *that they, who do ſuch things are worthy of death, and not only they that do them, but even they alſo who conſent with ſuch as do them* (*p*). *Acts* xvii. 23, 30.---*God whom ye* ignorantly *worſhip.*---*The times of this* ignorance *God winked at.* Epheſ. iv. 17, 18.---The *Gentiles walk in the* vanity *of their mind, having the* underſtanding darken'd, *being alienated from the life of God through the* ignorance *that is in them, becauſe of the* blindneſs *of their heart.* But no ſuch thing is ever ſaid by the apoſtles, of the *Jewiſh* nation, which was favour'd with a divine *revelation*, and with the knowledge and worſhip of the true GOD. St. *Peter* ſpeaks of them to whom he wrote, as *call'd out of* darkneſs *into God's marvelous light*, 1 *Pet.* ii. 9. Anſwerably we read, that St. *Paul* was ſent to the *Gentiles to open their* eyes, *and to turn them from* darkneſs *to light*, *Acts* xxvi. 17, 18. and that the *father hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the ſaints in* light, *and hath deliver'd us from the power of* darkneſs, *Coloſ.* i. 12, 13. They, to whom St. *Peter* wrote, were not GOD's people, and had not obtain'd mercy, till they became Chriſtians, 1 *Pet.* ii. 10. *Who heretofore were* not the people, *but now are the people of God*; *who had* not obtained mercy, *but now have obtained mercy.* Whereas the *Jewiſh* Chriſtians were the people of GOD, and had obtained mercy, before the Chriſtian Religion was ſet up. But it was not thus with the *Gentiles*, who were *ſtrangers to the covenants of promiſe, having no hope, and without God in the world*, *Epheſ.* ii. 12. And it is particularly to be taken notice of, that the expreſſion laſt cited from St. *Peter* is uſed by St. *Paul*, when he is unqueſtionably ſpeaking of the *Gentile* converts, *Rom.* ix. 24, 25.----*Even us* [Chriſtians] *whom he call'd not only of the Jews, but*

(*p*) This is the true ſenſe of the text, which ſhould be read thus, Οιτινες το δικαιωμα του Θεου επιγινωσκοντες, ουκ εγνωσαν, ὁτι οι τα τοιαυτα πρασσοντες ἀξιοι θανατου εισιν, ου μονον αυτα ποιουσιν, αλλα και συνδοκουντες τοις πρασσουσι. See Dr. *Hill* on the place.

but also of the Gentiles; as he saith also in Hosea, I will call them my people, who were not my *people.* The persons, to whom St. *Peter* directed his epistles, are expressly call'd *Gentiles*, and spoken of as having lived in the *sins* of the *Gentile* world, 1 *Pet.* iv. 3. *Let the past time of life suffice you to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, while ye walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries* (*q*). In like manner St. *Paul* continually speaks of the *Gentiles*, as living in these sins, *Ephes.* iv. 19. *Who being past feeling have given themselves over to lasciviousness, to work all* uncleanness *with greediness*, 1 *Thes.* iv. 5. *Not in the lust of* concupiscence, *even as the Gentiles.* The *idolatries* of which St. *Peter* speaks, were certainly the works of the *Gentile* world, by which they are distinguish'd from the *Jews*, 1 *Cor.* xii. 2. 2 *Cor.* vi. 16. 1 *Thes.* i. 9. And the other vices were look'd upon by the apostle as *characters* of the *Gentiles*, 1 *Cor.* v. 10. St. *Peter* hints in the *beginning* of his second epistle, that the Christians to whom he wrote, had been of the *Gentile* world. *Simon Peter----to them that have obtain'd like precious faith with us, i. e.* to the believing *Gentiles*, who have obtained *like* precious faith with *us* believing *Jews.*

I cannot find any thing that looks like a *considerable* objection to this account. It has been urged indeed, with a design to prove, they were *Jews*, that St. *Peter* calls them, *strangers scatter'd*, 1 *Pet.* i. 1. But surely *Gentile* Christians might be *strangers scatter'd through Pontus, Galatia, Asia*, &c. as well as *Jews.* If St. *Peter* had said, like St. *James*, To the *twelve tribes*, or, To the *Jews* that are scatter'd, there would have been proof in the case. But his barely saying, that *Christians* were dispers'd in those countries will never prove, that they were originally of the *Jewish* nation. Thus also when the apostle exhorts *Christians* to have their *conversation honest among the Gentiles*, 1 *Pet.* ii. 12. it will equally suit them, whether they were originally circumcised or not. Nor can his saying that good *Christian* women are the *daughters of Sarah, chap.* iii. 6. prove, that they were *born Jews*, since *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*, upon their faith in Christ, are become the *children of Abraham, Rom.* iv. 11. Besides the arguments already

(*q*) Thus this text should be read. The word, ημιν, *Us*, is not found in the *Alexandrian*, and some other MSS. nor in the *Latin, Syriac, Arabic*, and *Aethiopic* versions. And it must be observed, that the *Syriac* version makes use of the *second* person thus, *Let the time past suffice, wherein ye have wrought*, &c. The *Arabic* and *Aethiopic* versions, as well as some *Greek* MSS. read, *Let the time past suffice* you, &c.

already anſwer'd, *Eſtius* farther urges, with the ſame view, that ſaying of the apoſtle, 2 *Pet.* i. 19. *We have a more ſure word of prophecy:* whereas it is moſt certain, that the propheſies of the Old Teſtament do as much belong to *Gentile*, as to *Jewiſh Chriſtians.* It ſeems then moſt reaſonable to conclude, that St. *Peter* wrote his epiſtles to believing *Gentiles.*

The perſons, to whom he directed his epiſtles reſided in *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, *Aſia* and *Bithynia*, 1 *Pet.* i. 1. To the ſame Chriſtians he ſays, St. *Paul* alſo wrote, 2 *Pet.* iii. 15. Accordingly we find, that St. *Paul* did, in fact, write to the Chriſtians of *Galatia*, and *Aſia*. One of his epiſtles is directed to the churches of *Galatia*. *Epheſus* and *Coloſſe* were in the proconſular *Aſia*, as was alſo *Laodicea*; ſo that whether the epiſtle call'd, The epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, was really written to them, or to the people of *Laodicea*, as ſome have thought, ſtill it was an epiſtle to the Chriſtians of *Aſia*. As theſe three epiſtles of St. *Paul*, *To the Galatians*, *Epheſians* and *Coloſſians* were written to the Chriſtian Churches in *Galatia* and *Aſia*, to whom St. *Peter*'s epiſtles were alſo directed; there ſeems no room to diſpute, but that St. *Peter* refers to theſe very epiſtles. This is perfectly *natural:* whereas the ſuppoſition, that he refers to the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, will (beſides for the reaſons already mention'd) be very improbable; becauſe it cannot be any way made appear, that the Chriſtians of *Judæa* were driven from their own country, and diſperſed in *Galatia*, *Aſia*, and the neighbouring provinces between the times of writing the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and the ſecond of St. *Peter*. The epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was unqueſtionably ſent to the *Jewiſh* Chriſtians *reſiding in Judæa*, as will be obſerved in the *Synopſis*. They therefore who think, as Dr. *Mill* did, that St. *Peter*'s epiſtles were written to the *ſame perſons*, muſt make very *ſtrange* ſuppoſitions. Dr. *Mill* ſays, St. *Peter*'s firſt epiſtle was written, *A. D.* 61, the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, *A. D.* 63, and St. *Peter*'s ſecond epiſtle, *A. D.* 67. According to this, it muſt be ſuppoſed, that the perſons, to whom theſe three epiſtles were written, were driven out of *Judæa*, and diſperſed in *Galatia*, *Aſia*, &c. *A. D.* 61. that, *two* years after, they were ſuffered to return, and live in their own country (where Dr. *Mill* allows they were, when the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was ſent them); and that *four* years after this, they were again baniſh'd, and diſperſed where they were before. But of theſe things there appear no footſteps in hiſtory.

It

It will, in the next place, be needful to inquire, whether we can find, in the epiſtles to the *Galatians*, *Epheſians*, and *Coloſſians*, the things which St. *Peter* refers to in St. *Paul*'s epiſtles. And here it is obvious to obſerve, that upon every ſcheme the things refer'd to *muſt* be in *theſe particular epiſtles*, as will appear from St. *Peter*'s own words, which are theſe, *The day of the Lord will come---What manner of perſons ought ye to be in all holy converſation and godlineſs; looking for, and haſting to the coming of the day of God!---We look for new heavens, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteouſneſs. Wherefore beloved, ſeeing that ye look for ſuch things, be diligent, that ye may be found of him in peace without ſpot, and blameleſs. And account that the long-ſuffering of our Lord is ſalvation, even as our beloved brother Paul alſo, according to the wiſdom given unto him, hath written unto* you, *as alſo in* all *his epiſtles, ſpeaking in* them *of theſe things*, 2 *Pet.* iii. 10---16. He here expreſly ſays, that what St. *Paul* had written to *them* was the *ſame* as he had alſo written *in all his epiſtles*; and then adds, that St. *Paul* ſpeaks *of theſe things* in all his epiſtles. Conſequently he hath *written this*, whatever it be, and hath *ſpoken of theſe things* whatever they are in the epiſtles to the *Galatians*, *Epheſians*, and *Coloſſians*, in particular: whether theſe are ſuppoſed to have been written to the ſame perſons to whom St. *Peter* directed his epiſtles, or not. Upon every ſuppoſition then, we muſt look for the ſame things here intended by St. *Peter*, in theſe three epiſtles, as in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. Let thoſe therefore who think St. *Peter* ſpoke *firſt and ſeparately* of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and then of *all* St. *Paul*'s *other* epiſtles, ſhew how the things referr'd to by St. *Peter* are *written* and *ſpoken of* in *all* St. *Paul*'s epiſtles; and I ſhall be ſaved the labour of ſhewing that theſe things are written and ſpoken of in the epiſtles to the *Galatians*, *Epheſians*, and *Coloſſians* in particular. So that no man can object againſt the ſuppoſition here advanced (*viz.* That St. *Peter* ſpeaks firſt and ſeparately of theſe three epiſtles, and then of all the reſt, that were written by St. *Paul*) from the account that St. *Peter* gives of the *things* which are written and ſpoken of in them. For if any one ſhould ſay, that theſe things are *not* written in them, he would directly contradict the apoſtle, who expreſly ſays, that they are written in *all* St. *Paul*'s epiſtles.

Tho' what has been now ſaid is fully ſufficient to ſilence all objections to the ſuppoſition here made drawn from the context in St. *Peter*; yet it may be expedient juſt to obſerve, that the things ſaid to be written in St. *Paul's* epiſtles are *really* written there. When St. *Peter* ſaid, *As Paul alſo hath written unto you, as alſo in all his epiſtles, ſpeaking in them of theſe* things; he did not barely mean, that *Paul* had written concerning the *one* thing juſt immediately before mention'd, *viz.* that *the long-ſuffering of our Lord is ſalvation*: but he meant, that St. *Paul* had written concerning thoſe *ſeveral things* which St. *Peter* had before mentioned in that diſcourſe, *viz. The day of judgment, the obligations to holineſs and godlineſs, the future ſtate of righteouſneſs and glory, the obligation to be without ſpot and blameleſs, and that the long-ſuffering of God is ſalvation.* Of *theſe things* St. *Peter* expreſly ſaith St. *Paul doth ſpeak* in *all* his epiſtles. The future ſtate, and the obligations of virtue are unqueſtionably ſpoken of in the three epiſtles, to which I ſuppoſe St. *Peter* here *particularly* refers, *Gal.* vi. 7.–10. *Epheſ.* i. 4, 13, 14, 18. iv. 17, &c. v. 1.---18. *Coloſ.* i. 5. 9, 10, 22, 27, 28. iii. 1.---17. iv. 11, 12. In theſe epiſtles alſo there are hints ſufficient, that *the long-ſuffering of the Lord is ſalvation*, as plain and expreſs, I am ſure, as any in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews.* The paſſages in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* cited on this occaſion are theſe that follow; *Heb.* vi. 12, 15. *That ye be not ſlothful, but followers of them who through* faith and patience *inherit the promiſes.---And ſo after he had* patiently *indured, he obtain'd the promiſe.* ix. 28. *Unto them that* look for *Chriſt ſhall he appear the ſecond time---unto ſalvation.* x. 23, 36. *Let us* hold *faſt the profeſſion of our faith without* wavering: *for he is faithful that promiſed.---Ye have need of* patience, *that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promiſe.* For *yet a little while, and* that *which ſhall come, will come, and will not tarry.* In the ſame way as theſe texts can be proved to ſignify, that GOD's long-ſuffering, exerciſed towards mankind in delaying the coming of Chriſt to judgment, is deſign'd to give them time to prepare for ſalvation; it may eaſily be proved, that many expreſſions in the epiſtles to the *Galatians*, *Epheſians*, and *Coloſſians*, ſignify the ſame. It may be allow'd, that in the now cited paſſages of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, the apoſtle goes upon the *ſuppoſition*, that *the long-ſuffering of the Lord is ſalvation.* But without all doubt, the ſame thing is *as clearly* implied in the other three epiſtles, particularly,

ticularly, *Gal.* vi. 9. *Let us not be* weary *in well-doing: for in* due ſeaſon *we ſhall reap if we* faint *not*: which is moſt exactly *parallel* to the places juſt now cited from the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. This doctrine, *That the long-ſuffering of the Lord is ſalvation* is yet more plainly taught, *Epheſ.* ii. 3, 4, 5. *Among the children of diſobedience 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 the children of wrath even as others. But God, who is rich in* mercy, *for his great* love *wherewith he* loved *us, even when we were dead in ſins* [*i. e.* under ſentence of condemnation to death upon the account of ſin, without hope of a reſurrection] *hath quicken'd us* [or given us a title to a bleſſed reſurrection] *together with Chriſt.* In this paſſage the apoſtle very plainly teaches us, that the idolatrous and immoral nations of the earth deſerved to have been puniſhed with death: but GOD exerciſed *mercy*, love, and long-ſuffering towards them, and delayed paſſing a final ſentence on them. At length he brought the *Gentiles* into his church, and made them heirs of *ſalvation*. Thus his long-ſuffering was for their ſalvation. The ſame doctrine is taught in the ſame words, *Coloſ.* i. 21. ii. 13.

But to return: it may not be amiſs to take notice, that there are ſeveral things in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews like* to what St. *Paul* ſays in his other epiſtles. He calls *Timothy* his *brother*, *Heb.* xiii. 23. as he does, 2 *Cor.* i. 1. *Coloſ.* i. 1. *Philem.* 1. He concludes the epiſtle with his uſual ſalutation, *Grace be with you all, Amen*: which, when written with his own hand, was the token in every epiſtle, as he ſays, 2 *Theſ.* iii. 17, 18. I cannot indeed argue from theſe things, as ſome have done, that none but *Paul* could be the author of this epiſtle. For *Barnabas*, *Luke*, or *Clement* might call *Timothy*, *brother*; and ſay, *Grace be with you all* (as St. *John* ends his *Revelation*) as well as our apoſtle. But it is worth obſerving, that theſe things are *agreeable* to St. *Paul*'s manner.

As to the objections that have been made to its being St. *Paul*'s, it does not ſeem difficult to give a good ſolution of them. It is ſaid, that St. *Paul* could not write what we read, *Heb.* ii. 3.---- *The great ſalvation----was confirm'd to* US *by them that heard it.* "For (ſaith *Grotius*) the author, in theſe words, reckons himſelf "to be one of thoſe who received the knowledge of the goſpel, "not from Chriſt, but from his diſciples". But it is obvious to reply,

reply, that *Grotius* might with equal ſtrength prove, that St. *Paul* was not the author of the epiſtles to the *Epheſians*, *Coloſſians*, &c. It was a very common thing with the apoſtle to rank himſelf with thoſe to whom he wrote, by uſing the words, *We*, and *Us*. Thus, *Epheſ.* ii. 3. *Among whom* [*i. e.* the *Gentiles*] we all *had our converſation in times paſt, in the luſts of* our *fleſh*. *Col.* i. 12, 13. *The father*——*hath deliver'd* us *from the power of darkneſs*. In theſe and many other paſſages he ranks himſelf among the *Gentiles*, tho' he was really a *Jew*. His deſign herein was not to inſinuate any thing that is falſe, but to render his exhortations the leſs offenſive, and the more effectual. In like manner, when he reckons himſelf among them to whom the Goſpel was *confirm'd* by ſuch as had heard Chriſt preach it, he does not imply, that he had not alſo learnt the Goſpel from Chriſt's own immediate information; but he puts himſelf in the caſe of the people to whom he writes (which was in fact partly his own caſe alſo) and then, to avoid giving any offence to them, directs the exhortation to himſelf as well as to them.

Le Clerc fancies that the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was written *after* St. *Paul*'s death, becauſe it is ſaid, *Heb.* xiii. 23. *Our brother Timothy is ſet at liberty*. For (ſays he) St. *Paul*'s ſecond epiſtle to *Timothy* was written but juſt before the apoſtle's death. If then *Timothy*'s *impriſonment* had happen'd before St. *Paul* wrote his epiſtles to him; the apoſtle would certainly have mention'd it in thoſe epiſtles, and have commended *Timothy*'s *patience* and *conſtancy* (*r*). But *Le Clerc* forgot, that the apoſtle has done this very thing, 1 *Tim.* vi. 12. where he ſaith to *Timothy*, *Thou haſt* profeſs'd *a good* profeſſion *before many witneſſes*, *i. e.* "Thou haſt openly "own'd Chriſtianity before the enemies of it, and before thy judges". For in this ſenſe are the ſame words, Ομολογιαν μαρτυρειν, uſed in the following verſe, where they are render'd, *Chriſt Jeſus before Pontius Pilate* witneſſed a *good* confeſſion. *Le Clerc* will never be able to prove, that it was neceſſary for the apoſtle to ſay more on this head.

It is likewiſe urged, that the *language* and *ſtyle* of this epiſtle are *different* from the language and ſtyle of St. *Paul*'s undoubted epiſtles. To which it may eaſily be anſwer'd,

(1) That

(*r*) *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica*, ad *A. D.* 69. *p.* 459.

(1) That they, who inſiſt on this *difference of ſtyle* are not agreed in determining whoſe ſtyle the ſtyle of this epiſtle is like. *Clement* of *Alexandria* by ſaying that *Luke tranſlated* it (*s*) does as good as ſay, that the ſtyle of this epiſtle is like the ſtyle of St. *Luke*; and he expreſly ſays, that it is the ſame as the ſtyle of the *Acts* of the apoſtles (*t*). And yet *Euſebius*, another *Greek* writer, does as good as ſay the direct *contrary*. For from the ſtyle he infers, that the *Greek* of the epiſtle is not *Luke*'s, but *Clement*'s of *Rome*. His words are (*u*), "Some ſay that *Luke* the Evangeliſt, others, "that *Clement* of *Rome* tranſlated the epiſtle into *Greek*: the lat-"ter of which ſeems the more probable of the two becauſe of the "*ſimilitude of ſtyle* between the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and the "epiſtle of *Clement*". There is the ſame diverſity of opinions among the modern *Critics*. What ſtreſs then can be laid upon this argument from the *ſtyle*, when thoſe that have ſet up for nice judges of ſtyle, have gone into ſuch different ſentiments; and when two learned *Greek writers*, who muſt be ſuppoſed to be as good judges, as moſt, of different ſtyles in the *Greek* language, contradict one another on this head?

(2) Suppoſing the language and ſtyle of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* to be as like St. *Luke*'s as *Grotius* would have it: ſtill this will be no manner of proof that he was the *author* of the epiſtle: ſince if it was originally written in *Hebrew*, and *Luke* was the perſon, who *tranſlated* it into *Greek*, the language and ſtyle of the tranſlation would naturally be as like that of St. *Luke*'s *Goſpel*, and *Acts*, as *Grotius* thought it to be. If any reader would defend *Grotius* his opinion on this head, I would deſire him to compare the *Greek tranſlation* of the diſcourſes and ſpeeches of Chriſt and of *Paul*, which we meet with in *Luke*'s *Goſpel* and *Acts* (which ſpeeches were originally deliver'd in *Hebrew* or *Syriac* (as we ſhall ſoon ſee) with his tranſlation of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*:) and if he ſhall find the ſame ſtyle in both, he will not be able to infer more from it, than that *Luke* was the *tranſlator* of both.

(3) As

(*s*) See before, *p.* iii. *note* (*c*).

(*t*) Οθεν τον αυτον χρωτα διεσωθαι κατα την ερμηνειαν ταυτης τε της επιστολης, και των πραξεων. Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Lib. VI. c. 14.

(*u*) See before, *p.* ix. *note* (*b*).

(3) As to the words and phraſes in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, which *Grotius* ſays are *never* uſed by St. *Paul*, but moſt of which are *peculiar* to St. *Luke*, he ſadly trifles. It is very true, as he obſerves, that παρεχρυειδαι never appears in all St. *Paul*'s thirteen undoubted epiſtles: but then it is as true, that it is not found in any other writing of the New Teſtament, but only, *Heb.* ii. 1. It is true, that St. *Paul* in his other epiſtles does not uſe Αιωνες to ſignify the *world*, as it ſignifies, *Heb.* i. 2. xi. 3. but then it is as certain alſo, that St. *Luke* never uſes it in this ſenſe. To what purpoſe then did *Grotius* make theſe obſervations? Will they not as well prove, that *Luke* was not, as that *Paul* was not, the author of the epiſtle? It is true, that ευλαβηθεις ſignifies, *being afraid*, *Acts* xxiii. 10. and *Heb.* xi. 7. and that this word with its kindred words are never uſed by any other writer of the New Teſtament but St. *Luke*, and the tranſlator of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. But then it muſt be added, in contraſt to this, that the very next word in the *Greek* Concordance, *viz.* Ευλογια, which is twice met with in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, is uſed *ſeven times* by St. *Paul*, and not once by St. *Luke*. Is not this then as good an argument to prove, that St. *Paul* was the author? It is true, that Εις τι παντελες is uſed, *Luke* xiii. 11. and *Heb.* vii. 25. inſtead of Εις τι διηνεκες. But then, to have done juſtice, *Grotius* ſhould not have conceal'd, that this *latter* is the phraſe which is *moſt commonly* met with in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*; and yet is not once uſed in *Luke*'s Goſpel or *Acts*. See *Heb.* vii. 3. x. 1, 12, 14. *Grotius* next inſtances in μαρτυρουμενος, and μαρτυρεισθαι, *Acts* vi. 3. xvi. 2. *Heb.* vii. 8. xi. 2, 5, 39. But at the ſame time he took care not to obſerve, that St. *Paul* uſes the words *exactly* in the *ſame* ſenſe wherein they are uſed in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*: while St. *Luke* makes uſe of them in a ſomewhat *different* ſenſe. St. *Luke* ſpeaks of perſons, who had a good character among *men*: whereas the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* ſpeaks of perſons, who had a good teſtimony given to them by *God*, in the Holy Scripture. Thus alſo St. *Paul* in his undoubted writings uſes the word, μαρτυρουμενος, *Rom.* iii. 21.---μαρτυρουμενη υπο του νομου, και των προφητων, *The righteouſneſs of God is witneſſed to by the law and the prophets*; exactly parallel to his ſaying, *Heb.* vii. 8.---μαρτυρουμενος οτι ζη, *of whom it is witneſſed* (*viz.* in the Old Teſtament) *that he* (Melchiſedek) *liveth*. At the ſame time it may be proper to obſerve, that St. *Paul* uſes the word alſo exactly in the ſame ſenſe with St. *Luke*, 1 *Tim.* v. 10.

10.---- εν εργοις καλοις μαρτυρουμενη, a widow that had a good character among *men* for her good works. If *Grotius* had thus told out all the truth, he would not have deceived his readers, as, I fear, he has now deceived many. The next inſtance he produces is χρηματιζεσθαι, as ſignifying a *divine admonition*, *Luke* ii. 26. *Heb.* viii. 5. But how to infer any thing from this in favour of *Grotius* is beyond the power of man to tell; ſince St. *Paul* unqueſtionably uſed Χρηματισμος in the ſame ſenſe, *Rom.* xi. 4. *But what ſaith the* anſwer of God *unto him?* Is not this then as much St. *Paul*'s ſtyle, as St. *Luke*'s? The next word taken notice of by *Grotius* as uſed in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and by St. *Luke*, which is not uſed by St. *Paul*, is Ηγουμενος a *Ruler*, *Luke* xxii. 26. *Heb.* xiii. 7, 17. And I can tell him of a word that is uſed *eleven* times by St. *Luke*, and *thirteen* times by St. *Paul*, and yet is not once uſed in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, I mean, Ηδη, which ſignifies, *Now*, or *Already*. But can it be inferr'd from this, that the epiſtle was written by neither *Paul*, nor *Luke?* Surely as well as *Grotius* proves it was not written by *Paul*. His next inſtance is Αρχηγος, a *Prince*. *Acts* iii. 15. v. 31. *Heb.* ii. 10. xii. 2. On the other hand, we may inſtance in Αγιασμος, *Holineſs*, which is read in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and in St. *Paul*'s undoubted epiſtles, but not in the writings of St. *Luke*. Thus alſo Αγων, Αδωμος, Αιδης, Αιρεσμαι, Ακακος, Αμελεω, (*N. B.* Tho' St. *Matthew* uſes this word, *chap.* xxii. 5. yet St. *Luke* in his parallel account does not, *chap.* xiv. 18.) Αμμος (uſed *Matth.* vii. 26. yet not in the parallel, *Luke* vi. 49.) Αμωμος, Αναμιμνησκω, (inſtead of which St. *Luke* uſes Μνασμαι) Ανασεσρη, &c. are words found in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and in the unconteſted writings of St. *Paul*, but not in St. *Luke*'s Goſpel or *Acts*. And yet it is evident, beyond all poſſibility of contradiction, that St. *Luke* had as much occaſion to make uſe of theſe words, eſpecially of Αμελεω, Αμμος, and Αναμιμνησκω, as St. *Paul* had of uſing Ηγουμενος, and Αρχηγος. The only remaining inſtance mention'd by *Grotius* is, that the preposition Περι ſignifies *concerning*, in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and in the writings of St. *Luke*, as *Luke* xx. 19. *They knew, that he ſpake the parable* (ειπε προς) *unto*, or concerning *them*. *Heb.* i. 7. προς αγγελους λεγει, concerning *the angels he ſaith*. All this is juſt enough. But it is falſe in fact to add, as *Grotius* does, that this ſenſe of the word is *peculiar* to St. *Luke*. For there is as plain

an

an inſtance in St. *Paul*'s undoubted epiſtles, *viz. Rom.* viii. 31. Τι ουν ερουμεν προς ταυτα; which words may juſtly be render'd, *What ſhall we ſay* concerning *theſe things?*

From what has been now ſaid it ſeems exceedingly evident, that there is not the leaſt ſhadow of force in what *Grotius* has urged from the *language* of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, to prove that it was not written by St. *Paul*. If a man, in reading *Grotius*, will take his bare word without examination, and not conſider what may be ſaid on the other ſide, he will be apt to imagine, there is ſomething plauſible in the arguing. But when it is brought to the teſt, it is evident, there is nothing in it. We have now ſeen, that by arguments every jot as ſtrong as this of *Grotius*, we may prove that St. *Luke* could not be, but that St. *Paul* was, the author of the *Greek* epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. The truth is, there is nothing in the argument either way. And if the argument had not been offer'd by ſo great a man, it would not have been worth conſidering. But ſince *Grotius* has advanced it, it was *neceſſary* to ſift it to the bottom, tho' in ſo doing one ſeems to be *trifling*. For the argument cannot be anſwer'd in any other way.

Finally it is objected, that if St. *Paul* had been the author of this epiſtle, he would have prefix'd his name to it, as he has done to every one of his thirteen undoubted epiſtles. But this is more than the objectors know. Our not knowing the reaſon, why he did not begin this epiſtle as he began the reſt, is no proof, that there was no reaſon for it at all. Whoever was the author of it, it is fact, he has not ſet his name to it. There was the ſame reaſon (as far as we can perceive) for any other perſon's ſetting his name to it, if any other perſon was the author of it, as for St. *Paul*'s ſetting his name to it, if he was the author: and there may have been the very ſame reaſon for St. *Paul* to omit his name, ſuppoſing him to have been the author, as for *Luke*, or *Clement*, or *Apollos*, to ſuppreſs his name, provided either of theſe had been the author of this epiſtle. So that there is not the leaſt appearance of force in this argument.

Since then the moſt ancient and by far the moſt general tradition of the church aſſures us, That St. *Paul* was the author of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and there is no manner of *argument*, whereby it can be proved not to be his work; it remains, that we ought to receive the ſaid tradition as the truth; and to read the

the epiſtle with the reverence due to a writing of the great apoſtle of the *Gentiles*, who wrote as he was moved by the Holy Ghoſt.

II. *Of the* language *in which the epiſtle to the* Hebrews *was originally written.*

IN order to determine this matter it is neceſſary to obſerve, that that *Hebrew* language, which is retain'd in the writings of the Old Teſtament ceas'd to be the common, living language of *Judæa* upon the *Jews* being carried captive into *Babylon*; and that after they were reſtored to their own land, the commen language they ſpoke was the language of *Babylon*, call'd the *Chaldee*, which however is not much more than a dialect of the old *Hebrew*. The *Syriac* language varies a little more from the old *Hebrew*, and was the language of a country immediately bordering upon *Judæa*. Hence it came to paſs that the *Jews* imitated the *Syrians* alſo in their language, both before, and in the time of our Saviour. This compound language of *Chaldee* and *Syriac*, after the *Babyloniſh* captivity, became the common, living language of the *Hebrews*, and therefore was uſually call'd, the *Hebrew* language; tho' it was ſomewhat different from the *old Hebrew* preſerved in the Old Teſtament. That it was the common language of *Judæa* in the apoſtle's days is expreſly ſaid by St. *Luke*, *Acts* i. 19. *That field is call'd in their* proper *tongue*, Acceldama, *that is to ſay, the field of blood.* The word חקלא *Acel* is not at all to be found in the *old Hebrew* language, but in *Chaldee* and *Syriac* it ſignifies a *field*: from whence it follows, that the *Chaldee*, or *Syriac* was the *proper tongue* of the *Hebrews* at that time. Accordingly we find, that our Saviour and his diſciples, and the other *Hebrews*, with whom they converſed, continually ſpoke in the *Chaldee*, or *Syriac* language, as is evident from the *Syro-Chaldaic* words recorded in the New Teſtament, ſuch as *Abba*, *Bar-Jona*, *Bethesda*, *Boanerges*, *Cephas*, *Eloi*, *Ephphatha*, *Gabbatha*, *Golgotha*, *Lama Sabacthani*, *Maran atha*, *Rabboni*, *Raca*, *Tabitha*, *Talitha kumi*; which are not words of the old *Hebrew*, but of the *Chaldee* or *Syriac* tongue. At the ſame time it muſt be obſerved, that in the New Teſtament theſe words as ſpoken by the *Hebrews*, are ſaid to be *Hebrew*; *Joh.* v. 2. *The pool, which is call'd in the* Hebrew *tongue*, Bethesda. xix. 13. *The place called, the pavement, but in the* Hebrew *tongue*, Gabbatha. v. 17. *The place of a skull, which*

is called in the Hebrew *tongue* Golgotha. Yet every one who knows any thing of the eaſtern languages, knows that theſe particular words here call'd, *Hebrew*, viz. *Bethesda*, *Gabbatha*, and *Golgotha*, are really words of the *Chaldee* or *Syriac* language. But as this language was, in our Saviour's days, ſpoken by the *Hebrews*, and is really very little more than a dialect of the antient *Hebrew*, there is nothing odd in calling it, the *Hebrew* tongue.

This *Hebrew*, or *Syriac* language was the common language of the *Hebrews after* our Saviour's aſcenſion alſo, in the days of St. *Paul*, as is evident from the hiſtory of his life in the *Acts* of the apoſtles. When he was apprehended by the *Roman* officer *Lyſias*, and had obtain'd liberty to make a ſpeech to the *Hebrews* of *Jeruſalem*, it is ſaid, *he ſpake to them in the* Hebrew *tongue*, *Acts* xxi. 40. and in the next chapter, *v.* 2. it is added, *When they heard, that he ſpake in the* Hebrew *tongue to them, they kept the more ſilence.* The apoſtle, who had the gift of tongues, and ſpoke with tongues more than other Chriſtians (1 *Cor.* xiv. 18.) could have deliver'd this ſpeech in any language whatſoever. The plain and only reaſon therefore why he choſe to ſpeak in the *Hebrew* or *Syriac* language, was becauſe it was the language which the *Hebrews*, his auditors, would beſt underſtand, as it was *their own proper tongue*, *Acts* i. 19. He could have ſpoken *Greek* at that time if he would: but he knew, the *Jews* would not then underſtand him. Is it not therefore very natural to infer from hence, that *two* years after this, when he ſent them an epiſtle, he would be moſt likely to write in the common language of the country, that ſo the people, for whom the epiſtle was deſign'd, might be able to read, and to edify by it? Was there not the ſame reaſon for his *writing*, as for his making a ſet *ſpeech* to the *Hebrews*, in the *Hebrew* or *Syriac* languague?

As it is thus natural to ſuppoſe, that St. *Paul* wrote this epiſtle in *Hebrew*: ſo all the old traditions relating to this epiſtle expreſly ſay, that it was written in that language. This tradition is mention'd by *Clement* of *Alexandria* (*w*), *Euſebius* (*x*), and *Jerom* (*y*), and is not contradicted by any antient writer whomſoever. And ſince there is nothing odd, or unnatural in the thing it ſelf, but rather it was agreeable to the Condition of the *Hebrews* in

(*w*) Before cited, *p.* iii. *note* (*c*).
(*x*) Before cited, *p* ix. *note* (*b*).
(*y*) Before cited, *p.* xiv. *note* (*a*.)

in *Judæa* to whom he wrote, that he ſhould write in the *Hebrew* or *Syriac* language: I cannot ſee the leaſt ſhadow of a reaſon why we ſhould disbelieve this *antient* and *unconteſted* tradition. I cannot allow myſelf to argue againſt *facts* aſſerted by *ſufficient* and *credible* witneſſes.

It is not neceſſary to maintain in conſequence of this, that the *Syriac* text of this epiſtle, which we now have in the *Syriac* Teſtament is the original work of the apoſtle. Perhaps this is only, like the *Syriac* text of the other epiſtles, a tranſlation out of *Greek*. Yet, on the other hand, I cannot argue, as *Eſtius* does, that it *muſt* be ſo on the account of two or three *Greek* words, which are found in it, (as קבורגא Κιβωτος, and דיתיקא Διαθηκη, *Heb.* ix. 4.) ſince many *Greek* words were adopted into the *Chaldee* and *Syriac* languages, during the empire of *Alexander* the Great, and his *Grecian* ſucceſſors, three hundred years before the time of St. *Paul* (z).

There does not appear to me to be any manner of force in the objections that have been urged to confront this tradition, that the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was originally written in *Hebrew* or *Syriac*. However I ſhall briefly conſider them all.

In the firſt place it is objected, "That the preſent *Greek* text "does not look like a tranſlation, ſince if it had been ſo, there "would have been found in it continual *Hebraiſms* as in the old "*Greek* verſion of the *Hebrew* Bible: whereas the *Hebraiſms* in "this epiſtle are very few, and the language of it is very ele-"gant". But it is eaſy to anſwer, that the tranſlator of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, whether he was *Luke*, or *Clement*, was unſpeakably a better maſter of ſenſe and language than the ancient *Greek* tranſlators of the Old Teſtament, eſpecially of the later books of it, who neither underſtood *Hebrew* or *Greek* in any tolerable degree (a). But *Luke* and *Clement* have proved by their own undoubted writings, that they were well skill'd in the *Greek* language. And as *Luke* in particular has in fact expreſs'd in very good *Greek* the *diſcourſes* of our Saviour and of St. *Paul*, which were originally deliver'd in the *Hebrew* or *Syriac* language, it is *demonſtration* that he was capable of *tranſlating* an *epiſtle* from the ſame language into *as good Greek*.

(z) See the book of *Daniel*; and father *Simon's Hiſt. of the verſions of the N. T. c.* xv. *ſect.* 2.
(a) See this proved in my firſt Vol. of *Notes and Diſcourſes. Diſc.* v. *p.* 118, &c.

2. It is objected, " That St. *Paul* in his epiſtle to the *Hebrews* " did not write in *Hebrew*, becauſe he does not quote the texts of " the Old Teſtament as they lie in the *Hebrew* original, but ge- " nerally as they are repreſented in the *Greek* verſion; as, *A body* " *haſt thou prepared me*, *Heb.* x. 5. whereas in the *Hebrew* it is, " *Mine ears haſt thou open'd*, *Pſal.* xl. 6. *Jacob worſhipped, lean-* " *ing on the top of his ſtaff*, *Heb.* xi. 21. whereas in the *Hebrew* it " is, *On the bed's head*, *Gen.* xlvii. 31.". But there is not ſo much as the appearance of an objection in this to ſuch as are ſenſible, that the errors lie in the *modern* copies of the *Hebrew* Bible, which the *Jews* have communicated to us; while the true, original readings of theſe texts have been preſerved in the old *Greek* verſion, as has been remark'd in the Notes on theſe verſes in particular. The *Hebrew* text had not ſuffer'd ſo many alterations by the careleſſneſs of tranſcribers in the days of St. *Paul*, as it has done ſince. In his time the *Hebrew* copies repreſented the texts of the Old Teſtament in the ſame manner as he has quoted them. If any reader needs to ſee theſe things proved, I beg leave to refer him to the learned and ingenious Mr. *Whiſton*'s excellent *Eſſay toward reſtoring the true text of the Old Teſtament*; and to the liſt of *errors noted in the preſent Hebrew copies*, in my ſecond volume of *Notes and Diſcourſes*.

3. It has been objected by many great men, " That if this epiſ- " tle had been written in *Hebrew*, the apoſtle could not have diſ- " courſed about a *teſtament* in the ninth chapter, in the manner as " he there does. For (ſay they) while he there ſometimes under- " ſtands the word, διαθηκη, as ſignifying a *covenant*, and at other " times a *laſt will* and *teſtament*, there is no ſuch ambiguity in " the *Hebrew* word בְּרִית which never ſignifies a *will*, but " always a *covenant*?" This objection is ſolidly anſwer'd to my hands by the learned Mr. *Peirce*, who hath excellently obſerved and proved, that the writer does not, as ſome have haſtily ſaid, play with the ambiguity of the word, διαθηκη, but always uſes it in one and the ſame ſenſe, as ſignifying a *covenant*, particularly, *Heb.* ix. 15, 16, 17. See his Notes on theſe verſes. So that this diſcourſe might have been written in *Hebrew*, or *Syriac*, and the

apoſtle

apoſtle have uſed either the word בריתא or קימא or דיתיקא as he pleaſed.

4. It is farther objected, " That if this epiſtle had been written " in *Hebrew*, the author would not have done ſuch a very need- " leſs thing as to interpret the plain *Hebrew* words *Melchiſedek*, " and *Salem*, as he does, *Heb.* vii. 1, 2. *This* Melchiſedek *king of* " Salem,----*firſt being by interpretation* king of righteouſneſs, *and* " *afterward king of* Salem, *that is*, *king of* peace. Is it not as " *needleſs* to make this obſervation to one who underſtands the " *Hebrew* language, as it is to tell an *Engliſhman*, that the word, " *ſchool-maſter*, ſignifies the *maſter of a ſchool?*" There would have been ſome appearance of force in this objection, if we main-tain'd that the epiſtle was written in the *old Hebrew* language. But this objection can be of no manner of weight to prove, that it was not written in the *Syriac* language, which is what the firſt fa-thers, as well as the writers of the New Teſtament, call *Hebrew*. In the *Syriac* language the interpretation was *needful*. In this language as well as in *Engliſh*, there is a great deal of difference between *Melchiſedek* and *king of righteouſneſs*. *King of righteouſ-neſs* in *Syriac* is not מלך צדק but either מלכא דכאנותא or, at neareſt, מלכא דזריקותא which are different enough from the *Hebrew* words to render an explication ne-ceſſary. The *French* word *Neufchatel* needs to be explain'd to an *Engliſhman*, who knows only his mother-tongue, tho' it does not more differ from *Newcaſtle*, which it ſignifies, than the *He-brew* and *Syriac* words now mention'd do from one another. In like manner, *king of Salem* in *old Hebrew* is מלך שלם but *king of peace* in *Syriac* is מלכא דשלמא which are different enough both in ſpelling and in ſound to conceal the derivation from one that could only ſpeak the *Syriac* language. I may add, *ex abundanti*, that if any one would rather ſuppoſe, theſe inter-pretations were *added to* the *text* by the *Greek tranſlator*, he might confirm his ſuppoſition by obſerving, that St. *Luke* in another *Greek* tranſlation of a *Hebrew* diſcourſe has in fact inſerted ſuch an in-terpretation, as was not in the original. The diſcourſe I mean is that of St. *Peter*, which no doubt he deliver'd in *Hebrew*, or *Sy-riac*, and to which St. *Luke* in his tranſlation has made an addition,

Acts

Acts i. 19. *It was known unto all the inhabitants of Jeruſalem, in ſo much as that field is call'd in their proper tongue, Aceldama, that is to ſay, the field of blood.* Theſe words, it is evident, could not have been ſpoken by St. *Peter* in a diſcourſe he deliver'd to *Jews at Jeruſalem*: but the whole verſe muſt be look'd upon as a *parentheſis* thrown in by St. *Luke* the tranſlator. It is every whit as poſſible, that St. *Luke* ſhould add the explication of the words, *Melchiſedek* and *Salem*, in his *Greek* verſion of the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. For it is manifeſt the author builds nothing at all on theſe interpretations in the ſubſequent diſcourſe. See a like inſtance *Joh.* i. 42.

5. It is urged, "If this epiſtle was written originally in *He-*
"*brew*, whence comes it to paſs, that no copy of it in that lan-
"guage was ever read, ſeen, or heard of by the moſt diligent col-
"lectors of all fragments of antiquity in the primitive times?" In anſwer to this it muſt be obſerved, that as the ancient Chriſtians poſitively ſay, that it was originally written in *Hebrew*, they do as good as ſay, that they had *heard* of a copy of it in that language. But as *Jeruſalem* was deſtroyed about *eight* years after this epiſtle was written, and the *Hebrews*, for whoſe particular uſe it was intended, were *ſcatter'd* abroad, there was the leſs occaſion for the *Hebrew* copy of the epiſtle, ſince authentic copies of the *Greek* tranſlation would be more generally uſeful to the *Hebrew* Chriſtians themſelves in their *diſperſion*, and to others alſo.

6. In the laſt place it is urged, "That this epiſtle abounds
"with *Greek* elegancies and *Paronomaſia*'s that have no counte-
"nance given to them by any thing in the *Hebrew* tongue, ſuch
"as that for inſtance, *chap.* v. *v.* 8. Εμαθεν αφ' ων επαθε. *Chap.* x.
"34. Υπαρχοντων & υπαρξιν". I do not perceive the force of this objection, becauſe ſuppoſing the epiſtle had been written originally in *Syriac*, and from thence tranſlated into *Greek* by St. *Luke*, he could not, even in this caſe, have well avoided theſe *Paronomaſia*'s. In whatever language the author had ſaid, *Chriſt learn'd obedience from the things that he ſuffer'd*, and how far diſtant ſoever the words, *learn'd*, and *ſuffer'd*, in that language, were from jingling, or rhyming, or from being derived from the ſame root; yet the *Greek* tranſlator could not well avoid the mention'd *Paronomaſia*, *viz.* εμαθεν αφ' ων επαθε. The tranſlator does not appear to have

the

the leaſt *deſign* of chiming; and muſt have *taken pains* on purpoſe to avoid it, if he would not have words thus near in ſound ſtand ſo cloſe together. Thus alſo, in whatever language an author happens to mention mens being *ſpoil'd of their goods*, and their having a *better ſubſtance* in heaven, it would be moſt natural for a *Greek* tranſlator to uſe the words, υπαρχοντων and υπαρξιν, not for the ſake of a likeneſs in ſound, but becauſe theſe are proper words in the caſe. Beſides, if the author had *intended* a *Paronomaſia* in this place, and had originally written this epiſtle in *Greek*, it is more likely he would have ſaid υπαρχοντων, and υπαρξια, in *Engliſh* thus, *Ye took joyfully the ſpoiling of your* goods, *and have in heaven more enduring* goods. There is no arguing from theſe *Paronomaſia's*, unleſs they were manifeſtly *deſign'd* and *intended* by the author. For they often occur in writing *without* deſign. And they therefore particularly often happen in *tranſlations*, when there is nothing of the kind in the original. St. *Paul's* ſpeech to the *Jewiſh Sanhedrim*, *Acts* xxiii. was unqueſtionably deliver'd in *Syriac*; and yet we ſee a *Paronomaſia* in St. *Luke's tranſlation* of it, *v.* 3. Κατα τον νομον, and παρανομων: in *Engliſh*, *Thou ſitteſt to judge* legally, *and yet* illegally *commandeſt me to be beaten.* In like manner there is a *Paronomaſia* in the *Greek* of *Matth.* xvi. 18. Συ ει Πετρος, και επι ταυτη τη Πετρα, κ. τ. λ. and in the *Latin* verſion too, *Tu es* Petrus, & *ſuper hanc* Petram, &c. Yet, I hope, no one will infer from hence that our Saviour ſpoke theſe words to *Peter* either in *Latin*, or *Greek*: ſince he undoubtedly ſpoke in *Syriac*; in which language the *Paronomaſia* is ſtronger, as the ſame *Syriac* word כאפא ſignifies both *Peter* and a *ſtone.* There is therefore no arguing from a *Paronomaſia*, unleſs it was manifeſtly *deſign'd*, and *intended.* And if it was intended, ſtill, if it hold in ſeveral languages, the *Paronomaſia* can never determine, which language is the original, and which are tranſlations. And as there does not appear to be any one *Paronomaſia* in the *Greek* epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, that was *deſign'd* and *intended* by the author of the *Greek* edition; it is weak to go about to argue from an *accidental* chiming of words, that the *Greek* is not a tranſlation, but the original.

Upon

Upon the whole, there does not appear to be any reaſon for disbelieving the antient and unconteſted tradition, that the epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was written in *Syriac*, commonly in thoſe days call'd, *Hebrew*: ſo that I cannot but determine, that it was written in that language, and that St. *Luke* is very likely to have been the perſon who tranſlated it into *Greek*. Thus the different traditions among the antients appear to center in the ſame point. Thoſe that attributed the epiſtle to St. *Paul*, and thoſe that attributed it to St. *Luke* are both ſo far in the right, that St. *Paul* was the author of the *epiſtle itſelf*, and St. *Luke* (probably) the author of the *Greek tranſlation*.

THE

THE EPISTLE of St. *PAUL* TO THE *HEBREWS*.

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

SYNOPSIS.

THE *Hebrews*, to whom this epiſtle was written, were *Chriſtians* converted to the faith of Jeſus from among the children of *Iſrael*. By this title, *Hebrews*, they were diſtinguiſh'd not only from the *uncircumciſed* believers of the Goſpel, but alſo from the *Helleniſts*, who were (not *natural* Jews, but) proſelytes to the *whole* Jewiſh Religion from among the *Gentiles*, commonly call'd, *Proſelytes of juſtice*. In the ſame ſenſe St. *Paul* uſes the term, *Hebrews*, 2 *Cor.* xi. 22. *Are they* Hebrews? *So am I.* *Philip.* iii. 5. ---- *Of the ſtock of Iſrael, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew* deſcended from *Hebrews*. From hence it is *demonſtrable*, that the *Helleniſts* mention'd, *Act.* vi. 1. (call'd in our tranſlation, *Grecians*) were not, as ſome have thought, *natural* Jews of the ſtock of *Iſrael*, born *out of Judea*, and ſpeaking the *Greek* language. For, according to this definition, St. *Paul* was a *Helleniſt*, ſince he was born *out of Judea*, at *Tarſus* in *Cilicia*, *Act.* xxii. 3. and ſpoke *Greek*, *Chap.* xxi. 37: whereas it is certain that he was *not* a *Helleniſt*, but a *Hebrew*, as he expreſly ſtiles himſelf in the places above quoted from him. Tho' the *Helleniſts* are oppoſed to the *Hebrews*, *Act.* vi. 1. yet they are expreſly call'd *Jews*, *Chap.* xi. 19, 20. *Now they, who were ſcattered abroad upon the perſecution that aroſe about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to none, but unto the* Jews only. *And ſome of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they were come to Antioch, ſpake unto* the Grecians, or Hellenifts, *preaching the Lord Jeſus.* Since they preach'd *only* to the *Jews*, and preach'd to the *Helleniſts*, it is a clear caſe, that the *Helleniſts* were *Jews*, tho' not by *birth*, yet by ſubmitting to *circumciſion*, and by becoming *proſelytes of juſtice*. The *proſelytes* of *all* nations might be call'd *Helleniſts*, or *Grecians*, as well as the *uncircumciſed people* of *all* nations be call'd *Greeks*, *Rom.* i. 16. ii. 9, 10.

This epiſtle was particularly deſign'd for the *Hebrew* Chriſtians that dwelt in *one certain place*, and was ſent *thither*, as appears from the Apoſtle's ſaying, *Chap.* xiii. 19, 23. *I beſeech* you *the rather to do this, that I may be* reſtored to you *the ſooner* —— *I will ſee you.* And what *particular place* can this be ſuppos'd to be, but *Judea?* there the Chriſtians were continually perſecuted by the unbelieving *Jews*, as we read in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, and as St. *Paul* takes notice, 1 *Theſſ.* ii. 14. *Hebr.* x. 32—36. xii. 4, 5. By theſe *perſecutions* the *Hebrew* Chriſtians were *tempted* to *apoſtatiſe* from Chriſtianity, and to fancy there was ſtrength in the *arguments* urged by the perſecutors in favour of *Judaiſm.* The Apoſtle therefore ſets himſelf to guard againſt *both* theſe dangers. With reſpect to the *arguments* in favour of *Judaiſm*, *viz.* that it was a *divine* inſtitution; that the law was partly given by the miniſtry of *Moſes* an *extraordinary prophet*, and partly by the miniſtry of *Angels*; that it threaten'd *death* to ſuch as broke or renounced it; that it appointed a *high prieſt* and *propitiatory ſacrifices*, and was, as they thought, to laſt *for ever*, &c. The Apoſtle proves, that the Goſpel alſo is a *divine* inſtitution; that it was given by one vaſtly *above Moſes*, and the *Angels* too, even by the *Son* of GOD; that therefore renouncing this muſt needs be *puniſh'd more ſeverely* than apoſtaſy from the law to heatheniſm; that we have a *greater high prieſt* than the *Jews* had, even the *Son* of GOD in heaven; that *his ſacrifice* will procure a *full* pardon, a reſurrection, and eternal life, which the legal ſacrifices could not do; and that the *Moſaic* covenant was originally intended to give place to the Chriſtian, &c.

With regard to the *perſecutions*, to which the profeſſion of Chriſtianity expoſed them, he obſerves, that *many others* had born the like with *patience*, and in the exerciſe of a ſtrong *faith*, whoſe example they ought to follow; and that in *chaſtning* them with ſuch evils in this life, GOD, as their merciful father, deſign'd *their good*: for which reaſons they ſhould not faint.

The Apoſtle alſo takes frequent occaſions to inſinuate his great doctrine, *viz.* That the *Gentiles* ought to be receiv'd to Chriſtian communion *without circumciſion*, upon their *faith* in the *Goſpel.*

A more *particular* account of the argument of the epiſtle may be ſeen in the contents of the ſeveral ſections.

THE EPISTLE TO THE *HEBREWS.*

Writen 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.

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

1. GOD who in ſeveral parts (*a*), and in divers manners (*b*) uttered his mind, under the former diſpenſation, to the anceſtors of the *Jews*,
2. 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

TEXT.

GOD 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,

hath

NOTES.

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*) Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, *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. *Jer.* 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*) Ἐν 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 the fleſh. But it may be queſtioned whether that opinion has any ſolid foundation. I know not of any place of ſcripture where 'tis expreſly 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.* lxviii. 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

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom alſo he made the

hath conſtituted the Heir and Lord of all things (*e*), by whom he alſo made the worlds (*f*),

NOTES.

of the angels 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 an- " gels, 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 prefering him to them. But I would not be thought poſitive in rejecting that opinion, concerning which I have offer'd my ſuſpicions

(*e*) Ον 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 injoyment 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* Hoſa *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*) Hilkiah *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 κληρονομεῖν will thus anſwer to ירש נחל or אחז. 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, κύριος κληρονόμος. Hence *Voſſius* thinks that *heres* comes from ירש, 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*

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

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

NOTES.

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*, 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 promiſed 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 ſuperior 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' ὗ καὶ τοὺς 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 employed 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 expreſly 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 mentioned 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*) Ος ὢν 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,

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

and the expreſs image of his perſon, and upholding the very image of his ſubſtance (*b*), and upholding

NOTES.

lelt, 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 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 ſplendor 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.

(*b*) Καὶ χαρακτὴρ 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 *ſtedfaſt 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 χαρακτὴρ, the *expreſs image.* For as that is derived from χαράσσειν, to *grave*, it ſeems to denote an *image*, as the figure impreſt 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 *impreſt 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 pupoſe 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 it do's in the Son, ſince they are not immediately created by the Father, but mediately, the Son being the agent imployed by, and miniſtring 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 ſuperior 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 impreſt 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.

Let

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

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

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 imployed him to "make, muſt be in their nature inferior to him who was their immediate author, that "is, the Son, in whoſe production or generation no intermediate agent was imployed, "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 byaſs 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 expreſly aſſerted, that in theſe works he was an agent under God, or imployed 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 ἑαυτοῦ; and therefore as αὐτοῦ 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' ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος 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

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

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

NOTES.

ther render'd: Διατὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ ἁμαρτίας μὼν λύσιν, καὶ καθαρισμὸν τὰ ἁμαρτίας μὼν. 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 it seems to be intended that Christ alone, without any assistance or concurrence of the angels, made a perfect expiation of our sins.

(*l*) Ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τὰ μεγαλωσύνης 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. *Matt.* 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 call'd here the *majesty*; and hereof 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 οὐρανοῖς, *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 hereby 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 superior to the angels, appear to be extreamly handsome and agreeable.

SECT.

SECT. II.

CHAP. I. 4.--14.

CONTENTS.

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*, ſhows 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 ſhow that Chriſt at his reſurrection was conſtituted ſuperior 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 ſuperior in their nature to other creatures, it muſt of neceſſity follow, that as he is ſuperior to them, he muſt be ſuperior 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.

TEXT.

TEXT.

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?

PARAPHRASE.

This high dignity belongs to him, because he is so much better and more honourable than the angels, as he does upon his resurrection inherit a more excellent name and authority than they. And that he then inherited 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*). 4. 5.

NOTES.

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 this 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 Rabbi's of blessed me-"mory 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 "explain'd it". Rabbi *Solomon Jarchi*, 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

NOTES.

when the contents of the pſalm are thoroughly conſidered, it will appear, 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, thro' 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 גוים here ſignify the *heathen*, which is ordinary and common, and לאמים *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 expreſly by the prophet *Iſa.* li. 4. *Hearken unto me my people, and give ear unto me*, O my nation, לאומי. 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* indeavours 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 indeavours 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, altho' 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 concurr'd afterwards in their attempts to over-throw 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*, *v* 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 gather'd 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 hill*

NOTES.

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 נְסַכְתִּי inſtead of נָסַכְתִּי 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 מלכי *my king*, in the *Hebrew*, as tho' it were מלך מנו *king by him*; and ſo קדשי is turned as though it were קדשו *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, *v.* 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 *delaring* 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, *v.* 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 היום *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 היום *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 deſign'd? This ſhould, in my opinion, be anſwered from the foregoing verſe. *Yet 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 Fa- " ther ". 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 *Matth.* 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: *Matt.* 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*

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

the regeneration, to the time wherein the apoſtles 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 backwarder, 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 שנמשח 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, *ch.* 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 *Melchiſedec*, 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 Jews unacquainted with this manner of expreſſion, *Exod.* xix. 6. *And ye ſhall be unto me a* kingdom of prieſts, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, 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*

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.

give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermoſt parts of the earth for thy poſſeſſion: Thou ſhalt break them with a rod of iron, thou ſhalt daſh them in pieces like a potters 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 *Pſalm*, 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 daſhed 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 *Pſalm* 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 referr'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 referr'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

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

in the firſt 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* mention'd 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

NOTES.

refer 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 mentioning 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 contain'd 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 ſtand 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. 2 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 render'd 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 בהעותו 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 render'd 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 ὅς, and ſo הוא may be eaſily implied in אשר, or the elliptis may be ſupplied by איש or כל which uſe to be followed by אשר. I will here remark 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 עבריו ואת מקנהו בשרה *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 rendring 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 tho' what follows in the *Pſalm* were the *parable* or *dark ſayings* referr'd to *ver.* 2. altho' there is not in all the reſt of the *Pſalm* 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 thro' the reſt of the *Pſalm*; a new ſenſe ſhould have been begun *v.* 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 mention'd this, becauſe *ver.* 2. is cited by the Evangeliſt as a prophecy of Chriſt's ſpeaking in parables, *Mat.* xiii. 35. which I can't perceive to be

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.

NOTES.

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 may 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 אשר 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. Neverthelefs, 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.

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

And let all the angels of God worship him.

And

NOTES.

6. (*o*) Ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, λέγει, Καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν 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 δὲ, 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 in- "stead of that, he then commanded them to be subject to him". The verse therefore ought to be thus render'd: *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 οἰκουμένην, and does not add, (as *Chap.* ii. 6.) τὴν μέλλουσαν, *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 *Ps.* xcvii. 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 *Psalm* 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 προσκυνησάτωσαν, and αὐτῷ instead of Θεοῦ. 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 *Psalm* 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 *Psalm*, 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

ſtead of ἀπαγγήσομαι, as 'tis in the LXX. *Pſ.* xxii. 22. The reader may likewiſe compare *Chap.* viii, 8—11. with the LXX tranſlation of *Jer.* 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 Θεοῦ *of God*, inſtead of ἀυτῷ, *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 Θεοῦ, as they had ἀυτῷ. 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 *Jews* in oppoſition to Chriſt, and the writers of the New Teſtament, have corrupted the LXX. it may not be unlikely that they read προσκυνησάτωσαν in the pſalm, as well as εὐφρανθήτωσαν in the ſame verſe; at leaſt the *Hebrew* will bear this rendring, and therefore nothing can be charged upon our author for chooſing it. For השתחוו may as well be the third perſon plural of the *præteritum*, as the *imperative:* and then *Buxtorf's* rule, *Theſaur.* 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 ו *converſivum* prefix'd, and that he read והשתחוו 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: Εὐφράνθητε ἔθνοι ἅμα ἀυτῷ, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν ἀυτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ· εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀυτοῦ, καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν ἀυτῷ 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 Εὐφράνθητε ἔθνοι to Θεοῦ; ſee the *Polyglot.* And the *Alexandrian* MS. inſtead of πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ reads πάντες υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, and inſtead of ἀυτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ Θεοῦ has ἀυτὸς 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 Teſtament,

Chap. I.

NOTES.

and particularly *Pſal.* xcvii. 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 itſelf, 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 xcv, 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 ſoever 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.* xcvii. 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 inlarging 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 *rejoyce*, 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 reckon'd to be at the ſetting up the kingdom

TEXT.

; And of the angels he ſaith, Who maketh his angels ſpirits, and his miniſters a § flame of fire. But unto

PARAPHRASE.

And concerning the angels he ſaith (*p*), Who maketh his angels winds, and his miniſters a flame of fire (*q*). Whereas con- 7. 8.

cerning

NOTES.

dom 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.* xcvii. 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 rejoice: 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 peophetick 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.

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.

; (*p*) Καὶ πρὸς μὲν τὸς ἀγγέλους λέγει. *And of the angels, he ſaith.*] There is no room to doubt of the goodneſs of this tranſlation, and its preferableneſs 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 ποιῶν τὸς ἀγγέλους αὐτῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τὸς λειτυργὸς αὐτῦ πυρὸς φλόγα. *Who maketh his angels ſpirits, and his miniſters a flame of fire.*] The words רוחות and πνεύματα, 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?

Far-

PARAPHRASE.

eerning the Son he ſpeaks very differently, (r) ſaying, Thy throne, O GOD, is for ever and ever (s): a right ſceptre is the ſceptre
9. 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). And

TEXT.

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 oil of gladneſs above thy fellows.

NOTES.

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 rendred this exactly according to the *Hebrew*, a *flaming fire*, πῦρ φλέγον. But our author did not tye himſelf up to the very words of that tranſlation, even when they were ſufficiently exact, and therefore we may obſerve that he renders it πυρὸς 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 evil, among them.* Compare therewith *Exod.* ix. 23, 24. *Pſal.* cv. 32.

8 (r) Πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν. *But unto the Son he ſaith.*] This rendring 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 δὲ 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 δὲ in like manner, *But* of *the Son he ſaith.*

(s) Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεὸς, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.*] 'Tis doubtful how ὁ Θεὸς 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 in 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.

1. That

NOTES.

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 the 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 expreſs'd: "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 incouragement 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 itſelf, 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 the 8th and 9th verſes, each of them, expreſs the

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

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 oyl 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 diſcover'd 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 inlarging 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 שיר ידידת but ידידת is very different from ידידיה *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 τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ, *A ſong for*, or concerning *the beloved.* Whence it ſhould ſeem that they read in their copies ידיד inſtead of ידידת. The *Vulg.* agrees with the LXX. *pro dilecto.* And ſince there is no expreſs mention made of *Solomon* in the pſalm, משכיל in the title which denotes it to be a pſalm *for inſtruction*, as the LXX. render it, εἰς σύνεσιν, 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 *Rhel oboam*, 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 great

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	
10 And, thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foun-	And concerning the ſame beings, the angels, of whom I am ſpeaking (*n*), he ſaith, Thou,	10.

NOTES.

great difficulty that his ſucceſſors kept two tribes of the twelve ſtedfaſt to them. And if the *daughter of* Tyre, mentioned *ver.* 12. is taken for one of *Solomon's* wives, tho' 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 warriour, 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 remembred 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 (*n*) *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 works 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 entring 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 *v.* 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

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

Thou, O Jehovah [God the Father] (*w*) didſt anciently appoint earthly or human rulers, 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

TEXT.

dation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands. They ſhall 11 periſh, but thou remaineſt: and they all ſhall wax old

NOTES.

ſuch interpreters, will aſſert nothing 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 oyl of gladneſs above thy fellows.) 10. And [concerning the ſame "beings, the angels, we have the following 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 anywhere 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 διαμενεῖς, *Thou ſhalt remain.* This is agreeable to the other future verbs in the context, and to the *Hebrew* ואתה תעמד *But thou ſhalt endure*, as 'tis well rendred 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 *Clermont* and St. *Germains* copies.

12

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	12.

NOTES.

12 (*y*) Ελίξεις αὐτούς. *Shalt thou fold them up.*] There can hardly be any doubt that the true reading is ἀλλάξεις, *thou ſhalt change*, inſtead of ἑλίξεις, *thou ſhalt fold up.* For this beſt ſuits the *Hebrew* word of the pſalm, תחליפם 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 ויחלפו *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. *Germains*, and *New College* copies, and by *Veleſius*'s lections. So it was read by *Ireneus*, 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 ἑλίξεις, from *Iſai.* xxxiv. 4. Dr. *Grabe*, upon the place in *Ireneus* 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 indeavour 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, tho' "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 conti-"nue 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 con-"dition, is declared by the pſalmiſt, when he ſays, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning haſt laid "the foundation*, &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.

NOTES.

5. 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 this 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 ſorry of contending with any, who appear reſolved to underſtand the text in this 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 I 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 commited 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.* lxv. 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 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 referr'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-

as

NOTES.

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 propherick 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 *Tertul. 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 uſeleſs 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,* πεπαλαίωκε τὴν πρώτην, *he hath made the firſt* old. *Now that which* decayeth *and* waxeth old [τὸ δὲ 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*, Mat. 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, 2 *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.

He-

Chap. I.

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

He goes on: *And as a veſture ſhalt thou change them, and they ſhall be changed.* περιβολαιον which we render *veſture*, ſeems to mean a light upper garment, which was eaſily put on or off, like the womens veils, 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* xcvii. 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.* lxviii. 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, ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, *Eph.* iv. 10. but that he is *exalted far above all principality,* ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς, *and power, and might, and dominion,* Eph. i. 20?

13 (*a*) Πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων. *But to which of the angels.*] This verſe ſeems to confirm the interpretation of the foregoing citation. The adverſative particle δὲ *but* ſhows that this is connected therewith. But unleſs that interpretation be admited, what account can be given of any connection at all? nay, the very citation itſelf 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 transfer'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 commited 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 minister

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

NOTES.

The manner of our author's speech here seems to deserve our observation. He does not say, Πρὸς τίνα ὃ αὐτῶν, *But to which of them*; but Πρὸς τίνα ὃ τῶν 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 refer'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 confer'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*) Λειτουργικὰ 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, מלאכים, 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 con- "trary 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*, whole.

HEBREWS.

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

fter for them who shall be heirs of salvation?

NOTES.

"whose proper posture is *standing*, 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, *Ch.* 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, *v.* 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, *Ch.* ii. 5."

(*d*) Διὰ τὸς 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 to 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

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 μελλοντας, our author seems to have intimated thus much, it agreeing so exactly with τὸ διακρίνειν ἢ μέλλουσαν. 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 τὸς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν, *for them that were to inherit*, instead of διὰ τὸς κληρονόμους. And unless I am mistaken 'tis this: he considers the angels as made, at our Lord's resurrection, ministring 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 persuaded 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 be to 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 tho' this be true, yet it seems not to be the sense of this place, which considers the angels not so much as ministring 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 imployed in ministring 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 im-

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

ployed in good offices in a more general way for the ſervice of whole ſocieties, 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 miniſtring 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.

SECT. III.

CHAP. II. 1.—4.

CONTENTS.

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 ſtedfaſt adherence to Chriſt, and a continuing in the religion which he had taught.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

1. 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

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

NOTES.

1 (*e*) Διὰ τοῦτο. *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 writen 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 ἀκουσθεῖσι. *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

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

we ſhould let *them* ſlip.
2 For if the word ſpoken by angels was ſtedfaſt, and

any time we ſhould forget them (*g*). For if the law which was given by the miniſtry of angels (*b*) was ſtedfaſt, and every tranſgreſ- 2.
ſion

NOTES.

Ghoſt; or in the ſtile 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 rendred. 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 ſliping away of *things* than of *perſons*; though, I confeſs, conſidering the ſenſe of the word παραῤῥυῶμεν, 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 confered 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* confer'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 off 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 ourſelves *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 commited 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 παραῤῥυῶμεν. *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 iſthuc 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. Υιέ μὴ παραῤῥυῇς, τήρησον ὦ ἐμὴν βυλὴν καὶ ἔννοιαν. *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 chri-

 ſtians,

PARAPHRASE.

sion of and disobedience to it was justly punish'd
3. 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

TEXT.

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-

NOTES.

stians, that Christ 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 *begining to speak it*, of mens *hearing* 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*) Ητις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα. *Which began.*] This phrase is not unusual in profane authors. Thus *Ælian*, Var. Hist. lib. ii. c. 28. Πόθεν ὃ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν ὅδε ὁ νόμος, ἐρῶ. "I will "now relate whence this law took its rise or begining." 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.

Con-

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

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

ny of those who heard him publish it (*l*), and not only by their testimony, but by the testimony of GOD himself, who bore witness 4.
to the truth of what they preached (*m*), both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles,

NOTES.

(*l*) *Confirmed unto us by them that heard him.*] Matters of fact, which were transacted before our time, and whereof we could not be ourselves 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 writen 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*) Συνεπιμαρτυρῦντ⊙ τε Θεε. *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 meer 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 concurence 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 straitned by having

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

racles and gifts of the Holy Ghoſt (*n*), ac- gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, ac-
cording to his [God's] own will (*o*)? cording to his own will?

NOTES.

having nothing elſe to appeal to but the ancient prophecies, God gave them, by their 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 τέρασι, καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι, 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 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 אתות and מופתים. 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 *Matt.* xxiv. 24. has furniſhed us with a paſſage out of *Polybius*, lib. iii. c. 10. which, I think, is to be thus underſtood: Σημείων δὲ καὶ τεράτων πᾶν μὲν ἱερὸν, πᾶσα 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. Ηνίκα Αλέξανδρος ὁ Φιλίππου ἐπὶ τὰς Θήβας ἦγε τὴν δύναμιν, οἱ μὲν Θεοὶ σημεῖα αὐτοῖς καὶ τέρατα ἐπέστελλον, προσημαίνοντες τὰς περὶ αὐτῶν ὅσον οὐδέπω 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 admited, 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 δυνάμεσι καὶ διὰ 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 τέρασι καὶ δυνάμεσι. *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 αὐτοῦ, it muſt be refer'd to Θεοῦ 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.

SECT.

HEBREWS.

SECT. IV.

CHAP. II. 5---III. 2.

CONTENTS.

TWO 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 expreſly 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*.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

5. NOW 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 no where 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 5 not put in ſubjection the world to come, whereof we ſpeak. But one in a cer- 6 tain place teſtified, ſaying,

NOTES.

5 (p) Τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν. *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 refering 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 oil 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 οἰκουμένην 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 inferior to theirs, ſince he "was ſubject to, and confeſſedly underwent death, from which the angelical na- "ture 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 expreſly 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 7.
"madest him for a little time lower than the "angels, by puting him into such a mortal "state here in the world, as the angels are "not subject to (s), thou crownedst him "with

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) Διεμαρτύρατό πού τις, 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 writen, 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 עולם הזה 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 later 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 prophetical 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) Ηλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους. *Thou madest him a little lower than the angels*]. I have already intimated my agreement with those who choose to render the

PARAPHRASE.

" with glory and honour, and didſt ſet him
8. " 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 ſubjection under him*, leaves no room for any exception, he therefore muſt have left nothing

TEXT.

with glory and honour, and didſt ſet him over the works of thy hands: Thou haſt 8
put all things in ſubjection under his feet. For in that he put all in ſubjection under him, he left nothing

NOTES.

words thus, *Thou madeſt him a little* while *inferior to the angels*, which is the marginal rendring alſo of our tranſlators. There can be no doubt that βραχύ τι will bear this rendring: for it muſt neceſſarily be taken in this ſenſe, *Acts* v. 34. *He commanded to put the apoſtles forth*, βραχύ τι *a little* ſpace, as we juſtly tranſlate it. And that the *Hebrew* מעט 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 rendring, it ſeems more natural to underſtand the pſalm of Chriſt, than of *Adam*, or of mankind in general. For it was but 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 the 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*; Matt. 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 things put under him. But

thing unſubjected to his dominion (*t*). But whatever the grant made to the Son was, at preſent we don't yet ſee all things actually ſubdued to him; nor has he as yet vanquiſhed all his enemies (*u*). But we 9. ſee

NOTES.

8 (*t*) Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, οὐδὲν 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 δὲ οὔπω 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 ſeems 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 tho the ſame perſon were ſpoken of in both places; but 'tis ſaid, *But we ſee* Jeſus, *who was made a little 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 conſider'd as an hiſtorical narration of the caſe of man from the creation; but they muſt be prophetical 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 prophetical 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 the interpretation, is the word *yet*, which is here added, *We ſee not* yet *all things put unto 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, *Matt.* 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

HEBREWS.

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

we 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 became him, for

a

NOTES.

him, 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 δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου, δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον. *But we ſee Jeſus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the ſuffering of death, crowned with glory and honour.*] This rendring ſeems to imply, that theſe words, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ 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 Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται 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 Θεοῦ, *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, mention'd 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 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.

1. 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 begoten 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 omiting 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 caviling 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

PARAPHRASE.

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 (*y*), to make the captain of their ſalvation (*z*) perfectly

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

we are ſure 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 he 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. Ἐν πραΰτητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, μήποτε δῷ 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 ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου 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 (*y*) Πολλοὺς υἱοὺς 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 ἀρχηγὸν, 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 further conſidered the following part of his diſcourſe.

(*z*) Τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν. *The captain of their ſalvation.*] The word ἀρχηγὸς ſignifies a *captain*, as we have here rendred it, or a *prince*, as *Acts* iii. 15. v. 31. and ſometimes the firſt *inventer* 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 τῆς 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* αἴτιος *the author of eternal* ſalvation

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

fect through ſufferings. 11 For both he that ſanctifieth and they who are ſanctified, *are* all of one:

fectly qualified for, and conſecrated to his office (*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 11.

NOTES.

vation *to all them that obey him.* Compare alſo *Acts* iii. 15. where St *Peter* ſtiles him τὸν ἀρχηγὸν 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 fiting, that in particular his way to happineſs and glory "ſhould be the ſame as ours, thro' 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 render'd 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 rendring 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.*

11 (*b*) Ὁ, τε γὰρ ἁγιάζων, καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι. *For both he that ſanctifieth, and they that 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.

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

(*c*) Ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες. *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 the interpreters ſeem to have obſerved. They take the πάντες to be all one as ἀμφότεροι, 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 caviling 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 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 tho' 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 behoved 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 truft in him. again, which proves he was a fon of *Abraham*, in another prophecy he is brought in as faying, " I will put my truft in him (*e*). "

And

NOTES.

it 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 ἀπαγγελῶ inſtead of διηγήσομαι in their tranſlation.

13 (*e*) Καὶ πάλιν· Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ. *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 *Gen-*
" *tiles*, 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, whe-
" ther *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 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

HEBREWS.

PARAPHRASE.

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-

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

text) and therefore we have the leſs reaſon to wonder at our author's diſcourſe in repreſenting Chriſt as a ſon of *Abraham* by believing.

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 וקויתי לו 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*, אחסה בו 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 Ελπιῶ ἐπ' αὐτὸν.

(*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 perſuaded 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 indeavour 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 chanels, and go over all his banks.* 8. *And*

h

NOTES.

he ſhall paſs through 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 join yourſelves for their aſſiſtance] *gird yourſelves, and ye ſhall be broken in pieces; gird yourſelves, and ye ſhall be broken in pieces.* [Though God will ſuffer you to go far, yet not uterly 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 itſelf 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, יסף and עוד, 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* all over 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 כנף 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?

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

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 כי עמנו אל *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 omited, 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 had 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 לשני בתי ישראל *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 refer'd to. Farther, I think the last clause in *ver.* 14. *To the inhabitants of* Jerusalem, is exegetical of what we render, *To both 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 Καὶ ἐρεῖ, *And he shall say*, at the begining of *ver.* 17. though there seems to me to be vastly more reason why they should have made that insertion here at the begining 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 MY 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

NOTES.

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 un-" derſtauding 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 bleſ-ſed 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 *Moſaick* 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 writen, 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*, *Ephraimitæ 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 צרר is uſed inſtead of צור 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 commited, as they had been anciently to the *Jews*, *Rom.* iii. 2. The expreſſion appears to be alluſive to the cuſtom of commiting

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

miting writings or evidences of a man's title to an eſtate to a perſon's cuſtody. And however interpreters have overlook'd 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, rendred 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 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 *Theſſ.* 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 ſorceries and witchcrafts being much in vogue with the *Jews*, in and after our Saviour's time; for the proof of which, the reader is refer'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?

For

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 thro' death he might destroy him that had the

Forasmuch (*g*) then as the children were 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 14.

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, *tho' 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 writen, 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, *vrr.* 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 ὡσαυτως μετέσχε τῶν αὐτῶν. *He also himself likewise took part of the same*] The word ὡσαυτως 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.

(*i*) Ipse

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

(*i*) Ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸν διάβολον. *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 commited 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 *Gomorrah*, 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 begining.* 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 it's 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.

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

PARAPHRASE.

had been always subject in their Gentile state (*k*). And there was good reason why he should 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 to 16. 17.

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 implied in the word *again*. And we may see by *ver.* 21. what kind of fear it was that inslaved them, and caused 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 inslaving 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 inslaving. For want of a revelation, they were uncertain whether death did not render them insensible; aud 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 tht reason why our author chose rather obscurely to describe, than expresly 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*) Ου γὰρ δήπου ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Αβραὰμ 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, *Matt.* 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

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

him 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 18

NOTES.

them in fleſh and blood, *ver.* 17. But the reaſoning does not appear ſo eaſy and ſtrong the other way, when we ſuppoſe it to lie thus: "For as much 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*) Τὰ πρὸς τὸν 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 ἱλάσκεσθαι 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 mentioned. 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 obſerved,

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

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

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

NOTES.

in consequence 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*, Αὐτὸς 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 ἱλάσκεσθαι τὸν 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 itself. 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*, ἱλάσκεσθαι τὸν Θεὸν 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*, τοῦ συντελεσθῆναι ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ τοῦ σφραγίσαι ἁμαρτίας, καὶ ἐξαλεῖψαι τὰς ἀδικίας, καὶ τοῦ ἐξιλάσασθαι ἀδικίας, *to finish transgression, and to seal up sins, and blot out iniquities, and to make reconciliation for iniquities.* There is nothing in the *Hebrew* to answer to that expression, καὶ ἐξαλεῖψαι 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 τοῦ 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 τοῦ ἐξιλάσασθαι ἀδικίας, does alone answer to the *Hebrew* ולכפר עון *to make reconciliation for iniquity.*

And if our author here uses ἱλάσκεσθαι to express the *Hebrew* כפר 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 ἱλάσκεσθαι τὸν ἐξιλεῦσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας.

18 (o) Ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν αὐτός. *For in that he himself hath suffered.*] This rendring 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 suf-

Chap. III.

PARAPHRASE.

tried (*p*), he must be the more inclined and willing to help those who are tried (*q*).

1. Wherefore (*r*), holy brethren (*s*), who partake of, though you do not wholly ingross the

TEXT.

being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted. Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the

NOTES.

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

(*p*) Πειρασθεὶς. *Being tempted.*] As the sufferings of Christ are here spoken of, the word would have been better rendred *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* ἐ δύνασθε *ye cannot hear my word.* Ἐνταῦθα, τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι, τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαί ἐστιν. "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* θέλετε ποιεῖν *ye will do.* Ορᾷς 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 δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν πεπειρασμένον δὲ *that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted—* Chap. v. 2. *Who can* δυνάμενος *have compassion on the ignorant, and them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity.*

1. (*r*) Ὅθεν. *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 myself. 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 *these 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.

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

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 2
God the Father who appointed him, exactly executing the commands he gave him (*x*),

and

NOTES.

(*t*) Κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι. *Partakers of the heavenly calling.*] In *Phil.* iii. 14. we read of ὁ 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 κλῆσις *calling* here may be expounded by what is said of Christ, *Chap.* ii. 11. *He is not ashamed to* call *them brethren,* ἀδελφοὺς αὐτὰς 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 expresly 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 begining 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 τ ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν. *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 infer'd from what had been before delivered concerning him.

2 (*x*) Τῷ 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,

Chap. III.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

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

as alſo Moſes *was faithful* in all his houſe.

NOTES.

imports, and is indeed rendred in our margin; and they could not reliſh an author who ſaid that GOD *made* 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 objecters 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.

SECT. V.

CHAP. III. 3.---IV. 13.

CONTENTS.

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,

laſt, 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 ſtedfaſt in their profeſſion, they had as certain an aſſurance of obtaining a happy reſt, as the *Iſraelites* had. Chap. III.

TEXT.

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

PARAPHRASE.

(FOR 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 (*z*). For every houſe or family 3. 4.

NOTES.

(*z*) Καθ' ὅσον πλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τ οἶκος ὁ κατασκευάσας 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 itſelf, 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.

PARAPHRASE.

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

5. the Father. Now *Moses* was indeed related to him,

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

tended, that hereby is asserted, that 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 gloriæ iste præ* Moyse *dignus est habitus, quanto amplioremhonorem 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, *Matt.* xviii. 1, 4. xxiii. 11. 1 *Cor.* xiii. 13. And thus our own translators have rendred πλεῖον 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 *buildeth 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 omited 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 *Mo-* "*ses.*" 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*

even

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 ho-"nourable 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*) Εις μαρτύριον τῶν λαλησθησομένων. *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 expreſly 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 writen 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 *Ch.* 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*) Χριστὸς δὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον 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 begining 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.

Chap. III.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

houſe, and we are GOD's houſe or family, if we ſtedfaſtly 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;

NOTES.

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 call'd 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.* v. 29, 30, 32. *No man yet ever 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 itſelf 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 tho' 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 puting 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*) Ἐαν περ τὴν παῤῥησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος, μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν. *If we hold faſt the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.*] As βεβαίαν here agrees in conſtruction with τὴν παῤῥησίαν. 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

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

as the holy Ghoſt ſaith, To day if ye will hear his voice,
8 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: 8.

where-

NOTES.

reſpect to that 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*, εἰ περ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν, *if we hold faſt the begining of the confidence firm unto the end.* Which renders it highly probable that the *confidence* ἡ παῤῥησία here, and the *begining of the confidence*, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς 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 *begining of the confidence*, than to that confidence, or παῤῥησία 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 expreſly ſpeak of baptiſm, *Chap.* x. 22, 23. *And having our bodies waſhed with pure water*, καὶ λελουσμένοι τὰ σώματα ὕδατι καθαρῷ· *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. Κατέχωμεν ἀκλινῆ, *let us hold faſt without wavering* is plainly equivalent to κατάσχωμεν 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 παῤῥησίαν 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 παῤῥησία 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.

(*e*) Διὸ. *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 begining 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 begining 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 in 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 caution as a warning to chriſtians: for as St. *Paul* ſays concerning this very caſe, 1 *Cor.*

Chap. III.

PARAPHRASE.

9. wherewith your fathers tempted me (*g*), proved me (*b*), and saw my works forty
10. years (*i*). Wherefore I was grievously offended

TEXT.

wilderness: When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years. Wherefore I was in

NOTES.

x. 6. *These things were* our examples, *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 refer'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*) Οὗ ἐπείρασάν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν. *Where 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 οὗ, according to the manner of the *Greek* construction, relates to the τῷ πειρασμῷ, *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 prefering the other translation which is followed by the paraphrase, is because it makes the *Greek* exactly agree with the *Hebrew* כימם מסה במדבר אשר נסוני it being an elegancy with them to join to the substantive the conjugate verb with אשר prefixed to it. Thus *Psal.* lxxix. 12. *And render to our neighbours seven fold into their bosom* חרפתם אשר חרפוך *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 ר instead of the *Hebrew* אשר, however the *Latin* translation of it renders it by *ubi*, which would have been more properly express'd by איכא.

(*b*) Ἐδοκίμασάν 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 δοκιμασίᾳ, 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 בחנוני, 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 omited in the copies they used.

9, 10 (*i*) Καὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη. Διὸ προσώχθισα τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ. *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 refer'd the *forty years* to the time of their seeing his works, and reading מַעֲלָי *my works* instead of our present פָּעָלִי *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 ואקוט and so our author rendred the ו by διό. The ו *conversivum futuri* seems

TEXT.

grieved with that genera-
tion, and ſaid, They do
alway err in *their* hearts;
and they have not known
my ways. So I ſware 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 de-
parting from the living
God. But exhort one ano-

PARAPHRASE.

ed with that generation, and ſaid, They do al-
way err (*k*) in their heart, and they have not
known my ways. So I ſware (*l*) in my 11.
wrath, They ſhall not enter (*m*) into my
reſt) take heed, brethren, leſt there be in 12.
any of you ſuch an evil heart of unbelief as
was in them, that ſhould cauſe you to de-
part from the living GOD (*n*). But as long 13.
as

NOTES.

ſeems there to be wanting: and 'tis a hard 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*) Αεὶ πλανῶνται. *They do alway err.*] The *Hebrew* has עם תעי *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 עם was a corrupt reading for עלם or עולם; 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 ὤμοσα. *So I ſware.*] 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 un-"belief, for thereby you will depart from the living GOD, and ſhut your ſelves out of "his houſe and family."

Far-

Chap. III.

PARAPHRASE.

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 hard-
14. ned 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

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

Farther, 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 writen, 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 debaring 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 imploy'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 γὰρ γεγόναμεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. *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 τοῦ Χριστοῦ *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 συμμέτοχοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 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.

(*p*)

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

the begining of our confidence ſtedfaſt unto the 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.

NOTES.

(p) Εἴπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν καθάρωμεν. *If we hold the beginning of our confidence ſtedfaſt 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 αὐτῆς, *his confidence*; which reading is countenanced only by the *Vulg.* So that here is expreſs'd 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, begining " ſuch an 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 ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε. *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 endeavours 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 implied 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 οὖν *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 myſelf 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* TO DAY, *leſt any of you ſhould be hardned 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 expreſt 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 hardned 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 hardned, ſo he here ſets down the words of the text, which ſhews the danger there was of it; by which conſideration they were to excite and ſtir up one another.

How-

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

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 ſined 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

TEXT.

tion. For ſome when they 15.
had heard, did provoke:
howbeit not all that came
out of Egypt by Moſes
But with whom was he
grieved forty years? was
it not with them that had
ſined, whoſe carcaſes fell
in the wilderneſs? And to 18.
whom ſware he that they
ſhould not enter into his
reſt, but to them that be-
lieved not? So we ſee that 19.
they could not enter in
becauſe of unbelief. Let
us therefore fear, leſt a

NOTES.

However this account is followed in the paraphraſe, yet it will make no great difference, if our 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 λέγεσθαι, 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.

1 (*t*)

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

a promise being left *us* of entring into his rest, any of you should seem to 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 entring 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 *Vulg.* 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 κἀκεῖνοι. *For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them.*] Our own translators have elsewhere rendred 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 rendred 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 stiled 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 preceding 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 συγκεκερασμένος 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

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

and in like manner will the word we have heard be unprofitable to us, unleſs we be-
3. lieve 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

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

our tranſlators did, the ſenſe may be either what they have well enough expreſt, 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 of us good; and then faith is here conſider'd 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, μὴ συγκεκραμένες, in the plural, agreeing with ἐκείνους *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 chri-"ſtians, or elſe the word will benefit us nothing." I omit another various reading of τῶν ἀκουσάντων for τοῖς ἀκούσασιν, 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 reckon'd 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 St. *Chryſoſtom*, there would be reaſon to judge that the *Vulgate* read in his time as we do, or elſe he would not have quited 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 ſware in my wrath, They ſhall not enter into my reſt (*y*): and that notwithſtanding

NOTES.

(*x*) Εισερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν οἱ πιστεύσαντες. *For we which have believed do enter into reſt.*] The *Alex.* MS. which reads εἰσερχώμεθα οὖν, *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 ſubmited 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 va-"rious 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 rendred 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 εἴρηκεν, Ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν 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 prophetical of chriſtians. The ſenſe will run eaſily and ſmoothly thus: "We of whatever age or nation who have a pro-"miſe made us of reſt, enter into 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 reſo-"lution is the ſame concerning any other reſt, where there is the like, or even a great-"er 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 expreſly mention the unbelief of the *Iſraelites*, yet he points at it plainly enough in the expreſſions by which he ſets out their ſin,

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

ing God's works were finiſhed from the begining 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
5. 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-

TEXT.

works were finiſhed from the foundation of the world.
For he ſpake in a certain 4
place of the ſeventh *day* on this wiſe, And God did reſt the ſeventh day from all his works. And in this *place* 5

NOTES.

which brought upon 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 τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ καταβολῆς 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 objecters 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 *Jews* 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.

gain, If they ſhall enter
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-
cauſe of unbelief: Again,
he limiteth a certain day,

wilderneſs, ſaying, *They ſhall not enter into my reſt*; which ſhows that the reſt of the ſeventh day is conſiſtent with another reſt of GOD. Therefore becauſe (*b*) there was a promiſe made that ſome ſhould enter into GOD's reſt (*c*), and they who had the glad tidings of it firſt brought them, becauſe of their unbelief or diſobedience, did not obtain it, [Therefore I ſay] he again (*d*) determines a certain day for

6.

7.

NOTES.

6 (*b*) Ἐπεὶ οὖν. *Seeing therefore.*] Interpreters ſeem to have miſs'd the connection of theſe words, taking this verſe to contain one argument, and *ver.* 7. another, from whence the concluſion is drawn, *ver.* 9. as though his diſcourſe were thus ordered: *Seeing therefore it remains that ſome muſt enter therein, and they to whom it was firſt preached entred not in becauſe of unbelief, and ſeeing he again limiteth a certain day, ſaying in* David, *To day after ſo long a time, as 'tis ſaid, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, there muſt remain a reſt for the people of God.* But againſt this account there lie two objections. 1. That 'tis doubtful whether ἄρα is ever uſed in this manner as a redditive to ἐπεὶ, ſtanding at a diſtance from it: but in this caſe I am apt to think he would have uſed ἐπεὶ inſtead of ἐπεὶ. 2. Had he here uſed two diſtinct arguments, there ſhould regularly have been a καὶ prefix'd to πάλιν, *ver.* 7. as 'tis uſual in other places. I therefore chooſe to connect *ver.* 6, 7. together thus: "Wherefore ſeeing, or becauſe it remains that ſome "muſt enter therein, &c. he again in the ſame pſalm limits a certain day, &c." And then the ἄρα *wherefore*, or *ſo then*, ver. 9. will be free from all difficulty.

(*c*) Ἀπολείπεται τινας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτήν. *It remaineth that ſome muſt enter therein.*] The ſenſe in which our tranſlators took this is, "It appears as a conſequence of what I "have ſaid, or it is certain from the premiſes, that ſome muſt enter therein." But it will not perhaps be eaſy to find that the word ἀπολείπεσθαι ever has that ſignification. Our *Engliſh* word *remains* ſometimes is a proper rendering of that *Greek* word; but I doubt whether when we ſay *it remaineth*, meaning that it is a logical inference, it would be proper *Greek*, if we ſhould expreſs it by ἀπολείπεται. 'Tis evident that our author uſes the word in a different ſenſe, *ver.* 9. *There* remaineth (or is *left*) *therefore a reſt for the people of God*: and as far as I can perceive, ἀπολείπεσθαι, *ver.* 9. and καταλείπεσθαι, *ver.* 1. have exactly the ſame ſignification, nor will there be any difficulty in underſtanding the word in this ſenſe in the 6th verſe, only allowing an eaſy ellipſis to be ſupplied from *ver.* 1. thus, Ἐπεὶ ἓν ἀπολείπεται ἐπαγγελία τινὰς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτήν. *Seeing then a* promiſe *is left that ſome ſhall enter therein.*

7 (*d*) Πάλιν. *Again.*] This, as has been hinted, is not deſign'd as a meer introduction of a new citation, but it imports the reiteration of ſomewhat mention'd as done before, and the ſenſe 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 reſt is determined by him after that other reſt before mentioned. Nothing ſeems more natural and plain than theſe two verſes thus underſtood, which uſed to appear very difficult and perplexed: "Therefore becauſe there is a promiſe left, that ſome muſt enter into GOD's reſt, and "they who had the firſt glad tidings of it brought them, entred not in upon the account "of their unbelief or diſobedience, [therefore I ſay, to ſhow that was not the only on

"prin-

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

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 is

TEXT.

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 had given them reſt, then would he not afterward have ſpoken of another day. There remaineth therefore a reſt to the people of God. For he that is entred into

NOTES.

" principal reſt deſign'd] he again [after that reſt was 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 propoſition 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 ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς. *There remaineth therefore a reſt.*] However our author has changed his term, yet σαββατισμὸς muſt evidently mean the ſame thing here as καὶ ἀπαυσις, 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 σαββατίζειν *to keep a ſabbath*, viz. as a day of holy and joyful reſt. Hence σαββατισμὸς 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 expreſly 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 ſware 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 yourſelves 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.

10 (*g*)

TEXT.

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 of unbelief. For the word 12 of God *is* quick, and pow-

PARAPHRASE.

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 11. 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 12. may eaſily do, for now as well as then the word of God is quick (*b*) and power-ful

NOTES.

10 (*g*) Ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων 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 entred into his reſt*, underſtand our bleſſed Saviour: for though the thing be true that he is entred 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 ſware 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 entring into his reſt *is left*, Chap. iv. 1. *We believing* enter into 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* entred *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 entred till his work was over, which it never is while he continues here in the world.

12 (*b*) Ζῶν γὰρ 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 inforce 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 *Jewiſh* writers; and partly and eſpecially becauſe it ſeems not

Chap. IV

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

erful, and ſharper than any two-edged ſword, piercing de-

NOTES.

not ſo well to ſuit with the 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 threatning 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 threatning 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 ſpake unto you, they are ſpirit, and they are* life.

(*i*) Καὶ ἐνεργὴς. *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, ὃς καὶ ἐνεργεῖται, *which* effectually worketh *alſo in you that believe.* Or if it ſhould be doubted whether the ὃς, there ſhould not be rendred *who* refering 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 ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον. *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 σιδήρου.

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 herewith well compare *Iſa.* xl. 4. *He* [the Meſſiah] *ſhall ſmite the earth with the rod of his mouth.*

The

Chap. IV.

TEXT.

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

PARAPHRASE.

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 (*l*), and it judges the thoughts

NOTES.

The LXX. render it Τῷ λόγῳ τῆς στόματος 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 שבט were rendred *dart* instead of *rod*, as 'tis, and very justly, 2 *Sam.* xviii. 14. Compare 2 *Thess.* ii. 8.

(*l*) Διϊκνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν. *Piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints 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 joints 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 כי, 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 sore 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 compared 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 sore 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.*

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

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 κριτικὸς 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 hardned 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 γυμνὰ καὶ τετραχηλισμένα. *All things are naked and opened.*] The former of theſe two terms pretty well ſecures us of the ſenſe of the latter, which *Heſychius* explains by φανερούμενα, *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 ſlays 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 heads

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
with whom we have to do.	with whom we are concerned (*p*).

NOTES.

beasts to be offered were said τραχηλίζεσθαι, 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*) Πρὸς 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 offered. *Chrysostom* and several others think this to be the meaning, *To whom we must give an account.* The *Syr.* seems anciently to have rendered the place in like manner, though at present it reads יהבין for יהבינן *To whom* THEY [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.

SECT. VI.

CHAP. 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 stedfastness in their profession, and a diligent application to the throne of grace, to both which they had very great incouragement 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.

Chap. IV.

PARAPHRASE.

14. LET 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:

TEXT.

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.

NOTES.

14 (*q*) Ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν. *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. our author 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.	He calls him an high-priest, *Chap.* ii. 17. & iii. and the addition of the character *great* appears very just, when 'tis considered 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.
Seeing then we have a great high-priest,	*Chap.* i. 3. Having by himself purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high.
that is passed into the heavens,	*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.
Jesus the Son of God,	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.
let us hold fast our profession.	
Chap. iv. 15.	*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.
For we have not an high-priest that cannot μὴ δυνάμενον be touched with a feeling of our infirmities,	
but was in all points tried, like as we are, καθ' ὁμοιότητα,	*Chap.* ii. 17. It behoved him in all things to be made like ὁμοιωθῆναι to his brethren, *ver.* 18. He suffered being tried.
without sin.	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 considered 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 *Ch.* 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.

If Christ

TEXT.

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,

PARAPHRASE.

session of christianity, in spight of all the persecutions and temptations to which it may expose us. We might indeed well be discou- 15.
raged, if we had an high-priest who was not much concerned 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 16.
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.

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 rendred 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 considered 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 ingage him to exercise the tendereſt compassion toward us.

16 (*s*) Προσερχώμεθα οὖν μετὰ παῤῥησίας 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 entred 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 οὖν *therefore* here in the begin-

ning:

Chap. V.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

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 incounter (*u*).

and find grace to help in time of need. For every

1. 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 taker, and has a due warrant for the office) is appointed to act for men in things

high prieſt taken from among men, is ordained for men in things *pertaining* to

NOTES.

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 γὰρ *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 incouragement 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 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 εὕρωμεν εἰς εὔκαιρον 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 incourages 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 γὰρ 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:	things pertaining to God (x), that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins. Who 2
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 in-	can be moderate (y) toward those who are guilty of sins of ignorance and not of wil-
3 firmity: And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself,	fulness (z), since he himself is of the same frailty with them, and liable to be guilty of the like mistakes. And every such high- 3 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

NOTES.

(x) Ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν 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 preferred 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) Μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος. *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 ἀπαθὴς not subject to anger, fear, pity, and the like affections: but the Platonists and Peripatetics on the contrary held, Τὸν σοφὸν μετριοπαθῆ μὲν εἶναι, ἀπαθῆ δὲ οὐκ εἶναι, "That a wise man is moderate in these affections, but not destitute of them." Accordingly *Budeus* explains this, and renders μετριοπαθεῖν *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 שגג and שגה which are therefore rendred 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.* xcv. cited before *Heb.* iii. 10. *They do always 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 ordered 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*.

Chap. V.

PARAPHRASE.

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*
6. *thee* (*c*). As he saith, also in another place, *Psal.* cx. 4. *Thou art a priest for ever after*
7. *the order of* Melchizedec (*d*). Who before he

TEXT.

to offer for sins. And no 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 also in another *place*, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. Who in the days of his

NOTES.

3 (*a*) Περὶ ἑαυτῦ 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 offered 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 reckoned 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

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

flesh, when he had offered

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

NOTES.

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 expresly 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 considered 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 ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς 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

Chap. V.

PARAPHRASE

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

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

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 incident 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 forgeting 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 ἱκετηρίας πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σῶζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου, μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων προσενέγκας. *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 ἅπαντες οἱ δεδιότες καὶ κακῶς πάσχοντες καταφεύξονται, πολλὰς ἱκετηρίας καὶ δεήσεις ποιούμενοι. "All that are "afraid,

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

and was heard, in that he 5 feared; Though he were

heard in that he feared (*g*). However he stood in the relation of a son, yet he became thorough- 8.

NOTES.

" afraid, and that are injured will flee to us, and make many supplications and prayers to us." That Christ offered 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 εἰσακουσθεὶς 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 questioned 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 answered, and so delivered 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 rendring: *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 ὑπὲρ 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 refering to the meritorious cause, however it does frequently denote the efficient, as in these places, *Matt.* xiv. 26. *They cried out* for *fear*, ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου. xviii. 7. *Wo be to the world* because of *offences*, ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων. *Matt.* 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 learned 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 suffered*, 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 answered quickly after his fear, that is, though he was not saved from death by not being suf-

PARAPHRASE.

thoroughly 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

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

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 answered. This use of the preposition ἀπὸ, as refering 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 answered soon after the thing he "feared befel him, being quickly recovered from death) though he were a Son yet learned "he obedience by the things he suffered, &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 suffered.*] 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 obedi-"ence was, and by this means was as effectually ingaged 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 τελειωθεὶς. *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*) Αἰτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου. *The author of eternal salvation.*] Nothing can be juster than this rendring. Vain is the criticism of those who would here render αἴτιος the *guilty author,*

as

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	
tion unto all them that obey him; Called of God an high-prieſt after the order of Melchizedec.	to all them that obey him, being ſpoken to by God himſelf under the title of an high-prieſt (*l*), after the order of *Melchizedec*.	10.

NOTES.

although 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, ſalvation, never in the new teſtament ſignifies the happineſs of the future ſtate.

10 (*l*) Προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρχιερεύς. *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 Ο καλέμενος 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 handſomly 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

Chap. V. 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 incourages 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.

PARAPHRASE.

11. CConcerning which *Melchizedec* (*m*) we ſhall have occaſion for a large diſcourſe, which yet it will not be eaſy for you to underſtand

TEXT.

OF whom we have many things to ſay, and hard to be uttered; ſeeing ye

NOTES.

11 (*m*) Περὶ ὃ. *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.

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 (*n*); 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.

(*n*) Καὶ δυσερμήνευτον 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 γὰρ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον. *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 considered. 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 χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινα 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 τινα here for the accusative case singular, than for the nominative plural; and then the proper rendring 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 delivered under the old dispensation, from 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. τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον, τουτέστι, 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 *Jews* to receive the doctrine of the new.

(*q*)

Chap. V.

PARAPHRASE.

so weak as to need such a low diet as milk, but to be unfit for and unable to digest any
13. 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

TEXT.

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.

NOTES.

(q) Καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος, καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς 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* relished only the slighter 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 χρείαν ἔχειν γάλακτος will answer to μετέχει γάλακτος in the next verse.

13 (r) Ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης. *Is unskilful in the word of righteousness.*] For the explaining this phrase it will be proper to have recourse to St. *Paul*'s style, 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 designed 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

TEXT.

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
1 evil. Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of

PARAPHRASE.

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.

NOTES.

" 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
" degrade and unman your ſelves, as though you were babes and infants, whoſe proper food
" milk is.

14 (*f*) Τελείων. *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* νηπιάζετε *be ye* children; *but in underſtanding be ye* τέλειοι, men. This diſcourſe ſuits well with the account, which he alſo gives of the *Jews* 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 *Jewiſh* temper and fondneſs for the law, after they had been inſtructed in the chriſtian religion.

(*t*) Τῶν διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ. *Thoſe who by reaſon of uſe have their ſenſes exerciſed to diſcern both good and evil.*] Our margin renders ἕξιν 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 verſed 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 inlarging 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 τὴν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ 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 indeavour to entertain you with this
" more noble food." He ſeems to ſpeak here in the plural, when he means only himſelf, a

Chap. VI.

PARAPHRASE.

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 (*w*); I forbear therefore to lay again the *Mosaic* foundation of repentance from dead works

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

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 ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον is put for ὁ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀρχήν, which is in like manner rendred by the *Syriac*, שוריא דמלחה 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 στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ λογίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, *The first principles of the oracles of God*, Chap. v. 12. and ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ 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.

(*w*) Ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα 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* τῶν 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

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

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

works (x), and of faith towards God without an explicit, distinct and clear regard to Christ (y), and of the doctrine concerning 2.
the various washings that were prescribed among the *Jews* (z), and of laying on of hands

NOTES.

εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, *unto a* 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 καταβαλλόμενοι 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 reckoned among the στοιχεῖα 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 refered to; as may be seen in *Pool's Synops.* 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

Chap. VI.

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

and of the reſurrection of the dead, and of eternal

NOTES.

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, it is evident St. *Paul* reckoned 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 it is 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 overlooked hitherto, and which very much confirms the interpretation I have given. I obſerve then, that the places I have mentioned are the only ones where the word βαπτισμὸς, or rather βαπτισμοὶ 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 *Matt.* 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 βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς 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 mentioned, muſt in all probability be of the ſame nature.

(*a*) Ἐπιθέσεώς 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 peni- "tents: but this impoſition of hands was not common to all chriſtians, nor joined with bap- "tiſm, 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 offered 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 mentioned, 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.

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 seting 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 *Eljah* 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 delivered 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 hemmed 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*) Καὶ κείματος αἰωνίου. *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 applied 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——31? 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, *Matt.* 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

sentence

Chap. VI.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

to do in this epiſtle, if God permits me to have an opportunity for it, and you don't fruſtrate my expectations by your apoſtacy before it reaches you (*d*). For your apoſtacy would

we do, if God permit,

NOTES.

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 *κείμα* 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 rendered *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 *Gomorrah*, 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 offered, if they appear more ſatisfactory.

3 (*d*) Καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν, ἐαντερ 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, incouraging them to expect that he would, as he deſigned, 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 paraphraſe,

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*) 4. for those who have been once thoroughly inlightned in the christian faith (*f*), and have tasted of the heavenly gift (*g*), and have been

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*) Ἀδύνατον γὰρ, *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 extreamly difficult.* But this interpretation may well be called in question, since when our author speaks of the same case, without using the word here rendered *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 mentioned, 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 distinguished in its dreadful consequences.

(*f*) Τὸς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας. *Those who were once inlightned.*] 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 questioned 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 φωτισμὸς, 2 *Cor.* iv. 4, 6. I think our common rendring with that of the *Vulg* is to be prefered to the *Syr.* which refers it in both places to baptism.

(*g*) Γευσαμένους τε τ δωρεᾶς τ ἐπουρανίυ. *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

Chap. VI.

PARAPHRASE.

been made partakers of the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt (*b*), and have taſted the comfortable
5. word of God, the goſpel (*i*), and had expe-
rience of the extraordinary miracles wrought
6. in this age of the Meſſiah (*k*), if they for-
ſake Chriſt and fall back to their old religi-
on (*l*), to change and renew them ſo as that they

TEXT.

partakers of the holy Ghoſt,
And have taſted the good
word of God, and the pow-
ers of the world to come;
If they ſhall fall away, to 6
renew them again unto

NOTES.

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 puting* 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.

(*b*) Καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας 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 conſidered, 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 inabled to perform them.

5 (*i*) Καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους Θεοῦ ῥῆμα. *And have taſted the good word of God.*] The *good word* ſeems to anſwer to הדבר הטוב in the *Hebrew*, *Joſh.* xxi. 45. xxiii. 15. *Jer.* xxix. 10. *Zec.* i. 13. or דבר טוב *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 confirmed 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, δύναμιν ἤδη 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 עולם הבא. They who not only ſaw thoſe great miracles whereby chriſtianity was confirmed, but were themſelves impowered to work them, could not deſire fuller evidence of the truth of it.

6 (*l*) Καὶ παραπεσόντας. *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-

repentance: seeing they crucifie to themselves the Son

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

NOTES.

pears 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 cannot 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,* ἑκουσίως, 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 indeavour in case he was not prevented by their apostacy, which would render his indeavours fruitless.

This interpretation is confirm'd by the like use of ἀνακαινοῦν, which is synonymous with ἀνακαινίζειν, *Col.* iii. 10. *And have put on the new man,* τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον 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 παραπεσόντας, and the meaning be, *if they shall again fall back*, or *relapse* to their old religion. The word πάλιν, when 'tis joined 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 דתוב נחתון דמן דריש נתחדתון לתיבותא where the תוב answers to πάλιν, but מן דריש does not, it being only the rendring of ἀνὰ, as the same is used in rendring ἀνὰ in ἀνασταυροῦντας 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 designed 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 impowered 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 puting 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

Chap. VI.

PARAPHRASE.

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-
8. takes of the bleſſing from God (*o*): But that which inſtead of bringing forth ſuch herbs, bears only thorns and briars, is uſeleſs (*p*), and

TEXT.

of God afreſh, and put *him* to an open ſhame. For the 7 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 8 beareth thorns, and briers, *is* rejected, and *is* nigh

NOTES.

the advantage of this higheſt evidence (as I conceive that is the caſe refered to, 2 *Theſſ.* 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 lye; 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*) Ἀνασαυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας. *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 genuin. Nor can our tranſlation then be liable in any reſpect to cenſure. Apoſtates by forſaking Chriſt, and diſowning his character, abeted the action of thoſe who put him to death, and averred the juſtice of his perſecuters; 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 παραδειγματίζειν uſed, *Matt.* 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 παραδειγματίζειν 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 expreſſed. "Like as the rain often deſcending upon the earth will not render it fruit-
" ful, 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 there-
" fore, as ever you would obtain his bleſſing, to take care not to be out of the way of re-
" ceiving it, and conſequently to keep clear of the guilt of ſuch.

8 (*p*) Ἀδόκιμος. *Is rejected.*] The word ſeems here to be equivalent to ἄχρηστος, and to ſignify *uſeleſs* and unſerviceable, 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 beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, 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 (*f*). For God is not unfaithful to his 10.
pro-

NOTES.

(*q*) Καὶ κατάρας 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. Cursed *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 τριβόλους. As he here compares them to the earth, watered 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 cautioned them. It may be objected against this interpretation that the word ἐγγὺς 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 indeavouring 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 threatning, 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*) Ης τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν. *Whose end is to be burned.*] Compare herewith *John* xv. 6. *Matt.* 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 (*f*) *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 lye, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness,* he immediately turns his discourse, 2 *Thess.* 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 perswasion we may learn from *Philip.* i. 6.

Chap. VI.

PARAPHRASE.

promiſe, that he ſhould neglect to reward your work, and the love (t) which ye have ſhewn for his ſake to his ſaints in formerly miniſtring to them, and ſtill continuing to do ſo.

11. But (u) 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 (w), that you may have ſuch an aſſured hope as ſhall continue to the end of your lives (x):

12. That you may not any of you be ſlothful (y), but

TEXT.

unrighteous, to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have ſhewed toward his name, in that ye have miniſtred to the ſaints, and do miniſter. And we 11 deſire that every one of you do ſhew the ſame diligence, to the full aſſurance of hope unto the end: That ye be 12

NOTES.

10 (t) Καὶ τὸ κόπου τῆς 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. *Mill*'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 (u) Ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ. *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 δὲ, and ſeems here to be moſt pertinent.

(w) Τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδήν. *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.

(x) Πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἄχρι τέλους. *To the full aſſurance of hope unto the end.*] By the courſe mentioned 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 ἐλπὶς 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 admited, 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 τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῆ. *Let us hold faſt the* profeſſion *of our faith without wavering.*

12 (y) Ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε. *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.

It

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

NOTES.

It muſt be owned 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 offered, as conjectural, rather than as interpretations concerning which I pretend to be poſitive.

(z) Μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομούντων 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 itſelf 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 συγκληρονόμοι *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 ſtedfaſt in the chriſtian profeſſion. And farther, though the patriarchs might be called κληρονόμοι or συγκληρονόμοι *heirs*, or *fellow heirs* of the promiſe, yet it ſeems to me very doubtful whether they could be ſaid κληρονομεῖν 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 deſigned 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 thing.

Chap. VI.

PARAPHRASE.

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 ſware by him-
14. ſelf (*a*), Saying, Surely (*b*) *bleſſing I will bleſs thee, and multiplying I will multiply*
15. *thee* (*c*). And ſo after he had patiently indured,

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

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. ὁ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἔχων, 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 ſware 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 with-held 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 confirmed 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*) Η μλω. *Surely.*] The *Alex.* and ſome few other copies read here εἰ μλω, 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 אם but כי, 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*) Ευλογῶν ευλογήσω 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 ſware by himſelf, he

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

had patiently endured, he 16 obtained the promise. For

dured, he obtained that part of the promise which related to himself personally, that blessing God would bless him (*d*). And as certainly 16.

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 designed by our author. This oath of God relates to *Abraham*'s seed, and so might be an incouragement to them, and a mean 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* con-"verts, 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 mentioned. For when God made a promise to *Abraham*, they were in-"cluded in it, as *Abraham*'s spiritual seed, and so the solemn confirmation which God gave "when he sware by himself belongs to his seed among the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews*." I cannot see how the γὰρ, *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 forementioned 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 expresly 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 indeavoured 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 οὕτω μακροθυμήσας ἐπέτυχε τ ἐπαγγελίας. *And so after he had patiently endured he obtained the promise.*] This verse has seemed 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 ὅσῳ instead of ὅτω, 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

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 ſware by himſelf, ſaying*, &c. ſo that the ſenſe of the context is intire, if the parentheſis being omited, 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 refered 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 *Iſhmael*, 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 *Iſhmael* 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 ἐπιτυγχάνειν, 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 concerned *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 conſidered 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 hath* 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.*

TEXT.

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

PARAPHRASE.

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

NOTES.

sses. 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. Ἀβραμός τε τ̃ ἰδίαν εὐδαιμονίαν ἐν μόνῳ τούτῳ ἡγῶ καλλιπὼν ἐξελθεῖν τ̃ ζῆν ἐτάθεσο. Τοῦτο μέντοι καλὰ τ̃ τ̃ Θεοῦ βούλησιν ἔτυχεν. "*Abraham* "was willing to die, leaving what wealth he had got to this his only Son. And this he *ob*-"*tained* 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 implied 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 *Jews*; and therefore the *Jews* 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 admited 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 promisory 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*) Ἐν ᾧ. *Wherein.*] *Theophylact* has, I think, given the best sense of this, making it equivalent to διὸ or διὰ τοῦτο. 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*) Ἐμεσίτευσεν 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 designed to give. And *Philo's* expression concerning this matter fully agrees with this general account. Ἐν ᾧ τῷ ὅρκῳ βεβαιώσας τ̃ ὑπόσχεσιν. "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* transla-

PARAPHRASE.

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
19. 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.

TEXT.

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 19
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 חבש, which signifies elsewhere to *shut up*, as persons in prison, *Acts* xvi. 24. *Gal.* iii. 22, 23. *Luke* iii. 20. or any way to include, 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 μεσιτεύειν 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*) Οι καταφυγόντες κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος. *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 designed hereby has been already declared in considering the 12th verse: See note (*x*). All therefore that is farther designed 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 admited; because of that expression, *Which entreth into that within the vail*: 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.

19 (*i*)

TEXT.

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

PARAPHRASE.

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)*. 20

NOTES.

19 *(i)* Καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος. *And which entreth 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 ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, *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 atone-
" ment 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 *Melchizo-*
" *dec*, 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, whither 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)* Ὅπου πρόδρομος 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 expresly 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 debared 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.

SECT. VIII.

CHAP. VII. 1——28.

CONTENTS.

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 belonged 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.

PARAPHRASE.	*TEXT.*
1 FOR (*m*) this *Melchizedec* (after whoſe order God calls Chriſt an high-prieſt) king	FOR this Melchiſedec king of Salem, prieſt

NOTES.

1 (*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.

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

PARAPHRASE.

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 2.
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.

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*) Ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψίστου. *Prieſt of the moſt high God.*] This is expreſly taken notice of in the ſhort hiſtory we have of this perſon, *Gen.* xiv. 18——21. And though the word כֹּהֵן 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 concured 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 belonged 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 expreſly, ſuppoſing that he aimed at it.

2 ὃ: Ὧ καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισεν 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 μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενον 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:

Chap. VII.

PARAPHRASE.

king of *Salem*, that is, king of peace (*q*),
3. 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

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

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 conformed, 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 regal, 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 *Joſhua* x. 1. of *Adonizedec*, which name is of much the ſame import with *Melchizedec*, and who moſt probably reigned in the ſame place.

(*q*) Επειτα ὁ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ· ὅ ἐστι 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 inter-"preted) 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 *Joſhua* 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 deſcent.*] 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 begining 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 *begining of days*; and therefore this uſes to be limited to the begining of the days of his *prieſthood*. But this alſo ſeems to me too much:

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 commited (*u*), are 4. 5.

NOTES.

much: for as in the next clauſe with an adverſative 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 begining 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 for ever, 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 writen, 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*) Ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές. *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 rendred, *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 ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, *i. e.* ὃς ἐστὶν ὁ μάρτυς. So again, ver. 6. Καὶ ἐποίησεν is put for ὃς ἐποίησεν. And this beſt accounts, as I think, for the conſtruction of ver. 4. Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὢν κλ. *i. e.* ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὃς ἐστιν ὁ ὤν. If this conſtruction be allowed, there will be a neceſſity of ſupplying the verb ſubſtantive ἦν at the begining of this third verſe, there being nothing more frequent than the omiſſion of it in all authors.

5 (*u*) Καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ, τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες. *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 commited to *Aaron* and his family, but to the *Levites* in general, who gave to

the

PARAPHRASE.

are impowered by the law to take tithes of the people, that is, of their brethren (*w*), though they come out of the loins of *Abra-*
6. *ham* (*x*). But *Melchizedec*, who descended not from them, received tithes of *Abraham*, and

TEXT.

have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loyns of Abraham: But he whose descent is not counted from them, received tithes of

NOTES.

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.*

(*w*) Ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν ἀποδεκατοῦν τὸν λαὸν κατὰ τὸν νόμον, τουτέστι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν. *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 confirmed it by some parallel instances of that use of καὶ; but till they appear, this must be joined 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 ἐντολὴν *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 *Matt.* 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?* Ἐνετείλατο here, is expressed in *Mark* by ἐπέτρεψεν. *Moses* suffered *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, τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην, 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*.

(*x*) Καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος Ἀβραάμ. *Although they come out of the loyns 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 ho-
"nour confered on the *Levitical* priesthood, that they were impowered to receive tithes of
"the whole nation who were their brethren; and this honour appears yet the greater, when
"'tis considered that these their brethren came out of the loyns of *Abraham*, the friend of
"God, for whom and whose posterity God had a particular regard, as appears by his pro-
"mises; 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 re-
"ceived 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 de-
"scended from him." This gives a satisfactory account of the word *although*, which at the first reading seems obscure.

TEXT.

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,

PARAPHRASE.

and by virtue of his office as prieſt of the moſt high God, bleſſed *Abraham* to whom the promiſes were made. And without all diſpute the leſs is bleſſed of the better. And here among the *Jews* the *Levites* who receive the tithes are dying men, but there he received 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*) Ἐκεῖ δὲ, μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ: *But there he receiveth them, of whom it is witneſſed that he liveth.* The adverbs ὧδε and ἐκεῖ, generally, if not conſtantly, are to be underſtood 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 vail 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 ἔστι, *is*, as δεκάτας 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 interpretation, which looks forced, will not eaſily be admited; 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 *Melchizedec* 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 being 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 cannot 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 ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν. *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 ſomewhat 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.

Chap. VII.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

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
11. *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 thithes *in* Abraham. For he was yet in the loyns 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

NOTES.

11 (*a*) Εἰ μὲν οὖν 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 τελειότης, *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*) Ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομοθέτητο. *For under it the people received the law.*] If we retain this rendring, 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 turned: *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 belonged to it, were exactly delivered in the law of *Moses*; and to the priests were the people refered. *Mal.* ii. 7. *The priests lips should keep knowledge and they shall 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.

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

PARAPHRASE.

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 al- 12.
ter'd, there muſt of neceſſity be an alteration alſo of that law that appointed it. And that 13.
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 14.
that our Lord was of the tribe of *Judah* (*c*), of

NOTES.

were; and this commandment concerning the *Levitical* prieſthood he ſpeaks of as diſanulled, *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 eſta- "bliſh it, and that that law which confined the prieſthood to the tribe of *Levi*, and to the fa- "mily 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 γὰρ ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν. *For it is evident that our Lord ſprung 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 *fors* with which he connects the verſes are thus clear and eaſy.

Interpreters take no notice of any difference between πρόδηλον here, and καταδηλον 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 πρὸ may here, as well

Chap. VII.

PARAPHRASE.

of which *Moſes* makes not the leaſt mention
15. 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 conſidered
men as carnal and mortal, and therefore pro-
vided a ſucceſſion in the office (*g*); but ac-
cording

TEXT.

of which tribe Moſes ſpake
nothing concerning prieſt-
hood. And it is yet far 15
more evident: for that after
the ſimilitude of Melchiſe-
dec there ariſeth another
prieſt, Who is made, not af- 16
ter the law of a carnal com-

NOTES.

as in many other compoſitions, retain its proper ſignification *before*. So it does in the word προαγόυσης, *ver.* 18. and in many other words; and particularly in προδηλῶν. Nay, our own tranſlators have thus rightly rendered the word πρόδηλος, 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 begining of his *Oratio ad Demon.* Πολὺ ἂν μείζων διαφορὰν ἐιλήφασι, (*i. e.* λαμβάνουσι) ἐν τῷ πρὸς ἀλλήλους συνηθείαις.

15 (*d*) Καὶ περισσότερόν ἔτι κατάδηλόν ἐστιν. *And it is yet far more evident.*] What is here ſaid, is to be conſidered 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*) Ει. *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*) Κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδέκ. *After the ſimilitude of* Melchiſedec.] 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 conſidered as ſucceeding *Melchiſedec* 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 דְּמוּתָא, which ſignifies *ſimilitude*, not only here, but in rendring of τάξις *order* alſo.

16 (*g*) Ὃς ὐ κατὰ 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 conſidered 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.

mandment, but after the
power of an endleſs life.
17 For he teſtifeth, Thou *art*
a prieſt for ever after the or-
18 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

PARAPHRASE.

cording 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* prieſthood 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 reaſon 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 begining 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 ἐπεισαγωγὴ 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 γίνεται 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 οὐ 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 ἱερεὺς 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.

22 (*k*)

Chap. VII.

PARAPHRASE.

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
22. much was Jesus made a surety of a better co-
23. venant (*k*). And the priests under the law were

TEXT.

those priests were made without an oath: but this with an oath, by him that said unto him, The Lord sware, and will not repent, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec). By so much was Je- 22
sus made a surety of a better testament. And they 23
truly were many priests,

NOTES.

22. (*k*) Κατὰ τοσοῦτον κρείττονος διαθήκης γέγονεν ἔγγυος Ἰησοῦς. *By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament*] There are several things which deserve to be considered 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 considered when we come to it. Besides the word בְּרִית 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 considered 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 ἔγγυος, there can, I think, be no doubt of the properness of our translation. The word is used only in this place in the new testament, but 'tis in the *Apocrypha*, *Ecclus.* 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 ἐγγίζομεν, *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

NOTES.

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 considered, 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 impowered 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 commited 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 ordered, 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 expresly 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

Chap. VII.

PARAPHRASE.

were many, succeeding one another, because they were by death hindred from continuing in their office; but Christ our high-priest, 24. because he continues and lives for ever, has a priesthood which he continually executes himself without transmiting it to any successors. 25. 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. 26. For such an high-priest did our case require, as was holy (*m*), harm-

TEXT.

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 a- 25 ble 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- 26 priest became us, *who is* ha-

NOTES.

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 considered, 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 confered with an oath must be look'd upon as of a much more noble and important nature than that which is commited to men in a more common and less solemn manner.

25 (*l*) Οθεν καὶ σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελὲς δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ. *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 *compleatly*, it may seem to relate to his *saving*, and accordingly to be well rendered 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 διηνεκές. *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 ſiners (*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 refered to, *viz.* ἁγιάζειν or any of its conjugates, there would have been leſs room to doubt of this interpretation. But ſince the word ὅσιος 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 conſidered 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* חָסִיד, which is often rendred in the LXX. by ὅσιος, 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*) Ἄκακος. *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 admited. 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 admited there, ſince nothing unclean and polluting can enter there.

(*p*) Κεχωρισμένος 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 ſiners, in as much as the place to which he was to go, would not admit of the preſence of ſiners.

(*q*) Καὶ ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος. *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*

Chap. VII.

PARAPHRASE.

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 (*s*). 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 at all, he being so vastly different
28. 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.

TEXT.

those high-priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the peoples: 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.

NOTES.

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; 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 considered, 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 *Irenei* fragment, *p.* 465. *not.* 4. So that the proper rendring 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.

(*s*) Πρότερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίας ἀναφέρειν, ἔπειτα τῶν 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*

NOTES.

was since the law, makes the Son high-priest who is perfected for evermore. The *for*, γὰρ, 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 this 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 in-"firmity [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 ever-"more [and therefore needs no such offering upon his own account.]". And as the word τετελειωμένον stands opposed to ἔχοντας ἀσθένειαν *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.

SECT. IX.

CHAP. VIII. 1——6.

CONTENTS.

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.

PARAPHRASE.

1. NOW 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
2. 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

TEXT.

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 δὲ 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 joined with. Had it been ſaid κεφάλαιον δὲ ἅπασι λεγομένων, or in *Iſocrates*'s phraſe *Ad Nicocl.* in fine, κεφάλαιον δὲ ἁπάντων εἰρημένων (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 performed. 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 ἅγια in the plural. See *Chap.* ix. 8, 12, 24, 25. x. 19. xiii. 11.

(*x*) Καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ Κύριος καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος. *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

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

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 3.
gifts and sacrifices; whence there is a necessity that this high-priest, Christ Jesus, should have also somewhat to offer. For if he were 4.
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 taber- 5.
nacle, which was a draught or shadow of heavenly things (*a*), as *Moses*, who was to build

NOTES.

and ver. 24. *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 γὰρ ἀρχιερεύς. *For every high-priest.*] The *for* here may, perhaps, incline some to think that the first words of the foregoing verse should rather be rendred *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*) Οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσι τῶν ἐπουρανίων. *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

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

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.

" may be an example and ſhadow of heavenly things." But the word λατρεύουσι will by no 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. Οἱ 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, *Matt.* 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 κεχρημάτισται Μωσῆς, μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνήν· Ὅρα γάρ, φησὶ, ποιήσεις 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 γάρ 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 expreſly 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 μέλλειν 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 prefered this rendring. So *Matt.* 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 ἐξιέναι τῇ ἐπαύριον. Paul *preached unto them* being to depart *on the morrow*. And *ver.* 13. *But we going before to ſhip ſailed to* Aſſos, being *there* to take in *Paul*, ἐκεῖθεν μέλλοντες ἀναλαμβάνειν τὸν Παῦλον; *for ſo he had ordered*, being *himſelf* to go a foot, μέλλων αὐτὸς πεζεύειν. 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

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

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

NOTES.

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. 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 ἐπουρανίων, *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 cœleſtial, 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 διαφορωτέρας 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.

SECT.

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 miniſtred. 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 δὲ *then* 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 inforced and incouraged	BY how much alſo he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was

NOTES.

(*d*) Ὅσῳ 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*).

(*e*)

TEXT.

established upon better promises. For if that first *covenant* 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:

PARAPHRASE.

raged by promises of a more excellent nature, than were contained in the first covenant (*e*). For if that first covenant, had been perfect 7. and blameless, then should no place have been sought for a second. And yet there plainly is: For God himself finding fault with the 8. first, speaks of a second, when by the prophet *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

NOTES.

(*e*) Ητις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται. *Which was established upon better promises.*] 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 included both the preceptive part, that is the conditional duties of the covenant, and the promises of it, which were the motives and incouragements 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* injoyned 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*) Μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοῖς λέγει. *For finding fault with them he saith.*] I don't perceive 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 μεμφόμενος 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 defective as to give God occasion to find fault with it, and to design and promise another and better 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 promises 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*

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

Not according to the cove- 9
nant 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,

NOTES.

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 conſidered 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*) Κἀγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν. *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 rendred by the LXX. *And I regarded them not*; and their tranſlation our author has here followed. It has deſervedly exerciſed the ſtudy of the criticks, 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 נעלתי inſtead of בעלתי, and it muſt be owned that this correction was very ingenious, and would fully ſolve the difficulty. For the word נעל is uſed juſt in this way with the prefix ב added to the ſubſtantive that is governed by it; as in that place, האם בציון נעלה 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 נעלתי 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 ע 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 ἅπαξ 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 ע 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.

TEXT.

10 saith the Lord: For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith 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 peo-
11 ple. 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

PARAPHRASE.

For this is the covenant I will make with the house of *Israel* after those days are come, saith 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

10.

11.

12.

NOTES.

different a sense, as they have done; it seeming to me very natural to suppose that one way or t'other the *Hebrew* copies they used differed 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 בָּעַל 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*, Matt. 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 that they should have less occasion to take notice of them by

Ch. VIII.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

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 covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away.

NOTES.

reason of that *new* and vastly greater thing which God would do for them. Compare *Jer.* xvi. 14, 15. xxiii. 7, 8.

13 (*l*) Ἐν τῷ λέγειν καινὴν, πεπαλαίωκε 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 δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ] *Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.*] St *Paul* calls the *Jewish* 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 droping 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*.

SECT. XI.

CHAP. IX. 1——14.

CONTENTS.

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 begining 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 pitched

pitched by God and not by man, *Chap.* viii. 2. in comparison 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 superior 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 entred into the heavenly tabernacle, above that which was made by the high-priest once a year when he entred into the holy of holies.

Chap. IX.

TEXT.

1 THEN verily the first *covenant* had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary.
2 For there was a tabernacle made, the first wherein

PARAPHRASE.

THEN verily the first tabernacle (*n*) 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 was divided into two parts or tabernacles; and so the first or outward tabernacle was made,

1.

2.

NOTES.

1 (*n*) Εἶχε μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη. *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 *Italick*. 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, according to the order of his discourse, of which notice has been before taken. And 'tis considerable that no *Greek* copy here reads ἡ πρώτη διαθήκη. But the reader is refered to the Doctor upon the place.

(*o*) Δικαιώματα λατρείας. *Ordinances of divine service.*] It should seem that these ordinances 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 rendred *also*. Hereby seems intended that as Christ is a minister λειτουργὸς 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 ἅγιον κοσμικόν. *And a worldly sanctuary.*] This *worldly* is to be considered in opposition to ἐπουράνιον 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.

3 (*q*)

Chap. IX.

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

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

NOTES.

2 (q) Σκηνὴ γὰρ κατεσκευάσθη ἡ πρώτη, ἐν ᾗ τε 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 rendred, *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.

(ſ) Ητις λέγεται ἁγια. *Which is called the ſanctuary,*] 'Tis doubtful whether we are to take ἁγια 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* HOLY. 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*, ἁγια 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 τῶν ἁγίων, as *Exod* xxvi. 33, 34. yet they at other times render it ἁγια τῶν 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 ἁγια 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. xliv. 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 καταπέτασμα. *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.

of all: Which had the golden censer, and the ark of

which had the golden censer (*u*), and the ark 4.

NOTES.

4 (*u*) Χρυσῆν 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 entred 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 belonged 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 injoined, 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 handfuls 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 מְלֹא used here in both places, is to be understood in the same manner, 1 *Kings* xvii.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

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

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

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. e. where ſpeaking of this matter, he ſays, Πυρεῖον μὲν γὰρ ἀνθράκων πλῆρες καὶ θυμιάματ]ος εἰσκομίζει. *He brings in a cenſer full of burning coals and ſweet incenſe.* The whole ſtreſs of the objection muſt lie upon the word εἰσκομίζει, 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.

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

(*x*) Ἐν ᾗ στάμνος χρυσῆ 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. expreſly 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* ב, 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 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.

ticulars, 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 mentioned 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.* 5. 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 ᾗ ἐπισκίαζον. *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 ἐπισκίαζον *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 κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλαστήριον. *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 considered as the

Chap. IX.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

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 belonged to
7. 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

speak particularly. Now 6 when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service *of God*: But into the 7 second *went* the high-priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and *for* the errors of the people.

NOTES.

seat of God himself. It was here that the atonement was made, and that God was rendred 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 τῶ ἱλαστηρίε, *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 ישב הכרבים 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 *Shechinah* 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 inlarge 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 ſignifying, 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 imperfect delineation of the things of this preſent time (*d*), in which were offer'd both gifts 8. 9.

NOTES.

8 (*b*) Μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τ᾽ τῶν ἁγίων 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 infered 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 debared 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*) Ἔτι τ᾽ πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν. *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 thereinto, 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 permited to go any farther. So that 'tis plain from hence that the way into the holieſt was not then made manifeſt.

9 (*d*) Ητις παραβολὴ εἰς τ᾽ καιρὸν τ᾽ ἐνεστηκότα. *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 puting 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* παραβολὴ [that is, as *Theophylact* ſays, τύπος ἢ σκιαγραφία, 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 *Valeſius*'s readings it runs thus, Παραβολὴ ὅτι τῷ καιρῷ ἐνεστηκότῳ, 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,

Chap. IX.

PARAPHRASE.

gifts and sacrifices (*e*), which could not, with reference to the conscience, make perfect
10. 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

TEXT.

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.

Παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐνεστηκότα. This he calls in the next verse the *time of reformation.*

(*e*) Καθ' ὧν δῶρά 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. πρώτην σκηνήν, or else καθ' ἣν, sc. παραβολήν. 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 δυνάμενα κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα. *That could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience.*] This rendring 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 rendred 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 expressed, *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, μέχρι καιροῦ 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 begining 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 *Valesius*'s various readings, which seem adapted to serve that translation, I don't think it very necessary to regard his puting ἐπικειμένοις 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. *Germains* 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.

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	11.

a

NOTES.

tation so far be admited, 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 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 forbiden 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 forbiden 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 uncleaness 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 forbiden, and from the law that forbad 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, puting 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*) Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν. *But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come.*] Some would have the δὲ here to be a redditive to μὲν 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 παραγενόμενος is obscure as here used, and seems to have puzzled interpreters. One o ns 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

inter-

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

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
12 once thereinto, not indeed with the blood of goats (*k*) and calves as the high-priest did (*l*), but with his own blood, having obtain-
13 ed 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

NOTES.

interpreters is, that διελθών is to be joined in construction with εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἅγια in the next verse, and that the sense is this: That being as an high-priest come to the holy of holies he entred thereinto. That διέρχεσθαι and εἰσέλθειν 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 τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς, οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτέστι οὐ ταύτης 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 εἰσῆλθεν 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 פַּר בֶּן בָּקָר which we render *a young bullock*. The distinction the *Jews* make, is that עֵגֶל signifies a calf of the first year, and פַּר one of the second year; so that being so young it might be reckoned a calf. Accordingly the LXX. in rendering that place in *Lev.* continually translate it by μόσχος, and them our author follows, as does also the *Vulg.* which uses the word *vitulus*.

(*m*) Αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος. *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

TEXT.

blood of bulls, and of goats, and the aſhes of an heifer ſprinkling the unclean, ſanctifieth to the purifying of
14 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?

PARAPHRASE.

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 uncleaneſs (*n*), ſanctifies to the cleanſing of their fleſh (*o*), how much more 14
ſhall the blood of Chriſt, who through the eternal Spirit (*p*) offered 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*)?

NOTES.

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 his entring 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*) Ἁγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα. *Sanctifieth to the purifying of the fleſh.*] The legal impurities debared 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 conſidered 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*) Ὃς διὰ Πνεύματος αἰωνίου. *Who through the eternal Spirit.*] There are ſo many Greek copies which read here ἁγίου 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 lead us to conſider this *Spirit* as ſignifying the λόγος or divine nature of our Lord, ſince he is ſetting forth the intrinſick worth and excellency of his offering; though it muſt be owned that a good ſenſe may be given of the words, when they are interpreted of the Holy Spirit.

(*q*) Καθαριεῖ 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.

SECT.

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 begining of the next chapter. But here, upon his having asserted the great virtue of the blood of Christ, he inlarges in showing how necessary the sheding 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 entring 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

15. AND in order to Christ's accomplishing this (*f*), he is the mediator of the new covenant (*t*), that his death intervening for

TEXT.

AND for this cause he is the Mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the re-

NOTES.

15 (*f*) Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο. *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 ἐστιν. *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

demption 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 commited 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 conſidered, 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 *διαθέμενος*, 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*) *Ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς 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 conſidered 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 *θανάτου γενομένου 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 על 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 comited 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 ingaged 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 con-

Chap. IX.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

16. For in every ſuch covenant which God makes with ſinful men, there muſt alſo of neceſſity be the death of the pacifier (*w*). For

For where a teſtament *is*, there muſt alſo of neceſſity be the death of the teſtator.

NOTES.

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 (*w*) Ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου. *For where a teſtament is, there muſt alſo of neceſſity be the death of the teſtator.* It muſt be owned that if this and the next verſe were to be conſidered without relation to the context, nothing could be more agreeable than the interpreting them of a proper *teſtament*, the word *διαθέμενος* 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 τὸν διαθεμένον. This ſhows that the *διαθέμενος* muſt be the ſame as the *mediator* beforementioned; and conſequently that he muſt be conſidered 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 *διαθέμενος*, that it may agree with the ſcope of the context. Now though *διαθέμενος* 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*, *διαθέμενος* 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 *Cæſar* having obtained the province of *Spain* was detained by his creditors, whom he was not able to pay —— *however*, ſays he, *διαθέμενος* τοὺς ἐνοχλοῦντας 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 compacts were always tranſacted between them without the intervention of any

ſacri-

TEXT.

17 For a teſtament *is* of force after men are dead: otherwiſe it is of no ſtrength at all whilſt the teſtator liveth.
18 Whereupon, neither the firſt *teſtament* was dedicated
19 without blood. For when Moſes had ſpoken every

PARAPHRASE.

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 being 17. 18. 19.

NOTES.

ſacrifice at 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 cannot 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 applyed to the immortal God, who muſt be conſidered 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 δεῖ 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 fulfiled. 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 μή ποτε ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος. *Otherwiſe 'tis of no ſtrength at all whilſt the teſtator liveth.*] That is, the condition of the covenant not being performed by the pacifier's death, the covenant it ſelf is not confirmed and ratified. But to ſpeak freely, I doubt whether διαθήκη is the nominative caſe to ἰσχύει, 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 ἰσχύει, and ſo the conſtruction will ſtand thus: "Becauſe the pa-"cifier 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 οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται. *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.

Chap. IX.

PARAPHRASE.

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

TEXT.

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,

NOTES.

As to the word ἐγκεκαίνισαι 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 חָנַךְ and חָדַשׁ ſeveral times: but in the laſt ſenſe of *renewed* it often anſwers to חָדַשׁ, 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 μετ' 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 expreſly ſaid that they *offered burnt offerings*, *and ſacrificed peace-offerings of oxen* [or *calves*, the LXX. here uſing the word μοσχάρια] *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 offered 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 omiting 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 forborn 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 baſons 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 deſigned 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 parti-

TEXT.

and ſprinkled both the book
19 and all the people, Saying,
This *is* the blood of the te-
ſtament which God hath
enjoined unto you More-
18 over, he ſprinkled likewiſe
with blood both the taber-

PARAPHRASE.

and ſprinkled both the book and all the people (*b*), Saying, This is the blood of the covenant which God hath injoined you to obſerve (*c*). And in like manner afterward (*d*) he ſprinkled with blood both the tabernacle 20. 21.

NOTES.

particular direction 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 preſcribed to *Moſes* the ſame method which he did afterwards expreſly in the like caſes? See Lev. xiv. 4—6, 49—52.

(*b*) Αυτό τε τὸ βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν ἐῤῥάντισε. *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 conſidered 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 happened 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 injoined 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 בְּרִית 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 ordered 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

PARAPHRASE.

nacle and all the veſſels and inſtruments that were uſed in that ſervice. And there was
22. hardly any thing which the law required to be purified and cleanſed, but it was to be done with blood (*e*); and without the ſhed-
ing

TEXT.

nacle, and all the veſſels of the miniſtry. And almoſt
22 all things are by the law purged with blood; and

NOTES.

gives an account, *Exod.* xl. where he only expreſly 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 קדשת 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 20th and 21ſt 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 begining 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.* 25—26. The Doctor has, in my apprehenſion, given good light into theſe two verſes.

22 (*e*) Καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον. *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 rendred in this and the

TEXT.

without ſheding 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 heavenly things themſelves with better ſacrifices than theſe.

PARAPHRASE.

ing of that no forgiveneſs was to be obtained. There was therefore a neceſſity that 23.
theſe patterns and reſemblances of the heavenly things ſhould by virtue of theſe ſacrifices be rendred fit for their uſe (*f*): but the heavenly things themſelves which were more excellent in their own nature, and of which the other were only patterns, ſhould be fited and prepared for us by the means of ſome more excellent ſacrifices than theſe (*g*).

For

NOTES.

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 uncleaneſs 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* UNCLEANESS *of the children of* Iſrael. Where the LXX. uſe the ſame word as our author does here, καθαριῶ. The end therefore of cleanſing or purifying theſe things was to remove the uncleaneſs of the worſhipers, who were by reaſon of their uncleaneſs 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 ἐκαθάρισε *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 ſheding of blood is no remiſſion*; there is no remiſſion of the uncleaneſs of thoſe who uſe theſe holy things.

23 (*f*) Ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι. *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*) Αὐταὶ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια κρείττοσι θυσίαις παρὰ 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

Chap. IX.

PARAPHRASE.

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
25. 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
26. fresh sacrifices every time: (For then he must have

TEXT.

For Christ is not entred into 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 that he should offer himself often, as the high-priest entreth into the holy place, every year with blood of others: (For then must he

NOTES.

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 considered 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 pat-
"terns 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 pur-
"pose." 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 rendered 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 designed to foreshew and prefigure what is accomplished in the sanctuary made with hands; which is very absurd. Heaven therefore is considered as the true sanctuary, and the perfect exemplar or original platform, τύπος, 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 προσφέρῃ ἑαυτόν. *Nor yet that he should offer himself often.*] The word οὐδὲ 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

TEXT.

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 ſacrifice of himſelf. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this 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.

PARAPHRASE.

have often ſuffered ſince the begining 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.

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 προσφέρῃ, and the word ἵνα prefixed.

26 (*k*) Ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων. *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 συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος and τῶν αἰώνων. 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 appeared 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 ὀφθήσεται. *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 ſubmited 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.

SECT. XIII.

CHAP. X. 1——18.

CONTENTS.

OUR 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 remembring 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.

TEXT.

1 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.

PARAPHRASE.

FOR the law had yearly on the day of expiation a ſhadow of the heavenly good things which were to be beſtowed (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 1.

NOTES.

1 (*n*) Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς, οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς 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 indeavour 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 οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, or elſe οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα, ſhould be read in a parentheſis; if this latter is prefer'd, 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 κατ' 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 hyperbaton 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 omited 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 begining 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

Chap. X.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

2. For if they could have made the worſhipers perfect, they would have ceaſed to be offered again

For then would they not?

NOTES.

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 expreſly 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 tho' it may collaterally be infer'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 performed, 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 conſidered 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 ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ 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 entirely from their guilt, as that they ſhould be qualified for heaven.

TEXT.

have ceased to be offered? because that the worshipers once purged, should have had no more conscience of 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,

PARAPHRASE.

again after the first time (*o*); because atonement being once made by them for the worshipers, their consciences would have been easy without looking for any farther atonement for their sins (*p*); whereas by the appointment 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.

Sacri-

NOTES.

2 (*o*) Επεὶ ἂν οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι; *For then would they not have ceased to be offered?*] If the words are read, as in many copies, with the οὐκ inserted, they must be understood interrogatively, as *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius* observe, and our translators have rendered them. But if the οὐκ be omited, 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 as 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 τοὺς λατρεύοντας, ἅπαξ κεκαθαρμένους. *Because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins.*] It seems indifferent whither we read κεκαθαρμένους *purged*, or with others, κεκαθαρισμένους *purified*; because the effect of sacrifices being here considered, 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*) *Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith.*] The following passage is a citation 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

PARAPHRASE.

Sacrifice and offering thou wouldſt not; but a
6. *body haſt thou prepared me* (r). *In burnt-offer-*

TEXT.

Sacrifice and offering thou wouldſt not, but a body haſt thou prepared me: In o

NOTES.

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 σου, ὁ Θεός μου, ἐβουλήθην, as does the *Ethiopick* verſion. 'Tis poſſible this might have been the original reading, and that it might be altered 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.

(r) Σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω 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, *diged.* 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 happened. The words in the *Hebrew* in our preſent copies are אונים כרית לי and they who ſeem to offer faireſt at accounting for them, make them to be an alluſion to the law given to the *Jews*, 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 awl, and he ſhould ſerve him for ever.* They think therefore that this is intended by the expreſſion, Thou haſt made or ingaged 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 conſidered 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 כרה but דצע as *Exodus* xxi 6. or when a more general verb is uſed 'tis נתן as it is in *Deut.* ולקחת את המרצע ונתתה באונו ובדלת *ſhalt put the awl in his ear and the door.* Now 'tis

NOTES.

'tis highly probable that had the pſalmiſt deſigned 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 diging 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 happened. I can't find that learned men have ventured to publiſh their conjectures concerning this: they ſeem rather to have ſpent their pains in indeavouring 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	אזנים כרית לי
The ſuppoſed original reading	או גוף כרית לי

'Tis hardly to be thought that the firſt corruption was wilfully made, or that it happened otherwiſe than caſually, through the careleſneſs 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 כרית לי unchanged, the only alteration I ſuppoſe is of או גוף to אזנים, 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 droping of a letter. Thus for inſtance, *Gen.* xxx. 11, the *Jews* for בגד have put two words in the *Keri*, בא גד but ſince it may be queſtioned whether they were not therein miſtaken, I ſhall mention another place which is very plain. In *Iſaiah* iii. 15. which is well tranſlated, *What mean ye that ye beat my people?* of two words, as 'tis in the *Keri* מה לכם *what mean ye?* or, *what have ye to do?* the *Chethib* or the common reading have made but one מלכם, 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 ה 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 אז 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 adverſative, ſhould each be introduced in the ſame manner; and therefore as the laſt begins with אז *Then* I *ſaid* אז אמרתי it looks not improbable that the other did ſo too, according to the conjecture before propoſed. 'Tis true the LXX. have uſed ὴ, whereas in ſome places where the word אז recurs they render both by τότε, as they do that *ver.* 7. See *Pſalm* li. 19. *Jeſ.* i. 8. But as there is nothing in the *Hebrew* to which their ὴ can anſwer but upon my ſup-

NOTES.

poſition, ſo they are not conſtant in their rendring of that word : for beſide τότε they render it by ὃ, *Prov.* i. 28. and they might therefore as well render it here by ὃ, 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 preceded 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 conſidered to ſtand thus, " Sacrifice and offering, and burnt-" offerings, and offering for ſin, thou didſt not deſire or require : then theu preparedſt me a " body ; then I ſaid, I come to do thy will, &c."

But to go on with the conjecture ; if גוף be imagined to be the original reading, the change of ג into נ 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 נ ſo like to ג 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 ך is changed into ן. 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 ך into ם. Now in caſe the long ſtroke of the ך 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 *men clauſum* or *finale*, ם. I have here ſuppoſed that the word גוף was uſed by the *Jews* anciently, which is not unlikely, though we have now no inſtance of it in the bible, which reads in other places גופה, but it might be ἅπαξ λεγόμενον here, as is the more probable, ſince the Rabbins often uſe גוף. However if that be diſliked, we need only read גוה which we meet with *Job* xx. 25. where the LXX. tranſlate it by σῶμα. 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 ה into ם 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 conſidered only the *Chaldee* letters, and not thoſe we call the *Samaritan*, becauſe I doubt not the corruption happened 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 כרית as it was, however unuſual it is for that verb to ſignify the ſame as κατατίζεσθαι, 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.* l. 5. *In my grave which* כריתי לי *I have* diged *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 diged long before. See *Chap.* xlvii. 29, 30. xlix. 29———32. Thus muſt it be underſtood, 2 *Chron.* xvi. 14. *They buried him* [Aſa] *in his own ſepulchres, which he had made* [margin *diged*] *for himſelf in the city of* David. Here alſo אשר כרה לו 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, *procured* a body for our Saviour. We have likewiſe rendered it *prepared*, 2 Kings vi. 23. 'Tis hoped what has been now offered will be conſidered, 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.

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 offering, 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

PARAPHRASE.

offerings and ſacrifices for ſin thou haſt had no pleaſure. Then ſaid I, Lo I come (in the roll of the book 'tis writen concerning me) (ſ) *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 offered 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 (ſ) Ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ. *In the volume of the book 'tis writen 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 ingaged 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 writen, 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 κεφαλὶς βιβλίου. And ſome render this in the *head* or *begining* 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 begining 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 begining of *Geneſis* to *ver.* 8. of the vith 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 *begining*. 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 rolled up to preſerve them from duſt. And hence we have elſewhere rendred 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 rendred 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 κεφαλὶς to be the ſame as ἔλιγμα, the *folding* of a book. And ſo *Aquila* and *Symmachus* rendred 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 ἀναιρεῖ λέγων in the be-

Chap. X.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

will, O God, he aboliſheth the former will and preſcription of God concerning legal ſacrifices, that he may eſtabliſh the later con-
10. cerning the ſacrifice of Chriſt (*u*). By the which later will of God, we are cleanſed from our guilt (*w*) through the offering once
11. of the body (*x*) of Jeſus Chriſt. And indeed under the old law, every high-prieſt continued (*y*) miniſtring 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 to ſanctified, through the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt once *for all*. And every 11 prieſt ſtandeth daily mini-

NOTES.

gining of *ver.* 8. muſt of neceſſity be joined with ſome verb that follows, which is ἀναιρεῖ, 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 ἀναιρεῖ. Had our author deſigned to expreſs what our tranſlators do, it ſeems to me he ſhould rather have ſaid καὶ τότε εἰπών, or ἐρῶν. 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 ordered 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*) Ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ. *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 expreſly 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 refer'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, Ἐν ᾧ θελήματι, *By the which* will *we are ſanctified through the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all.*

10 (*w*) Ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν. *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*) Τοῦ σώματος. *The body.*] The *Clermont* and St. *Germains* copies read τοῦ αἵματος *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 πᾶς μὲν ἱερεὺς ἕστηκε. *And every prieſt ſtandeth.*] The πᾶς μὲν and the αὐτὸς δὲ in the next verſe are oppoſed according to the common uſe of thoſe particles μὲν and δὲ in the *Greek* language. The *Syriac* verſion, and the *Alex.* and other MSS. read here ἀρχιερεὺς, *and*

every

TEXT.

ſtring and offering oftentimes the ſame ſacrifices which can
11 never take away ſins: But this man after he had offered one ſacrifice for ſins, for ever ſat down on the right
13 hand of God; From henceforth expecting till his enemies 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 covenant 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

PARAPHRASE.

time (z), and offering oftentimes the ſame ſacrifices which can never expiate ſins. But 12.
Chriſt after he had offered only one ſacrifice 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 authority, 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 required 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 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 his 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 "this teſtimony, and has clearly declared the ſame." The *whereof* added by our tranſlators is needleſs when the words are thus underſtood.

PARAPHRASE.

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 remembred no more, there can be no occaſion for any farther offering for ſin.

TEXT.

write them: And their ſins 17
and iniquities will I remember no more. Now, where 18
remiſſion of theſe *is*, *there is* no more offering for ſin.

NOTES.

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.

SECT. XIV.

CHAP. X. 19—39.

CONTENTS.

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 offered 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 don this by his once offering himſelf; now follows the practical application, which is infered 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 *Jewiſh* converts, who above all others were very prone to it. 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

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 belonged 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. Chap. X.

TEXT.

19 HAving therefore, brethren, boldneſs to enter into the holieſt by the
20 blood of Jeſus, By a new and living way which he hath conſecrated for us

PARAPHRASE.

HAving therefore, brethren, liberty granted us to enter into heaven, the true holy of holies (*c*), by the blood of Jeſus (*d*), which way of entrance, a new and living way to us, he initiated or firſt went 19. 20.

(*e*)

NOTES.

19 (*c*) Ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοὶ, παῤῥησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων. *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 ἅγια, *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 debared 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 ἔχοντες *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.

(*d*) Ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ. *By the blood of Jeſus.*] The alluſion is to the manner of the high-prieſts entring 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*)

PARAPHRASE.

(e) passing through the vail, the vail I mean
21. of his own flesh (f). And having now Jesus
as an high-priest over the house of God;
let

TEXT.

through the vail, that is to
say, his flesh; And *having*
an high-priest over the house

NOTES.

20 (e) Ην ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν. *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 ἣν here refers to εἴσοδον just before, and that the sense is, *Which entrance he initiated.* The words ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν seem to be well explained by *Chrysostom*, who gives us this sense of them, τοῦτέστιν, ἣν κατεσκεύασε, καὶ ἧς ἤρξατο. Ἐγκαινισμὸς γὰρ λέγεται ἀρχὴ χρήσεως λοιπόν· Ην κατεσκεύασε, φησὶ, καὶ δι' ἧς αὐτὸς ἐβάδισεν· "That is, which he prepared, and which he himself began. For ἐγκαινισμὸς is the begin-" ing of the use a thing is afterwards put to. This then is what he says, that Christ prepa-" red, 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 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 belonged to such as had not been under the law, and was designed 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 ζῶσαν, *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 ζῶσαν is, as *Grotius* observes, put for ζωοποιοῦσαν, but then I think this is to be understood as opposed to θανατοῦσαν.

(f) Διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτέστι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. *Through the vail, 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 prefered, since it has much better authority to support it. And if τῆς σαρκὸς be taken not as governed by the preposition διὰ, but as following τοῦ καταπετάσματος, which it may not be unreasonable should be understood to be in sense repeated from the clause before, thus τοῦτέστι τοῦ καταπετάσματος τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, *through the vail, that is to say,* the *vail* of his flesh; the sense may seem to run more smooth and easy. But still we must inquire why the *flesh* of Christ is compared here to a *vail.* The vail 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 vail was to be turned 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 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 accomplished 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 entring into heaven the true holy of holies: but by his death this vail was removed, and a

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

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

let 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 burdensom (*k*); And having 22.

NOTES.

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, *Matt.* 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 worshiping 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 *worshipers*. 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 incouraged 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 infered from the privilege; *q. d.* "A way "is now laid open for us into heaven it self, and since God has granted us so great an ad- "vantage, 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 שָׁלֵם 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 πληροφορίᾳ 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*) Ἐῤῥαντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς. *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 uncleanesses. These uncleanesses did not, in 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

Chap. X.

PARAPHRASE.

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*). 24. And let us so observe and 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

TEXT.

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 let us consider one another to provoke unto love, and

NOTES.

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 λελυμένοι 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 begining 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 *puting 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 stedfastness 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 confirmed 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.

24 (*n*) *And let us consider*, &c.] This verse is very happily translated; our *provoking*, being a word of a middle signification, just as παροξυσμὸς 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 mutual duty, *Let us consider* ONE ANOTHER.

25 (*o*)

TEXT.

25 to good works: Not forſaking the aſſembling of our ſelves together, as the manner of ſome *is*; but exhorting *one another*: and ſo much the more, as ye ſee
26 the day approaching. For if we ſin wilfully after that

PARAPHRASE.

to love, and ſuch good works as are the genuine effects of it. This will be a good means 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* converts (*o*). And you have ſo much the more reaſon for this, by how much you may plainly perceive, that the time of the great deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, and the *Jewiſh* polity is nearly approaching (*p*). For in caſe we deliberately and wilfully apoſtatize (*q*) after 25. 26.

NOTES.

25 (*o*) Μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τισίν. *Not forſaking the aſſembling of our ſelves together, as the manner of ſome is.*] He may well be ſuppoſed here alſo to tax the behaviour which was too common at that time among the *Jewiſh* converts, who from their old and rooted prejudices had been ſo diſguſted at the *Gentiles* being 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 admited 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 behaviour 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*, κατατομὴ, deſigning to deny they had the true circumciſion, *Philip.* iii. 2, 3.

(*p*) Ὅσῳ βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν 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 judgment. And it was eaſy for every one to perceive, from the number of years that were paſt at the time when this epiſtle was writen, 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*) Ἑκουσίως 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

Chap. X.

PARAPHRASE.

after we have been convinced of the truth of Chriſtianity, and have embraced it, no other ſacrifice to atone for our ſins is left 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 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*),

TEXT.

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,

he:

NOTES.

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 ἔτι περὶ 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 τὶς 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*. 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 offered 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 contemned 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 ſining or apoſtatizing ἑκουσίως, *wilfully*, it will not be diſagreeable to underſtand that word to be repeated here, as ἀπὸ κοινῦ, and that what is here ſaid relates to mens ſining not through ignorance and miſtake, but *preſumptuouſly* and wilfully, in which caſe, they by conſequence *reproached* the Lord, and deſpiſed

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

died without mercy, under
29 two or three witneſſes: Of
how much ſorer 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 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 29.

NOTES.

ſpiſed his word; and therefore ſuch an one was ordered to be cut off from among his people, *Numb.* 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. *Numb.* xxxv. 30. The force of the argument is ſtrong and plain, when thus underſtood, both from the difference of the perſons imployed 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*) Ὁ 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. Παλήσουσιν αὐτὴν 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 ἔσται εἰς 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 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. καὶ πατήσω 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

blood of Chriſt, which is the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was ſanctified and admited into the body of God's covenant people, to be but the common blood of an ordinary malefactor (*u*); and reproaches that Spirit which God has graciouſly given us to afford us the fulleſt evidence of the gof-
30. pel (*w*)? For we know who has told us, *Ven-*

the blood of the covenant wherewith he was ſanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done deſpite unto the Spirit of grace? For we 30 know him that hath ſaid,

NOTES.

of the hiſtory of him, and particularly his ſufferings, and inſult him as an impoſtor, and a vile malefactor who ſuffered no more than he deſerved. But the purſuing that matter, is not proper in theſe papers; and therefore the reader is refered to practical writers for it.

(*u*) Καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος, ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη. *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*, Matt. 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 ἡγιάσθη, *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 omiting them. And therefore the other doubt is, 2. How the words are to be underſtood, ſuppoſing them to be genuin. 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 *my ſelf.* 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 admited into the covenant, and taken to be God's people, diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the world.

(*w*) Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας. *And hath done deſpite unto the Spirit of grace.*] The hopeleſs caſe of the ſame ſort of ſiners 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

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
Vengeance *belongeth* unto me, I will recompenſe, ſaith the Lord. And again, The Lord ſhall judge	*Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompenſe, ſaith the Lord* (x). And again, *The Lord*

NOTES.

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 offered 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) Οἴδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα· Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, 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. *Germains* copy. It muſt be farther owned 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 expreſſed, *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 abhored 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, 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 נָקָם וְשִׁלֵּם which we render, *To me belongeth vengeance, and recompence*, than to the LXX. which thus tranſlates it, Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω. *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 שִׁלֵּם to be a *verb* and not a *noun*, and ſo render it ἀνταποδώσω, *I will recompenſe*, as does alſo the *Vulg.*

Chap. X.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

31. *Lord ſhall judge his people* (y). And conſidering his people. *It is* a fear-

NOTES.

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* ו. 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 שלם is the third and not the firſt perſon, and therefore if we retain the ו it ſhould be read, וְשִׁלַּמְתִּי 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* אֶשָּׁלֵם, 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 א to remain tolerably plain while the two ſide ſtrokes were obliterated. I am the more confirmed in this, becauſe if we take the word to be a noun, and read according to the preſent punctuation וְשִׁלֵּם that muſt be as far as I can remember ἅπαξ 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 profeſſed 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 conſidered as a general maxim; and therefore equally applicable in all caſes wherein *vengeance* and a penal *recompenſe* is due.

(y) Καὶ πάλιν, κύριος κρινεῖ τὸν 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 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,

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

ful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.
32 But call to remembrance

sidering that he is the God who lives for ever, and has always an almighty power, it must appear to be much more dreadful to incur his vengeance than any punishments which men can inflict (z). But beside the tremendous judgments of God, I may press my exhortati- 32.
on

NOTES.

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 punished 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 כי and ו 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 considered 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 considered 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 incouragement 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 ingaged 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.

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 considered 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 *Matt.* 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.

Chap. X.

PARAPHRASE.

on upon you by your own example. Remember then the former times, in which after you were inlightened in the christian faith (*a*), ye indured a great combate (*b*) of suf-
33. ferings; 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 hard-
34. ships. For ye sympathized with those who were in bonds (*d*), and joyfully suffered the loss of your earthly substance, being persuaded that you have in heaven (*e*) . . . . .

TEXT.

the former days, in which after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions: Partly whilst ye 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 of your goods, knowing in your selves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.

NOTES.

32 (*a*) *Illuminated.*] See *Chap.* vi. 4. note (*f*).

(*b*) Πολλὴν ἄθλησιν. *A great fight.*] 'Tis the note of *Chrysostom* upon this, Οὐκ εἶπε πειρασμὸς, ἀλλὰ ἄθλησιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐγκωμίου ὄνομα, καὶ ἐπαίνων μεγίστων, "He does not "say *trials*, but a *combat*, 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 incouraging 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*) Θεατριζόμενοι. *Made a gazing stock.*] Compare 1 *Cor.* iv. 9.

34 (*d*) Καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου 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 writen by St. *Paul*. But the *Alex.* and other MSS. of the best note read here δεσμίοις instead of δεσμοῖς μου. 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.

(*e*) Γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὕπαρξιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ μένουσαν. *Knowing in your selves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.*] The *paronomasia* in τὴν ὑπαρχόντων and ὕπαρξιν 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 ἑαυτοῖς 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. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

SECT.

SECT. XV.

CHAP. XII. 25——29.

TEXT.

25 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 26 heaven: Whose voice then

PARAPHRASE.

TAKE 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 caused

25. 26.

NOTES.

25 (*a*) Μὴ ἀπαιτήσησθε ⸗ λαλοῦντα. *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* παρητήσαντο *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 refered 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*, *Yet 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 οὐκ ἔφυγον, τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς χρηματίζοντα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς οἱ τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἀποστρεφόμενοι. *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 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 χρηματίζειν 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 menti-

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

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

shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying,

NOTES.

oned 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 ingraven 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 alleged. 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 rendring ἀποστρεφόμενοι, *if we turn away*, we should render it *if we despise*, as *Budæus 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.

26 (*d*) See *Exod.* xix. 18. *Judg.* v. 4. *Psal.* lxviii. 7, 8.

(*e*) Νῦν δέ. *But now.*] As the τότε *then* refers to the time of giving the law at mount *Sinai*, and the νῦν δέ *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*)

TEXT.

Yet once more I ſhake not the earth only, but alſo hea-

PARAPHRASE.

in thoſe words, Yet once more I ſhake not the earth only *(f)*, but alſo heaven *(g)*.

Aud

NOTES.

(*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 ſtile.

(*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 (*z*). 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 propher, 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 deſigned 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 omited by the LXX. which I am apt to attribute either to their own, or their tranſcriber's careleſneſs, or elſe to the officiouſneſs of ſome chriſtians, who indeavoured 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 refered 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 ſeting 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.

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 kingdoms, 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 expreſly

NOTES.

preſly diſtinguiſhes 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 conſidered,

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, *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 charicts 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 ſeting up God's kingdom under the Meſſiah, becauſe the prophet there ſo plainly mentions him וּבָאוּ חֶמְדַּת 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 nations] *ſhall come to the deſire of all nations:* where nothing is ſupplied but אֶל or עַל or ſome like particle, the omiſſion of which is not unuſual after the word בּוֹא. 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 interpretation. And the order in which this clauſe ſtands in the prophecy will ſhow that it can't 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 חֶמְדוֹת inſtead of חֶמְדַּת and therefore rendred Καὶ ἥξει τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν. *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 author, ſince the *coming in of the* Gentiles muſt be upon the ſeting up the kingdom under the Meſſiah.

There is an objection againſt this interpretation which to ſome may appear plauſible, and therefore ought to be conſidered. 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 commentators.

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 conceal 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 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 ſeting 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 incourage *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

NOTES.

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 it self, 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, 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 rendred 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 incouragement 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 incouragement 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*

Chap. XII.

PARAPHRASE.

27. And when the prophet uſes this expreſſion, *Yet once more*, he ſignifies thereby (*h*) the change that ſhould once, and but once, be made

TEXT.

ven. And this *word*, Yet once more, ſignifieth the removing of thoſe things

NOTES.

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 imploys, and who are diligent in his ſervice. Thus a ſpecial promiſe is made to *Ebed-melech*, Jer. xxxix. 16—18. And *Joſhua* the high-prieſt, *Zerubbabel*'s partner in building the temple, is incouraged in the work by a promiſe like to that before us, *Zec.* iii. 7. So that in the general this may be looked 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 (*h*) *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* 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.

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

that are ſhaken, as of things that are made, that thoſe things which cannot be ſhaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace,

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 as we chriſtians do now receive a kingdom which we know ſhall be unſhaken and unmoveable (*m*), let us be ſtedfaſt in imbra- 28.
cing

NOTES.

(*i*) Τῶν σαλευομένων ὡς μεπαίθεσιν. *The removing of thoſe things that are ſhaken.*] Though our tranſlators might poſſibly underſtand μεπαίθεσιν in the ſame ſenſe I do, when they rendered 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 preter-perfect tenſe, ought to have been accordingly rendered. 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*, τῷ 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, *Matt.* 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 infered 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 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 παραλαμβάνοντες. *Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved.*] The phraſe παραλαμβάνειν 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. Ch.* v. 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 [παραλήψονται 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.

PARAPHRASE.

cing and adhering to the gospel *(n)*, which will direct us *(o)* how we may serve God acceptably, even with a holy reverence and
29. fear of him. And this is highly necessary for us, because our God is a consuming fire *(p)*.

TEXT.

whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear. For our 29 God is a consuming fire.

NOTES.

'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 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 forbiden thee. For the Lord thy God is a* consuming fire, *even a* jealous *God.* . . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

A

PARAPHRASE,

AND

NOTES

On the three laſt Chapters of the

Epiſtle to the *HEBREWS*:

BEING A

SUPPLEMENT

TO THE

Learned Mr. *Peirce*'s PARAPHRASE and NOTES on this Epiſtle.

WITH

An Eſſay to diſcover the Author of the Epiſtle, and the Language in which it was originally written.

By JOSEPH HALLETT, *Jun.*

LONDON:

Printed by J. PURSER, for J. NOON, at the White Hart, near Mercers-Chapel, in Cheapſide. M.DCC.XXXIII.

(Price Three Shillings.)

THE

PREFACE.

I Tis greatly to be lamented, that the PARAPHRASE and NOTES on the Epiſtle to the *HEBREWS were left unfiniſh'd by the late ingenious and learned Mr.* PEIRCE, *who was admirably qualify'd for the glorious work of explaining the Holy Scriptures. And the unhappineſs is the greater, becauſe he did not leave behind him ſo much as any paper of* hints *relating to the three laſt chapters of the epiſtle. It is to be wiſh'd the commentary on it were well finiſh'd. But ſince, after above five years waiting, I cannot learn that any one has undertaken the work, I have been prevail'd with by the importunity of ſome worthy friends to publiſh the following Supplement to Mr.* Peirce's *Notes. The Paraphraſe is all along conducted, according to the beſt of my skill, by the ſtricteſt rules of paraphraſing,* viz. *not to omit one thought of the text; nor to inſert any thought beſides what the Paraphraſt believes the author had in his mind, when he wrote the text. I have carefully read over the beſt commentators on this part of the epiſtle; and cannot help thinking, that after all their learned and valuable labours, there are ſome gleanings left, which I have indeavour'd to gather in. If I have gather'd good fruit, and not leaves, or ſtubble, the reader will think my pains well laid out; if otherwiſe, I beg him to accept my good intentions.*

I have publiſh'd a few ſcatter'd Notes on ſome other verſes of the epiſtle to the Hebrews, *in my two volumes of* Notes and Diſcourſes. *See the Index of Texts in each.*

Exon, Sept. 30.
1732.

ERRATA.

INTRODUCTION.

Page iv. Notes, line 1. for *moriens* read *monens*. Pag. v. Notes, l. 4. r. as *by* Valeſius Pag. xi. l. 12. for *of*, r. *in*. Pag. xiv. l. 5. for *at* r *to*. Pag. xx. l. 2. r. Varimadus. Pag. xxvii. l. 4. from the bottom, r. *confirm'd*.

In the Paraphraſe and Notes.

Pag. 1. Notes, l. 2. r. *Paronomaſia*. Ibid. l 3. r. υπαρχοντων. Pag. 4. l. penult. r. *this* future. Pag. 5. Notes, l. 13. r. good *thing*. Pag. 6. Notes, l. 40. the Printer has ſet thoſe three *Hebrew* words firſt, which ſhould be laſt. Ibid. l. penult. r. order *of*. Pag. 10. Notes, l. 5. and in ſome other places, r. *Peirce*. Pag. 12. Notes, l. 18. r. *their* belief. Pag. 13. Paraphraſe, l. 5. r. *perſon*. Ibid. Notes, l. 5. dele *not*. Ibid. l. 17. r. *of* the fruits. Ibid. note (*t*) l. 1. r. *gifts*. Pag. 17. Notes, l. 36, 37. r. *ſorts of beaſts, or birds, &c. there are in the world, would*. Pag. 18. Notes, l. 24. for *foot*, r. *feet*. Pag. 23. l. 26. for 2, r. 21. Pag. 29. Notes, l. 4. for, their *father*, r. their *God*. Ibid. l. 30. for, *not* r. *act*. Pag. 33. Note (*t*) l. 9. for *get*, r. *ſet*. Pag. 37. Text, l. 9. ſet the number 27 two lines lower. Pag. 42. Notes, l. 7 for, *or*, r. *nor*. Pag. 58. l. 6. from the bottom, r. *place*, was *becauſe*. Pag. 61. Notes, l. 7. r. *had not had*. Ibid. Note (*r*) l. 1. r. *thing*. Pag. 62. Notes, l. 24. r. *thing*. Pag. 63. Paraph. l. 6. after the word *them*, add the mark of the end of a parentheſis. Pag. 72. Notes, l. 21, 22. r. περγεια. Pag. 81. Notes, l. 8. from the bottom, dele *out*. Pag. 82. Notes, l. 11. r. *upon* mount.

THE

EPISTLE

TO THE

HEBREWS.

CHAP. X.

TEXT.

AND ye had compaſſion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the ſpoiling of your goods, knowing in your ſelves, that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring ſub-

PARAPHRASE.

FOR ye ſympathized with thoſe who were in bonds, and joyfully ſuffered the loſs of your earthly ſubſtance, being perſuaded, " that you have in heaven (*e*)" a more ſubſtantial treaſure, which is better, and more enduring than the worldly treaſure you have loſt. 34.

NOTES.

" (*e*) Γινωσκοντες εχειν εν εαυτοις κρειττονα υπαρξιν εν ουρανοις, και μενουσαν, *knowing*
" *in your ſelves, that ye have in heaven a better, and an enduring ſubſtance.* The *Paranomaſia*
" in των υπαρχοντων, and υπαρξιν 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 paſ-
" ſage. Our tranſlation, by an unuſual trajection, joins the εν εαυτοις with γινωσκοντες,
" *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 is agreeable, there will be a neceſſity
" to have recourſe to ſome different reading."

Chap. X.

PARAPHRASE.

35. loſt. Therefore, after you have made ſo good a beginning, and ſuffer'd ſo much, and ſhew'd ſo ſtrong a faith in the promiſes of heaven, do not now caſt away this faith and courage (*f*), which will be recompenſed
36. with a large reward. And you ought not to caſt away your faith and courage, becauſe ye have need of patience, that ye may hold on in a courſe of doing the will of GOD, and that afterward ye may receive the reward
37. which he has promiſed (*g*): Which reward you may depend upon receiving, if you hold on in the exerciſe of patience and courage: for it is but a little while, e'er the reward which is to be conferr'd upon you, will come, and will not tarry beyond the time
38. fix'd for its coming (*h*). And he, that is juſt

TEXT.

ſtance. Caſt not away 35
therefore your confidence,
which hath great recom-
pence of reward. For ye 36
have need of patience; that
after ye have done the will
of GOD, ye might receive
the promiſe. For yet a 37
little while, and he that
ſhall come, will come,
and will not tarry. Now 38

NOTES.

The providence of GOD here ſtop'd the ſagacious and learned Commentator, by a much lamented death, from proceeding in his beloved work: to whoſe unſearchable wiſdom we muſt ſubmit. If Mr. *Peirce* had lived to go on with his deſign, no doubt he would have choſen, and declared his approbation of, the reading of the beſt MSS. and verſions, *viz.* εαυτους; and ſo have render'd the text thus, —— *knowing that you* your ſelves *have in heaven a better, and an enduring ſubſtance.* There are plain traces of this reading in Mr. *Peirce*'s paraphraſe of the former part of the verſe above recited. This reading makes the text very eaſy and intelligible, and is ſufficiently confirm'd to be the true one by the ſuffrage of the *Alexandrian* and other MSS. of the old *Italic*, *Syriac*, *Arabic*, and *Æthiopic* verſions, and of *Clemens Alex.*

(*f*) Παῤῥησιαν. *Confidence.* The Greek word, as uſed in the New Teſtament, properly ſignifies *courage*, and reſolution in profeſſing the truth, and in perſevering in a courſe of virtue, when perſecution or other diſcouragements ariſe; as appears from the uſe of the ſame word, *Mark* viii. 32. where our tranſlation has it, Chriſt ſpake *openly*, meaning *boldly*, *i. e.* with courage, and without being daunted. See alſo *Joh.* vii. 26. xviii. 20. *Act.* iv. 13, 29, 31. *Epheſ.* vi. 19. *Philip.* i. 20.

(*g*) Κομισησθε την επαγγελιαν, *ye might receive the promiſe.* That the expreſſion, *to receive the promiſe*, ſignifies the ſame as, *to receive the* accompliſhment *of the promiſe*, or, *to receive the* reward *that was promiſed*, is fully confirm'd by comparing the following texts, *viz. Luk.* xxiv. 49. *I ſend the promiſe*, i. e. I ſend the *thing* that was promiſed. *Act.* vii. 17. *When the time of the promiſe drew nigh*, i. e. the time of *accompliſhing* the promiſe, or of *beſtowing* the bleſſing that was promiſed. See alſo, *Act.* i. 4. ii. 33. *Gal.* iii. 14. *Hebr.* vi. 15. xi. 13, 33, 39. The bleſſing, or reward here meant is called *a better and enduring ſubſtance in heaven*, *v.* 34. and *the ſalvation of the ſoul*, *v.* 39.

(*h*) *He, that ſhall come, will come, and will not tarry.* Theſe words, together with the whole next verſe, are borrow'd from the prophet *Habakkuk*, *Chap.* ii. 3, 4. with regard to which

which paſſage three things muſt be inquired into, *viz.* the true *reading* of the words in the prophet; the *meaning* of them; and the *application* made of them by the apoſtle. As to this firſt ſentence, *He, that ſhall come, will come, and will not tarry*, it is the ſame exactly in the *Hebrew*, in the old *Greek* tranſlation, and in the apoſtle, excepting only that the word, *And*, which is retain'd in all the verſions of the *Polyglot*, is omitted in the preſent *Hebrew* copies: which is a *ſmall* fault in the *Jewiſh* tranſcribers. Our tranſlators indeed have given a different *turn* to the *Hebrew* expreſſion of the prophet, and have render'd it thus; *It will ſurely come, it will not tarry*. Whereas the *Hebrew* word, בא is a *participle*, and fitly render'd in *Greek* by ερχομενος, *He that ſhall come*, or, *That which ſhall come*. As a *participle* it is frequently uſed, particularly *Numb.* iv. 3. *Joſh.* vi. 1. 1 *Sam.* xxx. 23. I hope, I need not admoniſh the *learned* reader, that no manner of regard is to be paid (as I never pay any) to the different *pointing* of this (or of any other) word by the modern Jews.

In the next place it will be neceſſary to inquire into the *meaning* of this firſt part of this paſſage, as the words lie in the prophet. The truly learned and judicious Bp. of *Durham*, in his excellent *Defence of Chriſtianity*, has particularly conſider'd this text, and interpreted it as a propheſy of *Chriſt*, *p.* 160, *&c.* His lordſhip renders and interprets theſe words of the prophet with the context thus, *And at the end he ſhall break forth, and not deceive: tho' he tarry* longer than your wiſhes, *expect him: becauſe he, that cometh, will come, he will not go beyond* GOD's period, or appointed time, *p.* 162. If the paſſage is to be interpreted of the *Meſſia*'s coming, I humbly move, whether it ſhould not be underſtood of his coming to *judgment*, or elſe of his coming to *reſtore the Jews* to their own land, and to call in the fulneſs of the Gentiles ſpoken of, *Rom.* xi. 25, 26. The reaſon of ſuppoſing this is, becauſe the paſſage does not ſeem capable of being meant of Chriſt's *firſt* coming into the world. For, according to his lordſhip's own interpretation of the prophet's words, this propheſy of the coming of the Meſſia *is propoſed as a comfort to the juſt:* —— *becauſe he ſhould remove the ſeeming objections againſt providence, from the little, or no diſtinction between the righteous, and the wicked*, *p.* 163. Whereas the *firſt* coming of Chriſt did *not* remove theſe ſeeming objections againſt providence, but rather *increaſed* them: ſince his religion has expoſed his diſciples to the *ſevereſt* kinds of *perſecution*. His coming to *judgment* will fully remove the objections: but his *firſt* coming did not.

Beſides, the *context* will not permit us to interpret this place of Chriſt's *firſt* coming. The ſeries of the prophet's diſcourſe is this: He begins his book with complaining to GOD of the proſperity of ſome wicked *Jews*, and of the evils which they brought upon good men of their *own* nation, in his days, *Habak* i. 1—4. Next he reports the anſwer which he received from GOD, which was, that *Nebuchadnezzar* and the *Chaldeans* ſhould be permitted to invade *Judea*, and to puniſh the *wicked* inhabitants of it, *v.* 5—11. The prophet apprehending, that this remedy would be as bad as the diſeaſe, humbly expoſtulates with GOD about his permitting the *idolatrous* nation of the *Chaldeans* to devour the *Iſraelites*, as the fiſhes of the ſea devour one another, *v.* 12—17. The anſwer which the prophet receives to this expoſtulation is the whole ſecond chapter. The four firſt verſes are the *preface* to the viſion; the reſt of the chapter is the *viſion* itſelf. One would naturally expect, that the anſwer to the expoſtulation of the prophet ſhould be to this purpoſe, *viz.* "Tho' I will ſend the *Chaldeans* upon you, and permit them to make dreadful havock among you: yet the time ſhall come, when I will ſettle you in peace in your own land, and neither the *Chaldeans*, nor any other nation, ſhall any more conquer or diſtreſs you. Believe my promiſe, and wait patiently for the time, when the *Deliverer ſhall come out of Zion.*" One might the rather incline to interpret the promiſe in this ſenſe, becauſe of what the oracle ſays, *v.* 14. which ought to be render'd thus, *The land* [of Judea] *ſhall be fill'd* [with inhabitants] *to know the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the ſea:* i. e. "Tho' the *Chaldeans* ſhall be permitted to deſtroy ſome of the *Iſraelites*, and to carry others away into captivity, ſo as that *few* men ſhall be left in *Judea:* yet there is a better time coming, when the land of *Judea* ſhall be *fill'd* with *Iſraelites*, as the waters fill the channel of the ſea." This interpretation of *v.* 14. I gratefully acknowledge I received from the *converſation* of that excellent commentator,

Mr.

NOTES.

Mr. *Peirce:* who, in the ſame juſt manner, interpreted the parallel place, *Iſai.* xi. 9. and obſerved, that the old *Greek* verſion has thus render'd both theſe texts. If this be (as it appears moſt likely to be) the meaning of the prophets, it will be impoſſible to interpret either of them, in the contexts of the ſaid places, as ſpeaking of the *firſt* coming of the *Meſſia*. For very ſoon after his *firſt* coming, A. D. 70. the land of *Judea* was ſo far from being *repleniſh'd* with *Jewiſh* inhabitants to know the Lord, that it was then almoſt *emptied* of them, and they have not yet been ſuffer'd to return to their own land. But this prediction of *filling the land to know the Lord* ſhall be *hereafter* accompliſh'd. *Ezekiel* has foretold the ſame, *viz.* that the *twelve* tribes ſhall be *reſtored* to their own land, ſhall *multiply* therein, and *know* and worſhip GOD, *Ezek.* XXXVII. 12, 13, 14, 21, 26.

But, to ſay the truth, I queſtion, whether the paſſage here borrow'd by the apoſtle out of *Habbakkuk* does at all relate to the *Meſſiah*. The apoſtle's uſing the words does no way oblige us to think ſo: in as much as he does not ſeem to give the leaſt hint, that he applies theſe words to *Chriſt*. And ſince, as was before obſerved, the prophet's *expoſtulation* related to the *Chaldeans*, it is moſt natural to think, that the *anſwer* of the oracle relates to *them* alſo, and ſo ſignifies, that the *Iſraelites* ſhould at length be delivered from the *Babyloniſh* oppreſſion, and captivity, and the land be again fill'd with its proper inhabitants, the *Iſraelites*, who ſhould not worſhip the *Babyloniſh* idols, but ſhould know and worſhip the *true* GOD. For this *happy time* GOD exhorts the prophet, and the reſt of the *Iſraelites* to wait with patience, aſſuring them, that it ſhould certainly come. This interpretation of the viſion, and of the preface to it, may be confirm'd from v. 8. where GOD plainly foretels the deſtruction of the *Chaldean* nation, ſaying, *Becauſe thou haſt ſpoiled many nations, all the remnant of the people ſhall* ſpoil *thee.*

According to this interpretation we may fully juſtify our *Engliſh* verſion of *Hab.* ii. 3. in uſing the word, *it*. *For the viſion is yet for an appointed time, but at the end,* it *ſhall ſpeak, and not lye: tho'* it *tarry, wait for* it, *becauſe* it *will ſurely come* (or rather, that, *which ſhall come, will come*) it *will not tarry.* It ſeems impoſſible to render the *Hebrew* in any other manner, than as ſpeaking all theſe things of the *viſion.* The old *Greek* tranſlator, in rendering this paſſage, has in a way not very unuſual with him, broken thro' the rules of grammar, and made uſe of αὐτὸν and ἐρχόμενον, words of the *maſculine* gender, in the latter part of the verſe, tho' ὁρασις, to which they refer, be of the feminine: ὅτι ἔτι ὁρασις εἰς καιρὸν, καὶ ἀνατελεῖ εἰς πέρας, καὶ οὐκ εἰς κενὸν· ἐὰν ὑστέρηση, ὑπόμεινον αὐτὸν, ὅτι ἐρχόμενον ἥξει, καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ. But it muſt be obſerved, at the ſame time, that the apoſtle is not chargeable with this ſoleciſm. As he only borrows the *latter* part of this ſentence, the ſoleciſm does not appear. Tho' the words he repeats are of the *maſculine* gender, he is guilty of no neglect of grammar, even upon ſuppoſition he interprets the prophet as ſpeaking of the *viſion*; ſince he leaves his readers to ſupply the ſubſtantive, which need not be ὁρασις, but may be ὁρατὸν, as *Aquila* put it. See *Montfaucon's Hexapla in loc.*

When the prophet ſays, *The* viſion *will come, and will not tarry,* he means, the *event*, which was repreſented and predicted in the viſion, *will ſoon come.* Accordingly the *Babyloniſh* captivity laſted no more than 70 years; at the expiration of which *Cyrus* rebuilt *Jeruſalem*, and the temple; and reſtor'd the *Jews* to their own land.

It is, finally, to be conſider'd, how the apoſtle *applies* this paſſage of the prophet to his purpoſe. He does not ſeem to give the leaſt hint, as if he thought it was originally ſpoken of the Meſſiah: nor does he ſeem to have had the Meſſiah in his thoughts in this place. The thing he is here ſpeaking of, is call'd, the *enduring ſubſtance in heaven,* the *great recompenſe of reward,* the *promiſe, life,* and the *ſalvation of the ſoul,* v. 34, 35, 36, 38, 39. It need not then be ſuppoſed, that in the intermediate verſe, v. 37. he ſpeaks of any *perſon*, or of any other thing than that *ſalvation.* So that it is more agreeable to the context to render the apoſtle's words, as *Habakkuk*'s are render'd, that, *which ſhall come, will come, and will not tarry*, meaning the promiſed ſalvation of the ſoul. The apoſtle does not repeat theſe words as a *direct proof*, that the great recompence of the reward, which was promiſed to the *Hebrews*, would ſoon be beſtow'd: nor did he ſuppoſe, that the prophet ſpeaks of his *future* reward of virtue in this place. But the apoſtle's deſign ſeems to be this, *viz.* to lead the *Hebrews* to take notice in the Old Teſtament, that GOD

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

the juſt ſhall live by faith: juſt by faith, ſhall obtain the reward of righteouſneſs, even eternal life (*i*): but if he

NOTES.

was *always faithful* to perform the promiſes which he has made to his people: from whence the *Hebrew* Chriſtians might ſurely conclude (ſince God is *unchangeable*) that he would now alſo fulfil the promiſe, which he had made them of eternal life, when the fit and appointed time ſhould come. We may expreſs the full ſenſe of the apoſtle in the following paraphraſe: "If you, Chriſtians, exerciſe patience and courage, you may de- "pend upon receiving the promiſed reward, the ſalvation of the ſoul. For (to uſe the "words we meet with, *Habak.* ii. 3. which indeed were ſpoken upon *another*, but a ſome- "what *like* occaſion) the good thing that is promiſed, and is to come, will certainly "come, and will not be delay'd beyond the time appointed As the *Iſraelites* of old "might depend upon receiving the good things that were repreſented to *Habbakkuk*, in- "the viſion, *viz.* deliverance from the *Babyloniſh* captivity, and a reſtoration to their own "land, becauſe God had given them a promiſe of theſe things: ſo you may depend up- "on receiving the good things promiſed you, even the ſalvation of the ſoul, becauſe the "ſame faithful God, who made the promiſe, will fulfil it in the appointed time. If the "prophet could ſay, in the former caſe, in order to encourage the *Iſraelites* to the exer- "ciſe of patience, that the *viſion*, or the *bleſſing* promiſed in the viſion, *would come, and* "*would not tarry:* as certainly, at leaſt, may I ſay to you Chriſtians, that the promiſe, or "the *bleſſing* tender'd in the promiſe of the new covenant *will come, and will not tarry* be- "yond the proper ſeaſon of beſtowing it". In this way of interpreting the apoſtle ap- pears to talk like himſelf, *i. e.* like a rational, and judicious writer. Tho' the proof is not *direct*, yet it is *ſtrong* and *good*.

(*i*) *Now the juſt ſhall live by faith.* It is an excellent hint of the learned Dr. *Owen* on the place, that the words may be ranged thus, *viz. the juſt by faith ſhall live.* To which we may add, that this is the only true order of the words as they lie both in the *Hebrew* and in the *Greek*. The meaning of the paſſage is this: The man, who is righteous by means of his *faith*, ſhall have the reward, that was originally intended to be the reward of per- fect righteouſneſs, even eternal life. To confirm this ſenſe of the words it muſt be ob- ſerved, that this is the *only* ſenſe of them that ſuits the deſign of the apoſtle in every place where he has quoted them. He cites this paſſage of the prophet, *Rom.* i. 17. where he introduces it thus, *viz. the righteouſneſs of God* (or that which, under the new cove- nant, God has determin'd to accept and reward as righteouſneſs) *is revealed by faith to faith* (*i. e.* it is revealed to be a righteouſneſs *by faith*, and not of works; and it is reveal- ed to *faith*, or, to all that have faith, whether they be *Jews* or *Gentiles*) *as it is written, The juſt by faith ſhall live.* That, which the apoſtle here brings this text to prove, plainly ſhews, that he underſtood it in this manner: ſince otherwiſe it cannot be conceived how it ſhould prove, that God's righteouſneſs is not a righteouſneſs by works, but by faith. The apoſtle again cites this paſſage of the prophet to prove the ſame aſſertion, *Gal.* iii. 11. *It is evident that no man is juſtified by the law in the ſight of God: for the juſt by faith ſhall live. But the law is not of faith: but he, that doth them* (*i. e.* the things required by the law) *ſhall live in them.* In this paſſage, the juſt, or righteous *by faith* is oppoſed to a perſon juſtified *by the law:* which ſhews, that the apoſtle thought (and to be ſure he thought rightly) that the prophet ſpeaks of a man's being *juſt*, or juſtified, *by faith.* In the ſame ſenſe, no doubt, the apoſtle underſtands the expreſſion in this place. For, upon the occaſion of this paſſage here borrowed from the prophet, he begins a diſcourſe about *faith*, and largely ſhews by various particular inſtances, Ch. xi. that God all along juſtified, and accepted men upon the account of their *faith*, who could not pretend to be righteous in point of *works*. Whereas this could not be certainly infer'd from the expreſſion as it lies in the *Engliſh* Bible. The ſaying, that *the juſt ſhall live by faith*, does not ſo certainly determine, as the other

Chap. X.

PARAPHRASE.

he apoſtatiſe from this faith whereby he was juſtified (*k*), my ſoul (ſaith GOD) ſhall have no

TEXT.

but if *any man* draw back, my ſoul ſhall have no plea-

NOTES.

other poſition of the words does, *upon what account* it is, that GOD accepts a man as juſt, or righteous. Notwithſtanding all that is contain'd in that expreſſion, it might be neceſſary a man ſhould be juſtified by *works*, or elſe not be accounted, and rewarded as a righteous perſon. For *living by faith* does not neceſſarily ſignify that *faith* will avail to a man's juſtification. If a man were *perfectly righteous* in point of *works*, he would truly *live by his faith*, as his faith in GOD would be the *principle* of his *perfect* obedience. But tho' he did *live* by it, yet he might not be *juſtified* by it. But when a man is ſaid to be *juſt by faith*, we neceſſarily underſtand, that he is *juſtified* by faith, tho' his obedience is *not* perfect.

Before I leave this part of the paſſage, it muſt be obſerved, that there is one little difference between it, as it now lies in the *Hebrew* text of the prophet, and in the diſcourſe of the apoſtle. The *Hebrew* is, *the juſt by* his *faith ſhall live:* whereas the word *his* is omitted in all the manuſcripts and verſions of all the three places, where the apoſtle uſes theſe words. I cannot help determining in favour of the reading eſpouſed by the apoſtle, with which the *Syriac* verſion of *Habakkuk* agrees. But if the word, *his*, be inſerted, it will make no manner of alteration in the *ſenſe*; for as much as he, that is juſtify'd by *faith*, is certainly juſtify'd by *his own* faith, and not by the faith of another.

(*k*) Και εαν υποστειληται, *but if* any man *draw back.* Our tranſlators have been ſo far very fair, as to cauſe the words, *any man*, to be printed in a character different from the reſt of the verſe; thereby to let the *Engliſh* reader know, that there is nothing in the *Greek* to anſwer to theſe words. The truth is, they did wrong to inſert them at all. Inſtead of reading, *if* any man *draw back*, they ſhould have read, *if he draw back.* The plain meaning of the apoſtle is that which is expreſs'd in the paraphraſe.

The doctrine of *perſeverance*, which ſome have labour'd to reconcile with, and others to overthrow by, this text, is not of ſuch importance as both ſides ſeem to have imagin'd. Perſeverance in a *juſtified* ſtate muſt, I apprehend, by the confeſſion of all Chriſtians, neceſſarily ſuppoſe perſeverance in *faith* and *holineſs*. So that a man cannot know, that he perſeveres in a *juſtified* ſtate one moment longer than he is conſcious that he perſeveres in *faith* and *holineſs:* and if he is turn'd aſide from the exerciſe of faith, and from the practice of holineſs, he can have no foundation to hope that he is in a ſtate of *favour* with GOD, and ſo can derive *no comfort* from the doctrine of perſeverance, becauſe he has *ceas'd* to perſevere.

This part of the paſſage differs much from the text of the prophet as it now lies in the *Jewiſh* copies of the Old Teſtament, where the words are, according to our tranſlation, *Behold, his ſoul*, which *is lifted up, is not upright in him*, *Habak.* ii. 4. But the apoſtle's own authority, without any other conſideration, is ſufficient proof to me, that the reading, which he hath choſen, was the true, original reading in the prophet. However, it is proper to obſerve, that the *Greek* and *Arabic* verſions of the prophet read this text as the apoſtle does: which concurring teſtimonies ſhew, that the primitive reading of the *Hebrew* was this ישרה נפשי בו הן העלפה לא, as was long ſince obſerved by the learned *Cappel* in his *Critica Sacra*, p. 537. to whom I refer the learned reader. If any one had rather reconcile the words of the apoſtle, and the text of the prophet, in the manner propoſed by the learned biſhop *Pearſon* in his preface to the *Septuagint*, I ſhall not much contend. The apoſtle ſets the two laſt mention'd clauſes in a different order from that obſerved in the *Hebrew*, and in all the ancient verſions of *Habakkuk* in the Polyglot, where they ſtand thus: *If he draw back, my ſoul ſhall have no pleaſure in him: but the juſt by faith ſhall live.* Perhaps the original order in theſe clauſes was that in which the apoſtle has put them; if not, ſtill the apoſtle can be eaſily defended in inverting it: ſince it

makes

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
39 sure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.	no pleasure in him: but I shall rather hate him, and cast him off. But we true Christians, and, I hope, you in particular, are not of the number of those who revolt from Christianity, and thereby make GOD their enemy, and run into perdition; but are of the number of them who continue on to believe: which perseverance in the faith will avail to the salvation of our souls. 39

NOTES.

makes no manner of alteration in the *sense* of the place; and he only borrows and uses the *language* of the prophet, without *directly* quoting him.

SECT. XV.

CHAP. XI. 1.---XII. 3.

CONTENTS.

AS the apostle had particularly observed in the words immediately foregoing, that perseverance in the *faith* avails *to the salvation of the soul*: he now proceeds in this section to *prove* this point by various instances of good men, who, upon the account of their faith, had received a testimony from GOD, that they were accepted of him, and made heirs of eternal salvation. This catalogue of believers he closes with the instance of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, whose perfect faith was rewarded with a seat at the right hand of the throne of GOD. Concerning many of the believers mention'd in this catalogue the apostle takes particular notice that they were severely *persecuted* for righteousness sake, and yet that they persevered in their faith and patience to the end, and so became heirs of eternal life. By these noble examples he endeavour'd to encourage and excite the *Hebrew* Christians to retain their faith and patience under their sufferings, in

Chap. XI. expectation of the promised reward. And it is reasonable farther to suppose, that he speaks here of GOD's accepting, and rewarding men upon the account of their *faith*, with a view to persuade the *Hebrews*, that the *Gentiles* might be accepted upon the account of *their faith*, without submitting to the law of *Moses*.

PARAPHRASE.

1. As I have just now observed, that faith avails to the salvation of the soul, and intend in the next place largely to prove it, it cannot but be proper here to acquaint you what that faith is of which I speak (*l*). It is such a firm persuasion as gives, as it were, a substance or present existence to the good things which we hope for, and which are not yet in being (*m*), and as engages us to depend upon the truth of unseen things, as really, as upon ocular demonstration (*n*). That

TEXT.

Now faith is the sub- 1
stance of things hoped for;
the evidence of things not

NOTES.

(*l*) I have already hinted, both in the contents and in the paraphrase, that the apostle labours, thro' this whole chapter, to *establish* what he had asserted in the last sentence of the preceding, *viz. That we are of them who believe to the saving of the soul*, or, *That faith avails to the salvation of the soul.* Before he begins his proof, he takes care to *explain* what he means by *faith*, that so he might guard against mens making an ill use of this doctrine; and that they might not depend upon an idle and ineffective Notion in the head, as sufficient to procure salvation, while holiness of heart and life is wanting.

(*m*) Ἐστι δὲ πιστις ἐλπιζομενων ὑποστασις, *now faith is the substance of things hoped for.* The interpretation given of these words in the paraphrase is confirm'd by the *Syriac* version, which runs thus, *Now faith is a persuasion concerning those things which are in hope, as if they did actually exist. Chrysostom* has given the same sense in his comment on the place, who says, *Things that are only hoped for, seem to have no* ὑποστασις, *subsistence, or being: but faith gives them a subsistence, or being.* A good thing yet *future*, and as yet only the object of *hope*, has no existence *in nature*, but has however an existence in our *faith*; we as truly depend upon it, as if it was already in being. For instance, the future Resurrection of the dead is, at present, only matter of *hope*; but faith gives it as it were a *present existence: i. e.* in plain *English*, laying aside the figure, he who firmly believes in the divine promises, does *as really* believe that the dead shall be raised, as he would do if he now actually saw them rising before his eyes. According to this interpretation, the word ὑποστασις is taken in its most *natural* and *usual* sense, as signifying *existence*, or *being.*

(*n*) Ἔλεγχος ὠ βλεπομενων, *the evidence of things not seen.* This expression, *things not seen*, comprehends more than the other, *things hoped for. These* can be only *future* and *desirable* things; whereas *those* are all things whereof we have no *personal knowledge*, whether past, present, or to come, whether good or evil. The *deluge*, which *Noah* expected and prepared for, was once a thing *not seen*; yet could *not* be said to be a thing *hoped for.* Of unseen things (such as the creation, the resurrection of Christ, the future torments of hell, &c.) the apostle says, *Faith is the evidence.* The original word properly signifies a

Demon-

TEXT. PARAPHRASE Chap. XI.

: seen. For by it the elders obtained a good report.

That this faith will avail to the ſalvation of the ſoul is evident, becauſe the Scripture has teſtified, that on the account of this faith, the ancient ſaints were acceptable to GOD (*o*). 2.

It

NOTES.

demonſtration, i. e. ſuch a kind of reaſon and argument as both *convinces* the underſtanding, and *engages* a man to *act* according to that conviction. So that the apoſtle's meaning is, when a truth is not actually diſcover'd, nor even diſcoverable, either by our ſenſes, or by our natural reaſon; when we cannot, in the proper ſenſe of the word, *demonſtrate* it: yet if it be reveal'd to us by God, we as certainly depend upon it, as if it were in its own nature capable of demonſtration, and we had actually demonſtrated it. Faith is inſtead of a demonſtration, and anſwers all the purpoſes of it. By this deſcription the apoſtle ſhews what that faith is which he ſaid, *ch.* x. 39. will avail to the *ſalvation of the ſoul*. It is not ſuch a wavering and uncertain notion as wicked men may have, which does not lead them to act conformably to what they profeſs to believe; but it is ſuch a *real* and *firm* perſuaſion of the truth of divine revelations as puts a man in the *ſame temper* and diſpoſition of mind as demonſtration, or eye-ſight, would do. If a man did with his own eyes ſee the bleſſedneſs of the heavenly *Jeruſalem*, and the torments of hell, or perceived theſe things to be actually *demonſtrated* in the *mathematical* ſenſe of the word, he would undoubtedly uſe his beſt endeavours to avoid the one, and to obtain the other. The faith, of which the apoſtle ſpeaks, anſwers the ſame end, and engages him to uſe the ſame endeavours. If a man who is much afraid of death, and very fond of life, ſhould tell me, that he *really believes* the ſhip in which he is venturing to ſea will ſink in the wide ocean, and that all the people in it will periſh, and yet will venture in it, I ſhould deſire to be excuſed from *believing him*; being aſſured, that if he really believed he ſhould be drowned, he would not venture. If a man did *firmly believe*, that he ſhould get *ſafe* to the end of his voyage, he would enter upon it, and go through it, *without any* concern. If he did neither believe the one nor the other, but was in a middle ſtate between the two; if he had *fears* leſt he ſhould be caſt away, and *hopes* that he ſhould be preſerved, he would venture with *ſome* reluctance. This reluctance would be always greater or leſs, in proportion to his fears; and would be *unconquerable*, if his fears were riſen to a *certain belief* that he ſhould periſh in the voyage. So that if the man does venture with very *little* or *no* reluctance, it is a demonſtration, that, whatever he pretends, he does not at all *really believe* that he ſhall be drowned in the voyage. In like manner, a man does not really believe the Goſpel, and the promiſes and threatnings of it, while he will not be prevailed on to *deny all ungodlineſs and worldly luſts*, in order to eſcape the damnation of hell; or to *live ſoberly, righteouſly, and godly*, that he may ſecure to himſelf that eternal life which he pretends to believe will be the reward of virtue. *Real* faith will *effectually prevail* on men to do theſe things; and where men are not prevailed on to do them, it is a demonſtration that they do not, *for that time*, really believe the Goſpel.

(*o*) *For by it the elders obtained a good report.* It has been thought by moſt, if not by all, commentators, that what the apoſtle here ſaith, was deſigned as a confirmation of the account which he gave of faith in the *foregoing* verſe. But it ſeems abundantly more reaſonable to think, that he deſigned here to prove what he had laid down, *ch.* x. 39. *viz. that faith avails to the ſalvation of the ſoul*; which is certainly proved by this conſideration, *viz.* that GOD in the Scriptures has given his teſtimony, that the antient ſaints were *pleaſing to* him, and *accepted by* him, upon the account of their *faith*. For all ſuch as he is thus *pleas'd* with, and *accepts*, ſhall, according to the terms of his gracious covenant, obtain the *ſalvation of their ſouls*.

Chap. XI.

PARAPHRASE.

3. It is not by eye-ſight, or by demonſtration, but by faith in a divine hiſtory, that we come to know, that the worlds were made by the mere word of GOD's order, or command (*p*): and we are taught to believe they were

TEXT.

Through faith we underſtand, that the worlds were framed by the word of GOD, ſo that things, which

NOTES.

In conſequence of what has been now ſaid about the connexion, it is eaſy to obſerve, that the chapters are not rightly divided in this place; to which wrong diviſion, I ſuppoſe, it has been owing, that commentators have overlooked the true connexion. Nor ſhould I have choſen to have begun a new *ſection* at the firſt verſe of the xith *chap.* if I could have uſed my own liberty: But as Mr. *Pierce* deſigned to end his *fourteenth* ſection with the laſt *verſe* of *chap.* x. and I intended theſe notes as a *ſupplement* to his unfiniſh'd notes on the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, I was obliged to begin a new ſection at the beginning of this chapter, where his xivth was deſign'd to have broken off.

The *elders* mentioned in this verſe are the antient ſaints, who lived under, or before the *Jewiſh* diſpenſation; as appears from the perſons mentioned afterward in the chapter, *viz. Abel*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, *Moſes*, *David*, *Samuel*, *&c.* Theſe are called πρεσβύτεροι, *elders*, becauſe they lived a great while before the days of the writer of this epiſtle. The *Greek* word is uſed in the ſame ſenſe, *Matth.* xv. 2. *Mark* vii. 3, 5. where the traditions of the *elders* were traditions received from the *antients* who died before our Saviour's time.

Their having obtained a *good report* does not ſignify, that the generality of *men* gave them a good character; for ſome of them were not ſpoken well of by *men*. *Noah*, no doubt, was derided by all the world for making proviſion againſt an univerſal deluge, which they did not expect, as they did not believe the revelation he had received from GOD. See *Matth.* xxiv. 38, 39. 1 Pet. iii. 20. And if theſe antient ſaints *had* obtained a good character among the generality of men upon the account of their faith, this would have been no proof, that faith conduces to the ſalvation of the ſoul.

The *good report* here mentioned is the *good character* given of them in the holy *Scriptures*, which *bear witneſs*, as the *Greek* word ſignifies, that they were *believers*, and that upon the account of their *faith* they were *accepted* of GOD. This is evident from the uſe of the ſame word μαρτυρεω in other places of the chapter, which are parallel to this; thus particularly, *v.* 4. *It was teſtified* (*viz.* in the Scripture) *that he was righteous*, GOD *teſtifying of his gifts*, v. 5. *It was teſtified* (*viz.* in the Scripture) *that he pleaſed* GOD. *v.* 39. *All theſe obtained a good teſtimony* (from GOD in the Scriptures) *upon the account of their faith.* The word is uſed in much the ſame ſenſe, Chap. vii. 8, 17.

(*p*) *Through faith we underſtand, that the worlds were framed by the word of* GOD. There can be no room to doubt, but that the *worlds*, αιωνες, here mention'd are the *material* worlds, the heavens, and the earth: ſince the apoſtle afterward in this ſame verſe calls them, *The things that are ſeen:* by which expreſſion he undoubtedly means the ſun, moon, ſtars, earth, men, and other *viſible* works of GOD. When the apoſtle ſays, that theſe things were *framed by the word of* GOD, he ſeems to refer to the account *Moſes* has given of the creation, *viz.* That the worlds, both lower and upper, the earth and heaven were made by GOD's *ſpeaking the word* of command, *Let there be light, and there was light; let there be a firmament; let the waters be gather'd into one place; let the earth bring forth graſs; and it was ſo*, &c. To this account of the creation, no doubt, the Pſalmiſt refers, *Pſal.* xxxiii. 9. *He ſpake, and it was done: he commanded, and it ſtood faſt.* And, *v.* 6. *By the* word *of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hoſt of them by the* breath *of his mouth:* where, by the way, it is plain, the *word* of the Lord is not the divine *Logos*, our Lord Jeſus

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

are ſeen, were not made of things which do appear.

were made by his word, to the end that the things, which are ſeen, might not ſeem to have been made of things that do appear (q).

By

NOTES.

Jeſus Chriſt, but GOD's *word of command*, which order'd the creatures into being; the ſame which, in the latter clauſe, is call'd the *breath* of his mouth, by means of which words are form'd and utter'd. Agreeably to this St. *Paul* ſays, GOD commanded *the light to ſhine out of darkneſs*, 2 *Cor.* iv. 6. The meaning of the apoſtle, in the text now under conſideration, ſeems to be the ſame. Nor does he here ſpeak of the Divine *Logos*. Nay he does not ſo much as uſe the word *Logos*, and thereby render the ſenſe doubtful; but he uſes the word, ῥημα, which never ſignifies the *perſon* of our Redeemer.

That the *worlds* were thus made by the *word*, or *command*, of God, is one of the *unſeen things* mention'd *v.* 1. which can be known only by revelation, and which *we underſtand* or learn *by* means of *faith* therein. Natural reaſon indeed teaches us, that the world was made by a perſon, who had wiſdom and power ſufficient to make ſuch a world as this is. If this perſon had not only this particular degree of wiſdom and power ſufficient to make a *finite* world, but alſo wiſdom and power abſolutely infinite, we have at once diſcover'd the *firſt* cauſe, or the moſt High GOD. But if the perſon, who *immediately* made the world, was not the firſt cauſe, but was derived from another, then from that degree of wiſdom and power, which was ſufficient to make this *finite* world, we aſcend, by an eaſy ſtep, to a degree of wiſdom and power ſufficient to produce a perſon capable of making the world. And thus, at length, we muſt come to the *higheſt poſſible* degree of wiſdom and power, and to a *firſt* cauſe: ſince an infinite ſeries of *derived*, *dependent* beings, is a contradiction. But reaſon alone could not diſcover the *particulars* of the creation, *viz.* That GOD ſpake the *word*, and gave the *command*, and that hereupon the creatures came into being.

(q) Εις το μη εκ φαινομενων τα βλεπομενα γεγονεναι, *ſo that things which are ſeen, were not made of things which do appear.* This is certainly a wrong rendering of the *Greek*, and a miſrepreſentation of the connexion of the apoſtle's diſcourſe. Εις το can never ſignify *ſo that*; but muſt be render'd, *that ſo*, *to the end that*, or the like. If any one needs to ſee this proved, he may turn to other places where this phraſe is uſed; particularly to *Epheſ.* i. 12. and 1 *Cor.* x. 6. where the apoſtle's words ——εις το μη ειναι——cannot poſſibly ſignify any thing but what our tranſlators have rightly repreſented to be their meaning, *viz. Theſe things were our examples*, to the intent *we ſhould not luſt after evil things.* Anſwerably the paſſage now under conſideration muſt be render'd, *By faith we underſtand, that the worlds were framed by the word of GOD*, to the end *that the things which are ſeen, may not have been of things that do appear.*

It muſt be farther obſerved, that the words, *may not have been*, ſignify the ſame as *may not ſeem to have been.* Thus when the apoſtle ſays, 2 *Cor.* iv. 7. *We have this treaſure in earthen veſſels, that the excellency of the power* may be *of GOD*; he means, that it might *appear* to be of GOD.

In the place now under conſideration, the apoſtle ſays, that the *end aimed at* was, that *the things which are ſeen may not* ſeem, or be thought *to have been, from things that do appear.* That which was done in order to accompliſh this end or purpoſe, was GOD's acquainting us in his revelation, that he made the creatures by his *word.* If he had not made them by his mere word of *command*, it might have been thought, they were made out of ſome pre-exiſtent matter; but to prevent any ſuſpicion of this, he aſſures us he made them by his mere word of command. From this paſſage of the apoſtle then it appears, there was no ſuch thing as eternal and ſelf-exiſtent matter. Since the time of

the

Chap XI.

PARAPHRASE.

4. By means of his faith in GOD, and in his revelations, *Abel* offer'd up to GOD a sacrifice (r) of

TEXT.

By faith Abel offer'd unto 4 GOD a more excellent sa-

NOTES.

the creation, many of the things that are seen are made out of the things that do appear, as all the works of men, houses, ships, &c. which they *cannot*, and GOD *does* not, make by a mere word or command. In like manner, plants seem to be made out of plants, men out of men, and all animals out of parent-animals. But at first it was not so. The first matter out of which all material things are formed, was created by the mere word or command of GOD, which spoke it into being. Whether GOD spake this creating word immediately with his own voice, or else by his son, makes no difference in this case: Still it is true, as the apostle here says, that the Scripture has taken notice, that GOD made the creatures at first by his word, *for this end*, that it might be infer'd from thence, they were originally made out of nothing, and not formed out of any self-existing matter.

The apostle, before he would begin his catalogue of *believers*, chose to mention this as an instance of *faith* in things *unseen*, because the Bible *begins* with mentioning this event. It well illustrates his account of *faith* laid down in the first verse of the chapter, where he describes it to be, *the evidence*, or proof, *of things not seen*. It illustrates likewise what he advanced in the second verse, *viz.* that GOD has in the Scriptures given a good character of the antient saints upon the account of their *faith*: For when he says, *By faith* we *understand*, it is natural to think he means, *all we believers* from the beginning of the world, particularly those that are afterward named in this chapter. For belief of *this* truth was one part of that faith which render'd them acceptable to GOD, and procur'd them an interest in his favour. What the apostle says in this verse is the more pertinent to his purpose, because it very agreeably introduces what he next says concerning *Abel* and his faith; the almost only article of which (over and above what *natural* religion taught him) was, that GOD made the world *by his word*. And when he was about to mention *Abel's faith*, it was very proper first to take notice of some article of faith or other, which could not, in the proper sense of the word, be *demonstrated*, but could only be known by divine *revelation*.

(r) Abel *offer'd unto GOD a — sacrifice*. The sacrifices of *Cain* and *Abel* were the first that we have any account of. Upon the occasion of the apostle's mentioning them, it will be proper to say something about the *original* of sacrifices. And there is no need to say much, since it is easy to be *demonstrated*, that sacrifices owed their original to the *will* and *appointment of GOD*. The apostle expressly says, as *Moses* said before him, that *Abel's* sacrifice was *acceptable to GOD*. But it would not have been acceptable, if it had not been of *divine* institution, according to that plain, obvious, and eternal maxim of all *true* religion, Christian, *Mosaic*, and natural, *In vain do they worship* GOD, *teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*, Mark vii. 7. If there be any truth in this maxim, *Abel* would have worship'd GOD *in vain*, and GOD would have had *no* respect to his offering, if his sacrificing had been merely a commandment of his father *Adam*, or an invention of his own. The divine *acceptance* therefore is a *demonstration* of a divine *institution*. If any reader is not yet convinced, I would desire him to say why he himself does not now offer up a bullock, a sheep, or a pidgeon, according to his ability, as a *thank-offering* to GOD, and a testimony of his *gratitude* to the divine goodness, after a recovery from a dangerous disease, after a remarkable deliverance in any other kind, or as an evidence of the just apprehensions he has of the demerit of sin. The true reason, why he will not do it himself, is, because he cannot know that GOD will accept such *will-worship*, and so concludes, that he should herein worship GOD *in vain*. From hence he may certainly infer, that since *Abel* did *not* sacrifice in *vain*, it was *not will-worship*, but a *divine* appointment.

It

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

crifice than Cain, by which he obtained witneſs that he was righteous, God teſtifying of his gifts: and by it

of the beſt and fatteſt of his flock, which was more excellent than what *Cain* offer'd (*s*): Upon the account of which faith, the Scripture teſtifies that he was a righteous perſons; ſince it declares that God teſtify'd his regard to, and acceptance of, the gifts which he offer'd in ſacrifice to God (*t*): and by the ſame

NOTES.

It may be added, ſince men had no right granted them to eat fleſh before the flood, *Abel* could not (unleſs ſacrificing was a divine inſtitution) ſee any right he had to kill an animal for ſacrifice: While he could not ſee his right, he muſt think it to be unlawful, and conſequently would not practiſe it in the worſhip of God. So that ſince he did not practiſe it, it is plain he knew there was a divine inſtitution of ſacrifices; and if we think we ſhould worſhip God in vain, if we ſacrificed without a divine command, we have reaſon to ſuppoſe that *Abel* would have concluded he ſhould have worſhipped God in vain, in caſe he had acted without a divine warrant. It is not to be wonder'd at, that the divine inſtitution of ſacrifices is (when other equally material things are) paſſed over, for brevity's ſake, in the very conciſe hiſtory of what paſſed before the flood.

(*s*) *A more excellent ſacrifice.* It has been much diſputed among commentators, in what ſenſe *Abel*'s ſacrifice is here ſaid to have been *more excellent* than *Cain*'s. But there ſeems to be no *real* difficulty in the caſe. It is evident the difference did *not* lie in the more general nature of the things which each offer'd to God. As *Abel was a keeper of ſheep, and Cain a tiller of the ground*, Gen. iv. 2. it was naturally to be expected, that each ſhould bring an offering of the things which *he had*; that *Abel* ſhould bring *ſheep*, and *Cain* only the *fruits* of the earth. If *Cain* had brought of the *beſt* fruits *he had*, his offering would have been *in itſelf* as acceptable as *Abel*'s, which conſiſted of the *beſt he had*. That *Cain* did not bring of his *beſt* ſeems to be hinted in *Geneſis*, where the Holy Ghoſt takes notice, that *Cain* brought of the *fruit* of the ground, without ſaying either, *the firſt fruits*, or, *the beſt fruits*; but that *Abel* brought of the *firſtlings* of his flock, and of the *fat* thereof, v. 3, 4. In this preciſely conſiſted the excellence of *Abel*'s ſacrifice above *Cain*'s, that it was of the *beſt* he had, while *Cain* ſeems to have made no choice, but to have taken any of the fruits, that came to hand, whether good or bad. The *cauſe* indeed of *Abel*'s taking a more excellent ſacrifice was his faith. If he had not had a ſincere faith, he would have thought of putting off God with any thing, as *Cain* ſeems to have done. But his believing in God as the greateſt and beſt of beings, as the ſupreme benefactor, and conſequently worthy of the beſt returns of gratitude, engaged him to offer in ſacrifice to God the *beſt* of thoſe things which the divine providence had beſtow'd upon him. *Abel*'s *faith* is not to be look'd upon as an *ingredient* in, or a *part* of, his ſacrifice, which render'd it more valuable *in itſelf* than the ſacrifice of *Cain*. For *Abel*'s was *in itſelf* more excellent than *Cain*'s (abſtracting from the conſideration of *Abel*'s faith) becauſe it was of the *beſt* and *fatteſt* of his flock. Faith, as I ſaid, was not a *part* of *Abel*'s ſacrifice, but was that which *put him upon* chooſing the beſt, and engaged him to offer up to God a ſacrifice in itſelf more excellent than *Cain*'s. In this way the diſpute among commentators is eaſily ended.

(*t*) *He obtain'd witneſs, that he was righteous*, God *teſtifying of his gift*: (i. e.) he obtain'd witneſs from God, or, it is teſtified in the Scripture, that he was righteous. But, it may be ask'd, where is this teſtimony to be found in the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament? The apoſtle's anſwer is, the Scripture tells us, that God *teſtified* his acceptance of *Abel*'s

giſts.

Chap. XI.

PARAPHRASE.

ſame faith he ſtill ſpeaks to, admoniſhes, and exhorts mankind, tho' he is dead (*u*).
5 *Enoch*, upon the account of his faith, was tranſlated from earth to heaven without dying, and was not found any more on earth,

TEXT.

he being dead, yet ſpeaketh. By faith Enoch was 5
tranſlated, that he ſhould not ſee death; and was not

NOTES.

gifts, or offerings. This *acceptance* of his gifts was a proof, that he was in *favour* with God. But he could not have been in favour with God, if he had not been righteous. Conſequently, when the Scripture tells us, that God *teſtified* of Abel's *gifts*, it bears witneſs, that he was *righteous*. When it is ſaid, that God *teſtified of his gifts*, the meaning is, that God declared, by ſome *ſenſible ſign* or token, that he *accepted Abel*'s gifts, and ſacrifices, and was *pleas'd with him* who offer'd them. Both theſe things are mention'd in the text in *Geneſis*, to which the apoſtle has a regard in this place, *Gen.* iv. 4.——*The Lord had reſpect to Abel, and to his offering*. By what means God manifeſted this reſpect, or teſtified his acceptance, it is in vain to conjecture, ſince the Scripture is wholly ſilent about it. Perhaps it might be by cauſing *fire* to deſcend from heaven, and conſume the ſacrifice; perhaps by a *voice* from heaven; perhaps by ſending an angel; or perhaps by another method that we do not think of.

(*u*) *And by it, he being dead yet ſpeaketh.* In this expreſſion the apoſtle undoubtedly refers to thoſe words of God to *Cain*, *Gen.* iv. 10, 11. *What haſt thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground. And now art thou curſed from the earth, which hath open'd her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand.* As *Abel then* ſpoke to God, crying for vengeance againſt his brother who murder'd him; ſo he *ſtill ſpeaks* to all thoſe who have an opportunity of reading or hearing the hiſtory of *Cain* and *Abel* in the book of *Geneſis*; particularly to all ſuch as *murder* others, eſpecially to thoſe who *perſecute* good men to death for righteouſneſs ſake. To all theſe *Abel* continually ſpeaks, to warn them againſt being guilty of perſecution or murder. As his blood cried to God for vengeance againſt the murderer and perſecutor, ſo it warns others in all ages, that the innocent and righteous blood of God's ſervants will cry to him for vengeance againſt them that ſhed it. *Abel* ſpeaks theſe things to mankind *by means of the hiſtory* recorded in *Geneſis* of the cry of his blood againſt *Cain*, and of the vengeance of God which fell upon the perſecutor. And he is ſaid to ſpeak this *by faith*, becauſe his faith conſtituted him a *righteous* man, and ſo proved that *Cain* was a *murderer* and *perſecutor*, expoſed to the divine vengeance. For if *Abel* had not been a believer, and a righteous man, but had for any miſdeeds deſerved death, and *Cain* had had a right to puniſh him with it, his blood would not have cried for vengeance; nor could *Abel*, in that caſe, have ſpoken ſuch admonitions to murderers and perſecutors as he now does. That *Cain* was really a *perſecutor*, as I have here ſuppoſed, is evident from what another apoſtle ſays of him, 1 *John* iii. 11, 12.——*We ſhould love one another; not as* Cain, *who was of the wicked one* [the devil] *and ſlew his brother: And wherefore ſlew he him? Becauſe his own works were evil, but his brother's righteous.* This is the exact and *diſtinguiſhing* character of *perſecutors*. The *real* and *only* reaſon why they perſecute their brethren, is, becauſe their brethren will not act againſt their conſciences, that is, *becauſe* they are *righteous*: while the *works* of the perſecutors are *evil* with a witneſs, and they are evidently the children of the devil, inaſmuch as all perſecution, or puniſhing men in the leaſt degree for worſhipping God according to their conſciences, is a direct and impudent oppoſition to godlineſs, virtue, ſincerity, and every thing that is good.

TEXT.

found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased
6 God. But without faith *it is* impossible to please *him*: for he that cometh to God, must believe that he is, and *that* he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek
him. By faith Noah being

PARAPHRASE.

earth (*v*), because God had miraculously removed him to heaven: It was, I say, upon the account of his *faith*; for the Scripture testifies of him, that before his translation to heaven he pleased God (*w*). But without 6.
faith in God, and in his revelations, it is impossible to please him, and be accepted by him (*x*): for he that comes to God with hopes of acceptance, must believe the existence of God, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him (*y*). By means 7.
of

NOTES.

(*v*) *By faith* Enoch *was translated, that he should not see death, and was not found.* In this passage the apostle refers to *Gen.* v. 24. where we read, that *Enoch was not: for GOD took him.* The Seventy and apostle say, *GOD* translated *him*, μετεθηκε. The *Hebrew* word לקח used by *Moses* properly signifies that God *took him away* from the place where he was. The old *Greek* translators and the apostle have therefore very well expressed the sense of the original, by saying, that God *translated* him, meaning to heaven, and to the enjoyment of himself. For it is clear from what *Moses* says about *Enoch*, that this was *his* meaning also. He says, that *Enoch walked with GOD*, or *pleased GOD* [*see the next note.*] and his pleasing God is a full proof that God did not take him away from thence to *punish* him, either with positive torments, or with annihilation. In this manner the apostle makes out his interpretation of the words of *Moses:* From *Enoch*'s *pleasing* God, he justly infers, that God had *translated* him to *heaven*, and *taken* him to *himself.*

(*w*) *For before his translation, he had this testimony, that he pleased GOD.* The apostle here refers to *Gen.* v. 22, 24. where our *English* translation has it, Enoch *walked with GOD*; but the *Greek* and *Syriac* versions render the *Hebrew* expression as the apostle does, Enoch *pleased GOD.* The same *Hebrew* expression occurs again, *Gen.* vi. 9. where the *Greek*, *Syriac* and *Arabic* versions render it, Noah *pleased GOD.* And no doubt this is the true meaning of *Moses* his expression. It must be added, that the words, *before his translation*, do not assign the *time* when this *testimony* was given him; but the time *when he pleased* God. He *pleased* God *before* his translation, and *afterward* this testimony was given of him by *Moses* in his history.

(*x*) *But without faith it is impossible to please him.* This verse is added by the apostle to make out his reasoning in that which precedes. He had there said, that God translated *Enoch*, without dying, *on the account of his faith.* The proof alledged in that verse was only this, that *Moses* says, *he pleased GOD:* Still it remained to be proved, that his pleasing God was an evidence that he had *faith* To prove this, the apostle here adds, *Without faith it is impossible to please him.* The argument now is full and convincing, and stands thus: The Scripture says, that *Enoch pleased* God, and that on this account God translated him. But this his pleasing God is a demonstration of his *faith*, since without faith he could not have pleased him; consequently he was translated upon the account of his faith.

(*y*) *For he that cometh to GOD, must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.* The apostle observes this to prove what he last said, that *without faith it is impossible to please him.* And it is very obvious that the proof is good.

PARAPHRASE.

of faith in divine revelations, *Noah* (being warn'd by GOD of things at that time unſeen, *viz.* the deluge, and the deſtruction of mankind thereby; and being excited by the fears of his own being deſtroy'd (z) with the reſt) prepared a kind of ſhip, in which

TEXT.

warned of GOD of things not ſeen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to

NOTES.

This is by ſome called, *The heathens creed.* But if they mean, as I ſuppoſe they do, that the heathens, in the preſent ſtate of *apoſtaſy*, can diſcover *both* theſe articles by the mere light of nature, without the help of a ſupernatural revelation, they carry the matter much farther than the apoſtle does. The former of theſe articles indeed, *that GOD is*, can undoubtedly be diſcover'd by the light of nature; as the apoſtle obſerves, *Rom.* i. 19, 20. But the knowledge of GOD's being a *rewarder* to thoſe *apoſtate* creatures who diligently ſeek to be reconciled to him, is to be diſcover'd merely by a poſitive and ſupernatural revelation. Accordingly the apoſtle, in the context, does not give the leaſt hint as if he thought this particular truth could be diſcover'd by mere unaſſiſted reaſon; but all along ſpeaks of the belief of it as founded on a divine *promiſe revealed* to mankind. He tells the Chriſtians, to whom he writes, *chap.* x. 34 that they *knew* they had an enduring ſubſtance in heaven. This their knowledge, or faith, was owing to a divine *promiſe*, *ver.* 36. *Ye have need of patience, that——ye might inherit the* promiſe. The faith then of which the apoſtle afterward ſpeaks, *v.* 39. and *chap.* xi. muſt be a faith built upon a *promiſe* of GOD. And thus in fact the faith of a future ſtate, which *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob* entertained, was built (not, that we can find, upon any arguments ſuggeſted by the light of nature, but) upon an expreſs promiſe of GOD, *ver.* 9, 10. they *were heirs together of the ſame* promiſe. The ſame thing is hinted again, *v.* 13. *Theſe all died in faith, not having received the* promiſes, *i.e.* not having received the bleſſings that were promiſed. It is added, *ver.* 39. they believed, but did not *receive* the promiſe. As the apoſtle thus confines his diſcourſe to thoſe good men who had a divine *promiſe* of a future ſtate of rewards *revealed* to them, his meaning in this ſixth verſe muſt neceſſarily be, *He that cometh to GOD, muſt believe that GOD is*, and muſt farther believe the *promiſes* which he has *revealed* to mankind of his being, in a future ſtate, *a rewarder of them that*, in this life, *diligently ſeek him.* If the reader deſires to ſee more on this ſubject of the impoſſibility of proving a future ſtate by the light of nature, he may pleaſe to read what I have wrote in the xiith *diſcourſe* of *vol.* i and in my anſwer to Mr. *Greve.*

Coming to GOD, and *ſeeking him*, unqueſtionably ſignify mens coming to him in a way of *worſhip*, and ſeeking an intereſt in his *favour*, and a title to the reward of eternal life, with a rational and well-grounded hope of obtaining it. Their ſeeking him *diligently* plainly implies, that if they would hope to find favour with him, they muſt ſeek it ſincerely, conſtantly, and without growing weary.

It may be finally obſerved, that what the apoſtle here ſays, illuſtrates the account he gave of faith, *v.* 1. The believing that GOD is, is a faith of ſomething *unſeen* and *inviſible*, *Rom.* i. 20. and the believing that he will, in *another* world, be the *rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him*, is a faith of ſomething *hoped for*, that is yet at a diſtance.

(z) *By faith* Noah——*moved with fear.* This inſtance is fully to the apoſtle's purpoſe, becauſe it is evident from what *Noah* actually *did*, that he had a *real faith* in the being and *revelations* of GOD. His faith in GOD's threatning of a univerſal deluge, moved his *fears* ſo ſtrongly, as that they actually influenced him to prepare a method for the ſaving himſelf from the deſtruction that was coming upon mankind. His faith was truly the evidence, or demonſtration of unſeen things.

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

the ſaving of his houſe: which he might ſave himſelf and family (*a*): and

NOTES.

(*a*) *Prepared an ark.* *Noah*'s ark was a kind of ſhip fitted to float upon the waters. It ſeems to have had a *flat* bottom, and no helm; but was conducted by the ſame extraordinary providence which ſent the deluge, and perhaps by the miniſtry of angels.

It has been thought by ſome, that the ark, according as *Moſes* has deſcribed the dimenſions of it, was *too little* to contain all the creatures which he ſays enter'd into it, together with food ſufficient to maintain them during their continuance there. But thoſe that have advanced this objection againſt *Moſes* his account, have deceived themſelves with a falſe imagination, that there is a greater number of birds and beaſts in the world than there really is. Till men come to a ſcrutiny, and make an exact calculation, they are very apt to imagine that a number is vaſtly greater than it is. I have often asked people to gueſs how many men there have been in a direct line between the preſent king of *England* and *Adam*, meaning only one man in a generation, the king's father, grandfather, great-grandfather, &c. The anſwer made upon a ſudden conjecture, has always been, *ſome thouſands*; whereas it is evident from a calculation, there have not been two hundred. For the ſpace of time between *Adam* and Chriſt let us take the genealogy of our Saviour preſerved in St. *Luke*'s Goſpel, in which the names between *Adam* and Chriſt, excluſive of both, are but ſeventy four. From the birth of Chriſt to the birth of the king, were ſixteen hundred and eighty three Years. Let it be ſuppoſed, that, in the liſt of the king's progenitors, every ſon was born when his father was twenty five years old, which is as early as can be ſuppos'd, one with another. According to this ſuppoſition, there were four generations in every hundred years: *i.e.* in thoſe ſixteen hundred and eighty three years there were ſixty ſeven generations; which ſixty ſeven, added to the foregoing ſeventy four, will make no more than a hundred and forty one. And there is a ſufficient reaſon to ſuppoſe, that king *George*'s progenitors, that lived between the times of *Adam* and of Chriſt, were about the ſame number of men as the progenitors of Chriſt. This ſhews how eaſy and natural it is for men to fanſy that a number of things is greater than it really is, when they only gueſs at the number, and do not make a calculation. That the ſame inconſiderate way of gueſſing has been the only occaſion of mens imagining that *Noah*'s ark was not large enough to contain all the animals that are ſaid to have enter'd into it, is evident from an excellent diſcourſe written by the very ingenious Bp. *Wilkins* on this ſubject, in his *Eſſay toward a real character, and a philoſophical language.* This diſcourſe is publiſhed at large alſo in *Poole*'s *Synopſis Criticorum*, on *Gen.* vi. 15. and a little abridged in the *Atlas Geographus* for *Aſia*, *p.* 238. It may therefore be needleſs to repeat the whole of the diſcourſe here. However, it will be proper to mention ſome of the moſt conſiderable paſſages of it, for the ſake of ſuch as have not ſeen the whole diſcourſe.

'He (ſays the Biſhop, *p.* 162.) that ſhould put the queſtion, How many ſorts of birds 'or beaſts, &c. are there in the world? would be anſwer'd, even by ſuch as are otherwiſe 'knowing and learned men, that there are ſo many hundreds of them as could not be 'enumerated; whereas upon a diſtinct inquiry into all ſuch as are yet known, and have 'been deſcribed by credible authors, it will appear that they are much fewer than is 'commonly imagin'd; not a hundred ſorts of beaſts, nor two hundred of birds.'

For all the beaſts the Biſhop finds room enough in their different ſtalls, or cabins, to ſtand, or lie, or turn themſelves as they pleaſed, as likewiſe to receive all the dung that ſhould proceed from them for a whole year. He finds room alſo for as many living ſheep as all the beaſts of prey could devour in a whole year, and for food to ſuſtain all the other animals. At the ſame time he does not ſuppoſe that the cubit by which the ark was meaſured, is any other than the common cubit, equal to a foot and half of our meaſure. The ark was divided into three ſtories. The lower ſtory, which contain'd 33,750 feet ſquare, was large enough for all the beaſts. The ſecond ſtory, which was equally

Chap XI.

PARAPHRASE.

and by this faith he condemned the unbelieving world about him (*b*), and became an heir of that righteouſneſs which is by faith (*c*).

TEXT.

by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteouſneſs

It

NOTES.

large, and fifteen feet high, was capacious enough for the food neceſſary for the beaſts a whole year. 'And then, as for the third ſtory, there can be no colour of doubt but 'that one half of it will be abundantly ſufficient for all the ſpecies of birds, tho' they 'ſhould be twice as many as before ſuppos'd, together with food ſufficient for their 'ſuſtenance, becauſe they are generally but of ſmall bulk, and may eaſily be kept in 'ſeveral partitions, or cages, one over another. Nor is there any reaſon to queſtion but 'that the other half would afford ſpace enough both for *Noah*'s family and utenſils.

'Upon the whole matter, it doth of the two appear more difficult to aſſign a ſufficient 'number and bulk of neceſſary things to anſwer the capacity of the ark, rather than to 'find ſufficient room for thoſe ſeveral ſpecies of animals already known.

'From what hath been ſaid, it may appear, that the meaſure and capacity of the ark, 'which ſome atheiſtical irreligious men make uſe of as an argument againſt the Scripture, 'ought rather to be eſteemed a moſt rational confirmation of the truth and divine autho-'rity of it. Eſpecially if it be well conſider'd, that in thoſe firſt and ruder ages of the 'world, when men were leſs verſed in arts and philoſophy, and therefore probably more 'obnoxious to vulgar prejudices than now they are, yet the capacity and proportions of 'the ark are ſo well adjuſted to the things it was to contain; whereas if it had been a mere 'human invention, 'tis moſt probable that it would have been contrived according to 'thoſe wild apprehenſions, which (as I ſaid before) do naturally ariſe from a more con-'fuſed and general view of things, as much too big, as now ſuch men are apt to think 'it too little for thoſe ends and purpoſes to which it was deſign'd.'

It may not be amiſs to add, that the ark was ſomewhat, tho' not a vaſt deal, bigger than the *Royal Sovereign* (ſuppoſing this ſhip to be made in the ſhape of the ark.) The length of the ark was four hundred and fifty foot, its breadth ſeventy five, and its height forty five. The length of the *Royal Sovereign* is two hundred and ten feet, the breadth fifty, and the draught of the water twenty two. If then the *Royal Sovereign* will carry eight hundred and fifty men, a hundred guns, and abundance of proviſion and goods beſides, we may eaſily allow that the ark ſhould carry eight people, a hundred ſorts of beaſts, two hundred ſorts of birds, and food for them all.

(*b*) *By the which he condemned the world.* *Noah* was in his day a *preacher of righteouſneſs*, while all the world about him were grown deſperately wicked. When he warn'd them of the univerſal deluge, they would not believe his prediction, or take any pains to guard againſt the approaching deſtruction: Therefore the flood came, and ſwept them all away. *Noah*'s *faith* then *condemned* the unbelievers, in the ſame ſenſe as every good man's virtues and exhortations condemn ſuch as will not attend to, and imitate him. The unbelievers were *condemned* by *Noah*, as he carefully avoided their practice, which he juſtly looked upon to be evil, and as their ſins were aggravated upon the account of his repeated admonitions. Some would refer the words *by which*, to the *ark*, and ſo make the apoſtle ſay, *by the ark* he condemned the world, even as by the ark he ſaved his houſe. But they have not conſider'd, that he became an heir of the righteouſneſs which is by faith, by the ſame thing by which he condemned the world. But it would ſound very odd to ſay, that he became an heir of righteouſneſs *by the ark*; it remains then, that he condemn'd the world by his faith. Thus *by which* ſignifies, *v.* 4.

(*c*) *And became heir of the righteouſneſs which is by faith.* This righteouſneſs by *faith* is oppoſed to a righteouſneſs by *works*. A perſon is ſaid to be righteous *by works*, when his good works are *perfect*, and he has never ſinned at all. The reward of this righteouſneſs

is

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

3 which is by faith. By faith Abraham when he was called to go out into a place, which he ſhould after receive for an inheritance, obey'd; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he ſojourned in the land of promiſe, as *in* a ſtrange country,

It was by means of faith that *Abraham* obey'd the call of GOD, when he called him (*d*) out of his native country into the land of *Canaan*, which he was to receive as an inheritance for himſelf, and for his poſterity: and he went out from his native country, not knowing the country to which he was going. By means of his faith in GOD, and in his promiſes, he ſojourned as a ſtranger in the before unknown country, which GOD promiſed to give to him and to his poſterity (*e*), as in a ſtrange or foreign country, where

8. 9.

NOTES.

is eternal life. But the righteouſneſs by *faith* is only ſuch a kind of righteouſneſs as *faith* can make up, where perfect obedience is wanting, *i. e.* in other words, a man's faith, by the grace of GOD, is accounted, or accepted for righteouſneſs, or in the plaineſt *Engliſh*, GOD will give them that ſincerely believe and obey the Goſpel (tho' they are not *perfect* in their obedience) the *very ſame reward* of eternal life, as they ſhould have had, if they had never ſinned, but had been always perfect in piety and virtue. When therefore it is ſaid, that *Noah became heir of the righteouſneſs by faith*, the meaning is, that tho' his good works were not perfect, and ſo he could not be juſtified as one abſolutely *innocent*; yet he by his faith acquired a title to juſtification, and became heir of eternal life, which is promiſed as a reward of faith, and of ſincere obedience. And when the apoſtle ſays, that *by faith Noah* became heir of the righteouſneſs which is *by faith*, he is not guilty of any tautology, but plainly means, that *Noah*, by his own *perſonal faith*, became heir of the righteouſneſs that is imputed to every one that has faith, or to every believer.

(*d*) Πιστει καλουμενος Αβρααμ, *by faith Abraham, when he was called.* *Eſtius* would chooſe to read, as in the *Alexandrian* MS. ὁ καλουμενος; and render the expreſſion thus, *By faith he, who was called Abraham, obeyed to go out, &c.* which ſeems to be a very harſh and unlikely ſenſe. Nor would ὁ καλουμενος bear this interpretation, unleſs Ανηρ, or ſome ſuch word, were ſet before it. It is much more natural to ſuppoſe, that the word, *called*, here ſignifies the ſame as it does, Chap. v. 4. *He that is call'd of GOD, as Aaron was.* As *Aaron* was call'd out by GOD to be the *Prieſt* of the *Jews*: ſo *Abraham* was call'd out to leave his native country, *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, and to go to *Canaan*. See *Gen.* xi. 31. xii 1, 5. xv. 7. The obeying this call was a very remarkable inſtance of faith.

(*e*) *The land of promiſe.* GOD promiſed *Abraham* that the land of *Canaan* ſhould be his, and his ſeed's, *Gen.* xii. 7. The promiſe was renew'd to *Iſaac*, xxvi. 3, 4. and to *Jacob*, xxviii. 13, 14, 15. *Acts* vii. 5. Moreover God added, that he would give the land of *Canaan* to *Abraham*'s ſeed *for ever*, *Gen.* xiii. 15. and for an *everlaſting* poſſeſſion, xvii. 8. The meaning is, the poſterity of *Abraham* ſhall poſſeſs the land of *Canaan to the end of the world.* This however does not hinder, but that, without a breach of this divine promiſe, the *Jews*, upon the account of their ſins, might for ſome time be baniſh'd out of *Judea*, as the *ten* tribes have been ever ſince their captivity, above 700 years before the birth of Chriſt; and as the two tribes were, during the 70 years captivity in *Babylon*, and have been ever ſince the laſt deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, for now almoſt 1700 years together.

PARAPHRASE.

where he dwelt, not in a fix'd habitation, but in moveable tabernacles or tents, together with *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, who were with him made heirs of the ſame country by the divine promiſe of giving it to them, and to
10. their ſeed. He dwelt in *Canaan*, I ſay, as in a *ſtrange* country: for he expected, according to GOD's promiſe, after the reſurrection, to dwell in his father's country, in the city of the heavenly *Jeruſalem*, which is not removed from place to place, like a tent, but has ſolid and unſhaken foundations, the builder, or maker, of which city is GOD
11. himſelf, who can preſerve it for ever (*f*). It was by means of faith, that even *Sarah* herſelf (who was now paſt child-bearing) miraculouſly received ſtrength to conceive a child; and tho' ſhe was paſt age, yet ſhe bore a child, *viz. Iſaac*, becauſe ſhe was perſuaded, that GOD is faithful, and would accompliſh the promiſe he made her of giving
12. her a child in her old age (*g*). And becauſe of

TEXT.

dwelling in tabernacles with Iſaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the ſame promiſe. For he looked for a 10
city which hath foundations, whoſe builder and maker is GOD. Through 11
faith alſo Sarah herſelf received ſtrength to conceive ſeed, and was deliver'd of a child, when ſhe was paſt age, becauſe ſhe judged him faithful who had promiſed.

NOTES.

ther. But ſtill they ſhall all, both the two tribes, and the ten, be ſanctified and be reſtored to their own land, in God's appointed time, and ſhall poſſeſs it to the end of the world, as he has expreſly promiſed, *Ezek.* xxxvii. 22, 25.——*They ſhall be no more two nations* (as they have been ever ſince the days of *Rehoboam*)——*and they ſhall dwell in the land, that I have given unto Jacob my ſervant*—— *they and their children, and their childrens children for ever*, xxxix. 23——29.——*The houſe of Iſrael went into captivity for their iniquity*——*Now will I bring again the captivity of Jacob, and have mercy upon the whole houſe of Iſrael.*—*then ſhall they know that*——*I have gather'd them unto their own land:*——*neither will I hide my face any more from them: for I have pour'd out my ſpirit upon the houſe of Iſrael, ſaith the* LORD *God.*

(*f*) *He looked for a city.* The grounds of *Abraham*'s expecting to dwell in an eternal ſtate of bleſſedneſs in the heavenly *Jeruſalem*, after the reſurrection, do not appear to have been any arguments ſuggeſted by *natural reaſon*, but the expreſs *promiſe* of GOD. For his *faith* here mention'd is his faith in divine *revelations*, as *faith* ſignifies throughout the chapter. All this that he expected in another world is promiſed in GOD's *covenanting* with *Abraham* to be *his GOD*. See on *v.* 16.

(*g*) *She judged him faithful.* The apoſtle mentions *Sarah* as an inſtance of faith, tho' *Moſes* does not expreſly ſay, ſhe believed. Nay it is certain, that when ſhe *firſt* heard the angel

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

12 Therefore ſprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, *ſo many* as

of the faith both of *Abraham* and *Sarah*, there ſprang from this one man, and him as good as dead as to theſe things (*b*), a poſterity

NOTES.

gel ſay, ſhe ſhould have a child, ſhe did not believe him, and laugh'd at it as a thing incredible, *Gen.* xviii. 12. Yet after the angel had *repeated* his prediction, and thereby given her farther aſſurance, ſhe appears, from ſome *hints* in *Moſes* his hiſtory, to have *believed* him, *v.* 13,14. *The Lord* [by his angel] *ſaid unto Abraham, Wherefore did Sarah laugh, ſaying, Shall I of a ſurety bear a child, which am old? Is any thing too hard for the Lord? At the time appointed will I return unto thee, according to the time of life, and Sarah ſhall have a ſon. Then Sarah denied, ſaying, I laughed not: for ſhe was afraid.* As the angel came in *human* ſhape, it is natural to ſuppoſe, that ſhe took him to be no more than a *mere man*; even as her husband, *Abraham*, entertain'd the three angels at this time *unawares*, not ſuſpecting them *at firſt* to be *angels*, *Hebr.* xiii. 2. While *Sarah* apprehended, that the perſon, who deliver'd the promiſe, was a mere man, and had not ſeen him prove any extraordinary commiſſion from GOD by miracles, it is no wonder, ſhe did not believe what he ſaid. But the angel ſoon convinced her, that he was more than a common perſon, by diſcovering *ſecret* things, and by letting her know, that he perceived what ſhe did, when ſhe was *out of his ſight*, when ſhe ſtood *behind* the door of the tent, and *laugh'd* at the promiſe ſhe heard him deliver. That ſhe was not in the angel's preſence when ſhe laugh'd, is certain from the account which *Moſes* gives of the fact according to the *true* reading of the words as preſerved in the *Samaritan* copy, and the old *Greek* tranſlation, of *Geneſis*. The *Jewiſh* incorrect copy has it, without any ſenſe at all, *Sarah heard it in the tent-door, which was behind him.* The true reading is, *Sarah heard it in the tent-door: and ſhe was behind it*, *i. e.* behind the tent-door, and ſo not in the angel's ſight. For הוּא read הִיא. And, no doubt, *Moſes* noted this fact (which in itſelf looks very inconſiderable) on purpoſe to ſhew, that the angel did *not ſee her* when ſhe laugh'd; that ſo we might from hence gather that ſhe had hereby ſufficient evidence of his being an extraordinary perſon, and ſent from GOD. Hereby ſhe was prepared to believe any revelation *he* ſhould make. When ſhe found he was an angel, *ſhe was afraid*, and denied that ſhe had laugh'd. It muſt therefore be concluded, that after this ſhe no more laugh'd at the promiſe; but when the angel, after ſhe knew him to be ſuch, *repeated* the promiſe to her, ſhe received it as a divine promiſe, and judged him faithful who had promiſed. In like manner, *Abraham* laugh'd the *firſt* time he heard the promiſe, and thought it incredible, *Gen.* xvii. 17. tho' when the promiſe was *repeated* and *confirmed*, he fully depended upon the accompliſhment of it.

(*b*) Και ταυτα νενεκρωμενον, *and him as good as dead.* Our tranſlators have not here expreſs'd the full ſenſe of the *Greek*, which ought to be render'd thus: *And him dead, as to theſe things*, i. e. as to the being a father: ταυτα is uſed for κατα ταυτα.

Upon this a *difficulty* has been moved, how the apoſtle, and *Moſes* before him, could ſpeak of *Abraham* as being *paſt age*, and repreſent it as a *miracle*, that he ſhould have a ſon by *Sarah* (*Gen.* xvii. 17. xviii. 11, 12. *Rom.* iv. 19. *Hebr.* xi. 12.) when yet he is thought to have had children by *Keturah* many years afterward? The difficulty may be ſtated thus: When *Iſaac* was born, *Abraham* was an hundred years old, and *Sarah* ninety, *Gen.* xxi 5. xvii. 17. When *Sarah* died, ſhe was an hundred and twenty ſeven, *Gen.* xxiii. 1. conſequently, at the time of her death, *Abraham* was an hundred and thirty ſeven. *After* this *Abraham* gets a wife for *Iſaac*, who was forty years old when he married her, *Gen.* xxv. 20. at which time *Abraham* muſt be an hundred and forty. After the hiſtory of *Iſaac*'s marriage, *Gen.* xxiv. 67. *Moſes* immediately adds, according to our tranſlation, *Then again Abraham took a wife, and her name was Keturah* (Gen. xxv. 1.) by whom he had

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

had ſix ſons. Upon this account of the facts it is asked, How it ſhould be repreſented as a *miracle*, that *Abraham* ſhould have a ſon in the hundredth year of his age; and yet ſhould, without a miracle, have ſix ſons when he was *full*, and more than, an hundred and forty?

No Commentator ſeems to me to have given a ſufficient ſolution of this difficulty. It appears to be a very unſatisfactory anſwer to ſay, as is uſually ſaid, that, in order to *Iſaac*'s being born, God gave a new *bleſſing* to *Abraham*'s body, which again render'd him capable of being a father; and that this bleſſing and capacity *remained* in him. If this had been ſo, why ſhould not *Sarah*'s capacity of *bearing* have been renewed and continued alſo by virtue of the ſame *bleſſing*? and, why ſhould not *Abraham* then have had more children afterward *by her*, during the thirty ſeven years that ſhe lived with him after the birth of *Iſaac*?

I beg leave therefore to propoſe to the world another method of ſolving the now-mentioned difficulty, which ſeems to me to be very eaſy and natural. It is this: It may well enough be ſuppoſed, that the hiſtory of *Abraham*'s marrying *Keturah*, is not ſet in the exact chronological order of narration; and then all the difficulty will vaniſh at once. Every one that has carefully read either the modern or antient hiſtorians, knows, that the *beſt* and exacteſt of them often *chooſe* to carry down the account of one perſon, in their hiſtory, farther than the time to which they are come in the order of the *whole* narration. When they have finiſhed that perſon's ſtory, they return back to the time where the digreſſion, as I may call it, began. And this is done upon *principle*, with great *judgment*, and for a very *good* end, even to prevent breaking the thread of a particular ſtory, which the writer ſaw it needful to *conclude*, before he began another. The ſame ſeems to be the caſe here. *Moſes* his chief deſign was to give the hiſtory of the *Iſraelites*, and of *their* pedigree. It was neceſſary then to give an account of *Sarah*, and of her ſon *Iſaac*; which account he prudently choſe to *lay all together*, and to finiſh at once, tho' it brought him down to the hundred and fortieth year of *Abraham*'s life. In the middle of this narration he did not think fit to mention the affair of *Keturah*, which had no manner of relation to it: yet he afterward obſerves, that ſhe was a wife to *Abraham*, and had ſeveral children by him; whom *Moſes* names, that they might know themſelves, and the *Iſraelites* might acknowledge them to be the poſterity of *Abraham*; and that he might the better illuſtrate the divine promiſe, that his ſeed ſhould be like the *ſand*, and *many nations* proceed from him, *Gen.* xiii. 16. xvii. 4.

We are left then to conjecture, as well as we can, in what part of *Abraham*'s life it was that he married *Keturah*. He ſeems to me to have married her *before he came into Canaan*, and ſo before he took *Hagar*, when he was young enough to be a father in a *natural* way. That he married her long before *Sarah*'s death, and that the hiſtory of his marrying her is by *Moſes* placed out of the chronological order, is *demonſtrable* from the account he gives of her *children*, *grandchildren*, *and great grandchildren*, as being born *in Abraham*'s life-time. In the genealogy which *Moſes* gives us of *Abraham*'s children by *Keturah*, he tells us that *Abraham* begat *Jokſhan*; *Jokſhan* begat *Dedan*; *Dedan* begat *Aſſhurim*, *Gen.* xxv. 1—4. ſo that *Aſſhurim* (or rather, I ſuppoſe, *Aſſhur*, the father of the people called *Aſſhurim*) was *Abraham*'s great grandſon. Concerning all the ſons, grandſons, and great grandſons of *Keturah*, *Moſes* ſays, *v.* 6. *Unto the ſons of the concubines* [*viz. Hagar* and *Keturah*] *which Abraham had*, *Abraham gave gifts*, *and ſent them away from Iſaac his ſon*, *while he* [i. e. *Abraham*] *yet lived.* Thoſe here called, *the ſons of the concubines*, are (beſides *Iſhmael*) the ſame as *Moſes* called, *the children*, or ſons, *of* Keturah, *ver.* 4. for the *Hebrew* word is the ſame in both places, which ſignifies either *children* or *ſons*. According to this account, *Abraham's great grandchildren* by *Keturah* were *born* before he died. He could not then marry *Keturah after Iſaac*'s marriage. For from the time of *Iſaac*'s marriage to the time of *Abraham*'s death, was no more than thirty five years; in which ſhort ſpace it was not poſſible he ſhould have *three great grandchildren* from his *ſecond* ſon *Jokſhan*. They did not uſe to marry till about thirty in thoſe days, as we may conjecture by the times of begetting noted in the genealogy of *Abraham*'s anceſtors; among whom, *Nahor*, *Abraham*'s grandfather, was the youngeſt at the time of begetting, *viz.* twenty nine

years

years old; and *Abraham*'s ſon, *Iſaac*, was not married, till he was forty. It can never be ſuppoſed then (if *Keturah* was married no more than thirty five years before *Abraham*'s death) that her ſons ſhould be married ſoon enough to have children three or four years old at the time of *Abraham*'s death; and it is then impoſſible, that *Keturah*'s *ſecond* ſon, *Jokſhan*, ſhould, *by that time*, have *three grandchildren*, and thoſe old enough to be *ſent* abroad to plant colonies. This matter is confirm'd by *Joſephus*, who, having named the ſons, grandſons, and great grandſons of *Keturah*, expreſly ſays, *Abraham ſent out* all theſe *children and grandchildren to plant colonies*, p. 33. edit. Hudſon.

It is to be obſerved, that *Joſephus* has placed the account of *Keturah* and her children, *ſooner* than it ſtands in *Geneſis*, *viz.* before the hiſtory of *Abraham*'s ſending his ſervant to ſeek a wife for *Iſaac*; ſo that *Joſephus* evidently went upon the ſuppoſition, that this particular hiſtory was not by *Moſes* ſet according to the chronological order of events. Yet ſtill *Joſephus* did not ſet it far enough back; ſince he places it after the death of *Sarah*: whereas in the ſpace of thirty eight years that interven'd between the deaths of *Sarah* and of *Abraham*, it was not poſſible *Keturah* ſhould have great grandchildren ſent abroad to plant colonies, as he himſelf ſays they were before *Abraham*'s death. From his own account then, as well as that in *Geneſis*, it is evident, that *Abraham* took *Keturah* to be his wife long before *Sarah*'s death. Thus much however is abſolutely certain, that either the time of *Keturah*'s *marriage*, or the *birth* of her great grandchildren, is placed out of chronological order, *Gen.* xxv. 1—6. And why we ſhould not ſuppoſe it is the former, I cannot imagine. For

Moſes ſeems to ſay expreſly, that *Abraham* had children while he was in *Haran*, long before *Iſaac*, or even *Iſhmael*, was born, *Gen.* xii. 5. *And Abram took Sarai his wife, and* Lot *his brother's ſon, and all the ſubſtance that they had gather'd, and the* ſouls that they had gotten *in Haran, and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan. The ſouls they had gotten in Haran*, I take to be the *children* they there *begat*. The word, *ſouls*, is uſed for *perſons*, (*ch.* xiv. 2.) where the king of *Sodom* ſaith to *Abraham*, *Give me the perſons* [Hebr. *Souls*] *and take the goods to thy ſelf*. The word render'd *gotten*, is עשה which uſually ſignifies, *to make*, or *to do*. When it is applied to *ſacrifices*, it ſignifies, *to offer them*; it may then bear a little farther variation, when applied to *children*, and ſignify the *begetting* them. In a ſenſe at leaſt very near a-kin to this, the *Hebrew* word is actually uſed, *Jerem.* xxxviii. 16. *The Lord liveth, who* made *us this ſoul*, i. e. who as a father begat us; and *Iſa.* lvii. 16. —*leſt the ſpirit ſhould fail before me, and the* ſouls *which I have* made, *i. e.* which I, as a father, have *begotten*; for this expreſſion is plainly of the ſame import with the title, *Father of ſpirits*, *Hebr.* xii. 9. Anſwerably to theſe expreſſions, it is natural to conclude, that when *Moſes* ſpeaks of the *ſouls*, or *perſons*, which *Abraham* and *Lot* had *gotten* in *Haran*, he means the *children* whom they had *begotten* there. This is abundantly more likely than the interpretation of *Grotius*, *Le Clerc*, *Patrick*, &c. who repreſent the ſenſe of the words to be, *the ſlaves whom they* had bought. But after all theſe great men have ſaid, I cannot find they have proved, either that נפש may ſignify *ſlaves*, or עשה *bought*. To prove the former, we are refer'd to *Ezek.* xxvii. 13. where merchants are ſaid to have *traded in the ſouls*, or perſons, *of men*. But how to infer from hence, that the word *ſouls* ſignifies *ſlaves*, I own is beyond my comprehenſion. Thoſe men indeed, in whom the merchants traded, were made *ſlaves*; but their being *ſlaves* is not (either here, or in the parallel place, *Rev.* xviii. 13.) ſignified by the word *ſouls*, but only and entirely by the words *traded*, or *merchandized*. Nor will any of the places refer'd to, prove that עשה ſignifies, to *buy*, or to *purchaſe*. The firſt place mentioned by *Le Clerc* is *Gen.* xxx. 30. where *Jacob* ſays to *Laban*, *When ſhall I* provide *for mine own houſe alſo?* i. e. as is the literal ſenſe of the word, *When ſhall I* act, *or* do *for my own houſe?* What is there in this to prove that the word ſignifies to *buy*, or *purchaſe? Jacob*'s thoughts at this time ſeem to have been, not on *buying* any thing, but on *multiplying* his *cattle* for the benefit of his family. Another text cited by *Le Clerc* on this occaſion, is *Gen.* xxxi. 1. where *Laban*'s ſons ſay, *Of that which was our father's hath Jacob* gotten *all this glory*. But there does not ſeem to be the leaſt room, in this place, to take the word in any other than its moſt uſual ſenſe. For the ſons of *Laban* undoubtedly meant, that *Jacob* had *made his fortune* out of their father's ſubſtance; there is no thought of his *purchaſing* it, as a man buys a

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

Slave. The only remaining place refer'd to, is, *Deut.* viii. 17, 18. which our tranſlators have render'd thus: *The might of my hand hath* gotten *me this wealth:*——*He giveth the power to* get *wealth.* The words here render'd, *Get wealth*, are עשה חיל which are uſed *nine* times more in the Old Teſtament, and in *eight* of them, without all diſpute, do not ſignify *getting wealth*, but either, *doing famouſly*, or, *doing valiantly.* In the former of theſe ſenſes our tranſlators have render'd them, *Ruth* iv. 11. *Do thou worthily*; and not much different, *Prov.* xxxi. 29. *Many daughters have done virtuouſly.* In other places they have render'd theſe words by *doing valiantly*, as *Numb.* xxiv. 18. *Iſrael ſhall do valiantly*; 1 *Sam.* xiv. 48. *He gathered an hoſt*; or, as it is in the margin, *He wrought valiantly*; *Pſal.* lx. 12. and cviii. 13. *Through GOD we ſhall do valiantly*; cxviii. 15. and again, *ver.* 16. *The right hand of the Lord doth valiantly.* The only remaining place where this *Hebrew* expreſſion is uſed, is, *Ezek.* xxviii. 4. where our tranſlators have render'd it, *Thou haſt gotten thee riches.* But as in the eight foregoing places it unqueſtionably ſignifies, to do *valiantly*, or *worthily*, it is moſt natural to ſuppoſe, that it ſhould be interpreted in the ſame ſenſe here; in which ſenſe alſo it will very well ſuit with the context, thus: *With thy wiſdom, and with thine underſtanding, thou haſt* [in thine own apprehenſion] done famouſly, *and haſt gotten gold and ſilver into thy treaſures.* There ſeems then ſufficient reaſon for interpreting the ſame words in the ſame manner, *Deut.* viii. 17, 18. thus, *The might of my hand hath done* famouſly, *or* valiantly——*he giveth thee power to do* famouſly, *or* valiantly. And it is worth noting, that tho' *Le Clerc* on *Gen.* xii. 5. *refers* to *Deut.* viii. 17. as ſpeaking of mens *getting* wealth, yet in his note on this latter text, he owns it may ſignify, *The might of my hand hath procured the* victory, and refers to *Pſal.* cxviii. 15, 16. before quoted, as a proof of it. Conſequently this text will not prove, that עשה ſignifies, to *buy*, or *purchaſe*, as a man buys *ſlaves.* There is then no text found to ſupport this interpretation of the word. It remains therefore, that the meaning of *Gen.* xii. 5. is moſt likely to be that which was before mentioned, *viz. The perſons whom Abraham* begat in *Haran.* Since then *Abraham* begat children in *Haran*, we muſt allow *Keturah* to be their mother. For he did not take *Hagar* till long after he came into *Canaan*, *Gen.* xvi. 1, 2. and we do not find that he had ever any other concubine beſides theſe two.

The eldeſt of theſe children ſeems to be the perſon whom *Abraham* (before *Sarah* or *Hagar* bare) calls his *heir*, *Gen.* xv. 3. *Lo one born in my houſe is mine heir.* Unleſs this heir be allowed to be *his ſon* by *Keturah*, he muſt be a mere *ſtranger*, the ſon of one of his *male ſlaves:* But this is vaſtly improbable, ſince *Abraham* had not only many *relations* in *Haran*, to inherit his eſtate and poſſeſſions, but had a *near relation* in *Canaan* juſt *at hand*, even *Lot*, his brother's ſon. Surely this would have been his heir rather than a ſon of one of his *men* ſervants, provided he had at that time no ſon of his own. It is therefore moſt likely, that *Abraham* had at this time a ſon of his own by *Keturah* to be his heir.

It is no objection to this, that it is ſaid in the ſame verſe, *Behold, to me thou haſt given no ſeed*; or that it is ſaid, *ver.* 4. *One that ſhall come out of thy* own bowels *ſhall be thy heir*; or, that *Abraham* is ſaid to be *childleſs*, *ver.* 2. For when *Iſaac* was *born*, he was called *Abraham's only ſon*, tho' *Iſhmael* was at that time living, *Gen.* xxii. 2. and he is called *his ſon*, by way of eminence, meaning his *only* ſon, after *Keturah's* children were unqueſtionably born, *Gen.* xxv. 6. In this ſame ſenſe *Abraham* might have been called *childleſs*, till he had a child by his *proper* wife *Sarah*; and in the ſame ſenſe in which *Iſaac* is called his *only* ſon, it muſt be ſaid, that he *only* came out of *Abraham's bowels*, i. e. he was the *only* child begotten in a *right* way on a *lawful* wife.

Let it not be here ſaid, that tho' *Hagar* was only a *concubine*, yet *Keturah* was a *proper wife*; ſince *Hagar* is expreſly called *Abraham's wife*, as well as *Keturah*, *Gen.* xvi. 3. and both of them are expreſly called *concubines*, *Gen.* xxv. 6.

From this laſt cited text, in which *Keturah* is called a *concubine*, it is neceſſary to conclude, that ſhe did not ſucceed *Sarah*, *after her deceaſe*, as a *proper wife*, but was *Abraham's concubine*, like *Hagar*, while *Sarah* lived.

The reaſon of *Iſaac's* being call'd, the *only* ſon, is, that he only was born of *Abraham's* proper *wife.* The children of the *ſlaves* were not to inherit with the child or children of the proper wife; and ſo were not treated as children, but as *ſlaves*, *Gen.* xxi. 10.

Accordingly

NOTES.

Accordingly we read, that *Abraham* gave *all* he had to *Iſaac*, the ſon of his proper wife; while he only gave ſome ſmall gifts to the ſons of the two concubines, and ſent them away from *Iſaac*, during his own life-time, *Gen.* xxv. 5, 6. From hence it is evident, that *Keturah* did not ſucceed *Sarah* as a proper *wife*; ſince in that caſe her ſons muſt have been *co-heirs* with *Iſaac*; but was only taken to be his *concubine*. And it is abundantly more probable, that he took her when he was young enough to be a father, than that he ſhould marry her forty years *after* he was too old to be a father. Nor is it likely he would delay ſeeking a child, till he took *Hagar*, when he was eighty five Years old.

The caſe ſeems to me to be this: *Abraham* had been married to his proper wife *Sarah* ſometime before he left *Ur* of the *Chaldees*; at that time ſhe was looked upon to be *barren*, *Gen.* xi. 30. After this they lived ſome time in *Haran*, before they came into *Canaan*. When *Abraham* found his wife barren, it is not at all unlikely that he ſhould take one of his ſlaves for a concubine, that he might have children by her, as was the cuſtom of thoſe times. He then, I ſuppoſe, took *Keturah*, who bore him children. Theſe he brought with him from *Haran* into *Canaan*. When he was in *Canaan*, *Sarah*'s deſire of having children ſtill continued. She could not look upon *Keturah*'s children as, in any ſenſe, *her own*; ſince *Keturah* was not *her* ſlave. Thus *Rachel* did not look upon the children of *Zilpah* as *her* own; nor *Leah* look upon the children of *Bilhah* as *hers*: But, on the other hand, *Rachel* conſider'd the children of *her own* ſlave, *Bilhah*, as *her own* children, becauſe their mother was her *property* (*Gen.* xxx. 3, 6, 8.) the ſlave that her father gave her, when ſhe was married, *Gen.* xxviii. 29. and *Leah* looked upon the children of *Zilpah* as *her own*, *Gen.* xxx. 11, 13. becauſe their mother was her *property*, the ſlave that her father gave her when ſhe was married, xxviii. 24. On this ſame account *Sarah* deſired *Abraham* to take *Hagar* (whom we may well ſuppoſe to be her own ſlave, given her by her father at the time of her marriage) that ſhe might have children *by her ſlave*, tho' ſhe had none of her own body, *Gen.* xvi. 1, 2. *Now Sarai Abraham's wife bare him no children; and ſhe had an hand-maid* [i. e. a female ſlave] *an Egyptian, whoſe name was Hagar. And Sarai ſaid unto Abram, Behold now, the Lord hath reſtrained me from bearing: I pray thee, go in unto* my maid; *it may be that* I *may obtain children by her.* So that *Sarah*'s deſiring *Abraham* to take *Hagar* is perfectly conſiſtent with his having taken his own ſlave, *Keturah* before; ſince *Keturah*'s children could not be *Sarah*'s, as *Hagar*'s would.

It is very true, that *Moſes* does not mention *Keturah*, when he ſpeaks of *Abraham*'s firſt going into *Canaan*, and of the perſons who then went with him, *Gen.* xii. 5. but this will not prove, that ſhe was not his concubine at that time. For when *Moſes* firſt mentions *Abraham*'s brother, *Nahor*, he only mentions his wife *Milcah*, xi. 29. whereas afterward he mentions his concubine *Reumah*, by whom he had four ſons, xxii. 24. From the diſlocation of which piece of hiſtory no one would conclude, that *Nahor* did not take this concubine, till after *Milcah*'s death. In like manner, *Keturah* might have been *Abraham*'s concubine *before* he came into *Canaan*, tho' not named till in the end of the hiſtory of *Abraham*'s life.

I know of but one thing more that looks like an objection againſt what has been now advanced, and that is, the *Engliſh* tranſlation of *Gen.* xxv. 1. *Then again Abraham took a wife, and her name was Keturah.* The thing immediately before-mentioned was *Sarah*'s death; ſo that the words *then again*, plainly ſignify, that *then*, *after Sarah's death*, *Abraham* married again, and took *Keturah*. But nothing of this is implied in the *Hebrew* expreſſion, which is to be literally render'd thus, *And Abraham added, and took a wife, and her name was Keturah.* The meaning of which is, that after he had *taken* (not buried) one wife, even *Sarah*, he proceeded and took another, even *Keturah*. And as he took *Sarah* while he dwelt in *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, he might take *Keturah* there too, or elſe in *Haran*, before he came into *Canaan*; and then *Keturah* might very well have great grandchildren born in *Abraham*'s life-time.

Many like inſtances of *Moſes* his mentioning facts out of the exact chronological order of the hiſtory may be obſerved in his writings; particularly in the tenth chapter of *Geneſis*, *Moſes* gives us the genealogy of *Shem*, and brings it down beyond the diſperſion of the nations, which he mentions *ver.* 25. when he had carried that genealogy much farther,

Chap. XI.

PARAPHRASE.

rity as numerous as the ſtars in the ſky, yea innumerable as the ſands which are on the
13. ſea-ſhore (*i*). All theſe forementioned be-

TEXT.

the ſtars of the ſky in multitude, and as the ſand which is by the ſea-ſhore innumerable. Theſe all 13
lievers

NOTES.

he returns back to the time of the diſperſion of the nations, and gives a particular hiſtory of that matter, *ch.* xi. 1——9. Then he goes back as far as *Shem*, almoſt two hundred years before the ſaid diſperſion of the nations, and gives a particular account of the time of his ſon's birth, and of *Shem*'s death, and in the ſame manner carries down the genealogy to *Abraham*, *v.* 10, *&c.* It is certain, however, that tho' there is a breach of chronological order in the placing of theſe narrations, yet they are judiciouſly placed in the manner wherein *Moſes* has ſet them; becauſe it would not have been agreeable to interrupt one narration by ſetting another in the middle of it.

We have in the xxvth chapter an account of *Abraham*'s death at an hundred and ſeventy five years of age, *ver.* 7. Next it is ſaid, *After the death of Abraham*, GOD *bleſſed Iſaac*, *v.* 11. Then *Moſes* gives a liſt of the children of *Iſhmael*, and brings down the hiſtory to the time of *Iſhmael*'s death, *ver.* 17. which happen'd forty eight years after the death of *Abraham*. After all this, *Moſes* returns, but with great judgment, to the time of *Iſaac*'s *marriage*, which was celebrated thirty five years before *Abraham*'s death.

There is ſufficient reaſon alſo to ſuſpect that the account of *Abraham*'s going into *Gerar*, and of *Abimelech*'s taking *Sarah*, in order to make her his wife, *Gen.* xx. is not placed in the hiſtory in the order of time in which theſe things happen'd. The place in which this narration ſtands, is *after* the account of the angel's aſſuring *Sarah* that ſhe ſhould have a ſon, *Gen.* xviii. 14. which is thought to have been at the time of her conceiving *Iſaac*, when ſhe was eighty nine years old, and reckon'd paſt child-bearing, *ver.* 11, 12. *After* this her being with child, *Moſes* relates the deſtruction of *Sodom*, and the inceſt of *Lot*; and then brings in the ſtory of *Abraham*'s going to *Gerar*. But it can never be thought, that *Abimelech* would have fallen in love with an old woman, univerſally concluded to be paſt child-bearing. Or, if by this time ſhe had appeared to be with child, *Abimelech* would have concluded her to be *Abraham's wife*, and ſo would not have had a deſire to take her to himſelf. This account therefore plainly appears not to ſtand in the hiſtory in the chronological order.

There is a very plain inſtance of ſuch a neglect of order in the hiſtory of *Keturah*, *Gen.* xxv. 1——6. For, according to what has been already obſerved, either the birth of her great grandchildren is mentioned too ſoon; or elſe her marriage is mentioned too late. We may then as well ſuppoſe the latter, as others have hitherto ſuppoſed the former. The ſuppoſition now choſen fully anſwers the objection againſt this part of *Moſes* his hiſtory, and ſets all matters *right*; whereas in the *common* way, the difficulty muſt be owned to be *inſuperable*. I make no apology for the length of this note, ſince the ſubject-matter of it is of great importance, and tends to vindicate the characters both of *Moſes*, and of St. *Paul*.

(*i*) *As the ſtars in multitude, and as the ſand innumerable.* There is, in fact, a difference between theſe two expreſſions, which is very juſt and philoſophical. The apoſtle ſpeaks of the *ſtars* as being only a *multitude*; whereas he ſays, the *ſands* on the ſea-ſhore are *innumerable*. Tho' the ſtars are innumerable, and thoſe of them which are viſible to the naked eye are a great *multitude*; yet theſe viſible ones may be, and have been, number'd by men. Catalogues of the fixed ſtars are publiſhed by the aſtronomers, who defy any man to ſhew them any ſtar in the heavens (unleſs a new one appears) which is not named in their catalogues, and marked on their globes. The largeſt catalogue, drawn by Mr. *Flamſtead*, contains but three thouſand, many of which cannot be ſeen without a teleſcope. But

Abraham's

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced *them*, and confessed, that they were strangers and pilgrims on
14 the earth. For they that

lievers retained their faith, till their death, or the time of their leaving the world; tho' they had not received the reward of their faith and virtue, which was promised them: but they saw this promised reward at a distance, in another life, and gladly entertained the promises of it (*k*), and confess'd, that they were but strangers, sojourners, and pilgrims here on earth (*l*). For by saying 14
they

NOTES.

Abraham's posterity was very soon more than three thousand, and at some times may have been three millions. It must be owned however, that the Scripture sometimes speaks, as if men could not number the stars, as *Gen.* xv. 5. where GOD says to *Abraham*, *Number the stars, if thou be able to number them*; implying that *Abraham* was not able to do it: which is undoubtedly true. For *Abraham* died before the constellations were formed, and so had no way of counting the stars. For when a man looks upon the stars in a confused heap, he cannot possibly number them; whereas if he will throw them into different figures, or constellations, it will be very possible first to number the stars in *each* figure or constellation *separately*, and then to take the number of the constellations, and from thence to find the number of the visible stars; which is the method that astronomers have taken. *David* speaks of numbering the stars as a thing peculiarly in GOD's power, *Psal.* cxlvii. 4. *He telleth the number of the stars, and calleth them all by their names.* It was very natural, and proper for *David* here to imply, that men could not number the stars, because he does not seem to have been bred an astronomer, or to have known the method of computing their number. As the holy Scriptures were never designed to teach men astronomy, but were wholly calculated to teach them piety and virtue, the writers of them were always directed to speak of *natural* things, in the common language of the age and country, in which they lived. Thus *Moses* introduces GOD as saying, *I set my bow in the cloud*, *Gen.* ix. 13. whereas the rain-bow is not in a cloud, but in the *drops* of rain, as they are falling, between the cloud and the earth; as will be evident to any one who shall observe (what I have often seen) part of a rain-bow against clear sky. But the bow is said to be *in the cloud*, because it usually appears *against* a cloud, and *seems to be in it*, as it was also generally thought to be. In like manner *Job* speaks of the clouds, as if they were large *vessels*, that *hold* up the rain, and which might be thought to be naturally in danger of being *rent* by its weight, *Job* xxvi. 8. *He bindeth up the waters in his thick cloud, and the cloud is not rent under them.* Whereas the clouds are no other than a *mist* or *fog* raised up above the earth, which consists of hollow shells, or globes of water filled with air, which break, and unite, and so form solid drops, and then fall in rain. But *Job* spoke according to mens common apprehensions. Thus likewise, when the stars, that are visible to the naked eye, are represented as innumerable, in the Scriptures, the sacred writers speak according to the common apprehensions and abilities of mankind.

(*k*) *And were persuaded of them.* This clause is omitted in the most and best MSS. in all the old versions, and in the antient commentators: so that, without doubt, it has been added to the text long since the days of the apostle. And tho' it contains nothing but what is evidently and strictly true, yet it ought to be expunged, because we must not add to the word of GOD.

(*l*) *And confessed, that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.* Thus *Abraham* said to the sons of *Heth*, *I am a stranger and a sojourner with you*, Gen. xxiii. 4. tho' he had at
this

PARAPHRASE TEXT.

they were but ſojourners in this earth, they plainly declared, that they ſought and expected another country, in a future ſtate, wherein their father lives, and which there-
15. fore they could call their own (*m*). And indeed, if they had entertained an inclination and deſire to have return'd to *Chaldea*, from whence *Abraham* (and his poſterity in him) at GOD's call came into *Canaan*, they might have found an opportu-
16. nity to have returned thither (*n*). But now (*i. e.* at the time now mentioned, when they had that opportunity) they deſire a better country than any on earth, even a heavenly country: wherefore, ſince they deſired this heavenly country, even the new *Jeruſalem*, in conſequence of GOD's promiſe of

ſay ſuch things, declare plainly, that they ſeek a country. And truly if they 15
had been mindful of that *country*, from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned: But now they de- 16
ſire a better *country*, that is, an heavenly; wherefore GOD is not aſhamed to be

NOTES.

this time lived in *Canaan* above *threeſcore* years. *And Jacob ſaid unto Pharaoh, The days of the years of my pilgrimage are an hundred and thirty years*, Gen. xlvii. 9. Tho' *Jacob* here calls his *whole* life a *pilgrimage*, yet the greateſt part of it was ſpent in *Canaan*, which was given him by GOD as *his own poſſeſſion*; which ſhews, that he never, through his whole life, even when he was at home, in *Canaan*, looked upon himſelf as *ſettled*, but ſtill wiſh'd and hoped to live in another place, even in the heavenly *Jeruſalem*.

(*m*) *They ſeek a country.* This tranſlation does by no means come up to the *ſpirit* and *beauty* of the original. The word πατρίδα (derived from πατὴρ, a *father*) does not ſignify *a country*, in *general*, but *ſuch* a country as a man's *father* dwells in, and poſſeſſes as rightfully his *own*, wherein conſequently his children have a right to dwell with him. This their *father's own* country is oppoſed to a *ſtrange* or *foreign* country, *ver.* 9. wherein they looked upon themſelves as *ſtrangers*, foreigners, ſojourners, pilgrims, or travellers, *ver.* 13. Their *father*'s country, and what therefore thoſe obedient children of GOD might, in a ſenſe, call their *native* country, or their proper *home*, is the bleſſed place, where GOD their *father* will dwell for ever, even the city of the heavenly *Jeruſalem*, where they ſhall dwell with him to all eternity. *Rev.* xx. 2, 3. *Behold the tabernacle of GOD is with men, and he will* dwell *with them, in the holy city, new Jeruſalem.* Ver. 22. *The Lord GOD Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple of it.* xxii. 3, 4, 5. *The throne of GOD, and of the Lamb, ſhall be in it, and his ſervants ſhall ſerve him; and they ſhall ſee his face.— The Lord GOD giveth them light, and they ſhall reign* for ever *and ever.* From which laſt expreſſion it is demonſtrable, that the apoſtle here ſpeaks of the ſtate of good men *after the reſurrection*, and not of the *millennium*, when they ſhall not reign *for ever*, but only for a *thouſand* years, *Rev.* xx. 4.

(*n*) *Had opportunity to have returned.* *Abraham* actually ſent his ſervant to *Haran* to fetch a wife for his ſon, *Gen.* xxiv. 4, 10. comp. xxvii. 43. It would have been eaſy for him to have gone thither himſelf, if he had deſired and choſen ſo to do.

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

called their GOD: for he hath prepared for them a 17 city. By faith Abraham,

of it, he is not aſhamed to be called their GOD; for he hath minded and fulfilled his promiſe ſo far as to have actually prepared this city of the heavenly *Jeruſalem* for them in the future ſtate (*o*). GOD was pleaſed to 17. try

NOTES.

(*o*) *Wherefore GOD is not aſhamed to be called their GOD: for he hath prepared for them a city.* The city hereſpoken of, is, without all queſtion, the new, or the heavenly *Jeruſalem*, *whoſe builder and maker is GOD*, ver. 10. xii. 22. When the apoſtle ſays, that GOD's preparing this city for them, prevents his being *aſhamed* of calling himſelf *their father*, he evidently implies, that he would not have ſtiled himſelf *their* GOD, if he had not prepared it for them; and conſequently, that his calling himſelf *their GOD*, is a full *proof* that he had prepared the heavenly *Jeruſalem* for their eternal habitation. The force of this proof is really irreſiſtible. It cannot indeed be diſcern'd by ſuch as do not perceive that the word GOD is a *relative* term, ſignifying the ſame as *king*, or *governour*. But ſince it has been made appear, that this is the proper meaning of the word GOD, there is no manner of difficulty for us to perceive the concluſiveneſs of the apoſtle's reaſoning.

As theſe believers were not perfect in their obedience, but had, in ſome inſtances, or other, broken the divine Law; the Almighty hereupon neceſſarily *ceas'd* to be *their God*, or king, and unavoidably look'd upon them as *rebels*, who had *forfeited* the privileges of ſubjects, and deſerv'd to be *puniſh'd* as rebels. When, *after* this, he promis'd to be their *God*, or *King*, he thereby evidently promis'd to receive them again into favour, and under his protection, and to treat them (not as *rebels*, but) as *ſubjects*, upon the account of their faith and repentance. If *after* this they had been dealt with, and puniſh'd as *rebels*, the promiſe would have been broken. As then the puniſhments threaten'd to theſe rebels were loſs of life, loſs of the divine favour, and eternal death, the Almighty's promiſe of being again their GOD, or king, obliged him to deliver them from death by a reſurrection, and to receive them into a better world, to a ſtate of perfect and eternal happineſs, which he had from the beginning appointed to be the inheritance of his faithful ſubjects. That this promiſe of being *their God* ſignifies the *eternity* of the reward is evident, becauſe his taking them again as *ſubjects*, and thereby declaring, that he would not puniſh them for their *paſt* rebellion, obliged him to preſerve them *for ever* from *that* puniſhment: ſince, if after their faith and repentance, and after their reſurrection (when they had *not*, according to the terms of the new covenant, *again* forfeited his favour) he ſhould, *at any time*, caſt them off, and condemn them to death, he would hereby puniſh them for their *old* rebellion, and ſo not contrary to his promiſe. The late earl of *Mar*, by his rebellion, forfeited all the privileges of a ſubject. But ſuppoſing his late Majeſty had promiſed him, after this, that, upon his ſubmiſſion, he would be *his King* again: the earl might have juſtly inferr'd from hence, that the King would have preſerved and protected him in the privileges of a ſubject *for ever*, unleſs he ſhould *rebel anew*, or *again* forfeit the King's favour and protection by new miſdeeds. If he had not done amiſs any more, but continued a faithful ſubject; and yet the King, after promiſing to be *his King*, had puniſh'd him with death, he would have had cauſe to be *aſhamed* of his promiſe, becauſe in this caſe he would have broken it. And as the King's promiſe, had he made it, would have obliged him to ſave that rebel, in caſe he had repented, from the puniſhment due to him on the account of his rebellion, and to mantain and defend him in the poſſeſſion of the privileges of a good ſubject, as long as that *earl* ſhould have lived: ſo the Almighty's promiſe of being the *God* of believers engages him to deliver them from death

Chap. XI.

PARAPHRASE.

try the ſtrength of *Abraham*'s faith by giving him a command that ſeem'd very hard to fleſh and blood, even to ſacrifice his ſon: but thro' faith in GOD's promiſes *Abraham* went ſo far toward offering up *Iſaac*, as that it was plain he would have ſacrificed him, if he had not been prevented by a voice from heaven, and ſo may be look'd upon, in point of obedience, as having actually ſacrificed him (*p*): and he that had received the

TEXT.

when he was tried, offer'd up *Iſaac*; and he, that had

NOTES.

death the puniſhment of ſin by a reſurrection, and after that to ſave them for ever from all other, eſpecially from all *worſe* puniſhments of ſin, and to preſerve and maintain them, as long as they live, *i. e.* to all eternity, in the enjoyment of that perfect happineſs, which is the inheritance of all his faithful ſervants. This important matter is explain'd, and confirm'd more at large in my *Second Volume of Notes and Diſcourſes*, p. 214——246.

(*p*) *Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Iſaac.* Some men have cavill'd at this piece of hiſtory, as if it was unlawful for *Abraham* to ſacrifice his ſon, on a divine command, and impoſſible for GOD to give the command. But the cavilling is very groundleſs. Indeed if *Abraham* had ſacrificed his ſon *without* a divine command, it had been *murder*, and could not have been excuſed: ſince *Iſaac* had not by any crime forfeited his life into his father's hands. But it is really aſtoniſhing, that any man ſhould be able to fanſy, that the *ſovereign* Lord of all had not a right to take away *Iſaac*'s life by his *father's hands*, as well as by a *fever*, or *old age*. The occaſion of mens miſtakes in this, and in ſuch like caſes, is their not duly conſidering *what the law of nature is*. They repreſent it to themſelves as a ſet of particular precepts, expreſs'd in words, like the ten commandments, whereof one is, *Thou ſhalt not kill*, another is, *Thou ſhalt not ſteal*. They withal rightly conſider, that the law of nature is *immutable*, and *indiſpenſible*. Upon this they are puzzled, while it ſeems to them, that when GOD order'd *Abraham* to ſacrifice his ſon, he diſpenſed with that *particular* law of nature, *Thou ſhalt not kill*, or, *Thou ſhalt do no murder*. To extricate themſelves, they talk of *two* laws of nature, a *primary*, and a *ſecondary*: ſaying that GOD can diſpenſe with the latter, tho' not with the other. But all this is mere amuſement. Strictly ſpeaking, there is no more than one law of nature, *viz. Do what is beſt*, or, Do that which, all parallel caſes, and all conſequences being conſider'd, will in the end, and upon the whole, be beſt. This *one* law muſt be applied to all caſes that can happen. When it is *beſt* to *ſave* a man's life, the law of nature commands us to ſave it; but when it is *beſt* to put a man to *death*, the law of nature *requires* us to put him to *death*: it is the duty of magiſtrates to execute *murderers*. In *ſome* caſes this law of nature *forbids* our taking away other mens goods without their conſent. But in other caſes, the ſame law requires us to do ſo, particularly, when a man is to be fined for his miſdemeanours. In this way of conceiving matters, it is evident, there is no ſuch thing as GOD's ever diſpenſing with the law of nature. By virtue of the *one* law of nature now mention'd, *Abraham* was *forbidden* to take away his innocent ſon's life, *till* he ſhould receive authority from GOD to do ſo. And by the virtue of the *very ſame immutable* law of nature, he was obliged to put his innocent ſon to *death*, *when GOD had* commanded it. For in this caſe, this was *beſt*. It was beſt and wiſeſt to ſubmit to the command of an infinitely wiſe GOD: and as GOD had an abſolute right to *Iſaac*'s life, he had a right to imploy any inſtrument

TEXT.

received the promiſes, offer'd up his only begotten
18 *ſon:* of whom it was ſaid,
That in *Iſaac* ſhall thy ſeed
19 be called: accounting that
God was able to raiſe *him*
up even from the dead;

PARAPHRASE.

the promiſes of having a numerous poſterity by *Iſaac*, and of having the world bleſſed in his ſeed (*pp*), offer'd up his only begot- 18.
ten ſon, tho' he knew it was ſaid of him, *In Iſaac ſhall thy ſeed be call'd* to be GOD's people. *Abraham* did this by means of his 19.
faith in GOD's providence, whom he believed to be able and determined even to raiſe *Iſaac* to life after his being ſacrificed and put to death (*q*): from which indeed he did receive

NOTES.

ſtrument in taking it away. GOD did not hereby authorize, or command murder. For Murder is (not merely putting an innocent perſon to death, but) killing a perſon *without authority*, when it is *fit*, *proper*, and *beſt*, that we ſhould *ſpare* his life. But *Abraham* had the *divine* authority and command in the caſe; and that made it fit, proper, and beſt for him to take away *Iſaac*'s life; conſequently it was *not murder*; and GOD did *not diſpenſe* with his prohibition of murder, or of doing an ill thing.

Nor is there the leaſt room to pretend, that this hiſtory gives any manner of *encouragement* to men to put innocent perſons to death without ſuch a divine command. *Abraham*'s example will juſtify none but thoſe that have *as plain*, expreſs, and poſitive a command from GOD to do it, as *Abraham* had. A man muſt be a very great ſtranger to reaſon, who can bring himſelf to believe, that *Abraham*'s ſacrificing his ſon *in conſequence* of a divine command, will warrant any other perſon's doing the ſame *without* ſuch a command. It may with as much truth be ſaid, that a magiſtrate's *commiſſioning* an *executioner* to put a murderer to death will warrant that *executioner*, and any other *private* man to do the ſame *without* a commiſſion: which, I ſuppoſe, no one is weak enough to imagine. It is fit to add, that in the ſame ſenſe, wherein the magiſtrate's commiſſion may be ſaid to alter the nature of the action, and to make that lawful, which (in common caſes) was before unlawful; the command of GOD to *Abraham* alter'd the nature of his ſacrificing his ſon, and made that to be lawful, which was before a ſin. That is beſt in ſome circumſtances, which is not beſt in others. Tho' GOD can alter our *circumſtances*, yet he cannot alter the nature of *wiſdom and folly*, of *good*, and *evil*; can never require us to do what is fooliſh and evil, and forbid what is wiſe and beſt, in thoſe circumſtances wherein he places us. So that the *natures* of *good* and *evil*, *virtue* and *vice*, do not depend upon the *will* of GOD, but are abſolutely in their own natures, *neceſſary*, *eternal*, and *immutable*.

(*pp*) *He that had received the promiſes*, *i. e.* the promiſe of a *numerous poſterity* by *Iſaac*, *Gen.* xvii. 19. xv. 5. xxii. 17. the promiſe that *his ſeed ſhould be called in Iſaac*, *Gen.* xxi. 12. (that is, that the poſterity of *Iſaac* ſhould be accounted the ſeed of *Abraham*, and be made GOD's *peculiar* people: while his children by *Hagar*, and *Keturah*, ſhould be permitted to fall into idolatry, and ſo not be the people of GOD, nor regarded as *Abraham*'s ſeed. See *Rom.* ix. 6, 7, 8.) and the promiſe, that *in his ſeed all the nations of the earth ſhould be bleſſed*, xxii. 18.

(*q*) *Accounting that GOD was able to raiſe him up even from the dead.* The command to ſacrifice his ſon ſeem'd inconſiſtent with the promiſes mention'd in the foregoing Note. But *Abraham* wiſely conſider'd, that GOD could eaſily *reconcile* theſe things by raiſing *Iſaac* from the dead to live again in this world, as Chriſt rais'd *Lazarus*. Then he might

PARAPHRASE.

receive him in a figure, as he was ſaved from the point of death (*r*): *Iſaac*, by means of his faith in the divine revelations and promiſes relating to his poſterity, foretold the bleſſings, which ſhould, in future times, deſcend upon his two ſons, *Jacob* and *Eſau* (*s*).

20. It

TEXT.

from whence alſo he received him in a figure. By faith *Iſaac* bleſſed *Jacob* and *Eſau* concerning things 20

NOTES.

have a numerous poſterity, and the nations might be bleſs'd in him. *Abraham*'s faith was perfectly *rational*.

(*r*) *From whence alſo he received him in a figure.* Some would interpret this of *Iſaac*'s being born after *Abraham* was reckon'd *dead* as to the affair of being a father. But this cannot be right, ſince the apoſtle does not ſpeak of *Abraham*'s being dead, but of *Iſaac*'s being dead, and then rais'd from the dead. Beſides, *Abraham*'s being reckon'd dead as to the affair of being a father *preceeded* the ſacrifice, and even the birth of *Iſaac*: whereas *Abraham*'s receiving *Iſaac* from the dead, here mention'd by the apoſtle, was plainly *ſubſequent* to his offering him up. *Iſaac* then was rais'd from the dead *in a figure*. The apoſtle, with the greateſt judgment, added theſe words, *in a figure*: becauſe in a *literal* ſenſe *Iſaac* was not rais'd from the dead, in as much as he was not actually put to death. But here was *as it were* a reſurrection, or a *figure* of a reſurrection: ſince his death was fully reſolved on, and nothing would have hinder'd *Abraham* from offering up his ſon, if he had not received a divine command to deſiſt from what he was about. *Iſaac* was *rais'd* from the dead in the ſame ſenſe in which *Abraham* is ſaid to have *offer'd* him up: both theſe expreſſions are true only in a *figurative* ſenſe.

(*s*) *By faith Iſaac bleſſed Jacob and Eſau concerning things to come.* The bleſſings here referr'd to are recorded, *Gen.* xxvii. 27, 28, 29, 39, 40. *Iſaac*'s *bleſſing* his ſons was no other than his *predicting* by divine inſpiration what happineſs they and their poſterity ſhould enjoy in after ages: for it was not in his power to *ſecure* theſe bleſſings to them, even in his life-time, much leſs after his death: nor could he have known in what circumſtances they would be in future times without divine inſpiration.

It is here ask'd, how *Iſaac* can be ſaid to have bleſſed *Jacob* and *Eſau* by *faith*, when in bleſſing that ſon whom *he took* to be *Eſau*, he ſeems directly to have contradicted the divine promiſe made to their mother, *The elder ſhall ſerve the younger? Gen.* xxv. 23. For while *Iſaac* was, as he thought, bleſſing the *elder*, he ſaid, *Be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's ſons bow down to thee*, xxvii. 29. If he believed the former prediction, how could he deliver this latter in *faith?* or, if he believed the latter, muſt he not disbelieve the other; and ſo want faith in GOD? To this two things may be anſwer'd; *viz.* (1.) It is very poſſible, that *Iſaac* had not heard of the former prediction, *The elder ſhall ſerve the younger*: ſince it was deliver'd to *Rebekah*, when ſhe went to inquire of the Lord concerning the two children in her womb, when it is natural to think ſhe was *alone*, *Gen.* xxv. 22, 23. She may be thought to have kept this oracle as a ſecret even from her husband himſelf. If this was the caſe, the difficulty is intirely removed. But (2.) ſuppoſing ſhe did make *Iſaac* acquainted with this oracle at the time ſhe received it, or at any time afterward; ſtill *he* might underſtand it in a *ſenſe* fully *conſiſtent* with the other prediction. He might underſtand the oracle deliver'd to *Rebekah*, as not ſpeaking at all concerning the *poſterity* of *Jacob*, and *Eſau*, but only of their *ſingle perſons*; and as meaning, that *Eſau*, in his own perſon, ſhould ſerve his younger brother while he was growing up, or in ſome other part of his life. This was not at all inconſiſtent with *Iſaac*'s ſaying to *him*, whom *he took* to be his *elder* ſon, *Be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's ſons bow down*

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.	
11 to come. By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, bleſſed both the ſons of Joſeph, and worſhipped *leaning* upon the top of his ſtaff.	It was by means of faith in GOD's revelations, and promiſes, that *Jacob*, when near his end, foretold the bleſſings which both the ſons of *Joſeph*, *Ephraim* and *Manaſſeh*, ſhould enjoy in after ages; and a little before that, worſhipp'd upon the top of his ſtaff (*t*).	21.

It

NOTES.

down to thee: for he does not here ſpeak of the circumſtances of *Jacob* and *Eſau* in their ſingle *perſons*, but of the circumſtances of their *poſterity*, as is evident from the words *brethren*, and mother's *ſons*. For *Eſau*, to whom *Iſaac* thought he was ſpeaking, had but *one* brother, even *Jacob*; and his mother had not *ſons* to bow down to *Eſau*. But afterward, when her grandchildren were born, and in ſucceeding generations, it was true that ſhe had *many ſons*, and that *Eſau*'s poſterity had *many brethren* deſcended from *Jacob*. Theſe things conſider'd, it muſt be allowed, that *Iſaac* might not ſee the leaſt appearance of inconſiſtency between the propheſy deliver'd to his wife, and the prediction pronounced by himſelf on him whom he took to be his ſon *Eſau*. There was then nothing to hinder his believing both.

(*t*) *Worſhipped* leaning *upon the top of his ſtaff.* The hiſtory here refer'd to by the apoſtle, is render'd by our tranſlators of *Gen.* xlvii. 31. thus, *bowed himſelf upon the bed's head.* But the original expreſſion of *Moſes* is render'd, *worſhipped on the top of his ſtaff*, by the old *Greek* and *Syriac* tranſlators, with whoſe verſion the apoſtle agrees. The *Arabic* verſion omits the whole clauſe; ſo that we can have no help from thence. The occaſion of theſe different tranſlations is this, that the *Hebrew* word מטה ſignifies either a *bed*, or a *ſtaff*. The *Greek* and *Syriac* tranſlators rightly took it to ſignify a *ſtaff*, or a walking-ſtick, in this place; whereas the *Engliſh* tranſlators of *Geneſis* too implicitly followed the modern *Jews*, and ſuppos'd it here to ſignify a *bed*. The modern *Jews* have got different marks to the word, according as, in their judgment, it ſignifies a *bed*, or a *ſtaff*. But their marks are of no validity. It is juſt as if a man ſhould now take our *Engliſh* Bible, and ſet one particular mark on the word *light*, whenever *he* thinks it ſignifies that which is *oppoſite* to *darkneſs*; and another mark on the ſame word, in all thoſe places where *he* thinks it denotes that which is oppoſite to *heavy*; and a third kind of mark in thoſe other places where it ſignifies, *to* light *upon a thing*: no good critic would truſt that man's judgment, but would examine for himſelf in which of theſe ſenſes the word *light* is uſed in any particular text. In like manner, no manner of notice is to be taken of the *Jewiſh* marks, or points; but we ſhould examine, by the help of the context, and of the antient verſions, in which ſenſe it is moſt natural to underſtand the word מטה here, whether as ſignifying a *bed*, or a *ſtaff*. And that it does not (as the *Jews* have ignorantly fanſied) ſignify a *bed* in this place, may be infer'd from ſome things in the context. It is not at all likely, that *Jacob* was now *in bed*; ſince at this time, when he deſired his ſon *Joſeph* to *ſwear* that he would bury him with his fathers, he told him in what *form* he would have him ſwear, by ſaying, *ver.* 29. *Put thy hand under my thigh.* The ſame form of taking an oath is mentioned, *Gen.* xxiv. 2, 3. where *Abraham* ſays to his ſervant, *Put thy hand under my thigh, and I will make thee ſwear.* That *Abraham* was not *in bed* at this time, will not, I ſuppoſe, be doubted. Why then ſhould *Jacob* be thought to be *in bed*, when he made *Joſeph* uſe this ceremony of putting his hand *under* his father's *thigh* at the time of his taking an oath? Nor does it ſeem to be very *decent* for *Joſeph* to have thruſt his hand into his father's *bed* for ſuch a purpoſe. It is abundantly more natural to think, that *Jacob* was dreſs'd, and *ſitting* up, as well as *Abraham*. Beſides, there is no reaſon to think that *Jacob* was at this time *ſick*; nay, the contrary ſeems fairly to be implied in the words of the

 hiſtory,

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

hiſtory, which immediately follow; *And it came to paſs*, after theſe things, *that one told Joſeph, Behold, thy father is* ſick, *ch.* xlviii. 1. And let it be farther conſider'd, to what purpoſe ſhould the *head* of the bed be mentioned? What can poſſibly be the meaning of *Jacob*'s worſhipping upon the bed's *head*? But the worſhipping upon the *head*, or *top* of his *ſtaff*, is very good ſenſe. To avoid this laſt mentioned difficulty, *Le Clerc* on *Gen.* xlvii. 31. has propoſed to tranſlate the paſſage without any hint of *worſhip*, in this manner, *viz. And he laid himſelf down on the bed's head*, i. e. ſays he, after *Jacob* had ſat up ſometime in the bed, and was weary, he lay back. But ſtill he does not avoid another difficulty: for it is far from a proper expreſſion to ſay, that a man lays himſelf down on the *head* of the bed. For the rendering and ſenſe of the place eſpouſed by *Le Clerc*, he pleads that the *Hebrew* word שחה ſignifies not only, to *bend* the body, but alſo to *lay* it *on the ground*; and that it may as well be uſed of thoſe who lie on their *ſide*, or *back*, as of thoſe who fall on their *faces*. But this is all talking without book. The truth is, this word in the conjugation *Hithpael*, never ſignifies any other bending of the body than bending it *forward*, as a mark of *worſhip* paid either to God, to idols, or to ſuperiors among men, as may be ſeen in *Buxtorf*'s concordance. *Le Clerk* names but *one* place where he himſelf can imagine the word ſignifies otherwiſe, and that is 1 *Kings* i. 47. where our tranſlation has it, *The king bowed himſelf upon the bed*; which *Le Clerc* would have to ſignify, that *David laid himſelf down* in the *bed*. But all the *old* tranſlators agreed to render it, *The king* worſhipped *on his bed*; which is what our *Engliſh* tranſlators alſo meant. And there can be no reaſon to doubt but that the *Hebrew* word here uſed ſignifies *worſhip*, as it does in above an hundred and ſixty other places, and in all places without exception, unleſs theſe two now under conſideration are to be excepted. It is much more natural to think, that in theſe two places alſo it is to be underſtood in its common and uſual ſenſe. *Le Clerc* would fain perſuade us otherwiſe; to which end he roundly aſſerts, that there is no example in all the Bible of this word's being uſed to ſignify *religious worſhip*, unleſs the word God is added, or ſome circumſtance belonging to worſhip is mentioned. But in ſaying this he was too haſty. For there are in fact ſeveral inſtances of this word's ſignifying *divine worſhip* in other texts, in which there is no more mention of the name of God, or of any circumſtance relating to worſhip, than there is in the two texts now before us. There is a very remarkable and inconteſtible inſtance to this purpoſe, *Judg.* vii. 15. *When Gideon heard the telling of the dream, and the interpretation thereof, he worſhipped*; i. e. he worſhipped God, as may be infer'd from the natural force of the word. See alſo *Exod.* iv. 31. xii. 27. There appears then to be ſufficient reaſon to interpret the Scripture as ſpeaking 1 *Kings* i. 47. of *David*'s worſhipping God, when he ſat up in his bed, and was too weak to riſe and do more; and as ſpeaking of *Jacob*'s woſhipping God, when it ſays, *he worſhipp'd on the top of his ſtaff*: Nor does there appear any manner of objection againſt any part of the tranſlation of this text given us by the ſeventy and by the apoſtle.

It may not be amiſs to add, that the comparing theſe two texts together confirms one in believing that *Moſes* did not mean to ſay, *Jacob* worſhipp'd upon the *head* of the *bed*; for in the caſe of *David* there is no mention of the *head* of the *bed*, as it is plain there was no occaſion there ſhould be. But if we interpret *Moſes* as ſpeaking of *Jacob*'s *ſtaff*, or *walking ſtick*, it was very natural to ſpeak of the *top* or *head* of it, and to repreſent the *weak old* man ſitting up in his chair, leaning forward to worſhip God, and ſupporting himſelf, that he might not fall, by reſting on the *head* or *top* of his ſtaff. So that I hope the apoſtle is fully juſtified in his tranſlation of this place.

Perhaps it will be aſked, Why the apoſtle takes ſuch particular notice of this ſeemingly *trivial* circumſtance, that when *Jacob* worſhipp'd God, he lean'd *on the top of his ſtaff*? In anſwer to this, it muſt be ſaid, that this is far from being a trivial circumſtance. The apoſtle was about to repreſent the *greatneſs* and *ſtrength* of *Jacob*'s *faith* in God: To which purpoſe he very pertinently obſerves, that when *Jacob* was very *old* and *feeble*, and could not bend himſelf forward (in ſuch a manner as men always then did) to worſhip God without reſting upon the *very top* of his *ſtaff*; yet ſtill he would not neglect the divine

worſhip,

TEXT.

22 By faith Joseph, when he died, made mention of the departing of the children of Israel; and gave commandment concerning his
23 bones. By faith Moses, when he was born, was hid three months of his parents: because they saw *he was* a proper child; and they

PARAPHRASE.

It was by means of faith in GOD, and his revelations, that *Joseph*, when he was about to die (*u*), made mention of the departing of the children of *Israel* out of *Egypt* in time to come; and gave them a commandment to carry his bones with them, at the same time, into *Canaan* (*w*). Through the faith which the parents of *Moses* had in GOD, they took care of their child, when he was born, and hid him for three months, in order to preserve his life, because they saw he was a well-form'd, perfect, and healthy child, that was likely to live (*x*), and by means of their faith

22.

23.

NOTES.

worship, but would perform it in the best manner he was able. This shews that his *faith* was strong, when his body was weak; and that (as he was at that time *near* his end) he *persevered* in the faith.

(*u*) *Joseph when he died.* The word τελευτων here used by the apostle, only signifies that *Joseph* was *near death.* In the same sense the word αποθνησκω is used in the old *Greek* version of *Gen.* l. 24. (to which place the apostle here refers) where we read, *Joseph said unto his brethren, I die*, i. e. *I shall* shortly *die*, or, *I am* near *death.* Thus also the word αποθνησκων is usedby the apostle in the preceeding verse, where he says, *Jacob was a dying*, or rather, *near his end*, when he blessed the two sons of *Joseph*: For after this he lived a little while, long enough to deliver a particular prophesy concerning every one of his sons, whom he sent for to attend him, *Gen.* xlix. 1, *&c.* the calling of whom, their coming together, and his discourse to them, must take up some time. In like manner, the things which *Joseph* is here said to have mentioned, were deliver'd by him in his *last* illness, when he was *near* death.

(*w*) *And gave commandment concerning his bones.* This commandment is mentioned *Gen.* l. 25. *Joseph took an oath of the children of Israel, saying, GOD will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence*; which was accordingly done, as we read, *Exod.* xiii. 19. *Jos.* xxiv. 32. *Joseph*'s foretelling the deliverance of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt* above an hundred and forty years before it happen'd, was perhaps owing to what he had learnt from the *revelation* made to *Abraham*, *Gen.* xv. 13—16. in which case here is a plain instance of his faith in a divine revelation. Or, if it be supposed, that a revelation of this matter was made *immediately* to *himself*, he is, in this case also, equally an instance of believing in a divine revelation. He farther shew'd the *reality* of his faith, by ordering *his bones* to be carried into *Canaan*, when the *Israelites* should depart thither. This shews, that he fully depended upon the divine revelation, and so was a proper instance for the apostle to produce in this place.

(*x*) *Was hid three months of his parents, because they saw he was a proper child.* By a *proper*, or, as it is in the *Hebrew*, a *goodly* child, is undoubtedly meant, a child that was not maimed, or sickly, but that look'd *well*, and *likely to live.* If the child had been weak, and manifestly near death, such *extraordinary* care might not have been taken of him. The design of *Moses* his parents in hiding him, was, that the *Egyptians* might not kill him at a time when *Pharaoh* order'd them to kill all the male children of the *Israelites*, *Exod.* i. 22.

PARAPHRASE.

faith they were not afraid of king *Pharaoh*, who commanded that all the male children
24. of the *Hebrews* ſhould be deſtroy'd (*y*). The faith which *Moſes* had in GOD, and in his promiſes, engaged him, when he was grown up to be a man (*z*), to refuſe to be called,

and

TEXT.

were not afraid of the king's commandment. By faith
24 Moſes, when he was come to years, refuſed to be call-

NOTES.

i. 22. They would have kept him concealed longer if they could; but we may well ſuppoſe they were at length ſo carefully watched, and their houſe order'd to be ſearch'd, that they ſaw it neceſſary to remove him; upon which they put him in a box made of bull-ruſhes, cover'd over with ſlime and pitch, to keep out the water, and laid him in a bed of flags, by the brink of the river, *Exod.* ii. 3. thus committing him to the providence of GOD. It was owing to their *faith* and truſt in GOD, as well as to their natural affection, that they thus *concealed* him; becauſe the king had commanded *all his ſubjects*, whether *Egyptians* or *Iſraelites*, to kill the male children of the *Hebrews* as faſt as they were born. And they continued to exerciſe this faith, when they put him in the coffer or box of bull-ruſhes, and laid him on the bank of the river; for it is plain they had no deſign to *kill* the child, but only to conceal him till they could find an opportunity, if ſuch a one ſhould offer, to take him up and preſerve him. This is evident from his ſiſter's remaining near the river, within ſight of him, to ſee what would become of him, *Exod.* ii. 4. And, no doubt, the providence of GOD over-ruled all theſe matters ſo, as that his life *might* be preſerved.

There is one ſmall difference between the apoſtle's account of this matter, and the preſent *Hebrew* text of *Exod.* ii. 2. This ſpeaks only of his *mother*; whereas the apoſtle mentions *both* the parents of *Moſes* as concerned in this tranſaction. The *Hebrew* text ſays, *When* ſhe *ſaw him that he was a goodly child*, ſhe *hid him three months*. The apoſtle has it, *He was hid by his* parents *three months*, *becauſe* they *ſaw that he was a proper child*. It muſt be owned, that the *Chaldee*, *Latin*, *Syriac*, *Arabic*, and *Samaritan* verſions, and even the *Samaritan* text too, agree with the *Hebrew*; yet the apoſtle is not alone in attributing this to *both* the parents: for the old *Greek* verſion of *Geneſis* does the ſame; and perhaps the *antient Hebrew* copies did ſo too. However this makes no conſiderable difference, ſince it is not to be queſtioned, but that his *father*, as well as his mother, ſaw him to be a likely child; and that his father *conſented* to his being hid, if he did not *directly order* it.

(*y*) *They were not afraid of the king's commandment.* By this expreſſion it is plain the apoſtle thought that *Pharaoh* commanded the *Iſraelites* to kill their own male children, as well as order'd the *Hebrew midwives*, and all the *Egyptians* to kill them, whenever it ſhould be in their power. They were tempted to be afraid of the king's commandment as a commandment deliver'd *to themſelves*. The apoſtle was right in ſuppoſing this; becauſe, without all doubt, *Pharaoh* would have puniſhed the parents of *Moſes* with death, if he had known they had ſaved the child alive, and had hid him in order to his preſervation. Their not obeying this command of killing their child, or, at leaſt, of delivering him up to be kill'd, when their obedience would both have ſaved their own lives, and have gained them an intereſt in the king's favour, was plainly an effect of their *faith* in GOD, and of their ſincere regard to his will.

(*z*) *When he was come to years.* St. *Stephen*, from an antient tradition of the *Jews*, informs us, that *Moſes* was *forty* years old when he left the *Egyptian* court, and went to take his fate among the *Iſraelites*, *Acts* vii. 23. At this age the apoſtle might well ſay, *he was come to years*, or, *was become great*, as the expreſſion in the *Greek* may be literally render'd; which is borrowed from the *Greek* verſion of *Exod.* ii. 11.

ed the ſon of Pharaoh's ‖ daughter: chooſing rather to ſuffer affliction with the people of GOD, than to enjoy the pleaſures of ſin for ‖ a ſeaſon; eſteeming the reproach of Chriſt greater riches than the treaſures in ‖ Egypt: For he had reſpect unto the recompence of the reward. By faith he forſook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he

and accounted, as he might have been, the ſon of the king of *Egypt*'s daughter (*a*): chooſing rather to ſuffer affliction with the 25.
Iſraelites (whom GOD had choſen to be his people in a peculiar manner, to worſhip him, to be under his eſpecial protection, and to receive the reward of eternal life) than to enjoy the ſinful pleaſures of a wicked and idolatrous court, which could, at moſt, laſt no longer than his ſhort life; eſteeming the 26.
reproach he ſhould ſuffer for his faith in a Meſſiah to come (*aa*) more valuable, and more worthy to be choſen, than the treaſures in *Egypt*. For he had reſpect to the eternal reward of his fidelity, which, he knew, would abundantly recompenſe all the reproach and ſufferings he could here endure for the ſake of his conſcience. *Moſes* was 27.
influenced by his faith in GOD, and in his promiſes, to forſake *Egypt*, and not to fear the wrath of king *Pharaoh*, tho' he could not but expect that he would purſue, and ſeek to puniſh him (*b*): For he held on in the

NOTES.

(*a*) *Refuſed to be called the ſon of Pharaoh's daughter.* The divine providence ſo order'd matters, as that *Pharaoh*'s daughter herſelf preſerved the life of *Moſes*, when he was in the utmoſt danger of death, and nouriſh'd up *him*, who was to deliver the *Iſraelites* from her father's tyranny. She, under the conduct of divine providence, appointed *Moſes*'s own mother to be his nurſe; and had him provided for as *her own* ſon, *Exod.* ii. 5—10. When he was wean'd, and taken from his nurſe, *Pharaoh*'s daughter took him home, and educated him as her own child. But when *Moſes* was forty years old, he left her, and join'd himſelf to his brethren the children of *Iſrael*, *ver.* 11, 12, 13. By this conduct he plainly declared, that he refuſed any longer to be called, and accounted, the ſon of the princeſs.

(*aa*) *The reproach of Chriſt.* This ſignifies reproach ſuffer'd *for the ſake of Chriſt*, as, *the marks of the Lord Jeſus*, are the marks of the ſtripes that were born *for the ſake of Jeſus*, *Gal.* vi. 17. See alſo *Philip.* iii. 10. *Coloſſ.* i. 24. 2 *Cor.* i. 5. and Mr. *Locke* and Mr. *Peirce* on theſe places.

(*b*) *Not fearing the wrath of the king.* The hiſtory here refer'd to by the apoſtle is that of the *Iſraelites* going out of *Egypt* under the conduct of *Moſes*; at which time it is evident *Moſes* had *ſtrong faith*, and, *no fear*, tho' the *Iſraelites* thought there was great cauſe

PARAPHRASE.

the exercise of this courage, because he as really believed the being and attributes of the *invisible* GOD, as if he had seen him with his eyes; and fully depended upon his con-
28. duct and assistance. It was by means of the same faith that *Moses* observed the feast of the passover in *Egypt*, and conformed to the divine order of sprinkling the blood of the paschal lamb on the door-posts of the *Israelites*, that their children might be preserved when the angel destroy'd the first-born
29. of the *Egyptians* (*c*). It was by means of faith in GOD's power and promises, that the *Israelites* passed through the *Red Sea*, as on dry land, while the waters stood in heaps on each side of them (*d*): whereas the unbelieving

TEXT.

endured as seeing him who is invisible. Through faith 28
he kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroy'd the first-born, should touch them.
By faith they passed thro' 29
the Red Sea as by dry *land*:

NOTES.

cause for fear. For when he saw the sea before them, and *Pharaoh* with his army come out to pursue them, and could not but be sensible that the king was full of wrath and revenge, he was still undaunted, and trusted that GOD would deliver his people; wherefore he admonished them to lay aside their fears, saying, *Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord, which he will shew you to day: for the Egyptians whom ye have seen to day, ye shall see them again no more for ever; the Lord will fight for you*, Exod. xiv. 13, 14.

(*c*) *Through faith he kept the passover*, &c. The particulars here refer'd to by the apostle are mentioned, *Exod.* xii. 12, 13, 21, 22, 23. The faith which *Moses* exercised upon this occasion, was a faith in GOD's *promise*, that the blood of the paschal lamb sprinkled on the door-posts, would, *as a term*, or condition, save the *Israelitish* children *alive*; and a faith in the divine *threatning*, that in the same night all the *first-born* of the *Egyptians* should *die*. His faith influenced him to obey the divine orders.

(*d*) *They passed thro' the Red sea, as by dry land.* That there was a miracle wrought at this time is beyond all question. For even if the event of the sea's dividing had been as much owing to a *natural* cause, as the *tide*, an *eclipse*, or the return of a *comet*; still the *predicting* the division of the sea *at that particular time*, was beyond the power of man. It is plain *fact*, neither the *Israelites*, nor the *Egyptians*, could predict it of themselves, because neither of them at that time had the least apprehension or expectation of any such thing. The *Egyptians* took it for granted, that the *Israelites* were bounded by the sea, and so would be certainly overtaken: And the *Israelites*, by their *anxiety* and *fears*, when *Pharaoh* pursued them, sufficiently declared that they had no knowledge of the sea's dividing upon any occasion. Yet *Moses* predicted the event, and it fell out exactly as he foretold it, *Exod.* xiv. 13, 16, 17.

Concerning the *miracle* of the sea's dividing, it must be observed, that at the place where the *Israelites* passed the *Red Sea*, they went over *as on dry land*; that both just before, and just after, the time of their passage, the water in that same place was *deep* enough to *drown* a large army of men, horses, and chariots; and that the time of its continuing dry was not of any very long duration. It was *night* before the sea *began* to divide, *ver.* 20.

And

NOTES.

And then it is ſaid, *ver.* 21. *The Lord cauſed the ſea to go back by a ſtrong eaſt wind, all that night, and made the ſea dry land, and the waters were divided.* In the *morning watch* (the fourth watch of the night, which began at *break* of day) the ſea overflowed the *Egyptians*, *ver.* 24. Theſe things put together, ſufficiently ſhew, that the miracle did not conſiſt merely in *Moſes* his predicting the event; but that the ſea was *divided* by a *miracle* too.

Le Clerc, who freely owns ſome miracle in the caſe, ſets himſelf however to account for all the circumſtances of the dividing the ſea by means of the *ſtrong wind* (miraculouſly raiſed at this time) juſt now mentioned, *ver.* 21. which he thinks help'd to carry off the waters toward the *Indian Sea*, when the tide was going out, and prevented their returning at the time when the tide ſhould regularly have flowed again; during which time he ſuppoſes the *Iſraelites* paſſed through the channel. The learned author was ſenſible this account would not ſolve the matter, if the *Hebrew* word קדים ſignifies an *eaſt* wind, *v.* 21. as our tranſlators have render'd it; ſince the *Red Sea* lies north and ſouth: For an *eaſt* wind would not then drive the waters to the ſouth end of the *Red Sea*, where it falls into the *Indian* ocean. He would therefore endeavour to perſuade us, that the *Hebrew* word does not denote the *point from which* the wind comes, but in general, any *ſtrong*, or *violent wind*, and particularly in this place, a ſtrong *north* wind. But this is very arbitrary: For it cannot be denied that the word *generally* ſignifies the *eaſt*. And which is more; when the four cardinal points of the world are mentioned together, קדים unqueſtionably ſignifies the eaſt, as *Exod.* xxvii. 9, 11, 12, 13. where the point called קדים is not only diſtinguiſhed from the *ſouth*, *north*, and *weſt*, but is alſo expreſſed by another word, מזרחה which never ſignifies any thing elſe. See alſo *Exod.* x. 13, 19. where קדים is oppoſed to the *weſt* wind. And in *Ezekiel* all the four winds are expreſly named together, *chap.* xlii. 16, 17, 18, 19. where the *eaſt* wind, as diſtinguiſhed from the *north*, the *ſouth*, and the *weſt*, is called קדים. When the meaning of the word is thus certainly fixed (not by the authority of modern writers of *Lexicons*, to which no good critic will truſt, but) by the original authors themſelves, who have uſed it, there does not ſeem to be any poſſibility of diſputing the ſenſe of it. To ſuppoſe, after this, that the ſame word which ſignifies the *eaſt* wind *as diſtinguiſhed* from the other three, ſhould ſometimes ſignify a *ſtrong* wind in general, or a *north* wind in particular, is ſomething very unnatural. The old *Greek* tranſlators of the Bible have indeed ſometimes render'd this word as ſignifying the *ſouth* wind, but without any manner of reaſon, nay, contrary to the plain meaning of the word fixed, as we have ſeen, by the ſacred writers themſelves. It muſt then be determined, that the wind which cauſed the ſea to go back, was an *eaſt* wind.

To this *Le Clerc* objects, that when the *Iſraelites* went over the *Red Sea*, they walked *from weſt to eaſt*, and conſequently the wind was in their faces; and that if it had been a *ſtrong* eaſt wind, they could not have born up, and marched againſt it. For anſwer whereto, it may be obſerved, that the ſtrong eaſt wind ſeems to have blown only till the time of the *Iſraelites entering* the ſea. The wind, we may ſuppoſe, as it were rais'd the water on both ſides, and made a path in the middle, and then ceaſed. There is no manner of occaſion to ſuppoſe, that it was needful the wind ſhould *continue* blowing in order to ſupport the waters; ſince the wind was no otherwiſe the *cauſe* of their being ſupported, than the rod of *Moſes* was the cauſe of their being rais'd, and of their returning, *Exod.* xiv. 21, 27. In like manner, the *bringing* of the *locuſts* to be a plague on the *Egyptians* is attributed to the *eaſt* wind, *Exod.* x. 13. and their being carried away to a ſtrong *weſt* wind, *ver.* 19. And the bringing of the quails into the camp of the *Iſraelites* is alſo attributed to the *wind*, *Numb.* xi. 31. *There went forth a* wind *from the Lord, and brought quails from the ſea*, i. e. from the *Indian Sea*, which lay to the ſouth-eaſt of *Kibroth-hattaavah*, where the *Iſraelites* then were. On which account the Pſalmiſt, ſpeaking of the ſame thing, mentions both an *eaſt* and a *ſouth* wind, *Pſal.* lxxviii. 26. *He cauſed an* eaſt *wind to blow in the heaven: and by his power he brought in the* ſouth *wind*; i. e. he cauſed a *ſouth-eaſt* wind. But no one ſuſpects that the *wind* was the *cauſe* of theſe events, in any other way than as *Moſes* his rod was the *cauſe* of the miracles in *Egypt*, and of the dividing and re-

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

turning of the *Red Sea*. Nor is it reaſonable then to ſuppoſe that the *eaſt* wind did in any other ſenſe divide the ſea.

There is no reaſon to imagine, that the water of the *Red Sea* was kept back by the *natural force* of the wind, ſince much ſtronger winds than the eaſt wind uſes to be, were never known to produce ſuch an effect in any place, or in any age of the world. The *natural force* of the wind is ſufficient to increaſe or leſſen a tide, in ſome degree, but not to make a *channel dry*. There muſt then have been at this time a very extraordinary power of GOD attending the wind (as it attended the motions of the rod of *Moſes*) or elſe the waters would not have ſtood on an heap to have made way for the *Iſraelites* to paſs. When the *Iſraelites*, after this, paſſed over *Jordan*, there is no mention, in the hiſtory, made of any wind that ſhould ſeem to be the occaſion of the waters of that river ſtanding up as an heap. There is then no reaſon to think, that the natural force of the wind was ſufficient of itſelf to divide the *Red Sea*. And ſo the *eaſt* wind might at that time blow no ſtronger than that the *Iſraelites* might commodiouſly march againſt it. Or elſe we may ſuppoſe, as I ſaid, that it ceaſed to blow while they were walking through the channel.

Let it not be here objected, that it is ſaid, *GOD cauſed the ſea to go back by a ſtrong eaſt wind* all that *night*, *Exod.* xiv. 21. For this does not imply that the wind continued blowing till all the *Iſraelites* were paſſed over the channel, as will appear from viewing the whole verſe; *And Moſes ſtretched out his hand over the ſea, and the Lord cauſed the ſea to go back by a ſtrong eaſt wind all that night, and made the ſea dry land, and the waters were divided.* This text only ſignifies, that *Moſes* ſtretched out his hand, and that the wind blew, till the ſea was made dry land, and till the waters were divided. But when the waters were actually divided, and the ſea actually become dry land, there is no reaſon to think that the wind continued to blow, or that *Moſes* continued to ſtretch out his hand. And yet it might well enough be ſaid to blow *all night*, becauſe it might blow for *nine* hours, from ſun-ſet to almoſt break of day, and yet leave time enough, after it ceaſed, for the *Iſraelites* to paſs the ſea before the next ſun-riſing, about which time the *Egyptians* were drowned, *ver.* 27. toward the *latter* end, I ſuppoſe of the *morning watch*, *ver.* 24. The time of the *Iſraelites* paſſing through the channel would not be very long. The number of people that went over were *ſix hundred thouſand men, beſides children, and a mix'd multitude*, *Exod.* xii. 37, 38. Let us ſuppoſe them all to have been a million (for the children that were carried in mens arms need not be conſider'd in this computation) and the breadth of the channel but two miles. Allowing then each man, one with another, to take up two feet from his breaſt to his back, 5280 men might ſtand in *file* in the channel at once, and then there would be no more in rank than 190, allowing each man three feet from ſide to ſide; in which caſe one rank would reach no farther than to the *one tenth* part of a mile. But a *file* of 5280 men could march thoſe two miles in the ſame time as one man could march that length twice. For when the *firſt* man of the file had paſſed the whole way, and was come to the *yonder* ſhore, the *laſt* man in the file would be at the hither ſhore, and would walk over in a ſpace of time equal to that wherein the firſt man had done it. So that if *one* man could have march'd the whole way in *one* hour, the *whole* file, and conſequently all the million, could have paſſed over in *two* hours, and the ſea have been divided in length no farther than the *one tenth* of a mile. But if the ſea was divided (as *Le Clerc* allows) for a larger ſpace, ſuppoſe a *whole mile*, then a *rank* of the *Iſraelites* would have conſiſted of 1760 men; and conſequently a *file* would have contained no more than 568. In which caſe one file would have taken up little more than the *fourth* part of a mile, or an *eighth* part of the *whole* way; ſo that a whole file would have paſſed it almoſt as ſoon as one man could have done it, *i.e.* ſtrictly ſpeaking, as ſoon as one man could walk two miles, and a little above a quarter, which would be conſiderably leſs than two hours.

Le Clerc ſuppoſes, that the waters of the ſea were raiſed in a heap *only on one ſide*, on the *right* hand of the *Iſraelites*, where the tide (he thinks) was kept back by a *north* wind; while on their *left* hand, according to him, there was no more water than what happen'd to lie in pits, and the deeper places of an uneven channel. But the text ſeems very plainly

TEXT. PARAPHRASE

which the Egyptians assaying to do, were drowned. By faith the walls of

lieving *Egyptians*, who attempted to do the same, were drowned by the return of the waters to their place. It was upon the account of 30.

NOTES.

to describe the waters as standing up like a *wall* on *both sides*, *Exod.* xiv. 22. —*The waters were a wall unto them, on their* right *hand, and on their* left; which in the song of *Moses* is thus described, *The floods stood* upright as an heap, *and the depths were congeal'd in the heart of the sea*, xv. 8. *Le Clerc* is hard put to it to account for the expression of the sea's being a *wall* both on the *right* and *left* hand. That it was so on the *right* hand he does not dispute. Its being so on the *left* he thinks means no more than this, *viz.* That there was standing water in the *pits* on the *left* hand, which could not flow away by reason of the situation. To shew that this might be all the meaning, he refers us to *Nahum* iii. 8. as a parallel place, where the prophet says, that the sea was the wall of the city *Noammon*, in *Egypt*. This city lay between the *Nile* and the *Red Sea*, which the prophet, by a very easy figure, represents as the *walls* of it; because they defended the city as securely as a wall could do, and hinder'd neighbouring nations from invading them: inasmuch as the river was large and full, and the sea unpassable. But supposing there were pits in the bottom of the *Red Sea*, they could not be compared to a wall, unless they were so *deep*, so *large*, and so *situated* with respect to one another, as to have made it impossible for the *Egyptians* to have come in upon the *Israelites* on that side. It must be added, that since, as *Le Clerc* allows, there is a *strong tide*, and a *deep sand* in the *Red Sea*, it is very unlikely there should be any such deep and large pits in the bottom of it, as he needs; since the *tide* usually makes the sand *smooth*. When therefore *Moses* describes the water as a *wall* on the *right* and *left*, he certainly means, that the appearance of the water was the *same* on *both* sides, and on both stood up miraculously as a *heap*.

This may be farther confirm'd by comparing the description of this division of the waters of the *Red Sea* with the division of the waters of *Jordan*, mentioned *Josh.* iii. 16. It is not at all said, or implied, that the waters of *Jordan* were a *wall* to the *Israelites* on *each* side; but it is said, that the *waters which come down from above*, i e. from the source of the river, *stood and rose up upon a heap*, while *those that went down toward the sea fail'd and were cut off*, and run away into the sea according to their natural course. By this means the *Israelites* passage might soon have been as wide as was the length of the river from the mouth of it to the place where the waters stood up as a heap. On their *left* hand then toward the sea, there was nothing that answered the end of a *wall*, or that could have hinder'd an enemy from attacking them on that side, if an enemy had then pursued them. This seems to be the true reason of the difference between the two cases. When the *Israelites* went over *Jordan*, no enemy was near, and so they were not at all endanger'd by having a long part of the channel made dry on their left hand: whereas when the *Israelites* passed through the *Red Sea*, they were *closely pursued* by the *Egyptians*; so that if there had been none, or very little water on their left hand, the *Egyptians* might have attacked them both behind, and on the left hand at once. To prevent any thing of this nature, it seems likely the sea was raised on *both* sides. Besides that hereby the destruction of the *Egyptians* was the more easily and securely effected, by the opposite floods of water falling in upon them at once. If the *Egyptians* are supposed to have been half a mile behind the *Israelites* at the time when the hindmost of the *Israelites* reached the eastern shore of the *Red Sea*, the hindmost of the *Egyptians* might have been gotten half a mile within the western shore, and so the whole army lying in the *midst* of the channel might easily be drowned by a pretty sudden returning of the waters to their former state.

I shall only add, that it is as easy to conceive how Almighty God should thus divide the waters, as how he should make the waters at first, and cause the tides.

Chap. XI.

PARAPHRASE.

of the faith which *Joshua* and other *pious Israelites* had in the divine promise, that the walls of *Jericho* miraculously fell down, after they had march'd round the city, every day for seven days together, according to
31. God's order (*e*). It was upon the account of the faith which *Rahab* the harlot had in the God of *Israel*, and in his promises, that she was not destroy'd with the other inhabitants of *Jericho*, who believed not; when she received and peaceably entertain'd in her house the men whom *Joshua* had sent to spy
32. the city (*f*). And what instances of faith shall

TEXT.

Jericho fell down, after they were compassed about seven days. By faith the 31
harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had receiv'd the spies with peace. And 32
what shall I more say?

NOTES.

(*e*) *By faith the walls of Jericho fell down*, &c. The history of this fact is recorded, *Josh.* vi. where we are told, that every day, for the first *six* days, the *Israelites* with the ark, and the priests, and trumpets, marched round the city *once*; and that on the *seventh* day they marched round it *seven* times in the same manner: only at their last time of marching round it, when the priests blew the trumpets, the people shouted with a great shout; whereupon the wall immediately fell down flat to the ground. Here was evidently a miracle. Neither the sound of the trumpets, or the shouting of the people, could have thrown down the wall by a *natural* power. It has been said, I know, that as a man's voice sounding the same note as a glass, will make the glass answer, and even break it in pieces; so the sound that was made at the taking of *Jericho* hit the tone of the wall, and by that means threw it down. But a man must have a strong imagination before he can believe that the sound of a trumpet, or the shout of an army, is *unison* to the sound of a wall made of stone, or of earth. The truth is, neither the sound of the trumpets, nor the shout of the people, was the *cause* of the fall of the walls of *Jericho*; but, *at the time* of their shouting, God, by his invisible and almighty power, caused the walls to fall. The shouting in this case was of the same influence as the blowing of the east wind at the time of the dividing of the *Red Sea*; neither was the *cause* of a miracle, but each *signified the time* when the miracle should be wrought.

The faith which the apostle here commends, was the faith not only of *Joshua*, but also of all the *pious* priests, and of all the *religious* people. They believed God, that if they did according to his directions, march round *Jericho* for seven days together, blow the trumpets and shout, the walls of it would hereupon fall to the ground. This their faith was perfectly *rational*, because the promise of the miracle was made by God, to whose infinite power, and not to the probability of the means, they were to look for the accomplishment of it.

(*f*) *By faith the harlot Rahab*, &c. The apostle took this character of *Rahab*, that she was a *harlot*, from *Joshua*, who often stiles her so, *Chap.* ii. 1. vi. 17, 22, 25. Some commentators indeed, both *Jewish* and Christian, would fain persuade us that *Joshua* did not intend to call her by so ill a name, but only meant, by the *Hebrew* word זונה that she kept an *inn*. But this is easily confuted, by observing, that the *Hebrew* word *never once* bears this *mild* signification in all the Old Testament, but *always* signifies either a *whore*, or

or an *idolater* that went a *whoring* from the God of *Israel*. The apoſtle therefore was undoubtedly right in giving her this character. How long ſhe liv'd this ſcandalous life we cannot ſay; but it ſeems unqueſtionable, that after the ſpies had been with her, and ſhe was brought to believe in the God of *Iſrael*, ſhe reform'd her life. She went and dwelt among the *Iſraelites*, and was married to *Salmon* the ſon of *Naaſſon*, the prince of the tribe of *Judah*, *Numb.* ii. 3. *Matth.* i. 5. *And Salmon begat Booz of Rachab*, or, as her name is otherwiſe ſpelt, *Rahab*. That ſhe was *cotemporary* with *Salmon*, and was capable of being married to him, is very plain. *Salmon*'s father *Naaſſon* was with *Moſes* in the wilderneſs, *Numb.* i. 7. ii. 3. vii. 12. In the wilderneſs he died, as he was one of that generation that was to die there, *Numb.* xxvi. 64, 65. *Salmon* then muſt, at the lateſt, be born before the *Iſraelites* left the wilderneſs. On the other hand, *Salmon* muſt have been *under twenty* when the *Iſraelites* came out of *Egypt*; elſe he had died in the wilderneſs as well as his father, according to the threatning, *Numb.* xxxii. 11, 12. But if he was born about that time, he was forty years of age at the time of taking *Jericho*, and ſo was capable of taking a wife. And when ſhe was married to ſo *great* a man, we need not queſtion, but that ſhe was reformed, and acted according to her faith; ſince otherwiſe *Joſhua* would not have permitted him to take her.

The apoſtle may be the rather thought to take notice of her having been a *harlot*, in his epiſtle to the *Hebrew* Chriſtians, that he might hereby the better perſuade them to believe that God is now ready to receive the *Gentiles* into his kingdom on their repentance. The general character of the *Gentiles* was, that they were addicted to *fornication* and all *uncleanneſs*, *Rom.* i. 24, 26, 27. *Epheſ.* iv. 17, 19. 1 *Theſſ.* iv. 5. On this account the *Hebrew* Chriſtians might be inclined to think, that theſe *ſinners of the Gentiles* ſhould not be admitted into the ſame church with them who were *Jews by nature*. But by this example of *Rahab*, the apoſtle proves from the Old Teſtament, that faith (*viz.* ſuch a faith as is attended with *reformation* and *good works*, deſcribed *ver* 1.) had availed to the juſtification of a *penitent harlot*, and conſequently would now avail to the juſtification of the *reformed* Gentiles.

Rahab's faith was, that Jehovah the God of Iſrael, *is GOD in heaven above, and in earth beneath*, the one ſupreme God; that he had *dried up the water of the Red Sea for* the Iſraelites, *when* they *came out of Egypt*, and that he *had given them the land* of Canaan, *Joſh.* ii. 9, 10, 11. In conſequence of this ſhe could not but believe in the law of *Moſes*. Whereas the reſt of the people of *Jericho* believed not theſe things: as appears from the *oppoſition* they made to the *Iſraelites*, and from their attempting to keep the city from falling into their hands: which they would not have done, if they had truly believed, that the God of the *Iſraelites* was the only true God, and that he had given the land to his people.

When the apoſtle commends *Rahab* for *receiving* the ſpies with *peace*, he takes care not to ſay one word in favour of the lye ſhe told in order to their preſervation, *after* ſhe had received them. She did well to receive them into her houſe in a peaceable and friendly manner, and would have acted an ill part to have gone and diſcover'd them in order to their being puniſh'd as ſpies by the king of *Jericho*. But the apoſtle does not commend the *method* ſhe afterward took to conceal them.

On this occaſion, I beg leave to ſpeak one word about what men call, *officious lies*, becauſe I fear, there have been great and dangerous miſtakes about them. Men have deceived themſelves by thinking, that there can in nature be ſuch a lye, as ſhall upon the whole, and all the conſequences conſider'd, do more good than hurt. But this is impoſſible. The lye that was told by *Rahab*, and others of the like kind, have made men cautious not to truſt one another in any parallel circumſtances; and ſo have undone that very good, which was intended to be done by them. Others cannot be conceal'd by the like ſtratagems again. Beſides, nothing can be lawful for me, which is not lawful alſo for all others in all like caſes. But the conſequence of allowing *every* man, and of every man's allowing himſelf, the liberty of ſpeaking what is falſe, whenever he thinks he can, upon the whole do more good than hurt thereby will be this, that no one will be able to believe any other in any thing he ſays; ſince there will be always a ſuſpicion, that

HEBREWS.

PARAPHRASE.

shall I farther add? For the time would fail me, if I should set myself to mention all the particulars, such as *Gideon* (*g*), and

TEXT.

For the time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and *of*

NOTES.

that the person, who speaks, has some private interest to advance, by speaking an untruth, and will be byas'd by his own interest to imagine, it will not do a greater prejudice to another: and then commerce, society, and mutual trust and assistance must have an end.

(*g*) *Gideon*, *Gideon*'s faith was shew'd, when he believed and obey'd the divine command revealed to himself, which order'd him to *throw down the altar of Baal, and to cut down the grove that* was *by it*, *Judg.* vi. 25, 26, 27. His faith was again proved to be real, and very strong, when he was sent with no more than 300 men to fight the army of the *Midianites*, which consisted of 135,000, *Judg.* viii. 10. yet notwithstanding this vast disadvantage of 450 to one, and the *impossibility* of succeeding in a *natural* way, *Gideon* at God's command ventur'd to attack that vast army, depending upon his almighty power to fulfil the promise of victory, which was made him, *Judg.* vi. 14. vii. 7.

It must be farther observed concerning *Gideon* in particular, and all the other believers named in this chapter, that the apostle declares, they are *heirs of eternal salvation*, *v.* 39, 40. *All these* (says he) *having obtain'd a good report through faith, received not the promise: GOD having provided some better things for us, that they without us should not be made perfect:* which implies that they *are now* in fact made perfect *with us*. So that the apostle has made it necessary for us to vindicate the *moral* character of every believer he has named, so far as to shew that he was *capable of salvation*.

It has been thought difficult by some to reconcile this with what we read in the Old Testament concerning *Gideon*, *Judg.* viii. 27. *And Gideon made an ephod thereof* (the spoils of the *Midianites*) *and put it in his city, even Ophrah, and all Israel went thither a whoring after it; which thing became a* snare *unto Gideon, and to his house.* From hence some have hastily concluded, that *Gideon* himself fell into this sin of idolatry, long after the time of his miraculous victory; and consequently that it cannot be supposed he *died* a *good* man. Their mistake lay here: they imagin'd the sacred writer meant, the *ephod* became a *snare to draw Gideon* into the *sin* of *idolatry*, whereas there is not the least foundation for such a supposition. For, as it happens, the *Hebrew* word here render'd, and rightly render'd a *snare*, cannot be *proved* in any one place of all the Old Testament to signify such a snare as drew men into the commission of *sin*; but in most places, at least, it unquestionably signifies a *snare*, that drew men into *inconveniencies*, *punishment*, and *misery*. And it is particularly used in many places to signify, that mens *committing idolatry* proved a *snare* to draw them into a state of *punishment*; as *Deut.* vii. 16. *Thou shalt not serve their gods: for that will be a* snare *unto thee: i. e.* thy *idolatry* will lead thee into *misery*. *Exod.* xxiii. 33. *Psal.* cvi. 36. In other places *other sins* are represented as a *snare*, because they also bring men into a state of *distress* and *woe*, as *Psal.* lxix. 22. *Prov.* xii. 13. xviii. 7. xxix. 6, 25. In another place, *Pharaoh*'s servants are represented as saying, that *Moses* was, and still would be, a *snare* to the *Egyptians*, *Exod.* x. 7. by which they plainly meant (not that *Moses* would lead them into *sin*, but) that he had already by some miracles brought them into *misery*, and would, if he were suffer'd to go on, yet bring them into more. And even the *Son of God* is spoken of by the prophet as a *snare* to the *Jews*, *Isai.* viii. 14. *He shall be———for a* snare *to the inhabitants of Jerusalem:* by which is only meant, that the Messiah would, in fact, *innocently* prove an occasion of their falling into *misery*, in as much as they would not receive, and believe in him. Answerably, when it is said, that *Gedeon*'s setting up the golden ephod became a *snare to him*, the plain meaning is (*not* that it led him into any *sin*, but) meerly, that it proved, without his intention, an occasion of *affliction* and *misery* to him, and to his house. The particular *affliction*, that it brought upon

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

Barak, and *of* Samſon, and and *Barak* (*h*), and *Samſon* (*i*), and

NOTES.

upon him, ſeems to have been this, that whereas immediately after his delivering the *Iſraelites* out of the hands of *Midian*, they deſired him and his poſterity to *rule over* them, *Judg.* viii. 22. and were by his influence and authority, during his life-time, kept from idolatry: they after his death, *went a whoring after Baalim, and made Baal-Berith their God:* whereupon they naturally diſregarded the memory and family of the ſervant of the true GOD, and *ſhewed no kindneſs to his houſe*, and would not ſuffer his poſterity to have the government, *v.* 33, 35. But as during his life he reſtrain'd them from this idolatry, and was always zealous againſt it, from the time that he threw down the altar of *Baal* to the end of his days: it cannot be reaſonably ſuppoſed, that he gave any manner of incouragement, either by example, or connivance, to the worſhip of the golden ephod. And there is no reaſon to doubt, but that *his only end* in making and hanging up this *ephod* was, that it might be a ſtanding *trophy* or *memorial* of the ſignal *victory*, which GOD granted him over the *Midianites*, out of whoſe ſpoils this *ephod* was made.

(*h*) *Barak.* *Barak's* faith was manifeſted by *depending* on the revelation which *Deborah* received from GOD, aſſuring him of victory over *Jabin's* army, *Judg.* iv. 4, 7, 14. and by actually attacking with 10,000 men the *vaſt* army of *Jabin*, which he could not well have expected to conquer without a miracle, *v.* 10, 13.

(*i*) *Samſon.* *Samſon's faith* was manifeſted, when *the ſpirit of the Lord came upon him, and he went down to Aſhkelon, and ſlew thirty men of the Philiſtines*, which it cannot be thought he would have *attempted* to do, unleſs he had *believed* GOD, that they ſhould be deliver'd into his hands, *Judg.* xiv. 19. He often diſcover'd what divines uſe to call a *faith of miracles*, when he believed that he ſhould be inabled to work a miracle, and thereupon ſet about it. It may not be amiſs to add, that there is not the leaſt improbability in the hiſtory of *Samſon's* tranſactions, ſince it is not pretended that he did his extraordinary works by a *common human* power, but by the *miraculous* power of *GOD*, to whom thoſe works were infinitely eaſy. No objections can be made to theſe miracles wrought by *Samſon*, but what will equally hold againſt *all* miracles whatſoever: againſt which there really lies no objections at all, provided GOD be allow'd to be ſtronger than men.

It is farther neceſſary here to conſider *Samſon's moral* character, ſince the apoſtle reckons him to be one of thoſe who have *obtain'd ſalvation*, whereas ſome can hardly think, he was at the laſt qualified to be made partaker of it. It muſt indeed be own'd, that he had very great defects and blemiſhes: but it cannot be proved, that he did not repent of them before his death. And we have no reaſon to doubt, but that the apoſtle had ſufficient evidence of his repentance communicated to him either by tradition, or by inſpiration. The principal thing laid to *Samſon's* charge is, that he *kill'd himſelf*, *knowing* he ſhould do ſo, when he pull'd down *Dagon's* houſe upon the *Philiſtines*. But if all circumſtances of the caſe are conſider'd, there is not the leaſt appearance of a crime in this. Indeed *ſelf-murder* is a *damning* ſin, and abſolutely *inconſiſtent* with ſalvation. And in this unhappy age, wherein this moſt ſhocking and *unpardonable* ſin is grown monſtrouſly common, I cannot but think it fit to add, that no man ſhould *mention* the ſin, when committed by another, with the leaſt degree of *levity*, but ſhould ſpeak and hear of it with the utmoſt *ſeriouſneſs* and *horror*: and in order the more effectually to reſtrain ourſelves from it, we ſhould reject the *firſt thought* of it with all poſſible ſpeed and deteſtation; and ſhould maintain in our minds an infinitely greater dread of it, than of being thrown among ten thouſand ſerpents, or of being tortur'd in the very worſt, and moſt tedious manner that ever the cunning and malicious devil directed his *chief* ſervants the perſecutors to torment the ſervants of GOD. If *Samſon* had been guilty of the ſin of *ſelf-murder*, it would have been impoſſible to vindicate the apoſtle in ſpeaking of him as an heir of ſalvation.

Chap. XI.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

and *Jephthae* (*k*), king *David* al- of Jephthae, of David alſo
ſo,

NOTES.

ſalvation. But in what *Samſon* did, at the time of his death, he was guilty of no ſin at all. The *ſinfulneſs* of *ſelf-murder* lies in mens putting an end to their lives, *without* receiving any *warrant* or *command* from GOD to do ſo. But *Samſon* had authority from GOD for what he did: and GOD had an unqueſtionable authority to command him to do it. This may be illuſtrated by the caſe of our bleſſed Saviour. His enemies could not have taken away his life without his free conſent, as appears from *Luke* iv. 28, 29, 30. *Joh.* x. 39. xviii. 6. *Matth.* xxvi. 58. Since then Chriſt had it in his power to have ſaved his life, if he would; his *yielding* up himſelf to die would have been ſelf-murder, in caſe he had not received from GOD, the ſovereign Lord of life and death, a commiſſion to lay down his life. Accordingly we find, that Chriſt himſelf pleaded this very thing as that which alone made it *lawful* for him to *conſent*, that his enemies ſhould take away his life, and to *permit* them to do it, *Joh.* x. 18. *No man taketh my life from me; but I lay it down of myſelf: I have* authority *to lay it down, and I have* authority *to take it again. This* commandment *have I received of my father.* This *authority* and *command* received from GOD made it lawful and fit for him to lay down his life, or to *allow* men to take it away: which, without that command and authority, would have been the ſin of ſelf-murder. In like manner, when *Samſon* gave up his own life at the time he kill'd the *Philiſtines*, he was not guilty of any ſin, becauſe he had received *authority* and *commiſſion* from GOD to give up his life on this occaſion. That he *really had* ſuch a *divine commiſſion* is very evident: becauſe he at that time perform'd a miracle, which no man could do unleſs GOD *were with him.* He pray'd for a *miraculous* power to throw down *Dagon*'s temple. In anſwer to his prayer GOD gave him this miraculous power: which demonſtrates that GOD was *with him*, and fully approved of the *method* in which he ſaw *Samſon* would imploy this extraordinary power. Many a commanding officer in an army has puſh'd on towards his own *certain* death, and yet no one has thought him guilty of ſelf-murder: becauſe they have well conſider'd, that his country's cauſe was a ſufficient *warrant* for his venturing or caſting away his life, when he had reaſon to hope, that they, who follow'd him, would gain the victory, and preſerve or recover the liberties of their country. When a martyr dies for religion, he is by all the world excuſed from the imputation of ſelf-murder, becauſe GOD has given him a *command* rather to *die* than to forſake the truth. If then theſe commands of the law of nature, and of the Goſpel are (as they moſt juſtly are) allow'd to warrant a man to lay down his life for the ſake of truth, or of his country: ſurely *Samſon* cannot be blamed, who did not lay down his life, till it was neceſſary for the recovering the civil and religious liberties of his brethren the *Iſraelites* to do ſo; and till he had received from GOD a *miraculous* power, and a *commiſſion* to uſe it, whereby he might deſtroy a great number of the enemies of his country, if he would give up his own life at the ſame time.

(*k*) *Jephthae.* Beſides this captain's faith in the *being* of GOD, and in his *providence* with regard to the children of *Iſrael* in times paſt, *Judg.* xi. 11, 15, &c. he alſo particularly hoped before hand, that GOD would give him the victory over the children of *Ammon*, *v.* 30, 31.

But at the ſame time, it muſt be own'd, his character is far from being *perfect*. His *raſh vow*, and his *deliberate fulfilling* it, were very enormous crimes. His vow is thus expreſs'd by our tranſlators, *If thou ſhalt deliver the children of Ammon into mine hands, then it ſhall be, that whatſoever cometh forth of the doors of my houſe to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, ſhall ſurely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt-offering.* The occaſion of the vow ſufficiently demonſtrates, that he now reſolved to ſacrifice ſo *great* and *valuable* a thing, as would be anſwerable to the greatneſs of the bleſſing,

ſing, which he now ſought from GOD. On ſuch great occaſions men did not uſe to vow, that they would ſacrifice *one ſingle lamb*. This would not teſtify a ſufficient gratitude for a great deliverance. They would rather vow, with *Jacob*, to give the *tenth* of all their ſubſtance to GOD, or to offer a *hecatomb*. It would have been trifling and ludicrous for *Jephthae* to have vow'd to ſacrifice the firſt animal he ſhould meet, whether ſheep, or ſwine, or cat, or dog. It is neceſſary then to ſuppoſe, that *Jephthae*'s deſign in this vow regarded no other than *human* ſacrifices. His intention doubtleſs was to ſay, as the *Hebrew* ſignifies, and as it is render'd in the *Greek* and *Latin* verſions, *whoſoever*, or whatſoever *perſon*, that belongs to my family (whether old or young, whether a ſlave, or a child, how uſeful, or how dear ſoever to me) *ſhall firſt come out of the doors of my houſe to meet me, when I return in peace*, ſhall be ſacrificed to GOD as a thank-offering. Accordingly, when his *daughter* came out to meet him upon his return, he determin'd to make *her* a ſacrifice, and afterward *did with her according to his vow*.

Some few learned men of late years have entertain'd a very different opinion of the meaning and execution of *Jephthae*'s vow. They apprehend, his vow was intended diſjunctively, thus, *It ſhall ſurely be the Lord*'s (*i. e.* devoted to his ſervice, if not fit for a burnt-offering) *or* (elſe, if it be a thing fit to be ſacrificed) *I will offer it up for a burnt-offering*. But can theſe interpreters think he *could* mean, *If it be not fit for a burnt-offering, it ſhall be* devoted *to the ſervice of GOD?* If a *ſwine*, or a *dog* had met him, do they ſuppoſe he intended to devote that dog, or ſwine to GOD's ſervice? In what ſenſe was it poſſible for him to devote ſuch things to the ſervice of GOD? It is plain then that *Jephthae* ſpoke only of *human* perſons. In conſequence of the other interpretation it has been thought by ſome, that he *did not ſacrifice* his daughter, but only devoted her to the ſervice of GOD in a ſtate of virginity. *Le Clerc* thinks, ſhe was given to the high prieſt to ſerve him in making bread, and cloaths, *&c.* for the uſe of the tabernacle. This interpretation they labour to confirm by the marginal reading of *v.* 40. which ſays, *The daughters of Iſrael went yearly to* talk with *the daughter of Jephthae four days in a year*. But there is no real foundation for this reading. All the old verſions in *Walton*'s *Polyglot* unanimouſly agree to render the place, as our tranſlators alſo have *well* done, *To* lament *the daughter of Jephthae*. The word in the *Hebrew* text was undoubtedly לנהות in *Pal* from נהה *to lament*. But the *Hebrew* tranſcribers have, ſince the making of the lateſt of the verſions in the Polyglot, miſtaken the word, and wrote לחנות which is a monſter of a word, that has puzzled the criticks, like many other *falſe ſpellings* of the *Jewiſh* tranſcribers; of which many inſtances are mention'd in my *Second Volume of Notes and Diſcourſes*.

The young womens *lamenting* her from year to year ſeems plainly to imply, that ſhe was put to death; and that they lamented her fate as people uſed to do the fate of ſuch as came to an untimely end. Her deſiring *two months to bewail her virginity* ſeems to have been very *needleſs*, if ſhe lived *many years* afterward in the high prieſt's houſe, or in any recluſe place, where ſhe had time enough to have done it. And the ſaying, *She knew no man*, at the *end* of the *two months* ſeems to have been an obſervation that would not have been made, if that was not alſo the *end* of her *life*.

Upon the ſuppoſition that her father *kill'd* her at the end of theſe two months, it has been ask'd, why ſhould GOD grant him ſucceſs and victory upon his making a vow to do ſuch a very wicked thing, as the offering a *human* ſacrifice? In anſwer, it muſt be own'd, that *Jephthae*'s vow on this occaſion was very immoral and wicked; and that the execution of it was ſtill a more heinous crime, contrary to the rules of all *true* religion both revealed and natural, and was unqueſtionably *worſe* than *mere murder*. But it cannot be infer'd from hence, that providence was obliged to *deny* him ſucceſs in fighting with the *Ammonites*. If any one ſhall ſay, it was, he muſt for the ſame reaſon maintain, that the providence of GOD is obliged to deny ſucceſs to *any general*, who before the beginning of a battel makes any other *ſuch unlawful* vow: which is what no man of thought will venture to maintain. Suppoſe a *popiſh* general, who goes out to fight in defence of the *juſt* liberties of his country, ſhould vow, that if GOD will grant him the victory, he will worſhip the Virgin *Mary*, and a golden *image* of GOD the father twice a day: or

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

ſuppoſe a *Mahometan* general ſhould make a vow, that if GOD will give him ſucceſs againſt the *unrighteous* enemies of his country, he will *worſhip Mahomet* with greater care and frequency than ordinary, and *kill* all the *Chriſtians* that he can lay hands on: is it any way inconſiſtent with the wiſdom of providence to grant ſucceſs to ſuch idolatrous and perſecuting generals after they have made ſuch immoral, and impious vows? Is it not evident fact, that providence has actually given ſucceſs to ſuch wicked men notwithſtanding? And yet no one hereupon impeaches the wiſdom of the divine providence. For GOD may have very great and important reaſons, upon *other* accounts, to grant them ſucceſs. In the caſe of *Jephthae*, it is very eaſy to diſcover a reaſon, why *he* ſhould be proſper'd notwithſtanding his irreligious vow. It was not only the *private* intereſt of *Jephthae*, that was concern'd at that time, but the vaſtly more valuable intereſt of the *whole Jewiſh* nation, GOD's own people. A holy GOD then might well ſucceed his attempts againſt the *Ammonites*, for the ſake of delivering *his own* people out of their hands, and for the ſake of accompliſhing the promiſes, which he made to their fathers, *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, tho' the inſtrument imploy'd to work the deliverance was very wicked. On the account of the covenant with *Abraham* GOD often ſaved the *Iſraelites*, even when the *far greater* part of them was in actual rebellion againſt him, as it is written, *Pſal.* cv. 42. *Deut.* vii. 7, 8. *Ezek.* xx. 9, 14, 22. Much more then might a holy GOD grant a victory to his people, in regard to the ſame covenant, though *one* man among them made a wicked vow.

Beſides, it is to be conſider'd, that *GOD* himſelf *did not* miraculouſly raiſe up *Jephthae*, to be the general of the *Iſraelites*, but *they choſe* him themſelves without conſulting GOD in the caſe, *Judg.* x. 18. xi. 5, 6. wherefore it is ſo far from being reaſonable, that GOD ſhould have diſappointed *Jephthae* upon the account of his vow, that they, who are diſpoſed to cavil at revelation, would undoubtedly have found fault, if it had repreſented GOD, as giving victory to the *Ammonites* over his *own* people, merely becauſe their *general* was guilty of a crime. The giving his counſels and army ſucceſs could not even *ſeem to look* like an *approbation* of his vow, unleſs there could not have been diſcover'd *any other* poſſible reaſon of granting him the victory. But when there was another very obvious reaſon of it, even the ſaving his *own* people, and the performing his *oath* made to *Abraham*, there cannot be the leaſt room to ſuggeſt, that there was any token of GOD's approving the inhuman and impious vow.

It may be thought ſtrange, that *Jephthae* ſhould be wicked enough to be capable of making ſuch a vow, and weak enough to think, that the performance of it would be any way acceptable to GOD. But the wonder will ceaſe, if it be remember'd, that for ſome time before his vow he had lived *abroad* out of *Judea* in the land of *Tob*, where it is likely that he learnt, and was incouraged in ſome *idolatrous* cuſtoms, whereof ſacrificing men was one; and that for above *eighteen* years together, before *Jephthae*'s government, the *Iſraelites* themſelves were devoted to the worſhip of *idols*, and *forſook the LORD, and ſerved him not*, *Judg.* x. 6, 8. In this time of apoſtaſy, the *Iſraelites* offer'd *human* ſacrifices to their idols, as the Pſalmiſt particularly takes notice, *Pſal.* cvi. 37. *They ſacrificed their ſons and their daughters unto devils:* where he plainly ſpeaks of the time that ſucceeded juſt after the days of *Moſes*, mention'd *v.* 32, 33. In the times of this *univerſal* degeneracy, and great *corruption*, we may well ſuppoſe *Jephthae* learnt the heatheniſh and idolatrous practice of offering *human* ſacrifices; and was bred up in ignorance, and ſuperſtition enough to believe, that ſuch ſacrifices might be offer'd to the true GOD, though it ſhould be a ſin to worſhip falſe gods. If it be ſaid, that the High Prieſt would not have ſuffer'd him to commit this wickedneſs; it may be anſwer'd, that perhaps at this time it was, as at another, *like people, like prieſt*; or elſe that the general deſpiſed the prieſt.

It muſt be own'd, that if *Jephthae* had not repented of this very heinous wickedneſs, he could not have been intitled to ſalvation. The apoſtle therefore, who has aſſured us of his ſalvation, muſt undoubtedly have gone upon the ſuppoſition, that *Jephthae* actually *repented* of it before he died. That he had *time* to repent is beyond diſpute, becauſe he lived near *ſix* years after this. For it is expreſly ſaid, he *judged Iſrael ſix years*, *Judg.* xii. 7. and it is as certain, that he made this vow in the *beginning* of his government

What

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

and Samuel, and of the fo (*l*) and *Samuel* (*m*), and the prophets; who

NOTES.

What evidence the apoſtle had of *Jephthae*'s *actual* repentance I cannot ſay. But it is indiſputable, that he knew many facts, by the help of old *Jewiſh* hiſtories extant in his time, about which the Old Teſtament is now wholly ſilent, ſuch as the *Names* of the *Egyptian* magicians, *Jannes* and *Jambres*, 2 *Tim.* iii. 8. and the account of *Iſaiah*'s being *ſawn aſunder*, in this ſame chapter, *v.* 37. In the like way, or by divine inſpiration he might know that *Jephthae repented*.

I have only to add, to prevent ſome objections to what has been now advanced, that when it is ſaid, that *the ſpirit of the Lord came upon Jephthae*, *Judg.* xi. 29. the meaning is *not*, that a ſpirit of *knowledge*, or of *holineſs*, but only that a ſpirit of *courage* came upon him. See 1 *Sam.* xi. 6. *Numb.* xxiv. 2.

(*l*) *David*. This good man was, in many inſtances, and on various occaſions, a remarkable example of a ſincere and ſtrong faith in GOD, and in his providence and word. He early diſcover'd his faith, when he went to incounter *Goliah* in ſingle combat. *All the men of Iſrael, when they ſaw Goliah*, fled *from him, and were* ſore afraid, 1 *Sam.* xvii. 24. Yet *David*, who was but an infant in compariſon of the giant, adventured to attack him, becauſe he could not bear, that this uncircumciſed *Philiſtine* ſhould defy the armies of the living GOD, *v.* 26. and truſted in GOD, that he would deliver him out of the hands of the *Philiſtine*, *v.* 37. and believed, that he ſhould ſmite the giant, and take his head from him, and then defeat the army of the *Philiſtines*, *v.* 45, 46, 47. Accordingly he was proſper'd, *v.* 49, 50, 51. He often conſulted the divine oracle and always believed it, and follow'd the directions which GOD gave him, 1 *Sam.* xxiii. 1.——5. 9.——13. xxx. 1.——19. 2 *Sam.* ii. 1. v. 19.—25. *David*'s faith was farther diſcovered all along from the time that *Samuel* anointed him to be king of *Iſrael*, to the death of *Saul*; in that, during theſe *ſeven* years of *utmoſt danger*, he conſtantly believed that GOD would fulfil his promiſe, and make him king, 1 *Sam.* xvi. 13. There was one time indeed, when *David*'s patience ſeems to have been almoſt wearied, when he began to think, he ſhould *one day periſh by the hands of Saul*, xxvii. 1. But he ſoon recover'd from this *human frailty*, and in a time of the greateſt *danger*, when *his own* men talk'd of *ſtoning* him, *he incouraged himſelf in the Lord his God*, xxx. 6. He exerciſed a ſincere faith in the laſt moments of his life, by his dependence on the divine covenant made with him, and with his family, 2 *Sam.* xxiii. 1.——5.

It is certain alſo, that *upon the whole David* acted *according to* his faith. During all the time of his life, he kept himſelf free from the common ſin of the nation, *idolatry*, and worſhipped only the true GOD. In two or three inſtances indeed, in other reſpects, he went aſtray: but then it is expreſly ſaid, that he *repented* of thoſe ſins of numbring the people, and of adultery and murder, 2 *Sam.* xii. 9, 13. xxiv. 10, 17, 25. And GOD hereupon forgave him. On theſe accounts the apoſtle might juſtly reckon him one of thoſe believers, who have obtain'd ſalvation.

David indeed has been accuſed of other faults beſides theſe: but there is reaſon to queſtion, whether he has been proved to be guilty. It has been often ſaid, that he dealt very *unrighteouſly* with *Mephiboſheth*, when he gave away half his lands to *Ziba*, 2 *Sam.* xix. 29. But I am inclined to believe, that this is a vulgar error, and that *Mephiboſheth deſerved* to be thus puniſh'd. When *David* fled from *Abſalom*, he might reaſonably have expected, that *Mephiboſheth* ſhould have follow'd him, ſince he had treated him with great friendſhip. But when *David* ask'd of *Ziba*, where his maſter, *Mephiboſheth*, was, *Ziba* told the king, he tarried at *Jeruſalem*, hoping that while the houſe of *David* was divided againſt itſelf, and involved in a civil war, the *Iſraelites* might be induced to reſtore the kingdom to the family of *Saul*, 2 *Sam.* xvi. 3. Upon this information *David* immediately

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

confiscated all *Mephibosheth*'s lands, and gave them to *Ziba* as a reward for making this important discovery, *v.* 4. At this time, no doubt, *David* believed, that *Ziba*'s information was true, and thought *Mephibosheth* to be *guilty*. If he was guilty, and *David* had sufficient reason to believe *Ziba*, then every one will own, that *David* acted both a politic and a righteous part, in depriving *Mephibosheth* of his estate, that he might be the less capable of raising a Party for himself; of which there was the greater danger, because the estate must needs be very large, as it was the whole of what king *Saul* possess'd, chap. ix. 7. But before we condemn him, we must hear what he has to say in his own defence. The reason he gave for his not following *David* is in these words, *My servant deceived me: for thy servant said, I will saddle me an ass, that I may ride thereon, and go to the king, because thy servant is lame*, 2 *Sam.* xix. 26. But what if *one* of his servants had *deceived* him, could he not have sent *another* to fetch a beast for him to ride on? Or, if he had no beast of his own, had he not interest enough with *David*, at whose table he dined every day, to have had a beast of him, if he had signified to the king, that he desired to follow his fortune? Could he not as easily have found means to ask this favour, as to dine with the king from day to day? Had he not time enough to do this, while *David*, and the people were *preparing* to go out of *Jerusalem*? Might he not, at least, have made ready to go with the *hindmost*? Or, might he not have found some opportunity in all that time, wherein the ark was carrying out, and brought back again? Chap. xv. 24, 25, 29.

It is true, that *Mephibosheth* roundly denied the charge, which *Ziba* brought against him; and said, that *Ziba* had *slander'd* him, *chap.* xix 27. But still the question is, whose evidence shall be taken, *Mephibosheth*'s or *Ziba*'s? It was manifestly for *Mephibosheth*'s *interest* to deny the charge: so that he cannot be admitted as a *sufficient* evidence in *his own* case. And it may be thought, that both what *Mephibosheth* afterwards said, and what the king determined on hearing *both sides*, prove him to be guilty. He said to *David*, *v.* 27. *Do therefore what is good in thine eyes*; and *v.* 28. *What right have I therefore yet to cry any more unto the king?* By these expressions he plainly confess'd his *desert* of *punishment*. Indeed he put it expresly upon the faults of his grandfather *Saul*, and his family, who had opposed *David*, and sought his life, *v.* 28. He would not directly confess more, lest he should condemn himself. But the king's answer to him seems to imply, that he thought *Mephibosheth* guilty in his *own* person, when he said, *Why speakest thou any more of thy matters? i. e.* I will hear no more: I have said, *Thou and Ziba divide the land*, *v.* 29. If *David* had meant, that he was fully satisfied with *Mephibosheth*'s excuse, it is most natural to think, he would have restored the *whole* estate to him, and have severely punish'd *Ziba*. But he seems plainly to have *believed Ziba*'s information, and to have look'd upon *Mephibosheth* as *guilty*, by not restoring the whole estate to him. And yet we can easily account for his restoring the half of it to *Mephibosheth*, considering that he had now made his *submission* in the strongest terms; that *David* was now in a temper of forgiving the bitterest enemies to his own person, particularly *Shimei*, *v.* 22, 23. and that half the estate might not be sufficient, tho' the whole might, to procure him such an interest among the people, as might lay a foundation for an open rebellion.

It must be farther observed, that *Mephibosheth* did *not* in the least complain or *remonstrate*, when *David* told him, that *Ziba* should *share the land* with him. His answer was, *Yea, let Ziba take all, for as much as my lord the king is come again in peace unto his own house*, *v.* 29. This expression of profuse zeal for the king seems merely design'd to procure a restoration to his favour. Of the like nature, it may be supposed, was the *neglect of his dress*, while *David* was absent from *Jerusalem*, mention'd, *v.* 24. where it is said, *Mephibosheth had neither dress'd his feet, nor trim'd his beard, nor wash'd his cloaths, from the day David departed* from *Jerusalem* for fear of *Absalom*, *until the day he came again in peace.* All this shew of a more than ordinary love seems to have been design'd only to cover over an intention he had of fishing in troubled waters, and of getting a party to set him on the throne. He would have shewn a real and a much greater zeal for the king, if he had told him at his table, that he was resolved to *follow* him, whithersoever he should go, than in tarrying at *home* in that uncouth and nasty manner.

There

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

;; prophets: who, through faith ſubdued kingdoms, who, by means of their faith, were inabled 33.
to conquer kingdoms (*n*), procured the favour

NOTES.

There muſt have been a fault either in *Mephibosheth*, or in *David*. But why ſhould our prejudices all lie in favour of *Mephibosheth*? Why ſhould he not be thought capable of deſiring, what he could not well avoid deſiring, *viz.* That the kingdom of his grandfather might be reſtored to him? Why muſt *David only* be thought capable of committing great faults? Conſidering the vaſt love *David* bore to *Mephibosheth*'s father, *Jonathan*; and the extraordinary favour he ſhewed to *Mephibosheth* himſelf, it can never be thought, that *David* would have taken away half his eſtate from him without a real cauſe. Nor can it be reaſonably imagin'd, that he would have given half of it to *Ziba*, if he had believed, that *Ziba* had *ſlander'd* his own maſter, and *David*'s friend. Even principles of *ſtate-policy* would have induced *David* to refrain from puniſhing *Mephibosheth* in this manner *without cauſe*: ſince this could only make *him* enemies, who had too many already, and might have provoked *Mephibosheth indeed* to ſeek the kingdom. For *Mephibosheth*'s innocence we have only his own bare word; but we have two witneſſes to prove him guilty, *viz. Ziba*, and the judgment of *David* after he had heard the whole cauſe.

David has alſo been accuſed of great *inhumanity*, becauſe he *cut the Ammonites with ſaws, and with harrows of iron, and with axes*, 1 *Chron.* xx. 3. To this accuſation it muſt be anſwer'd, that the *Syriac* and *Arabic* verſions of this text, and of its parallel, 2 *Sam.* xii. 31. repreſent them in a quite different light, as ſaying expreſly, that *David put no man to death*, but only *bound* them with *fetters*, and *impriſon'd* them. If this be the true, original reading of the texts, we are deliver'd from this objection againſt the *moral* character of *David*. But if the other be the true reading, and *David* did put the *Ammonites* to death in that ſevere manner: it muſt be pleaded in his excuſe, that he ſent his ambaſſadors in a very *civil* and *obliging* way to condole the king of *Ammon* on the death of his father; that without any manner of reaſon, or provocation, the *Ammonites abuſed David*'s ambaſſadors in a moſt ſhameful manner; that ſtill *David* had not the leaſt thought of avenging himſelf by a war; that, notwithſtanding this, the *Ammonites* afreſh, and ſtill *unprovok'd*, *began* another quarrel, and hired troops among their neighbours with a deſign to fall upon *Judea*. Then *David* was forced in *neceſſary ſelf-defence* to raiſe an army, and to ſend it againſt the *Ammonites*, and their auxiliaries. In this war *David*'s army conquer'd, and return'd to *Jeruſalem*, it not being, I ſuppoſe, a fit ſeaſon of the year to beſiege the town into which the *Ammonites* were retired. Soon after this, the auxiliaries of the *Ammonites* again attack'd the *Iſraelites*, upon which *David* was forced a ſecond time, in *neceſſary ſelf-defence*, to lead out an army againſt them. He conquer'd again, and theſe auxiliaries of the *Ammonites* made peace with *David*, and became his ſervants. After this, *David* (knowing, it is likely, that the *Ammonites excited* their auxiliaries the ſecond time to fight againſt *Iſrael*) was reſolved to bear no longer, but to puniſh them at once for all their crimes. He ſent to beſiege *Rabbah*, and when he had taken it, he treated the inhuman, inhoſpitable people, who had twice, if not three times been the *aggreſſors*, with a ſeverity they *deſerved*, in order to deter others from the like inhumanity for the future. See 2 *Sam.* x, xi. 1. xii. 26.——31. 1 *Chron.* xix, xx.

(*m*) *Samuel.* This good man is an example of *faith*, as he believed the many *revelations* that were made to him from time to time, particularly the propheſy againſt *Eli*'s houſe, 1 *Sam.* iii. 11, &c. the predictions deliver'd to *Saul*, *chap.* x. 2.—12. and in that he depended upon GOD's enabling him to work miracles, *chap.* xii. 16.——18

(*n*) *Subdued kingdoms.* This ſubduing of kingdoms is certainly more than defeating an army, that makes an invaſion. *Gideon*'s routing the army of the *Midianites*, and driving them back into their own country, here mention'd by *Grotius*, cannot be call'd, a

ſubduing

Chap. XI.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

your to be declared righteous (*o*), obtain'd the bleſſings that GOD had promis'd them (*p*), wrought righteouſneſs, obtained promiſes, ſtopped pro-

NOTES.

ſubduing of the *kingdom* of the *Midianites*. Men *ſubdue a kingdom*, when they ſeize the *land*, overturn the *government*, and make the natives *tributaries*. *Joſhua* thus ſubdued the ſeven kingdoms of *Canaan*; to which inſtance, no doubt, the apoſtle had a reſpect. And he was herein an example of *faith*, as he truſted in the divine *promiſes* of ſucceſs, and of miraculous aſſiſtance. *David* ſubdued the *Moabites*, and made them his *ſlaves*, 2 *Sam.* viii. 2. he ſubdued the *Syrians*, put gariſons in *Syria*, and obliged the people to *pay tribute* to him, *v.* 6. he alſo put *gariſons* in *Edom*, and made the *Edomites* his *ſlaves*; and *the Lord proſper'd David whitherſoever he went*, *v.* 14. and *he ſubdued nations*, *v.* 11.

(*o*) *Wrought righteouſneſs.* We have the very ſame expreſſion uſed by St. *Peter*, *Acts* x. 35. *But in every nation he that feareth God, and* worketh righteouſneſs, *is accepted by him.* In neither place does the meaning ſeem to be *merely*, that men did thoſe actions which were required by the law of GOD; but that tho' theſe good men could not attain to *perfect* virtue in this life, yet they did arrive at ſuch a *confirm'd* degree of *faith*, as inabled them *ſincerely* to do the will of GOD, and ſo intitled them to the juſtification promiſed in the covenant of grace. By their faith they wrought out for themſelves an evangelical righteouſneſs acceptable to GOD. We have another expreſſion pretty near the ſame with this, *James* i. 20. *The wrath of man* worketh *not the* righteouſneſs *of God*, *i. e.* mens wrath and ignorant zeal will not render them righteous in the ſight of GOD. Thus alſo when the apoſtle ſays, ſome ancient believers *through faith wrought righteouſneſs*, he means, that their faith render'd them righteous in the ſight of GOD, or, that GOD accepted and rewarded their faith as if it were perfect righteouſneſs. It is much more likely, that the apoſtle ſhould mean this, than that he ſhould barely mean, that thoſe believers perform'd *good works*. For in this place he does not ſpeak of the *general* character common to all believers; but has two or three *particular* perſons in his eye, of whom this may be ſaid in an *eſpecial* manner; as it is of others, that they *ſubdued kingdoms*, or *ſtop'd the mouths of lions*, &c. The perſons here refer'd to are *Abraham* and *Phineas*, of whom the Scripture expreſly ſays that their *faith was imputed to them for righteouſneſs*, *Gen.* xv. 6. *Pſal.* cvi. 31. while the Old Teſtament does not *expreſly ſay* this of any other. By their *faith*, and by the effects of it they *wrought out righteouſneſs* for themſelves. By this obſervation, it is likely, the apoſtle deſign'd to teach the *Hebrews*, that the *Gentiles* might be juſtified by faith, without becoming ſubject to the law of *Moſes*.

(*p*) *Obtained promiſes.* If this expreſſion ſhould be ſuppoſed to ſignify, as *v.* 17. that GOD *made* promiſes to ſome of the ancient believers, upon the account of their faith in him, *Phineas* will be an inſtance, whoſe faith and zeal obtain'd for him the promiſe and covenant of an everlaſting *prieſthood*, in his poſterity, *Numb.* xxv. 11, 12, 13. But if the expreſſion ſignifies, that GOD *fulfill'd* his promiſes to ſome of the ancient ſaints, becauſe they believed in him; *Abraham* will be an inſtance, of whom the apoſtle ſays, *chap.* vi. 15. that *after he had patiently indured*, in the exerciſe of faith, *he obtain'd the promiſe*, or received the bleſſing which GOD had promiſed him. As the words in both theſe places are the ſame, it is natural to think, that the apoſtle ſpeaks of the ſame thing in both. *David* by means of his faith in the divine promiſes obtain'd the kingdom; ſee *v.* 32 *n.* (*l*) *Gideon*, *Barak*, *Samſon*, &c. alſo received the accompliſhment of the divine promiſes, in which they believed.

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

34 the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed

procured the stopping of the mouths of lions (*q*), the remaining unhurt in the midst of a strong fire (*r*), escaped being kill'd by the sword (*s*), recovered from great weakness and danger of death (*t*), grew courageous and suc- 34.

NOTES.

(*q*) *Stopped the mouths of lions.* This undoubtedly refers to the case of *Daniel*, who was thrown into a den of lions, upon the account of his faith and piety. The apostle justly attributes the stopping their mouths to *Daniel*'s *faith*, because *Daniel*'s *faith* was the *reason* of GOD's miraculously preventing their hurting him, as it is written, *Dan.* vi. 22, 23. *God sent his angel and shut the lions mouths, that they did not hurt Him*, because he believed *in his God.*

(*r*) *Quenched the violence of fire.* The persons here meant are undoubtedly *Shadrach*, *Meshach*, and *Abednego.* Of their *faith* we read, *Dan.* iii. 17, 18. *Our GOD whom we serve is* able *to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace: and* he will *deliver us out of thy hand, O king:* But put case that our expectation of deliverance is *not* (tho' we are satisfied it is) well founded, still *we will not serve thy gods.* Hereupon king *Nebuchadnezzar* order'd that the furnace or oven should be heated seven times hotter than usual, and that they should be thrown in *bound*, that they might not be able to leap out of the fire. But tho' the fire continued to burn, and destroy'd those that cast them in, yet the *violence* of it as *to them* was *quench'd.* It did not singe the hair of their heads, nor make the least alteration on their cloaths, *v.* 27. The apostle's expression, *Quench'd the violence of fire*, seems particularly to refer to a passage in the last cited verse, *viz. The fire had no power upon their bodies.* It must be a very strong faith that could ingage these young men to venture themselves in a fiery oven, rather than be guilty of idolatry. They believed, that GOD would deliver them, by a miracle, from the death intended for them by the persecutor; or else that he would give them a blessed recompense of reward in the world to come. Without this belief of a future state, we may be sure, they would not have run the hazard of being burnt to death for religion, 1 *Cor.* xv. 32.

(*s*) *Escaped the edge of the sword.* There have been instances mention'd on the occasion of this expression, which I cannot persuade myself to believe the apostle had any regard to in this place. *David*'s escaping *Goliah*'s fury is not in the Old Testament represented as escaping the edge of *Goliah*'s *sword.* Nor did *Goliah* draw his sword at all, at that time, but it was, after his Death, drawn by *David* himself, 1 *Sam.* xvii. 17. No instance produced here will answer, unless there be *express* mention in the history of a *sword*, and of a believer's *escaping* it. One instance of this was *Moses*, who said, *Exod.* xviii. 4. *The God of my father was my help, and delivered me from the* sword *of Pharaoh.* The time of the deliverance here mention'd was, when *Moses* had kill'd an *Egyptian*, and *Pharaoh* thereupon sought to slay him, *chap.* ii. 12, 15. *Elias* is another instance, whom *Jezebel* threaten'd to slay with the *sword*, as he had slain the prophets of *Baal*, 1 *Kings* xix. 1, 2. GOD protected *Moses* and *Elias*, because they believed in him.

(*t*) *Out of weakness were made strong.* By weakness, ἀσθένεια, in this place the apostle means, *bodily* weakness arising from *distempers*, or the very distempers themselves, as the word frequently signifies in the Gospels, particularly *Luke* xiii. 11, 12. *Joh.* v. 5. xi. 4. See also 1 *Tim.* v. 23. *Hezekiah* is an instance on which the apostle had his eye. *Hezekiah* was *sick unto death*, and pray'd, and wept; and GOD promised to add fifteen years to his life, and wrought a miracle to confirm his faith in this promise, *Isai.* xxxviii. 1.—8. So that it may truly be said of him, he was, *thro' faith, out of weakness made strong.*

PARAPHRASE.

successful in battle (*v*), put the armies of
35. foreigners to flight (*w*). Women receiv'd their dead children from the grave by a resurrection (*x*); and others were tortured for their virtue's sake, and yet would not accept deliverance upon any sinful terms (*y*), but rather

TEXT.

valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received 35
their dead rais'd to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might

NOTES.

(*v*) *Waxed valiant in fight.* The word, ἰσχυροὶ, here render'd *valiant*, seems to signify both *strength* and *courage*. The persons spoken of seem'd too weak to undertake the fight, and yet, thro' *faith* in God's promises, had the *courage* to enter upon it, and were made *strong* enough to overcome. *Gideon* was an instance of this, when with his 300 men he fought and conquer'd the vast army of the *Midianites*, see on *v.* 32. note (*g*). *David* was another instance, when he went to *fight*, and kill'd the *Philistine*, *ibid.* note (*l*). Other instances will be mention'd in the next note.

(*w*) *Turned to flight the armies of the aliens.* Why Dr. *Whitby* should run to the *Maccabees* for an instance of this is unconceivable, when even *Estius*, tho' a *Papist*, does not, but supplied him with instances out of the undoubted books of the Old Testament. *Joshua* turn'd to flight the armies of the *Amorites*, being incouraged to attack them by his *faith* in a divine promise of victory, *Josh.* x. 5, 8, 10. and other numerous armies, *ch.* xi. 4, 6, 8. *Gideon* is another instance. *Jonathan* by means of his *faith* in God, when follow'd only by his armour-bearer, put to flight the large army of the *Philistines*, 1 *Sam.* xiv. 6, 10, 12, 13, 20. *David*, after consulting God, fell upon the *Philistines*, and put them to flight, 2 *Sam.* v. 9, 20, 21, 23, 25.

(*x*) *Women received their dead raised to life again.* One of these women was the widow of *Sarepta* (which the modern *Jews* pronounce *Zarephath*) whose son died, and was rais'd to life by *Elias*. She manifested her faith by receiving him as a true prophet, upon his multiplying her meal, and oil by a miracle, 1 *Kings* xvii. 14.—24. The other woman was the *Shunammite*, whose dead son was restored to life by *Elisha*. She is a remarkable example of *faith*, as she appears to have believed, that God had given to his prophet *Elisha* a power of recovering him from death, and that he would actually raise her son, 2 *Kings* iv. 20.—37.

(*y*) *And others were tortured, not accepting deliverance.* All the commentators agree in supposing, that the apostle here refers to the histories of the martyrdom of *Eleazer*, and of the mother and her seven sons mention'd in the second book of the *Maccabees*; and I was once carried away with the stream. But I am now persuaded, that the apostle, in this whole chapter, does not refer to any examples that are recommended by any other book besides the Holy Scripture. *Estius* goes upon this same *general* principle; and therefore concludes from the common application of this passage, that it affords a more than probable argument for the sacred authority of the second book of the *Maccabees*. For (says he, and I think very truly) all the examples of the saints, mention'd either expressly or tacitly in this chapter, are taken *from the sacred Scriptures*, *i. e.* from those books, which were, in the days of the writer of this epistle, esteem'd to be sacred by Christians, yet still, how a man of *Estius* his excellent sense could have a notion, that the second book of *Maccabees* was part of sacred Scripture, when it was *confessedly* written after the spirit of prophesy ceas'd in *Malachi*, and before it was restored in *John* the Baptist, is not a little surprising.

But there is no more need to go to the *Apocrypha*, than to *Fox*'s Book of Martyrs, for instances of mens being *tortured not accepting deliverance*. There are confessedly several instances

inſtances of this kind in the *Old* Teſtament. The apoſtle, juſt after, more particularly points at the perſons he means, *viz.* ſuch as were *ſtoned*, *ſawn aſunder*, or *ſlain with the ſword*, *v.* 37. Theſe were undoubtedly *tortured:* theſe did *not accept deliverance:* and theſe refuſed to accept of deliverance on ſinful terms, for this very end, *that they might obtain a* bleſſed *reſurrection* to eternal life. Theſe therefore *may be* the perſons here meant. Perhaps it will be objected, that the words, *and others*, *v.* 36. ſhew that theſe cannot be meant, *v.* 35. In anſwer it muſt be obſerved, that all this objection is built on a ſuppoſition, that under the word, *others*, *v.* 35, and the word, *others*, *v.* 36. the apoſtle divides all the inſtances he ſhould farther mention as belonging to the one or to the other of theſe two heads; and that all mention'd after *v.* 36. belong to the head there named. But this is plainly a miſtake, as any one may ſee by reading the verſes together: others *were tortured not accepting deliverance.*——— *And* others *had trial of mockings and ſcourgings, yea moreover of bonds and impriſonment. They were ſtoned, they were ſawn aſunder, were tempted, were ſlain with the ſword: they wander'd about in ſheeps ſkins, and goats ſkins,——in deſerts, and mountains, and dens, and caves.* Theſe *laſt* mention'd, ſurely, were not noted as inſtances of *mockings*, and *ſcourgings*, and *bonds*, and *impriſonment.* Men that *wander* in deſerts and mountains cannot be ſaid to ſuffer *bonds* and *impriſonment:* nor could they be *mock'd*, and *ſcourged*, when they were in *deſerts* at a *diſtance* from all mankind. It is therefore to be concluded, that the apoſtle firſt divides thoſe believers, that ſuffer'd for their virtue, under two general heads, *viz.* ſuch as were tortured to *death*, and others that were only puniſh'd with *mocking*, *ſcourging*, and ſuch like evils, as were *ſhort* of death. Then immediately he ſets himſelf to give more particular inſtances under each of theſe heads, and other inſtances alſo, which cannot be reduced to either of them; without obſerving any ſtrict order in placing them down. If theſe things are ſo, then there is no manner of reaſon to doubt, but the perſons ſaid to be *tortured*, *v.* 35. are the ſame as thoſe that are ſaid to be *ſtoned*, *ſawn aſunder*, and *ſlain with the ſword*, *v.* 37. The word, *they*, in the beginning of this 37th verſe cannot poſſibly refer to the perſons *immediately* before mention'd, *v.* 36. ſince thoſe that were *ſtoned*, and *ſawn aſunder*, are allowed to be of a different kind of ſufferers from them that had trial only of *mocking* and *ſcourging:* while they in fact belong to that kind of ſufferers, who were *tortured* to death, *v.* 35. The 37th verſe therefore muſt be paraphraſed to this purpoſe, *Of theſe two kinds of ſufferers whom I have been mentioning, ſome were ſtoned, ſome were ſawn aſunder*, &c. The *particular* inſtances then of men *tortured not accepting deliverance* will moſt naturally come to be conſider'd in the notes on, *v.* 37.

I have here gone upon the ſuppoſition, that our tranſlators, after the *Syriac* verſion, have *well* render'd the word, ἐτυμπανίσθησαν, *they were tortured*, or put to death by *torments*. That the *Greek* word has this *general* ſignification is ſo fully proved by the very learned *Gataker* in his *Adverſaria*, p. 464, 465. that there is no manner of room to make any doubt about it. And I cannot help thinking, that it is moſt natural to take the word in the ſame *general* ſenſe in many of thoſe paſſages of ancient authors, in which *Gataker* interprets it as denoting *one particular* kind of torture. *Gataker* indeed adds, that the context will not allow us to take the word in its *general* ſenſe in this place; but that it muſt here ſignify one *particular* ſort of torment diſtinct from the reſt. But I hope the ſeries of the apoſtle's diſcourſe has been now ſhew'd to require no ſuch thing; and to admit of our underſtanding this word, in this place, in its *general* ſignification.

Hitherto the examples of *faith* mention'd by the apoſtle were ſuch as had *not* ſuffer'd death on the account of their faith: nay moſt of them had *not* ſuffer'd *at all* on that account, but gain'd vaſt *advantages* by it even in the *preſent* world. He now proceeds to ſay, that whereas ſome, thro' faith, were reſtored to life, others, becauſe of their faith were tortured to death; and then mentions particular inſtances, *v.* 37.

Chap. XI.

PARAPHRASE.

ther indured the torture, that they might obtain a resurrection to eternal life, which is better than the resurrection of the now men-
tion'd children to live again in *this* world (z).
36. And others suffer'd mockings (*a*), and scourgings (*b*), yea, and worse punishments, such as

TEXT.

obtain a better resurrection. And others had trial 36
of *cruel* mockings, and scourgings, yea moreover,

NOTES.

(z) *A better resurrection.* I perceive, it has greatly puzzled commentators to find out the reason of the apostle's using the word, *better*, in this place. Better than what is this resurrection? Dr. *Hammond*, and *Crellius* say, better than a *present remission of torments*: Dr. *Owen* says, better than the *resurrection of the wicked to* torments: Dr. *Whitby* says nothing. Whereas one would think, a man that reads the *Greek* text could not possibly miss the sense, which is given in the paraphrase. *Estius* observes it, tho' he approves of the sense afterward espoused by *Hammond*. As for *Grotius*, it must be said of him, *Hic bonus dormitat Grotius.* His interpretation is this, that the seven brethren, mention'd 2 *Maccab.* vii. and *Eleazar*, *ch.* vi. submitted to be tortured, and would not accept deliverance, on sinful terms, in hope, that the *Jewish* state, which was now persecuted by *Antiochus*, would be restored to a more happy condition than it was in, during the persecution: which was a sort of figure of the resurrection which we believe. Whereas those martyrs expresly spoke of the future resurrection of the dead, as their incouragement to patience in sufferings. The second son said, Thou like a fury takest us out *of this* present *life*; *but the king of the world shall raise us up to* everlasting *life*, *v.* 9. See also, *v.* 11, 14. Surely this does not relate to the restoration of the *Jewish* nation to liberty and peace in the *present* life, but to the *future resurrection* of good men. It is evident that the apostle refers to the same resurrection.

(*a*) Cruel *mockings.* There can be no doubt but that these mockings were *cruel.* Yet there was no occasion for our translators to add this word to the text. One of the persons mock'd was *Elisha*, to whom the children of *Bethel* said, *Go up thou bald head*, 2 *Kings* ii. 23. Another was *Isaac*, who was *mock'd* by *Ishmael*, *Gen.* xxi. 9. which the apostle justly calls *persecution*, *Gal.* iv. 29. Others were those messengers of GOD, whom the *Israelites* misused, or *mocked*, as it is in the *Greek*, 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 16.

(*b*) *And scourgings.* This kind of punishment was whipping men *on the back*, as appears from the use of the word in other places of the New Testament, as *Matth.* xx. 19. *Mark* x. 34. *Luke* xviii. 33. *Joh.* xix. 1. *Acts* xxii. 24. On this account I cannot think with *Grotius*, that the apostle here speaks of *Micaiah*, and *Jeremiah*: since it does not appear they were scourged on the *back*, but seem only to have received a blow *in the face*, 1 *Kings* xxii. 24. *Jer.* xx. 2. xxxvii. 15. yet I cannot with Dr. *Whitby* run to the *Apocrypha* for instances. And if he had well consider'd matters, neither would he have done it in this place. He reckons the persons here said to be *scourged*, were *Eleazar*, and two of the seven brothers, the *very same* as, in his judgment, were mention'd in the preceeding verse as *tortured* to death. Whereas the apostle says, those were different persons from these. *Others were tortured.* ——Others *had trial of mockings*, and *scourgings.* Tho' we cannot now name the men that were scourged, yet they were well known in the apostle's days. Our Saviour perhaps mentions the same, *Mark* xii. 3, 5. *They took* GOD's messenger, *and beat him:*——*and again he sent another, and they murder'd him; and many others*, beating *some*, *and murdering others.* That this *beating* was the same as *scourging* will appear from the use of the word, δερω, in other places, as *Mark* xiii. 9. *Acts* v. 40. xvi. 37. where what St. *Paul* calls *beating*, was really *scourging* on the *naked back*, as appears from *v.* 22. where we read, that his, and his companion's cloaths were *torn off* in order to their being *beat.*

TEXT.

of bonds and imprisonment. They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain

PARAPHRASE.

as bonds (*c*), and imprisonment for virtue's sake (*d*). Of the two kinds of sufferers now mention'd (*dd*) some were stoned (*e*), others were sawn asunder in the middle (*f*), and were, by the views of these torments, and by feeling the beginning of them, tempted to deny the truth (*g*); others were slain with 37.

NOTES.

(*c*) *Bonds.* *Samson* was bound with fetters of *copper* (as the *Hebrew* signifies, for *brass* was not invented so long since) by the *Philistines*, *Judg.* xvi. 21. *Joseph* was *bound* with a chain, or a cord, upon the account of his virtue, *Gen.* xl. 3.

(*d*) *Imprisonment.* These were *Joseph*, *Gen.* xxxix. 20. *Samson*, *Judg.* xvi. 21. *Micaiah*, 1 *Kings* xxii. 27. *Jeremiah*, *Jer.* xxxvii. 15.

(*dd*) See before on *v.* 35, note (*y*).

(*e*) *They were stoned.* *Zechariah*, the son of *Jehoiada*, was stoned, because he exhorted the people to repent, 2 *Chron* xxiv. 20, 21. Our Saviour mentions such, *Matth.* xxiii. 37.

(*f*) *They were sawn asunder.* The person here meant is universally agreed to be the prophet *Isaiah*, of whom the *Jewish* tradition preserved in both the *Babylonish*, and the *Jerusalem Talmud* says, that he was sawn asunder by the order of king *Manasseh*. *Jerom* calls it, *A most certain tradition, that Isaiah was sawn asunder with a wooden saw:* on which account (says he) most Christians refer this passage to *Isaiah*. See *Jerom* on *Isai.* lvii. 2. *Justin Martyr* mentions the same tradition, and charges the *Jews* with razing it out of the Old Testament. *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 349. *Paris* 1636. That *Manasseh* was *wicked enough* to be capable of committing this crime, no one can question, who considers, that he did wickedly above the *Amorites*, made his son pass thro' the fire, committed all sorts of idolatry, fill'd *Jerusalem* from end to end with innocent blood, &c. as we read, 2 *Kings* xxi. 2.—16. And that it has been a *custom* in ancient times to put men to death by *sawing* them asunder will appear from 2 *Sam.* xii. 31. where we read, that *David put* the people of Rabbah *under saws, and under harrows of iron*; or rather, as it is more correctly read in the other copy of the same history, *he cut them with saws*, and with other instruments for cutting men asunder, as the version of the LXX shews, who read the text thus, *He* cut *them with saws, and with axes of iron, and with instruments of splitting*, διαπριζασι, 1 *Chron.* xx. 3. These *saws* may be thought to have been made of *wood*, as they seem to be distinguish'd from the instruments made of iron. See more concerning this text, on *v.* 32. note (*m*). Another account of sawing asunder is given us in the *Greek* translation of *Amos*, i. 3. where what in *English* is, *They* (*viz.* the people of *Damascus*) *have threshed Gilead with threshing instruments of iron*, is render'd, *They saw'd with saws of iron the women that were with child in Gilead:* it is thus render'd in the *Arabic* version also. And *Suetonius* mentions it as one of the methods of putting men to death used by the *Roman* Emperor *Caligula*, that he saw'd men asunder in the middle, *in Vita Calig. cap.* 27.

(*g*) *Were tempted.* Some would fancy, that this clause does not belong to the apostle's text, partly because it is omitted in two *Greek* MSS in the *Syriac* and *Æthiopic* versions, and as is pretended in the quotations of *Eusebius*, *Chrysostom*, and *Theophylact*; and partly because it does not seem to them to suit with the context. But to the *two modern* MSS at *Basil*, and in *New College*, *Oxon*, we may oppose *thirty nine* others, some of which are of very great *antiquity*, and *worth:* to the *Syriac* version we may oppose the *Latin*, and the old *Italic* preserved in the *Clermont* copy: to the *Æthiopic* version, which is hardly ever worth minding, we may oppose the *Arabic*; and I suppose also the *Armenian* and *Coptic* versions retain the Clause.

HEBREWS.

NOTES.

Dr. *Whitly* ſays, that *Euſebius* omits it in his citation of the text. The truth is, he repeats the text without this clauſe, *Preparat. Evang.* p. 583. But he ſeems to have repeated it as *his own* words, without directly *quoting* the apoſtle. Accordingly he varies from the reading in other inſtances; particularly he omits the clauſe, *Of whom the world was not worthy*, in the *beginning* of *v.* 38. and ſets it at the *end* of the verſe. Theſe things ought not to be look'd upon as various readings, becauſe here was no deſign of a direct quotation.

Grotius poſitively ſays, that *Chryſoſtom* did *not read* this clauſe in his copy; and yet it is certain fact, that *Chryſoſtom does read* the text exactly as we now do, in his comment on the place. It is true indeed, that he does not *interpret* the phraſe, *They were tempted*; but then it is as true, that neither does he interpret the phraſe, *They were ſawn aſunder:* and yet no one will ſuſpect, that this was wanting in his copy. Let it be allow'd, that *Theophylact* of the *eleventh* century found not the clauſe in his copy; this will not much avail, ſince other writers, that were abundantly more ancient, have cited the text exactly as we now have it.

Origen cites this text ſeveral times in his works, and this clauſe, *were tempted*, is but once omitted. In his 14th *Homily* on *Jeremy* he reads it, *They were ſtoned, were ſawn aſunder*, were tempted, *were ſlain with the ſword*, p. 141. *Edit. Huet.* To invalidate this proof Dr. *Whitby* obſerves, that in the old tranſlation of this homily, the clauſe, *were tempted*, is omitted. This old tranſlation will do the Doctor no ſervice, becauſe *Jerom*, the author of it, undoubtedly read the clauſe in his copies, as appears by his quoting the text in his comment on *Matth.* xxvi. 8, 9. It is therefore a great deal more likely, that *Jerom*'s verſion of *Origen*'s homily has been alter'd in this place by tranſcribers, who have careleſly omitted the word, *tempted*, than that the word ſhould be added both in *Origen*'s homily, and in *Jerom*'s comment on *Matthew*.

Origen again expreſly cites the text in his comment on *Matthew*, p. 225. "Let him believe what is written in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, *They were ſtoned, were ſawn aſunder*, were tempted,—*were ſlain with the ſword*". To this citation Dr. *Whitby* objects, becauſe, as he thinks, "Whoſoever reads the place will find, that *Origen*, in *commenting* on the words, takes no notice of the word, *tempted*, but proceeds immediately from, *they were ſawn aſunder*, to, *they were ſlain with the ſword*". Let the reader judge of the force of this objection, by conſidering the whole ſentence, which is this, *viz.* "Tradition informs us, that *Iſaiah* was ſawn aſunder. But if any one will not admit this hiſtory, becauſe it is written in an apocryphal book of *Iſaiah*: let him believe what is written in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, *viz. They were ſtoned, were ſawn aſunder, were tempted.* For that expreſſion, *were ſawn aſunder*, relates to *Iſaiah*, as the expreſſion, *were ſlain with the ſword*, relates to *Zechariah*, who was ſlain between the temple and the altar". It is here to be obſerved that *Origen* takes no notice of particular perſons that were *ſtoned* or *tempted.* Yet ſurely Dr. *Whitby* would not have inferr'd from hence, that the word, *ſtoned*, was not in his copy. *Origen* here ſaid as much as was to his purpoſe.

Origen again repeats the words of this verſe without any omiſſion, in his book againſt *Celſus*, p. 336. which Dr. *Whitby* has not taken notice of.

The Doctor tells us, that *Origen* omits the clauſe in his fourth dialogue againſt *Marcion*; whereas that dialogue was not written by *Origen*, but by a later hand, as is agreed by Dr. *Cave*, *Huetius*, *Du Pin*, &c. Beſides, the author, whoever he was, does not *directly cite* the text, but only repeats as much of it, as was to his purpoſe. His words are, "The prophets were partakers of the human nature, not in appearance only, but in reality. One had his fleſh ſawn aſunder, another was ſtoned, and the reſt were ſlain with the ſword". The true reaſon why the author did not mention being *tempted*, in this place, becauſe it would not tend to prove his point, *viz. That the prophets were really partakers of the human nature.* For an *angel* may be tempted, as the fallen angels once actually were.

Dr. *Whitby* next refers, by miſtake (in my edition at leaſt) to *Origen*'s *exhortation to martyrdom*; whereas the paſſage cited is in his *Letter to Africanus*, p. 232. Here it is certain, *Origen* directly quotes the text thus, "The writer to the *Hebrews* ſays, *They were ſtoned,*

were

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

with the ſword: they wander'd about in ſheeps skins, and goats skins, be-

with the ſword (*b*): they wander'd about cloath'd in the rough skins of ſheep, and of goats (*i*), being deſtitute of the neceſſaries of

NOTES.

were ſawn aſunder, were ſlain with the edge of the ſword. But this can never be thought to be a proof, that the expreſſion, *were tempted*, was not in his copy: ſince it is certain from *three* other places of his works, that he *did* read it there. It is moſt likely, that it was here omitted by *tranſcribers*.

Dr. *Whitby* reckons *Tertullian* on his ſide. Let the reader judge upon ſeeing the paſſage, which is this, "Righteouſneſs hath ſuffer'd from the beginning:—— *Abel* was "kill'd by his brother:—— *David* was toſs'd about, *Elias* was driven away, *Jeremiah* "was ſtoned, *Iſaiah* was ſawn aſunder, *Zechariah* was ſlain between the altar, and tem-"ple, &c. *Scorpiac. adv. Gnoſtic.* The truth is, *Tertullian* does not here cite the text at all: and it may as well be ſaid, that he read therein, *Elias was driven away*, as that he did *not* read, *they were tempted.*

In the works of *Clemens Alexandrinus* the text is cited thus, *They were ſtoned, were tempted, were ſlain with the ſword*, p. 515. *Paris* 1641. This, Dr. *Whitby* fancies, gives juſt ground to conjecture, that ſome ignorant writer put επειρασθησαν for επεισθησαν. But it is a thouſand times more natural to conjecture, that *Clemens* read both words (as his ſcholar *Origen* did, and as almoſt all the *Greek* MSS. do) and that the tranſcribers of the works of *Clemens* have, through heedleſſneſs, dropt one of the two words, which are much alike in ſound and ſpelling.

Upon the whole, I cannot but ſay, with the learned Dr. *Mill*, that there does not appear to be any reaſon for altering the preſent reading of this text; eſpecially conſidering, that it is eſtabliſhed by a very *marvelous* agreement of all the *forty one Greek* copies of this epiſtle, excepting only two very modern ones. This agreement is really *marvelous*, becauſe when two words ſo near alike in letters and in ſound ſtand together, it is vaſt odds, but the tranſcribers would have omitted one or other of them; rather than that moſt of the tranſcribers ſhould add a word in ſuch a caſe.

It was neceſſary firſt to examine with care, whether this expreſſion does belong to the text, or not: becauſe if it does not, we may ſave ourſelves the labour of ſeeking after the meaning of it; or if it does, we muſt ſet ourſelves to find out what the apoſtle intended by it.

I do not ſuppoſe, that the apoſtle here ſpeaks of perſons *different* from thoſe that were *ſtoned*, and were *ſawn aſunder*. Theſe were *tempted* by their *ſufferings*. The apoſtle ſeems to put theſe two things together, juſt as he did, *chap.* ii. 18. where he ſaith of Chriſt, that he *ſuffered being tempted*. Thus the martyrs here ſpoken of *ſuffered being tempted*, *i. e.* their ſufferings were *trials* of their faith and virtue. And it was fully as much to the apoſtle's purpoſe to make this obſervation *here*, as in the *ſecond* chapter.

(*b*) *Were ſlain with the ſword. Urijah* was ſlain with the ſword by the order of king *Jehoiakim*; becauſe he ſpoke the *truth* in delivering the predictions which God had commanded him to ſpeak, *Jer.* xxvi. 20, 23. Many *prophets* were *ſlain with the ſword* in the time of *Ahab*, 1 *Kings* xix. 10, 14.

(*i*) Μηλωταις. *They wandered about in ſheeps ſkins. Elias* is undoubtedly an inſtance, that the apoſtle had in his eye. It is ſaid, in our tranſlation, he wore a *mantle*, 1 *Kings* xix. 13, 19. 2 *Kings* ii. 8, 13, 14. in all which places the *Greek* tranſlator uſes the word, Μηλωτη, *a ſheep's ſkin.* It ſeems to have been *rough*, as it was taken off from the ſheep's back, in order the better to defend him from the cold, and rain, while he was wandering in the deſert to avoid the fury of his perſecutors. Skins thus *rough*, with the wool on.

PARAPHRASE.

of life (*k*), afflicted with fears and grief (*l*),
38. injured (*m*) (of whose society the wicked world was not worthy, though it treated them as not worthy to live in it): they wander'd in wildernesses, and in mountains (*n*), and sculked in dens, and in caves
39. of the earth (*o*). And though the Scripture has given a good character of all these, as being accepted of GOD upon the account of

TEXT.

ing destitute, afflicted, tormented: (of whom the 38
world was not worthy)
they wander'd in deserts,
and *in* mountains, and *in*
dens, and caves of the
earth. And these all hav- 39
ing obtained a good report

NOTES.

on, are still worn in many countries. I cannot find any instance recorded in the Old Testament of a believer that was dress'd in a *goat's* skin; but *Clemens* of *Rome* seems to say, that *Ezekiel* was an instance of this: his words are, "Let us imitate those that walk'd "about preaching the coming of Christ in *goats* skins, and sheeps skins; I mean the pro- "phets, *Elias*, *Elisha*, and *Ezekiel*.

(*k*) *Destitute.* *Elias* was *destitute* of the *necessaries* of life, when he was persecuted, and lay conceal'd at the brook *Cherith*; on which account GOD caused the ravens to bring him bread, and flesh, both in the morning, and in the evening, 1 *Kings* xvii. 5, 6. At another time, when he was forced to flee for his life, he was in like manner destitute, till an angel brought him bread and water, *chap.* xix. 5, 6, 7.

(*l*) Θλιβομενοι, *afflicted.* At the time last mention'd *Elias* was so greatly *afflicted*, that *he requested for himself, that he might die*, *v.* 4. This trouble, or uneasiness of *mind*, is, I suppose, particularly meant by the apostle, according to his use of the same word, 2 *Cor.* i. 6. *Whether we be afflicted*, θλιβομεθα ——*or whether we be comforted*; and *chap.* vii. 5. *We were troubled, or afflicted*, θλιβομενοι, *on every side: without were fightings, within were fears:* which *inward fears* were part of his *affliction.* Thus also *Elias* was afflicted with his *inward fears* of his persecutors, who sought his life, 1 *Kings* xix. 10. *David* also was afflicted, εθλιβη, 1 *Sam.* xxx. 6. and *Micaiah*, 1 *Kings* xxii. 27.

(*m*) Κακουχουμενοι, *tormented.* The *Greek* word properly signifies, *abused*, or *injured.* It is before in this same chapter render'd by our translators, *suffer'd affliction*, *v.* 25. where it is said, that *Moses chose to suffer affliction with the people of God.* And it is likely the apostle had *Moses* in his eye in this 37th verse also. This same word is used again, *ch.* xiii. 3. where our translators have render'd it, *suffer'd adversity.* If the apostle had a respect to any other particular person besides *Moses*, it may be thought to be *David*, because the Seventy use the same word in speaking of the *injuries* he received from *Saul*, 1 *Kings* ii. 26. where *Solomon* says to *Abiathar*, *Thou hast been* afflicted, or abused, *in all wherein my father* εκακουχηθη, *was afflicted* or abused.

(*n*) *They wandered in deserts and in mountains.* This is particularly true of *Elias*, of whom the Scripture says, that he fled for his life from the persecution of *Jezebel*, *and went into the* wilderness, *and went unto Horeb the* mount *of God*, 1 *Kings* xix. 3, 4, 8. And when king *Ahaziah* sent messengers to *Elias* (who was afraid of the idolatrous king, 2 *Kings* i. 15.) they found him sitting on the top of a *hill*, *v.* 9. *David* also was forced to wander in *deserts* and *mountains* from the rage of *Saul*, 1 *Sam.* xxiii. 14, 15, 24, 25, 26. xxiv. 1 xxv. 4, 20. xxvi. 1, 2, 3.

(*o*) *And in dens, and caves of the earth.* This was *David's* case, who fled to the *cave of Adullam*, 1 *Sam.* xxii. 1. *When Jezebel cut off the prophets of the Lord, Obadiah took an hundred prophets, and hid them by fifty in a* cave, 1 *Kings* xviii. 4. *Elias* also conceal'd himself in a *cave*, when he fled from *Jezebel's* persecution, *chap.* xix. 9.

TEXT. PARAPHRASE

through faith, received not
39 the promise: God having
provided some better thing
for us, that they without

of their faith (*p*), yet they received not the reward of another life, that was promised them (*q*), immediately on their leaving this world (whereas God has provided some better thing for us Christians, *viz.* that we should be made happy *immediately*, as soon as we leave this world) (*r*), that so they might not 40.

NOTES.

(*p*) *And these all having obtained a good report through faith.* Their obtaining a *good report* signifies, that the Holy Scriptures have given a good character of them, as was observed on *v.* 2. note (*o*). And it has now appeared in particular, that every one of the good men mentioned in this chapter has a good character given of him in the *Old Testament*, and is represented as having been interested in the favour of God. The reason why a good character is there given of them is this, that they *believed* in God, and in his promises, in the sense wherein the apostle defines faith, *v.* 1. If they had not such a *real* and *operative* faith, they would not have *obey'd* and *suffer'd*, as it is testified they did.

(*q*) *Received not the promise.* The *promise* here signifies the *thing promised:* see on *ch.* x. 36. note (*g*). The *thing promised* is the *better and more enduring substance in heaven*, *v.* 34. the *saving of the soul*, *v.* 39. the *city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God*, *chap.* xi. 10. the *heavenly country*, *v.* 16. To be sure, the apostle did not design to say so very obvious and trifling a thing as this, *viz.* that they did not receive the reward of the *future* state, *while* they lived in this *present* world. He must therefore mean, that when they *were dead*, they did not *immediately* receive the happiness of the world to come.

(*r*) *God having provided some better things for us.* The *better* thing provided for us Christians, which the before-mentioned saints did not enjoy, *cannot* be the *resurrection* from the dead, and the being, *after that*, received into the heavenly *Jerusalem:* since herein we shall have nothing better than they. The thing therefore that we have, which is *better* than what they had, cannot possibly be any other than our being received into *heaven*, and to the injoyment of God *immediately* upon our leaving this world. That the antient believers, who lived before the coming of the Messiah, did not partake of this favour (excepting *Enoch* and *Elias*) seems to be, at least, strongly *implied* in many expressions of the Old Testament, as *Psal.* vi. 5. *In death there is* no remembrance *of thee: in the grave* who *shall give thee thanks?* cxv. 17. *The* dead praise not *the Lord*; neither *any that go down into* silence, *Isai.* xxxviii. 18, 19. *The* grave cannot praise *thee:* death cannot *celebrate thee: they that go down to the* pit cannot hope *for thy truth. The living, the* living, *he shall praise thee.* See also *Job*, x. 21, 22. xiv. 10, 12. *Psal.* xxx. 9. lxxxviii. 10, 11, 12. *Eccles.* ix. 5, 10. By all these texts it seems pretty plain, that, *before* the coming of Christ, death was a state of *insensibility.* But as our blessed Saviour carried the penitent thief into heaven with him, *Luke* xxiii. 43. so he seems to have awaken'd the souls of all the *good* men that had died before him from the beginning of the world. In this sense it seems necessary to understand what the apostle says, 1 *Pet.* iii. 19. *By which spirit* (or soul of Christ, when separated from his body) *he went and preached unto the spirits in prison*; and *chap.* iv. 6. *The gospel was preached to them that are dead.* This doctrine is more expressly taught by *Hermas*, Lib. III. *Simil.* 9. *cap.* 16. If they had not thus *slept* after death, till the coming of Christ, it could not have been said that there was something relating to a future state provided for *us better* than what was provided for them. I cannot possibly find any meaning to the text now under consideration without supposing, that all good Christians *immediately* on their death (at least after a very few moments) enter upon a state of *thought*,

Ch. XII.

PARAPHRASE.

not be made happy in heaven, till Chriſtians ſhould be there received to happineſs
1. with them (*s*). And therefore (*t*) (ſeeing we Chriſtians,

TEXT.

us ſhould not be made perfect. Wherefore ſeeing we

NOTES.

thought, *ſenſibility*, and *happineſs*. If any reader thinks otherwiſe, I deſire him to try to paraphraſe the text on his ſcheme, and particularly to account for the apoſtle's uſing the word, *better:* and, I ſuppoſe, he will ſoon be convinced, that his opinion will not conſiſt with this expreſſion of the apoſtle, which plainly teaches, *both* that the *antient* ſaints did paſs into a ſtate of *ſleep*, till the coming of Chriſt; and that *Chriſtians*, when they die, do *immediately* paſs into *happineſs* and glory.

(*s*) *That they without us ſhould not be made perfect.* There is no manner of neceſſity to ſuppoſe that the being *made perfect* here mention'd ſignifies the *reſurrection*, and the happineſs that ſhall *ſucceed* it. Nay (beſides what has been obſerved in the foregoing note) if we make, as we ought, the apoſtle his own interpreter, it will be moſt probable, that he here ſpeaks of the happineſs which good men *now* injoy in *heaven*, between their death, and the reſurrection. For in the next chapter he ſpeaks of *the ſpirits of juſt men made* perfect, *v.* 23. which are their *ſeparate* ſouls now in glory. When it is ſaid, they are *not made perfect without us* Chriſtians, the meaning is, that they were *not* (excepting only *Enoch* and *Elias*) admitted into *heaven*, till after the death of Chriſt (whereby the future ſtate was purchaſed) when Chriſtians, as faſt as they left this world, were admitted thither alſo.

This expreſſion is not connected with that which immediately preceeds it, but with the laſt clauſe of *v.* 39. ſo that the beginning of *v.* 40. muſt be read in a parentheſis thus, *Theſe——received not the promiſe* (*God having provided ſome better thing for us*) *that they without us might not be made perfect.* The reaſon why they did not, till the coming of Chriſt, receive the ſalvation of the ſoul that was promiſed them, was, that they might *not be perfect without us.* In the parentheſis the apoſtle very pertinently obſerves, that God has provided *ſome better things for us* than he had provided for them, with a deſign to ſhew, that we might well argue from the foregoing liſt, that if God would favour them with ſalvation on the account of their faith; we can have no room to doubt of *as great* favour, at leaſt. Nay ſince God has provided ſome *better* thing for us, we appear to be *more* in his favour; and therefore the argument from *their* being juſtified to *our* being juſtified *by faith*, will be the ſtronger.

From hence it may be farther inferr'd, that we ought with the greater *patience* and courage to indure perſecution, ſince God has provided ſomething *better* for us than for them. If the antient believers therefore held out againſt the temptations of perſecution, when they expected no other, but that death would caſt them into a ſtate of *ſleep* and *inſenſibility*, for ought they knew, till the time of the general reſurrection: *much more* ſhould we patiently ſuffer afflictions, and even death itſelf for the ſake of truth, and of the Goſpel, when we know, that God has promiſed us ſomething better, *viz.* that we ſhall be conducted to heaven *immediately* after death, and be there ſpirits of juſt men made perfect, and be with Chriſt, which is far better than either to ſleep after Death, or to live longer in this world.

(*t*) Τοιγαρουν και ημεις. *Wherefore ſeeing we alſo.* This tranſlation ſuppoſes, that και is to be joined in conſtruction with ημεις. If ſo, the ſenſe of the place would be, *Wherefore let us alſo* (ſeeing we are incompaſs'd, &c.) *run with patience, as thoſe believers have done before us.* But I rather ſuppoſe, that και is to be joined in conſtruction with τοιγαρουν: and then it will be a kind of expletive, as it is after διο. For διο και does not ſignify *therefore alſo*, but merely *therefore*, or at moſt, *and therefore*, as any one may ſatisfy himſelf by

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
also are compaſſed about with ſo great a cloud of witneſſes, let us lay aſide every weight, and the ſin	Chriſtians are, as it were, ſurrounded with this great number of believers, as the ſpectators and witneſſes of our conduct, who at the ſame time incourage us to follow the example of their faith and patience, that we may be hereafter rewarded with them (*u*) let us lay aſide every thing that would hinder us in the way to ſalvation (*w*), and that ſin

NOTES.

by turning to *Luke* i. 35. *Rom.* i. 24. iv. 22. *Heb.* xi. 12. xiii. 12. In like manner τοιγαρουν και ſhould be render'd *and therefore*, or, as our tranſlators have well put it, *wherefore*; but then the word, *alſo*, muſt be expunged. The word, *wherefore*, refers to the whole preceeding chapter ſumm'd up in the parentheſis noted in the paraphraſe.

(*u*) *Are compaſſed about with ſo great a cloud of witneſſes.* It is evident enough that the apoſtle here alludes to mens running of *races*; but it is not as *evident*, that in writing to the *Hebrews*, who dwelt in *Judea*, he borrow'd his ſimilies either from the *Olympic* games of *Greece*, or from thoſe that were inſtituted in imitation of them at *Rome*; ſince, in all likelihood his readers had heard nothing of them. Nor is there the leaſt *need* to think, that the apoſtle had here any particular view to the *Olympic* games: ſince it cannot be doubted but that there were games enough in *Judea* for him to allude to. No doubt the *Jews* for mere diverſion ſometimes ran races as well as other people in other countries. Beſides the *common peoples* races, there were *ſolemn games* inſtituted at *Jeruſalem*, and a *theater* and *amphitheater* built by *Herod*, as *Joſephus* expreſly tells us, *Antiq. Jud.* Lib. xv. cap. 8. p. 688. Edit. *Hudſon.* *De Bel. Jud.* Lib. i. cap. 21. p. 1009.

When ſuch races were run, there were many ſpectators, who in all ſuch caſes are appeal'd to as *judges* to determine, who of the racers won the prize. Theſe ſpectators are call'd *witneſſes*, becauſe they *teſtified* the *fact*, who of the racers ran beſt, and arrived firſt at the goal. In alluſion hereto the apoſtle ſays, *We have witneſſes, i. e. ſpectators* who take notice, how we run the race that is ſet before us. In the ſame ſenſe the apoſtle uſes the word, *witneſſes*, 1 *Tim.* vi. 12——*Thou haſt confeſſed a good confeſſion before many witneſſes.* So we run the Chriſtian race in the view of many *witneſſes*. Theſe witneſſes are all the believers mention'd in the former chapter. The apoſtle, by a very handſome figure, repreſents them as having run the race themſelves, and as being arrived at the end of it, and as there ſet down taking notice of us while we are running. I do not ſuppoſe him, indeed, to mean, that thoſe ancient believers do now really know and obſerve what we do: but by his figurative expreſſion he would teach us, that we ſhould look to them, who have already reach'd to the end of the race, and incourage ourſelves to follow their example; and at the ſame time think how much we ſhould be aſhamed to grow weary or loiter, if they were conſtantly looking upon us. The apoſtle calls them a *cloud* of witneſſes, becauſe they are *many*; in which ſenſe the word is uſed in many antient Authors both *Greek* and *Latin* cited by *Grotius*, *Owen*, and *Whitby*.

(*w*) *Let us lay aſide every weight.* Such as attempt to run a race take care to lay aſide their *heavy* garments, and every other *weighty* thing that was about them. Thus we ſhould put away from us every thing that would hinder us from improving in goodneſs and virtue. He, who is led into ſin by *ill company*, muſt *leave* that company. He, who finds his fleſhly luſts too ſtrong, muſt by ſtrict temperance and ſelf-denial *beat down the body*, and *keep it* in ſubjection. He, that loves the world too well, muſt labour to with-

PARAPHRASE.

sin in particular which we are most in danger of committing (*x*); and let us run with patience, in a time of persecution, the Christian race that is set before us, and hold on
2. in the way to heaven, looking to, and imitating Jesus, the leader and captain of believers, and an example of a perfect and never-failing faith (*y*), who, for the sake of obtaining

TEXT.

which doth so easily beset *us*, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus 2 the author and finisher of *our* faith; who for the joy

NOTES.

draw his affections from it, that he may, with less distraction and difficulty, ingage in the practice of piety and virtue, and thereby prepare himself for eternal salvation.

(*x*) *And the sin which doth so easily beset us.* The allusion here is thought to be to a man's putting off a *long garment*, when he is about to run a race; lest it should wrap itself about his legs, so as to hinder him in running. The application of which simile is this, *viz.* that we should particularly set ourselves to mortify and subdue that sin, which we are most *apt*, and most *inclined* to commit. The apostle seems particularly to mean *infidelity*, which causes men to grow weary in a time of distress and persecution; and which he thought the *Hebrew* Christians then particularly in danger of committing, as appears from his labouring to guard them against it throughout this whole epistle.

(*y*) *The author and finisher of our faith.* The *English* reader may perceive that the word, *our*, is not in the original, since it is printed in a different character from the rest of the verse: nor was there any occasion to insert it. The apostle does not speak of *our* faith, but of *the faith*, or *faith* in general. If the apostle had spoken here of *our* faith, it might have been natural enough to suppose, that he intended to call Christ, the *author* of it, provided the word αρχηγος will bear that sense. But there is no need to seek after an unusual meaning of the word in this place. Its constant sense both in the New Testament, and in the *Greek* version of the Old is a *captain*, or, *leader*, who goes before others, sets them an example, and calls them to follow him. Thus, *Acts* iii. 15. Christ is call'd, αρχηγος της ζωης, which our translators have render'd, *the prince of life*, i. e. the captain, who goes before his disciples to eternal life, and calls them to follow him. In the same sense he is call'd αρχηγος και σωτηρ, *a prince*, or a captain, *and a saviour*, *chap.* v. 31. And he is stiled, αρχηγος της σωτηριας αυτων, *the captain of their salvation*, *Heb.* ii. 10. *i. e.* he leads them on toward that salvation and glory, into which he first enter'd himself. In like manner, when he is stiled αρχηγος της πιστεως. the true rendering appears to be, *the captain of the faith*, i. e. he is our leader and forerunner in faith, he is the *head*, or *chief* of all the faithful, he sets us an example of believing, and calls us to imitate him herein, and marches as our captain before us in fighting the good fight of faith. There is but one place in the Old Testament that is, as to the whole expression (tho' as to the single word, αρχηγος, there are many) parallel to this, *viz.* *Micah* i. 13. where *Lachish* is call'd, *the beginning of the sin to the daughter of Zion*, in *Greek*, αρχηγος αμαρτιας, *the captain* or *leader of sin*: by which is undoubtedly meant, that *Lachish* set *Zion* an *example* of sinning, and drew it to an *imitation*; that *Lachish* march'd in the *front*, like a *captain*, in the way of sin, and led on *Zion* in the same path. Thus Christ, as the *captain of believers*, marches in the front in the way of faith, and leads them on in the same way. To confirm this interpretation of the words it must be observed, that in the only places wherein the word αρχηγος is used in the *Apocrypha*, it must be understood in the same sense. Thus, 1 *Maccab.* ix. 61. αρχηγοι της κακιας, call'd by our translators, *authors of*

that

TEXT.

that was ſet before him, endured the croſs, deſpiſing the ſhame, and is ſet down at the right hand of the throne of God. For conſider him that endured ſuch contradiction of ſin-

PARAPHRASE.

obtaining the reward of joy and glory, and exaltation to be lord of all, which was promiſed him, and preſented to his view, was contented to indure all the pains of crucifixion, which was the condition of his receiving this reward; and who on the account of it deſpiſed and undervalued the ſhame that was done him of crucifying him as if he had been a malefactor, and of the loweſt rank of men; and has now obtained the promiſed and expected reward, being ſeated on the throne of GOD at GOD's right hand (*yy*) inveſted with the authority of king of the world. I have well exhorted you to run the Chriſtian race with patience after the example of Jeſus. For conſider how he indured 3.
with patience ſuch contradiction and reproach from

NOTES.

that miſchief, were really the *firſt*, and *chief*, or the *ringleaders* in it. Accordingly *Joſephus* calls them τους ηγεμονας, the *chief*, the *leaders*, who ſet the example, and led on others to the wickedneſs, p. 557. *Edit. Hudſon.* *Alexander* is call'd αρχηγος λογων ειρηνικων, *ch.* x. 47. which our tranſlators have render'd, *the firſt that entreated of true peace with them*, i. e. he made the firſt offers of entering into a league with them, and thereby, tho' without deſign, induced *Demetrius* alſo to make them offers of doing the ſame. *Alexander* was *foremoſt* in the affair, ſet the example, and led on *Demetrius* to an imitation. Thus Chriſt is the *captain*, or *leader of the faith*, becauſe he goes before us therein, and calls us to follow his example; he himſelf is a *believer*, and he is the *captain* of all the faithful.

It is next to be conſider'd, in what ſenſe Chriſt is call'd, τελειωτης της πιστεως, *the finiſher of the faith*. The meaning ſeems to be, that he *held faſt* his faith, or *perſevered* therein, to the end; that his faith was *perfect* in degree: and that he completely *finiſh'd* his courſe of faith. This ſenſe of the expreſſion is the moſt *natural* that can be put upon it. I cannot indeed find an expreſſion that is exactly parallel to it. But from the uſe of the verb τελειοω we may eaſily account for this expreſſion. As τελειωσω εργον ſignifies, *I will finiſh the work*, *Joh.* iv. 34. So τελειωτης εργου would neceſſarily ſignify *a finiſher of the work*, or one who does all the work that is required of him. In like manner, as η πιστις ετελειωθη ſignifies, *faith is made perfect*, or is compleated, *James* ii. 22. So τελειωτης της πιστεως muſt anſwerably ſignify *a perfecter of faith*, or one who exerciſes a complete and *perfect* faith, and *perſeveres* therein to the death. The ſame may be confirm'd from the uſe of the word τελειοω, *Ezek.* xxvii. 11. 2 *Tim.* iv. 7.

Since then Jeſus is our *captain* and *leader* in point of faith, and his faith was *perfect* both in degree and duration, it muſt be our duty to look to him as our pattern; to follow him as our leader, to obey him as our captain, and to imitate his example in the beſt manner we can.

(*yy*) *Throne of God.* See *Rev.* iii. 21.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

from ſinners againſt himſelf as you meet with; that ſo ye may not grow weary in well-doing, or ſuffer your faith and good reſolutions to faint in a time of perſecution and temptation; but being ſtedfaſt to the end, may be rewarded and crown'd with him.

ners againſt himſelf, leſt ye be wearied, and faint in your minds.

SECT. XVI.

CHAP. XII. 4.—13.

CONTENTS.

THE chief deſign of what the apoſtle ſays in this portion of his epiſtle is the ſame as he had in view in the preceeding, *viz.* to incourage the *Hebrew* Chriſtians to retain the faith and practice of the Goſpel, notwithſtanding the *evils* they ſuffer'd for it. To this he before incouraged them by the examples of others, who had patiently ſuffer'd for truth and virtue, eſpecially of Chriſt. Now he adds, that as the *Hebrews* were not yet call'd out to ſuffer to the death, they ought to look on their ſufferings as *chaſtiſements* of a *father's* hand, and patiently indure them for two reaſons; both becauſe every father corrects his children; and becauſe GOD always deſign'd to promote their welfare by chaſtiſing them. If others did not faint, when they ſuffer'd to the *death* in the cauſe of truth and virtue, much leſs ſhould the *Hebrew* Chriſtians faint, when they were *not call'd to reſiſt unto blood*, or to lay down their lives for the Goſpel.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

4. Several of thoſe believers whom I have now recommended to you as examples, particularly Chriſt Jeſus, ſuffer'd as far as *death* for the ſake of doing their duty; but in your

Ye have not yet reſiſted 4 unto blood, ſtriving againſt

TEXT.

5 sin. And ye have forgot-
gotten the exhortation
which speaketh unto you
as unto children, My son,
despise not thou the chast-
ning of the Lord, nor
faint when thou art re-
6 buked of him: For whom
the Lord loveth he chast-
neth, and scourgeth every
son whom he receiveth.

PARAPHRASE.

your striving against the temptations, which you are under to the sin of apostasy from Christianity, you have not yet been call'd forth to die (tho' you have suffer'd the spoiling of your goods) on the account of your adherence to it: wherefore you will be the more inexcusable if you faint, and draw back. And can ye have forgotten (z) the exhortation which is given you by the wise man, who speaketh to you, as his children, saying, "My son, take heed you do not, on "the one hand, *overlook* and *despise* the "chastnings wherewith the Lord corrects "you; nor do you, on the other hand, *faint* "and *despair*, when he rebukes you? for "GOD your heavenly father chastens all "those whom he loves, and scourgeth every "son, or daughter, whom he owns under "these relations (a). If then GOD chastises you;

5.

6.

7.

NOTES.

(z) Και εκλελησθε της παρακλησεως, *and ye have forgotten the exhortation.* I cannot persuade myself that the apostle here design'd to *accuse* the *Hebrews* of having forgotten this exhortation of the Scripture. It is more likely he design'd this passage should be read by way of *Question*, *And have ye forgotten the exhortation?* It is well known by all masters of the *Greek* language, that it is very common therein for an interrogation to be express'd in the very same words (and those placed exactly in the same order too) as a direct assertion; as for instance, ουκ οιδατε οτι, *Matth.* ix. 28. *Mark* xi. 24. συ ειπας, *Joh.* ix. 35. *James* ii. 19. καλως λεγεις, *Gal.* ii. 17, 21. ουτος εστιν ο υιος, *Joh.* ix. 19, 20. ουκ εστι, *Joh.* x. 34. *Acts* i. 7. The context then must determine in all such cases.

(a) *And scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.* The apostle, in this whole citation from *Prov.* iii. 11, 12. renders the *Hebrew* exactly as the old *Greek* translator did before him, as his translation stands in the *Alexandrian* MS. excepting only that that old translator omitted the word, *my*, after *son*, in the beginning of the citation. But the apostle was undoubtedly right in reading, *My son*, partly because the nature of the expression requires that the word, *my*, should not be omitted, and partly because it is retain'd not only in the *Hebrew* text, but also in the *Latin*, *Syriac*, and *Chaldee* versions, in the version of *Aquila*, and in the *Arabic*, which being made from the LXX in this book of the *Proverbs*, shews, that it was originally retain'd by the LXX too. But tho' the apostle's citation agrees thus well with the *Greek* version, commonly call'd that of the *Seventy*, yet it does not throughout agree with the *English* translation of the present *Hebrew* text. The difference lies in the last clause. The *Hebrew*, as pointed by the modern *Jews*, and as represented in the old *Latin*, and in our *English* translation, stands thus, *Even as a father*

the

Ch. XII.

PARAPHRASE.

you, he therein treats you as wise and good fathers use to treat their children: for what child is there, whom his father doth not
8. chasten, when he sees occasion for it? If therefore ye should be without chastisement, whereof every wise father makes all his own children partakers, when he sees it needful, you would be neglected as a man neglects a spurious breed, which his wife conceived by adultery, and not treated as a father treats *his own* children, that are of his own begetting. Wherefore, since God by chastening you treats you as *his own* children, you ought patiently to bear his chastisements.
9. Besides, they, who were our fathers according to the flesh, have often corrected us, and we reverenced them, and patiently bore their chastnings: should we not then much rather submit to God, who is the creator and father of our souls, and thereby secure to ourselves

TEXT.

If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons: for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye 8
be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore we 9
have had fathers of our flesh, which corrected us, and we gave *them* reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the father of spirits, and

NOTES.

the son in whom *he delighteth.* The *Greek* agrees with the apostle in reading, *And scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.* The *Arabic* version differs very little, which is, *And scourgeth every son whom he loveth.* The *Chaldee* and *Syriac* have it, *And as a father who scourgeth his son.* The *Arabic*, *Syriac*, and *Chaldee* agree with the LXX and the apostle in translating כאב *scourgeth*; which is render'd, *as a father*, in the *Latin*, and *English*. The difference here is mainly as to *translating*; for all the translators seem to have read the same *Hebrew* words in their copies, as we now find in the present original text. For וכאב signifies either, *and as a father*, or, *and scourgeth.* And ירצה signifies either, *he delighteth in*, or, *he receiveth.* There is sufficient reason to determine in favour of the translation given us by the LXX, and the apostle; since according to their rendring the *Hebrew* text is *complete*; whereas according to the other translation the word באשר must be supposed to be omitted. And it is more natural to say in this place, *He scourgeth every son whom he* receiveth, or adopteth, than, *He scourgeth every son whom he* loveth; since he is here plainly supposed to love *every* son without exception. Some, I perceive, would choose to suppose, that there is one letter omitted in the *Hebrew* text, *viz.* *Jod*, thinking that we should read ויכאב, but there does not appear to be any manner of necessity for this, in as much as וכאב makes it as good *Grammar.* There is, perhaps, one word omitted in the present copies of the *Hebrew* text, *viz.* כל every; *He scourgeth* every *son whom he receiveth.* This word is retain'd by the *Greek*, the *Arabic*, and the apostle, who do not use to add such a word to the text. Yet, on the other hand, it is certain, if they did not find this word in their copies of the Original, they added nothing to the *sense* by inserting the word in this place.

TEXT.

to live? For they verily for a few days chaſtened *us*, after their own pleaſure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holineſs. Now no chaſtning for the preſent ſeemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheleſs, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteouſneſs unto them which are exerciſed thereby. Wherefore lift up the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees. And

PARAPHRASE.

ſelves that eternal life, which he has appointed to be the inheritance of all his dutiful children? Nay we ought much more to ſubmit to GOD than to them: for they, during the time of our infancy, chaſten'd us as they ſaw fit, ſometimes, perhaps, without cauſe, or beyond meaſure: but our heavenly father in chaſtning us always deſigns and endeavours to promote our real benefit and advantage, even that we may become more like him in holineſs, and ſo be more fitted to enjoy him in another world. It muſt be own'd indeed that affliction in itſelf, and during its continuance, is not matter of joy, but rather cauſeth grief and ſorrow (*b*): yet however, afterward it brings forth the fruit of righteouſneſs, holineſs, peace, and joy, in them that are exerciſed therewith. Wherefore let us incourage ourſelves with the hope and expectation of this bleſſed fruit, in running the Chriſtian race that is ſet before us: and as a man cannot hope to ſucceed in running a race, when he is tired, and through wearineſs his hands fall down, and his knees are weak; but muſt, in order to his ſucceeding, and finiſhing the race, have his ſpirits rais'd, that he may not feel his wearineſs, that ſo his hands may be vigorous, and his knees firm, and ſtrengthen'd: ſo, when you ſeem to begin to be weary in the Chriſtian race, you muſt revive and incourage your faith and hope, and not ſuffer your minds to faint under affliction. And as they who are about to run a race, ſhould before-hand take

10. 11. 12. 13.

NOTES.

(*b*) Ου δοκει χαρας ειναι, *ſeemeth not to be joyous.* The word, δοκει, *ſeemeth*, is here an expletive, as it is chap. iv. 1. *Mark* x. 42. *Luke* viii. 18.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

take care to make the path plain, and to throw out of it all ſtumbling blocks (*bb*), leſt if their knees are ſomewhat feeble, and they a little lame, thoſe ſtumbling blocks ſhould turn them out of the way, or cauſe them to fall; and ought withal to labour to cure their lameneſs, and their feeble knees: ſo ye Chriſtians ſhould remove out of your way all thoſe things which tend to hinder you in the practice of piety and virtue; leſt temptations ſhould draw you aſide, and prevent your attaining to eternal ſalvation: and when you find you have, in any degree, begun to grow weary of well doing, immediately labour to cure yourſelves of this diſtemper.

make ſtraight paths for your feet, leſt that which is lame be turned out of the way, but let it rather be healed.

NOTES.

(*bb*) Τεχνιας ορθας, *ſtraight paths.* The apoſtle does not mean ſuch paths as have no turnings, or windings, in them. For when ways are thus crooked, we cannot well make them *ſtrait.* But he ſpeaks of ways that are *ſmooth*, in oppoſition to ſuch as are *rugged*, and fill'd with *ſtumbling blocks.* In this ſenſe is the expreſſion uſed, in the *Greek* tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, *Prov.* iv. 11, 12. xi. 5. xii. 15. *Jerem.* xxxi. 9.

SECT. XVII.

CHAP. XII. 14.—XIII. 25.

CONTENTS.

THIS ſection contains *practical* rules and exhortations, with the apoſtle's concluding *ſalutation* and good wiſhes.

SECT.

SECT. XVII. N. 1.

CHAP. XII. 14.---29.

CONTENTS.

IN this part of the ſection the apoſtle exhorts the *Hebrew* Chriſtians to the exerciſe of *univerſal peace* with believing *Gentiles* as well as believing *Jews*, and to the practice of *holineſs*, that ſo they might not fail of an intereſt in the favour and mercy of GOD revealed in the Goſpel. He ſets home this exhortation by obſerving, that they were not now called to the profeſſion and privileges of *Judaiſm*, but of *Chriſtianity*, and that therefore they ought to live in *peace* with *all Chriſtians*, and to receive the *uncircumciſed* believers into their communion in a peaceable manner, and to keep themſelves intereſted in the favour of GOD by the practice of ſincere and univerſal holineſs. Under the deſcription, which the apoſtle here gives of Judaiſm, and Chriſtianity, he particularly takes notice of thoſe differences between them, which ſhew, that the law ſpoke nothing but *terror*, while the Goſpel reveals the divine *Grace*, and that the privileges and ſociety, to which the Goſpel calls us, oblige us to be *holy* and *peaceable*, as a neceſſary condition of our injoying GOD in the world to come.

TEXT.	*PARAPHRASE.*	
14 Follow peace with all men, and holineſs, without which no man ſhall 15 ſee the Lord: looking diligently, leſt any man fail	Be careful, as much as lies in you, to preſerve peace in the church; maintain it with all men, and receive the uncircumciſed believers as well as the circumciſed in a peaceable manner to your communion, as Fellow-Chriſtians: and labour to improve in holineſs, without which no man ſhall be admitted to injoy GOD in his heavenly kingdom hereafter; taking heed leſt any one, by an unpeaceable, and unholy carriage, cut himſelf off from an intereſt in the eſpecial love	14. 15.

PARAPHRASE.

and favour of GOD, which is offer'd in the Goſpel; leſt as a bitter or poiſonous herb growing in a garden would be noxious, and perhaps taint other herbs that grow near it, ſo there ſhould ariſe any perſon among you who ſhould teach unpeaceable, dividing, uncharitable, and impure doctrines, and thereby diſturb the church of GOD, and defile the ſouls and morals of many Chriſtians (*c*),
16. leſt there ſhould be any whoremonger (*d*), or any ſuch profane perſon as *Eſau*, who for one meſs of meat (*e*) ſold his birth-right (*ee*); leſt there

TEXT.

of the grace of God; leſt any root of bitterneſs ſpringing up trouble *you*, and thereby many be defiled: leſt there *be* any 16
fornicator, or profane perſon, as Eſau, who for one morſel of meat ſold his

NOTES.

(*c*) Μη τις ριζα πικριας ανω φυουσα ενοχλη, *Leſt any root of bitterneſs ſpringing up trouble you.* It is very true, as Commentators have obſerved, that we have almoſt the ſame words with theſe in the old *Greek* verſion of *Deut.* xxix. 18. Μη τις εστιν εν υμιν ριζα πικριας ανω φυουσα εν χολη. The *Alexandrian* copy indeed here has it, as in the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, ενοχλη, as Dr. *Grabe* obſerves in the *margin* of his edition. But poſſibly that reading was derived thither from the New Teſtament. *Grotius*, *Mill*, &c. ſuppoſe, that the apoſtle originally writ εν χολη, *with gall*, and that tranſcribers afterward alter'd it into ενοχλη, *trouble you.* But this ſeems to be more than unlikely, becauſe *all* the MSS and Verſions, *without one* exception, agree in the preſent reading. And there is no reaſon to alter this text in conformity to that in *Deuteronomy*, ſince the apoſtle does *not cite* it, but only *uſes* ſo much of the language of that ſcripture, as was to his preſent purpoſe. He might therefore in this caſe, alter, add, or leave out, as he ſaw fit. In this way do all Chriſtians unblamably mingle ſome expreſſions of the Scripture among their own, with ſome variation of words.

(*d*) Μη τις πορνος, *leſt there be any fornicator.* Perhaps many *Engliſh* readers imagine, that the apoſtle here ſpeaks only of that ſin, which in our language is call'd, *fornication*, *viz.* unlawful converſation between an *unmarried* man, and an *unmarried* woman. But the truth is, the *Greek* word, πορνος, ſignifies any one that is guilty of any kind of whoredom, be it fornication, adultery, or inceſt. A *married* woman is ſaid to be guilty of πορνεια, which ſurely is not fornication, but *adultery*, *Matth.* v. 32. xix. 9. Accordingly, πορνεια, and μοιχεια are uſed to ſignify the *ſame* crime, *Rev.* ii. 21, 22. Πορναια ſignifies *inceſt*, 1 *Cor.* v. 1. Πορνη ſignifies a common *ſtrumpet*, *Rev.* xvii. 1, 2. xviii. 3. So that the words ſhould have been render'd, *Leſt there be any* whoremonger, &c. The apoſtle deſign'd to guard them againſt falling into any kind of whoredom, whether it be fornication, adultery, or inceſt.

(*e*) Βρωσεως μιας, *one morſel of meat.* In the *Greek* it is only, *for one eating*, or *for one meal.* As it was a diſh of pottage, *one* meſs *of meat* is a better rendring than *one* morſel. See the Hiſtory, *Gen.* xxv. 29, &c.

(*ee*) *Sold his bright-right.* It is needful here to inquire, *What* was *Eſau*'s birth-right; and wherein lay the *profaneneſs* of ſelling it?

Some have fancied, that *his* birth-right, and the *common* birth-right of *all eldeſt* ſons was the *prieſthood*, and ſo that he ſold the *prieſthood*. But there is no proof of this notion: and it is a clear caſe, that the *younger* brothers, ſuch as *Abel*, and *Abraham*, offer'd ſacrifices

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

17 birthright. For ye know there ſhould be any among you, that will part with his intereſt in GOD's favour, and the inheritance of GOD's children for the ſake of

NOTES.

crifices as well as, and during the life of, the firſt-born. *Eſau*'s birth-right was not, as has been hitherto ſuppoſed, *merely* the extraordinary privileges and portion *common to all eldeſt* ſons, above their brothers; but alſo, and *chiefly* a very *peculiar* and uncommon privilege, which was to be granted by *Iſaac* to *him* whom he ſhould eſteem to be his eldeſt ſon; in which the eldeſt ſons of other men have no manner of ſhare, and to which they can claim no right by birth, except the eldeſt ſons of ſome *monarchs*.

We may diſcover *Eſau's birth-right* by conſidering the *bleſſing*, which his father *Iſaac deſign'd* for him upon the account of his being the firſt-born, which he thus expreſs'd, *God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatneſs of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine: let people ſerve thee, and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's ſons bow down to thee: curſed be every one that curſeth thee, and bleſſed be he that bleſſeth thee*, *Gen.* xxvii. 28, 29. That there was ſomething *extraordinary* contain'd in this bleſſing, which was to be peculiar to him that injoy'd the *birth-right*, is evident from the *vaſt concern Eſau* was afterward under, when he perceived that his brother *Jacob* had by craft taken away this bleſſing from him, *v.* 34. and from the *great concern* that *Iſaac* alſo expreſs'd, when he found he had been *deceived*, and had given the bleſſing to *Jacob*, which he had *deſign'd* for *Eſau* his *firſt-born*, *v.* 33. This *extraordinary* thing which was *peculiar* to him that injoy'd the birth-right or had a right to the bleſſing intended for the *firſt* born ſon of *Iſaac*, was that he ſhould be *lord over his brethren*. On this ſingle thing *Iſaac* laid the ſtreſs, *v.* 37. *Iſaac ſaid unto Eſau, Behold, I have made* Jacob thy lord: *and* all his brethren *have I given him for* ſervants. This is all that was *peculiar* in the bleſſing to be pronounced on *Iſaac's firſt* born ſon. The younger was to ſhare with him in the bleſſing of *plenty*. For as *Iſaac* promiſed *Jacob* (taking him to have been his *eldeſt* ſon) *the dew of heaven, and the fatneſs of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine*, *v.* 28, 37. ſo he promiſed to *Eſau* (who was put off with the bleſſing of the *younger* ſon) that his *dwelling ſhould be of the fatneſs of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above*, *v.* 39. in which promiſe *plenty of corn and wine* is neceſſarily included: ſo that, *in this reſpect*, he, who injoy'd the birth-right, had no pre-eminence above his brother. All the advantage the Scripture expreſly takes notice of is, that he, who injoy'd the birth-right, ſhould be, *lord over his brother*. As *Eſau* was the *firſt* born, he had *originally a right* to all the privileges of the firſt born ſon of *Iſaac*, particularly to his father's *chief* bleſſing. But he ſold away his right to this chief bleſſing, and to all the happy conſequences of it, for a mere trifle, to his younger brother, who thereupon became intitled to them.

The *profaneneſs* of *Eſau*'s, management on this occaſion lay in his *deſpiſing* this bleſſing of being *lord over his brethren*, and the great advantages of *liberty* and *dominion*. If he had retained his birth-right, he would not have been condemn'd to *ſerve* his brother; nor would his poſterity have been made *ſlaves* to the children of *Iſrael*. But *Eſau deſpiſed* his native *liberty*, and ſold himſelf and his poſterity into a ſtate of *ſlavery*, for one meſs of *pottage*. This was vaſtly more profane, impious, and immoral than the men of *ſlaviſh* principles can poſſibly imagine. If a man is a *ſlave*, he muſt do as his maſter requires; but if he is *free*, he can ſerve GOD, and do good in the world without diſtraction. It muſt then be a very *profane* thing for men to throw up their natural *liberty* into the hands of a *tyrant*; and they are bound in conſcience to maintain their juſt liberties as long as poſſibly they can. For farther application ſee the paraphraſe on this verſe, and what is afterward ſaid on *v.* 25. note (*q*).

PARAPHRASE.

of injoying the good things of this preſent
17. life: take heed, I ſay, not to act like pro-
fane *Eſau*, ſince ye know, that after he had
ſold his birth-right, he would have been glad
to have inherited the bleſſing to which he
was thereby intitled, but that then his fa-
ther *Iſaac* rejected his requeſt: for he could
not perſuade his father to alter his purpoſe,
and to reſtore him the bleſſing, which was
given away to *Jacob* (*f*), tho' he ſought
it with diligence, and with tears. In like
manner, if you give up your birth-right,
you cannot but expect, that GOD will de-
prive you of it, and not repent of his ſen-
tence of condemnation paſs'd upon you,
with how many tears ſoever you may de-
18. ſire him to revoke it. Follow peace (I ſay)
with all men, both *Jewiſh* and *Gentile* be-
lievers, and fall not away from GOD's grace:
for remember, you are no longer *Jews*,
but are Chriſtians; you are not come to
mount *Sinai*, where the law was given to
the

TEXT.

how that afterward when
he would have inherited
the bleſſing, he was re-
jected: for he found no
place of repentance, tho'
he ſought it carefully with
tears. For ye are not come 18

NOTES.

(*f*) *He found no place of repentance.* Some very great men, it muſt be own'd, have interpreted this expreſſion, as if it ſignified, that *Eſau*'s repentance was not accepted. But it ſeems very plain, on the other hand, that however true this is in itſelf, yet it is not here intended by the apoſtle, and that he does not here ſpeak of repentance in *Eſau*, but of repentance that was ſought for in *Iſaac*. When *Eſau* came to his father, he found that *Jacob* had been there before him, and ſtolen away the chief bleſſing, which was originally deſign'd for *Eſau*. Upon this, no doubt, *Eſau* wiſh'd, that his father would revoke the bleſſing given to *Jacob*, and beſtow it upon himſelf. But *Iſaac* was ſo far from repenting of what he had done, that he *perſiſted* in it, ſaying, *I have bleſſed him, and he ſhall be bleſſed*, *Gen.* xxvii. 33. Upon this the Scripture tells us, *Eſau* begg'd his father for the bleſſing: but neither prayers nor tears would avail: the bleſſing given to *Jacob* was not to be recalled.

Some have thought, the apoſtle here meant, that *Eſau* could not perſuade *himſelf* to repent of the folly of ſelling his birth-right. But this is evidently a miſtake. For *Eſau* could not poſſibly miſs repentance, when he ſought it in himſelf *carefully*, and with *tears*. Beſides, what was it he ſought with tears? Is there any hint in the hiſtory of *Moſes*, that *Eſau* ſought to bring *himſelf* to repent of his own folly? No. He did actually *repent* of this: and his *tears* were deſign'd to *induce his father* to alter his purpoſe, or to repent of his deſign of giving the chief bleſſing to *Jacob*.

TEXT.

unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackneſs, and darkneſs, and tempeſt, and the ſound
19 of a trumpet, and the voice of words, which *voice* they that heard, intreated that the word ſhould not be ſpoken to them any more:

PARAPHRASE.

the *Jews* alone (*g*), a mountain on earth that was capable of being felt (*h*): you are not by the Goſpel call'd to mount *Sinai* filled with flaming fire, ſurrounded with blackneſs, and darkneſs, and attended with tempeſts (*i*), and to the ſound of the angel's trumpet, and 19.
to the voice which ſpoke the ten commandments: upon the hearing of which the people deſired that not a word more might be ſpoken to them in that ſhocking and tremendous

NOTES.

(*g*) *For ye are not come unto the mount.* What here follows was deſign'd as a reaſon to confirm the preceeding advice, *viz.* That they ſhould *follow peace with all men*, and continue in the *grace of GOD*, *v.* 14, 15. The motive hereto is this, in ſhort, *becauſe ye are not come to Sinai but to Sion.* You muſt maintain peace with, and receive to your communion, not only your brother *Jews*, but alſo the *uncircumciſed* believers, becauſe you are not come (as your anceſtors once did) to mount *Sinai*, where the *Law* was given to none but the *Jews*, who were then made GOD's peculiar people, while others were paſs'd by, *Exod.* xix. 5. but you are come to mount *Sion.* If you were now again come to mount *Sinai*, i. e. if Chriſt had made you *Jews*, ye might poſſibly think yourſelves excuſed from an obligation to receive to your communion, and to follow peace with, any more than your own brethren of the houſe of *Iſrael.* But as you are made *Chriſtians*, and come to mount *Sion*, to which *all believers* appertain, you muſt equally regard all theſe as your brethren, whether call'd from among the *Jews*, or the *Gentiles.* And when the apoſtle exhorted them not to fall from the *grace* or favour of GOD, *v.* 15. he thereby repreſented the Goſpel as the diſpenſation of the *grace* of GOD. He now ſets himſelf to *prove* this by obſerving, that the law ſpoke nothing but *terror*, *v.* 18.—21. whereas the Goſpel diſcovers abundant *grace*, particularly a mediator, his atoning blood, the happineſs of heaven, and the eternal glories of the New *Jeruſalem*, *v.* 22.—24. And every thing the apoſtle ſays concerning theſe two different ſtates will be found to anſwer one or other, and often *both* of his purpoſes, *viz.* to excite the *Hebrews* to *follow peace with all men*, and to continue in the *grace* of GOD.

(*h*) *That might be touch'd.* The apoſtle does not mean, that it was *lawful* or *allowed*, that the *Iſraelites* ſhould touch this mount, while the law was giving: for he obſerves this was *forbidden*, *v.* 20. but that it was a real, *corporeal*, *earthly* mountain, which was in itſelf *capable* of being touch'd or felt, while mount *Sion* is a *ſpiritual* thing that cannot be felt.

(*i*) *That burned with fire, nor unto blackneſs, and darkneſs, and tempeſt.* There is no manner of inconſiſtency in the apoſtle's repreſenting mount *Sinai*, as *burning with fire* at the ſame time as there was *blackneſs* and *darkneſs*; for a *thick ſmoke* will make a *cloud* that ſhall ſurround, and almoſt conceal the flame from view. Accordingly *Moſes* tells us, there was at that time a *cloud* and *ſmoke* on the mount, *Exod.* xix. 16, 18. *Deut.* iv. 11. This terror was ſuited to the law, as it was not a diſpenſation of grace, *Joh.* i. 17. *Acts* xiii. 39. *Gal.* iii. 10.—13.

PARAPHRASE.

20. dous manner (*k*). They desired this, because they could not bear the severity of the command given on that occasion, *viz. That if so much as a beast should touch the mount*, while
21. GOD was there, *it should be stoned* (*l*). And the appearances, at that time, were so very dreadful, that even *Moses* himself said, *I exceedingly fear and tremble* (*m*). We are not,

TEXT.

(For they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart. And so terrible was the sight, *that* Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake).

20 21

I

NOTES.

(*k*) *Intreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more.* It must not be thought that the apostle intended here to represent the *Israelites*, at the time of giving the law, as desiring that GOD would not *in any way whatsoever* make known any farther commandments to them. All that they here desired was, that GOD would not any more speak to them *with a voice from heaven*, in that *awful* and *tremendous manner* as he had done in delivering the first ten of his commandments to them. Still they were willing to hear the rest of his commandments, only intreating, that they might be made known to them in a *milder* and more *gentle* way. Their own words to *Moses* on this occasion were, *Speak thou with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us, lest we die, Exod.* xx. 19. *Go thou near, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and speak thou unto us all that the Lord our God shall speak unto thee: and we will hear it and do it, Deut.* v. 27.

(*l*) *It should be stoned, or thrust through with a dart.* The place in *Moses*'s history, to which the apostle here refers, is *Exod.* xix. 13. where it is commanded, *There shall not a hand touch the mount, but he shall surely be stoned, or shot through, whether it be beast or man.* This appeared to the *Israelites* to be very severe, and increas'd their terror.

The latter circumstance of the beast's being to be *thrust through with a dart*, does not seem to have been mention'd by the apostle, since it is omitted in the oldest and best *Greek* copies of this epistle; in the *Latin*, *Syriac*, *Coptic*, *Arabic*, and *Æthiopic* versions; and in the commentaries of the *Greek* writers. Tho' if it had been inserted by the apostle, he would have done nothing odd, since the thing is certainly true. However, it becomes us to keep the text as pure and unmix'd as we possibly can, and not to add a word to it, or take a word from it, but to leave it exactly as it was first written.

(*m*) *Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake* There is no difficulty in finding out the *meaning* of these words. But it is needful here to inquire, How they can be reconciled with *Exod.* xx. 20. and whence the apostle learnt this fact, which is not at all mention'd in the Old Testament? In answer to this latter inquiry, it may be said, that possibly the apostle learnt this fact by *tradition* from his ancestors, as he did the names of *Jannes* and *Jambres*, 2 *Tim.* iii. 8. *Isaiah*'s being *sawn asunder*, &c. Or else, it is very possible, that this matter was once mention'd in the Old Testament, but has since, by the carelessness of *Jewish* transcribers, been dropt, like some other passages cited, *Matth.* ii. 23. *Luke* xi. 49. *Joh.* vii. 38. *Ephes.* v. 14. *James* iv. 5. Be it how it will, this is absolutely *certain*, that the apostle had *sufficient* authority for asserting this fact: since he presumed to mention it in an epistle to the *Jews*, who had a *vast regard* for the character and honour of *Moses*; and who therefore would have been *vehemently inraged* with the apostle if he had *falsely* accused *Moses* of this *fear*. *They knew*, the account was *just*: else the apostle *durst not* have mention'd it, lest it should have ruin'd his credit with them, and have prejudiced his own cause.

It

TEXT.

» But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the

PARAPHRASE.

I ſay, by Chriſt made *Jews*, or called to the diſpenſation of *terror*: but we are made Chriſtians, and admitted to partake of God's *grace*: we are come to mount *Sion*, from whence the Goſpel of God's grace proceedeth (*n*), and to the city of the ever-living God, 22.

NOTES.

It has been ask'd, How can this account of *Moſes*'s ſaying, *I exceedingly fear and quake*, be reconciled with *Exod.* xx. 20. where we read, that *Moſes ſaid to the people, Fear not?* The true anſwer is, that *Moſes* might be afraid at *one* time, tho' he was not at *another*. *After* the ten commandments were pronounced, and the voice from heaven ceaſed, while yet the *people's* fears were not quite ſuppreſs'd, *Moſes* ſaid to them, *Fear not*, and then *drew near to the thick darkneſs, where God was*, *v.* 21. Yet, *before* this, when the thunders and lightnings *began*, when the ſound of the trumpet was *exceeding loud*, when mount *Sinai* was altogether in a *ſmoke*, and *quaked* greatly; at that time, I ſay, *Moſes might* be affected with fear and trembling; and may well be ſuppoſed, to have ſaid to God what the apoſtle here repeats. For *Moſes* himſelf tells us, that at this time he *did ſpeak* to God, *Exod.* xix. 19. *When the voice of the trumpet ſounded long, and waxed louder, Moſes* ſpake, *and God anſwered him by a voice.* What was it that *Moſes* ſpake at this time? It is natural enough to think, one part at leaſt of what he ſaid was, *I exceedingly fear and tremble.* And then we need not doubt, but that God's anſwer *incouraged* him, and *removed his fears.* And it is no way unlikely, that this ſaying of *Moſes* was originally inſerted in this very place of the hiſtory, tho' ſince dropt in all copies and verſions of *Exodus*. *After* this God called *Moſes* to the top of the mount, and he went up, *v.* 20. From thence, after ſome time, he deſcended to the people, to charge them to keep their diſtance while God ſhould ſpeak the law. Then the ten commandments were deliver'd: the people were terrified, and *Moſes*, being himſelf now grown fearleſs, exhorts them to lay aſide their fears. Tho' he was afraid and trembled *in the beginning*, at the *firſt* appearance of the terrors on mount *Sinai*, yet when he had been up there himſelf, converſed with God, and found he had received no hurt, it is no wonder his *fears vaniſh'd*, and his courage grew ſtrong.

(*n*) *But we are come unto mount Sion.* Originally the word *Sion* ſignified a part of the old city *Jeruſalem*, where *David* dwelt, which is called, *the caſtle of Sion, the city of David*, 1 *Chron.* xi. 5. 2 *Chron.* v. 2. At a diſtance from this *Sion*, on mount *Moriah*, *Solomon's* temple was built, 2 *Chron.* iii. 1. Hence it came to paſs, that mount *Sion* never ſignifies the place of the *old Jewiſh* temple. Afterward *David* and the other prophets uſed the word to ſignify the place from whence the *Goſpel* was to be deliver'd. In the temple built on mount *Moriah* none but the *Jews* and ſuch as were *circumciſed* had a right to meet for the worſhip of God: the uncircumciſed being not permitted to approach nearer than to an *outer court*. But the prophets continually ſpeak of mount *Sion* as a place whither the *uncircumciſed Gentiles*, as well as the *Jews*, might come: thus *Iſai.* ii. 2, 3. *It ſhall come to paſs in the* laſt days, *i. e.* in the times of the Goſpel, *that the mountain of the Lord's houſe ſhall be eſtabliſhed in the top of the mountains, and ſhall be exalted above the hills, and all* nations, *i. e.* all the *Gentiles, ſhall flow unto it, and* many people, even the uncircumciſed, as well as the natural *Jews, ſhall go and ſay, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the houſe of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us,* both *Jews* and *Gentiles, of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of* Sion *ſhall go forth the law* of the Goſpel, and *the word of the Lord from Jeruſalem.* See alſo *Zech.* viii. 21.——23. *Jerem.* iii. 14.——17. *Micah* iv. 2. *Pſal.* cii. 21, 22. The apoſtle has taught us in this manner to underſtand what the

Ch. XII.

PARAPHRASE.

GOD, the new *Jeruſalem*, which is now in heaven, to which all Chriſtians belong (*o*), and

TEXT.

city of the living God, the heavenly Jeruſalem, and

NOTES.

the prophets ſay of mount *Sion*, 1 *Pet.* ii. 5, 6. *Ye alſo* (tho' originally *Gentiles*, and ſtill uncircumciſed) *as lively ſtones are built up a ſpiritual houſe, an holy prieſthood to offer up ſpiritual ſacrifices acceptable to God thro' Jeſus Chriſt. Wherefore alſo it is contain'd in the ſcripture, Behold I lay in* Sion *a chief corner-ſtone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him ſhall not be confounded. Iſai.* xxxviii. 16. *Rom.* ix. 33. And our bleſſed Saviour alſo has directed us thus to underſtand the old prophets, *Luke* iv. 17.——21. *There was deliver'd unto Jeſus the book of the prophet Eſaias: and when he had open'd the book, he found the place where it was written* (*Iſai.* lxi. 1, 2.) *The ſpirit of the Lord is upon* me, the Meſſiah, *becauſe he hath anointed me to preach the* Goſpel *to the poor: he hath ſent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives.——And he cloſed the book——and he began to ſay unto them, This day is this ſcripture fulfill'd in your ears.* By this laſt expreſſion Chriſt plainly declared, that this propheſy was written concerning *him*, and *his* preaching. It muſt be farther obſerved, that immediately after the words cited by our Saviour the prophet adds, *v.* 3. *To appoint unto them that mourn in Sion*, &c. From whence it appears, that thoſe who mourn'd in *Sion*, were ſuch as heard *Chriſt* preach the Goſpel, and were by him call'd into the *Chriſtian* church. The prophets then, we ſee, ſpeak of *Sion*, as the place from whence the *Goſpel* proceeds, and where *Jews* and *Gentiles* meet together for divine worſhip. From this ſenſe of the word *Sion*, we may deduce part of the apoſtle's meaning, *viz.* we Chriſtians are not to come to mount *Sinai*, where the law was given, or made members of the *Jewiſh* church; but Chriſt has made us members of *his* church, which has received its law, *i. e.* the Goſpel, from mount *Sion*.

There is yet another ſenſe in which the word *Sion* is uſed, when it ſignifies not a hill in the *old Jeruſalem*, but a *heavenly hill*. In this ſenſe the apoſtle underſtands it here. He oppoſes *Sion* to the *mount that might be touch'd:* by which he plainly means, that in this particular reſpect *Sion* differs from *Sinai*, and that whereas *Sinai* was a *corporeal* and *earthly* hill, that was capable of being felt by men, *Sion* is a *ſpiritual* and *heavenly* hill, which men cannot poſſibly reach. Of this *ſpiritual* hill muſt we underſtand, *Pſal.* ii. 6. *Yet have I ſet my king on my holy* hill *of* Sion. As Chriſt is here repreſented as ſitting on *Sion*, and the Goſpel is by *Iſaiah* ſaid to proceed from *Sion:* ſo our coming to *Sion* muſt ſignify, that we are come to Chriſt as our king, and to the obedience and grace of the Goſpel; and conſequently muſt *follow peace with all men*, and take heed we do not *fall* from the *grace* of GOD.

(*o*) *And unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jeruſalem.* The old earthly *Jeruſalem* belong'd to the *Jews*, and to them *only:* ſo that if we had been by Chriſt invited *thereto*, we ſhould have been invited only into the *Jewiſh* church to ſubmit to circumciſion, and to all the rules of the law of *Moſes*. The apoſtle therefore in this place very pertinently obſerves, that *we* are not come to that *earthly Jeruſalem*, but to the *heavenly*. This *heavenly Jeruſalem* is the *city of the living God*, in the ſame ſenſe as the earthly was; and ſo is, at leaſt equal to it. But in another ſenſe of the expreſſion it vaſtly exceeds it: for the *old Jeruſalem* was built by *men*, whereas *GOD* is the *builder and maker* of the *new Jeruſalem*, *chap.* xi. 10 There is this farther difference between the two *Jeruſalems*, that whereas the *earthly Jeruſalem* comprehended only the *Jews*, the *heavenly Jeruſalem* ſhall comprehend *all true believers*, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*; and all of them *now belong* thereto, as it is written, *Gal.* iv. 25, 26. *Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and anſwereth to Jeruſalem, which now is, and* [this Agar] *is in bondage* [to the Moſaic law] *with her children* [the Jews]. *But Jeruſalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all*, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*,

TEXT.

to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first born, which

PARAPHRASE.

and to ten thousands of holy angels (*p*), to the general assembly of Christians, both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and to the Christian church, comprehending all that by faith have obtain'd the inheritance of the first born (*q*), whose 23.

NOTES.

Gentiles, that believe in Christ. This is the *heavenly Jerusalem*, in which all good men shall dwell for ever after the resurrection, described by St. *John*, *Rev.* xxi, xxii. It was easy for the *Hebrews* to infer from hence, that they ought to *follow peace with all men*, and to receive the believing *Gentiles* to their communion, with whom they were to live for ever. And while the *old Jerusalem* was in *bondage*, the *new* is *free*, and partakes of GOD's especial *grace:* wherefore let us take heed that we do not *fall from* this *grace* of GOD.

(*p*) *And to an innumerable company of angels.* When the *Jewish* law was given at mount *Sinai*, an innumerable company of holy angels was present to attend the divine majesty. Agreeably to this the apostle said before in this epistle, *chap.* ii. 2. that the law was *spoken by angels.* The number of the angels then present is express'd by the same word, μυριασι as that in the text. *The Lord* (says *Moses*) *came up from Sinai——and he came with* ten thousands (μυριασιν) *of saints*, or holy persons, *i. e.* angels: *from his right hand went a fiery law for them*, *i. e.* for the children of *Israel*, *v.* 1. The number of these angels at *Sinai Moses* says was *ten thousands*, in the plural number, *i. e.* several times ten thousand. The same the apostle says is the number of the angels to whom Christians are come, *viz. ten thousands*, μυριασιν, *i. e.* as our translators have well enough render'd the word, *an innumerable company.* In this particular Christians have no greater privilege than the ancient *Jews*; each come to *all the same* angels. Christians are come to them, as they attend on Christ our lawgiver, and as they are to dwell with them in the world to come. The apostle's design in mentioning this particular here seems to be to shew, that while we *exceed* the *Jews* in *most* other privileges, we do *not come short* of them in *any.*

(*q*) *The first born.* These are all such as inherit the birth-right, *i. e.* all believers. The apostle had just before, *v.* 16. warn'd the *Hebrew* Christians not to sell their *birth-right*, πρωτοτοκια, as *Esau* sold his. To this expression he has a reference, when he says, we are come to the first born, πρωτοτοκοις. *Jews* and Christians are here compared to *Esau* and *Jacob*. *Esau* was *really* the *first* born; and the *Jews* were the children of GOD *before* us. But *Esau* sold his birth-right, πρωτοτοκια, and thereupon ceas'd, as it were, to be the first born, πρωτοτοκος, *i. e.* he had no longer a right to the privileges and inheritance of the eldest son of *Isaac*. When *Jacob* had bought πρωτοτοκια, the birth-right, he, as it were, became πρωτοτοκος, first born, *i. e.* he had now a right to be treated as the first born, and had a title to the privileges and inheritance that were originally design'd for *Isaac*'s eldest son. In like manner, they of the circumcision were originally the people of GOD, and had the birth-right, a title to eternal life in the kingdom of GOD: to which at that time the uncircumcised *Gentiles* had no right. Afterward the *Jews*, by not believing the Gospel, forfeited their birth-right, and the *Gentiles*, through their faith in Christ, obtain'd this inheritance, which was at first promised only to the *Jews*. As all believers have now obtain'd πρωτοτοκια, the *birth-right*, like *Jacob*, they are, like him, become πρωτοτοκοι, *the first born.* Since then the first born, or they that inherit the birth-right, even eternal life, are believers of *all nations*; and since we are come to them, and not to the *Jewish* nation only, we ought to *follow peace with all men*, and not to fall from that *grace* of GOD, which has constituted us his first born upon the account of our faith.

Ch. XII.

PARAPHRASE.

whose names are recorded in heaven (*r*), and to GOD the judge and justifier of all believers, both *Jews* and *Gentiles* (*s*), and to the souls of all just or good men now made perfect in
24. heaven, (*t*), and to Jesus Christ the mediator of the new covenant of grace, comprehending both *Jews* and *Gentiles* (*u*), and to the

TEXT.

are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to 24
Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the

NOTES.

(*r*) *Which are written in heaven.* The allusion here is to the book, that contain'd the names of the first born of the children of *Israel*, mention'd *Numb.* iii. 40. Answerably the apostle represents GOD as keeping a book in which the names of all believers are register'd. Thus also we read of good mens *names written in heaven*, *Luke* x. 20. and of *the book of life*, *Philip.* iv. 3. *Rev.* xiii. 8. xvii. 8. xxi. 27. The plain *English* of which expressions is this, that GOD before-hand knows, who will believe and obey the Gospel; whereupon he determines, that they in particular shall have eternal life; of which they may be as sure as if they saw their names written in a list of such as shall finally be saved.

(*s*) *And to God the judge of all.* This word, *all*, was not here carelessly inserted by the apostle. There is a peculiar emphasis, beauty, and propriety in it. It signifies, that GOD will hereafter judge *all mankind*, both *Jews* and *Gentiles* And when they shall *all* be judged at the great day, *One* and the same *God* will *justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision thro' faith*, *Rom.* iii. 30. From hence it is easy to infer, that we ought to *follow peace with all men*, and to receive to communion all such as GOD will justify.

(*t*) *And to the spirits of just men made perfect.* One cannot doubt, but that the apostle, in this expression, had an eye to what he said before, *chap.* xi. 40. *viz.* that GOD hath *provided some better things for us* than he had for the good men who lived under the old dispensation; and *that they* were *not to be made perfect without us:* see before on that verse note (*r*) and (*s*). His meaning therefore appears to be this, *viz.* tho' the ancient believers were not admitted into heaven, and to the injoyment of GOD upon their leaving this world; yet they were admitted thither as soon as Christ was rais'd from the dead: whither also all true Christians are admitted *immediately* upon their departing out of the body; and there they are all, both the ancient saints, and the Christians, *made perfect* in holiness, and in happiness too, as to their *souls*.

That the apostle here speaks not of just mens being made perfect *after the resurrection*, but of their being made perfect in the *separate* state, clearly follows from his using the word, *spirits*: which surely does not signify their *bodies and souls* in union, but their *separate* souls.

Since then we are not come to the ancient state of the *Jewish* believers, who were not made perfect at death, but are come to the spirits of *all righteous men*, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, departed hence, now *made perfect*, and are to look upon ourselves as belonging to this society that has obtain'd this *favour*: let us *follow peace with all men*, and take heed we do not miss of this *grace* of GOD.

(*u*) *And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant.* The *old* covenant, to which this is opposed, was made between GOD and the *Jews*, by the mediation of *Moses*. But this *new* covenant is made between GOD as the one party, and *all believers*, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, as the other: of which new covenant *Christ* is the mediator, who revealed it to us, and purchased and confirmed it by his blood. Consequently the *Hebrew* Christians were obliged to embrace the *believing Gentiles* as brethren, in *peace*, and to take heed not to fall from the *grace* of GOD revealed in this new covenant.

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

blood of ſprinkling, that ſpeaketh better things than *that of* Abel. See that ye
25 refuſe not him that ſpeak-eth: for if they eſcaped not, who refuſed him that

the blood of Chriſt wherewith all true believers are ſprinkled, and cleanſed from ſin (*w*), which ſpeaks what is better than that which *Abel* continually ſpeaketh (*x*). Take heed 25.
that you do not reject, or diſobey any one that delivers a good exhortation to you (*y*): for if they have not eſcaped the vengeance of God, who refuſed to follow the admonitions given

NOTES.

(*w*) *And to the blood of ſprinkling.* The apoſtle here plainly alludes to *Moſes*'s ſprinkling the *Iſraelites* with the blood that was ſhed to confirm the covenant which was made between God and them, *Exod.* xxiv. 7, 8. to which the apoſtle more expreſly refers in this ſame epiſtle, *chap.* ix. 16.——21. where he ſays, that a covenant made between God and men muſt be *confirm'd* by the *death* of a *mediator* (ſee Mr. *Pierce* on that place); that the *firſt* or *Moſaic* covenant was confirmed by the blood of *beaſts* offer'd in ſacrifice to God; and that part of this ſacrificed blood was ſprinkled on the people, to denote, I ſuppoſe, that they were received into covenant with God, and intitled to all the privileges purchaſed or procured by the blood of thoſe ſacrifices. In like manner the new or Chriſtian covenant is confirm'd by the death and blood of a ſacrifice, even that of the ſon of God: which blood is, as it were, ſprinkled on all ſincere believers, whether they were before *Jews*, or *Gentiles*. When the blood of Chriſt is here called, *the blood of ſprinkling*, the meaning is, that it anſwers the ſame end as the ſprinkling of the blood of the ſacrifices under the law, *viz.* to take away the *guilt* of ſin, and to *confirm* a divine covenant. The blood of Chriſt does this as well and effectually as if it were actually ſprinkled on believers. As this blood of ſprinkling is the blood that confirms the new covenant of *grace*, before mention'd, in which all believers are included, we ought to *follow peace with* them *all*, and to take heed that we do *not fall from this grace of God.*

(*x*) Παρα τον Αβελ, *That ſpeaketh better things than* that of *Abel.* Our tranſlators, in this place, appear to have been of the ſame opinion with ſome other learned men, who ſay, we ought to read παρα το Αβελ. Whereas among all the written *Greek* copies of this epiſtle collated by Dr. *Mill*, there are but two which read in this manner, *viz. Pet.* i. of the *tenth* century, and *B.* 2. of the *twelfth.* Their authority cannot reaſonably be thought to be any balance againſt the reſt. In the *Syriac* and *Arabic* verſions indeed it is render'd, *than that of Abel.* But the authors of theſe verſions ſeem here to have taken the liberty of a paraphraſt; while the *Latin*, which is a moſt *literal* tranſlation, renders it, *that ſpeaketh better things than Abel.* Thus *Chryſoſtom* alſo reads the text. So that there ſeems to be abundant reaſon to retain this as the true reading. The meaning of the expreſſion then is, that the blood of Chriſt ſpeaketh better things than *Abel* ſpeaketh. The apoſtle ſaid before, that *Abel being dead yet ſpeaketh*, *chap.* xi. 4. On that place it was obſerved, that *Abel* ſpeaks to all murderers and perſecutors to admoniſh them of the evil of their ways, and to mind them of the righteous judgments of God. *Abel* then ſpeaks nothing but *terror* and *vengeance.* His blood cried out for vengeance on the murderer, and he himſelf in the Bible has continually, as it were, been denouncing the divine *wrath* againſt ſuch as murder others for conſcience ſake. But the blood of the new covenant ſpeaks *better* things, and publiſhes the *promiſes* of pardon, and of eternal ſalvation, to all them that truly believe and obey the Goſpel.

(*y*) *See that ye refuſe not him that ſpeaketh.* This is a *general* expreſſion ſignifying, that whoſoever ſpake to them what is *reaſonable*, and gave them any *good* admonitions, they ſhould take care to hearken to him, whether he were God, or man.

Ch. XII.

PARAPHRASE.

given them by *Abel*, who, tho' dead, yet continually ſpeaketh on earth (z): much leſs

TEXT.

ſpake on earth, much more

NOTES.

(z) Τον επι της γης—χρηματιζοντα, *him that ſpake on earth.* In the *Greek* it is, *him that* ſpeaketh *on earth.* This has been ſtrangely over-look'd by thoſe commentators, who have thought the apoſtle here ſpeaks of *Moſes*, or of *God* ſpeaking at mount *Sinai.* The apoſtle plainly means one that ſpeaks *now*, as well as in former ages, one that *continually* ſpeaks.

Some indeed have thought, that the perſon here ſaid to ſpeak *on earth* is *God the father* conſider'd as delivering the law at mount *Sinai.* But this is moſt directly *contrary* to the repreſentation which the *Scripture* gives of this matter; which continually repreſents GOD as at *that* time in particular *ſpeaking from heaven*, as *Exod.* xx. 22. *I* (ſaith GOD) *have talked with you* from heaven. *Deut.* iv. 36. *Out of* heaven *he made thee to hear his voice. Nehem.* ix. 13. *Thou canneſt down alſo from mount* Sinai, *and ſpakeſt with them from* heaven. Since then the Old Teſtament *conſtantly* and *invariably* repreſents GOD's delivering the law at mount *Sinai* as his *ſpeaking from heaven*; it cannot eaſily be thought, that the apoſtle ſhould here call it, *his ſpeaking on earth*, eſpecially conſidering that this ſpeaking *on earth* is by the apoſtle ſet in *oppoſition* to GOD's ſpeaking *from heaven.* It ſeems to me equally unlikely, that the apoſtle ſhould repreſent the Goſpel preach'd by Chriſt *in the fleſh*, as GOD's ſpeaking *from heaven, at the ſame time* as he is ſuppoſed to repreſent GOD's ſpeaking at *Sinai*, as a ſpeaking *on earth.* If the former is to be call'd a ſpeaking from *heaven*, ſurely the latter muſt be call'd ſo too. And it is impoſſible to call GOD's ſpeaking at *Sinai* a ſpeaking *on earth* in any ſenſe, wherein we ſhall not be obliged to ſay that GOD ſpoke the Goſpel by Chriſt *on earth* alſo. Accordingly we find in fact, that as the Old Teſtament repreſents GOD as ſpeaking the law *from heaven*, ſo the New Teſtament repreſents the Goſpel as ſpoken *on earth.* Thus Chriſt ſaid, he had authority *on earth* to forgive ſins, *Matth.* ix. 6. that he had glorified GOD *on earth* by ſpeaking to the *Jews* the things that belong'd to their ſalvation, *Joh.* xvii. 4. If any one ſhould imagine, that the apoſtle does not here ſpeak of the Goſpel as *preach'd by Chriſt in the fleſh* (tho' that was the time when it was preached to the *Hebrews*, and not till his aſcenſion into heaven to the *Gentiles*) but of the diſcoveries afterward made by the *Holy Ghoſt*; I would only beg leave to ask, whether there was any thing in the *manner* of communicating theſe diſcoveries, that can *more fitly* be call'd, *a ſpeaking from heaven*, than the pronouncing the law at mount *Sinai* by a voice *from heaven?* If the former be a ſpeaking *from heaven*; ſurely the latter cannot be a ſpeaking *on earth.* The truth is, when GOD ſpeaks, he always ſpeaks from heaven, and cannot do otherwiſe, becauſe his throne, from whence he ſpeaks, is in heaven. GOD ſpake from heaven to the *Jews*, when he gave the law at *Sinai*; and he ſpake from heaven (tho' in a ſenſe a little different from the former) when he ſent his ſon from heaven to preach the Goſpel to the *Hebrews*, and when he afterward ſent down the Holy Ghoſt from heaven both on *Jews* and *Gentiles.* The perſon, whom the apoſtle introduces as ſpeaking *on earth* is *Abel* juſt before mention'd, in the preceeding verſe; and of whom the apoſtle had ſaid before, that tho' he is dead, he *yet ſpeaketh*, *chap.* xi. 4. See there note (*u*). *Abel* is there repreſented as *ſtill* ſpeaking: and accordingly in this text the apoſtle uſes a word of the *preſent tenſe*, χρηματιζοντα, *that continually* ſpeaketh *on earth.* And it was as proper to apply this word to expreſs *Abel*'s admoniſhing mankind, as to expreſs an *angel*'s admoniſhing *Cornelius*, *Acts* x. 22. *Abel* warns men againſt committing murder, eſpecially againſt *perſecuting good* men to death. The perſons to whom *Abel* ſpeaks, or delivers theſe admonitions are all thoſe (particularly the *Jews*) who have had the hiſtory of *Cain*'s perſecuting and murdering his brother ſet before them in the Scripture. They, who have refuſed to hearken to *Abel* thus admoniſhing them, have not eſcaped

the

TEXT.

ſhall not we *eſcape*, if we turn away from him that *ſpeaketh* from heaven:
26 whoſe voice then ſhook the earth: but now he hath promiſed, ſaying, Yet once more I ſhake not the earth only, but alſo hea-
27 ven. 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
28 ſhaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a king-

PARAPHRASE.

leſs ſhall we eſcape puniſhment and vengeance, if we refuſe to hear, and dare to turn away from, Almighty GOD, who ſpoke to us from heaven, at mount *Sinai* (*a*): whoſe voice at that time cauſed a ſhaking of the earth in a proper ſenſe of the word (*b*); but ſince that, by the prophet *Haggai*, he hath promiſed another kind of ſhaking, which takes place under the preſent diſpenſation of the Goſpel: which promiſe is contain'd in thoſe words, *Yet once more I ſhake not the earth only but alſo heaven.* And when GOD uſes this expreſſion, *yet once more*, he ſignifies thereby the change that ſhould once, and but once, be made of thoſe things that are ſhaken, as of things that had been formerly appointed, that ſo the things which are not ſhaken may remain unchanged. Wherefore as we Chriſtians do now receive the Goſpel-

26. 27. 28.

NOTES.

the divine vengeance. Murderers have been condemned to death: and perſecutors, ſuch as king *Saul*, *Ahab*, *Jezebel*, &c. who would not hearken to the voice of *Abel*, have not eſcaped an extraordinary mark of the divine diſpleaſure. *Lamech* once (tho' when too late) took notice of *Abel*'s admonition, when he ſaid, *I have* ſlain *a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt: if* Cain *ſhall be avenged ſeven fold, truly Lamech ſeventy and ſeven fold*, *Gen.* iv. 23, 24. *Lamech* was one of thoſe that at firſt *refuſed him that continually ſpeaks on earth, viz. Abel.*

(*a*) *Him that* ſpeaketh *from heaven.* The word *ſpeaketh* is not in the original. We may as well ſupply the ſentence, with the word, *ſpake*, thus, *Him that* ſpake *from heaven.* And this was the apoſtle's meaning, as is clear from what he immediately adds, *whoſe voice* then, *viz.* at the time when he ſpake from heaven, *ſhook the earth*; which ſhaking the earth was at the time of GOD's pronouncing the law at mount *Sinai.* Thus the apoſtle moſt perfectly agrees with the repreſentation of the Old Teſtament, with the obvious nature of things, and with the truth of language in ſaying, that at the time of giving the *law*, GOD ſpake *from heaven.*

(*b*) *Whoſe voice then ſhook the earth.* The time when GOD's voice *ſhook the earth* was undoubtedly when he ſpoke the ten commandments at mount *Sinai*, *Exod.* xix. 18. But the time when he ſpoke *from heaven*, in the preceeding verſe, was the time when his *voice ſhook the earth*; conſequently, when the apoſtle, in the preceeding verſe, repreſents GOD as ſpeaking *from heaven*, he means his ſpeaking the law at mount *Sinai.*

From hence to the end of the chapter I refer the reader to Mr. *Pierce*'s notes; which I endeavour to ſupply, not to tranſcribe. However it will not be amiſs to tranſcribe his Paraphraſe with a little alteration.

PARAPHRASE. TEXT.

ſpel-kingdom, which we know ſhall be unſhaken, and immoveable, let us be ſtedfaſt in imbracing, and adhering to the grace of GOD manifeſted in the Goſpel (*c*): by the help of which we may ſerve GOD acceptably with a holy reverence, and fear of him: which diſpoſitions of ſoul in GOD's ſervice are highly neceſſary for us, becauſe our GOD, even under this diſpenſation of grace, is a conſuming fire to ſuch as reject and deſpiſe it.

dom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may ſerve GOD acceptably, with reverence, and godly fear. For our GOD *is* a conſu- 29
ming fire.

NOTES.

(*c*) Εχωμεν χαριν, *let us have grace.* It ſeems moſt natural to explain this word, *grace*, by what the apoſtle ſays in a paſſage of the like nature with this, *chap.* iv. 16.——*that we may —find* grace to help *in time of need.* Thus, *Let us have grace, whereby we may worſhip God*, is the ſame as, *Let us have* (as we are ſure to have, if we ſeriouſly ſeek) *grace* to help us *to worſhip God acceptably.* In both places the word, *grace*, ſignifies the *favour* of GOD ſhewing itſelf in *helping our infirmities.*

SECT. XVII. N. 2.

CHAP. XIII. 1.——25.

CONTENTS.

THIS part of the ſection is of the ſame *general* nature with the former, containing ſerious and *practical* exhortations. The exhortations here are many and *independent*: but ſuch as, no doubt, were *neceſſary* to be ſet before the *Hebrew* Chriſtians at that time. The apoſtle here exhorts them to brotherly love, hoſpitality, pitying the perſecuted, chaſtity, contentment, an imitation of their former, deceaſed, paſtors, a regard to Chriſt's ſacrifice, and not to the legal offerings; to do good, to ſubmit to their preſent paſtors, and to pray for himſelf: then he prays for them, and concludes with his ſalutations and good wiſhes.

Let

TEXT.

1 Let brotherly love con-
2 tinue. Be not forgetful to entertain ſtrangers: for thereby ſome have entertained angels unawares.

PARAPHRASE.

I beſeech you all to continue to love one another, and all them alſo whom you eſteem to be Chriſtian brethren (*d*). Particularly neglect not to entertain ſtrangers in your houſes, in a civil, and hoſpitable manner: for by ſo doing ſome of the ancient ſaints have unexpectedly had the honour and happineſs of entertaining angels (*e*). Remember them

1. 2. 3.

NOTES.

(*d*) Η φιλαδελφια μενετω, *let brotherly love continue.* By this exhortation the apoſtle plainly implies, that they did already love their Chriſtian brethren. Accordingly, he commended them before, *chap.* vi. 10. for their *miniſtring to the ſaints.* Very conſiſtently with this, he exhorted them, in the beginning of the former part of this ſection, *to follow peace with all men*; which implied that they were *defective* as to this duty of *charity* toward the *Gentile* Chriſtians. There is a difference between φιλαδελφια, *brotherly love*, and αγαπη, *charity*, according to what St. *Peter* ſays, 2 *Pet.* i. 7. *Add——to brotherly love, charity. Brotherly love* ſignifies mens loving thoſe, whom they eſteem to be their *brethren*, anſwerably to that relation. But *charity*, αγαπη, is the love, which men bear to ſuch alſo as they do *not* own to be *brethren*; to thoſe that are not of the ſame religion; and even to *enemies.* The *Hebrews* did exerciſe the former kind of love, *viz.* a love to all thoſe whom they accounted their brethren of the ſame religion with themſelves, *i. e.* all ſuch Chriſtians as were of the *circumciſion.* But from the apoſtle's diſcourſe in the former part of this ſection it is natural to conclude, that the *Hebrew* Chriſtians did not exerciſe love to the *uncircumciſed* believers; whom the former ſeem to have been backward to receive as Fellow-Chriſtians; thinking, we may ſuppoſe, as ſome *Jewiſh* converts, we know, did, that *except* the *Gentiles* would *be circumciſed*, as well as believe in Chriſt, they could *not be ſaved*, and conſequently could not be look'd upon as *brethren*, *Acts* xv. 1. On this account the apoſtle ſaw it needful to exhort them to *follow peace with all men.* At the ſame time, they *did well* in loving thoſe *Chriſtians* that were of the circumciſion: wherefore he exhorts them to perſevere in this brotherly love: while he alſo exhorts them to go farther, and to add hereto *charity.* And if what he had before ſaid ſhould convince them, that the *Gentile* believers were alſo their *brethren*, this exhortation would include *them* as well as the *Jewiſh* converts, whom they before own'd as brethren. This *brotherly love* ſignifies wiſhing well to our brethren, doing them good, and particularly receiving them as Fellow-Chriſtians to our communion in breaking of bread, and in prayers.

(*e*) *Some have entertained angels unawares.* The perſons here refer'd to by the apoſtle, no doubt, were *Abraham* and *Lot.* Three angels in the likeneſs of men came near to *Abraham*'s tent; upon which he ran to meet them, and entertain'd them in a very friendly and hoſpitable manner, *Gen.* xviii. 2, &c. At that time he had no apprehenſion of their being angels. As they were found in faſhion as men, he thought them to be mere men travelling from place to place, and as ſuch entertain'd them. This hoſpitality unexpectedly procured him the honour of entertaining angels. In like manner when *Lot* invited the two unknown ſtrangers into his houſe, and hoſpitably entertain'd them, *Gen.* xix. 1, &c. he had not the leaſt apprehenſion of their being other than mere men, but afterward he found, they were angels.

Ch. XIII.

PARAPHRASE.

them, that are perſecuted with bonds and impriſonment for the ſake of the Goſpel, with the ſame compaſſion and tenderneſs as ye would if ye were now in bonds with them: and remember them that are injured in any other way for the Goſpel's ſake, as conſidering, that you are yet in the body, and liable to the ſame affliction. Let the honour of the married ſtate be preſerved in all reſpects (*f*): and let the marriage-bed be

TEXT.

Remember them that are 3
in bonds, as bound with
them; *and* them which
ſuffer adverſity, as being
yourſelves alſo in the body.
Marriage *is* honourable in 4

NOTES.

It has been thought by ſome great men, that *one* of the three *angels*, whom *Abraham* entertain'd, was the *Son of God*; but I could never ſee any manner of *proof* of this opinion. Nay the apoſtle, by what he ſays in this place, very ſtrongly inclines one to doubt of it, becauſe he does not mention it, when yet, if true, it would manifeſtly have been much to his purpoſe. If it was pertinent (as it plainly was) to urge the *Hebrews* to exerciſe hoſpitality, becauſe ſome by this means had entertain'd *angels* unawares: would he not much rather have ſaid (if he could have ſaid it with truth) that by this means ſome had unexpectedly entertain'd the *Son of God?* It can never be thought, that the apoſtle would have neglected to make this obſervation, if he had believed, that the *Logos* was one of the angels who appear'd to *Abraham.* It is plain, the apoſtle thought, he was not; and then, without all doubt, they were three mere angels. See Mr. *Pierce* on *chap.* i. *v.* 2. note (*d*).

It has been apprehended, I know, that one of theſe angels is call'd *Jehovah.* But ſuppoſing this to be true, ſtill he could not be, as ſome have call'd him, *the moſt high God.* The ſupreme God is a ſpirit abſolutely *immenſe* and *unchangeable*: whereas each of the angels, who appear'd to *Abraham*, was *confined* within the limits of as ſmall a ſpace, as a common man, as he then appear'd to be: whereas the immenſe Deity cannot be confined in any ſpace.

The truth is, no one of the angels whom *Abraham* entertain'd is call'd *Jehovah.* The angels are diſtinguiſh'd from *Jehovah*, *Gen.* xviii. 1, 2. And when *they* were gone away from *Abraham*, it is ſaid, that *he ſtood yet before* Jehovah, *v.* 22. Theſe angels at firſt accompanied the appearance of the divine majeſty, who remain'd converſing with *Abraham*, after they were withdrawn to diſpatch other affairs. *Jehovah* appears to be the *proper* name of the moſt high God, as *Baal* was the proper name of one idol, or *Mercury* of another; or as *George* is the name of the king of *England.* The name *Jehovah* then cannot but be incommunicable. The Queen Regent might lately have ſaid, *I am ruler of England*; but ſhe could not ſay, *I am George.* So one that has all authority in heaven and earth committed to him is a *God*, or *King*; but he is not *Jehovah.*

(*f*) *Marriage is honourable in all.* It ſeems more agreeable to render this as an *exhortation*, as it is done in the paraphraſe; becauſe it ſtands among exhortations. And the words τιμιος ο γαμος, may undoubtedly be render'd as an exhortation, as well as αφιλαργυρος ο τροπος, *v.* 5. which is render'd, *Let your converſation be without covetouſneſs.* The meaning of the exhortation, *v.* 4. is this, Let thoſe, that are married, in all reſpects keep up to the honour of the married ſtate, by living in peace, love and friendſhip, and by performing all the duties incumbent on them in that ſtate. Particularly let them keep the marriage-bed undefiled with adultery, inceſt, unnatural luſt, or any other ſin that is

TEXT.

all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.
5 *Let your* converſation *be* without covetouſneſs; *and be* content with ſuch things as ye have: for he hath ſaid, I will never leave thee, nor forſake
6 hee. So that we may

PARAPHRASE.

be kept undefiled with forbidden luſts: but God will judge and condemn whoremongers and adulterers. Let your converſation and 5.
manner of life be free from a greedy deſire of the riches of this world, and be contented with ſuch things as you already injoy, ſo far as not to ſeek more with anxiety, or in any unlawful way: ſince God will take care of you, and ſays to you as he formerly ſaid to other good men, *I will never leave thee, nor forſake thee* (*g*). On which account we may ſay with courage as the Pſalmiſt does (*gg*), 6.

The

NOTES.

is inconſiſtent with the ends of marriage. Εσω is to be ſupplied in both clauſes of the verſe. I would read, not δε, but γαρ, as it is in the two beſt and oldeſt MSS. and in the old *Latin* verſion.

(*g*) *For he hath ſaid, I will never leave thee, nor forſake thee.* The promiſe here cited by the apoſtle was made to a *particular* man, *viz. Joſhua*, on his *own* account, *Joſh.* i. 5. (ſee the like made to *Moſes*, *Deut.* xxxi. 6.) It may be then inquired, How could the apoſtle apply this promiſe to *Chriſtians*, and argue from it, as if God had ſaid to each of them, *I will never leave* thee, *nor forſake* thee? The true anſwer is, that the apoſtle here went upon the *right* ſuppoſition, that the promiſe made to *Joſhua* was really made to *him alone*; and then *juſtly* argues from the *unchangeable* perfections of God, that he will do *like* things in *like* caſes. Since therefore God promiſed, when *he imploy'd Joſhua*, that he would not leave *him*; any Chriſtian whom *God* at any time *imploys* in any work, may, *for the ſame reaſon*, depend upon it, that God will not leave, or forſake *him*; but give *him* all needful incouragement and aſſiſtance, and make all things work together for his greateſt good.

It is not to be thought, that the apoſtle here intended to forbid *labour* and *induſtry*, which are every where recommended in Scripture. But it is to be conſider'd, that the Chriſtians, to whom he wrote, were in a ſtate of *perſecution*, and had ſome of their goods taken from them by the perſecutors, *chap.* x. 34. In that ſtate they had no opportunity to improve their eſtates by *trade* or *labour*. There was no other poſſible way for them, in *thoſe* circumſtances, to *increaſe* their ſtock but by *renouncing chriſtianity*; in as much as while they remain'd Chriſtians, they could expect no other, but that the perſecutors would hinder them from trading, or elſe by violence take from them what they ſhould earn. The apoſtle therefore wiſely caution'd them againſt indulging a fondneſs for worldly riches, leſt that ſhould lead them to apoſtatize, in order to have opportunities for gaining and injoying them; and exhorted them to be *contented* with the little they had, in a State of *perſecution*, when more could not be obtain'd without ſin. That the apoſtle here conſider'd them as in a ſtate of perſecution, appears from his directing them, in the end of the ſentence, to ſay, *I will not fear what man can do unto me, i. e.* "I will not fear "mens taking away my goods, or my life. Let them do it: ſtill I am not afraid of any "real injury they can do my *ſoul*.

(*gg*) *Pſal.* cxviii. 6.

Ch. XIII.

PARAPHRASE.

The Lord is continually my helper; and I will not fear what any man ſhall, or is able
7. *to, do to me.* Remember your former paſtors, and guides now dead (*b*), who have ſpoken

TEXT.

boldly ſay, The Lord *is* my helper; and I will not fear what man ſhall do unto me. Remember them which have the rule over you, who have ſpoken unto you,

NOTES.

(*b*) Μνημονευετε των ηγουμενων υμων, *remember them, which have the rule over you.* This tranſlation is unqueſtionably wrong. The literal and exact rendring of the words is, *remember your rulers*, meaning not thoſe who had the rule over them, at the *time when* this epiſtle was *written*, but ſuch as *had been* guides of the Church *before* that, and were *then dead*, as appears from the following part of the verſe.

The apoſtle here, and again, *v.* 17, 24. calls the paſtors of the Church ηγουμενοι; which word often occurs in the *Greek* verſion of the Old Teſtament, in the *Apocrypha*, and in the New Teſtament, and *always* ſignifies a *governor*, or *ruler*, who has *proper authority* over others: ſee *Matth.* ii. 6. *Luke* xxii. 26. *Acts* vii. 10. By applying this title to the paſtors of the Chriſtian Church the apoſtle did not intend to repreſent them, as having a right to *domineer* therein as they pleaſe. Whatever authority they have as ηγουμενοι, or *leaders* of the people, it is all derived from the Goſpel, and *limited* thereby. Even *civil* governors have no manner of *authority* to act *arbitrarily*. They are abſolutely bound to obey the law of *nature*, as much as the meaneſt *ſubject*; and there is a *God* above *them*, who will call *them* to a ſtrict account, if they do an *unrighteous* or a *foolish* thing. They have no authority to command any one thing, but what it is, in its own nature *fit* and *reaſonable* their ſubjects ſhould do. In like manner, all the authority that the paſtors of the church can reaſonably claim is *ſubordinate* to the authority of *Chriſt*, and can extend no farther than the Goſpel allows. Now we are ſure, the Goſpel does not impower or allow them to make any the leaſt thing *neceſſary* to communion with them, which is not *expreſly* declared in the *Scriptures* to be neceſſary to Chriſtian communion: nor have they the leaſt authority *themſelves to do* any one ſingle thing in the worſhip of God over and above what Chriſt has *order'd* them to do therein. Nay, on the contrary, if they preſume to do either of theſe things, they will affront Chriſt, the only legiſlator in his Church; and will find at laſt, that God will *reject* all their *will-worſhip*, and *humane inventions*, as in very awful words he has warn'd them, ſaying, *In* vain *do they worſhip me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*, *Mark* vii. 7.

The paſtors of the church have *no legiſlative* authority, no authority to *pronounce* what is *virtue*, and what is *vice*, or to fix the *terms* of our acceptance with God. But after they have ſeriouſly, diligently, and impartially ſtudied the Holy Scriptures, at another rate than the Generality of divines have hitherto done: they are obliged to *explain* the Scriptures to the people in the beſt manner they can, to *prove* the great and important truths of religion, to *inculcate* the commands, and to *ſet forth* the promiſes and threatnings of God's word, and to *charge* men, as they value the favour of God, and the ſalvation of their own ſouls, to believe and practiſe according to what appears to their *own* judgment to be the mind and will of Chriſt. The paſtors have no authority to *dictate* to the people what is truth, and what is duty. They muſt honeſtly tell them, what *they take* to be ſo, and then the *people muſt judge*, whether God has really taught, and required it or not. And when a paſtor, by his ſerious admonitions, and affectionate exhortations, has prevailed upon his people impartially to ſearch the Scriptures, like the noble *Bereans*, to ſee whether what they teach be true or not; heartily to imbrace the truths, which they themſelves perceive to be there revealed; and carefully to *practiſe* the duties, which they themſelves believe to be therein required of them: he may comfort himſelf with thinking,

NOTES.

ing, that the end of all his authority is answer'd; and that he has nothing more to do, in this kind, than to help them to improve, and urge them to persevere.

The *executive* authority of the pastors to inflict punishment on such as break the rules of the Gospel, and render themselves unfit for Christian communion, lies in denouncing the divine threatnings against sinners, in *admonishing* them *privately* in the *spirit of meekness*, and in casting them out of the society, if they will not repent: but if a man, who is excommunicated by the pastors or elders of the church, should think himself aggrieved, he has a right to appeal to the whole body of the communion, who may either confirm the sentence, if it were righteous, or depose the elders, if they have acted arbitrarily, and unjustly. The authority of pastors, which the scripture gives them, is no way odd, or formidable. I do not compare it to the authority of *parents* over their children; because this has much of the *arbitrary* in it; as a parent may *beat* a child, when his fault deserves it, and may punish him *without* calling in any others to *concur* with him in examining the child, and in determining what punishment the child deserves. Tho', by the way, parents have *no right* to go one jot farther in correcting a child than is really conducive to do more good than the forbearing that degree of correction could do. The pastors authority is like that of parents *so far*, as that they have a *right* to *reprove*, *rebuke*, and *exhort* with meekness and charity. But the pastors have none of the *despotic* and *monarchical* authority of parents. The authority of *pastors* is no more of an *arbitrary* or *tyrannical* nature than that which the king of *Great Britain* has over his subjects. As the king has no authority to tyrannize, so the pastors must not *lord it over God's heritage*. As the king *by himself* can make no new *laws*, nor require any instance of obedience beyond what the laws have commanded: so the pastors of the church have no authority, by themselves, to make any one *law* beyond those set down in the Gospel. As the king has authority to govern *only according to law*: so the pastors have no authority to govern otherwise than *according to* the rules of the *Gospel*. As the king can make no rule without the consent of the *nation* signified by their representatives in *parliament*: so the pastors can make no rule (about the *place* where the church shall meet, the *time* when the worship shall begin, and such other things as must be determin'd by every particular church for itself in order to have the worship *publick*) without the consent of the *church*. And as the king has no authority to *banish* or *execute* an offender without the consent of the *people* signified by the *jury*, who find him guilty: so the pastors of the church cannot *excommunicate* a sinner without the express or *tacit* consent of the *church*. On the other hand, as the king has an authority to *press* his subjects, by his royal *proclamations*, to obey the standing laws of the realm; and to *denounce* the *threatnings* therein contain'd: so the pastors have an authority to *set before* their people the *divine rules* of the Gospel, and to *denounce* against sinners its tremendous *threatnings*. As the king *with the consent of the parliament* has an authority to make *good* and *righteous* laws: so the pastors *with the consent of the church* have an authority to fix the *time* and *place* of publick worship, and every thing else that is necessary to its being *publick*. And as the king, *with the consent of the people* signified by a *jury*, has an authority to *banish* or *execute* a malefactor: so the pastors, *with the consent of their people*, have a right to *punish* an obstinate and impenitent *sinner* with *excommunication*: because *while* he is *impenitent*, he is *not capable* of joining in the *prayers* of the church.

From what has been now said it is easy to learn the nature of that *obedience* and *submission*, which the apostle afterward, *v.* 17. requires christians to pay to the pastors of the church. *Obey them* (says he) *that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves.* We are to obey them only when they act according to their commission; and we are to submit to them, when they do no other than what God has impower'd them to do, *i. e.* we must walk according to the rules of the Gospel, as our pastors direct us to do, and submit to their *just* and *friendly reproofs* and censures when we have done amiss. The apostle gives the same rule, 1 *Cor.* xvi. 16. 1 *Thess.* v. 12, 13. 1 *Tim.* v. 17.

Ch. XIII.

PARAPHRASE.

spoken to you the doctrine which God ordered them to teach you: and, considering the conclusion of their life and behaviour,
8. imitate their faith (*i*). For the object of their faith, Jesus Christ, is the same now as he was then, and will be the same for ever,
9. to the end of time (*k*). Therefore be not led away by such doctrines relating to christianity, as are diverse from what your deceas'd pastors taught you, and new and strange among Christians; as, That there is *now* virtue in meats offer'd on the *Jewish* altar: for it is better, the heart should be establish'd in the grace of the Gospel, than in a regard to such meats (*l*): in as much as they who

TEXT.

to you the word of God: whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation. Jesus Christ, 8
the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever. Be not 9
carried about with diverse and strange doctrines: for *it is* a good thing that the heart be establish'd with Grace, not with meats,

NOTES.

(*i*) *Whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation.* Our translators have inverted the order of these propositions, and thereby hinder'd many from observing the connexion of this verse with that which follows. They are restored to their true order in the paraphrase, as they lie in the *Greek*. The *end* of those pastors conversation was at their leaving the world: and perhaps they suffer'd martyrdom for the sake of the faith of Christ. Wherefore the apostle proposes them as examples of *stedfastness* and *perseverance*, and exhorts the *Hebrews* to *imitate their faith*.

(*k*) *Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to day, and for ever.* The connexion and meaning of this verse are now very easy. It contains a *reason* why the *Hebrews* should *imitate the faith* of their deceased, and perhaps martyr'd, pastors, *viz.* because the apostle knew, that those pastors believed aright concerning Christ; and that there was no change made since in the object of their faith. Jesus is the same to day, as he was yesterday, *i. e.* lately when those pastors were living and believed in him: wherefore you ought to entertain the same faith concerning him as they did. He was, and is, and for ever will be the same common and all-sufficient mediator between God and men; till at the end of the world there shall be no need for his acting as mediator any longer, when all his enemies shall be subdued, and all his people glorified, when *God shall be all in all*.

(*l*) *With grace, not with meats.* It is very common with our Saviour and his apostles to use the word, *grace*, when they compare the Gospel with the law. Thus, *Joh.* i. 17. *The* law *was given by Moses, but* grace *and truth came by Jesus Christ. Rom.* vi. 14. *Ye are not under the* law *but under grace. Gal.* v. 4. *Whoever of you are justified by the* law, *ye are fallen from* grace. The reason why the Gospel is continually stiled a doctrine of *grace* is this, That whereas the law could justify none but such as did *continue in* all things *which are written in the book of the* law *to do them*, *Gal.* iii. 10. the Gospel, on the other hand, assures us, that God, for Christ's sake, will justify all *sincere* believers, tho' their obedience is *not perfect*, *from all things*, *from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses. Acts* xiii. 39. This is an instance of great *grace*, that men, who are *not perfectly* righteous, shall receive the same reward as if they had been really so. The *Jews* retain'd too great

a

TEXT.

which have not profited them that have been occupied therein. We have
10 an altar whereof they have no right to eat, which
11 ſerve the tabernacle. For the bodies of thoſe beaſts,

PARAPHRASE.

who have paid a regard to them, have not thereby received any advantage. Nor let 10.
them boaſt of their having an altar at *Jeruſalem*, whereof no *Gentile* has a right to partake: for we have what is, at leaſt, as good as this: we have an altar, *viz.* the croſs of Chriſt, of which the *Jewiſh* prieſts, who ſerve the tabernacle, have no right to eat; *i. e.* their *Jewiſh* worſhip gives them no intereſt in the ſacrifice of Chriſt (*m*). For 11.
the law of God ordain'd, that the bullock for the ſin-offering, and the goat for the ſin-offering,

NOTES.

a regard for the old law, even after the grace of God was revealed in the Goſpel; particularly for thoſe *meats*, which had been firſt offer'd in ſacrifice to God upon his altar. The apoſtle allows, that eating of ſuch ſacrifices, and thereby partaking of the altar, was really holding communion with God, and a profeſs'd ſign of being his people, 1 *Cor.* x. 18, 20. But ſtill, as the apoſtle ſays, it is better to partake of the grace of God revealed in the Goſpel, than to eat of thoſe ſacrifices: for whoever partakes of this grace is juſtify'd, and intitled to a bleſſed reſurrection and to eternal life: whereas mens partaking of the ſacrifices under the law could only ſave them from that *untimely* death which was by that law denounced as the puniſhment of ſin, but could not procure them a reſurrection, and happineſs in the world to come: for many, who partook of them were, notwithſtanding that, condemn'd, and deſtroy'd, 1 *Cor.* x. 3, 4. 5. From hence it appears, that theſe meats did *not profit*, or benefit thoſe who paid the greateſt regard to them; while the grace of the Goſpel is profitable to procure eternal life for all ſincere Chriſtians.

(*m*) *We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which ſerve the tabernacle.* The Paraphraſe, I hope, ſufficiently expreſſes the ſenſe and connexion of the verſe. It may be here added, that the apoſtle often ſpeaks of *Chriſtian* privileges in the *Jewiſh* language; with a view to teach the *Jews*, that we do not want any of thoſe advantages, which they injoy'd under the law. Thus, he ſays, we are *circumciſed*, have a great High *Prieſt*; offer *ſacrifices* of praiſe, and have an *altar*. As the apoſtle here alludes to the altar of burnt-offering in the *Jewiſh* tabernacle, it was proper for him to repreſent the altar as having an offering upon it. And as the *Jews* did feaſt on that part of the offering, which was not conſumed, when it was taken from the altar: ſo it was agreeable enough by this to repreſent Chriſtians partaking of an intereſt in a crucified Saviour. It is plain, the apoſtle's expreſſions here are *figurative*: wherein we are diſtinctly to conſider the *ſimile*, and the thing ſignified by it. He did not intend to ſay, in a literal ſenſe, that we eat any thing that comes from the altar of the croſs: but he means, that as the *Jews* did eat of the fleſh of ſome ſacrifices, when taken from the altar; ſo we, tho' in a *ſpiritual*, or *figurative* ſenſe, partake of the ſacrifice of Chriſt, *i. e.* we have as much intereſt in it, and as much benefit by it, as if we did actually eat of it. Mens ſerving, or miniſtring in the tabernacle gave them no right to this intereſt in Chriſt: nay, if they reſted upon the legal ſervices as ſufficient to procure them *juſtification*, they would be thereby excluded from all intereſt in our redeemer, as it is written, *Gal.* v. 4.

PARAPHRASE.

offering, on the day of expiation, whose blood was by the high priest brought into the holy place to make atonement for sin, should be carried forth without the camp, and that their skins, their flesh, and their dung should be there burnt in the fire (*n*).

12. In conformity to which pattern, Jesus also, that he might redeem the people, whom he was sent to redeem, both *Jews* and *Gentiles* (*o*) by

TEXT.

whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burnt without the camp: Wherefore Jesus also, that 12 he might sanctify the peo-

NOTES.

(*n*) *For the bodies of those beasts, &c.* The connexion of these words with the foregoing seems to be this: the thing to be proved, *v.* 10. is, that the *Jewish* priests have no right *by the law* to partake of the *christian altar.* The reason of this is, because the sacrifice that was offer'd upon the christian altar of the cross was offer'd *without the gate of Jerusalem*: which shews that it was of the same nature with the old *propitiatory* sacrifices, whose bodies were order'd to be burnt *without the camp*; of which therefore it was unlawful, and impossible for the *Jewish* priests to partake. So that the law, which forbid them to eat of *propitiatory* sacrifices, did *deny* them a right to partake of the *propitiatory* sacrifice of *Christ.* From all which it is to be infer'd, that they should forsake the *law*, and become *Christians*, and have their *hearts established in grace not in meats.* The priests that served the tabernacle, were allow'd to partake of *some* sacrifices that were offer'd *within* the tabernacle, *Lev.* vi. 26. But they had no right to partake of those sacrifices which were *propitiatory*, as appears from the order given relating to the service of the great day of propitiation (to which the apostle here undoubtedly refers) *Lev.* xvi. 27. *The bullock for the sin-offering, and the goat for the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall one carry forth without the camp, and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung.* As then the priests had no right, according to the law, to partake of expiatory sacrifices: the law could not give them any right to partake of the sacrifice of Christ, which is of the same expiatory kind, and was figured and represented by them; as appears from his suffering *without the gates of Jerusalem* in conformity to their being burnt *without the camp.*

The apostle speaks of these things in the language of *Moses*, in whose days there was no *temple* built for the *Jewish* worship. He describes the people as living in a *camp* in the *wilderness*, only because he had a respect to the words of *Moses* just now quoted; which the apostle recites almost *verbatim.* As during the time of the tabernacle in the wilderness, the bodies of these sacrifices were to be burnt *without the camp*, or outside the hindmost tents of the *Israelites*; so when the temple was built at *Jerusalem*, the bodies of those sin-offerings were burnt *without the gates of Jerusalem:* for which reason Jesus was to suffer, as he actually did, without the gate of the same city.

(*o*) *That he might sanctify the people with his own blood.* There is no reason to doubt, but that the apostle had here a particular regard to the *believing Gentiles*, who were become the people of God as well as the *Jews.*

Christ's *sanctifying* them *with his blood* does not, in this place, signify his making them virtuous and God-like; but his giving his blood to make *atonement* for them, to redeem them from the *punishment* which is due to sin, and to purchase for them justification and life. See Mr. *Peirce* on *chap.* ii. 11. *note* (*b*).

TEXT.

ple with his own blood, suffered without the gate.
13 Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp,
14 bearing his reproach. For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one
15 to come. By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of *our* lips, giving thanks
16 to his name. But to do

PARAPHRASE.

by the shedding of his blood, suffer'd crucifixion without the gate of *Jerusalem* (*p*). Let us then go forth to him, away from the 13.
legal institutions bearing the reproach of trusting in a crucify'd Saviour (*q*). Let us, 14.
I say, go forth to him without the *Jewish* camp, or out of the city *Jerusalem*: for this city will not long continue (*qq*); but we seek the future city, the heavenly *Jerusalem*; and so must not be *Jews*, but Christians. And since Jesus hath suffer'd, that he 15.
might redeem the people with his blood, let us therefore apply ourselves to God through him as the mediator, and continually offer the sacrifice of praise to God thro' his mediation, not the *Jewish* sacrifices of the fruits of the earth, and of our flocks, and herds, but the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name (*r*). Besides this sacrifice of praise, 16.
let

NOTES.

(*p*) *Suffer'd without the gate.* When our blessed Saviour was to be crucified, he was carried outside the gate of *Jerusalem*, to *Calvary*, and there nail'd to the cross, *Luke* xxiii. 33. He was made like to the expiatory sacrifices appointed for the day of expiation, in being a sacrifice for sin. As the *blood* of those expiatory sacrifices was carried by the high priest into the Holy of Holies; so Christ, our high priest carried *his blood* into the most holy place, *i. e.* heaven, *chap.* ix. 12. And as the *bodies* of those expiatory sacrifices were burnt *without the camp* of the *Israelites*; so the *body* of Christ was crucified *without the gate of Jerusalem.* He thus suffer'd without the gate in conformity to the legal rule about expiatory sacrifices, for this end that he might be an expiatory sacrifice, and so redeem the people by his blood. Since then Christ was thus an *expiatory* sacrifice, and the *Jews* were not permitted by the *law* to eat of such sacrifices: it follows, that the *law* gives them no right to partake of an interest in the sacrifice of *Christ*; but this interest must be obtain'd by means of their *faith*, and of the *Gospel.*

(*q*) *Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp bearing his reproach.* This practical conclusion is drawn from the words immediately preceeding. The apostle's argument may be thus express'd: " Since, as I said, Jesus suffer'd *without the gate of Jerusalem*; " let us go forth out of *Jerusalem* to him, and not think ourselves any longer obliged to " the ceremonies and worship of the *Jewish* temple at *Jerusalem*: but let us adhere to " Christ alone, and patiently bear the reproach of trusting in a crucified Saviour, as he " bore the reproach of crucifixion. See on *chap.* xi. 26. *note* (*aa*).

(*qq*) *No continuing city.* Accordingly *Jerusalem* was destroy'd by the *Romans*, *A. D.* 70. about *eight* years after the writing of this epistle.

(*r*) *By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise, &c.* The *connexion* is, I suppose, sufficiently accounted for in the paraphrase. To what has been there said concerning the

meaning;

PARAPHRASE

let us alſo offer the ſacrifice of good works to GOD through Chriſt; not forgetting to do good to all men as we have opportunity, and to communicate out of our ſuperfluities to their relief: for GOD is well pleaſed with ſuch ſacrifices of praiſe, and of good works, and will accept and reward
17. them. Obey, and ſubmit to the ſpiritual guides, who now preſide over you: for, in conformity to the rules of their office, they watch and labour to promote the ſalvation of your ſouls, as men that are ſenſible they muſt hereafter give an account to GOD of their miniſtry (*s*), that they may be able to give

TEXT.

good, and to communicate forget not: for with ſuch ſacrifices God is well pleaſed. Obey them that 17
have the rule over you, and ſubmit yourſelves: for they watch for your ſouls, as they that muſt give account: that they may do

NOTES.

meaning of this verſe, it is fit to add, that as the apoſtle was now writing to the *Jews*, he choſe to ſpeak of *chriſtian* duties and privileges in *Jewiſh* language, in order to convince them, that Chriſtianity has all the advantages of which the *Jewiſh* church uſed to boaſt. As they had an *altar*, ſo have we: as they had *ſacrifices* to offer, ſo have we; not indeed the ſacrifices of brute creatures, but the ſacrifice of *praiſe* and thankſgiving; not the fruits of the *earth*, but the fruit of our *lips*, which is as acceptable to GOD as thoſe: and as they had a high prieſt, through whoſe hands their ſacrifices became acceptable to GOD; which they would not have been, if they had been offer'd to GOD *immediately* by their *own hands*: ſo we alſo have a great high prieſt, who, as the mediator between GOD and men, offers up our ſacrifices of prayer and praiſe to GOD, who accepts theſe our ſacrifices at Chriſt's hand, tho' he would not accept them, if we ſhould offer them up directly to GOD without a mediator.

The apoſtle here alſo teaches us the true form and method of chriſtian worſhip, which is to offer up our prayers *to* GOD, *thro'* Jeſus Chriſt the mediator; as the apoſtle ſays, we muſt do *cotinually*, and as the precepts and examples recorded in the New Teſtament univerſally teach us to do.

(*s*) *Obey them that have the rule over you*, &c. The nature of this obedience has been fully conſider'd already, on *v.* 7. *note* (*b*). It muſt here be added, that both in that place and this the apoſtle ſpeaks with juſt *limitations*, and with the greateſt *caution*. He was far enough from requiring Chriſtians to obey and ſubmit to *every* one without exception, that ſhould at any time, and by any methods be appointed to be their paſtor. If a paſtor be *impoſed* upon men *againſt* their conſent, they may leave him. If a paſtor acts *arbitrarily* and *tyrannically*, neglects his flock, or impoſes as neceſſary doctrines the commandments of men, the people are *bound in conſcience*, as they will anſwer it at the day of *judgment*, to yield *no obedience* to ſuch a paſtor, but, on the other hand, to *withdraw* and ſeparate themſelves from him, according to the expreſs command of GOD, *Mark them that cauſe diviſions and offences* (as all do who make any thing neceſſary to communion) *over and above the doctrine ye have learnt* (of Chriſt and his apoſtles) *and AVOID them*, *Rom.* xvi. 17. And if a paſtor be *known* to be a *wicked* man, they are bound in duty, not

TEXT. PARAPHRASE.

it with joy, and not with grief: for that *is* unprofitable for you. Pray for us: 18 for we truſt we have a good conſcience in all things, willing to live honeſtly. 19 But I beſeech you, the ra-

give an account of its ſucceſs among you, with joy, and not with grief. For as their want of ſucceſs will grieve them, ſo it will be unprofitable to you as to the happineſs of the world to come. Pray for me, particularly, that I may have ſucceſs in preaching the Goſpel: for I am worthy of your prayers, in as much as I truſt I preſerve a good conſcience, and am deſirous to behave myſelf well in all reſpects according to the rules of juſtice and honeſty, and of the apoſtolic office (*ss*). And I the rather intreat you thus 18. 19. to

NOTES.

not only to turn him out of his *office*, but alſo to exclude him from their *communion*, according to the rules laid down in the Goſpel, *Matth.* xviii. 17. 1 *Cor.* v. 11. 2 *Cor.* iii. 14. vi. 17. For if a *private* man, who is known to be an *impenitent* ſinner, muſt not be ſuffer'd to remain in chriſtian communion; much leſs ſhould a paſtor, that is known to be an impenitent ſinner, be permitted to remain in his office, or in the communion of the church. Or if the people cannot depoſe him, they muſt *withdraw* from him. Such as theſe the apoſtle never intended to command the *Hebrews* to obey. But he commanded them to obey thoſe ſpiritual guides who *at the time of writing* this epiſtle, *actually preſided* over them: becauſe *he knew* them to be men that acted up to their Character, and were *worthy* of this reſpect and obedience. This appears from the character he gives of thoſe particular paſtors, *They watch* (ſays he) *for your ſouls, as they that muſt give account.* If they had been of a contrary character, the apoſtle would not have order'd the *Hebrews* to obey them. From hence therefore we may form this *general* rule, ſuited to all ages, *viz.* That where paſtors in all reſpects behave themſelves as *Chriſtians*, and ſo are meet for *chriſtian* communion; where they are qualified with ſufficient *gifts*, and *faithfully* perform the duties of their paſtoral *office*; where they do *not lord it over God's heritage*, but are *examples* of all virtue *to the flock*, and heartily labour to promote the ſalvation of their people, under a lively apprehenſion, that they muſt hereafter give up a ſtrict account of their management to the great ſhepherd, who will either reward or puniſh them accordingly as they promote or hinder the ſalvation of thoſe ſouls for whom he died: where paſtors, I ſay, act in this manner, the people are bound to *obey* them, that is, to *hearken* to their *good* advice, to *ſubmit* to their *juſt reproofs*, as to men, who *like their parents*, have a *right* to exhort and reprove them. And no one that at all conſiders things, can think it any manner of evil, or hardſhip to ſubmit to paſtors of ſuch a character, in attending to their good and friendly admonitions, and in doing the things which are neceſſary to their own eternal ſalvation. The apoſtles themſelves were commiſſion'd to teach the church to *obſerve* only *all* thoſe *things*, which Chriſt either in perſon, or by his ſpirit *commanded* them to teach. If they had gone beyond their commiſſion, the church would not have been obliged to obey them. But while they did not exceed their commiſſion, obedience to them was really obedience to Chriſt himſelf.

(*ss*) *Willing to live honeſtly.* It is reaſonable to think, the apoſtle particularly meant, that he took care to act up to the rules of the *apoſtolical* office he had received, labouring to promote the ſalvation both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*: wherefore the *Hebrews* ſhould not

Ch. XIII.

PARAPHRASE.

to pray for me, that, in anſwer to your prayers, GOD may the ſooner grant me an opportunity of coming again and preaching
20. among you (*t*). As I have deſired you to pray for me, ſo I now pray for you, beſeeching GOD the author of peace, particularly between *Jews* and *Gentiles* (*u*) (who hath rais'd from the dead our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who became the great ſhepherd and Saviour of the whole church (*w*) by his giving his blood to purchaſe and confirm the everlaſting covenant, which GOD has made with all believers) (*x*) to fit you for, and improve you in

TEXT.

ther to do this, that I may be reſtored to you the ſooner. Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jeſus, that great ſhepherd of the ſheep, through the blood of the everlaſting covenant, make you per-

NOTES.

diſregard him upon the account of his labouring to convert the *Gentiles*, as ſome of the *Jews* were apt to do. For he could not *honeſtly* diſcharge his office without this. They therefore ſhould pray GOD to give him good ſucceſs.

(*t*) *Pray for us——that I may be reſtored to you the ſooner.* From what the apoſtle ſays in theſe two verſes it is evident, that the *Hebrews* knew who was the author of this epiſtle; and that his deſign in not ſetting his name could not be to conceal himſelf from them. What his deſign was herein we cannot ſay.

He would have them pray, that *ſucceſs* might attend his miniſtry, *where* he now was, that he might the *ſooner* be at *leiſure* to come to them. I ſuppoſe the caſe was the ſame as he deſcribes, *Rom.* xv. 20, 22, 23, 24. *I ſtrived to preach the Goſpel, not where Chriſt was named.——For which cauſe alſo I have been much hinder'd from coming to you. But now having* no more place *in theſe parts,——I will come to you.* Thus alſo he intended to be with the *Hebrews*, as ſoon as he ſhould *finiſh* what he had to do in *Italy*.

(*u*) *The God of peace.* This is a *Jewiſh* form of expreſſion ſignifying the ſame as the *pacific* GOD, or the GOD that *maketh* and *giveth* peace; as *king of peace*, *chap.* vii. 2. ſignifies a *peaceful* king; and the *lord of peace* is a lord that *giveth* or *maketh* peace, 2 *Theſ.* iii. 16. The apoſtle has more fully ſhewn his meaning, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 33. where he ſays, as the words ſhould be render'd, *For he is not the God of confuſion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the ſaints.* The apoſtle to the *Hebrews*, in ſtiling GOD, *The God of peace*, ſeems to have had a view particularly to the peace which GOD made between the *Jewiſh* and *Gentile* believers, and his reconciling them both to himſelf thro' Jeſus Chriſt. *Epheſ.* ii. 14—17.

(*w*) *The great ſhepherd of the ſheep.* The ſheep here ſignify the whole church including *Jewiſh* and *Gentile* believers, according to what our ſaviour ſaid, *Joh.* x. 16. *I have other ſheep which are not of this fold: them alſo* (*i. e.* the believing *Gentiles*) *I muſt bring, and they ſhall hear my voice: and there ſhall be* one fold, *and* one ſhepherd. This *one* ſhepherd is the ſame as the apoſtle calls *the* great *ſhepherd*, *i. e.* he is the *chief* and *ſupreme* ſhepherd that GOD has appointed, to whom GOD has order'd all other ſhepherds to ſubmit: ſo that he is the *one* and *only* ſhepherd that GOD has appointed to have the *ſupreme* overſight of his flock.

(*x*) *Through the blood of the everlaſting covenant.* The covenant here ſpoken of is unqueſtionably the covenant, which GOD, through Chriſt, has made with *all* believers.

TEXT.

21 fect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well-pleaſing in his ſight, thro' Jeſus Chriſt; to whom *be* glory for ever and ever.
22 Amen. And I beſeech you, brethren, ſuffer the word of exhortation; for I have written a letter unto you in few words.

PARAPHRASE.

in, every good work, that ſo ye may do his 21.
will; and to work in you that which is
well-pleaſing in his ſight, thro' Jeſus Chriſt:
To the GOD of peace (*y*) be glory aſcribed,
and given for ever and ever, Amen. And 22.
now upon the whole, I beſeech you, my chriſtian brethren, patiently to receive the exhortation I have given you: for I have not been tedious; but have written only a ſhort letter

NOTES.

is fitly called, *everlaſting*, becauſe it ſhall never be aboliſh'd. The *Jewiſh* covenant was intended to continue but for a time, is now decay'd, ſuperannuated, and vaniſh'd away, *chap.* viii. 13. wherefore place was found for a ſecond to ſucceed it, *v.* 7. But the *chriſtian* covenant ſhall never decay, or vaniſh, or be ſucceeded by another. The blood of this everlaſting covenant is the blood of the ſacrifice which was ſhed to confirm and eſtabliſh it: the blood of the old *Jewiſh* covenant was the blood of *beaſts:* but the blood of the new and everlaſting covenant is the blood of *Chriſt.* See *chap.* IX. 15.——24.

Commentators are not agreed in their judgments about the *connexion* of this clauſe with what goes before. Some think the meaning to be, that GOD *rais'd Chriſt from the dead thro' the blood of the everlaſting covenant*, or, becauſe by his blood he had *merited* his reſurrection; others, that GOD rais'd Chriſt *together with* his blood. But it ſeems more natural to ſuppoſe, that this clauſe was deſign'd to be connected with the words immediately foregoing, and that the apoſtle's meaning is, that Chriſt *became* the great ſhepherd of the ſheep *by means of* his voluntary *oblation* of himſelf as a ſacrifice for them, and by giving his blood to purchaſe and confirm the new covenant. It was by the ſhedding of his blood that he purchaſed for himſelf the authority of a ſhepherd, a governor, or leader to all believers. Accordingly the apoſtle calls the flock of Chriſt, *the church of the* Lord (as the beſt *Greek* copies, and verſions, and the oldeſt chriſtian writers read the text) *which he hath purchaſed with his own blood, i. e.* in other words, he purchaſed for himſelf the place of great or chief ſhepherd over the church, that he might ſave it, *Acts* xx. 28. Agreeably to this we read, that the authority, which Chriſt has over the church, was beſtowed upon him by GOD *as a reward* of his voluntary condeſcenſion and agreement to die for us, *Philip.* ii. 8.——11. *Epheſ.* 20, 21, 22. By the ſame blood then which purchas'd and confirm'd the everlaſting covenant, Chriſt purchaſed for himſelf the authority of the great ſhepherd, and Saviour of the church.

(*y*) *To whom be glory.* It is not abſolutely certain, whether the word *whom*, here relates to the *God of peace* mention'd in the beginning of the ſentence, or to *Jeſus Chriſt* named in the concluſion. But it is certain, that the ſcripture, in other places, aſcribes glory to each ſeparately, and to both together: *To God and our father be glory, for ever and ever, Amen! Philip.* iv. 20. *To him that waſhed us in his blood*——*be* glory *and dominion for ever and ever, Rev.* i. 5, 6. *Bleſſing and honour and* glory *and power be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the lamb, Rev.* v. 13. It is therefore of no conſequence which way we underſtand this text. However, I am inclined to think, that herein the glory is aſcribed to the *God of peace*, who is the *principal* perſon mention'd in the text: while Chriſt is ſpoken of as the *mediator, thro' whom* GOD communicated his bleſſings to his people.

Ch. XIII.

PARAPHRASE.

letter in comparison of what I could have
23. written on this occasion. I have to acquaint you, that our brother *Timothy* (z) is set at liberty (a), with whom (if he comes hither
24. shortly) I will see you. Present my service and good wishes to all your pastors, who have the rule over you, and to all the holy brethren (b). The saints that belong to *Italy*, send their service and good wishes to you.
25. May GOD receive you all into his especial favour! Amen.

TEXT.

Know ye, that *our* brother Timothy is set at liberty; 23
with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.
Salute all them that have 24
the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy
salute you. Grace *be* with 25
you all. Amen.

NOTES.

(z) *Our brother Timothy.* Tho' the word, *our* is wanting in many *Greek* copies, and in the *Arabic* version; yet it is retain'd in the *Latin*, *Syriac*, *Coptic*, and *Aethiopic* translations, and in some antient *Greek* MSS. particularly in the *Alexandrian*, as it is reasonable to think: for tho' the three first letters of ημων are worn out, yet their space, and the last letter are left: which sufficiently signifies that the whole word was originally there. It was not uncommon for St. *Paul* to call *Timothy* brother. See 2 *Cor.* i. 1 *Col.* i. 1. *Philem.* 1.

(a) Απολελυμενον, *is set at liberty.* The *Greek* word seems to imply, that *Timothy* had been *imprison'd* or in *bonds*, according to the use of the same word in some other places, as *Luke* xxiii. 16. *Acts* iv. 21, 25. xxvi. 32.

(b) *All the saints.* The word, *saints*, is here used in its *proper* and *natural* sense. Christians are frequently call'd *saints* in the New Testament, because all the members of the christian church in the first and purest age of it were either *real* saints in heart and life, or, at least, could *not* by men be *distinguish'd* from such as were. For as soon as ever any man *discover'd* himself to be *no saint*, he was, unless he immediately repented, cast out of the christian society, and look'd upon, and treated as a *Heathen*; as was before observed on *v.* 17. *note* (s). The same discipline ought to be observed in all christian churches now, and to the end of the world.

At the end of the epistle it is added in some *Greek* copies, as it is in our translation, *written to the Hebrews from Italy by Timothy.* Who first added this account we cannot find. But it is evident, whoever he was, he was too hasty. It is *not certain*, that this epistle was written *in Italy:* for when the apostle said, *They of Italy salute you*, *v.* 24. he might only mean, that some saints *of Italy* were then with him; which they might be, in *another* country. But it is *certainly false*, that it was sent by *Timothy.* This appears from *v.* 23. *Know ye, that our brother Timothy is set at liberty.* If *Timothy* had carried the letter, the apostle would not, in such a *plain* way, have written this *merely* as a piece of *news.* The apostle adds, *If he come shortly, I will see you* with him: which implies, that he was not then with *Paul*; that he would not delay the sending of his letter till *Timothy*'s arrival, even tho' he thought *Timothy* might come shortly, but would send it, as no doubt he did, before *Timothy* came to him; and that if *Timothy* should soon come, he would not send them a *letter* by him, but would accompany him *in person.*

The *English* reader is to be warned, that the *inscriptions* at the end of the epistles were set by *modern* and unskilful hands; and so are not of the least authority. It is pity, they should be printed in the Bible.

FINIS.

DISSERTATIONS
ON SIX
TEXTS
OF
SCRIPTURE,
VIZ.

Rom. xv. 7—9.	*Matth.* v. 14—16.
2 *Cor.* iv. 13.	*Mark* vi. 39, 40.
John xiii. 18, 19.	1 *Cor.* viii. 3.

By the late Reverend and Learned

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

The SECOND EDITION.

LONDON,
Printed for JOHN NOON, *at the* White Hart *in* Cheapside, *near* Mercers Chapel. M.DCC.XXXVII.

DISSERTATIONS

ON SIX

TEXTS of SCRIPTURE.

DISSERTATION I.

ROM. xv. 7—9.

7 *Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God.*
8 *Now I say, That Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers;*
9 *And that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy; as it is written, For this cause will I confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name.*

MY design being only to vindicate St. *Paul* in his citation in the last of these verses, and upon that occasion to treat of the place whence the citation is taken, the reason why I have set down the two former verses is, that the reader may see how St. *Paul* brings in the passage of which I am to treat. And that he may have a better view of it, I shall

here preſent him with Mr. *Locke*'s paraphraſe; the reaſon of which he may fetch from his notes.

Mr. *Locke*'s *PARAPHRASE.*

7. " Wherefore admit and receive one another into fellowſhip and
" familiarity, without ſhineſs or diſtance upon occaſion of diffe-
" rences about things indifferent, even as Chriſt received us *Jews*
8. " to glorify God (for I muſt tell you, ye converted *Romans*, that
" Chriſt was ſent to the *Jews*, and imployed all his miniſtry on
" thoſe of the circumciſion) for his truth in making good his pro-
" miſe made to the fathers, *i. e. Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*;
9. " and received you the *Gentiles* to glorify God for his mercy to
" you; as it is written, For this cauſe I will confeſs to thee among
" the *Gentiles*, and ſing unto his name."

In which citation we are to obſerve, that St. *Paul* alleges it as a proof that Chriſt was to receive the *Gentiles*; and therefore it is abſolutely neceſſary that the *I* in the citation, I *will confeſs*, muſt be underſtood of Chriſt, and he muſt be conſider'd as the perſon uttering thoſe words, or in whoſe name they were uttered. It is eaſy to ſee that otherwiſe they were nothing at all to St. *Paul*'s purpoſe: for if we take them as the words of *David*, and ſpoken in his own name or perſon, what proof, I beſeech you, could it be that Chriſt would receive the *Gentiles* to glorify God for his mercy, becauſe *David* declared concerning himſelf that he would confeſs to the Lord among the *Gentiles*, and ſing unto his name?

This being fixed, we are next to look for the place whence St. *Paul* cited theſe words: and to that the margin of our bibles will preſently direct us, *Pſal.* xviii. 49. where we have thus rendered the verſe, *Therefore will I give thanks* [in the margin, *confeſs*] *unto thee, O Lord, among the* Heathen, *and ſing praiſes unto thy name.* The exact agreement of the words with St. *Paul*'s quotation, ſhows that he had a reſpect to this place only. The word in the *Hebrew* render'd *give thanks*, ſignifies *to praiſe, thank*, or *confeſs*; and ſo does the *Greek* word uſed by the Apoſtle; and accordingly we have render'd it, *Mat.* xi. 25. *At that time Jeſus anſwer'd and ſaid, I* thank *thee, O Father*, &c. And again, though our tranſlators have added the word *praiſes*, which may ſeem to make ſome difference, yet there is no real difference; for

there is no word to answer to *praises*, in the *Hebrew*, in this place, and the verb signifies in general to *sing*; and accordingly have we sometimes translated it, as particularly *Psal.* xxx. 4. Sing *unto the Lord, O ye saints of his.* And indeed the citation agrees perfectly with the *Hebrew*, and *verbatim* with the translation of the LXX. except it be in this one thing, that it leaves out, *O Lord.* But however small and inconsiderable this difference may seem in a citation, yet it may be owing to a defect in some copies, and not to any omission in St. *Paul*: for the *Vulg. Latin*, *Arabic* and *Coptic* translations, the *Complutensian* edition, and ten old *Greek* MSS. together with *Chrysostom* and *Sedulius*, read *O Lord*, here in St. *Paul*'s citation.

The only thing that remains necessary to be done, is to inquire, what reason there is to believe that St. *Paul* has here quoted this verse according to the true original intention and meaning of it; and that when it was first penned it was meant as spoken by Christ, or in his name; and if I can produce solid reasons for this, I shall fully justify St. *Paul*: whereas if this is cited only by way of accommodation, it was nothing at all to his purpose, and he has put off his readers with a proof which in reality is no proof at all. I am sensible that this consideration will have its weight with those who are persuaded of the truth of the christian religion, and the inspiration of this great teacher of it. But other kind of arguments are to be used against the enemies of our holy religion, who from the citations of the apostles would take occasion to insult us, and run down their inspiration.

Now there is one thing which I hope all will allow me as a very reasonable *postulatum*, and upon which my justification of St. *Paul* will mainly rest; and that is, that one and the same person is to be understood as speaking through the psalm. It runs in one continued stile of the same person, as far as appears, from the beginning to the end of it; and whoever would suppose that one part is to be understood as spoken by one person, and another part by another, will, I am persuaded, find it very difficult to assign the different parts to their supposed respective speakers; or at least he will find it difficult to assign any convincing, or even tolerable, reasons for his making such a distinction. But this I may the more freely take for granted, because those whom I oppose do so too, and reckon the whole of it is spoken by *David* in his own person.

And

And when I plead for the pſalm's being uttered in the perſon of Chriſt, this is no more than what is uſual in other pſalms, which chriſtians have generally acknowledged to be written in this manner: To which purpoſe I may appeal to *Pſal.* xvi. (which St. *Peter*, Acts ii. 25——31. has demonſtrated is thus to be underſtood) and to *Pſal.* ii. xxii. and many others. I don't think this will privilege the wild fancies of men in applying whatever paſſages they pleaſe in the pſalms to Chriſt: for the reaſons they give for ſuch applications are to be carefully examined; as I am freely willing mine ſhould be in the preſent caſe.

This being premiſed as the foundation upon which I build, the next thing I would advance is, that there are ſome parts of the pſalm that are too auguſt and lofty to ſuit any other perſon than our Redeemer. I queſtion whether there is any part of the holy ſcripture which riſes higher in the majeſty of its expreſſions than ſome verſes of this pſalm, particularly *ver.* 7——15. *Then the earth ſhook and trembled, the foundations of the hills alſo moved and were ſhaken, becauſe he was wroth. There went up a ſmoke out of his noſtrils, and fire out of his mouth devoured: Coals were kindled by it. He bowed the heavens alſo, and came down: and darkneſs was under his feet. And he rode upon a cherub, and did fly; yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind. He made darkneſs his ſecret place: his pavilion round about him were dark waters, and thick clouds of the skies. At the brightneſs that was before him his thick clouds paſſed, hail ſtones and coals of fire. The Lord alſo thundred in the heavens, and the Higheſt gave his voice; hail ſtones and coals of fire. Yea, he ſent out his arrows and ſcattered them, and he ſhot out lightnings and diſcomfited them. Then the channels of waters were ſeen, and the foundations of the world were diſcovered, at thy rebuke, O Lord, at the blaſt of the breath of thy noſtrils.* It is hard to imagine how the ſtile could poſſibly riſe higher, or any terms be choſen that ſhould be more pompous and ſtately. I cannot but remember, that before I was convinced that theſe things were ſpoken in the perſon of the Meſſiah, I uſed to read them with the utmoſt wonder, deſpairing ever to diſcover any event to which they could with any tolerable propriety be applied. I was ſenſible there were many other places of the holy ſcriptures which I as little underſtood as this, and ſome other parts of the pſalms: but then as they plainly appeared to be prophetical, it did not ſeem ſtrange that the language was dark and puzzling; whereas this

pſalm, according to the title, ſhould be ſuppoſed of quite another nature. The ſubject is eaſy and plain, a deliverance *from the hand of all enemies*, and particularly from *Saul*. However the good man's heart might be ſuppoſed ſtrongly affected, and this might diſcover it ſelf in ſome elevated expreſſions, wherewith he clothes his pious and grateful acknowledgment; yet one would imagine that having ſuch a key to the pſalm, as the title ſeems to give us, and it being a narration of a plain hiſtory, or a laudatory commemoration of a kindneſs very eaſy to be underſtood, one would imagine, I ſay, that the meaning of the pſalm ſhould be obvious to every reader. But I am perſuaded moſt readers, as well as my ſelf, have found it quite otherwiſe. It will probably be pleaded that an allowance is always to be made for poetical deſcriptions; and that ſuch ſchemes and figures of ſpeech are in poetry not only tolerable, but fine and noble, as in ordinary diſcourſe, or an hiſtorical narrative, would be accounted affected, bombaſt, and inexcuſable. Now, though I am willing we ſhould make as much of this plea as we poſſibly can; yet, methinks, there ought to be ſome proportion obſerved between the ſubject and the expreſſion. But who can think there is any, when the *earth* is repreſented as *ſhaking* and *trembling*, the *foundations of the hills* as *moved* and *ſhaken*, and *God* himſelf is ſet out as *riding upon a cherub* and *flying*, as *flying upon the wings of the wind*, &c. and this great *apparatus* and pomp ſhould after all end only in the deliverance of *David* out of the hand of a few enemies? One would expect that ſuch lofty expreſſions were deſign'd to introduce an account of the final conflagration, or at leaſt of the execution of ſome tremendous judgment like that which befel *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, and not barely the overthrow of a ſmall handful of men who fell in an ordinary way, in the day of battel, when there was no ſign of any extraordinary, or at leaſt of any miraculous interpoſition of providence to bring about the event. Let any one read the account given us of *Saul*'s death, 1 *Sam.* xxxi. and then judge whether he can reaſonably interpret the lofty expreſſions of this pſalm concerning it: or eſpecially let him read the doleful lamentation which *David* made over *Saul*, when he was ſlain, and then conſider, whether it be likely that he ſhould here make the ſame thing the occaſion of ſuch an inſult and triumph over him, as according to the common interpretation this pſalm muſt neceſſarily carry in it. For my own part, this account ſeems to imply *David*'s lamen-

lamentation to be such a fiction and dissimulation, that I can hardly imagine how it could have been left upon record, without some severe censure upon him for it.

What I have said hitherto has been designed to show how unlikely, if not impossible, it is, that this psalm should be understood, in the common way, to relate to *David*. Now this, I think, will go a great way toward the establishing the interpretation here offered, that refers it to Christ; since they who deny it belongs to Christ, neither do, nor can pretend to apply it to any other than *David*.

This now leads me to consider, how the things here mentioned in the psalm, which apparently did not suit *David* in speaking of his own case, were very proper to be used by our Saviour in speaking of himself. Now in order to the clearing this, I desire the reader to observe, what I take to be the nature and design of this psalm in general; and that is, that it is our Saviour's hymn or song of praise to God, (1.) For raising him from the dead: and, (2.) For making him victorious over his enemies, and particularly over the *Jews*, in whose destruction he took vengeance on them for what they had done against him: and, (3.) For giving him a people among the *Gentiles*. To these three heads the several things said in the psalm may be easily reduced. I am persuaded that an intire comment upon the song, according to this account of it, might be of good service: but that would soon swell to a treatise, and is not proper to come into this dissertation, which is designed chiefly for justifying St. *Paul* in citing one verse of it. For the same reason I shall forbear to compare all the different readings we have of the same song, 2 *Sam.* xxii. which at first I intended; though I may have occasion to take notice of some of them. Farther, I shall pass over many things in the psalm which every reader will easily apply himself, from what I shall say concerning other passages.

To come now to particulars; there can be nothing more agreeable to the easy and natural sense of the expressions made use of in the seven first verses of the psalm, than if they are understood as spoken by Christ upon the occasion of God's raising him from the dead. The two first verses are laudatory, and so it must be determined from what follows, to what occasion they particularly relate. The first verse is left out in *Samuel*: and yet I make no doubt it belongs to the song; partly because it is more easy to suppose it might through carelessness be omitted by a transcriber, than that it

should

ſhould be inſerted through wilfulneſs, eſpecially when there is no appearance of any deſign he could ſerve by it; and partly becauſe *Pſal.* cxvi. which is upon the ſame ſubject, begins in much the ſame manner.

As to a clauſe in *ver.* 2. *In whom I will truſt*, the margin of our bibles refers us to it as the paſſage cited, *Heb.* ii. 13. Εγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ. They who acknowledge the divine inſpiration of that author, muſt own that this is a farther confirmation that the pſalm relates to Chriſt, and not to *David*. I know ſome think that *Iſa.* viii. 17. is rather cited by that writer, where the LXX. have Πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ. But as that writer quotes in the very next words what immediately follows in the prophet, *And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me*, it ſeems not likely he would have thus diſjoined the words of the prophet, by inſerting between them, *and again*, making two citations of them, in caſe he had in both referred to that one place, where both paſſages ſtand together, without any thing coming between them. It is more likely therefore he cites the former paſſage from another place in the old teſtament, and particularly from this ſong. It is true, in rendering the pſalm, the LXX. have Ελπιῶ ἐπ' αὐτον; but in rendering the ſame paſſage, 2 *Sam.* xxii. 3. they have the ſame words as in *Iſa.* viii. 17. And though I make no doubt that *Iſaiah* there ſpeaks of Chriſt, as well as this ſong, yet I think it may be queſtioned, whether the LXX. according to our preſent copies, have as juſtly rendered that place, as they have 2 *Sam.* xxii. 3. Nothing can be more proper than this rendering of אחסא בו in the ſong: but it may be doubted whether it ſo well ſuits קויתי לו in the prophet. Our own tranſlators accordingly make a difference, but of the pertinence of that citation I have had occaſion to treat elſewhere. However, if any one thinks that *Iſaiah* is rather quoted than the ſong, let him compare the expreſſions uſed in it, with thoſe we find it was foretold Chriſt ſhould uſe in *Pſal.* lxxxix. 26. which doubtleſs belongs to Chriſt, and then judge, whether that does not make it look the more likely, that *Pſal.* xviii. belongs to him alſo.

The third and ſixth verſes are expreſſions of the truſt the perſon ſpeaking repoſed in God in his diſtreſs, and the experience he had of his gracious Aid. What this diſtreſs was, we are to learn from *ver.* 4, 5. which are very much to our purpoſe. *The ſorrows of death compaſſed me, and the floods of ungodly men maae me afraid. The ſorrows of the grave compaſſed me about:* the ſnares *of death prevented me.* In the former

of theſe verſes, inſtead of חבלי *ſorrows*, we read in *Samuel* משברי *waves*. This latter reading is preferr'd by a learned commentator, becauſe otherwiſe there will be the ſame word repeated in the next verſe; and, beſides, this ſeems better to ſuit with the *floods* mentioned in the ſame verſe. Theſe reaſons muſt be own'd to be conſiderable: and yet there are others that may be alleged for the reading in the pſalm. For it may be urged, that ſuch repetitions of the ſame word are not altogether unuſual. Thus, *ver.* 44, 45. the *ſtrangers*, or the *ſons of the ſtrangers*, is as nearly repeated, as it is alſo in *Samuel*. Had theſe verſes indeed been tranſpoſed, there would have been more likelihood that the word for *ſorrows* runing in the tranſcriber's thoughts from what he had before writen, might occaſion his writing it over again: but the difference lying in the place where *ſorrows* are firſt ſpoken of, the overſight is not eaſily accounted for. And if we ſuppoſe an alteration to be made through wilfulneſs, rather than inadvertence; there may be more reaſon to imagine that the alteration might be made of *ſorrows* to *waves*, than the contrary: for the tranſcriber might be tempted to make the former alteration for the ſake of avoiding the ſo near repetition of the word *ſorrows*, and he might be induced to ſubſtitute *waves* in the ſtead of it, as beſt ſuiting the word *floods*, with which it is joined: but if *waves* had been the original reading, it is not eaſy to ſuppoſe the tranſcriber would wilfully loſe two ſuch obvious beauties by the alteration he made. To which ſome may be inclined to add, that the tranſcriber could not apprehend the difference that might be intended in the two expreſſions: for the *ſorrows of death* may import thoſe ſorrows which bring death, and ſo the other clauſe may lead us to interpret them, *the floods of ungodly men made me afraid*; whereas the *ſorrows of hell*, or *the grave*, may be thought to refer to the condition of thoſe who are actually dead, in the grave, or in *hades*. Compare *Pſal.* cxvi. 3. Hence when he ſays, *The ſorrows of the grave compaſſed me*, he adds, *The ſnares of death prevented me*; which ſeems to determine it that he ſpeaks of himſelf as actually dead, and in the grave: for I do not ſee how that expreſſion can ſignify leſs than this. So that in theſe two verſes the perſon ſpeaking ſets forth himſelf as having his life ſought after by wicked men, and as being actually ſlain by them; and the following part of the pſalm ſhows him to be reſtored to life; which things were not true of *David*, but muſt of neceſſity belong to Chriſt. If any one

diſlikes

diſlikes the juſt mentioned diſtinction of the *ſorrows of death*, and the *ſorrows of the grave*, and thinks they mean the ſame thing, I ſhall not contend, provided he allows that theſe import the perſon's being dead. The expreſſion of St. *Peter* may deſerve to be compared herewith, *Acts* ii. 24. *Whom God hath raiſed up, having looſed the* pains of death, τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου, *becauſe it was not poſſible that he ſhould be holden of it:* where he may be thought to refer to this ſong, or to *Pſal.* cxvi. 3. the LXX. having uſed the ſame expreſſion, ὠδῖνες θανάτου, *Pſal* cxvi. 3. and *Pſal.* xviii. 4. for the rendering the *Hebrew*, which we tranſlate *the ſorrows of death:* but 2 *Sam.* xxii. 6. they uſe the ſame to expreſs what we render the *ſorrows of hell.*

The perſon ſpeaking having thus declared his being in the ſtate of the dead, ſets forth, *ver.* 6. his behaviour therein. *In my diſtreſs I called upon the Lord, and cried unto my God.* In *Samuel* we have the ſame verb אקרא *I called* in both clauſes: but the reading in the pſalm, in the latter clauſe אשוע *I cried*, ſeems preferable. 'Tis eaſy to imagine, that after the writing the firſt clauſe the word אקרא runing in the tranſcriber's mind might occaſion his repeating it in the latter. Beſides, the word שוע is more commonly join'd with the particle אל; and, which is ſtill more important, the laſt part of the verſe ſeems to imply that this verb had been uſed before, *He heard my* voice *out of his temple* [that is, heaven, *Pſal.* xi. 4.] *and my* cry *came before him into his ears.* To omit the different reading in *Samuel*, which is not material, and ſeems not ſo good as that in the pſalm, this verſe ſhows us how the perſon ſpeaking called upon God for deliverance when he was in the ſtate of the dead, and that his prayer was heard and anſwered; that is, as it is expreſſed, *Pſal.* cxvi. 6. *he* helped [or *ſaved*] him, delivered him out of that ſtate of death he was in. And then there follows, *Pſal.* xviii. 7. a very particular and memorable circumſtance that accompanied God's gracious anſwer and the deliverance he wrought for him: *Then the earth ſhook and trembled, the foundations alſo of the hills* [the reading in *Samuel*, of the *heaven*, is highly improbable] *moved and were ſhaken, becauſe he was wroth.* Had there been any ſuch earthquake, that accompanied *Saul*'s death and *David*'s deliverance, 'tis ſtrange that in the hiſtorical books of the bible relating to that time, we ſhould not have the leaſt hint given us of it. But very remarkable is the account of that which was at the very inſtant of our Lord's riſing

from the dead, *Matth.* xviii. 2——4. *And behold there was a* GREAT EARTHQUAKE: *for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it; his countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow. And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and become as dead men.* I see no reason to question, whether this terrible *earthquake* is pointed at in this passage of the psalm: but 'tis very possible that more than that single one may be here intended. And indeed as the following verses of the psalm, down to *ver.* 43. seem to give an account of the signal vengeance of God upon the wicked *Jews* for murdering the *Messiah*, it is not unlikely the *shaking of the earth* here mentioned, may comprehend the many earthquakes which happen'd in that period of time, and of which our Lord speaks most expressly, *Matth.* xxiv. 17. *Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and* EARTHQUAKES *in divers places.* Compare *Mark* xiii. 8. *Luke* xxi. 11. Unless the other earthquakes appear to be particularly referr'd to in other parts of the psalm, there can be no difficulty in supposing them included in this verse, which, as every one who reads must see, is express'd in terms general enough to take them in. If this be allowed, the testimony of *Josephus*, the *Jewish* historian, concerning these subsequent earthquakes, is full to our purpose. He tells us, *De Bell. Jud. lib.* iv. *c.* 17. *vel* 7. "That the night in which the *Idumeans* lay "before *Jerusalem*, there arose a prodigious tempest, and fierce "winds, with most vehement rains, frequent lightnings, and ter- "rible thunderings, and great roarings of the shaken earth: and "it was manifest, that the state of the universe was disorder'd at "the slaughter of men; so that any one might guess these were "signs of no small calamity." And again, *Lib.* vii. *c.* 31. *vel* 12. he says, "That at the day of pentecost, when the priests by night "went into the inner temple, according to their custom, to execute "their office, they said they perceived first of all a shaking and a "noise, and after that a sudden voice, saying, Let us depart hence." Farther, we find, by other testimonies, that there were many earthquakes about that time in divers places, as in *Crete*, at *Smyrna*, *Miletus*, *Chios*, *Samos*, *Laodicea*, *Hierapolis*, and *Colos.* In which, says *Grotius* upon *Matth.* xxiv. 7. the *Jews* were concern'd, since many of them lived in those places.

To

To go on with the pſalm; it follows, *ver.* 8. *There went up a ſmoke out of his noſtrils* [I prefer the rendering of the LXX. who have both here and in *Samuel*, *in his anger*: with them the *Vulg. Latin* agrees in the pſalm, though it is the ſame with our tranſlation in *Samuel*] *and fire out of his mouth devoured: coals were kindled by it.* There is ſo remarkable an agreement between the expreſſions here uſed of the *ſmoke* and *fire*, with what we meet with *Joel* ii. 30, 31, 32. that they who believe St. *Peter* was not miſtaken, *Acts* ii. 19, 20, 21. in underſtanding him to foretel an event that was to preceed the terrible deſtruction of the *Jews*, will not ſee any difficulty in ſuppoſing theſe words in the pſalm might be very properly uſed by our Saviour. The words are theſe: *I will ſhew wonders in heaven above, and ſigns in the earth beneath, blood and* fire, *and vapour of* ſmoke. *The ſun ſhall be turned into* darkneſs, *and the moon into blood, before that great and terrible day of the Lord come.* And it ſhall come *to paſs, that whoſoever ſhall call on the name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved*, or *delivered.* Now, whether men take the words of *Joel* in a literal or metaphorical ſenſe, it will make no difference as to the ſuppoſition of our Saviour's ſpeaking here in the pſalm; ſince the expreſſions here may be interpreted juſt in the ſame manner. By the *blood* may be meant the horrible ſlaughters among the *Jews*, partly by the foreign enemies they fought with, partly by the *Sicarii*, or murderers, partly by the havock they made of one another, and partly by their laying violent hands upon themſelves. The blood thus ſhed could not be looked upon as an ordinary event: but to all who conſider it, as well as to their own hiſtorian, it muſt appear a prodigy. The *fire* may well relate to the deſolating fires that conſumed their temple, city, towns and villages round about, the conſequence of which muſt have been the aſcending of vapours, or pillars of ſmoke. So that the *fire* and *ſmoke* mentioned in the pſalm, are very eaſily accounted for, in the ſame way that men interpret the words of the prophet *Joel.*

Some are inclined to make a farther uſe of theſe fires, and think that the *vapours* or *pillars of ſmoke* aſcending every where from them, together with the ſtorms and tempeſts which then happened, might obſcure and darken the ſun, and cauſe the moon to appear of a blood-colour: and they who thus underſtand the prophecy of *Joel*, may eaſily apply the ſame explication of the *darkneſs* ſeveral times ſpoken of in the pſalm;

though I own I understand *darkness* differently, as I shall shew presently.

I would only add, before I leave this prophecy of *Joel*, that the last words of it, which St. *Peter* quotes, *Acts* ii. 21. *And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved*, or as we render it in the prophet, *shall be delivered*, viz. from that fearful destruction; I say, these words do marvellously agree with those of our Saviour, *Matth.* xxiv. 13. *He that endureth to the end shall be saved*; and with the account which our Saviour gives in this psalm, *ver.* 25—27. *With the merciful thou wilt shew thy self merciful; with an upright man thou wilt shew thy self upright; with the pure thou wilt shew thy self pure, and with the froward thou wilt shew thy self froward: For thou wilt save the afflicted people, but wilt bring down high looks.*

To go on now with the psalm; it follows, *ver.* 9. *He bowed the heavens also, and came down: and darkness was under his feet.* This verse contains two particulars, each of which are distinctly spoken of in the two next verses; the former, *ver.* 10. *He rode upon a cherub, and did fly; yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind.* In *Samuel* it is, *he was* seen *upon the wings of the wind:* the only difference being that between ד and ר, which are so very like as that they may easily be taken one for t'other. 'Tis doubtful which reading is the best. This answers to the former part of *ver.* 9. *He bowed the heavens also, and came down.* Ver. 11. *He made darkness his secret place: his pavilion round about him were dark waters, and thick clouds of the skies,* answers to the latter part of *ver* 9. *Darkness was under his feet.* Many may be ready to think the *darkness* here mentioned is to be explained agreeably to what has been taken notice of concerning the prophecy of *Joel*, and which might seem much to be confirmed by this passage of the same prophet, *Chap.* ii. 12. *The day of the Lord is at hand; a day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness.* But I confess, when I consider how the mention of darkness in the psalm is brought in, I think we are naturally led to another interpretation. If I mistake not, these august expressions denote the *Shechinah*, or the illustrious presence and appearance of God, when vengeance was taken on the *Jews.* Let what is here said of God's *riding upon a cherub*, and *flying upon the wings of the wind*, be compared with *Psal.* civ. 3, 4. and it may tend to clear this account. Doubtless the *cherub* here mentioned is not to

be

be underſtood of one ſingle cherub, but is put generally for all the angels, agreeably to *Pſal.* xxxiv. 7. *The angel* [that is, the *angels*] *of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them.* It is certain God's chariot is repreſented as conſiſting of vaſt numbers of them, *Pſal.* lxviii. 17. and it ſeems reaſonable to underſtand this place accordingly. Now agreeably to this, the *darkneſs* ſpoken of, *ver.* 9, 11. is to be explained of that *darkneſs* that uſed to accompany the *Shechinah.* Thus God was *in the thick darkneſs* at mount *Sinai*, Exod. xx. 21. there being *thunderings and lightnings, and a* thick cloud *upon the mount*, Exod. xix. 16. Compare *Deut.* v. 22. *Heb.* xii. 18. Thus he dwelt in the *thick darkneſs*, [that is, in the *cloud*] in the tabernacle, *Lev.* xvi. 2. and in the temple, 1 *Kings* viii. 10——12. If therefore we have any reaſon to ſuppoſe the appearance of the *Shechinah* on this occaſion, we need not wonder that God ſhould be repreſented, according to cuſtom, as having *thick clouds and darkneſs* about him, and that *darkneſs* ſhould be ſpoken of as his *pavilion* and *ſecret place.*

Now, whether there be reaſon to allow ſuch an illuſtrious appearance of God at his taking vengeance on the *Jews*, may be judged by the account of their own hiſtorian, than which nothing can be more full to my purpoſe. Thus then *Joſephus*, *de Bello Jud. lib.* vii. *c.* 31. *ſive* 12. " A few days after the feaſt of un-
" leavened bread, a ſtrange and almoſt incredible ſight was ſeen,
" which would, I ſuppoſe, be taken for a mere fable, were it not
" related by ſuch as ſaw it," [He may particularly mean himſelf, perhaps, among others] " and did not the miſeries which followed,
" appear anſwerable to the ſigns. For before the ſun ſet were
" ſeen on high in the air, all over the country, chariots and armed
" regiments *moving ſwiftly in the clouds*, and incompaſſing the
" city." I ſee no reaſon to ſuſpect the truth of this relation; or to doubt whether this ſtrange ſight was owing to angels imployed by God on this occaſion, which was much greater than that mentioned 2 *Kings* vi. 16. *Behold, the mountain was full of* horſes *and* chariots *round about* Eliſha. Nor can any thing more ſuit the ſtile of the *Jews*, than to ſpeak of ſuch an appearance as the appearance of God, of the *Shechinah*, or as though God rode upon the *cherubim* and flew. God by his angels was often preſent, when men perceived it not by their ſenſes: but very remarkable is the expreſſion in this ſong as ſet down in *Samuel*, *He was* ſeen *upon*

the

the wings of the wind: which if it be the truer reading, may be thought exactly fulfilled in what I have set down from *Josephus*. Compare with this, *Psal.* xcvii. 2.

It follows in the psalm, *ver.* 12——14. *From the brightness before him there passed his thick clouds, hail-stones, and coals of fire.* 13. *The Lord also thundered in the heavens, and the Highest gave his voice, hail-stones, and coals of fire.* 14. *And he sent forth his arrows, and scattered them: he shot out lightnings, and discomfited them.* These verses are somewhat differently read in *Samuel. From the brightness before him were coals of fire kindled.* [The reading in the psalm being more full, and carrying nothing inconvenient in it, seems here preferable.] *The Lord thundered from heaven, and the Highest gave his voice.* [The addition here of *hail-stones and coals of fire*, in the psalm, seems to be a repetition of the transcribers from the former verse, and not so agreeable to the stile of the scriptures, which use to represent not hail-stones and coals of fire, but only *thunder*, as the *voice of the Lord.*] *And he sent forth arrows, and scattered them; lightnings, and discomfited them.* [Where the difference is inconsiderable.] When it is said, *from the brightness*, the meaning is, by reason of it, that brightness was the cause of what follows. Compare 2 *Thess.* i. 9. Notwithstanding God dwelt in the thick darkness, such a glory attended his presence, as was too great for men to bear: *Exod.* xl. 35. 2 *Chron.* v. 14. vii. 2. Perhaps this brightness is therefore mentioned, to prevent our thinking that nothing was to be perceived but darkness. The brightness was such as could burst through the thickest clouds, and make them discharge hail and fire. The *them* in the last of these verses, whom he *scattered and discomfited*, are the ungodly men mentioned *ver.* 3. or those enemies of whose overthrow he treats afterwards in the song.

As this and some other parallel prophecies seem plainly to point at the vengeance of God against the wicked *Jews*, which need not be thought confined to what befel them under the empire of *Vespasian*, it may not be improper, for an illustration of some of the expressions, to refer the reader to the account which *Ammianus Marcellinus*, in the beginning of his twenty-third book, gives of the signal providence of God in hindering the *Jews* from rebuilding their temple at *Jerusalem*, when the emperor *Julian* set them about it, giving order to his officers to assist them in it, and resolving to spare no cost for the accomplishing it. When they had such incourage-

couragement, that writer thus relates the iſſue: *Metuendi globi flammarum prope fundamenta crebris aſſultibus erumpentes, fecere locum, exuſtis aliquoties operantibus, inacceſſum: hocq; modo elemento deſtinatius repellente, ceſſavit inceptum.* "Dreadful balls "of fire frequently breaking out about the foundation, rendered "the place inacceſſible; ſeveral of the workmen having been "burnt to death: and by this means the enterprize was laid aſide, "that element of fire obſtinately hindring it." Such a teſtimony from an enemy of chriſtianity, and a zealous advocate of his maſter *Julian*, whom he ſerved, is very remarkable, and confirms the accounts given by eccleſiaſtical writers, whether hiſtorians or others, which would otherwiſe be ſuſpected.

Herewith we ſhould compare *Pſal.* xcvii. 3, 4. *A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about him. His lightnings inlightned the world; the earth ſaw, and trembled.* And remarkable is *Ezekiel*'s account of the *cherubim*, Chap. i. 4, 13, 14. Some may think this is ſufficient to account for the expreſſions in the pſalm, that an appearance of the *Shechinah* is related, and that the deſcription of it is made in the uſual manner. But it is manifeſt that here ſome ſore judgment is repreſented as attending that appearance: and therefore it ſeems neceſſary to look a little farther. Some then may imagine, that the terms by which this ſore judgment is ſet forth, are borrowed from a remarkable and well known vengeance, which God had formerly taken; ſuch, for inſtance, as that which befel the *Egyptians*, Exod. ix. 23, 24. Moſes *ſtretch'd forth his rod toward heaven, and the Lord ſent* thunder *and* hail, *and the* fire *ran along upon the ground*; *and the Lord rained* hail *upon the land of* Egypt. *So there was* hail, *and* fire *mingled with the* hail, *very grievous.* And the rather may this judgment ſeem to be ſingled out, becauſe of the manner in which the pſalmiſt deſcribes the execution of it, *Pſal.* lxxviii. 47——49. *He deſtroyed their vines with* hail, *their ſycomore-trees with froſt. He gave up their cattle alſo to the* hail, *and their flocks to* hot thunderbolts. *He caſt upon them the fierceneſs of his anger, wrath and indignation, and trouble, by ſending* evil angels *among them. Evil angels* indeed cannot be ſuppoſed to bear any part in the *Shechinah*; and therefore were there a neceſſity of keeping to our tranſlation, this place would be here very improperly produced. But it is to be obſerved, that the expreſſion in the *Hebrew* is, *angels of evils*, that is, angels who inflicted evils and miſeries upon the *Egyptians*;

which may very well be ſuppoſed to be done by angels who were good in themſelves.

I might wave the making any particular application of the paſſages in the pſalm, to the great event, to which they are ſuppoſed to refer, becauſe the foregoing conſiderations may be thought ſufficient to account for them: but that the accompliſhment may appear more exact and full, I ſhall take notice of what occurs with reference to them.

I find not indeed any expreſs mention of the *hail* in *Joſephus*: but it may very reaſonably be thought included in the paſſage I have already cited out of him, wherein he relates the dreadful ſtorm that fell upon them. And if I indeavour to confirm this by the prophecy of *Iſaiah*, I am perſuaded I ſhall incur cenſure only from thoſe who are averſe to the allowing almoſt any of the prophecies of the old teſtament to relate to Chriſt. The place of *Iſaiah* to which I now refer, is *Chap.* xxviii. and that it relates to *Jeruſalem*, is certain from *ver.* 14. *Hear the word of the Lord, ye ſcornful men that rule this people, which is in* Jeruſalem. And that the threatning was to be executed after our Saviour's reſurrection, appears by the way in which it is brought in, or by what is joined with it, *ver.* 16, 17. *Therefore thus ſaith the Lord God, Behold I lay in* Sion *for a foundation a ſtone, a tried ſtone, a precious corner ſtone, a ſure foundation: he that believeth ſhall not make haſte* [or *be aſhamed.*] *Judgment alſo will I lay to the line, and righteouſneſs to the plummet, and the* hail *ſhall ſweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters ſhall overflow the hiding place,* ver. 21. *For the Lord ſhall riſe up as in mount* Perazim; *he ſhall be wroth, as in the valley of* Gibeon; *that he may do his work, his ſtrange work, and bring to paſs his act, his ſtrange act.* The expreſs mention made in this prophecy of the *hail*, and the comparing the judgment with that in the valley of *Gibeon*, lead us to conſider the account given of what was done there, *Joſh.* x. 11. *The Lord caſt down* great ſtones *from heaven upon them* [the *Amorites*] *unto* Azekah, *and they died: they were more which died with* hailſtones, *than they whom the children of* Iſrael *ſlew with the ſword.*

But as to the other things we here meet with in the pſalm, *viz.* The *brightneſs*, *ſmoke*, *fire*, *coals of fire*, and the *lightnings*, there ſeems to be ſomewhat remarkable in *Joſephus*'s account, which may be look'd upon as a literal fulfilment. He tells us, *Lib.* vii.

de

de Bello Jud. c. 32. *ſive* 13. " The temple and all the places " round about were on fire." And, *c.* 34. *ſive* 13. he brings in *Titus* thus beſpeaking the *Jews*: " When I got near to the temple, " I on purpoſe neglected the laws of war, and exhorted you to " ſpare your own holy things, and to preſerve to your ſelves your " temple, and gave you liberty to depart, with a promiſe of " ſafety; or if you reſolved upon fighting, I gave you an oppor- " tunity for it in another place. You deſpiſed all theſe things, " and with your own hands ſet fire to the temple." Again: It appears that *Titus*, as he aſſured the *Jews*, was deſirous of preſerving the temple, whether they would or no, *Lib.* vii. *c.* 10. *ſive* 4. And when his officers urged the neceſſity of burning it, he declared he would not burn ſuch a ſtructure, *c.* 24. *ſive* 9. *Joſephus* therefore ſpeaks of the burning of it as decreed by God, and makes the *Jews* themſelves the authors and cauſes of it. And when it was actually on fire, *Titus* ran preſently to the temple, to hinder the burning of it, and called and beckoned to the ſoldiers to extinguiſh it; but all was in vain, *Ib.* c. 26. Many more places are to be met with in *Joſephus*, to the ſame purpoſe, concerning the burning of the city, as well as the temple. Nor may it be improper here to mention what he ſays, *c.* 31. *ſive* 12. " That a ſtar, like a ſword, ſtood over the city, *or* a comet con- " tinued to appear for a year together:" [Theſe are underſtood by ſome to be two diſtinct things, agreeably to the words of *Joſephus* in our preſent editions; but according to the citations of *Nicephorus Calliſtus*, and others, they ſeem to be the ſame] " and that before the revolt of the *Jews*, and the beginning of " the war, when the people were met at the feaſt of unlea- " vened bread, the eighth of *April*, at nine o'clock at night, " there ſhined ſuch a light about the altar and the temple, as " though it were broad day; and this continued for the ſpace of " half an hour."

It follows, *ver.* 15. of the pſalm, *Then the chanels of waters* [or as in *Samuel*, *The chanels of the ſea*] *were ſeen, and the foundations of the world were diſcovered*, &c. which is, I imagine, deſigned to ſet forth a violent tempeſt, that ſo parts the waters, as to give an opportunity of ſeeing to the bottom of the ſea. I think there is the more reaſon for thus interpreting this verſe, becauſe of what our Lord ſays in foretelling the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, Luke xxi. 25. *And there ſhall be ſigns in the ſun, and in*

the moon, and in the ſtars; and upon earth diſtreſs of nations, with perplexity, the ſea *and the* waves *roaring.* So that the words of Chriſt in the pſalm, and in the goſpels, agree, repreſenting that calamity, as attended with a great confuſion and diſorder in the courſe of nature.

I omit to treat particularly of the following verſes, down to the 29th, becauſe, from what has been ſaid already, the application of them all to our Saviour will be eaſily made, excepting one which I ſhall hereafter have occaſion to conſider as an objection.

Ver. 29. *For by thee I have run through a troop: and by my God have I leaped over a wall.* From this verſe down to the 43d, he ſeems to me to ſpeak particularly of the vengeance he took on the wicked *Jews*, his enemies. That which has probably made many the more backward to perceive this, has been a perſuaſion that ſuch expreſſions of dependance upon God, and the aſcribing his victory and ſucceſs to God, well fitted *David*, but were not ſuitable to our exalted Redeemer. But ſuch would do well to conſider, that this perfectly agrees with the ſcripture account, though it may not with their ſyſtems. It was God the Father who gave him all his power, and *ſet him far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but in that which is to come, and put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church*, Eph. i. 21, 22. It was he who was to make his enemies his footſtool, *Pſal.* cx. 1. and to give him power to ſubdue them, *Pſal.* ii. 4——8. to omit the naming many other places.

By his *runing through a troop*, I ſuppoſe is meant his overthrowing the *Jewiſh* army; but in his leaping over a wall, we may well underſtand the taking *Jeruſalem* by the *Romans*. A man muſt be a ſtranger to the ſtile of the ſcripture, that ſees any difficulty in Chriſt's ſpeaking of this as his doing, becauſe it was done immediately by the *Romans*. Nothing is commoner than to ſpeak of a thing as done by him who is the grand director and cauſe of its being done. Thus *Matt.* xxii. 7. *When the king heard thereof, he was wroth, and ſent forth his armies, and* deſtroy'd *thoſe murderers, and* burnt up *their city.* Though the armies were the inſtruments, yet the *king* is ſaid to deſtroy them, and burn up their city. The *Romans* were God's armies, and the executioners of his vengeance; and Chriſt being impowered by God, may be ſaid to do what they did in puniſhing the *Jews*. And this paſſage had

had a remarkable fulfilment at the taking of *Jerusalem*. The city was fenced all round with three walls, one within another, except where it was secured by deep valleys. These the *Romans* were forced to break through, though they were stoutly defended by the *Jews*. The account of the particulars is too long to be here inserted; but it may be seen in *Josephus*, *lib.* vi. *de Bello Jud.* c. 16. *sive* 7. and several of the following chapters.

I shall therefore only take notice of a few passages he has, *c.* 42, 43. *sive c.* 16. "When the rampart round the city was finished, "on the seventh of *September*, the *Romans* brought their engines. "Some of the seditious, who now despaired of the cities being "preserv'd, forsook the wall, and retired to *Acra*; others of "them got down into jakes, and many of a contrary mind hin- "dred those who brought the battering rams: but the *Romans* "out-did these, both in numbers and strength; and above all, as "they were in good heart, while the others were dispirited and "feeble. But as soon as a breach was made in any part of the "wall, and any of the towers were beat down by the battering "rams, the defenders presently fled, and a greater fear than there "was occasion for seized the tyrants, *viz. Simon* and *John*: for "before their enemies could mount the breach they were in a "consternation, and desirous to flee.——One may here especially "discern the power of God, manifested against wicked men, and "the good fortune of the *Romans*. The tyrants deprived them- "selves of their best defences, voluntarily quitting those towers, "wherein they could never be taken by force, but only by fa- "mine. But the *Romans*, who had taken so much pains about "the weaker walls, now obtained that by fortune which they "could not by their engines: For the three towers, whereof I "spoke before, were too strong for all their engines: But the ty- "rants forsaking these, or rather being driven out from them by "God, fled to the valley of *Siloam*.——On the eighth of *Sep-* "*tember*, when *Titus* entred the city, and admired, among other "things, the fortifications and towers, he said, We have fought "with God on our side; and it was God, who withdrew the "*Jews* from these strong holds; for what could the hands of "men, or engines, do against these?" Which words sound like a comment upon the words of the psalm, *By my God I have leaped over a wall.*

When

When in the pſalm, *ver.* 33. it is ſaid, *He maketh my feet like hinds feet*; the meaning probably is, that he gives me to be ſwift and ſpeedy in performing my deſigns: and when 'tis added, *he ſetteth me upon my high places*; I ſuppoſe the ſenſe is, he diſlodges my enemies and gives me to poſſeſs, and according to my pleaſure to diſpoſe of, thoſe places of ſtrength and renown, which anciently belonged to me, ſuch as *Jeruſalem.* The *high places* of any country in ſcripture-language being the capital cities, or thoſe forteſſes, on the ſtrength of which they chiefly depended for defence and ſafety againſt their enemies. The high places of the *Jews*, our Saviour may be underſtood to call *his*, as he had been all along their king and protector.

Ver. 34. *He teacheth my hands to war, ſo that a bow of ſteel is broken by my arms.* קשת being commonly at leaſt feminine, the reading in the pſalm ונחתה is to be prefer'd to the other in *Samuel*, ונחת. A learned commentator obſerves upon this, "That "if *David* was able to break a bow of ſteel, he muſt have been "a very ſtrong man; otherwiſe the expreſſion muſt be hyper-"bolical." But, with ſubmiſſion, it is hardly to be thought that the expreſſion relates to that matter. The other part of the verſe leads us to conſider this as a thing done in *war*, or in *battel*, and that though we ſhould render the ו barely by *and*, inſtead of our *ſo that*. Now it is not to be ſuppoſed, that *David* in battel would try the ſtrength of his arms in breaking bows: and therefore I take this to be a proverbial kind of ſpeech, ſignifying the defeating of a well-armed warrior or hoſt. Compare *Pſal.* xxxvii. 15. xlvi. 9. *Jerem.* xlix. 35. li. 56. *Hoſ.* i. 5. ii. 18. *Zech.* ix. 10. 1 *Sam.* ii. 4.

The LXX. and the *Vulg. Latin* render it both here, and in *Samuel*, *a bow of braſs*, or *copper*, which is the proper ſignification of נחושה; and, for ought I ſee, we might have kept to that rendring. I know ſome allege that this metal is too ſoft for the uſe. But the ancients had a way of hardning it, and making it fit for ſuch uſes. Neceſſity, the mother of invention, had taught them to find out this before iron was in uſe among them. So *Heſiod*, lib. i. *Oper. & Dier.* ver. 149.

Τοῖς δ' ἦν χάλκεα μὲν τεύχεα, χάλκεοι δὲ τε δῖκοι,
Χαλκῷ δ' ἐργάζοντο, μέλας δ' οὐκ ἔσκε σίδηρος.

They had braſs weapons, and braſs houſes: They worked with braſs, nor was there any black iron. And if they could harden braſs ſo as to make it fit for a ſword, ſpear, or ax; why might they not alſo make bows of it? Nothing is more common in *Heſiod's Scut. Herc.* than to ſpeak of *brazen* weapons; and the ſame is to be met with in *Homer*. See *Iliad.* N. *ver.* 611. *Oduſſ.* A. *ver.* 100. and many other places.

Ver. 41. *They cried, but there was none to ſave them: even unto the Lord, but he anſwered them not.* There can be no doubt that this reading is preferable to that in *Samuel, They looked, but,* &c. for the Lord's not anſwering, mentioned in the latter part of the verſe, ſhows that ſome ſuch word as *crying*, or *calling* upon the Lord, had been uſed before. But the reaſon of my taking particular notice of this paſſage, is becauſe I think it very much confirms the way in which St. *Paul* underſtood the pſalm, as relating to Chriſt, and ſpoken by him. Nor do I ſee how we can well interpret this concerning *David*. The verſe is to be conſidered, together with thoſe among which it ſtands, as relating to the enemies whom the ſpeaker *purſued, overtook*, and from whom *he turned not till they were conſumed*, whom he *wounded that they were not able to riſe*, and who were *fallen under his feet*, whoſe *necks God had given to him, that he might deſtroy them* as the *haters of him*, whom he did *beat ſmall as the duſt before the wind*, and whom he *caſt out as the dirt in the ſtreets*, ver. 37, 38, 40, 42. Now to what victory over *David*'s enemies can we apply theſe things? Certainly not to the death and overthrow of *Saul*, which was not accompliſh'd by *David*, but by the *Philiſtines*: beſides, that was the ſubject of his lamentation, and not of his triumph: nor can this be well applied to any victory *David* gained over any of the children of *Iſrael*, who oppoſed him, or over ſuch as rebelled againſt him; becauſe it does not appear that he ever waged war againſt theſe with any deſign utterly to deſtroy them; nor would this have been much matter of triumph to ſo wiſe a governor, if he had accompliſhed it, and cut off ſo many of his own ſubjects. The only enemies therefore that are left to be the ſubject of his triumphant ſong, muſt be the heathen enemies round about him, with whom he waged war, and whom he ſubdued: but neither can theſe be meant, becauſe it is here ſo expreſly ſaid of theſe enemies, that they *cried unto the Lord* [unto Jehovah] namely,

to ſave them; which unqueſtionably cannot be true of the heathen nations, with whom he fought, who would in their diſtreſs call upon their own reſpective Gods, and not upon *Jehovah*, to ſave them. But nothing can be more exact than this, if we underſtand it as ſpoken by Chriſt, concerning the wicked *Jews*, whom he deſtroyed. The ſoreneſs of the calamity every way anſwers to the expreſſions here uſed; and eſpecially does the character of the *Jews* agree with what is here ſaid: for ſo infatuated were they under the moſt fearful and tremendous judgments, that nothing to the laſt could drive them from their confidence in God, that he would yet ſave them, and preſerve their temple. Remarkable is the paſſage we have to this purpoſe in *Joſephus*, *lib.* vii. *c.* 30. *ſive* 11. where, after he had related the deſtruction of about ſix thouſand, who had fled to one of the porches of the temple, he goes on thus: "The cauſe of their deſtruction was a certain "falſe prophet, who had preached to them in the city that day, "that God commanded them to aſcend into the temple, to re-"ceive the ſigns of their deliverance. For many falſe prophets "were then ſuborned by the tyrants to declare to the people that "they were to expect help from God, that ſo they might not go "over to the *Romans*; and that hope might retain thoſe who "were deſperate and ungovernable." By which account it is evident that theſe wretches had, at that very time, a ſtrong confidence in the Lord, that he would deliver them.

I am perſuaded the arguments hitherto uſed from the pſalm, to ſhow that it is to be underſtood as ſpoken in the perſon of Chriſt, and not of *David*, will not eaſily be evaded. In the laſt part of it, from *ver.* 43. to the end, it is chiefly taken up about the heathen; in which, though there are ſome paſſages which would without violence bear to be applied to *David*, there are others that ſeem hardly capable of being adapted to the hiſtory of him, or at leaſt they are not applicable to him, in the moſt full and abſolute ſenſe in which the expreſſions ſeem to be uſed: but there are none that I can perceive have any difficulty, when underſtood as uſed by Chriſt, except it be ſuch a difficulty as may perhaps ariſe from the doubtful ſenſe of an *Hebrew* word or phraſe. Let us briefly run over ſome of them.

Ver. 43. *Thou haſt delivered me from the ſtrivings of the people, and thou haſt made me the head of the heathen:* The *people* here ſeem to be contradiſtinguiſhed to the *heathen*, and ſo

to

to import the *Jews*. And though God had ſaid, *The ſword ſhall never depart from thy houſe—Behold, I will raiſe up evil againſt thee out of thine own houſe*, 2 Sam. xii. 10, 11. and it is manifeſt, he was not fully delivered from the evil out of his own houſe, and from the ſtrivings of the people on that occaſion, ſince he left them ſtriving about *Adonijah*, and that ſtrife was not fully ended till after his death, and ſo this may be thought not ſo well to ſuit the title of the pſalm, which ſeems to ſpeak of the moſt compleat and abſolute deliverance from all enemies; yet let it be granted that the expreſſion might only relate to ſeveral deliverances God had given him, from the ſtrivings of his own people: what ſhall we then make of the next ſentence, *Thou haſt made me the head of the heathen*, or of the *nations*? Does this alſo belong to *David*, in ſo abſolute and unlimited a ſenſe as the expreſſion ſeems to carry in it? We read indeed of *David*'s ſubduing ſome few of his heathen neighbours, the *Philiſtines*, *Moabites*, the king of *Zobah*, the *Syrians*, and *Edomites*: but how inconſiderable were theſe, in compariſon of the vaſt number of heathen countries over whom he had not the leaſt power! It is therefore hardly ſuppoſable, that for the ſake of theſe few he would ſpeak of himſelf as made the *head of the heathen*, in ſo general and abſolute a ſtile. But nothing could be more proper, than for Chriſt to ſpeak thus of himſelf, as made the *head of the heathen*, without limitation or exception; ſince he has *all power in earth* given to him, and *all things are put under his feet*, and he is become the *head over all things to the church*. But, perhaps, paſſages out of the old teſtament will be thought by ſome to be more pertinent. Who then but Chriſt was *David*'s Lord, to whom Jehovah ſaid, *Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footſtool*; and who was to *judge among the heathen*? Pſal. cx. 1, 6. This expreſſion of *judging among the heathen*, is taken up by the prophets, *Iſa.* ii. 4. *Mic.* iv. 3. Compare alſo *Iſa.* xlix. 6, 7. And again, *Pſal.* ii. 8. *Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermoſt parts of the earth for thy poſſeſſion.* Which paſſage, and indeed the whole pſalm, all the ancient *Jews* underſtood of the king Meſſiah, as *David Kimchi*, who pretends to go another way, is forced to confeſs. Theſe texts, with many more which might eaſily be alleged, manifeſtly ſpeak of Chriſt as the *head of the heathen*, and ſo juſtify our applying this paſſage in the pſalm to him.

It follows, in the same verse, *A people whom I have not known shall serve me.* A strange expression! if supposed to be spoken by *David* in his own person, at the time when he was just leaving the world, as this song must be composed at that time, according to the place in which it is set in his history, 2 *Sam.* xxii. But what could be more proper language than this, supposing it spoken in the person of our Redeemer? There seems to be an accuracy in this place in the *Hebrew*, which has been overlooked. It is common to speak of the *heathen* in the plural number, and to call them *peoples*; whereas here they are spoken of in the singular, which may refer to the state they should be brought into, they being all, of whatsoever nation, joined to God's people, and making one people with them, without distinction of *Greek, Jew, Scythian*, or *Barbarian*: To which purpose are the words of God, *Hos.* ii. 23. *I will say unto them which were not my people, thou art my people; and they shall say, thou art my God.* Compare *Rom.* ix. 26. 1 *Pet.* ii. 10. And especially let this expression in the psalm be compared with *Isa.* lv. 3——5. which must certainly belong to Christ. *And I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of* David. *Behold, I have given him* [*David*, certainly not *David* the son of *Jesse*, who was dead long before, but Christ, or the mystical *David*] *for a witness to the people, for a leader and commander to the people. Behold, thou* [turning the discourse to this *David* just mentioned] *shalt call a nation that thou* knowest not, and *nations that* knew not thee *shall run unto thee, because of the Lord thy God, and for the Holy One of* Israel; *for he hath glorified thee.* And is it not reasonable to understand the expressions in the prophet, and in the psalm, to relate to the same matter?

The two next verses, 44, 45. are obscure, by reason of the doubtfulness of the signification of some of the terms. *As soon as they hear of me, they shall obey me; the strangers shall submit themselves to me.* The former clause, according to this situation in the psalm, refers to the people he had not known: but the parts of the verse are transposed in *Samuel*, and stand thus; *strangers shall submit themselves unto me; as soon as they hear, they shall be obedient unto me.* The difference in that respect is not material: for the *strangers*, or the *sons of the stranger*, as our margin literally renders the *Hebrew*, are the same with the *people he knew not.* But there is some doubt of the meaning of the verb יכחשו; or, as it is in *Samuel*,

Samuel, יתכחשו whether that ſhould be rendred, *ſhall ſubmit* or *humble themſelves*, or, according to our margin, *ſhall yield feigned obedience*. If the former rendring be prefer'd, the ſenſe is, the heathens ſhall gladly ſubject themſelves to my government; if the latter, the meaning will be, that ſuch heathen as care not to be ſubject to me, ſhall diſſemble and pretend to ſubmit to me, being ſtruck with the terror of my name. The former ſenſe pleaſes me beſt, becauſe it is joined in the ſame verſe with *obeying* him, where the word does not imply any diſſimulation. Underſtanding the words thus as ſpoken by Chriſt, here will be foretold the great number of converts or proſelytes he ſhould have from among the ſons of the ſtranger, or of the heathen. Compare *Iſa.* lvi. 3, 6, 7. This increaſe of his ſubjects was not brought about by war and bloodſhed, but by the bare report made of him; *as ſoon as they hear of me*, or as our margin *verbatim* renders it, *at the hearing of the ear*. I queſtion whether the hiſtory of *David* will help us to account for ſuch an application of the words to him. But as the word may be taken in the other ſenſe, and the next verſe may ſeem to favour it, I don't lay any great ſtreſs upon this paſſage. It follows, *ver.* 45. *The ſtrangers ſhall fadē away, and be afraid out of their cloſe places.* This verſe, to whomſoever it belongs, ſeems to be more obſcure than any other in the pſalm. See Dr. *Hammond* in loc. and Mr. *Le Clerc* on 2 *Sam.* xxii. 46. If the reading of the pſalm be kept to, and we render it thus, *the ſtrangers ſhall fade away, and be afraid becauſe of their priſons*, it may be underſtood to carry in it what our Lord ſays, *Matth.* xxiv. 12. *Becauſe iniquity* [that is, *perſecution*] *ſhall abound, the love of many ſhall wax cold.*

The reſt of the expreſſions of the pſalm are not difficult, and therefore I forbear to mention them. I cannot here but obſerve that they who expound the pſalm of *David*, are forced to ſuppoſe it had a farther reference to Chriſt. See Dr. *Hammond*'s paraphraſe upon the laſt verſe. His laſt note upon the pſalm deſerves to be tranſcribed. "That this laſt paſſage, *ſays he*, of the pſalm, which "is *prophetical*, and extended beyond the perſon of *David*, *to his* "*ſeed for evermore*, is to be applied to the *Meſſias*, may be con- "firmed from ſeveral places of the *Chaldee paraphraſe* on this "pſalm, eſpecially on *ver.* 29, and 32. On the 29th verſe they "have theſe words: *Becauſe thou ſhalt inlighten the lamp of* Iſrael, "*which is put out in the captivity; for thou art the author of the*

" *light of* Iſrael. *The Lord my God ſhall lead me out of darkneſs into*
" *light, ſhall make me ſee the conſolation of the age which ſhall come*
" *to the juſt.* And on *ver.* 32. *Becauſe for the miracle and re-*
" *demption which thou ſhalt ſhew* למשיחך *to thy Chriſt, and to*
" *the reliques of the people which ſhall remain, all the people, nations,*
" *and languages, ſhall give praiſes to thee,* &c. And, *ver.* 49. *Thou*
" *ſhalt reſcue me from* Gog——by whom the *Jews* are wont to
" deſcribe *Antichriſt.*" See alſo Dr. *Whitby* on *Rom.* xv. 9. I can't ſee why this obſervation ſhould not have led them farther, even to apply the whole pſalm to him, as ſome of the ancients were inclined to do, who to avoid the difficulty ariſing from the title, imagined that by *Saul* was there meant the Devil. But concerning that difficulty I ſhall treat preſently.

I ſhall now conſider the objections which may be made againſt ſuch an explication of the pſalm. And, *Firſt*, The 23d verſe may be thought to be a ſtrong objection, *I was alſo upright before him: and I kept my ſelf from mine iniquity.* Many will be ready to ſay, ſuch words can't be ſuppoſed to proceed from our Redeemer, who was free from the leaſt inclination to ſin, and therefore could not call any iniquity *his iniquity.*

Two things may be returned, by way of anſwer to this objection.

Firſt, Suppoſing the word מעוני to be well render'd *from mine iniquity*, it is not to be underſtood as though he had any inclination to it, but it is only called *his* upon the account of his being ſtrongly tempted to it. However impoſſible it was for Chriſt to commit iniquity, yet he was capable of being tempted to it. *Heb.* iv. 15. *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. And if there is any neceſſity of underſtanding the term, uſed in its moſt proper ſenſe, to ſignify *iniquity*, we may by comparing *Iſa.* liii. 9. with St. *Peter*'s citation of it, 1 *Pet.* ii. 22. learn what that iniquity was to which he was tempted, and which upon that account he may be thought to call *his iniquity.* In the prophet the words run thus, *He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.* The inhuman and barbarous treatment he met with, was a temptation to him to uſe *violence* in his own defence, and to take immediate vengeance on his enemies; which would have been *iniquity* in him, it being contrary to the deſign upon which he was ſent into the world,

viz.

viz. to *ſave mens lives, and not to deſtroy them.* But whatever the temptation was, he did no *violence*, as the *Hebrew* word חמס properly ſignifies. St. *Peter* in his citation has ſo far followed the LXX. as to render it ἁμαρτίαν, *ſin:* but that he underſtood that general term *ſin*, particularly to refer to this of uſing *violence*, is evident by the manner in which he brings in this paſſage, *ver.* 20——23. *What glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for your faults ye ſhall take it patiently? But if when ye do well, and ſuffer for it,* ye take *it* patiently; *this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called: becauſe Chriſt alſo ſuffered for us* [viz. *patiently*, according to what follows] *leaving us an example, that ye ſhould follow his ſteps: who did no ſin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who when he was reviled,* reviled *not again; when he ſuffered he* threatned *not, but commited himſelf to him that judgeth righteouſly.* But,

Secondly, We may ſolve this objection, by alleging that it is not neceſſary to make the word here ſignify *iniquity.* That is indeed the firſt and moſt famous ſenſe of it, according to its etymology: but as the deſert and conſequence of iniquity is puniſhment, miſery, or calamity; ſo this word is often uſed to denote barely the effect, puniſhment, or in general any calamity or miſchief. 'Tis render'd ſeveral times by our tranſlators to this purpoſe, and perhaps ought to be more frequently than it is. Thus *Gen.* iv. 13. *My* puniſhment *is greater than I can bear.* 1 *Sam.* xxviii. 10. *As the Lord liveth, there ſhall no* puniſhment *happen to thee for this thing.* 2 *Kings* vii. 9. *If we tarry till the morning-light, ſome* miſchief *will come upon us. Iſa.* liii. 6. *The Lord hath laid on him the* iniquity [ſurely nothing but the *puniſhment* of the iniquity] *of us all.* And, *ver.* 11. *He ſhall bear their* iniquities, that is, the *puniſhment* of them. I will add one paſſage more, which I take to be home to my purpoſe, it being ſpoken in the perſon of Chriſt. The ſame perſon who *Pſal.* xl. 6. ſays, *ſacrifice and offering thou didſt not deſire, a body haſt thou prepared me*, &c. which is applied to Chriſt, *Heb.* x. 5. and indeed cannot be applied to any other; I ſay, this ſame perſon, at *ver.* 12. of the pſalm, thus inforces his plea: *For innumerable* evils *have compaſſed me about,* mine iniquities *have taken hold upon me, ſo that I am not able to look up: they are more than the hairs of my head, therefore my heart faileth me.* Mine *iniquities*, that is, my *troubles* or *afflictions*; the ſame as *evils* in the foregoing clauſe. If we underſtand the word

word thus in *Pſal.* xviii. 23. the verſe may be rendred, *I was alſo upright before him, that I might be kept from my trouble.* Or elſe, *I was alſo upright before him, therefore was I kept from my trouble. Therefore* [or *And*] *the Lord hath recompenſed me according to my righteouſneſs.* It being the ſame copulative ו in both places, it may as well be rendred *therefore* in *ver.* 23. as it is by our tranſlators *ver.* 24. If we thus underſtand the place, it will anſwer to our marginal rendring of *Heb.* v. 7. *Who in the days of his fleſh, when he had offered up prayers and ſupplications, with ſtrong crying and tears, unto him that was able to ſave him from death, and was* heard for his piety. I think therefore this objection need not prevent our applying the pſalm intirely to Chriſt.

Secondly, The only objection that remains needful to be cleared, is what is taken from the title of the pſalm; and that muſt be owned to carry in it the greateſt difficulty of all. It runs thus: *To the chief muſician.* A pſalm *of* David *the ſervant of the Lord, who ſpake unto the Lord the words of this ſong, in the day that the Lord delivered him from the hand of all his enemies, and from the hand of* Saul. The title therefore, it may be ſaid, expreſly attributes the pſalm to *David,* and that upon ſuch a particular occaſion as may ſeem peculiarly to ſuit him; David *ſpake the words of this ſong in the day the Lord delivered him,* &c. And this may ſeem very much ſtrengthned by the expreſs naming of *Saul,* who was one of *David*'s enemies, and the chief of them while he lived; *In the day the Lord delivered him from the hand of all his enemies, and from the hand of* Saul. And that nothing of the ſtrength of this objection may be concealed, it is farther to be obſerved, that no help is here to be had from the LXX. or the *Vulg. Latin,* they both perfectly agreeing with the *Hebrew,* excepting only that the preſent copies of the LXX. corruptly read ἀ for ὃς. Nor will it here ſignify any thing to call in queſtion the authority of the titles of the pſalms: for if that ſhould be deny'd, the difficulty will be ſtill the ſame, becauſe we have 2 *Sam.* xxii. a preface to the ſong, which is for ſubſtance the ſame with this title. *And* David *ſpake unto the Lord the words of this ſong, in the day that the Lord delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies, and out of the hand of* Saul.

Now however ſtrong the objection may ſeem, yet the ſtrain of the ſong does ſo manifeſtly ſuit our Lord Chriſt, that the *Syriac* inter-

interpreters did not ſtick to attribute it to him. For though in *Samuel* they have the ſame preface with the *Hebrew*, yet the title they give to *Pſal.* xviii. is, *Of* David. *A thankſgiving, and concerning the aſcenſion of Chriſt.* And the like conviction had ſeveral of the fathers from the nature of the pſalm, though it muſt be own'd they were ſorely at a loſs to account for the title. The difficulties are two, and ariſe from the two names here mentioned, *David* and *Saul:* and I ſhall conſider them diſtinctly.

The former of theſe difficulties would not alone be of any great ſtrength, becauſe it is notorious that Chriſt is frequently called by the name of *David*, in the prophecies of the old teſtament. What doubt can be made of this, ſince it appears that God foretels that *David* ſhould be the king of *Iſrael*, by thoſe prophets who lived a long time after *David*'s death? Let me mention a few of theſe, which are too plain to need a comment. *Hoſ.* iii. 5. *Afterward ſhall the children of* Iſrael *return and ſeek the Lord their God, and* DAVID *their king, and ſhall fear the Lord and his goodneſs in the latter days.* Again: *Jerem.* xxx. 9. *They ſhall ſerve the Lord their God, and* DAVID *their king, whom I will raiſe up unto them.* Again: *Ezek.* xxxiv. 23, 24. *I will ſet up one ſhepherd over them, and he ſhall feed them, even my ſervant* DAVID: *he ſhall feed them, and he ſhall be their ſhepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my ſervant* DAVID *a prince among them: I the Lord have ſpoken it.* Again: *Chap.* xxxvii. 24, 25. DAVID *my ſervant ſhall be king over them——and my ſervant* DAVID *ſhall be their prince for ever.* It is manifeſt theſe prophets, who all of them lived ſeveral ages after *David*'s death, muſt be underſtood to ſpeak not of the ſon of *Jeſſe*, but of ſome other king, under the name of *David.* And certainly it will be a very odd humour for men to apply their words to any other perſon than Chriſt, as though God could not as well foretel by his prophets the reign of Chriſt, as of any other king. And particularly it will be hard to find out any other king beſide Chriſt, who was foretold by *Ezekiel* and *Jeremiah*, who propheſied at the time when the regal government expired in *Judah.* Theſe texts are all very plain and full; nor can there be much doubt about that, *Iſa.* lv. 3, 4. *I will make an everlaſting covenant with you, even the ſure mercies of* DAVID. *Behold I have given* HIM [*David*] *for a witneſs to the people, a leader and commander to the people.* Nor is it at all unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that the like language might be uſed

by the writers of the pſalms, who were moved by the ſame ſpirit with thoſe prophets. I thus underſtand *Pſal.* lxxxix. 20. *I have found* DAVID *my ſervant: with my holy oil I have anointed him.* Let the preceding and following verſes be compared with 2 *Sam.* vii. 1 *Chron.* xvii.

This then being the ſtile of the prophetick writings, the reaſons before alleged may well incline us to allow that the name *David* is thus uſed in the title of this pſalm. Nor will that be a material objection, as ſome may perhaps imagine, that *David* is here called the *ſervant of the Lord:* it is ſufficient to refer ſuch as need ſatisfaction in this point, to the places juſt now mentioned; which unqueſtionably relate to Chriſt; particularly to *Ezek.* xxxiv. 23, 24. xxxvii. 24, 25. and to many other places in *Iſaiah*, where God calls him his *ſervant*.

I come now to the laſt and chief difficulty of all, which ariſes from the mention made of *Saul*. And after all that has been ſaid, if our rendring, which is agreed to by all verſions, be acknowledged to be juſt and true, and there be a neceſſity of reading *in the day the Lord delivered him from the hand of all his enemies, and from the hand of* Saul, we muſt give up all the reaſons that can be urged for applying the pſalm to any other than the ſon of *Jeſſe*.

But I would obſerve to the reader, that the paſſage, when thus underſtood, ſeems a little odly expreſs'd. Had it been ſaid, *In the day the Lord delivered him from the hand of* Saul, *and from the hand of all his enemies*, it would have been more agreeable to the hiſtory of the literal *David:* for *Saul* was the firſt of his enemies, and cut off ſooneſt; whereas one would think, as the words now run, his deliverance out of the hand of all his enemies, was compleated by his deliverance out of the hand of *Saul*. Nor does it appear likely, as has been obſerved, that *David* would triumph over his death by ſuch a ſong. Had he repreſented God as riding upon a cherub and flying, *&c.* that is, as ſo illuſtriouſly appearing againſt *Saul*, and taking part with the *Philiſtines*, by whom *Saul* was overcome, he would have given greater occaſion to the *daughters of the* Philiſtines *to rejoice, and to the daughters of the uncircumciſed to triumph*, than they really imagined they had. See 2 *Sam.* i. 20.

Theſe things, with what has been obſerved concerning ſeveral paſſages in the pſalm, make it ſeem to me very probable, I had

 almoſt

almoſt ſaid certain, that we at preſent, as well as all the interpreters we have, read the *Hebrew* wrong. I am far from incouraging a bold liberty of criticiſing upon the ſacred text: but when all difficulties can be removed without the change of one ſingle letter of the *Hebrew*, by only making a light alteration of the points affixed to the letters, the original and authority of which points is generally now judged by learned men to be human and not divine, or to ſay the leaſt, their authority is very doubtful, and a miſtake in tranſcribing them is eaſily committed; I ſay ſuch an alteration may well be allowed as neceſſary.

I think therefore we are to read שְׁאוֹל *the grave*, inſtead of שָׁאוּל *Saul*: and ſo the words ſhould be render'd, *In the day the Lord deliver'd him from the hand of all his enemies, and from the hand of the grave.* Where ſuch as have the leaſt ſmattering of the *Hebrew*, ſee there is no change or tranſpoſition, no inſertion or excluſion of ſo much as one letter. Nor can there be the leaſt doubt of the propriety of the expreſſion: for we meet with the ſame, *Pſal.* lxxxix. 48. *Shall he deliver his ſoul* מיד שאול *from the hand of the grave*, as our tranſlators well render it.

It is eaſy to account for this miſtake in the pointing the word. The ancient *Jews* had no notion of a Meſſiah who was to die, be buried, and be raiſed from the grave; and they knew for certain that the literal *David* was never delivered from the hand of the grave, as they were aſſured he was from the hand of *Saul*: and therefore no wonder they pointed it ſo as to make it ſpeak what they knew was true, rather than that of which they had no notion at all. And Chriſtian interpreters and commentators have been too eaſily led by them, and taken up with an imagination that the pſalm wholly related to *David*, the ſon of *Jeſſe*. This has been the occaſion of their not only overlooking, but really of their offering violence to thoſe expreſſions in the pſalm, which might have led them into the true nature and deſign of the pſalm, which ſets forth the perſon ſpeaking as in the ſtate of the dead; as *ver.* 4, 5. *The pains of death compaſſed me, and the floods of ungodly men made me afraid. The pains of* שאול *the grave compaſſed me about, and the ſnares of death prevented me.* Which one would think ſhould have directed men to read the *grave* in the title, ſince that is mentioned ſo particularly in the body of the pſalm, rather than *Saul*, who is not ſo much as once mentioned, or indeed hinted at therein. But all theſe expreſſions which are

ſtrong enough to deſcribe a perſon in the ſtate of the dead, and ſome of which are too ſtrong to ſignify any thing leſs, muſt be underſtood as denoting only ſome great diſtreſs; as though men were afraid to take the words in their eaſy and natural ſenſe, leſt they ſhould be applied to Chriſt.

Add to this, that what I mentioned but now as to the odneſs of the placing the expreſſions, when we read *Saul* in the title, is very eaſy and plain this way: for his being delivered from the *hand of the grave*, was that which compleated his deliverance from the hand or power of all his enemies.

I hope, upon the whole of what has been ſaid, it will appear to all who are not violently prejudiced againſt St. *Paul*, that there is no reaſon to charge him with any weakneſs or want of judgment, in fetching the proof he does from the 49th verſe of this pſalm; which is the thing chiefly aimed at in this Diſſertation.

DISSER-

DISSERTATION II.

2 COR. iv. 13.

We having the ſame ſpirit of faith, according as it is written, I believed, and therefore have I ſpoken: we alſo believe, and therefore ſpeak.

I Think I may well reckon this citation out of the old teſtament, among thoſe dark and obſcure ones that need to be farther cleared. At leaſt I may ſay, I have not yet met with any account of it that gave me ſatisfaction. Nay, however great a value I have for Mr. *Locke*, as unqueſtionably the moſt judicious expoſitor who ever wrote upon St. *Paul*'s epiſtles; yet I muſt needs ſay that he ſeems to have miſſed the ſenſe of his author in this place. I ſhall therefore here offer another interpretation of it. But that the reader may have the more intire view of St. *Paul*'s ſcope, I think it will be proper to tranſcribe his words, from *ver* 7. to *ver.* 14. and together with them Mr. *Locke*'s paraphraſe, which is a clear explication of them, excepting only the buſineſs of the citation, *ver.* 13. and what I diſlike in that, and would ſubſtitute in the room of it, I ſhall then candidly ſubmit to the reader's judgment.

Mr. *Locke*'s *PARAPHRASE.* *TEXT.*

7. BUT yet we, to whom this treaſure of knowledge, the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt, is committed, to be propagated in the world, are but frail men, that ſo the exceeding great power that accompanies it, may appear to be
8. from God, and not from us. I am preſſed on every ſide, but do not ſhrink; I am per-
9. plexed, but yet not ſo as to deſpond; per-ſecuted, but yet not left to ſink under it;
10. thrown down, but not ſlain; carrying about every where in my body the mortification, *i. e.* a repreſentation of the ſufferings of the Lord Jeſus, that alſo the life of Jeſus riſen from the dead may be made manifeſt by the energy that accompanies my preaching in
11. this frail body. For as long as I live I ſhall be expoſed to the danger of death for the ſake of Jeſus, that the life of Jeſus riſen from the dead, may be made manifeſt by my preaching and ſufferings in this mortal fleſh
12. of mine. So that the preaching of the goſpel procures ſufferings and danger of death to me; but to you it procures life, *i. e.* the energy of the Spirit of Chriſt, whereby he lives in, and gives life to thoſe who believe
13. in him. Nevertheleſs, tho' ſuffering and death accompany the preaching the goſpel, yet having the ſame ſpirit of faith that *David* had, when he ſaid, I believe, " therefore have
14. " I ſpoken," I alſo believing therefore ſpeak, knowing that he who raiſed up the Lord Jeſus, ſhall raiſe me up alſo by Jeſus, and ſhall preſent me with you to God.

BUT we have this trea- 7
ſure in earthen veſ-
ſels, that the excellency of
the power may be of God,
and not of us. *We are* 8
troubled on every ſide, yet
not diſtreſſed; *we are* per-
plexed, but not in deſpair;
perſecuted, but not for- 9
ſaken; caſt down, but not
deſtroyed. Always bear- 10
ing about in the body the
dying of the Lord Jeſus,
that the life alſo of Jeſus
might be made manifeſt in
our body. For we which 11
live are alway delivered
unto death for Jeſus ſake,
that the life alſo of Jeſus
might be made manifeſt in
our mortal fleſh. So then 12
death worketh in us, but
life in you. We having 13
the ſame ſpirit of faith,
according as it is written,
I believed, and therefore
have I ſpoken: we alſo be-
lieve, and therefore ſpeak; 14
knowing, that he which
raiſed up the Lord Jeſus,
ſhall raiſe up us alſo by
Jeſus, and ſhall preſent us
with you.

The only thing I apprehend to be amiſs in this paraphraſe, is what he ſays *ver.* 13. *We having the ſame ſpirit of faith that* David *had, when he ſaid.* This ſeems harſh and violent. Had

St. *Paul* in his diſcourſe upon this ſubject made any mention of *David*, the interpretation would have ſeemed natural enough: but that the ſame ſpirit ſhould mean the ſame ſpirit that *David* had, when not the leaſt hint is given of him in the preceding context, cannot but be accounted ſomewhat unuſual and ſtrange. It appears therefore reaſonable to ſearch for ſome other perſon, with whom in this place he compares himſelf. And unleſs I am much miſtaken, the whole ſtrain of his diſcourſe leads us to underſtand him thus, *We having the ſame ſpirit of faith that Jeſus had.* Nothing can be plainer, than that he is here comparing himſelf with Jeſus, both in his death and life. So *ver.* 10. *Always bearing about in the body the* dying *of the Lord* Jeſus, *that the* life *alſo of* Jeſus *might be made manifeſt in* our *body.* And ſo again, *ver.* 11. *For we which live are alway delivered unto* death *for* Jeſus *ſake, that the* life *alſo of* Jeſus *might be made manifeſt in* our mortal *fleſh.* And ſo again, after he had made his citation, he ſhows manifeſtly that he underſtood the citation concerning Jeſus, *We alſo believe, and therefore ſpeak, knowing that he which* raiſed up *the Lord* Jeſus, *ſhall* raiſe *up us alſo by* Jeſus. And, perhaps, for this reaſon is the name *Jeſus* here ſo often repeated, when a pronoun would have ſerved, to force us as it were to obſerve that St. *Paul* is comparing himſelf with *Jeſus*, and that accordingly the citation is to be underſtood concerning him. Every thing in the diſcourſe thus underſtood appears eaſy, ſmooth, and coherent; nor can there be the leaſt difficulty, provided we can find reaſon to believe that the pſalmiſt in uſing theſe words, *Pſal.* cxvi. 10. ſpake, as in many other pſalms, in the perſon of Jeſus, and not in his own.

I am ſenſible it is a very diſagreeable ſubject to many, which I am now entring upon. 'Tis become almoſt common and faſhionable to expound away the plaineſt prophecies of the old teſtament, and which the *Jews* themſelves underſtood concerning Chriſt, and to apply them to *David*, or ſome other perſon or event; and when a man attempts to apply other parts of the old teſtament to Chriſt, which it may be are more obſcure, and have been generally underſtood quite another way, he can hardly expect to eſcape the utmoſt ridicule and contempt. But this ſhall not diſcourage me from offering what appears to me to be true, and to tend to the vindicating the honour of St. *Paul*, in the application he makes of the words of the old teſtament to our Redeemer.

I will not deny that the relation of the words here cited, to our Saviour, is much more obſcure than that of many others: and had not the inſpired apoſtle, by the application he has made of it, led us into this interpretation, it might poſſibly have been always over-look'd. But the only queſtion which I would here calmly debate, is this; Whether, now St. *Paul* has given us this key, we cannot, abſtracting from his inſpiration, confirm his interpretation by ſome other good reaſons, taken from the place whence the quotation is taken? I think we may, and ſhall accordingly here produce them.

In the general, I ſee nothing in the cxvith *Pſalm* that is diſagreeable to what I apprehend is the nature and deſign of it, an hymn or ſong of praiſe, wherein the inſpired writer perſonates our bleſſed Saviour, as magnifying God for his reſurrection, or redemption from the grave. This general obſervation will be confirmed by a brief view of the particular expreſſions; all which, from the beginning to the end of the pſalm, are to be conſider'd as the words of Chriſt.

The four firſt verſes are ſo parallel to what we meet with in the ſix firſt verſes of the xviiith, that few who compare them can doubt of their relating to the ſame event. And indeed after I was, upon a careful examination, convinced of the opinion of many ancient writers, that *Pſal.* xviii. related to Chriſt, I ſoon perceived, by comparing the beginning of the two pſalms together, that this cxvith as well as the xviiith muſt be our Saviour's ſong of praiſe for his reſurrection; and that too before I took notice of the application St. *Paul* has made of the 10th verſe.

Concerning *Pſal.* xviii. I ſay nothing here, but refer to what I have ſaid before. All the uſe I now make of it is this, to ſhow how very much the beginning of this cxvith reſembles it. Thus *ver.* 1. *I love the Lord, becauſe he hath heard my voice, and my ſupplications.* The two firſt verſes of the xviiith expreſs the ſame thing, and may as a comment teach us how the Lord had heard his voice and ſupplications, even by acting for him as his deliverer out of his troubles. *I will love thee, O Lord,* my ſtrength. *The Lord is my rock and my fortreſs, and my deliverer; my God, my ſtrength, in whom I will truſt, my buckler, and the horn of my ſalvation, and my high tower.* The next verſe in each pſalm is a declaration of his reſolution to call upon the Lord, *Pſal.* cxvi. 2. *Becauſe he hath inclined his ear unto me, therefore will I call upon him*

him as long as I live. Pſal. xviii. 3. *I will call upon the Lord, who is worthy to be praiſed: ſo ſhall I be ſaved from mine enemies.* The two next verſes of the cxvith exactly anſwer to the three next of the xviiith, and in both the pſalms deſcribe the perſon ſpoken of as in the ſtate of the dead, and praying for deliverance. cxvi. 3, 4. *The* ſorrows of death *compaſſed me, and the* pains of hell [or the grave] *gat hold upon me: I found trouble and ſorrow. Then* called *I upon the name* of the Lord; *O Lord, I beſeech thee,* deliver my ſoul. In like manner, xviii. 4——6. *The* ſorrows of death *compaſſed me, and the floods of ungodly men made me afraid.* The ſorrows of hell [or the grave] *compaſſed me about: the* ſnares of death *prevented me. In my* diſtreſs *I* called *upon the Lord, and* cried *unto my God: he heard my voice out of his temple, and my cry came before him into his ears.* And here the pſalmiſt mentions what he had not before in *Pſal.* xviii. that his deliverance was in anſwer to his prayer: but this is omitted in the parallel verſes of the cxvith, becauſe it had been before expreſly mentioned in *ver.* 1, 2. Every one ſees how exact and proper the terms made uſe of in both pſalms are, when underſtood as utter'd by our Saviour concerning his own caſe: and why then may they not as well be taken in their ſtrict and proper ſenſe, as by the help of rhetorical figures be applied to any other perſon? Nor can any thing be more proper and ſtrictly true, than what we meet with *Pſal.* cxvi. 8. when thus underſtood, as ſpoken by our raiſed Redeemer, *Thou haſt* deliver'd *my ſoul from* death, *mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling.* Compare *Pſal.* xvi. 9——11.

The ſenſe of *ver.* 9. is, I acknowledge, dubious; *I will walk before the Lord in the land of the living.* It would be harſh to ſuppoſe that the heavenly regions, into which our Lord aſcended, ſhould be here called the *land of the living*; and it would not be much more ſatisfactory to explain this merely of the ſhort time of forty days between his reſurrection and aſcenſion. Whether we render it with our tranſlators, *I will* walk *before the Lord in the land of the living,* or with the *Vulg. Latin, I will* pleaſe *the Lord;* or as the LXX. *I will* pleaſe before *the Lord,* it will not ſeem ſo well to ſuit the application St. *Paul* makes of the next verſe of the pſalm. But I think this difficulty may be removed, and the pſalmiſt's words be explained very agreeably to St. *Paul*'s ſenſe of the pſalm, by obſerving in what manner the word הִתְהַלֵּךְ is uſed elſe-

elſewhere; as particularly *Lev.* xxvi. 11, 12. *And I will ſet my tabernacle among ſt you: and my ſoul ſhall not abhor you. And I will* walk *among you, and will be your God, and ye ſhall be my people*; which place is cited by St. *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* vi. 16. According to this ſenſe, the gracious preſence of Chriſt with men on earth, and his converſing with them, will be here ſpoken of. And to this many places of the new teſtament do perfectly agree. *Matth.* xviii. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there* am I in the midſt *of them.* xxviii. 20. *Lo*, I am with you *alway, even unto the end of the world.* And very pertinent is that expreſſion which is uſed concerning him, *Rev.* ii. 1. *That he* walketh *in the midſt of the ſeven golden candleſticks.* I think this interpretation receives ſome confirmation from the expreſſion *in the* lands *of the living*, it being plurally expreſs'd in the *Hebrew*, which is peculiar to this place, there being no other place where the *land of the living*, though ſeveral times mentioned, is thus ſpoken of. And ſince it is probable there was ſome peculiar reaſon for varying the phraſe in this one place, which differs from all others, perhaps a better reaſon will hardly offer than this, that Chriſt's regards would not henceforth be confined to the land of *Iſrael*, but extend to the many lands or countries of the heathens. Nor can there be any difficulty in our Saviour's ſaying he would thus walk *before the Lord:* for this is agreeable to what we meet with elſewhere; particularly *Pſal.* xvi. 8. *I have* ſet *the Lord always* before me: *becauſe he is at* my right hand, *I ſhall not be moved.*

The connection of the next verſe is very good when this is thus underſtood, *I believed, therefore have I ſpoken*; That is, "I firmly "truſted in God that he would raiſe me from the dead, that I "might thus glorify him by making him known to the world, "and therefore I was not deterred from boldly preaching that "doctrine which I ſaw would inrage men againſt me, and cauſe "them to put me to death."

Nothing could more exactly ſuit the apoſtle's deſign, than this citation thus underſtood concerning Jeſus, there being ſo much reſemblance in the caſes here compared together. And it is as though he had ſaid, "Jeſus believed that God would raiſe him "from the dead, and therefore in ſpite of that death which he "ſaw would be the conſequence, he freely ſpoke and publiſh'd the "errand upon which God ſent him; I his apoſtle, have the ſame

"ſpirit

" ſpirit of faith with Jeſus; and therefore though I am always de-
" livered unto death, and bear about in my body a reſemblance of
" the death of Jeſus, yet I ſpeak freely, and publiſh the goſpel,
" being well aſſured that he, who raiſed up the Lord Jeſus, ſhall
" alſo raiſe me up by Jeſus."

There ſeems not to be any room for an objection againſt this ſenſe of the pſalm from the next verſe, *I ſaid in my haſte all men are liars*, provided it be render'd, as I think it ought to be, *I ſaid in my fright*, or *my trembling*, namely, when I was *greatly afflicted*, and in the utmoſt diſtreſs, *All men are liars:* and thus the LXX. have rendred this word both here and *Pſal.* xxxi. 22. ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει μου. Never had any one more juſt cauſe to complain in this manner than our Saviour had at that time, when he was perſecuted by his own people, when the rulers ſo eagerly thirſted after his blood, when he was betrayed by one of his diſciples, denied very baſely by another, and cowardly forſaken by them all. He had then cauſe to complain of all men, that they were falſe, treacherous, and deceitful, and that no truſt or confidence was to be placed in any of them.

As to the expreſſions wherein the perſon ſpeaking in the pſalm ſets forth his gratitude and thankſgivings to God, they may be compared with *Pſal.* xvi. 7, 9. which pſalm St. *Peter* has not only applied, but unqueſtionably proved to belong to Chriſt. *Acts* ii. 25——31. And what he ſays concerning paying his vows, *ver.* 14, 18, 19. is parallel to what he ſays *Pſal.* xxii. 22, 25. which pſalm appears evidently to be ſpoken in the perſon of Chriſt, as from other paſſages, ſo eſpecially from thoſe, *they pierced my hands and my feet*, ver. 16. and, *they part my garments among them, and caſt lots upon my veſture*, ver. 18. which are literally true of Chriſt, but not of *David:* the expreſſions, I ſay, to this purpoſe, in *Pſal.* cxvi. are ſo parallel, that I think I need not to detain the reader by ſaying any thing concerning them.

I ſhall therefore only take notice of one paſſage more, which may ſeem to carry any difficulty in it according to this interpretation; and that is *Pſal.* cxvi. 16. *Oh Lord, truly I am thy ſervant, I am thy ſervant, and the ſon of thy handmaid: thou haſt looſed my bonds.* If the pſalm be underſtood of our Saviour, it may ſeem ſtrange that he ſhould fetch a plea from his mother. However agreeable this might be thought by the Papiſts, who attribute ſo much to the virgin *Mary*, yet Proteſtants will naturally think that

the only plea the relation would afford, would be to the mother, and not to the ſon. But then on the other hand, if we ſhould ſuppoſe the pſalm uttered not in the perſon of Jeſus, but of *David*, it may ſeem as ſtrange, if *David*'s mother was a woman of ſo extraordinary piety, as that *David* could thus draw a plea from her, that we ſhould never have the leaſt mention made of her in any part of the ſacred hiſtory, excepting this place, and *Pſal.* lxxxvi. 16. in which pſalm there is ſomewhat parallel to this: for there the pſalmiſt ſpeaks of God's *delivering his ſoul from the loweſt hell* [or *grave*] *ver.* 13. which together with ſome other paſſages, may incline us to underſtand both pſalms to relate to the ſame ſubject.

I am ſenſible of the uſe ſome have made of this expreſſion, *the ſon of thy handmaid*, as confirming the account of our Saviour's birth in the goſpel, that though he had a mother, yet he had no immediate earthly father, but was born of a virgin. Such cannot be diſpleaſed with me, that I interpret the pſalm as belonging to Chriſt, ſince they themſelves do in the general agree with me. And if they interpret it thus, "I am the ſon of thy handmaid, "having no earthly father," there is ſomewhat in it that renders it leſs diſagreeable. But if I may ſpeak my mind freely, I ſuſpect the ſenſe of the expreſſion has been univerſally miſtaken in both pſalms; and that without changing ſo much as one letter, but only the ſound which the *Jews* have by their points given to the letters, we ſhould read *the ſon* אֲמָתֶךָ *of thy truth*, inſtead of *the ſon* אֲמָתְךָ *of thy handmaid:* and the meaning then will be in the place under conſideration, "I am thy true and faithful ſon;" as the LXX. in *Exod.* xviii. 21. have rendred אנשי אמת by ἄνδρας δικαίους, *juſt men:* and ſo *Zech.* viii. 3. עיר האמת is tranſlated by them πόλις ἀληθινή, the *true* or *faithful city.* Or elſe, "I am thy ſon, in whom thy "truth and faithfulneſs has appeared in begetting me, and raiſing "me from the dead, and ſo making me by this new life thy ſon." Compare *Pſal.* ii. 7. *Rom.* i. 4. And this ſenſe ſeems to me confirmed by what he immediately adds, *Thou haſt looſed my bonds*; which ſeems to lead us to conſider him as ſpeaking of himſelf as his ſon, upon his looſing the pains of death, and raiſing him from the dead. I readily ſubmit the whole to the judgment of ſuch as diligently and impartially ſearch the holy ſcriptures.

DISSERTATION III.

JOHN xiii. 18, 19.

I ſpeak not of you all; I know whom I have choſen: but that the ſcripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me, hath lift up his heel againſt me. Now I tell you before it come, that when 'tis come to paſs, ye may believe that I am he.

IT has been thought as hard to account for the citation we have in this place, as for almoſt any of the reſt in the goſpels and epiſtles, ſome of which muſt be own'd to be conſiderably obſcure. And as the enemies of chriſtianity have been apt to triumph in the argument they urge from the citation before us, ſo its moſt hearty friends can't but acknowledge that they talk much more plauſibly upon this, than upon many other occaſions. We have the more reaſon to indeavour to clear and juſtify this paſſage, becauſe the honour of our Lord is immediately concern'd, the application of the words of the pſalmiſt being made by himſelf, and not by the evangeliſt as his hiſtorian. And above all others they muſt be obliged very carefully to conſider this, who make a wide diſtinction between the citations that are introduced in this manner, *this was done* THAT *the ſcripture might be fulfilled*, and thoſe which are only brought in thus, *then was fulfilled*; allowing that texts may be and frequently are alleged in this latter manner only by way of accommodation, but inſiſting upon it that in the former caſe the paſſages cited muſt have been direct pro-

phecies of that very event to which they are applied, and of that only. I muſt frankly own this to have been a long time my perſuaſion; nor have I yet ſeen cauſe to receed from it. This has led me more cloſely to ſearch into the meaning of this diſcourſe of our Saviour; and by the ſatisfaction I have gained, I am the more confirmed in the truth and juſtice of my perſuaſion in generall

The difficulty here ariſes from the citation's being taken out of *Pſal.* xli. And indeed no man can read that pſalm with any care and attention, but he muſt perceive that it can't relate to the Meſſiah at all. The 4th verſe of the pſalm is a clear proof of this, which ever way you render it: *I ſaid, Lord, be merciful unto me, heal my ſoul; for* [or *though, Heb.* כי] *I have ſinned againſt thee:* Which words can never be ſuppoſed to be uttered by Chriſt, or by any inſpired author aſſuming his perſon, and ſpeaking in his name; *who did no ſin, and in whoſe mouth no guile was found,* 1 *Pet.* ii. 22. Nor are the 7th and 8th verſes of the pſalm very likely to belong to Chriſt, or to have been utter'd by him: *All that hate me whiſper together againſt me: againſt me do they deviſe my hurt. An* evil diſeaſe, *ſay they, cleaveth faſt unto him: and now that he lieth, he ſhall riſe up no more.* Upon which follows the paſſage cited by our Lord: *Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I truſted, which did eat of my bread, hath lift up his heel againſt me.* Nor is there any other paſſage in the whole pſalm that ſhould incline one to ſuſpect that the uſage our Saviour met with, and particularly by reaſon of the treachery of *Judas,* was at all pointed at in it.

This difficulty has appeared ſo great to ſome who were heartily deſirous of ſolving it, that they have concluded there was no other way to do it, but by denying that our Saviour cites the xliſt pſalm; and therefore they have indeavoured to fetch the paſſage from *Pſal.* lv. 12——14. But the interpretation they offer is manifeſtly forced and violent: and though there be in that place ſomewhat to the ſame purpoſe with what we have in our Lord's citation, yet neither the words themſelves, nor the manner and turn of the expreſſions, are there to be met with, as they are *Pſal.* xli. 9. And I hope to be able to ſhow that there is no need to have recourſe to ſuch a harſh and ſtrained account as they give us.

To

To ſet our Lord's diſcourſe in the clearer light, it will be proper to take notice of the occaſion of it, by which it will appear to what it refers. Our Saviour then well knowing that his death was near at hand, that he might not only by his doctrine, but by his own example, teach his diſciples to be ready to perform the meaneſt offices of kindneſs and love towards each other, would waſh their feet, *ver.* 4, 5. *Peter*, when he came to him with this deſign, was aſhamed to admit ſuch a condeſcenſion in his Lord and Maſter towards himſelf; and therefore ſpeaks firſt in a ſurprize, *ver.* 6. *Lord, doſt thou waſh my feet?* and afterwards very peremptorily, *ver.* 8. *Thou ſhalt never waſh my feet.* Our Lord hereupon replies, *If I waſh thee not, thou haſt no part with me:* This might be taken literally, it being neceſſary that the diſciple who would continue in that relation to his maſter, ſhould acquieſce in his will, when clearly and expreſly declared. But it ſeems more natural and eaſy to underſtand the words in a myſtical and ſpiritual ſenſe: "Unleſs I, the Meſſiah, purify thee, and make "thee thoroughly clean, thou haſt no part in me." In this ſenſe it appears *Peter* underſtood him, ſince he anſwers, *ver.* 9. *Lord, not my feet only, but alſo my hands and my head.* And we may reaſonably think that he underſtood Chriſt according to his true deſign, ſince he finds not the leaſt fault with him in this reſpect, when he makes him that reply, *ver.* 10. *He that is waſhed, needeth not ſave to waſh his feet.* Which being taken in the myſtical ſenſe, is to be thus underſtood: "That a perſon being once "waſhed or cleanſed by Chriſt, does not need to have that tho"rough waſhing often repeated, but only to be cleanſed from "time to time from that guilt or filth which he occaſionally con"tracts in his converſation, which can't be expected to be wholly "free from ſin, as long as he lives in the world." This is very fitly reſembled by *waſhing the feet*, which were apt to be filthy and duſty in thoſe hot countries, wherein they moſtly uſed ſandals: whence it was uſual with them to waſh their feet; and it was reckon'd a piece of common civility to their friends or gueſts, at their coming to them, to offer them water to waſh their feet; and therefore our Lord complained of the incivility of *Simon* the *Phariſee*, Luke vii. 44. *I entred into thine houſe, thou gaveſt me no* water *for my* feet. Such an one as was thus *waſhed* by Chriſt, was, as he adds, *clean every whit* [his whole perſon was clean, καθαρὸς ὅλος] *And*, ſays he, *ye are clean* [ye my diſciples generally,

rally, and the far greater part of you, *viz.* eleven in twelve, are clean] *but not all* [one is to be excepted.] To this purpoſe St. *John* explains his words, *ver.* 11. *For he knew who ſhould betray him; therefore, ſaid he, ye are not all clean.* That is, *Judas Iſcariot*, who was now preſent with him, was not clean: which farther ſhows our Lord is to be underſtood in a ſpiritual and not in a literal ſenſe.

The more notice has been taken of this, becauſe the firſt words of *ver.* 18. *I ſpeak not of you all*, are commonly, and I think juſtly, underſtood to refer to that paſſage, *Ye are clean, but not all.*

There is indeed but one paſſage beſide this, to which theſe words can refer; and that is *ver.* 17. *If ye know theſe things, happy are ye if ye do them.* And then our Lord muſt be underſtood to mean, *I don't ſay of you all, that you are* HAPPY. But this interpretation does not ſeem at all agreeable: for as the ſpeech is only conditional, our Lord might as truly have uſed it concerning *Judas*, as any of the reſt of his diſciples; ſince he would have been *happy*, IF knowing theſe things, he had alſo done them. I conclude therefore that when our Lord ſays, *I ſpeak not of you all*, he means that he did not ſpeak of them all when he ſaid, *ye are not all clean.*

The next words are, *I know whom I have choſen*; i. e. "I know "the diſpoſition and temper of every one of you, and can diſtin-"guiſh between the ſincere and the hypocritical. I know who "deſerves to be, and accordingly is, approved by me." This I look upon as an interjected clauſe; which is to be omitted in fixing the connection of the diſcourſe, which therefore muſt ſtand thus: *I ſpeak not of you all, but that the ſcripture ſhould be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me, hath lift up his heel againſt me.*

The greateſt ſtrength of the objection lies in the word ἵνα, *that*, which is here uſed. Οὐ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν λέγω, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ. Now let it be ſuppoſed, as I think it has been univerſally by commentators, that the ſenſe is compleated, and the ſentence intirely finiſhed in the eighteenth verſe; it will then be plain that there muſt be an *elliptis* in the words, which it will be neceſſary for us to ſupply.

I don't find that others have made any general obſervation concerning this: but it ſeems to me that the expreſſion is frequently elliptical, when we meet with theſe words, ἀλλ' ἵνα. I ſhall mention

mention ſome inſtances, and 'tis likely the careful reader of the ſcriptures may obſerve many more: *Mark* xiv. 48, 49. *Jeſus anſwer'd and ſaid unto them, are ye come out as againſt a thief, with ſwords and with ſtaves to take me? I was daily with you in the temple, teaching, and ye took me not:* ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί, *but* that *the ſcriptures muſt be fulfilled.* Where our tranſlation leaves out *that*, as though it were not in the original. But there can be no reaſonable doubt that the place is elliptical, ſince St. *Matthew*, ſpeaking of the ſame thing, has taught us how we are to fill up the ſenſe, *Matth.* xxvi. 56. *But all this was done, that the ſcriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled.*

It will very probably be objected, that this *elliplis*, inſtead of removing, will rather fix and increaſe the difficulty: for in caſe we ſupply the *elliplis* in like manner here, then the paſſage in the pſalm muſt be a direct prophecy of this very event, and *this came to paſs that that might be fulfilled* which was there foretold.

But in anſwer to that let it be obſerved, 1. That that text is only alleged to ſhow that an *elliplis* in general is commonly to be ſuppoſed when thoſe words ἀλλ' ἵνα are uſed, and not that the *elliplis* is always to be filled up the ſame way. And, 2. That this place will not admit that the *elliplis* ſhould here be ſupplied the ſame way. Had it indeed been ſaid before, as 'tis afterwards, *ver.* 21. *One of you ſhall betray me*, the ſenſe might have been well enough compleated this way; *But this ſhall be done, that the ſcripture may be fulfilled.* But this is not the caſe. All that goes before, is, that Chriſt ſpake not of all his diſciples, when he ſaid, *ye are not all clean:* but *Judas*'s act in betraying him, had not yet been mention'd by him, though it had by the evangeliſt in commenting upon his words, *ver.* 11. Now it can't be thought that our Saviour meant that his SPEAKING thus of his diſciples, that they were *not all clean*, was the fulfilment of the pſalmiſt's words, even upon the ſuppoſition of their being prophetical. 'Tis ſome *fact* that muſt be ſuppoſed to be here refer'd to, and not our Saviour's *ſpeaking* of a fact, unleſs his ſpeaking of it be conſider'd as neceſſarily cauſing that fact.

Let me add a few more paſſages of this nature, which ſhall be all taken out of the writings of St. *John*.

John i. 8. *He* [*John* the baptiſt] *was not that light*, ἀλλ' ἵνα *μαρτυρήσῃ*, BUT THAT *he might bear witneſs of that light.* Where our

our tranſlators have filled up the ſenſe from *ver.* 6. *But* was ſent *to bear witneſs of that light*; as they might likewiſe from *ver.* 7. *But* he came *that he might bear witneſs of that light.*

Again, *John* ix. 3. *Neither hath this man ſin'd, nor his parents,* ἀλλ' ἵνα *but* [this is done, or he is born blind] *that the works of God ſhould be made manifeſt in him.*

Again, *John* xiv. 30, 31. *Hereafter I will not talk much with you; for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me;* ἀλλ' ἵνα *but* [he is permitted thus to come] *that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me command-ment, even ſo I do.*

Again, *John* xv. 24, 25. *But now have they hated both me and my Father;* ἀλλ' ἵνα *but* [as our own tranſlators are forced to fill up the ſenſe, *This cometh to paſs*] *that it might be ful-filled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cauſe.*

Again, *John* xviii. 28. *They themſelves went not into the judg-ment-hall, leſt they ſhould be defiled,* ἀλλ' ἵνα *but that they might eat the paſſover*; *i. e.* but they ſtaid without, that not being de-filed, they might eat the paſſover.

Finally: 1 *John* ii. 19. *They went out from us, but they were not all of us: for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have con-tinued with us;* ἀλλ' ἵνα *but* [*they went out from us*, as our tran-ſlation very juſtly fills up the ſenſe] *that they might be made ma-nifeſt that they were not all of us.*

And now after ſo many plain inſtances of an *elliptis*, when theſe two particles are uſed together, certainly it can't ſeem unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that ſomewhat of the like nature is to be met with in this place. And accordingly I now proceed to account for it. And here,

Firſt, I ſhall offer what may be ſaid upon the ſuppoſition of the eighteenth verſe's containing alone an intire ſenſe. And there are two ways which may then be taken to ſolve the difficulty. (1.) The ſenſe may be filled up from the two preceding clauſes, the latter not being then conſider'd as a parentheſis, or interjected clauſe, which does not affect the connection between what goes before, and what follows after it; which is what was before ſuppoſed. And then the ſenſe may ſtand thus: " I ſpeak not of " you all; I know whom I have choſen: but [I ſpeak of one " of you] *that* [you may know] *that ſcripture is fulfilled*

" [or verified in me] *He that eateth bread with me, hath lift up his* " *heel againſt me.*" Or, (2.) We may underſtand ἵνα, *that*, to be here uſed for *when*, as it often is in St. *John*'s writings. Thus *John* xvi. 2. *Yea the time cometh, that* [i.e. when] *whoſoever killeth you will think that he doth God ſervice*: which Dr. *Mills* tells us *Euſebius* cites thus, Ελεύσεται καιρὸς ἐν ᾧ; which muſt I ſuppoſe be by way of comment or explication of thoſe words, Ερχεται ὥρα ἵνα, ſince no copy favours that reading; and ſo it ſhows us how he underſtood the word ἵνα in that place. Again, *ver.* 32. *Behold the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that* [i. e. when] *ye ſhall be ſcattered, every man to his own home.* Compare alſo *John* xii. 23. xiii. 1. xv. 8, 13. 3 *epiſt. John*, ver. 4. And here it may be remarked that the *Syriac* tranſlation, tho' in rendring thoſe phraſes, Ερχεται ὥρα ὅτε, *John* iv. 21. v. 25. and Ερχεται ὥρα ἐν ᾗ, *John* v. 28. it uſes the word אמתי which properly ſignifies *when*; yet *John* iv. 21. it renders ὅτε only by the particle ד; which is the way in which it renders ἵνα in the ſame caſe, as *John* xii. 23. xiii. 1. xvi. 2. Should we take ἵνα thus, the ſenſe will be, " I ſpeak not of you all, " but of one, when that ſcripture ſhall be verified in me, He that " eateth bread with me," *&c.* But,

Secondly, That which beſt pleaſes me is the account I now offer, wherein I ſuppoſe that the ſenſe is not compleatly finiſhed in *ver.* 18. but that *ver.* 19. is to be added to it, in order to our having a full view of our Lord's meaning. If I miſtake not, there is a σύγχυσις, or miſplacing in the order of the words as they now ſtand, by reaſon whereof theſe two verſes ſeem to contain each of them a diſtinct ſentence, though really they together make up but one. I would therefore ſuppoſe the words to ſtand in this order: Ου περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν λέγω (ἐγὼ οἶδα οὓς ἐξελεξάμην) ἀλλ' ἵνα [ὅταν] ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ· Ο τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ, ἀπ' ἄρτι λέγω ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι, ἵνα ὅταν γένηται, πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι. That is, *I ſpeak not of you all (I know whom I have choſen) but that* [when] *that ſcripture ſhall be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me, hath lift up his heel againſt me, I now ſpeak to you* [all] *before it is done, that when 'tis done*, ye may *believe that I am he*, viz. the Meſſiah. Where the reader is to obſerve, that I join the ἀλλὰ, *but*, in ſenſe with, *I now ſpeak to you*: and the *epanalepſis* in λέγω and λέγω, ſeems to lead to this; and eſpecially ſince there is no δὲ in the 19th verſe, and it is not ſaid, Απ' ἄρτι δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν: for which no better reaſon can I think be given, but

that it was before expreſs'd by ἀλλὰ of the ſame importance. Again, I ſupply ὅταν after ἵνα in the 18th verſe, from the 19th verſe, where ἵνα ὅταν occurs. And in ſuch abrupt ſpeeches 'tis not unuſual to ſupply the defect of one clauſe from another that follows it, repeating only ſomewhat of it. See *Eph.* ii. 1, 5. and more eſpecially may this be allowed, when the latter clauſe is explicatory of the former. This then I take to be the true ſenſe of the place: "I ſpeak not of you all, when I ſay ye are not all clean "(I know whom I have choſen) but I now ſpeak to you all before "the thing is come to paſs, that ſo when it is come to paſs, and "you ſee that ſcripture verified in me, He that eateth bread with "me hath lift up his heel againſt me, you may then be fully con-"vinced that I am indeed the Meſſiah: not becauſe thoſe words "were really prophetical of this event, but becauſe I now foretel "it you."

Such kind of trajections and miſplacings of words are to be met with in good authors; and however they are apt to create an obſcurity, yet they are thought to carry a beauty in them. I think I could offer ſeveral examples of this nature: but I ſhall chooſe only one, which is ſo very plain, that hardly any doubt is made of it. *Acts* x. 36——38. Τὸν λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλε τοῖς υἱοῖς Ισραὴλ, εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ (οὗτος ἐστι πάντων Κύριος) Ὑμεῖς οἴδατε τὸ γενόμενον ῥῆμα καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ιουδαίας, ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐκήρυξεν Ιωάννης· Ιησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει. There is no verb *ver.* 36. to govern τὸν λόγον, and to ſupply that defect there is a neceſſity of fetching ὑμεῖς οἴδατε from *ver.* 37. altho' there another accuſative caſe follows it. Our own tranſlators were forced to take it the ſame way: *The word which God ſent unto the children of* Iſrael, *preaching peace by Jeſus Chriſt (he is Lord of all) that word*, I ſay, *you know*. And why may we not as well ſupply *John* xiii. 18. from *ver.* 19. eſpecially ſince the *epanalepſis* is in this caſe more obvious than in the *Acts*, where τὸν λόγον is changed into τὸ ῥῆμα: which yet is frequent in good authors, when they make ſuch repetitions, as we have an inſtance in *Cicero*; *Hoc premendum etiam atque etiam eſt argumentum*, confirmato illo, *de quo, ſi mortales animi ſunt, dubitare non poſſumus, quin tantus interitus in morte ſit, ut ne minima quidem ſuſpicio ſenſus relinquatur: hoc igitur probe* ſtabilito & fixo, *illud excutiendum eſt, ut ſciatur, quid ſit carere*, &c. There is yet another tranſpoſition in that place, *ver.* 38. Ιησοῦν τὸν

τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν κλ. *How God anointed Jesus of* Nazareth, &c. But the transposition will be still greater, in case we suppose ἀρξάμενον, *ver.* 37. to agree with Ἰησοῦν, and not with ῥῆμα. Nor is this unreasonable, considering the use St. *Luke* makes of that word concerning Christ, *Acts* i. 1, 22. *Luke* iii. 23. xxiii. 5. Compare also *Matth.* iv. 17. And if we admit this construction, which is perhaps the most natural, the sense will stand thus: *How God with the Holy Ghost and with power anointed* Jesus *of* Nazareth, *who began from* Galilee, *after the baptism which* John *preached.*

Of this *schema* or *figura in sententiis Isidorus Hispal.* gives us an example from *Virgil*, lib. i. c. 35. *Prolepsis est præsumptio, ubi ea, quæ sequi debent, anteponuntur: ut*, Interea reges ingenti mole, Latinus *debuit enim sic dicere:* Interea reges ingenti mole, & *statim adjicere quod sequitur*, Procedunt castris: *deinde dicere*, Latinus, &c. *sed facta est pro ornamento præsumptio rei, & qui sequi debuere reges interpositi sunt in septem versibus, & postea additum est*, Procedunt castris. *Inde præsumptio, quia anteposita sunt quæ sequi debuere.* The passage he refers to is in *Virgil. Æneid.* lib. xii. ver. 161. which I shall transcribe.

Interea reges ingenti mole, Latinus
Quadrijugo vehitur curru, cui tempora circum
Aurati bis sex radii fulgentia cingunt,
Solis avi specimen Bigis it Turnus in albis,
Bina manu lato crispans hastilia ferro:
Hinc pater Æneas, Romanæ stirpis origo,
Sidereo flagrans clypeo, & cœlestibus armis:
Et juxta Ascanius, magnæ spes altera Romæ
Procedunt castris, &c.

The same author in the next chapter gives us another example. Synthesis *est, ubi ex omni parte confusa sunt verba, ut illud,*

——— Juvenes, fortissima frustra
Pectora, si vobis audendi extrema cupido est
Certa sequi, quæ sit rebus fortuna videtis:
Excessere omnes, adytis arisque relictis,
Dii, quibus imperium hoc steterat, succurritis urbi
Incensæ: moriamur, & in media arma ruamus.

Ordo talis eſt, *Juvenes fortiſſima pectora, fruſtra ſuccurritis urbi incenſæ, quia exceſſere dii quibus hoc imperium ſteterat. Unde ſi vobis cupido certa eſt me ſequi, audentem extrema, ruamus in media arma, & moriamur.*

The paſſage is in *Æneid.* ii. *ver.* 348.

If any deſire to ſee examples in *Greek* authors, they may conſult *Budæus Comm.* Gr. L. in the places refer'd to in his *Latin index*, under *Figuræ conſtructionis & ſchema.*

Upon the whole, I can't perceive there is any neceſſity for our judging that our Lord alleged the words of the pſalmiſt as a prophecy of the treachery of *Judas*, or as a proof that he ſhould betray him: and I hope I have made it evident there is no ſuch neceſſity, which was the principal aim I had in treating of this paſſage of ſcripture.

DISSER-

DISSERTATION IV.

MATT H. v. 14, 15, 16.

Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill, cannot be hid. 15. *Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel; but on a candlestick, and it giveth light unto all that are in the house.* 16. *Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.*

COMMENTATORS do, I think, universally take it for granted, that our Saviour here compares, as some imagine, his apostles, or as others more justly reckon, his disciples in general, to three different things: *First*, The light of the world: *Secondly*, A city that is set on a hill: *Thirdly*, A lighted candle in an house. Nor can any of them, as far as I can see, give a tolerable account how what Christ says of a city set upon an hill does come in. That I may not reflect upon particular authors, I desire the reader, who has curiosity and ability, to consult the *Synopt. Critic.* upon the place.

On the contrary, I am of the opinion that our Lord here compares his disciples only to one thing, the *light of the world*: and that the other two passages are not intended to express any proper resemblances of his disciples; but are incidental passages brought in upon another design, which shall presently be explained: and

that

that *ver.* 16. is to be closely connected in sense with the first words only of *ver.* 14. *Ye are the light of the world.* My reasons for this interpretation are,

First, That *ver.* 16. which is the application our Lord makes of what he had said, has a respect to nothing but their being a light. Not the least notice is here taken of any comparison made of them to a city set upon an hill; which yet I think ought to have had some place in the application, in case it had been design'd as a proper resemblance.

Secondly, There is not the least intimation given in our Lord's words that he design'd these as resemblances of his disciples. He does not say, *Ye are a city set on an hill*, as he does, YE ARE *the light of the world*; and, *ver.* 13. YE ARE *the salt of the earth.* Commentators indeed tell us that the words are elliptical, and that the sense is thus to be supplied, *Ye are as a city set upon an hill, and such a city cannot be hid.* But I conceive the true reason why they do so, is because they miss'd the true sense, and so were forced to give that interpretation, if they would give any at all.

Again, in the other instance he does not say, *Ye are as a candle lighted up in an house*; but *neither do* MEN *light a candle, and put it under a bushel*, &c. which might reasonably have been taken as a hint by commentators, that they were not to understand this to be spoken by our Lord, as a proper resemblance of his disciples. For when he speaks of them as the *light of the world*, he must certainly be thought to mean that God had so appointed and constituted them; and it would be very strange, if after this he should represent them as candles lighted by men, from whom they derived not their light at all.

Thirdly, The *light of the world*, and a *city set on an hill*, are ideas so vastly different, that it cannot easily be admitted that our Saviour would thus jumble them together, and crowd in the second before he had done with the first, as 'tis manifest by *ver.* 16. he had not yet done with it.

Fourthly, Though there is not the same difference between the ideas of the *light of the world*, and the *light of a candle*, they both agreeing in the chief thing, it being *light*; yet there are other reasons why we cannot reasonably suppose he design'd this as a proper comparison or resemblance of his disciples. For however this might well enough agree in the general with what he had said of their being the *light of the world*; yet it as utterly as that disagrees with

with the intermediate ſuppoſed compariſon of a *city ſet on an hill.* And certainly 'tis very unreaſonable to imagine that ſuch very different things are mixed and confounded together, till we can ſhow that there is at leaſt one inſtance of the like nature to be found in any of his diſcourſes.

But as a farther reaſon I urge, that we can't thus interpret this text, without ſuppoſing our Lord to have been guilty of a very great indecency and impropriety in the art of ſpeaking or teaching, which certainly no chriſtian ought ever to allow; nor is there any ſign of it in his diſcourſes. If I can clearly make this out, it muſt be deciſive againſt the interpretations hitherto given by commentators. Now 'tis manifeſt that our Lord deſign'd to poſſeſs his diſciples with high apprehenſions of the great dignity God hath confer'd upon them, and the ſervice for which he intended them; and this in order to his more powerfully exciting them to their duty. But every one muſt perceive, that in this caſe nothing could be more improper than for the ſpeaker, in the progreſs of his diſcourſe, to fall and ſink in his compariſons. 'Tis rather his buſineſs to raiſe and heighten the idea of his auditors, or at leaſt to keep it up to as high a pitch as he had before ſet it; and ſuch words are therefore to be choſen by him as are adapted to this purpoſe.

I have been apt to think ſomewhat of this nature may be obſerved here in our Lord's diſcourſe; and though the remark ſhould not prove ſatisfactory, yet the taking notice of it will illuſtrate what I now deſign. Let the reader then compare the two reſemblances our Lord uſes of his diſciples, *ver.* 13, 14. wherein he ſeems to have had a regard to this rule in the art of ſpeaking. In *ver.* 13. he ſays, *Ye are the ſalt of the* EARTH: In *ver.* 14. *Ye are the light of the* WORLD. Commentators tell us that by the *earth* and the *world* we are to underſtand the ſame thing: and indeed, when we come to give the explications of the compariſons, 'tis natural enough to take them in that manner. But ſee how the expreſſion riſes and greatens in the ſecond compariſon. In the firſt they were the ſalt of the *earth*; which however large it appears to us, is but a ſmall and inconſiderable ſpot, in compariſon of the *world*, mentioned in the ſecond, when they are ſaid to be the *light of the* WORLD. By ſtiling them the *light of the world*, he compares them to the *ſun* (ſee *John* xi. 9, 10.) which is placed in the heavens, and diffuſes its light and influences through vaſt

and

and immenſe regions, and is not confined to ſuch a ſmall and inconſiderable point as this *earth* comparatively is. So that here in the progreſs of his diſcourſe there is a riſing and greatning the idea, and the adding new ſpirit and life, as it were, to the inculcated notion of the dignity confer'd upon them. But how ſtrangely would it ſound for any teacher, and eſpecially ſuch a perfect one as our bleſſed Lord, to ſink his compariſon and reſemblance ſo low, as is generally ſuppoſed, in the ſame breath, and after he had compared them to the *ſun* in the firmament, immediately to reſemble them by a poor ſorry candle lighted up in a narrow houſe, whoſe light is nothing at all in compariſon of that of the ſun?

Upon the whole therefore, it ſeems moſt natural and eaſy to underſtand our Lord as comparing his diſciples only to one thing, *viz. the light of the world.*

But then the queſtion will be, How are the two other paſſages to be underſtood, if they are not deſign'd to be proper compariſons?

To this I anſwer, that our Lord by comparing them to the *light of the world*, deſign'd to admoniſh them of their duty, as well as to put them in mind of the honour confer'd upon them. Their duty was to exert their light in the beſt manner they could, and to indeavour, according to their character, and the nature of light, to be as conſpicuous as poſſible. They were not therefore to expect to paſs through the world unobſerved and unregarded; nor were they to affect or indeavour it; as they might be under a temptation to do it from the perſecutions they might meet with, and of which our Lord had juſt before warn'd them, *ver.* 10—12. 'Tis the buſineſs of light to diſcover other things, *Eph.* v. 13. and it can't it ſelf but be viſible; and 'tis not poſſible that men ſhould diſcern other things by the light of the ſun, and yet take no notice of the ſun it ſelf. Hence then our Lord inculcates it upon his diſciples, that they muſt reckon upon being much obſerved, and upon that account muſt be the more careful not to conceal their light, but let it ſhine forth more brightly *before men*, i. e. in the ſight of all that behold them, *ver.* 16. or as 'tis expreſs'd by St. *Paul*, *Philip.* ii. 15, 16. They were to be *blameleſs and harmleſs, the ſons of God, without rebuke, in the midſt of a crooked and perverſe nation, among whom* they were to *ſhine as* LIGHTS *in the world, holding forth the word of life.* 'Tis evident from

the application, *ver.* 16. that this is the thing our Saviour design'd to inculcate upon his followers. Now this he inforces from the intention of God; *q. d.* " God would not have appointed you to " be the light of the world, if he had design'd you ſhould be hid " and concealed from the view of the world." And to illuſtrate and confirm this, are thoſe two paſſages brought in by him, whereby he teaches them to uſe the ſame method in judging of the deſign of God, that they did in judging of the deſigns of men, namely, to judge by the nature of the works. I think therefore I may expreſs our Lord's meaning in the following paraphraſe.

" 'Tis manifeſt, when men build a city upon a hill, they have " no intention that it ſhould not be ſeen. If an obſcure habita- " tion were deſigned, it ſhould be ſome den or cave of the earth, " or a ſmall cottage in a valley or a wood, and not a well built " city on the top of a hill. And again, when men light a candle, " they don't do it to put it under a buſhel, or any veſſel that ſhould " incloſe and ſhut up the light of it, which would render their " action inſignificant and impertinent; but they ſet it where it " may be moſt commodiouſly viewed, and beſt diffuſe its light, " and ſo be moſt uſeful in the houſe. Thus you account for mens " deſigns by their actions: do the like in accounting for God's de- " ſigns; and therefore expect not to be hid, ſince God has ap- " pointed you to be the light of the world. As therefore men " light a candle to give light to thoſe who are in the houſe, ſo " God has made you the light of the world, that you may ſhine in " and give light to it. This then you are to indeavour to do; " and accordingly, *Let your light ſo ſhine before men, that they* " *may ſee your good works, and glorify your Father which is in* " *heaven.*"

DISSERTATION V.

MARK vi. 39, 40.

And he commanded them to make all ſit down by companies upon the green graſs. And they ſat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties.

Καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλῖναι πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ. Καὶ ἀνέπεσον πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ, ἀνὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα.

I Have nothing to add to what is commonly alleged by commentators, concerning the ſenſe of the words πρασιαὶ and συμπόσια. The only reaſon why I take notice of this place, is that I may explain the manner in which the multitudes ſat when Chriſt fed them, which can, I think, be learned only from this text. The common opinion, as far as I have perceived, is that they were placed an hundred in one company and fifty in another, and ſo all of them diſpoſed into companies of one or the other number in diſtant places. This has appeared to me very confuſed and abſurd. The diſciples muſt have ſpent a long time in ranging ſuch a multitude in this order, which the circumſtances of the time when this was done will not well admit. For this was done in the *evening*, *when the time was now paſt*, as the diſciples ſay, *Matt.* xiv. 15. or when *the day began to wear away*, Luke ix. 12. or as St. *Mark* here ſays, *ver.* 35. *the day was now far ſpent*, and *the time was far paſſed.* To range therefore five thouſand perſons into ſo many diſtinct and ſeparate companies, would require more hours than the

the time of the day would then allow. Beſides, what end would ſuch an ordering of them anſwer? And why ſhould they not all of them have been placed in companies of hundreds, or all of them in companies of fifties? The eaſe and advantage of the twelve diſciples in diſtributing the loaves and the fiſhes could not be herein conſulted, ſince it would have been the ſame trouble to any of them to diſtribute to two companies of fifty, as to one of an hundred. Nor would this have anſwer'd any ſuch other ends, as I ſhall preſently mention, when I have given another account of the manner in which the multitudes were diſpoſed.

My opinion therefore is, that the whole multitude was ranged into one company after the manner of ſoldiers, and that they were an hundred in length and fifty in depth, or an hundred in rank and fifty in file. My reaſons for this interpretation are theſe.

Firſt, That this way of ranging them was the ſhorteſt, and therefore beſt fitted the ſtraitneſs of the time in which it was to be done. A little care will ſerve to place the hundred in front in due order, and to prevent the files exceeding the number fifty; and theſe being fixed, the reſt of the ranks and files would be filled up with little or no trouble.

Secondly, This account exactly ſuits the number of the multitudes. For ſuppoſing them thus ranged, an hundred multiplied by fifty will give exactly five thouſand, in which all the four evangeliſts do agree, *Matt.* xiv. 21. *Mark* vi. 42. *Luke* ix. 14. *John* vi. 10.

Thirdly, This interpretation perfectly reconciles St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*, which, as far as I can ſee, no other can poſſibly do. 'Tis expreſs in *Mark*, That *they ſat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties.* But in *Luke* ix. 14, 15. Chriſt ſays to his diſciples, *Make them ſit down by* FIFTIES *in a company.* And 'tis added, *And they did* so, *and made them* ALL *ſit down.* Now if they ſat in diſtinct and diſpers'd companies, how could they *all* ſit down by *fifties*, ſince ſome of the companies according to St. *Mark* conſiſted of hundreds? But according to the interpretation juſt now offered, every one ſat in a rank of an hundred, and every one in a rank of fifty; and ſo they might be ſaid to ſit down either by hundreds or by fifties, or by both.

Fourthly, This interpretation ſeems beſt to ſuit ſeveral things which our Lord may reaſonably be ſuppoſed to deſign, when he order'd them to be diſpoſed into ranks or companies at all. As,

(1.) This was as convenient for the eaſy diſtribution of the loaves and the fiſhes, as any other could be; and indeed it ſeems to have been much more ſo. If we ſuppoſe the one half of the multitude to be formed into companies of an hundred each, they will make five and twenty ſuch companies, and the reſt will make fifty companies of fifty each, that is in the whole ſeventy-five diſtinct companies; or if we ſuppoſe them to have made pretty near an equal number of companies of each ſort, and that there were thirty-three companies conſiſting of an hundred each, and thirty-four of fifty each, they will then make up ſixty-ſeven ſuch diſtinct companies; and there being but twelve to diſtribute to them, the diſtinct companies of ſuch a multitude would have been apt to be clamorous, when they ſaw others ſerved before them; and it would have been more eaſy for ſome of them to be over-look'd, which might have added to the confuſion. But when they all formed only one company, and the twelve diſciples went orderly along the ſeveral ranks, every one would be eaſy and quiet, ſeeing plainly that the loaves and fiſhes were coming to him, and he ſhould be ſerved in his turn. (2.) By this means every one would more eaſily perceive the number of thoſe our Saviour fed, and ſo the greatneſs of the miracle he performed. It was much more eaſy to reckon up the numbers of thoſe in rank and thoſe in file, and ſo to compute the ſum total, than it would have been to number firſt the ſeveral companies, and then of how many each conſiſted, and ſo the number of the whole. Beſides, the thing could not then have been ſo evident to them. It was an ocular demonſtration each of them might have of the numbers according to the interpretation propoſed: but they might have doubted, whether, if the other way had been taken, the diſciples had placed them exactly by hundreds and by fifties in a company; nor was it poſſible for them to examine each company thoroughly. (3.) They might, according to this account, much more conveniently behold our Saviour in working this miracle, and ſee that there was no fraud or colluſion in what he did; and might have the more advantage for hearing his diſcourſes to them, as 'tis not improbable that he took that opportunity of giving them uſeful inſtructions. This could not well be, had they been diſpoſed into ſixty or ſeventy diſtinct companies; but it might eaſily, if we ſuppoſe them all ranged in the aforeſaid manner in one company, and eſpecially if we imagine them to be placed upon the ſide of an hill, as our Lord ſeems to have choſen that advan-

tage

tage when he preached to the multitudes. And indeed this is not an arbitrary imagination, it being certain from *John* vi. 2, 3. that our Saviour was upon a mountain when he wrought this miracle.

The reader will bear with me in making two ſhort reflections upon this occaſion.

Firſt, That the order our Lord gave for this placing of the multitudes, as it was deſigned for the ſatisfaction of his diſciples and the multitudes concerning the greatneſs of the miracle, ſo it ſeems to have proceeded from the exact and certain knowledge he had of their numbers previouſly to their being thus ranged. Had he not known himſelf before-hand their number, he could not have preſcribed ſo exactly in what form; or to what number they might be beſt ranked both ways; even as an officer muſt firſt know what number of ſoldiers he has, before he can pitch upon the propereſt method or form of ranging them.

Secondly, It ſeems reaſonable to allow the like order to have been obſerved when our Saviour fed the four thouſand; though it is not mentioned by the Evangeliſts; *Mark* viii. 6—9. *Matt.* xv. 35—38. and that then they were placed either an hundred in rank and forty in file, or elſe eighty in rank and fifty in file. Abſtracting from the clear evidence we have of the fact in the other caſe, the ſame reaſons may induce us to believe that the like method was obſerved at both times; and that which is clear and certain may well ſerve as a key to the interpretation of the other, though the thing be not expreſly declared.

DISSER-

DISSERTATION VI.

I COR. viii. 3.

Εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν Θεὸν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

But if any man love God, the ſame is known of him.

MR. *Locke*, from the ſcope of St. *Paul*'s diſcourſe, has doubtleſs given the true ſenſe in the main of what he here ſays. 'Tis manifeſt that he is not here ſpeaking of God's knowledge of men, but barely of mens knowledge of God. As he obſerves in his *contents* of the *ſection*, " The deſign of the apoſtle ſeems to be " to take down the opinion the *Corinthians* had of their know- " ledge, by ſhowing them that notwithſtanding all the knowledge " they preſumed on, and were puffed up with, yet the eating of " thoſe ſacrifices [the things offer'd to idols] did not recommend " them to God; and that they might ſin in their want of charity, " by offending their weak brother." To clear this farther it will not be amiſs to take notice of the two preceding verſes, according to Mr. *Locke*'s paraphraſe upon them, which runs thus: " As for " things offer'd up unto idols, it muſt not be queſtioned but that " every one of you who ſtand ſo much upon your knowledge, " know that the imaginary Gods, to whom the *Gentiles* ſacrifice, " are not in reality Gods, but mere fiction: but with this pray " remember, that ſuch a knowledge, or opinion of their know- " ledge, ſwells men with pride and vanity. But charity it is that " improves and advances men in Chriſtianity. But if any one be " conceited of his own knowledge, as if Chriſtianity were a ſcience " for ſpeculation and diſpute, he knows nothing yet of Chriſtia- " nity as he ought to know it." This plainly leads us to underſtand the next verſe now under conſideration, and which is brought in by way of oppoſition to *ver.* 2. as ſpeaking of mens knowing God,

God, and not of his knowing them. And when he aſſerted of one conceited of his knowledge, that he *knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know it*, and brings in the next ſentence with the adverſative *but*, it was natural to expect that he ſhould ſay ſomewhat of thoſe who were not conceited of their knowledge, but who indeed had the true knowledge of God. And to this purpoſe Mr. *Locke* underſtands *ver.* 3. " But *(ſays he, in his paraphraſe)* if any one " love God, and conſequently his neighbour for God's ſake, ſuch " an one is made to know, or has got the true knowledge from " God himſelf." I can't ſee there can be any cauſe to queſtion that he has hit the true deſign of the verſe. But that which has given me occaſion to treat of it, is that I think neither he, nor any other commentator whoſe writings I have conſulted, have choſen the true conſtruction of the words. As to thoſe who underſtand them thus, *If any man love God, the ſame is known* [that is, *approved*] *of him*, they ſeem quite to miſtake the deſign of the place. Mr. *Locke*'s note is this: " Εγνωσται, *is made to know*, or *is taught*. " The apoſtle, though writing in *Greek*, yet often uſes the *Greek* " verbs according to the *Hebrew* conjugations. So *Chap.* xiii. 12. " ἐπιγνώσομαι, which according to the *Greek* propriety ſignifies " *I ſhall be known*, is uſed for *I ſhall be made to know*; and ſo *Gal.* " iv. 9. γνωσθέντες is put to ſignify *being taught*." He ſuppoſed doubtleſs that the apoſtle here uſed this *Greek* verb, as though it were in the *Hebrew* conjugation *Hiphil*. I can't intirely agree with him that ἐπιγνώσομαι, according to the *Greek* propriety, ſignifies *I ſhall be known*. Had it indeed been ἐπιγνωσθήσομαι, this might be pretended; but ἐπιγνώσομαι being a future in the middle voice, does properly enough ſignify, *I ſhall know*: nor do I perceive, that in the place refer'd to by him, he apprehended any neceſſity of making it denote more. For thus he paraphraſes thoſe words, *Then ſhall I know*, " I ſhall have an intuitive, comprehenſive " knowledge of things." And thus is the word uſed, *Matt.* vii. 16, 20. *By their fruits ye ſhall know them*, ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς. Nor can any great ſtreſs be laid upon his obſervation concerning γνωσθέντες, *Gal.* iv. 9. For when γινώσκεσθαι is uſed paſſively, it ſignifies barely *to be known*, as many places ſhow. See *Matt.* xii. 33. *Luke* vi. 44. viii. 17. and many others. And when that excellent expoſitor wrote upon the *Galatians*, he perceived not any neceſſity of the interpretation he here mentions, but explain'd their *being known of God*, by their *being taken into favour by him*.

And

And though I deny not that some *Hebraisms* are to be found in the writings of the evangelists and apostles, yet I am with Mr. *Gataker* persuaded that some persons have made them many more than they really are. Nor do I question but that it will be readily allowed, by all equal judges, that we ought to avoid them where we can, and where we can give a truly natural and *Greek* construction of the words, without having recourse to such a hard and difficult method of explaining them. And such I think presently offers it self in this place, if we only refer the ὅδε, *he*, or *the same*, to the nearest antecedent Θεὸν, and not to τις, *any man*, the more remote. For then the true and easy rendring of the words will be this: *But if any man love God*, he [or the *same God*] *is known of him* [of that man.] That ὅτος may thus refer to the nearest antecedent, see *Acts* x. 36.

F I N I S.