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

Having perus'd several Sheets of an English Version of my Additions to Dr. Hammond on the New Testament, which were sent me over, I was well satisfied with the care and faithfulness of the Translator, not doubting of his exactness in the other Sheets, which I have not yet look'd over; but considering how unfit Judges of such kind of Writings, those who can read them only in their mother Tongue often are, I could not tell whether I had any occasion to rejoice. For hereby those things are submitted to the Censure of the Vulgar, which are in part above a vulgar Capacity; for there are several things in this Volume, which, tho' render'd into English, cannot be understood but by those who have some skill in the Greek Language, and in Heathen and Ecclesiastical Antiquities. No others can safely enough judg of them, because the force of Arguments many times entirely depends upon knowing the use of the Greek Tongue, or Ecclesiastical or Profane History. Yet no Men determine more confidently of these things than those who want that knowledg; because they think themselves competent Judges of every thing that is written in their own Language. And therefore I have often wonder'd that the learned Man, whose Annotations I have translated into Latin, did not chuse rather to write in Latin, than in English; when he very well knew that a great many, nay all the best things he had written in them, were such as could not be understood by mere English Readers. Besides, I did not know whether some learned Men of your Church-Clergy might think well of a Translation of my Additions; not because I have any where opposed the Doctrins of the Church of England, but because many, I can't tell why, are displeased that the Books of Strangers should be read by their Countrymen. I have found this by experience, both before
and not long since, when one that was a perfect Stranger to me, without my Knowledge and Consent, turned into English the Lives of some Fathers that I had written in French a considerable time before, in the Bibliotheca Universalis. For those English Lives, which I have not yet seen, stirred up against me the learned Dr. Cave, who perhaps would have said nothing about the French Lives; at least he was till that time silent, when in truth he had no reason to reflect upon me for any thing I had said in them, as I shall some time or other, and perhaps soon, shew. And yet there is no man it may be in the Continent, that has a greater value for the English Clergy, and other learned Men of that Nation, than I, or that speaks or writes oftner in their praise; and this not out of Flattery (for what Advantages have I, or can have from thence, who have long since settled my self in Holland?) but because I am really of that mind. And this I have testified also by my Actions, having translated several of their Writings into more known Languages than English, that every one might have the benefit of the Learning of the English Nation. What therefore can be the reason, why some English Gentlemen are unwilling to have my Writings read in English? I do not know, nor do I think my self concerned to be very inquisitive into it.

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

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

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

Dr. Hammond was not only a very skilful Divine, but an excellent Grecian and likewise Hebrician, the Idioms of which Language are often mixed by the Writers of the New Testament with Greek Expressions. They that understand only speculative Divinity, often stumble in particular Passages, and many times look for Doctrines, true indeed in themselves, but nothing at all to their purpose, in places where they are not; and know not how to make a right use of those places whence they may really be deduced. They are contented not to oppose the received Doctrines, and think they cannot do amiss in seeking them any where, provided the words do not too plainly oppose it. By which means we see the Antient Interpreters of Scripture, both Greek and Latin, because they had no regard to Words or Grammar, but minded only truth of Doctrine, have strangely mistaken the genuine sense of Scripture. Hence, in part, came innumerable vain Allegories; which I do not call vain, because they contain false Doctrines, but because they are grounded upon no certain reason. Hence proceeded the violent Interpretations, and pitiful Subtilities, with which the Writings of those Interpreters abound. We need but read St. Austin's Commentaries on the Psalms, where we shall scarce
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meet with a page, that has not some examples of this kind. Which if it were a true way of interpreting, any thing almost might be proved or disproved out of any place whatsoever. This Dr. Hammond carefully avoided, and would have avoided more, if some particular things had not a little too often occurred to his thoughts; as the Hereby of the Gnosticks, the Destruction of Jerusalem, and Church-Discipline; which three things he frequently fought for, where no body acquainted with the Apostles' time, had ever before look'd for them, and few again ever will. Yet, as I said before, Dr. Hammond does not near so often dash upon this Rock, as the Antient, or most late Interpreters, especially those who have written in the last Age. I might add this also, which is no small commendation of his Annotations, that he follows mostly that scheme of Divinity which is more agreeable to Scripture, than the Opinions of many Interpreters, keeping a middle way between those who deduce a sort of fatal Necessity from all eternity, of which necessity the Mind of Man is a mere Instrument; and those, who like the Heathens, are said to deny that Virtue is at all owing to God.

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

The third Qualification, which I said was a Critical Habit of judging concerning the meaning of places, tho it was not so great in him as the two former, was however considerable. And this I doubt not he attained by a diligent reading of the best Writers, especially Grotius; and he would have acquired it in a much greater degree, if the constant trouble of defending the Church of England, against several sorts of Adversaries, had not diverted him. But if we compare him with the Antient Interpreters, or with the greatest part of those who have written in the foregoing Age, we shall find none among the Antients, and but few among those of late, that can be thought his Equals. For the Antients tho they understood Greek, trusted more to their skill in Rhetorick than Language; and took more pleasure in running out into common places, or Allegories, than in seriously interpreting words and expressions. Origen and St. Jerom, who besides understood Hebrew, did also much more seldom
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use their knowledge in that kind, than a sort of Eloquence which took much in their Age. And latter Interpreters have been more industrious to fill up their Commentaries with their own Divinity, and Controversies with other Sects of Chriftians, than with strict enquiries into the signification of Words and Phrases. But Dr. Hammond, considering what is expected from an Interpreter, and knowing the difference between a Preacher or a Divine, and an Expositor of Scripture, sets himself to perform the part of an Interpreter, and seldom concerns himself about any thing else.

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

But to give these Men satisfaction, if they are willing to be satisfied, I would fain know which of the two ought to be most valued, Dr. Hammond's Honour, or Truth? The Reputation of a Man long since dead, and whose Opinions no Law divine or humane obliges us to follow; or the defence of immortal Truth, which we cannot forsake without offending both God and Men? If they are of that humour, that they had rather maintain the Honour of a learned Divine, as I before said, but subject to error, than Truth, they are not fit to be spoken with. I will have no contest with such Men as profess themselves enemies to Truth; but shall leave them, without any reply, to the Mercy of their own perverse Temper. But the Errors, they say, of great Men, ought to be conceal'd, rather than aggravated. I answer, I have nowhere aggravated any thing, but confuted him in the softest terms, whenever I supposed him in a mistake. However, I don't think the greatest Mens Faults ought to be conceal'd, who the greater they are thought to be, the more liable unwary men are to be deceived by them, and therefore whenever they are out of the way, they ought above all others to be set right again. It is just we should forgive their Mistakes, and bear with their Defects, in consideration of their greater Vertues, and the notable Service they have done the learned World; but we ought not to let Errors pass.
pass under the disguise of Truths. It becomes all Candidates of Learning, especially those that study the Scriptures, to endeavour all they can, and contend earnestly, that Truth upon all occasions may appear; not that it may be concealed, out of respect to any man, or Error receiv'd instead of Truth. The only thing justly blamable, in those who take upon them to correct the Mistakes of great Men, is, if they charge them fallly, passionately, or maliciously, not for the manifestation of Truth, but to lessen their Reputation; or if they endeavour to obscure their great Excellencies, and severely inveigh against small Offences as unpardonable Crimes.

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

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

There is fallen lately into my hands an English Pamphlet intitled *A Free but Modest Censure* of some Controversial Books written in English, and among the rest of my *Ars Critica*, tho a Latin Treatise, and quite of another nature from those Controversies. To which there is also added the Authors judgment concerning my design in translating Dr. Hammond, of which I shall here subjoin a few things. That Modest, but Free Writer, whosoever he be, will not take it amiss, or at least cannot in reason, if I modestly and freely vindicate my intention. He
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says, it is a harmful project to publish Dr. Hammond's Annotations on the New Testament, and at the same time to mix my own Additional Notes with them. This, says he, is a politick way to promote the Cause, especially in England, where the Works of that learned and pious Annotator are in so great esteem: When his Criticisms and Interpretations are blended with the Socinian ones, how easily will they be both imbied together? I thought fit to caution my Countrymen about this hazard, that they may not be betrayed into Error, even the worst of Errors, whilst they are intent upon studying the Truth.

The Cause I have undertaken to defend, both in all my other printed Works, and my Additions to Dr. Hammond, is no other than the Cause of Christ and his Apostles; whose Authority alone (in matters of Religion) all Protestants think is to be regarded and followed, if we may judge of their Opinion by the Confessions they subscribe; of which mind I always was and ever shall be. I value the Authority of Socinus, or any other uninspired persons whatever, destitute of reason, no more than Dr. Hammond's or the Council of Trent's. When I think they agree with Christ and his Apostles, I assent to them; and if not, I differ from them. I never read all Socinus his Works, nor like his peculiar Opinions, so far as I know them, any more than other mens, whom I judge to be in an Error. Nay, I have sometimes confuted them, and as I see occasion shall confute more of them; not with a design to make his Followers odious, or to gain the favour of any Mortal, but to vindicate Truth. However, I am not of their mind who because men err in some things, that are otherwise obedient to the Precepts of the Gospel, and look for the coming of Christ to judge the quick and the dead, after the resurrection, by the rule of the Gospel, and reward the Good and punish the Wicked; and think not that they can attain Salvation by any other means, than the Faith they have in Christ, as one sent from God, which Faith alone they hope by the mercy of God, to have imputed to them for righteousness: I am not, I say, of their mind that sentence such men to everlasting Flames, into which they would, if they were able, immediately hurry them, without the least mercy; and in the mean time decree in a cruel manner to persecute them with Execrations, and Ecclesiastical and Civil Punishments. I have not so learned Christ, I do not find the Apostles ever acted in that manner: and whilst they are silent, and do not lead the way by their Example, I had rather incur the danger of being too merciful, than expose my self to the Charge of the least Cruelty and Barbarity. God will much sooner forgive them
them that heartily love him, that is, who keep his Commandments, and especially that great and so often repeated one of loving our Neighbour, their excessive Charity, if any Charity can be excessive towards men fearing God and Christ, tho in some things erroneous; than that horrible inhumanity, with which they are frequently defamed, and persecuted, and forced to endure all manner of Punishments, only because they profess themselves not to believe, what they think Christ or his Apostles never revealed. I had infinitely rather stand in the number of the merciful, before the tribunal of the great Judge, than in the company of Persecutors, whatever their Riches or Honours are in this World. I had rather be in the mean while evil spoken of and suspected of Errors, which I am as far from as can be, than appear by any means to countenance such Barbarity.

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

I am not at all for diminishing Dr. Hammond's Reputation, as I have already sufficiently declared; I do not deny but he was a pious and learned man; nay if I had not those thoughts of him, I would never have undertaken to translate one line of his Writings. But my Animadversions neither need his Piety nor Learning to make them be read, if they are valuable; and if they are not, the Learning and Piety of Dr. Hammond will not procure me the Reader's favour: on the contrary,
contrary, if I am any where mistaken, the comparing them with Dr. Hammond will but render my Mistakes the more visible. But Socinian Doctrins, says my Censurer, will be imbied with the true. I answer, I have before denied, that I follow Socinus as my Guide; but I don't understand why this Censurer should be so much afraid lest the true Doctrins asserterd by Dr. Hammond should not be effectual to prevent the ill impressions, that false and Socinian Interpretations may make upon Readers minds. If I were to reason after his manner, I should say that this Censurer is a close Socinian; who by secret methods endeavours to advance the credit of Socinus his Opinions. For it must needs be a very powerful Doctrine in his apprehension, which if any, tho' never so little, of it be mixed with the Writings of Orthodox Divines, it so obscures all their Reasons, that whether they will or no, it is easily imbied. This way of arguing tends more to magnify and promote, than to depress and extinguish Socinianism, against which the most learned Annotations on the New Testament are not, it seems, a sufficient Preservative. Besides this, there is another thing which gives ground for suspicion, and it is what my Censurer, and other such as he generally stand by. To wit, If a person be any thing ingenious, or more learned than ordinary, and writes out of the common road, he is presently a Socinian; as if all men of sense must needs turn Socinians. We have lately had a remarkable instance of this in the worthy and ingenious Mr. Lock, who, because he reasons more accurately about many things, than any before him had done, in his Excellent Treatise of Humane Understanding, is immediately cried down as a Socinian, by this Censurer and others. This is in earnest to favour the Socinians, to make all good wits of their number. Just such reports were formerly spread of Hug. Grotius, and Ren. Cartesius; which were no disgrace at all to those men, but an honour to the Socinians. So Erasmus was before charged with Arianism, by the Monks of those times, and others no better than they; as if it had been impossible for a man of his capacity to be Orthodox. I am conscious to myself how far I came short of those great men in learning and natural abilities; but if my Censurer was in earnest in the commendations he bestows upon me, he must needs own, that those endowments of mind which he attributes to me, were also the occasion of my falling into those Opinions, which he calls the worst of errors. But if he only flatter'd me, that he might speak the more spitefully of me afterwards, let me tell him, that feigned Respect is an argument of very little candour, to say no worse of it.

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

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

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

I said in Part 1. Chap. 1. § 3. That many things in the Writings of the Antients had a respect to the Opinions of their Times; which must therefore be known; that we may understand what they mean. Ita cum Judaeorum praecipua in divino cultu ceremonia in sacrificio effentista; ideo in Novo Testamento omnia fere piestatis officia sacrificii nomine interdum indigitari. So because the chief Ceremony of the Jews in divine
Worship was Sacrificing, therefore in the New Testament almost all religious duties are sometimes expressed by the name of Sacrifices. Then I add, Mortem Christi sacrificium quoque vocari, quod fuerit praeipua ejus pietatis pars, & quaedam babea sacrificiis similia: That the death of Christ is called also a Sacrifice, because it was the chief part of his Obedience, and had some things in it resembling Sacrifices. Here my Censor translated my words so negligently, that he renders the Phrase ejus pietatis, of that Religion, as if I had a respect to the Jewish Religion; whereas I manifestly speak of Christ's Piety towards his Father. Then hence he infers, that I suppose the Sacrifice of Christ was only a metaphorical and improper Sacrifice, to side with those that reject Christ's Satisfaction. But what kind of Logick is this? That action of Christ, by which he principally redeemed men, is called a Sacrifice, by a Phrase taken from the Custom of the Jews, tho' it did not in all things resemble a Sacrifice: therefore Christ did not redeem us. By what revelation came my Censor to know, that to the end Christ might redeem men, it was requisite he should be slain just like a Victim, without any manner of difference? And how will he prove that there was every thing in the death of Christ which was observable in a Sacrifice? It's certain the Priest and the Sacrifice was not the same; the Sacrifice was slain in a consecrated place, the Blood of it was poured out at the foot of an Altar; and many other Rites were used, none of which, properly speaking, were observed in Christ's Crucifixion. Notwithstanding which, the Death of Christ might have all the efficacy of a Sacrifice. It is fit, for my Censor's information, to observe that we are not to seek for all the circumstances of a Sacrifice in the death of Christ; because in so doing men often mix their own rotten Inventions with divine Revelation: as for instance, some inconsiderately say, that the Cross was an Altar; whereas there neither was, nor could be, any Altar in this Oblation, upon which the Sacrifice was to be consecrated: as it was in the Levitical Sacrifices. But this every one knows, and I would not have mention'd it, but that my Censor speaks as if he was ignorant of it. As for his saying that what I affirm of the word Sacrifice being attributed to the Death of Christ, is nothing to the business of which I undertook to treat in that place of my Ars Critica, I leave that to the examination of the Reader. I have not so much time to spare, that I should always be teaching the Elements of Logick or Grammar.
In Part II. §. 1. c. 3. I have put it beyond all doubt, that tho the most high God is styled by the Jews Elohim, yet that word signifies God, as he is the object of Worship, σεβασμός, not his most perfect Nature. I have shewn also that the word סֵתֵיס was used by the Jews that spake Greek, by the Gentiles and the Christians themselves in the same sense; which is of no small use to the understanding of innumerable Passages in ancient Writers, both sacred and profane, which would otherwise be very obscure. Nothing can be more evident; and the design of the whole Chapter, to those who are not wilfully blind, is very plain. The thing itself is not opposed by my unknown Censurer, because it is undeniable, and is confirmed by the Consent of the most learned men; but he suspects that my design in writing it was to intimate that tho our Saviour might be the object of divine Worship, yet that he is not God. Whether he speaks as he thinks I cannot tell, be that to himself; but I beseech him never to treat any other man at the same rate as he has done me. For to pretend to know the secret designs of Men, is not only immodest, but senseless; and in this matter I assure him he is utterly mistaken. I never thought Christ might be the object of divine Worship, tho he was not God: that would be mere Idolatry. Nay, the Socinians themselves do not say that Christ ought to be worshipped as the most high God, while they do not think him to be the most high God; but only with such a Worship as is due to an Ambassador from the supreme Majesty. I would have my Censurer read their Books before he undertakes to oppose them; and not attribute to me what neither I nor any man else ever imagine'd. It is not the part of a modest Man to cavil at what he does not understand, nor of a man of Candor, to misrepresent other mens Principles.

In the following Chap. IV. I said I did not think there was any Emphasis in this Phrase, thou shalt die the death, Gen. ii. 16. but that it signified simply, Death; and I rejected both the Opinion of S. Austin, who looks here for I know not how many kinds of Death, and those who interpret it of Mortality, which Interpretation I affirmed to be contrary to the constant use of the Hebrew Language. What says my Censurer to this? Does he shew that Use is against me? Does he prove that I was mistaken? By no means; but he contends that I side with a Party, viz. of Socinians; as if there were not learned Interpreters of all Parties that reject that Interpretation; which can be defended by no Example, but only by weak Arguments. Besides, for my Censurer's satisfaction, tho I do not think Mortality is there meant, yet...
yet I doubt not but Adam was immortal before he sinned, and that he really became mortal by Sin, which he might have understood from my Commentary on Gen. iii. 19.

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

I said that by this Phrase of St. Luke in Acts xvi. 14. The Lord opened her Heart, that she attended to those things which were spoken of Paul, was meant no more than that, by divine Providence it came to pass, (quibus-cunque tandem machinis usus fit Deus) whatever engines God made use of that Lydia attentively gave ear to St. Paul: As sufficiently appears by the foregoing Examples. My Censurer thinks this to be a strange expression, quibus-cunque tandem machinis usus fit Deus; as if any that understood Latin did not know it to be a metaphorical Phrase taken from Cities, are batter’d with Engines. And my using such a Metaphor cannot seem strange to those, who have read in St. Paul 2 Cor. x. 4. that the Weapons of the Apostles warfare were not Carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strongholds. For why may not I use such another Metaphor, and say Engines? Who, besides, that has anything of Learning does not know that the best Latin Writers use that word in this Metaphorical Sense? Let my Censurer read but this Passage of Cicero in Epist. xviii. to Brutus: ad reliquos his quoque labor mibi accessit, ut omnes adhibeam machinas, ad tenendum adolescentem. But would you know, good Sir, what those machines were, which God made
made use of to open the Heart of Lydia, seeing I have not expressed my Mind more clearly in my Ars Critica? Why they were those spiritual Weapons of St. Paul, by which he pulled down strong holds; namely, the Gospel, which opens the Hearts of its Hearers, unless they are wilfully shut against God’s call. So the Jews ordinarily said that the Law opened their Hearts, as you may be informed by Lud. Cappellus on Luke xxiv. 25. A sort of Inspiration whereby God works upon all the hearers of the Gospel, to enable them to receive it as they ought, if it be not their own fault, or upon some only, whom he irresistibly works upon, is nowhere intimated in Scripture, as some of the most learned Men have long since shewn, whom my Censurer may read. Whereas he says that I insist upon the ambiguity of the words to redeem, and Spirit: on purpose to patronize Socinianism, that is but the repetition of a Calumny which he brings over so often as to make it nauseous. He can’t deny that what I said is true, but to lessen my Reputation, he pretends I wrote it with an ill design. I must undoubtedly, to please him, not only have reviled the Socinians, but made my self also a Liar, or concealed the Truth, that they might be the more easily refuted, or rather seem to be so. Then the commendableness of my design would have made all my dissimulations and falsehoods praise-worthy: But these are the tricks of a Man whose own Conscience condemns him, and who is a great favourer of the Socinian cause, whilst to undiscerning Persons he seems to oppose it. Which if it was not my Censurer’s design, as I will not affirm; at least he manages things so, that it is as easy to see he is as unfit a Man to put an end to that Controversy, as he is good at detracting and calumniating.

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

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

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

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

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

In Chap. xiv. I did not say that St. John had the same thoughts of the eternal Reason, as Plato; but only called the Divinity which dwelt in Christ, as, in a Platonical manner; and added, that it remained to be enquir'd whether S. John understood that word in a Platonical sense, plainly intimating that I thought the same word might be taken in different notions. I said also that if that word were to be understood in a Platonical sense in St. John, we should be forced to go over to the Arians; which, according to the opinion my Censurer represents me to be of, no Man in his wits would say it were necessary to do.
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But this searcher into Heresies forgot that Platonism or Arianism was very different from Socinianism. And he knows not, or makes as if he did not know, that I have in a particular Dissertation, explained the beginning of St. John’s Gospel, in a sense contrary to Platonism. Whereas I said that all Christians do at this day very much differ from the Opinion of the Nicene Council, he knows that can be manifestly proved from English Books, not to mention Latin. He knows very well that the learned Dr. Cudworth has proved that the Nicene Fathers, and others, thought the three Hypostases to be three equal Gods, as we should now express it. Let him read also the Life of Gregory Nazianzen, which I have written, and has been translated into English, if he does not understand French; and he will find that Gregory was undoubtedly of that Opinion. The thing is so clear, that it cannot be question’d by those who have consider’d it. But of this elsewhere.

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

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

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

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

At last he concludes his unjust Accusations with an Observation, which effectually confutes almost all he had said before: to wit, that I have alluded nothing new in favour of the Socinians about those places, nor endeavoured to confute Bishop Pearson, and Bishop Stillingfleet. For thence he ought to have inferred, that I had another design, which I should not have executed otherwise than I have done, if there had never been any Socinians in the World. My intention having been only to shew the use of Critics in things of the greatest moment, and if I am not mistaken, I have reached my end. The rest of what my Censurer says, has either been already confuted, or does not deserve consideration.
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This, worthy Sir, is what I thought fit to say of Dr. Hammond and my Ars Critica, which I had a mind should be published, that the World might have this Testimonial of my Intentions, not to engage my self in a Quarrel with my Censurer; who if he be not brought to righter Apprehensions by what I have here said, no Arguments would ever convince him. Let him now call himself to an account for his Accusations, and not hope that God should be propitious to him, unless he repent of his unchristian Behaviour; which I speak with so hearty a good will to him, that I earnestly pray God not to lay this thing to his charge, but rather reduce him to a better Mind.

Yours,

Amsterdam,
Jan. 25. 1693.

J. Le Clerc.

Errata.


Addi-
Additions to Dr. Hammond's Annotations on the New Testament.

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

To this which Dr. Hammond has observed of the word ἡμέρα, if we add what is said of the same word by Grotius, there will remain but this one thing further to be noted, whereby many places of Scripture, yea the whole Christian Doctrine may be illustrated: Namely, that the word ἡμέρα, in whatever sense it be taken, is metaphorical, and borrowed from the Customs of Men; for Covenants and Testaments properly so called, are only made amongst Men. Now Metaphorical Terms are seldom grounded upon a perfect Similitude between those things, to which they are indifferently applied; and therefore they cannot always be screwed up to the whole Latitude of their natural Signification. It is sufficient if there be any Agreement, tho but small, between
tween the thing, of which any word is used in a metaphorical sense, and that which it properly signifies. So that all that can be inferred from the bare word, is, that the several things expressed by it, have some affinity with one another. And in order to determin wherein that similitude lies, we must carefully consider both things themselves: Which being done, we may argue from the thing to the signification of the word, but not from the word to the thing.

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

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

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

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

Addit. to the Remark on the words ἔκ τοῦ μεταξύ in the Title of the first Gospel, after these words, still remaining to us.] Barnabas who wrote in the same Age with St. Matthew, Ep. Cath. c. iii. cites this Gospel in these words: Attendamus ergo, ne forte, sicut scriptum est, multi vocati, pauci electi, inveniamur. Let us take heed therefore, lest we should be found as it is written, many are called, but few are chosen. These words are twice found in St. Matthew Chap. xx. 16, and xxii. 14. and in no other place of Scripture. For it is observable that St. Matthew is here cited as Scripture, as that form
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form of Speech, SICUT SCRIPTUM est, manifestly shows: wherefore we may infer in how great Esteem this Gospel was, as soon as ever it was published. Hence it came to pass that when Barnabas his Sepulchre was thought to have been found out by Revelation, by Anthemius Bisbop of Salarina in Cyprus, it was feigned that St. Matthew's Gospel was found also on the breast of Barnabas, written in Tables of Thyme wood (Thyinis tabulis.) See Theodor. Lector Lib. xiv. at the beginning; and Nicephorus Callist. Lib. xvi. c. 37. and Suidas on the word quia. It is reported also that the same Gospel was carried by Bartholomew into India, that is Æthiopia, where it was found by Pantenes Catichf of the Church of Alexandria, under the Reign of Commodus: see Euseb. Hist. Ecclef. Lib. v. c. 10. Those things, whether true or no, show that the Antients thought this Gospel was written before the others, and that the Apostles carried it about with them.
(1)

ANNOTATIONS
ON THE
GOSPEL according to St. Matthew.

CHAP. I.

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

And elsewhere, speaking of the Ocean, he calls it Σεαρ νεκταρ, that from which the Gods had their origin. בָּלָה יִבְשָׁמָה Therefore, as Grotius very well interprets it, is a description of the Origin, which title must be reckoned prefix'd only to this Chapter.

Ver. 8. יִבְשָׁמָה הַשִּׁמְשֹׁן וְיוֹסֵז [Yosè.] Here are three Kings left out; Abaziab, Jozæ, and Amaziab. Again, St. Luke reckoning up nineteen

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

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

'Ουκέλης ο' ουρανός τετοιον την χατα.
The Ocean from which all things had their origin.

And elsewhere, speaking of the Ocean, he calls it τον ουρανόν, that from which the Gods had their origin, Βίος λ᾽ γενεα. Therefore, as Grotius very well interprets it, is a description of the Origin, which title must be reckond prefix'd only to this Chapter.

Ver. 8. Τόνα, οινον, ο’ ουρανον. Here are three Kings left out, Abaziab, Joss, and Amaziab. Again, St. Luke reckoning up nineteen Generations,
Generations of natural Descendents from Salathiel to Joseph, whilst St. Matthew numbers but ten, according to legal extraction; this latter must needs have omitted seven persons likewise in his last class of generations. Concerning these Omissions, many make divers conjectures. That of Grotius is generally look’d upon to be the best; that St. Matthew kept to the number of Generations in the first Class from Abraham to David, which was most known, for memory sake, in the rest; and so it was necessary that some Generations should be omitted, that there might be but three fourteen. But it does not seem at all probable to others, that the Evangelist, merely for the sake of keeping to the number of fourteen, should designly pass over ten Persons, especially in that part of his Computation in which it behov’d him to use the greatest exactness, because it was least known; for till the time of the Captivity, the Genealogical series of the Royal Family of David was very well understood, but from that time to Christ it was known but obscurely. Besides, a person cannot be said to retain any Genealogy in his Memory, that out of fifty Persons, or thereabouts, omits ten; and if the Genealogy of Christ must needs have been divided into certain Classes, it was not therefore necessary that a fifth part of his Ancestors should be pass’d over to make a division into fourteen; when it had been easy to make another division. This made a very good Friend of mine think that St. Matthew lighted upon a genealogical Book of David’s Family that was defective; and accidentally observing there three Classes of fourteen Generations between these three great periods of time, viz. before the setting up of the Regal Government, during its continuance, and after its fall, was thereby mov’d to make such a division in his account of Christ’s Lineage, which he would not so much as have thought of, if he had made use of an entire Book. There was no reason, he said, to wonder at his saying that a genealogical Book might be corrupted, because a very great and considerable Error, that had formerly perplex’d the Antients, and by that appears to be a very old one, had crept into the 11th verse of St. Matthew’s Text itself, and that notwithstanding his accurate enumeration of Persons, and indication of their number. And hence also he thought it was, that there are some Persons omitted in 1 Chron. iv. 1. as likewise in chap. vi. in the recounting of Aaron’s Race, which Grotius upon this place observes. But this is submitted to the Judgment of the learned Reader. However it looks as if Matthew did in the 1st verse cite a Book of the origin of Christ, from whence he took all that follows, as far as verse 16.
Verf. 16. Ἰνος ὅ λεγοντος ἔκειτος. There are some Manuscripts in Chapter which the words Ἰνος ὅ λεγοντος are wanting, because the Transcribers thought them too languid; but in most of 'em, and those the oldest, they are found, as also in the ancient Versions. That Christian who inferred a Passage concerning Christ into Josephus's Antiquities, lib. 20. c. 8. did likewise make use of the same Phrase; upon which Origen against Celsus says, Josephus wrote that the Jews were oppress'd with so many evils for the bold attempts upon James the brother of Jesus, τὸ λεγόντα, that was call'd Christ, lib. 1. p. 37. concerning which place, see Tan. Faber in his Critical Epistles.

Verf. 18. Ἐφάνετο. i.e. it fell out or happen'd that she was big with child. So the word is taken in Apollodorus, Biblioth. lib. 1. c. 4. § 2. where he treats of the strife between Apollo and Marsyas; ἀθέτας ἔρχεται ἀπὸ Ἀπόλλων, when Apollo had overcome.

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

Mi Chreme, fateror, vincor; nunc hoc te obsccro
Ut mea justitia tua sit aliquid praefidii.

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

This Remark of Salmasius is confirm'd by an example out of Plutarch, lib. de curiosisate, p. 520. where he says that a person who is prying and inquisitive into the evils of other men, is like one that should have a Book full of Homer's Verses without a beginning, of tragical Incongruities of Speech, γὰς ὁ ἢ ἐπονομαστὶ τὰς γυναικάς ἀντιπότας καὶ ἀναλαμβάνεις ἑαυτὸν, ἐντὸν ἀθέτας κοινὸν: and of those things which were indecently and filthily spoken against women by Archilocus, by which he traduc'd himself, that is, made himself infamous, because such foul Speeches could come from none but a lewd and impure Person.
Chapter II.

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

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

I first therefore, I suppose that God did intend the Prophecies which were committed to writing, and enrolled in the public Canon of the Church, should be understood by the Persons concerned in them. For otherwise it could not properly be called a Revelation, if after the discovery things still remained as intricate as formerly. And it is not credible that God should publish Revelations only to exercise and puzzle the industry of human enquiries; or as an evidence of his own knowledge of things exceeding ours (tho indeed that it self cannot be known
by us unless we be able to discern some sense which otherwise could not Chapter have been known than by such Prophecies) much less to give occasion to Enthusests, and cunningly designing Persons, to practice seditions and innovations under the pretence of fulfilling Prophecies, without any possibility of rational confusion by the Orthodox, who upon this supposal must be presumed as ignorant of them as themselves: and there is no prudent way of avoiding this uselessness and dangerousness but by rendering them intelligible to the Persons concerned. And Secondly, the Persons concerned in these kinds of Revelations, cannot be the Prophecies themselves, or any other private Persons of the Ages wherein they were delivered, but the Church in general also in future Ages. For as Prophecy in general is a gratia gratis data, and therefore as all others of that kind given primarily and originally for the publick use of the Church; so certainly such of them as were committed to writing, and designedly propagated to future ages, must needs have been of a general and permanent concernment. And Thirdly, the Church concerned in those Prophecies, cannot only be those Ages which were to survive their accomplishment, but also those before; and therefore it cannot be sufficient to pretend, as many do, that these Prophecies shall then be understood when they are fulfilled, but it will be further requisite to assert that they may be so before. For the only momentous reason, that must be conceived concerning these, as well as other Revelations, must be some duty which could not otherwise have been known, which must have been something antecedent; for all consequent duties of patience and resignation are common to them with other Providences, and therefore may be known in an ordinary way. Now for antecedent duties, such as seem to be intimated in the Prophecies themselves where any are mentioned, nothing can suffice but an antecedent information. Besides, to what end can this postulate knowledge serve? For satisfying Christians of the Divine presence upon the accomplishment of his Predictions? This is needless; for they already profess themselves to believe it. Is it therefore for the conviction of Infidels? But neither can this be presumed on a rational account. For how can it be known that a prediction was fulfilled when it is not known what was predicted? Or how can it be known what was predicted when the prediction is so expressed as to be capable of many senses, and no means are acknowledged possible for distinguishing the equivocation? Nay, will not such a design of ambiguity seem to such a Person suspicious of that stratagem of the Delphick Oracles, to preserve the reputation of a Prophetick Spirit by a provision beforehand for avoiding the danger of discovery? for indeed this kind of Prophecy will be so weak an argument for proving Divine Inspiration, as that indeed
Chapter deed it may agree to any natural Man of ordinary prudence. For in public affairs (the subject of these Prophecies) which proceed more regularly, and are less obnoxious to an interposition of private Liberty, the multitude who are the causes of such Revolutions generally following the complexion of their Bodies, and therefore being as easily determined, and therefore predicted from natural causes, as such their complexions; it will not be hard, at least very probably, to conjecture future contingencies from present appearances of their natural causes. And then by foretelling them in ambiguous expressions, he may provide that if any of those sene, of which his words are capable, come to pass, that may be taken for the sense intended; so that a mistaking in all but one would not be likely to prejudice his credit. And at length if all should fail, yet a refuge would be reserved for their superstitious reverencers of his Authority, that themselves had rather failed of understanding his true sense, than that had failed of truth. Especially if among a multitude of attempts, but one hit in one sense (as it is hard even in a Lottery that any should always miss, much more in matters capable of prudential conjectures) that one instance of success would upon those accounts more confirm his credit than a multitude of failures would disparage it; because in point of success they would be confident of their understanding him rightly, but in miscarriages they would lay the blame, not on the prediction, but their own misunderstandings. Now seeing this way is so very easily pretended to by Cheats beyond any probable danger of discovery, it cannot to persons not already favourably affected (who only need conviction) prove any Argument of a Divine Inspiration, and therefore will, even upon this account, be perfectly useless. Supposing therefore that it is necessary that these predictions be understood before, as well as after that they are fulfilled; it will follow Fourthly, that where they were not explained by the Prophets themselves, there they were intelligible by the use of ordinary means, such as might, by the Persons to whom the Revelations were made, be judged ordinary. For that they should be explained by new Prophets to be sent on the particular occasion, there is no ground to believe; and if these Prophecies were so expressed as that they needed a new Revelation for explaining them, they must have been useless, and indeed could not have deserved the name of Revelations, they still transcending the use of human means as much as formerly. For if they had been revealed formerly, what need had there been of a new discovery? And if this need be supposed, it must plainly argue that the former pretended Revelation was not sufficient for the information of mankind in the use of ordinary means; and that which is not so, cannot answer the intrinsic ends of a Revelation.
This therefore being supposed, that old Revelations are thus intelligible Chapter without new ones, it must needs follow that their explication must be derived from the use of ordinary means. And then for determining further what these ordinary means are that might have been judged such by those to whom these Revelations were made, I consider Fifthly, that this whole indulgence of God in granting the Spirit of Prophecy was plainly accommodated to the Heathen practice of Divination. This might have been exemplified in several particulars. Thus First, the very practice of revealing future contingences, especially of ordinary consultations concerning the affairs of private and particular persons, cannot be supposed grounded on reason (otherwise it would have been of eternal use, even now under the Gospel) but a condescension to the customs and expectations of the Persons to whom they were communicated. And Secondly, that an order and succession of Prophets was established, in Analogy to the Heathen Diviners, is by a very ingenious Person proved from that famous Passage of Deut. xviii. 19, 18. to which purpose he also produces the concurrent Testimony of Origen cont. Cels. L. 1. And thirdly, that the sense of the Platonists and other Heathens, concerning Divine Inspiration, its nature and parts and different degrees, and distinction from Enthusiasm, does very much agree with the notions of the Rabbins concerning it will appear to any that considers the Testimonies of both, produced by Mr. Smith in his excellent Discourse on this subject. Hence it will follow Sixthly, that, as this Divination of which they were so eager, was originally Heathen, so they were most inclinable to make use of those means of understanding it to which they had been inured from the same principles of Heathenism; especially where God had not otherwise either expressly provided for it, or expressly prohibited the means formerly used; and those means, others failing, were most likely by them to be judged ordinary. And that Oneirocriticks were the proper means among the Heathens for explaining their Divinatio per somnum, answering the Jewish degree of Prophecy by Dreams; and indeed the principal Art of the Huriot and conjectures concerning Visions, as far as they held Analogy with those Representations which were made to other less prepared Persons in their sleep, will not need any proof. It might have been shewn how the principal Rules of the Jewish Cabbala were very agreeable to the like Arts of Tradition among the Heathen, and among them were a curious mystical kind of Learning contrived for maintaining a conversation with their Gods; wherein as they were imitated by the Gnosticks, so these Rules themselves were derived from the Heathen occult Philosophy. And certainly it is most likely to have been some kind of expressing and ex-
Chapter plaining Prophecies, and some kinds of Learning subservient thereunto,
which was so solemnly studied by the Jewish Candidates for Prophecies in
their Schools and Colleges, and which made it so strange, that Persons
wanting that preparation, such as Saul and Amos, should be by God ho-
noured with it. Besides that we find the punctual fulfilling of several
predictions of the Chaldeans by virtue of their Oneirocriticks (those most
eminent Transactions of the Conquests of Cyrus, and the Death of Alex-
ander the Great, were thus foretold) plainly implying that God himself,
as he designed those Dreams to be Divinatory, so he observed the Oneiro-
critical Rules in their signification. For it is not probable that Revoluti-
ons managed by such special designs, and signal interpositions of Divine
Providence, could have been foreknown or signified by the Devil, be-
ing frequently put to his solemn shifts of equivocation for concealment of
his ignorance in affairs of greater moral probability, and consequently of
easier prediction. And it cannot seem more strange that God should
observe the Rules of Oneirocriticks and Hieroglyphicks in his Responses
when made use of with a pious design by his own people, than that
he should answer the Heathens themselves in their own practice. Thus
he observed the sign proposed by the Philistins for discerning the true
reason of their sufferings, 1 Sam. vi. 2, 9, 12. and met Balaam in the
use of his enchantments, Numb. xxiii. 4, 16. and revealed our Saviour's
Nativity to the Magi by the means of a Star. And particularly
for Oneirocriticks, their futableness to this purpose will not be scrupled
by them who admit the Testimony of Trogus Pompeius, who ascribes the first invention thereof to the Patriarch Joseph, which will
be very congruous to that prevailing Opinion among the Fathers, and
many late excellent Authors, that all Arts were derived originally from
the Jews. Besides, Daniel who was so famous for expounding Dreams,
the he was thought by the Heathens to do some things by the Inspiration
of the Holy Gods, Dan. v. 11. yet had Chaldean education, Chap. i. 4.
and was a great proficient in it, vers. 17. and was accordingly included
in the decree for killing the Chaldeans, Dan. ii. 13. and was therefore, after his miraculous interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's Dream,
promoted to be Master of the Magicians, Astrologers, Southsayers and
Chaldeans, Dan. v. 11. and therefore certainly was thought, in things
not exceeding the power of the Art, to have proceeded according to
its Prescriptions; that is, in the interpretation, tho' not in the discov-
ery, of the Dream itself. And they, as well as the Jews, being
concerned in the event of his Prediction, must also have been so in
the understanding of them. So also Moses being expressly affirmed skil-
ful in all the learning of the Egyptians, must therefore be presumed skil-
ful not only in their Hieroglyphicks, for which they are so commonly Chapter famed, but also in Oneirocriticks to which they were also addicted, as appears Gen. xli. 8. And methinks that challenge made in the Re- velation concerning the name of the Beast, that here is wisdom, and that be that hath understanding should exercise himself in counting the number thereof (as it seems plainly to allude to the Cabalistical way of finding out Names by Numbers, whereof we have among the Heathens a precedent in Martianus Capella, who thus fits the names of Mercury and L. 2. Philology, to shew the congruity of their Marriage, besides very many more in the Gnosticks in St. Irenæus, so.) seems to imply that it was, the hardly, in the exercise of this Art, discoverable even by human wisdom. Certainly St. Irenæus understood him so when he attempted to unfuddle him by finding out names, whose numeral Letters, in the Greek Tongue wherein the Challenge had been made, might amount to such a number. I do not, by all that has been said, intend that all Prophecies are explicabile by any Rules of Art or suitable Conjectures. I know many of the Heathen Oracles themselves were not. The Oracles expounded by Themistocles, Curtius, Nebrus, &c. did not depend on Art but Luck. My meaning is only concerning the Prophetick Visions, and only those of them which are left unpounded by God himself, but are to be presumed sufficiently intelligible in the use of ordinary means.

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

Ibid. [ʂoxtv]+

About the signification of this word, consult Grotius upon this place, and upon the second precept of the Decal. It being used promiscuously in Scripture to signify both Divine Worship, and also that Honour which we give to Men, because in the East the same gestures of Reverence were used towards Men as towards God, 1 Chron. xxix. 20. It is not credible it should here be taken for an act of divine Worship, for the Wise-men did not know Jesus to be the Son of God, but only that he would be a very great King, and therefore they gave that Honour to him which us'd to be shewn to Eastern Monarchs. And for this reason I should decline the using of the word adore here, which tho it had heretofore a doubtful sense amongst the Latins, yet now by the use of the Schools is made to signify only divine.
Chapter on Worship. And therefore it is also a fault in the French Versions, where this word adoré is all along translated adorer, which in the French Language does by no means belong to civil, but Religious Worship only; it being altogether incredible, that all those who prostrated themselves at the Feet of Jesus, knew him to be the Son of God, who might and ought to be honour'd with divine Worship. And indeed what one Apostle calls adorant, another frequently expresses by adoré to fall down prostrate. See Matt. viii. 2. compar'd with Luc. v. 12. and ix. 18. compar'd with Marc. v. 22. Luc. viii. 41. and Matt. xviii. 24, 29.

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

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

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

2dly. Since it is no where found in the old Testament, that any such Intimation or Advertisement was given, either we must acknowledge that no Prophecy being ἡ ἐργασία could be understood by the Jews before the event; or else that the Prophets did privately instruct their Disciples, if not also admonish the common People, that whenever they recounted
recounted any of God's past favours, or when they spake of themselves, Chapter they had in their minds a respect to something future. Nay it was ne-
cessary they should have particularly and severally interpreted every Pre-
diction of that kind, and pointed to the events which it had a respect
to; for otherwise who could be so subtil as between two not much
differing events, to discern which of 'em was designed in the Predi-
ton? But the first of these having been confuted by Mr. Dodwell, we must
necessarily admit the latter, and say that there remained among the
Jews in Christ's time several traditions concerning the sense of Pro-
phesies, handed down from the Prophets themselves. The reason
why they did not commit those traditions to writing, I confess I do
not clearly see, but it does not follow from thence that there were
no such unwritten Doctrines. Nor do I deny but that this way of teaching
had its inconveniences, and that some false opinions might creep in
amongst the true traditions; but our enquiry is not what would be most
convenient, or what we ourselves should have done, but what was done;
which is the only thing to be considered in searching into Antiquities.

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

4thly. Unless these things be so, all the use of those typical Predic-
tions must have been confined to those to whom they were explained
after the event, which how small that is, appears from what we have
cited out of Mr. Dodwell at the 2d ver. And not to repeat what has been
said by him, I might at least gather from hence, that no Arguments
could be brought from that sort of Predictions to convince Infidels by;
and whatever weight they had among Christians, it was entirely owing
to the Authority of the Apostles, and not to the Evidence of the
Arguments. For it is manifest to all that understand Hebrew that the
Prophet speaks concerning Israel; and that he should, speaking of their
going out of Egypt, have had a respect to Christ's return into Judæa,
would have been impossible for us to know without a Revelation.
And therefore we must be oblig'd to say that the Prophets left their Disci-
plies a Key, q. e. by which to unlock their Predictions, which would
otherwise have been shut up out of every body's view. And had not
this been so, it is certain the Jews could never have grounded their
expectations of a Messias upon some places in the Prophets, out of
which no such matter could be fetch'd by the mere assistance of Gram-
mar; nor would the Apostles have cited them as making for their
purpose. For both the former had made themselves ridiculous if
Chapter they had neglected the grammatical sense, and recurred, without any
other reason than their own fancy, to a more sublime one; and the
latter had been but ill disputants, to produce such passages as might
be bis'd at. The Authority of the Apostles ought not here to be ob-
jected, as that which added strength to their reasonings; for they
themselves did not rely upon their own Authority, but upon the force
of their Arguments. You will nowhere find it said, that Prophecies
ought so or so to be interpreted, because the Apostles, who were in-
spired by the Holy Ghost, and whose Doctrine God confirm'd by Mir-
cles, did in that manner interpret them; but this they take every
where for granted, that they should be so explained, as they explain'd
them from the received Opinion amongst the Jews.

Ver. 23. Note 1. Many think it strange that the Prophets should here
be quoted, when no such thing as what is here mentioned can by the
help of Grammar be deduced from any words of the Prophets; for
there is no place from whence it can be grammatically gather'd that
the Messiah was to be called by this name of a Nazarene. That which
is drawn from the mere similitude between the words Nesfer and Nezin,
is harsh and far-fetch'd. By what means therefore could this be deduced
from the Writings of the Prophets? It must be, doubtless, by an al-
legorical Interpretation of some place which was vulgarly known in
those times, but is not now extant. And this seems to be the reason
why St. Matthew did not produce any one Prophet by name, but said
τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ, the Prophets, in the plural number, as referring rather
to some allegorical sense than any Scripture words, as Jerom has well
observ'd. So the Writers of the Apostolical times used to cite a Tra-
dition just as if they were the very words of Scripture, as we may see
frequently done in the Catholick Epistle of Barnabas, Chap. vi. and
especially where the Discourse is about the Scape-goat. He brings us,
as out of the Scripture, these words, as they are extant in the ancient
Version. *Exspuite in illum omnes & punige, & imponite lanam coccine-
am circa caput illius, & sic in aram ponatur: & cum sita falso fuesit, ad-
ducite quies ferat bircum in eremum, & auferat & portet illum in stiptem,
quae dictur rubus, cu,us & frucctus in agris adjusmus (leg. adsolemus) in-
venientes, &c. Spit all upon him, and prick him, and put scarlet wool a-
bout his head, and so let him be laid upon the Altar: and when you have
done that, bring some body that may carry the Goat into the wilderness, and
take him away and bear him to a plant call'd a Black-berry bush, the fruit
of which we also us'd, finding it in the fields, &c. See also what H. Grotius
has upon Matth. xxvii. 9. Just so Philo, p. 5. de mundi opificio, cites
these for the words of Moses, Tor 3 dēxepa xj maqij dawm 1nep 2 διὸ λέγω ἵνα
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That God might deprive the Jews of all pretence for unbelief, he would have all those things accomplish'd in Christ which the Jews thought were to be fulfill'd in their Messiah, which were not contrary to the end for which he sent Jesus into the world, viz. the Reformation of Mankind, and the making of them happy, whether they were allegorically understood from the Scripture, or had their rise from somewhat else besides it. Thus because the Jews interpreted the lxix. Psal. 22. of the Messiah, Jesus knowing that they would give him Vinegar to drink if he said he thirsted, said accordingly, he thirsted: After this Jesus knowing that all things were accomplish'd, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, said, I thirst, &c. Job. xix. 28. And so likewise at other times he took the occasion of fulfilling certain other Prophecies that otherwise were of no such great moment in themselves; which the Apostles have studiously observ'd. See afterwards chap. iv. 14.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 2. Immediately after that Citat. Tellus contra&ta peribit] To the Note c. Collections that learned men have made, that they might shew the meaning of Isaiah to be only, that John was to prepare the way for Christ, these Verses may be added out of Ovid. lib. 2. Amor. Eleg. xvi.

At vos, qua veniet, tumidi subsidite montes. Et faciles curvis vallibus esse via.

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

Ibid. at the end of that Note.] 'Tis a mistake in our Author, when he says that the Hebrew Judges were so denominated from their inflicting of Punishments, i.e. from the most hateful part of their office. They were called so from their judging or determining of Strifes between the Jews, as appears both by the History of Samuel, and also of the other Judges. This is the proper signification of the word Judge,
Chapter (which has nothing in it to provoke spite or ill-will) and from which this term of their Office is more likely to have been deriv'd. This needs no ampler proof, and nothing could have led our very learned Author into such a mistake, but only his earnest desire to illustrate the Subject he was upon, by too great a plenty of Examples, as his usual custom is.

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

\[ \text{Et modo carpebant vivaci cespice gramen,} \\
\text{Nunc epula tenera fronde cacumen trant.} \]

And a little after,

\[ \text{Pomaque & in teneris aurea mella savis.} \]

Clemens Alexandrinus Strom. lib. i. relates out of Helianicus, that the most Northern People eat of the tops of trees ingeniosis xerophileus.

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

\[ \text{Nam quis te, juvenum confidentissime, nostras} \\
\text{Jussit adire domos?} \]

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

Vers. 11. Note g.] Those that know how very antient the Custom was of purifying by Fire and Water amongst the Heathens, will hardly give their consent to what Dr. Hammond here says, about the Devil's imitating the Baptism of John and Christ. See what John. Lomisanus de Iustrationibus has collected with relation to this matter, Cap. xx. There being an evident and experienced aptitude in Fire and Water to purge away filth, it is no wonder that they were by many Nations made Emblems of the purifying of the mind.
St. Matthew.

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

Verf. 12. Τὴ ἄχυς.] Palaia, Straw, is not here intended, for that serves for many uses, and is never burnt; but it is the Husk, or that which the Grains of Corn are wrapt up in, and the beards or fragments of the ears, which by the Greeks are call'd ἄχυα. Hesych. ńskiego, τὴ ἄχυς. Ὡς σὴ ἄνεμος ἄχυς φοών. Αχυρ, a husk, is the name of that which is ἄχυος. We meet with it in a Verse of Homer, Iliad. e. 499.

"Ως σὴ ἄνεμος ἄχυας φοών ἱερὰ ἄχυας.
'Αράγην λαμπράν, ἵπτε τὰ ἕλευρα ἄμμαν.
Κελτείζεται σταθερὰ κατάπληξεν τὴ ἄχυα.
Ασ οἱ παραδόξακεντα ἄχυματι.

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

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

Verf. 16. Ἀνεώχησαν εὐρίσκει τῆς ἑσχατῆς.] I am apt to think there was a parting of the Clouds, and then that a light shone very high out of the Sky, as it was in the Gospel of the Nazarenes; concerning which matter consult Grosius. Plutarch has somewhere this Saying, εὐθύς ἔξωραν ὥξαρα, which cannot be understood but of a cleaving of the Clouds by their retiring hither and thither.

CHAP. IV.

Verf. 1. Ἄνθρωπος ἐλπίζειν μετανοεῖ Ο. What is here related, may more easily be conceived to have happened to Christ in a Vision or Dream, than really. It looks, me-thinks, very odd, that an Evil Spirit should be permitted to have such a power over our most holy Saviour, as to carry him through the Air; and then that prospect of the Kingdoms of the whole World could no
Chapter no more be shewn from a Mountain than upon a Plain: for what is there to be seen from a Mountain, besides Woods, Fields, Rivers, Villages, Towns, and the like, and those only afar off? But these things do not use to be shewn in any Language, the Kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them. That which we call the glory of Kingdoms, is rather the splendor of a King, which consists partly in his splendid Attire, partly in his Guards or Attendants, and partly in his costly Edifices, and other things of that nature. So the glory of a Kingdom is taken 2 Chron. ix. 25. where Solomon is the subject of the Discourse; as afterwards here in St. Matthew, chap. vi. 29. where the word Νῦς is used. See also Rev. xxi. 25, 26. Now it's true, in a Dream, the most powerful Kings of the Earth, with all their glory, might be shewn to Christ in a moment of time, as S. Luke says these things were, but not if he were awake or from a mountain. The Phrase 'τιπόνοιν ἐν θρονῷ, therefore, may be interpreted here as St. Luke does that of 'ΕΝ τῷ θρονῷ in the Spirit, i.e. in a Vision, as Rev. i. 10. And so Ezekiel declares himself συνεθηκέας ἐν θρόνῳ, ch. ii. 1. & iii. 12. when being in a Vision he thought the Spirit took him up. And chap. xli. 2. we find the same person again ζῷα παλαιάς (as be fancy'd) caught up into a high mountain. And so likewise St. John, Rev. xxi. 10. But however, by this Vision Christ might learn that his Life would not be without Temptations, and that he must do really what he seemed to himself to do in a Dream, i.e. strive against Unbelief and Ambition.

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

Vers. 8. To Νῦς ἐν ἔναυῳ. ] i.e. the glory and riches which he saw lying in the vast tracts of the earth. So ἔναυῳ amongst the Jews signifies glory and wealth. See what I have observed upon Gen. xxxi. 1. Apollo in Ovid is represented speaking thus to Phaeton, whilst he was looking down from the palace of the Sun upon the Earth, Metam. i. 2.
Sr. MATTHEW.

— Quidquid habet divus circumspice mundus,
Eque tot ac tantis coeli, terraque, marisque
Posce bonis aliquid, nullam paixere repulsam.

Vers. 14. Ἐπίλεγον ἦν See the Notes upon Chap. ii. 23. H. Groton has observed upon Jam. chap. ii. 23. that it was common for the Hebrews to say, that such or such a place of Holy Scripture Ῥήμα νευτικῆς i.e. ἔπεισθαι, or was fulfilled, whenever any thing came to pass, resembling what was mentioned in that place. But he gives us no example of it, and therefore I shall produce one out of R. Salomon upon Gen. xi. 8. where at the words the Lord scattered them abroad, he makes this remark, בָּרְלוֹנָם דַּהֲו מְדָמֶר פַּנֶּה נְפָצִי תַּלָּה יְהוָה שָׁמֶר: Shalma, מְנַוְּרָה רַשָּׁה יְם תַּבּוֹא:

As they had said, let us be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth; so that Saying of Solomon was verified concerning them, What he is afraid of shall come upon him. And this way of speaking the Greeks also themselves used upon a like occasion. Αἰλιαν lib. iii. c. 29 has these words: Διότι δ' Σωφρόνις συνέχεσθαι ἐπίσημον, ὡς ἡ αὐτή, η ὃς ταύτην ἐν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ ἐπίσημα αὐτῇ 'Εκπαυορίς καὶ ἀναντίον, εἶται οὖν πλανᾶς, ἀναντίον. &c. Diogenes Sinopenius used continually to be saying, that he fulfilled and underwent all the curses of Tragedy, for he was a vagabond, and had no home, &c. i.e. that one might see something in his condition resembling that which the Players in Tragedy used to wish, when they were in a rage, to others. So likewise Olympiodorus, in the Life of Plato, applies to him a Verse out of Homer: Κηρυκά, εἰς τετελεῖται σεφαντικάπηθειν πεπληρωμένη εἰς τῷ σώμα παιδῶν μετανοοῖ, ἰνα εἴρηται πείνα αὐτῷ ὤντως. Τῆς δὲ γυμνῶν μετανοοτί γυμνίωτα ρέει σῶμα. As he was lying all along, a swarm of bees came and filled his mouth with honey-combs; that so that Saying of Homer might prove true of him, From whose tongue proceeded a sound sweeter than honey.

Vers. 15. Note e. Our Author should rather have said, that several Nations dwelt in this Coast, than round about it. For there were several Nations that dwelt also round about the rest of Judea. We shall be most likely therefore to find out the reason of this Appellation, by what Strabo says about the northern parts of Judea, lib. xvi. Ταῦτα εἰς συντετελεία, τὰ πολλά δ' ὡς ἐκεῖν ἐστὶν ἡ πολυκράτεια μικτῶν εἰς ἑν τῷ Ἱερουσαλημίῳ ἐθνῶν, καί Ἀραβίων, καί Φανηκῶν: Now these Countries lie towards the North, and each of them are mostly inhabited by a mixt sort of People, made up of Egyptians, Arabians, and Phœnicians.
Chapter V.

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

Ver. 8. Note c. That in these words the pure in heart have a blessedness conferred upon them, is plain enough; but what that blessedness is, is not so clear. Of old the Jews as well as the Heathens thought they might sometimes have a sight of the Gods. By the Gods, I do not mean the very divine Nature, but corporal Shapes assumed by Angels. Yea and so the most high God himself (if it was not rather an Angel called by his name that appear'd to the Israelites) gave notice of his presence by a cloud or by fire, which form the Jews called by the name of God, as appears from the Pentateuch. They had a conceit also, that if any one should see those forms against the will of the Gods, they would certainly die, or lose their sight. See my notes upon Gen. xvi. 13. And therefore whoever was admitted by any God to an interview with him, was look'd upon to be his special favourite; as the Holy Scripture informs us concerning Moses, who went near to the Cloud, in which the Angel had wrapt himself, and talked with him. Hence, this phrase to see God was used to express some great happiness, even amongst the Gentiles, which gave occasion to those Verses in Virgil;
Add to this, that because God was thought, not only by the Hebrews but also by most Heathen Nations, to have his Habitation in a peculiar manner in Heaven, and Heaven was esteemed the seat of blessedness; therefore to see God, and to be in the seat of supreme happiness, came at last to signify one and the same thing. And hence it is said of the Saints, Heb. xii. 14. that they shall see the Lord, and 1 Cor. xiii. 12. face to face, i.e. like Moses, they shall be permitted to have access to the Light itself by which God manifests his presence in Heaven; and because they are to see him as he is, they shall also, as Moses, whose countenance was made to shine, become like to God, 1 Joh. iii. 2. From this it appears, that if there be any solidity in what the Schoolmen say about the beatific vision, they must deduce it from metaphysical reasonings, and not out of these places of Scripture.

Vers. 17. Note. g.] The Law being here spoken of, I should rather think that by γένεμα we are to understand the most simple, or that which we commonly call the Grammatical or Literal sense of the Law, in which respect there are innumerable external rites enjoined in it; and that by πνεύμα is meant the mind of the Lawgiver lying hid under those symbolical Precepts. Aristotle in Lib. de repub. often uses the word γένεμα for written laws, in opposition to the will of the Governor, or the interpretation that he puts upon them. So Lib. 2. ch. 9. ἵνα τὸ γένεμα ἐκ τῶν πνεύμων, ἂν ἔχει τὸ γένεμα τῆς κόσμου, it is not the best way to pass sentence according to our own will and pleasure, but by the written Statute and Laws. And Lib. 3. c. 15. after he had said that the Law speaks of things but in general terms, without accommodating it itself to particular cases, he adds, τὸ γένεμα, it is a foolish thing for a Governor to follow strictly the written Law; and a little after, ἵνα τὸ γένεμα τοῦ ἐνὸς πολιτεία, it is not the best way of administering a Commonwealth to keep close to the Letter and the Laws. So also Cicero opposes the letter of the Law to the intention of the Lawmaker, Lib. 1. de Inventione, cap. 38. Omnes leges ad commodum Reipublica referre oportet, & eae ex utilitate communi, non ex scriptione
Chapter quae in literis est, interpretari. All Laws ought to be directed to the benefit of the State, and have such a construction put upon them as the publick interest requires, without sticking too close to the letters in which they are written. See likewise Lib. 2. cap. 48. And under this consideration the Laws of Moses are called νόμοις and γράμματα, viz. when they are understood in a Grammatical sense; and are opposed to τοῦ θεού, i.e. the design of God in enacting them. The word Spirit is used in Scripture to signify any thing that is out of sight, in contradistinction to what is apparent and conspicuous, as the letters are of the Law. But this may be more clearly demonstrated in its due place.

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

Vers. 22. ὅδε γάρ ὁ λόγος, &c. Our Author, in his Paraphrase, partly makes Christ to speak himself directly, and partly intinuates and intermixes his own Remarks with his words. But yet I must say, that this is harsh and forced, as the Doctor's way of expression (no disparagement to his Learning) commonly is. Besides, his Paraphrase upon this period does not make the mind of Christ clear enough, which I take to be this. 21, 22. Ye know that Murder was forbidden by Moses, and that this Law of his threatened Death to the Transgressors of it; but let me tell you, that it is not only those heinous fort of crimes that will be punished by God in another life: Whoever shall but indulge his anger, and make a custom of carrying himself hastily and morosely to others without reason, shall have a punishment inflicted upon him, comparable to that capital one to which persons are sentenced by the lesser Sanbedrim; and that shall be the lightest penalty for Sins committed against your Neighbour. But whoever shall be found to have got an ill habit of mocking and deriding
"deriding others, shall in this kind of Punishments suffer as heavy a one, as that which used to be inflicted by the greater Sanhedrim for the boldest Crimes. But lastly, he that shall accustom himself to rail, or revile other men, shall have a Penalty laid upon him by God resembling the severest that is us’d amongst Men, such as to be burnt alive.

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

The names whereby Christ describes the Punishments that are to be inflicted for these evil habits in another life, are (as Interpreters, and amongst the rest Grotius, who is always to be joined with Dr. Hammond, have observed) drawn from the Jewish Custom. And it is no wonder; for there were no peculiar names given to the unknown and invisible Punishments of the other life; and if Christ had called them by any new names, no body would have understood him. And therefore he was necessitated to make use of such names and representations of Punishments as were known by those he spake to.
Chapter. Ver. 28. Note o.] Ovid, that Master in Debauchery, describes this matter to the life, Metam. vi. where he says of Tereus looking passi-
onately upon Philomela,

Speget cecam Tereus, pracontredatque videndo.

Ver. 33. 'Ἀπεδίωσε γὰρ Κυμή τὸς θείων συ. ] A person is said to pay his oath to the Lord, that fulfils a Promise confirmed by an Oath; because he that calls God to witness, does not so much oblige himself to the Party he makes a promise to, as to God. So Joshua kept to the Promises he made, in the Covenant entered into with the Gibeonites; not for the sake of the Gibeonites who had deceived him, but because of the obligation he was under to God, to whom he had appealed as a witness. See Jos. ix. 19. This also the Heathens understood, as we may see by the words of T. Quinctius Cincinnatus, in Livy lib. 6. c. 29. when he was going to fight against the perfidious Gauls: Ades te Dii testes suæ, & expetite pœnas simul vobis violatis, nobisque per numen vestrum deceptis. Be present, O ye Gods, that were witnesses of our League, and revenge both your selves for the affront that has been put upon you, and us who have been deceived by your Deity. And therefore they thought it no small part of divine Worship to keep their Oaths. Isocrates ad Demon. 3: θητείν η διὰ τη ἁγιασμόν. See what H. Grotius has upon this place; and to what he has observed add this Passage out of Athen. Lib. 2. p. 66. 'ὅσι πόλεις ἐνιαυτοὶ τῷ κεφαλῷ, ἰδὼν η διὰ της καθαρίας ὑμῶν. Καὶ τὰς χειρὰς ὑμῶν ἐν ἁγιάσμα τῶν ὑμῶν ἀρχηγῶν ὡς ἰεράς. ἀλλὰ μὴ ταῖς αὐτοῖς ἀρχηγοῦς τῆς πολλῆς ὑμῶν ἀρχηγῶν, ἐν τῇ ὑμῶν Ομορρίας ζητῆσθαι φησιν. But that they esteemed the Head sacred, may appear by their using to swear by it, and to reverence its Sneezeings as sacred: And also by its having been a custom to confirm Agreements or Contrats by nodding of it; as Jupiter says in Homer, Go to, I will now nod my head.

Ver. 39. Στείζων οὕτω καὶ τῷ ἁγιάῳ. ] This is a proverbial Speech, and ought not to be understood properly. It signifies to expose ones self to be injured or vilified. So Os contumelios præbere is taken in Livy, lib. 4. c. 35. where a feditious Tribune of the People says of the Commonalty that aspired to the Military Tribuneship, Petitisse viros domi, militiaeque spectatos; primis annis fugiitatos, repulsos, risu Patribus suisse; desistit postrema præbere ad contumeliam os. That such men had sued for
for it as were approved both at home and abroad; and at first were jeered and repulsed, and made a laughing-stock of by the Fathers, but now at length they were resolved not to suffer themselves tamely any longer to be abused. We meet with it also in Tacitus Hist. Lib. 3. c. 31. Circumspecturunt victores, & primo ingerebat probra, intentabant ilius; mox ut præberi ora contumeliis, & posta omni ferociâ, cuncta vixi patiebantur, subit memoria illos esse, qui super Bedriaci victoria tempus esset. The conquerors stood round, and at first heaped reproaches upon them, and lifted up their hands, making as if they would give them blows; but afterwards when they saw that the conquered let themselves be abused, and laying aside all fierceness, took every thing patiently, it came into their minds that they were those very same persons, that a little before had used their victory at Bedriacum with moderation.

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

C H A P. VI.

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

Ver. 8. οὐδὲ οὐκ ὕπαρξεν οὐδὲ ἔχεται Σωκράτης, as Xenophon tells us, lib. 1. Memor. p. 420. Ed. Grecæ H. Steph. ἗λθον σεῖς τὸς Σωκράτης ἐπιλέξας τ' ἀφαίρετι, ὥσ τὸς ἔκδοθαι εἰσήκητο ἐπὶ τὰ σημαίνει ἐφεστῶ τοῖς δυσαρεσκούσι Ἰσραήλ, ἔδωκεν εἰς τὸν Σωκράτην ἀπαγωγήν ἰστι, prayed simp-
Annotations on

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

Verf. 11. Note f.] There is none here but Grotius, whose opinion is first laid down by our Author, that deserves our regard; and the Doctor had done better if he had only endeavour’d to confirm his interpretation. Everybody knows that the Greeks used the Phrase of ἐκφραστὸς to signify as well in general the time future as the day immediately ensuing, from the verb εἴημι to approach or to be at hand. So Euripides in his Alcestes, v. 171. uses εἴημι μᾶλλον for an evil that is future or ready to come to pass. So in that place of Solomon Prov. xxviii. 1. 

Boast not thy self of to morrow, for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth; the Septuagint have τὸ ἡμέρας ἔστω to signify the time future. The meaning of Christ therefore is this: "Give us every day, all the remain-ing part of our lives, as much as may be sufficient for our subsistence. Vopiscus has almost such another kind of expression in the Life of Aurelian, where he speaks of the loaves that were daily distributed to the People: Siligineum suum (vix. panem) quotidie toto avo quisque recipiebat, & posteris suis demittebat. Every one daily received his white loaf as long as he lived, and that custom was continued to their posterity. Upon this place Salmatis observes out of Chronic. Alexandr. that such Loaves were called διασωλικιτες, i.e. such as every one was sure to have during his Life: so that διασωλικιτες and διασωλιτος signify almost the same thing.

It is likewise truly observed by Grotius, that this word comprehends under it both food and raiment, i.e. all the necessaries of Life, which we pray God we may never want as long as we live. Our Author makes it to relate also to the mind or soul; but without any necessity, for those things which concern the Soul are contained in the foregoing verses.

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

Vers. 16. Note h. ἀπανεῖν is to make any thing become ἀφανῆ, Chapter VI. which is the contrary of both ἄφων bright or shining, and of ἀφανεῖν conspicuous. And hence the verb ἀπανεῖν has a twofold signification, according as it is either opposed to ποιεῖν ἄφων to make bright, or to ποιεῖν ἀφανεῖν to make conspicuous. To begin with the latter, a thing becomes inconspicuous ἀπανεῖται, when it is either quite destroyed, or else carried to another place, or covered; for which sense there seems here to be no room, as has been well observed by the Doctor. In the former sense of the word, a thing is said to lose its brightness ἀπανεῖται, when it is some how or other defiled. Thus the countenance, when the face is washed and anointed, is ἄφων, shines; and when instead of using oil to make it shine, we disfigure it with Ashes or Dust, then ἀπανεῖται. In which sense ἀπανεῖν is the same with μολύνειν, to pollute, to defile. But the Grammarians observe the signification of polluting to have been more late, and that of taking out of sight to be the older of the two. Etymol. Magn. ἀφανεῖς ὑπὸ τὸ μολύνειν ἀπειλᾶ, ἀλλὰ κέ τὸ τελέσ ἀφανῆ ποιέων. Ἀπανεῖται was not used by the Antients for to pollute as it is now, but for to render wholly inconspicuous. Concerning the antient use also of this word, Suidas must be thought to speak when he says: ἀπανεῖς ἐν τῷ μολύνειν ὑπὸ ἐφέναι, ἀλλὰ κέ το ἀνείπειν ἢ ἀφανεῖται ποιέων: it does not signify to defile and pollute, but to take quite away and out of sight. But of this later signification of Greek words, discerned by the other which properly belongs to them, there are abundance of instances in the New Testament, amongst which the verb ἀπανεῖν must be reckoned one. Of this notion of the word the Doctor has given us several examples, and one out of Nicostatus, whose words he ought to have set down at their full length, for he understands them in a sense quite contrary to the intention of the Author. He is speaking concerning Women that had too great a passion for Ornaments, and brings reasons to dissipade and reclaim them from it. Πάρσον ἄν εἶ ῆν, says he, ἂς ἦν ἀνθίνας γειτ. ῆνόμως, καὶ ῆμαθίν, καὶ ἄναλλον ἂν ἄντεσθιν, ἂς ἀλλὰ χρῆματα ζαγεθεῖν καὶ ἀπανεῖν τῇ τοῖς: Far be it from a heathful woman to think she has any need of white paint, or red, to put under her eyes, or any other colour, in order to daub and pollute the face: not to make it more beautiful; for that is against the Writer’s design, and contrary to what this Verb constantly signifies. And that this word ἀπανεῖν is used by Christ in the sense of polluting, and denotes a purposed endeavour to deform the face, is manifest from the manner of the opposition: When ye fast, be not as the Hypocrites, of a sad countenance, ἀπανεῖται τῇ ἀορατῇ αὐτῶν, that they may appear unto men to fast; but thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face. It is as plain as the Sun at Noon-day; that
Chapter that an anointed head and washed face is opposed against agains, i.e. a dirty unwashed face, and one that is not anointed; such as theirs used to be who fasted in sackcloth and ashes. About anointing the face with oil, in order to make it the more shining, see Psalm civ. 15. and what Interpreters say upon that place. But this used to be neglected by Mourners, as appears from 2 Sam. xii. 20. So that tho' what Dr. Hammond says upon this place contains a great many learned things in it, and is worth our reading, yet he has certainly miss'd the scope of it.

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

Ver. 27. After the words proportionable stature. Teleporn in Greek, and Quadratus in Latin, does not signify as broad as high, which is absurd, but a just Stature. Consult Constant. Lexic.

CHAP. VII.

Ver. 14. ὑπάρχειν.] Ti for ὅς Grotius tells us is after the manner of the Hellenists, i.e. of the Jews, who spake Greek not so correctly as they should have done, and produces Examples of it. But Salmasius, in the Epist. Dedic. to his Commentar. de Hellenist. says, that he elsewhere proves it to be Alexandrian. Where this proof is I cannot tell; but it is enough to justify its being called a Hellenism, if it be but improper Greek, and has something discernible of a Hebraism in it. The Hebrews use הוה to express י and ὅς, which it is no wonder if he that interpreted S. Matthew imitated. Now the reason why the Gate that leads to Happiness is said by Christ to be straight, is because as men live, it lets in
in but few. The same similitude is made use of, to intimate this to us, Chapter by Cebes in his Table, where we find these words: "οὕτως ἔσται ἡ VIII. ἁρματή ἵππου τοῦ μαίους, ὅτι αὐτὸν ἐκτίθεν, ἐπεὶ τῇ πεποτοσάκει τῆς ἀναμνήσεως καὶ τηρείσως τοὺς ὁμοίους; Do you see also a certain little gate, and a path before that gate which is not much frequented, but trodden only by a very few, as seeming to be unpasable, rugged, and uneven? And he that was asked, making answer, that he did see it; ἵππος τοῦν ἐστὶν ἡ ἕπα, ἢν, ἢ ἅγιον ἂγες εἰς ἀλληλοῦ ἐνδεικτικὸν. This, he said, was that way that leads to true Learning.

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

C H A P. VIII.

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

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

E 2
Chapter VIII.

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

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

Vers. 10. Note f. Since our Author in his Notes upon this place has thought fit to put together all that he had observed concerning
the different notions of the word μισεῖς, I will contribute also my share. Chapter
VIII. 

has several significations amongst the Greeks that have nothing to
do here; but this is to be taken notice of, viz. that the trust be the
first notion of that word, and its secondary signification is that credit or
assent which we give to one who affirms things that we never saw, nor
have any mathematical demonstration of; yet because among things
of that kind, there are some asserted by all Nations that relate to divine
matters, and which in points of faith challenge the first place, althou
we neither see them, nor have any mathematical evidence for them,
therefore μισεῖς signifies ἀποτελέσαται or by way of eminence a perswasion
about matters of Religion. So Aelian Var. Hist. lib. ii. c. 31. having
 said that there was no Atheist to be found amongst the Barbarians, but
only among the Greeks; and that the Barbarians believed that there
were Gods who took care of human affairs, and foretold things to come,
adds: ὡς τῶν ἵστο ἔχετε ἕχοντες τὸν μισεῖς, ἵνα τοὺς καθῆκες ὑφο θεόνων ὅταν, ἵ
το ἐν ἔνει: having a firm perswasion of these things, they offer up sacrifices in a
pure manner, and keep themselves chast and holy, &c.

When the Jews began to write Greek, they used the word μισεῖς in the
same sense; for the credit yielded to their sacred Writings, and those
that believed them, they called μισεῖς and μεθορίσεις. So the Son of Sirach,
Chap. i. 29. 'Εν δὲ διὰ τὸν καθὼς μισεῖς καὶ συνέδρια: the things that please him
(i.e. God) are faith and meekness: and Ch. xlv. 6. ἐν μισεῖς καὶ συνέδρια
οἰκείον αὐτῶν: he sanctified him by faith and meekness. So 1 Macc. iii. 13.
ἐνωνείδαι τοῖς signifies a body of Jews. But the Christians that follow-
ed the Jews in their way of speaking, gave the name of μισεῖς to the
Perswasion of those that believed in Christ, and opposed it to a
twofold kind of αἵματα Unbelief, one of which was proper to the Hea-
thenes, and the other to the Jews, who notwithstanding they credit-
ed the Old Testament, yet refused to believe Christ and his Apo-
sles. However, in all these instances μισεῖς signifies a perswasion, of
those things particularly which the Discourse relates to; and as
those are various, so we may; if we please, make Faith to be of se-
veral kinds. But because no one can believe the Authority of any
Laws, but he must also observe them; provided he does not dis-agree with himself; therefore no body could seriously and heartily
believe that Christ was sent down from Heaven to men, to teach
them the way of eternal Salvation, without obeying Christ's Precepts:
just as no body believed the Law of Moses to be the only Rule of Life
revealed by God, who did not, in part at least, conform themselves
thereto. And hence this word μισεῖς came, in the Writings of the
Apostles, to signify not only a perswasion of the truth of the Chris-
tian.
Annotations on

Chapter 8. Christian Doctrine, but also a disposition of Mind, and Practice agreeable to it, the necessary effect of believing.

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

It shall suffice at present to have run over the different senses that the word ndef is capable of, and pointed to its original Signification.

But there is this further to be added, that as Faith includes more than a bare persuasion about the truth of a thing in the mind; so this persuasion itself must be such a one, as is the result of having seriously weighed and examined the Arguments by which the truth of the Christian Doctrine is confirmed. For it is not to be imagined that the Centurion, for instance, did believe in Christ, hand over head, without reason or due consideration: He had, without doubt, seen some of his other Miracles, and heard his Doctrine, and had been made to believe that there was nothing too difficult for Christ, who had
had all power given him by God, to do. This his Discourse manifestly shews. But he could never have examined Christ's Doctrine and Miracles, as it was requisite he should, unless he had been freed from two of the mightiest Impediments to it, whereof one is Obstinacy, whereby we become impenetrable to all reasons, be they never so strong; and the other, a wicked Life, which makes Men unwilling to believe those things, the acknowledgment whereof would render it necessary for them to live otherwise than they did before. And therefore it is, that Faith has such a commendation bestowed upon it; which matter I have discoursed upon in my Notes upon Gen. xv. 6, and have there quoted out of Philo a very remarkable passage in which Faith is commended.

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

'Ἄθανάτος ἀλλοιον ὑμῖν, ἐν τῷ τεχνικαίς
Εὐνύμιοι, ἐνδύον ἀρχαῖοι ἀμυνθεῖς, ἀθέθης.

Companions with the rest of the immortal society, making themselves merry with feasting, free from those pains to which mortals are subject, and never weary. And Epictetus following his example, in Enchirid. c. xxi. bespeaks in this manner one that had made a great proficiency in Wisdom: τὸ μὴ ποιήσῃ ἡ τελείωσθαι ἡμῖν; you will be a worthy guest, another day, for the Gods.

Ver. 12. Τί σαυτῷ μείξανεν.] For the understanding of this, we must reflect upon the similitude of a Supper here made use of. Now the time of surping was after the Sun was set, and the night came to be almost at the darkest. And therefore those that were thrust out of the place where the Supper was made, and the Room full of lights, are, in agreement with the other part of the similitude, said to be
Chapter cast into outward darkness. See also Ch. xxii. 13. This is the original of this form of Speech, and the meaning of it is easy to be understood: for as that which is signified by being a Guest at the Supper is Happiness; so to be put out of the place where the Supper was made, into the street, signifies the losing or falling short of it.

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

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

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

Oι σπηνών
Δαιμονίων
Κενδρονομών
Και τυφλονόμων
Φυγώσαν εις
Όιας διξαν.

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

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

C H A P. IX.

Verse 14. Question very much whether the Doctor rightly interprets the places he had occasion to quote in his Annotations upon this Verse. They will all very well admit of a different Explication. 1. That Question, Why do we and the Pharisees fast often, and thy Disciples fast not? may be construed as if the Disciples of John had said, Since we and the Pharisees often fast,
why do not thy Disciples also fast? or, Why do not they fast as we do? It was not the design of John's Disciples to enquire simply why the Disciples of Christ did not fast, but why they did not follow the example of all devout men among the Jews, who used to fast often. II. God's meaning in Exod. xx. is this: "After thou hast laboured six days, thou shalt make the seventh a day of rest. Had God spoken any otherwise than he did, it could hardly have been known which that seventh day was which he would have to be kept as a day of rest; for it might have been the seventh day of every month, or of every year. III. That place in St. Mark, Chap. v. is nothing at all to the purpose: Whosoever, says Christ, shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, committh adultery; and if a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committh adultery. Where Christ does not respect what might be done in pursuance of the Law, but the practice of the Gentiles, who allowed Women this power. We are sure that Salome, Herod's Sister, followed this example, and there were perhaps some others that would have been ready enough to have done the like. IV. St. Paul's meaning in Ephes. iv. is really, that Anger is not unlawful if it be but kept within bounds. V. The place cited out of St. James serves not in the least the Doctor's design. For the comforting of the rich upon the loss of their riches, is not the only thing that the Apostle there intends. See the Notes upon that place. VI. The form of speech used by St. Paul Rom. vii. 12. But God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine, into which ye were delivered, is almost like that of the Disciples of John. But that ye were in it signifies either, that ye are no longer the servants, &c. or, that tho ye were the servants of sin, nevertheless ye have obeyed.

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

Verse 2. ΠΕΤΘ and ΠΙΤΘ are certainly used indifferently; but those who spake Greek preferred the use of the former because they thought a word of the masculine gender more proper for the surname of a man than one of the feminine. But of this name here given to Simon there will be a fitter occasion to speak when we come to the xvi. Chapter.

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

πουξίλη λαγαλείως εκτάγμων, ἢδε γεννέων, ἐκπλημμυρον,

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

Verse 16. Note f. Our ingenious Author, to illustrate the general proposition he lays down by examples, plainly misapplies most of the passages here alleged by him. For excepting one place out of Matt. xxiii. 16. all the rest are either precepts or admonitions, as those who will but examine them will easily see. I shall instance but in two. Behold, says Christ, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye therefore wise as serpents, and simple as doves. These words contain a plain precept, and that a very necessary one, as well as one that is agreeable to Christ's Doctrine. For the Apostles being not sent to men that were lovers of Truth and Justice, but to such Persons as were more like Beasts than reasonable creatures, there was a necessity of their using prudence, lest going to address themselves to Men who were wicked to a degree of madness, their pains should not only prove ineffectual and to no purpose, but they themselves also be oppressed by them. And
this Christ commands Matt. vii. 6. Give not that which is holy unto Dogs, Chapter &c. But they were at the same time to take heed that that prudence of theirs did not turn to craftiness or deceit, as it would have done, if they had either privately renounced the Gospel which they had publicly preached, or feigned themselves inclined to the wicked opinions of the Pharisees. They were not to say everything in all places and in all companies, but they were to say nothing that was in the least repugnant to the Doctrines which they had received from their Master, or that might hinder the Gospel’s propagation. That which Christ therefore enjoins his Apostles, is, to mix prudence and a sincere plainness together. Of which virtues he himself was a most perfect pattern, who never exposed himself to the fury of the Jews but when there was a necessity for it. But St. Peter offended against this precept by acting the part of a Dissembler, of which we have an account given us by St. Paul, Gal. ii. 12. making use of prudence to an extreme, he forfeited the commendation of being sincere and upright.

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

Vers. 16. Note e. The word ἀδίκεω being immediately subjoined to Ἰησοῦς, it cannot signify one that does not hurt, but one who together with his prudence does not use any cunning or shifting, but is fair and upright. In this sense we find it used by S. Paul Rom. xvi. 19. But yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil, i. e. far from being cunning to do evil. So in the Addit. to Esther, Chap. vi. 4. crafty men are said ἄνδροι πόνος τοῦ Πάπα ἀνάραστος ἄδικος διανοούσιν, to have deceived the simple honesty of Rulers. Accordingly ἀδίκεω signifies such a sort of temper, in the same manner that ἀδικία signifies ingenuity or sincerity; to wit, when things are simple, and not corrupted by any art or deceit; whence this word ἀδικεῖ to denote a person who had not the least guile to be found in him. And so in the same manner, ἀδίκεω or
Chapter or ἀλαος, is used not only for pure, as ἰσεως ἰσεως pure wine,
but also for a man that is free from craft or deceit.

The Etymology which Eustathius gives of the word from μετέχω is harsh, and will not do in this place. And therefore the Author of the Etymologiae magnum supplies us with another, which is from μετα, i.e. μετα, μετήμετρα to mingle, instead of which μετέχω is the word in use; from whence ἰσεως came to signify primarily pure, and secondarily also one that is not corrupted with any dishonesty. And therefore the old Greek and Latin Copy, which contains rather a sort of Paraphrase than (as is generally but erroneously supposed) the bare words of the Evangelists, uses here the word ἰσεως, most simple. And thus also Hesychius renders ἰσεως by ἰσεως, ἰσεως, ἰσεως, unblemishable, pure, without deceit.

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

Verf. 27. Note k. J Hither perhaps may be aptly referred that Passage in Herodotus, lib. 3. cap. 24. where it is said that the Magi or learned Philosophers of the Country, who had seized upon the Persian Empire, would have obliged Prexaspes, by whom Smerdis the Son of Cyrus had been killed, to proclaim from a high Tower to the Persians in a full Assembly, that Smerdis was in the Throne. Ὑπεραυτοῦ Περσῶν πατὴρ ἱεραπότητα οὐκ ἔχει τοῦ βασιλίου τεῖχος, ἐκλείδων ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀπεδρεῖ ὅτι κατὰ τῷ θρόνῳ Σμερδίδος ἤρχετο: Saying that they would gather together all the Persians under the wall of the palace, they commanded him to go up upon a Tower, and proclaim to them that they were governed by Smerdis the Son of Cyrus.

Verf. 29. Note l. J Tiberius’s Assarium (which is that here spoken of) is said by Doctor Edward Bernard, lib. 2. concerning weights and measures,
Measures, sect. i. to have been equivalent to six English grains of Chapter Silver.

C H A P. XI.

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

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

Ver. 23. Note i.] I have some things to observe upon this last Note of the Doctor's, which may serve partly to confute, and partly to confirm what he says.
Chapter XI. It is true indeed, that the word ἁιων did not, as we shall presently see, immediately and properly signify among the Gentiles any place; but it is a mistake that it was put to denote the State of the dead, if we take the word in its proper signification. It is the name of a Deity, who was believed to be chief Ruler in Hell, and was otherwise styled ἑαυτων, Pluto, which every child knows. And hence the place where the Souls of the dead were thought to be, was usually called 'Αιων ἧμων, the house of Hades. As in Homer Odyss. κ. 512.

Ἀνάφα τε εἰς ἀναων ἵνας ὑμῖν διήγεται.

But do you go into Pluto's dark house:

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

Θορν εἰνε' εἰς ἁιων, θορν ἑγετης ὡς ἁρṣαις,

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

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

III. But it will be said that the Etymology of the word is on Phurnutus and Dr. Hammond's side. And I acknowledg it is so, if that be
be the true Etymology of it, which may with reason be doubted, because the word whose original we are inquiring into, is almost every where written with a Spiritus asper which is not usual in words compounded with a Privative. I confess that 'אָדָם is also written with a Spiritus lenis; but this not being constant, it is probable that the former is the true pronunciation of the word, and that the manner of writing it was varied for no other reason than because the Greeks afterwards thought that to be the true Etymology of the word which Dr. Hammond gives us. So the Author of the Etymologicum magnum says, "אָדָם, רֶחֶטֶר אֶפְרְס, אֶזֶּה תָּאָבָר לָתְנָח לְמָנָהוֹב. בְּהַדְּ פְּדָּו, דִּאָדָם אֵי מְדָאָה הָדָאָבָה L, אִי לָא, כְּאָדָם בְּדָאָבָה, צָאָדָה אֵי הָדָאָבָה אָתיוּלָא. But with all the Greek Grammarians leave, I should say that this is not the true Etymology of the word; but that it must be deduced from the Hebrew יִשָּׁר which may be pronounced not only as the Authors of the Masora do, but aijid. The Phænicians perhaps wrote it יִשָּׁר, as it is common for the guttural Letters to be confounded in the Oriental Languages, and as the Arabsians at this day write it: and so from יִשָּׁר Halejid came baides and bades; and that word, as it is very well known, signifies destruction. There are a great many words that the Greeks have in vain attempted to find the original of in their Language, and which have with good success been derived by learned men from the Phænicians. I could shew why the youngest of Saturn's Sons was so called, and assign the reason of the Names of the rest of them out of the same Language: but this is not a proper place for it.

IV. I cannot see the reason why our learned Author citing Esth. xii. 7. will not allow the Heathen King Artaxerxes (a Decree of whose is in that Chapter recited) to have had any thoughts of Hell, or a place of punishments. That heathen King, says he, cannot be thought to dream of Hell. For who does not know that the Heathens believed there was a place under the earth, in which bad men were punished? 'Tis plain the Greeks did, and I need not prove the Persians to have been of the same opinion; for he that wrote the Additions to Esther, was not so well skill'd in the sentiments of the Persians, but that he might confound them with those of the Greeks. Or however there is nothing that should oblige us to think, that as to this matter, the opinion of the Greeks and Persians was not the very same. Besides, 'אָדָם is not as much as to say in English to Hell, or in French en enfer; for these words do only signify the place of punishments, whereas the Greek are more comprehensive, and take in not only Hell or the place of Torments, but likewise the Elysian fields.
V. One question there is behind that is not easy to be resolved, viz. what notion the Jews who used the Greek Tongue, affixed to that word ἀναμνήσθη: I will not heap together all that might be said with relation to this matter; Two things only I shall observe, that may help us to find out the meaning of Christ's words. 1. That the Jews had a word in their Language which signified a grave, any subterraneous places, and the State of the dead; and that was χῶν Schole, which I have treated of on Gen. xxxvii. 35, and which upon all accounts it seems likely that Christ here made use of. The Syriack, I am sure, has כפרות. Now when this word is opposed to Heaven, it signifies, among the Hebrews, the lowest places of the earth; and where Heaven is by a metaphor taken for Glory and Prosperity, χῶν denotes obscurity and adversity. Thus Isai. xiv. 11, 12. it is said in this sense of the King of Babylon: they pride is brought down χῶν —— how art thou fallen from Heaven! &c. And just in this manner Christ here speaks to Capernaum, and uses the word χῶν in the same sense with Isaiab, for a miserable and low condition; as he had before used the word Heaven, to express the happy State of that City whilst he preached and wrought Miracles in it. 2. Amongst the rest of the senses attributed to the word ἀναμνήσθη by the Jews who spake the Greek Language, all which I shall not enumerate, there was that which I said belonged to the Hebrew word, instead of which they generally used this. Which appears clearly from hence, that κατακόπτω τῶν γνῶν and ἀναμνήσθη were in their speech synonymous. Thus whereas it is said by St. Peter, that it was impossible for Christ to be left eis ἀναμνήσθη, Act. ii. 27. St. Paul says that he descended eis κατακόπτω τῶν γνῶν, Eph. iv. 9. And in this sense St. Matthew or his Interpreter, in the room of the word χῶν which Christ made use of, has used the Greek ἀναμνήσθη. If this be true, as it is likely, almost all that our Author says upon this place must of necessity fall to the ground. To the other places of the New Testament, where this word is found, I shall say something when I come to them.

Verf. 27. οὐκ ἔχεις διαμνησθαι τὸν γιν, &c.] This Verse must be joined to the 25, that Christ may be understood to declare to the Jews, as well as Gentiles, that notwithstanding their professed eagerness after divine knowledge, the true Worship of God his Father, and the offices of the Messias, were things that they were strangers to. For the Jews imagined that the observation of the letter of the Law rendered them acceptable to God, whilst they neglected the purpose of the Lawgiver; which was to make them truly vertuous, in the manner that Christ alone has taught us to be. And they expected also the Messias to
to come in the quality of an earthly Prince, and free them from that Chapter extrem= bond age which they were under to the Romans. So that they neither knew the Father nor the Son.

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

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

Ver. 30. Note 1.] κερατός, when spoken of a person, signifies good, bountiful, courteous, or merciful; but when it is a thing that is spoken of, as it is here, then it signifies the same with κερατός profitable, which comes from the same Primitive, or else something like it, according as
Chapter the nature of the thing is. Jerem. xxiv. 3, 5. good figs are called κεράων by the Septuagint; and Ezek. xxviii. 13. a precious stone, τιθηκέραων.

Aeschylus, in Aristophanes, Ran. Act. iv. Sc. 2: says to Euripides: Πάνω πάντων κέραων λόγοι πάντων: We must by all means speak useful things. Whence in following Ages, any collections of useful things were called κερακλάδαι, and the sentences mark'd in the margin of the Books with the letter Χ, which needs no proof. So in Hesych. κέραως (for so it is to be read and not κέραως) is interpreted by κέρασμα, and κέρατος by κέρασσαι. If this were not a thing past doubt, I would add the words of Suidas and Porphyrion; but I must not take up my own or the Readers time. Ζυγοῖς: κέραως therefore signifies a profitable yoke, which is for the benefit or advantage of those that bear it; which the Mosaical was not, but as it is opposed to the Gospel yoke, was of itself unprofitable. For of what use were so many sacrifices, so many taxes, under the name of First-fruit and Tithes, taking so many journeys, and so many Purifications, if we consider them in themselves? All that they served for was only to consume that wealth which was gotten with a great deal of pains, and to render Life more troublesome. For these things did not of themselves make men good or acceptable to God. And therefore they were not κέραως, or, to speak in the words of Ezekiel c. xx. 25: they were precepts that were not good. But the yoke of Christ is useful to him that takes it upon him, many times in this Life, and always in that which is to come. It makes men good, and well pleasing to God, and confirms eternal happiness upon them.

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

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

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

Chapter XII.

V. 8, middle of Note a. Our learned Author goes about here to confute H. Grotius, who thinks that by the Son of Man we must understand Man in common, and not Christ. The whole strength of the Doctor's reasoning is from the use of that phrase; for all that he says besides is so forced, that the bare comparing of it with what is said by Grotius is enough to shew how much he is that great man's inferior in this debate. But however let us examin what he says. I. Those words in the 6 Verse, one greater than the Temple is here, are not connected with the following 8 v. for the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath, but with what goes before; and therefore it is not necessary that he who was greater than the Temple and the Son of Man should be the same. II. In Dan. vii. 13. the Son of Man is taken for a Man, and not for the name of the Messiah, whatever was the use of that phrase in Christ's time. I saw, says the Prophet, in the night visions, and behold there came with the clouds of heaven one like the Son of Man, יְהוָה בַּרְבּ, i.e. the appearance of a Man. This is known to be the constant use of this phrase in the Old Testament; and that Christ should sometimes use it in the same signification will not seem strange to any, tho' at other times he calls himself the Son of Man, or a Man. III. The phrase for man in St. Mark does certainly signify for the good of Man; to wit, that Servants might have rest, which was the principal end of the Sabbath; from whence it follows that Man is Lord of the Sabbath, in this respect, that he may either observe, or neglect the Sabbath, according as affairs, upon which his safety depends, require. For otherwise, if this had not been lawful, man had been for the Sabbath and not the Sabbath for man; in as much as it would have been his duty to set less by his own Life than the observance of the Sabbath. Thus, if there be a just occasion, we are obliged to lay down our lives, rather than not observe those precepts of eternal equity and obligation, that are contained in the Gospel; because the keeping of those precepts was the end for which God created us. And yet they too, I acknowledge, may in a sort be said to be for us, because, if they were but universally observed, they would be a means of making men happy both in this life, and everlastingly in the other. But the Sabbatical days of rest come quite under another consideration, and were not appointed for the good of the mind, so much as of the body. The Jews, according to the intention of the Lawgiver, were bound only to observe them so far as they could without inconvenience, and consistently with self-preservation. In all other cases they
Chapter they were to have a greater regard to their life than to the keeping of holy days. Dr. Hammond therefore has made an ill advantage of the ambiguity of this phrase for the good of man, which does not always signify the same thing. Add to this that I have said what Grotius has upon this place, and then there will be no room to doubt but that this learned English Gentleman has mistaken the true design of it.

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

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

Vers. 24. Note f. What our Author has about the God Achor, perhaps he took out of Selden de Diis Syris, Synt. 11. c. 6. where this matter is copiously handled. Certain it is that Mr. Selden wrote first. But both of them were deceived by a false reading in Pliny, whose words, in the vulgar editions were corrupted. In the Manuscript Copy there is no mention made of the Cyrenaens, nor of Achor Deus, as Salmosius in his Plinian. exercit. p. 10. Edit. Utraj. observes, who must be consulted by those that have a mind to enquire more thoroughly into this matter. He thinks, and very rightly, that we may from the marks that are found in the old written copy read the words thus: |invocant—— Elei Myiadon Deum, muscarum multitudine pestilentiam afferente;
It will bear likewise a dispute, whether it be a probable conjecture of our Author, that the 
Ekronites God Beelzebub was the same with the Grecians Jupiter. For Jupiter, a Deity among the Greeks, was as unknown to the Philistines, as Dagon the God of the Philistines was to the Greeks. It was a piece of vanity in the poor silly Grecians, rashly to think that their Gods were everywhere worshipped, as I might easily shew if it was a thing to be done in this place: But I do not here take upon me to explain the Greek Mythology.

Ver. 27. Note g. j The Doctor might perhaps have added, that the whole of Christ's reasoning in this place consists of Arguments ad hominem; for there are several things here supposed as true, because they were believed by the Jews, which are nowhere designedly laid down for certain by Christ, nor anywhere confirmed by the Apostles. One is, that there is such a political order amongst the Devils, as that one rules over the rest in the quality of a Prince, and under the name of Beelzebub; which every one must needs look upon as doubtful. Another thing is, that that political order should continue for a great while after that time, and consequently the Devils should have no civil definitions among themselves. It's certain that the Persians, who called the Devil by the name of Arimanes, thought that his Empire would never be at an end till it was overthrown by Oromazes or the good God. See Stanley Philosopb. Oriental. Lib. ii. c. 6. And much such an opinion as this seems to have been taken up by the Jews, who perhaps had it from the Chaldeans, and, if we believe learned men, the rest also of the Doctrine about the several orders that there are among the Angels. It may be further asked perhaps, why Christ did not answer an objection which easily springs up in a man's mind upon the reading of this reasoning of his. For it might have been pretended by the Pharisees, that this was only an artifice in the Prince of the Devils to expel his subject Devils for a little time, who might afterwards enter in again unobserved and settle him more securely in his Dominion; and so that there seemed to be a definition among the Devils, the really there was none. But this pretence and the Doctrine of Christ it self sufficiently confutes; and his Resurrection, which was purposely intended as a confirmation of his Doctrine, put the matter out of all doubt. For how could it be imagined that so holy a Doctrine, confirm'd by miracles from Heaven, should owe its being so universally spread to a previous jugglery and contrivance among the Devils? This is in effect, tho but obscurely, suggested by Christ at the 33d Ver.
Chapter X. Ver. 32. Note h. ] It is very true that רָשׁוֹמָה, which properly signifies a word, is taken very often for a thing; but the phrase to speak a word רָשׁוֹמָה was never used to signify to do any thing. The first therefore is very well observed by the Doctor, and demonstrated before by examples at chap. xi. ver. 23. of this Gospel. But the latter no body will ever be able to prove. For tho רָשׁוֹמָה signifies both word and thing, yet it does not follow that verbs of a near signification, as particularly that the verb רָשׁוֹמָה to speak signifies to do, nor can any such instance be given. It is true also, that those who speak words against the Holy Ghost do oppose him; but the reason of that is, because out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh, and it is impossible that a man should speak vilifying words of those Miracles that are wrought by a divine power, but he must have a design to resist them. So that our Author, which I am sorry for, has not in the beginning of this last Annotation of his, given us any Evidence of his great skill in Grammar: What he says besides is extraordinary; and no body, that I know of, has so happily explained wherein the Sin against the Holy Ghost consists. This Sin is excellently compared to sinning under the Law with a hand lifted up; which those were guilty of who, after warning given them, put an open contempt upon the Laws authority, and spake in reproachful terms concerning it, as we have shewn in our Notes on Numbers. For just as those who are here said to sin against the Holy Ghost, defamed the Miracles wrought by Christ; so those that sinned under the Law with a high hand derided the Miracles wrought by Moses.

Ver. 36. Note m. ] There are some who would have Christ to argue here a minori ad majus, q. d. If men must give an account even of idle words, much more must they do so of slanderous speeches, such as had been utter'd by the Pharisees. But there is not so much as the least footstep of this in our Saviour's words. And therefore I rather think with Dr. Hammond, that this word ἄρπας implies something in it more than ordinary bad. For tho it properly signifies idle, yet according to use, which often stretches the sense of words beyond what is contain'd in their true original, it may signify somewhat more. When any man was said to be ἄρπας, the only meaning certainly was not that he had a great deal of leisure, which may be true sometimes of good and industrious persons, but that he was a lazy, sluggish, stupid Fellow, as the word is rendred in an old Lexicon. And tho ἄρπας is not only a vain or idle word, such as the Discourse of trifling persons is oftentimes full of; but also a wicked one, such as is a means of corrupting the minds of the Hearers, and
making them lazy and slothful, i.e. hindering them from doing any good works; and as a consequence of that, occasioning their running headlong into all manner of evil practices. And of this sort were the Discourses of such men as the Pharisees, who, in respect of Piety, might be justly said to be slothful persons, performed no good works, but were wicked themselves, and by their bad Conversation kept others from becoming sober or serviceable. Their Discourses were the Discourses of slothful and indolent men (in point of Virtue) and such as induced the Heaters to be alike slothful. This Christ more than once upbraids them with. See afterwards Chap. xxiii. 13. And in this place we have an instance of it in them, in their not only refusing to believe Christ themselves, but using Arguments to persuade others that he was not to be believed, whilst they wickedly ascribed the Miracles that were done by him to the Prince of the Devils. So that I should understand the word sloth not only in a passive, but also in an active sense, i.e. that Christ speaks of such Discourses as were not only without the least spark of goodness in them, but had a bad influence likewise upon others. Thus the Doctrine of the Stoicks was by the rest of the Philosophers called sloth, in an active sense, as appears from a passage in Cicero Lib. de Fato: Nec nos impediet, says he, illa ignava quae dicitur ratio (appellatur quidem a Philosophis sloth, cui si pareamus nihil est omnino quod agamus in vita. So sloth, of which sloth is but a contraction, is used also actively. Hesych. sloth, slothful, idle or mischievous.

Verf. 42. [Ex mecum misi.] See my Notes upon Abd. ver. 20.

CHAP. XIII.

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

Verf. 12. [Quae sic et sic, quae sic et sic aliud aliud.] i.e. He that makes an ill use of God's benefits, so as that they prove almost insignificant to him, and makes little or no advances in Piety, shall be so forsaken of God, as to fall even from those first beginnings he has made in Virtue. Just such another expression, but in a different case, there is in Juvenal, Sat. iii. verf. 208.

Nulli habuit Codrus, quis enim negat? Q' rosum illud
Perditis infelix totum nihil.
The same Metaphor is used by Quintilian, de praecocibus ingeniiis, lib. iii. c. 3. Non subest, says he, vera vis, nec penitus immisis radicibus, ut quae summo solo sparsi sunt femina, celerius se se effundunt; & irritata spicas berbe, inanibus artis, ante messem flavescunt. Their forwardness is not the effect of any settled strength of judgment, but they are like seeds scattered upon the surface of the ground, which presently shoot up before they have taken any rooting; or like deep weeds growing amongst the corn, which ripen before the Harvest.

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

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

Ver. 35. ήε το ποσιν. It is strange that in the antient Copies, still extant, there should be no footstep to be found of that reading which is so often mentioned by S. Jerom, and which gave Porphyrius an occasion to endeavour the lessening the Evangelists Authority. I have read in some Copies, says he upon this place, and perhaps any diligent Reader may find the same, in the place where we have put, and the Vulgar Edition has dictum est per Prophetam dicentem; I say, I have read in some Copies per Elaiam Prophetam dicentem. And because no such thing as is here mentioned was to be found in Isaiah, I believe this was taken away afterwards by some prudent men; but I am apt to think that it was at first written per Asaph Prophetam (for the 77th Psalm, out of which this Testimony is taken, is entitled a Psalm of the Prophet Asaph) and that the first Transcriber did not understand what was meant by Asaph, but thinking it to be a mistake in the Writer, corrected it by putting Isaiah into
into its room, whose name was more familiar and better known. Much Chapter after the same manner he speaks upon the 78th Psalm; for all that is there said on this head seems to be truly S. Jerom's, tho there be perhaps, as Erasmus thought, a great deal of another man's added to that Commentary. It is said therefore, says he, in St. Matthew, Hac facer sanct ut impleretur quod scriptum est in Asaph Propheta; but some ignorant men took that away, and ever since that time, MANY Gospels at this day have it, Ut impleretur quod dictum est per Esaiam Prophetam, tho it was not Isaiiah that said this, but Asaph. In a word, that wicked wretch Porphyrius objectts this very thing against us, saying, Your Evangelist Matthew was so ignorant as to say, Quod scriptum est per Esaiam, &c. — it was an error in the Transcribers, who wrote Esaiam for Asaph: for we know that the Primitive Church was gathered out of ignorant and unskilful people; and so reading in the Gospel, Ut impleretur quod scriptum est in Asaph Propheta, be that first transcribed the Gospel began to question with himself, who should this Asaph the Prophet be? and because he was not known among the People, thinking it to be an error, and going about to correct it, committed one himself. If we believe those who have made it their business to collect the various Readings, there is no Copy now extant but what wants the Prophet's name. But tho there was a very important reason for blotting his name out, the antient Transcribers had none at all for adding it; which is a thing that deserves our consideration, as well as what S. Jerom says besides in that place.

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

CHAP. XIV.

V. 5. middle T
His observation seems to be taken out of H. Ste-
phens's Thesaurus, and with very little care: for
what is ascribed to Budaeus, Stephanus sets down
as out of the vulgar Lexicons; and those which are cited for the words
of Xenophon, are Aeschines's; and Budaeus interprets ade
by pro-
gredi facio. So that it would have been better if the Doctor had left
out what he here says.

CHAP. XV.

Chapter XV. Verf. 7. I do not think, with Gravius, and Dr. Ham-
mond, that there is any respect here had to a further
second accomplishment of a Prophecy of Isaiab, whose words
contain not a Predication of any thing, but are only a reproof which he
gives to the Jews of his time. But the reason of Christ's using such a
form of speech, is that Isaiab, in describing the ancient Jews, did at the
same time exactly represent the disposition of their posterity, even
at that distance. And therefore the word regarded here must not be
insisted on, the meaning of Christ's words being no other than this:
the Prophet Isaiab spake that of your forefathers which may very well be apply'd
to you. Something like this we may read in Cicero's Orat. pro Sextio
Cap. Ivii. where that Prince of Orators tell us that a great many things
out of ancient tragedy futing his case, were by Roscius and all the Romans
accommodated to him; and after he had recited this Verse, O in-
gratifici Argivi, inanes Graii, immemores beneficii, with a few more, he
goes on thus: illud scriptum discretissimius poeta pro me; i. e. these things do
so exactly fit my case, that if the Poet had wrote about me on set purpose,
he could not possibly have devise any thing more futable. And just
thus I should here understand Isaiab, to be figuratively said to have
prophesied that which did so well agree to the Jews in the time of Christ,
as that if he had really had a respect to them, he could not have spo-
ken otherwise.

Verf. 19. Note e.] I. The phrase to proceed out of the heart does not
signify for any thing that lies hid in the heart to discover it self
by some external Action, but to have a Fountain in the Mind, which is the
original of all our thoughts. And therefore it cannot be gathered
from this phrase that diamatoid in this place signifies any thing more
than bare thoughts. And indeed Christ opposes here those things which
are
are conveyed from without into the body, to those which have their Chapter rise from the Mind, whether they are latent, or whether they manifest themselves by outward Actions. Nor do evil thoughts begin definite a man whilst they remain secret in the mind, than when they are expressed in words. II. If there was a necessity of proving that σατανικος signifies Machinations or Consultations, the way would not be to consider the significations of the Noun σατανος, but of the Verb σατανιζειν, from which the word σατανικος immediately comes, and which amongst other things signifies to consult. III. Our Author's reasoning from the sins here enumerated being disposed according to the order of the precepts of the Decalogue, besides that it is overthrown by comparing this with the parallel place in St. Mark, does by no means agree with St. Matthew's way of writing, in which there is no such accuracy to be observed, no more than in the other writings of the Apostles. IV. As I do not deny but that part of the Wickedness spoken of in Gen. vi. 5. was the murders committed by those who lived before the Flood, so I am far from thinking that this is the only signification of those words the imaginations of the thoughts of the heart, and I am sure it cannot be proved to be so. In a word, the Doctor in this whole Annotation takes more pains, and uses greater subtlety than he needed to have done. It would have been sufficient for him to have shewn that σατανικος does not only signify the thoughts of particular persons, but also the consultations of several persons together, and that Christ had a respect to both, and by that word was meant all kinds of evil thoughts and wicked consultations.

Ver. 22. Note f.] I. I have not that Edition of Pliny which our learned Author made use of, nor Budaeus; but I read the place in Pliny, in the late Paris Edition of M. J. Harduin, thus: *Quis subtilissimus circumfundit Syria Phoeniceum volamt, et esse oram maritimam Syria cuius pars sit Idumaea & Judea, deinde Phoenice, deinde Syria.* Those that divide more subtly tell us that Phoenice is comprehended in Syria, and is the Sea-coast of Syria, of which Idumaea and Judea make a part, then Phoenice, then Syria: where the word circumfundit signifies to be contained or comprehended, not encompassed, as the Doctor and Pliny's interpreter thought, as appears by the following words, by which Phoenice is made a part of Syria, and not merely a Country which Syria surrounded. And the reason why the Phoenicians are commonly called Syrophoenicians, is not because they bordered upon the Syrians, but because the same Persons were both Syrians and Phoenicians too; and that perhaps on purpose to distinguish them from the Carthaginians, or those Phoenicians who inhabited the Sea-coast of Africa. II. The Barbarians mentioned...
Chapter by Laertius in Proem. can be no more the Jews than the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Brachmans, or any other Nation which were all called by the Greeks Barbarians. I know the Fathers generally affirm that the Greeks borrowed a great many things from the Hebrews; but I know too, that the examples produced by them are not sufficient to prove it: for the Greeks might as well be beholden for every thing that they instance in, to the Tyrians, Egyptians, or Chaldeans, as to the Jews; or it may be they might invent them themselves. This I could easily demonstrate if this were a proper place for it.

CHAP. XVI.

Ver. 6. I will not deny but that the Sadducess favoured Herod, and so were Herodians, as Grotius has observed upon this place; yet I am inclined to think that Herod is mentioned by name instead of the Sadducess here in St. Mark, by reason he was a Sadduee or one that denied a future State; and so it was all one for the Evangelist to say Herod or the Sadducess. And this seems to me to be the more probable, because it does not appear, from the account we have of Herod, that he had any opinion peculiar to himself; whereas that the Sadducess had so is manifest, which therefore Herod rather seems to have embraced than the Sadducess any Doctrine of his, he having none that was properly his own.

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

Ver. 13. I should not think it at all strange if a Roman or Gracian Writer should say that Cæsarea was in Syria; because Palestine was reckoned by the Greeks and Romans a part of Syria. But a Christian, that uses to follow the custom of the Scripture, which always makes a distinction between דָּרָם Syria and Canaan, would have spoken more accurately, if he had said that Cæsarea was in the territory of the Tribe of Manasse, on the west side of Jordan in Palestine or Judea. But the contention between the Jews and the Syrians, which he afterwards mentions, was the reason doubtless why our Author thus spake.
Ver. 18. Εἴτε πρόγονη, εἴτε μυπρυτή τι πιστεύεις.] Such another προγονιανία. I have observed in my Notes upon Gen. xlix. 8, which see. Had Interpreters taken notice only of this, they would never have denied Petrum and Petram here to be one and the same man, viz. Simon, that eminent Member of the Apostolical Society. Consult Camero in his Praelat. upon this place, or in his Myrothec. where he has put this matter beyond all doubt.

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

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

But what does Christ then mean, when he says that the gates of hell should not prevail against Peter, or not overcome him? namely this; that the danger of a certain and speedy death upon the account of his
Chapter preaching the Gospel, should not deter him from discharging the of-
XVI. fice imposed on him, and so not death it self. So that *sens* in these
words promises Peter, after he had professed his belief that he was the
Messiah, that he should be a foundation of his Church, and constant
in the profession of the Truth he had declared; which he fulfilled ac-
cordingly; for Peter, as we are told by Clemens Ep. c. v. ης ας ης εις,
αληθεναμεν ης μεμενον ες ης δικαιωμα των ες *ς ονον ης δις,
did not only undergo one or two, but many forrows; and so becoming a
Martyr, went to his proper place in glory. We may apply to him that
passage of Seneca as we find it in Lucretius Lib. vi. c. 17. ης εις ης
bene boneus, non spicis purpuris, non lictoris insignia ministris, sed
nulla re minor, qui cum MORTEM in VICINA videt, non sic perturbat-
tur, tanquam rerem novam viderit; qui suae tota corpore tormenta pa-ntur, suae flamma ore recipienda est, suae estendentes por patibulum manus,
non quierit quid patiatur, sed quam bene. This is that brave and honor-able
person, who is not remarkable for his fine but of feathers, his purple robe, or
his guard of Lictors, which is the least part of his glory; but who when he
sees death just before him, is not surprised with the strangeness of the fight;
and whether he is to undergo the torment of the rack, or to receive fire into his
mouth, or have his arms stretched out upon a cross, does not regard what, but
how well he suffers.

There is one thing that may perhaps here be objected, viz. that ac-
cording to this interpretation Christ does not keep to the Metaphor;
for after he had called Peter a stone, he adds that death should not over-
come him. It is true, but it was neither necessary that Christ should
go on in the same Metaphor; nor yet supposing that what we refer to
Peter did, as it is commonly thought, belong to the Church, will he
be found to continue the same Metaphor. For he compares the
Church to a building, which cannot properly be said to be over-some by
the gates of death, but only to be pulled down or destroyed. Nothing is
more ordinary in all sort of Writers than to begin with one Metaphor
and end with another. As for instance, Clemens says ad litter before the
words already alluded, concerning St. Peter and St. Paul: 'Ενεκαθαυ
ους ης πηνεσται τοις ης λαοις ης και ης θεανης: the faithful and most righteous
pillars of the Church were persecuted even to death. Pillars can neither be
persecuted nor dy.

However, by this it appears that St. Matthew or his interpreter ve-
ry fitly uses here the word *ναρκαν*, which properly signifies to over-
come by force; for this is what Christ means, that the terror of having a vi-o-
1ent Death set before him, should not overcome St. Peters constancy;
Tho he saw the gates of death opened for him, yet he should not with-
Standing hold fast his pious resolution. If any doubt of the significati-
on of the verb ἓρεθον, let them turn to the Greek Indexes to the first
books of Diodorus Siculus, and the Roman Antiq. of Dion. Halicarnassans,
... more examples than in any Lexicons. But it occurs likewise in the
same sense often in the version of the Septuagint. I know very well,
that Interpreters commonly make use of these words to prove the per-
petuity, if not also the insanableness of the Church; but they
will never be able to evince any such thing from this place by Gramma-
tical reasons. The thing it self shews that the Church is liable to error,
not is there any mention made in this place of errors. That the Church
has and always will continue, I do not in the least doubt, because of
the nature and force of the Evangelical Covenant; but this cannot be
concluded from these words, in which it is much more probable that
St. Peter is spoken of; both what goes before and what comes after
belonging to him and not to the Church. However I submit the whole
matter to the judgment of the Learned.

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

II. Indeed for my own part, I do not doubt but that the Apostles
committed the Government of the Churches to single Bishops, and ac-
cordingly that these ought to be reckon'd their Successors; but as their
Gifts were not alike, so neither was their Authority equal. And
therefore whatever Christ says to the Apostles ought not presently to be
accommodated to Bishops, at least by the same Rule and in the same
Latitude: Especially in this place, where Christ promises to St. Peter
and the Apostles something extraordinary for the Confession made by
St. Peter in the Name of all the rest, no Grammarian would say that
the Apostles Successors were also included: and therefore the words
of Christ cannot, till the thing is first proved by Argument, be ap-
plied
Chapter plied to Bishops; as if Christ had by these words alone conferred an equal Power upon the Apostles and their Successors. Cyprian, it's true, and some other Bishops did so interpret them, as if by virtue of these words of Christ they succeeded in the Apostles Rights and Privileges; but it were to be wished they had given their Grammatical Reasons for such an Interpretation of them.

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

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

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

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

Chapter of Death, but with the Punishment Death. Besides, the Doctor’s Annotation is manifestly confuted by the parallel place in St. Luke, ch. ix. 25. where the Phrase is ἐλαφρόν ζημωθής, losing himself, not ἐλαφρὸν. It is past all doubt, that as to save Life does not signify in this Discourse of Christ, to save those things which concern or belong to Life, but Life itself; so to suffer the loss of the Soul is to lose the Soul, i. e. Life eternal.

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

"Οὐ γὰρ ἐμιὶ τοῦτον ἀντέξειν, ἢ ὁσα φασὶν

"Ἀτρι φύλασσεν ἵνα τῇ ἐντολῇ.

For there is nothing seems to me fit to be laid in the Balance with Life, no not all the Wealth that they say is contain’d in the populous City of Troy, &c.

CHAP. XVII.

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

Verf. 24. Note e.] It is strange that our Author, when he had said that the name of Drachma came to the Jews after the time of the Seleucidae, should produce as a proof of it, a place out of Ezra ii. 69. who lived in the Reign of Cyrus. Did he think that the Book of Ezra was written or altered after the time of Alexander? I do not believe so. It must be therefore an Error, occasion’d either through want of care, or that common Infirmity to which Human Nature is liable, which in so great a Man ought easily to be overlooked. Thinking with himself that Drachmone was a Greek word, and knowing that the Jews had no Commerce with the Greeks before the time of the Seleucidae, he imagined that that word was not before known to the Jews; and not taking sufficient heed to Chronological Accounts, alledg’d, before he was aware, that place out of Ezra. To the questi-
Chapter on, whether it was a double, sacred or common Sbeke, I have spoken
XVIII. upon Exod. xxx. 13.

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

CHAP. XVIII.

Ver. 6. K

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

Ver. 7. Aνωθεν δὲ εἰς ἑαυτὸν συγκεῦλα. That is, Men are so wicked,
that they will certainly put Stumbling-blocks in others way, but they
shall be severely punished for doing so; namely, because there is no ne-
cessity of Mens being bad, tho they are bad, and as long as they
continue bad, they must needs be an offence to others. There is an
Expression not much unlike this in Herodotus, lib. 1. cap. vii. where
he speaks of the folly of Candaules, who was delirous to have Gyges see
his
St. Matthew.
Chapter XVIII.

his Wife all naked: 

Ver. 8. Η χειρ σα, &c.] The sense of these words is admirably well expressed in one Verse of Dionysius Cato:

Que noctura tenees, quamvis sunt caras, ruineas.

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

One thing there is which he here contradicts, viz. an Opinion that seems to have been common to the Jews with the Heathens, that according as Men differed in rank and condition, they had more or less powerful Genius's appointed to watch over them: So that great and rich Persons were attended, they thought, with a Genius of greater Power and Might than those that were poor, or of the lowest rank. So Plutarch in the Life of Antonius, p. 930. Αι γαρ τις μεγαλοί ευσεβείς, θεοί πυρ τού Καίσαρος θησαυρον φρεσμόνοι. ὥστε ναὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων —仞 — λόγῳ τῆς τυχῆς αὐτῶν ζωης — οὗτοι ἦσαν θεοί προς τοὺς οἰκίας τῆς φυλής — Ἆνθες ἦσαν τοὺς Καίσαρος — αἰμαγωγεῖς. Καὶ αὐθεντικῶς ποιητέας ὅσιαν καὶ γιοννικάτων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. Ὁ γαρ σφηκός ἡμῶν ΔΑΙΜΟΝ μέτα τοῦ φθειρού. Καὶ χρύσῳ ὄνομα ὅσιον, ὅπως οἰκεῖος τοῖς των παυσάνοις ἐστιν. Καὶ ἔτεινα ὃ παύειν ὑπὲρ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. The ludicrous Contentions that Antony had with Caesar in his Childhood, and in which he was always beaten, vexed him to the heart. For he had a certain Fortune-teller with him out of Egypt that pretended to understand what Men were born to — who told him, that tho his Fortune was great and extraordinary, yet it was obscured by Caesar's. And therefore he advis'd him to separate
Chapter separate himself as far as possible from that young Prince. For, says he, your GENIUS is afraid of his Genius; and tho' it is fierce and lofty when alone, yet at his approach it grows remiss and cowardly. Now what our Saviour here says, directly thwarts this Opinion; for he teaches us, that Angels of the highest dignity are appointed to take care of little ones. For to see the face of God, is all one as to be permitted a near access to him, as Grosciua has observ'd.

Vers. 15. Εἀρ ἢν ἐκκαταρκίαν εἰς σὲ ὑπὸ αἰτίας σου. ] Because our Author in his Paraphrase upon the 17th Verse refers the Reader to his Treatise of the Power of the Keys, where he explains this place more largely, I shall take out thence what is not to be found in his Annotations, that those who want that Book, may see fully what is Dr. Hammond's Opinion here.

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

"Go and reprove him, ἐλέγξω, i. e. either reprove him for it, as the word is used sometimes when 'tis join'd with μαθώ, chasten, or discipline, Heb. xii. 5. Apoc. iii. 19. or again ἐλέγξω *, make him sensible of the Wrong he hath done thee, or as it may be rendred, † make him ashamed of his Fact.

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

"If he bear thee, he thus wrought on:

* ἐλέγξως, φανερῶς εἰς κακομυθίως, Phavor. & ἐλέγξω, τὸ κακομυθίως ἀπότιμα πεῖς εἰς φῶς ἅμα, ἂν δὲ ἄρας τὸ κακομυθίως φανερῶς, ib. and so Joh. iii. 20. He that doth evil cometh not to the Light, lest his Deeds should be reproved, ἐλεηθής [discovered] in our Margin: and therefore 1 Cor. xiv. 24. when 'tis said of the Unbeliever, that he is convinced of all, &c. 'tis added v. 25. Thus are the Secrets of his Heart made manifest: to Ephes. v. 13. All things that are reproved, or discovered, are made manifest by the Light; for whatsoever doth make manifest, is Light.

† ἐλεηθής, αἰγυπτσίως, & ἐλεηθής ἢ ἐν αἰγυπτσίως ἡμείς, & ἐλεηθής ἢν Φαγὼν, Phavor.
"Thou hast gain'd thy Brother; gain'd him, first to thy self (gotten a Chapter
friend instead of an Enemy;) and secondly to Christ, gained a Con-
vert, a Profeylete to him, and this also a great acquisition to thee,
to have had the honour of doing that glorious thing, and of be-
ing capable of the Reward of them that convert any to Righteous-
ness.

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

"Take with thee (in farther, or over and above) one, or two,
that in the mouth of two or three Witnesses every word may be esta-
blished, i.e. that the thing which thou layest to his charge, be
so confirmed; according to that Joh. viii. 17. The Testimony of
two Men is true, i.e. of sufficient authority in Law (according
to an Hebraism, whereby ἅκαιρος, ἀληθῶς true, among the Greek
Translators signifieth mēς, fit to be credited) that so either by the
Testimony of these as Witnesses, he may no longer be able to deny
the Fact (as Heb. vi. 16. an Oath is said to be ἐκ βελαιων, for esta-
blishing, or confirmation, in that it is ἀναποι τικας, an end of affirm-
ing and denying; the thing to be established (because or so) by Oath,
cannot be denied, or the Parties denial will no longer stand him in
stead) or by authority of these he may be induced (as the Fudg is on
the accused, Deut. xix. 15. Heb. x. 28.) to give sentence on, to con-
demn himself; which if it may be obtained, is the prime end of
all these charitable Artifices, to bring the Injurious to a fight and
shame, the best Preparatives to Reformation: To which purpose
is that of Tertullian, Apol. cap. 39. Disciplinam praecipitorum incul-
cationibus densamus, We thicken the Doctrine of Precepts with ways of
inculcating, i.e. press them to Reformation whom our Doctrine
will not prevail on; where he mentions these three degrees, Exhor-
tationes, Cañigationes, Censura; Exhortations and Censures, and
then Censure.

"But if he hear not them (ἐκαθαριστήριν, if he be still refractory, either
through non-conviction of the Fact, or non-contrition for it;) if this
second Admonition be not in event ἐκ τισαμβρωτης, 2 Cor. xiii. 10. to
Edification, or Instruction; if it work not on him,
"Then tell it to the Church, I shall tell you what that is pre-
ently:

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

For so immediately it follows, Verily I say unto you; who are those you? Why, 1. In the plural Number [ὑμῖν.] Secondly, ὑμῖν μαθήσασίς to
to you Disciples, the same that were after made Apostles, (for so in Chapter
the first verse αὐτὸς τὸν αὐτὸν, the Disciples came to him with a XVIII.
question; and v. 3. he said, verily I say to you, i.e. to you Disciples:
and ver. 12. ναὶ ναὶ; what do you think? asking the Disciples,
or appealing to their own judgment, and so still the same Auditors continued, and his Speech addrest to them, I say unto you Dis-
ciples) whatsoever you shall bind on earth, &c.
"After this, it follows ver. 19. again I say unto you, that if two of
you shall agree upon earth, &c.] Many false illusions are by men
of different persuasions made from these words, which will all
vanish, I conceive, and the truth be displayed, if the Reader will
not despise this one observation, which I shall offer to him; and it
is this, that the method oft-times used in Scripture is (when it
hath proposed one or two several to speak of) to resume the last
first, and so orderly to go back, till it come to the first, to which
you may accommodate that expression, and description of God's me-
tod in other things. Many that are last are first (the last in proposing,
first in handling or resuming) and the first last.
"Other Examples of this Observation I shall leave the Reader to
observe, when he reads the Scripture more ponderingly, and only
proceed to help him to take notice of it in the point in hand. Three
cases, it is apparent, are here mention'd orderly by our Saviour
in the matter of trespass: 1. Telling the Trespasser of his fault be-
tween him and thee alone. 2. Taking one or two with thee, to do
it more convincingly, and with greater Authority. 3. Telling
the Church of it. Having said somewhat to each of these, as he
delivered them in the three first Verses, 15, 16, 17. he resumes
the matter again, and speaks first to the last of them, ver. 18.
telling them what, after the not succeeding of the third admo-
nition, the Apostles and their Successors are to do, when the cogni-
zance of this injury and contumacy comes before them, (which,
that in every case of trespass it always should, I conceive, doth
not hence appear to be necessary, save only in case that the Ma-
gistrate or secular Tribunal be Heathen, because that Supposition
may perhaps be the ground of the ἐπι τίνι Εθνικὸς, on which this
other is superstructured) viz. excommunicate such a Refractor till re-
formation, and then upon that, absolve him again; and [verily I
say unto you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth, &c.] From this
view it is not irrational to conclude, that the ἐκκλησία and the
ἐκκλησία, the Church, and the Disciples (considered prophetically un-
"der
der the notion of Apostles, i.e. Founders first, then Governours of Churches) may in that place signify the same thing. So faith St. Chrysostom in Mat. Hor. 6. εἰ δὲ ἀγγέλων, τοῦτο τὸς ἀγγέλων, Tell it to the Church, i.e. to the President and Rulers of it; and Theop. in Matt. xviii. εἰ δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἄρτιος ἢ τὸς ἐκκλησίας, &c. the Church for the Rulers of the Church: To which purpose it is observable, what Kimchi a Jewish learned Rabbi hath affirmed, that the Governours and Rulers are oft meant by the word ἡ ἐκκλησία, or Congregation; and so the word People, Exod. iv. 29. doth clearly signify the Elders, not all the People, Exod. iii. 16. Agreeable to which is the Inscription of the antient Apostolical Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρισίν Ἀρμανίων, The Church of God that dwells at Rome, meaning I conceive by the Title [the Church] himself (who wrote the Epistle, and was chief there, or Bishop at that time) and the other Clergy with him; for so the other part of the Inscription [τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ πατρισίν Κος] to the Church of God at Corinth] is after explained by him in the words ἐπισκόπων, καὶ διακόνων, to the Bishops and Deacons. But if this will not be acknowledged, then by ἐκκλησία I shall give you leave to understand any meeting, or Congregation of pious men, either a confessus Presbyterorum, a College of Presbyters, which were ordinarily assistant to the Bishop in the antient Church, or possibly the whole or any part of the People convened, whose Authority or consent may work somewhat upon the Offender, as S. Paul conceives it were apt to do, when he commands Timothy, ἀνατρέφοντες ἐρωτοῦν πάντων ἐπισκόπων, to rebuke the offenders before all men, i.e. in the presence of the community of the People, 1 Tim. v. 20. and perhaps when he speaks of the ἐπισκοπὴ τοῦ ᾿Αριστοτέλους, 2 Cor. ii. 6. the rebuke that was by or under the many, though it be not certain whether that signify the chastisement, (as our English reads) punishment and censure inflicted by the Presbytery, or under them, those assisting or joining in the censure, Acts of Canonical severity, (which in case of sorrow and relenting of the Offender upon rebuke, or admonition before ejection out of the Church, were wont to be thought sufficient without excommunication; and after excommunication, as in this place to the Corinthians, if they were submitted to, were sufficient, tho not presently to restore him to the Communion, yet to make him capable of being prayed for by the Church, 1 John v. 16. and to be delivered from the stripes of Satan, the diseases that the delivering to Satan in the Apostles
“Apostles times brought upon them;) or whether, as the words may be rendered, it import the rebuke, or reproof, viz. the third XVIII. admonition (or the second given by the Bishop, which was equivalent to that) which was under, or in the presence of many, viz. of the People or Congregation. The former of these senses seems more agreeable to the place to the Corinthians, the latter rather to belong to that in 1 Tim. and so that which even now in Mus. was coram multis, before many, and in St. Paul (if not υπερ many, yet) ἐν πρὸς πάντως, in the presence of all men. Christ may here express by εὐαγγελία the Church. This Interpretation, if being admitted, or not rejected, it then follows commodiously and reasonably, in the Text of the Evangelist, that after the matter is brought to them (i.e. to those many) or after this act of reproof, or rebuke before them, and upon continued refractoriness to these last admonitions, then the ἰησοῦς (that sure is) the Apostles or Governors of the Church, the Pastors (which cannot be in any reason excluded from under the former word εὐαγγελία Church, whatsoever it signifies) and those already promised this power, chap. xvi. may, or shall bind, or excommunicate them. And that is the sum of the 18th verse in reference to the 17th. And then vers. 19, &c.

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

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

Vers. 28. Note d.] The Verb ἱβεβες is used here in its proper signification; for when we take any man by the Collar, and hale him along
Chapter against his will, we almost choke him. The Latin Phrase for it is *oborto collo trahere*, which Erasmus here makes use of. So Plautus in *Pan趋于*, Act. iii. Sc. 5. ver. 45.

*Priorquem bine oborto collo ad pratarem trahor.*

Which is well interpreted by learned men, to take hold of a man’s collar, and squeeze his jaws together, and then drag him along. So a Philosopher is represented by Lucian in *Hermetismo*, demanding his pay of one of his Scholars, and hailing him before the Justice or *Prator*, *σπειρην ζνω καὶ τέχνην*, having thrown his cloak about his neck. And in the same Author, in *Lapithis*, this Stoick Philosopher is reproached with this very thing thus: *ινα διετρίβῃς μυρμήν, λέν μεκανικόν ἀλλήλοις: nor do I take my Scholars by the throat and drag them before the Justice, if they do not pay me my stipend when it is due.* See also the Dial. between *Aeusus*, *Protesilaus*, *Menelaus* and *Paris.*

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

**C H A P. XIX.**

Ver. 8. *Περὶ των ἐναρκτορικῶν.*] But you will say then, that to ones thinking God should have changed it: True, if it were the ordinary way of God to change the dispositions of men by the exercise of his infinite power; but because in order to that end he for the most part makes use of Laws, Threatnings, Promises, and such other means, he could not possibly have acted otherwise than he did, when no Laws could prove effectual to reform the Jews as to this point of the hardness of their hearts. He would not therefore require of them what he knew they would never do. And this was partly the reason
reason that Solon went upon, when he reformed the severe Laws made by Draco, as Plutarch in his Life tells us: Αἰτείς τὸ νόμα ἔτοιμον ἔπελεν οὐδὲν, οὐ βιωτος Κρίνων ἔπλεα, ἔπλεα πλοῖον ἐξισώσας καλλίτερον. He that makes Laws must consider the possibility of their being observed, if he intends to punish but a few, and do good by it, and not a great many to no purpose.

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

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

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

Verf. 28. Note d.] It is indeed truly observed by the Doctor, that the ἀνασύνετα or regeneration here spoken of, is not like that of the Pythagoreans; but he might have added that it was of a nearer similitude with that of the Stoicks, and that the Stoick Philosophers were the first that used this word to express the Restoration of the World after the burning of it. Tho in the circumstances they differ very much in their opinion from the Christians, yet in the general they agree as to this.
Chapter this, that the World shall be first consumed by Fire, and then after-
wards restored: and the Christian Writers, who knew the thing
more certainly, and came another way by their knowledge, seem to
have borrowed the word *ἀνακάμπσις* in this sense, from them. *Philo,*
in his book *de Incorruptibilitate mundi,* p. 728. Ed. Genov. after he had
spoken of the conflagration of the World, proceeds thus in giving an
account of the *Stoics* opinion: ἦς ἐστιν ἀνακάμπσις ἔσω τοῦ ἀμα-
νία τοῦ παγκόσμου, from which the Stoics say that there shall be another rege-
neration of the World, brought about by the Providence of its Author.
*Δύναται ἢ ἃ ἔστιν τέτοιος, ὅ ὑμῖν πᾶς ὁ ἰσός ἀνακαμπανος* ὁ πάντων ἡσυχασία.
*Φαιτὰ τό ἀνακαμπανος* ἐδυνάμωσεν. ἀνακάμπσις ἐν τοῖς ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ παν-
κόσμῳ ἐν τῇ ἀνακάμπσις: *Now according to these men opinion, it may be said
that there is one World which is eternal, and another which is corruptible; the
 corruptible one, so called, because of its Constitution, the eternal one, that
which after its Conflagration, will by the perpetual REGENERATIONS
and Revolutions of it be render'd immortal. And often in that book he
uses the word *ἀνακάμπσις* in this sense. So Marcus Antoninus, Lib. xi.
Sect. 1. faith, *The ἀνακάμπσις παντοτιας ἐστὶν ἔκκαθαρτικὴ: it perfectly
comprehends (viz. human Reason) the periodical regeneration of all things.
So Eusebius Pref. Evan., Lib. xv. c. 19. shews out of Boethus, ὁποῖος ἐξε-
ζητεῖν ὅπερ ἔστιν ἄνακαμπσίας ἐστὶν ἐκ τῶν, what the Stoics think about the Re-
generation of all things. And so likewise others speak of this opinion,
which puts it out of all doubt that this word was borrowed from the
Stoics, who had a great many more of the same kind peculiar to their
Sect. Seneca, in his Nat. Question. Lib. iii. c. ult. faith, *Omne EX IN-
TEGRO animal GENERABITUR, dabiturque terris homo inscius scele-
rum, & melioribus auspiciis natus.* Every living creature shall be regener-
ated, and the earth shall have men to inhabit it, that shall not know what it is
to be vicious, and whose birth shall be attended with better tokens. About the
opinion it self see *Juβ.* Lipsius Phys. Stoicæ, Lib. ii. c. 22.

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

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

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

CHAP. XX.

Ver. 15. I Do not at all doubt but that Christ often made use of Proverbs and Phrases borrowed from the common way of speaking amongst the Jews, as learned men, and in particular Dr. Lightfoot, has shewn; but that he borrowed whole parables or phrases entire discourses, I can by no means think. It does not seem to be the part of an inspired Teacher to propose to his hearers Parables that were vulgarly used, for his own. And indeed it does not appear that anybody used them before Christ's time; for those which are alluded out of the Talmudical or other Jewish Writers, were all written some ages after Christ's birth. As for instance, this Parable of the Householder and the Labourers, which is extant in the Jerusalem Gemara, was written an age and a half at least after the Destruction of the Temple. And this being so, it seems to me a great deal more probable, that the Author of the Jerusalem Gemara, or whoever it is that is there represented as using this Parable, did it in imitation of Christ, than that he owed it to any antient tradition. The same I say of many others, as of that which learned Men produce upon Matt. xviii. 17. out of the book Musar, and of another Parable like that, which we have afterwards in Chap. xxv. 1. & seqq. Or if this conjecture be not approved, it would not be perhaps absurd if one should say that sometimes the Jews happened upon the same thoughts with Christ; just as we see the Heathen Writers, who undoubtedly never read the Scripture.
Chapter ture, did by accident sometimes lay much the same things. I had rather say so, than imagind Christ, just like a Rabbi, repeating what he had learned from his Masters, as if he had not been self taught. Let this suffice for what may be said upon this and other the like places in our Author. It must be observed here besides, by the way, that the Hebrew words שָׁלוֹם בֶּשָּׁלוֹם are not rightly translated by the Doctor, be bash received his hire in peace, but ought to be render’d, be received his whole hire. He seems in his haste to have read בֵּשָּׁלוֹם B’shalom, tho’ that has no sense in it here.

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

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

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

micks, there is no connexion between τις ἑαυτῆς καταβάς καταλείπεις and the word 

κατάς, for these are the words: Παρὰ ἡμᾶς τις οὐκ ἄνευ ἐνάρξεως, ηὺς ἐκεῖνος, ἐν ὑπεράνω τις προσόντων, ηὐς τεκτόνες κατὰς ἄλλος ἀντίστατα: be observed all the Governors, Satraps, who were expelled (viz. to come to Babylon) and the Soldiers, and not a few Embassadors, and Artificers leading others that were sent for. These τεκτόνες seem to have been Fidlers, or any other sort of Musicians, who carried others along with them to Babylon, in order to make a Confort: for κατάς signifies one that is sent for or chosen out by name. So Homer Iliad. i. ν. 165. calls the Embassadors, which were chosen out of the Captains, and sent by Agamemnon to Achilles, κατάς, i.e. as Eustathius interprets it, ἐνομοκλαίον 

βασιλεῖα, pitched upon by name, or as the Scholia ἐν οὐμαῖον καταλείπεις.

IV. The Septuagint cannot be justified from the charge of having barbarously and improperly translated ὑπεράνω καταλείπεις αἰών, since not only the thing itself, but Grammar, shews that it is a holy Convocation that is there spoken of. See my Notes on Exod. xii. 16. Their design, as it should seem, was to say that the days upon which holy Assemblies were kept, were called holy days, which is indeed true; but the place was improper for it, and they expressed themselves contrary to the Rules of Grammar: for to put κατάς ἀγαθὰ ἐκατοστή, is intolerable. However, κατάς is indeed the same with κατάς, but this word signifies called not renowned. Nevertheless, to speak freely, it may perhaps be imagined that where we find κατὰς or κατὰς, we must suppose the Substantives ἑκατοστή or ἑκατοστὴν to be understood; so that ἔνεμον ἐν ἔσχεν κατὰς ἀγαθὰ ἐκατοστή may be put for ἐν τῇ ἐσχίᾳ ἐνεμον κατὰς συναγωγὴ ἀγαθὰ ἐκατοστή. This is certainly the meaning of Moses, whose words the Doctor manifestly strains. A festival day was called παρὰ ἑαυτῆς ἀγαθὰ, because there was a holy Convocation or solemn Assembly of the People, kept on that day.

V. The κατάς συναγωγὴ in Numb. i. 16. are those that were chosen or called by name out of the Congregation. The Κρίσεις in chap. xvi. ν. 2. of the same Book, are the called together of the Assembly, and the called out of the Assembly or to the Assembly. In the former place the Septuagint have, and that rightly, κατὰς βασιλεῖα those that were called to the Council, and in the latter κατὰς αἱ συναγωγῆς, which is to the same sense. So Xerxes in Herodotus takes counsel about his flight ἀμα Περσῶν τῶν δικάλουτων, with the Persians called together about him.

VI. I admire that our learned Author, whilst he was inquiring into the signification of the word κατὰς in the Old Testament, had no
Chapter regard almost to its primitive εκλει, which often occurs in the Septuagint, and is frequently made use of in the books of the Prophets, to signify what God did, when he called the People of the Jews to the knowledge of himself. See Isa. xliii. 1. and xlv. 3, 4. In the same Prophet we might have read καθώς in this sense, if the Septuagint had pleased, Chap. xlviii. 12. Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and thou Israel, my called καθώς μου. Hence καθώς also is taken for the Exhortation of the Prophets, calling the People to the Worship of God, Jerem. xxxi. 6. And this is the sense in which καθώς and καθώς are used in the New Testament; nor does the difference of Circumstances make any change at all in their signification, as appears by what the Doctor has said, who is but too curious and accurate in discussing the places where they are found. Several of them might from the Signification I have here given, be more grammatically and simply interpreted.

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

Ver. 28. Δόνω μετὰ λόγον ἃν τῇ πολλά. ] Interpreters here justly insist upon the force of the particle ἃν, which denotes a Substitution whereby Christ died not only for our good, but in our place or stead. And so the Heathens in a matter of this nature, understood that Particle. Thus Alcibiades faith in Euripides:
St. MATTHEW.

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

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

Fata Phereitiadac conjux Pegasea redemit,
Proque viri est uxor funere lata iuvi.

The Particle ἐρι has also the same signification, as appears by the last Verse of that passage of Euripides. The Heathens in those first Ages, and not only then, but also in latter times, thought that any one might escape Death, if another put himself into his place. Aristides, who was of the same Age almost with the Emperor Adrian, tells us in V. Sacrarum, that when he was dangerously sick, he was admonished by an Oracle, ἄρις ἡ ἡμῶν ἄρις ἄρις ἄρις, ἄρις ἄρις δύναται the Plutonos (one that was nursed with the same Milk) gave Life for Life, and Body for Body, her's for his. See more Examples to this purpose in Izaac Casaubon upon Suetonius's Caligula, cap. xiv. And Spartanus's Adrian, upon which consult also Salmasius. Such Persons as these were called ἄρις-ἄρις, which is a word often us'd by Ignatius in his Epistles, concerning which read Dr. Pearson's Vindiciæ, Part 2. cap. xv.

Ver. 29. Note d. It were to be wish'd that Dr. Hammond, as well as others who quote that Greek and Latin Manuscript, had given us also the Latin Version out of it, or rather that it were published entire. But in the mean time, the more I consider the various readings of that Manuscript, as they are set down both in many places of Beza, and in the Oxford Edit. of the New Testament, the more I am confirmed in the Opinion which I have sometime since made learned Men the Judges of, viz. that that Manuscript does not so much contain the words of the Evangelists as of some Paraphrases, who now and then fills up what he thought was wanting, and where the Greek was not good mended the Language; and all that will but examine it with a particular care will be of the same Opinion. The Paraphrase of Epipactus's Exhiridion published by Meric. Casaubon, is much such another, in which there are most of Epipactus's words set down, but often in a different order and with several Enlargements. And therefore I disagree with the Doctor in his suspecting that St. Matthew ought to
Chapter be supplied out of that one Manuscript, which all the rest contradict, it being more probable that that Addition is taken out of St. Luke, tho' with some Alterations. But I say again, that it were to be wished that that Copy were published entire; and those who keep up such things to be burnt by the next Fire, are not to be commended.

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

CHAP. XXI.

Ver. 7. Enais aurum J Our Author understands this rightly of the Colt. "Aurum is improperly put for avri or avræ.

See what I have said upon this place in my Ars Critica, Part 2. Sect. 1. cap. 10.

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

Ver. 12. Note b. ] I cannot imagine what ground our Author had to say, that the Jews were bound to go up to Jerusalem to pay their half Shekel, it being no where commanded in the Law, and the contrary being manifest from Chap. xvii. 24. of this Gospel, where Christ is said to have paid τα διανομα to those who collected it, not far from Capernaum. And then supposing them to have been obliged to
to carry this Tribute to the Temple, yet there was no necessity of their using a ñunqar to pay a quarter of an ounce of Silver. But it is certain that all the Males among the Jews were bound by the Law to thrice a year to go up to the Temple, Exod. xxiii. 17. And because the richer sort did not use to go thither without offering Sacrifices, and being at great Expences, the assistance of the Money-changers was needful to furnish them for those Expences.

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

Verf. 41. καὶ διὰ νῦν ἀναφερόντες.] This Phrase has something proverbial in it in the Greek Language, in which an Adverb is elegantly join'd with a Noun that is of a near affinity with it. Aristophanes in Plato has this very Phrase καὶ διὰ νῦν ἀναφερόντες. This could not be expressed the same way in the Syrian and Chaldee Dialect, but only by נָבֹא יִבְרָא in destroying he will destroy.

C H A P. XXII.

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

Quis vestrum temperaris usque adeo, quis
Perditus, ut dicat Regi, bibe? Plurima sunt que
Non audient homines, pertusae dicere, lana.

About the Garments used at Feasts consult Ot. Ferrarius de Re Vest.
Part 2. I. I. cap. ix, & xi.
Chapter 14. See what has been said already upon XXII. Chap. xx. 16. In that place the called refers only to the Jews, but in this it respects also the Gentiles; for this saying must be understood as well of those who came to the Supper out of the cross Streets and Highways, as those who were first invited. The meaning is; God calls a great many both Jews and Gentiles, but few answering, as they ought, his Call, are chosen or set apart by him to be his peculiar People. So this place is interpreted by Barnabas, who was an Apostolical Person, Chap. iii. Attendite ne quando quiescentes jam vocati addormianus in pec-catis nostris, & nequiam accipiens potestatem nostrum suscitet et excludat a Regno Domini, i.e. left the others that wicked one the Devil, as the Minister of God's Displeasure, getting us in his power, cast us out of the Feast. And a little after he says, Attendamus ergo ne forte scriptum est, multi vocati, pauci eleisti inveniamur. Let us therefore take heed lest haply that saying of the Scripture prove true of us. Many are called but few are chosen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. The word avimeres was never used in Scripture to signify any thing but the Resurrection of the dead; i.e. of Men whose Bodies were destroy'd; and which being raised, Men are said to be raised, because the Nature of Man consists in the conjunction of Soul and Body. Avimeres, when this is the thing spoken of, never signifies any thing but to rise or to rise again. In this sense it is used by Achilles in Homer Iliad. Θ. 56. where he speaks of the Trojans that he had killed.
Chapter The valiant Trojans whom I have kill'd, will certainly rise again out of obscure Darkness. Tho. St. Paul uses the word ἐπαναγίγνησις, it does not follow that these words signify the same thing, but rather that St. Paul and the Septuagint rendered the Hebrew word differently. Tho therefore, absolutely speaking, ἐπαναγίγνησις may be called ἐπαναστασις, a second State or Subsistence; yet since it is never met with in that sense, it must according to its constant use be understood of a thing that is fallen and then raised up again. Πρῶτος & ἐπαναγίγνησις are, as the Logicians speak, in this case Correlates. See 2 Maccab. xii. 43, 44. This word was so very commonly used in that sense, that even when it is put alone it signifies the Resurrection of the Body. It is a mistake also that the words ἐπαναγίγνησις in this Phrase ἐπαναστασις ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ are of the Neuter Gender, the Substantive ἐπαναστασις being to be understood, as appears from several places where the ἑαυτοῦ are said to be raised up, as in Mat. x. 8. and xi. 5. Luke xx. 37. Job. v. 21. 1 Cor. xv. 15, 16, &c. Our Author's reasonings against the perpetual use of the word are not to be regarded. The place which he cites out of Luke xiv. 14. may most fitly be understood of the Resurrection of the Body, as being the principal Reward which is opposed to the Rewards of this Life.

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

Ver. 37. Αγαπησεις ολην.] Tho the Love of God is often set to signify the whole Duty which we owe to him, both the Duties of the first and second Table; yet it being in this place distinguished from the Love of our Neighbour, I am apt to think that by that great Commandment we are only to understand the Worship of the one true God, whom we may be said to worship with all our Heart, with all our Soul, and with all our Mind, when we worship him alone and not any other. For those that worship more Gods than one, worship none at all with their whole Soul, but divide, as it were, their Minds between
tween many. This seems to be the proper meaning of this Phrase, Chapter which is so much diversified to signify the highest Affliction and Intention XXIII. of the Soul in Divine Worship. See Deut. vi. 5. and my Notes upon that place.

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

CHAP. XXIII.

Ver. 5. Concerning these Phyla...Series, see my Notes upon Exod. xiii. 9. where I have confirm'd what the Doctor says.

Ver. 15. Προσέχετε τίνων συνεχεῖς. ] So zealous were the Jews to make Proselytes to their Law, that it became almost a Proverb among the Romans, as we may see by Horace, who in the 17th Sat. of his Lib. i. after he had said that he sometimes made Verses, and that ought to be excused in him, because it was but a small fault, concludes thus;

Cui sī concede necum
Multa Poetarum veniēt manus, auxilioque
Sit mibi, nam multo phares sumus, ac veluti te.

JUDEÆ, cogenmus in hanc concede turbam.

Verf.
Chapter XXIII. Ver. 22. Οὕτως τῇ θεότητι τῷ Θεῷ.] This form of swearing the Jews used in imitation of the Heathens, amongst whom nothing was more common in ordinary discourse than to say ἐν τῷ θεῷ, as sufficiently appears from Aristophanes. And this Oath was used by the Heathens either because they thought Heaven it felt to be a Deity, or else understood by Heaven ἡ θεότης, the Gods that dwells in Heaven. But the Jews who charged the Heathen with folly and lightness in their Oaths, thought that they themselves might use that form of swearing. And hereupon Christ teaches them, that whenever they swore in that form of words, by Heaven, it was as if they swore by the true God himself, who dwells in a peculiar manner in Heaven. So Achilleus in Homer Iliad, A. v. 214. Swearing by his Scepter, the Scholiae observes that at the same time he swore by God: isto Νόον, ἢ Ἰερών γάρ τις πάλαις Θεόν: It must be observed that in swearing by his Scepter, he swears by God himself who rules over Kingdoms. The reason of which is, because the Scepter is an ensign of Kingly Power. And therefore he did but discover his ignorance, whoever he was, that ridiculed this Oath, by saying,

---Sceptrum non putat esse Deos.

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

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

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

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

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

XXIV. in this Verse (the number whereof Christ says in the Verse before, the Jews would afterwards augment) were already past. If I might be allowed to make a Conjecture, that which here biassed the Doctor was his desire of finding an Example to confirm what he says about Antipas in his Premon. to the Revelations, of which in its proper place.

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

C H A P. XXIV.

Vers. 3. I had been better if our learned Author had omitted his Note b. Comparison between Vespasian and Christ, wherein he is both too nice, and not so exact as he should be, as will appear by these following Remarks. I. Who can bear to have the Predictions of the Prophets concerning the future Reign of Christ, compared to a Prediction of flatterer Josephus, or to meer uncertain Surmises? II. The place the Doctor refers to in Suetonius, in the second part of the Comparison, is this. Cænante bos arator decussi jugo, Triclinium irrigit; ac fugatis ministris, quasi repente defessus, procidit ad ipsos accumbentis pedes, cervicemq; submissit: i.e. as he abbreviates him, an Ox brake in, and fell down at Vespasian's feet, as an Omen of his becoming Emperor. But all that is said by St. Luke of Christ, is that he was born in a manger, and wrapped in swaddling clothes; as to any Beasts being with him in the Stable, or falling down before him, he is altogether silent, nor had the Doctor any good Authority for his asserting it. III. I confess Suetonius and Tacitus do give us that account of Vespasian's Miracles of which the Doctor speaks; but that what they tell us was real matter of Fact, is not sufficiently clear: for what assurance can any Man give us, that some vain fellows among the Egyptians did not make it their business to flatter Vespasian, or that he himself being a Politick Man did not seek such an occasion to gain the favour of the superstitious multitude, at his entrance upon the Government? or else it may be it was an invention of Idolaters to oppugn Christianity, by making people believe that Christ was not the only Person that had healed the blind with Spittle; and it was dangerous for...
for any man to go about to detect a Cheat which was countenanced by Chapter
the Emperor. IV. I cannot imagin where the Doctor read in Suetonius XXIV.
that Vespasian was Humillimus & Clementissimus; for these words are not to be found in the Life of Vespasian. He says indeed in Chap. xii.
Principatus ad ultimum civilis & clemens; but he never calls him humil-
is, which amongst the Latins is a Reproach, and not the name of a Vertue. 'Tis only Ecclesiastical Writers who call that Humilitas which
the old Latins call Modestia. Humilis with these signifieth one of the common sort of People, a poor mean-spirited person, as I need not prove. V. I wish our Author had set down the place out of Josepbus which made him think that he believed Vespasian to be the Messias.
For it is possible, I confess, he might foretell that he should be Em-
peror, by misconstruing in his favour an antient and settled Opinion, famous throughout all the eastern parts, that the Fates had de-
reed, that there should come out of Judea at that time, those who should govern the World; but he never said nor could say that he was the Messias, i.e. the Deliverer of the Jews. And the same I say of his attributing afterwards the same Opinion to the other Jews: for tho' some of them might perhaps accommodate some Prophecies which were before thought to belong to the Messias, to Vespasian; yet it was impossible they should take one who almost extin-
guished the very Jewish name, for the Deliverer of their Nation.

I could find as many faults also with the Doctor's next Collection of
Parallels, which are but manifest Niceties. I. What tolerable agree-
ment is there, for instance, between what Isaiab says of John the Baptist, and the levelling of the High-ways for the coming of the
Roman Engines? II. It is false, that it was at the approach of the
Balisars that the Jews cried out filius venit, the Son cometh, as our Au-
thor says. The Story according to the Distinction made in the Latin
Translation, is in cap. 7. lib. 6. of Josepbus, but in the Greek in cap. 18.
That Cry was made from the Watch-towers of the Jews, when the
Stones were flung out of the Engines. Josepbus's words are these:
Σωκος εις αυτους δαι δη τηρεω με αληθων ανθρωπων εν αυτω ομοιω 
που εις αυτον, και πηρεα φεστιτη, τη πατειη για δια 
βαντος, o ρε επεται: The Spices sitting upon
the towers gave them notice before-hand when the Engine opened and a Stone
was coming, crying out in their mother-tongue, the Son cometh. Which I
take, nevertheless, to be a mistake in Josepbus, who standing with-
out, did not distinguish the word Ἰων eben, which signifies a Stone,
from Ἰων habben a Son; for without doubt they cried, when the
Stone was flung out, Ἰω φιν the Stone cometh, not Ἰω φιν the
Son cometh. And if this be true, then this part of the parallel is quite
spoiled.
Chapter spoiled. Our learned Author seems not to have looked into Josephus XXIV. when he wrote these things, or rather when he copied them out of some other book; as appears partly by the place alluded, and partly by the Chapters in Josephus not being always rightly referred to, but sometimes according to the division in the Greek, and other times in the Latin.

However, it is most certain that the Jews themselves acknowledged that destruction to have been brought upon them by God, and this is more than once observed by Josephus in his 6 and 7 Books of the Jewish War. See Lib. vi. Cap. ii. and Cap. xi. in the Latin, and Lib. vii. Cap. xvi. And Titus thought the same, who after he had viewed the fortifications of the City, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐπελημμένων, ἦν, καὶ πολλὰ ἐπὶ τῶν Α' ἐφημένων, ἰδεῖς ὅτι ἔθηκεν ὑμῖν καταλύνειν τὰ μνημεῖα, τὰ τῶν τῆς πύργου διορμῶν: We have fought, saith he, with the assistance of God, and it was God who dispossessed the Jews of those strong holds. For what human force, or engine could signify any thing against those Towers? Lib. vii. c. 16.

Verl. 3. Note c.] The Phrase οἰ̂ ν τοὺς αὐτὶν cannot be understood unless we first know the just import of the word οἰ̂ ν. Now that word seems to signify properly and primarily Eternity, for it comes from αἰών always, and οἰ̂ ν signifies eternal. Afterwards it was used in a figurative sense to signify as long a duration as could agree to the thing spoken of, whence the time of man's life was called οἰ̂ ν, as in Latin ænam. The Discourse here cannot be about Eternity, which has no consummation, or end; nor is it about the time of man's life, but about the space of time during which God had determined to preserve the Temple and Jerusalem, as our Author has best of all observed. So that if we consider only the series of the Discourse, this Phrase οἰ̂ ν τοὺς αὐτὶν will be Elliptical, and the words εἰ τί έγίνεται, in which the Temple was to stand, must be understood. But because the duration of the World is sometimes taken for the World itself, therefore οἰ̂ ν and οἰ̂ ν also in Greek, and Sæcula amongst the Latins, do now and then signify the World itself. The same may be said of the Hebrew בְּלָם, as learned Men have long ago observed. For which reason we use to interpret that word in the writings of the Rabbins sometimes Eternity, sometimes any long space of time during which a thing lasts, whatsoever it be, and sometimes the World itself. It is plain, that in the place cited out of the Book of Tobit, αἰών signifies both that determinate space of time during which the Temple was to continue, and also the whole duration of the World. For first Tobit says that they should build a Temple, but not such a one as the first, which should continue αἰὼν ὡς αἰώνιον τί οἰ̂ ν till the
times of the duration (viz. of the Temple) were accomplished. Then Chapter XXIV.

he says that there should be afterwards sier μαρτυρίας χριστός καὶ μετοχών οὐκ ἧδε, a structure that should be famous throughout all the ages of the world. Hence, by most Interpreters, the Phrase οὐκ ἥδε in this place of St. Matthew, is understood of the end of the world. They tell us that the Apostles ask’d Christ first, when the Temple was to be destroyed, and then what were to be the signs of his coming, and so of the end of the World? It being undeniable that the word is ambiguous, Christ’s answers must be ambiguous too; some of his expressions agreeing best to the destruction of the Jews, as Dr. Hammond has extraordinarily well shewed, and others more properly describing the Conclusion of the World in itself. I like Dr. Hammond’s Opinion best; which yet may in some measure be reconciled with the other, if we do but suppose the Destruction of the Jews to have been designed as a faint Representation of the end of the World, as our Author likewise thinks in his Paraphrase upon Cb. xxv. And so this Prophecy will be just of the same kind with those Old Testament Predictions which were so worded as to respect some greater event than that which was expressly and plainly foretold in them; of which see Grotius upon Matt. i. 22.

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

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

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

Namely, because they could not easily fly away, which is the case likewise of those that have sucking infants or little children. To this purpose are the words of Silius Italicus, Punic. lib. iv. where he describes the flight of the Romans upon the approach of Hannibal's Army:

\[ \text{Tum crine soluto,} \\
\text{Ante agitur conjux, dextra, levaque trabuntur} \\
\text{Parvi non æquo comitantes ordine nati.} \]

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

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

CHAP. XXV.

Ver. 1. Τὸν ταυσίαν.] Grotius has observed that the Syriack and Latin add here τὴν ταυσίαν; and so does also the Cambridge Greek and Latin Copy.

Ver. 4. Εὐεργετὴν Εὐανθίου.] There is not such a perfect decorum kept in Parables, as I have already observed elsewhere, as that every thing in them is an allusion to what was generally practised. This appears sufficiently from this place; for those that used Lamps, did not for one night, besides the oil that was in their Lamps, carry oil in another
another vessel, with which they might supply their Lamp that same night; but they filled their Lamp once for the whole night. But XXV. it is sufficient if what is said in Parables be not impossible, and there be a fitness in them to express the mind of the person that uses them.

Ver. 9. Μὴ ἔργατι. The words άναστήσω, or some other such, must be understood, and supplied thus; άναστήσω μὴ ἔργατι. An Ellipsis before the Particle τοῦ, that, is very common among the Hebrews.

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

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

Ver. 21. Εἰρέαν ἔγγυ ἢ ῾Ελληνικῶν Κύριον Ἡρώτημα. I cannot imagin what our Author's thoughts were taken up with, when he wrote his Paraphrase upon these words, for it has no agreement at all with the words of Christ. The word θεραμάξει here signifies a Feast, to which a Patron usually invited his Libertus or Client, upon his having well executed his Orders. The Septuagint, in Esther ix. 19. render the Hebrew ימיו כ權 a feast, by θεραμάξει. And it is no wonder that things which do so often accompany one another, as joy and a feast, are sometimes promiscuously used. That the Libertus used to lie down at meat with their Patrons, a Privilege not granted to the Servi by their Masters, is notorious. Demetrius the Libertus of Pompey the Great, is particularly branded for his insolence in lying down before his Patron. The Patron therefore here in this part of the Parable, is represented as ordering.
Chapter ordering his *Libertas* or *Client* to come into the Dining-room that he XXVI. might partake of his Feast.

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

**Ver. 29. **"O *txi.*] See my Notes upon Chap. xiii. 12.

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

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

**CHAP. XXVI.**

**Ver. 7. **I Don't believe that that is the true original of the word *αλακασερυ* which the Greek Grammarians, who are very notable men at inventing trifling Etymologies, give us of it; for if it were, that sort of vessel would rather have been called *αλακασορ* or *αλακολεκερ*, than with so little regard had to the analogy of the derivation, *αλακασερυ*. Besides, if that vessel had been so called, because it had no *σακιδα* handles, it ought to have been said *adjectively* *αλακασερυ*, whatever is defitute of handles, (which yet the Greek Language will not admit of) whence a particular sort of vessels were afterwards called *νερ. αἴεια* *αλακασερυ*. If the words were to be derived from a Greek original, I should rather deduce it, with *Salmosius*, *αρ* *νερ. αλακασερυ* *imponere*, and so make *αλακασερυ* to be an *Atticism* for *αλακασερυ*...
from that sort of Marble which was called Alabaster, of which those Chapter Vessels that bore that name were commonly made. For to say that XXVI. Marble was so called, because out of that were formed Vessels without handles, as the Doctor and Salmas. himself does, is absurd; since not only Vessels of all shapes and forms, but even Pillars also were made out of it. 'Tis as if one should say, because the word Onyx sometimes signifies a Vessel, therefore that sort of stone was so called, because it was the matter of which those Vessels were made. Now as for the word Alabaster itself, it is an Arabian name for that kind of Marble, for大理石 albatraton is the Noun it self in use, which by an addition of the Arabian Article لون becomes大理石, albatraton, لون alabaster. The reason why I think it had an Arabian name is, not only because the Arabian Article لون makes it probable, but because it was cut out of the Arabian Mountains, and was first brought from thence. So Pliny tells us, Lib. xxxvi. C. 7. Onychetae inum in Arabiam montibus, nec usquam aliubi nasci putaverunt veteres. The Antients also at that time thought that Alabaster grew in the mountains of Arabia, and nowhere else. And a little after he says, Nascuntur circa Thebas Aegypti, Damascum Syria: it grows about Thebes in Egypt, and Damascus in Syria. And there was a City, somewhere between the Nile and the Red sea, or in Egyptian Arabia, called for that reason 'Alabas, which is mentioned by Pliny Lib. v. c. 9. and by Ptolomy Lib. iv. c. 3. who places it in the Province of Cynopolis, near to which was the Alabaster Mountain mentioned by the same Author. So that the Doctor finds fault with If. Casaubon unjustly, for saying that Vessels not made of Marble were but by a remissness, or improperly, called Alabaster.

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

Ibid. Note c. I have shewed in a Note on Matt. xxv. 21, that xαρὺς there, and sometimes the Hebrew חָרְב signifies a feast. The French would say une rejouissance, which tho' it does not signify properly a feast, yet never uses to be made without one. What our Author says about the use of ointments in Feasts is very true, but who does
Chapter not know it? He had better only have referred us to some Critick who had treated upon that Subject. The indignation which Judas expressed against the Woman who poured the oil upon Christ concealed his covetousness the better, because none but delicate or voluptuous persons made use of such prehensio ointments, and Christ was a professed enemy to all sensual pleasures. So Aristeippus perceiving that he could not anoint himself without incurring peoples censures, cried out: Male si is effaminat divinum, quia rem tam bellam insanae rerunt: A mischief take those effeminate persons for bringing so good a custom into disgrace. See Diog. Laert. Lib. ii. S. 76.

Ver. 26. Note e. | I. Concerning the phrase the body of the Passover and the like, see Buxtorf in Diff. de Inst. Cenae Domin. Sect. 25. from whom our Author seems to have borrowed what he here says.

II. The word τὸν is not the relative to the ceremony or action, but only to the bread; for who, besides Dr. Hammond, would ever have thus explained Christ's words, This eating and drinking denotes my body? That learned man did not care how he expressed himself, provided the skilful Reader could but guess his meaning; but the words of Scripture must not be forced in that manner. Tis bread, not a ceremony, that is called the body of Christ; and eating and drinking are only the signs of our spiritual participation of that body. And it makes nothing against this that τὸν is of the neuter gender; it being usual in all Languages to demonstrate anything whatsoever; and the word ὁμας being always to be understood in the Greek language, when the name that belongs to the thing intended is not expressed. Besides, the word τὸν may be very well referred to ὁμας and not to ἄρκτος, and yet the sense be the same. The words of St. Luke are contrary to the Doctor's opinion, for who would say, the eating of bread is the figure of my body? In the rest of this Annot. our Author acts the part of a Divinist rather than an Interpreter, and speaks as if he were making a common place about the Lord's supper.

Ver. 33. Αὐτοκεφαλος εἶναι, &c. | It is an old Greek Proverb, ἦτε τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἐγγον ἐν τούτῳ χαῖς: be that undertakes a thing confidently is generally fearful. And to the same purpose is that saying of Epicharmus in the Scholiast upon Homer at ver. 93. Iliad. ᾧ καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπιτηρεῖται εἶναι φρενί: a coward is at first very confident of himself, and afterwards runs away. And this was just St. Peter's case before he had been confirmed by the Holy Ghost, upon Christ's praying for him.
Our learned Author, that he might be able to reconcile
Note a. S. Matthew with S. Luke, follows for the most part
D. Heinins, who by the word ἀμφάσια understands
suffocation caused by grief. But, I. There is no place by any one
alleged, wherein the word ἀμφάσια signifies such a disease, especially in men; for those which are cited by the Doctor are nothing to
the purpose, as I shall presently shew. That word is always taken
for strangling with a Halter, or some other violent way. II. The
place alleged out of Aelian does not prove that the Verb ἀμφάσια signifies any thing but strangling with a Halter. When he says that
Scafts have not only grieved men, but also killed them; he does not mean
that some who had been scoffed had laid it to heart as to die only
with Grief, but that they had been so impatient of Derision, as to
kill themselves. Thus Poliager being jeered hanged himself, ἀμφίκές.
And so Archilocheus's Lambicks made Lycambe and her Daughters hang
themselves. III. The word in Chrysostom is simply ἀμφάσια, which is
sometimes taken metaphorically for the anguish of the mind, but never
a Suffocation. Nor does that place signify any thing to the business,
as has been well observed by the learned Jac. Gronovius in his Diff. de
Casu Judae; for Chrysostom speaks of wicked men, who he tells us at
the last day, when their Sins shall be made publick and manifest, will
be ἀπιστολὴ, ἢ ἀμφάσια συνεδρί, suffocated and strangled with Conscience,
which is not the same with what is said here of Judas. IV. The
words ἰδία ἀμφάσια in Tobit, signify so as to think of hanging her self,
as is plain from what follows; where she is represented as blaming
her self for entertaining such Thoughts, and saying, I am my fathers
only daughter; if I should do this, it would be a reproach, &c. and a little
after, I said (i.e. I thought, according to the genius of the Hebrew)
that I had best free my self from the earth, and bear no more reproaches;
for so we ought to render the words ἐπον ἱστότω με, and not, I said, free,
or take me away; for it follows, ἢ μι αἰτοῦ μι, which does not sig-
ify and do not bear me, but I ought not to bear or bearken. And this,
I know not for what reason, Dr. Hammond has omitted; by which it
would have appear'd that the foregoing words were not rightly
translated. Let but the place itself be read, and the thing will
be plain. V. The Hebrew word כָּלַח in Job vii. 15. is rightly ren-
dered by Aquila ἀγγόν a halter, because the thing intended is eu-
vidently a squeezing of the throat with a rope, as a way of dying: My
soul
Chapter soul hath chosen strangling, and death rather than my bones; i.e. My grief XXVII. is so great, that I had rather die by strangling, or any other sort of death, than live. The Septuagint neither understood Job's meaning, nor knew perhaps what they meant themselves. It is certain at least, that their words do no more favour Dr. Hammond's Interpretation than any other. The Translation of the Vulgar Latin is very exact, elegit suspensionem anima mea, &c. VI. There is no doubt but that the Hebrew יָמֹן signifies to choke or suffocate by any means whatsoever, but it does not follow that the Greek ἐπόγκαλος is used in any other notion than that of hanging; nor is any other signification to be affixed to it where the discourse relates to a person in despair, and that chooses Death rather than Life, which was the case of Judas and Achorothel. VII. But our Author tells us, that it is necessary to put another sense upon this word, in order to reconcile St. Luke with St. Matthew. This would be true, if we could not make them agree in any other way; which we may very well do by compounding both their accounts together thus: καὶ ἔστησεν ἐπὸν ὅπως ἔγνυτον ὑποπτομένοις, καὶ ἐξελέφαντος τὸν ἐπὸν ἐξελέφαντος: And going away hanged himself, and falling down forwards be burst afiender in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out. But it may be asked, if he hanged himself, how could he fall down? To which I answer, ἐμπύμνεωσα ἐκείνως ἔμπυμνεώσα τοῖς ὁμομοίοις, by the ropes breaking, or by being cut down by some body; which circumstance, as long as it was known that he killed himself in despair, was not thought material enough to be set down. But it may be said again, How came he to burst afiender, and his bowels to gush out? I answer, because he fell down from on high, as he must needs have done if he hanged himself upon the battlement of some Terras, or upon a Tree that leaned over a deeper Valley than ordinary; for then if he fell upon some stone, or stump, or stake, that was underneath, his belly might easily be ripped open. Priceus upon this place has given us several Examples of this nature; and the thing is plain. But never did any Woman, by a suffocation of the Mother, burst afiender in the midst, and much less did ever any Man do so. Our Author should have given us but one such instance at least; but I am sure he was not able. The Interpretation I have given is not only the most natural, but agrees exactly with the words. The learned Person I but now spake of, who has written largely and on set purpose about this matter, does indeed very well shew that the verb ἐπόγκαλος signifies to kill by hanging; but he has not proved that Judas, as he conjectures, was thrown down from some steep Rock as a mark of infamy set upon him. It does not appear from
any Testimony, that those who killed themselves were so punished by the Jews. Besides, the Phrase καταρατός ἀνεβαίνει sufficiently intimates that the Body of Judas was not conveyed to any other place to be thrown down from; for that would rather have been expressed by καταρατός ἀποφαίνει, or some other such words; but the word ἀνεβαίνει signifies that the Body fell down without any forcible impulse. It may be enquired perhaps why St. Matthew did not add the Circumstance taken notice of by St. Luke, and why St. Luke did not make mention of Judas’s hanging himself? To which I answer, it may reasonably enough be supposed that St. Matthew heard only of his hanging, and St. Peter who speaks in Acts i. only of his falling down some steep place; and the both were true, yet they related severally the story just as they had heard it. That in a matter of no great moment, all the Circumstances are not exactly set down, let such only wonder, as have not observed that Circumstances of much greater moment are frequently passed over by one or other of the Evangelists, as appears from other places. Compare St. Matthew and St. Luke as to what they both say about the Thieves that were crucified with Christ.

Ver. 15. Note d. There are some things in this last Note that need Correction. I. The Phrase ad faciendum populum is not a Latin Phrase, nor has any signification, but I believe it was an Error of the Printer’s, and that the Doctor wrote ad faciendum sibi favorem apud populum. II. What is here said about the singular Privilege of the Citizens of Rome, has no affinity with the matter in hand; for tho a Roman Citizen could not be put to death without the Suffrage of the People, yet I suppose Pilate did not wait for the consent of the Jews to empower him to behead such as he judged guilty. He gratified the Jews when he let go a Criminal at their request; and he did not condemn any at their request, when they were otherwise affected, but of his own accord to get their favour: but in Rome no Magistrate had authority to behead any Citizen without the people’s Consent, and those that the people absolved were to be let go whether the Magistrates would or not, and those whom they condemned were certainly to be punished. III. It would have been better observed that it was the custom also among other Nations to release their Prisoners upon festival days. So in Athens it was a Law, ἐν τοῖς Θεσσαλονίκην νῦν ἐν τῷ σαμποτίνες, that at the time when the Feasts were kept in honour of Ceres, the Prisoners should be let loose. And the same was practised upon other Athenian Feasts, as Sam. Petitus has shewn, Lib. 1. de Legg. Att. Tit. 1. See likewise: If. Casaubon in his Notes upon Suet. Tib. cap. lxi. IV. This Custom was imitated by the Christian Emperors, who for joy at the Passover gave:
Chapter order in their Letters that the Prisons should be opened. But that
XXVII. you may not mistake, this was done in honour not of the *Jewish*, but
of the *Christian* Passover, and the *Jews* were released no more than
others; which contradicts what the *Doctor* says. So in *Cod. lib. i.*
*Tit. iv. Leg. 3.* there is this Law made by *Valentinian*, *Theodosius* and *A-
cadius*: *Ubi primus dies Paschatis extiterit, nullum seneat carcer inclusum,
omnia vincula dissolvantur.* As soon as the first day of the Passover is
come, let there be none kept shut up in Prison; let them be all released
of their Chains. There is no mention at all here made of the *Jews.*
And there are a great many such like Orders in *Cod. Theodosi.* where
the *Jews* are not mentioned. See the Collections of *Sam. Petrus* in
the place before cited. *Tis ofter than once that Dr. *Hammond* ei-
ther adds or diminishes the sayings of the *Ancients*, which he thought
by being a little changed, would better illustrate the *Writings of the
New Testament.* But yet I do not believe he did it designedly, who
was so good a Man, and so great a lover of Truth, but rather was
misled by others who were not so faithful as they should have been in
their Citations.

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

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

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

[Text continues as a historical and religious commentary, discussing a phenomenon referred to as "Messias," and examining the actions and implications of a thief named Chríst, including his repentance, imprisonment, and eventual crucifixion by the Romans. The text also touches on the earthquake mentioned in the New Testament and concludes with a historical account involving the Temple and the Sepulchre.]
Chapter is called γασπίζω, 2 King. xi. 11. So Suidas: ἐκκόπω, καλύτερα, σωρηκόπω
XXVIII αἰώνος, a Storm, a Whirlwind. And thus the Latins also say caelestum terram concuti, to signify the concusion that is made in the Air when it thunders.

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

ON THE

GOSPEL according to St. Mark.

CHAP. I

Ver. 1. ΑΡΧΗ ΤΟΥ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΤΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ.] These words I rather take to be an Inscriptio to this whole Book, than a form of introducing what follows, as the Doctor does in his Paraphrase. For even in the most antient times, these Books were called the Gospels, as Grotius has observed out of Justin, at the beginning of St. Matthew. And it is ordinary in Latin Manuscripts to find it written in the front, such or such a Book BEGINS, that the Reader may know the work to be entire, and that there wants nothing at the beginning. Such another Inscription as this, is that of the Book of the Prophet Hosea i. 2. The beginning of the word of the Lord to Hosea. I conceive therefore that these words ought to have a full stop made at the end of them.

Ver. 2. Ὁ, γεγονα, &c.] We must conceive this beginning thus: AS it is written in the Prophet Isaiah; Behold I send my Messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee: A Voice crying in the Desert, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths strait: John BAPTIZED, &c. The force of the Particle AS belongs to the 4th Verse, where there is, as it were, an Eidos, by which the Evangelist shews that the Event was answerable to what was foretold. Some learned Men have thought that the beginning of Herodotus is just like this,
Chapter this, but without reason, as will appear to any one that compares them.

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

C H A P. II.

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

C H A P. III.

Ver. 21. Avid le Clerc, my Uncle, has treated upon this place in his Questiones Sacrae, Ques. xiii. which is worth the reading.
Collections in r? saec[en] i.e. in a little ship at a small distance from the shore. Thus Prov. xxiii. 34. he that lieth down in the heart of the Sea, is one that lies down in a ship. And to the same sense is that of Propertius Lib. i. Eleg. xiv.

Tu licet, abjicetus Tiberiâ molliter undâ,
Lesbia Mentoreo vina bibas opere.

This would have been a needless remark, unless a man of a sharp wit, and whose judgment in critical matters is not to be despised, viz. Tan. Faber in Epist. Crit. Part 2. Epist. xvii. would have had this place, contrary to the Authority of all Copies, altered, by reading it en τῷ ἅψαπρον in a ship, and not en τῷ saec[en] in the Sea, which would not go down with him.

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

Οἱ πρῶται μὴ βλέποντες οὐλον ὑπάρχουν
Κλίνοντες ἐν πνεύμον, ἀλλ' ὀνησίμων
Ἄλλοις μορφαίως ἐμάχοντος
'Εσείσαν εἰκόνι πάντα.

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

And so Demosthenes Orat. 1. contra Aristogit. sect. 123. Τὰ τῶν πρῶτων, ὡς ἔποιησα, τὰ εἰσεῖσας καὶ ἐξεῖσεν: according to the Proverb, that those that see do not see, and those that hear do not hear.
Chapter V.

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

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

Ver. 34. יִתְחַנֵן וְעָשַׁהְתָּה i. e. hath healed thee. Thus Barnabas in Epist. Cathol. Cap. ix. brings in Moses speaking in this manner of the brazen serpent: יֵצֵקֵס וְאָדָם חֹוָותְוָה, וּרְאָחַשְׁנָה שָׁכִיןָהוֹ: it being dead can make alive, and he shall presently be saved, i.e. healed, viz. that looks upon it.

Chapter VI.

Ver. 2. ἢ διὰ ἵνα ἰδοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ, &c.] i.e. What is this wisdom which is given unto him? And how is it that such Miracles are wrought by his hands? For the particle ἦν must not be joined with Wisdom, which may be very great and yet separate, in the Person that has it, from the power of doing Miracles; but it signifies the same with τῶν: how. And so the Hebrew ב, which is very frequently rendered by ἦν, is sometimes used, as Isai. xxix. 16. ב How should the work say of him that made it, he made me not? See afterwards Chap. ix. 11, 28, of this Gospel.
Ver. 5. **Cui isti vos?** i.e. According to the laws which he had pre-Chair-fered to himself, he could not there do any miracles. For he did not use to work Miracles where he was not sought unto to work them, or where no body believed that he was able to work them. **He could not therefore, is as much as he would not.** The Evangelist, to use the words of Hierocles, "μεταφρασε ου καθο δια εναποιεια, μους μετα τω φυσικω και φυσικω και ναυτικη, speaks of a moral and not a natural power. And Hierocles is in the right when he tells us, μεταφρασε ου καθο δια εναποιεια, μους μετα τω φυσικω και φυσικω και ναυτικη: that the necessity of the mind is more powerful than any external force, with wise men. See his Notes on Pythag. Aur. Carm. ver. 8.

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

Ver. 2. It is true indeed that the word *wϊv* signifies polluted as well as common; but the proper signification of it seems to be common, whence by a Metaphor it was used to signify polluted, because those things which are intended for common use, are generally polluted, by such use. II. The Greek *νυσιν* cannot properly be said to be a part of the hand or *αρνι* but is the hand contracted to make the fist. So Herodotus. *Πυρινις* γεγονα*υ* τι συνεπιλεγμεν τις διακινούσεις, the fist, or the shutting up of the fingers. And Phavorinus, *Πυρινις* δι τι χειρις, οταν ιχνυς συνεπιλεγμεν τις διακινούσεις: in the hand, when a person has his fingers contracted. It is rather the contraction of the hand than the hand itself; but by a Metaphor it may signify the hand itself. The Phrase *πυρινις* βανδολομεν therefore is not properly to be washed up to the wrist *πιθη* η, as the Rabbins speak, but to put the fist into water, or to be washed with the hand contracted; tho considered in itself, the thing be much the same. See Jof. Scaliger upon Serarius cap. 7. and H. Grotius. Palladius abused the word when he applied it to the feet. III. This Custom of washing the hands amongst the Jews, had its rise in part from the Law: Levit. xv. 11. Whomsoever he that bath the issue toucheth, and bath not washed his hands, be shall wash his clothes, &c. The Jews thought that by this Law, as they misunderstood it, he that had been touched by one who had an issue, was presently to wash his hands, or else he was obliged to wash his clothes and all his body. And therefore when they came out of any mixed assembly of people, amongst which there might possibly be some such unclean persons, they immediately washed their hands. But the not having the hands washed, in that place of Moses, relates to the man that had the issue, and not to him whom he had touched.

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

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

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

Quem penes arbitrium est & jus & norma loquendi.

That I may discuss therefore the ambiguity of this word, by the use of it; I observe that ἄρωμα signifies two things, whereof one is a distemper of the brain, and the other of the mind. Sometimes it is taken for madness proceeding from some disease, or disturbance of the brain, without any fault in the patient. And in this sense the word ἄρωμα signifies a Person that is not in his right senses. But this signification has no place here, where the discourse is about a distemper of the mind. And in this acceptation again it is used two ways; first ἄρωμα signifies imprudent, and is opposed to ἔφων ὁ prudent: and ἄρωμα signifies imprudence in opposition to ἔφων prudence. Secondly, ἄρωμα signifies also intemperate, contrary to which is ἠμαρωμα temperate, as in like manner ἄρωμα is used for intemperance, and is opposed to ἠμαρωμα temperance. And in this last sense it is taken here in St. Mark; for imprudence without malice, which is very common, does not pollute the mind out of which it proceeds. But as ἄρωμα signifies a habit and actions opposite to ἠμαρωμα, that is, Intemperance and its usual effects, are sins which do really defile the mind. I need not bring many examples to prove that these words are used in the significations mentioned, for they may be had out of Lexicons, tho’ these do not suffi-
Chapter cinctly distinguish them. I shall produce only a few: I. ἄρρεν signifies mad in these words of Xenophon, de Exped. Cyri, lib. 4. towards the end, where he speaks of the honey of Colchis, whereof the Greeks, not knowing its nature, had eaten: ὄνιν ἤρον ἤρον ἀνείποίδεν πάλιν ἀφεσε θεῇ ἐγνόθεν, ἤ ημερο: all the Soldiers that did eat of it became mad, and vomited. But the next day after, as he tells us in what follows, ἄφεσε τῷ αὐτῷ ἀρρέν ἐφεσε, about the same hour they came to their right senses again. II. ἄρρεν signifies imprudent, and ἀφεσις imprudence. Thus Homer Iliad. i. ver. 220. Speaking of the outward appearance of Ulysses, says:


Faîns καὶ ξέκον τα του ἀνδριανά, ἀφεσις ι σ' αὐτον.

You would say that he was an angry sort of man, and one that acted rashly and imprudently. And Iliad. i. ver. 110. Menelaus desiring to fight with Heßor in a single combat, is commanded to abstain from that piece of imprudence, Οὐ ἄριε ἔλατι, says Agamemnon, ταύτις ἀφεσισίς, you have no need to be guilty of this imprudence. III. Lastly, ἀφεσις is opposed to ὑφεσις, and in contrary actions is used in the same latitude. As in Xenophon lib. 3. de Infat. Cyri, not far from the beginning, where after Tigranes had said ἄν ὑφεσισίς, ἀν ἔλατς ἀφεσίς ὁδοὶ ὑπεξ θεῶν, that without temperance no other virtue is of any use, ἀφέσις is several times opposed to ὑφεσις: and then afterwards Tigranes adds, ἃ τε ἔν τε ἔν τε ἐνταξάτο ἀφεσίς ἐν τρέχον θέτειτο ἐν τράπεζοις ἐν τράπεζοις ἐν ἤδιν, ἐπιτεχνικώτατον ἐπιτεχνικώτατον ἐν τοῖς ἀφεσισίς. Have you never observed so much as one man, that through intemperance (i.e. transported with Anger or any other extravagant passion) went to fight with one stronger than himself, how after he was beaten, his intemperance against that man was presently cooled?

So likewise among the Hebrews נבל nabal signifies mad and intemperate, and נבל nabal madness and intemperance; and the former is rendered in both senses by ἄφεσις, and the latter by ἀφεσις in the Septuagint. See Psalm xiv. 1. where the word נבל mad does not signify one that is mad ἄγγελοι through a bodily distemper, or is imprudent through an error in his mind, but a wicked evil man. And so נבל is not only folly, but a bad or wicked action. See Deut. xxii. 21. Judg. xix. 23, 24. xx. 6, 10. And yet the Septuagint have in these places ἀφεσις, and in Psalm xiv. ἄφεσις. And hence it came to pass that Plovorinus, and Suidas before him, misunderstood the word ἄφεσις by ὅ μοι αἱδώς ἀντοῦρας ἔφεσις, ἀμιτις ἀντοῦρας ἔφεσις, one that is ignorant of the true God, and unacquainted with the first principles of Wisdom.
If this man was naturally deaf and dumb, as Dr. Hammond seems to think, the meaning of these words must be, that he imitated rightly those sounds which he heard made by others; for it was necessary that he should have some time allowed him to learn to discourse in, even after that which obstructed his organs of speech was removed. But if we suppose, that whereas he heard and spake before readily, he came by a disease to be deprived almost of his hearing, and to speak with difficulty, as Grotius thought, then these words must be understood in their usual and obvious sense. And this makes me prefer this Opinion to the former, which is most agreeable also to the proper signification of the word 

C H A P. VIII.

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

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

Ver. 24. ὡς ἄνδρες πεπεφύτας. ] The sense of these words is rightly expressed by our Author in his Paraphrase; but he tells us in the Margin that the King's MS. and many printed Copies, read ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπον, ὡς ἄνδρες πεπεφύτας. Yet still these words ὡς ἄνδρες πεπεφύτας make but harsh construction, and I do not know but that the ancient reading was ὡς ἄνδρες πεπεφύτας, as trees that walk; and so the meaning of the blind man will be, that two sorts of objects presented themselves to him, whereof one stood still, viz. Trees; and another, which were also like Trees to his apprehension, walked, or were like walking eyes. The Syriack ירמיה is ambiguous, and may as fitly be bad, for I see men like walking trees, as like trees walking. Perhaps
Chapter the Evangelist wrote as I said, but the Transcribers would not endure Νὰ να δομέων σα γεμιστά a walking trees.

CHAP. IX.

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

For the better understanding of these words there are these three things to be observed: First, That the Apostles understood the verb οὐκέτι of the event, whence they inferred that it was impossible that Christ should be killed by the Jews; because he was not to enter upon his Reign till a great Reformation had been made among the People of
Jews by Elias. But Christ's answer, which is grounded upon matter of fact, shews that this ought to be understood of the design of John's preaching, and what it would have effected if the Jews had hearkened to it, and not of what really came to pass. That active Verbs do commonly signify a design and endeavour to do any thing, tho' it may be the event does not follow, is known to every one. See my Notes upon Gen. xxxvii. 21. Secondly, that the words έκ πολλῶν, and bow, &c. contain another Objection which might be made against what Christ had said, besides that which was made by the Apostles, as the interrogatory Particle μόνος shews. Thirdly, That the Particle αλλα must be rendered by attamen nevertheless, or but yet, according to its usual signification. See 1 Cor. iv. 4.

Ver. 23. Εἰμὶ δὲντά, τό εἰ χρώμαν.] The Article τὸ is indeed, as Grotius has observed, superfluous in Luke xxii. 2. as well as here; but the construction in that place is different from what it is in this. I know all that is said by others about this Particle; but to me nothing seems more probable, than that it proceeded from some Transcriber's repeating the last syllable of the foregoing word. It is certain, it is left out in Beza's antient copy, and two others in the Barberine Library; and that neither the Vulgar nor Syriack version take any notice of it.

Ver. 49. Note e. ] 1. That Christ's words here may be understood, they must first be set down in Hebrew, and then it must be shewn how fitly they are turned into Greek. The expression in Hebrew is: נַעֲלַת הָעַרְעָם יָדוּךְ יְמָה יִמְנָה יֶבִּלָּל פָּלַת_for every one shall be consumed by fire, and every offering of corn shall be seasoned with salt. And in the same manner it may be expressed in Syriack, as appears from the Syriack Interpreter. All the elegance of the expression lies in the ambiguity of the word יִמָּעַל פָּלָה, which signifies both יִמָּעַל פָּלָה shall be seasoned with salt, and יִמָּעַל פָּלָה shall be consumed; which ambiguity cannot be expressed in Latin. Nor is the Greek Language more fit for this purpose, in which there is no word that signifies both to season with salt and to consume. Which the Evangelist perceiving, in imitation of the Septuagint, and the Jews who spake Greek in Syria and Palestine, he abused the verb αἰσχρά which properly signifies to be seasoned with salt, by putting a new sense upon it. And so Symmachus rendered afterwards the word בִּלָּל in Isai. li. 6. for the Heavens יָדוּךְ יִמָּעַל פָּלָה shall be consumed like smoke, by αἰσχρά, or rather αἰσχρά. The meaning therefore of Christ in these words is this: that as every Corn-offering according to the Law extant in Levit. ii. 13. was seasoned with salt יִמָּעַל פָּלָה: so likewise every bad man shall at last be consumed with fire. The conjunction η
Chapter prefixed to the words every sacrifice, is of the same import here as the particle of as, as it is afterwards Chap. x. 12. and John xiv. 20. That which seems to have occasioned Chrift's comparing bad men to sacrifices, is partly his having made use of the word נֶאֶם in order to describe the future condition of the wicked; and partly his having made mention of unquenchable fire, such as was the fire of the Altar, as Grotius has observed. And so because the words by which he had described the Punishments of bad men had led him as it were to it, he did not decline the using of such an ambiguity as might easily be understood by persons skilful in the Language he spake in. And so likewise God, in the books of the Prophets, sometimes uses such kind of elegances, proceeding from the ambiguity of words. See Jer. i. 11, 12. and at your leisure Mer. Cafaubon in Diff. de Lingua Hebraica.

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

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

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

Chapter X.

This word κύριος not being in Bεζa's antient Copy, nor in the Syriack, nor in the parallel place in St. Matthew, may justly be suspected. It is possible that some Transcriber thinking it not to be sufficient to say καὶ ἐξῆς might add the word κύριος, to shew that the beginning of the World was spoken of. But this was needless; the beginning of the World being called ἐξῆς, by way of eminence as it were. See my Notes upon Gen. i. 1.

Ver. 6. See my Notes upon Mat. ix. 14. and Grotius upon this place in St. Mark. The sense of Chrift's words is this: Whosoever puts away his Wife and marries another ought to be reputed an Adulterer, as a Woman that puts away her Husband and is married to another Man is an Adulteress. The Particle καὶ, which begins the 12th Verse, is all one with καὶ ως, as I observed before upon Chap. ix. 49. In this respect Chrift levels the Husband with the Wife; whereas under the Law it was lawful for a Man to put away his Wife, tho not for a Woman to put away her Husband.

Ver. 17. This whole Passage is explained by Clemens Alexandrinus in his Book entitled τὶς σαξύνομαι πλησίως, and in §. 4. he sets it down, but not without some alterations, substituting synonymous words, and correcting some Hebraisms in it; which makes it probable to me, that tho he did not indeed read the Passage so in his Copy, yet thought however that it was all one whether he expressed it in the Evangelist's own words, or in a little better Greek, in compliance perhaps with critical Ears. The beginning of it is this: ἐντοεμανα ἐν τῇ εἰς ἐξῆς ἐστὶν τῆς ἐπιστήμης λέγων, &c.

Ver. 19. Note b. What our Author says about the sense of the tenth Commandment is, I grant, true; but we shall interpret both Moses and St. Mark more Grammatically, if we understand the verb κύριος of those fraudulent methods by which a Person may endeavour...
Chapter to invade another man's Possessions. For there are two ways of injuring our Neighbour, viz. by Theft, whether privately or by force, against the will of the Owner, and by taking away what belongs to another without any pretence of Right or Justice, which is forbidden in the seventh Precept of the Decalogue, or else by secret and cunning Devices, where the Law and a pretence of Right is made use of to cover the Injury, which is prohibited in the tenth Commandment, whereby all such Artifices are made unlawful, whether they prove successful or unsuccessful: And this Christ here calls simule, i.e. to defraud. So the Old Glosses: 'συνέχεσε διαφυγεσιν, to deprive, to defraud, to deny ones Trust. 'συνανέγιστη, he disowns or denies his Trust, or the Debt charged upon him. 'συνανέγιστη, fraud, fraudulentus, insciator. See my Notes upon the Decalogue.

Vers. 2.4. Περιποτοσ | Christ here shews what sort of πλοίω, or rich Men, they are that cannot heartily entertain his Doctrin, viz. such as trust more in their Riches, than to God's Promises. And those are said to trust in their Riches, who had rather preserve them, than obey God; who promise themselves a happy Life if they are but rich, and think themselves so miserable that no Piety can afford them any Comfort, if they are poor.

CHAP. XI.

Vers. 1-3. That the time of Harvest was earlier in Judæa than ordinary, is well proved by our Author, of which see my Notes also upon Exod. ix. 32. And hence likewise he rightly infers that other Fruits were gathered sooner in that Country than in many other places. But I have several Observations to make both with relation to this matter, and to what Dr. Hammond says in this Note.

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

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

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

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

IV. It had been better if our Author, instead of what he says about the time of Harvest, had observed that there were two sorts of Figs in Judæa, one of which might have been ripe at the time of the Passover, but the other not till the height of Summer. The former sort are mentioned by Solomon in Cant. ii. 13. where, describing the beginning of the Spring, he says among other things, the Fig-tree hath brought her Figs to perfection. And these were called early Figs, as we learn from Theophrastus and Pliny, and were common in Syria.

Theophrastus Hist. Plant. lib. 4. l. 2. Ο' Αθαντος ἀλλοτρ, ὁ τελείως τος Αἰγυπτίων σύκων δημιουργός ἐστιν, καὶ ὡς ἢ λικτάν ἀλλὰ περὶ Αἴγυπτον, ἀλλ' ἐν Συρία—ἀκινδύνων νῦν—; i.e. as Pliny lib. xii. c. 8. interprets him, Quidam Aegyptiam ficum dixere, errore manifesto; non enim in Aegypto nascitur, sed in Syria, semper comanibus foliis. Some have said that it was the Egyptian Fig, but they were manifestly mistaken, for it does not grow in Egypt; but in Syria, and its leaves always flourish. And a little after Theophrastus says; "*χικαί λαμία καὶ τοιοὺς καὶ τοὺς καρποὺς." Αραβοφαρέσαν γι' Μιατέα 

μετα κύριος, ἵνα ὁ ὅριος ὅνομα τοῦ προφέροντος γενής ἁμαρτον.—εἰτι δικαίως ἀνθεὶς ἐφεξαποτοῦν.
Chapter XI.

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

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

'Ασεβίς ποιεύοι μήνας θάνατος, ἄλλῳ τῇ πολλῷ

Λύματα οὖς, ἣ πολλὰν ἐφ' ἡδνῷ σοφοίσιν ἴσχυς.

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

C H A P. XII.

Ver. 14. This one thing is enough to shew that that MS. does not contain the very words of the Evangelists, but a kind of a Paraphrase of them: For it interprets the Latin word χρυσον, to Grecians who did not understand that word, by one more familiar to them. So in the Glossaries for Law-terms published by Car. Labbaus, χρυσον is explained to be εις ερυθρα: whence it may be inferred that the χρυσον here spoken of was to be paid in a certain species of Money, viz. in Denariis, which had the image of the Caesars impressed upon them, as was conjectured by Marq. Freherus.

Ver. 44. Note b. The Phrase ισοτιμον ου τινι, Colos. i. 24. is, what remained for St. Paul to suffer for the sake of Christ, as I have shewn in my Ars Critica, Part 2. Sect. 1. cap. xii.

C H A P. XHII.

Ver. 32. It is no wonder that it is so hard to understand wherein the Heresy of the Agnoster lay, because if it was their Opinion that Jesus, i. e. the Man that was born of the Virgin Mary, was ignorant of any thing, it is manifest that they were of the same opinion with our Saviour himself, who could not have affirmed this more plainly; but if they asserted that God also who dwelt in the human Nature of Christ, knew not when the day of Judgement was to be; such an Absurdity as this hardly any but mad Men could be guilty of. For my part, I am apt to think that the Grecians at that time were mightily given to be contentious, and fallly attributed Opinions to one another which they disowned, and were unwilling to understand themselves. Some have been inclined to think the same as to the business of Eutyches and Nestorius, who differed from one another and the rest of Christians more in Words than in Things. It is plain the Greeks took no care at all to speak their mind clearly in these matters, and a contentious humour might easily make them mistake one another's sense. But this is not a place to treat of this matter in.
Ver. 3. There are some things in this last Note that may lead the Reader into a mistake, which I shall therefore briefly confute.

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

II. Nard is not always liquid. There was a liquider and a thicker sort of it, as Dioscorides informs us, Mat. Med. lib. 1. cap. lxxv. where having described the manner of making this Ointment, he says; ἵππες ηγεία η γλυκαι, ἦν μὲν ἰματιν ἰκόγ: it is liquid, and not thick like dregs unless it have gum in it. Now nothing hinders but that the Ointment which St. Mark here speaks of might have gum mixed with it, and so be a thicker sort of Nard, which might easily also be if it had been a great while kept.

III. Our Author describes a sort of Nard unknown to all Antiquity, who never reckoned Nard among the ορθή. None of the Antients, and perhaps no one Modern Author besides Dr. Hammond, ever spake thus, who seems to have confounded Nard with Myrrh. Nard is an Herb of an indifferent bigness, as Dioscorides lib. 1. cap. vi. and viii. and Pliny lib. 12. cap. xii. tell us. The words of Pliny are these: De folio Nardi plura duci par est, ut principali in unguentis. Frutex est gravi & craffae radice, fæ brevi ac nigra fragilique—folio parvo, densoque, Cacuminæ in aristas se spargunt; ideo gemina dote, Nardi spicas ac folia celebrant. Of the leaf of the Herb Nard more ought to be said, as that which has the principal place in Ointments. It is a Plant that has a thick and heavy Root, but a short black and bristle one—its Leaf is small and thick, the top of it is bearded. Nard therefore is famous both for the virtue of its spikes and leaves. So he describes the Indian Nard, and having mentioned other kinds of it, adds; Sunt autem omnia herba, prater Indicam; they are all Herbs, except that which comes from India. Of these leaves, or the spikes bruised together and mixed with Oil and other Spices, the Ointment of Nard was made, and not of any Liquor which is distilled from them. This appears also from Dioscorides, lib. 1. cap. lxxv. and from Pliny lib. 13. cap. i. Our Author seems again to have confounded Nard with Myrrh, which makes an Ointment of it self without Oil, as Pliny tells us. He confounds also the
word Nard, as that signifies either the Plant before described, or the Chapter Ointment which is made of it; for the Plant indeed is called spicata Nardus, because of its spiked leaves, but not the Ointment which was called unguentum spicatum, or unguentum Nardi spicata, not Nardus spicata, viz. because the spike was the principal Ingredient in that Ointment, which Name was given to Nard by way of eminence. See Salmassius upon Solinus, p. 750. Ed. Ultrag. about this matter.

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

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

Ibid. Note b.] I grant the Verb συντελεῖν does not signify always to break, when the discourse is about a thing which may be hurt without being broken, as about a wounded Man, or a bruised Reed; but where the discourse is about a Vessel, and especially such an one as is made of brittle matter, it has ever that signification: and whoever says, συντελεῖν σωματεύθηκα εἰς τὸν κύλλον, it must be rendered to break a Marble or Glass Vessel. See Levit. vi. 28. xi. 33. xv. 12. Rev. ii. 27. And those that endeavour to put any other sense upon that Phrase here, strain it. Dr. Hammond's two first Reasons for another Interpretation I have confuted already in a Note upon the parallel place in St. Matthew. The third, together with the rest, are, I suppose, taken out of Baronius, and relie upon a nausious Fable which is related in the following words by Suidas, whom, if our Author had but look'd
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I believe he would never have made use of this Testimony.

Thus Suidas tells the story in φορω, out of some unknown Fable-maker, as he used to do. Κατάθεν τι μελημεών ουκ έχειν διό σεταινι, (or rather κατάθεν έν ολοκληρωμα πολλή είτε σκηναφορω, τέθηκε με βασιλεύ τι μεγάλη, αφελώντα οι πάντως τί μελημεών θεούς: under the Market-place were buried the two Cosses of the two Thieves, and the little Ointment Pot out of which Christ was anointed, and many other remarkable things that were laid there by Constantine the Great, but taken away by Theodosius the Great. Suidas does not give the least intimation that he thought this silly Fable to be true; he only tells it, as he does many others, as he had read it. And therefore the Consequences that the Doctor draws from his Authority and Learning are insignificant. Nay, tho' Suidas had said that he believed this Fable, yet it would be much more likely that he had either forgot this Passage in St. Mark, or that it did not come into his mind, than that he thought the Phrase ουντείκεν σχετο to signify anything different from what I have said it does.

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

Ver. 54. Note f. What our Author says about the words τος & φος he seems to have borrowed from Dan. Heinsius; who may be consulted by those that have leisure.

Ver. 72. Note i. The Participle ἐμβαλλεν ought not to be separated by a Comma from the following word, which is the Verb to that as its Nominative Case. The opinion of Grosius which is by our Author mentioned in the second place, is the most probable. The Verb ἐμβαλεν alone does not signify to see or look upon, but only when the Noun τος ἡκε, or some other like that is added to it, and εἰς τον or της for the most part follows. I am apt to think that in the place cited out of Phavorinus we ought after ἐμβαλλεν to read εἰς τὸν, because ἐμβαλεν προ to look upon any one, is no Greek Phrase; and ἡκε also must be understood, ἐμβαλλεν εἰς τὸν τῆς ἡκες.
That is, sixty annum, he used to release, as it is in St. Matthew Chap. xxvii. 15. After this manner the future Tense in Hebrew, and the aorist in Greek, and the preterperfect in Latin is many times used. See my Index to the Pentateuch upon the word futurum, and Rom. viii. 29, 30.

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

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

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

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

Verf. 43. [Note d.] I rather think that by Βαβυλωνία we are to understand that dignity that Joseph was in among the Jews, by being one of the Sanhedrim of LXXII Men, or the Jester of xxiii. For Arimathaea was not a Roman Colony.
Chapter XVI

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

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

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

Τῶν ἰερῶν ὁ πολλὸν ὅποι οἱ καθ' ἔτη ἰερών αἵτινες
Τιμήσει, οἴναζεν ὅ, ἵματι Δεῖ ΝΕΣΙΟΣ ΗΣΤΑΙ

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

But this might by the Poets, who fancied their Gods to be in the shape of men, be understood properly: the difficulty is, how S. Mark, who had quite another Notion of God, understood this Phrase ἔν αὐτοῖς ἐν Αφρις ὀς ἲθ. Interpreters tells us that it is a Metaphor, and must be understood to signify only the great Glory to which Christ was exalted, and nothing more. And it is certain, that this Expression of the right hand of God, if by God we understand the divine Nature considered in itself, must needs be metaphorical; but is it not some-
thing odd that a Christian Historian should in a naked account of Chapter things make use of such a Metaphor? So it will seem, if I am not mistaken, to those that attentively consider it. And therefore perhaps (for I affirm nothing positively) we ought rather by the Word God to understand a Light inaccessible to any but Christ, which is a Symbol of the divine Presence, and on the right side of which he, whom the Father hath made King of Heaven and Earth, sits. And this is that which the Martyr Stephen seems to have seen when he beheld νῦν μὲν ἑαυτὸν ἔλαβεν ἐν καίρῳ τοῦ εἰρηνικοῦ, the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, viz. of that inaccessible Light or Glory; of which see my Notes upon Exod. xxxiv. 18. For without doubt, properly speaking he did not see God; and to say that when it is affirmed of him that he saw Jesus on the right hand of God, the meaning is, that he saw him in the enjoyment or possession of the highest Glory, is harsh and unnatural. See also Matt. xxvi. 2. and Mark xiv. 62. Let the Learned consider whether this be not what the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews also intended in Chap. xii. 2. where he says, that Jesus is set down at the right hand of God. I have not time at present to prosecute these things at large: Which I mention, lest the Reader should think that I had too slightly passed over a Subject which deserves to have a great many Thoughts spent upon it.
Chapter I.

ANNOTATIONS ON THE GOSPEL according to St. Luke.

CHAP. I.

Ver. 1. It might have been said without any more ado, that the verb ἀπελευθέρωσιν signifies to certify, or assure, and is properly spoken of persons. Thus in the collections of Ctesias Cap. xxxviii. πολλαίς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ὀρθίᾳ ἀπελευθέρωσεν τὸς Μεγαβίζον: having by many words and oaths assured Megabivus. So in Socrates Orat. Trapezit. pag. 360. Ed. H. Steph. ἔτι ζωὴν ἐκδόντων ἔχετεν ἀπελευθέρωσεν καὶ ἀνοίγειν: whem he knew for certain that I had in the hearing of a great many witnesses denied that I had any thing. And from hence the word being applied to things, ἀπελευθέρωσιν signifies such things which we are sure are true, as in this place in St. Luke, as the following words shew. ἀπελευθέρωσον, no where signifies to come to pass, or to be fulfilled, where the Discourse is concerning a Prophecy. II. ἀπελευθέρωσις ἐκδόντων is to comply with or satisfy a desire; for so the verb ἀπελευθέρωσις also signifies. As in the old Glosses: ἀπελευθέρωσις morigero, satisfaction. Agreeable hereto is the Latin phrase expeliere animum, liberinum, &c. And which is much to the same sense, the Greek ἀπελευθέρωσις signifies to fulfil his trust or office, which the Latins express by impleure partes officii sui, numeros omnes impleure. III. ἀπελευθέρωσις is often of the same signification with the simple verb ἔλεγεν, and ἀπελευθέρωσις with ἔλεγεν. And in the old Glosses ἀπελευθέρωσις also is rendered by plenitudo, satisfaction, fulness, satisfaction. What is further observable about this word, Dr. Hammond has here set down.

Ver. 2. Note b.] I. The ἄρτησι λόγω are those which have fulfilled their office of preaching the Gospel, pursuant to Christ's Command. The word λόγῳ is often taken for the Gospel. See Acts iv. 4, &c. In the same phrase almost the office of such Persons is described by St. Luke in Acts vi. 4, where he calls it διακονίαν τῷ λόγῳ the ministry of the word.
II. The reason why St. John calls the Godhead dwelling bodily in Christ, by the name of Θεός, I have shewn in my Animadversions upon St. John, Chap. i. I cannot tell whether our Author thought that the Chaldee Paraphrase lived before Christ's time; but there are a great many things in them, which make it probable that they are of a later date. Besides, the Phrase "εἰμὶ τὸ λόγον of the Lord, which is so often used by them, does not signify a distinct existence or subsistence, as has been shewn by a learned man in a Discourse intitled de sermone Dei cuius ceberrima fit mentio apud Paraphrases Chaldaeos; tho I am not in all things of his opinion. III. In what sense the word Θεός was known to the antient Heathens, I have shewed in the forementioned Animadversions, out of older Authors than Amelius. Amelius's Testimony is extant in Eusebius Prep. Evang. Lib. xi. cap. 9.

Ver. 27. Note f. I Our learned Author trusting too much to his memory, vainly contends that the preposition ἐν in Malachi iv. 6. ought to be rendered with, not to; for it is the preposition ὑπὸ and not ἐν that is used in that place of Malachi, and he shall turn the fathers ὑπὸ upon or to the children, and the heart of the children ὑπὸ upon or to their fathers. It seems to be a proverbial form of speech, to signify that John was to call the Jews, who were at very great variance among themselves, to agreement and concord. Our Saviour, that he might represent the great dissensions that were occasioned by the variety of mens opinions about matters of Religion, speaks in this manner, Matt. x. 21. The brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall rise up against their parents and kill them; and verse 35. I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against the mother. Now to shew that John was to extinguish all such animosities, or at least use the properest means to that end, the Prophet made use just of a contrary expression, and said, he shall turn the heart of the fathers, &c. This is by two Evangelists called the restoring of all things, and here by the Angel turning the disobedient to the sentiments of the just; and indeed, the Jews could not be reclaimed from their dissensions, and disposed to submit to one Master Jesus Christ, unless John had been to make it his endeavour to restore the whole Jewish Nation, and to bring them over to the Deceus mind or opinion of the just. See Grotius on Malach. and this place in St. Mark. The Doctor here takes abundance of pains to interpret this place, to little purpose, because he had not looked into the words of Malachi. He represents the Prophet speaking the same thing over and over, like him that said:
For what else but a nausious Tautology are those words, old and young, young and old? But that which the Prophet saies, is, that John should endeavour to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, i.e. the fathers who were mistaken in their Opinions, to the Children who had righter apprehensions of things; and the hearts of the children to the fathers, or the erroneous Children to the judgment of their Fathers, who embraced the true Doctrine of Christ; in a word, to bring αὐθεντικὸς φήσιν διαλογικὸς the incredulous and disobedient to be of the mind or sentiments of the just.

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

Ver. 28. Note k.] I. For the understanding of what is meant by ἔχεσται in this place, it must be enquired not what Noun ἔχεσται, but what the Verb ἔχεσται signifies, and particularly in the New Testament. And we find this verb ἔχεσται used by St. Paul in a very clear notion, in Eph. i. 6. where he saies that God hath predestinated us to the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ, to the praise of the glory of his grace, εἰς ἔκεσται ἑαυτοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ ἑορτῇ, in which he hath gratified us in the beloved, i.e. by which he hath dealt most bountifully with us through Christ. And agreeably hereto the meaning of the Angel here must be: "O Virgin, who are highly favourd by God. Porrorinus renders ἔχεσται by μανημένη, οὐκομενή, beloved, blessed. 122
II. What our Author quotes out of Hesychius, relates rather to the Chapter body, or to elegance of speech, than to the Mind, which certainly we can have nothing to do with here. Thus ἐκεῖνα he interprets by ἐκάτο and ἐκεῖσαι pretty, elegant sayings. And the old Onomastikon, ἐκεῖνος facetus, gratiosus, witty, pleasant. In which sense it is taken in the Son of Socrates Chap. xviii. 19 where the discourse is concerning one that was well skilled in the art of speaking, or an eloquent man. The word ἐκεῖσαι in Hesychius ought not to be changed into ἐκεῖνος. The old Glosses have that word, and render it by gratus, gratus, acceptus, grateful, freely bestowed, acceptable. But ἐκεῖνα is undoubtedly, as the Doctor supposes, a false print for ἐκεῖνος.

III. The Phrase ἐκεῖνος γυνὴ δικέσεως in Prov. xi. 16. signifies a handson Woman; for which sense there can be no room here.

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

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

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

Ibid. After the 4th sense given of that word, pag. 190. lin. 29.]

When the verb ἀναγγέλλειν signifies to interpret Scripture, or exhort the People to Virtue, or both, it ought not to be rendered by prophesying or foretelling, which is its most usual signification, but by preaching or speaking publickly. And the reason of this is, because the Preposition ἐν is ambiguous, and does not only signify ante before, when it is referred to time; but also when the Discourse is about things and Persons, i.e. propē or coram, nigh to, or in the presence of; which last signification it manifestly has in many compound words. Thus ἀναγγέλλειν is producere, provebere, to bring forth, to carry on; ἀναφημεῖν, promere, proferre, to bring out, to produce; ἀνασκέψει, progredior, procedo, to go forward, to proceed; ἀναγγέλλω, promoveo, provebo, to put forward, to lead on; ἀναγγέλλων, proscriptum, a publick order posted up in writing; ἀνεκδοτος, proscindo, profisco, to publish, to profess, with many more which may be had out of any Lexicon. I have transcribed these out of the old Glossaries of Philoxenus and others, and to transcribe more was needless. It cannot therefore seem strange to any, if we interpret this verb ἀναγγέλλειν by proloqui to utter or pronounce, which is rendered in the old Onomasticicon by ἀναλέον, and accordingly call him a Prophet who delivers or pronounces a pious discourse in a Church Assembly. It is certain that the word ἀναγγέλλει is used thus in Lucian in Aug. Vitarum, where Dioge-

...
St. Luke.

I am resolved to be a PROPHET of truth, and liberty of speech; i.e. to speak freely whatever I think to be true and just. I confess, Diogenes seems here to have taken ἀλήθεια and παρεσθεία for two Goddesses by whom he was inspired; but then it was only in order to this end, that he might boldly speak the truth concerning men's manners, and not that he might foreshadow things to come. This is the sense in which the Verb ἐγγίζων is used by Aristotle in lib. de mundo, where he speaks thus concerning Philosophy: ἔρωτικον ἐν τῷ ἔρωτικῷ γνωστικῷ, καὶ ζωή τυχόν τοῦ καθαραίος ἀληθείας, τοῖς εὐφραίνοντας ἀναφέρεται: understanding, I suppose, easily things agreeable to her nature, and comprehending divine things with the divine eye of her mind, and declaring them to men. In this place also there is a respect had to inspiration, but not such a one as has any relation to the knowledge of things future. These two passages were not understood by H. Stephanus. Because therefore the Genius and use of the Greek language would admit preachers to be called ἀφορίστω, St. Paul made use of this word; and so much the more willingly, because therein he did not depart from the custom of his Country-men the Jews; among whom it was a Prophet's office not only to foreshadow things to come, but also to teach the People Piety and Vertue. The Egyptians also had their ἀριστοεικά; but that they prophesied, or confer'd with the People about their manners, is not known.

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

Ver. 70. Note p. I. The learned Jac. Rheeserdius has written a Discourse very well worth our reading about this phrase, seculum praesens & futurum, the present and future age; in which he asserts that the Phrase ἡ αἰώνια ζωή of the age to come, was used in antient times, and so in the time of Christ, to signify only the next life, and not the age of the Messiah. And indeed all the examples brought by the Doctor do confirm this very thing; nor is there any clear place allledged by him out of the New Testament, which puts the contrary out of doubt. One or two passages in a late Rabbin ought not to be taken for a certain proof of what was the custom and doctrine of the Antient Jews.

II. The interpretation which the Doctor gives of the phrase ἡ αἰώνια ζωή appears to be ingenious at first sight; but if it be narrowly examined, it will be found inconsistent with the use of the Hebrew language. For as the Phrase ἡ αἰώνια ζωή to age and to age signifies nothing but to all future ages; so the meaning of that other is no more than, for ever. It is a Hebraism, wherein the same word is repeated to express all that such or such a word signifies. And thus ש"י ש"י man, man, is used to signify every man.
Chapter III. The Gospel is called αἰων, eternal, because it will never be
made void by any other Covenant or Dispensation, as the Law had
been. It has no relation at all to the Phrase the present or future
age.

IV. The Phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἡ αἰωνίου is a Hebraism likewise, such
another as לְעָרָיו רְדֵּם to age of ages, that is, perpetually, or to the very
last age.

Ver. 73. Note q.] What is said here about the allusion of this whole
passage to the names of John and his Parents, is a meer trifle, only fit
for an Allegorist to say, not for a serious and exact Interpreter, such as
Grotius, from whom the Doctor took this remark. Our Author suppos-
bes, with others, that the name of Zacharias's wife was אִילְּישְׁבֶּא אַלְּיִשְׁבֶּא Elis-
chebah; but if that had been her name, she should have been called in
Greek Ἐνδαλεστ or Ἐνδαλεστ. Nor do I see why her name might not have
been אִילְּישְׁבֶּא אַלְּיִשְׁבֶּא Eliscbebat, my God is a Scepter, or עָנָיִשְׁבֶּא Eliscbe-
bath, my God is rest.

Ibid. Note r.] The word ἀφολας must undoubtedly be joyned with
ἐκτελοῦ, as Grotius rightly thought; nor can any thing be imagined
more harsh, than this Phrase ἐκτελοῦ ἀφολας to be delivered without fear;
whereas ἀφολας ἐκτελοῦ θεὸς to serve God without fear is a Phrase that every
body will acknowledge to be proper, when the enemies of Gods wor-
ship are so punished and kept under by him as to be incapable of hind-
ring his being openly and publickly worshipped. But that which made
our learned Author suppose that the Evangelist made use of so harsh a
Phrase was the difficulty of understanding what deliverance was here
properly spoken of, considering the primary notion of the words. Za-
charias here speaks concerning the Kingdom of the Messias as the Pro-
phets generally did, viz. as of a deliverance of the Jews from the
dangers that hung over them from their enemies. At the time when
Zacharias spake these words, the Syrians, Egyptians and other Heathen
Nations that bordered upon Judæa, bore the Jews such a grudge, and
were such troublesome neighbours to them, that they could not exer-
cise their Religion ἀφολας without fear, where the Heathens were more
numerous than themselves, nor go up to Jerusalem to offer Sacrifice
without danger. Nay, they were not without some fears and jealou-
sies of the Romans themselves, left being blinded with superstition they
should some time or other oppose the Worship of the true God, as after-
wards they often did. Zacharias therefore speaks of the Messias as of one
that was about to rescue the Jews from these dangers, in agreement
with the common opinion; nor did the Spirit of Prophecy undeceive
him as to this matter, and the proper sense of his words is this which
I have mentioned. But in a more sublime sense, this deliverance is to Chapter be understood in general of the Enemies of Christianity, who were in time to be converted to the Christian Religion, so that those who were before a terror to the Christians, should enter themselves into Christ's sheepfold, and yet the Christians free from all their fears, which came to pass only in the time of Constantine. It was then and not before that ποιηθήθησα εἰς οἶκον οἰκονήματος, all suspicion, misgiving, and fear was taken away from the Christians, as it is said in the Eunomus of Constantine, extant in Eusebius Hist. Eccles. Lib. ix. c. 10. Ταύτα δὲ ἐν τῇ σωφρονίᾳ ἔχουσιν διὰ τὴν ἀτιμίαν ἐχάνονται αὐτοί: and the side of the wicked was filled with the highest degree of shame and dishonour by the petty of their enemies; as Eusebius expresses himself in the next Chapter. These seem to be the Enemies here spoken of.

II. The passage cited by the Doctor out of Prov. i. 33. in the Greek translation, will not prove that ψυγαθαμ ἀφορίσεις zs a proper Phrase, for these are Wisdom's words: But who so hearkeneth unto me, shall dwell safely, and at peace, and free from fear of evil, which the Septuagint render by οὐχ θατερίας ἀποθανόμεν ἀπεφυλάττεται; that is, he shall fear no evil. The rest of the passages which he compares with this place in St. Luke, are foreign to the purpose.

C. H. A. P. II.

Verse 1. Of this passage in St. Luke, the learned Jac. Perizonius Note b. has treated in a particular Discourse by itself, wherein he has confuted Dr. Hammond and others opinion at large, and, if I am not mistaken, solidly. He affirms that St. Luke's words in the 2. verse ought to be rendered thus: hæc descriptio ante falla est, quam præcesset Syria Quirinus, this enrolling was made before Quirinus was Governor of Syria; and having examined his reasons, I freely subscribe to them, and refer the Reader to the Discourse itself.

II. Our Author has committed a great mistake in his paraphrase upon the 2. verse, where he tells us that at that time, i.e. in the reign of Herod the Great, Palestine was under Syria; whereas it is most certain that the King of Judæa had no dependence upon the Proconsul of Syria, and that Judæa was not a province, at that time. This appears evidently from Josephus Antiq. Jud. Lib. xviii. c. 1. where he tells us that Judæa was not made a Province till after Archelaus's banishment. But perhaps our Learned Author fell into the same mistake with Eusebius, who says that Josephus made mention of the same registrar in which St. Luke here speaks of, because he affirmed it to have been made by Quirinus, whose name is mentioned by St. Luke; for which mistake nevertheless,
Chapter theles, he has long since been corrected by learned Men. The passage which Eusebius refers to in Josephus is at the end of his seventeenth book of Antiq. in these words: τις δὲ Ἀρχελαοὺς ἤμερας ἄποινας ἐπεμενετέναι τῇ Σιρίᾳ, τιμούσας Κυρίον· καὶ Καίσαρος ἀνὴρ ἴσαν τοῖς τάξις ἀναμεμφυλών ταῦτα Σιρίᾳ. τὸ Ἀρχελαῶν ἀποδέχεσθαι έδώσειν: after Archelaus's country was made tributary and added to Syria, Cesar sent Quirinus, one who had been Consul, to enroll Syria, and felled Archelaus's own house. See also the beginning of the next book.

Verf. 3. Eis τὰς ἱερὰς πόλεις.] This was not only the custom among the Jews, as has been observed by Grotius, but also among the Romans, as appears by these words in Livy, lib. 42. cap. 10. Censum sunt civium Romanorum capita ducenta sexaginta novem millia & quindecim. Minor aliquanto numerus, quia L. Postumius Consul pro concioné edixerat, qui socii Latini nóminis ex edito C. Claudii Consuli, redire in civitates suas debiússent, ne quis eorum Romae séd omnes in suis civitatisibus conseruasset. There were enrolled of Roman citizens two hundred sixty nine thousand and fifteen; a number somewhat less than ordinary, because the Consul L. Posthumius had publickly proclaimed that those of their Confederates who should have returned into their respective Cities, pursuant to the Order made by the Consul C. Claudius, should not any of them be enrolled at Rome, but in the several Cities to which they belonged.

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

Verf. 14. Note e.] The Alexandrian and Cambridge Copies which are both venerable for their antiquity, and the Latin and Gothick Interpreters have that reading which the Doctor here expounds. And therefore it is not true, as Grotius says, that all the Copies consent in reading ἐπάνω, tho the greatest part read it so.
Vers. 35. *Note f. a* It is easy to conjecture what was the occasion of that grief that like a sword pierced through the heart of this holy Woman. For how could she see without extreme sorrow and trouble, almost all the Jews persecuting her Son, and that with such implacable fury, as to nail him at last to a Cross? As for the ἡμῶν, that is either Mary herself, according to the genius of the Hebrew, or if you please her heart which might metaphorically be said to be struck through, when she beheld her Son crucified. So in St. John Lib. x. Thebaid. a Father hearing his Son's life demanded, received the sentence.

*Non fecus ac torta trajetibus cuspidipe pelbus*  
*exanimis.*

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

CHAP. III.

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

Vers. 23. *Ἀεριστορ* a The force of this word is not sufficiently expressed by the Doctor in his Paraphrase. St. Luke's words are to be rendred thus: And Jesus himself when he began to execute his office,
Chapter to preach the Gospel, was about thirty years old, and, as was supposed, was the Son of Joseph, &c. In the last words, ὁ ἦν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ is all one with ἦν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, for the Participle ἦν is nothing but a form of passing over to the next words, and they who interpret it otherwise make a difficulty where there is none. Ἔν ἦν ἐκκλησίᾳ cannot be said in Greek for he began, which yet is commonly here supposed, tho without producing any such Example. I should paraphrase therefore this Passage thus: "When Jesus first began to preach the Gospel, which he did a little after he had been baptized by John, he was about thirty years old; and was of the Stock of David, his Mother being of the same Family, and Joseph her Husband, who was the Son of, &c.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 8. Eἰπον ὅτι ἔγενεν [aus] Besides what has been said by Grotius to confirm the truth of this reading, it may be farther observed, that it is read so in Beza's Cambridge Copy, and three others which he mentions, besides that which the Authors of the Coptick and Gothick Versions made use of.

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

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

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 13. That Christ was commissioned and authorized by God to found and govern the Church, and the Apostles by Christ, cannot be matter of doubt with any Christian; but I question whether the importance of the word ἀπόστολος be such, that the Authority which belonged to the Apostolical Office can by Grammatical Reasons be thence deduced. Admission does not, to speak properly, signify Authority, but only the purpose or action of sending by which there is a greater or lesser Power conferred upon the person sent, according as seems good to the person that sends him. Nor can the person that is so sent, assume to himself the Authority of him that sent him, merely because he sent him, but only because when he was sent, he received such or such a Commission, which he is obliged also not to exceed. This our Author seems indeed to have perceived, tho' but obscurely, whilst he affirms and denies in the same Annotation, that the word ἀπόστολος is a Title of Dignity.

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

Philo, brought money, and not to the Synagogues. Thus Philo p. 785. Ed. Gen. faith of Augustus: ἵνα τὸ κράτος ἐναρεύσῃ καὶ ἐναρευείη ἐκ τῶν πολτρωτῶν ἡ ισόλυμα διὰ τὸ τοῖς ἱεροσολυμικήν: he knew that they gathered the consecrated money under the name of first-fruits, and sent them to Jerusalem by those who were going to offer up sacrifices there. The like he repeats in p. 807, where he calls those persons ἵνα ἀρεύεται.

Verf. 22. Note e.] They be true that the word ὑπαρχεῖ is sometimes taken for a man, yet the phrase ἐν τῷ ὑπάρχει ὑπαρχεῖ ὑπάρχει ὑπάρχεῖ does not signify to cast out a man as wicked, but to defame, as Grosius has evidently proved, whom the Reader may consult.

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

CHAP. V.H.

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

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

Verf. 30. [Τὸν σωλήνα i.e. They rejected God's purpose of reforming them by John's Ministry. See Acts xx. 27.

Verf. 44. Note c. See my Notes on Gen. xviii. 4. CHAP.
St. LUKE.

CHAP. VIII.

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

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

III. The diáκων in John ii. are those that served the Guests in all things which they wanted, as well as in distributing to them Meat and Drink. It is not from this latter that the Deacons of the Church were so called, as by a Metaphor taken from a Feast, but rather from a borrowed signification of the word diáκων, which is taken sometimes for furnishing, i.e. supplying, or delivering out. And the reason...
Chapter IX. of the Metaphor's being taken from hence, seem to be because Servants or Ministers, at their Master's command, used to bring out whatever was necessary, not only for a Feast, but all other uses of Life. But this signification of that word seems to have obtained only after the purity of the Greek Language had bin lost; for in the ancient Writers, it is certain that ἐκάλασις is never used for ἔμπνευ, nor ἐκάλοιπα for ἔμπνε. And in like manner the Latins have altered the signification of their words ministrare and subministrare, which are frequently of late used for suppedistare, to supply. Perhaps also in this place there is a Latinism, of which kind there are a great many in the New Testament. But I leave this to be considered by the Learned.

CHAP. IX.

Ver. 12. The Verb ἐκάλασις signifying properly and literally to loose, it is much more likely that it was used metaphorically for baiting or lodging by the way, from the custom of those who use to travel in Coaches or Chariots, and whenever they light and betake themselves to any Inn, have their Horses loosed and carried into a Stable; and because the word ἐκάλασις came thence to signify the end of any Journey, therefore ἐκάλασις was used in general for leaving off, or putting an end to, and amongst other things, a Sea Voyage. The Verb ἐκάλασις is so far from being properly said of a Ship's leaving off sailing, if we consider the natural and primitive signification of that word, that on the contrary they ought then rather to be said ἐκάλασις, to be tied fast or laid up, and ἐκάλασις to be loosed when they are put to Sea. And therefore also the Greeks do not use the Verb ἐκάλασις simply, in the signification of arriving or coming into Port, but the phrase ἐκάλασις ἐπι τὴ. It's true, our Author follows Phavorinus, who says, ἐκάλασις εἰς παρθένες, ἢν μεναφεῖς ἢ καθαρεῖται ἐν τῷ νόστῳ εἰς λυκία ταξιδίου. But this observation of that, otherwise very learned, Grammariam, is contrary both to the use and genius of the Greek Language; nor is it always safe to rely upon his Authority. And he himself also confirms in another place what I have said, by a much better remark: ἐκάλασις, saith he, ἢν ἄντι μεναφεῖς ἐπι τὴν ταξιδίου, ἡ τῆς ἐκάλασις εἰς παρθένες. Ἐκ τῶν λύκης τὴ κατάλαμα, ἢν ἄντι ἐκάλασις ἐπι τὴν ταξιδίου ἡ τῇ φοίνικα λύκης: ἐκάλασις is taken from lodging in an Inn; and hence comes καταλάμα for an Inn, because therein the Beasts or their burdens were loosed. He seems to have taken this observation from Eustathius on Odys. p. 1480. Ed. Rom. who says there the same. And Suidas whom the Doctor has elsewhere (see Not. upon Mat. xiv. 3.) commended for his great skill in Gram-
mar, when there was no occasion for it, plainly favours what I say: "Kata-


Chapter IX.

Thucydides is said of those who ride in Chariots; "Kata'yevai, eis naos, & kata'yevai, of those who travel in Ships, viz. who are come to the place to which they were bound. Which is said in so many words by the Scholiast upon Thucydides, Lib. 1. p. 89. Ed. F. Porti. These things being evident, it must be observed by the way, that before ever we can safely make use of the antient Grammarians for finding out the significations of words, the genius and use of the Greek Language must be known some other way, viz. by a long and careful reading of the antient Writers, both in Verse and Prose; for otherwise he that hath no more knowledge of the Greek Tongue than what he has attained to by reading the New Testament, and a few of the Fathers, and that not so much with a design to understand the Language, as for the sake of Divinity, and only occasionally consults the old Lexicons, will frequently be led into Mistakes. And I wish this could not be said of Dr. Hammond, who was otherwise a very excellent Divine, and a man of an extraordinary Judgment.

Ver. 31. Note c.] In my last Note I undertook to confute our Author, because I thought he was in a mistake; but in this I shall confirm his Opinion because I think it to be true, and agreeable both to the use of Scripture and the Greek Language. For the word ξοδός, where the discourse is concerning a King, signifies his going forth to make War with any one, as Christ did with the unbelieving Jews. So 2 Sam. xi. 1. at the time when Kings go forth, εἰς τοὺς ναοὺς ἐξοδοῖς οἱ βασιλεῖς, is very well rendered by the Vulgar, Tempore quo solent Reges ad bella procedere, at the time when Kings use to go forth to battle. The same word which is there used אֵש, the Septuagint translate by ἐξοδούμων, Prov. xxx. 27. So also the Greeks used this word, as H. Stephanus, out of Herodotus, Xenophon, and Herodian, shews. Add likewise these Passages to the same purpose out of Dionysius Halicarnass. Antiq. Rom. Lib. 8. p. 303. θείων ἐξετασμοῖς ἐξοδοῦ κατηγορήσαι, the first Expedition that I served in was when I was very young. Lib. 11. p. 734. τῶν ἐξοδῶν μὲ καλέσαι ἐπὶ καταργήσων, not to hinder the going out of the Soldiers to battle. In the same sense he useth ἐξοδοῦ τροποδάκτυλοι for to make an Expedition, Lib. 8. p. 531. So the old Glosses, "Εξοδός εἰς πόλεων, an expedition. "Εξοδός ἐνδυναμῶς συνάγον, a military Expedition, or the going out of Soldiers to war.

And it cannot seem strange that the Vengeance that Christ was about to take upon his Enemies the Jews, should be represented by his going out to battle against them; for also in the Old Testament the punishments
Chapter nihments which God threatens to inflict upon wicked men, are often represented in the same manner. So Isa. xlii. 13, where there is the same Phrase made use of as here, it is said, The Lord shall go forth as a mighty Man, he shall stir up jealousy like a Souldier; he shall cry and roar, he shall prevail against his Enemies. Which might be rendered into Greek very well thus; ὁ Ἰάσωματος ἠγάπην ἐπὶ ὑπόδημα ἐοῦον θανάσις, &c. See also Chap. xiii. of the same Prophet, where God is represented as leading an Army of the Medes against Babylon.

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

CHAP. X.

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

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

Pompey
St. Luke.

Pompey he faith; Quia desiderat ex astra, lapsus potius quam progressus.

Chapter XI.

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

Ver. 43. Παῦσε. If this be interpreted according to the Doctrine of the Talmud, the Adjective παιδεω must be understood; for the Jews paid Tithes of such Herbs only as were eaten, and not of all sorts: see Selden of Tithes, Chap. 2. S. 7.

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

Chapter XII.

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

Ver. 19. Έκεις τολάα ἀγαθά.] Seneca Ep. c. 1. hath a very elegant Passage to this purpose, concerning such another man as Christ here speaks of: In ipso aetu, says he, bene currentium rerum, in ipso procurrentis pecunia impetui, raptus est. He was snatched away in the full career of his Fortune.
Infere nunc, Melibæe, pyros, pone ordine vites.

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

CHAP. XIII.

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

II. Afterwards this word was applied to the safety of the Mind; in which sense also we find it used by the Heathen Writers, out of whom I shall set down some Instances which will confirm what Dr. Hammond says. Thus Cebes in his Tab. p. 11. Ed. Amst. Gronov. speaking of the Genius which he supposed every one had to direct and instruct him, faith; ἐλευθερία ποιήσω σε, αυτὸς εἰς βοήθεια, εἰ ΣΩΣΕΘ ΣΩΤΗΡΙΟΙ μίλλων ἐν σίν: it shews what way they are to take if they would be SAVED in life, i.e. if they would be preserved from those Calamities and Evils with which Vice is usually attended. And, pag. 13. speaking of the Passions that were drawn in the shapes of Women, and which are the causes either of Mens safety or destruction, he faith; τι καὶ εἰς γένεσιν αὐτῷ; but whither do they lead them? Αἱ καὶ εἰς τὸ σώζεσθαι, τιν, εἰς τὸ σώζεσθαι: Some lead them to safety, and others to ruin. And, pag. 25. speaking of one that embraced the opinion which led to true Learning, he faith; οὐκ ἀγάπησιν ἀυτὸς ὁ σῶτερ, η μακάριος καὶ ἐν οὐδέν ἄλλῳ πρέπειν εἰναι.
St. L U K E.

Having being purged thereby, he is saved and made blessed and happy all his life; that is, he is preserved from vice, and the mistakes that accompany it. And, pag. 43. he that is represented as the explainer of the Table, says to his inquisitive Hearers, after they had promised to live according to what they had heard; Τοιαύτα ὤν καθαρίσθαι, If you do so you shall be saved. So Plutarch in his Book of the difference between a Friend and a Flatterer, towards the end; Διόγηνος ἠλεγχός ὅτι τὸ μέλλοντι σω-
ζεῖσθαι δὲν φιλός αἰσθᾶ τὸ διαφορέν ἀλλόσσε ὑπάρχειν: Diogenes said, That be that would be saved, must either have good Friends, or furious Enemies. For Diogenes, who was a despiser of Riches, and all those things that related to the Body, considered nothing but the safety of the Mind. I have met with several other Examples to the same purpose, which I cannot at present remember, but these are more than enough.

C H A P. XIV.

Ver. 23. Aναγκασμένοι εἰσενήσκειν.] See Grotius upon this place, and how he corrects St. Austin for his most shameful abuse of it, for it deserves to be called no better. And yet there are some that resolve still to follow St. Austin, contrary to all the rules of Grammar, the nature of the Christian Religion, and common Sense itself. Nay, there is a late Enthusiastical upstart, a contemptible Woman’s follower, that has foolishly attempted to skim over and defend St. Austin’s Opinion, tho he either never read him, or never understood him; and he every where falls foul upon the Criticks for not interpreting the words of Scripture according to the wild fancies of crackbrained Women, but according to the nature of things themselves, and the constant use of Languages. But this Passage alone is enough to shew us of what advantage Grammar, or if you please Criticisim, is to the right interpretation of Scripture, seeing St. Austin, who was otherwise a very ingenious man, but an absolute stranger to this sort of Learning, did so wretchedly force and misinterpret this Passage, and make use of it to defend the most cruel Opinion imaginable. Add to what Grotius has said upon this place, my Notes upon Gen. xix. 13. If there were any sort of force here intended, it must be that which God makes use of by his severe and afflicting Providences, which do often constrain, as it were, wicked men to live better than they did before, tho gentler methods had been ineffectual to reform them. There is an elegant Passage, and a true one (if we do but change the word Gods into God,) to this purpose, in Aeschylus in Agamemnon. not far from the beginning:
Chapter XV.

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

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

CHAP. XV.

Ver. 16. O F this Fruit Salmatis hath treated at large in his

Note b. Exercit. Plin. in Solin. p. 326. & seqq. Ed. Ultrap. who may be consulted by those that are curious about such matters. However it is no where said by Pliny that this Fruit was ordinary among the Egyptians; nay, on the contrary, he denies, as
as Theophrastus had done before him, that it grew in Egypt, Lib. 1. Chapter c. 8. but affirms that it was common in Syria: so that in this also our Author is mistaken. Consult Salmasius.

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

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

Verf. 12. Note c. This interpretation of ἀλλότερον is, with the learned Doctor's leave, a mere nicety. The word ἀλλότερον is taken here in a Philosophical sense, for that which does not belong to the Mind, and is such as may be taken away from us against our will, as Riches. And on the other hand, that which Christ calls ἤμετέρα, is that which pertained to the minds of those whom he spake to, and could not be taken away from them against their wills, viz. the Truths of the Gospel. The meaning of Christ in this place is, that those who abused their Riches, and could not obtain of themselves to employ them to better purposes, were unfit to receive the true Gospel-riches as they ought, and would not use them better than they did the other. Nothing is more common among the Philosophers, and especially the Stoicks, than this distinction of ἀλλότερα & ἤμετέρα. Priscus upon this place has given us some Examples of it; and a great many more might be added out of Epictetus only. Thus, Enchirid. Cap. 1. telling us what things are not in our power, he instances in the Body, Riches, Honours, Empires, and in a word, faith he, ὅν ἐκ ἤμετέρα ἔσται, every thing but our own Works. And, Cap. 2. he says, that those things which have their dependence on us, cannot by any one be hindered; but those which are not in our power, are weak, obnoxious to servitude, and a great many impediments; in fine, they are ἀλλότερα. And, Cap. 3. he hath these words; Μέμνησο ὅτι ἐὰν τὰ φύσι καὶ ἔθελη�ες εἰς ἄλλοτερα ἱδα καὶ ἐξαιδοδοια βασιλεύεις, ἐὰν ἐὰν γὰρ τὸ σόν τὸν μόνον ὑμᾶς σον εἶναι, τὸ γὰρ ἀλλότερον ὄσπορ ἐκεῖ, ἀλλότερον, ὑδέας στ ἀνακίνητος, &c. Remember therefore, that if thou thinkest those things which are servile to be free, and those things which are ἀλλότερα, anothers, to be thy own, thou wilt be hindered,—but if thou countest that only to be thy own which is thy own, and that which is anothers to be as it is anothers, then no body will compel thee, &c. See likewise his larger Discourses, Lib. 3. c. 24. I have also taken notice of a word borrowed from the Stoicks, in a Note on Mat. xix. 28.
Ver. 19. Note d. This Translation which the Doctor gives us of Chapter
the Parable set down in Gemara Babylon, is partly according to the words
in the Hebrew, and partly according to the Latin Version of R. She-
ingamus, and taken from thence; and this has led our exact Author
into a mistake which ought indeed easily to be forgiven him: but
whereby it appears that Learned Men are overseen sometimes when
they seem to be most exact. That part of the Parable which there is
a mistake in the Doctor’s Translation, is word for word according to
the Talmudical Dialect thus; A King of Flesh and Blood made a great
Feast, and called to it all the Children of his City. There came a cer-
tain poor Man and stood at the Gate, &c. Shevinamus in Præf. ad Cod.
Joma, sets down this Parable in Hebrew and Latin, and with more
freedom than ordinary translates the words בנים בנויה, which
ought to have been rendred omnes filios urbis sua, by multos hospites.
And Dr. Hammond knowing that the word hospes is sometimes used in
the same Notion with externus or peregrinus; and not sufficiently con-
sidering that the Discourse here was about Guests, translates that by
Strangers, whereas it is very manifest that the words בנים בנויה signify
Citizens, i.e. Persons belonging to the same City. And this I have
thought fit here to take notice of, not out of a captious humor, but
only to warn the Reader that he ought not to be too severe a Judge of
those mistakes which the Learned sometimes fall into through want of
care, since we err sometimes when we are most careful. But I have
this farther to add, that I cannot see any reason why this Parable
should be thought to be the same with that here in St. Luke, when all
the likeness that there is between them is only, that the Subject of
them both is a rich Man and a Beggar. But their scope is quite diffe-
rent.

Ver. 22. Ἀμνικαλκαν ἐκ τῶν ἄγγελων.] Plato in Phædon, S. 41.
(though he came by the Notion) has a Passage much to this pur-
pose, for he supposes the Souls of good men to have their Ἐγειραὶ τῶν ἅθμων τῶν ἀγέλων, Gods who accompany and conduct them, εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν ἀναστασιν, into their proper place.

Ibid. Ἰανα.] Oś χεῖρ, says Titus Bostrens, Pag. 808. C. ἀπεδρεῖσαι:
καὶ ἀνὴρ; Ἰανα: he did not say cruel and inhuman wretch, &c.
but what? my Son, saith he.
C H A P. XVII.

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

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

C H A P. XVIII.

Chapter Ver. 5. T H O the Verbs ἄρνειμαι & ἄμειναι come from the same Primitive, yet they cannot therefore be compared with one another; for we ought not to consider the significations of their Primitives, but the words from which they are most immediately derived. ἄρνομαι is that part of the face or countenance which lies just under the eye, and is taken also for a blue Scar caused by a bruise given to that part. And because the pugils or cutters used often to strike those parts with their Fists, the Verb ἄρνειμαι properly signified sugillare, to give one a black and blue Eye, as it is rendered in the Old Glosses. Afterwards the Noun ἄρνομαι was metaphorically used to signify disgrace or infamy, as by Cicero and Nisus. And
And in the same sense also the Latins often used the words nota and Chapter plaga: And from this signification of the Noun sordor, it is that the Verb sordelen came to signify, as in this place, to defame; just as among the Latins likewise the Verb fugiillare, which is properly to give one a blow upon the Eye, signifies also the same with infaire. And in this sense undoubtedly it is that the Greek is rendered in the vulgar by fugiillare, and that rightly. The unjust Judg was afraid left the Woman should defame him, and ruin his reputation every where where she went, by her cries and complaints.

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

C H A P.  XIX.

Ver. 9. Τὸ δὲ ἡτέτι. It is a Synechdoche, faith Grotius; for the house is put for the master of the house. But I rather think that it is put, as it most usually signifies, for the Family, which by the Master's example might be reduced to a better life; or for his Wife and Children, who perhaps imitated the one her Husband, and the other their Father.

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

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

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

Verf. 21. Ἅγες ὡς ἐκ οἴσσων.] Instead of this St. Matthew hath στέλλεισθαι ἔτι ἐν χειλεσίως, gathering where thou hast not scattered, which is to the same sense. But St. Luke seems to have expressed this proverbial form of speech most exactly, which had its rise from a Law common to the Jews, with many other Nations: Quæ non posuísti, ne tollísti; What thou hast not laid down, do not take up: Of which Law see my Notes on Levit. vi. 3. This was a kind of theft: but because those that found any thing after it was lost, could not be prosecuted at Law, as being for the most part alone when they found it, and telling
no body of their good Fortune; such as restored what they had so Chapter
found to the right owner, were looked upon as fair and just men, XX.
who acted from religious Principles, and not the fear of human Laws.
And on the other hand, a covetous or greedy person generally kept
whatever he found; because he could not be forced by the Law to re-
store it. And therefore such a man as lays hold of every opportuni-
ty which offers itself for his own interest, without having any regard
to equity, is called by St. Matthew άστεγος, and by St. Luke αύστερος, a
hard, close-fisted, tenacious, rough man, as Priscus upon Mat. xxv. 44. has
well observed. άστεγος is an ambiguous word, and signifies both a
grave and severe man, and one that is rustic and savage. Suidas:
άστεγος εἶται μετά τῆς σορᾶς τοῦ εὐφραίνοντος, πᾶσιν δὲ εὐφραίνον τὸν ὁμολογοῦν, τοῖς μὲν
ἐπὶ τῶν ταυτίσι τὰ χαῖρεν ὁμολογοῦν, τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖν τὰ γεγο
νόμον τὸν δικαίως ἐτάχθη. ὁμολογοῦν δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐστίν, ἔφεβοις θεσπισ-
μοι τοῦ αὐστεροῦ ὁμοιὸν μὲ τῇ φυλάκωσθεν χείρισί, πρὸς τὴν θρήσκειαν ἦν πειναί, ὅπερ
τὸ άστεγον οἱ Κομοδιάκος ἔχοντες ἄγειν. They call all wise and grave men austerere,
because they neither converse themselves for pleasure, nor admit any plea-
sant discourse from others; and there is another sort of men called au-
fere, just as Wine is said to be austerere, which is used in medicinal Po-
ton, but never drank; because in Comedy a rustic man is called austerere.
In the signification of fierceness or savageness, it is used by Diodorus
Siculus, Lib. 3. p. 168. where, speaking of a sort of beast that has a
head like a dog, he saith; ἀγχωτὰς τὸ πέτυμα τὰ κακά, ἔνταξιν ἄνθρω-
ποι. Τὸν άντί τούτων σκοτίων ἐνεμέρωσαν ἰχτίον. They are exceeding fierce
Creatures, and impossible to be tamed by any means whatsoever. They have
a fiercer aspect under the Eyebrows than ordinary. I need not tell the
Reader, that this word is taken here in the worst sense.

C H A P. XX.

Verf. 16. Ἐκχύσματα, &c. This is the answer of the Sanbedrim,
the their name for brevity sake be here omitted; as
appears from Mat. xxi. 41. See on vers. 24.

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

Ver. 20. Παγανιζόμενος. It is well observed by learned Men, that this Verb παγανιζομαι signifies to wait for an opportunity of doing mischief; See Chap. xiv. 1. of this Gospel, and my Notes upon Gen. iii. 15.

Ver. 24. Τίς ἦν έκινησε. St. Luke omits here what St. Matthew expresses, and must necessarily be understood, viz. And they brought unto him a Penny, and he said unto them, Mat. xxii. 19. Such another omission I have already taken notice of on ver. 16.

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

Ver. 46. Εν Σπαλαις. It is very well known that the Greek word σκεύη is used as well for a man's as a woman's Garment, tho' the Latin βσολα signifies only a woman's. This is more than once proved by Off. Ferrarius Lib. de Re Vestiaria. And yet Epiphanius seems to have understood the word σκεύη here of a woman's Garment, who Hæres. 16. says, that the Pharisees were like the Scribes, δι' καυμιστῶν γυναικῶν, for their apparel and womanish Garments. But perhaps he speaks in that manner, because amongst the Greeks the men wore short Garments, or γυνικέα Κάστα, and the women long Gowns, such as were usual among several of the Eastern Nations. In antient times also βσολα ταλάριν, a gown reaching down to the Anxles, seems to have been a Garment worn by Women among the Assyrians; See Off. Ferrarius in Anæleæs, cap. 23. But it is a good observation that Pope Celestine the first makes concerning Clergymen, in his Epistle to the Bishops of the Provinces of Vienne and Narbonne; Discernendi, inquit, à plebe vel catersis sumus doctrinâ, non vestis; conversatione, non habitu; mentis puritate, non cultu. We ought, faith he, to distinguish our selves from the common people, or the rest of mankind, by our Doctrine, not by our Apparel; by our Conversation, not by our Habit; by the purity of our Minds, not by our Drab.
Chapter XXI.

Ver. 4. ΤΟ βάλλειν εἰς τὰ δωρά τάχθαι & βάλλειν εἰς δόξαν be all one as to the sense, yet it is false that δόξα & τὰ δωρά are the same; for the latter phrase properly signifies to cast in among the Gifts or Offerings, and the former only into a Chest, of which there were several in the Temple wherein the Money was deposited, that was voluntarily consecrated to the use of the Temple. See Lightfoot's Descrip. of the Temple, Chap. 19.

Ver. 6. Ὁταν τὰ πρεσεῖς.] There are some that add here a note of interrogation, as if Christ had said, Are these the things which ye look upon? as it is in the Cambridge Copy, wherein the Gospels are rather paraphrased, than the words only variously read: and therefore Grotius justly rejects this note of Interrogation. The Evangelist expresses himself here just as the best Writers sometimes do. The end of the sentence does not answer the beginning, but the whole is made up of two different forms of speech mixed together: For either he should have said Ὁταν τὰ πρεσεῖς ἐπιστέψης ἔφαντο, ἔδειξαν γὰς ἥμαρτες, &c. These things which ye behold shall be quite destroyed, for the days will come, &c. or τῶν τὰ πρεσεῖς ἐπιστέψῃς ἔδειξεν ὅτι ἐν ἕκαστῷ ἔστιν ὕποδημα, &c. Of these things which ye behold, the days will come in which there shall not be left one stone upon another. But the Evangelist begins just as if he was about to express himself the former of these ways, and ends with the latter. Grotius has given us two examples of the like Syntax; and I add this one more out of Terence, Phorm. Act. 3. Sc. 2. O fortunatissime Anti-pho, qui quid amas domi est. He should have said, Qui quid amas domi habes, or cui quid amas domi est, Who hast what thou lovest at home. Such phrases as these have something of that impropriety in them which is frequent in ordinary speech.

Ver. 24. Note b. 1. Our Author tells us as out of Eusebius, that there died during the Siege of Jerusalem eleven millions of People, i. e. ten times more than there did according both to Eusebius and Josephus's account, who reckon up but eleven hundred thousand. 2. The words in Eusebius which the Doctor translates to be slaves there, are εἰς ταῦτα τὴν ἀργυρίαν ἕπαξ, which Her. Valesius renders ut metalla exercerent, to work in the Mines, and so they ought to be interpreted. 3. Eusebius is mistaken in the last Circumstance, and disagrees with Josephus whom he professest to follow; for that Historian tells us, that the number of those that were taken during the whole War was ninety seven thousand, Lib. 7. c. 45. de Bell. Jud. which was very ill understood by Eusebius of those
Chapter those that were made Captives after the taking of the City. Besides that Euseb. reckons but 90000, whereas Josephus reckons 7000 more.

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

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

C H A P. XXII.

Verf. 6. Ἐξομολογεῖτο signifies he accepted the Reward offered him,

Note a. or be agreed to the Bargain; for ἔσωλωσις is ordinarily taken for a Bargain or Agreement, as Stephanus has proved by many examples. In the 2 Cor. ix. 13. it signifies consent, as the same Author observes. And the old Glosses render it by stipulatus, pactio, convenientia, covenanti, bargaining, agreeing; the Verb Ἐξομολογεῖσθαι includes indeed a Promise; and the Greeks used that word in Bargains or Contracts, where the Latins used promittro and spondeo.
After the proposing of the Terms, the proposer demanded Chapter XXII. promise to stand to those Terms; and the answer was spondeo, promitto. Thus the Latins used to speak, but the Greeks made use of the word ἐμελολαγώ or ἐμελολάγω, i.e. not properly indeed I promise, but I consent. The Cambridge Copy has ἐμελολαγώ which is most common, and signifies often the same with consenting or agreeing about a price, ἐμελολαγώ μᾶλλον, after the proposal of it as it was here, as appears by the foregoing Verse: See the Greek Index to Xenophon made by Aemil. Portus, and to Dionysius Halicarn. Ant. Rom. by F. Sylburgius, in which there are a great many examples given of this signification: ἐμελολάγω therefore here signifies, he consented to the Price, and Dr. Hammond has manifestly misled the sense of it.

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

Ver. 52. Note e. For the reconciling of Josephus with St. Luke, and the understanding of the Evangelist's words, it must be observed that there were two Garisons placed in the Temple, which had their several Captains; one consisted of Levites, who kept guard in the Temple night and day, down from the time of David, as appears from 2 Chron. viii. 14. For that there was a guard kept in the 2d Temple, the Talmudists assure us in Cod. Middoth, Chap. 1. § 1 and 2. And the Captain of this Garison was a Jew, whom the Talmudists call יי הourmet or יי הroud יי ביה in the Man of the Mountain of the House, or in the head of the Watch, as appears from the forementioned place in the Talmud. And this Man might have other inferior Captains under him, whom he set over each single Band or Guard, which are all called by St. Luke regem ποιεῖται Captains of the Temple; who nevertheless calls the chief Captain in the singular Number regem τοῦ ἱεροῦ, Acts iv. 1. & v. 24. So that it is not to be wondered at if Josephus gives the same title to Jews, this Office belonging only to them: And hence we see that the Captain or Captains of the Temple are always by St. Luke joined with the Priests and Princes of the Jews. Now it was lawful for the Sanhedrim, who might employ for that purpose the Levites which kept watch about the Temple, to apprehend any Jew, and
Chapter cast him into Prison, if he offended against the Law; tho they had no
XXIII. power to put him to death, as appears from the History of Christ’s

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

But it may be demanded perhaps why the Captain of the Guard of
Levites is called seguam, which properly signifies a military Captain or
Commander, whereas the Levites were no Soldiers? And this is un-
doubtedly the reason why Dr. Hammond thought it was the Tribune
who was set over the Roman Garison that was called by that name.
But he and others who have fallen into the same mistake, should
have remembred that the Sacred Functions of the Levites are more
than once stiled by Moses a Warfare, ἀρματία: See Num. viii. 24, 25.
where the Septuag. have ἀρματία. And therefore he that was chief
over the Levites might very well be called ἀρματία, which in Greek
is usually rendred by seguam. See the Doctor upon Chap. xxiii. 11.
Note a.

C H A P. XXIII.

Verse 11. Have a care of thinking that seguam ever signifies
to serve, or seguam Servants. The Hebrew word
which is applied sometimes to the service of the
Levites, is therefore made use of because it signifies congregrari to as-
semble or gather together, as the Levites used to do about the Tabernacle
or Temple; or because they were God’s garison Soldiers, who came
together for the defence of the Temple, not because that word ever
signifies to serve. Timothy is called a good Soldier, not simply as a
Servant of God, but as a fighter in God’s cause: tho the thing con-
sidered in itself be the same, yet the significations of words are va-
rions; and it is not all one whether we say a Servant or a Soldier, tho
both may be said sometimes of the same Person. Our Author there-
fore here looked for a knot in a Bulrush, when it had been easy to
understand the word here used of Herod’s guard.

Verse
Ver. 35. *Ewvov, ἐγρ.]* The Cambridge Copy here reads, *Τόσον, συνήτων* Chapter ζ' 57, αἷ ὅ ἐ ὢν τῇ, ἐκ τοῦ ἐ ὢν τῇ: and in a great many other places there is as great a variation as this between it and other Copies, which discovers it to be a sort of a Paraphrase.

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

CHAP. XXIV.

Ver. 16. *Αὐτῶν μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ὑπέρτητον.*] i.e. Their Sorrow was so great that they had not sufficiently taken notice, nor looked steadfastly enough upon the Man that had joined himself to their Company, to know him to be Ἰησοῦς. So Ἡγαρ was so overwhelmed with Grief at the thoughts of her Son’s dying, that she did not see, or did not take notice of the Well of Water that was just by her; Gen. xxxi. 19. And so when it is said afterwards, Ver. 31. of this Chapter, that the same Disciples Eyes were opened, *ἐναίδισκας μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς μετὰ* — the meaning is nothing but this, that looking more steadfastly upon Christ, they knew him; which very Phrase is used in the story of Ἡγαρ in the same sense.

Ver. 19. *Δυσάρεστος ἐστιν ὁ ἤγουρος.*] i.e. Pious and Eloquent, not like the Pharisees who talked very big of Virtue, without practising it; and were powerful men in words, but not in works, which was the general reproach cast upon the Philosophers among the Heathens. Cebes Thebanus in his Table, describing a true Philosopher, tells us, that he is *ὑπὲρ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐνοίκος, ἐν χάρισιν ἐν νείναις, ἄλογον τοῖς ἄλογοις;* a prudent Man, and mighty in Wisdom both in Word and Deed: See Acts vii. 22.

Ver. 23. *Δίκαιος ἐστιν ὁ ἐκπαιδευμένος ἀγγέλλας ἐπανάλαλος, αἱ δέ μετὰ αὐτὸν ἔκριναν.*] These two Disciples of Christ do not seem to have spoken with the Women themselves, but only to have heard the report of others, by which means they came to know but half the Truth; for the Women affirmed that they had also seen Ἰησοῦς himself. Nor can this seem strange, since it is evident from the 21st verse, that these Disciples went from Jerusalem the same day that Christ rose from the Dead, a very few Hours after his Resurrection, and so could not have a perfect knowledge of all the Circumstances of it.
Chapter XIV.

Ver. 28. Πηγονοῦσι.] See my Notes on Gen. xix. 2.

Ver. 29. Καὶ προσβιβασάντο. i.e. they besought him instantly; so 2 Kings v. 16. Naaman the Syrian urged or importuned Elias to take the Gift which he refused, for curing him of his Leprosy: See note on Chap. xiv. 23.

Ver. 31. Ἀπαρτῇ εἰσεν.] i.e. he went out of the Room on a sudden, and they could not possibly understand whether he was gone: for it is not necessary to suppose that he became invisible before he went out of the Room. Pindar uses the same word of Pelops who had conveyed himself away, but certainly without becoming invisible; Olympion. i. ἄπαρτῇ ἐκεῖς, faith he, you disappeared. So afterwards ver. 36. of this Chapter, ἦν δὲ μιαν διήρυσσε, he came amongst them on a sudden and before they were aware.

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

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

On the

Gospel according to St. John.

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

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

I have already in the first Edition of this little Commentary, given the Reasons which induced me to publish it, and therefore I shall not here repeat them. I freely give my consent to the reprinting of it, because it is my interest to have my thoughts concerning the beginning of St. John's Gospel publickly known. I have so confuted Socinus, as yet sufficiently to intimate, that I intend not to publish any Theological Disputations about those things in which I disagree with him; and have expressly said so in a former Preface to these Animadversions. For that reason I have not affirmed, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, do not υπόστασις in one and the same manner, but that each has his peculiar υπόστασις: Nor was I under any obligation to do so from the thing itself; for Philo to whom St. John seems to have had a respect (in the beginning of this his Gospel) did not deny that the Father, the first begotten Son, and the Soul of the World, had their several distinct υπόστασις. The Evangelist corrects only what that Alexandrian Philosopher said concerning Reason, or the Son.
Some have been disgusted with my rendering the Greek word, which is usually translated Word, or Sermo discourse, by Reason. But I intreat them first thoroughly to consider the Reasons I have given for that rendering of it, and then to remember that the word ἐγκλής is in itself ambiguous, and may as well be translated Reason as Word. And tho this latter signification obtained in the West, because of the unskilfulness of the old Latin Interpreter, or, if you please, the poverty of the Latin Language; yet the Greek Fathers do shew, when they treat of this matter, that they understood Reason by it, no less than Word: see Dion. Phy. Dogm. Theolog. T. 2. Lib. 6. c. 1.

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

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

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

C H A P. I.

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

Verse 1. In the beginning was Reason, and that Reason was with God, and God was that Reason.

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

2. The same was in the beginning with God.

2. There was, I say, Reason in God, before the World was created.

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

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

4. In it was Life, and this Life was the Light of Men.

4. Heretofore was lodged only in this Reason, a full and complete knowledge of the way that leads to Eternal Life; and this Knowledge wanted only to be communicated to Men, to be a sufficient Light to guide them in their pursuit after that Life.

6. And
Chapter I.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Annotaciones

1. That the Apostle JOHN was the Writer of this Gospel, the Antients do universally, as I said, affirm, whose Testimony in a matter of this nature cannot by any one be rendered invalid, unless he can plainly make it appear, that the Antients were all mistaken, and shew us at the same time the occasion and original of their mistake. For to justify our dissent from the most antient Christian Writers, who saw the Disciples of St. John, and testify that they heard this affirmed by them; and to charge the Christian Churches of that Age with Error, who read this Gospel as the genuine produc of the Apostle John; it is not sufficient to propose some light conjectures, or shew a metaphysical possibility, if I may so speak, of their erring. But to make it credible that they were all really mistaken, and that so soon after St. John's death, there must be those evident proofs given of their mistake, as none of the weighty reasons I shall hereafter alluded can be thought sufficient to cope with: For it is absurd, against most probable Arguments, and such as in another case we should acquiesce in, to object bare suspicions or conjectures which have not the least appearance of likelihood in them, and prefer those to the former, merely because the opinion which we have espoused, and are resolved to maintain, makes it necessary for us to think that those conjectures are of great weight. It is just as if one that was accused of writing bad Latin, upon comparing and examining it with Livy's, who was certainly a very clean Writer, should therefore begin to doubt whether the History, which goes under Livy's name, and which all the Antients with one consent attribute to him, were really his; and proposing some very slight conjectures against it, should think he had rendered the Authority of that History questionable; and because it might possibly have been written by some other, pretend that no body ought to produce any testimony out of it ever after. And yet this they do, who, as I understand, go about to rob the Apostle John of that Gospel, which has always been reckoned his; as I shall briefly shew, by producing some of the most antient Testimonies to that purpose; which are well enough known already to learned Men; but it may be not so well to those for whose sake I now write, who seldom spend much time in reading the Writings of the Antients.
The first Testimony I shall mention, and the most antient of all, is Chapter at the end of St. John's Gospel itself, Chap. xx. 24. where, after a Prediction delivered by Christ concerning the great Age that St. John should live to, it is immediately added: Ὠ_destination; &c. THIS is the Disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things, and we KNOW that his Testimony is true. We may read what Grotius says in his Notes on Chap. xx. 29. and Dr. Hammond on this place it self. Where those great men have shewn that this is the Testimony of the Church of Ephesus; whereby it appears that from the very first, this Gospel was thought to be the Apostle John's, even by those who lived and conversed with him; which is a certain evidence of its being genuine, because this Testimony was given by Persons who lived at the time when it was written, and might certainly know who was the Author of it. Nor let any one say that this Testimony, or this whole Chapter was an addition put in by some other a considerable time afterwards, for it is read in all the Copies, and all Interpreters acknowledged it.

Another proof of this may be taken out of Justin Martyr, who when a Child might perhaps have seen St. John himself. And he in that Apology, which is commonly called his second, and which he presented to Antoninus Pius, in the year of Christ 140. where he describes the sacred Assemblies of the Christians, says, that in them were read τὶ ἀποκαθιστήριον ἡ Ἀπόστολος, the Commentaries of the Apostles, pag. 98. Ed. Paris. & Colom. By which he means the Gospels, as appears by what he says a little before: οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τῶν ἄνδρων ἔναντι ἁπάντων ἐκκλησίων, &c. The Apostles in their Commentaries, which are called the Gospels, &c. And tho' he does not very often cite the Apostles words themselves in those Writings of his which are extant; yet he frequently alludes to them, and particularly to the beginning of St. John's Gospel, from whence he took what he says in several places, about the Λόγος and its Incarnation, and which he every where sets down as points of Faith generally received among Christians: Which he durst not to have done, unless he had relied upon the Authority of the Apostles; for who among the Orthodox would have presumed first to use the word Ὠ_destination, which was commonly abused by the Valentinians and others at that time? Who would have ventured to make use of the word σωρουμένος, which might easily, by bad or unwary men, have been perverted to a wrong sense, unless an Apostle had first used it? It belonged only to the Apostles who were the ἐνώται, inspectors of Mysteries, and not to the ordinary sort of Mystae, to use new words in such kind of matters; for they alone might safely impose
Chapter impose new names upon things above the reach of human understanding, who understood them better than others, and so as none ever did without a particular Inspiration. I know indeed this was not observed in later times, but in those first it unquestionably was. Now Justin frequently makes mention of the ὁ Ἐλεές, as all know that have but occasionally read any thing in his Writings. I shall produce only one or two passages out of the forementioned Apology. In pag. 74. he has these words; ἂν προφητεύην σὺν τῷ παῖ τῷ πατίτεᾳ τοῦ κόσμου, ἡ δὶ τοῦ ὁ Ἐλεές ἦν· ὅστις τῶν σωροκόπων εὐθυγραμμάτως γέγενεν ἐν τοῖς ἔστιν ἤματι. The first Power next to the Father and Lord of all things God, and the Son is the Reason, which how it became man by being incarnated, I shall afterwards shew. And hence, pag. 83. he affirms, that all mankind who follow the direction of Reason, are also partakers of Christ: And adds; οὐ μὴ ὁ Ἐλεές τῆς ἡθικῆς θεωρήσων θεοῦ, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἔστω. ἤσχησαν με έκ τῆς ἡθικῆς τῆς ἡθικῆς θεωρήσων. They who lived according to reason were Christians, tho they were thought to be Atheists, as among the Greeks Socrates and Heraclitus, and others like them. And afterwards, pag. 98. ἔστω ὁ Ἐλεές, faith he, σωροκόπων εὐθυγραμμάτως γέγενεν ἐν τοῖς ἔστιν ἤματι διὸ ἤσει. Jesus Christ our Saviour was incarnated by the Reason of God, and bad both flesh and blood for our Salvation. Any body may see that these are manifest allusions to the beginning of this Gospel, and none but an Ignoramus will deny it. But there are extant also in that Book the express words of Christ as they are related by St. John, in Chap. iii. 3, 5. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐγεννημένος ῥητὸς, ἐν μιᾷ ἣ ἐκκαθημένῳ ἐν τῷ Βαπτιστὶ ἐν τῇ ἁγιασμῷ. He cites likewise the Apocalypse as that Apostle's Work, in Dial. cum Tryphone, which yet many have doubted of, tho all agreed as to the Gospel.

Thirdly, Among those who acknowledged the Apostle John to be the Writer of this Gospel, I might allledge the Testimony of the Valentinians, who, as Irenæus tells us, endeavoured to pervert it to their own advantage: For they pretended that St. John asserted what they called an Ogdoad Pleromatis, in the beginning of his Gospel, and thought, tho erroneously, that he very much confirmed their opinions; which makes it evident however, that before Irenæus's time, this Gospel was vulgarly reputed to be St. John's. See what the Valentinians themselves say, in Irenæus Lib. i. c. 1. p. 36.

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

The last shall be out of Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 24. who relying on the Authority of former Ages, and not merely on his own,
own, or of the Age in which he lived, speaks in this manner: Τὸ γὰρ Chapter 
αὐτὸν ἑαυτὸν τε λέγει ἐνυπερτομένῳ ἐκκλησίας, πρῶτον αἰνολογεῖτον.
Let this (viz. St. John's) Gospel, which is very well known to (all) the Churches under Heaven, be first acknowledged. And about the latter end of the same Chapter, he says; Τὸν ὅ τι ἦσαν συστήματον, αὐτὸς ἐπὶ 
'Εὐαγγελίῳ, καὶ ἐγκύκλῳ τὸν Ἐπιστάμεν ἐδὲ τοῦς νῦν καὶ τοὺς ἐν' αἰείναις ἀναμφίλεκτος 
ὁμιλητικῶς: Of St. John's Writings, besides his Gospel, the first of the Epistles is, and always was acknowledged without dispute: See also Chap. xxv. I shall not alledge the Testimonies of any other Writers, because it is certain, that from Irenæus's time this was the general opinion; and if these Testimonies which I have alledged, as one said, be not sufficient, I know not what is. But certain Hereticks, whom Epiphanius Hær. 51. seems to have called εὐλογοῦν, because they denied the ἄγγελον, for the same reason, rejecting the Authority of all the Antients, denied St. John to be the Author of this Gospel. It were to be wished that Epiphanius had given us their right name instead of catching at the ambiguity of the word ἄγγελον, to shew his wit. But whoever they were, it is certain they were ignorant Criticks, who for the sake of a preconceived opinion, affirmed this Gospel to be supposititious, which they would have owned to be genuine, if it had not contradicted that opinion. But to pass this by, Epiphanius observes that they appeared after the Cataphryges, Quintilians and Quartadecimans, i.e. about the end of the second Century, or the beginning of the third. Nor are they any where mentioned by Irenæus, who spends a great many words in praise of St. John's Writings, and would certainly have taken notice of them, if there had been any such persons in his time.

And therefore since they began so late to oppose the Authority of this Gospel, which before was universally owned and received, they ought to have given very clear proofs of its being supposititious, which yet they neither did nor were able to do. For whereas they say in the first place, that St. John writ in a singular method; this is plainly nothing to the purpose: for why might not St. John use a different way of writing from the rest of the Evangelists? But there are a great many puzzling difficulties, they tell us, in his account of the last years of Christ's Life. But this is not peculiar to St. John, for there are great difficulties also in St. Luke's Chronology, as every one knows; nor can it be denied, that the sacred Historians had generally very little regard to the order of time, in their relation of the Life and Discourses of Christ. But that is no Argument that all their Writings are supposititious. The Evangelists, it is plain, did not
design to make a Chronology, or an exact History of Christ's Life, but only to record his principal Discourses, and the main Circumstances of his Life, and some of his Miracles. But this pretence is confuted by Epiphanius, who has shewn that those times of Christ may be easily digested by an attentive Reader; and his Animadversions are excellently illustrated by Petavius.

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

These being the only Arguments that can be alledged to prove this Gospel to be supposititious; and those being very slight and frivolous, or rather none at all, it is no wonder that the Alogi of old had no followers: and I dare say, whoever shall revive their Heresy, and have no better grounds for it than they had, will meet with as few; for if they will but lay aside their preconceived opinions, and apply themselves for sometime to the study of Criticks, they will be ashamed of their own rashness. When the Alogi were asked who it was that wrote this Gospel, if it was not St. John, they answered Cerinthus, notwithstanding it was universally reckoned that Cerinthus's Opinion was directly opposite to this Gospel: and the same is pretended now by those who follow the Alogi. But their making such an absurd conjecture,
jecture, manifestly shews what excellent Criticks the Antients and Chapter we have to deal with: For it's most certain that Cerinthus's error was opposed by St. John, as I shall shew on vers. 1. And then can any one be induced to believe, that any thing which was written by so detested a Person as Cerinthus, could be so obtruded upon the Disciples of St. John, and all the Orthodox, as to be unanimously received by all the Christian World for Genuin, not long after St. John's Death? Who will believe that all the Antients were so blind as to think an opinion was confuted in a Book that asserted it? These things are absolutely incredible; nor would they have seemed less so to the Alogi of old, or now to their followers, than to us, if they had been able then, or could at present shew that the beginning of this Gospel does not contradict the opinion of the Unitarians; which because they despaired of, they resolved, contrary to all the Rules of Criticks, to deny this Gospel to be the Apostle John's. But with what success may be discerned from what I have hitherto said, and it is superfluous to add more.

II. The Antients which speak of the time when St. John wrote his Gospel do agree, that it was not written before his departure into the Island of Patmos; but some say that it was dictated in that Island, and published at Ephesus; and others that it was written in that City after the Apostles return. Now St. John was sent into the Isle of Patmos in the year of Christ 94, and thence he returned to Ephesus in the year 96. As appears from St. Jerome in Catal. Script. Eccles. And therefore it must either have been written between those two years, and afterwards made publick about the end of St. John's Life, or else both written and published at Ephesus after the year 97. The Author of the Synopsis of the Holy Scripture, whether Athanasius or some other, a very antient Writer, tells us that, τὸ Ἰωάννης Ἐφέσου ὑπὲρ ζωῆς τε ἀντίκρητος ἢ ἀπὸ Ἰωάννης ἢ Ἐφέσου ἢ Ἐφεσοῦ. Gaius in his Epistles says, of the Apostle John: the Gospel according to St. John was dictated by the holy and beloved Apostle John himself, when he was an Exile in the Island Patmos, and was published by him at Ephesus, by Gaius the beloved and bosom of the Apostles. But Suidas on the word Ἐφέσου affirms, out of a more antient Author, that it was written at Ephesus: of the Gospel, it was sent to the Islands of Patmos, and Patmos, it was composed by the Apostle John when he was a hundred years old. It is no matter to us which of these Opinions be true, as long as we are certain that St. John wrote his Gospel about the end of the first Century. Epiphanius confessing, that St. John wrote it ματα ἐν ἔννοιεσιν τα ὁ
Chapter at the ninetieth year of his Age, and after his return out of Patmos, erroneously makes that to have been in the reign of Claudius, as learned Men have observed: See his words in Hæræ. Alogorum, which is the 51. Sed. 12.

III. By these Testimonies it appears that St. John either wrote or published his Gospel at Ephesus, which Irenæus also expressly affirms, Lib. 3. c. 1. Ἰρηναῖος ὁ σαφῆς ἐν Κυκέοι, ὁ κύριοι τῷ σαβαὼν ἀνάλημα, ὁ δεύτερος δηλιγχοῦ σε ἐπίσκοπον ἐκ Εφέσου ἡ Αδαμὸς δακτυλίας: St. John one of our Lord's Disciples, who also leaned upon his Breast, and himself published a Gospel, dwelling at Ephesus in Asia.

If it be enquired on what occasion, and to what end St. John began his Gospel, so as we see he does? Irenæus answers in these words, Lib. 3. c. 11. after he had spoken of the other Evangelists: St. John the Disciple of our Lord, designing to extirpate that error which had been sowed (in mens Minds) by Cerinthus, and a great while before by those that are called Nicolaitans, who are a branch of that Heresy, which is falsely called Knowledge, (prorism from whence they had the name of Gnosticks) that he might confound them, and persuade them, that there is one God who made all things by his Word, &c. So that St. John, if we believe Irenæus, began his Gospel so as he did, on purpose to refute the Doctrin of Cerinthus and the Gnosticks, as he declares afterwards more at large. Eusebius in Hist. Eccles. Lib. 3. c. 24. affirms, that the intention of St. John was to fill up what was wanting in the relation of the other Evangelists: In his room I shall substitute St. Jerome, who in Catal. Script. Eccles. has these words: Novissimus omnium scriptor Evangelium, rogatus ab Asia Episcopis, adversus Cerinbum, aliisque Hæreticis, & maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogma consensus, qui afferunt Christum ante Mariam non fuisset; unde & compulsus est divinam ejus nativitatem edissere. Sed & aliæ causæ hujus scripturae sorunt, &c. He wrote his Gospel last of all, at the desire of the Bishops of Asia, against Cerinthus and other Heretics, and the Heresy of the Ebionites which began to prevail exceedingly at that time, who asserted that Christ was not before the Virgin Mary; upon which account also he was forced to declare his Divine Birth. But there is another reason likewise given of this writing, which is the same I have alleged out of Eusebius, and is not to our purpose. The same Author in Proem. ad Matthæum, speaks thus, Joannes Apostulus & Evangelista —— cum efficit in Asia, &c. St. John the Apostle and Evangelist —— being in Asia, and the Heresies of Cerinthus, Ebion, and others, who denied that Christ was come in the Flesh, and whom he also in his Epistle calls Antichrists, springing up at that very time —— he was compelled almost by all the then Bishops of Asia, and the Messages of many Churches,
Churches, to write concerning our Saviour's Divinity more particularly — Chapter
Whence it is also related in Church-History, that being urged by his Bre-
thren to write, he promised that he would, provided they would all keep a fast
and implore the assistance of God on his behalf, which being accordingly per-
formed, he was filled with the Holy Ghost, and immediately dictated as
from Heaven that Proemium: In the beginning, &c.

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

So celebrated a Writer therefore could not be unknown to the
Apostle John, who dwelt so long at Ephesus, in the very eye of Asia.
That he had been carefully read by the Author of the Epistle to the
Hebrews, the great Grotius has observed. And therefore being often
read by the Christians, and having a great many things in him of a
near affinity with the Christian Tenets, it was possible that many
who were taken with his Eloquence, might imitate him, and mix his
Opinions before they were aware with Christianity. To prevent
which St. John in the beginning of his Gospel, made use of those
terms which were most likely to impose on the un wary, that the
Christians might understand in what sense they might be used: and
how probable this is, will, by comparing the words of the Apostle
with those of Philo, sufficiently appear.
But before I come to that, I shall endeavour to strengthen this conjecture, by producing some passages out of him parallel to several sayings of Christ himself and his Apostles in this Gospel: For the more I shew to be in Philo resembling the Discourses of Christ and his Disciples, the more likely it will be that he was frequently read and delighted in by the Christians of that Age; and accordingly that St. John had a reference to him in the beginning of his Gospel.

1. There is nothing in Christianity that more offends the Jews, than our so asserting God to be one, as yet to make mention of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in whose names we are baptized. And there is something so like this Tenet in Philo, that you would almost think you were reading the words of some Christians. He seems indeed to speak more agreeably to the opinion which Arius afterwards espoused, than of the Orthodox, but he came nearer the Christians in this matter than the Jews, and might easily have imposed upon the unwary. His words are these in Lib. de Abrahamo, p. 287. *ΠΑΤΗΡ ὦ ἡμῖν οὐκ ἐστί, ὡς ἐν ταῖς ισέγεις γεγενήσις κυρίου ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ πατρί, ὡς τῷ βασιλείῳ ἑσφορεύεσθαι. Σὺ τῷ πατρὶ ΘΕΟΣ, πατὴρ γὰρ ἰδίως τῷ κυρίῳ ὁ πατὴρ του ἑαυτοῦ. ὁ βασιλεύς ΚΩΡΙΟΣ, οὗ μὲν ἀρχηγόν, τῷ δὲ κρατεῖν πτωμαίων: The Father is in the middle of all, who in Holy Scripture is by a peculiar Name stiled, the Being: and on each side are [two] most antient Powers next to the Being; whereof one is called the efficacious [Power] and the other Royal; and the Effective, God, for by this [the Father] made and adorned the Universe; and the Royal, Lord, for it is fit he should rule and govern what he has made. And in the next words he asserts also, that God is Three and One: *ἀποφορέως ὁ θεός ὢν σύμφωνον ἐκ τούτων ἐν ΘΕΟΣ, τοῦ ΤΡΙΩΝ φαντασίαν. ΘΕΟΣ ὢν σύμφωνον ἐκ τούτων οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων, ἀλλαὶ ἐκ τῶν γενόμενων μοναστικῶν. οὕτως ὑπακυπεῖς καὶ τῆς ἀμυντος τοῦ κυρίου ἀντικαταστάσεως: Being therefore attended on both sides with his Powers, to a discerning Understanding he appears one while to be ONE, and another while to be THREE. ONE when the Mind being in the biggest degree purified, and passing over not only a multitude of numbers, but also that which is next to an Unit, the number of two, endeavours after a simple and uncompounded Idea, perfect of itself: and THREE, when not as yet sufficiently exercised in great Mysteries, it busies itself about lesser, and is not able to conceive the Being without any other of itself, but by his Works, and either as creating or governing.
This it is certain was thought by learned Men among the Arians, Chapter to be the very Tenet of the Christians, as may be gathered from what Eusebius in Preap. Evangelica says out of Philo.

2. But especially he affirms those things concerning the Divine Reason, which as to the words, and sometimes also as to the sense, are very like the Christian Doctrine, of which I shall produce some examples. He calls Reason more than once the Πρωτότοκος, as St. Paul Col. i. 15. in Lib. de Agricultura, p. 152. where after he had mentioned the parts of the Universe, he tells us that God, ἐν μιᾷ ὑδάτινη ἔκθεσιν ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν, ὅς θέλει καὶ πάντα. And he said, ἐν ἕνῃ καὶ μιᾷ ὑδάτινῃ ἔκθεσιν, ἐν ἑνὶ μόνῳ καθαρῷ. Why, then, did he from that Word, from which he has made all things, confer this excellent gift, to stand as a Mediator, and divide that which comes to pass from that which he has made. And be perpetually interceding for perishing Mortals with the incorruptible Nature, and is the Prince’s Embassador to his Subjects — He is neither unbegotten as God is, nor made as we are, but of a middle Nature between both extremes, acting the part of a Surety or Pledge with both; with the Creator, by engaging that Mankind shall never all grow corrupt, or rebel, preferring Confusion to order; and with the Creature, by giving them good hope, that the Merciful God will never overlook or neglect his own Workmanship.

4. Upon this account he calls him also �绷γος ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς, in Lib. de somniis, p. 463. Διός γας, εἰς ἑαυτοῦ, ἀναμμενέω, ἐν σοφίᾳ τε οὐ πόθεν, εἰ μὴ ὅτι ἐὰν ἐγὼ ἐμφανίζω, εἰ μὴ ἄνεχω τοῦτο ἄλλο οὕτως. Ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστιν ἰδιότητα ἀναμνήσθήναι τὸ τὸ ἀνθρώπου, οὕτως ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἰδίας ἀναμνήσθήναι τὸ τὸ ἀνθρώπου. God seems to have two Temples, whereof one is this World, whose High-Priest is the Divine Reason, his first begotten Son, and the other the reasonable Soul, the Priest whereof is he that is truly a Man. In like manner St. Paul says, that we are the Temples of God, 1 Cor. vi. 19. and elsewhere.

5. In the same Book, pag. 461: Philo says, that there are two Αἴσθησιν, viz. a Divine, and a human. Εἰσὶ βίων ἐν ψυχῇ, γιατί ταίριαν, διὰ τὴν ὑμνον.
6. The same Author in several places affirms, that the Θεός is ὄν, the Image of God. So in Lib. de somniis, pag. 11. Οὐ νῦν ἔστιν ἄρσις ἐν καθημερίᾳ, ἀλλὰ πάντως ἐν τῷ ἔθελε τὸ σώματος. The invisible and intelligible divine Reason, and the Reason of God, he calls the Image of God, viz. Moses. So in Lib. de somniis, towards the end, he tells us that those who cannot understand God himself, yet sometimes Θεός ἐστιν, ἐν θύμῳ διὰ ταύταις ἔστιν, as διὰ τοῦν ἀρχαίων, do understand the Image of God, his Angel Reason, as himself. And elsewhere he gives the same description of the Θεός, which St. Paul also called the Image of the invisible God, the First-born of every Creature: see Lib. de Profugis, p. 363.

7. In his Book inscribed, Quod pejus est meliori insidiatur, he says, that the Lawgiver (viz. Moses) καὶ καθημερίᾳ, & προσθεσμωτα, ἐν τῷ ἀγρόν Σιων, calls by the name of Manna the most sations of all Beings, the divine Reason: see also Lib. 2. de Algorios Legis, p. 70. & seqq. So in his Book intitled, Quis rerum divinarum hares, pag. 784. he interprets τὸ καθημερίᾳ ἐν τῷ Θείῳ ἀγρῷ, τὸ διδασκαλία ψυχῆς ἐν καθημερίᾳ τῷ ἐθέλε, the divine Reason, the celestial and incorruptible Food of a contemplative Soul. Which compare with the words of Christ in John vi. 31. & seqq. There are many other things in Philo, resembling the Christian Doctrine, which I shall not here transcribe; for what I have alluded out of him is over and above sufficient to shew the possibility of his leading the Christians into an error by his Eloquence, if it were not prevented by the Apostles Authority. I shall now endeavour to interpret St. John's words, and shew that in many things he had a respect to Philo.

Ver. 1. In the beginning was] ἐκ καθημερίᾳ ἐστιν. Tho the word καθημερίᾳ be in the number of those which signify τῇ καθημερίᾳ, or in the language of the Schools, relatives; it is not therefore to be thought that it refers to the Argument or Subject of this Book, which is the Gospel. According to all the rules of Grammar we ought rather to regard the signification of the words which immediately follow, and their connexion. And here the following words are Θεός, and all things were made by it; and the Evangelist says, the World was made by it; which shews that he speaks of the beginning of all things, or of the Creation of the World: None of those that made use of the word Θεός in this sense, viz. for a Nature, which is with God, and is God, could understand these words otherwise, because they attributed, as I shall afterwards shew, the Creation of the World to Reason. And no wise
man ought to take uncommon phrases in a quite different sense from Chapter that wherein they are understood by those who mostly use them, and yet never warn the Reader of his understanding them otherwise. Nor is it the part of a skilful Interpreter to understand Phrases in a perfectly new and unusual sense, unless it manifestly appears by the Writer whom he interprets, that they ought to be so understood.

Ibid. Reason Λόγος. So I interpret the Greek word, and not by Verbum the Word, or Sermo Speech or Discourse; because those who first and mostly used it to signify a divine Mind, or God himself, did never mean by it a Nature speaking in the Name of God, but only understanding and disposing all things into order. Timæus Locrus, a Pythagorean, who perhaps first used this word, in his description of the Creation of the World speaks thus: ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ αὐτὸς Λόγος, ἦν τὸ ἀρχαῖον κόσμον. Οὐκ ἦν ἔνας ἐπαναγεννησθεὶς ἐν θάλασσαι. Before therefore the Heaven was made, there were in Reason the Idea and Matter, and God the Creator of a better. So Epicharmus the Comedian, in his Commonwealth, as he is cited by Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. Lib. 5.

Εστίν αὐτοῦ ἡ λογική, ὡς ὁ Θεός Λόγος.
Ο λόγος αὐτοῦ περὶ τῶν θεῶν πρῶτος έστιν.
Ο θεός πέλαγος ἐξωτερικής ἁμαρτίας ἡ Λόγος.
Ἐνθανεταίριά διότι, ὃ, τι μονήν διότι αὐτοκράτει.
Ος εξ ἀρχικῆς πρώτης ἀρχής ο Θεός ἀναγεννησθή.
Ο υπ' αὐτοῦ αὐτός Λόγος, ἦν, καὶ Θεός Αὐτοῦ.

Which Quintus interprets thus;

Est humana ratio; banc praefer est & divina altera. Ratio humana circa vitam & victum semet occupat; Ratio divina Ratio est artis opifex & comes animi, Edocens ipsum quid usque maxime facto fiet. Quippe homo non repertur artem, sed ut sine nactus. Deus, Ipsaque illa humana ratio nata est ex ratione Dei.

Plato, Timæus's Interpreter, and Epicharmus's Imitator, in his Timæus, calls likewise the Λόγος, λογική, reasoning, p. 528. Ed. Gen. of Ficinus: τόθεν ἐν τίς τρίτης ηλιοσθοῦς Θεοῦ — λογική. All this true reasoning of God — being reasoned, &c. But, in his Epinomis he uses the word λόγος; speaking of the World: ο θεός, that be, λόγος: ἐν ὑπέρ τεβαίου έγένετο. The Stoics who, as Diogenes Laertius tells us, in Lib. 7. Stoë. 135, 136. affirmed, τι τεθέν, ὃν καταμένει, καταμείεται ὁ θεός,
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That it was the same thing which was called God, and the Mind, and Fate, and Jupiter, and by a great many other names, said also that God is the reason of all, and that did in the beginning, being the seminal Reason of the World, dispose all things. The same Author, in Sect. 134, says, it was the Doctrine of the Stoicks, that there were two Principles of all things, viz. an Active and a Passive; the latter of which was Matter or Substance without any Quality; To de uóq to dýv Aoron Ton Óeon. But the former, viz. the Active, was Reason, which was in it, and which was God; for this being eternal, out of all that (viz. Matter, or Passive principle) formed everything. And to this Doctrine of the Stoicks, Tertullian in Apol. cap. 21, had a respect, when he says, Apud vestros quoque sapientes Abv, id est, Sermonem atque Rationem, constant artifex videri Universitas. Hanc enim Zenon determinat factitasorem, qui cuneta in dispositione formaverit; eundem et fatum vocari Deum et animum Jovis, & necessitatem omnium rerum. It is well known that also among your wise men, Abv, i.e. Speech and Reason, was thought to have been the maker of the Universe. For this Zeno affirms to have been the Creator, who formed and disposed all things, and was called Fate, and God, and the Mind of Jupiter, and the Necessity of all things. There was no need of joining the word Sermon to Ratio, to render the Greek word Abv; for what place could there be for Speech in the Creation and Disposition of the Universe? But there was for Reason; and therefore Socrates setting down the Opinion of Plato and the Stoicks, makes frequent mention of that, as in Ep. 65. Causa autem, faith he, id est Ratio, materiam format, & quocumque vellet versat.—Quem quis sit causa? Ratio factiens, id est, Deus, &c. The cause, that is Reason, forms all Matter, and turns or diversifies it how it pleases.—If you ask what is meant by Cause, it is Reason creating, that is, God. And in Lib. de Vita Beat., cap. 8, he styles it, incorporeus Ratio ingeniun operum artifex; incorporeal Reason, the Author of great Works. Consult also Philo wherever he speaks of the Abv, and the Creation of the World, and we shall see that he never understands Speech by it, but only Reason. See his Book de mundi opificio, where he says that it was the intelligible Pattern of the World, and had no other place, & Abv Aov & taeta demumscala, than the divine Mind or Reason which disposed those things: Other Passages out of him I shall produce afterwards. I might alleudg also the Testimonies of Modern Platonicks, and Ecclesiastical Writers to this purpose, but that I have determined to shew only how the Antients used this word. The Jews who were more antient than Philo himself, called Angels,
both good and bad, which is the same as if they had said, Chapter

Powers endowed with Reason, not with Speech; which Philo
also imitated. So the Author of the Book of Wisdom, Chap. xviii.
15, 16. speaking of the revenging Angel that was sent against the
Egyptians, says: οἱ παραπόναις σὺ λύγης ἐν ἀραβών ἡλέοις, &c.
Thee almighty Reason leapt down from Heaven out of thy Royal Throne, as
an inexorable Warrior, into the midst of a land of destruction, and brought
shone unfeigned Commandment as a sharp Sword, and standing up filled
all things with Death; and it touched the Heaven, but it stood upon the
Earth, &c. The Writer of this Book attributes a Throne to this An-
gel, in agreement with the custom of the Eastern Nations, who cal-
led Angels Thrones. Otherwise he imitates Homer, who Iliad Δ, ver.
443. speaking of Iris, faith: οὐχ ἡμέρας ἐν ἐκείνῃ, ἀλλὰ ἐν τοῖς δαιμονί-κας. She
fixes her head in the Heaven, and walks upon the Earth.

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

Ibid. And that Reason was with God.] Καὶ ὁ λόγος εἶναι ὁ Θεός. It is
said here, that Reason was with God, by way of antithesis or opposi-
tion to what is afterwards said concerning the manifestation of the
divine Reason among men. Afterwards it was said ὁ λόγος ἐστιν, when it
dwelt in Jesus Christ, may ὁ λόγος ἐστιν; forasmuch as Christ con-
verted with men, and by the inspiration of the divine Reason called
them to a better life. I might produce out of Plotinus, if he were not
a late Author, a like expression, &c. But I shall allude only the words of Ignatius, in his genuin Epistle ad Magnesios, con-
cerning Jesus Christ, pag. 33. Ed. Voss. οὐκ ἠδυνάτω οὐκ ἡμέρα
ημείας; who before [all] Ages was with the Father, but in the end ap-
ppeared. Which words allude to this place in St. John, and may serve
instead of an interpretation of it, as also what he says a little after:
οὐκ ἐστιν ἡ παραπόναις λαύρης, &c. There is one God, who has revealed himself by Jesus Christ—his Son, which is
his eternal Reason.

Ibid. God was that Reason.] Καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐστιν ὁ Θεός. St. John adds this,
left it should be thought that there was any thing besides the Divine
Nature before the Creation of the World. Philo also calls the ἀρχαῖος
God,
Chapter God, in Lib. de Summis, p. 465. on these words in Genes. xxxi. 13. I am the God that appeared to thee, in the place of God. It is faith, and of a reason that the Scripture calls God, is his most antient Reason. But there is this difference between St. John and Philo, that Philo would have the Θεός to be called God only abusively, or improperly; for a little before he faith: He that is truly God is one, those that are abusively so, are many. And after the words before alleged, he subjoins that the Scripture does not, because it says, but that Reason is not superstitious about the imposing of names. But St. John teaches us, that Reason not only was from the beginning, and with God, by which word he understands him who is in the most excellent sense so called, but adds, as it were, και ἡ τύχη, by way of correction. And that Reason was God; which, according to Philo, could only be said improperly. And indeed Philo everywhere makes his Θεός inferior to the most high God; whereas St. John affirms the Θεός, which he says conversed afterwards with men, to have been the one only true God, properly so called. And this he says also in opposition to Cerinthus, of whom is true in Lib. i. cap. 25. speaks thus: But one Cerinthus in Asia affirmed that the World was not made by the supreme God, but by a certain Power separate and very distant from that Principality which is over all things, and which did not know him who is over all things, God. See also Lib. 3. c. 11. For if Reason be God, even that God with whom he was from the beginning; and if Reason made the World, as St. John affirms, then Cerinthus was manifestly mistaken.

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

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

Deum quod sit Ratione vetustà
Gentibus humanis fundatum

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

But let us return now to the Jews, and particularly to Philo, who speak in the same manner as St. John: So the Author of the Book of Wisdom, cap. ix. 1. addresses himself to God thus; ου αυτως τα ΠΑΝΤΑ ει την θεον, ἣ την ορκε την κατοικενας ἐν ομηρους: who hast made ALL THINGS by thy Reason, and adorned Man by thy Wisdom. And Philo Lib. 2. de Monarchia, p. 736. faith, Αγοραί εισιν αυτων Θεον, η εν αυτοις ει σωματικην έναρσιν: Reason is the Image of God, by which the whole World was created. But there is this difference between St. John and Philo in this matter, that whereas St. John affirms, that the Θεον was God himself, vix. the most High, Philo would have it said that the World was created by it, as God's Instrument. So in Lib. de Cherubinis,
Chapter p. 100. after he had said, that there must be four things considered in every Production, viz. the cause, the matter, the instrument and end for which it is produced, and had applied those things distinctly to an Edifice, he adds concerning the World, that: ἤκολος ἄριστος ἡ ἡγεσία τῆς θείας, καὶ ἔλεος — ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς, η ἡ κατασκευὴ· you will find that the cause of it was God, by whom it was made — and the instrument the Reason of God, by which it was disposed. But in St. John, all things are said to have been made by Reason, in the same manner as if it were said the World was created by the Divine Power ἄνεξ ἀνθρώπου Θεοῦ: which words do not signify an instrument distinct from God, but God himself. Tho it's true, Origen thought it followed from hence, that Reason was something inferior to God, as we may see in his Comment. on St. John, T. 11. p. 55. Ed. Hut. But his reasoning is vain, as appears by what I said: So St. Paul says, that he was an Apostle ἄνεξ ἀνθρώπου Θεοῦ, by the Will of God, 1 Cor. i. 1. and 2 Cor. i. 1. but it cannot be inferred from thence, that the will of God is inferior to God.

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

Ibid. And without it was not any thing made that was made. οὐκ έστιν ἡ ὕποτροφία ἢ ἡ ἡγεσία τῆς θείας. Tho it be a very true Observation of a great Man, that the Holy Scriptures do many times explain what they assert by a Negation of the contrary; yet I do not think that these words are added to that end. The Epicureans thought that all and every particular thing was made without Reason; in contradiction to which the Apostle here affirms, that not only all things, that is, the Universe, but every single thing was made with Reason. The Epicureans, when any objected against their opinion the beauty of the World, and the great Benefit which Men received by the Order and Disposition of it, pretended to prove
That the World was not made by a divine Power and Wisdom for our use, there are so many faults in it. And they composed a Catalogue of things that were hurtful to Mankind, and seemed to be made without Reason, as we may see in Lucretius, Lib. 5. after the words alledged. And so Cicero likewise in Acad. Quaest. 4. c. 38. disputes thus against the Stoicks: Cur Deus omnia nostris causa cum faceret (sic enim vultis) tantum natricum, viperarumque fecerit? cur mortifera tam multa perniciosae terra, marique disperseste? &c. Why God having made all things for our use, as ye affirm, should make so many Watersnakes and Vipers? Why should he disperse so many deadly and pernicious things on the Earth, and in the Sea, &c. These Arguments had such an effect upon some who were otherwise friends to Providence, that they granted the Epicureans there were some things made χειρ κύρια without Reason. And among these Philo was one, to whom I make little doubt but that the Apostle had a respect in this matter also: as he has approved some things in his Doctrine, so he has rejected others, lest by the unawary the bad should be mixed with the good, and lest because he had approved some things, he should seem to have assented to all. That Doctrine of Philo was extant in his Book de Providentia, out of which we have a long disputation set down in Eusebius, Prep. Evang. Lib. 8. c. 14: where among other passages we meet with this: ἦν ἡ ἱερατία τα ἱερέα γένοι τὶ περιοικὸ ν ἔλλα καὶ ἐπαχείρησεν, ὡς ὁ πρὸτερος ἔπει. Ως βοηθήσαι τὰς ἰθαυματίας ἡμᾶς μεταβαλλὴ γένοι τὸ σπεύδων ἣν ἂν ἐπηθοῦσε ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ὡς ἔλεγεν με, ἢ ἂν τερμήν. Θέρεις δὴ καὶ ἢ ἰδοὺ τοις ὑπαρχέτως ὁ θεός ἐξ οἰκείων ἐξέστησεν τὰς στέφανος, ὃς ἐκείνης ἦν ἐκτὸς ἐπικυρηθέντας στέφανος: Those creeping things that are poisonous are not made by Providence, but come of course as I before said: For they are generated when the moistness that is inherent in them, or whereof they consist, becomes warmer than ordinary. [I think Mr. le Clerc does not express the sense of this period, when he translates it, Nascentur enim cum humiditas terrae inhaerens calore mutatur;] Some are animated by Putrefaction, as worms in the Belly, viz. by the putrefaction of Food, and lice of Sweat. But every thing which is procreated from a seminal and antecedaneous Nature [in the Latin it is praevisam, which I take to be a mistake either in Mr. le Clerc, or in his Printer, for prægressam] out of its proper matter, is justly ascribed to Providence. This is contrary to the Christian Doctrine, which teaches us that all things were created, and are taken care of by God; see Mat. x. 29. and Interpreters upon that place.
Chapter I. Ver. 4. *It was Life!* *ἐν δὲ τῷ ζωῆς. Life in this place seems to signify a clear Doctrine concerning eternal Life, and the way of attaining it, which were but obscurely known before Christ; upon which account St. Paul, 2 Tim. i. 20. says, that Christ *brought Life and Immortality to Light by the Gospel*. And that this is here St. John’s meaning he himself shews, in i Epis. i. 2. *For the Life, faith he, was manifested, and we have seen it and bear witness, and declare unto you that eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us*. And in the same Epis. Chap. v. 11. *God hath given to us Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son*: Or else the *ζωή* may be called *Life*, because it gives spiritual Life to Men in this world, and eternal Life in the other. Ignatius, St. John’s Disciple, in his genuine Epistle to the Inhabitants of Smyrna, after he had said that it was difficult for bad Men to repent, subjoins; τινὶ δὲ ἔχων ἐκείνης Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸ ἀληθινὸν υμῶν ζῆν: but this is in the power of Jesus Christ, (who is) our true Life. And in his Epis. to the Trallians, p. 51. Ed. Voss. speaking of Christ, he saith; ἔφη δὲ ἐξ ἀληθείας ἐν ἡμῖν ζῆν, without whom we have no true Life. There are some who think that St. John has a respect to the Doctrine of the Gnostic, who affirmed, that Reason and Life were two several divine Emanations. But whether this, which was afterwards the opinion of Valentinus, was before known, is very uncertain: See Note on Ver. 16. Besides, the sense I have given is plain, and agreeable to what follows. The Apostle seems rather to allude here to a Passage in Philo, who in his Book entitled, *Quis rerum divinarum Haeres*, p. 381. saith, Ζωὴς δὲ τετελεῖ τοῦ, τὸ μὲ σεῖς Θεὸν, τὸ μὲ σεῖς γένεσαν, τὸ μὲ συμβολὴν μαθιν ἀμφοῦ. τὸ μὲ ἐν σεῖς Θεὸν ὡς ποιήσῃ σε ἵτας, ἐν ἁλλὰν ἐστὶ τὸς τοιοῦτος ἀληθείαν &c. There is a threefold kind of *Life*, one which is with God, another which is with the Creature, and a third which is of a middle Nature mixed of both: That which is with God has not descended to us, or come for the necessities of the Body, &c. But St. John teaches us, that that kind of Life was brought down upon Earth by Christ.

Ibid. And this Life was the Light of Men. *Ἡ ζωὴ ἐν τῷ φῶς ἐκ θεοῦ ἠλπιστευόταν*. The light of the Mind is a thing very often mentioned by Philo; but because he does not fetch that light from the Doctrine of Christ, but from Judaism, mixed with an opinion of Plato, it is all frivolous that he says of it. It is only therefore to the Gospel that that Passage of his, concerning the Divine Light, in Lib. de Humanitate, p. 551. agrees; καθαρτέος ἡ ἀντιλαύνον ἀλήθεια τὸ μὲ σεῖς ἐκκαθαριζεῖ, φωτίζει τὸ πάντα τὴν τερατών ἢ ἡματίαν ἢ ἡμέραν, ὡς συναφῶν ζωή ἀνασκευάζεται, ὡς δὲ τῷ ἐφεξής εἰσερχόμενον. τὸ καθαριστάν ἡ ἀληθεία ἡ ἀληθεία ἐκθαλασσάτοι: For as when the Sun rises the darkness is dispersed, and all
things are filled with Light; so when the Sun made by God arises and ex-Ch. lightens the Soul, the darkness of Vice and Passion is dispelled, and a most pure and amiable form [in the Latin it is sanctissima species, but it should have been translated digna amatu] of most shining Virtue appears.

Verf. 5. Shineth in darkness. Ev τις σωτικώς φαενε: i.e. is risen to dispel Mens ignorance.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ibid. Knew it not] viz. to be the divine Reason, when they ought to have collected from the Discourses and Actions of Christ, that that same Ἀλήθεια, by which all things had been created, dwelt in him. He did not bring Laws that were useful for one Nation, and hurtful to others, but such as were equally profitable for all mankind, and therefore manifestly proceeded from the common Parent of mankind. They were Laws becoming the Creator of all things to make, and fit for all Nations and all Ages; and if the Jews had not been blind, Si mens non
Chapter 180

Annotations on

Chapter 180. As the Poet speaks, they might have easily discerned their Author.

Vers. 11. To its own.] That is, i.e. the Jews: Consult Grotius. The Jews are so stiled, because they are called the People of God, and so of the Life.

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

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

Ibid. Received,] for as their only Master.

Ibid. It gave them power to become the Sons of God.] That is, to be called God's Children as well as the Jews, and that in a more excellent sense than they. Moses, Deut. xxxii. 6. calls God the Father of the Israelites. In Psalm lxiii. 15. the same People are called the Generation of God's Children; and Hes. i. 10. the Sons of the living God. In this Gospel, Chap. viii. 41. they boast of their having one Father, even God. Now those are called the Sons of God, who worship the true God, and living conformably to his Commands, have a well-grounded hope of being made partakers of the good things he has promised. And this privilege the Jews contended to belong only to themselves, and those who embraced their Religion, by virtue of the Mosaical Covenant. But St. John teaches us, that the Divine Reason has conferred this privilege on all that believe the Gospel. Perhaps the Apostle designed also in this passage to contradict Philo, who distinguishes between the Sons of God and the Sons of Reason, in Lib. de confusione Linguarum, p. 267. Oi φυγείς, Luth he, ἀσχολοῦντες τὰ ἡρεμίας, καὶ δὲ Μωυσῆς ἀρχηγοὶ φάσεως, "τὸ ἡθος κυρίου τὸ Θεός καὶ θεοῦ ἐστιν ἠμῖν σα. Οὐκ ἀντίθετος σος ἐστιν εἰς πατρόν; ——Καὶ μεθύουσας νοήματι τις ἀνθρώπους ὡς ἔχεις αὐτοῦ, ἐν τούτῳ Θεός προσαγωγεῖται, σωφρόνες θεομοίνικες καὶ ἐν προκοπεῖ οὐκ ἐργάζεσθαι προστάται, καί ἡ ἐμοὶ ἑκατον Θεός παῖδες νομίζεσαι γεννάως, ἀλλά τοι ἐκ νεκρῶν οὗτος ἄρος ἐστὶν θεότητα. Those that make use of knowledge, are deservedly called the Sons of one God; as Moses also acknowledges, saying; Ye are the Sons of the Lord God: and, God who hath begotten thee: and, is not he himself thy Father? ——If any one be not as yet worthy to be called a Son of God, let him endeavour to be adorned by his first-born, Reason, the most antient Angel: For if we are not yet fit to be reputed the Sons of God, yet (let us strive to be so) of most holy Reason, his eternal Image.

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

Ibid.
Strange women that were taken Chapter Captives in war, and married to Jews, were look'd upon to be admitted into the number of God's Children, that is, to be also Jews. And of such it is properly said, that they became Israelites (or Children of God) by the will of the flesh, that is, by fleshly concupiscence: see Deut. xxi. 11. & seqq.

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

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

That by flesh we are to understand human nature, is generally observed by Interpreters, who may be consulted. But the άνθρωπος may be said to have been made flesh, or man, in more respects than one; and here it is said to have been made flesh, in regard that, being clothed, as it were, with the Flesh of Christ, it became conspicuous; for flesh sometimes signifies a conspicuous nature in opposition to one that is spiritual or inconspicuous. So it is used by St. Paul in 1 Tim. iii. 16, where he tells us that God appeared in Flesh, ἐν σάρκι, was justified in Spirit, &c. i.e. God became, as it were, conspicuous, when all the fineness of the Godhead dwell bodily in Christ; in Christ, I say, who being a Man, was conspicuous and visible, and in whom God shewed himself to be present. I know other Copies have ἔκστρωτος, but the sense is the same. That the word Flesh is taken here for human Nature, as conspicuous, appears by the following words in this, and by the 18th verse. Tho when I say that Flesh is considered here by St. John as conspicuous, or precisely under that notion, that is so far from excluding the other properties, as the Schoolmen speak, of human nature, that on the contrary it sup-
It is rightly said by Divines, that *Reason was made Flesh*, not by a conversion of the divine Nature into a human, which is as impossible as for a human to be changed into a divine; but by an unexpressible *indwelling* of God, whereby the humanity of *Christ* became the humanity of *God*, in a singular and extraordinary manner; as on the other hand the *divine Reason was made the Divinity of Christ*, by that secret union. From that time God might be called *Flesh*, and reciprocally the name of God might be attributed to *Flesh* or Man. And upon the account of this conjunction of two Natures in *Christ*, the *Apostles* speak of him sometimes as *God*, sometimes as a *Man*; and do not only ascribe to *Christ*, what they had seen done by the man *Jesus*, but also what the divine Reason did before *Jesus* was born: see Col. i. 14. & seqq. & Heb. i. 2, 10.

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

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

Ibid. *As of the only begotten*] whom he accordingly gave that glory to, which he had never before conferred on any, or ever will. The Prophets who were Brethren, and the Sons of God in the same manner as one another, had often an equal glory put upon them by the Miracles which God wrought at their request. But the Miracles of *Jesus Christ* were so many and great, that they were capable, if I may so speak, of obscuring all that had been formerly wrought by their multitude and splendor.
By this word only, begotten perhaps St. John might have a secret design Chapter to oppose the Doctrin of Philo, who generally calls the Λόγος not μονογενής the only begotten, but only μονογενής the first begotten, and ημετέρου the most antient of the Angels. Grotius thinks that the Gnosticks are here condemned, who made the Λόγος & μονογενής to be two different persons; but it is uncertain whether those frivolous Syzigiae Pleromatics had been invented when St. John wrote: see on ver. 16.

Ibid. Of or from the Father] Πατήρ φόρμις. This must be referred to the word Glory: see Grotius.

Ibid. Full of Grace and Truth] Πλήρες γενόμενος καὶ αληθινός. If these words be referred to the immediately foregoing, we must supply ος in who was, viz. the only begotten. Otherwise they must be included in a Parenthesis, as I have done them. Grotius however is of another opinion, who may be consulted.

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

Ver. 15. John bare witness] or bears witness, μαρτύρης, viz. in the Gospels. But I have preferred the former, because it follows (in the Preterperfect tense) κοινής be cried. It is thought by some, that this is repeated by the Evangelists, because there were some who chose to be the Disciples of John the Baptist rather than of Christ, and so gave the
preference to him. And when the Gospel was first preached, it is certain there were such persons, as appears by John's having Disciples of his own that went under his name, and from Acts xix. But that so many years after Christ's ascension into Heaven, there remained any such persons, is not probable; and the words of the Evangelist may respect any of the Jews whatsoever, who having a good opinion of John the Baptist, because he was of a Sacerdotal Order, and uncondemned by the Sanhedrin, did yet reject Christ, because he was condemned unjustly, and did not know that John the Baptist had given a most clear testimony of him.

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

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

Kal ἀ νομον γε με τοδεγαν ειςειν Σιλες.

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

Ver. 16. Of his fulness] ἐκ της πληρωμας. Irenaeus supposes this to have a reference to the πλήρωμα, which he attributes not only to the Valentinians, but to Cerinthus, and such as were antiinter than he, the Nicolaitans, Lib. 3. c. 11. But I cannot perfectly agree with him for the following reasons.

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

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

3. Irenaeus might easily confound the Doctrins of various Hereticks, as he did the Fooleries of the Millenaries, with the Doctrin of the Apostle John. He was a very pious man, and a great lover of the Christian Religion, the truth of which he sealed with his Blood; but that he was any great Judg of things or opinions, will not be thought by any who shall but carefully read his Writings. It were to be wished also, that he had rather left us instancies of his Charity to the Heterodox, than of his Zeal, which is often so like Anger, that it can hardly be distinguished from it. I am sure the innumerable dotages of those men
men deserved rather pity than anger. In fine, it is highly probable that the word ἁμαρτοµένος came into St. John's mind, and was therefore used by him, because he had said just before, that Christ had appeared ἁμαρτοµένῳ καὶ ἀιτοµένῳ; and he used it the rather, because he knew that St. Paul had made use of it in a like sense in his Epistle to the Colossians, Chap. ii. 9. and elsewhere. Now ἁμαρτοµένος here signifies the fullness of the Godhead, as St. Paul speaks, which dwells in Christ; that is, the divine Reason itself, from whence issued the Gospel, which is often called ἁμαρτοµένος by St. Paul.

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

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

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

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

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

Ibid. Was his Interpreter.] Εξουσία, viz. God, i. e. his Will: See Mat. xi. 27. and Expositors on that place.

Verf. 46. "ορ αγέλλ [ιουαδοι] For ιουαδοι αγελα εν Αγγελη. Of the like misplacing of words, see Examples in Chap. x. 36. & xvii. 3.

CHAP. II.

Verf. 4. There are two things which I would have here further observed for the understanding of Mary's Petition, and Christ's answer. One is, that the words they have no Wine, are the expression of Mary's request to her Son to supply that defect, as appears by the answer which Christ made her. But how was it that she would have him do that? Undoubtedly not by purchasing Wine with Money, with which she knew Christ did not abound; but, as Interpreters generally suppose, by working a Miracle, and supplying the new married couple with Wine, in the same manner as Ehijah of old had supplied the widow of Sarepta with Oil. And hence it may be probably inferred that Christ had done some other Miracles before this time: For how could his Mother have desired him to work a Miracle, if she had never seen him do any before? She knew indeed by the revelation of the Angel, that her Son was the Messias; but she could not from thence conclude that he would work Miracles, especially such a one as that, when she pleased to desire it. And therefore who
when it is said at \textit{vers. 11.} that \textit{this beginning of Miracles did Jesus, &c.} we must understand the Evangelist to speak of such Miracles as were done \textit{publicly.}

Secondly, I would have it observed, that the answer which Christ here gave to his Mother, contains nothing in it whereby she might conclude his purpose to comply with her Request; nay that on the contrary he seems to have rejected her Petition. And therefore it may be matter of enquiry, whence he gathered that he intended to fulfil it; and doubtless it must be from some other words of his, which perhaps St. John not having heard, has omitted; or some sign he afterwards gave her to assure her of it, tho her Request was at that time unseasonable.

\textit{Vers. 6. \(\Delta \nu \eta \tau \epsilon \iota \nu.\)} \textit{It is the part of a conscientious Witness, saith a great Man, to affirm nothing too peremptorily or particularly.} But St. John had not been the less conscientious a Witness, if he had \textit{determinedly} said either \(\Delta \nu \) or \(\tau \epsilon \iota \nu\), for there is no such exactness requisite in such matters as these; and the reason of his speaking as he did, was, because he did not justly know the size of the Waterpots. Nothing is more ordinary than this way of speaking in common discourse.

\textit{Vers. 9. \(\phi \omega \nu \iota \).} \textit{This word in the Vulgar, and other Interpreters, is rendered by \textit{vocat, called}, which is properly the signification of \(\kappa \alpha \lambda \nu \iota \); but it ought rather to have been rendered by \textit{compellat, spake to him, \(\phi \omega \nu \iota \) here signifying the same as \(\alpha \varepsilon \sigma \varphi \alpha \iota \iota \iota \); for the translating it by \textit{vocare, calling}, seems to imply that the Bridegroom was not at that time present with the company, but came when the Governour of the Feast called him, which is not at all likely.}

\textit{Vers. 11. \(\tau \iota \alpha \chi \varepsilon \nu \tau \gamma \omicron \mu \iota \iota \iota \nu \iota \), viz. which he did \textit{publicly:} See Note on \textit{vers. 3.}}

\textit{Vers. 18. \(\tau \iota \sigma \omicron \mu \iota \iota \iota \nu\).} \textit{The reason of their questioning Christ thus, was because none might alter any thing that was done in the Temple, unless he had either a Commission from the Sanbedrim, or Prophetical Authority; and that Christ had no Commission for doing what he did from the Sanbedrim, they were very well satisfied, and therefore they presently ask him how he proved himself to be a Prophet, since he acted in that quality. This our Author ought to have expressed more distinctly than he has, in his Paraphrase; in which he often elsewhere hooks in less necessary Remarks.}

\textit{Vers. 23. \(\epsilon \nu \iota \sigma \nu \epsilon \omega \nu \iota \iota \iota \nu \iota \iota \iota \iota \nu \iota \).} \textit{This might be expressed in Hebrew by \textit{אֵלֵי בָּשֵׁם, i.e. they did not only believe him, but they believed him also to be the Person that he was called, or that the name of a Prophet or Messiah was truly attributed to him.}
Verf. 5. The αὐτήν ἢν ἀνέγνωςσεν or regeneration, spoken of in Matt. xix. 28. has no relation at all to Baptism. See my Notes on that place.

Verf 19. Τὸ κακὸν τοῖς θυρέοις αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. ] The proofs of the Divinity of the Gospel are such, that as perspicuous as they are, they are only so to those that are of a teachable temper and disposition, and not blinded by their lusts. The holiness of Christ's Commands, notwithstanding their agreeableness with human nature, and the interest of men, displeases those who are obstinately addicted to the contrary Vices; who do not fall into Sin through ignorance or infirmity, but knowingly and wilfully serve their wicked inclinations, and would not be rescued from that slavery or bondage. Such men as these do not desire to have their evil deeds enlightened by the Gospel, and so made manifest to every one. But on the other hand, those that for the most part lived agreeably to Nature, and were misled only by ignorance or infirmity, were mightily refreshed and pleased with the light of the Gospel, and most readily entertained it, either because it was agreeable to those true notions that they had before, or delivered them from that ignorance and impotency which they would gladly have been freed from if there had been any light to convince them of the Truth, or confirm them in it. See Chap. vii. 17. This subject is excellently and eloquently prosecuted by Labantius Instit. Divin. Lib. 7. c. 1. out of whom I shall transcribe one or two passages. Hæc nostrâ, faith he there, quæ tradimus, prava vitiosaque mentes aut omnino non intelligent (bebetatur enim acies eorum terrenis cupiditatisibus, quæ sensus omnes gravant, imbescìleque redunt) aut etiamfi intelligent, dissimulabunt tamen, & hæc vera essè nolent, quia trahuntur à vitis & scientes malis suis favent, quorum suavitatis capiuntur; & virtutis viam deserunt, cujus acerbitate offenduntur. Nam qui avaritia & opum inexplèbili quídam fìsi flagrant, quia non possunt venditis aut dilagitis, quæ amant, tenui cultu vitam degere; fìne dubio malum id essè fictum, quo desideriis suis renunciare cogiuntur. These things which I have said, vicious and depraved minds will either not understand at all (their apprehensions being darkned with earthly desires, which weaken and stupify all the senses) or if they understand them, they will make neverthelesss as if they did not, and be unwilling that these things should be true, because they are overpowered and burried away by their lusts, and knowingly indulge their evil practices, with the sweetness of which they are captivated; and forsake the paths of virtue, the ruggedness whereof offends
offends them. For those who are inflamed with a covetous and insatiable desire after riches, because they cannot sell or give away those things which they love, and be content to live upon a little, will doubtless be willing to believe that false, which would oblige them to renounce their sinful desires. And having instanced in some other sorts of persons, he proceeds thus, *Ibi sunt homines, qui contra veritatem, clausis oculis, quoquo modo latrant.* *Qui autem sani erunt, id est, non ita visisset inmersi, ut insanabiles sint; & credent his & libenter accedent; & quaeruntur, recta, plana, simplicita, & quod maxime opus est, vera & inexpugnabilia illis videantur.* *Nemo virtutis favere nisi qui sequi potest, sequi autem non est facile omnibus,* &c. These are the men that shut their eyes against the truth, and do all they can to oppose it. But all unprejudiced persons, that is, such as are not incurably vitious, will easily assent to these things, and readily entertain them; and whatever we say will seem plain and natural to them, and as it is especially requisite they should, true and impossible to be confuted. No man favours the side of virtue but he that has the heart to practise it, and the practice of virtue is not easy to all, &c.

Ver. 21 Πονηροὶ πολίτες.] This is not properly to be understood of one that acts sincerely, as Grotius speaks, that is, whose virtue is not counterfeited, but of an honest or good man. The Hebrew מַטּוּ וּלְגֵד וָנְשָאָה *truth* is taken for righteousness and goodness in 2 Chron. xxxii. 1. and so the Greek ἀλήθεια is used in Eph. v. 9. And the opposition that is here made between these persons and ἀλήθεια τῆς ἀμαρτίας, not particularly *Hypocrites,* confirms this Interpretation.

C H A P. IV.

Ver. 1. Π Σ ευνόμων θεοῦ.] viz. by his divine knowledge, faith Grotius. But there is no reason to suppose but he might know it too by the report of others, since it is not secret thoughts that are here spoken of.

Ver. 5. Σεβὸς] S. Jerom it seems read it in his Copies, or at least thought that it ought to be read *Sichem,* for in his Epitaph on *Paula* he has these words: *Transsevit Sichem, non ut plerique errantes legunt Sichar, quae nunc Neapolis appellatur, & ex latere montis Garizim exstructam, circa pateum Jacob, intravit Ecclesiam; super quo residens Dominus, stiens; & osuiens Samaritanae fide satiatus est.* She passed through Sichem, not Sichar, as most erroneously read it, which is now called Neapolis, and entered into the Church that was built on the side of the mountain Garizim, near Jacob's Well, on which our Saviour sat, and satisfied his hungry and thirsty with the faith of the Samaritan Woman. But all our Copies and
Chapter and the Antient Interpreters agree, and possibly Sichar and Sichem might be two different Towns, as Eusebius thought, who in locis Hebr. speaks thus: Συχαρ, ου δε των πλησιον σημειον οτι λειπον, ἐν δὲ των Ιαχεβι, Ιωσηφ 

which words are thus rendered by S. Jerom: Sichar ante Neapolin, juxta agrum, quem dedit Jacob filio duo Joseph, in quo Dominus nofter atque salvator, secundum Evangelium Johnnis, Samaritana mulier ad puteum loquitur, ubi nunc Ecclesia fabricata est. Sichar before Neapolis, near the field which Jacob gave to his son Joseph, in which our Lord and Saviour, as St. John tells us in his Gospel, discoursed with the Samaritan woman, sitting upon a Well, where there is a Church now built. Yet Grotius and other learned men confound these two Cities. And doubtless they were near to one another.

Ver. 20. Ex της γενετυρι Dr. Hammond understands this of the mountains of Shiloh, which are twelve miles distant from that of Garizim, as S. Jerom affirms. But Grotius and others more truly think that we are to understand it of the mountain Garizim itself, because the discourse is concerning a mountain in which God was at that time publicly worshipped by the Samaritans.

Ver. 34. Ἐκεῖνος ἐδώματα] The Apostles discourse gave Christ an occasion to make use of this Metaphor; by which he intended to shew that the bringing of men to repentance was that which he was most intent upon, and could for sometime also neglect eating and drinking for. There is such another metaphor in Plautus, Cistellar. Act. 4. Sc. 2. v. 54. where a Servant, to shew that he was attentive to what a Woman said, is represented speaking in this manner:

Istuc ago, atque istuc mibi cibus est, quod fabulare:

i.e. I should not eat more heartily when I am hungry, than I now listen to what you say. So likewise edere sermonem is another phrase made use of by that Comedian in Aulular. Act. 3. Sc. 6. v. 1. See Taubmannus upon the place.

Ver. 42. ὁ σωτήρ τις κόσμῳ] i.e. he that is come to save or deliver us. By the World here is meant only the Circumcised, for it is not likely that the Samaritans had any thoughts about the salvation of the Gentiles, which the Apostles themselves knew for a long while nothing of. Compare Chap. vii. 4 with xii. 19. where the word κόσμῳ signifies only the Jews. And so in our modern languages, and particularly in the French, the Phrase tout le monde, is taken sometimes more strictly, and sometimes more comprehensively.
Ver. 2. Either the Verb itself here must be understood to signify the time past, or else instead of it we must, as some Copies do, read it in was; for St. John, as the Antients unanimously testify, wrote a great many years after the Destruction of Jerusalem. See my Animadversions on the beginning of this Gospel.

Ver. 31. i.e. If I only affirmed myself to be sent from God, and did not prove myself to be so, you might justly reject my testimony. For he that says he is a Prophet, and does nothing at all to confirm such an assertion, is certainly no Prophet, because God does not leave his Prophets without any testimony from himself that they are so. This argument quite overthrows the pretence of Mahomet. See Chap. viii. 16.

Ver. 32. i.e. The Cambridge Copy reads οὐδείς, and some others εὑρωκός. The former indeed seems proper, but the Copy is suspected. And besides, the latter is oftener used by St. John. See Chap. xxi. 24. I should render it in French by on fait, is known, for it is put for the Indefinite οὐδείς.

Ver. 38. i.e. Ye have heard and read indeed his word, but it has not entered into your hearts, so as to be a perpetual rule of life always in your view, and never to be forgotten by you. When we despise anything that another says, the remembrance of it seldom abides with us long; but what we are affected with, manet, as the Poet says, alta mente repostum, abides deeply fixed in our mind, and upon the next fit occasion it breaks out. This is the importance of the Verb now here, and we meet with it in the same sense several times in the 2d Chap. of the 1st Epist. of St. John, and in the 2d Epist. and 2d verse.

Ver. 39. i.e. This verb I rather take to be in the Indicative than in the Imperative mood, and interpret the words of Christ to this sense: "You are generally very curious in searching into the abstruse meaning of the Scriptures, because ye think, and that justly, that ye shall derive those instructions from thence which will lead you to eternal Life; and these give their Testimony to me which ye do not hearken to, because ye suffer your selves to be prejudiced by perverse Affections. It is very probably conjectured by a Learned Man, that the εὐδείς, or searching, here spoken of, does not refer to the Grammatical, but the Mystical sense of the Scriptures. It is certain that the Jews at that time neglected the study,
Chapter VI.

Study of Grammar, and therefore those Scripture passages which concerned the Messiah, do not seem to have been understood by them by the assistance of that Art, but by the instructions of the ancient Prophets: See Bruno Dissert. de Therapeutis. Perhaps Christ used the word שֵׁם, which at that time did not signify simply to inquire, but to search into the Allegorical meaning of any Passage: Consult Busdorf in Thesaurus, if you doubt of it.

Ver. 46. Eis ἐν ὁλίγης ἁπτ. i.e. "By whose Doctrin which ye profess to believe, ye think ye can attain to Salvation; for Christ here speaks of what will be at the day of Judgment. I do not believe these words are to be understood of Moses making intercession for the Jews, tho I know what is alleged by a great Man in favour of that opinion, out of the Rabbins. The sense will be most commodious, if we understand it to be that those who imagined themselves to act consonantly to the Law in rejecting Christ, shall be condemned hereafter by the Law itself, according to which they were certainly obliged to receive him. See Deut. xviii. 15.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 15. C H R I S T avoided the Multitude who took counsel together about making him a King, not only because this was a bad design, and proceeded from Persons of wicked and carnal Minds; but also because he would not give the least occasion for a Sedition, and that his enemies might never be able to accuse him with any appearance of Justice, of having affected to be an earthly Prince. If he had tarried among these Men, tho he had opposed them, and openly rebuked them, and hindered them from executing their designs; yet their very attempt alone would have caused suspicious Men to conceive such a bad opinion of the Gospel (which was then but in its infancy) as it would have been very hard to dispossess them of. Christ's enemies would have said that he had plotted a change in the Government, and that he was not so much displeased with his followers for their desire to deliver the Kingdom into his hands, as for their unseasonable resolution to make him their King, before he had brought his Conspiracy to a head, and increased the number of his Followers: They would have said that it was dangerous to suffer such a Teacher to live amongst the Jews, who might even without his knowledge and consent, give the common People an occasion to take up arms against the State. It is well known how mistrustful and cautious those to whom the government of
of the World belonged at that time, were in such matters; and when I do but mention the name of Tiberius, every one will presently apprehend that it was a most dangerous thing then, so much as unwillingly to be the cause of a Sedition. This seems to be the reason why Christ would not have it divulged that he was the Messiah, viz. left the very mention of that name should, like the setting up of a Flag, occasion a great confluence of People to him. See Note on Mat. viii. 4.

Ver. 27. Note b. ἐπιστὰς ἐβουν, to speak properly, is neither operari cibum, as it is rendered in the Vulgar, nor acquirere cibum, to acquire Food, as by our Author; but laborare ut acquiras, to acquire it by Labor. And so the Greeks say likewise, ἐστα αἰτ φιλον, for necessaria or viæ labores quod lucrari, to earn necessaries or a livelihood by one's Labour, or as the French call it gagner sa vie, to get ones living: See only Constantin's Lexicon. So in the example brought out of Palæphatus, νεκανιον βουν significs he got his living by his Labour. In the example of the Pounds, Luk. xix. 16. the word προσκυνεται signifies rather peperit, genuit, it hath produced or brought forth, than comparavit it hath acquired.

Ver. 44. Εκεί με κατα της γυνας και ολόκληρα το τηρεμι, i.e. unless they have been already so affected with God's former benefits, as to be ready to follow God whithersoever he leads them, which will make them come to me as soon as ever they hear my Doctrine. I like what is said by Faustus Regiensi, Lib. i. c. 17. de Lib. Arbitrio. Quid est, says he, attrabere nisi prædicare, nisi Scripturam consolationibus excitate, incipationibus deterrere, desideranda proponere, intentare metuenda, judicium comminari, præmium polliceri? Audi Dominum non duris manibus, sed spei nexibus attrabentem, & dilectionis bracibus invitantem, scit ait Prophetus, attracti eos vinculis caritatis, Hos. xi. 4. What is it to draw, but to preach, but to encourage People by the consolations of the Scriptures, and deter them by its Reproofs, to propose to Men such things as they should desire, and menace them with what they ought to fear, to threaten them with Punishments, and promise them Rewards? Hearken therefore to God who draws not with rough hands, but with the ties of Hope, and invites with the arms of Love, according to that of the Prophet, I drew them with the bands of Love.

Ver. 55. Note f. For the understanding of what the word ἀλαίονος signifies, when it is thus metaphorically used, we must consider whence such forms of Speech had their rise; which in all probability was from the custom of Merchants who used to distinguish true merchandizes from false, i.e. those to which the name they went by was truly attributed, (the received Custom determining that) from those to which it cannot be given but falsely: thus true Amomum, for instance,
Chapter VII.

Annot. 194

stance, will be that Plant to which this name is properly attributed; and false Amomum another on which it is abusively imposed. And because any sort of Plant which is truly called by the name it bears, has a much greater Virtue in it than a Plant falsely denominated, therefore true Amomum was preferred before false. And for the same reason, when any two things are compared together, which are endued with a like quality, tho in a different degree; that which has the strongest and best, and which is of most use, is said to be true, and the other compared with it, false. So the Platonicks used to call the divine Patterns of all things, as they expressed themselves, true, when they compared them with the things upon Earth, which are only their Pictures, according to them. And whatever Virtue there is in things visible, it could be no otherwise compared they thought with the Celestial, than as counterfeit things with those that are sincere and genuine: and therefore they called these false, and the other true. And just thus Christ in this place is said to be the true Bread, and the true Meat, and elsewhere the true Light, viz. because whatever propriety there is in Bread or Meat to nourish the Body, or in Light to illuminate the Eyes, that and a much greater there is in Christ's Doctrin to nourish and enlighten the Mind. Bread nourishes the Body, but does not exempt it from Death, which corrupts and dissolves at length its frame; but the Doctrin of Christ, whilst it nourishes the Soul with Hope, and excites and cherishes in it the love of Virtue, does not only fill it with solid and substantial joy at present, but also rescues it from dying for ever. Light illuminates the Eye, and shews it visible Objects when it is rightly disposed in their proper forms; but it neither cures the dis-tempers of the Eyes, nor can hinder them from being closed at last by Death: but the Doctrin of Christ makes blind Souls to see clearly, and enlightens them for ever; so that in this sense it is most truly called both the true Meat and the true Light.

C H A P. VII.

Ver. 35. I. T is true indeed that there was a vast number of Jews at Alexandria, who used the Translation of the Septuagint, as appears by many passages in Philo Alexandr. See Lib. against Flaccus. But that the European Jews had their chief Assembly at Alexandria, I cannot tell how our Author could have proved, unless he thought Alexandria to be in Europe, which would have been a strange mistake. It's true, some of the old Geo-
graphers place it in Asia, and others in Africa; but none of them ever Chapter
said that it was in Europe, which is too absurd. II. He ought also to VIII.
have proved, that the Onkelos was at that time read in the Synagogues
of the Jews at Babylon; for it is not safe to rely upon the Authority
of the Rabbins, who are always for putting as great a face of Anti-
quity upon their Writings as they are able.

Verf. 3. Note i. It is strange that Dr. Hammond, after giving
sufficient proofs of this Story of the Adulteress being supposititious,
and saying nothing almost on the other side to confirm its being
thought genuin, should yet assent to Grotius who has not in the least
folv'd the matter. If the Church in the time of Papias, or in the
next Age after him, judged this Tradition of his to be true; how
comes it to pass that so many Fathers and so many Copies a great while
after those times omitted this Story? It is much more probable that
it was added at first only to a few Copies by some Transcribers or Cri-
ticks, who took it from the Tradition or Copy of the Nazarens, and
in time came to be inserted by that means into more; nor is there any
footstep any where to be found, of the judgment of the Antient
Church concerning this Story: So that I think we ought rather to
be of Beza's opinion, who suspects this Story; at least what he says
as to this matter, is worth considering.

CHAP. VIII.

Verf. 3. "

It is true indeed, that at this
time the power of inflicting capital Punishments was
taken away from the Jews by the Romans; but the
Jews had no occasion to enquire about this matter of Christ, who
might easily have answered them, that the Woman deserved indeed,
according to the Law of Moses, to be put to Death, but that the ex-
ecution of the Punishment depended upon the pleasure of the Roman
President. There was no room here for any scruple, and I do not
conceive how the Scribes or Pharisees could have taken any occasion
to accuse Christ if he had given them this ready answer, tho he de-
clined it by giving them that which follows.

Verf. 6. "Ο ητ' Ἰνδός κατ' ην λας, &c.] Thofe who are of opinion that
this Story is supposititious, might probably enough suspect that Papias or some other, borrowed this Circumstance here mentioned from
that which is related of Menedemus, as it is thus set down by Dioge-
tes Laertius, Lib. 2. § 127."
Chapter VIII. Causes: For tho the Citizens of Rome, whilst the Commonwealth stood, might appeal first to the People, and then to the Emperor in such Causes; and accordingly the Magistrates, whilst the Commonwealth stood, could not condemn any one, either without the consent of the People if they were appealed to, or without the Authority of the Emperor, if an Appeal was afterwards made to him; yet it will not follow that what the Doctor says is true. Whilst the Government of the Roman Empire was in the hands of more than one, the Roman Magistrates no where expected the Suffrage of their Provincials, to empower them to condemn or absolve; and much less did they do so, when the supreme Authority came to be lodged in the hands of the Emperors. Tho the Jews were permitted to live according to their own Laws, yet at that time they had no power to sentence any one to death, as appears from Chap. xviii. 31. when Pilate condemned Christ because of the importunity of the Jews, he did it to gratify them, when he might have refused to do it; and not as our Author thought, because he was obliged to do so, as I have elsewhere already observed. The Proconsuls, Pretors and Procurators, did always with unlimited Authority, by the advice of their Council, i.e. a few Roman Citizens, pass sentence upon their Provincials, without ever consulting or convening their Provincials, unless they had a particular mind to gratify them. This sufficiently appears by Cicero's Orations against Verres. But the Doctor objects that Pilate asked the Multitude; What then shall I do with Jesus, who is called Christ? as if he waited for their Suffrages. I answer, it is certain that the common People of the Jews condemned none, no not whilst their Commonwealth stood. This Office belonged to the Judges, and in such Causes as these, to those of the Great Sanhedrim; see Grotius on Mat. v. 22. And after Judas was made a Roman Province, the common people had not, I suppose, a greater Power allowed them, than they ever had by the Laws of their own Country. The reason therefore why Pilate asked the multitude this question, was not that he might hear their resolution or determination, without which he could not have proceeded to pass Sentence, either of Absolution or Condemnation; but because he thought they favoured Christ, and would have rescued him out of the hands of the chief Men among the Jews, who had accused him out of malice and envy, as St. Mark in setting down this story tells us. He could have released him indeed without their consent, if he had not feared a Sedition; but he thought it better to condemn the innocent than to run that hazard. This is apparent from the relation that all the Evangelists give us of this
this matter, according to which the people did not condemn Christ by any Authority they had so to do, but sedulously demanded of Pilate his life. Pilate did not in the least act in this case as a Tribune of the People, who upon the peoples determination pronounced sentence in the name of the Commons; but as the Roman Presidents used to act, who gave judgment according to the advice of their Counsel. I have been the larger upon this subject, left Dr. Hammond's Authority should deceive such as are not very well versed in the Roman Customs. Or else to skilful Persons, it had been sufficient just to admonish them of his mistake.

Ver. 48. Note d. I have observed in my Notes on Gen. xxxi. 20. that the name of Syria carries in it something, I know not what, reproachful; see there. Levit. xxv. 47. is a false quotation in our Author for Deut. xxvi. 5. for in this place indeed we may find the word Aramean used in a bad sense, but in the other there is no mention made of Aramaens. Many such faults there are in Dr. Hammond's Annotations, which are owing either to the carelessness of the Printers, or the Author's thoughts being otherwise employed, which is no strange thing, and I do not reproach him with it.

CHAP. IX.

Ver. 2. It was a long while before this time, that many of the Jews believed the preexistence of Souls, and that they were sent down into such or such Bodies according to their several deserts, as appears evidently by these words in the Book of Wisdom, Chap. viii. 19, 20. 

Ver. 22. Note b. Of this word avvovavou, Selden has treated at large, Lib. i. c. 7. de Synedris. And if we believe him, αὐταρχὴς here signifies any assembly of people whatever, publick as well as private, in which it was not lawful for any that were αὐτοκράτορ, put out of the Synagogue, familiarly to converse. But they were not excluded from the publick Prayers, or forbidden to be present at Sacrifices, as the same Author shews, who is well worth our reading, and to whom I refer the Reader, the all are not of his opinion.
Chapter X.

Ver. 35. It must be observed that the word Law includes sometimes the Book of Psalms, (see Chap. xii. 34.) as sometimes all the Old Testament is called the Law and the Prophets; tho ordinarily it is divided into three parts, whereof a third makes the διογένεια, under which the Book of Psalms is contained.

Chapter XI.

Ver. 4. ὅλον ἐμὲ καὶ ἀπέλθεν ἀπὸ μοί] i.e. shall not die of this Disease as others do, who continue under the power of Death till the general Resurrection. It is a form of speech peculiar to St. John: So in his 1 Epistles v. 16, 17. by ἔννομον με ἀπῆλθεν ἀπὸ μοί he means, a sin that is not of such a nature, as to make it probable that the Sinner will continue spiritually dead as long as he lives: See the Notes upon that place.

Ver. 22. ἀλλὰ ἠγόνω ὅλον] These words have no agreement with Christ’s answer, unless something be understood which is not expressed, and which Christ perceived to be in Martha’s mind. Our Author should have solv’d this difficulty in his Paraphrase; which because he has not done, I shall endeavour to do myself. “Ver. 21. And when she was come to him and had saluted him, she told him that she should have been very glad if he had come some days before to Bethany, because he would then have healed her Brother, who had been dead now four days, and so he would have been still alive.

22. But now he was dead, there was no hope of recovering him; for tho’ she very well knew that God would grant Jesus whatsoever he asked of him, yet she hardly believed that he would raise up a dead man at his request. 23. To which Christ replied, that Lazarus should be raised up again. 24. But Martha saying, that she did not doubt indeed but he should at the universal Resurrection; 25. Jesus told her more plainly, that God had endued him with a Power to bring the dead to life again, especially those that had believed on him. I have here expressed the whole connexion of the discourse, that the sense might be the more evident. But the 22d verse might also be thus expressed: “That she knew indeed that all that the Lord Jesus asked of his Father would be granted him. She did not dare to add, that she did not believe he would presume to ask his Father “to
St. JOHN.

23. But this being in her thoughts, Christ answered, &c. Christ answered therefore to something not expressed; and it is easy to understand the reason of the insertion, viz. that Martha broke off her discourse for fear of offending her Lord. Unless this Interpretation be admitted, the 22d verse must be placed after the 27th, and then there will be no difficulty in the series of the discourse: But this would be contrary to the Authority of all the Copies.

Ver. 39. [Heb. 9.] Our Author represents Martha in his Paraphrase speaking too learnedly, according to the opinion of some Physicians, for she never thought perhaps of the time of the revolution of the Humors. And indeed as the thing itself is false, so it is nothing at all to the purpose. The revolution of the Blood is completed in a shorter time, and the climate or season of the year is the chief thing to be considered, when the discourse is concerning the putrefaction of a dead body; but this is not very material.

Ver. 48. Note b. Our learned Author had done well to produce the Testimony of some antient Writer, that related what he said here concerning Armillus; for the later Rabbins fancy a great many things for which they have no Tradition. We read indeed in a Chaldee Paraphrase which is said to be Jonasbans, on Isa. ii. 4. that a wicked Armillus should be slain by the Messias. But who shall certify us of the time when this Jonathan lived? For it is childish to give credit to the boasting pretences of the Jews. I am apt to think that by this word these men meant the Romans, whose Empire, after the destruction of Jerusalem by them, they had a very great spite against, and therefore gave out that it should be overthrown by the Messias. Afterwards they invented some other stories about this Armillus; of which see Buxtorf's Lexic. Talmudicum.

CHAP. XII.

Ver. 28. [Δεικτής τε η λέγεται.] One of the Copies of R. Stephanus has μια instead of σι, because the Transcriber thought that this agreed better with Christ's discourse. And the Author of the Coptic Translation seems to have read ύμν σο. But there is no need of these Alterations, for God the Father glorifies his Name, when he openly acknowledges his Son whom he sent to men in his Name; see Psal. cxvi. 1. and afterwards Chap. xiii. 31, 32. of this Gospel.
Chapter XIII.

Verf. 26. 

The Doctor's conjecture is confirmed by Hesychius and Phavorinus, who interpret ἄνθρωπα by ἀνθρώματα. And so I find Adam expounded by διονυσίῳ to draw, in the Lexicons, out of the Scholia of Nicander.

Verf. 27. ὁ μους πόνον.] See my Notes on Exod. iv. 13.

Chapter XIV.

Chapter Verf. 14. 

EN τῷ ὀρθῶν μω.] This phrase deserves in the Paraphrase at least to be expressed in other words, for a great many use it every day that do not understand it. And therefore I shall here briefly explain it. The Jews used to ask God, particularly in their solemn Prayers, in the name of their Forefathers, and especially the Patriarchs and Prophets; i.e. to pray to God that he would grant their requests, because they were their Posterity, and called by their Name, or Abraham, Isaac and Jacob's Posterity: This was to call upon God in the name of the Patriarchs. But Christ would have his Disciples to pray to God in his Name, i.e. to desire what they would have granted to them, because they were called, and were the Disciples of Christ. So the gathered together in the Name of Christ, are Christian Assemblies in opposition to an Assembly of Jews; see Mat. xviii. 20. And so afterwards, verf. 26. of this Chapter, the Holy Ghost is said to be sent in the Name of Christ, i.e. as that Spirit which was to be called the Spirit of Christ, and to be conferred only on Christ's Disciples. A great many Passages may receive light from this Interpretation.

Verf. 26. Note b. What our Author observes about the signification of the Greek words, is very true; but that Christ used the word άνθρωπος as the Talmudists did the ברק 변, or ἄνθρωμα phraktita, I very much doubt. Perhaps he used ἄνθρωπος μικρώματι, which in Syriack signifies only a Comforter; and if that were out of doubt, the Greek were to have no other signification put upon it. It is certain that there is no Hebrew word of the same latitude with the Greek άνθρωπος.

CHAPTER
Ver. 7. Note a. There is not the least footprint of any mention made of the Devil in this matter by Moses. Our learned Author lent the Prophet, before he was aware, his own conjecture.

CHAP. XVII.

Ver. 1. Grotius conjectures that this Prayer was conceived in the view of the Temple, when Christ went into the Garden of Gethsemane. But if we carefully read Chap. xiii. 21, it will seem rather to have been pronounced in the same Room in which the Passover was celebrated after Judas’s departure; and that Christ did not go with his Disciples into the Garden till he had said this Prayer, because Chap. xviii. begins thus; When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his Disciples over the Brook Cedron.

Ver. 3. These words must be rendred thus; That they may know thee who art the only true God, and Jesus who is the Christ that thou hast sent: For the article must be repeated before the word Christ. ’Tis as if the sense were expressed by the Infinitive Mood thus; That they may know thee to be the only true God, and Jesus to be the Messias whom thou hast sent, as if it had been said in Greek, ὑμῖν ἔστιν ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεός, ὑμῖν ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. Christ here says, that this is eternal Life, not because the whole Christian Faith in its greatest extent, is comprehended under these two Heads considered in themselves; but because these two things are, as it were, the foundations of all the rest, to believe him who is the Father of Jesus Christ, to be the only true God, and Jesus to be the Messias whom he purposed to send. Without these Christianity cannot stand; because all the rest of the Truths asserted in it are built upon these; and these being admitted as true, every one must admit the rest, and regulate his Life according to them, unless he be mad, and resolve to be inconsistent with himself, as every body easily perceives: See ver. 7, 8, 25.

Ver. 6. Tho the word χώρα signifies all Men in this Gospel, yet in this Chapter it seems to respect principally the Jews, as that word is also used elsewhere by St. John, as I have observed in a Note on Chap. iv. 42. That Christ chose Disciples out of all Mankind,
Chapter is too general a Phrase to signify his choosing some Jews. Thus vers.
XVII. 14. ὁ κόσμος ἵμαινος αὐτῶς ἐν ἐκείνῳ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, the World hateth them be-
cause they are not of the World: by the word κόσμος there is meant the
wicked Jews, who hated the Apostles because they were no longer of
their number; and not the Heathens to whom they were perfectly un-
known.

Vers. 12. 'Εν τῷ ὄνομαί σοι i.e. by a Power derived from thee, being
present with them, and acting as an Embassador in thy Name, and
taking upon me that Character. There seems here to be understood,
νῦν ὁ τάγμαν αὐτῶς, ἐμὺ ἀποντος, διὰ του πνεύματος σου, but do thou keep them
in my absence, by thy Spirit. For there is nothing set to answer the
words, while I was with them in the World I kept them in thy Name, in
what comes after, which yet the context requires: And therefore
what Christ did not express in words, he made up in his thoughts,
as the Apostles easily understood, for whose sake this Prayer was
made. And accordingly after Christ's Ascension the Holy Ghost came
down to supply his place, as Christ had promised, Chap. xvi. 7, 13.

Vers. 15. Ἰνα δεῖνα αὐτῶς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ i.e. I do not pray thee to take
them away from this wicked Generation of Men, and particularly of
Jews, and within a few days translate them along with me into the
regions of Happiness; but that thou wouldst preserve them from be-
ing corrupted by those evil Customs and Opinions with which Mankind
is so universally infected. By the World here, we are to understand
wicked Men whom the Apostles could not avoid conversing with.

Ibid. Ἀμαίνων αὐτῶς ἐν τῷ ἁλληλείᾳ σοι i.e. Cause them to be so affected
with that true Doctrin that I have taught them, as to express it in
their Lives. And indeed whoever understands Christ's Doctrin, and
thinks it to be true, if he suffers that thought to sink deep into his
Mind, will at length be sanctified by the Truth. The Doctor did not un-
derstand these words, as appears by his Paraphrase. There is an
expression much to the same purpose in Chap. viii. 31, 32. Then said Je-
sus to those Jews which believed on him; If ye continue in my word, then are
ye my Disciples indeed, and ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall
make you free. It is all one as to the sense, whether we say to be made
free by the Truth, or to be sanctified by it.

Vers. 19. Ἰνα ἐξαιτίαν σε ἔκλεισαι καὶ ἐλθεῖν σοι i.e. I offer up my self
a Sacrifice to thee, to obtain for them the pardon of their Sins, and
also the Spirit of Sanctification, that they may be so affected with
the Truth they are to preach, as to regulate their actions according
to it, as I have done. Christ puts up this Petition principally for his
Apostles, because it was impossible they should preach the Gospel with
any
any success, if they did not live according to its Precepts. There Chapte
could not have been a greater prejudice to the success of the Gospel, XVII:
than the ill Life of those that preached it: and next to the Apostles
were all other Christians, upon whose behaviour the success of the
Gospel did also depend, and for whom Christ therefore prays. This
is the design of the following words, and therein lies that agreement
both in Doctrin and sanctity of Life, whereby the Apostles would
become one among themselves, and one with Christ, as Christ himself
had been one with God. These things are not sufficiently expressed
in our Author's Paraphrase.

Verf. 22. Τίν δέ έκαν ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ μου διαγόνα αὐτών. ] This is rightly inter-
preted by the Doctor of the Power of working Miracles, consequent
upon which is their obtaining the highest Credit and Authority with
those who saw the Miracles which were done by them. So likewise
in Numb. xxvii. 20. the Hebrew יבב hod, which the Septuagint render
δέκαρ, signifies that Authority which Moses at his Death conferred up-
on his Successor John. Thou shalt transfer, saith God there, [some]
of thine Authority to him, that all the Congregation of the Israelites may be
obedient to him. άνως τοι δέκαρ σου ἐν αὐτών, as it is in the Septuagint.

Verf. 24. Πες κατασκήνως κόσμω ] The Doctor renders this in his Para-
phrase, before all eternity, which is an unsufferably improper Phrase,
elsewhere made use of by him, as I have already observed. This is
what I had to observe upon this Chapter, on which our Author has
made no Annotations. But for a more full explication of it, I refer
the Reader to H. Grotius, whom the Doctor follows in his Paraphrase,
defining this may stand only as a Supplement to what Grotius has said.

C H A P. XVIII.

Verf. 10. Ο Ναοὺς τῆς Νείλης Μαλχος. There are some who tell us that
this name must not be derived from the Verb לֵל to reign; and their reason is, because a Servant would
never have had such a Name given him, as imported authority in it: But notwithstanding that reason, this was a very usual name, and
common to Noble Persons with Ignoble. Thus Porphyrie, who being
a Tyrian had a Phanician name, was called Malchus. His own words
in the Life of Plotinus, where he speaks of a Book that was dedicated
to him by Amelius, are these: ανωσοφίας δέ αυτί βασιλεία εμοί. Βασιλείας δὲ
tόνωσα τῆς Πυρρηνίων έμοί σαρών, και τό πάτερον ἀδελεκτον Μαλχω καιλαμένων ἐστι
γενος και το ιεάναι όνομα πάλιντο το η Μαλχω εφύμεναν ἔνετο διαλεόν, εἶτε εἰς
έλεοιδε διάλεκτον μεταβάλλειν έκεῖπ. he dedicated that Book to me under the
Chapter XIX. ANNOTATIONS on

Chapter title of a King; and I Porphyrius had this name of King, because I was called Malchus in my own Country Dialect, which was also the name of my Father; for Malchus, if it be turned into Greek, signifies King. There was also one Malchus a Hermit, whose Life is written by St. Jerome; There was, says he, there a certain old Man named Malchus, whom we in Latin may call Regem a King, by Birth and Language a Syrian. Whence it appears that this was a very common name in Syria, as Luc. Holfvenius has also shewn by many examples, in the life of Porphyrius, Chap. ii.

Ver. 31. Note c. See the words of the Rabbins themselves, concerning the power of Judicature in Capital causes being taken away from the Jews, as they are set down by Dr. Lightfoot on this place. It is no good custom to mention Authors names and words, without citing the very place, as the Criticks of the last Age generally do. Of the manner of hanging, consult the Talmudical Book de Synedrio, Cap. 6. § 4.

CHAP. XIX.

Ver. 14. WHAT our Author has here is borrowed from Grotius, who says the same in his Notes on Mat. xxvii. 45. and confirms it by Testimonies. But there are several things to be observed in relation to what Grotius there says, which I shall briefly set down. 1. He produces a passage out of Ignatius, as in his Epistle to the Inhabitants of Smyrna, which is not in that Epistle, but in his Epistle to the Trallians. 2. He makes use of an Interpolator instead of the true Ignatius, but in this he ought not to be excused, because Ignatius's true Epistles were not then published by themselves. 3. But it is strange that he should allege that Passage as agreeable to the reading of our Copies, both in St. Mark and St. John, when if we believe that Interpolator, we ought in St. John to read the third and not the sixth Hour; and in St. Mark, the sixth, not the third, just contrary to the reading of the Copies: For his words in Chap. 9. Ep. ad Trall, are these: τι ες ἀγαπην, τειτ. ὧς ἐνθαγὼν ἐς ἕκατον ἐς τι πιλάτος, συνάγοντος τον Πατερος εκτις ἐκαμεν, καταθέντος: on Friday therefore, at the third hour he received sentence of Death from Pilate, the Father so permitting it; at the sixth-hour he was crucified; at the ninth he expired. But St. Mark says, ἦς τετί ὧς ἐς ἔκαμον ἀντίν, it was the third Hour, and they crucified him. And according to St. John, he did not receive the Sentence of Death, but ἔκαμον ἀντίν, about the sixth Hour. 4. The Clementine Constitutions, which Grotius also quotes,
say the same, Lib. 5. c. 14. and Lib. 8. c. 34. and almost in the same Chapter words; whereby the Author of them appears to have thought that the Hours of Christ's Condemnation ought to be so distributed as to make that in which he received the Sentence of Death to have been the third (and not as it is in our Copies of St. John, the sixth) and that of his Crucifixion the sixth, and not (as we read it now in St. Mark) the third. 5. And yet that Great Man infers from the Authority of Ignatius and the Clementine Constitutions, that we ought not to admit any alteration, contrary to the Authority of the most antient Copies, and of the Metaphrasts. But not to say again, that the contrary ought to have been inferred, I would fain know what Metaphrasts he means? Namely it is certain, who generally goes only by that name, expresses himself in his Metaphrasis of St. John, so as that he seems to have read in him rectly and not ine, for he says thus:

The third mortal Hour was lengthened out; i.e. was not yet past. And it is plain that if the Hours be thus disposed, and the Evangelists supposed to have written so, there will be no difficulty; and it is highly probable that there was a considerable interval of time between Pilate's pronouncing the Sentence and Christ's Crucifixion. For there was a Cross to be provided, which perhaps was not yet got ready; and it would take up some time to go to the place of Execution, because Christ was not well able to carry his Cross, and then there must be some time also allowed for their crucifying him.

It can hardly be doubted but that it was so, and therefore if Christ was not condemned, properly speaking, till a little before the sixth Hour, as the Doctor supposes, it will be difficult to understand how he was crucified in the second quarter of the day. And yet I hardly think that the Copies of both the Evangelists are corrupted. It would not indeed be incredible that St. Mark was corrected out of St. John, or St. John out of St. Mark; and there are frequent instances of such corrections as those; but that this seeming contrariety between them is owing to the corrections of some Criticks is not credible: and therefore I am apt to think that the ordinary reading is true, but we must take another Method to solve the difficulty.

St. Mark who wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem, seems to have reckoned the Hours after the manner of the Jews: and the Jews dated their first Hour from the rising of the Sun, and so by the third Hour we must understand the third from that time, viz. the Sun's rising;
Chapter rising; and accordingly if we suppose that the Sun (pursuant to our way of computation from Midnight) rose about six a Clock, that which is St. Mark's third Hour will be our ninth. And the relation which the Evangelists give us of this matter, makes it reasonable to think that Christ was not crucified sooner. For early in the Morning he was sent by the Sanhedrim, and accused before Pilate, Mat. xxvii. 1, 2. Mark xv. 1. John xviii. 28. Then Pilate questioned him, and sent him to Herod, and tried to rescue him out of the hands of the Jews, by ordering him only to be scourged, and suffering him to be mocked; and at last being no longer able to resist the Jews importunity, he condemned him. And about the third hour from the rising of the Sun we will suppose that he was fastened to the Cross; and after he had hanged there three hours, at the sixth from the Sun's rising, but the twelfth from Midnight, began that darkness mentioned in Mat. xxvii. 45. which rested till the ninth (i.e. our three in the Afternoon) upon Judæa. And then a little after the ninth Christ expired.

But how then is it said by St. John, that Christ was condemned about the sixth Hour? viz. according to the custom of the old Romans who used to reckon the beginning of their civil or artificial day from Midnight: of which see A. Gellius Noct. Attic. Lib. 3. c. 2. & Censorinus de die Natali, c. xxiii. I grant the same way of computation obtained afterwards among the Romans as among the Jews; but nevertheless the old Custom might also continue in some parts of the Empire: and therefore Plutarch in his Quæst. Rom. 83. makes it a matter of enquiry as a thing then in use, διὸ τὸν τῆς ἡμέρας ἀρχῆν ἐν μισς νύσσας καὶ ὁμοοργίαν; why they counted the beginning of the day from Midnight? And this Custom was probably followed by St. John, who wrote a great while after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Ver. 23. [ἡ δὲ τέμνει ἀπαθῶς] If we believe the conjecture of Olf. Ferrarius de Re Vest. Lib. 3. c. 16. this Coat was like our silk or worsted Stockings, which are knit with long Needles: or at least if that art was not then found out, it was, as he thinks, made only with hands without any Needle, and of the nature of small Nets, or a particular sort of Hoods which Women sometimes wear. And upon this account, he supposes, it is said to be ἐνωθεὶ ὑπατίς, i.e. wrought upwards, and ὕπατι, i.e. orbicularly, and all together, without having any Seam made in it. After this manner were made the straight Garments which Fathers, as Festus tells us, caused to be woven for their Children, as an omen of their being lucky; so called, because they were wrought from the bottom upwards, and by Persons standing: which Custom also prevailed amongst the Inhabitants of Palestine, as has been shewn by learned
learned Men out of Theophylact. But Euthymius tells us, that this Coat was wrought from the upper parts, just, faith be, as amongst us the Winter-coverings for the Head or Feet; and he is in the right, for the Phrase en τῶν ἑαυτῶν cannot signify towards the top upwards, as Ferrarius would have it, but from the top downwards, so as Stockings use to be knit.

However, those are mistaken who are of opinion that the Workmanship of this Coat was extraordinary rare and curious, which does not at all suite with the humility and poverty of Christ. Let us rather hear what Isidorus Pelusiotus says, Lib. I. Ep. 74. Τοι δὲνεῖ τιτις ἀπελευθερώθη, ἢ τοις οἰκείοις, ἢ τοις οὐκείοις τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ η μᾶλλον τὸ τοιῶν ἑαυτῶν ἐκδοτικόν εἰταί, ἢ τοις ἀνθρώποις, ἢν ἐκπροσευχῆς; But who does not know the meanness of that Garment which the poor of the Galilæans wore, amongst whom chiefly this sort of Garment used to be made, like Stomachers pressed or wove?

Ver. 35. Note e. lin. 29.] Bartholinus in Diff. de latere Christi aperto has treated more exactly of this whole matter, who may be consulted.

C H A P. XX.

Ver. 23. Suppose the same thing to be conferred upon the Apostles in this place, as in Matth. xvi and xviii. Our Author justly rejects the interpretation of Mr. Selden. But perhaps some may doubt whether it be just the same thing which is promised in both these passages, they being delivered upon different occasions, and no proof being given that the promise made in them is the same. And besides, the sense of the phrases to remit and retain Sins, is sometimes quite different from that which can belong to them in the business of the excommunication of an Offender, or the admission of a Penitent. The phrase to remit sin in the New Testament, signifies sometimes to deliver a person from the punishment inflicted upon him by God for his sins; and if we admit that sense here, to retain Sins will be to inflict or continue the infliction of such punishment. Thus Matth. ix. 2. Thy sins are remitted to thee, is all one as, I deliver thee from thy Palsy, which has been sent upon thee as a punishment for thy sins, as the following words manifestly shew, and Dr. Hammond acknowledges; and so if we apply the phrase in this sense to this place, that which Christ here bestows upon his Apostles, will be a power of delivering up to Satan, as St. Paul speaks, i.e. of inflicting diseases upon the impenitent, and
Chapter and curing them upon their repentance. Which Power depending upon the gift of doing Miracles, can have no place where that gift is not conferred, as learned men have observed on 1 Cor. v.

Thus also to bind, signifies sometimes to inflict diseases, and to loose, to cure them. So Luke xiii. 12. Christ speaking to the Woman that had been diseased eighteen years, says: ἡ ἄνωτέρα, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. And, ver. 16. Ought not this Daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound ἄνω, behold these eighteen years, be loosed from that bond ἀνακάθισσαν εἰς τὰς ἔρευνας τέρατον. So that granting our Author that the same thing, as it seems to be, is intended in Mat. xviii. and here; yet it does not follow, that Christ speaks of mere excommunication; without any disease consequent upon it. Let the Learned consider and judge of this matter.

Ver. 27. Kai ἰδε τις κηρσίς μου.] After Christ had said, Reach neither thy finger, it was consequent that he should say, Kai ἰδαρσίον τις κηρσίς μου, and feel my hands, or something like that, for we do not reach out our finger to see a thing, but to feel or touch it. And therefore there is an impropriety of speech here, ordinary in every one's discourse, whereby we apply a word that belongs properly to one sense, to another. And particularly, nothing is more common than to find this Verb to see, used for that which is to try or examin by some other sense. See Exod. xx. 18. and more Examples which have been collected by Sak. Glassius Rhet. Sacr. Traet. 1. Cap. 12. where he treats of the Metaphors that are taken from human senses. However, Christ seems to have kept the marks of the Nails and Spear unclosed, that that might be a certain sign to know him by; otherwise he needed not to have left the least sign of them in his body.

Ibid. Eis τιν πλακίσσαν μου.] He does not add εἰς τις ποδας μου, because his feet had not been pierced through with nails, but only bound, contrary to what our Painters and Statuaries now adays generally think. And therefore Dr. Hammond also well observes, that the Legs of the Thieves were broken, that they might not be able to run away; which the Roman Procurator would never have been apprehensive of, if both their feet had been fastened to the Cross by a huge nail driven through the soles of them.

Ver. 28. 'O κηρσίς μου, καθε Μνᾶς μου.] Tho the Nominative case is often put for the Vocative. I chuse rather with the Vulgar to use here the Nominative, as if the words ὅτι were to be understood, thou art my Lord and my God, i.e. I acknowledge thee to be truly that same Lord whom I before followed; and not a Man only, but to be also God, in as much as thou hast overcome death, which keeps all men under its power:
power: which sense exactly agrees with Christ's words; be not incredulous, but believing.

Vers. 29. Πεπιστευσας.] Faith is properly of those things which are not seen, because what we see, we are said to know, not to believe: see Heb. xi. 1. But yet sometimes any persuasion whatsoever is called Faith, even that which is built upon the testimony of the Seneces. Thus the Latin credere is taken in that Verse of Plautus, Asinar. Act. 1. Sc. 3. Semper oculatae manus sunt nostrae, credunt quod vident.

Ibid. Καὶ πρεσβύτερος.] This seems to refer to the time future: Blessed are those who tho they will not see, yet shall believe. And this is Faith properly called, whereby we assent to a thing upon solid reasons, which we never saw, notwithstanding the seeming strangeness of it. Consult Interpreters on Heb. xi. 1. and what I have said concerning Faith, on Gen. xv. 6.

C H A P. XXI.

Vers. 1. Παλαιος] i.e. in Galilee, or at the Lake of Gennesareth, as Grotius has observed; for at Jerusalem he had appeared to his Disciples before, more than once. This ought to have been expressed in the Paraphrase.

Vers. 5. Προσπάθεια] does not seem to signify in this place ὑπάρχον, but that which being sold might help to buy any sort of ὑπάρχον: for by what follows it appears that the Apostles had ὑπάρχον already by them on the shore; and the end of their fishing was not so much to get fish for themselves to eat, as to sell that they might provide themselves with other necessaries. As long as they followed Christ, they subsisted by the same liberality of pious Women that he himself did; but at this time the Apostles not being yet in any repute, there seems to have been a stop put to that liberality. And therefore they had been forced to betake themselves to their old trade of fishing again to get their living.

Vers. 9. ὁμιλευτος.] The Dolfor in concurrence with Grotius and others supposes that these Fish were produced out of nothing, which yet is unnecessary, considering that the Lake was very full of Fish, and that there was no body to see how they came upon the Coals; not to say that St. John gives no ground for such a supposition.

Ibid. ἔποιεσα.] Since the words knowing that it was the Lord follow, the Verb ἔποιεσα here cannot so properly signify darded, as thought fit or advisable; no body judged it convenient to ask him who he was, perceiving it to be the Lord, tho they did not presently know his face,
which had a greater majesty in it than before. But yet St. John chose rather to say ὡς ἤτοι ἡγεῖται ἐν αὐτῷ, than ὡς ἤτοι ἀνεὑρείς ὑπ' ὁμοίως ἔγερται αὐτῷ, because the Disciples abstained from asking that question, not only because of the Tokens by which they knew him to be the Lord, but also out of fear, lest he should be displeased with them as incredulous. They knew indeed that it was the Lord, but their knowledge of it was not so certain as to make it perfectly needless to ask him; but yet they dared not do it.

Ver. 14. Τέλος. I have already intimated that our Author in his Paraphrase does not clearly enough interpret this word. As therefore I have before interpreted the word παλιν in vers. 1. with Grotius, of a Place, viz. Galilee; so in like manner I think that this τελον ought to be understood of a place. And indeed it can hardly be understood of the third day after the Resurrection, it being certain that on the day of the Resurrection itself, the Disciples tarried at Jerusalem, and incredible that the Apostles could be a fishing so soon as the third day after it; for it is at least two days journey from Jerusalem to the Lake of Gennesaret, especially on foot. But besides, this was not the sixth, but the seventh or eighth time, if we reckon right, that Christ appeared to his Disciples: Consult Steph. Curcellaus Instit. Rel. Christ. Lib. 5. c. 14. about this matter.

Ver. 15. Note b. I am apt to think that the immediate occasion of Christ's question (for that there might be some remoter reasons of it I do not deny) was St. Peter's over-hastily descent into the Sea, not being able to stay till the Ship came to Land. For as soon as ever he had notice given him by St. John that Jesus stood on the shore, he presently leaped into the water, impatient of delay; that he might, as soon as possible, come to the Lord, whilst the rest tarried in the Ship, till they could step out of it upon Land. This occasion St. Peter gave Christ to ask him whether he loved him more than the rest of his Disciples, because he came sooner to him than they.

Ver. 18. "Οὐραγείς." Grotius here has this gloss: When thou hast lived almost forty years to those which thou hast already. But out of what Chronology did he learn, that from the year of Christ's death to the last of Nero, beyond which the death of St. Peter cannot be deferred, there was the space of forty years? From the year of Christ 33, in which he ascended into Heaven, to the 68th in which Nero died, there were only 35 years. And supposing St. Peter to have died Anno Christi 65, as the most exact Chronologers think, there will be fewer. I wonder that Dr. Hammond too should follow Grotius here, without any examination.
Ver. 22. Note c. This coming of Christ is very well interpreted by Chapter Dr. Hammond, who deserves to have almost all the glory of it. For XXI. few other Interpreters besides him ever discerned the true meaning of it, and no body has ever so clearly explained it, or so copiously demonstrated it. This opinion of his is confirmed by the Church of Ephesus, which in ver. 24. declares the truth of St. John’s Testimony, both as to this and all other things. If the Christians of that Age had believed the words τις λέγωμεν to signify till I come to judge the living and the dead, as the Apostles had thought, they must have judged the testimony of St. John not be true; because he was dead, and yet that last day was not come. Since therefore they thought St. John a faithful Witness, both of Christ’s Doctrin and Resurrection, and knew that he was dead, they must have understood this coming of Christ in another sense. And nothing happened in all that interval of time which could be called Christ’s coming, but that remarkable Vengeance which he took upon the Jews.

Ver. 24. Note d. How could the Ephesians say οὗτοι ονομάζονται. We know that his testimony is true? namely, not only by those evidences of veracity and prudence which they observed in St. John himself, but chiefly by his Doctrin and Miracles, the former being a holy Doctrin, and the latter God’s Seal to the truth of it.
Annotations

On the


At the end of the Premon. It is much more probable that St. Peter died in the Reign of Nero, and that in the year of Christ 65, as A. Pagus has shewn in Baron Epicr. ad Ann. 67.

CHAP. I.

Vers. 13. I have several Remarks to make on this Interpretation of Dr. Hammond.

I. That he recurred to this singular Interpretation, because he thought that these two Passages of St. Luke could hardly otherwise be reconciled. In the last Verse of his Gospel he has not said that the Apostles were always in the Temple, διδ ποιεσ εν της ἡρα. And here he speaks, και τι τη ταεται πωσεν καταπανοτες, of an upper room where they abode, and pray'd to God. But the Doctor himself acknowledges that the Apostles were not in the Temple the whole day, but only at the stated times of publick Prayer: At other times therefore they were at their own Houses, in which I do not see why there could not be ἦδοτα, into which they might retire in order to pray, or to spend their time with their Master, or in pious Discourses about him. And therefore this place may be very well understood thus; where they abode when they were not in the Temple, or hinder'd by other Affairs; where they were for the most part when they kept at home.

II. It is indeed very true, that there were several Chambers or Rooms in the Temple, which might be called so many ἄνεοντα, and the Doctor might have taken less pains in proving it; but he should have given us some Examples, to assure us that the common People, and especially Strangers, did not only pray in the Court of Jsael, but went up also into the Chambers that lay over the Porches, in order to pray with the more secrecy. For it is not at all probable that the Apostles who
who were poor men, and Galileans, and odious for their Master’s sake to the Jews, dared to do any thing which others could not in the Temple, in which they might have been taken notice of by the Priests and Levites. Our Author therefore ought to have shewn that it was the custom of pious Men to retire sometimes into the more secret Chambers of the Temple for their private Devotion, which I cannot tell whether any body can prove; at least I never met with any footstep of that custom.

III. He perfectly forces the words in Chap. ii.46. as I shall afterwards shew.

IV. Epiphanius doth not affirm that the ἄγερφων here spoken of was where the Temple had been, but in Mount Sion, upon which, as all know, was built the Palace or City of David, and not the Temple, which lay more towards the East and South, and stood upon another Hill, supposed to be Mount Moriah, and commonly called the Mountain of the House. He that does not know this, let him consult Dr. Lightfoot in Cent. Chorograph. premised before St. Matthew, Cap. xxii, xxiii, and xxvii, where, by Passages taken out of Josephus and the Rabbins, he puts this matter out of all doubt. It must be acknowledged however that Epiphanius by the inaccurate order of his words gave the Doctor an occasion to mistake: For he speaks thus; ἔφη τὴν πόλιν παρὰ ἑαυτοῦ εἰς θεόν. ἂς το θεόν τῇ θεόν καταπτυστήν, παρεκτός ὁ λόγον ἀνοίκησα: He found the whole City demolished, and the Temple of God trampled upon, except a few Houses. The three last words the Doctor makes to refer to the Temple, when they ought to be referred to the City. It follows; ἐξ τῆς ἡσυχίας μικρής ὢς, ἑνθα ἥσσος ἐστὶν, ὁ μαθητὴς ὅτι ὁ Σωτήρ ἀνέλαβε ἐκ τῆς Ἑλασθείας, ἀνέστη τις τὸ έξερήσας. ὁμοιὸ ἀνεφελμένος: and the Church of God which was little, in the place to which the Disciples returning, when our Saviour was caught up from Mount Olivet, went up into the upper room, for there it was built. This Church was not on the ground where the Temple stood, but in Mount Sion, as Epiphanius tells us in the next words: τοιάσως ἐν τῷ μέσῳ Σιὼν, ὅπερ ἦν τῷ θερμοκότῳ παρελθόντι, ἐν ζωής οὖσας ἢς αὐτὸν τῆς Σιών, ἐς τῇ Συναγωγῇ, ἄν εν τῇ Σιών μόνας ἑγέμονι: that is, in a part of Sion which was left undestroy’d, and some parts of the Houses that were about the same Sion, and seven Synagogues which stood alone in Sion.

Ver. 15. Note e. It is true indeed, that the Name of God in Scripture is often put for God himself, and that the Rabbins call God שֵׁם the Name with an Emphasis: But we never find it set to signify Men or Persons in the Old Testament. I am apt to think that it is rather a Latinism than a Hebraism: For in Latin Authors nothing is more common.

The ACTS.
Chapter common than for the word Names to be put for Men or Persons.

So Ovid. Amor. Lib. 2. El. 1.

---

Heroum clara valete

Nomina

So Statius lib. 6. Thebaidos.

— Quisnam iste duo, fidissima Phœbo
Nomina, commissis Deum in discrimina Reges?

So Valerius Flaccus, lib. 4.

Nomen ait prædulce mibi, nomenque sequutus
Otreos;

That is, Otreus. See vers. 225. of the same Book, and Lib. 5. vers. 61. and 120.

Verf. 18. Note g.] See my Note on the parallel place in St. Matthew, and what I have said there in opposition to Dr. Hammond's Opinion.

Verf. 25. Note k.] If our Author's Interpretation were true, the Conjunctio η should have preceded the Verb μετέχουσα. It will be very modestly said concerning Judas by the Apostles, that he went into his proper place, if by ητοι be meant that State, whatsoever it was, which he passed into after his Death. Such another Phrase Plato makes use of in Phædon; Ψυχή δε παθασάς κυ μετέχουσα τινὸς διεξαλλήλου—σφυς δ' αυτὴ ἱερὰ τὸν φοράντα: the Soul which has lived purely and soberly, dwells in a place suitable to itself.

C H A P. II.

Verf. 17. After the Cit. out of Deut. xxxi. 29.] I have shewn in my Notes on Deuteronomy, that these words signify only in general, after days. If they signify the days of the Messiah, the reason of that is because those days were after-days, or days then to come. Sometimes the Phrase έτάδις ιδέως signifies the last days, not of the Messiah, but of those Writers that made use of it, i. e. the days just past, or that were near at hand. This may easily be applied to the places that Dr. Hammond alludes.

Verf. 46. Κατ' οἴκον.] This is well translated by the Vulgar, circa domos, i. e. not in any one House, but sometimes in one and sometimes
times in another, for fear of being surprized by the Jews. I do not Chapter deny but that the word παλαιας may be set to signify a Chamber or Room in the Temple; but the Phrase κεχαριτωμεν can no more signify in one of the Rooms of the Temple, than κελαιαν in Jerusalem, Chap. xv. 21. & xx.23. Tit. i. 5. Who will ever believe that a vast multitude of Christians did every day eat in the Chambers of the Temple? No body besides Dr. Hammond.

Ibid. It is true indeed that the word πασχει signifies often a Benefit, as also the Latin gratia; but the Phrase παλαιας κεχαριτωμεν signifies only to be in favor with him, and not to give any thing to him. The case is plain. We must not enquire what words signify by themselves, but in conjunction with one another. Our Author’s arguing here is absurd.

C H A P. III.

Ver. 19. After the words utter ruin.] Our learned Author’s Memory here failed him. See my Notes on Gen. v. 29. Note 2. line 15.

Ver. 21. Note b.] This Interpretation which the Doctor here gives us of the words ὁ Ἡρῴδης ἐξαναστήσεται, is not, as he pretends, most agreeable to the Context, but a very harsh one; for it is manifest that what is here said concerning Christ, viz. that the Heaven must receive him, is opposed to the foregoing words, And he shall send Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you. St. Peter first exhorts the Jews to repent of their Sins, that they might obtain Mercy and Forgivenes when Christ should come from Heaven, and then he adds, ὁ Ἡρῴδης ἐξαναστήσεται, &c. i. e. whom the Heaven must contain, or who must continue in Heaven until the times of the restitution of all things. There could be no mention here made of Christ’s Government, or his having taken upon him the Government of Heaven, but only of his staying in Heaven, which is the opposite to his returning from thence. Our Author out of a desire to propose something new, says sometimes such things as none that have any skill in this sort of Learning can admit of.

Ibid. ἀποστασιων προτεραιός. What the Syriac and Chaldee word was that St. Peter made use of I cannot tell. But St. Luke expressing his sense, and meeting with a word proper to his purpose among the Stoicks, he used that. Thus Numenius in Eusebius Præp. Evang. lib. 15. cap. 19. setting down the Opinion of the Stoicks says, that after the Conflagration of the World, Nature ἰσορροπωσις εις τον κοσμον αναστησεται, και τινα διάκοσμον εκεινον τινα πολιτικὴν ἑναντια τοῦ μορφον, καθι συν αὐτος χαµιστε ἐς αὐτην γίνεσθαι εις ἰππορροσιν, will return to its first, as it is called, Reason, and that

Resurrection
Chapter Resurrection which will make the great Year, in which year the restitution of itself alone into the same will be brought about. See Lipsius de Physiol.

Stoic. lib. 2. c. 22. where there is a very remarkable Passage out of Julius Firmicus to this purpose.

Vers. 24. Note c.] I wish our Author had given us the Reasons which made him think that Samuel first of all instituted the Schools of the Prophets, for I confess I do not know how he could be certain of this. It is true, Samuel is described the first in the company of the Prophets, and going before them, 1 Sam. xix. 20. But it no where appears that he was the first Institute of such Schools. I should rather say that his Name is here put first, because he was indeed the first famous Prophet, whose Predictions are extant, that succeeded Moses.

CHAP. IV.

Vers. 1. Στραγμος ες ἔργο.] This was not a Heathen, but a Jew, the Captain of the Levites, of which see my Note on Luke xxii. 44. The Priests did not use to walk so close together with Heathens for fear of being polluted.

Vers. 7. ἤν ποιησαν;] Did you do this by a magical Power, or a Power derived from the Devil, or from God? ἢ ἐν πολεμίῳ ἄνθρωπῳ; or by whose authority, since you had none from the Sanhedrim? In whose Name do you pretend to be sent? That the invocation of any Name is here intended, I do not think.

Vers. 12. οὐκ ἐκ τῆς ἄλλης ἰδιώτητος.] This is rightly interpreted by the Doctor in his Paraphrase, so as to make the sense of St. Peter's words here to be, that Jesus is the only Mediator by whom we can have access or admission to God, and that God has sent no other; from which it is consequent that those must fall short of Salvation, who rejecting him, betake themselves to any other Mediator, as the Jews did who placed their Confidence in Moses. But this is nothing at all to the Heathens, who have neither ever heard any thing of Christ, nor ever cast him off to substitute any Mediator in his room. If God will think fit to pardon some of them who live the most agreeably to right Reason, and confer upon them some measure of Happiness out of mere Grace and Mercy; do we think that Christ will intercede that he may not? Sure he will not; and I do not see why we silly Mortals should set bounds to God's Mercy. But this belongs to the Theory of Divinity, which I have purposed not to meddle with.

Vers. 28. Ἁρκών] Δι' αὐτῶν must be understood. The meaning of the Apostles is, that God had before decreed not to hinder by his
Wisdom and Power what he foresaw would be done by them, unless Chapter his Wisdom and Power interposed to hinder it. Affirmatives, as they call them, must be often expounded by Negatives. And so wisdom here is all one as ἡ γνώσις ἡ εἰς τὸ γενόμενον, not to hinder its being done. See Gen. xii. 13. and my Notes on that place, as also on Chap. v. 3. of this History. And whereas the Apostles say not only χειρὶ σαρκί, but also ἐν τῷ θεῷ, when it is only the Counsel of God, to speak properly, that determines, and his Hand, that is, his Power, which executes what he has decreed; the reason of that is, because they would have it understood, that God did not want Power to have hinder'd this if he had pleased, but only he did not make use of it; which confirms the Negative Sense I have given of the word wisdom, to be done.

Verf. 35. καὶ εἰσὶν, &c.] The Testimonies of Philosophers, who thought all things ought to be common, and Examples likewise of some Nations which have reduced that into practice, have been collected by Lucas Holstenius on the Life of Pythagoras, p. 82. Amongst the rest he sets down these Verses of Scymnus, an antient Geographer of Chios, concerning the Nomades in Scythia who dwelt beyond Panticape.

They live in common upon what they all possess, every one receiving as much as he has need of from the publick Stock. And the wise Anacharsis, they say, came of this very pious Nation of the Nomades.

CHAP. V.

Verf. 1. ἔπεισαν κτίσμα.] I cannot see any reason to suppose, as the Doctor does in his Paraphrase, that Ananias and Saphira did this in pursuance of a Vow they had made to do it, i.e. to sell their Estate. It is not necessary to add any thing to St. Luke's History. Ananias and Saphira hoped, that giving part of the Price to the Apostles, they should enjoy the rest themselves, and at the same time have a maintenance allowed them out of the common Stock of the Church. In which they were guilty of a double Sin; First, That tho' they had no need of it, yet they would have the Church maintain them, and so rob those that were really indigent: And, secondly, That to that end they told a Lie, by saying that they had brought the whole
Chapter \( \text{V.} \)

Whole Price for which they had sold their Estate: That this is the true state of the Case, the bare reading of St. Luke’s words will shew, in which there is nothing that implies these two Persons to have been guilty of breaking any Vow.

Verf. 2. **ἐλεγα.**] The Context shews, that in this place we must supply in our thoughts this Circumstance; οὐκ ἔγνω ἔδωκαν, and said that it was the whole Price of the Possession. See my Index to the Pentateuch, on the word **Circumstance**. Otherwise St. Peter could not have been angry with Ananias, or upbraided him with lying.

Verf. 3. **καὶ ὅλης ὠλήν.**] These words must be interpreted by a Negation, for St. Peter’s meaning is no more than this; Why didst not thou hinder Satan from fitting thy mind? i.e. Thou oughtest to have hinder’d Satan from having so great a power over thee, as to persuade thee to tell a Lie, viz. by begging God’s Grace to enable thee to resist and overcome that Temptation. Of this way of interpreting an Affirmation by the help of a Negation, see my Note on Chap. iv. 28. The Verb ἔλησε here includes not only the Devil’s tempting Ananias, but the noxious effect or prevalency of his Temptation: for when the Devil tempers a Man he does but as it were knock at the Door, without entering in; but when his Temptation prevails, being admitted, he fills his Mind, and casts all thoughts of Virtue out of it. St. Jerom, not sufficiently understanding the force of this Interrogation, or of the Verb μίασε, translated it by cur tentavit, Why hath he tempted? Beza indeed supposes the reason of his rendering it so to have been, that he read the Greek ἔδωκαν, i.e. tentavit, tempted. But there are two things which make it probable, that he endeavour’d rather to express the sense of the place, or if he thought that it ought to be so read, that he relied only upon his own Conjecture, and not on any Copies. First, All the Copies out of which any various readings have been taken, that ever I could meet with, read it as we do. Secondly, It is certain that the old Translation before St. Jerom’s time, had implevit, filled; for so this place is alledged by S. Cyprian Testim. Lib. 3. Sect. 30.

Ibid. **Note b.**] The sense which our Author prefers before the rest, relies only on this supposition, which has been liked also by many others, that Ananias and Sapphira made a Vow, of which there is not the least word said by St. Luke. It will be much more natural to interpret the words so, as to understand τετελεσθε τινα εὐνομίαν, to signify to He to the Holy Ghost, speaking by the Apostles, or by lying to deserve him. Consult H. Græcius. If it be demanded why Ananias and Sapphira
Sapphira suffered so severe a punishment for telling a Lie? the Answer is ready. There were three very important Reasons why that Severity should be used. First, Those that acted in that manner, can hardly be supposed to have thought the Apostles to be Prophets, who could know Secrets by Revelation from God; which Opinion, if it had spread, would mightily have lessened the Apostles Authority, and consequently very much hindered the propagation of the Gospel. If any should doubt whether it were generally thought that Prophets could discern Secrets, he need only read Luke vii. 29.

Secondly, It was for the interest of the Christian Religion, that above all Crimes, dissembling should be most severely punished, none being more pernicious or of more fatal Consequence, according to those words of Cicero de Offic. Lib. i. c. 3. Tatus injustitiae nulla capitalior est quam eorum qui cum maxime fallunt, id agunt ut viri boni esse videantur. Of all Crimes there is none more heinous and capital than theirs, who whilst they deceive most, endeavour to appear honest Men. Thirdly, It was also of very great concernment, that those who first joined themselves to the Apostles, should not be hypocritical Persons, that made a show of Piety, when they had none, because the Sins of such Persons would have discredited the Christian Religion itself, among those to whom it had not been yet preached. Especially, if it had been commonly reported, that Men that were slothful or covetous had joined themselves to the Christians; because all that brought a little Money to the Apostles, pretending it to be their whole Estate, were maintained at the publick Charge: as this would have been a great Reproach to Christianity, so it would have induced a great many lewd People to feign themselves Christians, that they might abuse the Churches Liberality, as it frequently, I believe, happened in succeeding Ages, when the Possessions of the Christians were enlarged: Of which we have a famous Example in one Peregrinus mentioned by Lucian.

Ver. 4. Note c. There is no difficulty at all in this place, if we do but lay aside the thoughts of a Vow, about which St. Luke is perfectly silent. The sense will be very natural and commodious, if we understand the Apostle thus: “Who compelled thee to sell thy Estate? “Would it not have continued thy own if thou hadst not sold it? “But thou wert resolved to sell it. And couldst thou not have kept all the money which thou hadst for it after it was sold? Who required any part of it from thee? Thou mightest have kept it all to thy self, and no body would have complained; but thou oughtest not to come with a lie to those that are Prophets, and inspired by
ANNOTATIONS

Chapter V.

the Holy Ghost, and feign thy self to have brought the whole Sum, that thou mightest be maintained by the publick Liberality; as if thou hadst left thy self nothing at all, and made thy self as indigent as the poorest. The word ἥπειρος never signifies an immovable Estate; that is nothing but our learned Author's own invention.

Ver. 13. Τίν λοιπὸν ἦδης κτιλεμα κολληθεῖς. The word χειρὶ here does not signify those that believed and heartily embraced the Gospel, but rather Hypocrites or Dissemblers; who would in vast numbers have joined themselves to the Church, if the Apostles could have been imposed on. This Grotius perceived, whom our Author ought to have followed in this, as he ordinarily does in other things. The Apostles were not solicitous how many professed the Christian Faith; but how good and sincere they were in that profession, left by the evil practices of its Professors, the Christian Religion, when it was but in its rise, should be dishonoured; which would have been a thing of very bad consequence, as I have already observed.

Ver. 24. Στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ i.e. The Captain of the Garison of Levites, as I have shewn on Luke xxii. 52. And hence ver. 26. St. Luke calls those that he had under his command, not στρατηγὸς Souldiers, but ἱεραρχὰς Ministers or Officers, viz. of the Levitical Tribe, who according to the direction of the Law, obeyed the Priests that had the over-sight of the Temple.

Ver. 33. Note f. If our learned Author had look'd a little further into Hesychius, he would have understood what was the proper signification of this word: For thus that learned Grammarian interprets the word ἑσέλιστο: ἡσέλιστο, ἵσματο, ὧτελον τὸν ἵθυς. They were angry, they gnashed with their teeth. Which Phavorinus, as he uses to do, has transcripted.

Ver. 41. Note k. It is true, among the Romans scourging was a servil punishment, because it was not lawful to scourge any Roman Citizen; but it was not among the Jews, tho those upon whom it was inflicted, ἱσολίζοντο, were also reproachfully used. And St. Luke makes use of that word rather than ἵσολίζοντο, because the reproachful usage of the Apostles, was worse than their punishment ἔλαβες: See the Doctor on Luke xxiii. 16.
Ver. 1. THE words τὰ Ἐλληνὶς φιλοῦν, in the place alleged by the Doctor out of Phavorinus, are not well translated by him to have skill in the Greek learning, but ought to be rendered to be on the Greeks' side, or of the sentiments of the Greeks. And hence the learned J. Vossius, De Sybillinis Oraculis, Cap. 16. affirms those to be mistaken who interpret the word Ἐλληνικός as Dr. Hammond does, because Ἐλληνικός does not only signify to imitate the Language of the Greeks, but also to side with the Greeks, as ἡμικεῖον, μετακεῖον, ἀντικεῖον, signify to imitate the Manners or Customs, or be of the side of the Romans, Persians, Medes, or Antigonus, or any who howsoever countenance them. For it is certain, faith he, that the Jews were divided into two parties: Those that were for the Rites and Customs of their Country, bore the Grecian and Roman yoke, &c. impatiently. But those that were of a more peaceable temper, and exhorted the rest to bear with patience the yoke which God had laid upon them, were said to be on the Grecians' side, and upon that account were called Ἐλληνικοὶ and φιλικοὶ. But notwithstanding this, it is possible that some of the Jews might have this name of Hellenists given them merely because they understood Greek, and others because besides that, they were more favourable to the Greeks than the το Βαβυλῶνιοι profound Hebrews, and imitated in some measure their manners; nor do I see how either of these can be denied obstinately. But those, I think, are guilty of a mistake, who make a distinct language of that which was used by the Hellenists, and call it the Hellenistical Tongue; whereas it seems only to have been the Language of those who could speak nothing well but Hebrew, and spake Greek very ill; such as were those who translated the Old Testament into that Language, and likewise the Apostles and others who had learned to speak Greek in Judaea. But this was rather a corruption of the Greek Tongue, by mixing it with Hebraisms, than a distinct Language or Dialect, as Salmasius and others have shewn at large.

Ver. 3. [Εκαθάρισεν ἐν ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι.] Twice Abram received such a command as this from God; first when he was in Ur of the Chaldees, from whence he set out with his Father, and went to Charran, as we are told by Moses, Gen. xi. 31. and here by
Chapter VII. St. Stephen; and then afterwards at Charran, where he left his Father, of which Moses gives us also an account, Gen. xii. 1. Unless we distinguish these, we shall hardly make Moses agree with St. Stephen, or he consistent with himself: See my Notes on Gen. xii. 1.

Ver. 4. Μετά το άναστασιν κα ἀνεμωδήν.] If this discourse of St. Stephen were not extant, and the sacred Chronology were taken only out of Moses, every thing in Moses would be plain; for Abraham would be understood to have began his Journey whilst Terah was alive, as I have shewn on Gen. xii. 4. But because St. Stephen here says that Abraham departed from Charran after his Father's death; therefore the Mosaical Chronology is otherwise digested, and Abraham is reckoned to have gone into Canaan sixty years later. But if we examin the matter more throughly, it will seem much more probable that St. Stephen spake according to the account generally received in that Age, in which there might have been a mistake, than that he was inspired by the Holy Ghost to speak as he did, because it signified very little whether the year of Abraham's departure were exactly known; and the force of St. Stephen's reasoning, or the truth of the Christian Religion, did not at all depend upon that Chronology. And I suppose the reason of this mistake in the common account of the Jews, viz. that Abraham set out from Charran not till after his Father was dead, was because Moses in Gen. xi. made mention of the death of Terah before he spake of Abraham's departure. And it is no wonder that the Jews, who took little or no care to improve in any sort of Learning, were so mistaken in matters of Chronology, and overlooked those things which later Writers on Gen. xii. 1. have observed. Just such another Error I have taken notice of in Josephus, on Gen. xxv. 20.

Those who correct the Mosaical Chronology by St. Stephen's discourse, of which number is Lud. Cappellus, think that Abraham was born, not in the sixtieth, but in the hundred and thirtieth year of Terah's Age. But if this were so, why did Abraham think it so strange that a man of a hundred years of Age should be able to get Children, when he himself had been begotten by his Father when he was thirty years older? See Gen. xvii. 17. But then they on the other hand, ask us whether it is likely that Terah, who accompanied Abraham out of Ur, should rather choose to stay five and sixty years at Charran, than go to Abraham? Why not, since he had his Son Nachor there with him, who had a numerous Family? But at least, say they, after the miraculous birth of Isaac, he should have gone to Abraham. This cannot according to them be any such great Miracle, and their inference from it is weak: For Terah might have a great many reasons for his staying at Charran, more than we know of.
Verf. 14. Note g. Col. 2. lin. 12. after the words, Jacob's going into Chapter Egypt.] Our learned Author is mistaken: See my Notes on Gen. VIII. xxviii. 1.

Verf. 51. Note i. See my Notes on Exod. xxxii. 9.

G H A P. VIII.

Verf. 32. Grotius justly rejects the Opinion of Beza, who thought that the word πεποίησεν was made out of the Hebrew יִשָּׁר, tho' there be no great difference between them, either in sound or signification. Nor is Dr. Hammond's Conjecture any thing more probable, which relies upon the same grounds with that of Beza. Grotius has shewn out of Cicero, that πεποίησεν is a genuine Greek word which signifies periodus, a Period. For it comes from the Verb μεῖκνον, to contain or comprehend, which is used by St. Peter, 1 Ep. ii. 6. where, citing a place of Scripture, he says, μεῖκνον τῆς γενεσί, it is contained in the Scripture. I confess πεποίησεν has other significations belonging to it; but amongst those significations there is one that has a near affinity with this. So in the Old Glosses: πεποίησεν argumentum, πεποίησεν præjudicium argumentum, πεποίησεν continentia, πεποίησεν tenore, leg. tenoris; all which signify what may be otherwise barbarously called in Latin contentum, in French le contenu, the Contents.

Verf. 33. Note g. h. If St. Luke spake Hebrew, there is no doubt but that he cited the words of Isaiah as they are in the Hebrew; and that therefore his meaning is to be understood by the signification of the Hebrew words. But the Septuagint do not differ much from the sense of the Hebrew, if their words be but rightly pointed, thus: ἐν τοσοῦτω δικαίωμα καὶ γνώσει δικαιωμα, ὡς, in his humility was his judgment, he was taken away: That is, Christ appearing to be a person of a mean and low condition, the Jews and Pilate passed judgment on him as an inconsiderable contemptible man, who ought to be put to death to prevent any Seditions being made upon his account: And so in effect he was by Pilate's order. The words in the Hebrew are to be rendered thus: By reason of force and punishment he was taken away, or by reason of restraint and punishment; for the Verb ἀπήγαγε signifies both to force and to restrain. The Prophet's meaning is, that Christ suffered that punishment of death, by reason the Jews hindered Pilate to pass an equitable judgment upon him, or forced him, as it were, to condemn him. It appears by the paraphrase on verf. 35. that Dr. Hammond was of Grotius's opinion, or one very near it; for he thought that this Prophecy was literally ful-
Chapter filled not long after Isaiah's time: I wish he had spoken more plainly. It is not, as the Doctor tells us, the word יִשְׂרָאֵל, but יִשְׂרָאֵל basfarab that is render'd ₪; but they may, I confess, be used promiscuously, and therefore I will not quarrel with him about that.

CHAP. IX.

Ver. 31. THE 9th Similitude in the 3d Book of Herma's Pastor.

Note d. is worth our reading upon this Subject.

CHAP. X.

Chapter 25. THE Hebrew word alluded by our Author, signifies Incense or Perfume, not an Offering: See my Notes on Levit. ii. 4.

Ver. 25. ως ἀγνωτο εἰσιν καὶ ἐπὶ γην.] The Cambridge Copy, which was formerly Beza's, reads this Passage thus; εἰσὶν καὶ ἐπὶ γην, εἰσὶν καὶ ἐπὶ γῆν ἐστιν. But, ἐκπαραφράξεις οὐκ εἰσὶν καὶ ἐπὶ γῆν, ἐκπαραφράξεις οὐκ εἰσὶν καὶ ἐπὶ γῆν. It is manifestly a Paraphrase on St. Luke's words, and not a various reading taken out of any antient Copy; for the Greek is purer, and the style more natural and fluent than is usual in the New Testament Writers. There are in this Book a great many Passages paraphrased by the Author of that Copy: See Chap. xi. 1, 2, 26. and xiii. 44. and xiv. 1. and xxiii. by which places it will evidently appear, that the Writer of that Manuscript, being more skilful than St. Luke in the Greek Language, has every now and then changed the Phrase to make the construction more elegant. Those who affirm these, notwithstanding the contrariety of them to all the other Copies, and the agreement of the most Antient Fathers with those Copies, to be various readings, and that too older than any in our Copies, were certainly never any great masters of Criticks.

CHAP. XI.

Chapter 30. COL. i. lin. ult. after the Cit. out of Deut. xxxi. 28.] Our Author would have said what was more likely, if he had told us that old Men signified Magistrates, because publick Trusts were generally committed to aged Persons, upon the account of their great experience, and the Government which they have over their Passions above the younger fort.
Ver. 1. YEA, and which is more than that, it signifies to do a
thing, for in Gen. iii. 22. by putting forth the hand and
taking, we are to understand taking, and not merely an
attempt to take.

Ibid. Ἐξήλθεν ἀνάβας δὲ ἀνάκοιλις] There never really happened any thing
that was wonderful almost, but fanciful Men have feigned something
or other like it. 'So Ovid. Metam. Lib. 4. Fab. 10. speaking of one
Acetas who had been cast into Priyon by Pentheus, upon Bacchus's ac-
count, and was afterwards released, says that,

Sponte sua, patuifsse fores, lapsasque lacertis,
Sponte sua, fama est, nullo solvente, catenas.

It was the common report that the [Prison] doors opened of their own ac-
cord, and the Chains fell off from his hands of themselves, no body loosing
them.

Ver. 13. Note d. Tho the Verb ἀνάκεισαι often signifies to answer
one that calls, as Stephanus; before Dr. Hammond, had observed, and
proved at large in his Thesaurus; yet when the Discourse is about one
whose business it is to keep a Gate, it signifies the same as in Latin
subauscultare, i.e. to hearken from within side to the Voice of them
that knock, in order to know who they are: For the Porter or Port-
tress used to ask who it was that knocked before ever they opened
the Door, and to hearken to the Voice to see if they knew the Per-
fon: At Night especially this was requisite, lest they should let in
Thieves instead of Friends. See Stephanus and Priceaus on this place,
and there will be no room to doubt but that Erasmus has rightest of
all translated this Verb, by subauscultare.

CHAP. XIII

Ver. 10. It is ill supposed by the Doctor, that the words last cited by him out of Hesychius, are to be read without a com-
ma; for the Greeks do never, after the English man-
ner, heap up three Adjectives without any Conjunction, or Noun Sub-
stantive, no not the Poets themselves; in which if there be two that
seem to meet together, one of them stands for a Substantive, as Eu-
statius has observed on Iliad. r. Ed. Rom. p. 427. ἰδοὺ, saith he, ὁ ἔσθι
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Chapter XIII.

No εἰσὶν, πολλαὶ τὰ τῶν ζητεῖν τούτα, καὶ εἰς περιπλονήσιον: for there are never two, and much less three Epistles put together, without some Noun proper or appellative. The same learned Grammarian in his Notes on Odyss. A. p. 1506. explains the words παράγειν & παράγεται thus: παράγεται εἰς Ἀείς Διονύσιον, ὁ μαρτυρίος, ὁ παράγεται, δείκνυς, ὁ ἔθιμον ἐλεύθερον εἰς Σεουρέας: the first, according to Αἰλίους Διονύσιον, signifies mischievous or wicked, and the latter, faith he, carelessness and confidence about all things. But there is no signification which will better site this place, where the discourse is about a Magician, than that which we meet with in the Old Glosses, where παράγεται is rendered by falsum a cheat or falsity, and παράγεται falsarius, a falsifier or deceiver; for it is well known that a Magician is for the most part but another name for an Impostor. Dionysius Halicarnass. Lib. 1. Antiq. Rom. p. 63 and 64. uses the words παράγεσθαι & παράγεται, speaking of some false Miracles by which a certain lover of the Female Sex was supposed to have deceived a simple young Girl.

Verf. 15. Note e. That it was the Office of an Archisynagogus to appoint one to read in the Synagogue, as St. Luke here teaches us, the Jews also said. See Camp. Vitringa in Synag. Veter., Lib. 3. P. 1. c. 9.

Verf. 31. That Christ by his Resurrection received as it were a new birth, and so was begotten of God, might be properly enough said also according to the way of speaking usual among the Greeks; as appears by Hesychius on the word Δευτεροφθαλμός: ὁ τῶν παίδων, faith he, οὔκεις ὁ λόγος ὁ δεύτερος τοῦ τῶν παιδῶν τούτων ὅτι παῖς ἦν ὁ ἐμφανισθησθαι τῷ πατρὶ ᾧ ἐστεραμβασθήσῃ ζωήν—οὐ τὰ γενέσθαι ἐκ τῶν πτερυγίων, ἡ πτέρες ἐμπαλασθῆναι, ὅ ἐστιν καὶ γυναῖκοι κόλπων παιδὸς ἐστι τῇ Ἀθηναῖος, ἐν γυναικί γυναικεῖς: which is the same with the ὑποτελοῦσθαι of others, applied to a Person who having bad the funeral Rites performed for him, as for one that was dead, afterwards appeared alive—– or who after he was reported to have died in a foreign Country returned again, or one who had again passed from between his Mother’s Breasts, as the custom was among the Athenians, was said to be born or begotten again.

Verf. 48. Note m. It is a true Observation of the Doctor, that the word τετραγενής is used by a Metaphor taken from military Affairs, to signify that course of Life to which we are called by God. Thus it is used by Socrates, in his Apology, extant in Plato, whose words for brevity sake shall be set down only in English. In whatever place a Person either puts himself (ἐὰν ἄριστος) thinking that to be the best, or is put by his Commander, (ἐὰν ἄριστος τινι ἄξιος) in that, in my judgment, he ought to abide and face danger, fearing neither death nor any thing else more than baseness. Really, O Athenians, I should be guilty of a very great
great fault, if when the Captains chosen by you to be my Commanders, Chapter had placed me (ἀντιλογ) at Potidæa, at Amphipolis, or at Delius, I XIV. then kept the post in which they had set me, and underwent the danger of Death; and yet when God, as I thought, had set me (τετραγωνοῦ) and I have determined with my self to spend my Life in Philosophizing there fearing Death or any other thing, I should for sake my rank, τῆς. So likewise Epictetus in Enchirid. c. 29. Ο οἱ βασιλείς οὐ φανούλτον ἐχε, οὐ χαίρεις οὐ χαίρεις ὄν ὁ θεοῖς. Those things thou accountest best, adhere to, as if placed by God in such a Station.

CHAP. XIV.

Ver. 17. "O τὸν εἰκάζων ἢ ἐνδεικτικόν [i.e. God did not so entirely conceal himself from the Heathens, as to give them no evidences at all of his Providence; for every thing in nature was a standing witness of God's Wisdom, Power and Goodness. Nor were the Heathens altogether deaf to this voice of Nature, as appears by many of their sayings which learned Men have collected on this place, to which I shall here add these remarkable words out of Cicero, Tuscul. Lib. i. His autem, faith he, ubi habitamus, non intermittit suo tempore:

Cæolum mitescere, arbores frondescere,
Vites laxiffæ pampinis pubescere,
Rami baccarum ubertate incurvescere,
Segetes largiri fruges, florere omnia,
Fontes scatere, herbis prata convestirier.

Tum multitudinem pecudum, partim ad vesandum, partim ad webendum, partim ad corpora vestienda, hominemque ipsum quasi contemplatorem caeli ac Deorum, ipsorumque cultorem, atque boniminis utilitatem agros omnes & maria patentia. Hæc igitur & alia innumerabilia cum cernimus, possimusque dubitare, quin his praefit alius aut effecerit, si haec nata sunt, ut Platonis videtur; vel si semper fuerint, ut Aristotelis placet, moderator tanti operis & munere? And here on this Earth on which we dwell, the Sky does not cease to grow calm, nor the Trees in their proper season to shoot forth Branches, nor the Vines to bud and bring their reviving Fruit to perfection, nor the Boughs to hang down with ripe Berries, nor the Corn to yield its expected increase; but all things flourish, the Springs are constantly running, and the Fields are clothed with Grass. And then if we consider what a multitude there is of Cattle, partly for Food, partly for carrying, and partly for clothing.
Chapter XVI.

ANNOTATIONS on

Clothing our Bodies, and the nature of Man itself, who seems to be formed for contemplating Heaven and the Gods, and to adore and worship them, and that the whole Earth and Sea lies open for his use: When we see, I say, and consider these and innumerable other things, can we doubt whether there is a superior Being, who is either the Creator of these things, if they were indeed created, as Plato thinks; or if they always were, as Aristotle supposes, who is the manager and disposer of so great a work and charge?

Ver. 23. Note b. P. 394. Col. 2. Lin. 42. after the words used of the Apostles.

If we add what Mr. Selden has observed, concerning the word ἡττῶν, in Synod. Hebraeorum, Lib. 1. c. 14. to what is here said of it by Dr. Hammond, there will be nothing material left for us to know, either about the various significations of that word, or about that particular significations of it for simple constituting, which Mr. Selden, as well as Dr. Hammond, has shewn to belong to it, in this place. You may add if you please, the Testimony of Cicero about the Decrees of the Greeks, Orat. pro Flacco Cap. 6. Sunt expressa illa praecisa quae recitantur ἐκθεῖσθαι, non sententiae, neque autoritiatis declariat, nec jurejurando confirma, sed porrigenda manu, profundendoque clamore multitudinis concitatae. Those excellent Decrees which are recited (among them) are expressed, not declared by Opinions or Authorities, or ratified by Oaths, but by the stretching out of the Hand, and the loud cries of the beatified Multitude. By this it appears what ἡττῶν properly signifies, but it is metaphorically applied to signify any constitution, or, as Ecclesiastical Writers speak, ordination, as those learned Men thought, and have at large proved.

C H A P. XVI.

Ver. 13. I Cannot imagin what took up our Author's Thoughts,

Note a. when he said that the Neapolis here mentioned in ver. 11. was the same with that in Epiphanius; for St. Luke speaks of a City in Macedonia, which was situated upon the Gulph of Strymon; and Epiphanius, Hæres. 80. which is that of the Massilians, of the City Sicemb, in the middle of Palestine. But the greatest Men do sometimes commit mistakes through forgetfulness or want of care. Of Proseuchæ, Oratories or places for Prayer, consult at leisure the Collections of St. le Moine Var. Sac. p. 74. & seqq.

Ver. 16. Note b. 1. What our Author here says about the word Python, as a name of the City Delphos, he took out of Grotius, as he often does other things. If you would see more of that matter, consult Luc. Holstenius ad Stephanum Byzantium. For my own part I do
do not think that the Spirit of Python here has any thing common to Chapter
it with the City Delphos, or with Apollo, besides the name. That XVII.
name of the City Delphos was grown quite out of date, before ever
the word Python was in use in this sense; nor would the Greeks upon
that account have called a divining Spirit Python, or the Spirit of Py-
thon. Apollo himself was not called in Greek Πυθόν, but Πυθόνος. But
in the Phænician Language, as in the Hebrew, יָדוֹס phōth, or perhaps
ץֹן python, was used to signify a Woman's Privy-parts: See Is. 3. 17.
And hence a Prophetess, out of whose Privy-parts the voice proceed-
ed or seemed to come, might be called in that Language
נָחוֹת פֹּתֶן a Prophetess by Phython, i.e. one that prophesied out of her Privy-
parts; of which kind the that first of all resided at Delphos seems to
have been, who having been killed by Apollo, gave occasion to that
Fable about the killing of the Serpent Python, because the Phænician
word פֹּתֶן nabbasch signifies both a Serpent and a Prophet, and פֹּתֶן
Python was looked upon as a proper Name. Afterwards by a word
borrowed from the Tyrians or Sidonians, the ἴγασιμωθ were called
Python, or such as had the Spirit of Python; for this word having
grown out of use among the Greeks, was afterwards brought in
again, as Plutarch affirms, who is cited by Grotius to that purpose.
And hence the Antients always interpret Πυθών by ἴγασιμωθ, and
attribute this kind of Divination chiefly to Women. Besides the
Passages alluded by Grotius, add this out of Hesychius; Πυθών ἴγασιμωθ evaluations, ἴγασιμωθ, ἴγασιμωθ, ἴγασιμωθ, ἴγασιμωθ: a Man or Woman that speaks
or prophesies out of the Belly, or a Byzantian by Birth. Read ἴγασιμωθ, &c.
an Orator who was a Byzantian by Birth, of whom see Suidas. Πυθών,
σωμάτων νάϊμων, a divining Spirit or Devil.

2. The Hebrew יָדוֹס does not signify the Belly but the Womb: It
is rendered indeed by the Septuagint ἴγασιμωθ, but not rightly, as I
have shewn in my Notes on Levit. it being rather to be rendered

C H A P. XVII.

Ver. 11. Εὐπρεπέστον Beza has rightly observed, that there is a
comparison here made between the Jews of Thessalonica
and those of Berea; and that by this Word ἐπερασθεν we are to understand an extraordinary excellency of temper in the
Bereans, which was not in those of Thessalonica. Thus the Philoso-
phers thought a Person had need of δύναμις to make him despise plea-
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Chapter to Antigonus, extant in Diogenes Laertius, Lib. 8. Sect. 8. has these words: φίλος τον φιλοσοφόν ποιεῖν, εὐθυμεῖν τῆς πανθρεύματος ἡμῖν, τί ποι ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ὁμοίῳ, παραδείγμα ἢ τοιοῦ ποσίς χρήσεις διάνοιας πάντων, ἀλλαξεῖ ὁ σκέφτεσθαι.

For having a great desire to become a Philosopher, and shunning that pleasure which is so much cried up, and which effeminates the minds of some young men, thou manifestly shewest thyself inclined to generosity, not only by nature but by choice. φίλος τον φιλοσοφόν ποιεῖν, εὐθυμεῖν τῆς πανθρεύματος ἡμῖν, τί ποι ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ὁμοίῳ, παραδείγμα ἢ τοιοῦ ποσίς χρήσεις διάνοιας πάντων, ἀλλαξεῖ.

And a generous disposition with a little exercise, and a good Master, easily attains to the perfection of Virtue. The Beracans are as certain and noble an example of this as any that can be given. The word διάρκεια signifies properly nobility of Birth or Descent; but it is metaphorically used to signify greatness of Mind. Seneca likewise interprets the Latin generous thus, Epist. 44. Quis generosus ? faith he, Ἀδ νυντεύμι νηνα καὶ κατά κατακτήσεις: Who is a generous man? He that is by nature well disposed and formed for virtue. Plato, or as others think, Speusippus in his Definitions tells us that ἔνεργεια is ἀκούστῳ ἄνεργες ἄρσε. Ἐνεργεία ἄρσε ἃς ἐς λόγος, ἀκούστῳ: The virtue of a generous disposition, a pliability of mind to good thoughts and actions.

Ver. 19. Note e. Long before I had read what the Doctor here says, or had any thoughts of interpreting the New Testament, the etymology of the word ἀράτεια seemed suspicious to me; because I had observed that the silly Greeks do often very unhappily pretend to discover the originals of old Names in their Language, and afterwards endeavour to confirm those Etymologies by feigned Stories, as might be made appear by a hundred instances. And therefore searching a little further back, it came into my mind that it was a reproach formerly cast upon the Athenians, that they came from Ionia into Attica, and were called Ἰανόις by Homer; of which see Bochart in Phaleg. Lib. 3. c. 3. And I knew otherwife that the Language of the Pelasgi, the most antient Inhabitants of Greece, was a barbarous Language, and unknown to those that came after them, as the Glory of Great Britain Dr. Stillingfleet in his Origines Sacrae has shewn. And hence I made no great difficulty to infer that the Iaiones and Pelasgi were the Posterity of Javan or Ion, Ἰανόις, who spake that Language which they had brought with them out of the East, i.e. the Hebrew, or one very like it. Now in that Language ἅρπης signifies a Mountain of violence, or incursion, or alfo of slaughter; whence it may be conjectured, that that Hill was by the first Inhabitants of Attica so called, because of some slaughter or fight that had happened in that place; of which some footprint remained in the story about the slaying of Halyrothius Neptune's.
Neptune’s Son, mentioned by Dr. Hammond, and which may be read in those Authors which he allidges. *As is also the name of Mars, is a Hebrew word, for ייור or ייור signifies a Mountaineer, as Mars was, who is said to have had his abode in the Mountains of Thrace, and was made the God of War, because, as those that live in mountainous places generally are, he was a valiant Man, and had made himself famous in War. Athens also had its name, as the Greeks say, from Ἀθηνίς an Epithet of Pallas, which is the same with the Hebrew לָיָה or לָיָה, i.e. valiant. And Pallas is feigned to have been the Goddess of War in the same manner as Mars; and seems to have been some Amazon or warlike Woman that ruled over Attica in those fabulous times. She is called also the Goddess of Wisdom; and this seems to be intimated by the name Παλλας, if that be derived from the Hebrew פָּלָס, i.e. directed, considered, examined; from whence comes the Noun פָּלֶס, which signifies Justice, Prov. xvi. 11. But these things do not belong to this place.

Ver. 22. Note f. Col. 2. lin. 32. after the words, move for it. One that had never read Plutarch’s Treatise τῶν ἰδεῖσθαι, and should take strict notice of Dr. Hammond’s words, would easily persuade himself, that what he produces as out of Plutarch, were taken out of that Author himself; but they are not.

1. What he allidges as out of the Life of Alexander, is in the forementioned little Treatise τῶν ἰδεῖσθαι, p. 170. E. Edit. Francofurtensis, Ann. 1599. which is the Edition that I have, and is set down thus: ἵνα ἵνα διώξω ἢ ἐλάφον, ὅ τε ἀναδύουν ἐδώκεις, ὅτε ἔκανες ἂν Πλωταρχον, ὅ λέγειν ὁ Πλωταρχὸς ἢ πλωταρχον ἢ πλωταρχον, δύσματος τοῖς ἱεροῖς προφητείας, μακρὰνθο: I had rather, for my part, that men should say of me, that there never was, nor is any such man as Plutarch, than say that Plutarch is an inconstant, changeable man, one that is easily provoked to anger, greedy of revenge upon every slight provocation, and melancholy upon the least adversity that befalls him.

3. The whole passage about the Jews, which is also in p. 169, is not set down by him entire; for Plutarch justly derides their Superstition, who sat still on the Sabbath and let their Enemies scale the walls of the City, without making the least opposition against them, but lay all tied and bound by their Superstition as in one net. However, this is not a
Chapter common practice with our learned Author, to cite the Testimonies of the Antients upon the Authority of others.

Vers. 23. Note g. The place referred to by the Doctor in Pausanias is nothing to the purpose; for Pausanias does not say that the Lydians sacrificed to a God which they did not themselves know, but which was unknown to him. It is in pag. 391. Edit. Hanov. Ann. 1613. where speaking of a Magus, he says that ἔθνην οὐκ ἔν τινὶ πάθη ἔδειξεν, οὐδὲ ἐν Αἰγύπτι πέφυγεν. He sang an Invocation to any of the Gods in a barbarous Language, impossible for the Greeks to understand. Besides, our Author misrepresents Pausanias as saying the Lydians and Persians, whereas his words are, Λυδίας ἐθνῶν Πασηνής, The Lydians surnamed Persian. If you would see more Testimonies about the unknown God of the Athenians, consult Meursius de Piræo, cap. 10.

Ibid. The Doctor should have added the name of the Poet, or the place where he took those Verses, for there will be some that may suspect them to be made by some Christian. This passage of St. Paul may be illustrated by the words of Apuleius in Lib. de mundo: Petus opinio est, atque cogitationes omnium hominum penitus infedit, Deum esse originis, & haberet autorem; Deumque ipsum salutem esse & perseverantiam earum, quas effeceris, verum. Neque ubi est tam præstantibus viribus, quæ viduata Dei auxilio, sui natura consentia sit. Hanc opinionem vates sequuti profiteri ausi sunt, omnia Jove plena esse; cujus præsentiam, non jam cogitatio sola, sed oculi & aures, & sensibilis substantia comprehenderit. It is an antient opinion, which has possessed the minds of all men; that God is, and is accounted the Author of the World; and that God himself is the safety and perseverance of those things which he has made; and that there is nothing of so great strength, as to be self-sufficient, and not to stand in need of God's assistance. And this opinion the Poets having espoused, have not stuck to say, that all things were full of God; whose presence it seems not our minds only, but also our eyes and ears, and every sensible substance comprehends. He had a respect to the fame passage of Aratus as St. Paul.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Vers. 22. Our learned Author is mistaken, when he says that Cæsarea Philippi was not far from that Cæsarea which was also called Turris Stratonis, between which there was the distance of two days journey, which is a great deal in a little Country: See the Maps of Judea.
CHAP. XIX.

Ver. 33. I had rather interpret the word "εξελθων" with the Vulgar by propellere to push forward, or to carry along to judgment; for it did not belong to the Jews to question any man, but only to the Judges. So this word is taken, in that excellent saying of Solon in Plutarch: "Τὸν πόλιν σαφῶς οὐδεὶς κατειδρύησε, ὥσπερ ἐάν διανοοῦμεν ἐν οἷς ἐν μία ἐνδούμασιν κατελθοὺσες καὶ παρελθοῖς τὰ δίκαια: That City is extremely well governed, in which those that are not injured, as well as those that are, carry such do any injury to judgment, and punish them.

Ver. 35. Note i. The title of Νεοκωρύς is common in the Coins of the Cities of Asia; but Ephesus gloried in it above the rest. For there are some pieces of Ephesian Money to be seen at this day, in which Ephesus is not only simply stiled Νεοκωρύς, or twice Νεοκωρύς, but there is also a piece coined under the reign of Caracalla inscribed ΕΡΕΩΝ ΤΡΙΕ ΝΕΟΚΩΡΩΝ; and another under Heliagabalus, ΜΟΝΩΝ ΑΠΑΚΩΝ ΤΕΙΡΑΚΙΣ ΝΕΟΚΩΡΩΝ, in which they boast that they only of all the Cities of Asia had been four times Νεοκωροες. See J. Foy-Vaillant in Num. AE. Imp. coined in Colonies and Corporations, T. 2. pg. 171.

CHAP. XX.

Ver. 28. In the Alexandrian Copy the word "Chapter" is omitted, as the Oxford Edition of the New Testament observes. I wonder that Dr. Hammond, who often sets down the various readings of that Copy, should take no notice of this. It is observable also, that instead of Χριστός many Copies read Χριστός, and some χριστός Χριστός. And such variations as these are common in the places heretofore controverted, in the time of the Nicene Synod.

CHAP. XXI.

Ver. 7. The Vulgar reading is certainly right, and ought not Chapter to be changed; for no body besides the Doctor ever used διαχριστὸς πλῆθος as a Greek phrase for an oligarchy, but διαχριστός πλῆθος is very properly made use of to signify the finishing of a Voyage. The meaning of St. Luke is clear: Having finished our Navigation from Tyre, we came to Ptolemais; for they had first finished their Navigation before they came to Ptolemais, from whence
Chapter whence they went on foot to Caesarea. Whether a Comma be put between Ἰαυλόπτερος and ἔως, or whether it be omitted, the thing is the same, for Ἰαυλόπτερος is to be connected with ἔως, having finished, or made an end of our Navigation, we arrived.

CHAP. XXII.

Ver. 11. Ὁ ἐκεῖ Ἰαυλόπτερος ἔως ἐξῆκεν.] God did sometimes shew himself to Persons, encompassed with so dazzling a light, as even blinded the lookers on. And hence that laying of Hagar in Gen. xvi. 13. where see my Notes, as also what I have written on Exod. xxxiv. 18, 20.

Ver. 25. Note e. ill. 24. after the word such an one?] 1. Our Author's memory failed him, when he said, So faith Philo of Agrippa, &c. for what is there said, is spoken by Agrippa of Caligula, in Philo de Leg. ad Caium, p. 798. Edit. Genev. Philo produces a Letter of Agrippa to Caius, in which Agrippa writes to him thus: Φίλων οὐκ ἔστωτες ὀλάς ὁ Ρωμαϊκὼς Ἰουστοις χορταστικοῖς. And it is certain that could only be done by the Emperor at that time, and not by Agrippa, as every one knows. He should have said therefore: So faith Agrippa of Caligula in Philo.

2. It is strange our Author should produce a passage, as out of the 47th Book of Diodorus Siculus, who wrote only 40, as Photius affirms, Cod. 70. of which we have only half extant and some fragments. But he meant Dion Cocceianus, whose words those are in Lib. 47. p. 228. Edit. Grec. Rob. Stephani. Besides, those words of Dion, ἰδοὺ ἡ Ἰουλιοπόλις ὁποῖς ἄστω ἄνευ μεταμόδια, ought not to be translated, that from his own name be called them Juliopolis, but that they changed their name and called themselves from him, Juliopolis. For it was a piece of flattery in the Inhabitants of Tarshus; who afterwards also out of flattery to other Emperors, called their City Adriana, Antoniniana, and Severiana: Of which see Luc. Holstenius on Stephanus Byzantinus. The words of Dion are no proof at all that Tarshus had the freedom of the City of Rome given to it; and it otherwise appears, that after Augustus's time that was a free City, which was governed not by the Roman Laws but by its own, and therefore did not enjoy the privileges of the City of Rome: Consult on this place H. Grotius, whom the Doctor would have more safely followed, as being not so well acquainted with ancient History. Perhaps St. Paul had been made a Roman Citizen, because his Father, tho a Jew, had been made free of Rome; such as Philo speaks of in the place quoted by the Doctor in the next Annotation.
Ver. 5. Ὁ τικ ὤδειν ἐστιν ἀδίστηρος. St. Paul seems at that time to have looked another way, so as not to have observed who it was that had commanded him to be smitten. So that we must supply out of what goes before, the words; ἕν ἐπίταξε ὁ ἡγίασον αὐτὸς τὸ σῶμα, who had ordered him to be smitten on the mouth. There is nothing more natural than this; others seek a knot in a bulrush.

Ver. 1. Ἐνεπιστρεπτεὶς] The Doctor has hit the true sense of this word Chapter in his Paraphrase; but only, as he now and then does, he borrows terms from the present custom to express it by, which he should not have done, because at that time those who had an accusation against any, did not use to bring in the heads of it to the Proconsuls in writing, but only to speak what they had to say. However. Ἐπιστρεπτέω is not compare to appear or come before, as it is rendered by Beza, but to accuse, to lay open a Crime, as it is explained by Suidas, ἐπιστρεπτόριον, φανεροῦ, with whom agrees Phavorinus, who interprets it by φανεροῦ ση μετώπῳ, I show it you manifestly. It comes from φανῆ, as Priscus upon this place has well observed; and φανῆ, according to Aristophanes's Scholia on Equites, is ἐκατοψίλης, ἡ φανερᾶς πνεῦμα τῷ φησίναι, καὶ μνημο, an accuser, and one that lays open causes, and an informer. And the Old Glosses have ἐπιστρεπτέω allego, intimo, to allude, to intimate; ἐπιστρεπτέω declarare, to declare; ἐπιστρεπτέω intimatio, an intimation.

Ver. 25. Note a. We may apply those Verses of Juvenal, Sat. 13. even to the Heathen Judges of that lewd and wicked Age.

Prima est bacc ultio, quod se
Judice nemo nocens absolvitur, &c.

---bacc tu

Evanesse putas, quos divi conscia salet
Mens habet aspctos, & jurando verbare cadit
Occultum quatiente animo tortore flagellum?

Ver. 27. Ϋδας τοῖς ὑπατοῖς] i.e. To please or gratify the Jews, lest they should send Informers to Rome, and complain of his lewd actions to Nero; or else that he might appease and silence in some measure the Jews com-
Chapter XXV. Complaints. The Governors of the Provinces used to be particularly cautious how they offended any, just before their departure, as we may perceive by the Counsel given by Cicero in his first excellent Epistle ad Quintum fratrem: "Tanquam Poetae boni, & Altioris industriae solent; sic tu in extrema parte & conclusione munere diligentissimus sis. As good Poets and industrious Altors use to be; so be you very careful in the last part and conclusion of your Office.

And yet for all this Felix could not avoid making himself Enemies, for the chief Men among the Jews went to Rome in order to accuse him; and he had certainly been punished, but that Nero was prevail'd upon by his Brother Pallas, whom he had an extraordinary love for at that time, to pardon him, as Josephus, lib. 20. c. 7. informs us.

CHAP. XXV.

Ver. 12. Metê το Συμβολιον. That is, with a Council of his own Friends, such as the Presidents of Provinces used to have with them, as Grotius has well observed; by not following of whom in such matters as these, our Author sometimes falls into Mistakes. So in Josephus Ant. Jud. lib. 14. cap. 17. Julius Cæsar himself begins an Edict in favour of the Jews thus; I Julius Cæsar, made again Emperor and High-priest, metê συμβολιον υδατον περιεχων, have decreed with the advice of my Council. It is absurd to represent a Roman President, before he passeth Judgment, conferring with the Accusers at the Judgment-seat, and especially when he could not gratify them. See Grotius.

Ver. 23. Note b. I Instead of Dio, where the Doctor alludes the words of Laertius, read Bio; for those words of Laertius are in the Life of Bio Borystenites, Lib. 4. Sect. 53. Ed. Amstel.

CHAP. XXVI.

Chapter Ver. 18. Αυεῖς ὁρεύσας. That is, to teach them, as the Doctor rightly paraphrases it. See my Notes on Gen. xxii. 18.

Ver. 23. Et περὶ τῶν σι χρῆς. Verbatim, that the Messias was passible. Examples of this signification of the Particle si have been given by Budæus out of Demosthenes, Comment. L. Gr. p. 978. And so the Hebrew si chi, which for the most part signifies si tn, is often used for si, if; see Chb. Noldius num. 24. and Assim, which is si if, signifies also quod that, Gen. xxxi. 52.
the ACTS.

Ver. 28. "Εν ἀλλ' ἡμείς ζεϊμεν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν." This is certainly an irony, Chapter and should have been explain'd as such by our Author in his Paraphrase; XXVII. for it is sufficiently known that Agrippa never became a Christian.

CHAP. XXVII.

Ver. 2. Alexandria.] Grotius thinks with St. Jerom, that it is Adramyttium, a City of Africa, that is here intended: But I am rather of Beza and Dr. Hammond's Opinion, who suppose it to be Adramyttium a Town in Mysia, for two reasons. First, Because St. Luke saies that they were to sail by the Coasts of Asia; and a Ship in its return out of Palestine to Adramyttium, could not avoid coasting Asia, as any one that does but look into the Maps will plainly see. And, secondly, Because it seems to have been the Centurion's Resolution to go into that part of Asia, and cross over from thence to Thrace or Macedonia, the Passage being but short and much frequented: And then from Thrace or Macedonia to Epirus, and so into Italy. It is certain this was the safest way, because of the uncertainty of the Wind. And this seems also to be the reason why Aristarchus the Macedonian travelld in the same Ship, because accompanying St. Paul, he should have an opportunity of passing through his own Country.

Ver. 6. ibi or aere africo.] viz. Which in its course to Italy had been driven by a violent South-wind on the Coast of Lycia. The Centurion seems to have alter'd his first Resolution upon this occasion, because perhaps he thought he should be at less charges if he sailed directly to Italy.

Ver. 7. Eridon.] This Grotius interprets of an Island that lay over against Caria, and was famous for the Image and Worship of Venus. And Cnidus indeed properly was a Town situated in a Peninsula, but there was before that Peninsula a little Island which the Cnidians possessed; and which, as Strabo speaks, lib. 14. διότι τοὺς χωρίου καὶ τῆς Κνήδος [κυρα] divided in a sort Cnidus into two Cities.

Ver. 14. Εἰσεχωρον.] For so the word ought to be read, and not ἐξεχωρον, as Grotius has shewn, to whose Reasons add this; that whilst that Wind blew, the Mariners were afraid of falling into the Quicklands, viz. one of the African Syrens, which was called simply Syrtes ut ιέξαν. For with such a Wind one might sail directly from Crete thither. The letter Α might easily be changed into Α, and the Greek Transcribers understanding well enough the word ιέξαν, which is in English
Chapter English a Storm, but not the word 'Αχυλον, which is Latin, it is no won
XXVIII. der they mistook and writ Eυγεραλλων.

Verf. 15. 'Αντεπολεμησαί. ] For in order to fail into Italy it was necessity they should have a contrary Wind, which blew from that quarter of the Heaven that is between the South and the East.

Verf. 23. Θεος ε πνευ. ] Subintell. Νξογ, which word signifies not only a Worshipper, but a Minister or Servant, as appears by the Inscriptions of St. Paul's Epistles.

Verf. 39. Εκατον ἀνεκλοθ. ] The word ἀνεκλοθ here does not signify any ordinary shore, for there is no Gulph or Bay but has some shore; but a sandy or gravelly shore, as it is interpreted by Hesychius; Νμαλθ, faith he, ἡ μεγαλελονος, εν τινω ψαμμωδη, ου ἠφεθης ὁ λόις. And it appears that this shore was ἄμμωδος sandy by the 41st Verse.

Verf. 44. Ἐνι τινε καὶ το τῆς πλαυ. ] The words ἄμμωδος ὁ λόις in the foregoing Verse, must be here repeated, and he commanded the rest to get to Land, some on boards and some on broken pieces of the Ship, i.e. to take pieces of wood to bear themselves up with. The Vulgar absurdly renders it & ceteros alios in tabulis serebant, as if those that could swim, had carried the rest to land upon Planks.

C H A P. XXVIII.

Verf. 3. 'Εκατον ἀε τῆς θερμης, &c. ] This place has been largely handled by the learned Bochart in Hieroz. Part. 2. Lib. 3. c. 2. But I wonder so diligent a Man, as well as Steph. Curcellenis in Parallelis, should overlook that Passage in the Prophet Amos, Chap. v. 19. where, speaking of wicked Men who endeavoured in vain to escape the Justice of God which pursued them, as the Maltees thought St. Paul did, he says, The day of the Lord is darkness and not light. As if a Man did flee from a Lion, and a Bear met him; or went into a house and leaned his hand on the wall, and a Serpent bit him.

Verf. 4. Note b. ] 'Η Διν is the proper Name of a Goddess, which was look'd upon by the Heathens as the Revenger of Wickedness, and was otherwise stiled Nemesis. So faith Suidas, Νηματος, μεξις, Διν, Accusation, Justice. There is a notable Description given of her in Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. 14. cap. 11. which I shall here set down, that the reason of this Speech of the Maltees may be the better understood. After he had spoken of the Punishments which some wicked Men had suffered for their evil Practices, he proceeds thus:
Hec & bujusmodi quaedam innumerabilia ultrix facinorum impiorum, &c. Chapter
These and innumerable other such things the Revenger of wicked and villi-
ous Actions, and the Rewarder of those that are good, Adraflia, many
times effects, (and I wish she always did) whom we otherwise call Nemesis.
Some sublime Power of an irresistible Deity, placed, as Men suppose, upon
the Circle of the Moon; or as others define it, a substantial Guardianship
presiding with a general Power over particular Fates: Which the antient
Divines feigning to be the Daughter of Justice, from some hidden Etern-
ity, affirm to inspect all Affairs here on Earth. She, as the great Mistress
on whom the decision of all Causes depends, and the Disposer and Deter-
miner of Chances, varying the courses of Lots by turns, and many times
giving our Actions a different issue than it seemed at first they would
have, works a manifold change in the Purposes and Acts of our Will.
And by an indissoluble chain of necessity tying up the Haughtiness of Mor-
tals, vainly puffing themselves up, and (as she understands bow) turning
and winding about the Junctures of thriving and decaying in the World,
one while she treads upon the Necks of the proud and insolent, and quite
dispersits them; and another while she raises the good from a low and mean to
a happy and prosperous condition. The fabulous Antients feigned her to have
Wings, that by her extraordinary swiftness she might be thought present
with every one, and represented her as holding a Rudder, and standing over
a Wheel, that she might be understood to steer and govern the Universe
by running over all the Elements. On which words see Valesius and Linden-
brochius.

Verl. 15. Note c.] To confirm what is said by Jo. Scaliger, our
Author might have alleged the Testimony of Ammianus Marcellinus,
who seems to have been the Writer out of whom he learned it, and
who in Lib. 16. cap. 11. has these words: Conversus bino Julianus ad
reparandas Tres Tabernas, munimentum ita cognominatum, baud ita du-
dum obstinatione subversum, hostili qua adificato, constabat ad intima
Galliarum, ut confueverant, adire Germanos arceri. From hence Julian
went and repaired the Tres Tabernae, a Fortress so called, that not
long before had been ruined by the Stubborness of the Enemy; which
being rebuilt, he retired into the innermost parts of Gallia, and stayed
there, in order to hinder the Incursions which the Germans used to make
into the Country. And the Tabernae having been so called, because
they consisted of Tabulae, Boards or Planks; it is probable that
there were little Houses built there with Boards for the Souldiers
to lodg in, because they could not endure to abide always in the
Camp.
Chapter XXVIII.

Ver. 20. Τις ἤστερος τις ἰσθανώ.] Both by this place and what we find said in Chap. xxii. 6. and xxiv. 15. and xxvi. 6, 7. it seems probable that St. Paul's chief Adversaries and Accusers were not the Pharisees but the Sadduces; who were most of all offended with his saying that Christ had been raised from the Dead, and lived with God in Heaven; because they denied the Resurrection. And so besides the hatred common to them with the Pharisees, there was this peculiar reason of their cruelty towards the Christians. It's true, there is no mention made of this, either in the Accusation brought against St. Paul, or in any other part of St. Luke's History relating to that matter; but from the defence which St. Paul makes for himself, this may be collected, who here mentions a circumstance which St. Luke left out in its proper place; and that is no rare thing in the History of the Scripture. See my Index to the Pentateuch, on the word Circumstances, and Note on Ver. 5. This is better I think than to say, as some others do, that it was a stratagem made use of by the Apostle Paul, to feign himself accused for affecting the Resurrection of the Dead, when the question was about something else, that he might get the Pharisees to be more favourable to him.

Ver. 21. Τις ἀληθείας.] Our Author did not sufficiently mind who the Persons were that spake this, when he interpreted the word ἀληθεία Ἦστερον by Christian Jews: For it is clear that they were unbelieving Jews whom these Persons (who were also themselves such) called Brethren.

Ver. 22. Πιστ. τις ἐπισκόπος κ. τ. ο. ] It cannot from the foregoing words be inferred, that St. Paul was a favourer of the Episcopacy, or of the Christian Religion; and these Jews having no knowledge of him any other way, they could hardly have made this answer, if he had said nothing but what St. Luke here relates. But St. Luke has not set down all the Circumstances or particulars of St. Paul's Discourse, but only the principal part of it, and so it cannot seem strange if it be inferred from what follows, that there was something done or said which in the foregoing Context is omitted, viz. that St. Paul did declare himself to believe that God had raised Christ from the dead, or that some others had affirmed this of him. See on Ver. 20.

Ver. 23. Ου ἐξεπέφερεν διαμαρτυρόμενος τινα ἑπισκόπον τινα, τινα τινα τινα τινα τινα τινα, κ.κ. These words are misplaced, and for the better understanding of them, are to be read in this order: ου ἐξεπέφερεν τινα τινα τινα, διαμαρτυρόμενος τινα ἑπισκόπον τινα, τινα τινα τινα τινα τινα, κ.κ.] to whom are expounded those things which concerned Jesus, bearing Testimony to the Kingdom of God, and persuading them both out of the Law.
Law of Moses, and out of the Prophets. I know very well that there are Chapter
a great many instances to be found of the misplacing of words in the XXVIII.
very best Greek Writers, and particularly in Aristotle, as if Castelbo in his Notes on Theophrastus’s Characters c. 7. has observed. But such transpositions founding very harsh in Latin, and much more to those who understand only the Modern Languages; this here in St. Luke ought not to have been retained by Interpreters, because the thing is plain to one that is skilled in the Greek, yet it makes the sense very obscure to others. Translators ought no more to imitate the Original in such things, than the peculiar construction of the Greek Language, which it is impossible without altering to turn into other Languages. For the clearer perceiving of which I shall here set down the words of a few Versions of this Passage. The Vulgar has, Exponebat testificans regnum Dei, suadensque eis de Jesu, ex lege Moysis, &c. What is exponebat testificans? Besides, de Jesu does not express the sense of the words τὰ καὶ τὸ ἱνα, which ought to have been rendered quæ pertinent ad Jesum, those things which concern Jesus. But yet Erasmus so translates them, omitting the article τοι as superfluous. And Castelio was guilty of the same fault, who otherwise uses to recede, when there is no reason for it, from the Phrase of the Sacred Writers: for thus he renders the words, quibus illa differebat, divinum regnum testificans, & eis de Jesu ex Moysis lege persuadere conans; which is neither Latin, nor expresses St. Luke’s sense. Beza’s translation is a great deal better, cum attestations exponebat regnum Dei, suadens eis quæ de Jesu Christo sunt ex lege, &c. but he did not observe there was a transposition here, nor come up to the sense of every word. The not understanding of this, was the occasion of the Geneva and other French Interpreters mistranslating this Passage. The Geneva renders it, ausques il expliquoit par divers témoignages le Royaume de Dieu, & les induisit à croire ce qui concerne Jesu, &c. as if St. Luke had said, ἔμενεν ἐμφάνιζεν ἐγώ. The Port-Royal has, il leur préchoit le Royaume de Dieu, leur confirmant ce qu’ils leur disoit, par plusieurs témoignages, &c. which is taking too great a liberty, whereas they should have said, il leur raconsoit ce qui concerne Jesus, rendant témoignage au Royaume de Dieu, & les persuadant par la Loi, &c.

In the first place, the Verb τυγχάνω does not signify to interpret, but to relate or declare, when the Discourse is about matters of Fact, such as the coming of Christ, his Resurrection and Ascension into Heaven. Secondly, the words τὰ καὶ τὸ ἱνα signify the History of Jesus, by which he was understood to be the Messiah. Thirdly, Διαμαρτυρεῖται is to bear Testimony to the truth of any History, as the Apostles did,
Chapter when they testified that Jesus was risen from the Dead and gone up to 
XXVIII. Heaven; upon which account they are called his μεταυτοι Witnesses.

See Acts i. 8, 22. and x. 39, 41. St. Paul indeed was not capable of 
bearing the same Testimony to Christ as the rest of the Apostles, who 
declared that they had seen him dead, and a little after alive again, and 
and had heard and touched him, &c. But he was able to testify that he 
was still alive, which he knew by what had happened to him in his way 
to Damascus, Acts ix. See also Chap. xxii. 15. And thus we find the 
word διαμαντευμα used in Chap. x. 42. of this History; He command-
ed us to preach unto the People, and to testify διαμαντευμα, that it is be which 
is ordained of God to be the Judge of the living and the dead, viz. by giving 
account of what had happened to him, and of his Doctrin. St. Paul 
bore Testimony in a peculiar manner to the Kingdom of God, when 
he declared that Christ reigned in Heaven, and had been seen by him-
self surrounded with immortal Light and Glory. Of the transposing 
of words there is another plain instance in Chap. i. 2. of this Book.
Annotations

On the

Epistle of S. Paul, the Apostle to the Romans.

At the end of the Premon. Tho most of what our Author says in this Premonition be true, yet there are two things in him liable to reprehension; and those are, first, that he supposes many times the Apostle to have a respect to the Gnosticks, where the Heathens or Jews are thought to be spoken of by other Interpreters, and that with more probability, as will appear by those places, and especially by Chap. i, and ii. The second relates to his Paraphrase, which is many times intricate and obscure, full of Repetitions, harsh and forced, and in a word not sufficiently adapted to explain the Series of St. Paul's Discourse; tho' as to the main, he seldom misses the true scope of it. But no body will ever explain an obscure Epistle, without endeavouring perspicuity and brevity; which two things our Author's Paraphrase is extremely defective in.

Chap. I.

Ver. 4. This passage S. Austin, de Præd. Sanct. c. i. 5. says, may be so almost understood as the Unitarians commonly understand it. Prædestinatus est ergo, faith he, Jesus, ut qui futurus erat secundum carnet filius David, esset tamen in virtute filius Dei, secundum Spiritum sanctificationis; quia natus est de Spiritu Sancto, ex Virgine Maria. Jesus therefore was predestinated, as one who was to be according to the flesh the Son of David, and yet should be in Power the Son of God, according to the Spirit of Sanctification; because he was born of the Virgin Mary by the power of the Holy Ghost. But the following words, ζηρασθείς, must have a different sense put upon them, which I take to be this; viz. that the Holy Ghost, which Jesus had received, was as it were a Voice whereby it was, miraculously [ἐξ ἑυθείας] signified or declared that he should be the Son of God, after his resurrection from the dead, ζηρασθείς. He was the Son.
Chapter 1. Son of God it's true, not only in decree as the Schoolmen speak, but actually before his Resurrection, but he was again called the Son of God in a peculiar manner after his Resurrection, as appears from Acts xiii. 32, 33. And therefore in this respect he might be said, to be ordained by the Holy Ghost, to be the Son of God, and raised after his Resurrection. This same Verb is used by St. Peter in Acts x. 42. in a like matter, where having said that he and the rest of the Apostles had eaten and drank with Jesus after he was risen from the dead, he adds: And he commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that it is he which was ἐξουσίας ordained by God to be the Judge of the living and dead. As by the Holy Ghost which descended upon him, he was ordained or marked out by God to perform the Office of the Messiah, and so to rise again, and upon that account to be called the Son of God, besides other reasons, for which he has that title, by a special Right and Privilege given to him; so also by his being raised from the dead, he was ordained or marked out by God to be the Judge of the living and dead. That faith & expectation here are the same, is truly observed by Grotius, who yet interprets the sense of this passage somewhat confusedly. Add to the Examples and Authors by him alleged, the Authority of the Old Testaments, in which section instance is rendered statuta dies, an appointed day; and sedes praeestituta, foreordained or appointed. And that the Preposition ëx signifies sometimes after, appears from John xiii. 4. and 2 Pet. ii. 8.

Verf. 7. Οὕτως ἐστὶν Παλαιοί. He does not say Palestine, because the greatest part of those who professed the Christian Religion in Rome at that time, were not Roman Citizens, but Jews, and people of other Nations who lived at Rome upon the account of Commerce. This has been imitated by Clemens Romanus, and Polycarpus Smyrnensis, in the inscriptions of their Epistles; on which see the Notes of learned Men.

Verf. 8. Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ. That is, as a Christian I thank my God. So Ephes. v. 20. Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father, in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, i.e. as Christians; See Note on John xiv. 14. and xv. 16.

Verf. 17. Note b. It is a harsh transposition which our Author and others before him suppose to be in the Apostles words; nor is there any need of it, the sense being commodious if we understand them thus: "That from the Faith whereby the Jews believed the Prophets, and the Gentiles their Ancestors, they might proceed to another Faith. The opposition here which is between κακία and εὐερήμων, confirms this Interpretation. Clemens Alexandrinus uses the same phrase in
on. where he speaks of a Jew that was converted to the Christian
Faith: 'Ex iis etsi sit faith he, neque ad quinque, et quinque, is deparate is
vixit eundem ejusque misericordia: He is carried from Faith to
Faith, as being unsafe tossed in the Law, [like a Sea] and having a
dangerous station in it, he betakes himself to our Saviour as to a Ha-
ven.'

Ver. 20. Note d. I shall set down in this place an Animadversion of
the learned Doctor Pearson, formerly Bishop of Chester, which is in his
Exposition of the Apostle's Creed, Art. i. p. 19. Ed. 5. wherein he
reprehends Dr. Hammond, and sharply confutes Socinus; from whom
our Commentator seems to have borrowed this Interpretation: 'This
place, saith he, must be vindicated from the false gloss of Socinus,
who contends that it cannot be proved from the Creature that
there is a God; and therefore to this place of St. Paul answers thus:
Sociendum est verba a creatione mundi debere conjungi cum verbo Invi-
bilis — Atigitur eo in hoc Apostolus, etsernam divinitatem Dei,
id est, id quod nos Deus per se praeceperum, (Divinitas enim hoc
sensus atibi quoque apud ipsum entisitatur, ut Coloss. ii. 9.) etsernamque
potestatem, id est, promissiones quae nonquum intercident, (quo sensu:
paulo superior dixerat Evangelium esse potentiam Dei) hoc est, quae
nunquam postquam mundus creatus est ab hominibus visa fuerant,
id est, non fuerunt eis cognita, per opera, hoc est, per miracula ipsius
Dei; quin et divinorum hominum, praesertim veri Christi & Apostolorum ejus
operationes, conspecta sint. In which Interpretation there is no-
thing that is not forced and distorted: for tho his first observation
seem plausible, yet there is no validity in it. He bringeth only for
proof Matt. xiii. 35. munus est illud verum et prudum iis, which proves not
at all that illusorum has the same sense: and it is more than proba-
bly that it hath not, because that is usually expressed by esset
illud, Mark x. 6. and xiii. 19. 2 Pet. iii. 4. never by illud erat.

Besides, the rex regum in St. Matthew bears not that analogy with
dixerat which Socinus pretends, signifying not things unseen or un-
known till then, but only obscure Sayings or Parables; for which
purpose those words were produced out of the Psalms by the Evan-
elist, to prove that the Messias was to speak in Parables, in the Ori-
"inal דְּמוֹנָה מִרְבִּיעִים, in the LXX אֶרֶץ בְּרֵשֵׁית, i. e. wife,
antient Sayings, which were not unseen and unknown, for it imme-
diately follows, which we have heard and known, and our Fathers have
told us, Psal. lxxviii. 3. And tho he would make out this Interpre-
tation, by accusing other Interpreters of unfaithfulness, Plerique
interpretes ex prepostione a secundum ex, contra ipsorum Graecorum co-
dicium fidem, quod non in verba sed in actionibus habent: yet there is
no ground for such a Calumny, because it may be, and is often
rendered e or ex as well as e, as Matth. iii. 4. "et eis iraculam, e ri-
lis camellina, and vii. 4. et se obdanzi & homo oculo tuo. 16. eto eae,
ex spinis; and even in the same sense which Socinus contends for,
Mat. xvii. 18. et vts odes iacint, Vulg. ex illa bora, as Tully, ex co
die, and Virgil, ex illo Corydon, Corydon est tempore nobis, and,
Tempore jam ex illo casus mibi cognitus urbis Trojana. So the Greek
æwagen the Latins render ex parte, æd vts ex æquo: of which
Examples are innumerable. There is no unfaithfulness then im-
putable to the Interpreters: nor can such pitiful Criticisms give
any advantage to the last part of Socinus’s Exposition.

However, the Catholick Interpretation depends not on those
words τις και εκτιμ, but on the consideration of the Persons, that is,
the Gentiles, and the other words τιματυς νοματυς, which he farther
perverts, rendering them the miraculous Operations of Christ and his
Apostles, or, as one of our Learned Men [Dr. Hammond] their
Doings, mistaking τιματυς, which is from the Passive τιματυς, for
τιματυς, from the Active τιματυς, for τιματυς, is properly the thing made
or created, not the operation or doing of it; as καις is sometimes
taken for the Creature, sometimes for the Creation, but καις is the
Creature only. As therefore we read 1 Tim. iv. 4. πιν καις τη θυ
τυ αγει. So Eph. ii. 10. καις θυ την καις. In this sense spake Thales
properly, πησαμεναι τη του θεου, αγειειν πιν καις τη καις θυ.
The other Interpretations which he was forced to, are yet more
extravagant; as when he renders the eternal Godhead, that which God
would always have us to do, or his everlasting Will, and proves that
rendering of it by another place of St. Paul, Col. ii. 9. For in him
dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily; that is, says he, all the
Will of God: (whereas it is most certain, that where the Godhead is,
especially where the fulness, even all the fulness of the Godhead is,
there must be all the Attributes as well as the Will of God:) and
when he interprets the eternal Power to be the Promises which shall
never fail, and thinks he has sufficiently prov’d it, because the
same Apostle calls the Gospel the Power of God. For by this way of
Interpretation no Sentence of Scripture can have any certain
sense.

Thus, he with a great deal of reason refutes Faust. Socinus, who in
this matter shewed himself neither a Philosopher nor a Grammian.
But he is too sharp upon him, and at the same time upon Dr. Hammond Chapter
for understanding the Phrase ζητεῖν κόσμον in the same manner as
Beza did, who renders it jam inde a Creatione mundi, ever since the
Creation of the World. They went according to the proper signification
of the Preposition ὑπὲρ; and the word ζητεῖσθαι, which follows, being
understood in the sense that Dr. Pearson would have it to be, proves it:
the invisible things of God, from or ever since the Creation of the World, being
understood by the things which he has made, are seen. For if it had been
St. Paul's design to say what the learned Bishop would have him, he
should have expressed it thus: εἰς κόσμος οὐ τοιναύτα, by the Creation and
[his] Works, and not by εἰς κόσμον, τὸς ζητοῦσαν, from the Creation by
[bis] Works. The Examples he brings to prove that ὑπὲρ is used for εἰς
are nothing to the purpose, because the Phrases are different. He
should have given us an Example in which παύεσθαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς to know
any one from anything was put for παύεσθαι εἰς τοὺς. The Greeks say;
ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ οἴσαι, ἐν τῇ κατοικίᾳ τοῦ ὑψιστοῦ, ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι οὕσει, ἐν τῇ ζωῆς ὑπὲρ, ἐν τῷ ἡμῖν ἔνεμος, ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τῷ σωτῆρι, ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ παύειν. But they say also
ὑπὲρ ζητοῦν, (see Matth. vii. 16, 20.) tho the Preposition ὑπὲρ is more
commonly used in this Phrase. I could confirm this by the Authority
of many Interpreters who are far enough from Socinianism; but this
way Dr. Pearson himself does not take.

Further, tho it be very true that ζητεῖσθαι does not signify an Action,
but the Work itself, or thing done; yet because there is no Work with-
out an Action, nor any Action of God without a Work, Dr. Hammond
might well enough in his Paraphrase make use of a word which signi-
fied an Action, being it included also in it the Work itself. In fine,
Dr. Hammond thought that what is here said respected chiefly the
Gnosticks, in which I think he was mistaken; but being of this opinion
he was obliged to understand by the word ζητεῖσθαι, not so much the
Works of Creation as of Providence, both ordinary, and principally
such as were extraordinary, and made a mighty impression upon the
Minds of Men in Christ's time. As for Socinus's Interpretation of the
words Power and Divinity, as it is manifestly forced; so it is rejected
by his Brethren of the Polish Society, Crellius and Slichtingius, in their
Commentaries on this Epistle.

Ver. 23. Note f.] There are some things with relation to what
our Author here says about the Gnosticks, that deserve to be considered,
and I shall briefly set them down in this place, not designing after-
wards to repeat them.

I. It cannot be deny'd, that there were even from the Apostle's
time pernicious Hereticks, to whom there is often a respect had in
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Chapter these Epistles, as our Author has shewn: Of which number were the followers of Simon, if what the Antients say concerning them be true. And it is possible likewise that these Men might even at that time boast of their extraordinary Knowledg, and call themselves Gnosticks, tho that Name came to be more famous afterwards. Τρικκ among the Christians of that Age did not signify only Knowledg or Learning in general, but also some peculiar knowledg of the abstruse Points of Religion, and the mystical sense of Scripture; in which sense we more than once meet with it in an Epistle of St. Barnabas. See in the Greek, Chap. 6. not. 35. and Chap. 10. not. 60. and in the Latin, c. 1. not. 15. of the Amsterdam Edition, and the learned Dr. Pearson's Vindic. Ignat. Part 2. c. 6. But yet that the Participle τινως in the 21st Verse has a reference to these Hereticks, I do not think, nor is it necessary.

II. The Doctor is rash in following Justin Martyr, who erroneously thought that Simon Magus was deified by the Romans, because there was a Statue at Rome consecrated to SEMON SANCUS, which was an antient Roman Deity. Caesar Baronius indeed had gone before Dr. Hammond in this, but he had been corrected by Def. Heraldus in Comment. ad cap. 13. Apolog. Tertul. And his Opinion was afterwards confirmed by Henr. Valesius on Euseb. H. E. lib. 2. c. 13. and Ant. Pagus in Epip. Baroniana, ad An. 142. I do not think there is any more truth in what is related concerning the Contest between St. Peter and him; but if it were true, the Romans had undoubted-ly pulled down his Statue: for how could they have thought him to be a God who was overcome by a Man? but Heraldus justly calls this a Fable in his Notes on the second Book of Arnobius.

III. I do not doubt but the Gnosticks, or followers of Simon, imitated the Heathens; but I am of opinion, with most other Inter-preters, that the Apostle had a respect here to the Heathens them-selves, and particularly to their Philosophers, not those who imitated them. See Grotius. All that the Apostle here says very fitly agrees to the Heathens, but there are some things which cannot commodiously be applied to the Gnosticks.

IV. I wonder our learned Author should think the word Νεκ here to refer to Exod. xxiv. and signify that Splendor which appeared on the top of Mount Sinai, when the Law was given to the Jews; and afterwards say that the Phrase to change the Glory, is borrowed from Psalm cvi. 20. For it had been sufficient to mention that Passage in the Psalmist, to which this here manifestly refers, and not to that Splendor or glorious Appearance. The Glory of God is God himself, or his eternally
eternally glorious Nature. If by the glory of God in this place, were Chapter
charged upon the Gentiles would be, not that they had represented God by a visible shape, but that they had made use of another than
that. They ought to have expressed that splendor by Fire, as the Persians use to do; not by figures of living Creatures, as the Greeks and Romans. In the Psalm it is said they changed their Glory לברדמ chbodam.
But St. Paul could not call God the glory of the Heathens, who knew very little of him; and perhaps in the Chaldee Paraphrase of the Psalms, which was used at that time by the Synagogues, the words were read as they are now in ours ימי נברדמ the glory of their Lord.

V. To shew how aptly what St. Paul here says, may be applied to the Heathens, and particularly their Philosophers, I shall express the sense of his Discourse from Vers. 17 to the 26th, in a short Paraphrase.

"17. For in the Gospel there is a way shewn, whereby those that believe it may obtain the pardon of their Sins from God, to the end that from the Faith which they had in their former Religion, they might be induced to believe the Gospel; for to such only we may apply that passage of the Prophet Habakkuk, The just shall live by Faith. 18. Those who refuse to believe it, shall be punished by the Divine Justice for their former Sins, which cannot be expiated any otherwise than by Faith in the Gospel; and whereof the greatest by far is that whereby the Heathens, and even their Philosophers do dissemble the knowledge which they have of the true God, and do not conform their Divine Worship to it. 19. For many of them understood what God would have them know concerning himself, and hath manifested to them, 20. From the beginning of the World, by his Works, wherein his infinite Power and transcendent Nature do illustriously shew themselves, and are as it were visible; so that they have no excuse to make for the absurd Religion on which they profess. 21. Tho they knew how wise and powerful a Being God was, and had great experiences of his Goodness and Bounty, yet they neither gave that honour to him openly, which the perfection of his Nature challenged from them, nor thanked him for his Benefits. And therefore God in just Indignation suffered them to fall into so many errors, which he would otherwise have delivered them from, that they even rendered the most certain things doubtful. 22. And whilst they professed the study of Wisdom, they lost their Understandings. 23. Being blinded"
blinded through their own fault, as one error produces another, they represented God whom they might, as I said, have understood to be an infinitely more perfect Being than a Man, not only like a Man, but even like a Beast.

24. Nor did their depravation stop here, in the errors of their Minds, or in Divine Worship, but they became also most impure and abominable in their Lives, God not restraining them. 25. For the same Persons who had formed such vile Images of the Godhead, and so extremely unworthy of the Divine Majesty, and worshipped those Images, neglecting God himself; 26. As they had as much as in them lay, disgraced the Divine Nature; so forgetting also, as it were, themselves, they confounded the Offices of both Sexes, which Nature has distinguished, by Lusts not to be named, &c.

All these things the Heathens fell into, even their Philosophers not excepted, as might be easily proved out of Aristophanes, Latinius, Lucian, the Satyrick Latin Poets, Seneca, and in a word all Antiquity.

Verf. 29. Note i. Lin. 7. After the words, giving over all labour] This is an absurd Translation of the word ἀναγκαίος, which never had any such sense, but signifies having lost all sense of Pain or Grief. See on Ephes. iv. 19.

Ibid. At the end of that Note] Thο ἔλεγχος be truly deduced τοῦ ἔλεγχος, and is used both in a good and bad sense, of Riches, or Power, or Victory, or endowments of Mind, and other things in which some exceed and go beyond others; yet I do not think it any where signifies a desire of Pleasure; nor does any of all those places which our Author has here heaped together, prove what he intends, as I shall shew by a brief examination of them. For it is not ground enough, that such or such a sense of a word is not foreign to the design of any place, nay that it is very agreeable to it, to infer that that is sometimes the signification of that word; seeing the series of the discourse will often permit it to be taken in other senses altogether as commodious; and less proper words likewise are many times made use of instead of more proper. And therefore before we make use of reasoning to find out the signification of any word, the certain use of it must be otherwise known; for else it is very easy to mistake. Now to review the Passages alluded by our Author: (1.) The words of St. Paul in Ephes. iv. 19. will very well bear to be understood of Courteousness, as Grotius has observed, because there were a great many of the Male Sex, that prostituted themselves for the sake of Gain. (2.) The words of Photius, St. Chrysostom and Antiochus, do not ne-
Cellarily require the sense of Lusts, but may easily be understood like Chapter wise of Covetousness. (3.) The example of Austerius proves nothing I at all, because his words may be very well understood of a desire of Riches and Power, yea ought to be so. I have not indeed Alexander Aphrodisiensis, nor can I conveniently get him; but I dare lay any wager, we ought to read πλους ἡ δεον more than he should; for that is the definition of an unjust Man ἡ δέος, nor does that word among the Greeks ever signify a voluntary. (4.) Tho the Septuagint render the Hebrew word יִשָּׂ ב both by πλεονεξία and μαθέως, it does not follow that these Greek words ought to be used promiscuously. It is not to be thought that the Greek words made use of in the barbarous style of those Interpreters, are always of the same latitude with the Hebrew; and besides, there was no necessary reason for the Septuagints translating the Hebrew word in that place of Ezekiel by μαθέως. See Interpreters on the place. (5.) In the Prayer of Ephraim, there is nothing that should oblige us to understand πλεονεξία any otherwise than it commonly is; for why may not we suppose him to ask pardon for his Covetousness, as well as his Lusts or Uncleanness? Do not those Vices sometimes go together? (6.) Tho Plato uses the Phrase πλεονεξία τίτων after the mention of Pleasures, it does not follow that πλεονεξία there signifies Lust, for that Phrase may be very well rendered a greater abundance of these things, major horum copia, as Mars. Ficinus has translated it. See Plato himself, pag. 508. Ed. Genev. of Ficinus. (7.) Πλεονεκτίν τω αὐθαναύν in the Epist. of Barnabas, does not signify to be lustful, but multiplicare annum. See Cap. 10. Not. 51. Edit. Amstel. (8.) It is without cause that the Doctor interprets avaritiae, in Polycarpus and Bede, by Sensuality or the love of Pleasures. Could not Valens be at the same time πλεονεκτίτις or covetous, and lustful too? And do not sensual or lustful Persons use to be covetous, and to seize upon other peoples Possessions when they have opportunity, that they may spend them upon their Lusts? Bede does not seem neither to have confounded the word avaritia with the love of Pleasure, tho he joins together things that are in effect often conjoined. The same may be said of other Authors who have any like Passages; for what is more common than to speak of several Vices together? (9.) Tho the Sodomites be upbraided for their πονηρα and κακα, it does not follow that these words properly signify villainous Lusts; they are general terms, by which their wickedness may be described, whatsoever it consisted in, as the constant signification of those words shew. (10.) Of the Passages cited by the Doctor out of St. Paul, I shall speak when I come to them, as also of the other places of the New Testament. (11.) The word 

δεδικα.
Chapter II.

Ver. 1. The Apostle as far as the eighth Verse, goes on to condemn the Heathen Philosophers, who did those things which they condemned in others, and knew to be evil; upon which account they were reproached even among the Heathens themselves: See Lactantius Inst. Divin. Lib. 3. c. 15. who produces out of Cicero, Corn. Nepos and Seneca, very remarkable Testimonies against those who were Philosophers more in words than in manners. Dr. Hammond, to make these things agree to his Gnosticks, puts several things into his Paraphrase, whereof there is not the least footstep in St. Paul. It is easy to find out what sense we please in any Author whom we interpret, if we may take the liberty to patch up his Thoughts in that manner with our own. I wonder also at Grotius for thinking the Apostle here had reference to the Roman Magistrates, because of the word ἡσίλων which he saith properly signifies a Jugg; when that word may as well be taken for any one that judgeth, as a Philosopher who judgeth concerning Vice and Virtue, as a Magistrate. Yea Plato in Lib. 9. Rep. p. 506. Edit. Ficini, applies that word to a Philosopher, where he speaks of judging concerning what is good or evil. Διὰ τοῦτο δὲ, οἷς ἄνθρωποι, ἐγκατέστησαν, ἡ μὲν φιλοσόφων πεπεσμένη τῷ αὐτῷ, ἡ δὲ φιλοσόφων, ἀλλὰ ἐς φιλοσόφου: A covetous or ambitious Man is not qualified to judg, but only a Philosopher. And a great many more such examples, if I had time, and it were necessary, might be found out to shew that a Philosopher may be properly called ἡσίλων.

Verf. 8. Τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, &c.] This has a respect to the Philosophers, who when they ought, according to their own Doctrin, to have obeyed the Gospel, abused that skill in disputing which they had acquired by the study of Philosophy in resisting it. And such were afterwards Lucian, Celsus, Porphyrius, Hierocles, and others, who out of a love to contention, opposed the Christian Religion. Ἐπιθετικά is aptly to this purpose defined by Phavorinus, ἐπιθετικά, ἐπίκαιον εἰς φιλοσόφεια, contradicting or evil speaking, or contending by words, for which most of the Philosophers were infamous.
Ver. 9. Θείος, &c.] Here the Apostle returns to what he had said Chapter in the 15th Ver. of the foregoing Chapter, viz. that the Gospel belonged to the Gentiles as well as the Jews, and brought Salvation equally to them both; as in this place he tells them that if they continued in their Sins and Unbelief, and neglected the only way of Salvation, they would both bring destruction upon themselves. These he compares first with one another, and then inveighs against the Jews who persisted in their Sins; nor is there any thing that properly concerns the Gnosticks, as any one will see that does but read the Apostle.

Ver. 13. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν εὐδοκῆτο ἡμῖν ἰδεῖν. This Passage perhaps Porphyry had in his mind, who often read the Holy Scriptures that he might be able to oppose them, when he wrote in his Book de Abstinent. c. 57. that it was impossible for a Man to attain εἰς τὸ Θεόν, i.e. to Happiness, μὴ ἐπιπλοῦσα ὑμῖν, ἐὰν ἴδῃς φάνας, τὸ βουνό, ἐπιπλοῦσα ὑμῖν εἰς σωματός, ἵνα ἄρτι τοῦ φυγῆς ἐπιπλοῦσα, unless he were nailed, if I may so speak, to God, and divided from the Body and the Pleasures which by that affect the Mind: εἰ ἔργον εἰρήνης, ἢ εἰ άκρολύεται λόγον ζητήσει γενέας. for we are saved by WORKS, not by a bare HEARING of words.

Ver. 15. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ τάις ἀγαθοῖς αὐτῶν.] That is, they were not instructed out of the written Law, but their own Reason informed them what was good, and what was evil. For that is said to be written in the Heart or Mind, which we understand by reasoning, without any written Institution. This is not opposed to the knowledge of the Gnosticks, but of the Jews.

Ibid. Note c. To this purpose is that elegant Passage in Plautus in Rudente, Act. 4. Sc. 7.

Spectavi ego pridem comicos ad ipsum modum.
Sapienter dicta dicere atque iis plaudier,
Cum illos sapientes mores monstrabant poplo;
Sed cum inde suam quisque ibant diversi domum,
Nullus erat illo patre ut illis jussurant.

Ver. 17. Note e. This is all forced. Read the Apostle himself, and it will appear that he speaks of a Jew properly so called, and one that was circumcised.

Ἐν δὲ δώδεκα here, is not properly to be called or denominated; but to be celebrated or famous; so that St. Paul's meaning is this: it is a thing universally known, that thou art a Jew, or a Disciple of Moses; this is what
Chapter 11.

what thou pretendest thy self to be, and gloriest in. The Apostle has no respect in this to the Gnosticks, who could not neither be said to rest in the Law, which they took not the least care to observe, as our Author confesses, but when the fear of the Jews urged them to it.

Ver. 18. Note f. Dr. Hammond's Interpretation of the Verb δοξαζων may be confirmed by the Authority of an old Glossary, in which that Verb is render'd not only by perpendere, examinare, to weigh, to examin, but also approbare, comprobare, to approve. And in the same διαφησα is rendered by praesto, præcello, to excel. But yet because the Discourse is concerning one that is able to teach others what is good and profitable, and what is not, or of a Master, I chuse rather to understand it of trying those things that differ, or trying the difference of things, that is, distinguishing between lawful and unlawful. And so in that Passage of the Epist. to the Philippians, δοξαζων κα τα διαφησα may signify to distinguish carefully good from evil, or not ignorantly to confound things which are different: Whence the Apostle adds λα ἵνα εἰληκνείη, that ye may be sincere, that is, without mixture of good and evil, not sufficiently distinguished by you; and consequently, as it follows, εὔπροσωποι, without offence. However, it is most true, that the Verb δοξαζων does not only signify the examining of a thing, but also that which is consequent upon it, the approbation of it. But this may very aptly be said of the Jews compared with the Heathens, because the Jews were instructed out of the Law, which the Gnosticks were not, but were part of them Heathens.

Ver. 19. Οδηγον ἐγώ τα πυλῶν. The Blind cannot discern the right way from the Path which would lead them out of the Road they desire to take; and therefore they need a Guide to discern it for them. And in like manner such as cannot δοξαζων κα τα διαφησα, as to those things between which the Will of God makes a difference, have need of a Teacher to shew them the difference between what is lawful and unlawful. This, and what follows, plainly confirms the Opinion which I have preferred to Dr. Hammond's Interpretation, and agrees exactly to the Jews compared with the Heathens.

Ver. 22. Ἰερουσαλήμ. I do not think the Doctor has expressed the Apostle's sense here in his Paraphrase; I chuse rather to understand this word Ἰερουσαλήμ of stealing the Vessels that were consecrated to Idols; as if the Apostle had said; "Thou who pretendest to abhor Idols, as most polluted things, which thou wouldst not so much as touch, dost nevertheless, if thou hast an opportunity, steal the
Vessels which are consecrated to them, and are as polluted as the Chapter Idols themselves. In which he has a respect undoubtedly to that Law in Deut. vii. 25. The graven Images of their Gods shalt thou burn with fire; thou shalt not defile the Silver or Gold that is upon them, &c.

Ver. 25. Περιτμία ἦτο Ἰωάννης, &c.] That is, it is advantageous for a Person to profess himself a Jew, and to carry about him the sacred Ἡλετρυς of that Religion in his body, provided he observe its Laws, and those especially which relate to a good Life, and the Interest of Human Society. I know Divines usually call Circumcision a Seal of the Covenant, in the sense our Author uses those words. But see what I have said of that matter in my Notes on Gen. xvii. 10.

Ibid. Ἐν τῇ παρακάτω οὐκ. If those who boast themselves to be circumcised Persons, and bear the token of God's Covenant in their Bodies, neglect the most holy Laws delivered to them by Moses, their Circumcision can be of no use to them, which is only a sign of their professing Judaism, not the whole Jewish Religion.

Ver. 26. Ἐν τῷ ἱεροκλεισίῳ. That is, as all Interpreters have observed, the uncircumcised. Circumcision was instituted as a sign of God's Covenant, with which all that were marked professed their Resolution to obey the only true God, Creator of Heaven and Earth. But if there were any among other Nations who, without that mark set upon the Jews only, obey'd God in those things which they knew to be acceptable to him, their Piety was as pleasing to God as that of the circumcised Jews. That Sign was instituted only to put the Jews constantly in mind of their Duty, and not as a thing in itself grateful to God.

Ibid. Εἰς ἁγίατον λογισμον. That is, whoever observes those Laws that are of eternal Equity, ἴσανομή, wherever he be, and what Nation soever he be of, shall be accounted by God in the number of his People, as much as if he were circumcised. ἴσανομή among the Greeks properly signifies Equity, or that which is alledged to shew a Cause to be just or good: But in the Septuagint it is used to signify the Laws of God of what kind soever they be: But in this place ἴσανομή are those things which God may equitably require of all Nations, such as Experience and right Reason dictate to be just.

Ver. 27. Note h.] I wonder learned Men did not perceive there was an Ellipsis in this Phrase, and that the word ἤθικς must be understood, which is expressed afterwards. The meaning of S. Paul is this: They that have been hitherto uncircumcised, as they are born (for so the Phrase ἵν ἐν σώματι ἱεροκλεισίᾳ signifies) and yet observe the Moral Laws, &c. Jews, that is, in the number of God's People, not indeed accord-
Chapter ing to the letter of the Laws themselves, but according to the mind of the Lawgiver; and accordingly will shew by their Example that you are justly condemned, who by the letter of the Law and Circumcision are esteemed the People of God: τὸς δὲ γενήματος οὐκ ἤχομεν ἴνα ἴσως κείσωμεν ὑπὸ δικαιοσύνης ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησίων. Those that are Jews by the Spirit and Righteousness, shall condemn such as are Jews by the Letter and Circumcision. Afterwards in Chap. iv. 11. the Phrase ἐν δύνασίᾳ has another signification, to wit, among the uncircumcised Nations, or whilst they are uncircumcised; for the Preposition ἐν often signifies distance of place or time. See ver. 29. in which this Interpretation is confirmed. Of the signification of the word γενήματα as it is opposed to the Intention or Mind of the Lawgiver, I have already spoken in a Note on Mat. v. 17.

Verf. 29. ἐν γενήματι, ἐν γενήματι] That is, that Circumcision is worthy of Praise, which is agreeable to the spiritual Intention of God in instituting carnal Circumcision; not that which according to the letter of the Law is made in the Flesh, which in itself is neither good nor evil. So that when the Apostle uses the Phrase ἐν γενήματι, it is as if he had said κατὰ γενήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ σώλην, according to the spiritual Intention or Will of God: as on the other hand, τὸ γενήματα is the same with κατὰ τὰ γενήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, according to the letters of the Law. Whence in the Writings of St. Paul, the Law of Moses is often called γενήματα, the Letter; and the Gospel γνώσις, the Spirit, because this revealed the spiritual Intention of God, which was concealed under the letter of the Law. See 2 Cor. iii. 6.

Ibid. ὅν τις ἐν γενήματι.] To wit, the Jews, who highly preferred a Person that was circumcised to one that was not, having little or no regard to how they both lived: They considered the letter of the Law, and not the spirit of the Lawgiver; and so neglecting Mens internal Qualifications, commended chiefly their external.

CHAP. III.

Verf. 2. Note a. Nothing could have been said more fallly concerning the Original of the word λόγος, which was commonly used by the Greeks in that signification before ever the Greek Language was spoken in the Land of Canaan. It was used by Herodotus and Thucydides, who lived whilst the Persian Monarchy stood; nor did the Septuagint for any other reason call the Pelgoral λόγον, tho improperly and barbarously, than because that word ordinarily signified in Greek an Oracle, and λόγος in the
Plural, Oracles; which were so called because they were αὐτοὶ λόγοι, that Chapter is, audibly pronounced or expressed, when otherwise the Gods were supposed to give their Responses by Dreams, Intrails, Signs, or Omens without any Voice. This derivation of the word seems to be more proper than that which is given of it by Thucydidus's Scholiast in Lib. 2. p. 104. Ed. Am. Porti, where on those words of the Historian; πολλὰ µὲν λόγα ἐλέγξατο, πολλὰ δὲ χειρομαλάτως εἰς: Many Oracles or Responses were given, many things were sung by the Prophets; he makes this Remark: λόγα εἰς τὰ διὰ τὸ θεοῦ λεγόμενα καταλαβήν. χειρομαλατίας ἐμπέπληκτον λέγεται: λόγα are those Responses which are made by God in Prose, and χειρομαλατία those which are given in Verse. Hence also the Author of the Book of Wisdom, chap. xvi. 11. and the Son of Syrach in chap. xxxvi. 16. call λόγα the Revelations of God by the Prophets. And such the Apostle here means, and not the Responses given by the High Priest, as Grotius has shewn. But our Author being deceived by the ambiguity of the word, treats of the Pectoral in an improper place.

Ibid. In the same Col. after the words, Judgment of Urim. ] How foreign all this is to this place in St. Paul, I have already shewn. But I have one or two things more here to observe. First, That the Doctor took what he here says out of Rob. Scheeringamius in his Notes on cap. 8. Iomae, as he has done other things also of that nature. Secondly, That the Rabbins, whose Authority he here alludes to, are as ignorant of this matter as we, only they had the confidence to set down their own Inventions for known and certain Truth, which is a very usual thing with them. Every one knows, that during the second Temple there was no Urim and Thummim; and I would not have any one so silly as to think that the Rabbins, who lived some Ages after the destruction of that Temple, understood by certain Tradition what Urim and Thummim were. Their Opinion is evidently confuted by Spencer in his Treatise of Urim and Thummim, cap. 3. sect. 11. As for me, I think quite otherwise of the whole matter, as I have declared in my Notes on Exod. xxviii. 30. and Numb. xxvi. 21.

Ibid. Col. 4. in that Note, lin. 10. after the words dead Witnesses. ] I have shewn that λόγα signifies in Greek God's Responses, without any respect had to the Pectoral; and λόγα γνώριμα, as has been well observed by H. Grotius, are enlivening or quickning words. I wonder he did not allude to that purpose Heb. iv. 12.

Ibid. lin. 20. after the words there consisted ] Our learned Author heaps Mistakes upon Mistakes; for it is certain συμφαία has no allusion to the Pectoral, and does not signify Letters, but the Rudiments or first Principles of Piety.
Chapter III. Note b. That the Doctrine which our Divine here teaches is very true, considered in itself, no one can doubt, that understands the nature of the Gospel-Covenant. But I expected he should have acted the part of a Grammarian rather than a Divine, and reasoned not from the Analogy of Faith, but the grammatical use of words. What our Author therefore has not done, shall be briefly done by me. And, first, It must be observ'd, that the words יִשָּׁר in Hebrew, and ἱσθήσεις in Greek, are most frequently used in the largest sense, to signify a good Man, or one that loves Righteousness, but are sometimes taken in a more limited notion, and signify a Man who is guiltless of any particular Crime. Of the first signification we may every where meet with Examples; of the latter there is an Instance in Prov. xvii. 15. He that justifieth the guilty (יִשָּׁר) and he that condemneth the just (יִשָּׁה) are both an Abomination to the Lord. See also Isa. v. 23. And agreeably to this twofold sense of the word just, the signification also of the Verbs יָשָׂר and ἱσθήσεις to justify, is twofold; either for to esteem just, that is, good; or just, that is, innocent or guiltless of the Crime charged upon him. In this latter signification they are used in the Passages before mentioned in the Proverbs and Isaiah; but this Notion in this dispute concerning Justification, can have no place: For God does not justify any Man from all Sin; that is, account him guiltless; because all Men are Sinners. But there remains another sense, in which God may properly be said to esteem those just, that is, good Men, and acceptable to him, who believe in Christ, tho their Righteousness be not perfect or faultless, because he mercifully accepts of an imperfect Virtue instead of a perfect one, upon the account of Christ's Sacrifice. And in this sense it is said of Abraham that ἵσθησις, he was justified; that is, accounted a just Man, not according to strict Justice, but the gracious acceptance of God, who judged him to be a good and pious Person: Whence it is said in Scripture, that Abraham believed God, and it was counted, or imputed to him for Righteousness; that is, that Faith was look'd upon as the Act of a good Man, and one that feared God; and therefore Abraham was judged by God to be such an one. See my Notes on Gen. xv. 6.

These things, if carefully observed, will give great light into this whole Disputation of St. Paul, which is otherwise hardly intelligible. The Jews affirmed, that by the bare observation of the Law of Moses, as they interpreted it, a Man was justified in the sight of God, that is, accounted just by God, and accordingly accepted by him, and might expect from him the Reward promised to all good Men. And they thought.
thought they could exactly fulfil the Law in all points, and so be justified as good Men upon that account; meaning by the observation of the Law, a Life so regulated, that no Charge could by any one be brought against them out of the Law, as Transgressors of any of its Precepts, which had a threatening of Punishment annexed to it: And if they lived so, they thought the Reward of pious Men was justly due to them. This was the Opinion of the Jews, against which St. Paul disputes, and shews that Men are not justified by the Works of the Law, that is, esteemed pious by God; but by Faith, i.e. upon their believing God’s Revelations, and for the future obeying them, tho’ they had not before observed the Law, or any of its Ceremonies: To which purpose he alludes the Example of Abraham, who, when uncircumcised, was accounted just by God, upon believing his Promise. And he urges that no Man can justly contend with God, because all have heinously sinned, and therefore stand in need of God’s pardoning Mercy in order to their being accounted just: With many other Arguments, of which, as the matter shall require, I shall afterwards speak.

Two things I will further observe in this place; First, That promise here is taken in that sense in which I said a Person was justified, who is not esteemed guilty of any unjust or wicked Action: for David’s meaning in Psal. L. 6. is this, that he acknowledged he had committed a very great Sin, so that he had no reason to doubt of the Divine Justice in threatening to punish him. Secondly, That towards the end of the foregoing Annotation, Dr. Hammond does ill compare the Phrases to be imputed to Righteousness, and to be accounted worthy of a Reward, with one another, as will appear if we look into St. Paul’s words.

Ver. 8. Note d.] There is no necessity of any Parenthesis in this place; if we do but supply the word מים from what follows, the sense will be plain thus: Why yet am I also judged as a Sinner? Why do not we do, as we are slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say, that we will do evil that good may come?

Ver. 25. Note b. lin. 13. after the words propitious to the People.] Our learned Author is mistaken in thinking that the Hebrew word כְּפָרַתָה, is indifferently rendered לָשׁון and נַחֲנָנָה. There is only one place in Exod. xxvi. 34. where the Septuagint can seem to have translated it by נַחֲנָנָה; but if it be more narrowly look’d into, it will appear that they read כְּפָרַתָה, which is the name of the Veil that was drawn over against the most Holy place, and thought that Moses was commanded to put the Ark there within that space. I have rendered the place, impones operculum area. testimo-
ni in sanctissimo adyto, Thou shalt put the Covering upon the Ark of the Testimony in the most Holy Place; and they, κατακρηστευται τη κατακρυβομενη. And it is certain to κατακρυβομενη signifies only a Veil, which κατακρυβομενη is extended, in order to hide any thing; and so they constantly translate מַעֲרֵכָה parocheth, which is the name of the Veil or Curtain that hid the most Holy Place. But a Covering, such as that was which was put upon the Ark, would be more fitly called in Greek κελαμα, or οπικαλαμα, or πωμα, or by another Name. I fear our learned Author confounded the Hebrew words alleged, because of the similitude there is between them, and through want of memory.

Ibid. Lin. 39. After the words, to be performed.] To speak freely my opinion, I am apt to think there is no allusion here to the Covering of the Ark, but that Christ is called ἱερατευμον, ἱεραστη, ἱερον or σώμα sacrifice; because immediately there is mention made of Blood, which has no affinity with a Covering. So the Greeks call ἱερατευμον, a Sacrifice offered up by way of Thanksgiving. But I confess I never could meet with that word in this sense save in the old Omonographon, where ἱερατευμον is rendered propitiabile, which word is to be understood actively, for that which is capable of pacifying or rendering God propitious, as in like manner impetrabilis signifies one that can easily obtain what he desires. So that the vulgar who renders this word Expiationem, and Beza who renders it Placamentum, i.e. an expiatory Sacrifice, have translated it better than others, who render it by propitiatorium, a propitiatory, by which word is generally understood the Covering of the Ark.

Ibid. At the end of that Note.] Tho what our Author here theologically discourses be very true, yet it does not much conduce to the understanding of St. Paul's words, if the proper signification of them be considered. πιστεω ει τη αυτη αιματι, is here spoken of, not for the reasons mentioned by our Author, but because the Discourse is about an expiatory Sacrifice, whereof the Blood can be of no use to us unless we believe on Christ, and hope that by his Sacrifice God will become propitious to us, tho we have been great Sinners against him.

Ibid. Ακα τη τελετα.] The Doctrine indeed laid down by our learned Author in the foregoing Annotation, I heartily subscribe to; but I think it is foreign to this place, as depending upon a wrong interpretation of the word τελετα. The scope of the Apostle is to shew that there is another kind of Righteousness brought in by Christ, which he calls the righteousness of God, different from that which results from Works, and by which we are justified freely by his Grace, through
through the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus. And for the clearer explanation of that, he adds, whom God hath set forth as an Atonement, through Faith in his Blood; that is, "which Jesus God declares in the Gospel to be an expiatory Sacrifice, by whose Blood the Sins of those who believe on him are expiated: To make known his Righteousness, because of the remission of former Sins under the forbearance of God; To shew that those are just in his sight, whose past Sins he has remitted, and whose Repentance he did not in vain wait for: At this time, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that is of the Faith of Jesus; which at this time only is manifest to all: whence we may conclude, that God is both a lover of Righteousness, and also accounts those just who have believed in Christ, and heartily obey him. The whole series of the Discourse does as it were proclaim this to be the scope and sense of the Apostle; and I wonder that Grotius himself did not see it, tho the Doctor, who often gives forced Interpretations of Places, might easily not discern it.

Tho I do not deny that the ἀνατομίαν, or Righteousness of God, is often put for his Goodness and Mercy, as Grotius has shewn; yet in this dispute it has another signification, as appears from Chap. i. 17. and vers. 21, 24, and 26 of this Chapter, where it is manifestly taken for Gospel-Righteousness, that is, for sanctity of Life, consequent upon Repentance. And this Righteousness which God accepts, upon the account of Christ's Sacrifice, is not grounded upon a connivance or taking no notice of past Sins, but the remission of them. For God accounts those just, not whose Sins he overlooks or connives at, but those whose Sins he has already pardoned, and upon their Repentance takes into his favour, contrary to their deserts.

I contend that παρέξεις is all one with ἁφτον, and that the Preposition σὺ cannot be urged to prove παρέξεις to be the same with συγγεγέρται. Nothing is more common in the Greek Language, than for Prepositions to lose their proper force in compound words, as every one knows, who has had but the least taste of that Language. And therefore Grammarians and Greek Writers make the words παρακάτω and ἀνατομίας promiscuous. Hesychius interprets παρέξεις not only by ἁφτον, κατα-λαμπών, to suffer, to omit, but also by συγγεγέρται, ἁφτον, to grant, to remit, and παρέξεις by ἁφτον remission. So Dionysius Halicarnass. Antiq. Rom. Lib. 2. p. 103. Ed. Syburg. παρέξεις αὐτὸς τὴν ἀκαπατὴν ταὐτῷ ἁμνῷ: We forgive them this Offence without setting any fine upon them; or if you please, we let it go unpunished, which is the same with pardoning. And Lib. 7. he opposes παρέξεις not to remission, but delaying or putting off: p. 446. Παρεξεὶς ἐν πολλὰς συμφωνίας τῷ αὐτῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ. 

ΠΑΡΕΞΕΙΝ.
Chapter IV.

Ver. 1. "ThO as to the thing itself, our Author seems to have reached the scope of this place, yet as to all the words he will not satisfy an exact Grammarian. For καὶ ἄνω cannot without violence be interpreted ἔν ἄνω, or also by human strength, both which he seems to think are meant by that Phrase. Kατά ἄνω in the places alluded to by him, signifies according to the course of the Flesh or human Generation, as Christ is said Chap. i. 3. to have been of the Seed of David according to the Flesh; which signification cannot be pertinent here, unless these words be joined with πατρὸς Φαθερ, which yet he will not allow of: See Chap. ix. 3. 5. St. Paul's words therefore must be explained thus; What shall we say then? that Abraham our Father hath found (ἐνενέ γρας) according to the Flesh? that is, in the judgment of Man, or according to a carnal Judgment. It is certain this alone can be said; for if Abraham was justified by Works, he hath whereof to glory before Men, but not before God. So John viii. 15. to judge according to the Flesh, signifies to judge after the manner of Men. See also 2 Cor. i. 17. which very thing is expressed in 1 Cor. ix. 8. by speaking ἔν ἄνω.

Ver. 26. Note k. I have before interpreted the word ἄνω, not a revenger of Sin, but a lover of Righteousness, or Gospel-sanctity; which agrees very well with the scope of the Apostle. For having said that God accounted those Persons just, whose Sins he had remitted, he adds with great reason, that God was nevertheless Just or Holy; lest the Jews should perhaps object, that by his Doctrine the Justice or Holiness of God was impeached, because he justified Men that had lived in a course of Sin. But he does but touch upon this here transiently, designing in the vi, vii, and viii Chapters to speak to that matter more at large: So God is said to be just, in Deut. xxxii. 4. and elsewhere often.
The use of the Phrase πριν αἰγα in this sense, being thus known, it must be considered whether the Context requires it to be understood in this sense here. Now St. Paul shews in the foregoing Chapter, that all Men were Sinners, and therefore had nothing to alledge in their own defence; and that none could boast of their justification before God, as if they were therefore accounted just by him, because they had never sinned. This is the sum of the foregoing Chapter, whence it might be justly inferred that Abraham himself was not justified by Works before God; and therefore in that sense could not be said to have found or obtained Grace before God, but only in the judgment of Men, who cannot judge of things exactly, and to talk of whose judgment in this case is absurd. For which reason to the question proposed, that Abraham our Father hath found Grace according to the Flesh? the Apostle answers nothing, because it is confuted by the bare proposal of it, it being manifest that in this dispute he speaks of the judgment of God, and not that of Men. And therefore he goes on, If Abraham was justified by Works, if he was accounted just for his works ζητα εἰγα in the judgment of Men, be hath whereof to glory, viz. οίς ζητα εἰγα, before Men; but not before God, ἄλλας οίς εἰγα & ceteras. These last words manifestly shew the judgment of God here to be opposed to the judgment of Men, of which there should accordingly have been something said before, and yet of which nothing will have been said, unless ζητα εἰγα be interpreted κατ’ ἔρθανων. This our Author was in some measure sensible of, as appears by his Paraphrase on the 2d verse; but he discerned it as other Interpreters also did, just as a Man sees the Moon through the Clouds, which put him strangely upon the wrack to find out the sense of these words, and the connexion of the Discourse. This Verse does not contain any objection made by the Jews, who not only said that Abraham was justified κατ’ ἔρθανων, but also ζητα εἰγα, as the Scripture declares. It is rather a concession of St. Paul, wherein he grants that Abraham might possibly in the judgment of Men, for his spotless Life before them, be accounted just; which is not the thing here spoken to, the Discourse being about the judgment of God.

Ver. 5. Διατηρησαι ἔν οὖν. That is, him who accounteth one just, that was before ungodly; because he believes in Christ, and obeys his Precepts. The Works which are excluded from Justification, are those which precede Faith and Repentance, and are wicked Works; in the room of which succeed Faith and new Obedience, which are accepted instead of constant Righteousness and Innocence: and therefore Faith is said to be imputed for Righteousness.
Chapter V.

Ver. 17. Note b. St. Chrysostom's Interpretation is a mere Nicety, as Bexa rightly thought, nothing being more common in Scripture than this Phrase, before God, ἑαυτῶν ἀληθῶν, which has no such signification, as in the place alleged by our Author out of Gen. xvii. In this it signifies truly, tho' Men, viz. the Jews, falsely thought otherwise. See my Notes on Gen. x. 9.

Ver. 5. Αἵματα καὶ ἐνέχθαι διὰ τούτου. That which seems to be intended by these words is, a power of doing Miracles conferred on the Apostles and innumerable others by Christ, as the Doctor intimates in his Paraphrase. For hereby the Apostles and the rest of the Christians were assured that Christ would not disappoint those who waited for the accomplishment of his promises, having already so plentifully bestowed on them the promised gifts of his Spirit.
Ver. 7. *Heb.* That, as our Author well observes in his Para-
Chapter phrase, ἀληθινὸς, beneficent or charitable, which is more than ἀληθις just.
So in a great many places God is said to be ἀληθις, which signifies not his Goodness, that is, his ἁγιοτητα, but his Bounty, or ἀληθινὸς towards Men: See Psalm cxxxvii. So Mat. xx. 15. Is thine Eye evil because I am good? ἀληθις ἀληθις, that is, bountiful, as the Parable shews. So in
Aelian Var. Hist. Lib. 3. 17. Taegurion ἔγινεν ἀληθινὸς ἄγγελος. Archytas was good to the Tarentines, i.e. a Benefactor to them. So the old Glosses; ἀληθινὸς bonus, benignus, good, gracious; and Phavorinus among other things says, it signifies, ὁ ἀληθινὸς ἄγγελος τοῦ καλοῦ ἄγγελου, one that without asking bestows good things freely.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 3. Ἐβασπυδ.assertIn ἑκτὸς.] The sense of this Phrase is not suf-
ficiently expressed by our Author, nor by other Inter-
preters. The Particle is here signifies, as it usually does,
the end of Baptism; and the Apostle's meaning is no more than this:
we were baptized to this end, that we might be Christians. So in 1 Cor.
1. 2. the antient Jews are said to have been baptized is μναχ., i.e. to
that end that they might be the Disciples of Moses: See Note on
Mat. xxviii. 19. And fo in the next words, εἰς σῳστηρ, signifies to
the end we might imitate his Death, viz. Christ's.

Ver. 6. Note a. Cok. 1. Lin. 34. after the words, in the notion of
ἐκκαι.] There are several things in the beginning of thisAnnotation
I cannot assent to.

1. To confirm the sense our learned Author puts upon the word
ἐκκαι he alledges places as parallel that are not. For there is a great
difference between places in which the word ἐκκαι is joined with Pron-
nouns Possessive, where the discourse is about Men, as my Body, &c.
and places in which it is joined with the names of other things.
There is no doubt but the Phrase my Body, is often all one with I my
self, by a Synecdoche of the part for the whole, common in many Lan-
guages. But when other Names are added to the word Body, the
Phrase is quite different, because they cannot be said to consist of two
parts, of which one may be called the Body, and give a denominati-
on to the whole thing, as to a Man. Nor is there any comparison be-
tween Phrases, whereof one, as the Logicians speak, signifies a.sub-
stance, as when Body is attributed to a Man, and the other an accident,
as the body of Sin, if that Phrase be to be understood of Sin it self.
II. I had rather in this place, and such others, recur to another very frequent Idiom of the Hebrew Language, whereby a Noun Substantive in the Genitive Case is put for an Adjective, and so by the Body of Sin understand a sinful Body, or a Body obnoxious to Sin: which Interpretation how agreeable it is to this place I shall afterwards shew. So in Chap. vii. 24. αὐμα σωμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is a Body obnoxious to death, as I shall prove. And Phil. iii. 21. αὐμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας and αὐμα τῆς Δεινίας is manifestly a vile Body and a glorious Body. From whence, faith St. Paul, (viz. from Heaven) we look for our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our Body of Vanity, that it may be fashioned like unto the Body of his Glory.

III. By the Body of Sin, or obnoxious to Sin here, we are to understand reduplicative, as the Schoolmen speak, the Body as such, or the Body as a body of Sin. The Apostle does not respect the Substance itself of the Body, but this quality of it, that it is the original, incentive and instrument of Sin, as he tells us in the next Chapter. And it is certain sensible things do not draw us to sinful Actions any other way than by affecting our Bodies, and by that means impressing our Minds. And that most of the Sins we are guilty of, proceed from an inordinate love of sensible things, every body will readily acknowledge. After therefore the Apostle had said our old Man was crucified, that is, we had left our old sinful Customs, he very fitly adds, that hereupon that deadly and destructive Power which was in our Bodies to draw us to Sin was taken away, ἵνα ναπαράξῃ, he, το αὐμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, so that the Body of Sin is weakened or disabled, for so I interpret the Particle in by the figure called Ecphrasis, not as a Cause. So Col. ii. 11. In whom also ye are circumcised with the Circumcision made without hands, in the putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh; for that Body which before served Sin, is as it were put off, in order to put on another new Body which may serve Righteousness. The change is in use of the Body, not in the Substance of it, that is here meant.

IV. The Hebrew word נִבְּשָׁם properly signifies a Bone, not the Body, of which there is no Example, and comes from a Root which signifies to be strong, because the Bones are the strongest parts of the Body. But afterwards, I know not for what reason, it came to signify the thing itself, which the Discourse related to. Instead of Judg. 9. our Author writes Jof. 9. as it is falsely quoted also in Val. Schindler, from whom, or some other Lexicographer, he took it upon trust, without looking into the place, which is thus: Remember that I am בְּשָׁמֶךְ, your Bone and your Flesh, which is a Hebrew Phrase used to signify Consanguinity. See my Notes on Gen. ii. 23. The Phrase in
Job ii. 5. Touch his Bone ἅρματον and his Flesh, is a Periphrasis of the Body, Chapter which consists chiefly of Flesh and Bones. Nor do either of those places serve the Doctor's design. I confess, among the Rabbins, the word ἅρματον is used to signify a Substance, as it is opposed to Accidents, and that ἃρματον signifies my self; but it would not be properly rendered ὁμα τοῦ Body. Of the word ὁμα τοῦ in Col. ii. 9. I may have occasion to speak elsewhere, for we have nothing to do with it here.

Ibid. At the end of that Note.] These descriptions of Regeneration illustrate indeed the thing St. Paul here speaks of, but do not shew us what is the proper meaning of the Phrase καταργεῖν τῷ σώμα τῷ ἄρματο, which was most requisite. The word καταργεῖν is as seldom used by Heathen Writers, as it is frequently by St. Paul, in whom it occurs more than twenty times. The simple Verbal signifies to be at rest, to cease, from ἀνεπίκουρος or ἀνεπίκουρος, idle, one that has nothing to do. And hence καταργεῖν is to make to cease, and by consequence to render vain or useless. In the Old Glossary it is rendered by cassio to frustrate or make void, and καταργεῖν by avocat calls off, viz. from business, to ἀπελευσία or rest. And Phavorinus has καταργεῖν, ὁμα τῷ, ἀνεπίκουρος, should overcome, should make to cease; καταργεῖν τῷ ἀνεπίκουρος, καταργείν γε καὶ τῶν ἀνεπίκουρος, ἄρτα ἀπελευσίαν, to make to cease, and finish: for καταργεῖν ὁμα τῷ is as much as ἄρματον, it was made to cease. And so here καταργεῖν τῷ σώμα τῷ ἄρματο is to make those Sins which have their rise from the Body to cease.

Ver. 19. Note to.] 1. I believe our Author never look'd into the Passage in Demosthenes, for if he had, he would have seen that it was nothing to his purpose, and would have otherwise translated it. It is in the Greek Ed. of Morellus, Num. 72. where Demosthenes, speaking of the Stripes inflicted on him by Midias, faith, τὸ αὐτοῖς ὁμα τῷ μακρὰς σαρκίς φανερὰν ἐν παρεξήγησιν ἀντί; what excuse will seem human and modest for those things which he has done? That is, in which a Man would acknowledge that he had been humanly treated; of which Phavorinus H. Stephanus in his Thesaurus. The place in Horace ought to have been more exactly referred to: For who ever alluded a Testimony out of Horace, lib. 2. without adding Carm. Sat. or Epist.? That place is in Epist. 2. Lib. 2. ver. 70. where, speaking of the tediousness of the ways, which could not be travelled but with great pain; he ironically says, Intervalla vides human et commoda, that is, valde commoda, or such as you would in all reason desire. The Doctor, who did not look into the place, renders it parum commoda, little profitable.

II. The latter Interpretation is favoured by Phavorinus, who saith out of a Lexicon which contained perhaps the words of Scripture, of which.
Chapter VII.

But S. Chrysostom seems to favour the former, who interprets it by ἀπὸ καθερετικῶν λογισμῶν, ἀπὸ τῆς συνήθεισ εἰσαγωγῆς: from human reasonings, from those things which are commonly or customarily done. And indeed the word λεγεῖν sufficiently shews, that τὸ καθερετικὸν is to be understood ἀπὸ τῆς λέξεως of the Apostles form of speaking. And because words borrowed from common use are plain, and clear, therefore the Phrase καθερετικὸς λεγεῖν signifies to speak plainly, as it is usual to speak, not in a bigger or more swelling style than ordinary, and consequently more obscure. A Cook in Strato in Phœnicide is brought in speaking of another that used old fashioned and poetical words, thus:

Πιπώ οἰκωτῷ γ' ἄνων ἡδύ μεταβαλέων,
Καθερετικὸς λεγεῖν τε.

But I earnestly beseech him to change his Dialect, and speak humanely. It is in the 9th Book of Athenæus cap. 7. on which see J. Cæsarian. It is certain what St. Paul had said before was not καθερετικὸν λέγειν, and therefore it is no wonder if, changing the form of his Discourse, he says here καθερετικὸν λέγειν. So also the Latin humanus is opposed to poetice in Petronius cap. 50. Minus quam duabus horis mecum moraris, et raptius poetice quam humanè loquutus es; You have been with me less than two hours, and have talked oftener poetically than humanely.

CHAP. VII.

Ver. 5. Our Author confounds here things that ought to be distinguished, and distinguishes between things that are the same, because he had a greater regard to Divinity than to Grammar.

I. Being in the Flesh is a Phrase here applied to the Jews, who observed only the letter of the Law, as St. Paul speaks, that is, its carnal Commands, which respected only the Body, but had no regard to the spiritual design of them. But this could not be said of all the Jews, among whom such as were pious did doubtless take more care about real and inward Holiness, than external Ceremonies. To this purpose is that Declaration in Hosea vi. 7. concerning the excellency of Mercy above Sacrifices, and the like sayings in the Prophets.

II. The Phrase καθερετικὸς λεγεῖν signifies to enjoy, the spiritual sense of the Law, not the literal or grammatical; that is, to regard the Mind
Mind or Spirit of the Lawgiver more than his Words, as the Christians Chapter did. See on Chap. ii. 29. and compare that Verse with the foregoing, which will shew what is the meaning of the word Spirit on one hand, and Letter or Flesh on the other; for these two last are used promiscuously.

III. But because they that followed only the carnal sense of the Law, were not lovers of true Piety, the Phrase to be in the Flesh, taken in this sense, draws another Notion along with it, which is to indulge the Lusts of the Body, or ἀρετής ὀρθός ἀνώτητος, to be according to the Flesh, those Phrases being indifferently used by St. Paul, chap. viii. 5, 8, 9.

Ver. 7. Note e.] But the discourse is not about a Jew, who could not doubt but that Coveting, which was forbidden by the Law, was a Sin, but one that knew not the Law, as those Jews which lived before the Law was given. Unless God had prohibited coveting, they had not believed it to be a Sin no more than most of the Heathens. To seize upon what was another's by force, or secretly take it away, they knew to be Theft, and a thing manifestly prejudicial to human Society, and therefore evil and offensive to God; but they did not think it unlawful either to covet what was not their own, or to get what was another's by Artifices, such as are used by Merchants, who think they may lawfully do a great many things either to raise the Price of their own Goods, or to buy another's cheap, and the like, which are undoubtedly unjust, tho very agreeable to the Custom of most Nations. But this insipient, or coveting, God forbade, and that inward affection from which such Sins proceed, as I have shewn on Exod. xx. See also on Mat. v. 28.

Ver. 15. "O φιλω.] That is, would, vellem, as Grotius and others have rightly observ'd. See 1 Cor. vii. 7. So it is used also by Anacreon in the beginning of his first Ode:

Θεά νέμει άρετίδας,
Θεά άφες Καςτικόν γένη.

I would speak of the Atridae, I would sing of Cadmus.

CHAP. VIII.

Ver. 2. ΤHO it be very true, that he who is freed from the Law of Sin, is freed from Sin; and that the Law of the Spirit is not without the Spirit, so that what is said of the Law of the Spirit may be said also of the Spirit; yet neither of these Phrases can be properly and literally explained so as our Author
Chapter interprets them. The Law of Sin is properly the Dominion of Sin, as VIII. appears from the 23d Verse of the foregoing Chapter, namely, be- 
cauSe it belongs to a Ruler to impose Laws. And on the contrary, 
the Law of the Spirit is the Dominion of the Spirit: So that St. Paul’s 
meaning is, that the Spirit which Christ gives, and whose Commands 
Christians obey, does free them from the Dominion which Sin former-
ly had over them; which is so manifest, that in his Paraphrase the 
Doctor has followed this Interpretation: Only having no regard to 
propriety of Speech in his own Stile, he is as careless of it in inter-
preting anothers.

this word in a sense quite contrary to Dr. Hammond. The Apostle, 
faith he, here explains what he means by ὑπὸ ὥτ, מִטְרוֹם, which is 
usually rendered דֵּין מִדָּעָה, not only by Interpreters, but also by Josephus, 
and properly signifies such things as are in their own nature good and just, as 
I have said on Luke i. 6. and in Lib. 1. c. 1. 9. de Fure B. & P. But 
they are both in an error; for, First, The distinction which the Rab-
bins make between the Hebrew words מִטְרוֹם mitzvot and דִּין בּוּקָם dibukim, 
has no foundation either in their Etymology or Use, as I have ob-
served on Gen. xxvi. 5. Secondly, The Greek word δικαίωμα is used by 
Greek Interpreters to signify the Divine Laws in general; and they most commonly render דִּין בּוּקָם by δικαίωμα, yet they use also that word 
sometimes where the Hebrew has מִטְרוֹם. See Deut. xxx. 15. and 1 
Kings ii. 3. Among Attick Writers, or the best Grecians, 
מִטְרוֹם signifies a Statute, Law, or Record, Instrumentum, by which 
the justice of any Cause is determined; but in the Old and New 
Testament God’s Ordinances or Institutions, of what sort soever 
they be, are called מִטְרוֹם, because it is just מִטְרוֹם, to obey them; 
and sometimes the observance of those Laws it self, as in Rev. xix. 
8. which place our Author forces. So that it must be collected from 
the thing it self, and not from the word, whether the Discourse be 
about Moral Precepts or others.

Verf. 15. מִטְרוֹם פְּלִיוֹן.] The word Spirit here manifestly signifies 
an affection of the Mind, as the Spirit of Jealousy in Numb. v. the 
affection of a jealous Mind, and so in many other Phrases of the same 
kind. St. Paul’s meaning here therefore is, that the manner of God’s 
Behaviour toward the Jews, had rather produced in their Minds a 
flourishing Disposition, than a filial one. But wherein did that servile 
Temper consist? This we are told in the following words εἰς φόβον to 
fear, that is, that ye should be governed more by fear than by hope; 
for that is the case of Servants who stand in great fear of their 
Masters,
Masters, but hope for very little from them; whereas Children hope much from the bounty of their Parents, and fear but little. But what was the reason why the Jews fear of God was greater than their hopes? Namely, because the breach of his Laws, excepting Sins of Infirmity, and some of less moment, was threatened with Temporal Punishments, which were unavoidable whilst the Jewish Commonwealth stood and flourished, and God had not any where promised Mercy to Persons so offending, either in this Life or in the next, or allowed any place for Repentance: Because he had not appointed any Expiatory Sacrifices in the Law for spiritual Sins, such as Pride, or Covetousness, or the like, tho he had denounced no Temporal Punishments against them; whereby it came to pass, that the covetous, proud, or any other such sort of Sinners had nothing to apprehend from the Magistrate, yet they were afraid of being punished by God, who had made no Promises so much as to the penitent. But under the Gospel things are quite otherwise, as I need not here at large shew.

This is what Dr. Hammond ought only to have expressed in his Paraphrase, which may be gathered from St. Paul’s words themselves, and not arbitrarily have inserted foreign things into his Discourse. Compare with this place Gal. iv. 1, &c. Who in reading St. Paul would ever have dream’d that under those things, which are signified by the Spirit of Adoption, were contained the mild Punishments of the Church? Where did Christ, where did his Apostles teach any such thing? More might be said which I designedly pass over.

Vers. 19. Note f.] If ever any thing was written by Dr. Hammond that was harsh and forced, (and a great many Instances of such things might be given) it is certainly what he says in this place, as I shall briefly prove.

I. He confesses that the ἀνέσθης καὶ ἀνέγείρθη, in the 18th Verse, is either a deliverance from the Persecutions of the Jews in this Life, or the happiness of the next; of which last it is only to be understood, the Discourse being about that Inheritance whereof we are joint Heirs with Christ, which respects only the other World. But the Apostle goes on: For the Creature lifting up (as it were) its head (ἡ ἀνέκεισθαι τῆς κλήρου) waits for the Revelation (ἀνεκήσθη) of the Sons of God; which manifestly shews that he still speaks of the Glory which is to be revealed, and which makes nothing to the distinction that was to be put between the incredulous Jews, and those among them who believed and obey’d the Gospel. If our Author had not been used
Chapter used to a more intricate Stile, he would soon have perceived that he offered Violence to the Series of the Discourse.

II. The word ἀποκατάστασις cannot be applied to such an expectation as he describes, for we are properly said ἀποκαταστάσεως, when upon previous notice given of it, we understand there is some great happiness to be looked for, and which we impatiently expect, tho' perhaps we do not know perfectly what it is. But the Gentiles knew nothing at all of their vocation to the true Religion upon the Gospel's being rejected by the Jews. Who will believe that St. Paul, in order to express the Affection of the Gentiles, plunged in the greatest ignorance and wickedness, and who accordingly could not be said otherwise than Ἀποκαταστάσεως, to be in expectation of the Gospel, would make use of a word that has a singular emphasis in it? It had been hardly tolerable if he had mollified it as much as possible, by adding καὶ ἔκτοτε, or some such other form. The phrased to seek death, and to love death, which signify to do those things which such as fought or loved death would do, are not here to the purpose. For the Heathens did not do what those ought to have done who were in a longings expectation of the Gospel. The words of Jacob in Gen. xlix. are otherwise to be understood, as in my Notes on that passage I have shewn. Nor is there any necessity of interpreting the words of Haggai of the Gentiles, to whom Christ should be as yet unknown; but they may be very well understood of those which, after they had already embraced the Gospel, should make Christ their desire, that is, should long to enjoy his promised Benefits, and see him returning from Heaven to judge the World. This is that which is the object of our ἀποκατάστασις, or earnest expectation.

III. It is very true that in the Language of the Rabbins, signifies men. Our Author might also have added, that in the same dialect the word הָרָבי signifies Heathens, in opposition to Jews, as his Countryman Dr. Lightfoot on Mark xvi. 15. has observed. The meaning of St. Paul therefore is, that the Heathens who were converted to the Christian Faith, did earnestly expect the time when the Sons of God were to be revealed, that is, as the foregoing and following context shews, were to be made partakers of eternal Glory and Happiness by Christ after the universal Judgment. He distinguishes afterwards himself and the believing Jews from the Heathens, when he says that not only they, or the Creature, did expect that time, but we also that have the first fruits of the Spirit, i.e., we Jews who have first received the Holy Spirit from God. The Gentiles at this time were no longer in expectation.
4. Besides, I cannot imagine whence our Author inferred, that the happiness of the Gentiles did depend upon the obduracy of the Jews; as if upon supposition that the whole Jewish Nation, or the greatest part of it, had believed in Christ, the Gentiles were never to have had the Christian Faith preached to them! We are told indeed, both by Christ and his Apostles, that the Gospel was to be preached first to the Jews, pursuant to God's decree, but no where to them alone. There was no difference to be made in this matter between the Jews and the rest of the World, but only in the time of preaching the Gospel. If the whole Jewish Nation had received Christ, they had understood that the Gentiles were to be called to the same Faith, and that they must abandon their Rites and Ceremonies; and so all the Jews had become the Disciples of Christ. I confess the obstinacy of the Jews was the occasion of the Apostles going to the Gentiles; but what the Jews obstinacy was the occasion of, Religion and Charity would have obliged the Apostles to, if the Jews had all or most of them believed in Christ. This we may conclude from the story of Cornelius in Acts x. to whom St. Peter was directly sent before the Apostles had departed from the Jews. And this Christ expressly commanded in Mark xvi. 15. and Acts i. 8. So that it hence also appears that our Author puts a wrong interpretation on this discourse of St. Paul.

Ibid. Note g. The Revelation of the Sons of God is manifestly the same with the Adoption spoken of in vers. 23. and that being nothing else but an admission into the Kingdom of Heaven in the view of all the World, the Revelation of the Sons of God must be that same Adoption of God whereby he will make known to all, who those are that he acknowledges for his Sons. The series of the discourse puts this out of all doubt: The CREATURE earnestly waits for the REVELATION OF THE SONS OF GOD, in hope because the Creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of Corruption, into the glorious liberty of the Sons of God: for we know that every Creature groaneth, and travaileth in pain until now; and NOT only they [expect, to wit, the Revelation of the Sons of God, and groan because of their present condition!] BUT WE OURSELVES also, who have the first Fruits of the Spirit, groan likewise our selves within our selves, waiting for the ADOPTION of Sons, viz. the Redemption of our Body. The Doctor
Chapter hinder’d his discerning this, by mixing a great many foreign things with St. Paul’s discourse, of which there is not the least mark or footstep in the Apostle, perhaps to have the reputation of saying something new.

By the Revelation or Adoption of the Sons of God, is signified an act of Christ, acknowledging those that are his, at the day of Judgment, in some such words as those, Come ye blessed, &c. because it does not now appear who are the Sons of God by any particular and visible evidences of the divine favour towards them above the rest of mankind, and so others deny them to be by a special privilege the Sons of God; but when Christ comes to separate the Godly from the Wicked, this will be plain and manifest. See John i Ep. iii. 1, 2.

Ver. 20. Note i. Our Author covers one Mistake with another, to keep them, as one said, from leaking. This I most of all wonder at, that he should produce the Example of a most superstitious Heathen, and most malicious and implacable Enemy to the Christian Religion, viz. Porphyry, as a Philosopher who groaned under the burden of Idolatry. Whoever reads his Writings and his Life, writ by the learned Luc. Holstenius, and understands but the nature of that new Platonick Philosophy, will soon perceive that no Men were ever more devoted to Idolatry, than Porphyry, and the rest of the Philosophers of that Age. Our Author ought rather to have produced the Examples of Socrates, Plato, and others, who in some measure disapproved Idolatry, than of such as were its greatest Champions, and with all their might defended it against Christianity.

But there was no need of recurring to that, for the word ματαιός does not signify Idolatry, nor is the Discourse here about Idolaters. For tho I should grant our Author that Idolatry is called ματαιός, and Idolaters ματαιοποιοῦσις, it does not follow, that wherever that word is used it must be so interpreted, or that it respects the Worship of Idols rather than any other Vanities of the Heathens. It may be better understood here of that Emptiness or Vanity which is in all the things of this Life. For the Heathens who had embraced the Gospel did earnestly expect that time wherein they knew they should be delivered from the Vanity of this World; to wit, when Christ should openly acknowledge and declare them to be the Sons of God, as I before said. Those who have entertained the Christian Religion, and seriously considered it, do best of all know that those things which relate only to this Life are ματαιός ματαιοποιοῦσις, perfect Vanity; such only understand the truth of that saying of the Preacher, Vanity of Vanities, all things are Vanity, and of the Poet, How quantum est in rebus inane!
And accordingly the Heathens who had been converted to Christianity, did groan and as it were travel in pain, till they were set free from those vain Occupations, which partly necessity, and partly the ignorance and weakness of human Understanding, has imposed on us.

That is the proper signification of the word ματαιότης, viz. a vain desire or labour, for it signifies what is done υμεν in vain, as υμεν signifies frustraneous, insignificant, and in the old Glosses is rendered by inane, cassus, vanus, supervacuus, and ματαιότης frustratio, vanitas. Such are most of the Employments of this Life, des signed either to procure what we judge profitable, or to redress those Evils which trouble and torment us, in which we often find our selves disappointed; so that we grow weary of our present Condition, and are made to wish for that time wherein being delivered from all these vain distractions we shall enjoy the happiness of the Sons of God.

Ibid. Note h. Having already overthrown what Dr. Hammond says in the foregoing Annotations, what he has here about the word. οὐκ ἔστις must needs fall to the ground. The οὐκ ἔστις is God who has made Men for their Sins subject ματαιότης to vanity, that is, as I said before, the vain employments of Life; which the Wise Man in Eccles. i. 13. and iii. 10. calls עזאבל הbabalim, and the Septuagint elegantly render ματαιότης. This fore Travel, saith he, (this vain Labour, ματαιότης, as it may be renderd in Greek) hath God given to the Sons of Men, to be exercised therewith. And to so many vain labours with which humane Life is encumbered, we are unwillingly subject, and should not patiently undergo them but for God, who has subjected us to them, and in whose most wise and just Providence it is fit we should acquiesce. But in the mean while nothing hinders but we may desire to be delivered from these vexations, which will then only be, when the Sons of God shall be revealed, who now together with the wicked are subject to the same troubles and labours, and will not be set at Liberty till Christ's return. In comparison of this Interpretation, to omit the rest, Dr. Hammond's is violent; and all he says besides is nothing to the purpose.

Ver. 21. Note k. θαρσοτε in this place, signifies nothing but that corruption to which our Body is naturally liable, and which in this Life we are unwillingly in Bondage to: So it is used in Cor. xv. 42. It is not the same with ματαιότης vanity, that being but a consequence of it; for the corruptible nefs of our Bodies is the reason of our being exercised with so many vain labours.

Ver. 23. Note l. καθαρσία, as I before said, is that solemn acknowledgment of the Sons of God which will be made at the day of Judgment.
Chapter VIII.

Annotation on

...ment, presently after the resurrection of the Dead. Now we are rather ordained or appointed to be the Sons of God, than actually enjoy that Dignity; as Jesus was determined the Son of God after his Resurrection, as St. Paul speaks in Chap. i. 2. No one besides Dr. Hammond would say Еσεχομένως οὐμάκαινος, when it is delivered from Persecutions.

Ibid. Note m. Lin. 9. After the words, in a different sense.] Our Author forgot himself when he wrote this, for we do not find this word ἐσεχομένως used in the 22d verse, nor any where else in this Chapter, or in this Epistle, but in Chap. iii. 24.

Ibid. At the end of that Note.] It is much more agreeable to St. Paul's style and the series of his Discourse in this place, to understand the word ἐσεχομένως of the resurrection of the Body; after which we shall enter upon that Happiness which is opposed to the vanities or vanities of this Life.

Vers. 26. Note n. There was no need of proving that αἰσχρός in the New Testament often signifies Diseases, that being very well known, and to be learned by any Concordance. The rest our Author had from Grotius, and nothing is his own but his translating the Greek word τῆς by labour, which in this place ought to have been rendered grief; for the Hebrew never signifies labour, and the Greek is very often used in the other sense.

Vers. 28. Note o. Col. 1. Lin. 36. After the mention of 1 Kings i. 41, 49. 2 Sam. 14. 11.] Our learned Author is mistaken in his interpretation of these two places, as I have shewn on Mat. xx. 16. Numb. ii.

Ibid. At the end of that Note.] Πλήθος here seems to be taken for that purpose or course of Life which those who embraced the Gospel lived in before they came to the knowledg of it; and so St. Paul's meaning will be, that all things turn to the advantage of those to whom the Gospel-calls was, καὶ ἀποκατάστασι, agreeable to their former purpose, i.e. disposition of Mind, and manner of Life. And indeed those Persons prove the most constant, who receive the Gospel in an honest Heart, as Christ tells us in the Parable of the Sower, Luke viii. 15. because they throughly discern the beauty and excellency of it above all other Doctrins, and suffer it to sink deep into their Minds. They are distinguished in the New Testament by several commendable Characters, which Dr. Hammond has excellently treated of in his Annotations on John vi. 37. and Acts xiii. 48. and elsewhere. Such a one was Cornelius the Centurion, whose manner of Life was such that he needed not to change his aetiam or purpose, to believe the Gospel. Such
Such also were the Bereans, whom that wise, or excellent and generous Disposition, which God had before planted in their Minds, had prepared for a ready submission to the Gospel, and all others among the Jews who with a pious Mind waited for the Kingdom of God, or among the Gentiles like them. These all persisted in their former purpose of living piously, and did not alter it when they embraced the Gospel.

The Verb ἔθετος signifying to resolve or decree beforehand, ἔθετος must also be a previous Purpose, or Resolution formerly taken up: And that Purpose may be either concerning any thing in particular, or about the whole course of a Man's Life: so that what comes to pass τοῦτο ἔθετος, or τό ἔθετος, may be understood of what is either contrary or agreeable to a particular purpose, or the whole scope and aim of a Man's Actions. So ἔρμηνης signifies both a single purpose, and ἔρμηνης the general course a Man resolves to live in. So Propositum in Latin is used in both those senses: And these words we may more confidently compare with that here in St. Paul, because the Greek Grammarians use the former by which to interpret ἔθετος, and the latter is manifestly an imitation of the Greek.

Hence when the discourse is about any particular thing, τοῦτο ἔθετος signifies on set purpose, and τό ἔθετος that which comes to pass against our Will or Intention. Thus in Suidas ἔθετος is rendered by ἔρμηνης will or design, of which he gives this Example: ἦν ἂν αὐτόν ποιήσῃ μὲν ταῦτα ἔθετος, but he did not injure any one wilfully, or on set purpose. So the Author of the Quest. and Answ. to the Orthodox Quest. 19, speaking of the palpitation of the Heart, which takes Men sometimes on a sudden, demands εἴ τι ψυχήν ὄντος, πῶς ἔσοδοι τὴν ἴσως ἐπιφυλάξεις ἔθετος; if this be an evil, how comes it to happen against our Will? The same Phrase he uses in his Answer. That Propositum among the Latins signifies a certain way of Life, Rob. Stephanus in his Thesaurus has shewn by several Examples, as his Son Henricus will furnish us with others of the word ἔθετος for design or purpose.

So that whereas Beza supplies here ipsius, his, and renders the words ex frustru ipsius, according to [his] purpose, referring the word purpose to God; if any thing be supplied, I think it should rather be suum their. And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to their purpose. For that it is rather the purpose of Men than of God that is here intended, appears by the Active Participle ἐρμηνεύω, because if St. Paul had spoken only of God, he would have said ἐρμηνεύων εὐθὺς ἐν Θεῷ to them that are beloved of God.
Chapter IX.

Ver. 30. *Ow* κατάνειλαν, τίτις καὶ ειμέναιν, &c.] The discourse here being about a thing, which at the time that St. Paul wrote was as well both present and future as past, I would not have all these *Aorists* render'd by the *Preterperfect* tense, because it is certain the *Aorist* among the Greeks, as the *Future* among the Hebrews, often signifies a *Custom*: See my Notes on Gen. x. 9. So that I think these words should be translated thus: *Whom he hath predestinated, them he also calleth* (i.e. useth to call) and whom he hath called, them he also justified; and whom he hath justified, them he also glorified. That this is the Apostle's sense all Interpreters acknowledge, only they did not observe that the *Aorists* denote a Custom.

Ver. 34. *Kataxelov.*] That is, who shall implead or prove them to be guilty? For so the Lawyers speak, amongst whom this is an Axiom: *Peregrisse reum non alia quis videtur, nisi & condemnaverit.* A Person does not seem to be proved guilty, unless he be also condemned. St. Paul speaks of an accusation before God, against Christians, which he affirms would be ineffectual to procure their condemnation, because they had *Jesus* for their Advocate with the Father, if they lived according to the Laws of the Gospel.

CH A P. IX.

Ver. 1. *I* T is a perfect force our Author puts upon that expression *Note a.* in Acts v. to lie to the Holy Ghost, of which see what I have said on that place, as also of the Vow that *Ananias* is groundlessly suppos'd by learned men to have made.


Ibid. In that Note, Lin. 41. After the words, *most High.*] There is no such expression as this in Job i. 5. and I cannot tell whence our Author took it, unless it were from some Greek Interpreter on that place.

Ver. 5. *Note d.*] It were to be wished our learned Author had examined here the Animadversion of Grotius on this place, rather than copied out Jewish Fables that make little to the purpose; especially seeing Erasmus had long ago written enough to overthrow all that can be inferred from them. For if what Grotius, and before him Erasmus, have observed stand good, Dr. Hammond's reasoning cannot be thought of any force. Let those that are inquisitive into these matters compare both places.

Ver.
Ver. 9. Note c.] By the place in 2 Kings iv. 16, it appears that Chapter the Doctor was in the wrong, to think that the Passage in Genesis was corrupted, on which see my Notes.

Ver. 11. Note e.] There is no election or chusing without preferring, and therefore there was no need of observing that the Hebrew word is rendered to prefer as well as to chuse.

Ver. 12. O μείζων ἢ ὁ ἥδη τῶν εἰκαστήρων.] It being certain that these words are alluded by St. Paul in the same sense that they are used in Gen. xxv. 23, they must here be understood not of the Persons of Esau and Jacob themselves, but of their Posterity: for these are the words of the Oracle; Two Nations are in thy Womb, and two manner of People shall be separated from thy Bowels, and the one shall be stronger than the other, and the greater shall serve the less. Of which prediction see my Notes on that place in Genesis. Therefore in this Passage of St. Paul, the Phrase μείζων ἢ ὁ ἥδη τῶν εἰκαστήρων, ought not to have been rendered in the English Translation, the elder shall serve the younger, but the greater shall serve the less. And so the Apostles scope also requires, who manifestly speaks of the Election, not of particular Persons, but of whole Nations.

Ver. 13. Τὰ τῶν γανόν.] It is manifest from the Prophet, that this has a reference to the Nations that descended from Jacob and Esau, and not to them themselves. So that I wonder our Author in his Paraphrase, on occasion of these words, should observe that that Prophecy, the greater shall serve the less, was fulfilled personally in them, especially seeing the contrary appears from the History of Moses, as in my Notes on the formentioned Chapter of Genesis I have observed.

Ver. 15. ἐλήμφων ὁ ἄν τίσι, καὶ διδάχων ὁ ἄν ἀλλὰ.] This place I have interpreted on Exod. xxxiii. 19, and shewed the meaning of God to be, that "because he had began to shew Favor and Mercy to the "Israelites, he would continue to do so:" and this is all that is here intended by these words. The Apostle having said that the Posterity of Jacob were preferred by God before the Idumeans, because it seemed good to him, and not because Esau's Posterity were worse than that of Jacob, proposes to himself an objection, Is there unrighteousness with God? Which he denies with detestation, saying, God forbid; for, faith he, he said to Moses, I will have Mercy on whom I have Mercy, and I will have Compassion on whom I have Compassion: that is, as God began to shew kindness to Jacob himself, so he continued his kindness to his Posterity, without the least injustice; because he did not deny any benefit to the Idumeans which they had deserved, but
Chapter only went on to do good to the Israelites tho unworthy. For it is no injustice to be merciful to those that do not deserve it, tho it would be so to punish those that do not deserve it. Mercy may be justly shewn, when punishment cannot be justly inflicted.

As this Interpretation is favoured by the place referred to in Moses, as I have shewn in my Comment on Exodus, so it agrees also with the Greek words as they are here accented, for we read them by in the present tense indicative, which is not so favourable to the vulgar translation, according to which we ought rather to read in the subjunctive mood, as it is generally accented in the Greek copies of the Septuagint, so that it might be rendered as it is by Beza: Misereor cujus misericors fui, & commiserabo cujus commiseratus fui; I will have Mercy on whom I shall have Mercy, and I will have Compassion on whom I shall have Compassion. But this is contrary to the Hebrew words which are thus: אֲלֹהִים I have favoured him whom I will favour, I have had Mercy on whom I will have Mercy; where one of the verbs is in the future tense, and the other in the preterperfect; which preterperfect is rendered here in the Present, because it is the same thing, for God did still shew Mercy to the Israelites, and had never ceased to shew Mercy to them, when he spake. Which being so, I wonder that Beza should find fault with the Vulgar, and Erasmus for making use here of the present tense, and rendering it cujus misericors, or cujusque misericors, To whom I shew Mercy, or to whomsoever I shew Mercy, and give this reason for it, that in the Hebrew the Verb is in both places in the future, which the Reader has just now seen to be false. He adds that the Particle et shews it must be interpreted by the future as past; and I cannot deny but that Particle yshews to be joined to a subjunctive, but it being joined to a preterperfect sense indicative, it may be also joined to the present, especially where the purity of the Greek language is not observed, as it is not in St. Paul. It must be observed further, that the words of Moses are inverted; for whereas in him it is, I have favoured him whom I will favour, &c., the Septuagint understood it as if it had been said, I will favour him whom I do favour, &c. Because the those Phrases signify the same thing, yet the order of the words in the latter suits better with the Greek Language.

Ver. 16. Οὐ εἰς Σοφός, ήν ὑπερήφανος. This seems to be a proverbial form of speech, commonly used to signify that all human endeavours are insignificant unless God concomitance them. I suppose it was taken from the Grecian Games, to which St. Paul often alludes. In like manner an unknown Poet, in Gesius's excerpts, says that,
The meaning is, that from the mere arbitrary pleasure of God: proceeded that favour he continued to shew to Jacob's Posterity, rather than to Esau; not from any thing that the Israelites had done to deserve the divine Favor more than the Idumeans. From which Doctrine it followed that God might without any injustice, call the Heathens to the knowledge of the Gospel, and reject the carnal Jews, the otherwise the Heathens had done no more to merit this token of God's favour than the Jews. Having thus far endeavoured to clear the Apostle's sense in this place, I shall subjoin a Paraphrase of seven Verses, from the tenth to the sixteenth, to shew how aptly what I have said agrees with St. Paul's Scope, and the series of his Discourse.

"Ver. 10. And not only the Example of Isaac and Ishmael teaches us, that it is not sufficient for any Nation to have descended from the Patriarchs, to claim to themselves a Right in the Divine Promises, or entitle them God's People. This appears likewise by the instance of Esau and Jacob, which Rebecca bare to one Isaac. 11. For before ever they were born, and consequently had done good or evil, by which to procure the favour of God, or make him their Enemy; that the purpose of God concerning chusing a certain People to himself, might appear to proceed from his own arbitrary pleasure, and not to have been excited by any Virtue or Merits of that People; 12. God answered Rebecca when she consulted him about her Children striving in her Womb: That she carried in her Bowels the Fathers of two great People; of which People that which did first become the most numerous, and acquired the greatest Riches and Power should afterwards serve the other, tho' in the beginning not so powerful. 13. To which purpose also is that saying of God in Malachi, that he had preferred Jacob and his Posterity, to Esau and his Progeny, and upon the former conferred much greater Benefits. 14. Perhaps some may object that God, according to this Doctrine, seems to be unjust, who, as I affirm, so much prefers one People before another, that are no better than they. But that does not in the least follow from this Doctrine. 15. For Moses, whom none will affirm to charge God with any injustice, tells us, that when he had prayed God to continue to go before the Camp of the Israelites, tho' they had deserved his anger, and prevailed, he received this answer from him, that the Israelites, tho' they had
heinously offended him, since he had begun to shew them favour, should find him also for the future gracious to them, and still be accounted by him his People. So that the Mercy of God in calling any Nation to the knowledge of himself, and making them his peculiar People, does not use to depend on the Merits of that Nation, but on his own free Will and arbitrary Purpose.

This is, if I am not mistaken, the Series of the Apostle’s discourse, which being so explained, directly answers his design in this place, and admirably agrees with the sense of the places he refers to in Moses, as it is in Moses himself. About the 12th Verse we must consult Grotius.

Ver. 17. οὐτὶ γάρ γε ἔχεις.] The Particle γαρ here seems to refer to the sense latent in the foregoing words, in which tho St. Paul speaks only ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐξολοθρείας, concerning the election, yet by this very thing, that he declares God to chuse a Nation whom he may shew a peculiar kindness to, he intimates that he leaves other non-elect Nations in their Sins. For as I before suggested, there can be no election where something is not cast off, because that which is not chosen must necessarily be rejected. And to this the Apostle’s words in this and the Verses following refer, wherein he discourses separately concerning rejection, as in the foregoing he had mostly treated about election. So that I should paraphrase this 17th Verse thus: "Moses also teaches us that, as to the rejection or preterition of sinful Nations, whereby it comes to pass that the People so abandoned fall into the greatest evils and calamities, that may without blasphemy be imputed to God, because he says he was commanded to speak to Pharaoh in God’s name to this sense, that he, if he so pleased, could easily destroy both the King himself and the whole Egyptian Nation, and so make his People a free passage, which they had so often refused them, out of their Country; but he would suffer Pharaoh still to live, that he might give further demonstrations of his Power, and make his Name great and famous throughout the World. See what I have written on Moses’s words, in Exod. ix. 15, 16. for what our Author says in the following Annotation, does not agree with them.

Ibid. Note h. Tho the Hebrew word be in the Preterperfect tense, yet I have rendered it in its proper place, as if it were the Future, because of the Verse foregoing, which seems to require its being so rendered: See my Notes on that place, by which this must be understood.

Ver. 18. Note i. By God’s hardening the Heart of Pharaoh, I think is neither intended any action of God upon Pharaoh’s Mind, nor so much
much as any withdrawing of his Grace from him, seeing there is neither Chapter any mention made of such withdrawing in Moses, nor is it necessary to suppose it. Nor do I think that Moses purposely abstained from using the Phrase, the Lord hardened his Heart, till the sixth Plague that he inflicted upon that Egyptian King was past, as if then, and not before, he particularly forsook him. For before ever Moses went to Pharaoh, God foretold that he would harden him, Exod. iv. 21. which refers to all his obstinacy from first to last. See therefore my Notes on that place.

Ver. 28. Note k. What our Author says in this Annotation he took from Grotius, with whom nevertheless I cannot agree in correcting this place out of one Alexandrian Copy, contrary to the Authority of all the rest, and the Antient Interpreters. It is harsh I confess for 28 to be put after 24, and the construction is intricate; but neither is it much clearer in the Septuagint. Besides, in alluding Testimonies of Scripture, there is but little regard had to the series of the Discourse, provided the Writers words are but to the purpose, and rightly quoted. The words in the Hebrew are thus, ver. 21. which the Septuagint render, λαβεὶ συντάξειν τῇ συντάξειν καὶ διερείψειν, finishing and making up his account in Righteousness; whence it is probable they read רכש, the Participle Benoni for Pabul. Then follows in v. 22. בּוֹאוּ יָהָאָלָו וְנִרְעָה, אָּלָו יָהָאָלָו, because an account cast up will the Lord make in all the Earth, by which it appears that they thought רכש, רכש, & רכש, chalab, to signify an account; and if that be true, we may render the words something more commodiously, tho to the same sense, thus: he will balance an account exactly cast up in Righteousness; for an account, and that exactly cast up, will the Lord God of Hosts make in the whole Earth. The words רכש & רכש signify diligently and particularly cast up; and this very thing in part וּנֵרֵעַ also seems to signify, so as to be the same with אָּלָו to cast up, or draw together several sums into one. And the Verb מָנַה, according to the use of the Chaldee, I render by to balance. In French the words might be translated thus: il déplacera de faire exactement son compte avec justice, car le Seigneur créateur, Dieu des armées, fera un compte & un compte exact, dans tout le pays; He will balance to make exactly his account with justice, for the Lord God of Hosts will make an account and an exact account in all the Land. The Prophet's meaning is, that as one who carefully casts up an account of his expences and receits, sees if there remains any thing over, and tho it be but a small sum lays it safe up; so God will destroy all the wicked, and save only.
Chapter X.

the good, tho they be but very few: which admirably well futes with
the design of the Apostle. I shall add nothing more in this place, be-
cause I intend hereafter, if God permit, to handle this matter more
largely in a Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah.

Ver. 33. Note m. As there are two Passages here in the Prophet
Isaiah, at a considerable distance from one another, put together by
the Apostle, so there are two Figures also conjoined. First, Christ is
considered as a stone of Offence, at which whether it be in walking or
running, if any one do stumble, he is in danger of falling; and this
refers to the Metaphors the Apostle had before taken from the Gre-
cian Games, and particularly that of Running, which made him think of
a stone of Offence, than which, in a swift motion, nothing can be more
dangerous. Afterwards in the next words, every one that believeth in
him shall not be confounded, Christ is represented not as a stone of Of-
fence, but as a corner stone, which he that builds any Wall upon, must
trust to the firmness of; and if he be deceived in his confidence, after
he has finished his Structure, his building falls, and that fills him with
shame.

This latter Similitude is in Isa. xxviii. 16. where God speaks thus;
I lay in Sion for a foundation, a Stone, an elect Stone (if we read שׁבּבָוָרָה becbourah elect, for בָּבָה bobban a Tower) a corner Stone and precious, a
most firm foundation. He that believeth shall not make haste, שׁיָּרֵז; that
is, shall never be judged to have made too much haste in choosing it,
nor ever be ashamed of his choice. And the former is in Chap. viii. 14.
He shall be for a stone of Stumbling and for a rock of Offence to the two
Houses of Israel; where the Metaphor is quite different, and it is no
longer a corner Stone that is spoken of, but a stone on which a Per-
sons foot or the wheel of a Chariot happens to strike, as the following
Verse more clearly shews.

C H A P. X.

Ver. 5. The meaning of St. Paul in this place seems to be only
this, that the Law promised nothing, but to those
that observed it so as Moses taught it was to be ob-
served; that is, unless either all its Precepts were obeyed, or the Sa-
crifices appointed by the Law were offered up for the expiation of
some sort of Sins against it. Otherwise it promised no Mercy from
God to those who had committed such a Sin as the Law threatened
with death, or allowed no Sacrifice for. But on the contrary, the
Gospel assures us that God will pardon such sins as those, if the Sin-
ner does but firmly believe they shall be remitted to him, and abstain Chapter from them for the future. This is all we are here to consider; for what our Author says in his Paraphrase, that it was impossible the Law should be observed, that is so far from being the assertion of Moses, that he everywhere supposes the contrary, as appears even by the very next words. See my Notes on Deut. xix. 9.

C H A P. XI.

Ver. 8. Our Author truly observes, that according to the use of the Atticks, or those that spake the purest Greek, ἄρανες signifies communion; but he might have added that the Greek Interpreters, whether through ignorance, or according to the use of the Alexandrians, confounded the Verbs ἀρανίζω & ἀρανά, the first of which signifies to prick, to pierce, and the latter to nod or slumber; which made them think that ἄρανες signified nodding, tho' it comes from the Verb ἄρανομαι. It will be worth our while to read Lud. Cappellus about this matter, in his Critical Notes on Psalms iv. 4.

Ver. 12. Note d. I have often observed our Author to write so as not to make what he says at last to agree with what he had said at first; because, I suppose, after he had written half an Annotation he changed his Mind, and yet was loth to blot out what he had already written. And this we have an instance of in this place; for after he had proved that the word ἴσθαναι signifies a multitude, he alters his opinion, and gives it another signification. But his second thoughts were not the best, as I shall briefly shew. For

1. That this word does sometimes signify a multitude, appears also by Hesychius, who interprets it among other things, by παντοθέ.

2. The Hebrew נֶפֶשׁ is not used for collecting, but for that which fills up, as the Lexicons will shew. Neither was a multitude so called ἐκ τοῦ ἄρανοματος from a piece of Cloth put into a torn Garment to make it whole again, but because it makes a πλήρη τιμωρίαν or full and complete Assembly, or ἕν ἄρανομα τὸ εἰς ὑπάρχοντα, because it fills the places into which it is gathered together. Perhaps also there may be a respect here had to the original of the word ἴσθαναι, which is thus set down in the Etymologicon: Πρῶς ἐκ παραχθεῖ ἐπιτίματος, τοῦ ἵσταναι ἐπιτίματος: οὕτω ἐκ ἵσταναι ἐγγύτηται, εἶ ἵσταναι ἐγγύτηται.

3. The Jews who were to-come in late to Christ, are no more called ἰσθανή because of their filling up what remained empty in the Church, than the Heathens, who are called by the same name, and made up the greatest part of the Church.
Chapter XII.

Ver. 1. It is so manifest that the word αἰτίας is to be understood only in this last sense, that I wonder our learned Author would spoil Paper, and lose time in proposing the other Conjectures. For they are such as may be reckoned indeed in the number of things that have no natural repugnancy in them; but there is not the least shadow of likelihood in them, nor can they be confirmed by any example. But, unless I am mightily mistaken, he had never set them down, but only to fill up his Annotations on this Chapter, which he found would otherwise be but short. And a great many other things there are of the like nature in this Volume, which yet I pass by without reprehension: Such is what he inserts into his Paraphrase on this Chapter about the Gnosticks, without any necessity; as if there could have been none corrupted with Vices contrary to the Virtues which the Apostle here commends, besides the Gnosticks!

Ver. 2. 'Aravoraç, για νοσους.] The word υπ' here does not signify only knowledge, or an opinion conceived in the Mind, but an affection of the Soul: And thence comes κατάρα, which is not only a change of Judgment or opinion, but also of Affections. See Beza on Mat. iii. 2.

Ver. 5. 'Εν τω χριστίν ἔτοιμον.] That is, we all make one body of Christians, or all true Christians are one Body. The Phrase κατάρα ἐν Χριστίν is often used by St. Paul for being a Christian. See Chap. viii. 1. There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, that is, to Christians: See likewise Rom. xvi. 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13. and 2 Cor. xii. 2, &c. This I thought fit to observe, because I perceived this expression was not understood by Grotius, who says here; We are one body in Christ, that is, by Christ who was the Compactor of that Body; for tho' that be true, yet it is not the meaning of the Phrase.

Ver. 6. Ἀναγκαζόμενος ἀποκριθείναι.] That is, let him say no more than what evidence duty he is entrusted with; in which word the Apostle has a reference to the antient Prophets, who were to say nothing but what God revealed to them: See Ver. 3. and Ephes. iv. 7. and Beza and Grotius on these words, whom our Author would have done well to follow, and not suffered himself to be imposed on by that which is now
now ordinarily called the Analogy of Faith. I wonder the English Translation did not suggest to him another Interpretation of this Phrase, in which it is truly rendered, according to the proportion of Faith.

Verif. 8. Ἀλογίας our Author in his Notes on Mat. vi. 22. has very well shewn to signify liberality or bounty; of which interpretation I shall here give this brief account. Ἀλογίας or simplicity is opposed to διαφορά putting a difference, or using too much Caution in distinguishing those that are proper objects of our Charity from those which are not. Hence the Wisdom which comes from above is said in James iii. 17. not only to be full of MERCY and good Fruits, but also ἀνάλογον without difference, that is, not too nice or scrupulous in putting a difference between those which it does good or shews Mercy to. To which purpose is that advice in Herma, Past. Lib. 2. Mand. 2. OMNIBUS in opibus da SIMPLICITER, nihil dubitans cui des. Omnibus da. Omnibus enim dari vult Deus de suis donis. Qui ergo accipiant reddent rationem Deo quare acceperunt, & ad quid. Qui autem accipiant filia necessitate, reddent rationem, qui autem dat innocens erit. Sicut enim acceptit a Domino, ministerium consummavit, nihil dubitando cui daret & cui non daret; & fecit hoc ministerium SIMPLICITER gloriose ad Deum. Give to ALL that are poor SIMPLY, without scrupling whom you give to. Give to all. For God will have all to partake of his Gifts. Those therefore that receive shall give an account to God, why they received it, and to what end. And such as feigned themselves to be poor that they might receive the Charity of others, shall be called to a strict account for it, but the giver shall be judged innocent. For by giving universally and without difference to all, be fulfilled the Trust committed to him by God, and did it SIMPLIITER and to God's Glory. The Greek words are thus set down by Antiochus, Hom. 98. tho perhaps with some alteration. Καὶ ὅπως ἐὰ μὲν ἐτὰ ἐν τὸ κατ᾽ ἐκεῖνας, ἔν τινι διὰκρινόμενος, πῶς ὁ ἀνθρώπινος περὶ τὰ Αʹ ΠΛΑΣΥ, ὧν ἡ τῆς ἀνθρώπου, τίνι τοι. Πάντως δὲ τοῖς σύνεχεσιν τοι, ἐν τῷ ἐν τὸν διάκριτον, ἐν τῷ διάκριτῳ διακρινέσθαι τὸν Θεὸν. Ἡ δὲ ἐνακριβεία Αʹ ΠΛΑΣΥ τελείωσε, ἐν τῷ διάκριτῳ διακρινεῖν τὸν Θεὸν. Καὶ τοιαῦτα ἄλλα ἐνακριβεῖα τῶν ἑαυτῶν, τῷ Θεῷ δεικνύει. Several other Passages might be produced out of the Antients to the same purpose. See Lib. 3. Constit. Apostol. cap. 4.

Ibid. ἐν ἡμέρας.] Partly because that cheerfulness discovers a truly liberal disposition of Mind, it being natural to Men to be cheerful in following their own Inclinations, and partly because it makes the benefit seem the greater to him that receives it, if it be bestowed cheerfully. See Seneca de Beneficiis, Lib. 2. cap. 4.
Chapter XII.

Verse 11. Note b. This conjecture of Dr. Hammond is favoured by the series of the discourse, in which it is not probable that among particular Precepts the Apostle would bring in that general one, comprehending all the duties of a Christian's Life, of serving the Lord. Besides, after the words πρέπει τοῖς, it very aptly follows καθευδόντες, and both together make up an excellent Precept to this sense: "In the business of Piety you must be zealous and fervent, but yet so as to observe the proper time for it, lest by your unseasonable fervor you should bring yourself into danger without doing any body else any good. The Apostle here makes use of a known Proverb, and ordinary both in Greek and Latin Authors. So Phocylides:

μετ' ἄνθρωπον αἰτία χάριων.

We must serve the season, and not blow against the Winds. So Cicero de Finibus, Lib. 3. num. 73. among other Precepts of the antient Sages sets down this, temporis parere, for one. So the Author of the Panegyric ad Pisonem:

Temporibus servire decet, qui tempora certis
Ponderibus pensavit, eum si bella vocabunt,
Miles erit, si pacem posisset armis.
Hunc foras pacatum, bellansem castra decebunt.

It's true, in St. Paul, the sense is something different, but it is sufficient if it have but an affinity with that which it is commonly taken in; for such sort of sayings have generally more senses than one. Which the Transcribers of the New Testament not sufficiently understanding, and knowing that this Proverb was sometimes used in an ill sense, for hypocritical time serving, changed καθευδόντες into υπέρτης. This is much more probable than that the word υπέρτης was changed into καθευδόντες, or the Phrase to serve the Lord so very common in these Books, into one less usual, to serve the time.

Verse 15. Note c. Tho Grotius also, as well as our Author, supposes this Verse to have a reference to the two Gates of the Temple, yet I am not of their opinion, nor do I think the Apostle had any particular respect here to excommunicated Persons. The words are general, and contain an excellent general Precept to all Christians, to endeavour to get the Love and Friendship of those with whom they live, nothing being more pleasing to Men than to see others sympathize with them in their Afflictions, and rejoice at their Prosperity. I know they are for the
most part Flatterers and Hypocrites that practice this; but then it is Chapter
not for that they are to be condemned, but their hypocrisy in pre-
tending to grieve or rejoice at what happens to others when they re-
ally do not, but have other Ends and Designs. But a good Man also
not only may, but ought to be truly affected with others Prosperity
or Adversity. I am apt to think also that St. Paul here rather made
use of a common proverbial form of Speech, than a new phrase not
before heard of. We meet with the like expression, tho to another
purpose, in Horace de Arte Poetica:

Ut ridentibus arrident, ita flentibus adsint
Humani vultus.

Adsint, for so the word must be read, according to the opinion of
learned Men, not adsunt. Of the thing it self see Stobaei Florileg.
Tit. 113, and 115.

CHAP. XIII.

Ver. 1. Note a. After the words, avenger of Wrath.] I don't well
understand what our Author meant, in tak-
ing so much pains to prove that ἰερὰ Πο-
signifies the person of the Ruler or Magistrate; for who would have ever
question'd it? But perhaps his design was to shew that the ἰερὰ or
governing Power was so confined by God to some particular Persons
or Families, that it could never pass from them. Which is true,
where the Kingly or any other Power, according to the custom of the
Country, descends by Succession to the next Heir, and that Custom
cannot be altered without great danger. But where the Custom is
otherwise, as it was in the Roman Empire, in the time of St. Paul, I
do not see the use of what our Author here says: For it is known, that
the supreme Power was not confined to any one Family in Rome, but
belonged to those whom the Army elected.

Ibid. Col. 2. Lin. 4. After the words Fideni or Gabii.] Our learned
Author misquotes here the words of Juvenal, and puts Fidenorum
Gabiorumque, instead of Fidenarum Gabiorumque, which for want of
sufficient skill in the Roman Antiquities, he seems to have taken for
the names of two People; whereas Fidenæ was the place where Juve-
nal wrote; and every Child that has read but the first Book of Livy,
knows that Fidenæ and Gabii were two Cities of that name, whereof
the People were called Fidenates and Gabini, not Fideni and Gabii.
Chapter XIII.

The Verb \textit{supra} signifies no more than \textit{ex lo, emineo, excel}, to have something that another hath not, to excel or be eminent in any thing; and so may be applied, not only to that which is in its kind and order \textit{supreme}, but also to that which in any thing whatsoever excels others destitute of it. Thus in the \textit{Old Glosses} \textit{supra} is rendred by \textit{ex lo, emineo, excel}, \textit{præcello, exsupero, antecello}; all signifying to \textit{excel}: \textit{supra}, \textit{eminet}, \textit{exsit}: \textit{supra}, \textit{exsiant}, \textit{excellens}. \textit{Supra} therefore here is rendered rightly by the Vulgar \textit{superius}.

The Powers here meant, are the Emperor, and all the other Roman Magistrates, who \textit{supra}, were at that time \textit{superior} to all the Princes of the Nations contained within the bounds of the Roman Empire. And these Powers were all \textit{from God}; not that God had conferred a greater or a less degree of Power to \textit{this} or that person \textit{immediately}, but because it being the Will of God that men should form themselves into political Societies, and live peaceably with one another, he is said, upon that account, to will also that there should be Magistrates, both supreme and subordinate; because there can be no \textit{Commonwealth}, nor any \textit{Peace} kept without Government. And this being so, whenever any one, either with the consent of the People, or by an \textit{ex lo}, superiority of strength seizes upon the Government, provided we may live peaceably under it, we ought to be \textit{subject} to him for the sake of the \textit{Commonwealth}, and consequently of \textit{God's Ordinance}, and of \textit{Conscience}. So did the Christians under the Heathen Emperors; and so did also the wisest men among the Heathens.

Verf. 6. \textit{et filius} \textit{superius} \textit{triumphá].} \textit{Viz.} Because it is but just that those who employ themselves in the service and defence of the \textit{Commonwealth}, should be furnished for all necessary expences. This being a necessary consequent of Society, God who will have men live in Society, must accordingly be supposed to require the paying of Tribute to its Governors. In which nevertheless the Laws always are to be regarded which appoint that Tribute: For this Reward given to the Magistrate for serving the Community, is constituted by Men, not by God \textit{immediately}; tho it ought not therefore to be accounted the least sacred, because in this particular of requiring Tribute, men act according to the Notions they have received from God, by the very Constitution of human Nature. This is what St. \textit{Paul} means, and not that God has \textit{immediately} ordained either \textit{Kings}, or the payment of \textit{Tribute} to them, as our \textit{Author} seems to think, which no one would say concerning the \textit{Roman Emperors}, and the Tribute paid to them.
As it is very certain to me that Honor is due to Kings, and none but seditionous persons can make a question of it; so I cannot tell whether any one can prove that the fifth Commandment requires us to pay that Honor which is due to Magistrates. There is the same reason indeed for both; but they are not required in the same Precept. See what I have written on the beginning of the Decalogue, in my Comment on Exod. xx.

Note c. All this, Plautus's Interpreters, and the Greek Lexicographers had observed a great while before our Author. But what is the meaning of lotis in the last Verse he cites out of Plautus? Perhaps it is a false print for lotus: The ordinary reading is thus;

Tute tibi puer es lautos, luces cereum.

Which needs no alteration. See Taubmannus on that place.

OUR Learned Author, on Matth. xv. 19. took abundance of pains to affix a sense upon the word ἕλεγομαι, which does not belong to it in that place.

And so he does here to as little purpose; for the ἕλεγομαι may signify that reasoning which respects the regulation of a man's Life, yet that is not the literal importance of the word, which signifies any other sort of reasoning equally with that.

II. In Epicurus his Epist. to Idomeneus, ἕλεγομαι signifies all the Inventions and Disputations of that Philosopher, of what kind soever they were, which he had committed to writing, and the remembrance of which so much refreshed him. Ἴρμος in his Epist. to Menaceus, is another thing, and signifies the act of reasoning itself. Hence Cicero (not in Lib. 5. Tuscul. Quæst. but de Finibus Lib. 2. Cap. 30. where he recites that whole Epistle) renders ἕλεγομαι by rationes & inventa, Reasons and Inventions. As for St. Ambrose, who did not design to be extraordinary exact in rendering that word, his Authority can signify nothing.

III. In this place I take ἕλεγομαι to signify a Speculation, or Opinion conceived in the Mind, and the meaning of the Apostle to be, that those among them who were more knowing and intelligent, ought to receive and treat the ignorant with all mildness, tho weak in the Faith; that is, tho having a less degree of knowledge and understanding in
Chapter XIV.

Christianity, they differed from them in their Opinions. So that μὴ εἰς διάκεισιν διαλογίων, will be equivalent to ἀνὰ διάκεισιν διαλογίων, without discrimination of Opinions. The Judaizing Christian was to be received and entertained with as much affinity by those that understood their liberty better, as if he did not Judaize. It is plain διάκεισις signifies discrimination in 1 Cor. xii. 10. and Heb. v. 14. And διαλογίων are the reasonings of the Philosophers, in Chap. i. 2. of this Epistle, on which their Opinions or Errors were grounded.

Ver. 4. Στόχον ἐν ποιήσει. H: Grotius has observed before the Doctor, that the phrase to stand or fall, signifies to be acquitted or condemned; and that the Latins say, cadere causa. We have an Example of both in this one Verse of Ovid, in Lib. Fastorum, where speaking to Germanicus, he saith:

Ingenium vultu statque caditque tuo.

That is, according as you receive this Work, favourably or otherwise, my Wit will find its endeavours either condemned or approved.

Ver. 12. Αἵων ἄνευ τῆς ἔναν. This Verse is strangely paraphrased by the Doctor; for what occasion was there here to say any thing about the Power of the Keys? any thing else might as well have been found out in this place.

Ver. 15. Note c. 1. The following words shew that λυπησθαι signifies something more in this place, than barely to be grieved, as Dr. Hammond well observes, viz. to be prejudiced and alienated by that grief from the Christian Religion, which is the Notion of λυπησθαι to perish, or be destroyed. But the reasons he gives for this signification are not only forced, but also in part contrary to what he endeavours to prove. In one word, he might have shewn us what he meant, if he had said that the Antecedent was put here by a Metonymy for the Consequent, λυπησθαι for the effect of that grief, i.e. for a defection from the Christian Religion. By a like figure the words to love and hate signify the effects of those Passions, as in that famous place in Malach. i. 2, 3. Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated; that is, I have confer'd those benefits upon Jacob, which I never bestowed upon Esau. See other Examples of the same, in Sal. Glassius Rhet. Sat. Tract. 1. Cap. 1. On the contrary, our Author produces Examples wherein the Effect is put for the Cause; which are nothing to the purpose, the Cause here being put for the Effect.

2. It is yet less to the purpose, what he says about the Conjugation Hipbil, and its being rendered in Greek by a Verb Active. For that
which is used here is a Verb Passive, which is taken for the effect of Chapter that which it properly signifies. Besides, he confounds Nouns with Verbs, and Verbs with Nouns, as if they were all one; and is hard put to it to extricate himself out of the maze of his perplexed reasoning. He had said afterwards that "ἔφισμα which signifies destruction, and is often rendered by ἄρρωστον, is, in Prov. xxxi. 6. rendered ἄων, or οἰκον; Just as if ἔφισμα abed were a Noun, and in the place of Proverbs were not the Participle ἔφισμα obes, perishing, but a Noun.

Ver. 17. Note d. The most simple and natural sense of this Verse seems to be this: "That which Christ, who is our King, requires of us, does not consist in abstaining from meat or drink, but in living righteously, peaceably, and cheerfully under the sense of those Gifts of the Holy Ghost which we have received from God; and therefore we should endeavour to follow after Righteousness and Peace, and not be morose towards others who do not abstain from the Meats forbidden by the Law. xagα here properly signifies cheerfulness or pleasantness, in opposition to the moroseness of the Jews, who could not look upon those who ate of all sorts of Meats indifferently without frowning. The same word signifies Joy, in Gal. v. 22. which is reckoned among the Fruits of a Gospel-Spirit, and comprehends both that affection of mind which I have described, and that behaviour towards our Neighbour which proceeds from it, and which consists in living and conversing with him in a friendly manner. And this amicable disposition and behaviour St. Paul recommends elsewhere, as in 1 Thess. v. 16. where he exhorts Christians to rejoice always; or, as it is in Phil. iv. 4. to rejoice in the Lord always, that is, for the Benefits they have received from the Lord. This Joy, as it shews that we are satisfied with our condition, so in all our transactions with our Neighbour it clearly discovers it self, in the courteousness and affableness of our behaviour towards him. Whereas on the contrary men who are discontented with the condition they are in, as they want this Joy, so they are generally rugged and morose in their deportment. Of which number were the Jews, who were very much offended at the approaching destruction of their Temple, and could not upon any terms be friends with the Gentiles, who did not observe the difference between Meats prescribed by the Law. It is truly said of such a man by Amphius in Florileg. Stobaei, Tit.
Chapter How ingrateful a thing is a pensive discontented Man! in every thing be carries himself morosely.

Ver. 23. τὰ δὲ ἐν ἐν κρίσει εὑρεθήκατε τινὶ. i. e. Whatever we do, not knowing whether it is lawful or not, is a Sin, because it proceeds from a Mind careless of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of Actions. This Philo Judeus has expressed almost in the same words as St. Paul, in Lib. de Profugis, pag. 336. where after he had given an allegorical interpretation of Abraham's Sacrifice, he subjoins that, δὲ τὸ συνεχεῖς λόγος νουσία βίοτος ἡ ἑκάστη κρίσις: The best Sacrifice is Forbearance and Abstinence, in things about which we have no certain Faith.

Ibid. Note e. Our learned Author had no reason to speak of the Posthumous Notes of Grotius, as if he doubted whether they were genuine or not. They were committed to the care of Joan. Mercerus, who published them very faithfully; nor did any of Grotius's Family ever complain that they were not faithfully published. I speak this, because I know Dr. Hammond has elsewhere, for no reason, call'd into question the fidelity of that honest Man. Nor indeed is there any thing here or elsewhere in those Notes unworthy of Grotius, tho' there may be some things in them liable to censure, as there are in his other works, and in all the Writings almost of all other Men.

However it is well shewn by the Doctor out of St. Paul himself, that Doxologies are not only used by way of Conclusion: Which may be confirmed by the instance of St. Clement, one of St. Paul's Disciples, who has the like Doxologies more than once in his 1st Epistle to the Corinthisans. See the end of Cap. 20. and what Patric. Junius has observed on that place, and Cap. 58.

CHAP. XV.

Ver. 3. Οὐ ἦσαν διδόσκαλος ἤμερον καὶ ἐν μνημονεία. In this Citation we have an instance of what I observed on Chap. ix. 28. that when any passages of Scripture are cited, the connexion of the Discourse is generally neglected. For the sense here is imperfect, and must be made up by the Reader thus, or to this purpose: "For even Christ did not please himself, but was very careful to avoid every thing that might prejudice the weak, and did not give his own Judgment that free liberty that he might have done, for fear of giving them an occasion to blaspheme against God, which he was as careful to shun as if those Blasphemies had fallen upon himself; so that it may be justly said of him, The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me. It is certain Christ might have said a great many things
things as to the abrogation of the Law of Moses, and the calling of Chapter
the Gentiles, which afterwards he revealed to the Apostles, and by
the Apostles to others; he might have gone before them himself by
his example, in neglecting the vain Ceremonies of the Law, and con-
verting freely with the Heathens, which undoubtedly would have
been more advantageous and pleasing to him than to hold his
peace, because the Apostles could not as yet bear what he had to
say, and much less the rest of the Jews; or to avoid the society of
the Heathens as polluted Persons, who would more readily have be-
lieved on him than the Jews, lest he should give these latter an oc-
casion to blaspheme the Christian Religion, which was then but in its
infancy. This is the sense, if I am not mistaken, of this place,
which our Author did not sufficiently understand.

Ver. 4. "Ome παρατεργεῖν, &c.] Here also there must be something
supplied to this purpose. " These words of the Psalmist shew you
what it is your duty to do in endeavouring to avoid giving any
occasion to Men to blaspheme Religion: For whatever things were
written, &c. The despising of the scruples of the weak was a thing
of very dangerous consequence, because it might alienate their Minds
from Christianity, and make them turn Apostates and Blasphemers,
and so expose it also to the contempt of Infidels, when they saw it
foraken by them that had first of all embraced it, and that the Chris-
tians were divided amongst themselves.

Ver. 8. Διδασκόντων καταρθήσας φαραούν.] That is, preached only to the
Circumcised; which our learned Author has not clearly enough ex-
pressed in his Paraphrase. See Grotius.

Ver. 12. Note a. Those which are here called ὧν, and in the Pro-
phet People and Nations, are literally the Tribes of Israel, as will ap-
ppear to any one that compares the 10th verse, out of which the Apostle
cites this Passage, with the following verses. But as under the person
of Hezekiah is described the Messias, so by the Jews and their sever-
al Tribes are represented all the Nations throughout the World, that
should believe on the Messias. And the Jews, in St. Paul's time, gen-
erally took those Passages to belong to the Messias, and therefore
they are here fitly urged.

But our Author is mistaken when he supposes the power of making
War, which belongs only to him that is supreme, is here referred to;
for Isaiah does not speak of making War, but of bringing back the Is-
raelites that were dispersed in the neighbouring Countries in Juda,
of which he says that Hezekiah should be an Ensign: See Is. xiii. 2.
Chapter XVI.

It is a Metaphor indeed taken from Military Affairs, because at the setting up of an Ensign Souldiers use to gather together, but the power of making War is not alluded to. Nor had the Septuagint any such thing as that in their thoughts when they translated this Passage, but only for הִנֵּה, for an Ensign, read, or thought it ought to be read נִשְׂלָל for a Prince; by which the sense is not much alter'd, because the same Person that was to be a Prince, was also to set up an Ensign.

Ver. 16. [Ὑπαιθέντης εἰς τιμίαν ἁγίον.] Two ways any offering might be said to be sanctified; first, by him that determined to offer up any Sacrifice to God, and delivered it already consecrated in his Mind to the Priest to be actually offer'd up: and 2dly, when it was placed upon the Altar, which sanctified, i.e. made it to be esteemed Sacred whatever that touched: See Exod. xxix. 37. and Mat. xxiii. 19. This I suppose, the Apostle here has a reference to, rather than, as the Doctor, to the Priest, or as Grotius, to Salt; and that by σεβασμός τοῦ are meant the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, whereby the Gentiles, after they had believed, were consecrated to God as by the sacred fire of the Altar. See Acts x.

Ver. 21. [ὁς μὲν ἐν δύναμεν νεκρό νεκρό, &c.] To understand here Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase, we must read Grotius on this place, and on Isa. li. where he interprets the words of the Prophet as spoken primarily of Jeremiah, and secondarily of Christ, forcedly indeed in my opinion. But I have not room here to discuss that matter: I shall only remark, that St. Paul might very pertinently allude to this Prediction, speaking of the calling of the Gentiles, because it was commonly supposed to have a reference to the Messiah.

Ver. 31. [Ἄνεβον.] This Dr. Hammond in his Paraphrase interprets of the Judaizing Christians; but I think it ought rather to be interpreted of the unbelieving Jews, whom St. Paul had most reason to be afraid of, as the thing it self shews.

C H A P. XVI.

Ver. 1. [Ἡ αὐτή ἡ θεία ἀληθεία.] I t is very true that in the New Testament ἡ αὐτή ἡ θεία ἀληθεία signifies to supply the poor with necessaries, and δίκαιωσία liberalitas; but it does not appear from any example that any one was therefore called either simply δίκαιος or δίκαιωσίας. No Grecian ever spake in that manner, to signify a Woman that was liberal to the poor of any Church, out of her own substance. So that it
it is much more probable a Deaconess is here meant, as the Christians Chapter afterwards used to speak, which had the oversight of the publick Alms of the Church, and performed perhaps other Offices in it. Not all it may be then that have since been attributed to them, but there were undoubtedly in those Primitive times Deaconesses, which administered several things relating to the Church; as appears both by this place, and by an Epistle of Pliny to Trajan, wherein he makes mention of such ministra (to he calls them) among the Christians. On which passage Ger. Vossius has put together almost all that belongs to that Office, as Joan. Bapt. Cotelarius has also done on several places of the Apostolical Constitutions. See particularly on Lib. 3. cap. 15.

I wonder Dr. Hammond, when he had Grotius to go before him, did not rather keep to this, than say things which are nothing to the purpose: For it is no where said that Phæbe accompanied any of the Apostles, and what is affirmed of such Women is very suspicious. For it is true, certain rich Women did sometimes follow Christ, but this seems neither to have been constant, nor ever practised in great Journeys, when the longest were from Galilee to Jerusalem, and that at the time of the Feasts, in which Women otherwise used to go up to that City. But that in the journeys which the Apostles made into far distant Countries, they had rich Women to accompany them, and supply them with necessaries, which might otherwise have been more easily and decently done, let them believe who use to give credit to all that the Antients affirm, without the least appearance of likelihood. It were easy to shew the improbability of it, and I shall say something to that purpose on 1 Cor. ix. 5.

Vers. 7. [Ex xelîq.] That is, Christiæs, as I observed on Chap. xii. 5. See there.

Vers. 16. Note c. It is uncertain whether St. Paul here had a respect to that Salutation which the Christians us’d to give to one another in their holy Assemblies; nay it is very improbable, and that for these two reasons. First, because the Apostle here speaks of such a Salutation as was given by Friends in the room of their Friends, to persons whom they desired in a Letter to be saluted in their name; which Salutation has nothing common with that Church-salutation. Secondly, in the Church where Men and Women sat apart from one another, the Men were saluted by the Men, and the Women by the Women; not promiscuously the Men by the Women, or the Women by the Men. The Author of the Apostolical Constitutions, Lib. 2. c. 57. where he sets down the whole order observed in the Christian Assemblies,
Chapter XVI.

ANNOTATIONS on

blies, describes that Custom thus: ἔτι ἐσποζησθεν αὐλάκυς ἐν ἄφετε, ἕν ἀλλήλας αἱ γυναικεῖς τῷ ἐν κυρίῳ φίλῳ. Then let the Men salute one another, and the Women one another, with a kiss in the Lord. He had said before: οἷς ἐν ἔνδοτον μίσθον ἡ λαϊκος κυβερνήσωσιν, μετὰ ποσον πονηρός ἐκ τουτειαν, ἕν αἱ γυναῖκες μεγαποιησομεναι ἔτι τῷ κυβερνήσωσιν, πανακεφαλαίως: Let the Laicks sit on one side in all quietness and good order; and the Women also fit apart by themselves, keeping silence. I know there were several alterations made in the Order of the Church in the following Age, but thus in all probability it was antiently, not only because of the decency of it, but also because it is certain this was the Custom among the Jews, whom in many things the Primitive Church followed, as J. Bapt. Cotelerius on this place in the Confess. Num. 32. Edit. Amst. has well observed.

Verf. 17. Ἐν τῇ ὁμοσπονδίᾳ, &c.] At the end of the Premonition to this Epistle, I said I did not think that the Gnosticks were referred to whereever Dr. Hammond thought so; but I did not deny that sometimes the reproves of the Apostles might belong to them, as these do in this place. They were subtil crafty Persons, who perceiving that a great many had embraced the Christian Religion, who were very liberal to the poor of that Profession, and ready to hearken to any that made a shew of Piety and Learning, took occasion to deceive the simple, that they might live idly at their cost, and privately indulge themselves in all manner of Sensuality: Of which number seems to have been that Peregrinus, whose death is related by Lucian, if we may give credit to an Epicurean and an Orator. And to these Hereticks seem to be owing that multitude of superstititious Writings which were received and used by the Christians ever since the first Ages, and those Philosophical Opinions with which Christianity was very early corrupted; and were taken by the ignorant and unwary for Apostolical Doctines. See Col. ii. 8. and 2 Tim. iii. 2, &c.

Verf. 20. Ἐβραῖος ἢ Σατανᾶς.] Dr. Hammond in his Paraphrase puts several things together, to shew the full importance of this Phrase. But I believe it has a reference only to the persecuting Jews, who waged an irreconcilable War with the Christians as Apostates: For these being the instruments of the Devil, who is called ἐν θεοῦ Σατανα, or an Adversary, and by his inspiration endeavouring to oppress the Christian Religion at its first rise, could not be destroyed, but Satan must be trod under foot as it were, at the same time. The Heathens had not as yet begun to persecute the Christians for Religious sake, but only under the notion of seditious Persons, by which name...
name the Jews endeavour'd to defame them amongst the Romans, as appears from the History of the Acts. So that the Christians had no Adversaries at that time but the Jews; who having some years after become odious themselves to the Romans upon the account of their Seditions, were not in a condition to do the Christians any great harm. And that seems to be the reason why St. Paul promised the Christians peace in \( τὸ χαίρειν \) shortly, from the God of Peace. What the Doctor says here besides this, is besides the meaning of the Apostle: That about the silencing of the Oracles is perhaps false; and it is certain Satan ceased not to stir up the Heathens for some Ages after against the Christians.
Chapter I.

ANNOTATIONS

On the First Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians.

CHAP. I.

Ver. 5. It is easily discernible, that all Dr. Hammond says in this Annotation are mere Niceties, which have no foundation in Grammar, but depend upon bare reasoning, every part of which almost may be denied. Nor is it needful to confute it all particularly. It is much more natural, both here and in 2 Cor. viii. 7. by the word ἄνωθεν to understand the knowledge of Religion; which the Apostle Paul calls ἄνωθεν in the same sense that the Latins call Learning litteras, and the Greeks litteras ἄνωθεν, as every one knows, or if they do not, they soon may by the Lexicons. Ἐν ἄνωθεν ἄνω therefore signifies in all knowledge; that which relates, for instance, to the interpretation of Prophecies, that which concerns the speculative part of Religion, and that which respects the government of the Life. Nor is it any objection against this Interpretation, that hereby ἄνωθεν and ἄνωθεν are made to signify the same thing, nothing being more common than for synonymous words to be joined together. But see also Dr. Hammond's next Annotation.

Ver. 15. Εἰς τὸ ἐκεῖν ὑπομα. That is, that they might be called my Disciples, or receive a denomination from me, and be stiled Paulistes. See my Note on Mat. xxviii. 16.

Ver. 20. Note f. What our Author says on this place, is certainly very ingenious; and some things he has transcribed out of Grotius so as to mend, and add to them. But if we consider, we shall find that the Prophet Isaiab is cited as a Witness to the Gospel only in ver. 19. out of Chap. xxviii. 14. and that the following words in ver. 20. are taken by St. Paul out of Isa. xxxiii. 18. not to prove anything, but only express his mind by them as his own words. Just as the Greeks and Latins frequently borrow passages out of their own Poets, not
I. CORINTHIANS.

I prove any thing by their Authority, but to express their mind in Chapter their words more elegantly than they could do in their own; and to the same end likewise the Hebrews frequently alledged the words of the Old Testament. And as the Greeks and Latins make no difficulty of applying the sayings of their Poets to a different purpose than they intended them, provided they do not apply them absurdly; the same is observable also among the Hebrews. Of which there are innumerable Instances to be met with in the Talmudists, and the mystical Interpreters of the Scripture; and before them in Philo, who seldom ever cites the Scripture but in that manner. And this being a usual practice in the time of the Apostles, it is no wonder if they followed the custom of the Age wherein they lived, there being no harm at all in that custom. A very remarkable instance of such a Citation we have in Rom. x. where the discourse is about the Righteousness of the Gospel. But those passages are carefully to be distinguished from others, by which any thing is proved, or any conclusion drawn from them. I don't think St. Paul did so subtilly examine the agreement of the words of Isaiah with what he designed to say, as Dr. Hammond.

CHAP. II.

Ver. 4. WHAT our Author says here about the several Arguments that might be used to procure credit to the Gospel, is all very true and undeniable; but the greatest part of it is besides the scope of this place: For by &Tph there is meant only the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, which were used by those who are called &Tqmdmnlo in this very Chapter, in the Church; as the Gift of Tongues, which was no small evidence of the truth of Christianity. Achaia at that time being a place of great commerce, a great many Jews and Gentiles, out of Africa, Egypt, and other places where the Inhabitants were &Tqmdmnlo, if I may to speak, resorted to it. And these could not hear the Apostle speaking properly in their several Languages without the highest admiration, knowing that he had never learned them. See Chap. xii. of this Epistle, where the word Spirit often signifies such Gifts. And by &Tqmnus, as Grotius rightly observes, is meant the Gift of healing Diseases, or the like. See the same Chapter, ver. 10, 28, 29. St. Paul's meaning therefore is, that he did not come to the Corinthians as a Philosopher, to persuade them to believe what he said by argument and reasoning, but endued with miraculous Gifts, such as the Gift of Tongues and the like, and a power of curing the diseased; that the credit they gave,
Chapter II.

The Arguments for the truth of the Christian Religion taken from Prophecies, which Grotius and our Author would have to be partly here intended, were not "\( \text{αὐτόδεξις} \)" demonstrations to any but the Jews, who had already fixed a certain sense upon them, and believed them; but they could not in the least move the Heathens. The rest also were not "\( \text{αὐτόδεξις} \)" distinct from reasonings, but to those that had seen them: It is present Miracles that are here meant, whereby the Apostle, without any long arguing, proved "\( \text{ἐνσυνεχσόν} \)" that he was sent from God. Our Author in his Paraphrase on this Chapter, puts in so many things foreign to the sense of St. Paul's words, that it is rather he himself than the Apostle that reason in it.

Verf. 5. "\( \Delta νβρόθης \ Θεῷ. \)" That is, the Power of God; from which he received an ability to work "\( \Delta νβρόθης \)". This word in the foregoing Verse signifies the effect of the divine Power, but here the "\( \text{divine Power it self which was the cause of those Miracles. } \)" That Faith which relies upon Miracles wrought by a divine Power, relies upon the divine Power itself by which those Miracles are wrought. Dr. Hammond here, according to his manner, makes a difficulty where there is none.

Verf. 6. "\( \text{Σοφίαν ἣν ἡλικίαν, &c. } \)" This Verse should be paraphrased thus: "\( \text{All that throughly understand what is true Wisdom, will easily perceive that the Gospel is so. It is not, I confess, such Wisdom as that of Philosophers or Orators, who by their subtilty and eloquence render themselves so acceptable to the great Men of the World, which Wisdom is made vain by the preaching of the Gospel. } \)" "\( \text{Σοφία ἢν ἡλικίαν} \)" is Philosophical Learning, which is vain in the account of those that are perfect, or that throughly know what it is to be wise, as Christians do. And by the "\( \text{Wisdom of the Princes of the Age} \)" seems to be meant Elocution, which in that Age the Nobility of Rome did diligently study, as appears by both the Seneca's, Quintilian, both the Pliny's, and others. "\( \text{Ἄρεστας} \) I render the Nobility, to make that word comprehend, not only the Roman Emperors, but also lesser Powers, such as the Presidents or Governors of Provinces.

Ibid. "\( \text{Καὶ ἀρχώνας. } \)" This word is not to be referred to the Authority of the Roman Magistrates, which at that time prevailed, and afterwards continued, but to their "\( \text{Wisdom or Learning, which was vain} \)"
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and empty, because it could not make them happy, or lead them to the Chapter
knowledge of the true Religion.

Verf. 8. ἄρα μὴ ἔμαθεν ὃς ἦσθιν.] I don't think this Phrase signifies the
chief Men among the Jews, excluding the Heathen Magistrates; or
these latter only, and not the Jews. For both may be intended, it
being manifest that some multitude is designed in this expression:
NONE of the Princes of this Age, &c.

Verf. 11. Πράγματε καὶ πνευματικοίς συγκειόμενοι.] That is, to spiritual Men
speaking spiritual things. For that after πνευματικοί we are to supply
ἀγίας, appears by the next Verse, where the ἄγιος ἄγιος is oppo-
sed to them: And spiritual things are such as agree with the spiri-
tual Nature of the Gospel, according to the usual notion of that
word; not Arguments deduced from Prophecies, which πνευματικοί is
nowhere else used to signify: this appears further from the following
Verse, which makes me wonder that both Grotius, and Dr. Hammond
who follows him, should talk here of Prophecies, of which St. Paul
does not speak one syllable in this place.

Verf. 14. Χρυσὸς ἀγίας & θεαταί.] I don't think that by χρυσός
ἀγίας here is meant a Man that makes use of nothing but rea
on, as our Author supposes, after Grotius; such a Man should rather have
been stiled κοραί, for reason is called λόγος not ἄγιος. I rather think it
signifies a Man who is no more raised in his Mind to spiritual things
than any other χρυσός living Creature, i.e. than Plants and Animals.
Perhaps Plants were called χρυσός, but at least Animals were stiled so
in Greek at that time, in imitation of the Latins, so that χρυσός & ζώον
were all one. And to this the old Glosses seem to have a reference,
which interpret χρυσός by animalia, & χρυσός by animalis. It is cer-
tain χρυσός is frequently taken for that life which is common to us with
Brutes. Χρυσός ἀγίας therefore is a Phrase used by way of contem
posing to signify a Person that is wholly devoted and enslaved to earthly
things, and entirely taken up with the concerns of this Life, like a brute Creature: As on the other hand πνεύμα signifies the Mind
or reasonable Soul, which is peculiar to Men, and capable of discern-
and attaining to πνευματικά spiritual things. The Verb πνεύμα sig-
nifies here to assist, in the notion it is more than once met with in Thuc-
ides, as H. Stephanus will inform us. Tho there is no need of Thuc-
ides's authority, it being often so taken in the New Testament, as in
Mat. xi. 14, where Christ speaking to the multitude concerning John
the Baptist, faith: εἶδεν Ἰησοῦν Ἰησοῦς, if ye will admit or receive it (that is,
ent to what I say) this is Elias, which was to come: See Mark x. 15.
uk. viii. 13. and xviii. 17. Acts xi. 1. and xvii. 11. Jam. i. 21. The
sense
Chapter sense according to this interpretation is very proper: "He that is not raised above an animal Life, and so thinks of nothing but this World, does not assent to those things which come from the Spirit of God, for he looks upon them as Trifles.

Ibid. On δυνατας γνωναι.] The simple Verb γνωναι here seems to be put for δισερναι to discern them, viz. from such as are false. So it is used in John x. 14. I know my Sheep, and am known by them. That is, as I discern those who are so disposed as to believe in me from all others, so they in like manner discern me from Impostors. And I interpret this word γνωναι here to discern, because of what follows, where on the contrary Spiritual Men are said δισερναι to discern, for it is a clear opposition: "For such a Man does not discern or distinguish those things which are from the Spirit of God, from Trifles. When it is said δυνατας, he cannot discern them, the meaning of that is η δυνατας νεανις, ει δυνατας νεανις, as long as he continues sensual, and judges sensualy, viz. because being biased by his sensual disposition, he minds only present and sensible things.

Ibid. On andμασαι δισερναι.] That is, because the Doctrine of the Gospel is grounded not upon carnal reasonings, which respect only present things, but upon spiritual, which take in the knowledge of things Future and Invisible, and suppose it to be already in the Mind; or in fewer words; by such a disposition of Mind as whereby wise Men are not less affected with incorporeal and future Things, than those which are present and sensible. It is true what our Author here says in his Paraphrase, but beside the scope of this place: The opposition here made between Spiritual and Animal things, plainly proves what I have said. So in John vi. 63. by the Spirit is meant such things or Doctrines as could not be understood by the use or knowledge of things sensible. See afterwards Chap. iii. 1, 11. and x. 3, 4.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 15. It is truly observed by learned Men, that this is a proverbial form of Speech, taken from those who hastily and narrowly make their escape from a Fire which had like to consume them. Such another Metaphor there is in Livy, Lib.22. cap. 39. L. Æmiliium Paulum, qui — ex damnatione collegit, & sua, prope ambushus evaserat —— ad petitionem compellit. And cap. 40. the same Æmilius faith, se populare incendium, priore consulatu, ferminiens effugisse; That in his former Consulship, he had escaped out of a common Fire, half burned.
But our learned Author forcibly applies all this to his Gnosticks: Chapter for tho in Judea it is possible the Gnosticks might feign themselves to be Jews, to escape persecution from them, because the Jews there were far more numerous than the Heathens; it does not follow there was any reason to be afraid of them at Corinth, or in Achaia, where the Jews were much fewer in number than the Greeks, and where their Complaints of the Christians were not hearkened to by the Roman Magistrates, as appears from Acts xviii. 12, &c. And after the Jews once began for their Seditions to be suspected by the Romans, as not long after it happened, it had not been carnal Policy for any to join themselves to their party; so that there is no room here for what the Doctor says about the compliance of the Gnosticks with the Jews.

If the Gnosticks had reason to fear any danger in Greece, it was from the Romans; but it does not appear there was any persecution raised against the Christians in those parts, till a great while after the destruction of Jerusalem: See Mr. Dodwell's Dissert. de paucitate Martyrum, among his Cyprianica. So that that day of which St. Paul speaks, cannot be referred to the destruction of the Jews. It is much better by Grotrius understood of a long space of time, which very often discovers what is true, and what is false, as many of the Antients have observed. Consult Stobaei Excerpta de Resum Natura, Tit. 11, where there are a great many sayings to that purpose. As for the Fire which St. Paul here makes mention of, that is nothing but an examination of Doctrines, which after some time the Christians would set themselves to, and upon which all that were false would be rejected, and the true retained; which is called Fire by a Metaphor taken from Metals. They that retained the foundation of Christianity, tho' they built strange Doctrines upon it, would at length upon that examination of them, find that they had built bubble upon gold; and when they understood that they had been in danger of casting away the foundation of Religion itself for those Errors, they would presently forsake them, and escape as out of the Fire, not without the loss of their Reputation and Time, besides what they must be reckoned to have lost in pious Actions and right Apprehensions, by continuing so long in their Errors.

That Character of the Gnosticks, which our Author would have to be contained in the following words, agrees to any others that err through a false notion of Wisdom, and do mischief to the Christian Church. So that what he thought to be manifest, seems to me to be plainly false.
Chapter IV.

Ver. 6. \( \Phi v t e n \) properly is to think, and does not signify to be proud simply taken, but only when there is something else added to it, as here \( \nu w n \; \gamma e k t a t i \); that is, be not lifted up in your Minds, beyond what these Instructions will allow which I have already written, either in this Chapter, or the foregoing, but especially in Chap. iii. where St. Paul had taught the Corintheans what they ought to think both of themselves, and of their Teachers.

Ver. 13. Note b. 1. It is true indeed what our Author says about the signification of the words \( \alpha \varepsilon l i m a \) and \( \alpha i k o v i a m a \). But there is another notion given by the same Grammarians of these words which I like better, as seeming to be more agreeable to this place, for purgamenta, filth, quisquilia, retrimenta, the dregs or refuse of any thing. For the Apostle's meaning is no more than that he was the Object of every bodies Contempt, and so was \( \mu i s i m a \; \pi a t t o n \), or \( \mu e k h a b a m a \; \pi o x a m a \), look'd upon by all the World as refuse. And this notion of the words is agreeable to their Original, \( \mu e k h a b a m a \) coming from \( \kappa o b a l e w n \) to purge, and \( \pi i s i m a \) from \( \alpha e \lambda a t o n \) to wipe off. Hesychius has indeed \( \mu e k h a b a m a \), but without any interpretation of it, which must be supplied out of Phavorinus, who seems to have had the most correct Copy of that Grammarian, and tells us, that \( \alpha i k o v i a m a \; \alpha t i \; \kappa o l a m a m a \), \( \nu \; \delta o n \; \varepsilon m a e p i m a t a \), for filth, and as refuse. The other word is interpreted in Hesychius by \( \alpha e k a t a m a m a \) which comes from \( \alpha e k a t a m a m a \) to wipe off, and ought not to be alter'd. It follows; \( \alpha i n i l a t e s \), \( \alpha i n i l a n \), \( \nu \; \tau \; \i \; \kappa o n \; \pi a t t o n \), it should be, \( \alpha \varepsilon l i m a \), \( \alpha i n i l a t e s \), \( \alpha i n i l a n \), \( \nu \; \tau \; \i \; \kappa o n \; \pi a t t o n \); but the former word was omitted because of its likeness to \( \alpha e k a t a m a m a \), which went before. In Suidas also it should be read \( \alpha e k a t a m a m a \), as Emil. Portus observed, who ought to have corrected the whole passage by Hesychius: For it follows in Suidas; \( \nu \; \tau \; \i \; \kappa o n \; \kappa o l a t e s \), which he ridiculously renders; ipsa sub vestigiis redemptionis, when it is manifest the words ought to be read with a Comma after \( \kappa o n \) thus: \( \nu \; \tau \; \i \; \kappa o n \; \kappa o l a t e s \), or what is under foot, also redemption.

Phavorinus interprets \( \alpha e l i m a \) not only \( \beta \i l i m a m a \) abomination, but also \( \alpha e l a m a \) with the idiomata \( \kappa a m o n t o s \) \( \varepsilon b o i s \; \kappa o d a \): a Towel which wipes the Sweat off one that is tired with work; \( \nu \; \tau \; \alpha e k a t a m a m a \; \kappa o l a t e s \), \( \alpha i n i l a t e s \), or refuse which is cast away, as useless: \( \nu \; \tau \; \mu e k h a b a m a \; \kappa o l a t e s \), \( \tau \; \kappa o l a t e s \) \( \alpha e k a t a m a m a \; \mu e k h a b a m a \) \( \nu \; \varepsilon b \; \kappa o d e s \): by a Metaphor taken from those who wipe down Tables after eating. He adds, \( \mu e k h a b a m a \; \alpha i n \; \kappa a t a m a m a \), \( \alpha i n i l a t e s \); \( \pi e s e f i n \) is put for that which signifies to purge, to wipe off with a Sponge; but he ought to
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1. The word ἀκριβές can signify but two things in this place.

First, it may denote the certainty of the Report, and be referred to the Verb ἀκριβέσθαι, and so St. Paul’s meaning will be, that that report had been a long while spread, and it was universally affirmed for a certain truth, by all that knew the Church of Corinth; in which sense ἀκριβές is an Adverb of affirming. Secondly, it may be a Particle, whereby the Apostle signifies he would tell them briefly and in one word, why he should come to them ἐπί σαλπίγγιῳ with a Rod. In both these senses this Particle is used in good Authors, but never in Dr. Hammond’s, that I know of; and if it were, yet in this Construction, that could not be the sense of it. It signifies also ἀκριτῶς, wholly or altogether; but for that signification of it there can be no room neither here: See Mat. v. 34. and afterwards Chap. xv. 29. of this Epistle. I rather think it is here an Adverb of affirming, because the Verb ἀκριβέσθαι immediately follows it.

Verf. 2. Note c. Lin. 13. After the reference to Rom. xii. Note c.] This passage of St. Clement, as also the Citation out of Origen, was taken by our Author out of Grotius, as is evident by this, that Grotius refers us only to Constit. 2. without setting down the Chapter, which he
Chapter 3.8.

V. he ought to have done in the quotation of a Book that had been long since divided into Chapters: and so does the Doctor. Gratian does not truly cite the words of the Constitutions; no more does Dr. Hammond. The place is in Lib. 2. cap. 41. and the last word of it here alluded, is not "memorad", but "memorad cut off." By this it appears that learned Men are not to be absolutely trusted in citing the Testimonies of the Antients.

Ibid. At the end of that Note.] If our learned Author to this passage in St. Paul, had added only that in 2 Cor. xii. 21. no one would ever have disputed with him about these interpretations. But all that he says afterwards is manifestly forced, because St. Paul does not speak of that Sorrow which was caused by the censures of the Church, or Excommunication, but concerning Sorrow which proceeded from a depravation of Manners in the Corinthians, for which St. Paul had justly reprehended them. For it is apparent that St. Paul speaks to the whole Corinthian Church, which no one would say was excommunicated because the Apostle had in this Epistle reproved their Manners, or because he had ordered that one incestuous Person, spoken of in this Chapter, to be delivered to Satan. The thing confutes it self upon the very mention of it; and I dare say our Author had never written in this manner, if he had not some time before composed a disputation about the Power of the Keys, which he was very much in love with, and perhaps more than he should have been, and that made him think he saw those Keys where no body else would ever have thought of them.

Verf. 5. Note e. I. It had been better in my judgment, if our learned Author had insisted only on the second reason he assigns of this phrase, which is manifestly grounded on the Apostle's writings; for what need was there of inventing another new one, when the Apostles had given one very sufficient reason of it? But, unless I am mistaken, the Doctor did not sufficiently distinguish the common Excommunication, as it is described by the Jews, or as it obtained in after Ages, from that delivering up to Satan in the time of the Apostles. For this was a confecrating of that miraculous Power of the Apostles, whereas the power of Excommunication was not conjoined with any Miracle. What Josephus relates concerning the Essen, may so be understood, as that the Excommunicate Person should be said to have died for Grief, not by the miraculous Virtue of the Excommunication; which yet if Josephus had believed, it would be no Crime to refuse to give Credit to him. And it is certain those Essen were neither Prophets themselves, nor instituted by Prophets: But of this and other things which belong to Excommuni-
Excommunication, we may consult Mr. F. Selden, de Synod. Judaorum, Chapter Lib. 1. cap. 7, &c.

II. What our Author conjectures about the sense of the Verb *συνοδεύω* that it signifies here to deliver up upon Demand or Petition, is certainly ingenious; but if it should be denied, I don't see how it could be proved. For an Executioner does not use to require the Magistrate to deliver up Malefactors to him, but they are delivered up to him without his demanding them. And when it is said that Satan desired permission of God to lift the Apostles, that was not properly to execute Punishment on them for their Sins, but to assault them more vehemently with his Temptations and wicked Suggestions: Nor indeed can the Devil be supposed to demand bad Men of God in order to torment them, whom he would rather make happy, if he could, that he might entice others into sin by the example of their Prosperity; so that he is rather to be thought to punish bad men against his will, than to ask leave of God to afflic them. And it's visible that bad men who serve Satan, are so far from being more miserable and obnoxious to diseases than the good, that the contrary is generally true. Whence also by the way we may infer, that if to be delivered to Satan, were all one as to be cast out of the Church, those who never were within the Church must have been reckoned from their very birth to have been delivered up to Satan, and by consequence have been all more obnoxious to diseases than the Christians: And all likewise that were rightfully Excommunicated should have been said to have been delivered to Satan, and been afflicted with Diseases, which yet that it was of old so, no Writer has ever asserted, nor does any one believe. But delivering up to Satan, tho' conjoined with Excommunication, is not the same thing: And therefore our Author ought not to have confounded this unusual Punishment inflicted by Apostolical Authority, with the ordinary Censures of the Church. Nor is he more fortunate in conjecturing that this delivering to Satan was an imitation of God's dealing with Sinners, when he leaves them to the power of the Devil to execute his pleasure upon them.

Vers. 9. *Epexegesei ca to fóros.*] Many Interpreters would have this to be understood of this very Epistle, contrary to all the rules of Grammar, lest it should be thought that any of St. Paul's Epistles were lost; which yet why they might not, no reason at all can be given: For if so be, we want none of those things which are necessary to Salvation, what reason can we have to accuse the Providence of God, if any of the Writings of the Apostles were lost? Should we have been over the less Disciples of Christ, if any of those Epistles had...
Chapter had been lost, which we now have? Was it absolutely necessary that
every thing which the Apostles wrote should be transmitted to Postere-
rit? Nay we may suppose that there were some such Epistles, which
it was the interest of the Churches, and Men of that Age to conceal;
for there are secrets which every body need not to be acquainted with.
And it would be no hard matter to produce instances of such secrets,
if every one could not easily find such himself. So that there being
no sufficient reason to perswade us that all the Apostles writings ei-
ther were or ought to have been preserved, if it be most agreeable
to the rules of Grammar to suppose, that the Discourse here is about
an Epistle which is lost, I do not see why we should not be of that
Opinion. And there are three things that shew St. Paul to speak of
some other Epistle.

First, That he had no where in the foregoing part of this admo-
nished the Corinthians μη συμβαίνετε, not to associate with Fornicators:
For what he had said about the Corinthian who was guilty of Incest, can-
not be the thing here referred to, because that had no ambiguity in it;
and it appears by the following Verse, that the ambiguity of St. Paul's
words either did, or at least might have given the Corinthians an oc-
servation to mistake: I wrote unto you, faith he, in an Epistle not to keep com-
pany with Fornicators; but not altogether with the Fornicators of this World,
or with the Covetous, or Extortioners, or Idolaters, for then must ye needs
have gone out of the World. But now I have written unto you, not to keep
Company with any Man that is called a Brother, and is a Fornicator, &c.

Secondly, The 11th Verse which begins with the Particle ΝΥΝ
now, sufficiently shews that the Apostle in that speaks of this Epistle,
and in the 9th Verse of another: I WROTE unto you, faith he, in an
Epistle, not to, &c. But NOW I have written unto you, &c. There is
here a plain opposition between the time of the Apostles writing the
one and the other; for tho the Particle now be sometimes only a transi-
tion, and does not signify any difference of time, yet it is manifest that
St. Paul speaks here of a thing that was past, which he now explains
more clearly. Nay tho we should grant the Particle now to be here a
form of transition, and the Apostle to speak of the same Epistle in
both Verses; yet that Epistle must be an Epistle in which St. Paul had
spoken ambiguously, and not this in which there is no ambiguity, as I
have just now said.

Thirdly, If the Apostle had meant this Epistle, he would not have
said ἐν τῇ ἑπιστ., but either have wholly omitted it, or said ἐν ταύτη τῇ
ἐπιστ., in this Epistle; tho even that could not be handsomly enough
said, if but just before he had written that which by many he is sup-
posed
posed here to refer to. But undoubtedly he meant another Epistle, as Chapter in his 2d Epist. Chap. vii. 8. where he speaks of this, which is come to our hands: οὕτως δὲ προσές, faith be, in θέτοντι, I made you sorrowful in a Letter, viz. formerly written to you. Tho I confess the Phrase in εἰρωνεία, is used elsewhere by St. Paul, to signify τὴν ταύτην εἰρωνείαν, this Epistle, viz. in Colos. iv. 16. and 1 Thess. v. 27. But I do not rely only on this reason, or the bare omission of the Pronoun ταύτης.

All this did not hinder Dr. Hammond, who was an excellent Divine, but an indifferent Grammarian, from declaring himself of another Opinion in his Note upon this Verse, which, if I am not mistaken, was owing to a Theological prejudice, mentioned in the beginning of this Animadversion.

Ibid. Note g. Col. 2. Lin. 23. After the words, guilty of those Sins.] I have already confuted what Dr. Hammond here says, who would have done better to follow Grotius whom he so often had recourse to. That none of the Antients have made any mention of that Epistle to the Corinthians, which I say is lost, does not prove that there was no such Epistle; because there might be reasons, as I before said, for the concealing of it, or perhaps also after it was read, for the tearing and burning it, by the Apostle's own order, who had written it.

Verse 10. Note h. i. As μαλακός nowhere signifies a Voluntary, unless it be in Dr. Hammond's Lexicon, as I have shewn on Rom. i. 29. so neither does δέμας when it is alone, signify a Ravisher of Boys or Women; but the circumstances of the place where that word occurs, must oblige us to take it in that sense; otherwise it always signifies one that is greedy of Money, and takes away what is another's, either under a pretence of right, or by abusing his Authority to that purpose. And in this place where the word μιθρός is set in the first place, and signifies a Person addicted to Venery, there is no necessity to take it in any other than its ordinary sense: See especially, the following Verse, where δεμας is last mentioned after the names of four other Vices.

II. The word δεμας in 2 Pet. ii. 12. signifies no such thing; for Animals made αἰδοιος x. δεμας are Animals therefore created that they might be taken and destroyed: See Grotius on that place. There was no necessity of recurring to the Version of the Septuagint, to shew that μιθρός signifies reperere to ravish; for who does not know that?

III. What is said of the sense of Gen. vi. 11. is all mere conjecture, which has no ground either in the History, or the proper signification of the words. The Hebrew בֵּית קָחָמָא does not signify Violence but Injury; and בֵּית קָחָמָא he was corrupted, signifies any change whatever.
Chapter whatsoever for the worse, and not only Lusts, as any Lexicon will shew. It's true, the Marriages of the Ensidæ with the Cainites, were a means of corrupting all Mankind; but it does not thence follow that Lust was their principal Sin, no more than from St. Peter's joining the Men who lived before the Flood with the Sodomites; for to put them together, it is sufficient that they were both Sinners, tho' their sins were different, and both utterly destroyed, tho' not in the same manner.

IV. I grant a lustful Person was the occasion of what the Apostle here says; but it does not follow therefore that the Vices which he mentions in vers. 10, and 11. belong to the same thing. Surely εἰμί, λαλῶς, λῆσθαι, & μιθωθαι, do not signify one given to Venery, tho' I confess, Idolaters, Railers, and Drunkards, have been often addicted to Lust.

V. There is no doubt but ἰδοὺ is sometimes taken for a Ravisher of Boys or Women; but as I said before, the Circumstances of the place must shew that the word is used in that sense, as in the place alluded out of Harmenopus, which nevertheless I do not warrant, because I have not look'd into him. But the Passages cited out of the Sybiline Oracles, are certainly wrested; nor do I believe that our learned Author took them out of the Book itself: For the first is in the first Book, not the second, out of which he cites it. And the place it itself shews that he misinterprets it; for after the word ἰδοὺ is subjoined the word ἵστασιν, for Tyrants, who are rather Ravishers of Goods and Possessions than of Men. In the second are collected the names of several Vices, whether they have any Affinity with one another or not: and tho' Men are called by the Sybil, A race of Adulturers, Idolaters, Deceivers, and Persons whose breasts are full of Rage; and she adds,

Arsēns dēnī vírus, aiavīs suūd υγείτες.

Snatching to themselves, having an impudent Mind; it does not thence follow that ἰδοὺ must here be understood of the ravishing of a Boy or a Woman, tho' there were nothing added which shewed the contrary. But it follows,

Ovitēs ωντίν ἓρετικα ἐλλεῖν πεμπήθηκαν.

For no rich Man that has great Possessions, will make another participate of them. By which it is evident that it is not so to be understood. Two Verses after that it follows,
Many Widows will privately love others for Gain. Which is nothing to the Verb ἐρωταῖ. In the last Verse but two of the Book, the Sybil faith, that the day of Judgment, of which she had before spoken, would come

When the smell of Brimstone should be gone. In which I cannot tell whether she had any respect to the destruction of Sodom.

VI. In Mat. xxiii. the words ἐρωταῖ & ἐρωτέᾳ are used in their ordinary signification; and ἐρωταῖ, which is opposed to them, is not only that purity which consists in Abstinence from carnal Pleasures, but from any sort of Wickedness, as appears by the place alleged out of St. Luke, where ἐρωταῖ signifies all kinds of Vice, as the Hebrew Ḥū ṭūḇ in Gen. vi. 5. They who think otherwise, can bring no Argument either from the thing itself, or the word to confirm their Opinion: So that upon the whole here is, as the Poet speaks,

Pergula pictorum, veri nihil, omnia falsa.

Ibid. Note i. Here is, I confess, uīnas ἰὸς a mighty flood of Examples, but

For it is true indeed, the Solemities used in the worship of some Deities, in some places, were accompanied with shameful Lusts; as I have shewn my self on Exod. xxxiv. 15. But that either every where, or for the most part it was so, I leave them to believe who are ignorant of the antient Heathen Customs. Our Author speaks as if the Greeks and Romans did very freely suffer their Wives and Children to be corrupted and prostituted in their sacred Mysteries; and as if that was the general Custom, than which nothing can be more false: Nay there were severer Decrees sometimes made against Impurities in the worship of their Gods, as appears from Livy, Lib. 39. and by an order of the Senate it self still extant: See also Cicero de Legibus, Lib.
Chapter Lib. 2. Cap. 14, 15. I do not therefore believe that an Idolater simply is ever taken for a Fornicator or Adulterer, as if Idolatry and uncleanness had always gone together: Nor does our Author produce any one Passage to make it probable; for tho' all the Sins which are joined with Idolatry here and elsewhere, respected carnal Pleasures, it would in no wise follow that by Idolatry is meant Impurity, when neither the proper significature of that word, nor its use will admit that sense; and it is very common for Sins of various kinds to be joined together. And yet upon this only ground almost, our learned Author in his Note on Rom. i. 29. endeavoured to prove that πεπλωτησα signified Luxury, against the proper significature of the word, and the constant use of all Writers, as I have there shewn. And the fame I shall do here, as to the word Idolatry, lest any should be deceived by his Authority, or multitude of Examples.

I. The Hebrew word בִּילַע gilloul signifies Dung properly, and Idols are by way of contempt so called, not because of those carnal Pollutions that accompanied the Worship of them, but because they were made no more account of than Dung by the Jews: For Dung did not pollute, viz. with any legal Pollution. By the Septuagint this word is rendered κανάμα, not as if that were the proper significature of it, but because the Jews who spake Greek, commonly called Idols κανάμα abominable things, not polluted; for κανάμα does not signify to be polluted, but to abhor, to detest. And the same is the significature of the Hebrew root שָׁבָקָתָה₁, whence שָׁבָק an abominable thing, not properly because of carnal Pollution, but because it is evil. Lyra's Authority is not to be regarded. See my Notes on Gen. xxi. 7.

II. I do not doubt but in the Bacchanalia, or night Revels of Bacchus, there were horrible Villanies committed; but I do not think it was universally known in Greece, that those things were done there in honour of that God. Our learned Author might have produced a great many fitter Testimonies, to shew that the Mysteries of Ceres were secret, than those which he alledges out of Horace and Seneca; or rather have let them quite alone, since every Child knows such things.

III. That passage in Jerem. xliv. 19. is perfectly foreign to this business, there being nothing there said about nocturnal Sacrifices: For thus the Women who had offered Sacrifice to the Queen of Heaven, that is, the Moon, speak: When we burned Incense to the Queen of Heaven, and poured out drink Offerings, did we make her Images without our Husbands? &c.

IV. I am of opinion indeed with our Author, that God by the sacred mark of Circumcision, did signify the amputation of inordinate Pleasures;
Pleasures; but whether he had a particular respect to the nameful Chapter practices of the Heathens in their Religious Solemnities, which in that Ceremony he condemned, I cannot tell; nor is it evident from any place of Scripture.

V. Our Author had not look'd into 2 Kings xxiii. 7. for the word there in the Hebrew is לְאַשֶׁר laascherab, that is, in a Grove, not לְבָשְרָה besheroth, which has a different signification. But he was deceived by an overhasty reading of what Mr. Selden says about this matter, de Diis Syris, Synt. ii. Cap. 2. who may be consulted; and who has also treated at large of Melitta and the rest here spoken of, in Syntag. 2. Cap. 7. To me likewise it seems most probable, what he conjectures about the original of the names Atergatis and Derceto, in cap. 3. of the same Syntagm. as if they were the same with אדייר-דָּג addir-dag, a magnificent Fish, because he sets down a story which agrees with his conjecture, as he at large shews.

VI. By a pleasant mistake our Author produces Verses out of the 3d Book of the Sybillin Oracles, as respecting the Roman Lustrations, of which there is not in them the least mark or footsteps; merely, if I am not mistaken, because Joann. Opisopow, who turned the Sybillin Oracles into bad Latin Verse, had thus translated the two first which Dr. Hammond alledges:

Masque mari se junget, statuentque pudendis
In LUSTRIS pueros.

But these Lustra any one will see to be Bawdy-Houses, who observes it to be in the Greek αἰγές την. The other places prove nothing, but only that the Heathens were generally given to inordinate Lustrs, but not that those Lustrs were reckoned by the most of them a part of Religion.

VII. In the Eleusinia Sacra, or Rites performed in honour of Ceres, there were indeed some indecent things practis'd, as Joannes Meursius in Eleusinia will inform us; but that any horrible Villanies, and such as are not to be named, were committed in them, will not be thought by any that shall read what is said of them by Cicero de Legibus, Lib. 2. in the place before cited.

VIII. In Coloss.iii. 5. the word παρεξήγη is taken in its usual and constant signification for Covetousness, and not for lustful Idolatry: The same I lay of Ephes. v. 5. The rest of the places allledged prove nothing at all, for the Affinity there is between some Vices does not make it necessary that all others should be of the same kind. What is produced.
Chapter duced out of Polycarpus and Beza, has been already confuted on Rom. i. 29.

V. The words of the Council of Iliberis are figurative, and signify no more than that the Heathen Priests, who after they had taken upon them the profession of Christianity, did again return to the worship of Idols, were as guilty as if they had committed the three Sins there mentioned.

Ver. 11. Our Author did well to add this at last, for it is false that loved ever signifies a lustful Person: See Hesychius, Phavorinus, the Old Glosses, and all the Lexicons in the World. I name Hesychius among the rest, because he interprets ἔλεος by a Railer, for there is one sort of ἔλεος which lies only in words: Whence the Old Glosses render it not only injuriam Injury, but also convitium, probrum, railing, reviling, &c. ἔλεος convitiatur, convitium facit, contumeliatur, ἔλεος contumeliosus. Phavorinus: ὁ ἔλεος ἐν μόνον ἐν λόγω, ἀλλά ἡ ἔλεος τὸν ἔλεον ἔξοδον. Συνεισμένον ἐν ἔλεος κακολογῶντα. ἔλεος ἐν μάλιστα ἐν δικαιοφύτεις. As for the Gnosticks, I should no more imagin them to be here referred to, than any other bad Men, unless our Author meant to give the honourable name of Gnosticks to all the vile wretches that in the Apostles times had crept into the Christian Assemblies; tho why he should, I can see no reason.

Ver. 12. Note I. Our Author who makes his stile both in English and Latin rugged with unnecessary and misplaced Parentheses, and thereby often renders it tedious to the Reader, makes too much use of that expedient to connect the Discourse of the Sacred Writers. Besides, if we read the Greek words, it will appear that the Discourse does not sufficiently hang together; for we should be obliged to read: τῷ παλαιῷ ἔλεοι, doing this ye shall put away.

I shall propose here a Conjecture, which if it were true, would make all things plain. We read the words in our Copies thus: τῇ γὰρ καὶ ΚΑΙ τῆς ἔλεος κείμεν; Now what construction this is, τῇ μοι καθιστά, I confess I do not understand. I know the sense commonly put upon it is, What have I to do, or what business is it of mine to judge them that are without? i.e. it is not my business. But there is no example given of any such Phrase. Besides, the Conjunction ΚΑΙ intervening, makes the Phrase still more harsh; for which reason it is left out in the Alexandrian and other Manuscripts, and omitted by the Syriack Interpreter; but in my judgment rashly, because that Particle may be of use to direct us to the true reading, which seems to be this: τῇ γὰρ, τῷ ΤΟΤΕ έλεοι, ΚΑΙ ΜΕΝΟΤΝΓΕ τῆς ἔλεος κείμεν: τῆς Ν έλεοι Δ Στίς κείμεν: τῇ ἔλεοι τῷ πάντων, &c. For what have I to do with those that are without? But do you judge those that are within; and those that are without
Chapter VI.

First, η μεν ἐστιν is a phrase very common in the Sacred Writers, and as much as, take care of your own business, and I'll take care of mine: See Mat. viii. 29. John ii. 4. and Interpreters on those places. And the sense here must certainly be; it is not my business to take care of the Manners of the Heathens, who have not yet embraced the Gospel. Next, the words ΚΑΙ ΜΕΝΟΤΝΕ might easily enough be changed into ΚΠΙΝΕΙΝ 'ΟΤΧΙ, because the verb κόπω occurs twice in the following words. And μενος is an Adverbial Particle frequently used by St. Paul: See Rom. iv. 20. and x. 18. and Phil. iii. 8. This makes the sense very plain; whereas that interrogation, do not ye judge them? is very harsh and improper in this place. If St. Paul had said; It is not my business to judge those who are among you, do not ye judge them? this would be some sense, tho' foreign to this place, and the discourse would be current; but as it is now, the connexion of the words is extremely harsh. Thirdly, the following words τας ΔΕ ζω (there being here a manifest opposition between the οι ζω & οι ζω, shews there ought to have preceded the Particle ΜΕΝ, which is contained in ζωινυν, for μενος is all one with ζω & εις, and if we believe H. Stephanus, ought to be so distinctly written. Fourthly, ΚΑΙ ξασιν is evidently conjoint with κατω, judge and ye shall put away: The words intervening, and those that are without God judge them, ought not to be included in a Parentesis, because they are set in opposition to that which went immediately before, and not inserted ζωινυνυν.

And it cannot seem strange, that I suppose this place to be corrupted, seeing the Syriack Interpreter seems to have thought the same, who has left out in the 12th verse ζ & ζ, & ζ again in the 13th, because he did not see how the Apostle's words could otherwise be made to hang together. The Latin also and the Arabian Interpreters omit the Particle ζ in both Verses. The Ethiopian departs yet further from the rest, who has; & curn qui intus homines judicabit. And there are other variations in the Manuscript Copies, which I pass by.

C. H. A. P. VI.

Vers. 2. WHAT our Author says here about the notion of Note a. the word κρίνειν is true; but as that word has more significations than one, so in this place it seems rather to be taken for judgment: for ἐνδικον ἦλας κρίνεως κρίνεω signifies not Persons unworthy to sit in the lowest judgment-seats, but to judge of the smallest matters; and therefore is very rightly rendered by the Vulgar qui.
Chapter VI.

... And thus the Old Glosses render veremum judicium, examen, senentis, Judgement, Examination, Opinion, and veremum judicia. But in vers. 4. veremum seems to signify to have things to be judged of relating to life, as Dr. Hammond himself interprets it in his Paraphrase. So that in this Verse veremum is taken for the act of judging, and in vers. 4. for things to be judged of.

Vers. 7. Note b. Here the word διακρίνεται is as much as omnino, or a Particle of affirming, as I have shewn on that place in Chap. v. 1.

Vers. 10. πλασκεύω.] This word our Author here in the Margin, according to his manner, interprets of a Person of inordinate Lusts. But if that were the true sense of it, it should have been joined with the foregoing words in the 9th Verse, and not have been put here in the 10th after the word ἐξοντας: But πλασκεύω signifies in this place, as it is rendered in the Old Glosses, fraudator, avidus, A cheating, covetous Person.

Vers. 11. ἐξευτελίζεται.] διακρίνεται in this place is the same with ἐπολυσθαί & διακρίνεται, to be washed and sanctified, which went just before. The Phrase ἐξοντας το Κυριον signifies, when ye became Christians, or took upon you the profession of the Christian Religion in Baptism; which obliged all those that received it, to reformation of Life. See Acts ii. 38.

Vers. 19. Ναὶς ἐν υἱὸν ἀλήθεως.] This expression may be illustrated by a passage in the Epistle of Barnabas, where he faith: Ναὶς ἐν Χριστῷ της κυριοτητος της πατρίς: For the habitation of our Heart is a holy Temple to the Lord. The Holy Spirit is said to dwell in our Bodies, because it is present with our Minds, which inhabit our Bodies. Grotius does but trifle when he tells us, that the Spirit of the Mind is the Sanctuary, the other parts of the Mind the Court of the Temple, and the Body the Porch and its outward parts. Such a Remark as this might perhaps be tolerable in a Pulpit, but by no means in an exact Interpreter. Claudian has an expression much like this in his Second Book, on the first Consulship of Stilicho, speaking of the Goddess Mercy:

Hec Dea, pro templis & thure calentibus aris,
Te frutur, postuitque suas hoc pestore sedes.

And a little after:

Huic Divae germana Fides, eademque sorori
Corde tuo DELUBRA tenens.
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Verf. 20. St. Paul seems to allude here to a House, Chapter which none but he may use how he pleases that has purchased it. And God having, as it were, bought our Bodies as well as our Souls, he only has a sovereign Right to prescribe to us how we shall use them.

C H A P. VII.

Verf. 3. Of this matter, according to the Doctrine of the Rabbins, Mr. Selden has treated at large in his Uxor Hebraica, Lib. 3. c. 4. and seqq.

Verf. 5. Note b. Anegeta and its opposite ευγενετη ρατον, according to the subject matter, are taken sometimes in a larger, and sometimes in a more contracted Notion. In general εναγετης signifies one that has not the command of his Passions, ἢριν εναγετης ὁ πεθεν, ἅλλων αὐτῶν εναγετης, but is commanded or overruled by them: And on the contrary, εὐγενετης one that is not subject to the dominion of any Passion, but is always his own master: But because the Passions are various, proportionable to the variety of objects to which they may be carried out, therefore εναγετης & εὐγενετης have also divers objects, as Aristotle will teach us in the beginning of his 7th Book of Ethics, ad Nicomachum. And so in this place, where the discourse is about the lawful pleasures of Marriage, εὐγενετης is used in a much narrower signification, not for a Vice, i.e. a disposition of Mind contrary to the Law of God, and pernicious to humane Society, but a certain natural heat of Body, which of itself is neither a Vice nor a Virtue. But it is described as a Vice, because it is an occasion of becoming vicious to those who do not govern it with reason.

Verf. 6. Note c. Col. 1. Lin. 45. After the words, on the other side.] Our learned Author might have confirmed this observation about the use of the word διδωμι for malo, I had rather, by that Passage in Hos. vi. 6. I will (διδωμι) have Mercy and not (αἰτω) Sacrifice; which is all one as if God had said, διδωμι μισγεβα, than Sacrifice: and if the Prophet had written so, it could not have been rendered otherwise than by I will, or bad rather. And that this the Prophet meant is evident by the next words; and the knowledge of God, καταλαβαι meboloth, than burnt Offerings: whence the Septuagint according to the Vatican Copy, read; διδωμι τα αιτων, καταλαβαι μελεβα τα, and Jonathan, μελεβα than Sacrifice: But in Mat. ix. 13, and in the Alexandrian Copy, we read τα διδωμι, which is yet to the same sense. It is certain the Hebrews have no Verb whereby to express the Latin malo or μαθαινω in Greek.

Tt
Chapter VII. Ver. 14. Note d. From this place I readily allow the deduction of this Confessory, that the Infants of Christian Parents may be baptized, because they are Holy, i.e. reckoned as a part of God's People; but that this Phrase signifies Baptism itself, does not appear by any thing that Dr. Hammond here says: For tho' the Verb ἁγιασθήσῃ to sanctify, signify also to wash, it does not follow that by ἁγιάσαντος may be meant one whose condition is such as to make him capable of being washed, or baptized. And on the contrary, the Children of Heathens were accounted ἐκλεγμένοι impure, that is, as part of those who were out of God's Covenant; and so could not be baptized, because Baptism follows the profession of Christianity, which could neither be made by Parents who were Heathens, nor by Infants. This is the Notion of the words Holy and Impure, which being first used in that Sense by the Jews, came afterwards to be taken in the same by the Christians; which is the reason why Christians are so often stiled Saints in the Epistles of the Apostles. See the inscriptions of St. Paul's Epistles.

Ver. 17. Note e. I. The same reason which moved Dr. Hammond to prefer the reading of some ancient Copies mentioned by Theophylact, before that in ours, makes me think that the ordinary reading ought to be retained: Namely, because the obscurity arising in the Sense from ☼ς µάτι might easily induce some Scribe or Critick to change ☼ς into ☼ς, and join these words with the foregoing, to make the Sense more perspicuous; but there was no reason why, when the Sense was clear, it should be made more obscure.

II. I have more than once observed, that the end of an Annotation does not agree with the beginning; the reason of which I suppose to be, that the Doctor did not write it all at the same time: For otherwise he would have made his Discourse here hang better together. For after he had said, it will be reasonable to acquiesce therein, viz. in that other reading, he gives a reason for so doing, which makes it unreasonable; for if the Sense will be current, the we retain the ordinary reading, and only change the pointing of the words, what reason can there be to acquiesce in any alteration of them?

III. We ought therefore to keep to the present reading of all Copies and Interpreters, and ☼ς µάτι must be rendered but, as the Syriack and Arabick reader it נָה, that is, מָה.
others in the reading of this place, is nevertheless set down in the
Chapter London Polyglott: But in that Edition there are other instances of very
great negligence. I am perfectly of Dr. Hammond's opinion, as to the
use of the Verb melèw, which I shall confirm by these Verses of Virgil,
wherein he elegantly describes the Mind distracted with variety of
Cares, and uses the word dividere, Æneid. 8. at the beginning.

--- Magna curariam sī quaeris estu,
Atque animum nunc boc celerem, nunc D I V I D I T illuc,
In partesque rapit varias, perque omnia versat.

Nay and the Verb μελέων, which signifies to be vexed with Care, is
defined by the Greek Grammarians to be ΜΕΠΙΖΕΣΘΑΙ of the Progress Suma;
in μελέων λέγεται τὸ μετὰ τὸ Ποιμν. to be divided between different Res-
solutions, because it comes from μελέων by changing the Letter τ into η.
See Eustathius on Homer, pag. 80. and 1427. Edit. Rom.

But there are two things in this Annotation of the Doctor liable to
censure. The first is his Citation out of the Jerusalem Paraphrase,
which makes nothing to the purpose, it being manifest that those words
signify Distrust or Unbelief, not Cares or Distractions. And the second
is his saying that a Verb in the Singular number cannot be applied to two
Nouns: whereas nothing is more common in all the best Authors in
both Languages than that Construction, and, which I wonder he did
not take notice of, it must be admitted according to the reading of the
Alexandrian Copy, which he prefers before the other: ἤ γεννὴν ἡ ἁμαρτ.
ἐξ ἐν περιποίησιν ἣν ἡμαρτ. μεταμφέν το ὧν ἦς Κυρίω, 80.

C H A P. VIII.

Verf. 4. I Don't think St. Paul had a respect to the Hebrew word,
Note a. which perhaps was unknown to the Corinthians, but to
the meaning of the word εἰδον it self which he here
uses, and which properly signifies an Image conceived in the Mind,
which is no where but in our Understanding; and afterwards was ap-
plied to other things which are look'd upon as vain Spectres. And
this is the reason why the Jews who spake Greek, gave the name of
Idols, first to the Gods of the Heathens themselves, and then to their
Statues. All which I shall deduce a little more particularly, because
it will conduce very much to the clear understanding of this Passage.
And first of all it must be observed that the Verb εἰδον signifies to be
Chapter like unto, in which sense it is often used in Homer, as for instance in
VIII. Iliad B. Verse 280.

--- Προς το γλυκιδωμ αθών,
Εἰδώλων τεχνῆς.

And near to him stood grey-eyed Minerva, like to a Cryer; εἰδώλων, faith
the Scholast. Whence the words ἡμάθεια, & εἰδοθεῖα came to signify an Image or
representation of things, such as is formed in the Mind. And εἰδώλων,
as H. Stephanus has shewn out of Plutarch, signifies sometimes the same.
And therefore Plato in his Phaedrus, p. 346. Ed. Gen. Ficin. calls an incorporeal thing, supposing it appeared in a visible shape, εἰδώλων, in
that remarkable Sentence: ἔστιν οὖς ἐν περικόλοις τραχὺς ἐν φάσισι, εἴ τι τῶν
αὐτῶν εἰμασθέντων εἰς οὕτως: Men would be extremly in
love with Wisdom, if it did but present some lively Image of it self to their
view. And because they thought that the Souls of dead Persons were
clothed with a certain airy Form, resembling outwardly that Body
which they inhabited when those Persons were alive, that Form they
usually called εἰδώλων. We frequently meet in Homer with this half
Verse, τοιαύτα τούτα ἐμφανίζων the Images of deceased Men. Virgil ren-
ders it simulacra & figuras, which he thus describes in Æneid. 6.
Verse 292. Speaking of Æneas, who was going to encounter the Ghosts,
if Sybilla had not diverted him:

Et mi dolia comes tenues sine corpore vitas
Admoneat volitare, cava sub imagine forma,
Irruas & frustra ferro diverseret umbras.

This was the use of the word εἰδώλων among the Greeks, when the Jews
first came acquainted with them; and therefore when they had learned
to speak Greek, they fitly called the Gods of the Nations εἰδώλων, part-
ly because they were but meer human Inventions, having no real Ex-
istence; and partly because they generally worshipped dead men,
τοιαύτα τούτα ἐμφανίζων, or to use the words of Virgil,

Horum umbras tenues, simulacraque luce carentum.

Which shews likewise the reason why the Apostle says that an Idol is
nothing in the World, for the Fictions of Men have no real Existence,
nor are there any such Images or Apparitions of dead Persons, as the
Poets speak of, no more than there is any

Horrendum
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Horrendum fritens, fiammisque armata Chimaera.

Philo Judæus, Lib. de Monarchia affirms, that Riches are also called in Scripture πλοῦς, because they are but the fading Images of true good: καὶ εἵνεκα, γὰρ ἐάν, δῶμεν τῷ ὑπάρχοντι, ἐνάρκτος ἀπώθητα. Thus, these are the things which [the Scripture] calleth Idols, like Shadows and Phantoms, which depend upon nothing firm or certain.

Ver. 5. Καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Ἀρχάγγελῳ, κ. δ. The sense of this Verse is not truly expressed by our Author out of Theophrastus. It must be rendered; for there be those which are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in Earth (as really there are Gods many, and Lords many) yet so there is one God the Father, &c. By Gods in Heaven are meant God and the Angels; in the Earth Magistrates, who are also called the Lords of the World. But Christians called only the Father, by whom all things were created, God; and Jesus Christ, by whom were all things, Lord in the most excellent sense. The Apostle has no reference to the false Gods or Idols of the Heathens, nor to the common way of speaking among the Jews themselves; for he grants that those were truly called Gods and Lords. He seems when he wrote this, to have had in his mind that passage of Moses in Deut. x. 17. The Lord your God is God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, a great God, mighty and terrible, whom the Jews ought alone to serve. And in like manner St. Paul here teaches, that tho there were many that were called Gods and Lords, yet there was but one of those Gods, and one of those Lords that were to be made the Objects of divine Worship.

Ver. 7. Note b. No body will deny but ἀστυνομία, where the discourse is about the Body, signifies to be sick, and is taken also for a disease of the Mind, if the discourse be about the Mind. But I don't think St. Paul here has a respect to the general Notion of a distemper of the Mind, or of Sin, but rather speaks of an infirm purpose in the profession of the Christian Religion, and the observation of its Precepts; such as is usual in ignorant People, who are hardly brought to an entire renunciation of their former Errors. This is the proper signification of the word ἀστυνομία: And these the Apostle calls ἀστυνομίας τῷ θεῷ, Rom. xiv. 1, 2, which does not signify sick or diseased in the Faith, but Persons whose Faith was not so firm and strong as it should have been. As on the other hand in Chap. iv. 19, of the same Epistle, speaking of Abraham, he says that ἐν ἡμέραν τῷ θεῷ he was not weak in Faith, i.e. he did not doubt: And so in the Septuagint, ἀστυνομία is sometimes taken for to stumble, because those who do not take their steps firm, often stumble; as Children do when they first begin to go alone. Our


Chapter IX.

Ver. 5. **M** Μὴ ἐν ἤπειρῳ ἵππῳ ἡγεῖται ἡ ἱδρυτα;] Have we not power to lead about a Sister, a Wife? So it must be rendered, for I have already shewn on Rom. xvi. 1. that the Opinion which Dr. Hammond follows here in his Paraphrase, in concurrence with some of the Antients, is very improbable. If St. Paul had designed to say what they affirm, he would not have added γυναῖκα, for ἡ ἱδρυτα alone would have been sufficient; and the Greeks do no more use to say ἡ ἱδρυτα γυναῖκα for a Sister, than ἡ ἱδρυτα ἡρμηνευτικά for a Brother. St. Paul therefore here intimates that he had married indeed a Wife, whom he might if he pleased take along with him as a Companion in his Travels, but he did not ἐκκαθίστατο παρακρατεῖται, lest he should be burdensome to the Churches; for tho' he could have easily got his own living by working, yet it would have been much more difficult for him to provide both for himself and his Wife, if she had travelled with him.

It is groundlessly therefore inferred by some from this place, that St. Paul was a single man, for he does not say, have not we power to have a Wife, γυναῖκα ἤ λοχον, but to lead about a Wife, viz. which he already had. And to this place perhaps the Interpolator of Ignatius's Epistle to the Philippians, pag. 98. Ed. Usser. had a respect; where having spoken of unmarried Persons, he saith: Οὔ τὸν τῆς λοιπῆς μακάριος ἡ γένος ἑκατομμυρίων, εἶ ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖνοι, ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἑκατοντάδος ἡμῶν, εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς οὖν ἂν ἦσαν, ἡ Παύλος ἡ Παύλος, ἡ Ἱακώβις ἡ Ἱακώβις, ἡ Ἰωάννης ἡ Ἰωάννης; ἦσαν ἡ ἐκκλησία τῆς γένους ἑκατομμυρίων: but I do not derogate from the rest of the Blessed that were joined in marriage, which I have now mentioned. For I desire to be found worthy of God at their footsteps in his Kingdom; as of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, as of Joseph and Isaiah, and the rest of the Prophets,
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Phets, and as of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the other Apostles, who were Chapter married Men. Nor is it any objection against this, what St. Paul says in Chap. vii. 7, 8. of this Epistle; for the meaning of the Apostle in that place is only, that he wished everybody else had as little Appetite to the lawful pleasures of Marriage as himself, and that it was expedient for Widows and unmarried People at that time to remain as he was, that is, not to be more desirous of Marriage than he was of the Society of his Wife.

Vers. 10. The same word ἵνας has a twofold Notion in this place; for the former signifies the thing hoped for, and the latter the Affection it self. Such things are common in the writings of the Apostles. See Note on St. John's Gosp. c. i. 16.

Vers. 12. Εἴδες ὑμῶν.] That is, τιμᾶς over you: See Mat. x. 1. John xvii. 2. and what I have observed in my Ars Critica, Par. 2. S. i. c. 12. 11. So likewise afterwards Chap. x. 6. of this Epistle, πᾶν ὑμῶν are πᾶν ὑμῶν, examples for our Instruction.

Vers. 17. Note a. Some such works of Supererogation may really be done, but have a care of thinking upon that account that they deserve any reward from God: The reason is, because tho Men may out of a pious zeal do that whereof the omission would not bring punishment upon them; yet they have offended in other respects, and stand in need of God's Mercy, by which alone they can obtain the pardon of their Sins. If God had dealt according to strict justice with St. Paul, he had never pardoned those Sins which he had been guilty of whilst he remained a Jew, nor had his successful Zeal in the service of God when a Christian, been sufficient to expiate the Perfections he had formerly stirred up against the Christians. But as he had mercifully forgiven him all his past Sins, so also out of his infinite Bounty and Goodness, which is as it were the peculiar Character of the Divine Nature, he resolved to reward his pious Actions.

Vers. 18. The ἵνας ἐσμὲν ὑμῶν.] That is, ἵνα, for what does God propose to me a reward? Not simply for preaching the Gospel, but for preaching it gratis, so as to be able to say I never used the Power I had, to take Money of my Hearers to maintain me. So that I should render this interrogation: of what sort then is my Reward? i.e. what is the condition of the Reward that God proposes to me. Which I think is better than to interpret ἵνα which follows by if or when, tho I confess the signification of that as well as other Particles is various. The word ὑμῶν here, tho set without any addition, must be observed to signify an extraordinary Reward, greater than that which should be conferred on all that preached the Gospel; for they might
Chapter all except from God some degree of Reward, upon the performance of their Office, tho' they did no more than what they were necessarily obliged to.

Ver. 25. Note h. I have several Animadversions to make upon this foregoing Annotation. I. That the Doctor did not sufficiently understand the meaning of the word ἀναγκαία, when he supposed it to signify a custom of the Athleta. “In forcing themselves to eat, that by that means they might become fleshy and corpulent. For the Athleta did not strive to make themselves fat or thick beyond measure; because that would have lessened their Activity, and been a great hindrance to them both in Cuffing and Running; but they endeavoured to get such a habit of Body as was requisite for the well performing of those Exercises, i.e. to become strong and nimble: For which purpose the Gymnasiarches, or Masters of the Games, did prescribe to them the eating of certain Meats, and such a proportion of them at stated times; and it was not lawful for them to use any other sort of Diet, or to eat how and when they pleased, but they were bound to follow another's prescriptions. And this is the meaning of the word ἀναγκαία, and not to cram themselves per force, as the thing it self will afterwards shew. Lucian in Lib. deinde ἡμέραις describes the Athleta, or those that often exercised themselves in these sort of Games, thus: οὐ κατακαλλυκότας, οὐ γεγυμνόντες, οὐ κατακαλλυκόντες, εἶτα ἐζητεῖς ἐκ θεοῦ, καλλίστα δὲ σύμμετρα ἀναγκαίαν, τὸ ἀζευτόν τοίχων, ἕσσαρι τοὶς ἱδρυμιν ἡμαλλυκότες: they are neither shrivelled or wasted away, nor yet so extraordinary big as to be heavy, but of a just size; the useless and superfluous parts of their Flesh having been consumed in Sweat. See also what follows.

II. Our learned Author seems to owe the greatest part of what he here says to Pet. Faber, or Hier. Mercurialis; whom he also hastily perhaps looked over, and collected as much as he had occasion for about the ἀγαθοι̇̃̄ς of the Grecians, out of the works of those Writers. For by his citation of some Passages, it appears that he did not look into the Authors themselves, out of which they are taken. The place alluded out of Lucian, is in Dialogis mortuorum, p. 279. Ed. Amst. and it is not Charon, but Mercury that is there represented, as afraid of letting Damasias with so much fat about him come into his Boat; which yet we are not to understand was so much neither as to hinder his Activity, as if he had been a Man that had minded nothing but his Belly. The passage cited out of Julian does not shew that the Athleta ate immoderately, but only certain Meats, in a certain quantity, and at a certain time; which would be very inconvenient for an Emperor, especially when journeying, or engaged in important Affairs, who must
must eat, μοῦσα δὲ πρεσβύτερος ἡμῶν: when Business will permit.

III. If our Author had looked into Suidas, or at least not read him negligently, he would have alluded his definition of ἐγκεκριμένα, which shews what that word properly signifies: It is ὁμοθυμον, faith he, ἀναπνεύσας ἢ ἡμῶν ἥσσον: a disposition which will not suffer a Man to go in any thing beyond reason: τῷ δὲ ἱερῷ ἑαυτῷ, and a Habit which cannot be conquered by Pleasures: So that ἐγκεκριμένα is one that has such a power over his Passions, as to abstain from those things which he judges hurtful to him, notwithstanding the pleasantness of them. And accordingly where the discourse is about an Ἀθλητα, who is said πᾶν οὐκ ὠφελεῖ ἐγκεκριμένος, the meaning is, that he is one who in all things is so much his own Master, as to do nothing of weight, and do nothing which may impair his Strength. Which the Apostle did in another sense, who governed his Affections so as not to gratify them in any thing, tho lawful, that might in the least hinder the propagation of the Gospel.

IV. The place in Αelian is absurdly thus quoted by our Author: So Αelian of the Tarentinus Luætator; as if the Luætator’s name had been Tarentinus, whereas he was called Iccus, and Tarentum was the name of his Country. I shall set down the words of Αelian entire, which are these: ὁ Iccus ὁ Tarentini πάλιν ὑμηθεῖσας ἀφεγετικὸν ἔχων γενέσθατο, ἐκ Κεκολασεν Τροφὴν Ἐκδίκοσας, οὐ Αρεστίνων εἰμάθης διατελέσας: Iccus the Tarentinian was a Luætator, who lived soberly all the time of his combating, and used to eat moderately, and abstained to the last from Venery. See Joach. Kubbinius on the words put in Capital Letters, who by other Testimonies proves that the Athletæ lived quite differently from what the Doctor imagined.

V. Our Author erroneously thought that the word πάντα in this place of St. Paul was governed by the Verb ἐγκεκριμένα, whereas the Preposition ἂν is understood, and the words ought to be renderd, is temperate in all things, or with relation to all things. Which all things must be understood, according to the subject matter, of those things which were capable of weakening, if the Discourse be about an Athletæ; and if about St. Paul, of those things which might obstruct the course of the Gospel.

Verf. 26. Note 1. Παγκύκλον was an exercise performed by the Combatants standing, whereas they often strove on the Ground, as we are told by Lucian in Dial. ἐκ γυμνασίου, and fighting both with their Hands and Feet. So, in that Book, Anacharsis after he had described the Combatants in Sand and in Clay, represents them: ὃ ἀν δὲ ἔθελεν κακομυκώμενον, καὶ ἄνυ διά πάνω ἄλλην ἀθέαταντες, καὶ λατρίζων: and these standing upright and all covered with Dust, Strike, and kick one another. And
Chapter Solomon a little after, reciting the names of the Exercises which Anacharsis had described, is brought in as speaking thus: Φοινικωμένας ὥτε τέτων, τὸ ἐν τῷ ἡλικίας ἑδερω, καὶ τὴν καλυπτάτην οὐτὶ ἐν τῷ κλίθε καταλόγου αὐτοῦ τὴν δὲ στελέω ἀλλίπον ἐθελοτρικῶς παρακείμενοι λέγοντοι: Of these Exercises, that which is performed in that Clay is called Wrestling: And those in the Dust do also wrestle, but their striking one another standing upright, we call παρακείμενοι. Of these faith Suidas: τοῖς ἄρθροις τοῖς πυκνωμένοι, they fight with their Hands and Feet; in which kind of combat they used to exert all their Strength.

Ibid. Note m. The place cited out of Eusebius is not in his Ἱερακολαί on Ἰλιαδ Ε, but Ἰλιαδ Υ, pag. 1215. Ed. Rom. and if Dr. Hammond had took it out of the Author himself, he would have set it down entire, because it may help us to understand St. Paul's words. Homer had said of Achilles, who had endeavoured thrice to strike Hecuba no purpose: ταῖς ἄρθροις τοῖς ἄμβλοις, thrice he struck the thick darkness, with which Apollo had covered Hecuba; οὐ τε, faith Eusebius, εἰλικρίνεις μεταδοθέντα τοῖς οὐτίς τε, ἄρθροις τοῖς ἄμβλοις ἕχεσθαι ὑποτασσόμενος τὸν παντὸς πᾶσι περιβάλλον εἰρήνειας δοξοῦν: οἱ πολλάκις οἱ νοχεῖς, καὶ πῦρ ὑπὸ τοὺς χεσταίας: From whence the Proverb to beat the Air seems to be taken, which is applied to Persons who undertake impracticable things. But some think this Proverb was taken from Cufflers, who often, &c.

Vers. 27. Note n, and o. I have confuted Dr. Hammond on Rom. vi. 6. where he endeavours, to no purpose, to prove that οὐχί μέ signifies my self; and therefore what he here says upon that Hypothesis is all vain. Besides, it is refuted by what he himself adds last of all in this place; for it is the Body that is subdued by bodily exercises, and not the Mind, any further than as the Body being once subdued, the Mind is no longer infected with those evil Affections which arise from the Body.

C H A P. X.

Vers. 1. Note a: After the words, to do them.] What our Author here says about the symbolical signification of the Wings of the Cherubims, he ought to have confirmed by some express Testimony out of Moses or the Prophets; for it is not necessary to think that God had a respect to all those things in instituting of the Mosaical Rites, which learned Men conjecture he might have a respect to. An infinite number of such things were of old fancied by the Fathers, who thought they might say what they pleased in this kind, tho they had no ground for it; and as many more
more are every day invented by our late Divines, which if denied, they can bring no Argument to make them appear probable. As to the

known saying which Dr. Hammond speaks of among the Jews, that is
taken from a passage in Moses, which is in his last Song in Deut. xxxii.
11. in these words: As an Eagle stirreth up her Nest, fluttereth over her
young, and spreadeth abroad her Wings; so the [Lord] took him (viz. the
People of the Jews) and bore him upon his Wings. Which place is at
large illustrated by Sam. Bachart, in Hieroz. Part. 2. Lib. 2. c. 3.

Ibid. In that Note, Col. 2. Lin. 7. after the words, that followed
them.] Any one may see that this is a forced interpretation, which
seems to be grounded only on this, that St. Paul says the Israelites were
under a Cloud; as if they could not have been said to be under a Cloud,
if the Cloud had lain only on the foremost part of the Camp. Rabbi
Eliezer never saw that Cloud, or knew any thing about this matter,
no more than the rest of the pretending Tribe of Rabbies, but what
they could collect from Moses, who has no such thing. But, faith our
Author, the protection of God will be better represented by a Cloud
encompassing the Camp, than only going before it. That I utterly
deny, for the Divine Protection was sufficiently signified by a perpetu-
al symbol of his Presence whatever it was, if it could but be seen by
all; and we are not to change stories written in the plainest words,
into intolerable improprieties, to make them express what we would
have them.

Ibid. In that Note, Lin. 24. after the words, under thy Wings, &c.] A
pillar of Cloud cannot be otherwise understood than of an oblong
Cloud, which like a Pillar suspended in the Air, was visible to all
the Israelites: And under it might be said to be, not only those over
whom it hung perpendicularly, but also who were placed on every side of
it. As under the constellation of the Crab are said to be, not only those to
whom that Constellation is vertical, but also all the Ethiopians: So that
what our Author dreamt in order to explain this Phrase, like other
Dreams, has no truth in it. The phrase under the shadow of his Wings
is not, as I have already said, taken from a Cloud, but from the
custom of Birds, who use to defend their tender Brood against the
heat of the Sun with their Wings.

Ibid. In that Note, Col. 3. Lin. 17. after the words, mention of
both.] St. Paul rather seems here to make mention of the Cloud, as
afterwards he does of the Fire, because he intended to allude to the
Christian Baptism, which is more resembled by a Cloud, that is, a
watry Vapour, than by Fire.
Chapter this matter; when otherwise we should never have so much as dreamt of them. So that in order to our understanding that kind of Predictions, the assistance of other Divine Persons would have been necessary, whom for other reasons we already believe, viz. for the excellency of their Doctrine, and the Miracles which were wrought in confirmation of it. But this being supposed, what need is there of Types to those who already believe Christ and his Apostles upon the firmest grounds? They illustrate, it may be you’ll say, the Apostles Doctrine; that I deny, and say that they would rather obscure it if they occurred in their Writings, for the alleged reasons: See my Note on Mat. ii. 2. Let the Learned judge of these things, and consider whether it be not better at last to let all this Doctrine about the Types alone, which the Heathens of old derided, and the Jews ridicule at this day; and only make use of the most convincing Arguments whereby to prove the truth of Christianity. But this would be the subject of a whole Volume, which I have here but transiently touched, intending wherever there is a fit occasion, to shew the weakness of all that is alleged in defence of Types out of the Apostles Writings.

Ver. 4. Απο των καταχωριστων σωματων. That is, of that spiritual Water, which God made to proceed out of the Rock, which Water followed the Camp. So Gen. iii. and elsewhere, to eat of the Tree, is to eat of the fruit of the Tree. Which must be carefully observed, lest any one think that the Rock itself is here properly called spiritual, that Epithet being to be attributed to the Water which flowed out of the Rock, which the not expressed, is yet to be understood: For no one will suppose that the Rock, from which the Water proceeded, followed the Israelites, or was carried about with them through the Wilderness. But granting, may some say, that the Rock is here put by a Metonymy for the Water that came out of it, yet how is it said that the Water itself followed the Jews? The common opinion is, that a little River or current of Water proceeding out of the Rock followed the Jewish Camp whithersoever it moved. But there is not one syllable about that in Moses, who yet it is not probable would have omitted the mention of so great a Miracle, if any such had been; for it would have been no small Miracle for God to have made a Channel for that Water to run in, and follow the Israelites whithersoever they went. But there is no need of feigning here a Miracle, in order to explain St. Paul’s words, which may be very well understood without it, to wit, by supposing only that this Water was carried about by the Israelites through the Deserts of Arabia, in leathern Bottles, or any other Vessels, that followed them with the rest of their Carriage. For
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For thus this Phrase is used by Ἀλιαν ὑπ. Αὐθ. Lib. 12. Chap. 40. Chapter.

Which he begins thus: Τάτε ἐπὶ τὴν ἑπτάναν ἐπιστολήν ἦτο ἐπὶ τὴν ἑπτάνα  

Ibid. Ἡ ἡ πρία ἐν ὕ τε χορής. That is, faith Grotius, prefigured Christ. 

But it may every whit as well be interpreted: “And that which “might be said of that Rock in a carnal sense, may in a spiritual “be affirmed of Christ. As all the Israelites drank of the Waters of that Rock, and yet those among them who rebelled, were destroyed in the Wilderness: so all are equally enlightened by the Doctrin of Christ, but whoever does not regulate his Life according to it, shall perish. This is the sense of the Apostle, which needs no typical Prefiguration to explain it, his Discourse not being at all grounded thereon: or else this Passage may be rightly paraphrased to the same sense thus: “And the case was the same of the Water that flowed out “of that Rock, and those that drank of it; and of the Doctrin of “Christ and Christians. So in the Parables of Christ, the parts of the aπόθεμα are often called the parts of a Parable, because they are compared with one another, and the case is the same in both: As Mat. 13. 19. When any one heareth the word of the Kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one and catcheth away that which was sown in his Heart: THIS IS he which received Seed by the way side. But he that received the Seed into strong places, THIS IS he that heareth the Word, &c. And it is known that the Jews, whom the Apostles followed, do very frequently borrow Comparisons from the Old Testament, and allude to the Stories of it so, as often to apply the words of them to their purpose; not that they thought those places contained prefigurations of that which they accommodated them to, but because they thought it a piece of elegance to appear to take every thing out of the Old Testament. See Gal. iv. 24, 25, 26.

Ibid. Note b. I. Something, but briefly and obscurely, there is about this matter in Rabbi Solomon, on Numb. xx. 2. perhaps taken from the Christians; for it is not easily to be believed that all the late Rabbins say, they owe to ancient Tradition. It’s certain neither the
Chapter X.

Paraphrase of Jonathan, nor the Jerusalem Targum, have any thing about the Water which followed the Israelites, on Exod. xvii. but in quite another place, viz. on Num. xxi. 19, 20. where Moses speaks of a Well that was digged upon the border of the Moabites, the year before the Israelites entered into Canaan. The words of Jonathan are these: And ever since the Well was given them in Mattan, it went up again with them into the high Mountains, and from the high Mountains it descended with them into the Hills. It encompassed all the Camp of Israel, and yielded itself for every one to drink out of the door of the Tabernacle. It descended also with them out of the high Mountains into the low Valleys, &c. The like we read in the Jerusalem Paraphrase, but with this difference, that there is nothing there said of this Well encompassing the Camp, or breaking out at the Gate of the Tabernacle, as Jonathan affirms.

II. The Jews did not want Water, because they both carried about with them the Water of Horeb, and might also meet with Springs in other places; for tho the rocky Arabia be a dry Country, yet it is not everywhere without Water, there being mention made of several Rivers which run through it. See my Notes on Gen. ii. 12.

III. What Dr. Hammond says about the Water’s ceased to follow the Jews, upon the course of their Travels being changed, is a mere Invention, to support his tottering Interpretation.

IV. If the Water of Horeb followed the Israelites without a Miracle, they must have all along journeyed near a Valley, in which it might have a free course after them, from the time of their departure from Horeb. But that is another of Dr. Hammond’s Fictions, which I need not say much about.

Verf. 5. Τοις παλαιοις διώκων εις ευδικημα] It is warily here said by St. Paul, with the Most of them God was not well pleased, not with all of them, except two, as our Author says in his Paraphrase, which is not true. See my Note on Num. xxiv. 65.

Verf. 6. Τυποι της γενεων.] That is, the punishments inflicted on the rebellious Israelites, are so many examples which God proposes to us, to take heed of falling into the like Sins. So also verf. 11. St. Paul having again made mention of God’s destroying the murmuring Jews, faith, οί - πέτα οί υπατεινώον, all these things happened unto them for examples, and were written for our Admonition, &c. that is, God designed those things for Examples, to be recorded in the Holy Scriptures, and proposed as Warnings to every one that should read them. They that render the word γενεων here by in figura, in a Figure, or typo, typically, must shew that God intended to prefigure the punishments of Sins by the punishments of the Israelites; which I suppose they will never
never be able to do. But it is certain this word ινα, is taken only Chapter

And first for any Form, whether corporeal, or conspicuous only to
the Mind; which sense does not belong to this place. See John xx. 25.

Secondly, It signifies an Example, as here and in many other places,
as we shall presently see. The first signification of it is proper, this
metaphorical. For ινα is properly a Figure or Form into which
anything is beaten or hammer'd, ιναται. But because such figures were
sometimes made to serve instead of patterns to others (in French, pour
servir de modèles) therefore it was metaphorically applied to any sort
of Figure or Example proposed to others for their imitation or warn-
ing. So Phil. iii. 17. Brethren, be ye followers of me; and mark them
which walk so, as ye have ινας us for an example. So 1 Thess. i. 7.
Ye were ινα examples to all that believe in Macedonia, &c. See also
2 Thess. iii. 9. 1 Tim. iv. 12. Tit. ii. 7. 1 Pet. v. 3.

Thirdly, In another metaphorical signification, because a Model or
Pattern is like those things which are made according to it, the word
ινα in one place of St. Paul is taken for a thing which in some re-
spect resembles another: And that is in Rom. v. 14. where Adam
is said to be ινα τω μετατο, that is, like him that was to come, viz. in
this, that he alone had done something that was propagated to all
Mankind, as Christ did something alone which extends to all Men.
For in other things the Apostle observes not only a dissimilitude, but
an opposition between them. But now who will believe that it was
God's design, that Adam should first of all sin alone, and that that
Sin should do mischief to all his Posterity, to prefigure what was to
be done by Christ? Who was able to discern the Similitude before the
Event? Who after the Event finds his Faith confirmed by that Simi-
litude? Nor certainly was this the Apostle's meaning, but only that
in the respect I have mention'd there was a Similitude between Adam
and Christ, as there is between a ινα and an αντικειμενον.

This last word perhaps may be made the ground of an Objection,
which is twice found in the New Testament. The Author of the
Epistle to the Hebrews, Ch. ix. 24. denies that Christ was entred into
Holy Places made with Hands, αντικειμενον το άληθινον, but that is, which
were made after the example of the true, viz. Heaven, or which were the
images of Heaven, not which prefigured Heaven. So Baptism is said
in 1 Pet. iii. 21. to be αντικειμενον to Noah's Ark, that is, in some measure
to resemble it. But no Man of sense would thence infer that it was
God's
Chapter God's intention by the Ark to prefigure Baptism, and reveal this
Mystery which was before unknown by St. Peter.

Ibid. Eis το μα γενών οδηγείτε κανών.] These words manifestly show
that νίκα ought to be regarded Examples, for Punishment is inflicted on
guilty Persons, for an example to others not to imitate them: So
that it is absurdly rendered by the Vulgar and Erasmus, figura, and as
ill by Beza, typi; but rightly in Castalio, and in the English and Gene-
va Translations, Examples. Which being so, I wonder Grauam should
speak here of Prefigurations.

Vers. 7. Note c. Notwithstanding all the Doctor has with so much
care here put together, I rather think the place in Exodus here refer'd
to, is to be understood of Dancing about the Golden Calf, on which
place see my Notes, as also on Gen. xxii. I do not pay so great a de-
ference to the Rabbins, as to take all which those Men fancy, to explain
the Old Testament, for certain truth; nor perhaps would our Au-
thor himself have attributed so much to their Authority, if he had
not resolved to force his Gnosticks here upon us.

Vers. 20. Δαμνίωνος ὡ δὲ καὶ οὖ. The word Δαμνίωνος in this place does
not necessarily signify Devils, or evil Spirits; for the Heathens did not
always sacrifice to evil Spirits, if we consider what were their true
Thoughts. But the greatest part of their Idolatry consisted in this,
that when they ought to have been Soveraigns, they were Δεέκλεισται.
And the Heathens also themselves have confessed that they did not
offer sacrifice to Gods, but to Demons: As appears by the words of
Porphyry, in Lib. 2. de Absintentia: Οὐδὲ τὸς Θεὸν, εἶπεν Δαμνιωσ, τῆς ἱστο-
μες, τὰς ἤκατεν αἰματίαν ἔρεμον οἱ τας ὅρα τὸν παντὶ δυνάμειν παραπλήσαν, ἐν τοῖς
ἐπιστέπαιται παῖς ἀντὶ τῶν θεόλων: nor did those who knew the powers of the
World offer bloody Sacrifices to the Gods, but to Demons; and this is affirmed
[in the Latin it is translated creditur, which is πεπιστευται] by Divines
themselves.

CHAP. XI.

Vers. 4. If it had been the Custom in capital Punishments, to cover
the Heads only of Men and not of Women, our Author
would have rightly deduced what St. Paul here says from
that practice; but seeing there was no difference between Men and
Women in this respect, why would it have dishonoured the head of a
Man to have a Veil cast over him like a condemned Person, and not
of a Woman? I rather think therefore that the Apostle had a respect
only to the Custom of the Greeks, among whom it had been a disgrace
for
for a Man to speak publicly with his Head covered, and a Woman Chapter with her Head bare. Our Author's distinction between the Prepositions ן and כ will appear to be vain, if we compare Mark xiv. 3, and Mat. xxvi. 7.

Verse 7. Note b. Here our learned Author abuses an impropriety in the Septuagint, to enlarge our Lexicons with new significations of the word אָנֶס, as he does also elsewhere.

I. It is false that the Hebrew בָּלֶט simply taken, signifies a Beam, tho if it be added to the word Sun, it signifies its Splendor and Beams. It is false also, that because the Septuagint have perhaps somewhere (tho I cannot tell where) improperly rendered what ought to have been translated a Beam by אָנֶס, therefore the word אָנֶס signifies a Beam. To authorize that signification, it was requisite they should have frequently and industriously used the word אָנֶס to that purpose, and not rashly before they were aware.

II. Nor is it true that the word בָּלֶט was ever rendered by אָנֶס, or tho אָנֶס be metaphorically called אָנֶס, that those words are promiscuous. The Doctor should have produced but one example, in which אָנֶס signified a Beam or Splendor. Besides, is this Phrase, the Woman is the beam of the Man, any thing plainer than this, is the glory of the Man, which he interprets by the former? But the truth is, what our Author here says is only a misinterpretation of Grotius's Note upon this place, to which I refer the Reader.

III. אָנֶס is used by the Septuagint for בָּלֶט or that symbolic likeness of God which appeared in the Tabernacle, because that used to be so called, and not because אָנֶס signifies any Similitude, as well as the Hebrew word. There is nothing more deceitful than such sort of reasonings, as the Doctor often makes use of in order to find out the signification of words, unless at the same time their use and Analogy be regarded.

IV. Setting aside what is said about the Glory of God in the Pentateuch, which does not at all belong to this place, tho Grotius thinks otherwise; the Man is called the Glory of God, because whoever looks upon a Man, will perceive him to be a piece of Workmanship worthy of the divine Majesty, and give Glory to him upon that account. And the Woman is the glory of the Man, because there is some ground for the Man to glory, when he considers that the Woman was formed out of his Body, and created for his Help and Assistance. The following Verse does shew that by being his glory, the Apostle means that for which he was made, and we need not go any further to understand St. Paul's Mind: The sense of the whole place is, that
Chapter XI. The Man indeed ought to have his Head uncovered, because God made him, as his other Works, to be beheld; and it is not for the glory of God, to have that Work of his hid by a Veil: but the Woman, which was made for the Man, ought to be veiled, because she is inferior to the Man, who uses her as he pleases, and would have her veiled. It is for the Man's glory to have his Authority appear over the Woman, and as in other instances, so in this particularly, of having her conceal herself whenever he pleases. Solomon has a saying in the sixth Chapter of Proverbs, ver. 16. which according to the Version of the Septuagint is, Τυπικοι δευτεραυαντες ἄνδρας, δευτεραυαντες γυναικας μετανοιαν. And so saith Esdras, Lib. 3. c. iv. 7. of Women: ποινει δεξει τοις αυθεντοις.

But of this whole reasoning, and many other such, it must be observed, that they are not at all demonstrative, because they are not grounded upon things that are unchangeable, but alterable according to the Custom or Opinion of Men. It was thought by the Greeks to be a token of the Mens Authority over the Women, for the Men to appear abroad with their Heads uncovered, as being their own Masters, and exposing themselves to every ones view; and on the contrary an Argument of subjection in Women to go abroad veil'd, because that signified them to be but one Man's, who had power to remove their Veil, and would not have them publickly beheld. But if a contrary Custom had prevailed, St. Paul would have reasoned quite otherwise, to persuade the Corinthians to what he endeavoured to induce them, viz. to do all things decently in the Church, and wherever any one prophesied. I confess he grounds his Argument also upon the History of the Creation; but if we consider the thing, who can deny but that the Woman was created after the Image of God, and for his Glory as well as the Man? See Gen. ii. 27. Nor indeed is this denied by St. Paul, but only in a certain sense, viz. as the Woman is said to have been created after the Man, and to be an assistant to him. And in this sense only his reasoning is valid, and not by a general, and, if I may so speak, mathematical deduction.

Ver. 10. Note d. The Rabbi cited by Schickard was not a Talmudical Doctor, but only cited a place out of the Talmud, as we may see by the words that Schickard alludes.

Ibid. Note e. About this difficult place of Scripture, I have written two years ago two Letters in answer to a Friend, who desired to have my Opinion of it, which I shall here propose to the Readers examination, declaring my self ready to alter it whenever I see sufficient reason. That part of those Letters which relates to this matter is as follows.

I. I
I. CORINTHIANS.

I. I shall never forget that advice of St. Austin, than which nothing Chapter in such matters can be more reasonably call'd to mind: That in things obscure and remote from our senses, if so be we read any thing in Holy Scripture, which may without endangering the Faith we profess, be made to comply with different Opinions, we should not rashly espouse any of them; or if we do, yet not so as to resolve not to change our judgment whatsoever light be offer'd to us afterwards, or to contend not so much for the sense of the Holy Scriptures, as our own Opinion, as the true sense of the Scripture, when it is our own, whereas we ought rather to make that to be ours which is the assertion of the Scripture. I have set down the whole Passage at length, to shew you that I am not so wedded to my present Opinion in this matter, as to resolve that no reasons shall move me to forfake it. Two things must here in the first place be observed. First, that the Discourse in 1 Cor. xi. is about Men and Women praying, or prophesying among others at home: For the Women among the Greeks did not appear abroad without a Veil, nor therefore stand in need of the Apostle's Admonition, which no honest Matron ever acted contrary to. And that some of their Neighbours or Acquaintance were present with them in those Exercises is manifest; because it is absurd for a Woman praying by herself to cover her Head, or to prophesy alone. Secondly, that as far as the fifteenth Verse, the chief scope of the Apostle's Discourse is to shew the Corinthian Women, they ought not to prophesy or pray when Men were present, without being veiled. These two things I take here for certain, because they offer themselves to the Readers Mind at first view. After therefore St. Paul had alleged Reasons to that purpose, at the 1oth Verse he concludes thus: δια γάρ τοι ἔφθη εἰς τινι ἡ δοξάσεως. For this cause ought the Woman to have upon her Head, what? viz. a Veil, which the Apostle calls εὐρηκαρία, as the Jews ιδος dominatus est, of which see Dr. Hammond, and my Notes on Gen. xxiv. 64. If St. Paul had added nothing more, there would have appeared no defect in his Discourse; but there follow three words which have extremely perplexed Interpreters, because they seem to be altogether superfluous, and to have no dependence upon what goes before. And indeed if in the Conclusion, as Logicians speak, there ought to be nothing but what is contained in the Premises; either it must be shewn that the sense of these words is couched in what went before, or we must acknowledg them to be superfluous: and to me the former seems to be very easy, as it is certainly the best, if we do but instead of δια τοις ἄγγελοις, which is manifestly not contained in the Premises, read διὰ τῆς ΑΓΓΕΛΙΑΣ, that is, when she declares the Revelations made to her, or while she is delivering her ἀγγελία. So a prophetical
Chapter prophetical Doctrine, which Isaiah, Chap. xxviii. 9. calls שומעה, is filed by the Septuagint ἀγγέλια. To which I might add a passage out of Herodotus, where the word ἀγγέλια seems to be taken in the same signification; but because it is obscure, and St. Paul did not learn from him to speak Greek, I shall abstain from it. But you will ask me, I suppose, how it came to pass that ἡ ἀγγέλιος was changed into τῆς ἀγγέλου; To which I answer, because ἡ ἀγγέλιος is a word much more common in Scripture than ἡ ἀγγέλιος which occurs but once in all the New Testament, and not often in the Old. And many times it happen'd that the Transcribers substituted a more usual and familiar word in the room of one less known, as St. Jerome thought of the Name Isaiah, which occurs in Mat. xiii. 35. The Apostle adds ἂν τῆς ἀγγέλιος, because it was not necessary for the Woman to cover her self with a Veil at home, but only when she went abroad, unless there was this or the like reason for it. They that make the discourse here to refer to the Church, do not remember that it was unlawful for Women, covered or uncovered, to speak in the Church, as St. Paul teaches in this same Epistle, Chap. xiv. 34. But at home amongst their Acquaintance nothing hinder'd but they might prophesy, if they had received that Gift from God; but they ought to have their Heads covered, as when they appeared in publick. This is my conjecture about this place, which I shall not abandon till I meet with something more probable.

II. It is a place of that nature, that as by its obscurity it opens a door for Conjectures, so likewise it leaves room for innumerable Difficulties; and it is no wonder that very great ones are objected against this of mine, which would not be a conjecture if those who are of another opinion could bring no probability against it. Nevertheless what you alledge, I shall consider as briefly as I can. 1. You suppose the Apostle's Discourse here to refer to publick Assemblies, in which all or most of the Christians of the Church of Corinth met. But it is plain St. Paul forbids Women to speak in publick Assemblies, either covered or uncovered, Εἰς ἐκκλησίας ἐν ταῖς ἑαυτῶν. But in private Conversation, say you, it does not seem probable that the Spirit of Prophecy was given: Why so? It's true, the principal use of it was in Churches, but it might be useful also sometimes in private Conversation amongst familiars, for Christians to edify one another privately. And it is certain, Women had it not to preach, that being not allowed them by the Apostle. 2. But you say, tho it was not lawful for Women to teach others, yet they might secondly, that is, sing in the Church, as the learned J. Mede interprets that word.
I. CORINTHIANS.

word. I do not deny but the Hebrew מַעֲבָה in the Old Testament has that signification, and is rendered by the Greek Interpreters ἁγγελία, but in the New Testament I do not know of any place wherein that word is so taken, and in this dilputation of St. Paul I am sure that signification does no where agree to it. 3. That the fault of the Corinthian Women lay in their coming to Church with their Hair all loose, is no where intimated by St. Paul, who would have much more vehemently inveighed against Christian Women that should have imitated the ἐσπροχεῖς ἐν τιμίτοις, the Propheteesses or Interpreters of impure Spirits. He does not say one word about their Hair being loose or bound up, but speaks only of a Veil. 4. But why did the Apostle call the pious Discourses of the Corinthian Women, ἁγγελίας, and not ἀγγελίας or predictions? In answer to that, I acknowledge that the latter was the most common word, but the former was also used, as I have shewn. And then ἀγγελία signifies, at least for the most part, the thing it self prophesied, not the act of prophesying; but ἁγγελία not only the thing declared, but the Action it self, or Office of declaring, if we believe Eustathius on Iliad A. vers. 140. where by ἁγγελία he thinks that Homer means ἡ ἐσπροχῇ ἡ ἀγγελεῖα. And in this place I did not say that by ἁγγελία was meant the spiritual Gift of Prophecy, but either Prophecy, or the action it self of prophesying of what kind soever that be, which the Apostle has chiefly a reference to; tho' because of their affinity they may be easily confounded, as the word ἂγγελος is taken both for the thing it self preached, and for the Office or Action of preaching. 5. Another thing which you seem very much to stick at is, that this word ἁγγελία is but once used in all the New Testament: but consider first that it is very common in Homer, Xenophon, and other Greek Writers, and therefore taken from the vulgar use. And then secondly, there are in St. Paul's Epistles, as well as in other Authors, words that are but seldom used, as for instance πεπρασμένος in Chap. xiii. 4. of this Epistle, τοιούτους in 2 Cor. xi. 9. and several others which learned Men have taken notice of. 6. You add that in vers. 16. the Apostle draws an Argument from the Custom of the Churches; but that Custom does no more respect publick than private Assemblies; for the Apostle does not say, ποιεῖν ἁγγελίαν in ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, but ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τί θεῖ. St. Paul here has a respect to the Custom of the Jews, which the Apostles had introduced into Churches consisting partly of Jews, and partly of Greeks, together with other Jewish Customs. Hear what Tertullian says, de Corona, Chap. 4. Among the Jews it is so ordinary for the Women to have their Heads covered, that they are distinguished by it from others.
Chapter others. This is what I had to reply to your objections, which are so far from satisfying me, that they confirm me in my conjecture. If we had any Old Copy which instead of ἀγέλοσε read ἀγέλει, and ΑΝΔΡΑΣ, I should have no manner of doubt about this place, whatever others thought.

Ver. 14. Note f. I. I have at large shown in my Ars Critica, P. 2. Sect. 1. c. vii. §. 6. that St. Paul's meaning in Ephes. ii. 3. is this, that the Jews (meant by the word we, and not the Romans) were of as lewd and wicked a Disposition as other Nations.

II. But in this place to the Corinthians, the word Nature does not signify properly a Custom or Disposition, but is opposed to Instruction. It is just as if the Apostle should have said, Do not you know this of your selves? Do you want any one to teach it you? So the Latin natura is used by Cicero in Lib. 1. Tuscul. Quest. where comparing the Romans with the Greeks, he saith: Illa quæ naturâ, non litteris, adequati sunt neque cum Græcis, neque ulla cum Gente sunt conferranda. As to these things which they have acquired the knowledge of by Nature, not by Learning, they (viz. the Romans) incomparably go beyond the Greeks and all other Nations. The same Author in Philipp. 2. thus bespeaks Antonius: An verebare, ne non putaremns natura te potuisse tam improbum evadere, nisi accessisset etiam disciplina? Were you afraid lest we should think you could not have arrived to such a pitch of wickedness by Nature, unless you had also been instructed?

Ver. 29. Note g. I. The Hebrew יר in the Book of Joshua, manifestly signifies to consecrate, the Discourse being about places of Refuge, which were esteemed Sacred. The Septuagint unnecessarily expressed the sense, rather than the proper meaning of the word; for the Cities consecrated for places of Refuge, were by that Consecration distinguished from others. But hence it does not follow that ἡσσαλλον or διακειον signifies reciprocally to sanctify.

II. The Apostle's sense is best interpreted by those who affirm this to be an Elliptical Phrase, and the meaning of it to be, not distinguishing the Lord's Body, ἐκ τῶν ἐξής, from other Bread; or not eating the Consecrated more reverently than any common Bread. In the 31st verse we have the same expression again; for if we did but distinguish (ἐνεκείμενον) ourselves, we should not be condemned; that is, if we distinguished those that were not rightly disposed or qualified, from those that were; εἰ οὖν διακείμενον τῶν ἐξής, καίδεις ἅπαθητεν. To look here for any thing else, is to seek a knot in a Bulrush.
Vers. 2. Eἰδώλα ἀγων, I do not often find fault with our Author's Paraphrase, tho' in a great many places the mind of the Apostles might have been more fitly expressed. I am contented if he does but any how interpret the sense. But his Paraphrase of this Verse is intolerable; for the Heathens did not believe that their Idols spake of themselves, or that their Priests answered them of their own Heads, but were both moved by the Gods, whose Priests and Statues they were: So that the two first could not be charged upon them, and all that could be objected against them was, that it was not any God, as they supposed, that answered them by their Idols, but an evil Spirit. But the Apostle does not upbraid them so much as with that in this place, but only that they had formerly suffered themselves by their own blindness to be led to the worship of Idols, which gave no answers to them that enquired of them, either by their Priests or by evil Spirits; but were shamefully deceived by their crafty Priests, who pretended themselves to be acted by the Spirit of the Gods, or by mere human artifice imposed on the credulous, so as to persuade them that Images could speak, which were ιδωλα αγων. And such sort of Men were very unfit to distinguish between true Inspiration and feigned, which therefore the Apostle here teaches them how to do. I confess Dr. Hammond had Grotius to go before him, but the thing itself confutes him.

Vers. 4. Τῷ χαιρετῷ, This place was imitated by St. Clement in his 1 Epistle to the Corinthians, Chap. 46. Ουχὶ ἦνε καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἱερόν, ἐν Χριστῷ; ἐν ἰδωλεῖ Οὐ κατὰ τὸ ἱερόν, ἐν Χριστῷ; Φιλοσοφία, Which was not one God and one Christ, and one Spirit of Grace given unto us, and one calling in Christ?

Vers. 12. Καθὼς τῷ σῶμα ἐν ἰερᾷ, This Similitude also is used by the same St. Clement more than once, in the forementioned Epistle, and among other places in Chap. 36. On μεταλαμπέτ οὐκ ἐστίν ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν τῷ μεταλαμπέτ συγκροτοῦσι τὰ σώματα πάντα, ἐπί τῶν χριστίων. Αἵτως τῷ σώματι ἐν Χριστῷ καὶ μεταλάμπετ συγκροτοῦσι τὰ σώματα πάντα, ἐπί τῶν χριστίων. Αἵτως τῷ σώματι ἐπί τῶν χριστίων ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐπάνω τῶν σώματων ἔχουσιν πάντα συντελεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν χριστίων. Ἐν τῷ σώματι πάντα εἰσὶ τῶν σώματων ἐν Χριστῷ: The great cannot be without the small, nor the small without the great; there is a kind of mixture in all things, and every thing has its use. Let us take for instance our Body. The Head without the Feet is nothing, nor the Feet without the Head. The
Chapter XII. Smallest parts of our Bodies are necessary and useful to the whole Body; but they all conspire and jointly subserve the preservation of the whole.

Ver. 13. Εἰς τὸ σῶμα ἐποιήθησας.] That is, we were baptized that we might be called by one name, of one Society, the Church of Christ. See my Note on Chap. x. 2.

Ibid. Ἑν τῷ σῶμα ἐποιήθησας.] Having spoken before of Baptism, which is performed with Water, the Apostle here keeps to the same Metaphor, and says, that Christians had drank of the same Spirit. Which is to be understood both of the Spirit of Miracles, and of the Spirit of Christianity. Such another Metaphor is made use of by Cheses in the beginning of his Table, where he feigneth Ὗς θείαν τὰς ἀντιστροφίας εἰς ἀπέραντα ἑλθέντας ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτῆς Ἰς, Ἴμπουσος μοινικάς τὰς ἵπατις ὑπερίκεισι. Impuasure making those who enter into Life to drink of her power.

Ver. 28. Note d. Π. Of the difference between a Teacher and a Prophet, some things must be further observed, which our Author having omitted has left us not a little in the dark about this matter. The Prophets under the Old Testament had a twofold Office: The first and highest consisted in declaring those things which they had received immediately from God, or by the mediation of Angels, and were such as could not have been known by Men, without a Divine Revelation: The other was to persuade Men to the observation of the Law already revealed, by pious Exhortations, Reproofs and Counsels. And to this seems to belong those Schools of the Prophets, so often mentioned in the Old Testament, and particularly in 1 Sam. xix. 20. 2 Kings iv. 38.

Because the Worship of the only true God was to be firmly established among the Jews, a generation of Men that chiefly regarded the things of this Life, and defended against the encroaching Idolatry of their neighbour Nations for several Ages, God saw it necessary to raise up Prophets, by inspiring them in an extraordinary manner. And under the New Testament likewise, to establish the Authority of the Apostles, God vouchsafed them and others the same extraordinary Inspiration; but as the Christian Religion grew and flourished, and by growing acquired Strength, the gift of foretelling things to come was by degrees more sparingly conferred. And because Christianity did not much regard what was to happen in this World, but put Men upon the thoughts and expectations of another Life, the principal Office of the New Testament Prophets lay in interpreting those things more clearly and at large, which were revealed by Christ and his Apostles, for the benefit of the common People.
In which Office there are two things to be carefully distinguished: one Chapter is, their preparation for the exercise of that Office, in which besides natural Gifts, and Knowledge acquired by Industry, they were endowed with the Holy Ghost, which was conferred on them by the imposition of the hands of the Apostles, as appears from 1 Tim. iv. 14. Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. And tho' we do not know how the Holy Spirit influenced their Minds, or what change it produced in them; yet it appears by what is afterwards said about these Prophets by St. Paul, that this was the effect of that divine Inspiration, to fit them to preach the Gospel: Which fitness, in verbum as St. Paul calls it, was all at once conferred upon them.

And when they were thus made fit, in verbo prophetarum, for this Office, they executed it not by a particular sort of Inspiration, by which such things were revealed to them as they knew not before, or which unaccountably and extraordinarily moved them to speak, but as they saw fit themselves; and those things which they had received from Christ and the Apostles, they interpreted after their own manner. Which was the ground of those Disorders and Tumults in the Church, of which St. Paul speaks in the 14th Chapter, when more Prophets than one would be heard at the same time. And hence this Gift did not supersede the necessity of Study and diligent reading, as appears by that advice of St. Paul to Timothy: Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, &c.—Meditate upon these things, give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all.

These are they whom the Apostle calls Prophets; the Teachers seem to be those who had qualified themselves for preaching the Gospel only by Study, and had not received the extraordinary Gift of the Spirit. The Prophets, for the most part at least, did not teach by Inspiration, but had been fitted to teach by Inspiration; but those who are here peculiarly called Teachers, did not only teach without Inspiration what they had learned, but had received no extraordinary preparation from God for the exercise of their Office. In which particular they were inferior to the Prophets, besides that these did sometimes foretell things to come. Unless this Interpretation be admitted, it will be hard to understand any thing that St. Paul says afterwards about Prophets.

II. As for these Teachers in that Age having been always Bishops or Priests of the first Rank in the Church, I do not know whence that can certainly be concluded. I am sure what our Author alludes
Chapter to that purpose, does by no means prove it; nor is there any reason from the thing itself, which should oblige us to be of his opinion.

Ibid. Note e. If the Apostles had shewn any other instances of severity beside that on Ananias, in the beginning of their Ministry, I do not think but St. Luke would have related them, and therefore I suppose they are other Miracles intended in Acts ii. 43. But why doth St. Luke say there was such a general fear upon that account? To wit, because that fear might as well follow upon beneficial Miracles, as punishments inflicted on wicked Persons; for any Miracles joined with a pious and reasonable Doctrine, are capable of impressing an awe upon the Minds of Men, and making them afraid to oppose. the Teachers of it, lest they should be found fighting against God. This is a much better Interpretation, than to say that the Apostles terrified Men by inflicting DISEASES upon them, and menacing them with Death; which they very seldom did, and could not have been frequently done, without giving a fair occasion to the enemies of Christianity to cavil both at the Apostles conduct, and it. And I as little believe that this power belonged to all Governors of Churches, which we read of none that used besides the Apostles, and those to whom the Apostles did as it were lend it, as St. Paul did to the Corinthians: See chap. v. But the Doctor thought he could never say enough about Church Censures.

Ibid. Note h. I. Of the word γνωσις, Phil. Fac. Maussacus has copiously and learnedly treated, in a Dissert. premised to Harpocratus, where he has at large shewn that γνωσις signifies not only Languages in general, but strange Languages, and words peculiar to certain Dialects, for the interpretation of which Glossaries were composed.

II. Tho it is said in Acts ii. 5. that there were at Jerusalem devout Men, out of every Nation under Heaven, who heard the Apostles speaking in their own Languages; yet that expression is not to be taken in the strictest and most comprehensive sense, because it is certain universal Phrases are often used for indefinite or particular ones, of which see my Notes on Gen. vii. 19. and Part. 2. Sect. ii. cap. vi. §. 16. of my Ars Critica. And indeed it is not at all probable that the Apostles could speak all the Languages so much as of the Asian People, among which were the Scythians, who inhabited a great and vast Country towards the North, and the Seres and Japhanders, and divers Indian Nations, to which they never went. And therefore by all Nations and all Languages must be meant the most and most famous within the Roman Empire, and in bordering parts of the World: Tho I do not doubt but that if the Providence of God had called the Apostles to the most remote Countries, God would have miraculously conferred on them the knowledge
knowledge of their Languages. But it was time enough for that when Chapter they had occasion to use them.

III. There are some things to be observed about the Gift of Tongues, which I shall afterwards set down, because our Author has past it by.

C H A P. XIII.

Ver. 1. 'Εν τοις γυναικεύσι το ἀνθρώπων λαοί καὶ το Λυκίανον. St. Paul here seems to speak according to the opinion of the Vulgar, who think that the Angels cannot communicate their Thoughts to one another without speech; the Spirits, whether pure, or clothed with another kind of Body, may have other ways to convey their Thoughts to each other: And those ways altogether as conceivable as the manner how we understand one another's Thoughts by Speech, which is not at all, as I might easily shew, if this were a proper place to philosophize in: But I shall rather set down a passage out of Michael Psellus, in his little Book de operationibus Daemonum, where he describes thus the manner of their discoursing: εἰς ο λόγον περίπερα χιλιάδοις άγγελοι περίπερα διανέφερον, ἅχι χιλιάδοις άγγελοι περίπερα διανέφερον. ο έξ ουρανίου ἐν σύνθεσιν πνεύματος καὶ ωρίματος ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἀρθραί, ἀλλ' ή χειρακότης λόγος άγγελοι περίπερα διανέφερον άγγελοι περίπερα διανέφερον. ο έξ ουρανίου ἐν σύνθεσιν πνεύματος καὶ ωρίματος ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἀρθραί. ή έξ τούτων σωμάτων οι μικροί λεπτοί. Τών ά έ έποιαν χιλιάδοι περίπερα καὶ τοῦ βορείου καὶ τοῦ νότου καὶ τοῦ θαλάσσου καὶ τοῦ ἅλλου οὐκ ἔστωσαν ἄνθρωποι. ο έξ τούτων σωμάτων οι μικροί λεπτοί. Ή έποιαν χιλιάδοι περίπερα καὶ τοῦ βορείου καὶ τοῦ νότου καὶ τοῦ θαλάσσου καὶ τοῦ ἅλλου οὐκ ἔστωσαν ἄνθρωποι. Ή έποιαν χιλιάδοι περίπερα καὶ τοῦ βορείου καὶ τοῦ νότου καὶ τοῦ θαλάσσου καὶ τοῦ ἅλλου οὐκ ἔστωσαν ἄνθρωποι. Ή έποιαν χιλιάδοι περίπερα καὶ τοῦ βορείου καὶ τοῦ νότου καὶ τοῦ θαλάσσου καὶ τοῦ ἅλλου οὐκ ἔστωσαν ἄνθρωποι.

He that speaks, if he be afar off, is forced to speak very loud; but if he be near, he whispers what he has to say into the Ear of the Person he speaks to. And if he could have an immediate access to the Spirit of the Mind, he would not need so much as to whisper, but he might make himself be understood, and communicate whatever he had a mind by a secret way, without any noise; in the same manner as they say Souls do after their separation from the Body, who converse without making any sensible impression on each other. And this way the Devils also discourse with us Men, and wage war with us unperceived. And afterwards he faith thus: Ιερών ζειδέα Δαιμόνων ὡς εἴδος ζειδέα καὶ Ελληνισκός, καὶ Σύρας, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἄνθρωπων. ή έξ ουρανίου τοῦ άνθρώπου ὡς εἴδος ζειδέας, καὶ ο έξ ουρανίου τοῦ άνθρώπου. That Demons have any peculiar Language we shall not find; for instance, Hebrew or Greek, or Syriack, or any other barbarous Tongue: For on what occasion have they for Speech, who converse together without Speech, as I before said? But he goes on and faith: Ἡμι ή άρα λέξεις έν Κυρίῳ ήθος εἴρηται ἔργον ζειδέας, καὶ Ελληνικὸς ζειδέας ζειδέας, εφ' οί ή τοῦτον ο έν θανάτῳ Αθήνας ζειδέας. Ελληνικὸς ζειδέας ζειδέας, Ελληνικὸς ζειδέας ζειδέας, Ελληνικὸς ζειδέας ζειδέας.
Chapter 13. Among the Demons of the Nations, some presided over one, and some over another, and had each their distinct place of Residence; so they severally spake the peculiar Languages of those Nations. For which reason those of them that resided in Greece, gave their responses in Greek Heroick Verses, and those in Chaldea were invoked in the Chaldean Language, &c. This as it is not 

exαιρετικόν without any examination to be admitted, so nor absolutely I think to be rejected; wherefore I thought fit to set it down here, that the Learned might judge of it.

Ibid. Note a. There are several things in this Annotation which I cannot assent to, and are undoubtedly false.

I. From the order observed, in reckoning up the Confort in Psalm cl. it cannot be inferred that the Cymbal was a musical Instrument of a bigger sound than those before named; for who told Dr. Hammond that the Discourse ascended? Does the Psalmist use to be so exact in placing his words? They must have read the Psalm but very carelessly that can think so.

II. The Cymbal cannot be said to have been a wind Instrument. It was made in the form of a Hemisphere, hollow within, and two Cymbals were shaken and struck one against another, to make a sound. "If any one ask me (faith A. T. Turnebus in Advers. Lib. 26. c. 33.) what sort of Instrument a Cymbal was, I will send him to the Herb Cotyledon, Pennywort, whose Leaves resemble a Cymbal. So saith Scribonius Largus, Mentastrum vel radicum κυμαλλιον, quae herba similia folia Cymbalis habet, Wild Mint, or the root of the Herb Cotyledon, the leaves of which are like Cymbals. He might have added, that this Herb was for that reason called κυμαλλιον, as appears by Dioscorides in Lib. 4. c. 92. who gives this description of it, and at the same time tells us what was the form of the Cymbal. κυμαλλιον, ος κυματαλιον, ος κυμαλλιον φιλλον ηχος ηχητικος θεοβολος, λειπθες κολον: Cotyledon, some call it Scytalium, others Cymbalium, hath a Leaf like a Sawce, of a round shape, and gradually concave. That the manner of sounding these Instruments was by dashing or shaking them against one another, appears by this Verse of Virgil Georg. Lib. 4. vers. 64. where he shews the way how to call back a swarm of Bees:

Tinnitusque cie & matris quate cymbala circum.

On which place Servius hath this Note, by whose words it will more fully appear what was the form of the Cymbal: que (viz. cymbala) in ejus (Matris Deum) tutela sunt, quia sunt similia HEMICYCLIS cæli,
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caeI, quibus cingitur Terra, quæ est mater Deorum: Which are under her protection, because they are like the half Circles of the Heaven, by which the Earth is encompassed, which is the Mother of the Gods. That they were shooed together, we may learn also from the words of Isidore in Orig. Lib. 2. c. 21. Cymbala & acetabula quaedam sunt, quæ percussa invicem se tangunt & sonum faciunt. Diša autem Cymbala, quia cum ballematica simul percussiuntur. Ita enim Greci dicunt Cymbala ballematica. Cymbals are a sort of Sawcers, which being struck against one another, make a sound. The reason why they were called Cymbals was because, &c. What the meaning of the word ballematica is I do not understand; but the word Cymbal must be derived not ὡς τί συμβλασθείτω, but ὡς τί κυπαρισσί, which signifies concave, as ὡς τί κεφαλή, κεφαλων. Whence Cymbals are called concave by Lucretius, Lib. 2. Speaking of Cybele's Priests:

Tympana tenta sonant palmis & cymbala circum Concava.

Nonius Marcellinus interprets cymbalissare, cymbala quater. And it's certain they were used in Dances, as the Timbrels and Tabors, as appears by Lampridius in Commodo: Praefettum Praetorio suaem Julianum salutis etiam nundum ante concubinas suas jussit, quatients Cymbala deformato vultu: He commanded bis Praefett Julian to dance naked in the Court before his Concubines, shaking Cymbals, and with bis Countenance disfigured. But the manner of sounding Cymbals is best of all described by Ausonius, in Ep. 25.

Cymbala dant fiditu sonitum, dant pulpita saltu
Ita pedum, tentis reboant cava tympana tergis,
Isiacos agitant Mareotica sístra tumultus. *

III. The matter of these semicircular Instruments being Brass, they made a tinkling or shrill sound, not a loud or big one, as the Doctor thought; whence they are stiled ὑπογραφα in the Epigram of Alexis Priest of the Mother of the Gods, of which I shall here produce these Distichs out of the Anthol. Lib. vi. p. 418. cap. 5.

* Since the Impression of this I have observed that the learned Laur. Pignorius has printed Figures of Cymbals from the ancient Marbles, exactly in the same form as I have described them.
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The female Alexis bequeaths this to thee, the mad tokens of her Fury, leaving off her brass's striking Rage: Her shrill sounding Cymbals, and high grave sounding Pipes, which are made of the crooked Horns of a Calf: And her echoing Drums and Swords died with Blood, and yellow Hair, which she formerly shook.

IV. Hesychius interprets the word χαλάσσαμα by καλαμα, κυμαλα, that is, brazen Kettles, Cymbals, as Phavorinus also reads it, not καμα κυμαλα brazen Cymbals, as it is fallly quoted by our Author. And the reason why these Instruments are called χαλάσσαμα is because they were made of Brass, not because they were ventus wind Instruments.

V. The Epithet ἀλαχτόν here proves nothing but that the Cymbal was an Instrument of a shrill sound; and indeed two such semicircular Instruments made of Brass could not be beat one against another, without making a pretty great Ringing or Tinkling, which yet was not so great as to equal the sound of Organs, especially if of a large size. Hence Xenophon, in the beginning of his Book de re Equestri, compares the sound of the hollow hoof of a Horse to the sound of a Cymbal: άριστας κυμαλάτων γιροτα τετράχθες τά δειπνήμια κοίλη οἰσίλ: a hollow Hoof struck upon the ground makes a noise like a Cymbal. Besides the word ἀλαχτόν signifies to make any sort of confused noise, not only for Joy, but for Grief, as appears even from Mark v. 38. Consult what H. Stephanus says about this word under its primitive ΛΑΛΕΩ, with which what is said here by our Author is nothing to compare. So that St. Paul admirably resembles the sound of the words of an unknown Language to the confused noise of a Cymbal, or ἀλαχτόν. Perhaps Tiberius Caesar had almost the same reason for calling the Grammarian Apio, Cymbalum Mundi, the Cymbal of the World, viz. because he dunned mens ears by his vain and unprofitable talking. See Pliny's Pref. to his Nat. Hist.

VI. The use of the Cymbal does not belong to this place. The Apostle does not here respect the occasions or times in which it was made use of, but only its confused sound: However I shall in a few words here set down the use of that Instrument, because our Author had
had not a true Notion of it. It was used whenever any confused Chapter noise was to be made, either as a signification of Joy or Mourning. For the antient Eastern People used that sort of Musick on both those occasions, whether in War or Peace. It was a token of Mourning in the sacred Solemnities of the Mother of the Gods, as we are told by Martial, Lib. 14. Epig. in Cymbala, 204.

Aëra, Cælænaeis lugentia Matris amores,
Esuriens Gallus vendere sāpe solet.

Of which see the Additions of T. Demsterus to the Rom. Ant. of Rosinus. But in the worship of other Deities, they played upon Cymbals for the sake of mirth; as appears by Athenæus's description of the Parilia, or Feasts in honour of the Goddess Pales, Lib. 8. p. 361. Ἐξάκον ἐγκεφαλικώς, καὶ πάντα ἀνδρῶν ἀκούει, καὶ κυμαλωτὰ ἁχός, ἐν τῇ παραλάω σκυθοῦ Μετὰ ᾅθαν ἡμῶν ἀπαλών: There was heard through all the City, the noise of Pipes, and the sound of Cymbals, and the beating of Drums, and singing. So Herodian, Lib. 5. Speaking of Heliogabalus, cap. 5.19. Πεπέτυμής ἡμᾶς ἐξέρχετο καὶ παντὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξέρχετο καὶ παντὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξέρχετο καὶ παντὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξέρχετο: He danced about the Altars, with the sound of all sorts of Instruments; and the women of the Country danced with him, running round the Altars, and carrying Cymbals or Tabers in their hands. That there were Cymbals also used in private Meetings for dancing and mirth, I have already shewn, and could easily prove more at large. It is known also that they were used in War, but it was only among the Arabians. And see faith Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromat. 2. p. 164. Χριστιανάς τοὺς πολέμους ἀντιιπο- 

VII. Because I have said so much about the Cymbal, I shall add something about its Original, tho' it contribute nothing to the illustration of St. Paul's meaning in this place. It sufficiently appears by the places already alluded, that it was neither a Roman nor a Greek Instrument, but an Asiatic: because it was principally in use among the Phrygians and Phenicians, as we have seen out of Herodotus; and the Arabians, as we have been told by Clemens. And hence faith Apuleius, in Lib. de Deo Socratis: Gaudent Aegyptia numina ferme plangoribus, Græca pleurumque choreis, barbarae autem stirpitu cymbalitarum, & tympanitarum & choralarum: The Egyptian Deities are pleased generally with Beatings, the Greek for the most part with Dances, and the Barbarian with the noise of men playing upon Cymbals, or Tabers, or Pipes.
It was very common among the Jews, in whose Language it is called "tsilisef", from a Root which signifies to ring or tinkle, both among them and the Arabians. The word "tsilisef" is constantly rendered by the Septuagint κύματα, except in one or two places, which are perhaps corrupt. Possibly it signified also Sistrum, a Timbrel, as I shall have occasion hereafter to observe on Psal. cl. It is certain both these Instruments might by an Onomatopoea be so called.

I have been larger than I usually am, in treating of the Cymbal, partly because Dr. Hammond did not know what it was, and partly because two other great Men were as ignorant in this matter as he: One is H. Grotius, who tells us, that for the most part this Instrument was made of Silver, which by what I have said already, appears to be false; and for further proof take this passage out of Josephus, in Lib. 7. cap. 10. p. 243. where among the rest of David's musical Instruments, he reckons κύματα, and describes them thus; εις τατα τοια χυματα κειλεν, they were broad, great, and brassen. The other is S. Bochart, who in his Pbaeg. Lib. 4. c. 2. affirms, that the Cymbal differed hardly in any thing but the roundness of its form from the Timbrel, whereas the Timbrel was an Instrument with holes in it, and made with little cross bars of Metal, not like a pewter Saucer as the Cymbal. Which it is not proper in this place to prove at large.

Ver. 4. Note c. See my Note on the word χειροσ, in Mat. xi. 30.

**C H A P. XIV.**

Ver. 2. Ο γας λειαν γαλααυν.] What is said in this Verse, seems to be by way of concession, and therefore should be paraphrased thus: "For granting that he who speaks "in an unknown Language, does really use a Gift which he has re- "ceived from God; yet he should remember that he can speak in "that Language only to God, not to men who do not understand "it, and to whom all that he says is unintelligible. It was certainly a piece of folly and arrogance, not to say any worse of it, to speak so as to be understood by no body; for it was a mere ostentation of the Gift of Tongues. But there are some things to be observed with re- "lation to that Gift, which our Author has past by, and will it may be give light to this whole Business."

I. They who received the Gift of Tongues, were doubtless in-"structed with them, in order to propagate the Gospel among those Nations whose Languages they were; whether they went into their
Countries, or discoursed with such as came out of them: and therefore Chapter the time for using them was only when they could not be better un-derstood in any other Language. Those that were at that time at Corinth, and could speak Greek, ought to use the Greek Tongue among the Corinthians, and not strange Dialects which they could not understand, and for which they might be suspected of Imposture, because no body understood them. For certainly one who could speak Greek, and industriously used another Language among Grecians who understood nothing but their native Dialect, might not without reason be taken for a Deceiver or Impostor.

II. But besides Grecians, and those who understood Greek, there were at Corinth some other People out of Africa, Asia, and Europe, who resorted thither for the sake of Trade, and were unskilful in the Greek Language, and who having been converted by the Apostle to the Christian Faith, had also received the Gift of Tongues, to enable them when they went into their own Country to preach the Gospel among barbarous Nations. And these seem to be the first who might abuse the Gift of Tongues in the Church of Corinth; as if for instance, a man that could speak Latin, because born and bred in Italy, had used the Ilyrian, Celtick or Spanish Language, the knowledge of which had been conferred upon him by God, when no body was present that understood any of those Tongues.

III. It must be acknowledged notwithstanding, that a Grecian, be-fore Grecians, might, for example, speak Spanish, that those of his own Country might know he was instructed by God with the knowledg of the Spanish Tongue; to which purpose there was need of an Interpreter, who by a faithful interpretation of what he said, might shew that he did not speak some fictitious Language, or use sounds that had no sense belonging to them, but the true Spanish Language. For if he himself had first used a strange Language, and then spoken in Greek what he had said before in an unknown Tongue, he might be suspected by those who did not understand that strange Language. But if no body were present, who could perform the Office of an Interpreter? It was better for the Person so miraculously endued with the knowledge of the Spanish Language to hold his peace, lest he should speak to those who did not understand it, to no purpose, or become suspected to the Hearers, if he himself should take upon him to be his own Interpreter, or at least by his proud ostentation of an useless accomplishment, at that instant of time, offend them.

IV. These two sorts of men St. Paul here reproves, who used the Gift of Tongues in an improper place and time, and prefers such Pro-
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Chapter XIV. Pilgrims as Spake nothing but Greek to them. But you will say, Were not those who preached the Gospel in strange Languages, also Prophets? Yes, undoubtedly; but not to those who did not understand those Languages, and therefore the Apostle distinguishes them from those who spake only Greek. And he justly prefers a Grecian, endued only with the Gift of Prophecy, and speaking to his Countrymen in their own Language, to one who did not use the Gift of Prophecy, but of Tongues, among those who did not understand them. These things being diligently observed, which, if I am not mistaken, are true, or very probable, the Apostle's whole discourse will be perspicuous, which is otherwise very dark and intricate.

Ibid. Παντί μη ναρεῖ.] I do not think this is to be understood of a particular Inspiration, for they who had once received the Gift of Tongues, were not inspired as often as there was occasion to use them; but they expressed their minds whenever they pleased, in any of those Languages with which the Spirit of God had instructed them. So that by παντί here is meant to his own understanding, but not to another's.

Ver. 5. Εὐτες ον μη διδασκαλία.] That is, not as our Author says, unless he afterwards speak in a known Language, what he had expressed in an unknown; for it would have been absurd to speak, for instance, in Spanish to Grecians, that which one should be forced afterwards to speak oneself in Greek; but, "he is a greater Prophet who prophesies in one known Language, than he that prophesies in many unknown, if he cannot deliver his mind without them in a known Tongue. A Carthaginian, for example, who besides the Punick, should have understood all the Dialects of the Mores and Lybiens, could not be so much esteemed at Corinth, as a Greek Prophet that understood only his native Language, unless he were able also to express in Greek what he could say in the Language of the Mores or Libyans. This St. Paul calls here ιδιον προφητεύον, because he is speaking of a man who did not understand Greek, and wanted an Interpreter among the Grecians, and so would have been his own, if he had understood that Language. No other Person can be intended, for who doubts but a native Grecian was able to speak in his own Tongue what he said in a strange one? Grotius would have the Gift of Interpretation to be understood of a faithful Memory, but that is manifestly a harsh and far-fetch'd Interpretation.

Ver. 10. Τωνίου γεν ονομόν.] I wonder Dr. Hammond in his Paraphrase should represent St. Paul as using that Fiction of some of the Antients about seventy Languages; which has been confuted by S. Bochart.
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obart in his Phileg. Lib. 1. c. 15. to whom I refer the Reader.

Ver. 13. Περιστρέφεται τον εστιανρέης. I of one that could speak Greek this cannot, as I have said, be understood; for what need had any man of a miraculous Gift, to enable him to express that in his Mother Tongue, which he himself spake in a strange Language, if he did but understand what he said? And every one that uses a Language, the knowledge of which he has received from God, is supposed to understand what he himself says; for he would really be a sounding brass, or a Cymbal making a confused noise, who should speak words in a strange Dialect, which yet he did not know the meaning of. Grotius interprets these words thus: Let him pray that he may faithfully retain in his memory what he speaks outwardly with his Tongue, that so he may deliver the same things in Greek. But, first, this Interpretation does not agree with the sense of the word ἰσχυρόμενος, which signifies to interpret, not to remember. Secondly, He supposes that those who used strange Languages, spake from Inspiration, not their own thoughts, but what was suggested to them by the Spirit; which we have no certain ground to believe, nor is it probable it was so, at that time particularly, and in that place: For if this supposition of Grotius were true, the Holy Ghost would have inspired a Corinthian to speak, for example, in the Punick Language, in such time and place as he would least of all have stood in need of that Tongue, there being no Carthaginian present. But to what end I pray? Was it that he might hold his peace in the Church; in which certainly it would have been very improper to speak in the Punick Dialect, if there was no body there that understood it? Or was it that he might keep his skill in that Language till a fitter occasion? But he had better have been inspired with the knowledge of the Punick Tongue, when there was need of that Inspiration; left his memory should not retain it, or there should be occasion for a new Miracle to confirm his memory. For if (which I observe in the third place in opposition to Grotius's Interpretation) he could not have interpreted by his memory in Greek, what he had said by heart and extempore in the Punick Language, without a Miracle, much less could he have performed that some time after. And the Interpretation which Dr. Hammond gives of these words in his Paraphrase, is altogether as insignificant, unless we understand the Apostle to speak of a Stranger that could not speak Greek.

Ver. 14. Εάν το θεοδίκημα μιλούν, το προφάων μα θεοδίκημα, ώς το θεοδίκημα ο ελπίς. I have set down this whole Verse in Greek, that the Reader may compare it with our Author's Paraphrase, in which he speaks barbarously and improperly, that he rather obscures the sense of the
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the Apostle, which is dark in itself, than explains it. What mortal would have interpreted το πνεύμα by my Gift, or the Gift of Tongues which is given me? and what intolerable Language is it to say my Gift prays? and so of the rest. This is lapides loqui, as one said, not verba humana, to break a Man's teeth with hard words. Grotius much more fitly interprets το πνεύμα of a motion from Inspiration, and explains the last words by this Paraphrase: Mens mea nihil bene ex cogitatum profert; My own mind produces no good thoughts. But this is nothing to the purpose, for who had not rather hear an inspired discourse, if he can but understand it, than one that is merely the product of a man's own meditation? Some other Interpretation therefore must be given of this place; and St. Paul's mind, if I am not mistaken, expressed thus: "If I make use of an unknown Tongue, I pray indeed my self with my mind, because I understand what my words signify; but the sense of what I say is of no use to others who do not know it; and if they join with me in that Prayer, pray rather with their bodies than with their minds.

First, The Phrase το πνεύμα με πνεύμα signifies, I pray with my mind; and is tacitly opposed to the action of the Hearers who were then present, and prayed rather with their bodies than their minds, because they did not understand what he that made use of a strange Language said. Nothing is more ordinary than for the Spirit and the Body to be opposed to one another; which in the use of the Sacred Writers are such perpetual correlates, as the Logicians speak, that upon the mention of one, the other is presently thought on. See Rom. viii. 23. and Gal. v. 16.

Secondly, The phrase ὅτι διὰ της μυθικής or understanding signifies the sense or meaning of what I say; which is ἀποτελον, without Fruit; viz. to others who do not understand it. So this word της is frequently used, and among other places in the Book of Wisdom, Chap. ii. 16. These things being supposed, the sense also of the following words is evident, which will otherwise be very obscure.

Vers. 15. Πνευματικός γι' ἐν τῇ νοικίᾳ They is, I will pray so, as at the same time to pray to God with my mind, and that the sense of what I say may be understood by the standers by. I confess an Attick Writer, or one that had studied to express himself neatly and elegantly, would never have said Πνευματικός γι' ἐν τῇ νοικίᾳ, for ἦνοικόθαι ἢ ἡμέρας ἢ πνευματικός γι' ἐν τῇ νοικίᾳ, to pray so as that those who are present may understand the meaning of my Prayer. But St. Paul was never curious in his style, and he said to pray with my mind, tho in a different sense, because he had said before to pray with the Spirit. But he certainly
tainly meant what I have said, or something like it, as appears by what follows: See ver. 19. Grotius interprets this Verse thus: Optandum est, ut orem, id est, ut oret aliquis non tantum motu illo afflaticio, verum etiam is quæ ipse excogitavit; It were to be wished that I prayed, that is, that a Man prayed not only from that Divine impulse, but also out of his own Thoughts. But I say it were to be wished rather that all who pray in publick, prayed by Inspiration or a Divine Impulse, but in a known Language. St. Paul in this Discourse does not oppose that which a Man devises himself, and speaks in a known Tongue, to a Prayer that is inspired, but is expressed in a strange Language; but only a Prayer which cannot be understood, to one that may. They who had the Gift of Tongues might as well express their own Thoughts in a strange Dialect, as that which was revealed to them by Inspiration. This our Author in some measure perceived, and therefore mollified a little Grotius's Interpretation.

Verf. 16. Note a. I rather think the Apostle means here other acts of Thanksgiving, which particular Persons, according as it seemed good to them, offer'd up to God in the Church, in strange Languages, to which they who did not understand those Languages, could not say Amen. For who will believe that there was any Governor of a Church so senseless, as when he celebrated the Eucharist, a religious Ceremony in which all the Members of the Church were to join, to use an unknown Language? This is confirmed by the Pronoun εὖ θύ, which shews the Apostle to speak of Thanksgivings offer'd up in the name of one Man, and not of the whole Church.

Verf. 19. Αἰδὲ τὸ νοεῖς μου λαλιν. Tho do νοεῖ in this place as well as νοεῖν μου λαλιν. it seems to be but a harsh Phrase, to signify, that I may be understood; yet that is the meaning of it, may appear by the following words, ἵνα ἐξ ἐλευθερίας, that I might teach others also; as also by its being opposed to λέγῃν εἰς ἔλευθερα words in an unknown Tongue. Grotius interprets this also a me ipso cogitata, The product of my own Thoughts; as if one that had been endued with the Gift of Tongues, could not have expressed the product of his own private Thoughts in an unknown Language! Or as if he that so unseasonably made ostentation of that Gift, spake by Inspiration!

Verf. 21. Εἰς ἐπερχόμενος ἔε ἐξ ἐκλείπον ἐτέχεις λαλιν. Dr. Hammond follows indeed for the most part Grotius, and not without reason, as being unquestionably the best of all the Interpreters of Scripture. But here he justly forsakes him, because that great Man puts such an Interpretation upon this Passage allledged out of Isaiah, as makes it to be nothing to the purpose. Besides, there are other things in his Annotation.
Chapter tion on this place liable to reprehension: As when he saith; Hec- 
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tari à Paulo, ex loco quidem Esaiæ xxviii. 11, 12. non tamen ex versione 
LXX Intt. sed ex versione Aquila docet nos Origenes Philocaliae viii. 
For, first, Origen speaks of this passage, not in the viiiith, but ixth 
Chapter of his Philocalia. Secondly, he does not say that St. Paul 
had cited Isaiah according to the Version of Aquila, whom he very well 
knew to have lived but in the time of the Emperor Adrian. All that 
he says is this, after he had set down this place of St. Paul, wherein 
he alludes Isaiah's words: ἔγειρη γὰ τῇ ἰσωσίας ἐπὶ τῆς λίθου τεῦχος ἐκ τῆ 
Ἀρμῶνια κείμενα: for I have found what is equivalent to this expression 
in the interpretation of Aquila. St. Paul, who understood the Hebrew 
Language, cited these words out of the Hebrew Copy, not out of the 
Version of Aquila, which was composed a great many Years after the 
Apostle's death. If Aquila translated them in the same manner, the 
reason of that was, because he also carefully follovd the Hebrew. This 
was an error in Grotius, which proceeded not from carelessness or occtancy, 
and much less from ignorance, but from an unavoidable weakness 
in human Nature, which will not bear a perpetual Intention of Mind. 
For I do not doubt but this difficult Chapter kept that great Man's 
Thoughts a long while employed; and so writing this after he was 
tired with too long Study, he fell into a double Mistake, which I do 
not speak to upbraid him, far from that, but only to caution the 
Reader.

CHAP. XV.

Verf. 8. 

WHAT is observed by Baronius out of Suetonius, and here 
Note:b. since him by Dr. Hammond, is vain, being grounded up 
on a corrupt reading of the words of Suetonius, where 
instead of Abortivos, the best Copies have orcos or orciros, which if 
Casaubon and Lav. Torrentius have shewn to be the true reading. The 
phrase used here by St. Paul, is much older than Augustus; for the 
Hebrews metaphorically call any mean or contemptible thing, בָּלִי, 
and that word the Septuagint very truly render by ἔξωρμα in Job iii. 16. 
and Ecclef. vi. 3. So any thing whatsoever that is in its kind little, might 
be called abortive, as Antonius's Dwarf in Horace, Sat. 3. Verf. 46.

Appellat — pater — pullum male parvus 
Si cui filius est, ut abortivus fuit olim 
Sisyphus.

On which place see the old Interpreter.
Two things St. Paul proves in this Discourse: 1. That the Apostles did not falsely pretend themselves to expect a Happiness after this Life from Christ, but truly expected it; because otherwise they would never have underwent so many Hardships and Dangers for his sake. 2. That this their expectation was not vain, because it was grounded upon the Resurrection of Christ, whereof they were witnesses, and therefore credible, because they suffer'd so much for being so, and it was a thing in which they could not be deceived. This arguing has a great deal more strength and certainty in it, than that of Ciceron in a like matter, and grounded in part upon the same Topicks, Acad. Quest. iv. where saith Lucullus: Ille vir bonus, qui statuit omnem cruciatum perferre, intolerabili dolore lacerari potius, quam aut officium prodat aut fidem; cur has sibi tam graves leges imposuit, cum quamobrem ita oporturer nihil habueret comprehendere, percepti, constituti? Nullo igitur modo fieri potest, ut quisquam tanti aequitatem & fidem, ut ejus conservanda causa nullum supplicium recuset, nisi siis rebus adversus sit, quæ falsæ esse non possint. That good Man who resolves to undergo all manner of Torments, and to be torn in pieces with unsufferable pain, rather than to betray his Duty or Trust; why has he imposed upon himself such severe Laws if he did not see sufficient reason for him to do so? It is utterly impossible that any Man should put such a value upon Justice and Honesty, as to submit to any Tortures rather than all contrary to them, unless he have assented to such things as cannot be false. And Tuscul. Lib. 1. Cicero himself speaks thus: Nescio quomodo inhaeret mentibus quasi saecularum quoddam augurium futurorum, idque in maximis ingenii, altissimisque animis & exsistent maxime & apparat facillime; quo quidem demto, quis tam effert armens, qui semper in laboribus & periculis viveret? I know not how, there abides in the Minds of Men as it were a presage of a future State, and especially in Persons of the greatest Capacity and deepest Thoughts, in whom it most easily discovers it self; and if this apprehension was taken away, who would be so mad as to live perpetually in Troubles and Dangers? This indeed shews that those Heathens believed another Life after this, but does not prove that they were not mistaken. For it was possible they might be deceived by an Opinion taken up in their Childhood, for which they could produce no sufficient Arguments. But the case of the Apostles was quite otherwise, who proved the reality of a future State by the Authority and Resurrection of Christ; which they themselves had seen, and confirmed the truth of by their Sufferings.

Ibid. Εἰρυκόταςει πάντων. Who can neither live quietly nor die naturally, nor so much as find a Grave after Death. To this purpose is
Chapter that Inscription on the Monument of Callipus, if it be an antient one, in Rom. Subterr. Par. i. p. 307. ALEXANDER mortuus non est, sed vivit super astra, & corpus hoc tumulo quiescit. Vitam expelit cum Antonino Imp. qui ubi multum beneficii anseverit praevidet, pro gratia omnium, odium reddit. Genua enim fiebant, vero Deo sacrificatur, ad supplicium ducitur. O tempora inausa! quibus, inter sacra & vota, ne in cavernis quidem salvati possimus. Quid miserius visa? Sed quid miserius morte, cum ab amicis & parentibus sepeliri nequeant?

Vers. 29. Note c. I. That Ellipsis, which our Author would have to be in this Phrase υπὲρ ἀστέρων for υπὲρ ἀστερῶν, in the series of such a Discourse as St. Paul’s here is, and in the middle of a Disputation which required that every thing intended should be expressed, is very harsh, and has nothing common with those examples which he alludes.

II. What he confidently affirms in the latter end of this Annotation, that the παρ’ εἰς εὐαιρ. vers. 12. is the Nominative case to the Verb βασιλεύσας, is groundless and unnecessary, βασιλεύσας having a Nominative case belonging to it in this very 29th verse, viz. εἰς τοῖς δικαίως, which immediately goes before. But that intricate way of Writing which the Doctor had accustomed himself to, made him able to digest what none besides himself could do.

III. I confess the opinion of St. Chrysostom and others about this place, contains a very commodious sense, if we consider it in it self, but compared with the Apostle’s words it cannot stand. And to me their Interpretation seems to be most probable, who take υπὲρ here to be equivalent to ἀνήρ, and so the sense to be this: “If there were no Resurrection, what would become of those who every day, tho’ they see Christians put to Death for their Profession, do yet cheerfully receive Baptism, that they may supply the place of those that are dead in the Christian Church? By the same way of arguing we might prove, that bearing of Arms is not without a reward annexed to it: If those that bore Arms were to have no reward for so doing, when so many Soldiers are continually killed, what should they do who are listed in the room of those that are dead, and supply their place? That υπὲρ is frequently used for ἀνήρ no one can doubt. Yet I shall add a Passage out of Dionysius Halicarnass. in which he speaks of Soldiers substituted in the room of others that are killed, whereby not only that appears, but St. Paul’s words may be very much illustrated. And it is in his Antiq. Rom. Lib. 8. p. 553. ΤΗΡΑΤΑΠΘΩΝΤΩΝ, faith he, ἐς τοῖς ἑαυτὸς ἄνθρωπος τελευτᾷ σεβαστῷ εὐλογοῖς κατέρρειν: FOR those that DIED in the War with the Antitians, they determined to levy other Soldiers.

IV. What
IV. What our Author relates out of Photius concerning Synesius, is in Cod. 26. But there was a great difference between Synesius and those against whom St. Paul disputes; for he being a Platonick, believed the Immortality of the Soul, and the Rewards and Punishments of another Life; but these Corinthians, together with the Resurrection of the Body, denied the Soul's Immortality, and a future Judgment, and were perhaps Jews, who of Sadduces had embraced the Christian Religion. Now St. Paul, in order to prove the Resurrection, proves that there were rewards to be expected after this Life; which reasoning could not be designed against the Platonists, because they confessed a future Happiness, tho they did not believe the Resurrection of the Dead. And Religion might well enough consist with the opinion of the Platonick, tho the Sadduces who disowned the Immortality of the Soul utterly overthrew it. And therefore the Egyptians bore with Synesius, notwithstanding he was a Platonick, which they would never have done if he had been a Sadduce.

Ver. 33. οὐκ ἔχεις οὕτως ὑμᾶς ἐκκινήσει.] There are some who from this place, and the citation out of Aratus, infer that St. Paul was conversant in the Writings of the Heathen Poets: But without sufficient ground, because such as these were common proverbal forms of Speech used by every one, and might be easily learned from ordinary Discourse, even of ignorant Persons, by which means I am apt to think the Apostle came to the knowledge of them. For the Jews did not use to read much the Writings of the Heathens; nor does the sile of St. Paul otherwise give us the least reason to imagin that he ever so much as attempted any thing in that sort of Study. For if he had been at all conversant in Heathen Authors, we should doubtless have seen more effects of it in his way of Writing. However we may learn from hence, that Christians ought not to reject any thing which was well said by the Heathens: And therefore I think it not amiss to produce two more Passages, besides those which have been allledged by Grotius, out of Heathen Writers to this purpose. Aeschylus ἐν τῇ δὲ

\[\text{That is, according to the interpretation of Grotius:}\]

\[A\ a\ a\ 2\]

\[Adeo\]
Ade meliorum, scilicet, commercio
Nil pejus usquam est; oritur infelix seges,
Nam sceleris arvum nil nisi mortem partit.

Episcopus in Enchirid. cap. xliv. 'Ea v o i t ότας Θ μελονούσας, ει η σφετεριωτε τοῦ μολύβδου αναγικρ, καὶ εκ τοῦ πυρὸς καταλεῖς: si a companion be corrupted, he that converses with him must needs also be corrupted, the perhaps be were [before] pure.

Ibid. Note e. I take χειρον here in the sense in which it is commonly understood, because those who denied the Resurrection were undoubtedly Persons of evil Manners; and that this was St. Paul's meaning, appears by the following words; Awake to Righteousness, and sin not. So in Aristophanes in Nub. p. 177. Ed. minoris, Act. 5th. the Chorus addressing themselves to just Reason, say:

ἀλλ' δὲ μαλακίς τῆς ἀφελείας ἡμον κατάκεισθαι'
'ρέξον χειρον ἢ πιν χειρον, εἰ τινάν ουκ ἔχουσιν ἀληθινάν.

But O thou who hast crowned our Ancestors with abundance of good Manners, speak and declare thy Nature. Where unquestionably χειρον signifies good Manners, as in many other places: Yet Dr. Hammond's Interpretation and this may be joined together.

Ver. 54. Note g. This remark our Author took out of H. Gratin; but tho the Hebrew נשל signify for ever, and Death be to be finally abolished after the Resurrection, yet St. Paul does not refer to that here: for if he had, he would have rendered the words of Isaiah, Chap. xxv. 8. by εἰς αἰώνα, which he now interprets εἰς ψυχή, because he had before reckoned Death in the number of Christ's Enemies, ver. 25, and 26. and afterwards in ver. 57. he faith that God had given us νίκης the victory over Death. So that of two significations, whereof the Phrase נשל הנסף is capable, viz. for ever, and νίκης, St. Paul here follows the latter, which made most for his purpose: And indeed that signification agrees best to the place in Isaiah it self.
Ver. 19. I wonder our learned Author should begin this Annotation with saying that *Eunome* the Church did not only signify the place of assembling together, but also the Persons that used to do so: When it is certain the former signification of the word, for a Place, was wholly unknown in the times of the Apostles, in which *Eunome* was always used for an Assembly, as well among the Christians as by the Greeks.

II. I rather also understand *Eunome* of the House itself, which is said here to have had a Church in it, because there were in it several Christians, so that that House seemed to contain a whole Church. Terrullian in Lib. de Exhort. ad caes. cap. vii. Where there are three Persons, there is a Church, tho they be Laicks.

Ver. 22. Note d. I. Those learned Men who affirm there were only two degrees of Excommunication among the Jews, are Selden and his followers: See his Treatise de Synedriis Judaeorum, Lib. i. cap. 7. And I confess I could never meet with any that has answered his Arguments, tho Dr. Hammond does not doubt but he was mistaken; but our Author was too great a favourer of Ecclesiastical Punishments, which yet it is certain have done more mischief than good to the Christian Church.

II. What he says about the word *Maran*, is taken out of Grotius, without Care or Examination. (1.) The Etruscans did not call their Kings *Mariani*, but *Murrani*, as Grotius tells us out of Servius on Aeneid. 12. vers. 529. (2.) The Syrians are not siled *Maronita* because they call Christ Lord, but from one *Maron* an Abbot, whom the *Maronita* affirm to have been Orthodox, but others a Heretic; or from *Maronia* a Territory of Syria: on which matter there is extant a Dissertation of Gabriel Sionita and Joannes Hexzontia, both *Maronites*. It is certain *Maron* is a Syrian name, there being in the Recogn. of S. Clement, Lib. 3. c. 2. mention made of *Maron* the Tripolite who entertained St. Peter. (3.) I cannot tell where Epiphanius says that God was called by the *Gazari*, *Marnas*; but I know that Mr. Selden, a great while before this was published by Dr. Hammond, or before ever Grotius first wrote it, had shewn that *marnascha* was the name of a Deity among the *Gazains*, in his Treatise de Deis Syris, Synt. 2. c. 1. (4.) Stephanus was mistaken, when he said that the Cretians called their Virgins *Mepras*, for they were
Chapter called Maecenas, of which see J. Selden, and C. Salmasius on cap. 11.

XVI. of Solinus.

III. The Spaniards do not say, Anathema Maranatha, but Anathema Marano, as it is rightly set down by Grotius out of Mariana, Lib. 7. cap. 6. Rerum Hispanicarum. The Arabick words subjoined to that form of speaking among the Spaniards, are not an interpretation of it, nor brought as such by Grotius, but of this place in St. Paul, out of the Arabick Translation, published by T. Erpenius.

IV. The conjecture set down by the Doctor, concerning the passage in Steph. Byzant. on the word ἀναθήμα, is taken from Dan. Heinius, whose name he ought to have mentioned, tho' it be but an unhappy conjecture. The Shepherd there spoken of, said in Syriack ܫܡܥܐ ܡܕܢܝܐ, thou art high, viz. O God. Stephamus misunderstanding Philo, as S. Bochart well observes in Canaan. Lib. 2. c. 12. to whom I refer the Reader.

Ver. 24. Ἡ ἀναθήμα μου μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐν Χειρὶ Ἰσραήλ.] The Pronoun μου here is omitted in the Alexandrian Copy. But I have sometime suspected that the true reading was ὅς οὐ the same with ὅς, which by a mistake came to be changed into ὅς.
ANNOTATIONS

On the Second Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians.

CHAP. I.

Ver. 11. THIS Observation our Author had out of Grotius; but it is false, that the Hebrew מִפְּנֵי רַבִּים ever signifies in respect of: And if it did, the phrase אֶת הַתֶּלֶת would not signify in respect of many, viz. men, but in many respects; and the latter part of the Verse should be rendred thus: That the Gift bestowed upon us in many respects, might be received by many with thanksgiving for us. To make sense of which words, we should be obliged to interpret in many respects, by to many purposes or ends; which yet will not agree either with the Hebrew or Greek phrase. I believe therefore indeed that there is here a Hebraism, but so as that אֶת הַתֶּלֶת is answerable to the Hebrew words מִפְּנֵי רַבִּים mischief from the face of many, that is, from many. It is certain מִפְּנֵי often signifies from, as Chr. Nolius in Conc. Particularum has observed. The Greek words are only transposed, and אֶת הַתֶּלֶת put for אֶת הַתֶּלֶת תְּלֵת, from the faces of many. And אֶת הַתֶּלֶת which follows, is put for אֶת הַתֶּלֶת חָשֵׁשׁ, as it is set at length in Chap. ix. 12. of this Epist. just as אֶת הַתֶּלֶת signifies in a few words, in Heb. xiii. 21. So that this Verse ought to have been rendered thus: That many thanks may be given for us by many, for the Gift bestowed upon us by God.

Ver. 13. Αὐθανάσσετε, ἢ οὐ σκευάσετε.] This is a Paranomasia, or figure in which words of a like sound and different sense are joined together. Such another as that of Dionysius Lato: Nam legere & non intelligere, negligere est; or which see Jos. Scaliger. It is a noted saying of Julian; οἰκίζων, ήμων, εἰκίζων, I have read, I have known, I have condemned.
Chapter II.

Ver. 22. Συγκαταθησθαι ἢ ἐν τῷ ἐπιστήμων τῷ ὄντων. Those who purchase any thing, for which they do not pay ready Mony, nor take it immediately away, for fear of its being changed, or a worse commodity substituted in its room, to mark it with their Seal, and give the Seller earnest. And this seems to be the ground of this metaphorical description here, of those benefits which God confers upon us, whilst we live in this world, by the names of Seal and Earnest. God has redeemed us with the Blood of his Son, and yet he does not presently for ever make us his own, by bestowing eternal Blessedness upon us, but leaves us in this mortal Life. But that the Primitive Christians might not doubt whether God had really bought them, they were distinguished, as it were, by God’s Seal from the rest of mankind, and received as an Earnest from him the Spirit of Miracles. See Ephes. i. 13. and iv. 30. Yet the thing from whence the Metaphor is taken, does not in every respect agree with that which is thus metaphorically described; nor is it necessary it should, for it is sufficient if there be but some similitude between them.

Note b. THO, properly speaking, the Apostle was the Author, both of the Punishment inflicted upon the incestuous Corinthian, and of his Cure upon repentance, yet ἐταλαίπων ought not therefore to be rendered under many, or in the presence of many, contrary to the use of the Greek Language. St. Paul here joins others with himself, because they had consented to the punishment; which thereupon might be said to have been inflicted by them, especially considering it was denounced by their mediation.

Ver. 11. Ἰδοῦν ἀκούσατε καὶ ἀρνώσετε. It may possibly, not without some colour of truth, be conjectured that by Satan in this place we are to understand a man who was an enemy to the Corinthian Church, rather than the Devil; which endeavoured to draw away him who had been delivered to Satan and others from its Communion. And therefore it follows; for we are not ignorant of his devices: Which words if they be understood of the Devil, seem to be flat and superfluous; for who does not know that the Devil does all he can to pluck men out of the hands of Christ? Thus the word Ἰδοῦν Satan is used in 2 Sam. xix. 22, and Matt. xvi. 23. Which word the Apostle seems to have paraphrased in his Epistle to Titus; Ch. ii. 8. By ἔρανθος I cannot tell whether Dr. Hammond had not also some such thoughts about this
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this place, because he paraphrases it as if the Apostle had said; for we Chapter are ignorant of his Devices.

Ver. 16. 0ίς ὑπὸ ὑποτήτως, &c.] Namely, by their fault, whose folly and wickedness made them reject the Divine Mercy; and not without commendableness in those who received so great a favour as they ought to do. Such another υποτήτως came into the mind of Genes, when he was composing that excellent little piece called his Table, wherein he represents the old Man that undertook to explain the design of it, speaking in this manner to the Spectators: Εἰ μὴ συνέχεσθαι ἡ τοῦ ἡμῶν, φαντάσεις καὶ συνήθεις τῆς, ἐπιστολής τῆς καταδείκνυμαι, τί μὴ συνέχεσθαι τοις αὐτοῖς τοις ἡμῶν προσώπων. Ἡ τον προσώπων τοις αὐτοῖς τοις, τῆς συνήθεις τῆς εἰς τον συναγωγόν τοῖς. If you mind and understand what is said, you will become wise and happy; but if not, you will be foolish and miserable, and wicked in your lives. For the explication (of this Table) is like the Riddle of Sphinx, which she proposed to men; if any one understood it, he was saved; but if not, he was destroyed by the Sphinx. This is the case of all those whose fate it is,

Virtutem ut videant, intrabescantque velibas.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 1. The Epistles commendatory usual among Christians. Note a. did not owe their Original to the tessera hospitales of the Heathens, but to an universal custom among all Nations of writing Letters of Recommendation in behalf of their Friends. And those publick Letters which were sent by the Bishops of one Church to another, were instituted especially upon the account of Heathens and Hereticks, for fear Idolaters, or Persons of erroneous Opinions in the Faith, should creep into the Churches, and make an ill use of their Liberality. See Beveridge on Can. Apost. 1:2; and 33.

Ver. 5. Οὐκ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὡς οὕτως λογίζεσθαι, μετά τέταρτῶν.] It is certain that all our Faculties, Encouragements and Helps to Faith and Piety, both General and Special, Natural and Evangelical, are entirely owing to God; and therefore all thanks and praise must be given for them to him alone: But these things St. Paul does not here speak of, but of those Thoughts and Gifts which were necessary to enable men, whether Jews
Jews or Gentiles, to preach the Gospel. And it is certain that neither Jews nor Gentiles could any of them of their own heads have preached anything like the Christian Doctrine; but it was requisite that those first Preachers of the Gospel should receive the Evangelical Doctrine by Revelation from God and Christ, and be endued with necessary extraordinary Gifts, to communicate the knowledge of it to others, such as the power of working Miracles, a singular constancy and unweariedness of mind, and incredible patience to undergo all manner of Afflictions, and the like. Both the foregoing and following Context clearly shew, that the Apostle here speaks about a sufficiency to preach the Gospel, and nothing else; and therefore our Author should have kept to that alone in his Paraphrase.

Ver. 6. οὐ γενόμενος εἰς ἕτος γνώμης.] I have already more than once observed, that by γενόμενος is meant the Law, as it was understood by the Jewish Doctors, in a literal or grammatical sense, and so proposed by them to the observation of their Disciples; and by γνώμης the mind of the Lawgiver, in giving the Law, that is, the Doctrine of the Gospel, of which the Law contained only the auxiliar Elements. And this St. Paul here seems to have a reference to, and tacitly to oppose his Apostolical Ministry to the Industry of those Jews who travelled over Sea and Land to make Proselytes to the Letter of the Law. There is a manifest opposition put between the Law and the Gospel in the 30th Verse. See my Note on Mat. v. 17. and Rom. ii. 29.

Ibid. ὅ τι γενόμενος εἰς γνώμης, τῇ γνώμῃ σοι οὕτως.] The mere observation of the Letter of the Law would not save any Man, or make him acceptable to God, unless he had also a regard to the Spirit or Intention of the Lawgiver, that is good Works, such as are prescribed in the Gospel. But the Spirit, that is, the Gospel, saves alone, without the observation of the Letter of the Law. This is the meaning here of St. Paul, and not what our Author says in his Paraphrase, which has no manifest ground in Scripture, but relies purely upon Theological conjecture.

Ver. 17. ὁ σιωπάς τῇ γνώμῃ ἤσων, καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ Κριτική ἤσων.] That is, the Lord Jesus, and his Gospel, is the Spiritual End of the Law, or the ultimate Scope to which the Lawgiver had a respect. And where that Spiritual Intention of God or the Gospel is known, there is Liberty; that is, men are no longer dealt with as Servants, who obey more out of fear than love. See my Note on Rom. viii. 15. There is nothing here that has any reference to a Veil, which is a token of subjection, as Dr. Hammond thought. The Veil which
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St. Paul mentions belongs no more to that than the Veil of Moses, Chapter which was not put upon those that obeyed, but on him that com-
manded.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 7. I am apt to think that the word ἐσχατα, that is, baked Clay; and thence by a Metaphor was applied to Animals covered with a certain Shell, which for the hardness of it might be compared to ἐσχατα. Yet I affirm nothing positively; but this I affirm, that in this place ἐσχατα undoubtedly signifies earthen Vessels; because that is the perpetual signification of this Phrase, and the other alleged by Dr. Hammond is without example. Besides, the place itself necessarily requires the word ἐσχατα should be so understood; for it is manifest that St. Paul compares the Apostles to frail and contemptible, and not precious or artificial Vessels, such as are made of the finest sort of Shells. There is a clear opposition here put between the great Excellency of the Gospel, and the meanness of its Preachers; or between the Power of God which exerted itself in the Gospel, and the Infirmity of the Apostles.

Ver. 8. Note c. I fully agree with our learned Author in interpreting St. Paul's words here, by the customs of the Heathens in their Agones. But there are some things to be observed on this Annotation.

I. It is strange he should confound the Verb ἄγεω in Greek with the Latin algó, when the Greek constantly signifies to grieve, so be tor-
mented, and the Latin to be cold. Yet he has elsewhere committed the same mistake, lest any one should think it was by mere accident. It is manifest that St. Chrysostom interprets the Verb ἄγεω by the word ἄγεω, and this latter does no more signify to be cold than the former, but to be grieved or afflicted.

II. In the place of St. James, ἄγεω is not an Agonistical term. The words of the Apostle are: Let patience have its perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, deficient in nothing, τελειος ἐν ὅλωθεν, in man-
ner complete: where the thing spoken of is manifestly a defect, and not any Victory which might be gained over the Christians.

III. It would have been worth observing that the Preposition ἐκ in composition, carries a greater emphasis with it than ἄγεω; for which reason ἐκαίνια signifies only to be perplexed, but ἐκαίνια to despair utterly. So Aristophanes in Nubibus, Act. 4. Sc. 1. ἀποκλέιν με φοβος καθολικως, be
Chapter be faith he will destroy and utterly ruin, or undo me.

Ver. 12. To αὐτῷ ἄριστας ἢ γίνεσθαι. That is, faith Grotius, Habentes communem nobiscum Dei Spiritum, qui non datur nisi credentibus. Iterum hic genitivus causam significat; id est, conditionem requisitam. Having the common Spirit of God with us, which is not given to any but Believers. Again here the Genitive Case signifies a Cause; that is, a necessary Condition. I should rather interpret the Spirit of Faith, of a disposition of Mind suitable to what we believe, or to the Faith which we profess. So the Spirit of Jealousy, and the Spirit of Bondage, &c. are the dispositions of jealous Persons, or Servants. Which interpretation agrees better with what follows; for because the Apostles were so disposed as Persons who did not doubt of the truth or excellency of the Gospel, ought to be, therefore they boldly preached it, and could not be deterred from so doing by any danger.

CHAP. V.

Ver. 1. Οὐδεὶς ἀνίκησε.) I don't think this is an Hypallage, whereby οὐδεὶς ἀνίκησε is put for οὐδὲ ἀνίκησε, as Beza supposed, and therefore without necessity inverted the words in his Translation. But an House of a Tabernacle is a Hebraism, for a House which, like a Tabernacle, is easily dissolved, a House that is built of Boards which may be easily taken asunder; in opposition to a House of Stone, which abides firm after its Tenant is removed. So that the Genitive σῶμα is equivalent to an Adjective, which would signify like a Tabernacle, such as σῶμασα, if it were in use, for then it might have been said, ἵππος ὁ ἐνδύωσεν ἄριστας σῶμασας κατεφύλαξε, if our earthly House, like a Tabernacle, were dissolved. Which the Greek not permitting, it is no wonder that St. Paul, after the manner of the Hebrews, supplied the place of an Adjective by a Substantive. Hippocrates in Aphorismis: ἡμῶν ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς σώματος ἁγίης, the Soul having left the Tabernacle of the Body.

Ver. 10. Note a. The Vulgar Interpreter read also τὰ ἔδρα, as appears by his translating it præpropriis, and the sense is not improper; but have a care of thinking that σῶμα signifies a Man himself. See what our Author has said about that matter on Rom. vi. 6. and what I have there objected against him.

Ver. 11. Note b. To ἔδρα be often joined with a great opinion of the Person who persuades; and he that desires to persuade, must above all things endeavour to get the approbation and good opinion of his Hearers; yet the use of the Greek Language will not permit
that word to be taken in the sense which our Author here fixes upon it. The Accusative case to the Verb μιθητι, which must be repeated from what goes before. The sense is: knowing how much the judgment of God ought to be feared, we persuade others to fear it, that we may induce them to a Holy Life; of which God is our witness, and you also, if I am not mistaken, conscious. Nor is it to be expected that the Doctor will anywhere prove that μιθητι signifies any thing but to persuade. It is common with him to impose significations upon words, collected from mere uncertain reasonings; whereas use is that which ought to be principally regarded, and nothing else, when a word may be conveniently taken in its usual sense. Nothing is more dangerous than those kind of reasonings, which ought never to be recurred to, but when it is impossible to apply the ordinary significations of words to any particular places in which they occur.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 2. I have already elsewhere said, that out of Judaea the Christians had no reason to fear the Jews, in those times; and therefore the day of Salvation here cannot reasonably be referred to the Jews, the Apostle writing to Persons that lived in Achaia. But Grotius and others more fitly understand it of eternal Salvation. But I am not against thinking that the Apostle here opposes his own and the rest of the Apostles Life, to the ill Manners and Effeminacy of false Teachers; provided the 2d verse be not interpreted of a Deliverance from them, by a sudden destruction which was to befall them. For what deliverance could this be from Heretics, when the Heathen Persecutions daily increased from this time, throughout all the Roman Empire?

Ver. 14. Note b. Our learned Author, who finds fault with Budaeus and Stephanus for taking up with a conjecture, rather than attending to the use of the word, ought to have produced a place in which the Verb μιθητι signifies to incline to one part more than another; not a single passage out of Phocylides, where the Noun μιθητι signifies an uneven balance. For if the signification of the Verb must necessarily be deduced from the Noun μιθητι, by the same reason I will derive it from another signification of the same word, viz. for of another kind. In which sense it is used by the Septuagint in Levit. xix. 19. where for, thou shalt not let thy Cattle gender with a diverse kind, they read, τὰ ἄγγελα ἐπὶ ἅπασαν ἄγγελαν. And so ἄγγελοι will be, by joining themselves to Unbelievers, to mix with another sort of Men,
Chapter VII.

St. Paul seems to have had a respect to that Law in Lev. It's certain at least that Moses by that Symbolical Law signified the same which the Apostle here forbids, as I have shewn in my Notes on that place. But why are Cattel of a different Species called ἐνέκυψατο; namely, because they do not use to be joined together in the same yoke ὧδ' εἰς κύμαν. So saith Hesychius: ἐνέκυψαν, οἱ μὲν αὐτῷ κυρίων, οἱ δὲ συνεργάζεσθαι, οὐκ οὐκ εἶναι συνεργαίοις. And on the other hand, γάμος a Wife is by the same Grammarians called ἐνέκυψα, because she is linked together in the same Yoke with her Husband.

This Interpretation is more natural than that of the learned M. Melibomius, in Lib. de Fabrica Triremium, p. 37. where he renders this place; do not strive with Unbelievers, viz. like Rowers who endeavor by unequal force of rowing to pull the Vessel to one Side. But what he says is worth our reading, tho' it be much more simple and agreeable to the scope of the Apostle to interpret ἐνέκυψαν ὧδ' ἐνίοτε κύμαν, to yoke themselves with Infidels, so as that ἐνέκυψα, which is in the composition of this Verb, be not opposed to the yoke of Unbelievers, but to the Yoke of Christ.

CHAP. VII.

Ver. 2. E ingressorum.] That is, as it is rightly rendred by Beza, quæstui habituus, made gain of them. Our Author's interpretation I have confuted on the place of the Epistle to the Romans referred to in his Paraphrase.

Ver. 8. Note a. Unless our Author had here look'd for Church Censures of all kinds, he would not have had one word to lay upon this Chapter; but with all due respect to the Memory of so great a Man be it said, he had better have said nothing than wrested the Apostle's words at such a rate.

1. He should not have said indefinitely that the Greeks used the word ἐν ἐν ἐν ἐν to signify a short space of time, but only the latter Greeks, as it is said by Grotsius, from whom he took this remark, but should have better transcribed him. And the latter Greeks, as the same learned Man thinks, borrowed the word in that signification from the Latins. So it is taken in Horace, Sat. 1. Lib. 1.

---

Horace

Momento vita mortis venit aut victoria latea.
II. The Verb ἄγω here does not signify to excommunicate, but to Chapter grieve by severe Reproofs, as I have already observed on 2 Cor. v. 2. And the Corinthians are said to have been grieved for a short time by St. Paul's reproofs, because they were sensible they had deserved them; but when they had a little while after seen that they whom St. Paul had particularly aimed at in those reproofs became sober and penitent, they rejoiced that the reasonable severity of the Apostle had so good an effect upon them. St. Paul has no reference here to Excommunication, nor must delivering to Satan be confounded with Excommunication, a Punishment peculiar to the Apostles times, but afterwards unknown, as I have on 1 Cor. v. observed.

III. It's true indeed there are others besides the incestuous Person here referred to; but that they had the Censures of the Church inflicted upon them, is not said by the Apostle, nor so much as intimated, but only that they were at first so far as there had been such Disorders committed among them, as gave St. Paul just reason to reprehend them; and afterwards rejoiced that they had been reclaimed by his reproofs from those sinful practices. There is no regard here had to Excommunication, inflicted either for a longer or a shorter space of time.

Verf. 9. Ἐν Πολυφύλετος] Our Author goes on in his Paraphrase to interpret this word of excommunication, contrary to the Rules of Grammar: For who does not see that, to sorrow to Repentance, is to be grieved so for what we have done amiss, as to forbear offending for the future? Obstinate Persons are troubled indeed when their Sins are reproved, but they are not troubled because they have sinned, they are troubled only because they are reproved. And therefore they are angry with those who reprehend them, and never think of reforming their evil Practices. But Persons of a yielding Temper are not sorry that they are reprehended, but that they have sinned, and therefore they take it well of those who reprove them for their faults, and carefully abstain from them ever after. And this Sorrow St. Paul here calls ἄρετας ἡμαῖρα στοματική.

Ibid. Ἐν Πολυφύλετος [προέδρου ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.] That is, so as not to think that you suffered any loss of Reputation by my severity in reproving you; quite otherwise than obstinate Men would do, who would have cried out that they were injured and defamed, without ever becoming better.

Verf. 10. Ἡ γὰρ ἔστιν ἄλλοι ἡμῶν, &c.] An excellent sentence is here quite spoiled by our Author, and turned into an empty sound of words, by his wrestling the words of the Apostle. ἄλλοι ἡμῶν faith he, is the Discipline of the Church, and ἄλλοι ἡμῶν are punishments inflicted by Men. Who,
Chapter VIII. Who will endure such an Interpretation as this, so distant from the literal sense of the words, especially when a very good and excellent one arises from a Grammatical Explication of them? For the meaning of St. Paul is this, "That a Sorrow agreeable to the Divine Will, such as is the Sorrow of all good Men, worketh Reformation of Manners, and consequently Life; but the Sorrow of worldly minded Persons makes them but sin the more, and that brings eternal Death upon them, the just reward of obstinate and incorrigible Offenders. For, as I have already said, good Men are sorry that they have sinned, bad Men that they are discovered and reproved; the former upon Reproof amend, but these latter grow but the more hardy (tho' perhaps more close) in sinning.

CHAP. VIII.

Ver. 2. [παρεντ.\] That is, of Liberality, the original of which phrase I have set down on Rom. xii. 8.

Ver. 10. Note a. I cannot persuade my self that St. Paul would say, ye have begun not only to do, but also to will, in the same sense as he would have said, ye have begun not only to will but also to do; nor is there any example of such an inversion. So that I had rather, with Dr. Hammond, enquire for some other notion to fix hereupon this word Will; and because it is common with us to do some things, especially in acts of Charity, with some kind of regret and not heartily, in vino demiserunt, as Homer speaks, interpret it of a cheerful and liberal Mind, and so make the sense to be: Ye have not only from a Year ago begun to contribute a sum of Mony, but also as to your manner of doing it, it was not by compulsion, or the bare importunate persuasion of those whom you could not deny, but with a ready, cheerful and charitable Mind: Without which qualification, the liberality which any Man exercises is \\textit{παρεντ.\ }} against his Will, and becomes unacceptable, so that those who receive a Benefit from one who is not heartily in bestowing it, had almost rather not receive it at all, as esteeming more the Will of the giver than the Gift it self. And if it be so sometimes among Men, with God it is always so, who has ever a greater regard to the Disposition with which a Man gives, than what he gives. St. Paul therefore might aptly subjoin a word, which signified the affection of the Persons who gave; to a word which signified their Gifts themselves; and his Discourse does not descend, but ascend. Seneca has a great deal to this purpose in the beginning of his Lib. 2. de Beneficiis, and elsewhere in the same Book. This interpretation
terpretation is confirmed by the following Verf. and the beginning of Chapter the sixth Chapter.

Verf. 19. This our Author must needs understand of a Synod and Bishops, as if some Churches could not by Letters declarative of their Mind, have agreed about sending a particular Person along with St. Paul. I should rather have used general words, because it in no wise appears that this matter was determin'd in a Synod. The same Person that is here intended, is afterwards, verf. 23. called διά τοῦ ἀνεμού, that is, one deputed by the Churches to accompany St. Paul in his Travels, and ease him of part of his work. Of this see the learned Mr. Dodwell in Dissert. Cyprian. 6. S. 17.

Verf. 23. Διὰ τοῦ ἀνεμοῦ. That is, instruments, faith Grotius, of the glory of Christ; viz. in advancing the Gospel, faith our Author in his Paraphrase. But I think it is much more natural to say, that those are here called the glory of Christ, who are an honour to Christ by the integrity and sanctity of their Life; as bad Christians are a disgrace and reproach to him. See what I have said about a like expression on 1 Cor. xi. 4.

C H A P. IX.

Verf. 2. Προσωπικά. That is, that from a whole year past they had been forward to give, and begun already to contribute. Our Author here fancies some new act of liberality in the Corinthians, as if they had already before sent a sum of Money to Judea, which is no where intimated by St. Paul. This opinion of his proceeded from misunderstanding the 10th verse of Chap. viii. on which see my Note. St. Paul had not told the Macedonians, that the Corinthians had a year ago got ready a sum of Money to send to Judea, which he knew to be false; but that they had begun to contribute from that time, and were so forward and cheerful in their Contributions, that the whole Sum expected from them would easily be completed. So that the word προσωπικά here must be referred to a readiness of Mind. To which it is very properly applied: Gratissima (faith Seneca de Beneficiis Lib. 2. c. 1.) sunt beneficia PARATA, facile occurrentia ubi nulla mora fuit, nisi in accipientis verecundia. Those Benefits are most grateful which are READILY bestowed, that come easily from a Man, and as it were of their own accord; and if there be any hesitation, it is on be part of the bashful receiver.
Chapter IX.

Ver. 8. Διδοὺς δὲ Σαμ. Our Author interprets what St. Paul here says that God was able to do, so as if he had said he would certainly do it; and thence he infers that Riches are promised to the liberal, even under the Gospel. But the promises of the Gospel respecting all of them, the Soul and a future State, as appears both by the nature of the Evangelical Covenant, and innumerable places in the Gospels, it is not necessary to represent St. Paul as saying here what he did not say. Nay he seems to have on set purpose spoken cautiously, when he said Διδοὺς δὲ Σαμ., and not παραδότος, he will make to abound; because God does not promise, or give such things under the Gospel but for certain reasons, which are many times unknown to us. And if he does not give them; we have no cause to complain, because he has not promised them, and those things which he gives us are infinitely more valuable. But does not the Apostle, you will say, pray to God that he would reward the bounty of the Corinthians, by bestowing upon them greater Riches? I acknowledge he does, but it does not therefore follow that God has promised to make the bountiful always rich, but only that this is sometimes done by him, and that it is lawful to pray for it, because we may desire Riches both for our selves and others, on this condition, that we make a good use of them. So that all that our learned Author says about Riches being promised under the Gospel to the liberal, is insignificant, and, to speak the truth, more worthy of those who affirm Riches to be a mark of the true Church, than of Dr. Hammond.

Ver. 9. Ἑκάστου, τοῦτο, &c.] These words only, which are alluded by St. Paul, ought to have been urged, and not others which he omits: For otherwise it is not the Apostle, but Dr. Hammond that here reasons, who groundlessly infers from hence that Riches are promised in the New Testament. The place which he refers to in his Annotation on the foregoing Verse, viz. Mat. xix. 29. does not prove that good Men shall be made rich in this World, or receive again their Kindred and Friends, and other things of the same nature, which they have forsworn for Christ; but only what will be, ἵσταται ἄγαθον ἀγαθόν, an hundred-fold better in the room of them, viz. a Mind contented with its present State, and the sure hopes of eternal Happiness. So that what our Author infers from the Passage alluded here out of the Psalms, has no foundation, and cannot be attributed to St. Paul.

Ver. 11. Ἐν μιᾷ ἑκάστῳ ἐπιλογῇ.] See before Chap. viii. 2. and my Note on Rom. xii. 8.
II. CORINTHIANS.

CHAP. X.

Ver. 4. I. Do not at all doubt, but that St. Paul here speaks, as Grotius before our Author had observed, of that Rod with which he had chastised Elymas, the incestuous Person, Hymenæus and Philetec, and with which St. Peter had chastized Ananias and Sapphira; but I confess I cannot digest what Dr. Hammond here and elsewhere does, viz. the confounding of that miraculous Power of the Apostles with the ordinary Excommunication of Bishops. He ought to have proved first, that that delivering to Satan, or any other such Punishments inflicted by the Apostles, were the arms not only of the Apostles, but of all the Governors of the Christian Church; which he neither ever did before his Death, nor, I believe, would ever do if he were to live again. This was a Seal which God set to the Apostles Doctrine, to fix the Christian Church upon a lasting and immovable Foundation; and all the rest of the Miracles wrought in the Apostles time were designed to the same end: But that being once settled, no Man had such a Power granted him, nor can any one be supposed to have had the like Authority.

II. However, it is well observed by the Doctor, that carnal here is all one with weak, which I shall confirm both by Reason and Examples. The Flesh is very often opposed to the Spirit, that is, the Body to the Soul, in which comparison the Flesh is the most infirm and feeble; and hence the word carnal came to signify weak, as it is used in Isa. xxxi. 3. where the Prophet thus bespeaks the Jews, who put too much confidence in the Egyptians: The Egyptians are Men and not God, and their Horses Flesh and not Spirit; the Lord shall turn his Hand, and be that helpeth shall fall, and be that holpen shall fall down, and they shall all be consumed together. To this purpose also is that saying of Christ in Mat. xxvi. 41. The Spirit indeed is willing, but the Flesh is weak.

III. Tho καθαίρεσις signifies sometimes Excommunication in the Writings of the Fathers, and ὀργανά may very aptly be applied to a Mind full of Pride and Obstnacity, and by those Vices fortified against the Truth; yet it in no wise follows that καθαίρεσις ὀργανά signifies the Excommunication of an obdurate Sinner. What words do or may separately signify, they do not always signify conjunctly, as every one knows, who is anything of a Critick in this sort of Learning. The reason is, because one Phrase can have but one metaphorical sense belonging to it, and ὀργανά being properly a strong Hold or Fence, and here translated to signify whatever Flesh and Blood puts in the way of the
Chapter X.
The Gospel, to hinder the success and efficacy of it; it is necessary that καθαίρων εἰσχειρίας & καθαίρων εἰσχειρίας should be rendered the destruction of the Fence, and to destroy the Fence, by a Metaphor taken from Military Affairs. So in ver. 5. λαγόμυς καθαίρων is not to excommunicate those that reason, but to overthrew reasonings. Nor let any one say that Fences are destroyed, and Reasonings overthrown by Excommunication; for granting that, yet it will not follow that the Verb καθαίρων and the Noun καθαίρων in these Phrases signify to excommunicate and excommunication.

IV. It is a pleasant mistake also in our Author, which his too great desirousness to find Excommunication everywhere where spoken of in the Writings of the Apostles led him into, when he says that καθαίρων in ver. 8. signifies Excommunication, where St. Paul faith that he might boast of the Power which God had given him for edification, and not for destruction, εἰς εἰκόνες τῷ ἐν εἰς καθαίρων. For who does not see that the opposite here to the Edification of the House of God, is not excommunication but destruction? One may as well say an Edifice is excommunicated, meaning that it is destroyed, as that an excommunicated Person is edified, to signify that his Sins are forgiven him. The same must be said of Chap. xii. 10. where the same Phrase occurs.

V. Even in Ecclesiastical Writers, καθαίρων does not properly signify Excommunication, but only Abdication or degrading from Office, and is applied to Clergymen; nor is it always joined with Excommunication. See Int. on the Eleventh Apostolical Canon.

Verf. 5. λαγόμυς καθαίρων.] Our Author intrudes again into this place the Censures of the Church without any distinction, whereas those Apostolical Arms, of which I before spake, are here intended. And indeed with whatever Arguments any Philosopher came armed, or what sublimity ever his Reasonings seemed to have in them; if he attempted to disturb the Church by Heretical Doctrins, and went to resist the Apostles, as if he had found them in an error; the Apostles could presently shew how much he was mistaken, by sending a Disease upon him, such as Blindness, which St. Paul inflicted on Eliymas, or delivering to Satan, to which others were subjected. For these were plain signs, by which it appeared that God approved of the Apostles Doctrin. But in ordinary Excommunication the case is otherwise: For all that can be concluded from that is, that when any one upon the springing up of some new Controversies, was excommunicated for disagreeing with the Bishop of the Church to which he belonged, the Bishop and the rest perhaps of the Clergy were of another Opinion; which might as easily be the worse of the two as the better.
better. For Excommunication was a certain evidence of Mens differing among themselves, but not that the excommunicate Person was in an error; because one that had the Truth on his side, might be excommunicated by ignorant and prejudiced Persons. But if any were chastised in the manner aforesaid by the Apostles, viz. by having a Disease inflicted on their Bodies, this was an infallible proof of their being Heretics; because God would not have suffered any pious orthodox Person to undergo a Punishment which he had not at all deserved. Besides, that a Miracle wrought in confirmation of any Doctrin, such as this was, the present inflicting of a Distemper upon Mens Bodies, was of it self sufficient to shew the falseness of any thing advanced in contradiction to it, tho' with some appearance of probability; but certainly the Excommunication of any Bishop, who might as easily abuse his Authority, as others fall into Error, was no sure evidence of any Man's being an Heretick. These two things therefore must not be confounded, nor the ordinary Governours of the Church equal'd to the Apostles in their Censures, any more than in other Gifts and Endowments, as our Author occultly does, whether designedly and knowingly I cannot tell, but I am sure without reason.

**CHAP. XI.**

*Verse 2.* I. **The first signification which our Author produces out of Pollux, sutes best with this place, for St. Paul does not say simply that he was an ἀγαμάτως, or did ἀγάματι ἤπατον ἁρκοιμάν, but ἰδού ἐκμακρύνει αὐτόν, which cannot otherwise be rendered than I have espoused you to one Man or Husband. Which words we rightly read with a Comma after them, which cannot be transferred after the Verb ἐγαμάτησας, but absurdly, so that I wonder Dr. Hammond should judge that to be the best punctation. The following words παρέδωκας ἐκμακρύνει ἁρκοιμάν της χείρι, ought, as they are rightly by Grotius, to be rendered, that I may present or deliver you a chaste Virgin to Christ. A Virgin is first espoused to one Man, and afterwards she is delivered to him. And because it was possible, and sometimes also happen'd, that a Virgin who was espoused to any Man, upon intervening Strifes, or for some other reason was given in Marriage to another, and that between her Espousals and Marriage she might be vitiated; St. Paul says, I have espoused you to one Man, even Christ, and I never intended that this Match should be broken off, or suffered you to be privately corrupted by any other, but have done my utmost to keep you pure, that I might present you a chaste Virgin to him.*
Chapter XI. Of those things which might fall out between Esposals and Marriage, we may read Interpreters on Mat. i. 18. Now the Christian Church in this World seems to be only espoused to Christ, and the Marriage between them not to be celebrated till all other things are consummated: so that many things may fall out between that spiritual Espousing and Marriage, and really do so, whereby the Church which is espoused to Christ is vitiated and defiled, or sometimes also married to another. The Corinthian Church was by St. Paul espoused to Christ; but before he presented it, and delivered it as it were into his hand, false Apostles might allure it again to the love of Heathenism, or wed it to another opinion almost as bad as that, by which means the Esposals of that Church would have been made of none effect.

II. The Doctor does not seem sufficiently to have distinguished between the nuptial Solemnity and Esposals, because he alludes a passage out of Cinnamus, where the Discourse is about the marriage Solemnity, which he immediately subjoins to the place cited out of Polux, as parallel to it. He had better have produced some examples out of Herodotus, in which the word ἐσμοιαῖος clearly signifies to espouse, and which have the more agreement with this matter, because the Virgin of which that Historian speaks, were not as yet delivered to their intended Husbands, the very thing which St. Paul was solicitous about, as to the spiritual Marriage of the Corinthian Church with Christ. And he in Lib. 5. c. 47. Speaks thus about one Philip the Son of Bacchidas: ἂμοιαῖος ἔκ τινος ἱερου ἐς Συκαμίουν ὑματίσει, ἐπιθυμεῖ μέν ἐκ Κεστονθεί. Πρώτος ἔγερσεν ἰς γάμος ἐκτῆτο ἀλλά ἐκ Κυκλίν: having espoused the Daughter of Telys a Sybarite, he fled from Croton, and being disappointed of the Marriage, he failed to Cyrene. And Lib. 6. c. 65. Ἀμοιαῖοι ζητοῦσιν Ἀθηναίων ἡγεμόνων ἐν τῷ χιλείῳ ἐκ τῆς Συκαμίου: οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐπεβαίνουσα οὐστεῖ Λαμπρῶς τῷ Λεοντίνῳ, πῆλος ἀνείπνει, τῷ Πέργαμῳ ἐγέρσαι, ἔχει γυναῖκα: when Percaia the Daughter of Chilo the Son of Demarmenes had been espoused to Leutychides, Demaratus by Treachery deprived Leutychides of the Marriage, coming himself and taking away Percaia and marrying her. And Lib. 9. c. 107. Speaking of Xenes, who espoused at Sardis the Daughter of his Brother Mases, he saith: ἂμοιαῖος ἦν ἐς τὰ συμβολαίαν, ἀπένδειον εἰς ἄρα ἐκίνησε αὖ ἐπίσκεps ἐκ τῇ ἐνακτεῖ ἐν τῇ Δαείᾳ τῷ γυναῖκε. Having espoused her, and performed what was customary, he went to Susa: And being come thither, and having led home to Darius his Wife, &c. By these examples it appears that St. Paul may properly enough be said ἐσμοιαῖω to have espoused the Corinthians to Christ; seeing that word is applied as well to a Guardian, or him that espouses, as to the Man to whom a
Virgin is espoused. Nor is there any other Notion of this word to be look’d for, where the Discourse is about Marriage, this being then the perpetual signification of it; tho if St. Paul had spoken of any thing else, it might perhaps be said that he had a respect to the custom of the Lacedaemonians, which our Author now unnecessarily supposes.

Verse 6. Ἐν ᾧ ἰδιώται λόγοι, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ γνώσει.] The word λόγος in this place signifies a stile or faculty of speaking, as it is opposed to knowledge in the Mind. As there are Persons of no great Learning, who yet are skilful in the art of speaking; so on the other hand there are a great many learned Men, who are unhappy in expressing their Conceptions, in which number St. Paul here reckons himself. For ἰδιώται signifies one of the vulgar sort, a Person of no polite Learning. And agreeably ἰδιωτικώς, and ἰδιωτικῶς λέγεται are Phrases vulgarly used among the common People. But here we must carefully distinguish things from words and their oratorical Disposition; for things in themselves very excellent, may be expressed ἰδιωτικῶς, tho those ἰδιωτικώς be not elegant, and ἰδιωτικῶς disposed, tho the disposition be improper. In respect of knowledge the Apostle Paul was not ἰδιωτικῶς rude or ignorant; but he does not deny but his stile was ἰδιωτικῶς. Which because learned Men have not sufficiently understood; but have confounded things with words, I shall insist on a little more at large.

Orators differ in three things from the illiterate Vulgar, in discourseing upon any Subject. First, in Invention and choice of matter, in which they far surpass the ordinary sort of People; but this I need not treat of, the Discourse here being about Eloquence. Secondly, in Disposition, the rules of which are laid down by Rhetoricians; and are unknown to the Vulgar. Thirdly, in Eloquence, or choice of words and Sentences: And as to these two last, Idiots never equal Orators unless it be by chance, and in a very short Discourse. So that ἰδιωτικῶς λόγος is a Stile or Discourse, in which neither the Laws of Disposition nor Eloquence, such as are laid down by the Masters of Rhetorick, are observed; tho it be otherwise full of excellent Sentences, and shew the Speaker to have a great measure of Wisdom and Knowledge.

In Diogenes Laertius in Platonic § 87. according to the opinion of Plato, ὁ λόγος ἰδιωτικός ἐστὶν ποιτήτης, ὅπως ἐν τῇ ἰδιωτικῇ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ποιτήτῃ ἐλεγχόμενος ἐν τῇ ἰδιωτικῇ ἐπέδρασσε, ἔν ἰδιωτικῇ ποιτήτῃ. Discourse or Stile is divided into five kinds, whereof one is that which the Administrators of the Commonwealth make use of in publick Assemblies, and is called Political. Of this kind is the Stile of Demosthenes and other Orators, whose Employment lay in pleading at Court. Εἴπεται δ' ἵνα ἔργον ἐστὶν ὁ ποιτήτης, ἐπεὶ ἵνα ἐν τῷ ἱμηρίῳ ἐν τῇ ἰδιωτικῇ, ἐν τῇ ἰδιωτικῇ αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ καθημερινῇ. Τὸ τε τῷ τούτῳ καθημερινῷ ποιεῖται. Another kind
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Stile is that which is used by Rhetoricians, and is for ostentation, in which are written Encomiums, and satyrical Discourses and Accusations; and this kind we term Rhetorical. Such is the Stile of Isocrates, and other Rhetoricians, who spent all their time in Schools. This latter kind has more of Grace and Ornament in it than the former, otherwise there is no difference between them. 

Τείτα το ποιήσας λόγος, ἐν ὧν ὁ Ισόκρατης ἔριξεν ἑαυτόν, δὴ καὶ ἐπίστας ἐκεῖνος Ἰσοκράτης: A third kind of Stile is that which Idiots, or illiterate Persons, use in common discourse; and this is called Idiottick. That is the Stile which I before described, and which is used by St. Paul. And it is not opposed only to the painted Eloquence of Rhetoricians, but also to the Elegance of Politicians, to whose Stile that of the Vulgar is much inferior. This as to St. Paul, and the other Writers of the New Testament, has been shewn at large by C. Salmasius in Comment. de Lingua Hellen. Sect. 2.

The other kinds of discourse mention'd by Diogenes I omit, because they are not to our present purpose.

But when I say that a Rhetorical or Political Stile excels that of the Vulgar or Idiota, my meaning is not that it surpassed it only in Ornaments, which do not belong to the Matter, but also in Disposition and Propriety of words, which very much contribute to the peripety of any Discourse. For which reason, one that is skilful in the Greek Language may much more easily understand Demosthenes or Isocrates, than St. Paul; not only because the Stile of this latter has abundance of Hebrew Idioms in it, but because the order of his Sentences is many times inverted, his Phrases and Terms improper, and his Metaphors harsh. As Diogenes Laertius also, who wrote in an Idiottick Stile, and had no great regard to order or choice of words, is in many places very hard to understand. And such are, among the Greek Fathers, Epiphanius, and the Author Historiae Lausiaca, in whose Writings often occur the like difficulties, proceeding from negligence of Stile.

Which being so, I cannot sufficiently wonder why Beza was so angry with St. Jerom, because he did not admire St. Paul's Eloquence, which setting aside his Matter, and considering only his Words, was certainly none at all. But let us hear Beza himself: Quidigitur, siquidem, an imperitus loquendi Paulus, & elinguis, ut Hieronymus eximiat? What then, did not St. Paul know how to express himself, or had he not the use of his Tongue, as St. Jerom thinks? No, he was not so perfectly tongue-tied neither, that the Substance of his Discourse and Doctrine cannot be understood; but his Stile is so clear, nor his Expression so elegant, as to make every thing that he says easy, or pleasant to critical
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St. Paul did not aim at that disposition in his Words which might facilitate the understanding of a thing in itself obscure, or render his Discourse more plain and perspicuous: which Beza very well knew, and no one can be ignorant of. Who has read but St. Paul's Epistles in Greek. But Beza goes on, and states: *Imo vero Chrysostomum potius, & doctissimos quoque ex Graecis, ipsum denique rationem sequitus, quamvis nativa ilia & germana masculae facundiae ornamenti ipsi videri possint non defuisse, fateror tamen illum lucis illius rhetorices pigmentis uti noluisse.*

The rather following St. Chrysostom, and the most learned among the Greeks, and Reason it self, tho' those native and genuine Ornaments of masculine Eloquence seem not to have been wanting in him; yet I confess he uses none of those colours of false Rhetorick. But a clear way of speaking, to begin with his last Words, and disposing everything we say in its right order, is no fucus. That artifice of those Rhetoricians who endeavor to magnify by words, things that are in themselves inconsiderable, or skim over those that are base, may properly be stiled fucus, daubing; but not apt Expressions, or soft Metaphors, and an orderly disposition of every part in a Discourse; in which the Speaker has no other end than to make himself easily understood, and carefully to avoid all Ambiguity, which might lead his Hearers into a mistake. And St. Paul's stile is not only without fucus, but deficient also in these things, which are not indescernible: So that if we follow reason, we shall never say that St. Paul was eloquent; provided it be remembred we are speaking of words, or disposition, and not of matter. That St. Paul's matter is praised by St. Chrysostom, and other Greek Fathers, and preferred before all the Arguments which the antient Greeks have treated of, I know, and none but a Mad-man will deny: but that they commended his Style, or the Order of his Words and Sentences as clear and elegant, I do not think; and if I did, their Authority would not move me, because the contrary is so manifest. But they were not altogether void of Understanding, as to attribute that Eloquence to St. Paul which he himself disclaims. Nor does Beza himself disagree with me in this matter, when he adds, that St. Paul would not make use of Rhetorick, *Ut vi spiritus hominum animos ad Christum raperet, non autem Sermonis blanditiae, adulatocii more aliquiet.* That he might bring men to Christ by the Power of the Spirit, and not allure them after the manner of a Flatterer, by smoothness of Speech. Which is as much as if he had said, Those who are affected with what St. Paul says, are affected with his Matter, not with his Words or Expression, as being brought by the Spirit of God to an Enquiry and Love of the Truth, tho' deliver'd in a rude stile.
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He adds: **Cum orationis ipsius totam indolem & characterem propriam considero, &c. When I more narrowly consider the whole strain and form of his (the Apostles) discourse, I must needs say I never could see any such loftiness in Plato himself, when ever he undertakes to thunder out the mysteries of God; any such divine Majesty or Force in Demosthenes, when ever he applies himself either to terrify men with the fear of the divine judgment, or to admonish them, or to draw them to contemplate the goodness of God, or to exhort them to the duties of piety and mercy; or lastly a more exact method in teaching, even in Aristotle or Galen, who were otherwise very excellent and skilful artists. If we consider the things themselves, I acknowledge all this to be very true, but we are speaking now about stile and order of discourse; in which as those authors mentioned by Beza were superior to St. Paul, so as to things themselves they are vastly inferior. Yet I do not deny but there occur even in St. Paul also, some sentences admirably well expressed, but then they are but rare, and his stile is for the most part barbarous, as the speech of Idiota uses to be. But as things of small moment in themselves being set off with rhetorical colours, are and have been often admired; so on the other hand, things of the greatest importance have many times made an obscure and ill ordered discourse to be extolled; whereas those two things should be distinguished and separately consider'd.

I have been the larger upon these things, that I might shew in what sense, and how truly the Apostle here calls himself *idiota noster*; and what I have said may be of exceeding use to direct us in the interpretation of these books; for knowing that they are written in a rude stile, we must not go about to anatomize every single word or expression in them, or examin all that is said with a kind of geometrical exactness, which the nature of an idiotic stile will not bear, which regards things only in general, and not every minute or particular circumstance; nor may we deduce too rigorous conclusions from any phrases used in these writings, which those who speak rudely never think of. We must have always before our eyes the substance of the gospel, and the main design of the speaker; and by that his expressions must be explained, rather than by an over-nice and subtle scanning of every word. But this is a subject which would require a whole volume to treat of it as it deserves; in this place it may suffice to have touched briefly upon the chief heads.

Ver. 9. Note b. It is certain that *naturae* signifies to be burdensome, esse oneri, as it is render'd in the vulgar, or something like it, that signifies a man's living upon another's charity. But the only difficulty
faculty is how the word καταραχή comes to have this signification. The Doctor conjectures that it is to ask or importune, because they that ask any thing of another, cause a chiness or numness in those whom they ask. But this is harsh and forced: The passage which he refers to in Seneca is in Lib. 2. de Beneficiis, c. 2. But Seneca does not speak of a Person of whom any thing is asked, but that asks; and therefore that passage is nothing to the purpose: Molestum verum est, faith he, onerosum, & demissum vultu dieendum, Rogo: I ask, is a troublesom and burdensom word, and must be spoken with a submissive look. I had rather say that καταραχή is to be burdensom, because those who are benumbed with a Disease, are much heavier than ordinary, whence by a Metaphor it was used to signify to be a burden to others through Poverty. Whence St. Paul elsewhere expressing the same thing, uses the word σαλαθίου. 1 Thess. ii. 9. For ye remember, Brethren, our labour and travel: for working night and day, because we would not burden any of you, οὕτος θέλοντες γα宜昌 ὑμᾶς, we preached unto you the Gospel of God. See likewise 2 Thess. iii. 8. This Interpretation is confirmed by the opposition which is made in this very Verse between καταραχή and ἀλαθίον ὑμῶν, to keep himself from being burdensom.

Verf. 22. Εἰσίν εἷς; καὶ μή γρογολατήσαι εἷς; καὶ μή γρογολατήσαι Ἅρματα εἷς; καὶ μή. The false Apostles with wonderful haughtiness, boasted that they were Hebrews, that they were Israelites, that they were the Seed of Abraham; the very same thing expressed several ways, for Emphatic sake; which St. Paul here, to shew the vanity of that empty, vain-glorious boasting, imitates. Quanquam eadem veres funt, & unde sententia coeniuitur, plura tamen esse exiitamentur, quotinam aures & animum fœius fieriunt: Tho they are almost the same things, and come all to one sense, yet they are thought to be many, because they strike several times upon the ears and mind, faith Favorinus in Gellius, Lib. i. 2. c. 24. where he gives us several Examples of such Repetitions out of the best Authors both Greek and Latin.

Verf. 24. Note c. It is manifest that our Author had not look'd into the Passage which he cites out of Josephus, in the Historian himself, because he allitudes it but by halves, and translates it absurdly: It is in Lib. 4. c. 8. in these words: Εἴ τις τολμῇ, καὶ αἵματι ἐπηρεάσῃ αὐτόν οὐκ ἀδικήν ὑποθάληται, αἵματα τραυματίζῃ μᾶς ἡ διώκειν λαμβάνων: For his bold and rash Accusation and Calumny, let him suffer punishment, receiving forty stripes save one. Our Author absurdly renders the word ἐκτείνω, let him extend himself, as if it were ἐκτείνω, which would be a corrupt reading, if it were any where extant, because there is nothing that can be referred to the word ἐκτείνω, except
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Vers. 25. Note d. Since several other hardships, which St. Paul here says he had undergone, as his being thrice scourged by the Jews, &c. are not mentioned by St. Luke, I do not doubt but he has omitted also this of his having been in the Deep. And hence it may be infer'd, that Arguments drawn from St. Luke's silence about any thing are not very strong, because he has not written an entire History of St. Paul's Actions, even for the time that his History refers to.

Vers. 32. Note e. Mr. Pocock in his Notes on Greg. Abul-Farajius his History of the People and Customs of the Arabians, p. 77. acknowledges that many of the Gassanii were called Harethi, or Arte; but he tells us, he never observed that all the Arabian Chiefs were so styled by them, as Jos. Scaliger affirmed. But Scaliger does not speak of the Kings of Damascus, but of the Hagarens, whose strongest Fort was Petra. See Lib. 2. de Emend. Temp. p. 111. Ed. Roveriana.
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Vers. 2. 'Anagamous or Xerxos' is rightly here interpreted by Grotius, Note a. a Christian, whom our Author ought to have followed, since there are manifest Instances of this Phrase in that sense, as I have shewn on Rom. xii. 5. It is a thing to be wonder'd at, that Dr. Hammond in his Paraphrase on Rom. xvi. has not once rightly interpreted this Phrase. The Examples which he here alleges, are perfectly forein to his purpose, and all the likenesses between them is only in the Particle iv.

Vers. 7. Note b. If St. Paul had said simply, that there was given to him a Messenger of Satan, that thrust a aowelTwig in his Flesh, I should easily believe that this passage were rightly understood by Dr. Hammond and other Expositors, of some Persecutions which St. Paul suffered. But see the he says, there was given me a Twig in his Flesh, a Messenger of Satan to buffet me; I rather think a molestation from some particular evil Spirit in here meant, who continually afflicted him, and put him to as great pain as if he had thrust a Twig into his Flesh, and brought as much contempt upon him as if he had been buffeted; St. Paul not being ignorant of the cause of his suffering so many Evils. And because it is before said, Least the greatness of the Revelations should exalt me, or lest I should be lifted up above measure by the excellency of the Revelations: I am apt to think that the word ἐξοιλάματι is an allusion to some very sharp piece of Wood, not of any sort whatever,.
ever, but one which should be placed over a Man stooping, ready Chapter
to prick him grievously when ever he rose up. Let us represent to XIII.
our selves the case of Regulus, whom the Carthaginians χανευμεν εν γά-
λαγρε παντωπ ιχον λάμβαλεν, killed by shutting him up in a Cage
that bad Goads on all sides; which are the words of Appian in Lib. i.
Which way foever he moved himself, the Goads prick'd him. And
something like this would be the case of a Man who should have some
sharp Stakes or wooden Spears hanging over him, whilst he bowed
his body, that would run into his Flesh, whenever he raised himself.
And so if St. Paul grew proud, or suffer'd himself to be puffed up
because of the Revelations which he had received from God, there
was ready at hand an evil Spirit, who had obtained permission of God
to oppose him, to torment and afflict him.

Ver. 8. Τεύτ δέ και εκατερον παρεκβάλνσα ινά σαρκι δε' επι. [These words, in
my judgment, show that it is not any sort of Persecutions stirred up
by Men against St. Paul (which he was always ready to suffer for the
sake of the Gospel), that are here spoken of; but a particular evil
Spirit, which, as it were, accompanied St. Paul, and wherever he
went, did him all the mischief he could, either of himself, or by
men as his Instruments.

Ver. 11. Νανάδωντι.] It seems then by this, that it is not always
unlawful for a Man to speak in his own praise. See Plutarch's little
Treatise de laude sui.

Ver. 21. Πονεία ο χανομεν.] Our Author thinks the Apostle has a
respect here to the unnatural lusts practised at Idol-Feasts; as if there
were no Feasts kept by the Heathens in honour of their Idol Gods.
where such Lusts were not practised, whereas it is certain that the
Heathens, especially in Greece, seldom mixed any such vile practices
with their Religious Solemnities, as I have already elsewhere more
than once observed. See on 1 Cor. v. 10. So that I rather think any
sort of unlawful Lusts whatsoever are here intended.

CHAP. XIII.

Ver. 1. I. ΤΗΟ the conjecture which our learned Author
Note a.
here proposes be ingenious; yet if it be more
narrowly examined, it will be found not to be so
probable. His principal reason why St. Paul should be thought to
have had a respect to the words of Christ in Mat. xviii. is this, that
he makes use of some part of those words, viz. In the mouth of two
or three. Witnesses every Word shall be established. But these were not
the
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The words of Christ, but of Moses in Deut. xix. 15. and St. Paul in reciting them may as well be supposed to have had a respect to that place in Moses as the other in St. Matthew: which of the two is so much the more probable, because St. Paul does not subjoin them to a discourse about Censures, but a Journey he was to make to Corinth; which now he purposed the third time, because he had been twice before disappointed. So that it is all one as if he had said: "I have twice resolved already to come to you, and yet have been frustrated in my design; but a third resolution which I have taken up about the same thing, shall not be defeated; as that which was confirmed by the testimony of three Witnesses under the Law, could not be made void. It is an adapting the words of Moses to the present business, καθὼς λέγει, as the learned Grotius observes.

II. Dr. Hammond unnecessarily joins the word άνέδειξεν, from which it is separated by the Participle ἀνέδειξεν, when from the order of the words as they now lie, arises this very commodious sense; "I have told you already before, and foretold you again, as intending to be with you a second time, and being absent I now write, that I will not spare," &c. Οἶνος here is all one with μέλλων ὀφθαλμοῖς, as Grotius observes. The Apostle had been once already at Corinth, and he intended to go thither again. The Hebrews having no future Participles, it is no wonder that St. Paul speaking after the manner of the Hebrews, uses a Greek Participle in the Present Tense for the Future. See my Notes on Gen. vi. 7. & Exod. iii. 2.

III. That passage in Mat. xviii. is supposed by our Author to belong chiefly to private Persons, and not to the Governours of the Church, to whom it is not thought that this Precept, Tell it to the Church, can be directed, without doubt, because they themselves are supposed to be the Church whereof Christ speaks; which ought to have been proved, this being not an Age wherein Men are apt to believe every thing that serves to magnify the Governours of the Church; or else it had been better to have said nothing. Of the passage in Tit. iii. 10. I shall speak when I come to it, for it is nothing to the Doctor's purpose.

Ver. 4. ἄρα εἰς ἡσυχίαν ἔστε.] Dr. Hammond refers the word ἔστε here to Christ; but the style of St. Paul shews that God the Father is intended. See Rom. iv. 24. & viii. 11. & x. 9. 1 Cor. vi. 14. & xvi. 15. 2 Cor. iv. 14.

Ver. 5. Note b. I. It may be not unfitly conjectured, that the word αὐτοῖς in this place is used in an Active sense, for one that cannot suaual prove or try, and so the sense will be: Except ye are able
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able to try things, you will know that the true Gospel has been Chapter
preached among you by a true Apostle. But I confess I have never
yet met with the word ἀποκριθείως used anywhere else in this sense.

II. I cannot tell in what Copy our Author read the Particle ἀποκριθείως cer-
tainly, for I have never read it in any. If he thought that it was an
Omission, he ought to have told us his mind. However, St. Paul's
words here are Elliptical, and signify what Dr. Hammond would have
them. It is all one as if the Apostle had said; Do ye not know that
Christ Jesus is among you? Ye must needs certainly know it, unless ye
are uncapable of trying and judging in such a case.

Ver. 11. Note c. I. Our Author in this Annotation follows those
who deduce the word ἀποκριθείως and its Derivatives from the Verb ἀποκριθείως,
that is, to fit; which derivation is not altogether so certain. But
grant it to be true, yet he should have observed that the Verb ἐπαγαλλομαι
does not immediately come from ἀποκριθείως, and therefore should have had a
greater regard to its nearest Original. From ἀποκριθείως, which signifies
entire, safe, perfected, is first made the Verb ἐπαγαλλομαι, which is properly
ἐπαγαλλομαι, to make, to perfect, as it is taken in Theocritus Idyll. 13. or
Hylæ Ver. 43. Νομοθετήσει ἐπαγαλλομαι, that is, ἐπιτείμασε danceth, faith the
Scholiast. And because those things which are designed for any par-
ticular use, ought to be ἐπαγαλλομαι, entire and perfected in their kind, or fit,
if the forementioned etymology of the word be approv'd; therefore ἐπαγαλλομαι
signifies also fit, and made ready, in Homer and Herodotus,
and ἐπαγαλλομαι in Hesychius is explained by ἐπικαταλελειπομαι, πλέω, to fit,
to gather together, to knit, and ἐπικαταλελειπομαι by ἐπιστρατεύομαι, to make,
to prepare. And so in Suidas there are two places alluded, in which
this Verb signifies, to be set in order, or prepared: One ἐπικαταλελειπομαι δειλων
τῶν συναντῶν, being set into order, they divided the Army. Ο de πᾶσιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐπι
ἐπικαταλελείπομαι, τῷ τε γετε ἐπικαταλελείπομαι, but he being subtle, and prepared for
all the uncertainties of Fortune. But the Compounds of the Verb ἐπαγαλλομαι
are much more in use, and especially the Verb ἐπαγαλλομαι.

II. The primary signification of this Verb, as of the simple, is to
make, to perfect, to finish. For which reason in Suidas it is interpret-
ted by τελεσθείως, without the addition of any other signification. But
afterwards it signified, 1. To make ready, to fit; 2. To repair, or re-
store; which significations belong as well to the Mind as to the Body:
3. To reconcile, or bring to agreement. Of all which Examples may be
had out of Lexicons, and especially Henr. Stephanus, whom I shall not
here transcribe. The same Lexicogapher has observed also that ἐπαγα-
λομαι is said by some to be used by Plutarch in the Life of Themisloclus
for institution, of which by and by. The Old Onomasticon readers

---
Chapter XIII. καταγρίζω by στιρω, ἵστρω, κονστρω, περσίκο, ρεσίκο; to build, to set in order, to join together, to perfect, to repair. I shall now apply what has been said to the Scripture Examples.

III. καταγράφων a House, a Wall, a Body, is to make or finish them, as κατακωμμέναι, not to complete them. καταγράφων λίθων is to repair or make ready Nets, to make them δείκται entire and prepared. καταγράφων αἰών is to prepare or make praise. καταγράφων μετατρέψεις is a perfect Disciple, as Βεζά in his Notes on St. Luke has shewn. καταγράφαι τειχώματα must be rended with the Vulgar, complete que desunt, to fill up what is wanting, that is, to perfect. καταγράφαί εἰς πάντα τοιαύτα is to perfect in every good work, or to render perfect and compleat in all kinds of Virtue. οὐσίαι καταγράφων εἰς ἀπόλυμα are Vessels prepared for destruction. God is said καταγράφης τοῖς αἰῶναῖς, that is, to have made the World, κατασκευάσας. In all this we meet with no such Notion of the word as that of compaeking.

IV. To discourse likewise the other places alluded in Ephes. iv. 12. καταγράφοντες αἵματος is the perfection of the Saints, or the compleatness of all its Members, so that nothing is wanting to the Church, εἰς θεωρίαν τῶν, which is necessary for the Work of the Ministry, or for the performing all Offices in the Church. In Gal. vi. 1. the Verb καταγράφω has the signification of restoring, as Dr. Hammond well observes. So, as Budæus remarks, καταγράφων signifies to put Members out of joint into their right place again; whence it might be applied to the recovering a Person whose mind is disturbed and put out of its natural posture. In this place, Chap. xiii. 9. of 2 Cor. καταγράφω is the soundness of the Body, and consequently its health; as in Hesychius ἄρσην is not only explained by δύναμις, sound or entire, but also by υράς, healthful. In 1 Cor. i. 10. καταγράφοντες signifies unanimous. I beseech you, Brethren, faith St. Paul, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no Schisms among you, but that ye be καταγράφοντες, joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment. In that signification this word is more than once used in Herodotus, as appears by Amelius Portus his Lexicon Ionicum. In which sense it seems to be here taken in Chap. xiii. 11. of 2 Ep. to the Corinth. In 1 Pet. v. 10. καταγράφοντες υἱῶν will be best rendered periction vos, make you perfect, with the Vulgar. All which being clear, if the immediate Original of the word καταγράφω, and the use of it in other Authors be attended to, I do not see why we should run to another signification deduced from a more remote Etymology, and of which no certain Instance can be alluded.

V. As for the word καταγράφως, I don't know whether it signifies just the same as καταγράφως; but there is a passage in Plutarch, in the Life of
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Themistocles, in which it seems to signify the same, as it does in the Chapter words of Hippodamus, viz. in pag. 112. Ed. Francof, where he tells us, that Themistocles used to say, τὰς τεχνήτας πάλιν δείξεις ἑαυτῷ γενέσθαι, διὰ τὸν ἔχειν τὰς παρακλήσεις κατάτησιν ἐγγενεῖ. That the fiercest Colts become the best Horses, when they have that management and bringing up which is requisite. And to this place Henr. Stephanus seems to have had a respect, tho he reads κατάστημα instead of κατάτησιν. But between these two, as there is no great difference in the sound, so neither seemingly in the signification. And therefore Dr. Hammond had no reason to think that κατάτησις in Hesychius was a corrupt reading for κατάτησι, the Verb κατάτησι being as true Greek as κατάτησι, and having that signification which Hesychius in the place alleged assigns it.

And this is abundantly sufficient to confute the little subtilties of our Author in this place, interpreting the Greek word rather by arguing, than according to use.

Verf. 14. Note d. I. From this place it may be gathered, that we ought not to dispute too subtilly from the order of words in the New Testament, since Christ is here mentioned before the Father: The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.

II. Χριστός Χριστὸς is the favour of Christ, from which all his Benefits flow; not his Liberality, properly speaking. Χριστός does not signify Charity, nor would Caritas Dei in Latin signify the Love of God to us Men, but our Love to God. I wish our Author had cited more exactly the Passage which he refers to in Cicero, by setting down the Chapter, or noting the Page, for I cannot find it; and any one that understands Latin, will presently see that it is misquoted.

III. Κοινωνία Πνεύματος I rather take to be the Communion of the Spirit, or the common fruition of Spiritual Graces, whereby all are made partakers of them. So the word Κοινωνία is taken in 1 Cor. x. 16. & Phil. ii. 3. iii. 10. & 1 John iii. 6, 7. Our Author indeed interprets Κοινωνία in Phil. ii. 1. actively also, of the Liberality of the Holy Ghost, but without reason; for who will grant him that that interpretation is rightly deduced from the following words, as if Bowels and Mercies signified Liberality? But see the Notes on that place.

E e e ANNO-
Annotations
On the Epistle
Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Galatians.

At the end of the Premon.] I. We have no certain ground to believe that those whom St. Paul confutes in this Epistle were Uncircumcised; but it is much more probable they had received Circumcision, whether they were Jews or Gentiles.

II. That the Christians had so much reason to be afraid of the Jews in Galatia, that the Gnosticks should be forced to feign themselves Jews when they were not, is not at all likely. For the Roman Magistrates, as appears by the instance of Gallio, did not give much ear to the Accusations of the Jews, or lend their Axes or Rods to the Circumcised. And that without the Magistrate the Jews could do any great matters, will not be thought by any who know what was the form of the Roman Government. So that it had been much better to say that St. Paul here opposes the Jews, who indeed had embraced the Christian Religion, but yet were tenacious of their antient Customs and Ceremonies.

Chap. 1.

Vers. 1. ΚΑΠΟΤΟῖς. Aναθεσαν. — We must supply here the Preposition Ανάθεσαν, that there may be a perfect opposition thus: ἐκ ΑΠΩΘΕΣΑΝ, οὐκ ἔδωκαν διὰ ΓΩΝΙΣΜΟΝ, διὰ διὰ ΓΩΝΙΣΜΟΝ, διὰ διὰ ΑΙΔΟΝ ΚΕΙΣΤΕ, ἐγὼ ἈΠΟΘΕΣΑΝ: not from Men, neither by Men; but by Jesus Christ and from God the Father. Besides, it is certain that God the Father did not call St. Paul immediately, but by Christ, who appeared to him as he was on his Journey to Damascus.

— Vers. 7. Τινὶς εἶναι οἱ τεκμιρίστες.] Dr. Hammond brings into his Paraphrase on this place not only his Gnosticks, but Men that by birth were Heathens and uncircumcised; as if in Galatia they had been under the same
same necessity of endeavouring to gain the favour of the Jews, as in Chapter Judea. But there should have been something in St. Paul to support this interpretation, otherwise it may very reasonably be rejected, as I have already said at the end of the Premonition. It is more than probable that these disturbers of the Churches of Galatia were Jews, and consequently circumcised, and had embraced the Gospel, the Design and Virtue of which they did not however understand. I confess Grotius, in the Preface to his Annotations, had gone before our Author in the contrary Opinion; but how great soever the Authority of that learned Man is with me, when it is not accompanied with solid Reasons, it does not in the least move my assent.

He thinks that St. Paul is more vehement in this than in his other Epistles, because those who would have deprived the called among the Gentiles of their Liberty as to the Jewish Ceremonies, were not Jews, whose zeal for their Religion might in some measure be excused, but strangers who lived in Judea, of whom the chief was Cerinthus. But it's true, it was a pardonable thing in the Jews themselves to observe the antient Rites imposed upon their Nation, and to be willing that the rest of their Countrymen should observe them, provided they were otherwise obedient to Christ; but to impose them upon the Gentiles, and endeavour to make all the World submit to the same Yoke, this surely could no more be born in the Jews than in others. Besides, there is nothing here that gives the least ground to think that those who were so zealous for the observation of the Mosaical Ceremonies, were by birth Heathens. But Grotius goes on and says: And such were those who at Philippi taught the same Doctrine, as St. Paul himself tells us, Phil. iii. 3. To which I say, it appears indeed by St. Paul's words that there were some at Philippi, who gloried in the Circumcision of the Flesh; but they were Jews and not Gentiles: For we, faith St. Paul, are the Circumcision, who worship God in the Spirit, and glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the Flesh. In which words he has undoubtedly a respect to the Jews, who gloried in fleshly Circumcision, as the context evidently shews. So that I wonder that both Grotius and our Author should alledg this place.

The same Men, faith the learned Grotius, asserted the necessity of conforming to the Law of Moses, not out of any principle of true Piety, but that they might grow rich and great by the assistance of the Jews. But I confess I do not see what Honors or Profits Men that were Heathens and Uncircumcised could expect from the Jews, a People despised and hated by the Romans, and that in a Roman Province, as Galatia ever since the time of Augustus had been, as we are told by Strabo, Lib. 12.
Chapter I. With either of these learned Men had essayed to prove more at large what they say, for they would presently have perceived the vanity of such an undertaking. But perhaps they thereby avoided those pressures which lay upon the Christians, for in those times the Jews, by the Roman Laws and Edicts, had the free exercise of their Religion; which the Christians had not, but begun then to be persecuted, as appears from the Acts, and other Epistles of St. Paul. To which I answer, if such as were not heartily and really Jews, had a mind to escape persecution, they ought rather to have feigned themselves Heathens than Jews, in Galatia. Besides, the Jews were allowed the profession of their Religion in the Roman Empire, they had not therefore any power granted them over others, so as to be able to do any hurt to the Christians. They might indeed by Calumnies, and such kind of unjust Methods, endeavour to mischief them, but that was all they could do, as sufficiently appears from the Acts of the Apostles. And they annoyed the Christians that way, who were resolved to obey all Christ's commands, and firmly adhered to their purpose, whom upon that account they accused and charged with Sedition; but they could not molest Men, who if it were necessary feigned themselves to be Heathens, of which sort were the Gnosticks.

Verf. 8. Αναθεματισμος εκατον.] Our Author in his Paraphrase rightly thinks that this has a respect to the second degree of Excommunication; but I don't well understand what he means by the last words: that none is to have any commerce with in sacred matters. For if we may judge of the effects of Excommunication by the Doctrin of the Rabbins, excommunicated Persons were neither excluded out of the Temple nor the Synagogue, as Mr. Selden has shewn, de Synedr. Judaeorum, Lib. i. cap. vii. It was only unlawful to converse with them familiarly, and within the space of four Cubits, as the same Author has proved at large. And if the Christians at that time behaved themselves otherwise towards the excommunicated, our Author would not have spent his time ill to have shewn it us: For it is not safe to judge of what was done in those Primitive times, by the practice of latter Ages.

Verf. 10. Note b. Tho our Author in this Annotation follows Gratius, yet I cannot assent to either of them for this reason, because the Verb with, according to the perpetual use both of Sacred and Profane Writers, always signifies elsewhere to persuade, and never to appear. I can neither find after the most diligent search, nor remember any passage in any Author I have read, in which it can be reasonably taken in any other sense; and if I can shew that this signification will agree to all the instances produced by the learned Gratius and Dr. Hammond, there will be then no necessity of recurring to any other. And
And this it will be very easy to do, when I have only premised that there is an Ellipsis in all the alleged examples, in which that which is wanting must be supplied to shew what the Verb μὴ in them signifies.

In the example out of the Book of Samuel, there is a manifest Ellipsis, which must be thus supplied: καὶ ἀπέστη τῆς Σαμουήλ, and David persuaded his Men not to kill the King. Not he appeased them, but he prevailed with them not to slay him.

A Patron or Advocate is said indeed μὴ μακαρίαν, but that is to persuade the Judge, not to appease him; that is, persuade him that his Cause is just. For if μὴ μακαρίαν could be rendered to appease the Judge, there should be added the Person of the Accused, or whole cause is pleaded, in the Dative case thus: μὴ μακαρίαν τῷ καταργοῦντι ὑμᾶς, to appease the Judge to the party accused or contending, which yet there is no instance of.

In Mat. xxviii. 14. there is the like Ellipsis, which must be supplied again in this manner: if this come to the Governor's ear, ἵνα μὴ μακαρίαν, we will persuade him, μὴ ἀκρακτεῖν μείν, not to be angry with you, and secure you.

So in this place, ἵνα μὴ μακαρίαν ἐὰν Θάναι, is all one as if St. Paul had said: do I persuade God or Men μὴ ἀκρακτεῖν μείν, not to be displeased with me. And thus all those Phrases must be understood, in which neither the Case of the Defendant nor any Infinitive mood is subjoined to the Verb μὴ, which often occurs, contrary to what Beza thought. I know Henr. Stephanus, and other learned Men, render it then, ήδεικτε, to incline or bend; but it's plain they have more regard to the sense than the proper signification of the word; and in all that multitude of examples which are alluded in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecæ, the Figure Ellipsis takes place. I shall instance only in one, by which we shall be able to judge of the rest. In Plutarch, in Lib. de cibibenda Ira, Euclidês to his Brother who had angrily said, ἀπολοίησαι εἰ μὴ τῇ πυροποίησαι, let me perish if I be not revenged on you, returns this mild answer, ἀπολοίησαι εἰ μὴ τῇ πυροποίησαι, let me perish if I cannot bend you, Pereaam nifi te flexero; in which Version the sense indeed is expressed, but not the just import of the word. For we must supply συγκατείν μοι τῷ: If I cannot persuade you to forgive me this [offence] or some such thing. And that such Supplemnents as these are understood in all these Phrases, may appear by infinite examples of intire expressions wherein the Verb μὴ is made use of, some of them to be had out of any Lexicon. I have been the larger in disputing against our two learned Men about this word, lest mere reasoning from some few places, contrary to the rules of Grammar and constant use, should prevail: A thing which Grotius is very seldom guilty of; but Dr. Hammond often, as I have shewn.
Verf. 1. That correction according to which instead of \[\text{ XIV.}\]
that is, fourteen, we ought to read \[\text{ IV.}\] four, is proposed
by Lud. Cappellus in Hist. Apostol. Appendice, Character
4. which is worth consulting, because he starts a great many difficul-
ties there against our Author's Chronology. And that Conjecture was
approved by Grotius, because of the connexion of the Discourse: Yet
Dr. Pearson has excellently shewn in his Annales Paulina, that St. Paul
here reckons the years that had passed from the time of his Conver-
sion. But he refers the Jerusalem Synod to the year of Christ xlix, and
makes St. Paul's Conversion to have happen'd two Years later than
Dr. Hammond, and that with good reason. Consult himself, and
compare him with Cappellus.

Verf. 6. Note d. I. It is very true what our Author here says about
St. Paul's Solacisms, which others using a softer term call febrigid
Seemings Solacisms. But it matters not much by what name they are
called, if we do but agree as to the thing. And it is universally
acknowledged by those who understand Greek, that there are a great
many expressions in the Writings of St. Paul, which cannot accord-
ing to the rules of Grammar be resolved into proper Construction.
The examples alleged by Dr. Hammond, put this matter out of all
doubt: yet some learned Men have made it their business to collect a
certain number of \[\text{αναφέρω&alpha; & αναφέρωδε τα incoherences and incon-
coherences out of the best Authors both Greek and Latin, to shew that the
Stile of St. Paul ought not therefore to be accounted the less elegant.
But there are two things which may make it appear that those Authors
are ill compared with St. Paul. The first is, that those foremen-
tioned defects do seldom occur in them, whose whole Discourse is other-
wise agreable to the Rules of Grammar, and has all those orna-
ments which are requisite to make it proper and elegant. On the con-
trary, the stile of St. Paul is both destitute of all those things which
are so much admired and commended in any Discourse, (I speak of
words and not of Matter) and has abundance of seeming Solacisms. Se-
condly, the most elegant Heathen Writers, tho' they were at the same
time very well skilled both in Grammar and Rhetorick, do de-
signedly sometimes violate the Rules of Grammar for variety sake, left their
Stile should seem too studied and artificial; which therefore may be
look'd upon as so many Figures, and a particular sort of elegancy.
But St. Paul naturally falls, as it were, into these kind of
\[\text{αναφέρω&alpha; & αναφέρωδε τα,} \]
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... because regarding things and neglecting words, he thought it enonough if he were understood by an attentive and diligent Reader, who loved the Truths he declared. So far is he from designingly diversifying his Discourse with that kind of Negligence, that he does not seem to have aimed at so much as the common ornaments of Stile. Let us hear about this matter Quintilian, in Lib. 9. cap. 3. Effect, faith he, omne schema vitium, si non peteretur, sed accideret. Virtus est, si habet probable aliquid, quod sequatur. Una tamen in re maxime utilis, ut quotidiani & semper sodem modo formati sermonis fastidium levet, & nos a vulgari dicendi genere defandat. Quo sique parce, & cum res posset uterur, velit adserfo quodam condimento jucundior erit. At qui nimium affectaverit, ipsam illam gratiam varietatis amitteret, &c. Every figure would be an imperfection if it were not chosen, but casual. It is an excellency if it have something probable following it. But there is one thing in which it is most useful, and that is to take away that nauseousness which is bred, by forming our Discourse always after the same manner, and to keep us from a vulgar way of expression: Which if any one sparingly use, and only when the thing requires it, it will give a grateful relish as it were to his Discourse. But if he unnecessarily affects it, he will lose all that agreeableness which a Variety would otherwise cause, &c. Now I do not think there is any one will suppose that St. Paul purposely chose those harsh and frequent expressions, to make his Discourse less distasteful to his Readers. And therefore it remains that they be looked on as Defects and Imperfections, which yet are no prejudice to his matter, because the Gospel is a very plain and easy thing, which does not need to be illustrated by any Light depending upon Elegancy, or exactness of Expression. It is well said by St. Jerom on Chap. vi. of this Epistle to the Galatians, verf. 1. Qui putant Paulum juxta humilitatem & non vere dixisse, et si imperitus Sermone, non tamen scientia, defendant hujus loci consequentiam. Debut quisque secundum ordinem dicere: vos qui spirituales estis, inquit Luciani, in spiritu lenitatis considerantes voce met'ipso, & vos tementini; & non plurali inferre numerum singulatorem. Hebraeus igitur ex Hebrais & qui esset in vernaculo sermo doctismus, profundos sensus aliena lingua exprimere non valebat; nec CURABAT MAGNOPERDE VERBIS, CUM SENSUM HABERET IN TUTO. They who think that St. Paul spake only out of Modesty, and not the real truth, when he said, tho I am rude in Speech, yet not in Knowledge, let them defend the Connexion of this place. For according to good Syntax he ought to have said, Ye that are Spiritual restore such a one in the spirit of Meekness, considering your selves, lest you also be tempted, and not have brought a Singular number upon a Plural.
Chapter II.

II. The Passage referred to by our Author in the same St. Jerom, in Comment. ad Ephes. iii. I have set down a little more fully [in my Latin Translation] than the Doctor, who did not complete the sense, but ended at the word adnotamus; and it is thus: Quotiesque sola
cismos aut tale quid adnotamus; non Apostolum pulsamus, us malevoli
minantur, sed magis Apostoli adsertores sumus, &c. Whenever we take
notice of any Solacisms or the like, we do not injure the Apostle, as some
malignicious Persons would lay to our charge, but we do him so much the more justice,
&c. Our Author adds, and so Epis. cap. 1. Quæst. 10, which I have
omitted, because to produce the testimony of St. Jerom in that man-
ter is absurd, and I could not find the passage to which he referred.
I don't think he look'd himself into St. Jerom when he sent us to that
place: For otherwise he would certainly have cited him with more
care, and instead of those Divines which he alledes, appealed to the
Testimony of St. Jerom, whose Authority is much more considerable.
And with St. Jerom he might have joined Origen who lays down this
Rule, of which more at large in cap. 8. Philocalia: ut erit tæ claritatis,
qui in confessa quætur, inquit, spem in quæribant, et in desiderio,
unde nimia semper inveniatur, quæ visa quæstion est, in quæ inveniatur:
that we ought not to attempt
the correcting of any seeming Solacisms, or verbal incoherences in Scrip-
ture, where to discerning Persons the sense is well enough connected.

Ver. 11. Note g. I do not think that from an ill interpretation
of one place in the Old Testament, we ought to deduce an unheard of
sense of the word καταγραφή, as if it therefore ordinarily signified
the same with the Hebrew used in that place. One single place in the
Septuagint where they arbitrarily fix a sense upon a word which they
could not properly render, does not change the use of a Language, as
I have already elsewhere suggested: For they used the word καταγραφή,
not because they thought it signified just the same with the Hebrew
טַקְרִי, but because it contained a sense not altogether disagreeable to
that place, as they imagined. So that I chuse here to follow the vul-
gar Interpretation, and especially seeing it best suits with the context,
viz. when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because
he was to be blamed; that is, because he did what he ought not to have
done, not because he was look'd upon by others as a Dismember. For first
he did really pretend to avoid the Society of the Gentiles, which he
used not to do, nor ought to have done. And secondly, others did not
see him dissemble, because by his example and manner of Life, the Chapter
Gentiles began to be persuaded that they were obliged by the Jewish
Laws. So that it is rightly observed by Grotius, after a great many
others, that the Participle ἐντονοῦσας here is the same with the Ver-
bal ἐντονοῦσας.

II. The Passage in Ecclesiasticus makes nothing at all to the purpose,
which is thus: ἐθ' τῇ κλάτῃ οὖν αἰγίνου, κατ' ἐντονοῦσας ἀπεκπήλουν:
Shame is upon the Thief, and an evil Condemnation upon the double
Tongue; that is, they are at length condemned, and suffer a shameful
Punishment. I do not see any necessity of interpreting ἐντονοῦσας here
by detection.

Verf. 14. Ἀπαγωγὴς ἐν χειρὶ ἑαυτῆς.] They are said to compel not only
who use Commands, Threatenings, or Violence; but those who when
they say or do anything, others dare not but follow their Example or
Authority, or cannot neglect anything which they would have them
do, without great prejudice to their Interest or Reputation. So
the word Ἀπαγωγὴς is taken in 2 Cor. xii. 11, where St. Paul says that
the Corinthians had so carried themselves towards him, that to keep up
his Reputation he was compelled to speak somewhat more highly and
honourably of himself than he would otherwise have done. And to
the same sense the Latin cogere is used by Cicero in the beginning of
his Book de Amicitia, where Lælius speaking to his Sons-in-law, who
had earnestly entreated him to discourse concerning Friendship, says:
Vim hoc quidem est afferre, quid enim recte quæ me ratione cogatis?
Cogitis enim certe, studiis enim generorum, præsertim in re bona, cum dif-
ficile est, tum ne æquum quidem obsistere. This is pure compulsion; for
what does it signify what way you take to force me? For force me you cer-
tainly do; for not to comply with the desires of my Sons-in-law, especially in
a good thing, as it is hard, so it is unreasonable.

C H A P. III.

Verf. 1. If the Ebionites were so called from an Opinion, I am:
Note a. apt to think that name was given to them by the

Christians, after the writing of this Epistle in which
their Doctrine is called πτωξε ἐπαχεῖα κάσων, beggary. Elements of the World,
chap. iv. 9. And this seems to be intended by Origen in the begin-
nning of his 2d Book contra Celsum, where he says: Οἱ ἄνθρωποι Ἰουδαῖοι ἐκ τ
Ἰουδαῖων περιττότις καταλελοιμασμένοι ἐπιτέλεσαν νόμον. Βιβλ. ὃ κατ' ἑντονοῦσα
ἐπισταντες ἐντονοῦσας τῷ ἄθικῳ γλυκύνιον. Εβίβαιον τοῦ ὅ πτωξες ἀρχεῖν Ἰουδαίοις καλεῖ-
tειν, καὶ Ἐβιοναι ἕναματιζον οὐκ οὔτε τ' Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ἰουδαίοις εἰς ἱερόν σωζομενον:

F f f.
Chapter III. The Jews, who believe in Christ, have not forsaken their ancient Law; for they live according to it, and are surnamed from the poverty of their Law. For Ebion in the Hebrew Language signifies Poor; and those of the Jews who receive Jesus as the Christ, are called Ebionites. And it's true that in Hebrew עבון, is used indeed for Poverty, but never for Folly that I know of, tho' I have made diligent search. But to speak what I think, I am of opinion that this name of Ebionites belonged to some poor Samaritans, who had embraced the Gospel; but not being sufficiently acquainted with its Doctrines, had mixed their ancient Religion with it: which mixture they too obstinately adhered to, when they might have learned better from the Apostles and other Christians. The reason why I think they were Samaritans and not Jews, is this very considerable one, that they received only the Law of Moses, and rejected the Prophets, as Epiphanius in their Herefy tells us, which was a principal part of Samaritanism. See Num. xv. It's certain the Ebionite who wrote the Clementine Homilies, alludes only to the Law: Nor is it any wonder that these Men were poor, because they were universally hated, both by Jews, Christians, and Heathens, who none of them took any care to relieve their Necessities.

II. But I do not think that St. Paul hath a reference here to these Heretics, because he upbraids them with nothing but their obstinate adherence to the Mosaical Ceremonies; the observation of which they endeavoured to impose also upon the Gentiles. Our learned Author will have them to be the Gnosticks, whom for that reason he represents as the Promoters of all kind of Herecies. But whereas the Case as to the Gnosticks is doubtful, it is certain that the Jews of that Age who had received Christ, were very zealous for having the Mosaical Rites observed; and there is nothing said here by the Apostle which does not exactly agree to them. And therefore we ought not to feign St. Paul to have had any other Adversaries. Tho' if any one think fit to call some of the Jews Gnosticks, because they boasted of an extraordinary measure of γνῶσις knowledge, with all my heart.

III. The Allusion which Dr. Hammond supposes the Apostle here might have to the name of Ebionites, is vain: for it is not true that their name signifies folly; nor is it necessary, because St. Paul calls the Jewish Rites πεπαύγασται poor and beggarly, that therefore he should be supposed to have a respect to that name, because there are other reasons, and those very considerable ones, for his speaking in that manner, as we shall see on Chap. iv. 9.

Verse 8. Note c. What our Author says here at last are mere Nicieties; but nothing can be truer, than what he has before, as I have shewn.
shewn on Gen. xii. 3. and those who carp at it never considered the Chapter Reasons which Dr. Hammond and I have there given, which yet they ought to have done before they condemned us.

Ver. 10. "Omi y3 ɓe nyum ynu, yaw nandew eni, &c. to the end of Ver. 11. and Ver. 21, 22. Bi y3 ɓen ɓo ɓuɗuɓu (nandew, &c.) All these Verses I shall interpret together, because tho they are disjoined in place, they are united in sense. In interpreting the Law of Moses, and enquiring into its nature, the first thing to be taken care of, is, that we do not confound things which are distinct, that is, the Law itself as it is recorded in Moses, and may be understood according to a literal and simple interpretation of the words, with the Opinion of the Jews, prevalent in St. Paul's time, and against which he here disputes. For otherwise we shall hardly be able to reconcile St. Paul with Moses, or with right Reason.

If we consider the Law of Moses as it is set down in the Pentateuch, we shall plainly perceive that it was very difficult indeed to observe all the Rites therein prescribed; but yet that it was not such as that the performance of it was impossible, as I have shewn on Deut. xix. 9. And indeed Moses every where supposes that it might be observed, as all Lawgivers also do; and if they did not, there should be no Laws made, because it is absurd to make Laws which cannot be kept, and unjust to punish Men for not doing what they cannot do. Nor indeed is the Law of Moses so very severe, as not to pardon the least Sin, or to require such a degree of Holiness as is above human strength: As appears only by two things which put the matter beyond all controversy. First, That God had instituted Sacrifices for some Sins; I do not mean ritual, but moral, upon the offering up of which he promised to forgive the penitent Offender; of which we have several Instances in Levit. v. 4. & vi. 2. & seqq. Secondly, That he suffered Divorces, which were contrary to Charity, and might be attended with very great Inconveniences, as every one easily sees. Such is the Law considered in itself, if we examine it a little more closely.

But the Jews in St. Paul's time, had got quite another Notion of it, and boasted it to be the most compleat and perfect Pattern of Sanctity imaginable; as appears by several places in Josephus, and particularly in his Books against Appius, and of them chiefly the 2d. And it signifies nothing to say that the Jews otherwise thought, and did those things which shew that they ought not to have had such a Notion of their Law, if they would be consistent with themselves; for it is certain they frequently both did and spake Contradictions.
The same Persons interpreted several places in the Law, not grammatically, as Lawyers use to do the Roman Laws, but Theologically; that is, not with a bare regard to the use of the Language and the connexion of the Discourse, but to their Opinions, with which they made the Law to agree, as is evident from several places in Philo, Josephus, and the Talmudical Doctors. For they made their Traditions equal to the Law, which Christ often upbraids them with. As for instance, the Rabbins used (as appears by the Version of the Septuagint, and the Citations of St. Paul in this place) to interpret Deut. xxvii. 26. as if the meaning of Moses there was, that God required of them the most perfect Holiness, which if they did not perform, they were to expect to be cursed by him. But in reality, all that Moses says, is only that the People were to curse him that did not confirm the words of the Law to do them, as I have shewn in my Notes on that place.

St. Paul who disputes here against the Jews, and endeavours to overcome them with their own Weapons, reasons from these Opinions of theirs, and shews that supposing the Truth of what they asserted, it was manifestly impossible any Man should be accounted just before God by the Law, because they acknowledged that all men were Sinners. So that it is all one as if the Apostle had said: "You say, O Jews, that ye expect Justification from God by the Law, and think that the Law is a most perfect Rule of Life. From whence it follows that you lie under the Curse of the Law, because you have not perfectly kept it, for you do not pretend to be absolutely sinless; and by your own concession, the Law denounces a Curse upon all that do not perfectly obey it. So that you cannot hope for Justification by the Law, but must seek it from the Gospel.

If it be enquired how I know St. Paul does not reason here from the thing itself, but upon the Jews Principles? I answer, By his citing the place of Scripture here alluded, not as it really is, but according to the Interpretation of the Rabbins. For the words of Moses are these: קרש אֶשְׁר לוֹל יִטְהְרֶה יִטְהְרֶה לַעֲשׂיא. Cursed be he that confirmeth not the words of this Law, to do them. Which the Septuagint render, εἰς τὸς ἐνεχθέντος τῆς ἁγίας ἡμῶν ἡμῖν καὶ συννομῆς τῆς λόγου τῶν νόμων τούτων ποιήσαι αὐτής. And these St. Paul follows as far as the word ποιήσαι, but then changes the rest into τῆς ἑκάστης ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας τῶν νόμων τούτων ποιῆσαι αὐτής. But doubtless he would never have altered any thing in the words of Moses, nor followed the Septuagint at all, but render'd the Hebrew himself exactly, if he had reason'd from the bare Authority of the Prophet, and not from the Opinion of the Jews. And it is common with St. Paul to cite the Old Testament, so as it
was usually alleged by the Doctors of the Jews, whom they called Chaper
and to argue from them so alleged, because that was the custom of the Jews. See but the place cited out of the Prophet Habakkuk Chap.

Ver. 11. That is, by perfect Holiness, for the Law and a pattern of perfect Holiness was the same in the opinion of the Jews. And the thing itself is sure, Christian, error of the Law's perfection; which truth of the thing itself made St. Paul express himself as the Jews did, tho not so accurately as they should have done.

Ver. 13. There are three things here worth our enquiring into, which most other Interpreters securely pass over. First, who are meant by the word in us; Secondly, what is the Curse of the Law; Thirdly, how Christ has redeemed us from it.

By us we are to understand the Apostle himself and his Countrymen the Jews to whom the Law was given, not all Mankind. This is evident from the thing itself, because other Nations were utter Strangers to the Law of Moses, which cannot be said to have been given to such as were always ignorant of it. Nay it was not given so much as to the Jews themselves, who were born after the revelation of the Gospel, and much less yet to Christians that they knew it; because it was already abrogated before they came to the knowledge of it, yea before ever they had a being. The following words also shew that the Jews are opposed to the Heathens in this Verse: and therefore what Dr. Hammond here says in his Paraphrase, about the redemption of Men in general, tho it be true, does not belong to this place, because the discourse is not about all Mankind, but the Jews only.

The Curse of the Law here spoken of, seems to be that mentioned by Moses in Deut. xxvii. and denounced upon those who were guilty of several Impiety, and, as I before observed, who refused to confirm the Law, and did not think themselves obliged by it. And those who were so cursed, could not expiate their Sins by any Sacrifice, but ought to be punished with Death; which because it could not always be inflicted, (as in case the Crime or its Author was not known) therefore the Person so offending had a Curse denounced upon him, or was pronounced worthy of all manner of Evils and Calamities: See my Notes on that Chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy.

It is certain whilst the Law remained in force, or before it was abrogated by God, all the Jews ought to have engaged to observe it; and it was not lawful for them to say that
Chapter 406

ANNOTATIONS on

III. that they would not be obliged by it, or live otherwise than according
to its prescription. And if any of them did so, they unavoidably
subjected themselves to the Curses of the Law: Nay those who thought
the Law required perfect Holiness, and yet did not think themselves
perfectly Holy, ought, if they would be self-consistent, to look upon
themselves as under the Law's Curse.

But Christ having established a New Covenant, whereby that old
Mosaical one was abolished through his Death, did at the same time
free the Jews from all the curses contained in the Law; for whoever
brings in a new Covenant, and makes new Laws, abrogates the old:
Only that the Jews might partake of that Redemption, or be absolved
from the necessity of observing the Mosaical Law, and exempted from
its Curses, it was requisite they should embrace the Gospel-Covenant,
and keep it. And thus the Jews were redeemed from the Curses of the
Law, but not the Gentiles, who were never obnoxious to them, and,
as St. Paul tells us in Rom. i. shall be judged without the Law. The Jews
might therefore, after the New Covenant’s being established by the
Death of Christ, deny that they were any longer obliged by the Law,
and neglect its prescriptions where they disagreed with the Gospel,
without any fear of its curses, to which God from that time ceased
to have any regard.

Ibid. ἐν δὲ τῷ καταλήμνῃ ἔπεσε·] Namely, for us Jews; for Christ offer-
ing himself a Sacrifice to God the Father for all Mankind, and ex-
piating thereby the Sins of all Men, died for the Jews as well as others,
and at once reconciled them to God, and freed them from a necessity
of observing the Law, which denounced a Curse upon those who tran-
gressed it. ἔπεσε here is for ἔπεσεν καταλήμνῃ, as is rightly observed by
Grotius; for nothing worse could have befallen a Man whom the Law
cursed, than Crucifixion. And ἔπεσε is in our room: for as a Sacrifi-
cence is killed in our stead, and suffers that Death which we deserved;
so Christ died in the stead of the Jews, and all Mankind.

Ibid. ἐν δὲ τῷ καταλήμνῃ ἔπεσε·] Of this place I have
treated at large on Deut. xxii. 23. and I shall not here repeat what I
have there said. All that remains is to shew that St. Paul does not
disagree with Moses: Moses had said, that he that is hanged is the curse
or abomination of God, that is, according to the Statutes of the Law, a
very polluted thing. But St. Paul follows the Septuagint, excepting
that he omits the word שָׁם, which they have, because indeed it is not
necessary, nay in the Greek Language might have bred a mistake:
For all that the Apostle means is this, that Christ was dealt with by
the Romans as a vile Malefactor, tho he was perfectly innocent, and
underwent a very infamous Punishment, which according to the Chapter Customs of the Jews, render'd the Person so suffering a polluted thing; and a greater and more disgraceful than which could not have been inflicted upon the most profligate and cursed Offender. So that ἀποκλημένος is here the same with κα τέρας in the foregoing words. If St. Paul had added, by God, tho according to the Hebrew phrase that signifies no more than what I have here said, and shown in my Notes on Deuteronomy; yet those who understood only Greek might have been offended with an expression which seemed to intimate that Christ was cursed by God, that is, hateful to God; which is so far from Truth, that God was always well pleased with Christ, and especially then when he beheld him on the Cross, performing or having performed the highest Office of Love to Mankind, and most signal instance of Subjection to himself. It is certainly known that the Jews, who from that time did not sufficiently understand the Hebrew Language, abused that phrase. Nobis, faith St. Jerom on this place, solut a Judaeis pro insignia objici, quod Salvator nostri & Dominus sub Dei fureis maledici. It is a thing we (Christians) are often upbraided with by the Jews, as a matter of disgrace, that our Lord and Saviour was under the curse of God.

Ver. 14. “In omnis ut deum, &c.” While Christ established a New Covenant through his Death, and thereby abrogated the old one, he did not only free the Jews from the Mosaical Yoke; but dying also for the Gentiles, he obtained from God the forgiveness of all their past Sins, if they did but believe and obey for the future: so that upon their Faith they are accounted just by God, in the same manner as Abraham. The Connexion therefore of this Verse with the foregoing is this: “Ver. 13. Christ has delivered the Jews from a necessity of observing the Mosaical Ceremonies, and from the fear of that Curse which was threatened against those of that Nation who wilfully neglected them, or thought themselves not bound to observe them; having established a New Covenant between God and Men, by an ignominious and cruel Death, which may be called cursed according to the Stile of the Law. 14. And he has so freed the Jews from the Mosaical Yoke, as at the same time to provide that the Gentiles, upon whom it was never imposed, and who by those Ceremonies were kept off from having any communion with the Jews, might, setting aside the observation of those Rites, be adopted into Abraham's Family, become partakers of the same benefits with Abraham, and embracing the Gospel, receive the gifts of the Holy Ghost, as well as the believing Jews.
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It seems at first sight that the word which here followed should have been ἀδελφός, because the Verb ἦνess went before in the third Person; but the reason of St. Paul's using the first, is because this latter part of the Verse belongs as well to the Jews as the Gentiles, with whom he therefore here joins himself and his Countrymen.

Ver. 16. Οὐ λέγει ὃ τοῖς σπήλαιοι.] It is highly probable that this was a commonly received way of arguing in the ἄθροισι midraschim or Allegorical Interpretations of that Age. And the Jews indeed might well enough make use of it against the Arabians, Edomites and Samaritans, who boasted that they also were the posterity of Abraham, to shew that the Promises made to Abraham and to his Seed, did not belong to them. But if it be considered in itself, it cannot be thought of any force by those who have other Sentiments, because the Hebrew יְרָע zera is a collective name, and signifies any succeeding Generations whatsoever, tho of a different Race: Nay, as learned Men have observed, the Jews never used to apply the word יְרָע in the plural number, but to the Seeds of divers sorts of Plants. But it was sufficient that this way of reasoning was thought to be conclusive by the Jews, to give the Apostle ground to make use of it against them; and what they were wont to say, on the behalf of the Israelites according to the Flesh, against the Arabians, Edomites and Samaritans, St. Paul might properly enough allude in honours of those who were Israelites according to the Spirit, to overthrow the carnal Jews with their own Weapons. I have already before observed, that St. Paul disputes against the Jews upon their own Principles, and there will be other examples of that in this Epistle.

Ver. 16. Note d. Tho the word Christ elsewhere signifies the Head of the Church, in conjunction with his Body or Members; yet in this place I rather think it is used for his Body alone, that is, Christ's Disciples: for there is nothing in the Covenant made with Abraham, properly speaking, promised to Christ; but rather Christ himself was promised therein to Abraham, together with all his Benefits.

Ver. 19. Πηγεῖ καὶ καὶ έν όρυγιου.] That is, God did not acquiesce in the Revelations he made to Abraham; but when he saw that the Israelites transgressed all rules of Piety and Vertue, he added the Moshaical Law, to keep them in some measure within the bounds of their Duty, till the Messiah should come. This is all that St. Paul here means, whatever our Divine pieces up his Paraphrase wish.

Ibid. Ἐπίλαμα ἐν ἐκγέννητο.] So undoubtedly it must be read, and not ἐπίγενται, as may appear from the 16th Verse, where the Promises
are said to have been made to the Seed, not the Seed it self. Chapter III.

Ver. 10. I cannot sufficiently wonder at Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase of this Verse, and if he had paraphrased the rest of this Chapter in the same manner, I should have quite lost my labour in translating him. For who would ever have imagined that the Apostle meant any thing like what he says, upon reading only St. Paul's words? At this rate of paraphrasing a Man may make any thing what he pleases of any Verse of Scripture. This Verse therefore must be better explained.

It seems to be brought in by way of Parenthesis, for the 21st Verse is manifestly to be joined with the 19th, and so to be consider'd as a digression in which the Apostle upon occasion of the word μετατρέπειν, admonishes the Galatians as he goes along, that as the Covenants made by God with Men were more than one, so each had their distinct Mediators, tho God himself was one. The words μετατρέπειν signify is not one, as appears from the opposite member of the Sentence, but God is one; tho they properly signify is not of one, αὐτῷ, as in some such word being to be understood. It is all one as if St. Paul had said: I told you that there was a Mediator between God and the Ancient Hebrews; because tho God be one and the same, yet he has not appointed one single Mediator of one Gospel, but the Law likewise had its Mediator, viz. Moses. Which comes to no more than if the Apostle had said, there is not one Mediator; for to say that the Law had a Mediator appointed it as well as the Gospel, is nothing but to say that it is not one only that may be called by that Name. If it be asked why St. Paul admonishes the Galatians of this; I answer that it is an Exegetis by way of Parenthesis, of the word μετατρέπειν, which kind of Parentheses are very frequent in St. Paul's writings. See Ephes. ii. 5. and iv. 9, 10. This I thought to be the sense of this obscure place, which if not true, does however, very little depart from the Apostle's words; whereas nothing can be more distant from them than Dr. Hammond's Interpretation.
Chapter III. 

Vers. 21. The Apostle here argues upon the Jews Hypothesis, as I have before said, who affirmed that God required perfect Holiness in the Law; upon which supposition, no Man can be justified by it, nor consequently attain to Life. Otherwise Moses everywhere supposes and takes it for certain, that it was possible to observe the Law; but he had not that Notion of the Law which the later Jews had, who interpreted every thing mystically. And according to these Mens Sentiments St. Paul here disputes, and not that of Moses: Which unless we observe, it will be impossible to reconcile the Prophet with the Apostle.

Vers. 24. In this particular St. Paul does not reason from the Sentiments of the Jews, but declares his own Mind, tho' it be a Consecracy necessarily following from what went before, supposing the truth of the Jews opinion concerning the perfection of the Law. But the same also might be inferred from the Nature of the Mosaiical Law it self, as that which contain'd only the superior elements of the Christian Religion. And those who are taught only the Elements of a thing, are still under a Schoolmaster. This might be proved by other Arguments if it were necessary: So that what in it self was true and relied upon firmer grounds, that St. Paul proved also from the Jewish Opinion, by this means the more effectually to put the Jews to silence, a thing which he often does. Such is the perverseness of Mankind, especially in matters of Religion, that they are not moved so much by cogent Reason, as by prejudices and opinions taken up in their Childhood. Such is the pride of Mens Hearts, that they cannot bear to have their Errors confuted or inveigh'd against, especially when their mistakes are of a long standing and grown inveterate, or when those who are charged with Error have been always judged by their own party to be in the right, and look'd upon as learned and judicious Men. And for these reasons Christ and the Apostles reproved as few of the Jews mistakes as they could, viz., those only which would not consist with Christianity; but their other prejudices that had no very bad consequences attending them, and which their obstinacy would not suffer the eradication of to be attempted without manifest danger, they chose rather to bear with, and to reason against them upon their own principles, because they perceived that that way of arguing had the greatest influence upon them. But seeing we now live in a time in which we are to search out the Truth more for our own use, than for the use of the Jews, it is our part, after the discovery of it, to set it down just as it is: Because if we do not, we shall never understand the Apostle's Writings, nor be
be able to defend them against the objections of Infidels; yea perhaps Chapter
(which God of his infinite Mercy prevent) instead of a solid Piety IV.
established upon its own Light and Evidence, all our Religion may de-
genrate into but dark and fearful Superstition.

C H A P. IV.

Vers. 3. O των μνησ.] That is, we Jews; for the Gentiles were ne-
ever under the discipline of the Jewish Law, which they
were ignorant of, and from which they were excluded
by the very nature of the Law. For it was a Law given to one Nation
living in one Country, the Land of Canaan. This deserved here to
be noted, because if it be not observed, the whole Discourse of the
Apostle in this place will be very obscure.

Ibid. Συμφίλον νοούν.] The same St. Paul calls άνων ουρων γυγια, in
Vers. 9. And there is no doubt but he means the Mofaical Law;
whence it may be again inferred that St. Paul did not think, with
the Jews, that that Law was a perfect rule of Sanctity: For if he
had been of that mind, how could he have called it the Elements of
the World, and weak and beggarly Elements? The elements are the rude
beginnings of any Art or Science, and far from containing the whole
art in its greatest Extent and utmost Perfection. Which being so,
undoubtedly he thought those Elements might be observed by Men if
they were considered in themselves, as they are in Moses; the perfect
Holiness, such as the Jews affirmed the Law to be a complete pattern
of, was never by any Man, excepting the Saviour of all Men Christ
Jesus, expressed in his Life.

But it will be said, it may be that St. Paul has a reference to the
Ceremonial part of the Law, and not that which is Moral. To
which I answer, by confessing indeed that he has a respect chiefly to
the Ritual part of the Law, but so as not to exclude the Moral part of
it, nor consequently the Moral Law itself; which if compared with
the Commands of Christ, comprehends only the Elements of true Piety,
as sufficiently appears from Mat. v. and the following Chapters.
For many things were lawful under the Mofaical Law, relating to
Manners, which are there forbidden by Christ. What the Moral
Law given by Moses commands is indeed Good and Holy, and what it
forbids Evil; but it is not a perfect rule of Holiness, that is, it does
not command every thing that is Holy, nor forbid every thing that is
evil. For instance, Husbands loving their Wives to such a degree as to
bear with their Manners; and never to put them away but in case of

Adultery,
Chapter Adultery, is a vextue not enjoined in the Mosaical Law; as the
contrary lnhumanity in putting them away at every turn, is not
therein prohibited, nay is expressly permitted, if they did but give
them a Bill of Divorce. See Mat. v. 31, 32.

Verf. 5. "Ις τοις ιδιων ικαρεγερον.] That is, the Jews, or their Pro-
felytes, as is rightly observed by Grotius, who upon embracing the New
Covenant, were no longer oblig'd by the Laws of the old, to which
they were before subject. See my Note on Chap. iii. 19.

Verf. 6. Το πνευμα του χριστου.] The words Spirit of his Son, are capable
of two senses, both which St. Paul seems to have comprehended under
this Phrase. First, by the Spirit of Christ may be meant the Spirit
which Christ had promised to the Apostles and the rest of the Chris-
tians, which he accordingly afterwards sent down upon them, and by
whose power they were enabled to work Miracles. For on the
effusion of that Spirit upon them, the Jews, and such as of Gen-
tiles had embraced the Jewish Religion, perceived that they were
then much more bountifully dealt with than when they were under
the Law, and called upon God afterwards with greater assurance, no
longer now behaving himself as a hard Master, or requiring the obser-
vation of superfluous Rites upon the severest Penalties, but as a most
gracious and compassionate Father. Whence that Spirit is said to
cry Abba Father, that is, to make the Jews upon their Conversion to
the Christian Religion, to look upon God as a Father and not as a se-
vere Master. Secondly, by the Spirit of his Son may be meant such an
affection of Mind towards God as was in his Son; as the Spirit of Elias
and the like. And that Affection was produced in the minds of the
Jews, by the knowledg and participation of the Benefits of the Go-
spel. Both these Spirits jointly residing in the minds of Men, seem
to be called by St. Paul πνευμα υποδεικνυσι τον Ηλια, the Spirit of Adoption, in Rom.
viii. 16.

Verf. 8. Τοις δε εοικειοις.[&c.] St. Paul here speaks not to those
who were ως by birth Jews, and had been brought up in the knowledg
of the true God, but those who were made Jews by assumption.
that is, Proselytes to the Jewish Religion before their Conversion to
Christianity. And it appears that what the Apostle here sa's, has a
reference to such Persons, because he afterwards demands of them,
how they could των ους to the weak and beggarly Elements;
that is, to the Jewish Rites which they had before, in part at least,
obversed. If Dr. Hammond had not overlook'd this, which is ob-
surely intimated by Grotius on verf. 5, he would have given a much
more clear and exact Paraphrase of this and the following Verse.

Ibid.
Ibid. Ἐν τοῖς Θεοῖς.] That is, to Gods which Men had made and Chapter invented for themselves; for the opposite to τὰ φῶς is τὰ θεῖα, that is, things which depend upon the decrees and institutions of Men. That this place ought to be thus understood, I have shewn at large in my Ars Critica, Par. 2. Sect. 1. Cap. vii.

Vers. 9. Πάσα εἰσπρέφεται πᾶλιν εἰς τὸ ἀπειθεῖον καὶ ἰσχίον. I have already before said, that by weak and poor Elements is meant the Jewish Law, and that is clear from this and the following Verse. But there are two things which I shall here a little more particularly enquire into, first, why the Mosiacal Precepts are called weak and poor; secondly, how the Galatians who had worshipped false Gods, are said to return to those weak Elements.

The Elements of any Discipline relating to good Manners and divine Worship, such as is the discipline of Moses, cannot be stiled weak in any other sense, than as they are not effectual to reform Mens Manners, or bring them to worship God in that manner as they ought to do. And indeed the Rewards and Punishments of the Jewish Law, which in a literal sense were only temporal, could not have such an influence upon the Minds of Men, as to bring them to any great degree of Vertue. For tho' they might restrain them from committing those Sins which would have render'd them infamous in the Eyes of others, or exposed them to civil Punishments; yet they could not keep them from doing a great many things contrary to true Vertue; of which see Matt. v. and what is said by Grotius and Dr. Hammond on that Chapter. In this sense therefore the Law was ἀπειθεῖον weak, that is, ineffectual and uncapable of making Men truly Pious and Vertuous. See also Rom. viii. 3. with the same learned Mens Notes.

Again, any Institution may be called πτωχος, in a metaphorical sense, when it is imperfect in its kind, and a great many things are wanting in it which must be made up and supplied out of another: as πτωχοκαταναλωσις are Men destitute of the necessary supports of Life, and who unless relieved by the liberality of others, are unable to subsist. And such an Institution is the Law, which unless it be perfected by the Gospel, cannot bring Men to such a degree of Piety as to make them acceptable to God, and worthy of eternal Life; as manifestly appears both from the nature of the thing itself, and a great deal said by Christ to that purpose in the fifth Chapter of St. Matthew. And this may possibly be the reason why St. Paul here uses the word πτωχος rather than ἀπειθεῖον imperfect, to intimate by a word of a special Emphasis, that the Law of Moses was not only in a few things but exceeding poor and defective. For πτωχος does not only signify poor, but poor to
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a degree of Beggery. And therefore the Greeks distinguish πτωχεία from πτωχία, & πτωχὸς from πτωχός. Poverty or Πτωχία, in Aristophanes in Pluto, in an elegant disputation, wherein he endeavours to shew that Poverty is advantageous to Men, after Chremylus had described the inconveniences of Beggery, is brought in speaking thus:

Συν ἡ τό εἰσοδήμος, καὶ πτωχὸς δὲς πτωχοί.

You have not been speaking of my Life, but declaring that of Beggars. On which words the Scholiast makes this observation: ἡ τὸ πτωχός μετακομίστηκεν εἰς οἰκίαν, πῶς τὰ χρήματα μένεισαν, λέγει τὸ πτωχός, ἐν τῷ ἐπάθει, εἰς ὑπάρχει, ὅτε τὸ πτωχὸς περιέχεται τῷ πτωχῷ πάντως: The word πτωχός signifies a middle sort of indigence, when a Man acquires necessaries by Labour; and comes from the Verb πτωχεύομαι, that is, to labour, and by that to acquire Necessaries: but a πτωχὸς is so called from his begging of every Body. See also the following words of Chremylus and Poverty. But I dare not insist too much upon the significance of this word in St. Paul, who does not use to be very critical in the choice of his words.

Further, the Galatians who when they knew not God, did service unto them which by nature are not Gods, are said here by St. Paul, upon their defection to Judaism, to have turned to the weak and beggarly Elements, whereby they desired again to be in bondage; because, as I have already suggested, they had gone over from Heathenism to Judaism, before they became Christians. There is no doubt but many of those who first believed the Gospel among the Gentiles, were before κυριακοῦν, or Prophets of the Gate, as the Rabbins speak, or also of Righteousness. Of the former sort were Cornelius the Centurion, spoken of in Acts x. and Lydia in Acts xvi. And there is no reason to think but the greatest part of the Galatian Christians were such Men, who certainly might much more easily relapse to Judaism, than embrace it if they had not before known it after their Conversion to the Christian Religion. I remark this, because Grotius, who on vers. 5. had observed that St. Paul spake of Prophets, unmindful of what he had there affirmed, tells us that the Galatians are said here to return to the elements of Piety; non quod Judaizassent antea, sed quia multa usurpassent cum Judaicis communia, ut ciborum defectionem, dolorum discrimina, &c. Not because they had Judaized before, but because (whilst they were Heathens) they had a great many Customs common to them with the Jews, as the distinction of Meats, and Days, &c. But that he is mistaken is evident, because it is the Jewish Law that was before called the Elements of the World, on which words he has an excellent Anno-
tation; and because the following Verse here clearly shews that they are said to return to the Jewish Ceremonies; not to say how manifest that is from the whole series of St. Paul’s disputation in this place. Besides, the Religion of the Heathens cannot be said to contain the elements of Piety, which taught the most consummate wickedness. So that St. Paul would rather have said that they returned is a* dolcear, if what Grotius here says were true. And therefore we must understand him to speak of the Mosaical Rites, which the Galatians, who were once Jewish Proselytes, before they had embraced Christianity, had in part at least observed.

Ver. 12. Τίνος ἐστι, οὐκ οἴητε, οὐκ ἃπαν ὡς ὑμεῖς.] I don’t know which to chuse, Dr. Hammond’s interpretation of these words, or Grotius his, who makes them to be a Description of St. Paul’s extraordinary affection to the Galatians. The place in Cicero, which Grotius refers to, is in Ep. ad Famil. Lib. 7. Ep. 5. to which add this Distich out of the Epigram of Zeno, the founder of the Sect of the Stoicks, which Apuleius sets down in his Apology:

Hoc modo simul vos unus sibi quisque quod ipse est.  
Hoc mibi vos eritis quod duo sunt ociuli.

Ver. 15. Τίς εἶ μαχεσεσμοί, &c.] I cannot see what reason moved our Author in his Paraphrase of this and the following Verses, to make mention of Persecution, whereof there is no footstep in St. Paul’s words. He is as much out of the way too in seeking here for his Gnosticks, and the Authority of the Jews, out of their own Country.

Ver. 21. Τὸν μὴ μάλλον ἐκ ἀνώτητ.] That is, do not ye understand the Law, or do ye not hearken to it attentively when it is read to you? It deserved here to be noted, that St. Paul argues from some received שדר midrasch vulgarly known: For if that Allegory, whereof he here speaks, had not been before heard of, he would have had no reason to wonder that the Galatians had never collected any such thing from the Story which he refers to; it being not at all necessary that the words of Scripture should have any such allegorical signification as that is, supposed to belong to them. And therefore undoubtedly it was a known Allegory, tho perhaps somewhat otherwise expressed by the Jews.

Further; seeing this Interpretation could not be urged against those, who might deny that the Scripture ought to be so understood, and the Apostle does not make use of his Authority to confirm it, it is evident that he argues here from what was generally allowed. Which,

*
Chapter kind of things it is not material should be true or well grounded, as long as they contain nothing in them prejudicial to Piety, and are believed by those against whom we dispute. So that from St. Paul's using such an Allegory against the Judaizing Galatians, it does not follow that we in this Age are bound to admit it, as a secret revealed from Heaven to the Apostle. For if we thoroughly consider it, we shall find that most which has ever been said by learned Men against this way of interpreting Scripture in general, may be objected against this particular Allegory.

Ver. 24. Note b. ἀλληγοροῖναι is not a Participle in the Middle voice, as every one knows, and as Dr. Hammond himself very well knew, tho he said otherwise before he was aware. It is to be taken in a Passive sense, and rendered thus: which things are allegorically explained, or use to be so explained, that is, by a mystical Interpretation applied to signify other things besides those which that History literally contains.

This kind of Allegories must be carefully distinguished from the Allegories of Homer and other Poets: For the Greek Grammarians, and especially their Philosophers, affirmed that a great many things which were said by their Poets about the Gods, were false in a proper sense, and never really happened; but in another obstruse and secret sense were true. Whereas the Jews did not deny but that their Histories were true, but from real events deduced Conjectures belonging to other matters, as if those events had been as so many representations of other things. Heraclides Ponticus in his little Treatise de Allegoriis Homericis, gives us this true definition of a Poetical Allegory; ἄλλη [ἀλληγορεῖν] τετηθεμένος, ἵππας ὁ ὁ λέγει συναινεῖ, ἔπομεν ἀλληγορεῖν καλεῖται: A Trope wherein one thing (ἀρτοῦς ζῷας) is said, and another thing different from that signified, is called an Allegory.

Ver. 25. Note c. Our learned Author has sufficiently indeed here shewn that the Arabians were circumcised, but not in conformity to the Mosaical Law, but a more antient Precept given to Abraham himself; and in imitation of Ismael, not of Isaac. Whether they had any other Custom which might be look'd upon as an imitation of the Law of Moses I cannot tell; but it is false that the Ismaelites ever bound themselves to observe the Mosaical Ceremonies, as was observed by Grotius, whom I wonder Dr. Hammond did not give ear to. I have often observed, that learned Men supply out of their own Invention what is wanting in the Testimonies of the Antients; and afterwards thence draw Conclusions, as grounded upon the undoubted Authority of Antient Writers; which yet is certainly no good way of arguing.
GALATIANS.

The 24th and two following Verses, may be thus paraphrased: Chapter IV. 24. "These things use to be allegorically explained by the Jews, and may be interpreted so as to signify what I little before said. Sarah and Hagar are as it were the Symbols of two Covenants; the latter, viz. Hagar, of the Covenant given from Mount Sinai, the Laws of which impose nothing but Slavery upon those who seek to be justified by it. 25. (And Hagar is so much the more fitly said to be an emblem of the Covenant delivered from Mount Sinai, because her name signifies a Rock.) And to that Covenant, of which the Servantmaid Hagar was an Image, belongs the earthly Jerusalem, which is entirely taken up in the observation of servile Rites, and acted by a slavish Fear. 26. But Sarah the free Woman is a Symbol of the Evangelical Covenant, according to the Laws of which the Citizens of the Spiritual Jerusalem live, that is, all we Christians.

The Apostle undoubtedly alludes to the name of Hagar, which being written with an n, according to the usual confusion of the guttural Letters, נבגא, signifies a Rock among the Arabians. It is probable that the Jews, who were no very great Friends to the Arabians, said a great many things by way of Allegory out of the History of Moses, to extol their Nation, and on the contrary to depress the Hagarens; and that St. Paul here applies to those who were Israelites according to the Spirit, what the Jews used to say in honour of their Nation; as on the contrary to the carnal Jews, what they often asserted to the disadvantage of the Hagarens.

I shall take the liberty here, which I do not otherwise use, to allegorize a little after the Jewish manner, that we may the better see what might give the Apostle Paul an occasion to speak so as he does. And first I shall perform the part of a Jewish דרשן, or Allegorical Preacher; and then represent a Christian retorting the like Allegory upon the Jew.

THE JEWISH דרשן

That ye may be sensible, O Israelites, of the great benefits which God has conferred upon you, compare your Original with that of your Neighbours the Hagarens. The founder of your Nation Isaac was born of a free Woman and Mistress of a Family, Sarah; on the contrary, Israel the Father and Founder of the Hagarens, was born of a Servant. Isaac was conceived by a particular efficacy of the Divine Power, when Abraham was neither able to beget, nor Sarah to conceive, by reason of his age.
Chapter of old Age; on the other hand, Ismael was born of Abraham and Hagar when younger, according to the ordinary course of Nature. Nor did the distinguishing Providence of God terminate only on Sarah and Hagar, and their Sons Isaac and Ismael; but drew as it were in them the figure of what has already come to pass in former Ages, and shall hereafter happen to both their Progenies. The Posterity of Isaac have been protected almost with perpetual Miracles, and often enjoyed the sweets of Liberty, and had dominion over their neighbour Nations, and shall again have, when that great King whom we much expect and long for, and whose Reign our antient Prophecies foretell, comes to rule over us. But the Hagarians, like their Mother, cast out and dispossessed, have already more than once been our Servants, and shall hereafter be so, being subdued by the Power and Authority of the Messias. Do not in the least doubt of the truth of what I say, for God has heretofore given you a pledge of future events, on one hand in Sarah and Isaac, and on the other in Hagar and Ismael, who, as I said before, represented the several Conditions of their posterity.

THE CHRISTIAN ALLEGORIST.

We take you at your word, O Jews, that antient Events did shadow out and represent things future. But as of old the Offspring of Abraham was twofold, so it is now; and the same which was the condition of that twofold race of Abraham, is at present the lot of their Posterity. Hagar and Ismael were Images of the Carnal Israelites, who are the Seed of Abraham indeed according to the Flesh; but because they do not imitate his Faith and Piety, shall not inherit the Promises made to him upon believing. They shall be cast out of his Spiritual Family, and be subject in a servile manner to the Covenant established on Mount Sinai in Arabia; of which Hagar may the more fitly be said to be an Emblem, because her name signifies a Rock, and her Posterity still inhabit that Country. So that the Bondwoman Hagar, who was cast out together with her Son, represented the State of the earthly Jerusalem, which is subject to slavish Rites and Ceremonies. But Sarah the Freewoman, of whom Isaac was heretofore born beside the course of Nature; in like manner as now Men are made Christians by an extraordinary efficacy of the Divine Power, was an Image of the Evangelical Covenant, and the Jerusalem, which was to come; that is, the Christian Church. As Sarah and Isaac were Free, so also Christians freely obey God, and are not tied to any ser-
vii Rites. As Isaac only was Abraham's Heir, so none but Christians shall obtain that heavenly Inheritance which Abraham by his Faith obtained.

If the Jews thought their reasoning against the Arabians to be cogent, there was no reason why they should reject the Christian Allegory. And this I doubt not made St. Paul here use an allegorical way of reasoning, which he otherwise would not have done.

CHAP. V.

Ver. 6. SEEING our Author has thought fit to put together in this place all he had to observe about the word ἐμπροειδικός, I shall examine all that he says; for there are some things in it which I cannot assent to. I grant the Verb ἐμπροειδικός may, according to the Analogy of Grammar, be taken as well in a Passive as an Active sense, as the matter requires; but I do not think it is so used in all the places here allledged. In Rom. vii. 5. ἐμπροειδικὸς signifies actively, and the whole passage is rightly rendred, the afflictions of Sin which were by the Law, wrought in our Members, not were consummated or perfected in them; for ἐμπροειδικός has never that signification, nor do the places allledged out of the Apostle James, and Clemens Alexandrinus prove it, as we shall presently see. The second place is 2 Cor. i. 6. which may receive indeed a Passive signification, if we read оνειδικος σε ἐμπροειδικωμεν, with the Vulgar Interpreter and other Copies. And the same may be said of 2 Cor. iv. 12. But in Ephes. iii. 20. and Col. i. 29. the Participle ἐμπροειδικωμένος must in all reason be understood actively, for the discourse there is about the power of God which is not wrought, but works. In 1 Thess. ii. 13. ἐμπροειδικῶς cannot be rendred obtains its end, by any who understand Greek, or consider carefully what they say. But in 2 Thess. ii. 7. it may well enough be interpreted in a Passive sense. In this place ἦ προειδικος ἐμπροειδικωμένος is best of all rendred working by Love, that is, which performs works of Love.

II. Tho St. James says that ἦ ζησαν και πιστευαται Faith was made perfect by Works, it does not follow that ἐμπροειδικός signifies all one with πιστευαται made perfect; for why may not St. James say something different from that which is said by St. Paul? How did Dr. Hammond know that St. James performs the part of St. Paul's Interpreter? Besides, granting these two Passages in both the Apostles to be parallel, it will not thence follow that exactly the same thing is saied in both; so that the Verb made use of by St. Paul, may grammatically be interpreted by that
that which is used by St. James. Nor will the Etymology or perpetual use of the word ἰσγήματος suffer it to be rendred, made perfet.

III. The place referred to in Clemens Alexandrinus is in Strom. Lib. iv. Pag. 518, & 519. Ed. Paris. & Colon. but is not here pertinently alledged, as will appear by his words, which. I shall therefore set down entire. He is speaking in praise of Love, out of Clemens Romanus, and among other things says thus: ἐὰν ἀγαθὸν τελεωθητος καθ' τὸν τὸν ἁγιόν, ἤχουσιν ἡ διδάσκων: those who are perfected in Love, according to the Grace of God, obtain the place of Pious Men. And underneath he says: ἢ ἀγαθόν τὸ μακροχρόνιον ἔχον μὴ ἐπιβιβασαί, καὶ τὰ πλοῦτα περιποιηθείς, φῶς ἄρματος ὕπερμακρον. τὸ ἀντί γῆς ἀνθρώπου παραδέχεται, ἢ ἀγάθη τελεθήν, ἢ ἴδια διὰ τίτον, ἢ ἰσγήματος εἰσγήματος: Love therefore makes us not to commit Adultery, and not to covet what is our Neighbours, which before we were restrained from by fear. So that there is a difference in the same action, as it is either done out of Fear, or wrought in Love; or as it is performed only out of Faith, or also from Knowledge. In this place ἰσγήματος is no more than what is done or wrought, as its synonymous words ἰσγήματος & μακρουρία, and the thing it self shew. So that it cannot hence be inferred that ἰσγήματος is the same with to be consummated or made perfect, in French estre perfectionnée. Besides, ἰσγήματος διὰ ἀγάθος before, signifies another thing, where the Discourse is about Persons, not about Actions.

IV. In James v. 16. Ἰσγήματoς seems to signify an earnest Prayer. Of the word ἰσγήματος, being taken in a good sense, add to what the Doctor says, the observations of Budæus and Henr. Stephanus, who have done the World a great deal of Service in the pains they have taken about the Greek Language.

V. The words of Hesychius are much worse corrupted by our Author, than they are in the common Editions. If he had looked into Phavorinus, perhaps he would have understood how they were to be corrected. That Grammarian has out of Hesychius, ἰσγήματος ἢ ἰσγήματος ἢ ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος. But it must be read: ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, prepared to work, or working. ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, ἢ ἰσγήματος, not vain, beard, perfected, or fulfilled, viz. ἰσγήματος, Prayers; Hesychius having a respect to the forementioned Passage in the Apostle James. So that it's true there was here a void space, or Lacuna; but different from what Dr. Hammond thought. The Scribe, whoever he was, omitted the word ἰσγήματος because of the next following, which differs only from
from that, in having the Letter ά instead of o. Such Omissions are Chapter
current in the Writings of the Antients, proceeding from the same

V.

Caule, as I have shewn in my Ars Critica, Part 3. Sect. i. Cap. 5. and
it is needless to add any thing more about this particular corruption
in Hesychius.

Ver. 12. Note c. ὡπεῖλον signifying utinam, I wish, is always joined
with an Infinitive, Optative or Subjunctive Mood or Preterperfect Tense,
ever with a Future, nor is the Particle η followed ever interposed. See
Thomas Magister on that Particle. And therefore I should under-
stand ὡπεῖλον here as if it were ὡπεῖλον, if not also read it so, to this sense:
They ought to have been cut off, and shall actually be cut off, when I
come among you, that trouble you; and so it will be an Elliptical phrase,
for this entire one: ὡπεῖλον ἀποκοτθέντα, ἐπὶ οὔτος ἀποκοτόντα; Such an-
other as that in these Verses of Virgil in Catulcles, after the Verb
debut:

—que maxima deterrendi
Debuit, audendi maxima causa fuit.

Where out of what follows we must supply, causa esse, as here ἀποκτή-
νέναι. Or else we must understand ἦμεῖς, I say, Loss or Punishment,
which often use to be understood after the Verb ὡπεῖλον; whence it comes
to pass that ὡπεῖλον is taken simply for he was condemned, because con-
demned Persons ought to suffer Loss or Punishment. As in Dionysius
Halicarnassiacus Lib. ix. Ant. Rom. pag. 585. speaking of Menenius
who was accused by the Tribunes of the People: διὸ ἔστω ἡ ἰσολο-
ρία ἡ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόνες, ἦμεῖς ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόνες, ἀποκτήνα: the People giving Sentence by Tribes,
by no small number of Votes, he was condemned. It is all one which of
these ways we interpret the word ὡπεῖλον. It might be confounded with
ὁπεῖλον, of which it is really made, by taking away the augment, un-
less it be thought rather to come from ἀπεῖλα, which often signifies
the same with ἀποκτάμαι; or else the Transcribers might easily change
ὁπεῖλον into ὡπεῖλον. St. Jerom's interpretation of this place, which Grotius
follows, is intolerable, utinam abscindatur, ipsum membrum genitale.
Such an imprecation would have been fitter for a lewd Buffoon than
for St. Paul. And Dr. Hammond's last conjecture lessens the Apostle
another way, because it represents him as diffident of his Authority
among the Galatians, notwithstanding it was supported by so many
Miracles; which cannot reasonably be thought. Besides, as I before
said, they are both contrary to the Rules of Grammar.

Ver. 14. ἐκ μοι.] That is, all in the Law that relates to our
Neighbour; against which part of it those who offended their Neigh-

* * *
Chapter bour by their Liberty in not observing the Law, might sin, tho not
against God.

Ver. 20. Note d. I. Tho Simon and Menander were Magicians, it does not follow that they are here referred to; for there might be other Impostors besides them. Perhaps too 
publicans may here signify Sorceries or Witchcrafts, rather than Magical Arts properly so called.

II. The place in Eusebius, or rather in Irenæus, was not sufficiently understood by our Author, as appears by his making ephets eunus to be the same with the ἣς ἐπίστευσεν, which are to be distinguished. For Menander would have had it believed that he was εἰς τῷ ἀρχαῖον ἔργον οὖσαν διὰ σεβασμοῦ ἀνωτέρως: sent from some superior place and invisible Εones for Men's Salvation, to overcome the άγωνια ἡσυχίας.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 1. Our Author seems here to suppose that none were privileged with extraordinary Gifts, but the Officers or Governours of the Church, otherwise there is no reason why they should be called Spiritual rather than others. For as to the Duty here spoken of by the Apostle, it may belong to any Christian, who ought to endeavour by Admonition to reduce his wandering Brother into the right way, and that by a gentle way of Admonition, or in the Spirit of Meekness. See Rom. xv. 1.

Ver. 2. Tā bān.] I don't believe that the Apostle here alludes to a Building, as Dr. Hammond thinks in his Paraphrase, but to Men travelling together loaded, of which those who have the lightest Burden, help such as are overcharged, by taking from them part of their Load. By Burdens here are meant those Difficulties and Temptations which beset Christians in this World, and endanger their falling into Sin. And so we are said to bear one another's Burdens, when we mutually assist each other in those difficulties, to prevent our being surprized by them into Sin: See Mat. xx. 12, where πλησίως πάσης ἑπομένως signifies to have laboured all the day.

Ver. 3. ἔτι δὲ δοκεῖ μοι ἐποια.] I do not see why this may not be meant of any proud conceited Persons, who despise their Neighbour, and will not vouchsafe to assist him; that it should be necessary to recur to the Gnosticks, as our Author does in his Paraphrase.

Ver. 12. ἤomer ἢτα τὸς συγχρόνου καθώς ἔχειν ἄνωτερως.] Grotius and Dr. Hammond would have St. Paul here to speak of a Persecution that was to be feared from the Jews, in which I cannot agree with them for the reasons.
reasons alluded at the end of the Premonition to this Epistle. All the Chapter danger was from the Romans, whom they needed not to fear if they declared themselves to be circumcised, because the Jewish Religion was tolerated by the Romans; and for that reason those here spoken of strove to impose the Mosiacal Yoke, which they themselves bore, upon the uncircumcised Gentiles, to save them, together with themselves, from the Roman Persecution.

Ver. 13. Οἱ τεκμοδικαὶ.] These words make it highly probable that the Persons here spoken of were circumcised; otherwise they would not agree to this place. For I cannot see with what face or prospect any number of Men could attempt to force others to become circumcised, if they themselves had not received Circumcision. It is very unlikely that the Heathen Magistrates and Jews would suffer themselves to be so imposed upon, as to take uncircumcised Persons for Jews; nor could their persuasions have any influence upon the Gentiles, if they did not observe themselves what they exacted from others.

Ibid. ἵνα εἰς τῇ οὐσίᾳ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.] That they may boast of their bringing you to submit to Circumcision, because they are Jews, and so would be hugely pleased to see all the Gentiles subject to their Laws. The phrase εἰς οὐσία is all one with εἰς οὐσίαν τῆς ἀρχής, εἰς ἀρχῇ Circumcision. I am not of our Author's Opinion, that the Apostle here speaks of the Gnosticks.
Annotations

On the Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Ephesians.

At the end of the Praemon. This Epistle is with more probability referred by Dr. Pearson to the Year of Christ Ixii. or the ninth of Nero. The same learned Man proves that what our Author mentions in this Premonition, about Timothy's being left at Ephesus, happened in the Year of Christ Ixiv. Consult himself.

Instead of the single Sect of the Gnosticks, which our Author thinks St. Paul opposes in this Epistle, Grotius with much more reason supposes that the Apostle inveighs against the Heathens and Jews. For it is certain there were Jews and Heathen Philosophers almost everywhere at that time, but it is not so clear that the followers of Simon were dispersed in all places.

CHAP. I.

Ver. 4. What is here said by our learned Author is true, but the thing must be proved a little more Grammatically. To choose properly is out of many things proposed to us to prefer one thing before the rest, which we may make use of to a certain end, rather than any other. Upon which follows the execution of that preference, whereby we do what we had before purposed, and which is also sometimes called choosing. In this latter sense God did not choose us before the foundation of the World; but in the former only, wherein he purposed to call those Nations whom he afterwards called actually to the knowledge of the Gospel, by Christ Jesus. And so ειληξατο ηανα ειναι τω των κατηληκτων ξωμ, is all one as if St. Paul had said: before the World was made he preferred us before other People, as those whom he intended by Christ and his Apostles (that being very fitly attributed to Christ, which is done by his Apostles in
Hence the execution of that preference is sometimes signified by the same word as the Decree itself: As we may see by Clemens Romanus in Epist. i. to the Corinthians, chap. I. ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ παράκλητος ἐξελεξάμενος ἐκ τῆς ἐκλεξιμενούς καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἰσχυρὰ ἁγία, τὶς ἶματα γεγονοῦσα, ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τῆς Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἰμάτια, τῷ εὐφρόσυνῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἰματία τῆς ἱλασμοῦ: This blessedness came upon those that were chosen by God through Jesus Christ our Lord. And the same Writer in Chap. lvii. faith: ὁ παράκλητος θεού μνησίς ἡ ἱματία ἡ παρακολουθία, ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τῆς Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἰματία, οὗτος εἶναι ἀ一个多月ἀνῦ: God the sovereign of all things, and sovereign of Spirits, and Lord of all Flesh, who has chosen Jesus Christ, and us by him, for a peculiar People.
Chapter 2. Verse to shew that the sense of the last words is different from what is vulgarly thought. They render ἀνετομοῖσαν, by que preparavit, which be bath prepared, and i do not deny but that according to the Greek Construction it may be so rendred; but the thing it self, and the Phrase, ought to have admonished. Interpreters that ἔπαιδας was rather to be understood, and that it should be rendred for which be bath prepared us or made us fit. The foregoing words, in which Christians are called God's workmanship, and said to be created by Christ, shew that St. Paul speaks of a change made in Men, who of bad and indisposed to good Works, were made good and fit for the exercise of Christian Vertues. And therefore the Verb ἐντομοῖσαν should have been referred to them. It's certain ἐντομοῖσαν εἰς γένος ἐναβίσει, is the same with ἐντομοῖσαν εἰς γένος ἐναβίσει.

There can scarce be a harsher Phrase, and more destitute of examples than this, to prepare good Works that Men might walk in them. But Men themselves are frequently said ἐντομοῖσαν & ἐντομοῖσαν. So in Rom. ix. 23. where St. Paul speaks of a like matter, God is said: to make known the riches of his Glory on the vessels of Mercy, which he had before prepared, ἐντομοῖσαν, to Glory; whom he also hath called, not only us of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles. God is here said ἐντομοῖσαν to have prepared us to good Works, because the knowledg and belief of the Gospel has that influence upon us as to fit us for the performance of virtuous Actions. So in the Book of the Son of Sirach Chap. ii. 1. all that intend to serve God are exhorted ἐντομοῖσαν ἐν αὐτοῦ ἐναβίσει to prepare their Souls for Temptation. See vers. 18. of the same Chapter, and Chap. xvii. 25.

Vers. 14. Note a. The place in Ecclesiasticus is nothing to this business, which perhaps our Author did not look into, in the Book itself, because he quotes it wrong out of Chap. xix. 29. whereas it is in Chap. xxix. 30. and ἐντομοῖσαν signifies an honorable Man, and the discourse there is about another thing. Nor was the stranger commanded to go out of the Sanctuary of Israel, but forbidden to enter into it.

Vers. 15. [ἐν ἀετῷ] Here our Author tells us in the Margin that the Kings Manuscript reads ἐν, which he renders together; but to express that, St. Paul should have said εἰς ἀετῷ.

Vers. 19. Note b. It is truly observed by Dr. Hammond that ἁνίον here refers to the Jews, but there was no necessity of recurring to Procopius for the reason of their being so called. The Jews are stiled Saints, because they were consecrated to the true God, and not because their Forefathers were holy in their Lives. See Exod. xix. 6. and my Notes on that place.
CHAP. III.

Ver. 5. "O EN ἐν τούτῳ ἡμεῖς ἐν συμβύων τοῖς ὑπό ὅλης Ἐνθρωποί, ἐκ.] The same thing which is here said in other Ages not to have been made known to the Sons of Men, is said in ver. 10. to have been unknown also to Angels. Which being so, I confess I do not well understand how those who are neither Prophets nor Angels, can find out so many places in the Prophets, in which the calling of the Gentiles is manifestly and directly foretold. For certainly if it was of old revealed to the Prophets, they understood it; for that which is not understood cannot be thought revealed. And if it could have been gathered from the literal sense of any Prophecies, the Angels might have understood it by those Prophecies. But the event, you will say, which is the best Interpreter of Prophecies, has unfolded the sense of them. But I demand whether such an event can be easily supposed to be respected in Prophecies, which are so obscure, that neither Men nor Angels could before understand them to contain any such sense? If that can be supposed, I do not see what event may not be found in them. But, you will say again, the Apostles, and so the Angels, came to know that they had a respect to such an event by divine Revelation. But, as I said before, that cannot be called a Revelation which no body understands, and therefore it was of no use to the Prophets: See what has been alleged out of the learned H. Dodwell on Mat. ii. 2. From hence all that I here infer is, that we ought not presently to condemn those who look for other events, which happen'd before Christ in the antient Prophecies, of which number the great Grotius must be reckon'd the chief: otherwise this matter would deserve to be more exactly discussed.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 8. Αὐταὶ δὲ ταῖς αὐταῖς.] It is a conjecture of a Friend of mine, that by Captivity here is meant the dead bodies of Saints, which were held captive by Death, but were raised with Christ at his Resurrection, and ascended with him into Heaven, Mat. xxvii. And accordingly he thought that St. Paul says, Christ descended into the lower parts of the Earth, because he descended into the Grave, that he might bring them out from thence. And there is nothing in the thing itself, nor in the words repugnant to this Interpretation.

Ibid.
Chapter IV.

Ibid. Note a. I. Marcus Aurelius gave nothing to the common People of Rome in the time of Triumph, nor any thing of his own accord. The story is thus related by Xipholinus out of Dio: 

The story is thus related by Xipholinus out of Dio: πέτον τοῦ δακρύσεως, ἵππον μεταξὺ λιχώδεις αὕτη τῇ τῇ ἀλλα, ἦν ἐν πελοποίησίσιν ἀναζητημένας ἐν, ἀνθρώπου, ὡτε: ἡ τοῦ τοῦτος χαράς, ἵνα ἐν ἐκ χρυσοῦ τοιάντι 

As he was making a speech to the People, and saying among other things that he had been abroad many Years, they cried out, Eight; and this they signified also with their Hands, that they might receive so many pieces of Gold. Upon which he smiled, and said himself also Eight; and afterwards distributed among them two hundred Drachms. It had been better therefore to have instanced in some other Triumph, which might easily have been done: See what is said by Suetonius about the Gifts of Julius Caesar upon that occasion, in Chap. xxxviii. of his Life.

II. What our Author says here about the signification of the Verb πρέπῃ, he owes to Mr. Pocock; whose conjecture that is, in Porta Moses Cap. ii. But when that Verb signifies to give, there follows a Dative case, because to receive for any one is to receive that we may give it to him: See Exod. xviii. 12. and xxv. 2. But the Hebrew here has ᾿ΑΛΒΗ in Man; which has made learned Men conjecture, and not without reason, that St. Paul read ᾿ΑΛΒΗ, inadam, to Man.

Vers. 14. Note c. Seeing ἔπειτα properly signifies a square Body, and secondarily a Dye because of its figure; and seeing Impostours made use of Dice or Lots for divination, the word ἔπειτα here would not be ill rendred sortilegium, a Lottery or divination by Lots. And this is what was meant by Irenæus, in the place alluded by the Doctor; for ἔπειτα is magical divination by Lots, not deceitful Artificers, such as are used by Conjurers. And tho the word ἔπειτα here follows, it is not therefore consequent that ἔπειτα signifies the same with that, but only that they were often joined together. Conjectures about the meaning of words which are grounded neither upon their Etymology, nor their proper signification, nor use, are not to be much regarded, nothing being more uncertain.

Vers. 16. Note e. I confess the Apostles words in this place are somewhat dark and intricate, but yet they did not need such a laborious explication as this, whereby tho the substance of the matter be made clearer, yet the particulars are more obscured. The Doctor, who never minded propriety of words in his Stile, or knew what it was to carry on one design with the same simple thread of Discourse, confounds here every thing with his forced and perplexed reasonings, and has no regard at all to the use of words.
I. His first question is altogether unnecessary and impertinent in this Chapter place, for St. Paul says nothing here about the Heart; nor is there any Metaphor taken from the Heart in his words. So that in explaining this Verse there can be no room for any enquiry about the Heart: tho the Heart be as it were the workhouse of the Blood, in which the vital Moisture is temper’d, and whence it is spread by a reciprocal flowing through the whole Body, St. Paul has no reference at all to that, but to the effluvia of the Brain, from which proceed Spirits, that help the motion of the Blood, and moisten the whole Body; and so the Body, which would otherwise wither and decay, is made to encrease.

II. The words ἀπὸ τῶν ἐφός ἐνεργείας, must not be joined with those immediately going before, but with the Verb ποιεῖται, so as to signify those Conduits or Passages by which the Body receives Spirits from the Brain, thus: from which (Head) the whole Body being fitly compacted and joined together, according to the working or efficacy of the Head in proportion to every part, maketh encrease of the Body, i.e. is encreased by receiving Spirits from the Brain, through the joints of supply, or by which the Spirits are conveyed for the supply of the whole Body. It's certain the Body cannot be said to be ὀμφαλογείμαιον καὶ ὀμφαλόχυμαιον with Nerves, Arteries, and Veins; but rather with Muscles, Tendons, and Bones. But St. Paul says nothing of these, but only that the Body being fitly compacted and joined together, receiveth effluvia from its Head, by Conduits belonging to the whole Body; which therefore it would not receive if the Members were put out of Joint, or divided from one another, because those effluvia pass through the Joints or Ligaments of the Body. So that ἀπὸ ἐνεργείας are the Joints and Ligatures of the Members properly so called, through which the Nerves pass, which convey the Spirits proceeding from the Brain to all the parts of the Body.

III. The place in the Colossians is wrested by our Author while he supposes it to be clear and undoubted that St. Paul has a respect there to Veins and Arteries, of which perhaps he had not the least thought. He speaks thus, after making mention of the Head: from which all the Body, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐφός ἐνεργείας, ὀμφαλογείμαιον καὶ ὀμφαλόχυμαιον, increases with the increase of God. Where by ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνεργείας the Apostle means the Joints and Ligaments of the Body, that is, the Muscles, Tendons and Gristles, which are in those places where the Members are joined together, to perform as it were two Offices; first, to receive the Conduits whereby the effluvia which proceed out of the Brain descend into the Body: secondly, to cement or knit together all the Members with one another. So that the Apostles meaning is this: From which Head
Chapter IV. The whole Body receives a divine Increase, by the Joints and Ligaments whereby those Spirits are supplied, and by which the Members are joined together as by so many strong Bands. This seems to me to be clear, especially seeing every one knows that no Arteries descend from the Brain, but only Veins, by which the Blood is carried back to the Heart and Nerves, which are dispersed through the whole Body.

IV. I cannot tell what made our Author think that the Genitive ἔθνης was in the place of ἔθνος; the only signification of that being, that the Joints are the ways by which the ἔθνης is made: as the Joints of Tubes which receive Water flowing into them out of some large Fountain, and convey it wheresoever they are directed, are the Joints of the ἔθνης of that Water.

V. Ἐπίθειμα must not be referred to the Conduits, through which the effluvia that proceed out of the Head do pass, which Conduits operate nothing, but to the Head itself, from which, to use the words of Virgil with a little alteration,

infusa per artus
Vis agitat molem, & toto se corpore miscet.

So St. Paul, who was none of the extreme Members in the Body or Church of Christ, says that he laboured, striving according to his working, κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἄντι, which be worked in him, in Coloss. i. 29. See also Chap. i. 19. and iii. 7. of this Epistle.

VI. Σύμμα ποιεῖν ἄντι συμμάτως, is a noted Hebraism, in which συμμάτως is repeated for ἑαυτῷ, as Grotius observes. What is said by our Author is taken from the use of the Rabbins.

Ver. 19. Note I. Who this Pausanias is I cannot tell, but perhaps Dr. Hammond wrote Phavorinus, whom he often cites, and who has, ἀπληθυστὸς ἀντὶ τῆς παυσανίου ἀλγεῖν, ἐν ἀπληθυστὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ λίγα τὰ τῆς πολλῆς ἀκριβείᾳ. To which places our Author refers, which Suidas also has out of Thucydides and Polybius.

II. But wheresoever Dr. Hammond had this, it is certainly false, for ἀλγεῖω never signifies algere in Latin, to be cold, nor ἄλγω algor cold, tho' they resemble one another in sound. Ἀπληθυστὸς is to lose one's feeling, to be no longer sensible of any Pain, whatever be the cause of it. I confess it proceeds sometimes from extremity of Cold, when the parts of the Body being congealed with the Sharpness of Air, or the like, cease to feel any Pain; but ἀπληθυστὸς does not therefore signify to cease to feel cold, but any sort of Pain. So in Hesychius: Ἀπληθυστὸς, ἀναισθεῖν.
Chapter IV.

Ver. 26. Note h. 1. I confess I do not see any allusion in the words of the Apostle to those three kinds of angry Persons mention'd here by our Author out of Aristotle. He teaches us that all excessive Anger is to be avoided, but he does not seem to refer to the distinction made by that Philosopher between the several degrees of Anger; at least there is no sign of it in his words. Besides, why did not the Doctor say that St. Paul had a respect to four sorts of angry Persons, seeing so many sorts are reckon'd up by Aristotle, viz. ἀργός, ἀργεῖον, παρακολουθεῖν & καλαπατεῖν? The reason of that, I suppose, was because he did not look into Aristotle himself, but cited his words upon trust; for what he alludes out of him is not in either of those places which he refers to; but in Lib. 4. Cap. 11. If we reason out of Aristotle, St. Paul here will not condemn the ἀργός, that is, those who tho they are soon angry, soon forgive, but the excessive anger of other Persons.

II. The place referred to in the Psalms is in Psal. iv. 4, not in ii. 4. but our Author could not infer any thing from thence, because the Hebrew word רָגַז, ought rather to be render'd fear, tho the Septuagint, whom St. Paul follows out of Custom, translate it otherwise.

III. The Passage alluded out of Plutarch is much more pertinent than that out of Aristotle. And it is pag. 488. Ed. Wechelianæ.

Ver. 30. Note k. 1. By the Holy Spirit, here seems to be meant the Gifts of the Holy Ghost conferred by God on the Ephesians, whereby they were enabled to work Miracles; for by them they were sealed, as sufficiently appears from what is said by Dr. Hammond. But because those Gifts were bestow'd on the Ephesians by a Person, therefore they are forbidden here to grieve them, that is, to do any thing which might displease the Person from whom those Gifts came, or provoke him to withdraw them. But St. Paul seems principally to refer to the Gift of Prophecy, which lewd Discourse corrupted and rendered useless. For it appears by other places, that those who had received that Gift were obliged to preserve it by care and holiness of Life, which if they neglected to do, it was taken away from them. See 1 Tim. iv. 14.
II. Our Author confounds things which ought to be distinguished; for Christ is not said to have been sealed by the Father, just in the same sense as the Ephesians and others, who had received the Gifts of the Spirit. God is said to have sealed Christ by way of Allusion, not to any ordinary Servants, but to the Ambassadors of Kings; who are then first believed when they produce their Masters Letters marked with their Seal. Labour not, faith Christ in John vi. 27. for the Meat which perisheth, but for that Meat which endureth unto everlasting Life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you; for him hath God the Father sealed, ἐσφραγίσας τὸν Χριστόν; that is, hath sent with Power and Instructions, as you may see by his Miracles, which are as the Seal of God, for which ye ought to believe me. But the Ephesians are said to be sealed to the day of Redemption, by a Metaphor taken from Merchandizes or Slaves, which the buyer did not take away with him as soon as he had bought them. See my Note on 2 Cor. i. 22.

III. I cannot see to what purpose our Author, tho' it is but by the way, sets down the Etymology of the word servis from servando, when he is explaining an Author who wrote in Greek, and could not have any respect to that Latin word.

IV. Our Author's interpretation of the words, to grieve the Holy Spirit, and to the day of Redemption, is perfectly forced. The meaning of the Apostle is this: "Ye that have received Gifts from the Holy Spirit, do not either by neglecting them or despising them grieve him, and provoke him to take away from you those things which he has given you, to distinguish you from other Men even in this World; till that day comes, in which in the view of Men and Angels, he will distinguish you from all the rest of Adam's Posterity. See my Note on Rom. viii. 21.

Ver. 31. πάντα μνεα, το επιφονο, το ἀπόρρητον, καὶ τον ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τηράξεων, καὶ τηράξεων.] By these words Dr. Hammond might have discerned that St. Paul had no reference, when he wrote this, to Aristotle's distinction between the several degrees of Anger, because he does not reduce them to the Order and Notions of that Philosopher: Which it may not be unuseful to shew briefly, out of Aristotle himself, by alleging his words. For by this alone it will appear that Interpreters ought to omit all unnecessary Niceties, in explaining the rude or idiotick Stile (as St. Paul himself calls it) of this Holy Apostle. That Philosopher therefore in Mar. Lib. 4. c. ii. setting down the several degrees of Anger, and proceeding from those who are least vicious in that kind, to those who are tainted with the highest degree of this Vice, defines ἔργας to be so called ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ: οἱ καὶ οἱ ἀνθρώπους ταχέως καὶ ἀργάνως, οἱ οίς κ ἄρτος, οἱ ἔτοις.
Chapter V.

Vers. 2. I. Προσοπεδ and Hveda may, I confess, be distinguished as Dr. Hammond would have them, but they are very often confounded; and particularly frequently signifies all kind of Oblations, in Hebrew קרבן Korban, or whatever is laid upon the Altar, as Kircher's Concordances will inform those who are ignorant. In this place they seem to signify the same thing, because the scope of the Apostle does not oblige us to distinguish them.
II. Our Author's reasoning to this purpose from 1 Ebr. x. 3, 6. has no validity in it: for it is not necessary that these two words occurring in ver. 6. should be perfectly synonymous or answerable to those two others in ver. 5. Wherefore, faith that divine Writer, when he comest into the World, be faith, Sacrament be, Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldst not, but a Body hast thou fitted me, in a great sacrifice, whole Burnt-offerings, and for Sin thou hast had no pleasure. If according to Dr. Hammond's reasoning, a whole Burnt-offering, according to him, and a Sacrifice be, be exactly the same, an offering and a sacrifice for Sin of a great sacrifice will be literally the same also, which yet he would not allow. But the words of the sacred Writers must not be reduced to the rules of Rhetoricians.

Ver. 3. [Ἀσυνεξία.] Our Author in his Note on Rom. i. 29. endeavours all he can to prove that this word signifies a desire, not of Riches, but of Pleasures; tho' with what success I leave the Reader to judge, by what I have written on that Annotation. This is the chief place that gives any countenance to his conjecture. And indeed there are two specious reasons which, as to this Passage of St. Paul, may be alleged on his behalf.

I. It is said ἀσυνέξία, Uncleanness OR Covetousness, and the Particle ἀ ή or seems to join together words of the same signification. In answer to which I acknowledge that that is very frequently the use of the Particle ἀ ή or; but it is very often also a Disjunctive, and connects together words of a different sense. And when a Negation follows or goes before, it is equivalent to nor, as in this place; for it is all one as if St. Paul had said: "Let neither Fornication, nor any "Uncleanness, nor Covetousness be named amongst you.

II. It may be said that the words not be named among you, contain a prohibition which agrees better to Lusts, whereof the very names are obscene, than to Covetousness, or the Sins which proceed from that Vice. Which I do not deny; nay, I think St. Paul spake thus, merely because he had before made mention of Fornication and Uncleanness, to which that prohibition seems properly to belong. But it cannot hence be inferred, that ἀσυνέξία signifies a vice of the same kind with those beforemention'd, contrary to the etymology and perpetual use of the word; for it is very common for one Verb to be subjoined or prefixed to many Nouns, with all which it does not equally well agree. See my Index to the Pentateuch, on the word Verbam.

Ver. 4. Note b. All that our Author here says is very much to the purpose; to which add, that Men of debauched Lives use to call their Vices by soft and gentle names. For which reason ἀσυνεξία &c.

might
might properly signify, in common use, not only light and rauch, but even obscene and filthy Discourses, such as the Jests which we every where meet with, especially in ancient Comedies. This Pla-tarch has observed with relation to the Athenians, in the Life of Solon, p. 86. "Αυτή τῇ, λέγει, η Αθηναίων έλθον τοις έ έργον με κατασκευάζεις ένθα χρημάτις και πολυπλοκικίας εκδιδαχτούσας αυτούς επιμέλειαν, τις κα το δόγμα της της φυσικής μεταφοράς, χριστάς τας ημέρας το στεφανόν του πολέμου, την μνήμην το ερευνητήν καθήκοντα, μετά των Ἀθηναίων μὴ για τέλος, συμφωνώς μήτε στοματίων σωματικών ὑποθέσεων."

For what is said of late, that the Athenians, covering odious things with mild and pleasing Titles, to avoid giving offence, call Strumpets Companions, Taxing Registing, Garisons Safeguards of Cities, and a Prison a House; that seems to have been first the device of Solon, who called the forgiving of Debts an Acquisition. Other examples to the same purpoce may be had out of Heliodorus Besantinus in Chrestomathis. We may easily conceive how such sort of Men might call their obscene and filthy Discourses by the names of μελασταία & ἁπερήσταία.

Ibid. Note c. This latter Interpretation would very well agree to this place, if it were certain that ἡξαρθία was ever taken in the same sense with τὸ διέρχεσθαι, which signifies elegancy of Speech, as well as of other things. The passage cited out of Prov. xi. does not at all belong to this matter, the Discourse there being about a beautiful, not a pious Woman.

Verf. 14. ΑΙώνιον.] Pál. ye could the Scripture, the Apostle here referring to the place in Isaiah alluded by our Author in his Paraphrase, tho' rather expressing its sense than citing the Prophet's own words. Barnabas in Epist. Catholica, particularly in cap. v. often uses the same term in citing the Scriptures words: "Scriptum est enim, faith he, de illo, quaedam ad populum Judeorum, quaedam ad nos. DIGIT autem: Vulgaris est propter inquitates nostras, & c. Supergratulatori enim debemus Domino, qui & praeferata nobis ostendit & sapientes fecit, & de futuris ut non formas sine intellectu. DIGIT autem: Non injuste tenduntur retia avibus. For it is written of him, some things (relate) to the People of the Jews, and some to us. And he SAITH thus: He was wounded for our Transgressions, &c. For we ought to be exceeding thankful to the Lord, because he hath both shewed us past things, and (so) made us wise, and (instructed) us also in the knowledge of things Future, that we might not be without understanding (as to them.) And he SAITH: Not without cause are Nets spread for Birds. A great many more examples to the same purpose might be allledged out of that Epistle.

Verf. 16. Note e. It being manifest from the place cited out of Daniel in the beginning of this Annotation, that the phrase to redeem...
the time, signifies to delay, or put off as long as possible; that only
Notion of it should have been kept to; and not things of an Affinity
with it, or very distant from it mixed together, as they are here by
our Author, that he might have an occasion to obtrude his Gnosticks
upon us: See Grotius on this place. St. Paul here advises the Ephes-
ians to endeavour by all lawful means to get time allowed them by the
Heathens, and to take heed lest by their rash tervour they should bring
Persecution upon themselves, especially in an evil and troublesome
time, such as that was wherein he wrote this Epistle; which was
towards the end of Nero's reign, or those black and dismal days in
which that monster of a Man outdid all that ever went before him in
Wickedness and Villany. The reason of the Apostle's Admonition
is this, that there was a time coming wherein the Truth might be
defended with less danger. And the nature of Truth is such, that if
it have but time allowed it, and is not presently extinguished, tho' it
lie cover'd as it were under Ashes for a while, yet afterwards in a fitter
time it shines out, and makes an universal day. So that those who
defend it, ought never, as long as they can avoid it, to run all adven-
tures, or undergo the last hazard, that it may either triumph instantly
over Falshood, or else unavoidably be oppressed for ever.

Now I am apt to think that this phrase had its rise from the custom
of Debtors, who when payment is demanded of them, and they can-
not restore the whole sum or principal due, obtain a longer time to
discharge their Debt in, either by a present Fee, or by advancing the
use of the Mony lent them. For this is truly to redeem time; whence
it afterwards came to pass, that because the solution of a Debt is thus
defered, therefore to defer or delay is sometimes called to redeem the
time. Parallel to this is the Latin phrase moram acquirere, which oc-
curs in Cicero pro Caecina cap. ii. or Num. 6. where the Delegates,
who had, after twice hearing the Cause, deferred to pass Sentence,
are said moram ad condemnandum acquisire, and also to have given
the Defendant a space wherein to recollect himself.

Ver. 18. Note f. There was no need here of the Bacchanals or
Gnosticks, because there were Heathens enough in Asia that loved
Wine, and whenever they had an opportunity drank to excess, and in-
dulged themselves in other Lusts; whose example might have had a
bad influence upon the Christians, if they did not take great heed to
themselves.

Ver. 19. Note g. Our Author has shewn indeed here, that Songs
are called by three several names; but that those were so many dif-
ferent kinds no one can prove, because they are often confounded, as
appears by the titles of the Psalms. The Greek words might also be Chapter referred to several sorts of Songs, if the most frequent use of them be respected, but those also are often put one for another. So that I should rather say that St. Paul here does but express the same thing in three different words.

Verf. 21. ὑπακούομεν ἀλλήλους, ἐν φλεβερ νηκέν.] That is, so complying with each other, as yet to do nothing which may displease God to gratify any one whatsoever. That this is here the signification of the Verb ἑπακούομεν may appear by the word ἀλλήλος, which shews that it is a mutual subjection, that is, compliance, which is here spoken of. So the Noun ὑπακοή must be understood in Gal. ii. 5. where St. Paul speaking of false Brethren faith: To whom we did not so much as for an hour give place, ὑπακοή, by compliance. Yet Grotius to explain the word ὑπακοή here faith thus: siempe secundum ordinem naturalem, civilem, ecclesiasticum, quae omnia nobis servanda, propter Chrifum: viz. according to order, whether natural, civil, or ecclesiastical, which must all be kept for Christ's sake. And this Dr. Hammond follows in his Paraphrase. But to signify that, it should have been said: ὑπακοήν τοῖς ὕποκείμενοι, or τοῖς ἑπακοούμενοι, or something to that purpose, and not ἀλλήλος, which shews that it is a mutual Duty here intended.

Verf. 30. Note h. Our Author here compares together things that have no agreement with one another, for to be of Christ's Flesh and Blood, is not to be Christ himself, as that which is called the Heaven and Earth is the very Universe, but to be very intimately joined to Christ, in like manner as Kindmen by Blood, and Man and Wife are to one another. See Grotius on this place, and my Notes on Gen. ii. 34.

Verf. 31. Κατάλειπται ἔντομον.] This is not a Precept wherein Matrimony is commanded, or its Laws enforced; but an observation of a Custom begun ever since Adam, and propagated to all Mankind. See my Note on Gen. ii. 24.

Verf. 32. Τῷ μαρτυρίῳ τῷ μὴ ἴσετι.] 1. From verf. 23. of this Chapter St. Paul compares the love which does or ought to intercede between Man and Wife, with the love of Christ and the Church; for which reason he mixes Precepts belonging to married Persons, with Precepts which relate to the love of the Church towards Christ. And therefore he subjoins verf. 31. in which the union of the Husband with the Wife is described, immediately and without any transition after the foregoing words, whereby he had described the union of the Church with Christ; not because they belong to the same Argument, but because he so mixes the thing compared, with the thing to which it is compared. If he had intended to make a perfect Comparison, he would...
Chapter would first have set down that which relates to Christ and the Church. It is difficult, and afterwards described the conjunction of Man and Wife. He makes use of an imperfect comparison, in which the "εν οίκῳ" is hardly distinguished from the "εἰς τὸν οίκον." His meaning may be expressed in this Paraphrase. "Vers. 30. For between us and Christ there intercedes so near a conjunction, that we may be called his Flesh and Bones, as it is said of a Woman with relation to her Husband. So that as Christ loves his Church, as if it were his Wife and so his own Body; 31, 32. So Husbands having left their Fathers House for the sake of their Wives, and become as it were one Flesh with them, should look upon it as their Duty to love their Wives as themselves. If we carefully read St. Paul's words, and consider the scope of his Discourse, we shall not doubt but this is his meaning. For the Apostle's design here, at least primarily and professedly, is not to teach any thing concerning Christ; but from the noted example of Christ to shew what conjunction and intimacy of affection there ought to be between Man and Wife. So that what he says of Christ, is said but by the way, and assumed as sufficiently known.

II. This being supposed, it will be easy to perceive that the 32d verse is a Parentthesis inserted between words belonging to the same thing, but which make nothing to the series of the Discourse. And by this Parentthesis the intention of the Apostle is only to shew, that what he had said about that intimate union of Christ with his Church, for which he suffer'd Death, was hitherto unknown to Mankind. This he calls "μίμησις," as in 1 Tim. iii. 16. and so these words are referred, not to the mystical sense of the place in Genesis, but to the thing itself; that is, to the love of Christ to his Church, which was so great that he did not refuse to die for its sake. Away therefore with that mystical sense, which is without reason sought for in the words of Moses, as by the suggestion here of the Apostle.

III. But what shall we say then to those Jews, whom our Author cites in his Paraphrase, as knowing that great Mystery from the secret sense of the words of Moses? To speak what I think, they are either the words of some Impostor acting the part of a Jew, or misconstrued to a wrong sense. Our Author took this Testimony from H. Grotius, who on this place saith: "Sic & Hebraei amunt mulierem de latere viri desuntam, ad significandum conjunxium viri suæm, benedicti: So the Jews also say that the Woman was taken out of the side of the Man, to signify the marriage of the highest, blessed Man. But where are those Jews who say this? Do they with one consent speak thus in any publick form? Or is it some Rabbi who proposes his own Conjecture, or
the Tradition of the Antients? Such Citations as these, in a matter Chapter
of no small moment, or not universally known, should be avoided by
learned Men; seeing they cannot be relied on, unless it be supposed
that a vain uncertain report may be so. But I know, if I am not
mistaken, whence Grotius took this observation; to wit from Camero,
who himself had it from Sebastian Munster, the first Author of it, in
his Annotations on Gen. ii. 24. Hebræi magistri, faith he, docent id
quod Paulus ducus, &c. The Jewish Rabbins teach the same thing which is
taught by St. Paul, that a Man should love his Wife as his own Body, and
honour her more than his own Body, because of that signification and Mystery.

The Vulgate Interpreters render it de Amore. Of which Mystery St. Paul also
makes mention, who teaches that we are espoused to Christ. He did not
render the Hebrew words, which seem to be corrupt; but they are
rendred by Camero, after premising that he took them from Munster,
thus: ad significandum conjugium viri superiori, qui benedictus est; to sig-
nify the marriage of the Man on High, who is blessed. And so they are
rendred by Grotius. But מין is not vir, but Homo; besides what is
the meaning of מתה? Should it be read למה to thee? What can be
the sense of these words, the most high Adam shall be blessed? In fine,
both Munster ought to have more exactly cited his Witnesses, and
others been more cautious in believing him. For who will not prove
any thing from the Jews or others, if such Testimonies as these be
admitted? I know this was the custom of the Philologers of the
last Age; but it was certainly a very bad one, and justly censured by
the more exquisite Wits of ours. I am apt to think it proceeded
either from want of Judgment, or unfaithfulness, in their not being
sensible with what caution and tenderness Testimonies ought to be
handled, from which any Confectary is to be deduced, or being un-
willing to have their Citations examined. Both which a Man that
aims at Accuracy and pursues Truth, should be very far from; for he
that would neither be deceived himself, nor deceive others, cannot
desire to have what he affirms believed rashly and without examina-
tion.

IV. A vast inconvenience arises from the custom of writing out oth-
er Mens Citations, unless we look into the Authors themselves from
whence they are taken; because something may easily be added,
whilst the sense is rather expressed than the words. The Hebrew
words allledged by Munster can hardly be understood, and he dared
not translate them. Camero has rendred them, and added of his own,
that the Jews confess the creation of a Woman out of the rib of the Man,
was to signify, &c. When Munster says nothing of that, but only what

*
I have produced out of him. Grotius followed Camero, and neither added nor changed any thing, but Dr. Hammond has changed the highest Man, who is blessed, into the most High, God blessed for ever. Perhaps there will come some body afterwards, and add to these words, that which our Author subjoins out of St. Chrysostom, as taken out of some Rabbins; from whence he will infer that all the mysteries of the Christian Religion were very well known to the antient Jews. As common Fame is magnified the further it goes, so Testimonies not looked into in the Authors themselves, are many times enlarged, as they are deliver'd from hand to hand.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 1. The Author here in his Paraphrase adds to Children, Subjects, and to Parents, Princes; in which he seems to have committed a double fault. First, in supposing that the word Children here comprehends under it Subjects, and the word Parents, in the Decalogue, Magistrates; which appears by no example, nor any reason. I do not deny indeed but that according to the most sacred Laws of human Society, and consequently of God himself, People ought to obey Magistrates, as long as they command nothing which is contrary to true Devotion, Society, or good Manners. That Obedience being as necessary and natural a Duty as for Children to obey their Parents; because without it Society, for which we are formed and born, cannot consist. But hence it does not follow that, when the Scripture speaks of the honour due to Parents, we must presently run the discourse to Magistrates. Secondly, he ought to have represented St. Paul, in his Paraphrase, speaking so as he speaks; and not fasten'd upon him a Conjectury, which he did not think of. Dr. Hammond might, if he would, in his Annotations have deduced from the words of the Apostle, what seemed deducible from them, but not in his Paraphrase, in which St. Paul himself ought to speak, and not his Interpreter. But even in this Dr. Hammond is not so consistent with himself as he ought to be; as I shall observe on ver. 4. See my Notes on the fifth Commandment in Exod. xx.

Ibid. [Ev. Kueay] That is, as far as the Laws of God will permit, as Interpreters generally observe, which was a necessary Admonition, especially at that time in which without doubt there were a great many Heathen Parents, who were displeased with their Children for having embraced the Christian Religion. But Dr. Hammond, who makes the Apostle here to speak of obedience to Magistrates, interprets these words in the Lord by under the Gospel; for as to Parents, it would have been
been but flat to say, that *they* ought as much to be honoured under the Chapter Gospel as under the Law, for who could have doubted of it? But there might have been some among Christians who thought, as most of the Jews did, that they were not to be subject to the Roman Magistrates; for which reason St. Paul more than once in his Epistles teaches the contrary. But he says nothing at all about it in this place. See Rom. xiii. 1.

Ver. 2. πρεσβυτερίων] I am apt to think there is a Hebraism in this place, and that St. Paul renders the word πρεσβυτέρων, which perhaps he had in his mind, by the Greek ἄγαν, because that word signifies both first and one. And thus as the Hebrew word and the Greek πρεσβυτέρων frequently signify first; so reciprocally ἄγαν first will be taken here for one.

Ver. 3. ἰδέα ἐστιν γιαγιάς] This promise, in Moses, belongs only to the Jews, and to those only among them who were obedient to their Parents, and gave them all due Respect and Honour. Besides, that which is there promised is a long and happy Life in Canaan, and that respected not so much particular Persons as the whole Commonwealth; for if the Commonwealth were overthrown, a small number who had honoured their Parents could not expect by virtue of this Promise, to live happily in their own Country. I do not believe that St. Paul understood this Promise in any other sense, because there can be no doubt raised about it. Why therefore did he mention here a Promise which did not at all concern the Ephesians? Undoubtedly not to move or persuade them by that Promise to honour their Parents; but to shew them how very pleasing the performance of that Duty was to God, because he had formerly annexed a promise to the Precept wherein the Duty of Children to their Parents was enjoined. As for what our Author says here about a peaceable Life being the effect of obedience to Superiors or Magistrates, that as it is often true, so it is frequently false. Civil or foreign Wars, not to mention Tyranny or Arbitrary Government, do no more spare faithful than unfaithful Subjects. Tho' it be very true, that factious Persons, and such as are desirous of Innovations, do bring upon themselves a great many evils from the supreme Power; it does not therefore follow that such as are quiet and willing to obey, do enjoy a longer or more happy Life. Which as it holds good at all times, so then especially when the supreme Power is of a different persuasion in Religion from those who honour their Parents, as it was in the time of St. Paul. So that what the Doctor says here about the honour which is to be given to Magistrates, tho' true, does not belong to this place.
Chapter VI.

Ver. 4. Of πατερες μιν πατερον. [The word πατερες here undoubtedly signifies the same with πατερος in the first Verse of this Chapter, that is both Parents. But I cannot but wonder that Dr. Hammond, who took πατερος in that first Verse to be meant of Princes as well as Parents, and thought the Apostle spoke there of that honour which is due from Subjects to Magistrates, should not have one word about them in his Paraphrase on this place, but make mention only of Parents. Is it therefore, that when the Discourse is about the Duty of Children to Parents, to Parents must be joined Princes; but when the Scripture speaks of the Duty of Parents to Children, in that Magistrates are not at all concerned? Or is it true, that tho Subjects ought to obey Magistrates, yet there is no Duty incumbent upon Magistrates with respect to Subjects? What can be the reason of this difference? Surely it deserved to be mentioned if there was any. But, to speak my thoughts, our learned Author writing this in a time when he saw his Countrymen had rose up in Arms against the King, whose cause he very much favoured, and that a great many abused the Power which they thought was lodged in the People, resolved to omit no occasion of magnifying the Authority of Kings; and carefully to avoid every thing which might seem to countenance the Cause of the People, left his Adversaries should abuse it. By which it came to pass, that sometimes he does not so much perform the Office of an Interpreter, as a Preacher for the King's party. About the Cause itself, which I have not sufficiently consider'd as to England, I pass no judgment; but it had been better to interpret St. Paul so, as if there never had been any seditious Persons in England, because our learned Author wrests a great many things in favour of his own side.

Ver. 11. ταυτολογια. This word must not be rendered all the Arms, as if St. Paul had said, take all the Arms which you have. For tho this word be compounded of τοι all, and τοιον, that is, Arms; yet he has made it to signify another thing, which belongs to a particular sort of Soldiers: To wit, that heavy Armour which was born by the Legionarii among the Romans, or those that served in the Phalanges, Brigades of the Macedonians. For tho the Slingers and Archers were furnished with all the Arms, wherewith according to Custom they ought to be armed, yet the ταυτολογια was never said to belong to them. So επιταυτα signified heavy armed Soldiers, without any Addition. And St. Paul very fitly made use of that word in this place, where he does not speak about a Skirmish which might be made with light Armour; but about a long and sharp engagement with very formidable Adversaries. To which purpose he advises them not to take a Sling or a Bow.
Bow, which are light Weapons, but the Armour of Legionary Souldiers. Chapter VI.

Verf. 12. Note a. I will not deny but that the Devils made use of the assistance of Hereticks, whoever they were, to destroy the Pious and Orthodox; but I do not believe that St. Paul has here a direct reference to any Hereticks. For all that is here said, immediately at least, belongs to evil Spirits, as Grotius has shewn, and Dr. Hammond acknowledges. So that there was no necessity for introducing here the Gnosticks.

Verf. 14. Παρειδομοροι.] The Apostle here alludes to Isa. xi. 5. and at the same time to the Custom of Soldiers. The first thing they did was to put a Girdle upon their Coat to keep it fast, and hinder it from moving one way or other under their Breastplate; but they did not put it over their Armour, as Dr. Hammond thought: See Ever. Feistius Ant. Homeric. Lib. iv. c. 8. And therefore St. Paul says ἐς τὸν δομὸν ἄσφαλτον, and not ὅπλα. But it must not be particularly or nicely enquired, why St. Paul compares some Vertues with this kind of Armour, rather than with any other; because he might as well have said that Christians ought to take the girdle of Righteousness, and the breastplate of Truth, as the girdle of Truth and the breastplate of Righteousness. All that he means in this whole Discourse is, that Christian Vertues are Arms which good Men may and ought to use, both to repel the assaults of their Enemies, and to overcome them. Nothing else is here to be sought for, unless we have a mind to feed our selves with Fancies instead of Realities.

Verf. 15. Note b. I. It may be worth our while to read what the learned and diligent Ant. Bynaus, Lib. i. Cap. 5. de Calces Hebraorum, has written on this place. But I am rather of Dr. Hammond's Opinion, which may be confirmed by several places which he alledged, or which are to be found in those Authors whom he cites. But to give further light to St. Paul's words, I shall subjoin here a Passage out of Virgil, in which he describes the pavellia of Aeneas, and omits no part of the Armour mention'd by the Apostle, but the Girdle, nor adds any thing but the Spear, in Aeneid. viii. beginning at verf. 619.

Miraturque, interque manus & brachia versat
Terribilem cristas galeam flammasque vomentem,
Fatiferumque ense, loricam ex are rigentem, &c.
Tum laves ocreas, electro auroque recetto,
Hasiamque & clypei non enarrabile textum.

II. I cannot tell whence our learned Author took this Interpretation of the Egyptian Custom, that the Egyptian Virgins were not permitted
Chapter to wear Shoes, lest they should be ready to go abroad. I have shewn out of Diodorus Siculus, on Exod. xii. 11. that it was the Custom not only for Virgins, but also for Children to go unhod, in Egypt, because of the mildness of the Air.

Ver. 16. Τα βία τα ποιητα τα πανδημεία. Our Author in his Paraphrase is of opinion, that the Apostle here alludes to poisonous Darts, which, faith he, are called fiy because they inflame the parts that are wound with them, as Serpents with poisonous Stings are called fiy Serpents. But I do not think that all sort of poisonous Serpents may be called fiy; because the biting of all such Serpents does not hurt by causing an inflammation, and there is a peculiar kind of Serpents called by that name. I should rather say that the Darts of the Devil are called here fiy, by a Metaphor taken from the fiy Darts, which the besieged use to fling at the Souldiers and Works of the Befiegers, whereof there is frequent mention made in the Histories of the Antients, where Sieges are described. I shall produce but one example, in a matter very well known, out of the Writer of the Spanish War, cap. xi. Noctis, faith he, tertia vigilia, in oppido acerrime pugnatum est, ignemque multum miserunt; sic et omne genus, quibus ignis per jactus solitus est mitti. In the third watch of the Night, they fought in the Town very sharply, and threw a great deal of Fire, as also all kind (of Darts) in which Fire uses to be thrown. These are fiy Darts properly so called; which lighting upon an iron Shield, could do no harm to the Souldiers. And St. Paul here seems to have called the Darts of the Devil fiy, rather than by any other Epithet; because they do mischief by inflaming the sensual Appetite.

Ver. 18. Ποιον ὑλην ἄγιον. Our Author, as appears by his Paraphrase, and the Note in the Margin, thought that the word ἄγιον should here be understood, and so renders this last part of the Verse, concerning all Holy things. And it is certain that an Ellipsis of that word is very common in the Greek Language, but never in such a Phrase as this that I know of. And therefore I had rather follow the Vulgar and other Interpreters, till an example be allledged, in which ἄγιον is the same with ἁγιόν, or in which Νομι οίμοιρ όν signifies, evidently, Prayers for the obtaining all Holiness.
ANNOTATIONS

On the Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Philippians.

At the end of the Preamon.] I. I rather refer this Epistle, as the foregoing, to the Year of Christ LXII. with Dr. Pearson, whom I desire the Reader to consult in his Annales Paulina.

II. Instead of the Gnosticks, who had formerly been Heathens, and which our Author too easily supposes to have been almost in all places where the Apostles had preached, I rather think S. Paul here refers to the Jews, who it is certain were dispersed throughout the whole Roman Empire, and being tenacious of their own Ceremonies, endeavoured to impose them upon all others.

CHAP. I.

Verf. 1. I. What Dr. Hammond here says of Philippi, may be confirmed by other Arguments, by which it will become more manifest. It is very true that Philippi was a Roman Colony; as appears not only from the express Testimonies of the Antients, but also from the Coins of that City. There is a piece of Philippian Money, coined in honour of Claudius, the backside of which has this Inscription; COL. AUG. FUL. PHILIPP. that is, Colonia Augusta Julia Philippensis. And there are other pieces coined in the times of M. Aurelius, Commodus, and Caracalla, that have the like Inscriptions. The learned Joan Foy-Vaillant had reason to think that the name Julia signified that Julius first planted a Colony at Philippi, as Augusta that another was afterwards order'd thither by Augustus. After which Observation, he produces a place out of Dio lib. 51. where he speaks thus about Augustus, after the Victory at Actium: Τις δ' ημών τε ἐν τῇ Ιταλίᾳ, τῆς τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ἀντικρινθέντος, τοῦ ἐν σεβασμὸς τὸς τοῦ πόλεως ἡ σεβασμὸν ἔχειν...
Chapter I. Having banished those People in Italy which bad favoured Anto-
nius, he gave their Cities and Territories to his Soldiers. But instead of
them, he gave the greatest part of those whom he had banished, Dyrrachium
and Philippi, and other Towns, to inhabit. By this it appears, how a
little before St. Paul's time, Philippi came to be enlarged, because
that City had twice received a Colony of Romans. We may consult Foy-
Vaillant, on Numismata area Coloniarum. The same Author tes-
tifies, that Philippi, in pieces of Coin, is stiled Metropolis. But that there
was any regard had in that to Ecclesiastical order, or dignity of Bishops,
even from the very time of St. Paul, Dr. Hammond has not proved,
nor will any other, I believe, prove; tho' the thing be undoubtedly
more antient than many think. The Passage alluded out of the Digest
is in lib. 50. tit. 15. de censibus, leg. 8. §. 8. and is Paulus's, not Ulpi-
an's, as is saied by our Author; who, it seems, cited him upon truist.
He might have added that of Celsus in leg. 6. Colonia Philippiensis juris
Italici est.

II. Our Author affirms, that after Vespasian had brought a Colony
into Caesarea, that City became immediately, even in respect of Ecclesi-
asical Government, a Metropolis; under which Jerusalem it self was.
But at that time there was no Jerusalem, because it had been razed to
the ground, and was not rebuilt till under Adrian, who put into
it a Roman Colony; as we are told by Xiphilinus in the Life of Adrian,
and as appears by a great many Medals in which it is called COL. AEL.
CAP. Colonia Aelia Capitolina. And who told our Author there was
a Bishop at Caesarea in the time of Vespasian? From what marks of
Antiquity did he gather that the Caesarean Bishops were reckoned
superior in Dignity and Order to those of Jerusalem, from the Age of
Vespasian? If what he says be true, that a City which had a Roman Co-
lony brought into it was made a Metropolis, Jerusalem enjoyed that Privi-
lege as well as Caesarea, tho' not quite so soon. Ulpian, in the fore-
mention'd Tit. lib. 1. §. 6. faith, Palastina duae fuerunt Coloniae, & Ca-
sarenfis & Aelia Capitolina, sed neutra jux Italicum babet. But I look
upon this also as improbable.

III. I am ready to think, that the reason why the Antients place
Philippi sometimes in Thrace, and sometimes in Macedonia, is not be-
because those Provinces were variously divided, which yet I do not deny;
but because when Cities stand upon the borders of any two Coun-
tries, it is doubtful to which of them they belong. The same I say
of Nicopolis. What our Author says besides about many Churches,
and those Episcopal, depending upon the Metropolis of Philippi, is no-
thing
thing but Conjecture, which I am not wholly for rejecting, but which I do not easily believe. Learned Men often partly prove things out of the Ancients, and partly make up by Guess and Conjecture what they would have to be true; then they equal their Conjectures to that which they have proved, and from all put together they very easily infer what they please. Because St. Paul preached the Gospel first at Philippi, does it presently follow that that City was also accounted the Metropolis, in respect of Ecclesiastical Order? The rest also is very deceitful and uncertain.

Ibid. Note b. i. The Opinion of Grotius and others seems to be much plainer; who think that as the words Presbyter and Bishop are promiscuously used, tho' there was one Bishop α ἔξω, so called: so also the word Bishop signifies both Orders, first and second; which is the reason why we meet with this word in the Plural Number where the Discourse is but of one Church. There was a Communion of Names between Ministers of the first and second Rank, so that those of the first Rank were sometimes stiled Presbyters, and those of the second Bishops; not because their Authority was the same, and their Office in every respect alike, but because there was little or no difference between them as to preaching the Gospel, and administering the Sacraments. But the particular Power of Ordination might belong to one Bishop, α ἔξω, so called.

II. That which our Author says about Metropolitans, and by the help of which alone he defends himself against his Adversaries, as to those Apostolical Times, is very uncertain; nor can it be proved by the Authority of the Writers of the following Ages, who speak of the Primitive Times according to the Customs of their own, and not from any certain Knowledge: not to say at present, that Bishops or Presbyters aspiring to that Dignity, cannot always safely be heard in their own cause. It is not probable that there was any Episcopal Church in the Proconsular Asia, besides Ephesus, at the time spoken of in Acts xx. or in Macedonia, besides Philippi and Thessalonica. But a little while after, when the number of Christians was increased, there were other Episcopal Seats constituted in them.

Ibid. Note c. i. I also have spoken pretty largely of the word ἡσυχία on Luke viii. 2. and I shall not repeat what I have there said. Our Author in the beginning of this Note uses the word dimensum for demensum, tho' that itself was not proper to be used in this place, because demensum signifies the Portion or Allowance of Servants, not of Guests. See Fr. Taubmannus on Plautus his Stich, Acts i. St. ii. ver. 3.
II. I think indeed with Dr. Hammond, that the Original of Deacons must be fetched from the Jews, and that Deacons were in the Christian Church what the אָנוּסִיָּה עָבָרָיָה, were in the Jewish Synagogue. But I do not think we have any thing to do here with the שְׁבָرأִים, which was the Name only of the Officers that attended upon Magistrates, or certain publick Criers. See my Note on Exod. ver. 8.

III. Nor do I think that real true Juniors, ought to be confounded with the Charanite, especially in Acts v. 6. where any of the younger sort, who were accidentally then present, seem to be meant. Tho' the Disciples of Doctors are called Juniors, in Maimonides, it does not therefore follow that what word must be so taken where-ever we meet with it.

IV. The Saying of the Jews about the decay of Learning among them, which our Author speaks of, is, in Sotæ, fol. 491. thus: שֶׁהַמִּנְהַב בֵּי חֵוֵדֶה תֹּלֶדַת לְחֵוֵדֶה לְתֹּלֶדַת לָלֹאִים לְמַרְבֶּה כְּפֹרָם לְכֵּּהוֹא לְרָשָׁוָה. Since the second House was destroyed, the wise Men began to be as the Scribes, and the Scribes as the Minister of the Synagogue, and lastly the Minister of the Synagogue as the People of the Earth. Which Dr. Hammond mistranslates, and inverts the Words themselves. They may be found by those that may perhaps have a mind to turn to them in the Editions of Joan. Chr. Wagenseilius, in Sotæ, Cap. ix. S. 15. It appears that our Author did not look into this Saying himself, but went upon trust for it, and that made him render it so ill, and not so much as refer to the Book in which it is set down.

Vers. 13. Note e.] Some years ago there arose a great Controversy about this place, between two Gentlemen very skilful in the Roman Antiquities, Ulricus Huberus and Jac. Perizonius, concerning the Signification of the word Pratorium here; whence there was a considerable Volume made, which may be read by those who are curious about such Matters, not without advantage. Huberus thought that Pratorium, where the Discourse was about Civil Affairs, signified the Palace of Cæsar, or properly his Judgment-hall; but Perizonius, a Body of Praetorian Troops, or the Camp in which the Prator’s Guards used to pitch their Tents. And there is no doubt but that the most frequent notion of the Word, in the best Writers, is agreeable to the Opinion of this latter. And so S. Paul’s meaning will be, that his Bonds, that is, the Reason for which he was cast into Bonds, was known to the Prator’s Guards, to which the Soldiers with whom he was bound, might have brought him. Yet others quote a Passage in Cicero, in which Pratorium seems to signify a publick Place of Judicature, in Orat. 5. against Verres,
Verres, cap. ult. Vos omnes rerum foresium, consiliorum maximorum, legum, judiciorumque arbitri & testes celeberrimo in loco PRÆTORII locati, Cæsæorum & Pollux, &c. Te Judges and Witnesses of all matters belonging to Court, of the greatest Counsels, Laws and Suits, who are seated in the place of the Praetorium, Cæsæorum & Pollux, &c. The Forum is the place in which was the Judgment-seat of the Praetor, which may seem to confirm the Interpretation of Phavorinus and Dr. Hammond. For it appears, that there was in the Forum a Temple dedicated to the Cæsæors, by Suetonius in the Life of Julius Cæsar cap. x. But it is not probable that St. Paul, who had appealed to Cæsar, was judged by a City Praetor; and I am rather of Perizonius his Opinion. See his Diss. de Praetorio, S. 35. & seqq.

Verf. 23. Note h. I. What our Author says about the word רַעֵשׁ he owed in part to Grotius, but it is not a Hebrew word which has that signification, but a Chaldee and Syriack one, as Lexicons will shew. When Grotius said it was commonly used by the Jews to signify Death, he meant only the Rabbinis; who often speak more in Chaldee than in Hebrew.

II. That which our Author here says about the word ἀναλύων, may serve to confirm what I have said against him about another compound of the same Primitive, on Luke ix. 12. The conjecture of Philoponus, about the reason why a particular sort of Method is called ἀναλυμα, tho' very agreeable to the nature of the thing, yet seems to be false; because the term ἀναλυμα must be understood by its opposition to ἀντίθεμα, which is another kind of Method. And that being called ἀντίθεμα which gathers up Principles, and deduces Consecutaries from them compounded and joined together, by ἀναλυμα must necessarily be meant that which resolves things conjoined, and separates the parts, to make way for the knowledge of each particular. And indeed that is the use of this Method, as every one knows. Phavorinus faith much righter than Philoponus: ἀναλύων, ἐκ τοῦ συμπλοτοῦ πρῶτον φανεροκτιμένος ὦν αἰχθός διαφύλακτι ῥαξίας ἀναλύουσα. ἂν ἐν ὁ ἀναλύμα ἐκ τῶν συνδέσμων συνεκκομησθαεὶς τοῖς ἀναλύμα, ἐκ τῶν συνδέσμων ὢν ἀναλυματικός. Whence it appears that ἀναλύων is here rightly indeed rendered by reverti, to return, but that this interpretation of it is ill confirmed by the name ἀναλυμα.
OUR Author has well enough confuted, in this place; the Interpretation of Grotius, but has proposed nothing more certain instead of it, nor sufficiently consider'd the several of the Discourse.

I. He ought not to have interpreted ἐν μορφῇ τῷ ὑπερήφανῷ as if it were ἔν ὑπερήφανός, without bringing an example of the like phrase. For as to the word ἐν μορφῇ separately consider'd, supposing that signified what our Author affirms, it will not follow that it has the same signification in this Phrase. But Aeschylius, who was a very bold Poet, is no fit Author to be made use of in explaining the simple stile of St. Paul. And Phavorinus judged of the sense of the word ἐν μορφῇ partly by the use of the Peripatetics, partly by the opinion of Divines, not by its vulgar acceptation. Μορφή ἐν really signifies a servit Form or Appearance, as we shall afterwards see. These things could not be opposed to the perpetual use of the Septuagint and the Writers of the New Testament, according to which, as Grotius has observed; that word does not signify something internal and secret, but apparent and visible.

II. If that were the meaning of St. Paul in this place, which our Author after others supposes, the Apostle should have express'd himself thus: ἐν ἐν μορφῇ ὑπερήφανῷ, ὃ ἐν ὑπερήφανος ἐναρκάω ἐνα ἐνα, ὅμως ἐν ὑπερήφανῷ, who being in the form of God, and thinking it no robbery to be made equal with God, yet emptied himself. And so ἐν ὑπερήφανῷ, &c. would be opposed to all which goes before. But as the words now lie, it is opposed only to ἐν μορφῇ τῷ ὑπερήφανῷ, who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery, but, &c. Which is all one as to say; tho he was in the form of God, yet he did not think he might assume to himself an equality with God, but submitted himself to his Will, and took upon him the form of a Servant, &c. That this is the series of the Discourse, this the sense of this place, was well understood by Novatian in Lib. de Trinitate, cap. xvii. whose words I shall not think much to set down. Imitator omnium paternorum operum, dum ipse operatur sicut & Pater ejus, forma, ut expressimus, est Dei Patris. Et merito in forma pronunciatus est Dei, dum & ipse super omnium, & omnium creaturarum divinarum, &c. Deus est, exemplo, Patris; hoc ipsum tamen a Patre proprio consequitus, ut omnium & Deus est, Dominus est, &c. Deus ad formam Dei Patris ex ipso, genitus, atque prolatus. Hic ergo quamvis esset in forma Dei, non est rapinam arbitramus aequalis, sed Deo esse. Quamvis enim se ex Deo Patre Deum esse memi-
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nisset, nunquam se Deo Patri aut comparavit, aut contulit; memor se esse ex suo Patre, & boc ipsum quod est habere se, quia Pater dedisset. Inde denique & ante carnis assumptionem, sed & post adsumtionem corporis, post ipsum praeterea resurrectionem, omnem Patri, in omnibus rebus, obedientiam praetitit pariter ac praeat. Ex quo probatur nunquam arbitratum illum esse rapinam quandam divinitatem, ut equaret se Patri Deo; quinimô contra omni ipsius imperio & voluntati obediens atque subjicitus ut formam servit fusciperet contentus est. Being an imitator of all his Fathers works, and working also as his Father does, he is, as I have expressed, the form of God the Father. And justly was he pronounced to be in the form of God, because he also being over all things, and having a divine Power over every Creature, is God after the example of the Father; yet so as to have obtained this Dignity from his Father, that he should be God and Lord of all things, and to be God according to the form of God the Father, begotten and brought forth by him. And therefore tho be was in the form of God, he did not think it robbery to be equal with God. For tho be knew within himself that he was God of God the Father, yet be never compared himself with God the Father, being mindful that he was of his Father, and whatever he was, he was by his Father's Gift. And both before and after his assuming Flesh, and after his Resurrection, he yielded and still yields all obedience to his Father in all things. Which shows that he never thought any Divinity robbery, to equal himself with God the Father; nay on the contrary, being obedient and subject to all his Commands and Will, he was content to take upon him the form of a Servant. This is the direct tendency of the form of St. Paul's discourse, which will not admit of any other interpretation. And with this sense all the words made use of by him agree, as I shall shew. But first of all it must be supposed that the Discourse here is about the Man Jesus, and not about the Deity, which is evident, to produce but this one Argument for it, from that which follows; for he whom God hath exalted, and given him a Name above every Name, that in the name of Jesus every Knee should bow, is undoubtedly the Man Jesus, and not the Deity, which never received any thing, nor could receive any new Dignity; and he whom God so very highly exalted, is the same who had humbled himself, and suffer'd Death in obedience to the Will of his Father. This reasoning, which yet is the sum of the common Interpretation, is hardly tolerable. The Divinity of Christ, the equal (yea numerically the same with the Divinity of the Father) to the Father, humbled it self to put on Humanity; wherefore, that Humanity received this Reward from the Father, to be raised to the highest pitch of Glory. On the contrary, it is he that humbled himself, that St. Paul
here says was rewarded. This premis'd, I shall now explain the several Phrases the Apostle makes use of.

III. ἐπὶ μυρόσ ἢ is best of all, interpreted by Grotius, of that Power which was observable in Christ, in so great a degree, that he could do whatever he pleased, wherein he came as near as possible to the most High God. The same thing is elsewhere intimated by St. Paul, where he says that Christ was the visible Image of the invisible God, Coloss. i. 15. For εἰκών & μυρόσ are sometimes the same. Hesychius: Μυρόσ, ἴδα, έδα, the word signifies a form or species. So Suidas: Μυρόσ, έδά, ίδα, σώμας, a Species, Form, or Aspect. And Phavorinus hath the same. Whence μυρόσ ἢ among the Heathens, signifies the Images of the Gods; as in Dionysius Halicarnassæus de Romulo, Lib. 2. Ant. Rom. p. 90. ἵδα μνημέων, ἰεροῦ, ἰδέως, (μυρόσ) ποιήσαν αὐτόν ἠμάκληι — ἀπεκδίωσε: he erected therefore their Temples, and Groves, and Altars, and the places of their carved Statues, and their (Images) and Symbols.

IV. οὐχ ἀνταγωνισμὸν ῥήσας seems to be all one with ἵδα ὑπόστατο ἀνακτή, that is, he did not think it a thing which he might snatch or ravish to himself. So Gregory Nazianzen uses the word ἀνταγωνισμόν, in Orat. 1. against Julian pag. 67. where he speaks of the Government's being usurped by Julian: ἵδα ἀνταγωνισμὸν ἦν ἵδα ἀνακτή, εἰς ἄρτας ἐθνῶν, ἰδέως θεῶνς, ἵδα ἂν λείπων εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὡς ἐρυθάρα ἀλειτωσία: which not a rape or robbery of Fortune, but the reward of Virtue, or Time, or the suffrage of the King bestows. But the expression of Cicero, in Latin, comes much nearer that of St. Paul; who in his V. Orat. in Verrem, speaking of Verres, says: Omnium bona prædam suam duxit, He thought every one Good his prey. And in Lib. vii. Ep. 13. ad Atticum, speaking of Cæsar, after Pompey had forsaken Rome, he says: Huic tradita urbs est, nuda pretio, refertur copias. Quid est, quod ab eo non metuas, quis illa templi et teæa non patriam, sed prædam putat? The City was delivered up to Cæsar, destitute of its Garrison, and was filled with Soldiers. What is there not reason to fear from him who thinks those Temples and Houses, not his Country, but his Prey? The Man Christ, tho he had received all Power both in Heaven and in Earth, yet said in John xiv. 28. That his Father was greater than he, and would not suffer himself to be made equal with God. Contrary to what was done afterwards by Simon Magus, who trusting only to Magical Artifices, dared to equal, if not to exalt himself above God: See Acts viii. 10. and H. Grotius on that place. Which if our Author had but here thought on, without question he would have greedily took up, to say that St. Paul here opposed Jesus Christ to Simon the Patriarch of the Gnosticks.

V. To
V. To ἐγένετο ἡμῖν Σκυλλή, that is, to make himself equal with God. Chapter Which Christ openly professes in Job. v. 19 for after he had said to the Jews, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work; and the Jews thereupon sought to kill him, not only because he had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself, as they affirmed, equal with God; τὸν θεὸν ἐμὸν ἔφυγεν ὁ Σωτῆρ : Jesus answers, that the Son could do nothing of himself, but what he saw his Father do; that is, that he only followed the Example of God, in which he shewed himself to be inferior to him; for he that follows another's Example, and cannot depart from it, is inferior to him who sets the Example. But all this must be understood of the Humanity of Christ, and not of his Divinity.

Vers. 7. Note b. To keep to the Propriety of the Verb καταγόω, it must be rendered thus: He behaved himself so, as if he were void of all that Power which he had received from his Father. He used it no more, than if he had not had it. Which must be understood only of those times, in which Christ was to suffer any thing, either from the Jews, or from the Romans.

Ibid. Ἡμὴν ἱλαρόν.] He did not really become a Servant, but, having taken upon him the form of a Servant, he seemed to be such. For when Christ behaved himself towards the Jews and Romans, who vilified and loaded him with all manner of Injuries and Reproaches, as if he had been subject to their Power, like the rest of the Jews, he truly took upon him the form of a Servant; that is, a fervile Appearance. He did no more use that Power which he had received from God, and whereby he had wrought so many Miracles, and with which he was then endued as much as before, to defend or deliver himself, than if he had quite exhausted it. It is known that among the Hebrews those who obey, are called Servants נֶעְבָּדִים bəbadim, and those that are subdued by Power, are said to become its Servants. They who understand these Words of the Divine Nature, interpret them of the Assumption of Humanity, because Men are the Servants of God; which might be born, if any thing in the Context favoured their Opinion.

Ibid. Ἐν τοίνυν ἁμαρταὶ ἀνθρώπων ἡμῶν.] The Apostle does not say ἀνθρώπων γυνῶν, being made Man; which might intimate his Incarnation, and would be the same Phrase with that in Job. i. 14, but he was made in the likeness of Men; that is, was like other Men, who submit to a Superior Power, because they cannot resist it, and suffer themselves to be ill used, when they are unable to defend themselves. Christ was neither a Servant to the Jewish or Roman Magistrates, nor destitute of Power, to deliver himself from their Injuries and Cruelty;
Chapter but he behaved himself so, as if he were like the rest of the Jews, and had nothing in him peculiar or extraordinary. The External Appearance of Christ at that time was ἄνθρωπος, the form of a Servant; he was ἡμιανθρωπός, or, as the Jews speak, כֹּל הָאָדָם, chneged, the Sons of Men, that is, κυρίων ἀνθρώπων, ordinary Men; for so the Hebrew word כָּל adarm sometimes signifies. I wonder here at Grotius, who interprets these Words, made like to the first Men, i.e. sinless; which is a Phrase without Example, and very distant from this place; where it is manifest the Discourse is about the Humiliation of Christ. I know he puts a Diapeople after καὶ, and makes these Words to begin a new ἀντιθέτος, opposite Member in the Discourse, but nothing can be more violent.

Ver. 8. Καὶ ἡμιανθρωποί ἐστι καὶ ἀνθρωπός. ] When the Jews and Romans persecuted him, he was just like an ordinary Man in outward Appearance. This is the proper Signification of the word ἡμιανθρωπός. Ησυχία: Σκευας, πλάσμα, ἰματισμός, διάβαθμος, κόσμος, [in the Latin it is printed κόσμος] a Fiction, a Garment, Disposition, Habit, or Ornament: Σκευας τίμιας περιτυγίων, ἡμιανθρωπός, counterfeit, making a show, or appearance. The old Glosses: Σκευας, figura, cultus, habitus, gestus, gêstae, forma. And this is extremally well opposed to the form of God, in which the Christ appeared when he wrought so many and great Miracles; yet when he was abused and persecuted by the Jews and Romans, he was like one of the Multitude, and put on no other appearance than belonged to any ordinary Person.

Here again I cannot but wonder at Grotius, who interprets these Words thus: Dignitate talis apparuit qualis Adamus, id est Dominio in omnes creaturas, in mare, ventos, panes, aquam, &c. He appeared such in Dignity as Adam, that is, with Dominion over all Creatures, over the Sea, Winds, Bread, Water, &c. For Adam indeed had the use of all those things which God had made, and which were within his reach; but he had not a Command over the Sea and the Winds, and every thing in Nature, like Christ. See my Note on Gen. i. 26.

Ibid. Εὐθείαν πάνω εἰσῆλθεν.] That is, in obedience to the Will of his Father, he subjected himself to all manner of Indignities, and Death itself, no less than if he had been one of the meanest sort of Persons. He who had the command of the whole World, suffered himself to be despightfully used, and cruelly killed by wicked Men. This cannot in the least be said of the Divine Nature, and therefore nor that which went before. For such a Discourse as this would be intolerable: The Divine Nature of Christ condescended so low as to assume Humanity, and humbled it self so, as to become obedient to the Death of the Cross.
Cros. The Divinity of Christ was not obedient unto Death, but his Chapter
Humanity only, as all agree. And all that is in the same compass of
Words, and the same Antithesis ought to be referred to one and the
same Nature, unless the undoubted Signification of Words, or the
things spoken of require the contrary.
Ibid. [στίχως ἦν ἐνωστὸς μείζων Σωτήρ, Σωτήρ Α' τίθην.] In this part of his
Humiliation, which was the greatest, Christ might be said in a special
manner to have taken upon him the form of a Servant; the Cross be-
ing, among the Romans, a servile punishment. See Grotius.
Ver. 9. Μω αὐτῷ ἀναμένωσιν. This is the reward of the Humili-
ation which that Nature underwent that was obedient unto death;
that is, the Humane. The Divine Nature cannot have any reward
conferred upon it, which as it is never lessened, so it is never exalted,
or made greater.
Ibid. [ὕσια μὴ παύει ματα. This is well interpreted by Grotius, of
Christ's Dignity; for when a new Dignity is conferred, there is a new
Name also conferred. St. Paul, who is his own best Interpreter, in Eph.
i. 20. says: He raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right-
hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might
and dominion, and every Name that is named, not only in this
age, but in that which is to come, and hast put all things under his feet.
Where a Name that is named signifies a Dignity, as the foregoing
words manifestly shew.
Ver. 10. Ἐκ τῆς ἐνυματίας ἰσότ.] That is, not because he is called Jesus,
as Dr. Hammond misinterprets it; but, that all Creatures might re-
verence the man Jesus, exalted to so high a dignity as to be God's Vice-
gerent. By his Redemption indeed he acquired to himself a power
over all men, whom he made his own; but not over other intelligent
Natures, who receive, properly speaking, no benefit by the Redemption
of Mankind. And therefore the Apostle has no reference here
to the title of Redeemer, but of King, and one that was so even of
the Angels, because it so pleased God, no less than of Men.
Ver. 11. ὁ Κυρίος Ἰησοῦς.] Lord, namely, of all things, ex-
cepting him that put all things under him. This is the Name above ev-
ery name, which St. Paul before spake of, and not the name of Jesus.
Ver. 17. Note e. There is no doubt but St. Paul here has a refe-
rence to the pouring out of Wine upon Sacrifices, and compares his
Blood also to Wine. And it is as undeniable, that the Faith of the Phi-
lippians is here consider'd as a Sacrifice which the Apostle offered up to
God. But what our Author says here besides, are vain Niceties, which
have no ground either in the use of the Greek Language, or the sacred
Writers.
O. cannot otherwise be rendered, than not to weigh things. It does not appear by any example, that Plutarch otherwise understood, or that which is sign of fearfulness. For they who pride themselves in the words of the Jews, to whom Plutarch applies them, who may be confounded, for they who apply them to themselves, are with reason confounded.

Verf. 1. Note, i. e. I do not think it necessary to write the solemn, nor the sacrifice, to be offered, rather than the publick Office of the Priests. It is highly important to our Author, to shew his own words, from whence the publick Office of the Priests to God and the things, as is nothing but a publick Office of the Priests.
II. The word 

III.

H. The word 

III.

Ver. 11. Ei πως καλητεχνει γεις των Καθαρων.] By which here, tho set simply without any addition, must be understood a Resurrection to a blessed life; because tho the dead bodies of the wicked are to be restored to their former state, yet that Restoration is hardly worth the happy name of a Resurrection, which is succeeded by eternal death. Thus Polycarpus also speaks in his Epistle to the Philippians: "Ο ουκελος αυτω (Χριστων) ει καθε της ινας εις αυτη"; και ποιηθει αυτω της ονειρης αυτων εις της ονειρης αυτω: He that raised Christ from the dead, will raise us up also, if we do his will, and walk in his commandments.

Ver. 12. Note d. Tho S. Paul here uses several words taken from the Agones, and the τελευτα τυχεμενα may perhaps signify the most noble and valuable Rewards; yet that τελευταναι is an Agonistical term, I shall not believe till I see some place in an antient Writer, who in the description of an Agone uses it in that sense. For it is not necessary to think that St. Paul keeps in every thing to the same Metaphor; nor can it be inferred from the phrase τελευτα τυχεμενα, that τελευταναι is to attain to those Rewards, unless an example to that purpose be alluded.

I. I acknowledge that Gregory Nyssen calls the Death of a Martyr τελευταναι αναλημεναι, but he does not therefore allude to the Agonistical way of speaking, in that word, as in the word αναλημεναι. Ecclesiastical Writers very often call Martyrs Athletae, and the Death of Martyrs 

II. It is not probable that the Apostle James, in c. i. 17. had a reference to the Rewards of the Agones, because οδον and διαγεια are not Agonistical names, signifying the Rewards of such as overcame. Of the passages alluded out of the Epistle to the Hebrews, I shall treat in that Epistle.
Chapter III. What our Author says about the word ἰδίῳ is true; but S. Chry.

III. soṣtom's Observation does not belong to that, but to the word ἔνα

IV. St. Paul here uses the Verb ἐξενάθμισε in a more general sense, not for Death, but the attainment of Perfection, from which men cannot fall into an unhappy condition; such as is the Perfection of the Saints, admitted into the mansions of eternal Blessedness. So that his meaning is this; that he had not as yet attained to such a degree of Holiness, as was perfect, from which he could not fall. We meet with this Verb used to signify Perfection in Vertue, in Jam. ii. 22. 1 Joh. ii. 5. and iv. 12, 13, 18. See also Ver. 15. of this Chap.

Ibid. Note f. That which was said of one of the Antients, Nescivit manum de tabula tollere, may justly be applied to our Author, who seldom knew when he had said enough about one thing. Because in some places he had some reason to think that the Gnosticicks were referred to by the Apostles, therefore wherever there was but the least occasion for such a suspicion, the Gnosticicks must undoubtedly be respected; as if all the Hereticks and wicked men that disturbed the Christian Churches at that time, had been Gnosticicks. And so here, because there are some Agonistical terms used, he strains them all to the same Metaphor, and can see nothing in this place but Metaphors borrowed from the use of the Agones. The Verb ἐξενάθμισε here may much more naturally be interpreted of that Action of Christ, when he suddenly κατέλαβε apprehended S. Paul as he was persecuting the Christians in his way to Damascus, in order to make him an Apostle. But if any one will needs, with Dr. Hammond, have this to be an Agonistical word, I should not interpret it of the attaining a prize, but of overtaking or catching, viz. when a swift Runner overtook another that ran more slowly; as if Christ should be said to have run after St. Paul, and overtook him. Suidas: κατεληκείν εἶπεν η ὃ ταῖς ποδίσκαιν λείψας, ὅ πλὴν περιοῦν διάδεξιν κατελαβεῖ: The word is applied also to the swiftness of the feet, and therefore we say, such a one pursuing another that ran away, overtook him.

Verf. 20. Note I. I. Our Author, in the beginning of this Note, puts municipium for municipatus; for municipium is the Town corporate it self, and municipatus the Privileges or Condition of municipes, Free-men of any City or Corporation: Which word Tertullian and S. Jerrom make use of to explain this place, as learned men have observed.

II. But, the truth is, neither of these words belong to it; for no municipes could say, My municipatus, or my municipim is in Rome. Rome could not be called a municipium, which name belonged first on-
ly to the Cities of Italy, but afterwards also to others, the Inhabitants of which were indeed Roman Citizens, but in their municipia were govern'd by their own municipal Laws, and not those of Rome: of which see A. Gellius, lib. xvi. c. 13. If we would describe the Condition of Christians by a Metaphor taken from the Condition of municipes, we ought to say, that they have indeed a municipium on Earth, but their City is in Heaven.

III. I can't tell whether the place in Cicero was transcribed by our Author out of Cicero himself; but it's certain it is false quoted. For it is in lib. 2. de Legg. cap. 2. in these words; Omnibus municipibus duas esse censeo patrias; unam naturae, alteram civitatis (not juris) ut illa Cato cum eft Tusculi natus (not exemplo Cato quia) in populi Romani civitatem (not societatem) suscepit eft. If our Author wrote this passage out of Cicero himself, he was scarce awake; if he transcribed it out of another, he did not act prudently. [See Note on Matt. xiii. 54. where this place is cited by Mr. le Clerc upon another occasion.]

IV. Polis in Acts xxii. 28. does not signify municipium or municipatus, but the Privilege of the City of Rome. Besides, that word does not belong to this place; for no one would say, besides Dr. Hammond who abounds with improprieties of Speech, our privilege of Citizenship is in Heaven? Polis here is all one with polis City, that is, Patria Country; huius rei polis in caelo; that is, our City or Country is in Heaven, and not on Earth. Elsewhere polis signifies the way of administering a Commonwealth. According to the twofold signification of the Verb polis, which is taken, for living in a City, or administering a Commonwealth, the word polis has also the two alleged significations. But the former only can be admitted here, because St. Paul speaks of a Place, as appears by the Preposition in, in; in caelo, in Heaven. See Heb. xi. 13. and seqq.

CHAP. IV.

Vers. 3. Of this Phrase see my Note on Deut. xxxii. 32. where I have spoken of it at large, and confirmed what Dr. Hammond here says. But he produces imprudently a piece of a Verse as out of Homer, taking it upon trust, which is no where extant in him. At least as I never read it, that I remember, so neither can it be found by the help of Seberus's Index. It is very ill done in any to alledge the Antients in such a manner, that the Reader cannot know whether they are truly cited: such Persons deserve never to be trusted.
Chapter IV. Note b. I can easily assent to what our Author here says, if we put but Jews instead of Gnosticks, or if by the name of Gnosticks we understand the Jews themselves; because tho' it is certain there were Judaizers wherever the Jews were, it is not certain that the Heathen Sect of the Gnosticks was so widely dispersed. It must be further added, that ἰέω does not signify only the Mind, but also frequently quickness of Wit or Understanding; whence ἰέω is to be ingenious. Hesychius tells us, that this word signifies ἱέως, ἰενθεῖσθαι, properly, the action of a composed mind, that is, a clear understanding of things. And so St. Paul's meaning here will be, that the love of Peace was much better than all the Wit and Subtilty that the Disturbers of the Church boasted of.
ANNOTATIONS
On the Epistle
Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Colossians.

At the end of the Preface.] I. It may not be unuseful to observe that Colossae was even in antient Times a wealthy and populous City; as those generally were which the first Preachers of the Gospel went to, because of the likelihood of having a greater harvest in them than in others. Xenophon in Lib. i. de Exped. Cyri speaks of it in this manner: Ἕξαερε, ἵνα τευγγάς τιτεὶς Κολοσσαῖς πόνην ἀπεμειναί, ἐνδικηματα νὰ μεταλείπειν: he led (them) through Phrygia one Station, eight Parafanges, to Colossæ, a populous, rich and great City.

II. This Epistle seems to have been written in the same Year with the two foregoing, that is, according to the account of Dr. Pearson whom I follow, Anno Christi lxxii. and the ixth of Nero.

CHAP. I.

Ver. 15. Ἐξάερε, ἵνα τευγγάτων.] The word εὐξάερε mysteries must be supplied here after εὐξάερε, thus: the visible Image of the invisible God, which is to be understood of the Humanity of Christ itself, as Beza well observes, who may be consulted. But to the Humanity of Christ we must add the visible Miracles which he wrought in the view of Multitudes. This is that which is otherwise called μεταφασμα in Philip. ii. 6. Our Author ought to have expressed this more fully in his Paraphrase.

Ibid. Note a. I. If we carefully examine the places brought by our Author and others, to prove that παραγινος signifies sometimes a Lord, we shall find them to be of no force. In Psal. lxxxix. 28. the firstborn of the Kings of the Earth, doth not signify a Lord over other Kings, but an excellent or most glorious King, as Dr. Hammond himself acknowledges, and the thing itself shews. But Job xviii. 13, makes
Chapter makes nothing at all to the purpose, for the firstborn of Death is not there the Lord of Death, but a mortal or deadly Disease. In the Civil Law, Hæres an Heir, does not signify properly Dominus a Lord; but Justinian tells us, that he who pro Domino gerit, represents or manages for a Lord, gerit pro Herede, does the same for an Heir; and then he adds: Veteres enim hæredes pro dominis appellabant: For the Antients used to say Heirs for Lords. But hence it does not follow, that because the Heir was the First-born, therefore the First-born of an Estate may be put for an Heir, and so for the Lord of an Estate.

II. I think therefore with Beza and others, that by μεστότοχος ηῶν νόμων is meant he that was before all Creatures; but I interpret μεστότοχος just in the same manner as if St. Paul had simply said αἰώνιος, laying no Emphasis at all on the two last Syllables τόνως, which come from the Verb τίμητοι to bring forth. Because μεστότοχος a firstborn is before the rest of his Brethren, therefore St. Paul calls Christ the first-born of every Creature, just in the same sense as if he had called him αἰώνιος νόμων. This Interpretation the Apostle himself suggests to us, who explaining his own mind, says more clearly in vers. 17. he is ο vids πρῶτος before all things; and in vers. 18. calls Christ μεστότοχος in οἰκονομίαν the first-born from the dead, that is, μεστότοσ ἡγησάθη ἐν οἷς ἐπλησίων, he that was first raised from the dead. St. Paul proves that Christ was before every Creature, because by him all things were created. But no body in his wits ever dreamt that the Man Jesus was before every Creature; and therefore this must be understood of the Λόγος or divine Reason, the πνεύμα ναόν of which, as St. Paul afterwards speaks, it pleased the Father, ἐν αὐτῷ κατασκεύασεν, should dwell in him. See my Notes on John i.

III. I know that not only Joan. Crellius, and other Unitarians, but also H. Grotius interpret these things of the new Creation, and tell us that Christ is called here the first-born of every Creature, because he was the first and chief in the new Creation. But that is a forced Interpretation, and remote from the most usual sense of the words, if we consider what follows. Besides, that in this place it should be laid in the praise of Christ that he was before every new Creature, that is, before the Renovation made by himself, and this again proved by that Renovation, and repeated in vers. 17. is certainly flat and mean, when the thing is so evident of itself. Compare this place with John i. and see what I have there said.

Vers. 16. ἐν αὐτῷ ἐντοιχία ταῦτα ταῦτα τα ταῦτα ἦσαν, ἐν τῷ ὑπὸ τῶν ὅψιν. I acknowledge that things are sometimes said ἐντοιχία which are constituted, or which have acquired a new State, as Grotius has shewn in his Preface.
mena before the Gospels: So Men converted to Christ are called new Chapter
Creatures, and the like. I have shewn also that νεων signifies colonis
instruere, To furnish with Inhabitants, on Gen. i. 1. But if we through-
ly examin this phrase of St. Paul, we shall easily perceive that those
interpretations can here have no place. Christ is said here νισσας to
have created all things in Heaven, which St. Paul afterwards inter-
prets of Angels. Now, 1st. This cannot signify to constitute the Angels
in Heaven which were already in it, and performed the same Offices
as before. 2ly. Nor can the Angels be said to have been put into a new
State, because nothing new befell them, but their becoming subject to the
Man Christ; upon which account they can no more be said νισσας
by him, than the Romans by Julius Caesar, because he ruled over them
with the title of Perpetual Dictator; that is, not without speak-
ing very improperly. 3ly. Nor would it be any thing more proper
to say that the Angels νισσας, because Heaven received new Inhabit-
ants into it. That these significations or any of them might be ad-
mitted, it should have been said ἑγουσι νισσας, and not the Angels, be-
cause we might then indeed think (if there was nothing in the Con-
text to oppose it) that things in Heaven were disposed after a new
manner, or that there was a certain use of it constituted and settled,
or lastly, that it was furnished with Inhabitants; but that the Angels
themselves, who were already in Heaven before the Man Christ, and
discharged the same Offices, should be said to be created or conditi-
made, the use of the Holy Scriptures will not bear, nor the genius of
the Hebrew or Greek Languages. I observe that the Learned do often
err, in thinking that any signification which belongs to words when
they are found separately, or in such or such a particular construc-
tion, may also be attributed to them in any construction whatsoever.
But if the reading of the Antients did not, methinks the very geni-
us of Modern Languages might teach them, that there is a great dif-
ference between the significations of words, according as they are
joined with one another, and that the sense of Phrases is quite chang-
ed by the addition or alteration of one small Particle.

To understand therefore the Apostle's mind, nothing can be here
more fitly devised than this Paraphrase: "Ος ου εν κυριωτις ην οερης ειναιν
Θεον δοετε, κε αυτου Θεον ην αετης μενον κπονοι, κε αυτου νεων τα καινα:
Who among Men was a visible Image of the invisible God, and was with
God before all Creatures, for by him were all things created, &c.

Ibid. Note b. I do not think the same words can be understood of:
Angels and Men, as if the several Orders among both were intended
by the same Names. See Grotius on this place.
All things were created by him, viz. *de aequo* by the divine Reason; and for him, that is, that the infinite Wisdom of the divine Reason might be made manifest. See John i. and my Notes on the first 18 Verses of that Gospel.

Ver. 20. Note c. This Interpretation is violent and forced, and tho agreeable enough to Divinity, quite contrary to Grammar, and therefore I think it is wholly to be rejected. For the question is not, whether what Dr. Hammond says be true, but what the Apostle says in this place.

I. I acknowledge there is some agreement between Ephes. ii. 14. & seqq. and this place, for in both the Redemption of Christ is spoken of; but that they are perfectly and in all things parallel, I utterly deny, and so will any one who does but read both places with any Application. And therefore this place ought not to be strained, to agree exactly with that other.

II. This reasoning of our Author is inconclusive: *The Heavens and the Earth signify this lower World; this lower World is all one with Men; therefore all things in Heaven and Earth signifies all Men, Gentiles as well as Jews.* The parts of this Argument are false, and the consequence illegitimate. *Firstly,* it is false that *Heaven and Earth* does any where signify merely this lower World, that is, the Earth and the Air lying round about it, exclusive of the upper spaces. For those words are used to comprehend the whole Universe, not excepting the Starry Heaven, as appears by Gen. i. I confess Heaven often signifies the Air, but then it is not joined with the Earth, which must be carefully observed; for the usual signification of an entire Phrase is one thing, and of single words another. *Secondly,* granting that the Phrase *Heaven and Earth* signifies this inferior World, it will not follow that Men are so called, nor indeed are they so ever. But *thirdly,* suppose that also were true, it must be observed that it is not said here simply that *Heaven and Earth* were reconciled, but *all things which are in Heaven or in Earth,* which is a quite different thing; for in this phrase, the Heaven and the Earth, are clearly distinguished from those who are in them; nor can the words *Heaven and Earth* be here thought synonymous to the name *World,* which often signifies Men. The Particle *or,* which being twice repeated is a *Disjunctive,* shews also that those who are in Heaven, are not the same with those who are on Earth, and therefore that Men only cannot be intended. Besides, tho the word *World* signifies all Men, and *Heaven and Earth* is called the World, it does not follow that Men may be signified by these words, *all things which are in Heaven or in Earth.* In interpreting Lan-
Fourthly, hence it may be inferred, that what our Author adds about the Phrase πᾶς καὶ ἄλλα τὰ πάντα, every Creature, is to no purpose, for it is certain that is often used to signify all Men; but that this other all things both which are in Heaven and on Earth signifies the same, appears by no example.

III. If Eph. ii. 16. ought to be corrected to Dr. Hammond's mind, we should not change eis ἀνωτέρων into eis ἀνωτάτων, which would here signify nothing, but into eis τὸ ἀνωτάτων into the same: But there is no need of any correction. What follows makes nothing to the purpose, and as it does not help Dr. Hammond, so it does not hurt me.

IV. The reconciliation of Angels is not to be understood of a reconciliation with God, but with Men, who being God's Enemies by evil Works, were at the same time Enemies to the Holy Angels; which are so intimately allied to God, that the Friends and Enemies of the one are the Enemies and Friends of the other. But Men being once converted by Christ to a holy and religious Life, and made Friends with God, they become also Friends to the Angels, who love the good as much as they detest the wicked. Thus God has reconciled all things into him, that is, Angels and Men, acknowledging and worshipping one Lord Jesus Christ; made them Friends with one another, and composed one Family of all those orders of Creatures, who were before at a vast distance from each other, both in their Habitations and Dispositions. This is that which is signified in Ephes. i. 10. on which place see Grotius. It was a Mystery before unknown, that the time would come when πάντα τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, that is, all the Nations upon Earth, should become one Family with the Angels, as well as the Jews; that is, should own and worship the true God according to his own prescriptions, and so be accounted his Children. Which being so, what our Author alleges as out of that place in St. Paul, to confirm his interpretation of this, is insignificant.

Ver. 22. Note d. Grotius and others, much better interpret this Phrase of a fleshly Body, that is, obnoxious to the same Infirmities as ours. It is not true, that φύτος signifies Body, tho our Author has several times affirmed it.

Ver. 24. Τὰ Ἀναγκαία τὰ ἄλλα ἄλλοις ἔργοις.] That is, I that formerly persecuted the Church of Christ, do now on the contrary suffer many evils.
Chapter evils for its advantage, and go on to suffer with undaunted constancy. II. all that Christ has left me to suffer for his Church. So I have interpeted this place in my Ars Critica, Part 2. S. i. C. xii. where see what I have said.

**CHAP. II.**

*Ver. 8.* Easily grant that these Words signify Philosophical Do. Note b. trines; but it does not appear to me that the Gnostick are here referred to. For why may not the Apostle have a respect to the Heathen Philosophers, who had not a full and entire knowledge of true Vertue, but only some Elements of it? No body certainly can doubt but there were Philosophers in all parts of Asia, who might oppose the Christian Religion; but it is not so easy to prove that the Followers of Simon were so universally dispersed.

*Ver. 9. Note c.* The Context seeming to require the sense which our Author gives of this place, it is probable to me that σωκηω signifies here indeed Elements, or Rudiments of Vertue; but that S. Paul alludes to another Signification of that Word, because he opposes to σωκηω, σωμα Θεων, the Body of the Deity. And that is when it is taken for a Shadow, of which Signification we have a clear Instance in these words of Julius Pollux, Lib. VI. c. 8. το σωκηω την παλαιατηρησια την οπι το εχθεδον οδι, εν κ α ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΟΝ εκδον. και αυτο σωκηων οι άνθρωποι εις την σωκηων ειν: they gathered from the Shadow when it was time to go to the Supper, which [shadow] they called σωκηων: and it behoved them to make haste if the σωκηων was ten foot long. This he took from Aristophanes, in whom a Woman is brought in speaking thus, in Concionat. pag. 744. Ed. Maj. Genev.

---

"Ουτα το δεινον το σωκηων, λεγεις τοιον εις Θεων.

Take care, as soon as the Shadow (on the Sundial) is ten foot long, to go [instantly] or neatly to the Supper. On which place the Scholiast has the same Observation with that I have set down out of Pollux. And hence perhaps the Representations which are made to us in Dreams were called σωκηων, because they are as the obscure Shadows of things. Suidas: Στοιχειον, αι εικονες και διαπλασιοι την ανεικον, αι δι' ολιγον την κολαξ τω ιεναν κειμενοι: the Images and Fictions of Dreams, which in a shorter or longer time have their exit. So that σωκηων κοσμον, that is, an obscure and faint Description of those Duties which Men ought to perform, or the gross and rude Elements of Vertue, are very fitly here opposed ὡμων ελαφραίας ἡμεῖς Θεων ομοτητῶν κατοικίᾳ εἰς Χριστόν to all the Fulness of the Godhead dwelling bodily in Christ.

*Ver.*
Ver. 16. Note e. Tho I deny not but the Hebrew יִפְטָא may Chapter be rendred by μὴ, yet two things hinder my assenting to Dr. Hammond. First, that the Talmudical Traditions were not written at that time, nor consequently divided into Chapters. Secondly, that to condemn in the Chapter of the Feast is no Rabbinical phrase, to signify the condemnation of a Person not observing what is taught in the Chapter of the Talmud concerning a Feast. What then is καταλεγόμενον; I answer, it is an Elliptical expression, the sense of which is this, καταλεγόμενον, ὅτι πᾶτε ἐν μνεῖς ἄρπαν ἡμεῖς ἠφελτοῦ ὕποπτα ἡμαῖς, οὐ μνείς, ἐκεῖ, because ye do not reckon the Jewish Feasts, or New Moons, or Sabbaths, in the place or number of Holy days. So καταλεγόμενον in Βεσπτι, ἐν πολίς, is to condemn you because you do not scruple eating, what the Jews thought it unlawful for them to eat or drink. It is a very noted Phrase, οὐδὲν ἐν μνεῖς πᾶς πεπηγματο, not to reckon in the place of any thing, that is, not to think it such, or the same. Of which Henr. Stephanus, or Rob. Constantinus, or any other Lexicographer will furnish us with plenty of examples.

Ver. 18. Note f. The word καταλεγόμενον, by Analogy, may have that signification which our Author gives it; but the following words do not favour it, which much better agree to the notion of deceiving than condemning. And indeed καταλεγόμενον may properly signify to obtain the prize against another, or καταλεγόμενον ἐκ τῶν, and then by a Metaphor to deceive, because the Prize which was due to another was often got by deceitful Artifices. Suidas: καταλεγόμενον, καταλεγόμενον, καταλεγόμενον, τό ἄλλο ἀναφορΐν ἄλλον σαλποῦν λιγύς ἄντεκος καταλεγόμενον: recenseatur, let it be recounted, let him condemn, (perhaps it should be read καταλεγόμενον let him be condemned) let him be overcome. The Apostle uses καταλεγόμενον to signify that when one strives, another is crowned. I believe instead of καταλεγόμενον we ought to read καταλεγόμενον, let him be deceived, for there is no Affinity between καταλεγόμενον and καταλεγόμενον recensere.

Ibid. Note g. The phrase σιλψ ἐν τίνι πεπηγματι, is without doubt a Hebraism; for the Jews say, ר ים הבשבי bo, that is, literally, סלבים in divs. But to speak my thoughts, if there were any Authority to countenance it, instead of σιλψ I should willingly read the word with an addition but of one Letter θελων, which yields an excellent sense thus: let no Man deceive you, ENTICING or ALLURING you by Humility and worshipping of Angels, &c. Nothing agrees better with deceiving than σαλποῦν alluring. But I am not for changing any thing against the consent of the Copies.
Chapter II.

Verse 19. Περὶ τῆς οὕτως θετικῆς ἀπαχορίας, &c.] I have explained this place, contrary to Dr. Hammond, on Eph. iv. 16.

Ibid. in Note i. pag. 658. col. 2. lin. 16. After the words Advice or Opinion only.] That which Dr. Hammond adds, in the end of this Note, after the words here set down, being an explication of some passages in the English-Saxon Councils, which cannot be understood by those who are ignorant of the old Saxon Language, and is in itself of little moment, I have omitted in my Latin Translation. But instead of it I shall make some remarks on St. Paul’s words, and the foregoing part of the Doctor’s Annotation:

I. The words μὴ ἀνάγεσθαι, ἐν τῇ ἀποχεῖσθαι, are very fitly referred to forbidden Meats; for Swines-flesh could not be touched according to the Jewish Statutes, without pollution; and it was unlawful to taste or eat several other sorts of Meats which might be touched without Defilement. Or else, as Grotius thinks, these words might be rendered, ne tangeas ut vesarias, ‘touch not with a design to eat,’ of which see my Note on Gen. iii. 3. The words μὴ δικαίωμαι I refer also to the same forbidden Meats. Tho the Verb δικαίωμαι be used in places where another that signified to come near might have been used almost in the same sense, it does not therefore follow that that Verb may be so rendered, or signifies just the same, because handling is something more than coming near; for one that comes near a thing does not therefore touch it, tho’ it cannot be touched without coming near it. The Judaizers often made use of these words, speaking of those Meats which were prohibited by the Law, touch not, taste not, handle not; not all perhaps at the same time, or in the same order, but now one, and then another, just as it happened. So that it is no matter if the same thing be repeated, as long as they are different words, which were equally used to signify one thing.

II. The following words ἐντὸς τοῦ φυτοῦ εἰς ἀναχορεῖσθαι, are, I suppose, to be understood, with Grotius, of the corruption of Meats cast out of the Body τῆς ἀποχεῖσθαι (for so it must be read with some of the Antients) by excretion, i.e. by their being turned into excrements. To which there is a parallel sense in Mat. xv. 17. In comparison with this, our Author’s interpretation is harsh and violent. For how could it be said of the Meats from which the Jews abstained, which are abused to bring in abominable Lusts? That agrees indeed to the Doctrine about the unlawfulness of Marriage, but by no means to abstinence from Meats, which yet the Doctor would have to be also respected in the words immediately foregoing.

III. Τίμη does sometimes undoubtedly signify a Price, or also a Reward, from τίμω to pay; but τίμη σαφές cannot therefore here be the supplying of the
the wants of the Flesh, because it is opposed τῇ ἀρετῇ σαμαρταῖα to pinch-}

ing and not sparing the Body. And so those who live an austere Life, and content themselves with mean fare, are very fitly said to live ἐν τῷ ἐρχομένῳ, because they seem to give no honour to their Bodies. It is also a forced Interpretation of τῷ ἐρχομένῳ to say that it signifies Marriage or the honourable use of Marriage, because the conjugal State is somewhere said to be τῷ ἐρχομένῳ, honourable, and he that lives chastly, and does not pollute his Body with shameful Lusts, may be said ἐν τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ἐκείνῳ to possess his Body in honour. There must always be a regard had to places and construction, in finding out what words signify, and not any signification affixed to them in all places, as our Author sometimes does.

IV. In 1 Thess. iv. 5. all Copies read ἐκαθαμβάζει, not ἐκαθαμβάζει, and Dr. Hammond ought not to have produced his own Conjecture for the words of St. Paul, without an Admonition. See on that place.

V. I do not indeed condemn ἡδονοσθενία, as it is described by our Author; but I cannot persuade my self that St. Paul here uses that word in a good sense. When he says that the Life of those whom he condemns, had some κατὰ σοφίαν, he does not speak his own Sentiments, but the opinion of the Vulgar, who are more taken with those outward shews, than with true inward Piety. And I have this reason on my side, that according to the judgment of St. Paul, that Humility which consisted in the worship of Angels, had no appearance of Virtue in it; because to speak in the softest terms, it favoured something of Idolatry. The same may be said of ἀφελεία συμμακατε, which he declares to profit but little; which place I wonder Dr. Hammond would alledge, seeing it makes so much against him. But besides this, there is another reason which puts this matter out of all doubt, and that is, that the ἡδονοσθενία here spoken of, is the worship of Angels, which was therefore unlawful because voluntary; it being unwarrantable to invent ἀκατάκτα προσκύνησις of Worship to our selves, of our own accord, without a Command from God. Compare this verse with the 18th, where St. Paul speaks thus, Let no Man seduce you in a voluntary Humility, and worshippign of Angels; and there will be no doubt but the voluntary Worship, which the Apostle here speaks of, is the worshipping of Angels, it being manifest that he treats of the same thing in both places. So that ἡδονοσθενία according to St. Paul's notion of it, signifies something unlawful, tho the common sort of People who did not understand the nature of true Piety, admired such voluntary and affected Worship.

VI. But
Chapter II. But the case, as to the freewill-Offerings of the Jews, and the voluntary Worship of Angels, of which S. Paul here speaks, was quite different. For God had commanded that Sacrifices should be offer'd to him, and prescribed the way in which they were all to be offered; so that all that was voluntary in those Sacrifices, was the offering them up at such certain times as the Suppliant of his own accord determined, according to God's prescribed Rule, both as to the matter and manner. But God never commanded or permitted that religious Worship should be given to any but himself and his only begotten Son; and much less has he prescribed the manner how Angels ought to be worshipped. So that there can be no comparison between these two things.

VII. I acknowledg there may be some things good in themselves, which yet may be omitted without Sin; but that therefore εὐροθέμεναι here is taken in a good sense, I do not think, because Ἠρωθεμεναι properly signifies religious Worship, which we may not give to any of our own accord. But the Doctor understood the matter here so, as if Ἠρωθεμεναι signified either a lawful way of divine Worship, or any Action good in itself, but not indispensably commanded. And so indeed εὐροθέμεναι may be taken in a good sense: but the former, which I take to be the sense wherein it is used by the Apostle, is a bad one.

VIII. After all, there are two things which seem necessary to be observed concerning all voluntary Actions relating to Piety; which if they be not consider'd, this whole business will be very obscure, and may be misunderstood.

First, That under the Gospel, to make any voluntary course or act of Piety acceptable to God, the matter about which it is conversant must be good in itself, and such as cannot be done but by a good man, and consequently a better than those who do not perform any such Action: otherwise, if it be a thing indifferent in its own nature, and may be done by bad men as well as good, that voluntary Piety cannot be thought to please God. To preach the Gospel with a pious design, and ἰδαμνον without making it chargeable to the Hearers, that so men might be the more easily persuaded to the practice of Virtue, and brought to believe in Christ, was a thing good in itself, and could not but be commendable in St. Paul, and acceptable to God. But to live a single Life, tho' chaste, is a thing neither good nor evil, if it be opposed to a chaste married Life; and may be found in a man that is proud, unmerciful, contentious, or imperious, and consequently worse than others who are married. And therefore that voluntary Piety, as it is called, cannot please God, whatever is said by
by S. Jerom; who was not a whit the better for being a single man. Chapter II.

The second thing to be carefully observed in this matter is, that voluntary acts of Piety are commendable only in those who observe what is indispensably required, and not in those who neglecting necessary and commanded Duty, as mean and trivial, would seem to aspire to some higher degree of Piety. For what Master would be well pleased with a Servant, who omitting his express Orders, should set himself to do other things greater than he commanded him to do? All Masters, and that with reason, expect their Servants should do first what they require of them; and then, and not before, they may attempt to do something extraordinary; otherwise they are offended with the pride and perverseness of those Servants, who when they do not perform what is exacted from them, are yet vainly ambitious of appearing better than others. St. Paul, after he had done all those things which became a good man and an Apostle, preached the Gospel freely, to his great Commendation, and with the sure hope of a special Reward. But if he had neglected plain Duty, or any essential part of his Apostolical Office, and pleased himself only with this, that he had preached the Gospel without making it costly to his Hearers, he would not upon that account have been any thing the more acceptable to God. And so when we see that some of those in antient times who shut up themselves in Monasteries, under a pretence of exercising themselves in a more sublime course of Piety, and being righteous above what is commanded, do manifestly discover a great deal of Pride, Hatred of their Neighbour, Impatience of Injuries, and the like Vices, in their Writings; he must be either stupid, or infected with the same Vices himself, that admires them, or thinks they were for that reason at all more pleasing to God. Such also were the Pharisees, at least for the most part, whom Christ so sharply reproves, and whose λογος της ντεισπνωςίας I cannot but wonder that Dr. Hammond should take in a laudable sense. No one that reads the beginning of the description of their Heresy, in Epiphanius, can doubt but that word is used in a bad notion. The learned Dion. Petavius, tho a Jesuit, presently saw this, as appears by his Version of Epiphanius's words, here subjoined: 'Ελληνικά ἐν παραδοσίᾳ διὰ αυτοκείσαμι τινας αυτος ἑν ἐκείνων εἰρήνης και των λαλητής Κεριούς ἐχει ἀυτος τὸν ἡμών των: Qui ideo, faith Petavius, Pharisiæ dixi sunt, quod essent, propter adscissitiam, superstitiosamque disciplinam à reliquis sejuncti; who were therefore called Pharisees, because by their affected and superstitious Discipline they were distinguished from others.

Hence
Hence it may be inferred in the third place, that those whose business it is to persuade men to Piety, have seldom need to recommend to their Auditors, there being very few who perform necessary duties as they ought. These are the things which should be urged, and often inculcated; seeing, especially, they are of a vast extent, and frequently violated. Other things may be safely let alone, because those who are fit to be exhorted to works of Supererogation, are not only few in number, but do not need Exhortations to them.

IX. Sacrifices not commanded by God, and Holy-days, and other things of the same nature, not prescribed by any divine Laws, were in themselves neither good nor evil; nor could they be acceptable to God, any otherwise than as they were performed with a devout and affectionate mind: and therefore accurately speaking, it was not those voluntary acts of Piety, materially considered, wherewith God was pleased, but the devout Mind of those that performed them. Which was then only truly so, when, after they had done what was commanded them, they performed over and above those uncommanded things. The same may be said now of Ecclesiastical Rites, not prescribed by God, the observation of which can no otherwise, than upon those terms, be pleasing to him.

X. I wonder our Author should allude the words of Maimonides, which have no manner of agreement with what he says; nay, are contrary to it. And yet he uses them elsewhere to the same purpose. See his Note on 1 Cor. ix. 17.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 14. If the phrase Bond of perfection were an Hypallage, it would signify perfection of Bond, and not a perfect Bond. If we observe that S. Paul in the 12th Verse uses a Metaphor taken from Garments, and that the word ἔστιν there used must be repeated again in this, we shall easily see that he continues the same Metaphor: And over all these things [put on] Charity, which is the bond of perfection. In which words, the Apostle alludes to a Girdle, which being put over our Garments, binds them fast together; and his meaning may be expressed in this manner: “After ye have put on all other Vertues, over them put on Charity, which, like a Girdle, may bind them fast together. So that τελεσθήσεται will signify here what it usally signifies; that is, a concurrence or conferent of all Vertues; which wherever it is found, denominates a Christian τελεσθήσεται.
PHILOPPIANS.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 5. K

That is, endeavouring to get time allowed by the Heathens for the spreading of the Gospel, left it be oppressed in its first rise, which it was possible for them to obtain by Prudence. See my Note on Eph. v. 16.

Ver. 16. Note a. I. As to the thing itself, I fully agree here with Dr. Hammond; yet I cannot but caution the Reader, that he should not think the words he produces as out of the Digest by the very words of the ancient Lawyers. Our learned Author did not look into the Digest by, but transcribed the words of Grotius in his Annot. on the Inscription of the Epistle to the Ephesians, which he erroneously thought to be the same with those contained in the Digest. Grotius his words are these: Litterae ejus sunt, cujus tabellario sunt tradita, mul-
toque magis ubi & reddita sunt. L. Si Epistolam D. de acquirendo rerum
Dominio. But Laboe in Lib. vi. Pithan. epitomized by Paulus, whose
words are in Dig. Lib. xli. Tit. i. S. 65. speaks thus: Si Epistolam
tibi miseris, non erit ea tua, anqueam reddita fuerit. Paulus: imo contrà,
nam si miseris ad me Tabellarium tuum, & ego rescribendi causa litteras
tibi miseris, simul atque Tabellarium tuo tradidero, tua sint. Idem accidet
in his litteris, quas tuae duntaxat rei gratia miseris; veluti si petieris a
me, uti te aliquis commendarem, & eas commendationes tibi miseris litteras.
If I send you a Letter, it will not be yours before it is delivered to you.
Paulus: Nay on the contrary, if you send me your Carrier [with a Let-
ter] and I write another in answer to it, as soon as ever I deliver it to
the Carrier, it becomes yours. And the same may be said of a Letter
which I should send only on your behalf to another Person; as suppose you
should desire me to recommend you to any one, and I should send you that
commendatory Letter. These words Grotius abbreviated, whose
Epitome of them, the Doctor rashly took for the words of the Lawyers
themselves. Yet hence it appears that an Epistle of Laodicea may sig-
nify not only one written by the Laodiceans, but also one sent to the
Laodiceans. In the mean while, those who desire neither to be mistaken
themselves, nor to deceive others, may learn by this example, not
rashly to believe other Mens Citations, nor to allwed Authors them-
selves upon trust.

II. Our learned Author seems as little to have look'd into those places
of Tertullian, where he speaks of the Epistle to the Laodiceans; for he
affirms

P p p
Chapter affirms expressly, and does not only seem to affirm, that it was the Epistle to the Ephesians, whose Inscription Marcion had changed. Lib. 5. c. ii. against Marcion. Præterea hic, faith he, & de alia Epistolæ, quam nos ad Epheisios præscriptam babemus, hæretici vero ad Laodicenos. I forbear also to speak of another Epistle which we have inscribed to the Ephesians, but the Hereticks to the Laodicenos. And cap. 17. Ecclesia quidem veritate Epistolam istam ad Ephesios babemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos; sed Marcion aliquando ei titulum interpolare gestit, quæ & in ipso diligentissimus explorator. We of the true Church read that Epistle as directed to the Ephesians, not to the Laodicenos; but Marcion once thought fit to change its Title, desiring in that also to be look'd on as a very diligent Critick.

Ver. 16. Note b. I. Every time almost that Dr. Hammond speaks of St. Paul's Bonds, he uses the word imprisoned. As here speaking of Epaphras, he says, he was imprisoned at Rome with St. Paul, and again, fellow Prisoner with St. Paul. But St. Paul was not imprisoned, but only bound in the same Chain with a Souldier, as the Doctor himself has shewn out of Lysius, in a Note on Acts xxvii. 16. And perhaps he meant no more than that here, when he uses the word imprisoned; but because such an improper Phrase might lead his Reader into a Mistake, it was not to be paff'd by without Censure.

II. I do not well understand how the Colossians should here be exhorted to admonish Archippus, who had an Episcopai Authority over that Church, according to Dr. Hammond, with these words, Take heed to the Ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, to fulfil it; unless perhaps Archippus be charged with negligence, and therefore is here commanded to be publickly reproved and admonished by the whole Congregation. But it may be he was not the Bishop of Colosse, but an Evangelist, who did not execute his Office so diligently as he ought; and lying idle among the Colossians, or somewhere in the Neighbourhood, was to be admonished by them. Which seems the more probable, because this Archippus, in the Epistle to Philemon, ver. 2. is called the fellow Souldier, oræcwfos of St. Paul. On which place see Græcius.

Ver. 17. practice unctions in the Church, etc. Kætor, 

Græcius, who is followed therein by our Author, thinks there is a Hebraism in these words for, see that thou fulfil in the Lord the Ministry which thou hast received; so that the phrase in the Lord should signify, according to the Precepts of the Lord. But tho I do not deny but this may be the meaning of St. Paul's words, they are capable of two other senses:
first, Consider throughly the Office which thou hast received in the Lord, in order to a complete discharge of it; or else, secondly, Consider in the Lord, that is, as in the sight of the Lord, or, according to the Precepts of the Lord, &c. So the Verb ἐλεον is sometimes taken, as in 2 John 8. ἠλεοθείς, &c. See your selves that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full Reward; that is, throughly consider or examin your selves, &c. τὸ εὐεργέτης and τὸ ἁρπαῖον are all one, and according to the various significations of the Preposition ἐν, which is ordinarily rendred ἐν, and used in a manifold sense, signify diverse things. I confess I do not know which of these senses is the best.

Ver. 18. ἰδοὺ ἔπεμψαν τὸν Πάπα τοῦ Στίτη.] The bare remembring of St. Paul's Bonds being in itself no part of Piety, it is consequent the design of the Apostle in these words must be, to admonish the Colossians to behave themselves both towards God and towards him, as became those that were mindful of his Bonds; that is, who very well knew that he was cast into those Bonds only for the sake of the Gospel; or to be constant in the profession of the Christian Religion, as he was, and love him, and pray to God in his behalf, that he might be set at liberty.
ANNOTATIONS

On the First Epistle
Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians.

At the end of the Præmon. I. Dr. Pearson and other the most exact Chronologers, suppose this Epistle was written in the year of Christ lxi. or the xiith of Claudius.

II. I have already several times observed, that the Jews were neither so formidable as our Author thought, nor the Christians so perfectly set free from persecution by their destruction throughout all the parts of the Roman Empire; so as that those who dwelt in Greece found the Heathens more favourable to them, after the overthrow of Jerusalem, and the excision of the Jews.

III. I do not easily believe what Eusebius says about the journey of Simon Magus to Rome, nor St. Peter's contest with him, which seems to be all taken ex Clementinis, and out of Justin; the former being a feigned History, and Justin having run into a mistake through his ignorance in the Latin Tongue, as learned Men have long ago observed. I wonder our Author, in this discerning Age, in

Quo pueri nasum Rhinocerotis babent,

should build his Interpretation upon such rotten and nauseous Fables: But he produces, you will say, the Testimonies of Eusebius and St. Jerom, and Orosius. But this is but one Witness all this while, because she two latter only transcribed Eusebius; and the single Authority of Eusebius is not much to be regarded, because he often affirms things without considering whether they are true or false, and some that are manifestly feigned. It's true, Justin makes mention of the Statue of Simon, in his Apology, commonly called the Second; but he says nothing at all about St. Peter's Conflict or Victory over him, which he would never have omitted, if that had been the general opinion of those times, because it might be made very great use of against the
the Heathens, whom he upbraids with deifying Simon. Irenæus also Chapter mentions the Statue, in Lib. i. c. 20. but says nothing about the contest. That was but an invention of the false Clement, which others rashly received for truth. There being very few, if any Historical Records in the first Age, excepting the Acts of the Apostles, Men that had nothing else to do, misemployed their wits in devising Fables, which the injudiciousness of Posterity has almost made it a Crime to question the truth of. But I am sorry to find Dr. Hammond should so easily give Credit to these Trifles.

CHAP. I.

Ver. 1. 

There are a few things which it may not be amiss to remark upon this Chapter, tho Dr. Hammond has passed it over without any Annotations, contenting himself to express what he thought to be the meaning of it in his Paraphrase. Grotius explaining these words tells us, that the Apostle, non nominat bic Presbyteros & Diaconos, quia recens erat Ecclesia, nesciam formam plenam acceperat; does not name here Presbyters and Deacons, because the Church of Thessalonica had been but lately gathered, and not yet formed into a regular Church. But if this reason be good, none of the Churches to which St. Paul wrote, except that of Philippi, were regularly formed Churches; because there is no mention made of Church-Governors, Bishops and Deacons, in the inscriptions of any of the Epistles, but to the Philippians. But who will believe that the Ephesian and Corinthian Churches, in which St. Paul had for a great while resided, were not yet so constituted as to have Rectors in them; and yet that the Church of Philippi, in which he made a shorter stay, had? Of the Church of Ephesus the contrary appears from Acts xx. 17, 28. and of the Corinthian, by the Epistles themselves written to that Church. So that there must be another reason given for St. Paul's not making mention of Bishops and Deacons in the Inscriptions of all his Epistles. And that which seems to me the most probable is, that the Governors of the Primitive Churches were modest, humble Men, who were unwilling to have themselves distinguished from the rest of the People in the front of St. Paul's Epistles, that they might not appear to pretend to any magisterial Authority, but to look upon themselves only as Ministers instituted for the sake of Order and Christian Society. There are a great many signs of this, especially in the Epistles to the Corinthians, in which the Governors of the Churches of Achaia are nowhere order'd to use any Authority in the Administrat,
Chapter of their Office, or in curbing evil Men who broke the Order of the Church. St. Paul every where speaks to whole Churches, never to the Governors of them apart from the People. However I would not be thought to deny, that some Churches were not yet compleatly formed when St. Paul wrote to them; in which number seems to have been the Church of Rome. But this of Thessalonica must be excepted, as appears from Chap. v. 12, 13.

Ibid. Εν Θεσσαλονικαι και Κιλικοι και Κερταγειαν. That is, the Church of God, and Christ. The Jews often pleaded that they were προς την κληρονομιαν, The Congregation of the Lord, a phrase not unusual in Moses, of which we have an example in Num. xvi. 3. Now to distinguish the Christians from the Jews, St. Paul calls them, not only the Church or Congregation of God, but of Christ. The Phrase εις Χριστον was to be in Christ, is to be a Christian, and being subjoined to ους ἔνηση signifies a Christian Church, or a Church of Christ. See Note on Rom. xii. 3.

Ver. 3. τοιαύτας σας ἐκείνους. The Genitive Case here signifies the relation of a cause to its effect; so that εκείνους is a work of which Faith is the cause, or such a work as can proceed only from Faith. Such was mens renouncing Heathenism, and totally forsaking their old Customs and Practices in order to embrace the Christian Religion, and regulate the remaining part of their Lives according to its Precepts; which could not be done but by those who believed Jesus to be truly sent from God, and gave the Apostles a Commission to preach what they did, and so the whole Doctrin of the Gospel to be true. About the ambiguous signification of a Genitive case, see what I have said in my Ars Critica, Part 2. Sect. 1. C. xii.

Ibid. Καρπος εἰς αὐτούς. Love or Charity creates ισχυρος, that is, labour to a degree of Fatigue, when a Man loves his Neighbour so as to put himself to a great many Hardships and Troubles, and resolves to spare no pains whereby he may benefit others. Such was the Charity of St. Paul, who patiently underwent incredible difficulties in those long Journeys, to mention no more, which he made, that he might rescue multitudes of Men from eternal Destruction. And that the Thessalonians followed his example, as far as they could, he himself teaches us in this place.

Ibid. Τὸς τούτοις εὐαγγελιζε. That patience of Adversities, which Hope produces, is never more remarkable, than when Christians are persecuted for their Religion, and submit to any Sufferings rather than comply with the demands of Heathens. For the hope of eternal Happiness makes them most patiently undergo the cruellest Torments.
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The Apostle therefore here teaches us that from the three great virtues of Faith, Charity, and Hope, proceed as all kind of good Works, so particularly an officious Diligence, which declines no Labour, and submits to any Calamities whatsoever.

Ibid. Ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ ἡ Ὑστοτε.] That is, God looking on, as an Agonotheta or Overseer of the Games, who confers a Crown on those that exercise themselves in Christian Virtues, and persevere in them to their lives end. The Arabick and Syriack seem to have omitted these Words, because they could not connect them with the foregoing, when other Copies have them. But they might have been left out without disturbing or altering the Sense.

Verf. 4. Εὐδοκέω τιλ ἐκλογὴν ὑμῖν.] That is, knowing and seeing that upon your embracing the Gospel, God has actually distinguished you from other People. See Note on Eph. 1. 4. They who rejected the Gospel when preached to them, were not discriminated from other people, but lay buried still among the unbelieving multitude of mankind, as before.

Verf. 6. Ἐν χαλκίῳ πολλῇ.] Supply ὑπαν, having received the Word, which was in much affliction, that is, the Preachers of which were grievously afflicted; with joy of the Holy Ghost, that is, with a pious cheerfulness, preferring a good Confidence and the hope of eternal Happiness, to carnal Joy, joined with a course of Sin, and worldly Possessions.

Verf. 7. τοῦτο.] See what I have laid on this Word on 1 Cor. x. 7.

Verf. 8. Ἁρμόδιον τῷ ἐξειρημένῳ ὁ λόγος τῷ Κρητικῷ ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ.] Beza and Grotius think that ἡμῶν must be prefixed to the Words ὁ λόγος, as if the Sense should be: For from you not only founded forth the Word of the Lord in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place your Faith is spread abroad. But if we carefully consider these words, we shall perceive that the opposition here is not between ἐξειρημένος λόγος the founding out of the Word, and ἡμῶν the Thessalonians Faith, but between Macedonia and Achaia, which were parts of Greece, and every place, that is, all the places of the Roman Empire in which there were any Christians. For the Discourse ascends in this manner: "The Gospel is become famous not only in some Countries of Greece, by the means of your Faith, whereof they have heard, but also through all the Christian Churches your Faith is spread abroad. The Word of God is said to have founded out from the Thessalonians in Macedonia and Achaia, that is, to have been made famous by their Faith. And this is what is meant by the ἐξειρημένος τῆς ἀυτῶν πίστεως, the going out of their Faith, for to go out is to be spread abroad. See Psalm xix. 4. and Interpreters.

Verf.
Ver. 9. Omnia εἰσερχόμενον.] The Alexandrian Copy here reads ἐγενή, which is better than ἐγενήν, because ἐπίστημαι follows, and the Discourse is about a thing past: So that it must be read either ἐγενήν, or εἰσερχόμενον.

Ver. 10. Τὸν ἐμπορευόν.] Grotius thinks this is the Present tense for the Future, but without any necessity; for he at present frees us from the wrath to come, that sets us upon such a Course of Life, which if we constantly follow, we shall have no reason to fear that wrath. Dr. Hammond thinks the Destruction of Jerusalem is also here intimated; but I am not of his opinion.

CHAP. II.

Ver. 1. I had rather retain here the usual signification of the Word Notea. νομίζεσθαι, for vain or light. For St. Paul shews in the following Verse, that it was not any Rashness or Vanity that had put him upon preaching the Gospel, which he himself did not believe to be true, in Macedonia: because notwithstanding the fierce opposition and despiteful usage which he met with from the Jews at Philippi, he had constantly persisted in his Work. For rash and vainglorious Men do indeed easily sometimes undertake difficult things, but they as easily lay their Designs aside, if they meet with any great difficulties in their way: But those who have thoroughly considered things, and think, for very good reasons, they ought to do that which they have undertaken, cannot be deterred by any Difficulties from prosecuting their first Purpose. They may apply to themselves that Saying of Aeneas to the Sybil, in Virgil, Aenid. Lib. vi. ver. 102.

Non ulla laborum,
O Virgo, nova mi facies, inopinave surgit;
Omnia praecepti, atque animo mecum ante peregi.

Ver. 5. Notes d and e. I. I easily assent to Dr. Hammond, interpreting the Word λόγος here by talk or report; for λόγος has often that signification, as H. Stephanus will shew. I see also that Constantine produces out of Aristotle the Phrase εἰ λόγους εἴμας, for to be the Subject of mens Discourse; bominum sermonibus celebrari. So that if St. Paul's Words were to be rendred in French, in agreement with that Latin Phrase, they would be rightly translated thus: nous n'avons jamais été en réputation de flatterie: We were never reputed to flatter.
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II. But I question whether he did not misunderstand the Words of Phavorinus, from which he endeavours to prove that ἔγορα signifies an Accusation; for wherever he renders αἰνια an Accusation, it might as well be rendered a Cause or Plea, whether true or pretended. For instance, Phavorinus faith, ἔγορα, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἔγορα, ἐνάντια ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερόν των θεῶν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῆς ἀληθείας: the word ἔγορα is properly a specious Oration pretended in accusation of any one, but secondarily simply a Cause. I am apt to think this must be understood of one that acts the part of an Advocate, and brings an Excuse in defence of his Client against his Plaintiff; because the word ἔγορα in good Authors often signifies an Excuse, but never an Accusation. And the Defendant or accused Party is excused ἔγορα; that is, by a feigned Cause or Plea alleged to shew that he ought to have done as he did. His Fault is coloured over with a handsom name. Afterwards ἔγορα signified any Cause. This I am sure is agreeable to the perpetual use of Greek Authors. Besides, Phavorinus interprets the Verb ἔγορα in Latin by εἰς ἔγορα ἔνακτο, which ought not to be changed, that being undoubtedly often the signification of that Verb. However, our Author seems to have understood the Words of St. Paul rightly as to the Sense of the Phrase, tho perhaps he did not perceive the full and critical importance of it, it being more probable that εἰς ἔγορα signifies in a pretence of Covetousness, and so the just meaning of the Apostle will be, that he never gave any man the least pretence or occasion to accuse him of Covetousness.

IV. I have shewn on Rom. i. 29. that our Author is mistaken, wherever he interprets the word ἀλεξεία Lust, and in this place he commits the same Error. St. Paul shews that he never gave any one the least ground to suspect him of ἀλεξεία, or Covetousness, in ver. 6. and 9.

Verf. 6. Note 1. To denominate Letters βασιλευ κως weighty or severe, it is not necessary they should threaten Excommunication; for there may be weighty, i.e. severe Letters, which have nothing in them about Excommunication. Besides βασιλεύς no where signifies Excommunication, or any thing like it; and much less can the Phrase εἰς βασιλεύαι be interpreted to excommunicate, according to the use of the Greek Tongue, either in Profane, or even in Sacred Writers. 'Εν βασιλεύαι, as Grotius and others well observe, is the same with ἐνβασιλευϊ, in ver. 9. It is opposed...
Chapter III. pos'd to ἵνα χρῆται, because he that rigidly or severely exacts his right is in Castr., burdensome, but he that recedes from it, ἰνάγο. If the Doctor had thought of these things, he would not have look'd here for Church-censures without any example: but it was his failing to be more inquisitive after them than he should be, which made him think he had discovered them sometimes where they were not.

Ver. 19. Note k. Στίχων -Oct. καρπῶν is a Crown of which any man boasts, not in which he rejoices; for tho those things are often joined, yet they are not to be made the same, unless we would equal Dr. Hammond in impropriety of Speech.

C H A P. III.

Ver. 10. Ἐκεῖνος ἐν Φιλιμόχος ἔρεμους εἰς τὸ ἰδίαν ὑμῶν τῷ ἐρωτῶν.] I am apt to think there is a transposition in these Words, and that they must be put into this order: ἔρεμους εἰς τὸ ἰδίαν τῷ ἐρωτῶν: praying that we might see your face, as that which would overflow our heart with joy, or would be a super-abundant cause of joy to me. St. Paul was not satisfied to know that the Thessalonians steadfastly adhered to the Gospel, tho the news of that was matter of very great joy to him, but he desired ἐκεῖνος, over and above to see them. Ἐκεῖνος signifies somewhat, which if not superfluous, is at least unnecessary, and abounds, and therefore cannot fitly be joined with ἄνωθεν Prayer, which is always necessary: And with the addition of ὑμῖν it signifies an overflowing or excess, which by no means agrees with a necessary Duty. That this is the force of that Particle appears by Eph. iii. 20, where St. Paul says that God is able [ὑμῖν] πάντα ποιήσαι ἐν φιλάθλῳ, to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think. So likewise in this Epistle to the Thess., c. v. 13. We beseech you — ἵνα δέχησθε ἐν παρακλήσει ὑμῶν ἑαυτῶν, i.e. to love them with a superabundant love. So that it is better to refer this word to that which St. Paul prayed for, than to his Prayer itself. See an instance of the like transposition in ver. 7. of which there are a great many in St. Paul.

Ibid. τὸ ὑπερώτημα ἐπὶ τῶν ὕμων.] The word ὑπερώτημα here must not be understood of an assent of the Mind yielded to the Gospel, which was as perfect in the Thessalonians at that time as it could be, of which their constancy in suffering Persecution for Religion was a clear evidence; but Knowledge, which might be increased by further Instruction. For St. Paul had not tarried long at Thessalonica, nor had time enough to teach them perfectly all that concerned the Christian
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Christian Religion. So the word ἐστις is taken in Rom. xiv. 23, where Chapter see my Note.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 4. What our Author says here out of Barnabas and the Jews, he took from Grosius, except the interpretation he gives of the word πίλος; which never signified an Instrument, but only a Cup: Nor is there any such affinity, as he contends, between that word and the Greek ἐκφύγεται, either in sound or signification.

Ver. 6. Note b. All that our Author here says does not perwade me to believe that τοῦ Καισάριος or ἀλογορεῖται are to be referred to fleshly Desires, contrary to the use of Scripture, and all other Greek Writers.

For,

I. What he infers from the Series of this place, he would plainly have perceived to have been of no force, if the Gnosticks had not stood in his light, and like a Cloud hinder'd him from seeing the thing as it is. The Apostle here teaches us that there are two sort of Vices to be especially shunned; the lusts of the Flesh, and an inordinate desire of other men's possessious: The former in verses 3, 4, 5. in these words: This is the Will of God, your Sanctification, that ye should abstain from Fornication; that every one of you should know how to possess his Vessel in Sanctification and Honour, not in the lust of Concupiscence, even as the Gentiles which know not God. The latter in vers. 6. where he speaks thus: And that no man go beyond, or overreach his Brother in any matter, because the Lord is the avenger of all such, as we also have forewarned you, and testified. Then he subjoins the special reasons of both these Injunctions; of the former in ver. 7 and 8. and of the latter in ver. 9. which shews that the 7th verse must not be immediately connected with the 6th verse, as it is by our Author, but with the 5th verse, and the 9th with the 6th. That this may be the order of the Discourse is undeniable, and that it not only may, but really is so, every one will think, who knows that the Verbs τοῦ Καισάριος and ἀλογορεῖται never signify what Dr. Hammond would have them. And we ought not to impose an unheard of signification upon these words, because of the Series of the Discourse, when the order of St. Paul's reasoning is clear without it. Of the Verb ἀλογορεῖται and the Noun ἀλογορεία I have spoken on Rom. i. 29.
Chapter IV. As to the Verb ἀσεβεία, the places alluded by our Author do not prove that word to signify the practice of unnatural Lusts. The last Verse of Hesiod’s Εὔνα ὢν ὅμοια ὑπενθύμισις shews that ἀσεβεία signifies Sin or Transgressions, but that is nothing to Dr. Hammond’s purpose. The place in Phocylides must be set down more correctly and at large.

Do not transgress, of all things a mean is best, and Transgressions are grievous. Where the Discourse is about breaking into another man’s Ground, as appears by the Words immediately going before.

Ἀγείρε ὑμῖν ὑπὸ ὑποκεισθήσοντες

Abstain from thy Neighbour’s Field. But what is this to Sodomy or unnatural Filthinesses? The place cited out of Hesychius proves nothing, because ἀσεβέω is rather taken for an Injury joined with contempt, ἀσεβειαν signifying praecellere, superare, to outgo, to surpass, and velt being afterwards interpreted in Hesychius by ἐπιθυμεῖναι. What our Author adds about the Verb εἰλέω and its Derivatives, or Compounds, does him as little service: for the signification of a simple Verb, or of some of its Compounds, does not necessarily pass to all the rest; and there is no example brought by the Doctor, where ἀσεβεία iver signifies to commit filthiness with him.

III. Besides, the annexed Words ἢ τὸ ἀεὶ αἰνεῖ & ἄδικος shew that St. Paul did not so much as dream of that Sense, which our Author here affixes to his words. For no body ever said in Greek ἀσεβέων ἢ τὸ ἀεὶ ἐκλαῖα to signify an act of Uncleanness; and, if St. Paul had so meant, he would not have said τὰ ἄδικα, that is, a Christian, but μὴ ἐλέηται ὅπερ, for it was as bad to commit that Sin with Heathens as with Christians.

IV. Nor did ever any one say, in that signification, ἀδελφόντως ἢ ἀσεβεῖα; and I wonder how any Expositor could differ here as to the Sense from Beza, who interprets these words: Ne quis opponit aut habeat quæstus inullo negotio fratrem sium: That no man oppress or make a gain of his Brother in any matter. Consult himself and Crofts on this place. Πλειστερεῖσ ὁμολογία to make a gain of in 2 Cor. vii. 2. and xii. 7, 8.
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Chap. V.

Ver. 1. Our Author here, as in many other places, meerly
Note a. serves an Hypothesis, and forces every thing to a com-
pliance with his own opinion.

But I. Why may not we think that St. Paul, after he had spoken of
the last coming of Christ in the conclusion of the foregoing Chapter,
passes here to the time of it, not as to another thing, but as an-
other circumstance of the same thing; so as also to ipeak in this
place about the last coming of Christ? The Thessalonians la-
mented the condition of those who died under Persecutions; and
therefore St. Paul in the end of the last Chapter comforts them
with the prospect of an endless Reward, which such persons were to
receive at the coming of Christ; and here he adds, that there was no
need of his writing to them about the time when that should be, be-
cause it would come on a sudden, and when it was least expected, as
Christ himself had more than once said. Which can be understood
only of his final coming. For tho' the Siege of Jerusalem might perhaps
be sudden and unexpected to the Jews who lived in that City; yet it was
an easy matter for others to conjecture that some great calamity was
like to come upon them from the Romans, for their perpetual seditions
and unruly tempers. Josephus has shewn at large in Lib. ii. of the
Jewish War, that the indignation of the Romans against the Jews was
not presently stirred up. But those especially, who were dispersed
through the Roman Empire had time enough to know that the Jews
were upon the point of utter ruin, when they saw Judea laid waste by
the Roman Armies. Besides, the Jews who lived out of Palestine, as
those who were dispersed through Greece, did not perish by any sudden
Destruction, in which they involved the Gnosticks; but only those who
took up Arms against the Romans, as the Antiochians, Cyrenians, and
some others. I know indeed the Jews suffer'd very great Mise-
ries under Adrian, in the Isle of Cyprus; but our Author will not
have the time of Adrian to be here referred to, nor did those Cal-
amities befall them on a sudden. It is not probable that the Gnosticks,
who had no true Zeal for the Jewish Religion, and who, as the Doc-
tor often tells us, complied with the Jews to escape being accused by
them before the Roman Magistrates, did yet conspire with a
handful of that Nation against the whole Roman Power.
II. Our Author supposes that a constant Faith and holy Life would be an infallible means to preserve the Christians, which as I acknowledge to be most true, understood of eternal Salvation, so I do not believe it true, if understood of a Deliverance from the Persecutions of the Romans. For could not the Gnosticks feign themselves to be Heathens, and do sacrifice to their Gods, that they might not be accounted Jews? And that, if I am not mistaken, was abundantly enough to cause a distinction to be put between them and the Circumcised, especially if the Gnosticks, as our Author thinks, were not real Jews. Besides, the Christians in Greece, whilst the Romans were incensed against the Jews, did not escape the fury of the Magistrates because they were Christians, but because they were not Jews, and were look'd upon as peaceable Men, who were not for making any disturbance in the Government. I wonder our learned Author did not see these things, but so often serves himself of an Hypothesis which he never attempted to prove by History.

Ver. 10. Note b. Our Author goes on to fasten his own Conjectures upon St. Paul, without any regard to Grammar.

I. It is true indeed, that to live may signify to be in prosperity, and there are several examples of the word taken in that sense, as our Author has shewn on Chap. iii. 8. of this Epistle; but that to live with Christ has ever any such signification, Dr. Hammond will never prove without examples, to any that understand Greek, or are acquainted with the Stile of Scripture. Whatever a word signifies alone, it does not signify in conjunction with others. Whatever is meant by it in one place, it cannot signify in all. In this place, to live with Christ does not only include the notion of eternal Life, but signifies nothing else, as the bare reading of the Verse shews: who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we might live together with him. Can Christ be said to have died for the Christians of Thessalonica, that they might not perish in that destruction which was to come upon the Jews, but survive them? Where does the Scripture mention any such end of the Death of Christ? Dr. Hammond did not think fit to say so much as this in his Paraphrase, where he does not express the words of St. Paul, but what he himself thought.

II. But Christ having died for Men, that they might live with him, i.e. that they might enjoy eternal Life with him in Heaven, and that being the sense of the Apostle’s words, the next thing to be consider’d is, what is meant in this place by waking or sleeping. And because St. Paul says that neither of these things signifies any thing to Salvation, for whether we wake or sleep we shall live together with Christ;
thofhe Phrases cannot be thought to signify either a Vice or a Virtue, Chapter contrary to what they do in ver. 6, 7, & 8. Our Author who thinks the Discourse is about a temporal Deliverance, interprets them of Solicitude and Security; which I cannot admit, because I affirm that the Discourse is about eternal Salvation, as the thing itself also declares. What therefore do they signify? why this, and nothing else, whether we are still alive, when he shall come to judge the Living and Dead, or whether we die before that time. As in Chap. iv. 13, 14. ους οικοδομουν, those who were asleep, are they who shall be dead at the coming of Christ: so here those who shall be awake, signify them which shall be found alive at that time, as Grotius well observes, whom our Author ought to have followed. What the Doctor says in this Annotation besides, I have already confuted.

III. Yet there is one thing perhaps that may be objected in favour of Dr. Hammond, viz. that St. Paul seems to speak of a thing which was to come to pass in his time, because he exhorts the Thessalonians to watch, in ver. 6. lest they should be found in Darkness at the day of the Lord's sudden Coming. But God having not revealed the day in which he will judge Mankind, so much as to his Son Jesus Christ, whilst he conversed in this World, but only said that it would come on a sudden, and when it was least expected, with a design, seemingly, to keep Men from delaying their Repentance, while they hope to have time enough to repent before that day comes; it is no wonder that St. Paul here speaks of the last Judgment, as a thing which was to happen in his Age. He could not speak otherwise, seeing God had not revealed the thing more clearly. To which purpose it must be observed that he does not deny but that the Judgment was deferred, in which there would have been a manifest Error, but only teach the Thessalonians that Men ought to be always prepared, for fear of being surprized by the sudden coming of Christ. I know indeed Dr. Hammond in his Paraphrase of the 2d Verse, represents the Apostle as saying that the Coming of Christ was not far off; but if we read St. Paul's words, we shall see that he only teaches that it would be sudden and unexpected, not that it was near at hand, or shortly to be. For it is compared to the coming of a Thief in the Night, in which nothing but the θετοσάραντος or unexpeitedness of it is considered.

Ver. 12. Note c. The word θετοσάραντος may much more simply be interpreted to signify the Governors of both Orders in the Church, who may be comprehended under the common name of θετοσάρης, as being all set over the Church of Thessalonica, tho' not with an equal Authority. Considering this is grounded upon the proper signification.
Chapter six and incur blame. And the reason why St. Paul mentions them severally, is not because he would have them conceived as disjunct, but only that he might describe the whole Man the more distinctly.

V. As for the words ἐν τῇ παρωδίᾳ τῇ κυρίῳ unto the coming of the Lord, they must be understood thus: That when Christ comes ye may be judged blameless, that is, such as according to the tenour of the Gospel-Covenant, cannot be accused before Christ. So that it is as if St. Paul had said: εἰς τὸ εἰμίωσεν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ παρωδίᾳ τῷ Κυρίῳ, that ye may be blameless when Christ comes; so as that your Spirits may neither be upbraided with dangerous Errors, or vitious Habits, nor this charge brought against you, that you once redeemed your Lives by dissembling or Apostacy, nor, in fine, that you polluted and profaned your Bodies with sensual Lusts. Many perish by one of these three things, but no Man is saved but by a conjunction of all the contrary Vertues.
Annotations

On the Second Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians.

At the end of the Premon. This Epistle is referred by Dr. Pearson to the Year of Christ LIII, or the XIIIth of Claudius, at which time St. Paul still remained at Corinth, after he had been in vain accused by the Jews at the Tribunal of Gallio. Of the occasion on which it was written I shall speak on the Epistle itself.

Chapter I.

Ver. 5. What the Christians said about Christ's coming to punish the Jews, might possibly expose those of them that lived in Judea, to the Fury of that Nation; but in Greece, or other remote Provinces of the Roman Empire, that the Christians were persecuted particularly upon that account I do not believe; so as that St. Paul could say that the Thessalonian Christians suffered επει τις μελλων παραδειμνησθη. The Roman Magistrates did not so much befriend the Jews, especially out of Judea, as to afflict the Christians because they portended that the seditious Jews would ere long be destroyed by the Romans themselves. Of which we have a manifest instance in Gallio, Acts xviii. 12, & seqq. And it appears no less from profane Writers, that the Jews were not at that time in favour with the Romans. Tiberius commissuerat, had restrained not only the Egyptian but Judaicos ritus, the Jewish Rites, as we are told by Suetonius in the Life of Tiberius, Cap. xxxvi. Judaeorumque juventutem, per spectem Sacramentl, in provincias gravioris coeli distribuit, religios gentium ejusdem, vel similia servantes urbe submovit, sub pena perpetua servitutis; and distributed the Youth of the Jews, under the presence of a military Expedition, into Provinces of an unwholesome Air, forbidding the...
the rest of that Nation, or any that were of the same Sect, to make their abode in the City, upon pain of perpetual Slavery. Claudius also, a very little while before the writing of this Epistle, Judeos, impulser Christo, as the same Author speaks in the Life of Claudius, cap. xxv. affiitum tumultuantes Roma expulsit; that is, I suppose, cast the Jews, disagreeing among themselves about Christ or the Christian Religion, some standing up for it and others opposing it, [upon which account Christ may in some sense be said to have been the impulsive Cause of their Banishment] out of the City. This might be confirmed out of Philo and Josephus; but the thing is so clear that it needs no further proof.

Ver. 7. Note b. Whatever our Author here says, all these things may much more fitly be understood only of the last Judgment, of which see Grotius and other Interpreters. Tho St. Paul speaks of the Judgment, as of a thing near at hand, it does not follow that it is not the last Judgment which he speaks of; because, not knowing the time when that was to be, he was obliged to speak of it as of a thing not afar off, that so the Christians might be always ready, considering Christ might come when he was least expected.

CHAP. II.

Ver. 1. I have shewn, on the former Epistle, that the places which our Author applies to the Destruction of the Jews, may very well be understood of the last Judgment. And what St. Paul says here, being written on occasion of what he had said before, must be referred to the same coming of Christ.

Ibid. Note b. As the θεατής, or coming of Christ, both in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians and this, is his final coming to judge the living and the dead; so also εὐαγγελίαν, or good tidings, as Grotius has well observed, the gathering together of good men to him, that they may be made Copartners with him of eternal Happiness in Heaven. See Mat. xxv. 31. Our Author should have produced an Example in which θεατής is εὐαγγελίας signified to be assembled for the Worship of Christ.

Ver. 2. Note c. All that our Author here says may as fitly agree to those, who through a misapprehension of St. Paul's Words should have thought that the end of all things, and the coming of Christ to judge the World, was at hand. And so there is no need of recurring to any other coming of Christ.

Ver. 3. Note d. I. To speak the truth, I confess none of the various Interpretations which I have read of this place, fully satisfy me:
me: But as I can easily find something to object against others, so there is nothing which I can propose myself as certain. The Interpretation which our Author prefers before all others, is grounded only on this Supposition, that there was a vast number of Gnosticks before the Destruction of Jerusalem, who were destroyed together with that City; which he has nowhere solidly proved. When the Christians are admonished not to believe Impostors, it is not necessary to understand it as a Caution to them to avoid the Errors of the Gnosticks; for there were a great many Jewish Impostors, which Josephus makes mention of in the History of that Age, and there might be many more which he passes by. It does not appear by any certain account that all or most of the Samaritans, who had embraced the Christian Faith, fell off to the Heresy of the Gnosticks. Our Author has not so much as attempted to prove this; and indeed it would have appeared by the Vanity of such an Undertaking, that he had not carefully enough examined the Histories of those Times. See my Note on his following Annotation.

II. Tho I acknowledge I can think of nothing here which may be satisfactory, I shall however propose to the Reader a Conjecture, which seems to be much more probable than either Grosius's or Dr. Hammond's. And that is, that by Ἀνωτάται the Apostle means that great and famous Deception of the Jews, when they endeavoured, tho to no purpose, to shake off the Roman Yoke. This Christ in Mat. xxiv. foretold before the end should come, first of the Jewish Commonwealth, and then of the whole World; and by this the Christians might know that the end was not at hand, because that Ἀνωτάται had not yet happened: For the beginning of the Jewish Rebellion was about the end of the Reign of Nero; of which see Lib. ii. de Bello Judaico cap. 30, according to the Division in the Greek. And such a deception is often called Ἀνωτάται or Ἀνωταταν. Josephus in the same Book, cap. 31, represents the chief of the Jews as τῷ τούτῳ ὑπ' ἁπατήσαντος ἀνωτάταν, being offended with the boldness of the deception; and a little after it is said of Agrippa, that he was willing ἀφαίρεσιν ἄφαρθουν to spare the Rebels; and in cap. 33, the seditious are said Ἀνωταταν Παλαιαν, to have revolted from the Romans. The same Words frequently occur afterwards in that signification in Josephus and other Writers. The old Glosses have Ἀνωτάται, rebellio, segregatio, abitus, defection. Ανωτάται, discessio, discidium. Ανωτάται, rebellis, rebellio, transfuga.

Ibid. Note e. I. I acknowledge that διαβαρος διαμηλας, tho in the singular number, must be understood to signify not one Man, but a Multitude, who yet were to be headed by some one notorious Villain, to whom this and the like Characters should of special right belong. Nor do
Chapter II. I deny but Simon Magus deserved to be thus signalized, or rather branded, but I do not believe it is he whom the Apostle here has a respect to; nor is there any certain History which relates all that is said of him by Dr. Hammond, or agrees with his conjectures. It is affirmed first by Eusebius out of Justin, that Simon went to Rome under the Reign of Claudius, οἰκονομεῖ καίσαρεῖ, which our Author interprets of the beginning of the Government of Claudius, because it seemed to agree better with his conjectures. Justin, and out of him Eusebius, say that Simon was accounted a God, and that a Statue was erected to him as such. In which learned Men have long since shewn that Justin was mistaken; and it may be probably conjectured that that Journey of Simon to Rome was a Fiction of some ignorant Man, who had not a due regard to Truth, and misunderstood the Inscription of that Statue. At least that St. Peter came to Rome in the time of Claudius, there are very important Chronological Reasons to disbelieve, tho' I do not doubt but he came into that City, and suffered Martyrdom in it, under the Reign of Nero. Justin further adds, γεσερ ταύτας θεατάσις, that almost all the Samaritans worshipped Simon; but perhaps he speaks hyperbolically, perhaps Justin relates a thing which he was not sure of, who wrote all whatsoever he heard without making any difference. That which he says about the deifying of Simon is alone enough to shew, that he is not an Author, whose bare Affirmation may be safely trusted. And hence perhaps Irenæus would not positively affirm a Claudius Cæsare status honoratum proper magiam, that [Simon] was honoured with a Statue by Claudius Cæsar for his magick; but prefixed to this Story dicitur, it is reported. What our Author says about his concealing himself, and contending with St. Peter, is taken ex Clementinæ, and unworthy of any credit. The rest which he relates concerning his Followers should have bin particularly proved by the testimonies of good Authors; because it is the ground of what he says here about the revelation of the Gnosticks, and that being uncertain, the other must be so too. Any one may easily deduce what Interpretations he pleases out of feigned Circumstances.

II. Now to give my own opinion concerning the Man of Sin, seeing I have interpreted οἰκονομεῖ of the Rebellion of the Jews, it follows that the ἀδελφοι τῶν ἀσάριας must be the rebellious Jews themselves, and especially their Ringleader Simon, not the Magician, but the Son of Giora, spoken of by Josephus towards the end of his 2d Book of the Jewish War, and afterwards often: Which Simon gathering together a Company of Robbers in the Lordship of Acrabatena, began to play the
the Tyrant, but first more secretly; till at last despising the Author-
ity of the chief men of the Jewish Nation, he violated all Laws
both divine and human in Jerusalem itself, as Josephus in the following
Books declares at large. And that such a man, or any who were like
him, should be called ἀνθρώποι ἀμαρτίαις, is not strange.

Ibid. 'Ουδὲν ἐξάγωνος. A son of Perdition is one that deserves to be
destroyed, or is condemned to Death, as our Author well observes;
and how properly this Title belonged to Simon and his Companions,
Josephus will inform us, who in Lib. vi. c. 36. Speaking of all the People
[of the Jews] observes that, Ἠρωδεὶς ἡ ἡττίτος λαός [ἱπποκρίνεις] κ ἐκεῖ
ἀντίκειται ὕποστρέφει: It was God, who had condemned
all the People, and turned all means of safety into Destruction. And in Lib.
vii. c. 7. Speaking of Simon himself, after he had related how he
shewed himself out of a Vault under ground, where the Temple had
flooded, and was taken by the Romans, he says, Σιμώνα μὲν ἐν εἰς πτωχώς ἐς
προς τὴν πολιτείαν ὁμοίως θεοῦ; ο ἐκεῖᾳ ἄντικειται, γίνεται ἔνα ἀπὸ μιᾶς
πολιτείας ἐν μιᾷ θεοῦ; κ ἐν ἁγίω θεοῦ ἄντικειται, ἐν ἐν ἑαυτοῦ ὑπὸ ὁμοίως ἐς τὴν
timērian ἐκαλοῦσα, κ ἐκεῖᾳ ἄντικειται ἄντικειται, ἀπὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἀνθρώπων ἐς τὴν
Ῥωμαίαν μεταβαίνει. ἦ κ ἐκεῖᾳ ἀνθρώπων ἐν θεῷ χρῖον, ὡς ἐκαθαρέως ἐκκενθά
ἡμῖν ἐκεῖᾳ ἀνθρώπων ἐν τῇ ἐκαθαρέως ἀμαρτίας. Therefore delivered up
Simon for the punishment of his Cruelty towards the Citizens, over whom
he had bitterly tyrannized, into the hands of his greatest Enemies, not taken
by force, but throwing himself of his own accord upon punishment (God so
ordering it) because he had cruelly put a great many [others] to death,
bringing false Accusations against them, of a deflection to the Romans. For
Wickedness can never escape the Vengeance of God, nor Justice ever be en-
feebled, but early or late it overtakes those that bid defiance to it, and inflicts
a heavier punishment upon the Wicked, because they expected to be delivered
from it, not being presently punished. He suffered in the Publick place at
Rome, as this Writer tells us in Cap. xvii. of the same Book accord-
ing to the division in the Greek. By this it appears how fitly those
wicked men might be called ἀνθρώποι ἀμαρτίαις and ὕποστρέφεις. And that
the rest of the characters contained in the following verse do as well
agree to them, shall be distinctly shewn on each.

Ver. 4. ὁ ἀντικεῖται κ ἐκκαθαρέως: καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον Θεοῦ. These
Words express the extrem Wickedness of men, and their marve-
lous Insolence towards Governours, proceeding from an incredible
Zeal for Innovations. For he is truly called ἀντικεῖται an Adversary,
viz. of God, who has no more regard to his Laws, than if he in-
dustriously opposed and fought against him with all his might, and
Chapter endeavoured to destroy his Worship, and root his Fear out of the minds of men. And such were Simon, John, and Eleazer, and the rest of the Captains of the Seditious, whose horrible Impieties Josephus often mentions, openly charging them with Atheism. See the last Chapter of Book vi. where he says that that Generation of men was more impious than any of those who for their Wickedness were swallowed up by the Earth, or destroyed by the Flood, or perished by Lightning. Magistrates or Governors are called also Gods, as every one knows. And these seditious men rose up in great fury, both against the Rulers of the Jews, such as were the Priests, and against the Romans; for they killed the former, and waged an obstinate War with the latter, as Josephus throughout his whole History relates. See particularly about the Priests, Cap. xviii. Lib. iv.

Ibid. I am apt to think St. Paul added this word, by way of Exegesis, that the Thessalonians might the better understand what he meant by παισθεγομενον ἐν, for the Hebrew ים, which is rendered θεος, properly signifies σεαμα, as coming from the old root רון alab, which at this very day among the Arabians signifies to honour or reverence, ἱεραμα. And there could not be a fitter Greek word chosen to express the sense of the Hebrew; for σεαμα signifies as well that Honour which is due to Magistrates, as to God. So it is used by Charondas in Stobæus Serm. xiii. χεὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ δεξυμενον παῖσθεγομενον, καθαρὰς παρεκτεν, παρετεμενα τῇ [σεαμα] We ought to bear as good a will to Rulers as to our Parents, submitting our selves to them, and reverencing them. But the seditious Jews were so far from reverencing the lawful Authority both of their own Countrymen and Strangers, that on the contrary they thought themselves superior to them, killing all the chief men among the Jews, and acting in a hostile manner against the Romans.

Ibid. Note g. I. ὅνας ὡς ἄν is not, in the style of St. Paul, simply ὅνας, any Temple, but the Temple of Jerusalem, which alone was so called. This appears by the doubling of the Article, nor can those words, in any Jewish Writer, be ever understood otherwise. The Jews would not allow the Temple of Garizim that title, which they look'd upon as no better than a Temple of Idols.

II. Our learned Author here pays a greater deference to the Authority of Justin Martyr than he need; for why might not he be mistaken in this, who erred in so many other things? Did not the same man make Herod to be contemporary with Ptolœmaeus Philadelphus and the Septuagint? Did not he say that the word Satanas was compounded of Sata and nas, tho' he was disputing with a Jew, who could easily
fily refute such a mistake? Did not he very unjustly and fallly, and yet with no small confidence, accuse the Jews of corrupting the Holy Scriptures? And could not he who erred so grossly in these things, not to mention any more, rashly take an occasion from the inscription of a Statue, which he misunderstood, to say what was not true? He was a Martyr, what then? Are Martyrs infallible, or to be believed when they are manifestly mistaken? And if they have been deceived in some easy things, and are not to be credited in all, why might not they be mistaken in matters of greater difficulty? Besides, this Inscription, if it be understood of Simon Magus, is contrary both to the use of the Latin Tongue and the Custom of the Romans, nor is it at all countenanced by the History of that Age. In Latin there is none so called, absolutely Deo Sancto, besides Semen or Simon (if we chuse so to write it, tho corruptly) an unknown God of the Sabins, or Hercules, as Lilius Giraldus will inform us in Hist. Deorum. And it was not the custom of the Romans to erect Statues to private men, and that before their Death, such as Simon the Samaritan, as to Gods; nor can any one instance to that purpose be produced out of all the Roman History. And if so unusual a thing had been done by Claudius, whose Folly so many Writers have recorded, there would be some mention made of it by the Heathens, whereas there is not the least mark or sign of it any where to be found. But, says our Author, if Justin had been mistaken, or wrote what he knew to be false, the Emperors to whom he wrote, would easily have discovered the Cheat. But the Emperors perhaps did not so much as look into the Apologeticks of Justin, it may be which was their ignorance or wickedness; they laughed at them, and despised every thing else that was good in them, because of this error. And who can doubt, if there was ever any Tribo Judaicus in the World that should have read his Dialogue, or any other Jew whatsoever, but he would have scorned, and that justly, what Justin upbraids the Jews with, as to the corruption of the sacred Writings, which in a modern Author would be called a Calumny. The bare authority therefore of Justin is not to be regarded.

III. But it is confirmed by Irenaeus and Tertullian. I have answer'd this in part already, by observing that Irenaeus premises before this Story the word dicitur, it is said, which shews he was not confident of the truth of it, but only declares what some others reported. And Tertullian, as those Apologetick Writers used to do, did but transcribe those that went before him, never minding or examining whether what they said was true; and out of him again this Story was taken by the later Writers of the Church of Rome; but that these
Chapter took any great care, not to affirm any thing concerning former Ages, but what was certain and unquestionable, no one will believe that reads their Writings with his eyes open.

IV. But if Simon Magus be not the Person here described, who is it, you will say, that is thus characterized? I answer, Those wicked Zealots and Edomites who forcibly possessed themselves of the Temple of Jerusalem, and so settled themselves in the place of God's peculiar residence, in which they behaved themselves very proudly and insolently, despising all the Laws of God, filling the Temple with the blood of the Citizens, and profanely using the holy things of it as their own; as Josephus in many places tells us. First, the Zealots made themselves Masters of the Temple, and used its holy things as their own, as we are told in lib. vi. cap. 1. Then John with his Edomites entered into it, as we may learn from cap. 11, and as little abstained from the holy things, being used to say in his own justification, "rei μακαρίως καθαρά καθαρά υποθέσασθαι ους ζευγάρον, καθ' τὸ τε νῦν τέκτων θεοῦ αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ," That those who stood up for God, ought boldly to use the consecrated things, and they who fought for the Temple be maintained out of it, as Josephus informs us in cap. 37. And those that did such things, might well enough be said to sit in the Temple of God, as God, showing themselves as if they were God.

Vers. 5. Ταύτα έχειν ὑμῖν.] The things here spoken of, seem to be taken from Christ's Discourse in Matth. xxiv. where the like things are mentioned, as forerunners of the Destruction of Jerusalem, and of his final Coming. Whence it might be easily inferred, that the last Judgment was not as yet at hand, because those things, which were as the Harbingers of the excision of Jerusalem, had not as yet happen'd.

Vers. 6. Note h. The τὸ κατέχειν is that which restrained the Jews from breaking out into open Rebellion; viz. partly the Reverence of the chief men of the Jewish Nation, who were against making War with the Romans, because they saw there was no hope of shaking off their Yoke, and that the thing could not be attempted without the Ruin of the Jews; partly the fear of the Roman Armies, which the Jews had not yet laid aside, especially while they hoped they might live a quiet life under their Governors. As long as these things continued in the minds of the Jews, the Counsels of the Seditious rested secret, and the number of those that were desirous of Innovations was but small: but as soon as the chief Men of the Nation began to be despised by the Conspirators, and some hope of Victory appeared, because the greatest part of the People were incensed against the Romans, and the President was remiss and cowardly; then the Jewish Nation,
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Nation, like a swift Torrent, that should have broken down its Chapter banks, rushed headlong into its own Destruction; then all the vilest sort of men began openly to put in practice their impious Designs. This Josephus relates at large in several places of his History of the Jewish War, and particularly in lib. 2. And S. Paul wrote this in the 13th year of Claudius, when Felix had been again sent Procurator into Judea; at which time the Jews were weary of their Yoke, and had raised the last year a Tumult, yet they still obeyed, as to the main body of the Nation.

What the chief Men among the Jews thought of engaging in a War with the Romans, Josephus in many places shews; see but Agrippa's Oration in lib. 2. cap. 28. in which he dissuades the Jews from rebelling, and endeavours to keep in quiet the seditious. And till that time he and the rest of the principal Men of the Jewish Nation had some Authority over the common People; but Gessius Florus had so highly injured and provoked them, that they utterly refused to obey him; and when Agrippa would have persuaded them to submit patiently to his Government, till there was another sent in his room, as 


And the King seeing the fury of the Innovators to be UNRESTRANABLE — departed into his Kingdom. They are the words of Josephus in cap. 29. Afterwards he relates the beginning of the Rebellion; to which the Priests and all the leading Men in vain opposed themselves, being no longer able to hold in the enraged multitude, as they had done in former times. Yea many of them were killed, as Ananias, Ananus, Jesus and others; whose Authority being once despised, those wicked Captains of the Seditious discover'd their minds, and shewed that it was a tyrannical Power, and not the Liberty of the People that they had aimed at. At the same time they set upon the Romans, and took courage from the cowardice of Gessius, as Josephus declares at large in lib. ii. c. 31. & seqq.

So that the Authority of the chief of the Jewish Nation, and the fear of the Romans were the τάχητα, viz. τζεβία, or the thing that withheld the Jews. Which obstacle being removed, the Seditious thought the time was now at length come, in which they might οπερασασθαι, openly declare their purposes, and act as the Leaders of the People of the Jews. That Simon the Son of Giora, who affected to become a Tyrant, and robb'd and plunder'd the Axabatena Toparchia, was repelled by
Chapter 11. Ananus, Pemoeus, in drut sa Aran y g[m] argon regias, by an Army sent against him by Ananus and the Rulers; but he fled to the Robbers which were at Massada, and stayed till Ananus and the rest of his Enemies were killed, as we are told by Josephus in the last chap. of the 2d Book. See lib. iv. and v. where the Villanies of these wicked men are at large related. This is much more probable, than what Dr. Hammond has invented about the dissembling of Simon and the Gnosticks, whilst the Jews and Christians did in some measure agree with one another; for which he alledges no Argument out of History.

Ver. 7. Note i. The μυστεριον ἀνωμίας which began to work at this time, consifted in this, that under the pretence of setting the people of the Jews at liberty, yea and of a more strict observation of the Law of Moses, a most treacherous and wicked Design of domineering was concealed, till the Strength of the Conspirators being increased, it appeared at last what they aimed at. So the Zelots behaved themselves, who, as an unlawful thing, rejected the Sacrifices which used to be offered up for the Romans; tho the Priests shewed that it was not a crime to receive Sacrifices from the Gentiles. See Josephus de Bello Judaico, lib. ii. c. 30. who affirms that this was the beginning of the Jewish War. In the meanwhile the Zelots did not think it unlawful for them to commit any villany whatsoever after they had laid aside the fear of punishment. The same Historian speaks of them thus in lib. vi. cap. i. "Eleazar and Simon, who had first separated the Zelots from the People, and carried them into the Temple, as offended with the continual bold attempts of John, who did not cease from shedding of blood, but in truth not enduring to be subject to younger Tyrants than himself, went off through a desire of Superiority, and thirst after Dominion. And in lib. vii. cap. 30. after he had said that the Edomites άλλως περιείχατο ημ᾽ ουν υμαν τον Ἀνομιαν, had introduced into all places the highest Iniquity: he adds, έν τε γε γελατων ολης νυχων ἡμου, οι των συνεργων την θρυσην ἐπιλατώσαν. την θρυσην απόν εξενεμώσαν, μεν έν τω αντεθη αυτις μή πλήθος ημαν αὑτοις θερμων των συνεργων αὑτις ἵνα ἄμη σαί συνεργων επιλατώσαν. την υπερσυναίσχον ἰτον, δε τω ᾧθῃ υπο- ἀληθείαν, την μόνην ἢ ἡμεροφωνίαν χρονίας: in which that sort of men called Zelots had arrived to the highest pitch, who staine their Title with the foulness of their Actions. For they imitated every evil work; even that which had never been done before in the memory of man, they did not leave unmis-
uniminated. Tho they imposed on themselves a specious Name borrowed from the love of Virtue, either their savage Disposition made them deride those whom they injured, or they thought the greatest Evils to be Virtues. This was a Mystery, which was concealed under the name of a Virtue, viz. Zeal; but in reality it contained the vilest Iniquity; which principally discover'd it self when Gessius Florus was President of Judea, towards the end of Nero's Reign.

But there was a Mystery, as I said, in this also, that these desperate Villains made the Liberty of the People of the Jews a pretence for their Robberies, whilst their design was to tyrannize over their Countrymen, as appeared afterwards by their Actions. Of this number were the Sicarii who opposed the Taxing of Judea by Cyrenius, and as Josephus a little before lays, καλοιον οης του σωματος Ρωμαιων ή πλὴν τον ος πολεμοιο συνεχεσθο, κα τας εκ δυσνος ἀρπαξαντες, κε ἀρραβωνιας, τας και νικητες αυτοι πυρ εθελες. ην έν χαλαρωμα αυτοις γειανεαν τεκνα, ή ειν ιστηκεν τον αναμενον τυφλων Ιουδαιων ινησθον πεσαλλες, κα ιερεις αλεξενος τον η χαι Ρωμαιων ελεγχονθωται. ην α εγε το α προηασις εις συνεργονον αλης και πετοσες κα τας αυτης λαχδων τας ες πυρ απελευον ενως και μη γραμν ετινοΰν: conspired against those who were willing to obey the Romans, and exercised all manner of Hostilities against them, spoiling and carrying away their goods, and setting their houses on fire: for they said there was no difference between them and Strangers, who so basely gave up the Liberty of their Country, for which they ought to fight, and professedly chose to be in bondage to the Romans. But this was a mere PRETENCE, and said only to cover their Cruelty and Avarice, as their Actions plainly shewed. Hence it appears, that before ever S. Paul wrote this Epistle, the Mystery of Iniquity began to work among the Jews.

Ibid. Μενον δε καταξιον λεγει εν μινον χτιων.] It was not one man who withheld the Jews from breaking out into open Rebellion: but on one side they were restrained by the Roman President; on the other by the chief men of the Nation, King Agrippa, and a great many Priests, as I have before shewed. But after these were expelled out of the City, or slain, the Seditious were at liberty to do what they pleased, and accordingly committed the most abominable Outrages, and acted contrary to all Laws both of Religion and Humanity. See Josephus de Bello Judaico from cap. 28. lib. 2.

Verst. 8. Note k.] I. Our Author truly observes, that the σονταξ is here are the same wicked persons which were before called ον γειανοικον, but those, I think, are the Seditious Jews, not Simon and the Gnostic, notwithstanding the mention made afterwards of lying Wonders, as I shall presently shew.
II. The destruction of Simon, which he relates out of Arnobius, is a mere Fable, which Arnobius had taken out of the Clementine Homilies, a Book full of Fables. This was the fault of Men and the Times, not of the Christian Religion, which is grounded only upon Truth, to take up right or wrong every thing that offer'd it itself to their Minds, and make use of it against the Heathens, whom otherwise they might have overcome with very good reasons, and really did so. Tho it is manifest that the foremention'd Book is supposititious, not St. Clement, and abounds with fallacies; yet a great many have cited it as the genuine product of St. Clement, and confidently transcribed Fables out of it for certain Truths. Which I know not whether we ought to attribute to want of judgment, or unfaithfulness; yet one of them it must needs be. But now after the revival, not only of good Learning, but also the cultivating and restoring of right Reason, to give credit to such Fables, is to prefer the darkness and deceits of former Ages to Light and Truth.

III. It is strange that Dr. Hammond was not sensible of this, but no less strange that he should use the Authority of the Antients, so as to trust them whenever they speak in his favour, and lay a great stress upon their Testimonies when they seem to confirm his Conjectures, but not regard them at all when they speak against him. For if they have any Authority at all distinct from probabilities of truth taken from things themselves, it is as great in one thing as another; and if their Authority be none in itself, let probabilities of Truth be alleged, and not vain Testimonies. Dr. Hammond produces a saying out of Eusebius, whom he would have believed, about the destruction of the Gnosticks, because if that be not thought true, a great many of his Interpretations must necessarily be rejected. But that Eusebius was mistaken, I shall shew out of Eusebius himself, and the thing it self at once. After he had mention'd the Heresies of Menander the Disciple of Simon, and the Arch-Heretic Germainus, and the Nicolaitans in Lib. iii: Cap. 26, 27, 28, &c. 29. he concludes this last Chapter thus: Ταῦτα ἐν τῷ φεύγων Χριστίνων ἀληθείᾳ μετάφρασαν τὴν ἑλεκτρικὴν ἐνθυμηματικὴν, ἀλλὰ μὴ μεν οὐτὸν ἐστὶν πεντελεῖς εἰσπραξίων εἰσὶν. And so much for those who having attempted to corrupt the truth, about the forementioned times, were in a moment destroyed. But if we believe Eusebius himself, the followers of Simon were not utterly destroyed, even in the reign of Constantine, that is, when Eusebius himself lived, who in Lib. ii. c. 13. speaking of Simon, says thus: Εἰς τὸν τινὰ χριστιανὸν μεταφράσαν την οὐφεραν καὶ διὰ καθαρεύσαται εἰς τὸν τινὸς Χριστιανὸν, καὶ τὸν θεομορφίαν φιλοσοφίαν ἐκκενομώντα, μὴ εἰς ἕδεσαν ἀποκαλομάτως ἐγεῖν.
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From whence (according to H. Valerius his Interpretation) till our Age, those that profess his Heresy, pretenting to have embraced the Christian Religion, which is so famous for its Modesty and Sanctity, have yet relapsed again to the superstitious worship of Demons, which they seemed to have cast off, falling down before the Pictures and Images of Simon and the aforesaid Helena, and not scrupling to worship them with Incense, Sacrifices and Drink-offerings. This shews that the Disciples of Simon did not perish with their Master, nor were destroyed in a moment of time. It is certain Menander, Basilides, and Carpocrates, who were either his Disciples or Imitators, did not die with him, but together with their Followers flourished in the second Age, as every one knows.

III. Which being so, it is strange that Dr. Hammond should contend for the extinction of the Gnosticks at that time, after which they chiefly flourished and were most known; viz. after the destruction of Jerusalem. Nay if any of Simon's followers happen'd to perish with the Jews in Jerusalem, or Judæa, it is not probable that their obstinate adherence to the party of the Jews, was the occasion of it; because the Gnosticks (as our Author himself often tells us) made no scruple when it was for their safety to comply with the Heathens in their Worship, and it was easy to conjecture that the Romans would be Conquerors. So that neither History nor Probability is on our Author's side.

IV. I will not repeat that what he says about the Conflict which St. Peter and St. Paul had with Simon is a meer Fable, but shall observe that by the Spirit of the Mouth of the Lord is meant, not the Gospel, but the great Ease with which Christ should destroy the obstinate Jews. So Psalm x. 5. he shall blow upon all his Enemies (in omnes hestes suos sufflatin.) that is, he shall easily destroy them, as Interpreters will shew. So in Plautus, in Milite Glorioso Act. 1. Sc. 1. v.17. a certain Flatterer, to intimate the great ease with which a Victory is obtained, expresses himself thus:

Cujus tu legiones diffavisti spiritu,  
Quasi ventus, folia, aut panniculum tectoriam.

So Valerius Maximus Lib. ix. cap. 1. Exemp. 5. inter Externa, speaking of the Egyptians, faith: Quapropter deliciae tam enerves animi SPIRITUM exercitus nostri sufinere non potuerunt. The same thing is otherwise
Chapter otherwise here expressed by τῇ ἐνφανείᾳ καὶ παρουσίᾳ αὐτῷ, that is, by the mere brightness of his Coming; as we say of an Army which is easily defeated, that it could not so much as abide the glittering of the enemies Arms. And God is said ἐνϕαίνεται when he gives the Victory: See Grotius on this place, and Dr. Hammond on Mat. xxiv. It's certain the attempts of the Magicians, of which afterwards, were easily defeated, and the Jewish War finished by Vespasian in little more than a Years time.

Ver. 9. Οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία κατ' ἐνϕαίνεται τῇ Ζατανᾷ, &c.] These words are thought by our Author to be so clear a description of Simon, that he often repeats it as the chief ground of his Interpretation of this whole place. But there were also other Impostors, of whom this might be said by St. Paul, which are frequently mention'd in Josephus; to prevent all doubt of which, I shall allude the words of that Historian; who in Lib. xx. c. 6. Antiq. Judaic. where he relates the transactions of Felix, faith thus: Λαυρειάν οἱ ἱερεῖς πᾶλιν ἀναπλαθῆσθαι ἐξ οἵτων ἁγιούντων, οἱ ὡχλοὶ ἑπάτων: the Country was filled again with Robberies, and Magicians who deceived the Multitude. And not long after: οἱ ἄρθων οἱ ἀπατητὰς ἀνθρώποι ὡχλοὶ ἐπιθυμὸν αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν ἁρματικὸν ἴσβος, λυπᾶντι τὰ ἔχοντα ἑκατοντάρχας πίστειν πρὸς ομοία, καὶ τῶν τῆς Ἐβραίων γυναικῶν, καὶ πολλῶν παραφάντων ἀλήθειαν πρωτείαν ἔχουσιν: some Magicians and Deceivers persuaded the People to follow them into the Desert, saying that they would shew them mighty Signs and Wonders, which were wrought by the Providence of God; and many hearkening to their Persuasions, suffered for their Folly. Afterwards he mentions the Egyptian, who is spoken of in the Acts. The like he says in Lib. ii. de Bello Judaico c. 23. To the same purpose is what he relates in Lib. vili. c. 30. about six thousand Men that were burnt in the Porch of the Temple. Τῇς εἰσίν ἡ ἀπολογίας θεοτρεπθῆσθαι κατέσχε, κατ' ἐκάστῳ ἀνθρώπῳ ἑτοιμασάτες τοῖς ὄντος ἔχοντος, ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἑρμῆν ἀνακοίνωσεν. Ταύτης ταύτης ὡς κατατέθης κατὰ τις ἁπατεῖ: The cause of these Mens destruction was a certain false Prophet, who had declared that day to those who were in the City, that God commanded them to go up into the Temple, in order to receive signs of their safety. And there was a multitude of such false Prophets, as Josephus tells us in the following words: Πολλοὶ ὃς ὅπως ἐγέρθησαν θερήματος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀνακοίνωσαν τῇ πόλις τῷ Θεῷ βούλοντας καταγγέλλεται, ὡς ἐν οἷς αὐτομολογοῦν, ὥς τοῖς ἐμφανεῖς ὄντος ἡ ὑπόθεσις ὡς ἐπεκτείνεται τοῖς ἄνθρωποις ἐν συμφορᾷ. ἄκουσαν ὃ ἐν φυλασσέσθαι ἀπατήτων κατηγορίαν ἔστω ἐν τοις καταγγέλεσθαι φῶς, ὡς ὁ παρευρέθη εἰς ἐκκλησίαν. Τῆς γὰρ ἱεροῦ νῦν ὃς ἐπατεῖ τῷ καταγγέλοντος τῷ Θεῷ τιμωρίαν παράδεισον: for there were many Prophets at that time suborned by the Tyrants, to admonish the People to wise for the assistance of God, that they might not go over to the Enemy, and
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and to confirm the hope of such as needed not to be watched, and were above fear. And a Man is soon persuaded to any thing in Adversity. But when he that deceives promises him also deliverance from the evils he is under, he that suffers becomes all Hope. And therefore those Impostors and believers of God persuaded the miserable People. This excellently well agrees with the 10th, 11th, & 12th verses, where the condition of the unbelieving Jews is represented by St. Paul, almost in the same colours.

Ibid. "Et nos judaeos, & gentes nusius." It is highly probable that St. Paul has a reference to the words of Christ in Mat. xxiv. 24. whence it may be inferred that the Discourse here is about Judaean and the Jews, as it is there.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 2. *Apopo* when spoken of a Man, signifies lewd, base, villanous, and belongs no more to a Gnostic than any other wicked Man; such as there were a great many among the Jews and Heathens, who opposed the Gospel, which makes it unnecessary to recur to the Disciples of Simon, whom our Author supposes like so many Shadows to have followed or gone before the Apostles, without any certain ground from the History of that Age. What he says, that Simon is described by Polycarp, is also his own Conjecture, not the Affirmation of Polycarp, who speaks of any one possessed with those errors, and does not mention Simon by name. But this does not belong to this place. *Hephaistias*; *Apopo*, *xomeia*, *dikez*, wicked, base things. *Apopo*, *dikez*, *xomeia*, baseness, wickedness. The old Glosses: *Apopo*, *flagitium*, *facinum*, *A* villany, a wicked Action. *Apopo*, *facinorosus*, *flagitosus*.

Ver. 2. *Ou* *t* *x* *x* *x* *x* *x* *x* *x* *x*.] Dr. Hammond in his Paraphrase interprets these words so, as if he thought that *x* *x* *x* Faith here signified true Faith, in opposition to pretended. Which interpretation he seems to have invented for the sake of the Gnosticks, who feigned themselves to be Christians when they were not, and of whom he understood these words of St. Paul. But St. Paul says nothing here about the Gnosticks, but speaks of any bad Men, who through their wicked Dispositions did not only refuse to believe the Gospel themselves, but also hindered others from embracing it. Such were the Jews, who had a greater regard to the Ceremonies of the Law than to true Vertue, and everywhere opposed the progress of the Gospel with all their might, as appears from many places in the Acts, and the Epistles of the Apostles. Such were the Epicureans and other Pseudo-Philosophers.
Chapter phers, who lived in the practice of the greatest Vices, which they cover'd with a philosophical Cloak, and could not endure the sanctity of the Christian Doctria; or being blinded by Pride, and a false conceit of their own Wisdom, thought it would be a disgrace to them to confess that Men so universally learned as they, could learn anything from Barbarians, as the Greeks called them, or acknowledge that they had all the while before been studying and philosophizing in vain. Such were those who heard St. Paul at Athens, as St. Luke tells us in Acts xvii. And seeing no one can doubt but that these Adversaries of the Gospel were dispersed almost in all places throughout Europe and Asia; what need is there of imagining to our selves, the Gnosticks everywhere opposing the Apostles, of whose being so universally spread we have no account in any credible Author? And therefore setting aside the Gnosticks, let us say that the phrase & alors is used by the Apostle in this sense: all Men indifferent are not qualified to embrace the Gospel, but only those who are lovers of Truth and Virtue, tho they are not sufficiently acquainted with them before the Gospel is preached to them. Such a disposition as this is excellently described by Dr. Hammond on John vi. 37. and elsewhere.

Ver. 5. Ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ Θεῷ, καί τῷ ἀναμνῆσθαι τῷ Χριστῷ. Here is an example of that ambiguity in the signification of a Genitive case, of which I have largely spoken in my Ars Critica Part 2. Sect. 1. Cap. 12. Grotius interprets the Love of God to signify that Love which is terminated upon God, and so makes the Genitive Θεῷ to have the relation of an object to αἰῶνι, which I acknowledge to be a sense worthy of the Apostle. But if we interpret it of a Love commanded by God, so that the Genitive be understood to signify a Cause, the sense will be altogether as proper and agreeable to the Gospel. So again by ἀναμνῆσθαι Χριστῷ Grotius thinks is meant that patience of which Christ is the efficient, and there is no doubt but that is frequently the signification of the Genitive case, as I have shewn in my Ars Critica. But yet ἀναμνῆσθαι may be interpreted of that patience of which Christ was a Pattern, and perhaps more fitly. And if by ἀναμνῆσθαι we understand not so much constancy as waiting for the coming of Christ, then Christ will be the object of our στέφει, and so this Phrase is taken in Rev. i. 9. I John your Brother, and companion in Tribulation, and in the Kingdom ζῶντας Χριστοῦ, and expectation of Jesus Christ.

Ver. 6. Ἐν τῷ ἀναμνῄσκων ὑμᾶς.] That this Phrase νικάπτων ὑμᾶς to withdraw your selves, signifies to excommunicate, as our Author interprets it in his Paraphrase, I do not believe; the proper word for that being
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Grotius thinks, if there had been a Presbytery at Thessalonica, St. Paul would have commanded these disorderly Men to be excommunicated; but because there was not, he only commands the rest to avoid all familiar Conversation with them, which every particular Christian had a power to do. But when he says there was no Presbytery at Thessalonica, he is mistaken, as I have shown on 1 Thess. i. 1. That double Admonition which our Author in his Paraphrase finds to be intimated in these words, and which ought to precede Excommunication, few doubtless would have perceived, without being advertised of it: Nor can I, for my part, perceive it yet. I grant the Apostle had twice admonished the Thessalonians about this matter, but does it presently follow that those Admonitions, which were twice read in the Church of Thessalonica, were accounted as forerunners of Excommunication? Does it follow also that St. Paul had a respect to it in this place? I think not.

Ibid. Ἀταναστὴς επιμανήτης.] The Phrase ἀταναστὴς επιμανήτης is not barely to be idle, but to do that which Idleness, especially in young people, is the cause of, that is, to live wantonly and irregularly. The Old Glosses: Ἀταναστής, inquietus, inordinatus, petulans, troublesome, disorderly, violent. Ἀταναστής, tumultuosiores. Ἀταναστής, inordinatus. Ἀταναστής, tumultuatio.

Ver. 12. Ἐφήσε τῶν ἑαυτῶν.] That is, the Bread which they shall get by their Labour, for that is every one's own which he acquires by lawful Industry. This perhaps may lead us into the true meaning of that in the Lord's Prayer, ἐστίν ἡμῶν ἡ ἑαυτῶν, give us OUR Bread; that is, order it so by thy Providence, that we may not live by other Mens Labours, but upon Food got by our own Labour. And so the sense of the whole Petition will be this, Grant that the remaining part of our Lives we may daily by our Labour provide Food for our selves. On the contrary, they are said in Latin alieno pane vesci, not whom another Man maintains, because they are industrious in his Service, but who like Drones, live idly at another Man's cost. So Juvenal begins his vsth Sat. against Parasites thus:

Si te propositi nondum pudet, atque eadem est mens
Ut bona summa putes, aliena viverequadra,
Si potes illa pati, &c.

Ver. 14. Εἰ ὡς ὅς ἐκ ταυτὰς τῷ λόγῳ ὑπὸν ὑπὸν ὑπὸν ὑπὸν ὑπὸν ὑπὸν ὑπὸν συμαίνει.] The Antients for the most part omitting the use of Points, it is uncertain whether these words should be rendred, if any Man does
Chapter not obey our Word, signify that Man by an Epistle, i.e. write me word
who it is; or, if any Man obey not our Word by this Epistle, note that
Man. The former is preferred by Erasmus and Grotius, and indeed
σμειωθέν τις ἡ τιμίασις is oftner said than ἕνος ἢ τις ἡ τιμίασις. The latter by
Beza and Dr. Hammond. Besides, these who are fond of Excommu-
nication, make σμειωθέν to be all one with to brand by Excommunicati-
on, but they ought to have produced an example of that signification.
For all Lexicons indeed tell us, that σμειωθέν is to signify or notify; but
I don't know whether it be ever used for to brand or set a mark of in-
famy upon a Man, ignominia notare. I confess that is often the notion
of the Latin Verb notare, but hence it does not follow that the Greek
Verb σμειωθέν signifies the same.

Verf. 16. ἐν πάνιν τῇ ἐκτάσει. It seems the Vulgar Interpreter read τοια,
having rendered it loco. And that reading is approved by Grotius, who
explains the mind of the Apostle thus: Deus det vobis res bonas, in
Thessalonicae eritis, sive in Judeam, seu Syriam redivitis, sive aliò mi-
grabitis: God give you good things, whether ye stay at Thessalonica, or
whether you return into Judæa or Syria, or wherever else you go. This is sen-
good enough, but most Copies have ἐν πάνιν τῇ ἐκτάσει, which I chuse to fol-
low, in this sense: God give you always (ὅπως πάνιν, viz. χειρος) Peace by
all means; [so it is in the English Translation] that is, whether
Peace be taken for all Prosperity; or for Tranquillity, which the Hea-
thens may let you enjoy; or for Concord, which ye may preserve a-
mong your selves, both publickly and privately. For all these things
are in Scripture comprehended under the name of Peace. This is cer-
tainly the fittest sense of these words, if the whole Assembly be con-
sidered, which lived at Thessalonica, and to which St. Paul writes; not
to particular Persons, who might take those Journeys which Grotius
speaks of.
Annotations

On the First Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to Timothy.

At the end of the Praemon. Dr. Hammond here attempts in order to assign the time in which this Epistle was written, is contrary to what he says about the Journeys of Timothy; for it is not likely that Timothy was left Bishop at Ephesus, that presently after he should leave that City, and travel with St. Paul, and go to visit him as far as Rome. It is much more probable that Timothy was ordained Bishop of Ephesus after St. Paul was released from his Bonds, and went from Rome to Asia, about the year of Christ lxiv. or the xivth of Nero, and that the year after this Epistle was written, as Dr. Pearson in his Annales Paulinae thinks.

Chapter I.

Ver. 3. ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν πατέρων, &c. These two Verses must be joined with the 18th, all the rest which intervene being a Parenthesis. It is, I confess, a harsh Hyperbaton, but St. Paul was not curious about such things.

Ver. 4. Note a. What Dr. Hammond says here about Antiphanes, as the Author of the Gnostic or Valentinian Genealogies, he owes to Irenaeus in Lib. 4. c. 19. who affirms that that Poet wrote such things in his Theogonia. It is strange that Comedy of Antiphanes should nowhere else be cited. But perhaps this was not the name of a Comedy, but Irenaeus refers to a place in which something was laid upon that Subject, [viz. the generation of the Gods] as in Aristophanes his Aves we have something still extant about that matter. As to Hesiod the thing is plain, if we read the beginning of his Theogonia; and the Valentinians...
Chapter Lentičians are more than once upbraided with applying the fabulous
Stories of that Poet to their purpose, by Irenæus and Epiphanius. But
as to Philistio who wrote Mimick Poems, I very much doubt whether
he be rightly reckon’d in the number of those who described the Ge-
nealogies of the Gods. I am apt to think our Author was deceived
as to him, by misunderstanding a Passage in Epiphanius, in Hares. xxxiii.
which is that of the Ptolemaites, § 1. where Epiphanius speaks thus: ἐν
τῇ τελευταίᾳ τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ τοῦ τότε οἰκεὶοῦ ἀναγεννησίᾳ, η
δοξή, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ γενεαλογίᾳ, ἡ οἰκείος πατρεὶς, οἰ τῶν μουσῶν ἀναγεννησίᾳ τῇ
γενεαλογίᾳ, τοῦτον θεόν ἡ ὑποκρίσις ἐκτύπω δώκε, οἱ ἐν τοῖς τοχαρίοις σαρκίζων ρεῖ
ταῖστοι γενεαλογίαις ἀνεπέμβαν: For none of those antient Tra-
gedians, or their Successors the Mimicks, Philistio, I speak of, and Diogen-
es, who wrote things exceeding all belief, nor any of all those other Writers and
patchers up of Fables, could have forged so great a Ly as these men [temerite
fuisse ipse vitæ persecutione acti finxerunt] add to the fear of their own
lives, have boldly invented, and intangled the minds of men who believe
them, in foolish Questions and endless Genealogies. Epiphanius here com-
pares the τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σαλβής or incredibility of the Fables, which were
written by the Mimick Poets, with the τῇ ἡμέρᾳ of the fooleries of the
Valentinians, but he does not say these latter owed their Genealogies
to the Mimicks.

Ver. 15. Note c. I do not believe St. Paul here has a respect to the
Jews Cabbala, for ἀναγεννήσεως in Greek very often signifies to approve, and
ἀναγεννήσεως approbation. So that ἀναγεννήσεως ἡ ὑποκρίσις is a pure Greek Phrase, in
which there is no allusion to the Cabbala. Suidas: ἀναγεννήσεως, ἀναγεννήσεως ἡ
ὑποκρίσις, ἀναγεννήσεως ἡ τεῖν τρόπος, ἡ ἀναγεννήσεως ἡ τεῖν τρόπος: The word
is joined with an Accusative and Genitive Case, and signifies to approve, as
ἀναγεννήσεως, &c. I approve your manners. So Hesychius: ἀναγεννήσεως, ἀναγε
ἀξιωθητία: esteemed worthy of acceptation. So the old Glosses: ἀναγε
ἀξιωθητία: esteemed worthy of acceptation. See also my Note on i Cor. ii. 14.

Ver. 17. Note d. 1. Barather's αἰῶνων is an imitation of a Hebrew form
of speech very common among the Rabbins, who often call God
melekh bolamim, or יי רְעָבָנִים melekh bolam, that is, the
King of the World, as appears by their forms of Prayer. It is not
probable that St. Paul would use a foolish term of the Gno-
sticks, where he does not dispute against them.

II. I am apt to think that the Gnosticks called Angels, or inferior
Deities, αἰῶνες, not from Ezechiel, where they are stiled living Crea-
tures,
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ures, which has no affinity with ancient ages, but as it were all ages. Chapter everlasting, as Homer often calls the Gods: And so wrested an usual word to a signification which did not belong to it. In the mean while, what is here said by St. Paul may as well be opposed to the Heathens as the Gnosticks; to whom our Author had no reason to suppose the Apostle alluded almost in every word.

Ver. 18. Note f. Our Author here confounds things very different with one another, because there is some similitude between them in found: which is a fault he often commits, not being sufficiently accustomed to a grammatical etymology, nor having taken so much pains in studying Criticks, as Divinity and Ecclesiastical History. I. In Num. iv. 3. the word הָעֵד must not be rendred into the host, but into the troop, or company, as I have shewn on that place. And a troop or company is so called, because any company of men marching in order, is in some respect like an Army, whether put in array or moving forwards. See my Notes on Exod. vi. 26. and xii. 41.

II. In Numb. r. 50. This Law is given to the Levites: They shall bear the Tabernacle, and all the vessels thereof; they shall minister unto it, and shall encamp round about the Tabernacle: which words must be understood in their proper sense; for the Levites in the Desert did really encamp about the Tabernacle. And therefore they make nothing to the metaphorical signification of an Army, tho they gave occasion to it.

III. Our learned Author had not look'd into the place in Exod. xxxviii. 8. for there is no mention there made of Women lately delivered. Moses is said to have made the Laver of brass, and its foot of brass, of the Looking-glasses of women assembling by troopers at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation. There is no signification here of warring, or of sacred Ministration. See my Notes on that place.

IV. In 2 Sam. vi. 2. God is called the Lord of Hosts, in the same sense, as frequently elsewhere, not as the Lord of the Ark or Tabernacle, which is a Phrase that nowhere occurs, and the Ark and Tabernacle are never called host; but the Discourse is about conveying the Ark from one place to another, to which the title of Lord of hosts, that is, President of War, has no manner of relation. But what then? Is not God often called by that name in the Prophets, where neither War, nor the Ministry of the Priests or Levites is spoken of? Yes, it is a title the Prophets frequently make use of, whatever be the subject of the Discourse; just as Homer in abundance of places calls Jupiter rex ignum, where he has nothing at all about Clouds or Rain; and Achilles nodis axiis, where there is nothing said about running. Such as these:
these are perpetual Epithets, and as it were Appendages to proper Names, or like Surnames, which are used whenever those Names are mention’d without any certain design. The Jews called the true God the Lord of Hosts, because they look’d upon Victory as one of the chief Favours God could confer upon men in this World; and on the contrary, a Defeat in War, whereby whole Nations were sometimes subjected to Slavery, as the greatest evil. They saw also often, that those whom God favoured obtained the Victory, tho they were inferior both in Policy and Strength to their Enemies: and that tho all military Stratagems were used in Battels, yet the Event was uncertain, and did not depend upon men; because unforeseen Accidents, tho very small, are sometimes the cause of Victories and Defeats. Therefore they thought that God did preside in a special manner over War, and thence made him a Surname. The Heathens sometimes speak almost in the same manner about their Deities, as Hirtius de Bello Alexandr. c. 75. where he describes the Battel between Caesar and Pharnaces, whom Caesar overcame with much fewer Forces, and those not sufficiently prepared to fight: Clamore sublato, faith he, consilii, multum adjuvante natura loci, plurimum DEORUM immortaliæ BENIGNITATE; qui cum OMNIBUS CASIBUS BELLII INTERSUNT, tum præciue eis, quibus nihil potuit ratione administrari: After a great shout (on both sides) the two Armies engaged one another, the situation of the place being a great advantage (to Caesar’s Party) but the FAVOUR of the GODS a much greater; who as they are PRESENT in ALL the CHANCES of WAR, so especially in those in which there is no room for the exercise of Conduit. For these Reasons, the Jews attributed to God the title of Lord of Hosts, which must by no means be urg’d, as if it were never used but where there is a respect had to an Army, either properly so called, or metaphorically.

V. The Angels are called Gods Hosts in Psalm ciii. 21. because God uses them as Kings and Generals do Armies, to assist their Friends in danger, and subdue their Enemies; and the Stars, not the Sun and Moon only, because they are like a straggling Army, dispersed over all parts of the Heaven.

VI. Our learned Author had not cast his eyes upon Isa. xl. 2. where there is no mention of the Priesthood, no footstep of the Levites. The Prophet speaks thus: Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak that which may please Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, because her sin is expiated. That which the Prophet here calls Jerusalem’s warfare is the banishment of the Jews, and the misery ensueth thereupon, which he foretells would shortly be at an end.
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I cannot conceive by what Engines this can be applied to the Cessation Chapter of the Levitical Priesthood.

VII. In 2 Tim. ii. 4. there is mention indeed made of fighting, but in a proper sense. But the place alluded by Dr. Hammond is in the same Epistle, chap. iv. 7. and the Apostle does not there speak about Warring, or make use of a Metaphor taken from War, but from the Agones. I have striven, faith he, a good strife, &: ἑγέρθη & ἐκλειν ἐπιτρέμειν, I have finished my race, ἡ ἐνεί, I have kept the faith. So that I wonder our Author should alluded that place.

CHAP. II.

Verf. 1. I. THE word μῖσος in the passage of St. Chrysostom, alluded in the beginning of this Note, is not well rendred Priests; for μῖσος signifies any Believers, that were present at the Celebration of the Eucharist, or any other religious Mysteries. And the reason why St. Chrysostom says the thing was known to them, and not to others, is because the Christians prayed for the Emperors μετ' ὧν ἔσον αὐτὸ, when there were none but Mystes present. In the Apostolical Constitut. lib. 8. c. 13. in a Prayer for the faithful, μετ' ὧν ἔσον αὐτὸ, after a divine Oblation, we meet with these words: 'τῷ βασιλείῳ καὶ ἐκ τῶν συνεγερθέντων τῶν ἱερῶν ἱερῶν, &c. Let us pray for Kings, and those that are in Authority, that we may live at peace, &c.

II. In St. Chrysostom's Liturgy, Dr. Hammond renders the words Σουσώθαις basileus by Defenders of God, or of the Faith of Christ, because, I suppose, he had in his mind the Title of the King of Great Britain, who is ordinarily called Defender of the Faith. But Σουσώθαις signifies one that is kept or preserved by God, not one that preserves or defends God; as Σουσώθαις is one taught of God, and not one that teaches God. So in the old Latin Version of the Liturgy of St. Basil, Ed. Plant. An. 1560. Pro piissimo & à Deo conservando Imperatore nostrō, omniqve palatio & exercitu ejus, Dominum postulemus. Let us beseech God for our most pious Emperor, to be preserved by God, and for all the Court, and his Army. So in the Translation of the Mals of S. Chrysostom, publish'd by Leo the Tuscan: Pro piissimis & cælitus custodiis Imperatoribus nostris, toto palatio & exercitu eorum, Dominum depre- cemus. Let us pray earnestly to the Lord for our most religious Emperors, which Heaven preserves, for the whole Court, and their Armies. The thing is clear, and needed no proof, if our learned Author had not stumbled in it.
CHAP. III.

Ver. 1. No Man that understands what is the Office of a Bishop or Presbyter, which may be learned from these Epistles to Timothy and Titus, can doubt but that it is a very honourable and excellent work. But we ought not therefore to decry other conditions of Life, as worldly; in which a man may as truly serve God, provided he regulates himself according to the prescriptions of the Gospel: nor can I assent to what our Author here says about Demas, of which I shall have occasion to speak afterwards.

As to the desertion of that Office, it is a great Sin without doubt in those, who have applied themselves to it being duly qualified, and can discharge it as they ought and usefully; but how many are there who rashly aspire to that Office, as to some Magistracy or Secular Dignity, for the sake of Honour and Profit, who are destitute of Gifts necessary to the right exercise of it? And it would be much better if such men repented of their Vow (if a purpose respecting only Riches and Honours ought to be called a Vow) after they had found by experience how unfit they were for the Ministry of the Gospel, and sat themselves to some other employment, for which they were better qualified. Such Men in Hebrews xi. 6, and Hebrews iv. 18, who whatever Orders they have entered into, or whatever Promises they have made, it

Verf. 8. Note b. The Doctor read Aristea too hastily; for if he had read the following words, he would have seen that there was no need of any Correction, there being immediately added after the words alleged, έν τοις άντικείμενοις τω άνθρωπω και τω άνθρωπω, and so the entire sense being, as it is the general custom of the Jews, having washed their hands in salt water, after they had prayed to God, they went to reading, and every one interpreted.

Verf. 15. Note d. I wonder our Author has made no mention of the Opinion of Grotius, who following Beza, interprets άντικείμενα by τα τεκνοφυγητα; and so the Apostle’s meaning will be, either that Women, tho they are punished for Sin in Child-bearings, should nevertheless be saved if, &c. as Beza thinks; or, that their bearing of Children should be no hindrance to their Salvation if, &c. which Grotius prefers. These are certainly the most natural Interpretations, and from them we may easily assign a Reason of the confusion of the Numbers, which are often set promiscuously, when the Discourse is about a whole Species, as Grotius, and Dr. Hammond himself, well observes.
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would be well if they were loosed from their Engagements, and re-Chapter
turned to the World as they use to say, than that they should profane and
abuse so sacred an Employment. But if that were done; so many Le-
gions of Angels of the Lord would be reduced to a few.

Ver. 2. Note b. I. There is a fault either of the Printer, or Dr. Ham-
mond in his haste, in the citation of the Neocæsarean Synod, for that
which he refers to is in Canon 7. and there are but 15 Canons of that
Synod.

II. There is such another mistake in the citation of the Ancyran Synod;
for Dr. Hammond referred to Can. 19, and there are no more than
25 in all. Besides, the word ἀθανασία does not signify in that Canon a term
of time, but a Constitution or Determination, by which a certain pe-
num was imposed upon such as had been twice married. ἄθανασία γὰρ
κύρια, by ἀθανασία is meant a Constitution and Canon, faith Zondras.

III. Our Author cites Plutarch in his Paenula, as if he had looked
into the Greek; whereas Plutarch says the quite contrary, as will ap-
pear by his words, which I shall set down entire, that the Reader may
see Citations are not always to be trusted; because our learned Author
relying upon the fidelity of others, obtrudes upon us I know not what
Dreams for the sense of Plutarch. These are that Writer's words
in Quest. c. 3. Πώς τίνα εκτιμήσατε ταῖς μνήμονεσ ἡμεῖς, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡ μνήμο
ναις, ἓκ τοις μνήμοναις; Why is it not the custom for Virgins to be mar-
ried on the publick Feasts, and for Widows to be married? Dr. Ham-
mond supposes the contrary; tho' he is not consistent with himself in what
follows. Now to that Question Plutarch answers thus: Πώς τίνα εκ-
tιμήσατε ταῖς μνήμονεσ, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡ μνήμοναις λογικάς; εἰ δὲ καὶ τοις μνήμο
ναις, ἕκ τοις μνήμονας εἰς τοὺς πολῖτος παρατρέπεις, ζητάτως λογικὰς ἕκ
τοις μνήμονας ἐπιμελεί. Is it, as Varro said, because Virgins when they
are married are sorrowful, but women joyful? And at a feast time nothing
should be done sorrowfully or by constraint. Or rather because it is decent
for Virgins to be married in the presence of a great many, but not for Widows.
For the first marriage is desirable, but the second is abominable. The last
words are alluded by Grotius, than which nothing can be more perti-
nent to the business in hand; and our Author would not have done
amiss, if he had followed him, who is for the most part a faithful
guide. Plutarch adds some things to which our Author refers, which
I shall therefore transcribe: Αἱ γυναῖκες γὰρ οἵτινες ἐστιν καθόλου, τέρτον καθόλου;
εἰς οὓς ἀνείπα Ῥωμαίοις, ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, ἔστιν ἄμειγσιν καθόλου. τὰ τοῖς ἤθελον εἰς
δικαιοσύνης: for they are ashamed, if while their former Husbands are alive, they
are married to others; and if they die, they mourn, which makes them pre-
Chapter for Quiet, to the noise of a Multitude, and pompous Solemnities. Note, that the Law had imposed this upon Widows, or such as were forsaken by their Husbands, that they might not be too hasty to marry a second time.

IV. To the places alluded by Grotius and our Author, as well here as on Chap. v. 9. add this out of Livy, [Lib. x. c. 23. Mr. Le Clerc does not cite the place, which I wonder at, because he blames Dr. Hammond so often for the same thing] by which it will appear, who it is that is said to be the Husband of one Wife. That Historian describing the strife between the Roman Matrons, in the Nobles Temple of Chastity, out of which Virginia was expelled, because she being a Noble Woman, had married a Commoner, faith: Brevis altercatio inde, ex iracundia muliebri in contentionem animorum escasit, cum se Virginia patrician & pudicum in patriciae Pudicitiae templum ingressam & UNI N U P T A M, ad quem virgo deduxit ait — — — —— — verò gloriaretur. A short quarrel occasion’d by that means, through the Women’s peevishness, grew to a very fierce contention, Virginia boasting that she being a noble and virtuous Woman, had entered into the Nobles Temple of Chastity, and had been MARRIED to ONE Man, to whom she had been deliver’d a Virgin.

Verf. 15. in Note e. Col. 2. Lin. 8. after the words, Donour, or Plenipotentiary.] Dr. Hammond would have done well if he had proved what he afferts here about a Metropolitan Power, and the rest of what he says, out of Scripture, or those Antients which lived nearest the times of the Apostles; because he could not but know that there were some in the World who would look upon the greatest part of those things as Fables. But perhaps they were delivered first from the Pulpit, in a Discourse to the People, and afterwards inserted in his Annotations on the New Testament, but in an improper place. What he says about the Church and the House of God, there is no one undoubtedly but knows, and it might have been said much more clearly in three words, without the tediousness of so many repetitions.

Ibid. Lin. 39. after the words, one and the same Title.] Our learned Author might have allledged another place out of Maimonides, more like this of St. Paul, which has been already allledged by Mr. Lightfoot in his Description of the Temple of Jesus, Chap. xxii. This great Council setting in Garith **יִהְיָהוּ תַּעֲרָדָה מַעֲלֵה פָּרָס יְהוּדִי יִוָרָאָה** was the FOUNDATION of the Oral Law, and the PILLAR of Instruction. For this is said of an Assembly, as it is also an Assembly which St. Paul speaks of.
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[Note: At the end of the same Note.] I. All this will be insignificant, Chapter if the words Pillar and ground of Truth should not belong to the Church, but to that which follows, viz. the mystery of Godliness. Which is the opinion of Episcopius and Camero, none of the lowest rank of Divines, who may be consulted.

II. I wonder our Author should produce these words as out of the Epistle to the Magnesians: for they that did so, &c. when there are no such words in that Epistle. Whether they are to be found in any other place of Ignatius, I cannot tell, nor have I time to look; but it was not prudently done to cite them as out of a place where they are not.

III. Nor is that confused heap of places out of Ignatius much to the purpose, because St. Paul says nothing here about Bishops, and because such times may happen wherein it would be a piece of madness to trust Bishops, as our Author acknowledges. So that whatever is said by Ignatius, must all be understood with this exception; provided a Bishop truly discharge the Office of a Pastor, not if he be a Heretic, or a Tyrant, who thinks he is not for the Flock, but the Flock for him; not if he obstinately persist in gross Errors, which he will not by any reason be brought to renounce, through his Pride or Covetousness. It was possible that in the time of Ignatius, all the Bishops, of whom many had seen the Apostles, and many had their Disciples for their Teachers, might be Men devoted to the Truth, and faithful Pastors; and that induced him to insist so much upon their Authority: but these are not lessons for all times and places.

Ver. 16. It must be owned that our Author in the precedent Annotations, has often acted the part of a Preacher or Divine, rather than an Interpreter. And therefore to supply what is wanting in him, I shall subjoin here out of another English Gentleman, a Discourse much more critical than any thing said by Dr. Hammond. I mean Dr. Pearson, who has treated of the true reading of this place, on the 2d Article of the Apostles Creed, p. 128. whereafter he had said that all the Greek Copies have ὅσιος, God was manifested in the Flesh, &c. not ὅ, which was manifested, &c. he speaks thus: "Nor need we be troubled "with the observation of Grotius on the place: suspetiam nobis banc "lectionem faciunt Interpretes veteres, Latinus, Syrus, Arabis & Ambrosius, "qui omnes legerunt ὅσιος. I confess the vulgar Latin reads it "otherwise than the Greek, Quod manifestatum est in carne; and it "cannot be denied but the Syriack, however translated by Tremellius, "agreeth with the Latin; and both seem to have read ὅ instead of "ὁς. But the joint consent of the Greek Copies and Interpreters,
are above the Authority of these two Translators; and the Arabick
set forth in the Biblia Polyglotta, agreeth expressly with them. But
that which Grotius hath farther observed, is of far greater con-
sideration: Addit Hinsicarus Opusculum lv. illede sedis his postium a Nestori-
anis. For if at first the Greeks read ἅτεραρια, and that ὧν were
altered into Σας by the Nestorians; then ought we to correct the
Greek Copy by the Latin, and confess there is not only no force, but
not so much as any ground or colour for our Arguments.

But first it is no way probable that the Nestorians should find it
in the Original, and make it Μή, because that by so doing they
had overthrown their own Assertion, which was, that God was not
incarnate, nor born of the Virgin Mary; that God did not ascend
unto Heaven, but Chrifies, by the Holy Ghost remaining upon him,
καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἑαυτῷ κατέχοντος Concil. Ephes. Part. 1. chap. 17. Sec-
condly, it is certain that they did not make this alteration, because
the Catholick Greeks read it ἅτερας before there were such Heretics,
so called. Nestoriani a Nestorio Episcopo, Patriarcha Constantinop-
litano. Aug. Hæres. Nestorius, from whom that Heresy began,
was Patriarch of Constantinople after Sisinnius; Sisinnius after Athou,
Atticus after Nestorian, who succeeded Junius, vulgarly called
Chrysostomus. But S. Chrysostom read not ἅτερας, but ἅτερα, as appears by
his Commentaries on the place: οἱ δὲ εἰρηνεύοντο ἐς αὐτόν, τυριστ. i
ἐπιστ. And St. Cyril, who by all means opposed Nestorius upon
the first appearance of his Heresy, wrote two large Epistles to the
Queens Pulcheria and Eudoxia, in both which he maketh great use of
this Text. In the first, after the repetition of the words, as they
are now in the Greek Copies, he proceedeth thus; τὰ Ὢς εἰς σαρών ἅτερα
γενέσθαι; ὁ δὲ λόγος ὡς τοῦτο ζωής ἐν Θεῷ παρέχεται Ἴη, εἰς ὃς ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστιν
τὸ εὐπρέπειας κυρίεξος: οἱ δὲ εἰρηνεύοντο ἐς σαρών. Whence in St. Paul
he reads Ὢς God, and took that God to be the Word. In the second,
repeating the same Text verbatim, he manageth it thus against
Nestorius: Εἴ τὸς θεός ὁ λόγος ἐναποθήκηξεν κατεργαζόμενος ἐν αὐτῷ, ὃς ἐν Θεῷ μεθοὺς τόπον
θεὸς, ἀλλ' ἐν τοις οἷς: ταῖς ἑαυτοίς, μέχρι ὅτι τότε χρειαστῇ μετά ἐστίν τοῖς
εὐπρεπεῖσι μυστικοῖς: εἰ τὲ καθὼς κατεργάζεται κατεργαζόμενος ἐν αὐτῷ, πώς ἐν σαρών παραπλή-
σθαι; καὶ τὸ ποῦ ἡ ἐπάνω ἐναγώθη, ἐν τῷ ἀληθεύομαι ἐν σαρώ διὸ ἐστιν: εἰ σὲ ἐν
τῇ ἐπαύγη ὑπὸ τοῦ καθὼς ἐπαύγης; And in the explanation of his second Anathema,
he maketh use of no other Text but this, to prove the Hypostatical
Union, giving it this Gloss or Exposition: τὸ ἐστι τὸ θειουργεῖν ἐς σαρών
τῶν καθὼς ἐναγώθη ὡς ἐν Θεῷ μεθοῦς λόγος. So. The same he urgeth in his
Schoolion de Unigeniti incarnatione. So also Theodoret contemporary
with St. Cyril: θειουργεῖν τῷ τοῦ ἐναγώθη ὡς καθὼς ἐν Θεῷ μεθοῦς λόγος ἐς σαρών
ἐναγώθης.
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Thirdly, Hincmarus does not say, that the Nestorians put θεός into the Greek Text, but that he which put it in was cast out of his Bishoprick as a Nestorian. His words are these:

Quidam nimium ipsas Scripturas verbis ineditoris imposueraverunt; sicut Macedonius Constantinopolitanus Episcopus, qui ab Anastasio Imperatore ideo a Civitate expulsus legitur, quoniam falsavit Evangelia, & illum Apostoli locum ubi dicit, quod apparet in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu, per cognitionem Graecarum literarum, in hoc modo mutando falsavit. Ubem enim habuit Qui, hoc est ος monosyllabum Graecum, lettera mutata o in o verit; & fecit ος, id est, ut esset Deus apparuit per carnem. Quapropter tanquam Nestorianus fuit expulsus. Hincm. Opus. iv. c. 18. Now whereas Hincmarus says expulsus legitur, we read not in Bedeagius, or the Excerpta of Theodorus, or in Joannes Malalas, that Macedonius was cast out of his Bishoprick for any such falsation. It is therefore probable that he had it from Liberatus, a Deacon of the Church of Carthage, who wrote a Breviary, collected partly out of the Ecclesiastical Histories, and Acts of the Councils, partly out of the relations of such Men as he thought fit to believe, extant in the fourth Tome of the Councils. In which, chap. 19, we have the same relation, only with this difference, that o is not turned into θ, but into Ω; and so ος becomes not θς, but Ως.

So that, first the Greek Copies are not said to have read it θ, but Ως, and so not to have relation to the Mystery, but to the Person of Christ; and therefore this makes nothing for the Vulgar Latin.

Secondly, whereas Hincmarus says there was but one Letter changed, no such mutation can of ος make θς ος, it may Ως, as we read in Liberatus; and then this is nothing to the Greek Text.

Thirdly, Macedonius was no Nestorian, but Anastasius an Eutychian; and he ejected him not as he did other Catholic Bishops, under the pretence of Nestorianism, but for other reasons. However Macedonius could not falsify all the Greek Copies, when as well those which were before his time, as those which were written since, all acknowledge Ως. And if he had been ejected for substituting Ως, without question Anastasius would have taken care for the restoring θ, which we find not in any Copy. It remaineth therefore that the Nestorians did not falsify the Text, by reading Ως instead, but that the antient Greek Fathers read it so; and consequently being the Greek is the Original, this Lection must be acknowledged Authentical.
Chapter IV.

This is excellently said by the learned Doctor, but he is mistaken when he denies that any Greek Copy reads α, unless we are deceived by the Oxford Edition, which sets down the various Lections, and wherein the Clarimont Copy, of great Antiquity, and another of Lincoln College, are said to have α, which the Latin and Syriack Interpreters undoubtedly found in their Greek Testaments.

Ver. 8. I am plainly of the mind that St. Paul here despises bodily Exercises, as altogether unprofitable to Salvation, for of that profitableness he here speaks, because he considers them apart from Piety, which he opposes to them; and if they are abstracted from that, they do not serve for few things, but for nothing at all. For let those who are destitute of true Piety exercise their Bodies as much as they please, it will never avail them anything as to eternal Salvation. For who will believe that the Brahmins, [for instance] who live an austere Life in the Woods, and abstain from many lawful things, for ostentation sake, or out of superstition, are anything more acceptable to God than the other Indians, who do not think such Abstinences necessary? If we use those bodily Exercises, on purpose to make our selves fitter for the performance of some Duties of real Piety, then it must be granted that they are not profitable α ἀληθῶν, but α ἁλατῶν, and therefore St. Paul does not here consider that use of corporal Exercises, but that which does not render Men more fit for the practice of Vertue. He would have commended Socrates, qui inter labores voluntarios, & exercitias corporis ad fortuitas patientia vices firmandi, stare solitus dicitur perditus atque pernox, a summo lucis ortu ad solem alterum orientem, qui is said to have continued whole Nights and Days from the Sun's first rising, till it rose again, in voluntary Labours and bodily Exercises, to harden himself to undergo whatever it might be his lot to suffer. Which are the words of A. Gellius in Lib. ii. c. 1. Thus Socrates behaved himself, that he might become the more steadfast in Vertue, and that the fear of bodily pain might never remove him from it. But St. Paul would not have praised the patience of a Robber, who exercised his Body that he might be the more fit for spoil, and harden himself against the fear of suffering for his Crimes, no more than the exercises of the Athlete, which were performed only out a desire of vain glory.

Ver. 10. Ἡσ περὶ τῶν ἄθλων, μάλιστα πατήρ.] These words our Author, after others, interprets of eternal Salvation; but I rather understand
understand them of a deliverance from temporal Dangers, out of Chapter which God often rescues all Men, but especially those who put their trust in him. St. Paul's meaning is this: that he did not refuse to expose himself to the greatest Dangers, Reproaches, or Persecutions; because he knew that God could rescue him out of all those dangers if he pleased. He has a respect to Psalm xvii. 7. where the Psalmist speaks thus: Make thy loving kindness marvellous, O thou Saviour, דִּבְרָי, which may be rendered of them that believe; for to hope and believe, when the Discourse is about a thing which is matter of Joy, and that yet future, signify almost the same thing. So, as others have observed, God is said to save Man and Beast, in Psalm xxxvi. 6. So the Author of the Book of Wisdom, chap. xvi. 7. speaking of those who looked up to the brazen Serpent, and were healed, says, be that turned himself was not saved, ἵστατο, by that which was seen, but by thee the Saviour, υἱὸς, of all Men.

Vers. 15. I will not deny but the word μετατάσσειν is used in an Agonistical sense; but there being nothing said here of those Exercises, I rather think it ought to be rendered mind, or take care of these things; so as that μετατάσσειν should be the same with μετάλλον, do not neglect, which went before. So, μετάλλον, in Hesiod, signifies care, ἀργύριον: vers. 380.

Πλὴν μὲν ἀλῳ Ῥωμαῖοι μετάλλον, μείζων δὲ ἐπιφάνειαν.

Where faith Proclus: μετάλλον ἀλῳ πᾶν ἔργον, so be calls care. And μετατάσσει is the same Poet is used for to take care, as in vers. 316.

—μετατάσσει βίον ἀλῳ περιλαμβάνω:

I know in Prose the word rarely occurs in this signification, but as long as it very well agrees to this place, nothing should hinder us to admit it. Out of this, which is the proper signification of the Verb μετατάσσει, as appears by its coming from μετά, resulteth that other mention'd by Dr. Hammond; for they that exercise themselves in any business, are careful and diligent about it.

C H A P. V.

Vers. 17. I. μετά signifies unquestionably sometimes Wages or Reward, according to the signification of the Verb παραδίδω, or παρέχω, for to pay or requite, and I doubt not too, but μετά παράδίδω here must be interpreted double Wages. But the other pla-

X x x
Chapter V.

...alleged by our Author, to prove that μετά signifies to reward, or something of that kind, do not seem to prove it. For the there were Rewards joined with the Honours there spoken of, it does not follow that the word μετά is expressive of those Rewards, which undoubtedly were not the ἴδιον Honour itself, but an outward signification of Honour, and are joined with Honour, as its Concectaries.

II. It is true also, what our Author says about the Verb διδόω; but here it seems to signify not only to receive, but also to be judged worthy to receive, which is the most usual signification of the word. In the place of the Exposition of the Faith, printed with the Works of Justin, διδόω is not simply they have or have had, but they have been endued with that dignity or excellency of Nature as to be partakers of the same Divinity. That is the perpetual signification of the word, which is hardly ever used but in a good sense, and to signify that he, of whom it is said, enjoys that of which he is worthy.

Ver. 22. Note g. Dr. Hammond, in this Annotation, has ingeniously cleared the order of the Discourse, but has omitted one thing, which he ought first of all to have proved; viz. That the Gnosticks forbad not only Matrimony, but the use of Wine. For tho the former be universally charged upon them, yet I cannot tell whether any did ever accuse them of prohibiting the use of Wine. It is certain neither Irenæus nor Epiphanius object any such thing against them; and later Writers we need not trouble our selves about, who for the most part copy after them. Tho those Fathers omit nothing, whereby they may render the Gnosticks infamous and odious, so that we can scarce believe all they say. Nay, there is a passage in Epiphanius, which if true, shews the Gnosticks did not abstain from Wine; in Hæres. xxvi. which is that of the Gnosticks, Sect. 5. where he speaks thus: "Τα σώματα ου μπορείτε και μεθ' άμυναν, προκειμεν γυνακείαν, και υμωροτατον, μυστασμουν, οπώς ου και μεθ' υλήν ἄγνωστος και εκθεταίρων τ' ἑδονήν, πληροιτος, και δι' εκείνην, το οὔ όροςζωσ' τά το μονοσ' Με τι χάριν ἴσων θυσίαν. ἐν δὲ σφησιμω εἰς τ' ην εὔνους ἐθανατιζομεν, καὶ το θυσμά και τον ὄντων, ὡς πρᾶξεν αὑτῆ: Night and day sorry Fellows and Wenchs employ themselves in taking care of their Bodies, anointing, washing, feasting, worring, and making themselves drunk. And they curse all that fast, saying, that People ought not to fast, because fasting belongs to the Maker and Prince of this Age; and they must feed, that their Bodies may be strong, and able to bring forth fruit in its proper season. There were indeed afterwards other Hereticks, who taught it was unlawful to drink Wine, as the Encratites, as we are told by Epiphanius in Hæres. xlvi. But all the Doctrines of all Hereticks cannot be attributed to the single Sect of the Gnosticks; unless perhaps the Gnosticks were of several sorts.
The text in the image is a page from a religious text, specifically a commentary on the New Testament. It appears to be discussing the works of early church figures, such as Irenaeus and Epiphanius, and references to the Gnostics and their heresy. The text is a translation into English, likely from a Latin or Greek original, and is discussing the challenges of understanding and interpreting ancient religious texts.

The page contains a section starting with "Chapter VI," and continues with a detailed analysis of the writings of St. Paul, particularly focusing on the concept of knowledge and its differences from the Gnostics. It mentions the importance of not being misled by certain traditions or interpretations, and stresses the need for a clear understanding of biblical texts.

The text also touches on the evolution of religious beliefs and the challenges faced by early Christians in distinguishing between orthodox and heretical teachings. It highlights the role of tradition and scripture in maintaining the integrity of the faith.

Overall, the page is a reflective and analytical piece, aimed at providing insights into the complex interplay between religious beliefs, historical context, and theological frameworks.
wards he interprets the words of Moses allegorically, and says that by
the Land was meant Jesus. See also Chap. x. towards the end, where
that word occurs twice in this Signification. Some persons seem, as
they easily might, to have abused that way of interpreting, whose
knowledge St. Paul here calls ἱστορίαν ἡμῶν ἱστορίαν, and to whom he often
alludes in this Epistle. But we must beware of seeking such Allusions
where it is not necessary, as our Author does in many places, who yet
sometimes seems to have hit the nail on the head, as in Chap. iv. 4.
& seqq.
ANN OTATIONS

On the Second Epistle
Of St. Paul the Apostle to Timothy.

At the end of the Premon. J. Notwithstanding all that is here said by our Author, it is much more probable that St. Paul wrote this Epistle after his last Bondage, in the year of Nero XIII. and of Christ LXVII. a little before his death; as it is thought by Dr. Pearson, who has easily solved all the Difficulties which our Author here objects against that Opinion. I shall say something to them on Chap. iv.

CHAP. I.

Ver. 3. Χαὶ ἐν τῷ θαυμάσιῳ τῷ μου, ὥστε τὸν τούτων ἔχων τὸν ἁγιόν, ἵνα πάντας ἐκεῖνος αἰματίας τῇ ἀρετῇ σου ἑλθίσῃ. The sense of these words seems to be this: I thank God, that he gives me cause to make perpetual mention of you in my Prayers; that is, because thou adherest to the Gospel: for the Apostle did expressly make mention of those in his Prayers for whom he had a particular Affection, and whom he knew to be faithful to Christ. This may be gather’d from the beginning of most of his Epistles. See especially that to Philemon, ver. 4, and 5.

Ver. 9. Χαὶ ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος ὁ αἰματίας, ὥστε σὺ τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκεῖνος ἐμοὶ. That is, in 4, ὥστε σὺ τῷ ὁμοίῳ ἐκεῖνος ἐμοὶ, ὥστε τῷ ὁμοίῳ ἐκεῖνος, ὥστε τῷ ὁμοίῳ ἐκεῖνος. Which of a long time God had purposed to give us by Jesus Christ. He means the Gospel, which God had purposed should be preached both to Jews and Gentiles, as appears from ver. 10. That αἰματίας is used for a long time, is evident from Tit. 1. 2. where see our Author, and Grotius upon this place. And that is said to be given, which is by a certain and immutable Counsel decreed to be given. So Virgil, Æneid. 1. ver. 282. represents Jupiter speaking thus concerning the Romans:

His ego nec metas rerum, nec tempora pono,
Imperium sine fine DEDLI.

See Note on Ephes. i. 4.
The place in Tertullian is in Chap. xxxiii. de Præf.; Haret, where he speaks thus: *Paulus in prima ad Corinthios notat negaturos &; aditatores resurrectionis, Hec opinio propria Sadduceorum. Partem ejus usurpat Marcion & Apelles &; Valentinus. St Paul in his first to the Corinthians made those who denied or doubted of the Resurrection. This opinion was peculiar to the Sadducees. Part of it is espoused by Marcion, &c. And a little after: Aequa tangit eos, qui dicent falsam jam resurrectionem, id de se Valentiniani afferunt; He likewise takes up those that said the Resurrection was already past, which the Valentinians affirm of themselves. The rest which our Author says in this Annotation about the Verb viues &; its Derivatives, and about viues, is a mere Medley, and perfectly useless. I will not say to those that understand the Greek Language, but those also who can consult Lexicons, in which they may find these words more largely and better explained than they are here. I shall note only a few things concerning them.

I. Because while Cattel viues are feeding, they wander out of one place into another, therefore viues sometimes signifies to wander, as on the contrary the Latin word errare signifies to feed, as in that Verse of Virgil:

*Mille meæ Siculæ errant in montibus agna.*

The same I may say of the Hebrew יְנָר, which we find in Numb. xiv. 3, where the Vulg. Interp. renders the word יְנָר roham by vago, Wanderers. The Nomades in Scythia, and the Numidians in Africa, were really both Shepherds and Wanderers, so that they might be denominated from both; which every one knows. But what is that to the roham of a Gangrene? Our Author ought to have produced Examples, which shewed that roham is taken for the eating of a spreading Ulcer, of which there are several given by H. Stephanus. The Doctor alludes a Verse as out of Hesiod, which is Homers, in Iliad. 1. v. 249, where ἐπὶ ῥόμας is a profusion of words, with which any one feeds himself, as Eustathius on that place observes. Yet that word occurs in Hesiod in the same sense, in Ec. ver. 403, where the Poet admonishes Persa, that if he did not labour, there would come a time when he should beg with a great many words in vain:

Ἀξέσθη τις ἐν τοῖς ῥόμασιν ψωφίς
*A profusion of words will be useless.*
II. There was no need of recurring to the Septuagint, to shew that Chapter the Verb ἀποστείπειν signifies sometimes to shun, that being the use of it in the best Greek Writers, as Lexicographers will shew. And therefore ἀποστείπειν signifies to shun, because if we meet with any thing in our way which we would not run upon, and we cannot remove, we go round about it. Or if we would come nearer the proper signification of the Verb ἰστήνω, ἀποστείπειν will be to stand about, that is, to stand still when we meet with any stumbling block, for fear of falling upon it. Suidas interprets ἀποστείλω by ἀπογεννοῦσιν flying from or avoiding; and then he produces the place concerning Moses alleged by our Author, Πεσείγω, ἕκχον ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔτει τῆς Σοφίας ἀποστείλατε μαθητά: he always avoided a multitude, and Tumults especially.

CHAP. III.

What our Author says here about Simon's Contest and Flying, he took out of Caesar Baronius, as also other things of no great moment. See Baron. Annal. ad A. C. LXVIII. of Nero the 12th. But these things I have already elsewhere confuted. See especially what I have said on 2 Thess. ii. 3. I shall only add, that the place which our Author refers to in Suetonius does not at all belong to this matter: it is in Chap. 12. of the Life of Nero, and the words are these: Inter Pyrrbicarum argumenta, Taurus Pasiphaen igneo javencia simulacror abditam initi, ut multi spectantium crediderunt. Icarus primo statim conatus juxta cubiculum ejus decedit, ipsum cruore respersit. Among the Arguments of the Pyrrhic Sports (which Nero represented to the People) a Bull covered Pasiphae inclosed in an Engine of Wood made in the Shape of an Heifer. One that affed the part of Icarus immediately upon the first attempt fell down near the Emperor's Pavilion, and sprinkled him with his Blood. What is there here about the Contest of Simon with S. Peter? Who does not see that Suetonius speaks of a poor miserable Wretch that was forced to attempt flying to make the People a show? We may be sure if any such Contest had passed before Nero and the People, in the Amphitheatre, the fame of it would have been so great among the Heathens, that it would never have been forgotten. But these are the Fables of some idle Christians, which Posterity greedily took up.

CHAP.
Ver. 6. The σπέρματα is properly said of the Wine which was poured out upon the Head of the Sacrifice; yet here I think it ought to be understood metaphorically of the Sacrifice itself, upon which the Wine is poured out, a little before it is killed. So Hesychius: Σπέρματα, Σιλαε. Σιλαε, Σιλος. St. Paul uses the Present Tense, because of the nearness of the danger, as the Particle ἐν now shews. Our Author forces this place, when he interprets it of a past danger.

Ibid. Ἐφεσμα.] This indeed is a Verb in the Preterperfect Tense, but it is very frequently taken for the Present; whence the Vulgar Interpreter, and almost all others, render it instat, is at hand. And that it is to be so understood, the foregoing words shew. So that our Author had no reason to interpret it in the Preterperfect Tense, in his Premotion and Paraphrase of this Verse.

Ver. 7. Note a. It is true indeed, that St. Paul here uses Agonistical words; but as the Crown was due not to him who was yet running, but who was come to the end of his race, and that before others, so also God bestows a Crown not on him that behaves himself manfully in any particular Calamity, but during his whole Life. So that what St. Paul calls a good Combat, is the whole course of his Life, which he tells Timothy he had finished τελευταί, because he knew his Death was near, as the foregoing Verse sufficiently shews. What our Author says in his Note on Acts xxii. 7. I have confuted already on that place. See 1 Tim. vi. 12. and Acts xx. 24.

The word ἄνωθεν seems here to be in the place of an Adjective, so as that, according to a known Hebraism, a Crown of Righteousness should be put for a righteous or just Crown, that is, a Crown justly due. This is confirmed by the Epithet Just added to the word Judg. The places which our Author produces, as if the Hebrew יִבְשָׂמְל signified in them Felicity, I might shew to be improperly alleged, if it would contribute anything to the illustration of St. Paul's words.

Ver. 9. Εὐθύδαιμον ἥλκει τέσσαρα με τέξας.] It is certain indeed that Timothy was present with St. Paul when he made his first Defence, but whether he could go again to Rome soon enough, to be there before St. Paul's Death, is somewhat questionable.

Ver. 10. Ἁγωγιὸς ἐν ρωί ἀιών.] Our Author will not have Demas to have revolted from the Faith, but only, forsaking his Office of preaching the Gospel, to have applied himself to worldly Affairs. But to love...
the present age, signifies something worse than that, viz. to prefer it before the future; which he forsoaks an Office, which he finds himself insufficient for, does not. See Matt. xiii. 22. and James iv. 4.

Ver. 13. Note b. The Etymologicon Magnum hath it so, as Dr. Hammond thinks the words of Phavorinus should be read; but in this matter I neither believe the Writer of the Etymologicon nor Phavorinus, because pardon is not a Greek word, and signifies no such thing in the Latin Tongue. See Grotius.

Ver. 14. Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπελευσεν ἅπαντα οἰκονομικά.] Dr. Hammond thinks St. Paul here has a reference to the Troubles he endured at Ephesus, mention'd in Acts xix. but neither is it from that place sufficiently evident what Alexander did against St. Paul, and if he did any thing, I do not think the Apostle here has a respect to that, but something which was done at Rome: for this Alexander seems to have gone from Asia to Rome, where he fiercely opposed S. Paul, and from thence returned to Asia; for which reason St. Paul here admonishes Timothy to beware of him.

Ver. 16. Ἐν τῷ ἔποιεί τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, &c.] This cannot be understood of that Defence which St. Paul made for himself when he was first in bonds: for undoubtedly he would not have told Timothy a thing which he already very well knew, as having been present with him at that time, nor have said what was nothing to the purpose. He speaks of his pleading before him whom Nero at his departure into Greece left Governor of the City of Rome, by whom he was not presently condemned, but yet kept still in bonds, perhaps till Nero's Return, by which means many in the mean time had the Gospel preached to them. See Grotius on the following Verse, by whom it will appear, it was not well understood by our Author, in his Premonition to this Epistle.

Ver. 17. Note d. The mouth of the Lion does not, it's true, signify Nero, who seems at that time to have been in Greece, but Helius, to whom Nero committed the Government of Rome during his Absence. See Dr. Pearson in his Annal. Paulin. ad A. C. LXVII.

Ver. 18. Τριάδοι προς Ἐκκλησίαν.] These words are alluded by our Author in his Premonition, to prove that St. Paul here speaks of a Danger he was deliver'd from. But the Apostle does not add ὅπερ ἂν περιέχεται, but ὅπερ περιέχεται, that is, as Grotius well interprets it, from doing any thing unworthy of a Christian, or unworthy of an Apostle. This is clear from the next words, and will preserve me to his heavenly Kingdom; as Dr. Pearson also has observed.
Chapter I.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to Titus.

At the end of the Premon. Dr. Pearson with more reason refers the writing of this Epistle to the Year lxv. in which also St. Paul wrote his first to Timothy. It is probable, Titus remained in Crete, under the name of an Evangelist rather than of a Bishop or Archbishop (a word then unknown, as well as the thing it signified) because St. Paul afterwards commanded him to meet him at Nicopolis, as appears from Chap. iii. 12. and after that he went to Dalmatia, as St. Paul tells us in 2 Tim. iv. 10. undoubtedly to perform there the Office of an Evangelist. Which Function can hardly consist with the Office of a Bishop, watching over the Flock committed to him, with that care and diligence he ought. The Testimonies of the Antients about this matter, who judged rashly of the times of the Apostles by their own, and spake of them in the Language of their own Age, are of little moment; and so do no more prove that Titus was Bishop of the Island of Crete, than what Dr. Hammond says, proves him to have been dignified with the Title of an Archbishop. So the Antients very unanimously affirmed that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome; but the more judicious sort of Persons presently discovered them to be in an Error.

CHAP. I.

Ver. 2. It deserved to be noted, that in this one Verse, the word 

Note a. \(\text{\textit{e\'\text{\textasciitilde}n\text{\textasciitilde}n}}\) is taken in two several senses; for \(\text{\textit{e\'\text{\textasciitilde}n\text{\textasciitilde}n}}\) signifies eternal Life, that is, which shall never have any end; but \(\text{\textit{e\'\text{\textasciitilde}n\text{\textasciitilde}n}}\) eternal times, is no more than ancient times. This is a usual thing with St. Paul, of which see what I have said in my \n
Titus

Ver. 12. Note c. I. I do not believe Phavorinus read these words otherwise than we, but rather set them down as he remembred them. It is an improper Etymology which our Author gives of the word μεθευσαμαι; wherein contrarily to all Analogy, μ is inserted between two words. Clemens Alexandrinus gives us a much better interpretation of it, in Paedag. Lib. ii. c. 1. Ἡ μεθευσαμαι, διαείρυς τὸ τέμνειν, ὡς ἐν τῷ τύμπανῳ σφαλή, μοίρας τῷ γαστρὶ: τό μεθευσαμαι: it is an intemperance about Food, and as the word literally signifies, a madness in the Belly, for μεθεπι signifies Mad. This Etymology is suggested also by Phavorinus, which I wonder our Author did not take notice of.

II. The word ἁμαρτόεται both in Epimenides and in St. Paul, signifies what it ordinarily signifies, that is, idle and slothful, as Gluttons usually are. It's true, Slothfulness and Gluttony are very often attended with Uncleanliness, but Idleness and Uncleanliness are not therefore the same. In Ezekiel, Idleness does not signify Uncleanliness, but that which is the cause of it: Bebold, saith he, this was the Iniquity of thy Sister Sodom, Pride, fulness of Bread, and abundance of Idleness was in her, &c.

Chap. II.

Ver. 2. By a comparison of this place with 1 Tim. iii. our Author has well shewn that the Discourse here is about Deacons; but there are two things he will hardly persuade those that understand Greek, and are exercised in the reading of these Books to believe. One is that πρεσβύτες is distinguished from the word πρεσβυτέρος, both those words being promiscuously used in the Version of the Septuagint, as well when they signify Dignity, as Age, as Kircher's Concordances will shew. The word πρεσβύτες is taken for a Judg in Isa. iii. 2. Lament. ii. 21. & v. 14. and πρεσβυτέρος for the same in Levit. iv. 15. Num. xvi. 25. and elsewhere often. And so in many places both these words are used for an old Man. The degrees of Comparison ought not to be urged, against the perpetual use of the Language, especially πρεσβύτες & πρεσβυτέρος being properly laid with a respect to younger or young. As these two last words signify the same, so likewise the two former; and the two last, as Logicians speak, are correlates to the two first. They are used also indifferently in the New Testament. Compare Philem. 9. with 2 John 1. & 3 John 1.

The other is, that the word νεανισσάς in ver. 6. signifies Believers, who have no Office in the Church. It signifies only young Men, as the word νεανίς signifies before Women. See what I have opposed to Dr. Hammond on Luke xxii. 26.
Chapter III.

Ver. 3. Note b. *The κατασκευα to be ordain or constitute, it does not follow that κατασκευα signifies the rank of those who are constituted in any certain Office. For nothing is more common than for Derivatives to depart from the signification of their Primitives. So that the use of a word must always be joined with Analogy and Etymology; unless perhaps it be a singular word, or the series of the Discourse shews it must necessarily be understood in a particular sense. But neither does the series of the Discourse in this place favour our Author, and Use is evidently against him. The Deaconesses are commanded to be ἄρτεμισις in τῷ κατασκευα, that is, to go in such a dress, and behave themselves in such a manner as continued to be Women consecrated to God. This very well agrees with the whole series of the Discourse; and Use constantly interprets κατασκευα of a dress, habit, or gesture of Body. Consult J. C. Suicerus in his Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, or any other Lexicographer.*

Ver. 13. Περιτεύμενος — τὸν ἐπόδαμον ὑπὲρ τῷ μεγάλῳ θεῷ] A Gentleman of great reading, who published some years ago Notes and Observations on the Epistle of Polycarp, thinks St. Paul here so alludes to the Cabiri, or great Gods that were worshipped not only among the Samothracians, but also in the Isle of Crete, as to oppose Christ to them. And it is certain יבּir chebir in Arabick, signifies great, and thence the Greek word ηφαίστεως seems to have been formed, as S. Bochart well conjectured. Those Gods also were thought by some to be the same with the Corybantes, which every one knows were very much worshipped in Crete. And there was a mighty talk concerning their ἐπόδαμος, as well as of other Gods, as the learned Gentleman before mentioned has largely proved. But I think there is more wit than truth in this Interpretation, there being nothing in St. Paul’s words that shews he had a respect to the Religion of the Cretes; for if there be, it must be something else besides the words ἐπόδαμος & μεγάλῳ θεῷ, appearance and of the great God, which were often in the mouth of the Jews, without any allusion to the Isle of Crete or its Gods. See the Greek Index of Kircher’s Concordances.*

CHAP. III.

Ver. 10. Αἱρετικήs properly is the same with αἰτιοτρίσμμα, that is, he that follows any αἰτία Seë, whether its Doctrins are true or false. But the Doctrins of the Apostolical Churches, govern’d by the Apostles, or by Apostolical Men,
that agreed with their Teachers, being true; whoever departed from their disse (that word being understood in a good sense) did by consequence maintain false Doctrins. And hence Persons of erroneous Opinions, whether they were such as desired to live in the Church provided they might be tolerated, or whether they chose to separate themselves from it, were afterwards called Hereticks. But as there is a difference to be made between Men and Times, so also between Hereticks; and therefore this Precept of St. Paul must not be urged beyond what he intended it. Whoever heretofore departed from the Apostles, did by that very thing deny themselves to be Christians, because they contradicted inspired Men, from whom alone the Christian Doctrin could be learned, and whose Authority was confirmed by Miracles. Those undoubtedly were to be avoided by Christians, who when they had believed the Apostles, did afterwards reject their Doctrin and follow other Teachers. But those who after the Governors of Churches were not inspired, nor endued with a Power of working Miracles, seemed to themselves to observe in the Churches a departure from the Apostles in things themselves, tho' they were cunningly dissembled, and requested a reformation of those Errors from the Governors of Churches; these, I say, were not any longer dis[i]nus to be avoided, if they could truly charge others with dangerous Errors and Tyranny. These cannot have that bugbear name of the Church objected to them, as if the greatest number which are qualified with that name, could not by degrees at least fall off from the Doctrin of the Apostles; and all that separated from it must necessarily be in a state of Damnation.

Ibid. Note c. I. Besides the difference which our Author has observed between this place and the words of Christ in Mat. xviii. there is this further observable, that there Christ speaks of an injury done to any private Man, and which if it endamaged him, it was only with relation to his private Affairs; but here the Discourse is about a departure from the Apostles Doctrin, which concerned both the Apostles and the whole Church; in which case one or two Admonitions might be sufficient, to know whether those who separated themselves from the Churches, would again return to them. Yet I do not think the words of St. Paul are to be taken so, as if he forbade such Men to be admonished a third time, before they were avoided, if there was any hope of reclaiming them. He only says after the first and second Admonition, to shew Christians that Men are not to be given over for lost presently after the first Admonition, but to be
Chapter often admonished. Surely Christian Charity will not allow us to number St. Paul's words so, as if after two Admonitions, without any regard had to Circumstances, it were necessary to proceed to Excommunication. Here are no Lawyers forms, in which Words are weighed, and Citations counted; but only a repressing of an overhasty Judgment, that no one might be condemned unheard, or given up too soon.

II. As in Matt. xviii. 17. Let him be unto thee as an Heathen and a Publican, does not signify Excommunicate him, for the Discourse is about any private Men, who had not the power of Excommunication: so also in this place, Σύρε is not to Excommunicate, but do not any longer converse with him, after several Admonitions given him to no purpose, avoid him. It is plain this is the proper signification of the word Σύρε, nor can it be applied to Excommunication, unless the thing it self requires it. But here there is no necessity of its being taken in that sense, because an Heretick was self-excommunicate, and because he made a new Sect, and did not look upon Excommunication as a Punishment. Sinners who desire to continue in the Church notwithstanding their sinful practices, are excommunicated, that they may be reclaimed to a more Holy Life, when they see they cannot be accounted Members of the Church as long as they live wickedly; not those who voluntarily separate, and will no longer communicate with the Church. The following words confirm this interpretation, which is also Grotius's.

III. I have shewn on 2 Cor. xiii. that that place of St. Paul is wrested by our Author, and I will not repeat what I have there said.

Vers. 11. Note d. Here our Author does not seem to be sufficiently consistent with himself, having before interpreted ἀντεχθήμενον to avoid of Excommunication; besides, he does not clearly enough shew what is meant by ἀνταπηκτήσει, because he confounds the present Churches with the Apostolical, which in that Age agreed with their Teachers. Ἀνταπηκτήσει here is one who forsaking the Apostolical and Christian Assemblies, did by that very thing deny himself to be a Christian, and therefore ought not any longer to be accounted a Christian by his own judgment. He was to be avoided therefore by Christians, of whose number he denied himself any longer to be. But now there are a great many who are called by other Christians by the hateful names of Hereticks and Schismaticks, who yet cannot be said to be ἀντεχθήμενον, because they endeavour as much as others, to understand the Doctrin and Precepts of Christ, and conform themselves to them, and no less hope to be saved by the Grace of Christ alone. In this imperfect state of Mortality, many Errors creep into mens Minds through ignorance,
norance, or prejudice and weakness of Judgment, who live no less Christianly, as to other things, than those that are free from such Errors. And it would be very unjust to call such unhonoured, because they separate from others. Again, they who denied themselves to be Christians, could not complain if they were avoided by the Christians; but one that charges others with what he thinks to be Error, and cannot be present at their Assemblies, unless he approve them, and therefore absents himself from them, but yet does not avoid the Men themselves, or treat them less Christianly, is highly injured, if equal courtesy be not shewn him. This which was plain of it self, I thought fit to say in a few words, because our Author did not seem clearly enough to explain the mind of the Apostle; not that I designed to handle the thing as it deserves.

Ver. 14. Note f. In the place of the Ad's χρησις a business, not a providing of necessaries for Life. See Grotius on that place.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to Philemon.

At the end of the Premon.] I have observed on the Premotion before the Epistle to the Colossians, that that Epistle seems to have been written, according to the account of the most exact Chronologers, in the Year of Christ Lxii, or the ixth of Nero.

Ver. 12. To ευς συνήγχησα.] That is, my Son; for St. Paul accounted all those he had converted to the Faith of Christ, his Children; and it is usual for Children to be called the Bowels of their Parents. So Cepheus in Ovid. Met. Lib. v. Fab. 1. speaking of his Daughter Andromeda:

Sed qua visceribus veniebat bellua ponto Exsaturanda meis.
Chapter
I.

ANNOTATIONS

On the Epistle

Of St. Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews.

CHAP. I.

Vers. 2. \( \Delta \tau \varepsilon \kappa \tau \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \lambda \nu \varsigma \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \nu \sigma \omega \nu . \) He hath appointed Jesus Heir or Lord of all things, by whom also be made the Worlds; that is, having heretofore by that \( \Delta \gamma \delta \Theta \) Reason, or eternal Wisdom which resided in Jesus, and was most nearly united to him, created all things. In the Paraphrase, that which distinctly agreed to each of these, should have been distinctly expressed, that the meaning of the Apostle might be the clearer: For want of which our Author's Paraphrase is often obscurer than the Apostle's Text itself.

Vers. 3. \( \varepsilon \sigma \iota \alpha \varphi \nu \rho \mu \nu \varsigma \sigma 
\) ò \( \beta \) \( \varepsilon \xi \varepsilon \iota \theta \varepsilon \varsigma \kappa \alpha \varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \) \( \varepsilon \iota \mu \alpha \varepsilon \sigma \varsigma \varsigma \) \( \varepsilon \nu \mu \alpha \varsigma \varsigma \). That there are a great many things common to the Writer of this Epistle with Philo Alexandrinus, has been observed by the great Grotius on Chap. iv. and elsewhere. He might have added these expressions which Philo also has in Lib. de Creatione Mundi pag. 25. Ed. Gen. πας ἐπερμητικὴ χρήσις Ἰδρυμάτων ἔχειν Ἀθηναίων φιλόλογον. ἦν 

αὐτὸν ἡ Ἀπάτασμα σύνθεσις: every Man, in respect of his Understanding, is allied to the Divine Reason, being an IMPRESSED IMAGE, or abstract [i.e. a Particle broken off] or BRIGHTNESS [a Ray] of that blessed Nature. The expressions in both places are so like one another, that hardly any two can be more like. The word ἀπατασμα is the same in both places, and ἐμαγείων & κακευτης are all one in sense. For as κακευτης is derived from κακεύω, to engrave, and is properly a graven Image: so ἐμαγείων comes from ἐμαγείω, to impress, or express, and signifies such an Image as is made by the impression of a Seal. And hence these words are joined together as synonymous in the Writer de Mundo, who passed under the name of Philo, pag. 892. Ed. Gen. "Αγαμετες ἐκείνη τε ἐκδόθησαν, ἡ δὲ ἐκείνη τε ἐκβιβασθεῖσα, ἐντολικὴ ἡ ἐκείνην ἐκατερεῖ τε ἐκατερεῖ: for whatever
ever each of the senses intromits, like a Ring or Seal, it impresses its own Image, or it [viz. the sense] retains the impressed Image on it self. Gravaiov therefore being the same with χαρακτης, φως & ταινίας will be also the same. And indeed the Son of God, even as Man, is the brightness of his Fathers Glory, because he expressed the divine Power in the greatness of his Miracles; and the impressed Image of his substance, because he resembles him in his Perfections. And it must be the humane Nature which this sacred Writer spake of, that the Jews might understand what he said was true; for that alone is visible, and nothing but what is such, can be called the Image or Brightness of any thing among Men. Other things might be alleged to this purpose, which for brevity sake I forbear to mention.

CHAP. II.

Verf. 3. If these places, which our Author here wrests, comprehend eternal Salvation, it is needless to recur to that temporal Deliverance, which they cannot be applied to without Violence. For as for his saying that the design of this whole Epistle is to confirm the believing Hebrews in the hopes of a sudden deliverance from the persecutions of their Countrymen, if it be denied, he will not prove it, unless by some wrested places, as he too often endeavours to do.

Verf. 7. Note c. I. Tho Men in Psal. viii. are called בִּתְאוֹת and those words usually signify the meanest sort of Men; yet whoever attentively reads that place, will see that all Men without exception are intended, who upon the account of their meanness are so called; and that they are compared with the Angels, than which they are said to be a little less.

II. I cannot see why Grotius and our Author interpret בֵּשְׂפָר for a little while, contrary to the signification which it has in Psalm viii. For doubtless Jesus was a little less than the Angels, whilst he conversed here on Earth, because he was liable to death, and did actually die; to which Infelicity the Angels are not subject. But this was but for a short time. I grant it, but neither the Psalmist nor the Apostle have any respect to that.

Verf. 10. Τελειωσας.] This word is not well rendred to consummate or make perfect, because the Discourse is about a Priest, who is said τελειωσας, when he is consecrated for the exercise of his Office. The Jews call this to fill the hands (implere manus) which the Septuagint often render by πλησιωσας. See Exod. xxix. 10, 33, 35. Levit. viii. 35. &c.
Chapter XVI. 32. & XXI. 10. Num. III. 3. The Glosse of Philothonus have: III. 

Chap. vii. 28. The Glosse of Philoxenus have: III. 

Chap. vii. 28. 

G. H. A. P. III.

Verse 3. This observation our Author took out of Grotius, and Note a. is very true. See my Notes on Gen. XVI. 1. and Exod. I. 21.

Verse 11. Note c. I. In the time of Moses, Canaan was called מָנוּבָּה, because it was a place in which the Israelites rest. To enter into rest, was all one as to enter into a Land where they should be at rest: Nothing else is to be look'd for in that word. See my Note on Gen. XLIX. 15.

II. Psalm xcvi. 11. has nothing prophetic in it, nor is the Discourse so much as about David's times. The Psalmist only relates what had happen'd in the time of Moses, and endeavours to dissuade the Men of his Age from imitating the Israelites of those times, who had provoked God to that degree, that he had sworn they should not enter into the Land of Canaan. This is so manifest, that I wonder our learned Author should study for any thing else; for what he adds about the Ark, there is no mention of in the Psalm. It is a mere guess of our Author, who often adds to the sacred Writers what he pleases, tho' the series of the Discourse requires no such thing.

III. As the Rest promised to the Jews in the Wilderness, was the Land of Canaan; so the Rest promised to Christians is Heaven, or a place of eternal Happiness. Nothing can be more natural, nothing more agreeable to the Apostles Doctrine: on the contrary, what our Author here says is forced, and far fetch'd, nor is it needful to confute it all particularly. They are the fancies of a Man looking into the Clouds, and seeing what he pleases.

IV. Of the Halcyon Days, which our Author so often repeats, we shall see what may be said on the place in the Revelations, to which he refers us.

G. H. A. P. IV.

Chapter. Ver. 1. Καταγελάω αὐτῷ.] That is, into Heaven, of which the Land of Canaan was a Representation; not the time when the Jews did no longer persecute the Christians, who nevertheless were spitefully used by the Heathens. Our Author here

Verse.
That is, we have received a gracious promise, as well as they. For if God promised to the antient Jews a quiet Habitation in the Land of Canaan, he hath promised us eternal Rest in Heaven. So that here 

is taken in its proper, that is, in a general sense, for receiving of any good tidings, as it is often used in the Version of the Septuagint, where the Verb in the Original is 

isser. Nothing can be more flat than what the generality of Interpreters think the sacred Writer here says concerning Christians, we have received the Gospel as well as the antient Jews; because there can be no comparison made between the knowledge which the Primitive Jews had of the Gospel, and ours. What our Author says in his Paraphrase, agrees neither with the words, nor the series of the Discourse.

Ibid. Note a. It is much more probable that the true reading is 

for the words are these: 

the Word of HEARING did not profit them, not being mixed by Faith with those that HEARD it; that is, the words of the Promise concerning a quiet Habitation, did not profit those who only heard it without believing it. For they who believe the Word of God are nourished by it so, as if it were incorporated with them, and converted into their substance; that is, they are no less acted and moved by the things which they receive by revelation from God, than those which they have found to be true by reasoning and experience. And that which makes this mixture of the Word of God with the hearers of it, is Faith, for which reason the sacred Writer faith, 

that the Word is mixed by FAITH with those that hear it.

Verse 3.  

That the words of the xcvi. Psalm be here alluded, I do not believe the Sacred Writer uses the Authority of the Psalmist to prove what he designs, but only expresses an antient Story in his words; which is related in Num. xiv. and Deut. i. And he interprets Rest in the words of God, expressed by Moses and by David, in a sublimier sense, according to the custom of his Age, in which all the places of the Old Testament were explained in a more sublimier sense than what the words literally contained. And as those who believed, in the time of Moses, enter'd into the Land of Canaan, which then might be called God's Rest: so the Souls of pious Christians enter into the mansions of eternal Happiness, to which that name more eminently belongs. Therefore it is said by the sacred Writer, we that believe do enter into Rest.
Chapter IV.

Ver. 10. [O θεος, κ.κ.] Here the Author of this Epistle renders a reason why he called the ταξιδιωματα, by a name taken from the Sabbath, viz. σαββατισμος: namely, as the day in which God ceased to create, or, as Moses speaks, resteth from his Works, was called the Sabbath; so the time wherein we shall rest from all those Labours and Troubles we are forced to undergo in this Life, may be called a Sabbathism. What our Author here says in his Paraphrase, of a rest from Persecutions, and a liberty to worship God, is violent.

Ver. 12. [Ζων γε γαρ η ποιησις η θεος, κ.κ.] What is said here by Interpreters about the Word of God, is harsh, to which what the Author of this Epistle affirms concerning the η ποιησις η θεος, cannot be applied without violence. Can any Man think this to be a tolerable way of speaking: the Gospel is living and powerful, and more piercing than any two edged Sword, reaching even to the dividing of Soul and Spirit, and of the Joints and Marrow, and is a dissembler of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart, nor is there any Creature that is not manifest in his sight? Yet I can hardly persuade myself the Discourse is about the Divine Reason, which is so much spoken of by Philo. But I am apt to think this Phrase is taken from the Custom of the Jews of that Age, who for God, and any of the divine Attributes, used to say the Word of God, מיס ויהי, of which Custom there are still frequent instances in Chaldee Paraphrases of the Old Testament; where in many places we find the Word of God set for God, not for the Messiah, as some think. This conjecture is confirmed by ver. 13. where all things are said to be naked and opened unto his Eyes, which cannot be said of the Gospel, but only of God. See about this matter a Dissertation de Verbo vel Sermon Dei, cuius coeberitam fit mention apud Paraphrasias Chaldeoos, printed at Irenopolis, Ann. M.DC.XLVI. So that the meaning of the Sacred Writer is this, that God who is displeased with Apostates, cannot be deceived, for God is living, &c.

Ver. 13. Note c. I do not indeed doubt, but the Metaphor which the Author of this Epistle here uses, is taken from the cutting of the Sacrifices. But 1st, it is a mistake, that this was the business of a μυσξοσθοπ, who, among the Jews, searched only for outward blemishes, such as we find mention'd in Levit. xx. 22. & seqq. not for inward defects, which were unknown to those who deliver'd the Sacrifice to the Priests. 2dly, It is as untrue, which our Author says, that the Sacrifice after its being περασσομεν was laid upon the Altar to be searched into; for the Altar of Sacrifices had a continual fire kept in it; nor was any thing laid upon it, but only the pieces appointed by the Law.
HEBREWS.

CHAPTER V.

Vers. 2. Aνοιγει ἐκλαυμένος] It is not to be thought, with Dr. Hammond, that the Apostolical Writer of this Epistle speaks here so, as if no Sacrifices at all were admitted, but for Sins that proceeded from mere Ignorance; for there were also other Sins committed against Light and Knowledge that were expiated, and are mentioned by Moses in Levit. Chap. vi. 1. to the 7th, where see my Notes. But the Sacred Writer speaks in this manner, because the greatest part of those Sinners, for which Sacrifices were offer’d up, were ἀναφημεῖται and ἀναφημεῖται.

Vers. 7. Note b. I. Our Author tells us, in the beginning of this Note, that the word ἁφωνία fear, coming from ἀφανιστής in Exod. iii. 6. but it is the Root itself which is used in that place. It is strange our learned Author should sometimes cite places of Scripture upon trust.

II. The words of Isaiah are in Chap. viii. 12, 13. not in vers. 16: and מיכראה signifies there that which fears, to wit, the People of the Jews who are there spoken of, and not the terrible thing, as will appear to any that look into the place. I will not say that in the places of Deuteronomey, the word מיכראה was ill translated by the Septuagint, because they erroneously derived it from the Root מיכראה, he fear, which was to be derived from מיכראה, he feared. For those places in the Septuagint are nothing at all to the purpose; and it is true that fear may be taken for the cause of Fear.

Vers. 9. Note e. It is true what our Author here says about the Verb τελέσω, which he might have said before on Chap. ii. 10. where see my Note. But I think he had better have omitted the Dream of Menander, which has no agreement with the thing here spoken of, but only in the likeness of some words.

Vers. 14. Note d. Solid Food compared with Milk, and fitter for grown Men than Babes, in that figurative sense which it is here taken in, may be understood two ways. It may signify either something more excellent, that is, more useful than first Elements; or simply Doctrins hard to be understood, and such as cannot be digested but by skilful and judicious Persons. In the first sense it cannot here probably be taken; for tho’ all that is here said be useful, yet the Doctrins proposed as Principles and Foundations, in the beginning of Chap. vi. are much more useful than the Allegories we find in Chap. vii. & seqq. For these were as so many ornaments of the Christian Religion, particularly,
particularly among the Jewish Allegorists; which if we had lost, we should have missed nothing necessary. But on the other hand, the Doctrin of Repentance, Faith, the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Judgment to come, are so necessary, that being unknown, the Christian Religion is also unknown; as on the contrary, being understood, nothing necessary escapes our knowledge. Nay if any one could write of these things which belong to the nature of Christianity, wholly omitting Judaism, as if there had never been any such thing, in that manner as they deserve; nothing could possibly be devised more divine, more excellent, more sublime. We must understand therefore by the name of solid Food, some difficult interpretations of the Old Testament, which the Jews mightly valued, and did not use to propose, if I may so speak, to Novices or fresh Men. Such is that representation of Christ, which the Author of this Epistle finds in the History of Melchisedek. Such is also the comparing of the Priesthood of Christ with the Aaronical Priesthood. None of these could well be proposed to Men newly initiated, because they supposed this, viz. that the Priesthood of Christ was already very well known. But they are not sublimer than those things which are taught concerning Christ's Sacrifice, separately from Judaism, or the rest of the Doctrins peculiar to the Christian Religion: I am sure, as I said before, they are not so useful.

Ibid. Τὰ διδάσκαλα γραμματευμένα. These words seem to be taken from the use of the Philosophers, and especially the Stoicks; who defined ἀματιβίαν the avoiding of vain things. Καὶ ἀναφέρον τὰς φαντασίας ὧν ἐὰν ἀκολουθοῦν, a habit reducing Fancies or Visions to right Reason, as we are told by Diogenes Laertius in Lib. vii. S. 47. The same Men taught τὰς ομορράσσαι τὰς φαντασίας, that Persons who had unexercised Fancies, fell into Absurdity and Vanity.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 1. Τελεότητα.] By this word the Apostle means, not a more useful knowledge than of those things which he presently after enumerates, but some Doctrins which might be added to them, to render Christianity more perfect. So a building has several things added to it, not necessarily belonging to a Building, and without which it cannot stand firm; but ζεύς τὸν τελεότητα to make it the more complete, such as are several kinds of Ornaments. Yet no allegorical Interpretation, of whatever sort it be, is any wise comparable either for its Usefulness or Wisdom, with the elements of
of Christianity taught by our Saviour in Mat. v, vi, & vii. What Chapter Dr. Hammond adds in his Paraphrase of this Verse, about his Gnosticks, VI. he inserts purely of his own head; the Sacred Writer did not give him the least occasion for it.

Vers. 6. Note a. I. I acknowledge Baptism is very frequently in the Fathers, called φωτισθεὶς, but that use of theirs seems to be grounded upon this very place, where they thought φωτισθέντας to be all one with βαπτισθέντας; in which, because they might be mistaken, I do not think the Apostle's Language can be understood by their use. And here I had much rather take φωτισθέντας to be meant of the enlightning of the Mind, than the external rite of Baptism: See Grotius about this word; which, I may also here add, is to be understood of spiritual illumination in the Old Testament, in the version of the Septuagint. See Psalm xii. 4. & xviii. 9. & cxix. 129. according to the Greek distinction.

II. It is very uncertain whether ever ἀλήθεία υἱὸν signifies the times of the Messiah; and tho those may be called ἡ τελεία ἀρχή, the latter days, yet compared with former, they are no where κατ’ ἑκάστην so called. And in this place μισθος αἰωνίων much more probably signifies the Life to come, the αἰώνια or foretafts of which Christians have in this, when they are weary of all earthly things, and nothing moves them but the expectation of eternal Happiness, in which they sweetly acquiesce. This is indeed to taint the powers of the World to come, when the hope of that only, accompanied with a contempt of all other things, affects and delights our Minds. Of this and the other words consult Grotius.

Ibid. Note b. I. The signification of the Verb ἀνακαταστάσθην must be taken from the simple καταστάσθην, and not from another compound of the same Verb. For all that understand Greek, know that the compounds of the same root have sometimes very different significations. So that tho ἐκκαθάρισθην be to dedicate, it does not follow that ἀνακαταστάθην signifies the same. Besides, who but Dr. Hammond that had accustomed himself to a barbarous and intolerable way of speaking, could endure this phrase to dedicate to Repentance? καθάρις is, as every one knows, new, and καθάριζω to make new, whence ἀνακαταστάθην is to renew or to make new again. They who first took upon them the title of Christians, with a sincere resolution to live piously and virtuously, were so very much changed from what they were formerly, that they are called new Men, and new Creatures, by the Apostles: See 2 Cor. v. 17. Gal. vi. 15. Ephes. ii. 15. & iv. 24. Consequently those who forsaking these first purposes, fell off again to the weak elements of the Jewish Religion, or
Annotations

Chapter to Heathenism, must, if they would return to Christ, εἰς μετάνοιαν, be made new again, or become new Men, that they might repent. I allude the Authority of St. Paul for this interpretation, who speaks thus in Coloss. iii. 10. *Lie not one to another, putting off the old Man, with his Deeds, and putting on the new Man, Τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον, which is renewed to knowledge, εἰς ἑπίγνωσιν, &c.* That renovation the same Apostle calls ἀνακαινίων ὕπότις, Rom. xii. 12, and μετάνοια, Tit. iii. 3. Nor let it be said that the word here used is ἀνακαινίζω, for ἀνακαινίζω and ἀνακαινίω signify just the same: See the former in the Version of the Septuagint, Psal. cii. 5. & ciii. 31. Lament. v. 21. And the Old Glosses have, ἀνακαινίζω, ἰδέω, & ἀνακαινίζω, ἰδεῖν. So Suidas: ἀνακαινίζω, ἰδέω ἵππας ἑρεμικά ἀνακαινίζως καὶ ἀνακαινίζω. I believe it should be: ἀνακαινίζω καὶ ἀνακαινίζω; the repetition of like words was the cause why one of them was omitted, and the decay of a Letter corrupted the last; which is observable in many places of that and other Lexicoms.

II. This being suppos'd the genuine and proper signification of the Verb, the series of the Discourse is clear, which otherwise is something intricate. The Apostolical Writer faith, that the Jews needed to be instructed in that part of the Christian Doctrin, which was proposed to Proselytes; which yet he says he would not now set before them, deferring it to another time; then he subjoins the words ἀνακαινίζω, &c. as if he had said, "I will not propose again that Doctrin, whereby Proselytes use to be converted to the Christian Faith, that so I may reduce those Jews who have apostatized from it; for this they know as well as other things, which I might say to that purpose. By such a Discourse Men who have been once enlightened with divine Light, who had received the heavenly Gift of a quiet Mind, who had been endued with a power to work Miracles, who have had foretastes in the Church of the promised Happiness of another Life, and nevertheless have revolted from Christ; by such a Discourse, I say, I cannot renew again such Men so as that they should repent. But why is it ἀνακαινίζω, impossible to renew again such Men? viz. because whatever could be said or done in order to that end, had been done and said already. They had heard all, and had been sensible of all that was naturally apt to fix and engage them for ever to Christ. And yet they had not adhered to him, because of Persecutions. There was nothing more could be done to reduce them to a better Mind, unless those things which they already perfectly understood, and perceived the efficacy of, were again repeated to them, which would have been to no purpose. The same
is the sense of the following comparison, and of that which is said Chapter about this matter in Chap. x.

III. Now if any one enquire concerning the thing it self, if he thoroughly consider it, he will easily see that it is not without reason that the Apostolical Writer affirmed it to be "eternam," that is, if not absolutely impossible, as we now speak with the Vulgar Interpreter, yet at least extremely difficult, and the hardest thing possible. The reason I before intimated, because such Men have abused all the Reasons and Arguments which might have inseparably united them to Christ. They are that "Vine of God" for which he had done all that could be done to make them bring forth good Fruit, and yet had brought forth wild Grapes: For which reason some of the Antients plainly affirmed that it was in vain to expect the Repentance of such Men. As Hermas in Lib. iii. Simil. 6. "His non est, fuit, he, per penitentiam regressem ad vitam; quoniam quidem adjecerunt ad reliqua peccata sua, quod nomen Domini nefandis insueltati sunt verbis; hujusmodi homines morti sunt destinati. These Persons cannot return by Repentance to Life; because they have added to the rest of their Sins, that of blaspheming the Name of the Lord; such Men as these are appointed to Death." See also Clemens Alexandrinus in his Book entitl. Quis dives salvetur.

IV. Meteoron is no where in the Holy Scriptures taken for those Church-Penalties which were imposed upon Penitents before they were admitted again to Communion. Our Author should have produced but one place to make himself believed. For it is not safe to reason about what was done in ancient times from the title of the Fathers, because together with new Customs there were new Names also invented, and new significations given to old ones. We have no reason to suppose that the manner of a publick Repentance was the same in the Apostles times, as afterwards. The English or German Articles are vainly alluded to in the place: But our Author should have cited the viith Can. of the Neocesarean Council, in which the phrase he sets down is, not the lii, for there are only xv Canons in all of that Council. Such another mistake I have already elsewhere observed.

V. Of the Gnostic, there is not the least mark or footprint. The Apostolical Writer only makes mention of some that had revolted from Christ, whether to the Heathens or the Jews. And such Men joining themselves to the persecutors of the Christians, which had formerly crucified Christ, did, as much as in them lay, the same; because they approved the fact, and despitely used Christ's Members. This agrees no more to the Gnostics, than to any Apostates.
VI. I don't think the Church of Rome or others, rejected this Epistle, because of this place, as contrary to their Custom; but rather because the Author of it was not certainly known. Nor was it admitted because this Passage began to be better understood, but because at length the most judicious Persons easily observed that the style and reasonings of this Epistle were agreeable to the Apostles times; in which also and no other there could be an Epistle written to the Jewish Brethren, apart from the Gentiles; for in the following Age there was no difference between the Members of the Christian Church, nor any remembrance of Circumcision and Uncircumcision. In the antient Church of Rome, as appears from Hermas, there was the same opinion about the difficulty of Repentance, in those who after they had been throughly instructed in the Christian Religion, and been zealous for it, shamefully apostatized from it. Besides, that manner of Repentance which was afterwards instituted, not having been known in the Primitive times, not to say that there is no mention made of it in this place, an Epistle could not be rejected as contrary to a Custom which had not yet prevailed.

VII. It is very true that ἀναλαμβάνειν often signifies what it is not lawful to do, but here it seems to signify that which is very difficult; for which reason a very antient Greek and Latin Copy of the New Testament, kept at Paris in the Library of St. Victor, has in this place, difficile, tho the Translation is usually literal: So ἀναλαμβάνειν is taken in Matt. xix. 26. I shall not add any thing about the Gnosticks, whom our Author here seeks for, because I have often confuted him.

Ver. 7. Note c. Our Author here thinks that in this place the ἀναλαμβάνειν & ἀναλαμβάνομεν of a Similitude are confounded; for which reason the Apostolical Writer speaks of the Earth, as he would speak of Men. And indeed there seems to be some ground for this supposition, if the words μεταλαμβάνομεν & μεταλαμβάνειν be rendred, as usual, receiveth a blessing from God. But that mixture of the parts of a Similitude being very improper, I had rather interpret μεταλαμβάνομεν so, as that the consequent should be expressed by the antecedent, and that the Verb μεταλαμβάνομεν should not signify to receive, but to use the blessing received from God, that is, Rain, Sunshine, &c. So the sense will be very proper: for the Earth which drinketh in the Rain that cometh often upon it, and bringeth forth Herbs meet for them for whom it is dressed, uses the Blessing which it receives from God; but that which beareth Thorns and Briers, is reprobate and near a Curse, whose end is to be burnt; that is, which is of no use, except that the Briers and Thorns which grow upon it are burned, or serve to make Fires. It is common for the antecedent
cedent to be taken for the consequent: See S. Gassius Rhetor. Sacr. Chapter Traft. i. c. 1. de Metonomyia Cause. I might otherwise interpret these words, is said to have received a blessing from God.

Ver. 20. Note e. I. I don’t understand what our Author means when he says that it was perhaps taken into the Heathen Oracles from the Prophets, that about that time among the Romans the dignity of the Pontificat was joined with the Imperial. What Oracles are those? When and where deliver’d? Was there any need of inferring from the Jewish Prophets, contrary to all the rules of Logick, that a thing was done at Rome, which every one knew? But perhaps he meant to speak of the time to come, tho his words signify a thing past. However that be, either those Oracles were none at all, or only counterfeited; and our Author dared not, or could not produce them.

II. Even from the time of Julius Caesar, it was decreed, that if he begat a Son, he should be High-Priest. Of which see J. Andreas Bosius, de Pontificatua Max. Imp. Rom. cap. 1. who will inform us more exactly in such matters than our Author, who spent but little time in studying the Heathen Antiquities, but mostly employed himself in the study of Ecclesiastical.

III. He should have added the Chapter of the Life of Augustus, as well as of Galba and Claudius. But we have no reason to be sorry he did not, for all this should have been blotted out, because the places marked in Suetonius are nothing to the purpose; which I should have wondered at, if I had not often observed a great many more such things in the Doctor: The place in Tacitus is shamefully corrupted. It is taken out of the Oration of Servius Maluginensis Priest of Jupiter, Annal. Lib. iii. c. 58. who desiring to have the Province of Asia given to him, said this among other things: Privatis olim simulatibus effecitum, ut a Pontificibus Maximis (Flamines Diales) ire in Provincias prohiberentur; nunc, Deum munere summum Pontificum etiam summum hominum esse, non amulationi, non odio, non privatis affecionibus obnoxium. Through private grudg it came to pass in former times, that they (viz. the Priests of Jupiter) were not suffer’d by the Chief Priests to go into the Provinces; but now by the bounty of the Gods the Chief of the Priests was also the chief of Men, and not subject either to envy, or hatred, or private Passion. The Latins did not say summus Pontifex, and perhaps Tacitus would not have used the word summus, but only for the following opposition.

CHAP.
Where nulli majores are such, whose Names and Exploits through length of time are forgotten. And such were the Parents of Melchisedek, for which reason he is said to have been without Father and without Mother, &c. If we consider this attentively, we shall easily perceive that before the time of Christ no Man could, without a revelation, have imagin'd from the Story of Melchisedek, there would hereafter come an Eternal Priest, who was to be Successor to none, nor have any to succeed him. Nor could any Man after the Coming of Christ, gather by mere reasoning, grounded upon critical Rules, that Melchisedek's Parents and Death were omitted in the Scripture with this design, that by such a silence he might be an Image of Christ. Whoever should have pretended this, might have been confuted by a bare Negation. Why therefore, you will say, did the Apostolical Writer insist so much upon that Story with the Jews? For it's plain he does not say here he had any revelation made to him of that matter, nor require credit to be given to his bare Affirmation. I answer, the Allegorical Writers of the Jews at that time, accommodated innumerable places to the Messiah, not relying upon any Grammatical Interpretation, but a certain old Custom of explaining the Scripture in that manner. So because they interpreted Psalm ex. of the Messiah, the Sacred Writer makes use of that Interpretation to his purpose; and because they acknowledged the Messiah ought to be like Melchisedek, he reasons against them from their own Concession; not against other Men who might have denied what he affirmed. And he used this way of disputing with the Jews so much the more willingly, because nothing followed from such an Interpretation contrary to those things which he knew were true concerning Christ; yea he might, according to the Jewish Custom, compare Christ to Melchisedek. Otherwise, if the thing be consider'd in it self,
self, no strong or Grammatical Argument could be drawn against o -thers from that History; and therefore such things are not to be too much urged now, because that way of explaining the Scripture is grown out of use.

Verf. 4. Note a. I. The true original of the word ἀρχαία is well ob-

served by our Author out of Phavorinus. It may be further added, that 

the Fruits gathered out of Fields, and the Spoils taken from En-

emies, were piled up in heaps, before the owners of the Fields made use 

of the Fruits, or those who had taken the Spoils divided them; 

and then from the tops of those heaps, ἐξ ἀρχάια ἀρχαία, before they 

were disposed of, were taken the First-fruits which were offer'd to 

the Gods; whence any First-fruits came to be called ἀρχαία. I do 

deney but the blest part was consecrated, but I do not think ἀρχαία 

signifies here the choice. It is plain ἀρχαία is used to signify Fruits, 

not as if chosen from Trees, but because they are on the extremities of 

Boughs, or on the tops of Trees. However I wonder our Author 

should quote pag. 110. of Phavorinus, when what he alledges out of 

him is in Column 100. and no where else.

II. But I more wonder he should produce only in English the 

words of Philo, out of Lib. 11. Alleg. Legis, which are no where 

to be found in that Book. Philo has only this passage that can be- 

long to this place, in pag. 57. Ed. Genev. "Ἄρχαία τοι ἐξεταζότα 

Ἀρχαίας ἐν Μοσαίας τοίς θελεταὶ παρεμμεθάν ἐν θείοις": for he offer'd Bread and Wine, which the Ammonites and Mo-

abites would not give, for which reason they are kept out of the Assembly and 

Congregation of God. Then he enquires, why he gave Wine and not 

Water, and that he interprets Allegorically.

III. It is strange also that our Author, in this pious liberality of 

Abraham, should see a sufficient Example and Testimony of the Custom 
in Abraham's time, of paying Tithes to the Priest of ALL our increase, 
of what kind soever it is. For he himself has observed two things con-

trary to this Inference: First, that Abraham gave Tithes only of the 

Spoils of the War, which is no Evidence that the Antients used to 
pay Tithes when ever their Possessions were increased; for an uni-

versal Proposition, as Logicians speak, cannot be concluded from a particu-

lar. Secondly, that those Tithes were extraordinary, as being paid 
to a Priest, to whom that tract of Land, wherein Abraham dwelt, 
did not belong; which surely cannot be an example of a perpetual 

Custom of paying Tithes to Priests of the same Country.

Verf. 5. Note b. It is very barbarously, and without example, 

that Dr. Hammond here joins λαόν with χρισον so, as to think that is
Chapter a *periphrasis* of the Jews. The reason he allidges for this Interpretation is of no moment, because here is not a mere repetition. The Sense is: "They have received a Commandment to require Tithes of their Countrymen, in that manner which is prescribed by the Law.

Ver. 11. *Tēleiswos*. This word our Author interprets in his Paraphrase, of a *perfect expiation of Sin*; but he ought to have produced examples of that Notion. Grotius thinks it signifies *id quod in genere sacerdotii perfectissimum est*, that which is most perfect in the kind of Priesthood; but that this might be said the thing should have been expressed thus, *et teliswos ev tē ἱερόν ἵεον* ἵνα, if therefore there were perfection in the Levitical Priesthood, and not ἵνα ἱερόν ἵεον, by the Levitical Priesthood. I believe therefore that here *teliswos* is taken for Consecration, whereby not the Priests themselves, but private Persons who offered Sacrifice, were by the hands of the Priests so consecrated to God, as to become acceptable to him. So the Heathens thought themselves by their Priests ἵνα ἵνα ἱερόν ἱεόν ἵνα, to be through Sacrifices initiated and consecrated to their Deities, so as to be upon that account the more pleasing to them, as is well known of the Mysteries of Ceres. Hence the Christians used *teliswos* to signify a Consecration, whereby we are rendred more acceptable to God: See J. Cesp. Suicerus his Thesaurus on this word. In the same manner I understand the Verb *teliswos* in ver. 19. Of the *teliswos* of Priests, see on Chap. ii. 10.

Ver. 19. Note c. I am apt to think ἵνα ἱεόν has a reference to the mystical signification of the Verb *teliswos*, that is, *to consecrate, to initiate* in certain Rites. For as those that were initiated drew nearer than others to the Images of the Gods, and entered into the secret places of their Temples: so the consecrated Priests among the Jews enter'd into the Sanctuary, which was nearest that place where God was thought in a special manner to reside; and among Christians any one whatsoever, as initiated by the most Holy Rites, betakes himself to God in prayer without the intervention of any mortal Priest. See Note on ver. 11.

Ver. 27. Τῷ ἀπόκλοσεως ἔχων ἔφθασεν.] This must be referred only to the last words ἔως ἂν τῷ λαῷ, and is not to be understood so as if Christ had offer'd not only for the sins of the People, but also for his own; as Grotius and Dr. Hammond understood it. For there is no such thing in any other place suggested by the Apostles, and what those learned Men here say is violent. These Writers are not to be examined so by the Rules of Rhetoricians, as always to be thought to intend what...
a Rhetorician would have meant by the same words. It's true, accu-
Chapter rarely speaking τις should be referred to the whole verse, but the for-
mer part of it not agreeing to Christ, it must be supposed only to be-
long to the latter.

C H A P. VIII.


Ver. 2. Τὸ σωματὸς τῶν ἁλαθῶν. I That is of Heaven, in
which Christ exercised the chief part of his Priesthood, when he car-
ried into it his blood, as into the most holy place. Our Author mis-
understood this of the Church in which Christ did not execute his
Priestly Office, but in Heaven. In the words of the Apostle, after
the true Tabernacle we must supply θέα, of God, which is called true be-
cause God there shews himself in a peculiar manner present, by an
inaccessible light, with which his inhabitation of the Mosaical Tabern-
acle can no more be compared, than the malignant and as it were false
light of the reflex rays of a Torch, with the true light of the Sun. See
what I have said about this phrase on John vi. 55. and about the Taber-
nacle of God, on Rev. xxi. 13.

Ver. 4. Εἶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ὡς ἐν ὃς ἐστὼς.] I don’t think we ought to
supply here only, after the words on earth, with Grotius and Dr. Ham-
mond; for the reasoning of the Apostle is not at all cleared by that
Supplement. But to be a Priest on earth, is to be understood so as
if he had said, by the Mosaical Law, which appointed only the race
of Aaron to be Priests, and that to offer up brute Sacrifices in the Tem-
ple, whose blood they alone, according to the Law of God, might
pour out at the altar, and carry into the Sanctuary. For Christ
was of the Tribe of Judah, as the Apostolical Writer of this Epistle
elsewhere observes.

Ver. 5. Ἐκείνη δή, καὶ ἕως ἡ ἀναγνώρισιν τοῦ ἱεράν. Καὶ ἕως
and one can by no means signify a prefiguration of something future; for
Heaven was a great while before the Tabernacle and Temple; but
some faint and obscure Image of a thing extraordinary beautiful and
glorious. For ἔκεινη is, as painted Images are, an imitation, as it
is used in this very Epistle, Chap. iv. 17. Let us labour to enter into that
rest. Let any man perish in the same imitation of unbelief; that is, in the
imitation of the same unbelief, in reproducing of the antias.

It comes from the Verba τὸ ἔκεινη, which Phoebusinus interprets thus: he re-
presents
Chapter presents for be paints; I will shew a thing by discourse, as by some picture.

IX. So that ClearColor is sometimes the same with ClearColor, which is, to delineate, or to draw the first and rude lineaments of things; from whence ClearColor is a rude draught or delineation. And now here is the same with ClearColor, that is, a dull or rough Picture, like the representation of a body by its shadow. Then the Phrase to serve to the delineation and shadowing of heavenly things signifies to minister to the Sanctuary, which was a delineation, &c. as was done by the Jewish Priests. What our Author says here in his Paraphrase, is besides the scope of this place.

Verse 9. Note a. I. What Dr. Hammond here says about the mistakes of Transcribers, is very true; as Lud. Cappellus in his Critica Sacra has shewn: in which Mr. Pocock has confuted indeed a few cases, but left the foundations untouch'd; tho' he ever now and then has a stroke at them, both in his Notes ad Portam Mosis, and elsewhere. Yet they cannot be overturned, because they are undeniably true. But it is true also, before any place be thought to have been differently read by the Septuagint, the neighbouring Languages ought to be consulted, which was not always done by Cappellus. In this place our Author might have added, that ClearColor and ClearColor are one and the same root, but differently written; the Letters of the same Organ in the Eastern Languages, and especially the Guttural, being very often confounded.

II. I wonder our learned Author thought the Septuagint pointed otherwise the word ClearColor; for melammedab is of the Feminine Gender, and cannot be joined with what goes before. The words may be literally render'd thus: Fuit ut timere eorum me præceptum bonumum edoctum, their fearing me was a precept taught by men. If any thing else were to be changed by the Version of the Septuagint, we should read ClearColor, melammedim, teaching. But that is needless, the sense being the same in the Hebrew words as they are now, as it is in the Greek.

III. Our Author mistranslates ClearColor by I have given or sent. He confounds this Verb with ClearColor be bath sent, in his Explication of Zabhar. xi. 13.

Chapter IX.

Verse 1. 

The word ClearColor here does not seem to signify an Image of the whole World; as Grothus and Dr. Hammond explain it, but rather Earth; for was is often taken both for this lower World and for Men. ClearColor is opposed to ClearColor. This was observed, which the learned
ed Doctor and Grotius should have followed in this matter.

Ver. 2. Ἡ γύναι τάξιν ἐστὶν. Which is called Holies, in the plural number, because the most holy place was called the Holies of Holies, ἡ γύναι τάξιν, by those that spake Greek; for in Hebrew the former is called the Sanctuary or Holiness, יִשְׂרָאֵל mikdașh, or שִׂרְאֶל kodesh, never in the plural number; the latter the Holiness of Holinesses שִׂרְאֶל יִשְׂרָאֵל. By this and what I shall observe afterwards of the word שִׂרְאֶל, 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.

Ver. 4. Οὐχ ἐπείρασαν: Grotius understands by this word the Golden Censer which had fire put into it out of the Altar by the High Priest, who afterwards threw Incense upon it into it, on the day he entred into the most holy place. That Veisel used to be kept in the outward Sanctuary; but non est, faith he, difficile intellegi, cur dicat hic scriptor interius illud tentorium babuiffe batillum, non quod ibi semper esset, sex quadrupiem Arca, quae erat in Aedio, resiceret, &c in illo die maxime solemnne expiationes, in tentorium interius; id est, in Aedium transferatur. Habere enim dicimus quod est in nostrum usum. It is easy to understand why this Writer says that inward Tabernacle bad the Censer, not because it was always there, but because it was always had a respect to the Ark which was in the most holy place, and on that most solemn day of Expiation was carried into the inward Tabernacle, and into the most holy place. For we are said to have what is for our use. By the same reason every thing which was in the outward Sanctuary might be said to have been in the most holy place, because they had a respect to it. It might have been said to have the Fire and the Incense before they were carried into it, because they were for its use, and were to be carried into it. Which things as they cannot be said, according to the ordinary use of Speech, so they are by no means agreeable to the Stile of this Writer. For when he says, whereas was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread, that must undoubtedly be understood properly; and we cannot otherwise understand what is said here, which had the golden Censer, &c. I am apt to think therefore, that this was a Jewish Tradition of that Age, by which they supposed that the Censer used on the day of Expiation was kept in the most holy place. See on the following words.

Ibid. Note b. It's certain that is a Tradition to that purpose. See what Joan Buskoffius has collected about this matter out of the Rabbins and other Interpreters, in his Aedem Fredericis, cap. 5.
ANONIATIONS

Chapter.

Vers. 5. Note d. See also what I have said on Rom. iii. 25.

Vers. 7. Note e. All the Sins that were expiated by Sacrifices, were not involuntary, but only the most, as appears from Lev. vi. 1. & seqq. and the greater number gave the denomination.

Vers. 13. Note f. In this place ἄλλατι does not signify washes, ablutions, but the νασσατι, purifies or purges, that is, according to the Institution of the Law, makes one that was before judged unclean with an Uncleanness, not properly so called, but legal, to be accounted clean; tho neither his Mind was made more holy, nor his Body, properly speaking, more clean. For the sprinkling of Blood and Ashes rather defiles than washes the body. It is a plain case. Why therefore did the Apostolical Writer say, that it ἁγιώθη τὸ σαρκό? I answer, It is as one as if he had said, the Body of such a man was accounted holy or clean, and might be touched without Pollution: for those that were accounted unclean were thought to pollute every one that touched them.

Vers. 16. "Ora die SVM, which in these Writers constantly signifies νασσατι, that is, a Covenant, was used by those that spake the best Greek for a Testament. It is true indeed, a Testament is ratified by the death of the Testator, and Christ is dead. But Christ was not the Mediator of a Testament, for Testaments do not want Mediators; and if it should be granted that he was, he could not be thought at once a Mediator and a Testator, by whose death alone a Testament was confirmed. The Testator here is God the Father, whose heirs men are, in conjunction with Christ; but God the Father can in no sense be said to die. See Dr. Hammond's Annot. on the Inscription of the New Testament. So that this Discourse is to be look'd on merely as the play of an Hellenistical Writer, who because he saw that νασσατι was used for that Covenant, whereof Christ is the Mediator, and signifies also a Testament, and Christ was dead, thence deduced Consequences which are true indeed considered in themselves, but here rely upon weak Principles, rather to set off his Discourse, according to the custom of that Age, than to convert the unbelieving Jews to the Christian Faith by force of reasoning.

They who think every thing said in these Writings is mathematically demonstrative, are greatly mistaken, and have not read them with due Attention. Nor does this lessen the Authority of this Epistle, the Writer of which nowhere says that 'he would bring nothing but Demonstrations. All the Heads of the Christian Doctrine which he prosecutes are very true, and may be demonstrated by other

places.
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places of Scripture; but the manner in which he illustrates them, is Chapter plainly like the custom of those times, as we may see by Philo; in whom there are often such accommodations, as Divines speak, of places of Scriptures, and consequences deduced from them, in which no regard at all is had to Grammar, and the only thing observed is, that the thing it self, illustrated by them, be true. That was the way of that Age, which we ought no more to wonder at, than at our own present Customs.

Ver. 18. Οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρχή, &c. The similitude between the Old Covenant and a Testament, which is here urged, is that in both there is a Death observable, in a Testament, of the Testator, in the Covenant of a Sacrifice; and that by that Death both are confirmed, tho' not in the same manner. This is but a slight Similitude, from which nothing can be philosophically inferred: but considering the Custom of that Age, an elegant way of reasoning. I know that Grotius would have ἠμαρτίαν to be taken in a more general Notion, for an explication of the import of the Testator ἀποκαταστάλην his Will. Which is true, where the Hebrew word מְשֵׁרָה brith is translated, and nothing is added to shew there is a respect had to a Testament properly so called; but where there is mention made of the death of a Testator, the Discourse is about the last signification of his Will, as in this place.

Ver. 24. Ἀπεσάντηθαν ἡ ἀληθινή. That is, fashioned according to the πρὸς ἡ ἀληθινή. The Sanctuary of Heaven is the Pattern, or πρὸς, in the likeness of which the Tabernacle was made: See my Note on 1 Cor. x. 7. But wherein consisted that likeness? In this, that as God in a special manner is thought to dwell in Heaven, so he dwelt in the Mosaical Sanctuary. This Similitude is certain; what is further added out of Philo, or others, are mere Conjectures, and for the most part vain Antiquities, niceties.

C H A P. X.

Ver. 1. Τί πρέπει; That is, by its nature so to reconcile and render them acceptable to God, as that they might hope for eternal Happiness from him. See my Note on Chap. vii. 11.

Ver. 26. Note b. I. That it is a defection or falling away from Christianity which is here meant, there can be no doubt; but that we are to understand it of a defection to the Gnosticks rather than to the Heathens or Jews, our Author has not proved: for there is nothing said in this place, which does not exactly agree to those who had revolted.
Chapter volted to the Syrians or Jews, after they had known the truth of the Christian Religion.

II. What our Author here adds, about the contempt of the Governors of the Church, I do not see upon what ground it relies; for Men did not ordinarily revolt from the Christian Faith, out of a contempt of the Governors of the Church, but rather of the Gospel itself. They forsook the Assemblies of the Christians, not to new they despised their Bishops, but to secure their Lives and Possessions for which they had so high a value, that for their sakes they trod under foot the Son of God, accounted the Blood of the Covenant as a profanation, and reproached the Spirit of Grace. Παρακατάλησεν indeed is the Office of Bishops, but private Men also may exhort one another, and there is no mention here of the Governors of the Church.

III. What is meant by ἀφτείν the Law of Moses, I shall afterwards explain. But it is strange that Councils are here appealed to, and such examples brought out of them, to shew what it is to reproach the Spirit of Grace; which is to speak contumeliously of the Spirit vouchsafed under the Gospel, to the Apostles.

Ver. 28. Ἀφτέιν τις νόμος Μωϋσῆς.] The Verb ἀφτείν is not simply to violate, but by words and deeds to declare a Man will not observe the Law, and does not think it ought to be observed, or scornfully to reject it. And for that wickedness among the Jews, there was no Sacrifice of Expiation, as we are told in Num. xv. 30. where see my Notes: add also Deut. xxvii. 26. & xxix. 19. The Verb ἀφείσει signifies to reject in Luke vii. 30. & x. 16. John xii. 48. Jude 8. and elsewhere. So the Old Glosses: ἀφεισες, to reject; ἀφεῆς, disapproves. Hesychius: ἁφτάθει, ἀπαχα, ἰπτακται. ἁφτάται, ἰπταμαι, καταπανιται.

Ver. 34. Τούς ἴδιους.] Dr. Hammond observes in the Margin of the English Translation, that the Alexandrian Copy reads here τούς ἴδιους. So does also the Vulgar: vintiis compati est, I have sympathised with the bond; which reading is countenanced likewise by the Syriack Interpreter. So also it was read in two Copies of R. Stephanus. And I doubt not but that is the true reading, which was changed by those who rashly supposed St. Paul was the Author of this Epistle.
HEBREWS.

CHAP. XI.

Ver. 1. In the place cited out of Ezekiel, in the Chaldee Paraphrase, must not be rendered "ausi sunt," they took confidence, but impudenter confirmant; they impudently confirm, viz. serenem suum ratum fore. That their word should be made good or come to pass. The Hebrew Verb יִתְלוּלֵּה יִתְלוּלֵּה must be rendered they have made others to hope, that the thing should be accomplished. But supposing this, our Author's conjecture is nevertheless good.

II. "ἵνα" in the Septuagint Version of Mich. v. 7. must not be translated to subsist, but to hope. The Hebrew has: The Remnant of Jacob shall be among the Nations, and in the midst of many People, as a dew from the Lord, as showers upon the Grass; which does not wait for any Man, nor stay for the Sons of Men, where the Septuagint, who yet have very ill translated these words, have right enough ἵνα, that is, nor waits for the Sons of Men, or puts Confidence in them. For those Interpreters must often be understood by the Hebrew words, which they endeavoured to illustrate in their Translation. Now ἵνα never signified to subsist.

III. Our Author in his Paraphrase interprets the word ἐκεῖνε, a Conviction or Perswasion; but he should have brought us an example wherein it appeared that ἐκεῖνε signified a certain disposition of Mind, and I cannot tell whether any can be found. But till such an instance be alleged, I chuse rather to interpret this word according to its usual significations, that is, argumentum, an Argument, as it is rendered in the Vulgar. The firm and constant Faith of wise Men, has that weight and influence upon others, as to be an Argument for which they believe with them, the reality of things which they do not see. So St. Paul in i. Cor. xv. to prove the certainty of the Resurrection, to those who had not seen it, argues from his own and the rest of the Apostles, and Christians Faith: Else what shall they do, faith he, who are baptized for the dead? If the Dead rise not at all, why are they then baptized for the Dead? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour? — If after the manner of Men I have fought with Beasts at Ephesus, what advantageeth is me, if the Dead rise not? &c. These things may be called ἐκεῖνες παρασκευασεις, that is, arguments proving the truth of the Resurrection of the Dead; it being not at all probable that wise and good Men would have rashly, and without reason, submitted to such things. The same may be said of those examples of Faith, mentioned in this Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.
Chapter XI. Verf. 4. Πειραματις. Our Author in his Paraphrase rightly interprets the word πειραματις here the best, for this Verse is taken out of the Greek Translation of Genes. i. 7. where Cain is said to have offered indeed rightely, but not to have divided rightely, that is, to have kept to himself what was God's. See my Notes on that place.

Verf. 10. Τω τω σημείῳ εκθέμεν. This Grotius rightly refers to Jerusalem, which our Author interprets in a mystical sense; I know not for what reason; for if we read Genesis, we shall be perfectly of Grotius his Mind, nor does the series of the Discourse here require any other interpretation.

Verf. 16. Κείται το επίθετον τοῦ ουρανοῦ. These words are rightly understood by Grotius and Dr. Hammond so, as if the Apostolical Writer had said: κείται το επίθετον τοῦ ουρανοῦ. ην εν αυτούς τους εις αυτως. they desired a better Country, which was an antitype of Heaven, that is, the Land of Canaan. For it appears from Gen. xxiii. 7. & xlvii. 9. that the only meaning of the Patriarchs, in saying they were strangers and sojourners in the Land, was that they had no ground of their own in the Land of Canaan, but dwelt in it merely by the courtesy of the Canaanites.

Verf 20. Note d. What our Author says in this Note is very ingenious, and if not true, seems highly probable, as far as the last period, beginning with, and this perhaps. Because that which follows is plainly forced; for who would say that the Edomites were Lords of the Jews, because when their Commonwealth was overthrown by the Chaldeans, they did no longer obey them. Is it all one to be any Mans Lord, and not to serve him? I think not. So that this last remark should have been blotted out, or rather not at all written.

Verf 21. Note e. See my Notes on Gen. xlvii. 31. We had better here acknowledg the hand of a Writer who did not understand Hebrew, and followed without examination the Septuagint, than endeavour to reconcile inconsistencies. Our Author commits here another great mistake, in seeking in Gen. xlix. for that which is in Gen. xlvii. and joining the words of Chap. xlix. belonging to another Story, with the words of Chap. xlvii. 21. See the places, and you will think it strange that our learned Author, who so diligently studied the Scripture, should commit such an error.

Verf 29. Note f. This also is a Dream, plainly contrary to the History, and owing to the false reasoning of Interpreters, as I have shewn in a Dissertation de Maris Idumæi Trajectione, added to my Commentary on the Pentateuch, Numb. iv.

Ibid. Note g. All this is true, but had been observed before by Grotius and others. See also Davidis Clerici Quæst. Sacr. x.
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Ver. 35. Note h. I. Mr. Gataker has treated largely concerning this word in Adversar. cap. xlvi. who may be consulted. From the places by him alleged, it sufficiently appears that πιμανων, where the Discourse is about an instrument of Torment, was properly a Club, so called from πιμανων to beat; and secondarily the place or torment itself of πιμανωνοις. From πιμανων was deduced πιμανιζεων, that is, to strike with a πιμανων or Club, till the Person accused made Confession, or else died; which Verb was afterwards used to signify any kind of painful Death. But here where there are particular kinds of Death mention'd, I think it is to be understood properly, of those who were beaten to death with Clubs. So that what our Author conjectures of I know not what Engine, that was called πιμανων, and on which Malefactors were hanged, is vain. Mr. Gataker also very truly observes, that Lexicographers often attribute to words those significations, which either precede or accompany the thing signified; and that shows the reason why πιμανιζεων is said by Hesychius and Suidas to signify to be slain or hanged.

II. I do not see why Κοφαν and the Yoke, mention'd in Jerem. xxviii. 14. should be reckoned the same. For from the beginning of the foregoing Chapter it appears that those Yokes are consider'd as representations of Slavery, which the Prophet foretold to several Nations, not of Torment or a Prison. The only similitude between them, we have any certain knowledge of, is that they were both put upon the Neck.

III. Tho in the νεροποιητια of Lucian, πιφανες and τοξεαi are joined together, it does not follow that τοξεαi is the same with πιμανων; tho, tympanum sometimes signifies a Wheel among Architects. It is sufficient that the Wheel was an instrument of Torture, as appears by the Fable of Ixion, that in the description of Hell there might be mention made of πιφανες and τοξεαi. It is not safe to deduce Conjectures from the order of words. See Lucian Tom. i. p. 334. Ed. Amstel.

IV. Ετι πιμανων ιερεαi, may very fitly be rendred to come to the torment of the Club, or if you please, to the place in which that Torment was inflicted, because that is abusively called πιμανων. Celsius also improperly said πιμαναζεων for that which is to die a painful Death; nor is it necessary he should have thought of a πιμανων, or of hanging, as we shall afterwards see, on the place in Eusebius, which Dr. Hammond last of all alludes.

V. The pulling off the Skin, or cutting off the Members, signify nothing to a πιμανωνοι properly so called; nor was it necessary that those who suffer'd this kind of Torture, should also have their Skin pulled.
ANNOTATIONS on

Chapter off, or be dismembered. But all these severities might improperly be called παναισμος, in the sense that this word is taken for any sort of Torment.

VI. They who have been a long while beaten with Clubs in all the parts of their body, may truly be said [as in Aristotle] δεων των πετεβων, and εν δυρχοι εις το μελλον: but it does not follow that παναισμος properly so styled, was a capital Punishment; for there might be a παναισμος of fewer or more blows, rather for Chastisement, or to Death, as the Judges thought fit, or the Crime deserved.

VII. It is a strange citation of Eusebius, which we have here in our Author, after the place in the Maccabees. First, there is no such thing in Lib. iv. of Eusebius, but the passage is in Lib. ix. c. 40. Secondly, it is not taken out of Polybius, but out of Berosus himself, or rather out of a fragment of his, which we find in Josephus, out of whom Eusebius cites it, as appears by the very Inscription of the Chapter. The same fragment has been published by Scaliger out of Josephus. So that the comparison the Doctor makes between Alexander Polybius out of Eusebius, and Berosus, is vain; because one and the same Writer is cited in both places, in whose different Copies, especially in a barbarous name, there might be a various reading.

VIII. The place in Daniel is in Chap. vii. 11. as was well noted by Scaliger in Not. ad Fragm. p. 11. and not in Chap. v. But this I should not observe, if the foregoing and following things did not shew that our Author, in collecting this medly, was extreamly careless beyond what he uses to be, and did not think it worth while to look into the places in the Writers themselves. He says afterwards, "Megæsthenes out of Abydæus calls the King of Babylon Αδειργετω: On the contrary, Abydæus produces the words of Megæsthenes, in Eusebius Lib. xi. c. 41."

IX. I easily believe the punishment of the Club, even to Death, was used among the Greeks and Babylonians. But our Author's παναισμος, as he describes it, was nowhere used; nor can any thing be alleged in his favour out of Justin, who subjoined a synonymous Verb to the Verb αγγελειν, thinking there was no difference between them; after which manner both he and other Fathers often cite the Scripture. The place is in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, p. 248.

X. Nothing could have been more impertinently allledged by the Doctor, to prove that his παναισμος was in use among the Romans, than the passage of Eusebius, or rather of the Churches of Vienna and Lyons, out of Lib. v. c. i. of Eusebius. For after he had said that the Emperor had written word, that those who professed the Christi-
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an Religion ought πυμανιζων, describing the manner how the Presi-
dent had executed the Emperor's orders, he says: ου ο η θεϊκαν πολιτειαν
τοιον ειρακον τας κεραλαις, τας 3 λατινοι επισκοπεις εις Σιφαβ:
all that were judged to have been made free of the City of Rome, be cut off
their Heads, and the rest be sent to the wild Beasts. Where is here our
Author's πυμανιζων? Christophorson milde him, who had rendred the
word tympanis torqueri, which is justly cenful by H. Valesius, with
whom yet I should not render it gladio cadit, for those who were
condemned to be devoured by wild Beasts, πυμανιζων as well as
those who were beheaded.

XI. Not only our Author, but also the great Grotius did not know
what πυμανιζων signified in this place, who on 2 Macab. vi. 19.
conjectures that the πυμανον was fidicule quibus pellis humana ita tende-
batur, quomodo bubula in tympano, & qui sicut cruciabantur didos πυμανιζων,
little Cords whereby a Man's skin was stretched so, as the Skin of an Ox on a
Drum, and those who were so tormented were said, &c. But both the
reason of the word and use are plainly against him, as will appear
to any one that reads Gataker, whom I will not transcribe. I shall
only add, that in the Old Glosses πυμανον is rendred fresplo, which is
a corrupt Writing for spicio, a Staff.

Verf. 37. Note i. I wonder our Author here cites Copies which no
one else has mention'd. I mistrust they are Conjectures, which he
imposes upon us, for various Leetions. Beza affirms that it is so read
in all his Copies, and there is no variety of reading observed in the
Oxford Edition, but of one Copy in which this word is wanting. The
same Beza conjectures that we might read ἵππαθον, they were burnt;
and Tanaquillus Faber in Ep. Crit. Lib. ii. Ep. 14. ἵππαθον, they were
maimed or dismembred, which kind of punishment was common among
the Eastern People. The Reader may chuse which of these he pleases,
either of them being better than the received reading.

Verf. 40. Note k. I. If we should admit the reasonings of Dr.
Hammond, about the signification of the words καταρθον, so as to
grant they signified tranquility in this World, and the perpetual
duration of the Christian Church; yet we could not allow him, that
this may be referred to the times of the Apostles. For what tran-
quility did the Christians enjoy for three Ages, greater than the
Jews, from the beginning of their Commonwealth to this time? It's
true, the Jews in so many Ages suffer'd various Calamities, but they
had also long intervals of Rest and Prosperity, such as the Christi-
ans for 300 Years never enjoyed, as the Scripture informs us; as in
the reigns of David and Solomon, and other Kings. Did the Christi-
Chapter of Passive signification, because they are derived from the third person of the Preterperfect tense Passive. So ἐναπεπάνος, easily passable, ἐναικισθήποτος, well done, ἐκπεπλεψας, which is easily expanded, ἐπεπεριστηκτος, which is easily subverted, ἐπεπεριστηκτος, easy to be beheld, ἐπεκεισθήποτος, which is easily taken away, and innumerable others, which may be found in any Lexicon. St. Chrysostom interpreted this Passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews by Conjecture, not by Grammatical Rules.

Ver. 2. Ἐν ἑκείνῳ τῷ Ἐρυμνῷ ὕπερ του Θεοῦ.] That is, on the right side of that inacessible Light, which is a Symbol of the presence of the most high God. See Note on Mark xvi. 19.

Ver. 3. Note b. ἐκμεθοῦν is properly to be tired, and metaphorically to faint or languish, because when a man is excessively tired, his strength fails him. So in the Apotheogm of Coriolanus, ἐκμεθοῦν is to have his strength fail him, or to do that which fainting persons use to do; for when those who stood by him besought him ἵνα τε καθίστη, έπειτα τῆς καμπάς, ἐν ἑκατεροί τοις τεταυτοις, that being burdened with labours and Wounds, he would retire into the Camp. Εἰ τούτον πρόθυμον, ἑστα τεταυτοις τοις τεταυτοις: be saying that it was not the part of Conqueror to be overcome by weariness, pursued them that fled. Thee Words are found in Plutarch in the Life of Coriolanus p. 218. Ed. Wechel. T. 1. I cannot tell whether our Author read them in the Writer himself, it's certain he sets down the saying of Coriolanus otherwise than Plutarch. However that be, ἐκμεθοῦν signifies, as I said, to be tired; secondarily to do that which tired persons use to do, as in this place of the Epistle to the Hebrews; as to desist from running, to quit the Field, that is, to betake ones self to another Course of Life.

Ibid. Note c. For Jerem. xxxv, we must read Ἰσāi. xxxv, which place had bin cited by Grotius and others.

Ver. 4. Note d. Here our Author confounds σκιμαχία, that is, a vain fighting with ones own Shadow, with skirmishing, or διαθλομένοις, which are not the same among the antient Greeks.

Ver. 16. Note f. That which is here produced out of the Rab-bins I have shewn to be vain on Gen. xxv. 31. Esau was certainly profane in this, that he despised the last Benediction of his father, as thinking it to be of less value than a Mels of Pottage.

Ver. 23. Note h. There may also be an allusion here to Exod. iv. 22. where Ἰσραήλ is said to be God's Firstborn, because of the peculiar benefits which God had conferred upon him. For the Christian Church succeeded in the place of Ἰσραήλ according to the fleish.
Ibid. Note 1. This is a figurative expression, of which I have spoken on Exod. xxxii. 32. God is represented to have as it were a Book, in which he writes down his peculiar Favourites: as Kings have Registrers of the names of those whom they employ in their service, or upon whom they confer any benefits.

Ibid. Note k. I easily believe this phrase was taken from the use of the Jews; but our Author who looks here besides for I know not what Agonistical sense, ought to have produced at least one place, in which signified a Conqueror in the Games; which he could not do. And therefore he ought to have been contented with what he had borrowed from Grotius, about the use of the Jews.

Vers. 24. Note 1. 1. Our learned Author would have done much better if he had followed Grotius, what he here says being either wrested or affirmed without reason. To begin with his last words, I will not say that the authority of the Writers of Liturgies, whoever they be, is of little moment to the explication of particular places of Scripture; because they had scarce any tincture of Critical Learning, as every one knows. But I will say that our Author supposes here two things, which may be called into question. First, that a bloody Sacrifice was offer'd up by Abel, which is uncertain, as I have shewn on Gen. iv. 4. Secondly, that all the Sacrifices were Types, that is, in the language of our modern Divines, Prefigurations of the Sacrifice of Christ; which if denied, can be proved by no Argument: tho' I acknowledg there was some likeness between them, in which sense they might be called Types and Shadows of the Sacrifice of Christ, because of their Similitude, not because of a design to pre-signify one by the other, which no one knew of. Yet our Author, in his Paraphrase, attributes his own opinion to the Writer of this Epistle, who has nothing at all here about that matter. See my Note on 1 Cor. x. 3.

II. The efficacy of Christ's Sacrifice is not compared here with the efficacy of Abel's Sacrifice; but the thing which Abel called for (whether by his own, or the Blood of Sacrifices) with the thing which Christ demands. And therefore the word is superior better things, which cannot be referred to efficacy, and respects nothing but what Christ obtained. But it is said, the design of this Epistle is to shew the preeminence of the Gospel above the Law. I do not deny it, but every particular word does not tend to that design; for there are also a great many things intermix'd in it foreign to that design. So that I had rather with most Interpreters, look upon these words as an allusion to what is said of Abel in Chap. xi. 4. which opinion is manifestly confirm'd by the Verb narrat used in both places. For as there Abel is
Chapter XIII.

10. is said to have cried unto God from the Earth: So here the Blood of Christ merited AΛΕΙΝ than Abel, or than the Blood of Abel.

Ver. 25. ὁ δὲ τὴν γῆν ἔρχεται τὴν ἄγιον τούτοις ἐδὲν ἔρχεται.] I. The δὲ τὴν γῆν ἔρχεται is undoubtedly a Periphrasis of Moses, but he is not to be thought to have spoken from Mount Sinaï, when he ἔγαγεν ὁμανη, gave Oracles, from which he himself said nothing; but in the Camp, when he heard the Responses of God from the Sanctuary, which he afterwards declared to the People.

II. The δὲν ἔρχεται does not seem to be Christ, who for the most part taught the Gospel upon Earth; tho sometimes also, but rarely, he revealed himself to the Apostles from Heaven after his Resurrection. I rather think it is to be understood, with Grotius, of those Voices which came from Heaven on the behalf of Christ, mention'd in Mat. iii. 17. & xvii. 5. and elsewhere.

CHAP. XIII.

Ver. 4. Def. Erasmus and Nicol. Zegerus had gone before our Author in this Interpretation, but Beza objects against it the following words: πάντως ἐκ τῆς μαρτυρίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, where if that interpretation be allowed, Θεοῦ must be taken for Θεός, in this manner: Let Marriage be honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled, for Fornicators and Adulterers God will judge. I am of opinion the Antients read Θεός for Θεοῦ, as it is in a Greek and Latin Copy, and in the Vulgar Translation which has enim; and that this was changed into Θεοῦ by those who did not think these words were an Exhortation.

Ver. 9. Note d. When our Author made this collection, he does not seem to have looked into Acts xv. 40. where to be commended or deliver'd to the Grace of God, is without doubt to be recommended by Prayer to the divine Goodness. Besides, the words which he produces as following, are in Acts xiv. 26. But he seems to have fallen into a mistake, because there is also the same expression in this latter place of the Acts, immediately preceding them: And thence failed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, for the Work which they fulfilled. But here ἀποστασίως τῇ κατοικίᾳ τῆς Θεοῦ, is not to be sent to preach the Gospel, but to be recommended by Prayer to the divine Grace; tho this had been done, that Paul and Barnabas might preach the Gospel with success.

Ver. io. ἡ δὲ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκτενεῖς ἐξενεις ἀπὸ τῆς σωμάτων λατρεύων.] He alludes to the Sacrifices offer'd up on the day of Expiation, as every one sees.
But to make the series of the Discourse clear, he should have expressed Chapter what is here to be understood, and upon which that which follows XIII. depends. Christ is an expiatory Sacrifice, which we must eat, that we may have an interest in the efficacy of it, as we are taught by Christ in John vi. 50. and seqq. But by the Mosaical Rites, no Man tasted of such a Sacrifice, so that they who desire to be dealt with by God according to that Law, cannot partake of the Expiation made by Christ. This is the reasoning of the Writer of this Epistle, of which he has only expressed the two last Propositions, by which omission the series of the Discourse is made obscure. But it will be said perhaps, that there is an ambiguity in this reasoning in the word ἔστιν, because the Christians did no more eat of the Flesh of Christ, properly speaking, than the Jews of the expiatory Sacrifices. I acknowledge there is that ambiguity, but the Sacred Writer did not urge this Argument as a demonstration. It is a reasoning which properly proves nothing against Men of other Sentiments, but illustrates only the Christian Doctrin after the Jewish manner; of which kind there are a great many in this Epistle, as I have already elsewhere observed. That which follows in this place, is of the same kind.

Ver. 11. [On ἕνωσις &c.] Our Author in his Paraphrase says that the Jews themselves acknowledged that the expiatory Sacrifices typified or prefigured the Messiah. I wish he had produced a passage out of some Antient Jew, in which that was affirmed; for no one will believe him saying this rashly. For my part I cannot persuade my self that the Jews had any such Thoughts; whose greatest Argument against Jesus his being the Messiah, was his Death; and the Gospels sufficiently shew they imagin’d no such thing of the Messiah.

Ver. 15. Note e. I. It being undeniable by all learned Men, that the Septuagint very often read the Hebrew otherwise in their Copy, than we do now inours, what need is there with Mr. Pocock, of inventing forced interpretations, rather than acknowledge what is easy and plain? There is much more probability in their opinion, who think the Septuagint read (with a difference in the division of the Letters) הָרִיתְוֹת אֲשֶׁר, fruit out of our Lips, or blotting out ᾿Η τοῦ φρούτου of our Lips. Nor must it be thought, that because γάζεως and γάζωμα are derived from the root καρφίς, therefore those words may be confounded. For γάζεως & γάζωμα are immediately deduced from καρφίδως, which is properly to be gathered, and is applied to Fruits; then, because Fruits after they are gathered are consumed, it signifies to consume, by which signification we are to explain the two former words, as al-
Chapter so their Compounds ἵππος & ἵππωμα, which are often in the XIII. Version of the Septuagint used for whole Burnt-offerings. The same Interpreters render the Verb ἥν to eat ἵππωμα in Jof. v. 12. So also they render the Verb ἐφάνετο to burn in Deut. xxvi. 12. So that ἵππωμα & ἵππος may signify a whole Burnt-offering, tho' the word ἵππος do not occur in that signification; because that word is not deduced from ἵππωμα, as the two former are.

II. The Rabbinical reason, why some Holocausts should be called ꔷספsummer Fruit, I do not value a rush, because it is not certain that it is an antient Phrase. For that giving of thanks is here called ἵππος signifies nothing to the name of Holocausts, which elsewhere are always called by other names. Besides, it is utterly false that Holocausts, which were the chief and daily Sacrifices, never to be omitted, as appears from Num. xxviii. could be look'd upon as a Banquet over and above the prescribed Feast. In fine, who will believe that in this one place of Hes. xiv. 2. ἵππος is used for an Holocaust, which is constantly called ἵππωμα and ἵππωμα, or by other names; and that this happen'd accidentally in a place where we may reasonably suppose the Septuagint read the Hebrew word ὑδηρ, which properly signifies Fruit? They who can believe such things, after due examination, must either have spoiled their judgment with a continual reading of Ar-bick or Rabbinical Trifles, as some have done; or else be naturally dull.

III. And therefore our Author, not willing to rely upon Mr. Pococke's conjecture, turns himself to other things; but 1st, he is certainly mistaken in thinking the Septuagint used the single word ἵππος, only because it yielded the same sense with ἵππωμα, as sufficiently appears by what I have already said: 2dly, he is mistaken in thinking that ἴππος is Praise expressed with the Mouth. It was a kind of Sacrifice, in which a Victim was offered no less than in others. 3dly, It is a mistake that the Septuagint have thrice rendered the word ἵππος as he says; for that word is twice only found in Levit. vii. 1, 2. Besides, our learned Author was deceived by a false distinction of the Chapters in the Version of the Septuagint, which do not answer the Hebrew in the Polyglot Bibles. The Version of the three first Verses of Chap. vii. of Leviticus, in the Hebrew, is in that Edition of the Septuagint, Chap. vi. 31, 32, 33. where ἵππος is rendered rightly ἵππωμα & ἵππος. That which is in the same Edition in Chap. vii. 1, 2, 3. answers to ver. 11, 12, 13. of Chap. vii. in the Hebrew, and we do not there find the word ἵππος ašbam, but the words ἴππος and ἵππωμα salvātoria & celebratio, which bring Salvation, and celebrating. The Septuagint have nowhere rendered ἵππος by another.

IV. The
St. JAMES.

IV. The Offerings joined with the celebration of the Eucharist are without doubt pious, and the practice of the Christian Church in that particular, both heretofore and now, very commendable; but I do not think there is any reference here had to those Oblations, which cannot but very harshly, and if I may so speak, ἐμμονῶνας, in the dialect of Dr. Hammond, be called the fruit of the lips. But in the following Verse there is mention made of Liberality. What then? Can't that be a new Precept? By all this it appears to how little purpose Dr. Hammond's Collection is in this place.

ANNOTATIONS ON THE
General Epistle of St. James the Apostle.

At the end of the Premon.] I. I am apt to think the title of Ἐφεσών, was not added to the name of James, in the Apostolical times; wherein no one was called an Apostle simply and without any addition, besides Apostles properly so styled, that is, men called by Christ himself; as appears by the constant use of St. Paul. The use of following Ages I do not regard, nor the judgment of Theodoret, which is confirmed by no antient Example. So that I think this Inscription to be of a later date than the Age of the Apostles.

II. It is much more probable that St. James was killed in the Year of Christ LX. as Ant. Pagus on that year has shewn, in Epicrisi Baroniana.

III. The passages in this Epistle, which our Author understands of the Gnosticks and the destruction of the Jews, are as fitly interpreted by others, of any bad men whatsoever, or any other Judgments of God. Of which matter, it will be more proper to speak on those passages themselves.

CHAP.
Chapter I.

Ver. 3. This is generally interpreted, the trying of your faith, as if it were μετά τῆς ὑστερίας; but it is harsh to transpose the Pronoun ὑστερία; and without any Transposition these words will have the same sense, if they be rendred thus: the tryal of your worketh patience of faith, that is patience proceeding from faith, as ὑστερία is obedience proceeding from faith. Yet there is a like transposition observable in 1 Pet. i. 7. in this very Phrase, unless perhaps in both places for ὑστερία we ought to read ὑστερίας.

Verf. 6. Note a. I have a suspicion that Dr. Hammond, when he first set about the explication of the New Testament, began with the explanation of this Epistle, because his Stile is harsher and more intricate than ordinary, which yet is everywhere very much neglected; and because besides there are a great many things here violently and by straining deduced from the words of St. James. In his Paraphrase he represents him speaking what he pleases, because he departs far from his words, and in his Annotations he wrests them with forced conjectures.

I. It is false that in verf. 9. the discourse is about sufferings; and tho that should be granted, it would not follow that the four antecedent Verses belong to the same matter, because in this Epistle there are divers Precepts often set one after another without any order or connexion, as well as in other Apostolical Epistles. These holy men spake those things which they thought would be useful to those whom they wrote to, without observing any method, which is not necessary in such Writings and Admonitions.

II. If the Apostle had intended to say what our Author would have him, he would have expressed his mind thus: αἰτεῖται εἰ τὴν θύεται, and not said simply αἰτεῖται εἰ τὴν, which is, let him ask with faith; that is, believing that God can and will do good to us, and grant us every thing that is necessary; or not doubting concerning the divine Promises. This is properly that Faith which is to be joined with our Prayers.

Verf. 8. Ανενομίας ἡς θερισμός:] That is, doubting concerning the divine Promises. Clemens, in Epist. i. to the Corinthians, cap. xi. says, that Lot’s Wife disagreeing with her Husband, was changed into a Statue of Salt, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι διὰ τὸν θερισμόν. ὢς ἡ αἰτεία καὶ ὡς οἱ ἐνδοξισμοὶ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ θυείᾳ ἔργα μετὰ τοῦ κατάβατος τῆς θυείας προῆρθε. That all might know, that double-minded persons, and such as doubt concerning God’s Power,
are for a condemnation and sign to all generations. The same Clemens uses the Verb ἁμαρτήσω in the same sense with ἁμαρτήσων, cap. 23. Μη διάφωτησιν, καὶ θεολογίας ἐν ῥηγα ἐξαγοράζεται καὶ τοῖς ἀθεστοῖς αὐτοῖς. Πάντως ὑπὲρ ἂν ἐξαγοράζεται, ὅτι λέγει: τιματογοι εἰσάν ὁ διαφωτήσω, οἱ διαφωτό-}tes τιν ἀρχή, &c. Let us not be double minded, and let not our Soul besituate about his excellent and noble Gifts. Far be from us that Scripture where it is said: Miserable are the double minded, they that are of a doubtful Heart, &c. The same Verb is used by Barnabas cap. xix. in the way of Light: Οὐ μὴν ἀρτικοὶ ποτέ ἐστιν. η γάρ: do not doubt whether it shall come, to pass, or not. Hesychius: Διαφωτίζω, ἀπόφασις, doubting. In the same sense we more than once meet with the word dubius in Herma's Pastor. See Lib. iii. Simil. ix. § 21.

Ver. 9. Note b. I. Tho joy and boasting are usually joined together, yet those words ought not to be confounded, as if they had the same signification, which really differ; because there may be joy without boasting, and this place manifestly requires the notion of boasting properly so called; which is opposed to ταμίωσε, humiliation, and is joined with ἡγεῖ height. For if we may mix things which have an affinity with one another, we shall make strange confusion; and here the elegancy of St. James his saying will be all lost. Let the Brother that is low boast in his height; that is, that he is a Christian, than which nothing can be more honourable, if we rightly consider the thing: but on the other hand rich Men, whose confidence in their Riches generally makes them proud, ought ἐν χαρά εἰς ἀμβλύνωσιν ἐν τῇ ταμίωσιν αὐτῶν, to blush and be ashamed in their humility, that is, because of their low and base disposition, in putting confidence in earthly and fading things. There is a double Antithesis here observable; for first the ἡγεῖ of the poor Man is opposed to the ταμίωσει of the rich, and secondly the ταμίωσει of the former to the ἡγεῖ of the latter. For tho there be no Verb joined with ἐν ταμίωσει, the manner of the opposition shews that some such thing must necessarily be understood, as Grotius and other Interpreters have well observed. And nothing can be better opposed to boasting than shame: So that we must supply, with Oecumenius, ἀμβλύνω. To this sense which necessarily arises from the very words of St. James, our Author's Paraphrase makes nothing; in which he expresses his own forced conceptions, and not the mind of St. James.

II. What is here said of the dispositions of poor and rich Men, has not any special relation to persecution for the sake of Religion, but may be said of them at any time. For as poor Men ought always, to keep themselves from being cast down, to think how honourable a Condi-
Chapter it is to be a true Christian, and to boast in the Lord; so rich Men, if they are conscious to themselves of putting confidence in their Riches, ought at all times to be ashamed of the vileness of such a disposition.

III. But the particle δι, if Dr. Hammond may be judge, shews these words must be connected with what goes before. But δι here is put for κατά, because there follows another δι, and the words are to be rendered thus: 

Let the Brother indeed that is low, boast in his height; but let the rich Man be ashamed in his being low. We meet with a great many examples in the best Writers, where when δι occurs twice, the first is taken for κατά, as the manner of the opposition shews. See Hem, Stephanus.

Verse 11. Note c. If there were any thing here to be alter'd, I should chuse to read εὐσεβείας, in his Riches, that is, together with his Riches.

Verses 16, 17. Μη πλανᾶσθε, &c.] Our Author in his Paraphrase obtrudes his Gnosticks here upon us, of whom there is not the least mention or footstep in St. James. So Men see in the Clouds what they please.

Verse 21. Ἐν παρευρίσκει ὁ λόγος and ἐπαρχεῖται, but the Gnosticks. St. James alludes to Circumcision, in which the filthy and superfluous Skin was cast away, not to any peculiar practices of the Gnosticks. 'Ο λόγος ἄνωθεν is a word which is ingrafted in the Minds of its Hearers, that is, takes as it were root in them, if they receive it with Meekness, that is, with a teachable Mind. This word is used also, in the same sense, by Barnabas Epist. cap. ix. Οἶδαί τινα ὁ λόγος, ἐπαρχεῖται καὶ ἐπαρχεῖται, ἐπιτύπωσεν ὁ λόγος κατὰ ὑμᾶς: he knows, who has put into us the ingrafted Gift of his Doctrine. Where the old Interpreter mistranslates the word ὁ λόγος by natural, which he has also in the beginning of that Epistle, where the Greek is wanting.

Verse 23. Note e. Without doubt the former interpretation is the more probable, if not also true. But I had rather,

I. Understand ἐκπληρούμην γνώσεως of a natural Countenance, not as it is opposed to a Vizard or Mask, but as opposed to a painted face. For Maskers do not use to behold their Vizards in a Glass, but their Face. I might shew that Dancers, and other effeminate Men, corrupted the natural colour of their Countenances with Paint; but αὖθις seems to be taken here for ἐναρξάμενος homo, as it is often in Poets, so as to comprehend also Women.
II. I do not think St. James speaks as well of that which is usually done, as of that which might be done. For he compares them who having heard the Word, retain the Vices which the Word condemns, with those who seeing the Stains of their Countenance in a Glass, should not wash them off; which being accounted a piece of Madness and Absurdity, they must also necessarily be accounted Fools and Madmen, who when they observe their Vices represented and condemned in the Doctrine of the Gospel, do not think of forsaking them. The former is very seldom done, the latter too frequently; because Men take more care of their Bodies, than of their Souls. They are offended with the spots of their Face, but they are not offended with the blemishes of their Minds.

Ver. 27. Note f. This might all be admitted, if it were certain that none but the Gnosticks thought Religion to consist rather in Faith than in Practice. But who told Dr. Hammond that, among those who lived in the Apostolical Churches, there were none who turned the Grace of God into lasciviousness?

C H A P. II.

Ver. 1. I do not think there is a respect here had to the Shechinah; for the Glory of Christ signifies rather in this place his Kingdom, as Dr. Hammond himself seems to have observed. So that I take the meaning of this Verse to be this: "Ye who believe that Christ reigneth in Glory, ought not to have respect to Persons; because he promised to make the Poor, as well as the Rich, provided they believed and obeyed him, partakers of his Kingdom. See ver. 5.

Ver. 2. Note b. ITo begin with this last remark, our learned Author ought to have told us where we might find the Jewish Canon he speaks of, and alleged the words of it themselves; but I am apt to think he had it only from the Mouth of some Jew, or learned Man that affirmed he had read it in the writings of the Rabbins. Where are the Christians, who having Controversies with Jews, and those of mean Condition, think fit to refer them to the judgment of a Chacham? Namely in the Kingdom of Utopia. Yet there is, I confess, a Jewish Canon to this purpose, tho' not such as our Author speaks of; set down by F. Henr. Hottinger, out of R. Levi Barcinonensis, in Leg. cxlili. Juris Hebraici: Let not one sit down, and the other stand; but let them both stand, because when they are before the Council, it is fit they should stand as if they were in the presence of the divine Majesty———Yet the Rabbins say
Annotations on

Chapter II. That if [the Council] will permit the contending parties to sit down, they may, which words must be understood of the time during which the Cause is examined; but whilst Sentence is pronounced, they are obliged to stand. But because it became the Custom in all the Consistories of the Israelites, that after the decision they were commanded to sit down, to avoid contention, tho' they were only Witnesses, they command them now also to sit down. Hottinger sets down the Hebrew words, and refers the Reader to other places in the Rabbins.

II. I don't think that νευρίες in vers. 6. signifies the seats of Christian Judges, or places in which they assembled; for a rich Man drawing a poor Christian before Christian Judges, could not be said νευρίες ἵνα ὀπισθανθῇ, because it belonged to the Judges to restrain the rich Man's Anger. Besides, it is a mistake that νευρίες in 1 Cor. vi. 4. signifies a Tribunal, as I have shewn on that place.

III. What our Author alleges, does by no means prove that κανείς signifies Consistories of Christian Judges. For first none were Judges properly so called, but Roman Magistrates, or those of privileged Cities. Secondly, respect of Persons may have place not only in publick Judgments, but in any other; as when we entertain poor Men with scorn, whatever Gifts and Vertues they are endued with, and treat the rich with all kind of respect, because they are rich. Thirdly, if we suppose that the Controversies which arose between Christians, according to the advice of St. Paul in 1 Cor. vi. were decided by Christian Judges; we must not dream here of Tribunals and Footstools set for those Judges. These were the appurtenances of Magistrates, not of private Men; unless perhaps it should be thought that Bishops, in that Age, pronounced sentence from some high place, like Magistrates; which none, I suppose, who understand these matters will say in good earnest. Fourthly, we become κανείς or Judges of the dignity of Men, when we assign them Seats, as we think their Dignity requires; and when we have only a regard to Riches in this matter, then we imitate corrupt Judges. So that any may be called κανείς, who do something like them. Fifthly, κανείς, as I have said, did not belong to Christian Judges, but to Heathens; and therefore that word does not prove that the Discourse is here about Judges. Lastly, a variety of Seats does not belong so much to an assembly of Judges, as to a Congregation of many private Men, such as Ecclesiastical Meetings.

IV. So that it is much better to understand these words, with Grotius and other Interpreters, of a Church Assembly, in which St. James
St. JAMES.

not without reason complains that the poorer sort were treated with too much contempt, and the rich with too much honour; for in those Assemblies at that time, when there were no Magistrates, who, upon the account of their Office, justly have the most honourable Seats allotted to them, it was absurd to have a regard merely to Riches. Those who sat there, were estimated by nothing but the name of Christians; and were admitted into those Assemblies because they were Christians, and not because they were Rich. And therefore no difference should have been made between Men as to the place of their sitting, barely upon the account of their possessions.

Ver. 4. Note c. 1. To begin inv. excess, preposterously, our learned Author is mistaken, when he says that the Verb [μετέχειν] is in the middle voice, which drop from him before he was aware; for any Child knows that [μετέχει] is the first Aorist passive.

II. καί is might easily be a Hebraism for & interrogative, or whether or no, because in that Language the Particle And often abounds. It is plain, it is prefixed to interrogations in Mat. xviii. 21. and Acts xxiii. 3. from which it might be absent, without any prejudice to the sense. But I had rather in this place blot out καί, with the Alexandrian Copy, to which we may join perhaps the Vulgar Interpreter: καί here seems to have been added by some Transcriber, who did not sufficiently understand the series of the Discourse.

III. Nothing could have been invented more harsh, than that the [σέβοरθ] of the period should begin in ver. 5. If ye have a respect, &c. — hear, my beloved Brethren, hath not God chosen? &c. Besides, our Author without necessity fastens a Solecism upon St. James; for after five Verbs in the Subjunctive Mood had gone before, which are governed by the conditional Particle εάv, he supposes that [διερχόμεθα] and [πεπίστευμεν] are subjoined in the same construction. If any one come in, εἰσίτω, having a gold Ring; and there come also, εἰσίτω νῦ, a poor Man; and ye have respect, ἔχελεντε, to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say εἰσίτω to the poor, Stand thou there; which words, according to Dr. Hammond’s opinion, would be followed by these, and ye have not doubted in your selves, and are become judges, &c. But to avoid a Solecism, St. James should have said [διερχόμεθα], and [πεπίστευμεν], in the Subjunctive Mood, whereas we have here two Indicatives, which I wonder our Author could join with the foregoing in the Subjunctive.

IV. [διερχόμεθα], in the Passive voice, seems to be taken in an Active sense, as innumerable other Passives, in Greek Authors. So in Herodian Lib. iv. c. 6. οἱ πεπίστευσαν τι διερχόμεθα τι δίπλα σοι αναστήσοντες. The Souldiers had—
CHAPTER III.

The interpretation of Grotius seems to me to be much more natural, according to which St. James here forbids every one indifferently to aspire to the Office of a Teacher; because a severer account will be required of him that undertakes to teach others, and would have himself believed by the more ignorant, than if he were content to be wife for himself, or err alone, without endeavouring to make Proselytes of others. 

**Note.**

Ver. 1. The interpretation of Grotius seems to me to be much more natural, according to which St. James here forbids every one indifferently to aspire to the Office of a Teacher; because a severer account will be required of him that undertakes to teach others, and would have himself believed by the more ignorant, than if he were content to be wife for himself, or err alone, without endeavouring to make Proselytes of others. Meteov xeioua xatadara is not to have a greater Jufg, but to receive the greater Judgment, that is, the greater Condemnation if we offend. So xatadara is taken in Mat. xxiii. 14. Luke xx. 47. Mark xii. 40. See also Rom. xiii. 2. It concerns indeed every one to bridle their Tongue, lest they should condemn any rashly, but especially those who teach others; because their Judgments are most valued, and have the worst consequences attending them, if they are unjust. This makes both Pages in Ecclesiastical History, and a more wholesome Precept than this could
not have been given to Christians, which I wish they had suffer’d to Chapter
sink down into their Minds! But there neither was of old, nor is at III.
this day any thing more common than the rash judgments of masters.

II. That long and nice Comparison of this place with others, in
which either the same thing is not spoken of, or at least the Discourse
is no more about the Gnosticks than the Jews, too much addicted to
Judaism, or about other Men no better than they; that nice Compa-
rison, I say, of those places does not prove that St. James here has
a respect to the Gnosticks. Nay, I do not think, here and elsewhere,
where the Apostles address themselves to Christians, living under
Christian Bishops in Apostolical Churches, that Schismatics are re-
ferred to. See vers. 10. & 13.

Verf. 5. Note b. ὡς is certainly the beginning of an ἀνάλογον here,
and the Particle ἐν of the ἀναλογικός. The sense is: As Horses are
governed by a small Bridle, and a Ship by a small Stern, so the Tongue
which is a little member, rules whole Societies. I do not see why
we should depart from the natural signification of the particle ὡς.
But it is no wonder that our learned Author, whose style is full of
intricacies and windings, should make a difficulty where there was
none.

Verf. 6. Note c. Our Author here follows Grotius. But the Syriack
Interpreter seems rather to have rendered the place, corrupted, as he
thought it should be understood, than as he read it, because all the
Copies contradict him. Besides, he rendered it otherwise than the
Doctor says, for he has: and the Tongue is a Fire, and a world of Iniquity
is like a Wood. Grotius had not carefully enough look’d into that In-
terpreter, and Dr. Hammond rashly followed him. When I read this
place, I can hardly forbear thinking that a Gloss out of the Margin
crept into the Context; and if it be cast out, both a useless repetition
will be avoided, and the series of the Discourse very proper thus:

Ἐὰν οἷον τοῖς ἡλίκιοι ὑλὴν ἀνέτην; καὶ ὡς η ἑλέκτρα ἠλικιαταὶ εἰ τῶν μικρῶν ὁμάδων,
ἡ σφικτά ὅλον τὸ σῶμα, καὶ φυγίζεται ὁ τετράχ χ ἴν απόῃ: behold how great a
matter a little Fire kindleth; and so the Tongue is among our Members,
which defileth the whole Body, setting on Fire the wheel of our Generation
(geniturae nostrae.) As there is nothing wanting in this sentence, so
there is nothing superfluous. First, the word ὡς shews that thence
we must begin the ἀνάλογον of the comparison, as in the foregoing Simi-
litudes; in which the ἀναλογικός is begun with the Particle ἐν, and the
ἀνάλογον with the Conjunction ὡς, as it is here. Secondly, the words
which signify the same thing, and have no coherence with one ano-
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Chapter then, being unnecessarily interposed between the parts of the Similitude, are cast out; for ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ signifies the same with the whole Similitude, and κόσμις ἀδιαφόρησθαι plainly spoils the connexion of the Discourse.

But how should these words come to be written in the Margin? so, in this manner. Some body had expressed the substance of the whole Similitude in these two words ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ, and added them to the Margin of his Copy; as many do, who to find out any thing the more easily, set down by way of Abridgment the subject spoken of in such or such a place, in the Margin of their Books. Then as an interpretation of ἐκ νησίων, he had added ὁ κόσμος, the World, namely, is meant; and had subjoined ἀδιαφόρησθαι to explain the word ἀγνώστως, understanding the wheel of Generation to signify the wheel of Iniquity; that is, a wicked and unregenerate Life, or such as the Life of Men born, but not born again. And these things having, not without some reason, been set down in the Margin, were rashly inserted into the Context.

Ibid. Ἀκούσατε.] This word I render is, according to its usual signification, in good Authors. What a spark of Fire is, put among combustible matter, that the Tongue is among our Members.

Ibid. Note d. I have observed on Mat. i. 1. that the word ναζαν does not signify every event, and I must not repeat here what I have there said. I had rather understand by τῆς ἁγίας, the Wheel, or Chariot of Life, so called, because at our Nativity we enter into that Chariot, and with restless Wheels run hastily, till we come to the Grave.

Τετράδες ἀγιατὸς ὡς ὁ θανάτος. For like the Wheel of a Chariot
Βίος ἄγιος ἡ κωπία τῆς. Life runs rolling.

They are the words of Anacreon Od. iii. on himself.

Ver. 17. Note f. I. I have shewn on Chap. ii. 4. that our learned Author is mistaken, in the signification he attributes to the Verb ἀναδείκνυμι. But tho' what he there says were true, it would not follow that the word ἀναδείκνυμι ought to have a signification deduced from the middle Voice, because it comes from the third Person of the Preter-perfect tense Passive ἀναδείκνυται, as every one knows.

II. But because the Passive conjugation of this Verb is taken both in a Passive and Active sense, ἀναδείκνυμι may be taken also in either of these senses, according as the thing spoken of requires. Thus Hesychius first interprets ἀναδείκνυμι, μὴ ἔκτρω ἄλλως, which has no difference,
or makes no difference, in an active Notion. And then \( \text{αδικητης} \) Chapter IV. (not \( \text{αδικητης} \) as it is commonly read) \( \text{αδικητης} \), undistinguished, in a Passive signification, as it is expounded also in the Old Glosses. So Suidas: \( \text{αδικητης} \), \( \text{αδικητης} \). \( \text{αμακινητας} \) \( \text{κε} \) \( \text{δι} \) \( \text{μη} \) \( \text{νομισκαλων} \) \( \text{το} \) \( \text{νοτα} \), \( \text{αντικειμενον} \) \( \text{ολω} \). it is taken also for those who do not know what they ought to do, or that talk triflingly and foolishly. Here it is taken in an Active sense, but in a good one, for him that does good to all without distinction. For that other signification put upon it by Dr. Hammond is without example, and has no foundation in any antique Grammarian.

Verf. 18. Note g. I do not think there is here any \( \text{αντανακλως} \), for it is a Greek phrase which may be expressed in Latin thus: \( \text{Quo faciant pacem illi serunt in pace fructus justitiae, those that make Peace sow in Peace the fruits of Righteousness} \); that is, they who promote Peace or Christian Concord, whilst they follow after Peace, sow as it were that Righteousness, the fruit of which they shall hereafter reap. For to sow the fruit of Righteousness, is all one as to do righteous Works, which shall be rewarded in their proper time. But St. James express'd himself somewhat harshly, when he said to sow Fruit for that which is ordinarily called sowing Seed, whence a Plant or Tree is produced, which afterwards brings forth Fruit. But he could not say to sow Fruit, that is, a Reward, without speaking very improperly.

CHAP. IV.

Verf. 5. HOW forced what our Author here says after other Note a. Interpreters is, every one sees. I had rather say here what is sufficiently evident from several places of the New Testament, and of two very antient Writers, Barnabas and Clemens, that in those times the Jews used to produce, as out of Scripture, not only the sense of places without regarding the words, but also a Jewish Tradition, or interpretation of places of Scripture. So that I should no more look for what is here said, in the Old Testament, than what is allledged in Heb. xii. 21. as spoken by Moses of himself, I exceedingly fear and quake, or what is said in Barnabas of the Scape Goat cap. vi. or in Clemens cap. xvii.

Verf. 6. Note b. It was a long while since Dr. Hammond had read Virgil, when he allledged his words in such a manner. He describes the Manners of the Romans, and not the part of Kings, Aeneid. Lib. vi. 1. 851. & seqq.
Ver. 3. If this Epistle had been written to the Jews, who lived in Palestine, Dr. Hammond's interpretation might be admitted; but what he says here does not agree to those of that Nation that were dispersed through the Roman Empire, for all the Jews every where were not killed by Vespasian. Those only who lived in Palestine, and the neighbouring Countries, and had risen up in Arms against the Romans, were destroyed by them. So that I rather think St. James here speaks of that day, which is much more truly called the last, and that his admonition is more general.

Ver. 7. Note b. Seeing the Jews, who in Italy, or in Greece, and other Provinces remote from Judea, had embraced the Gospel, received no harm by the standing of Jerusalem, and the Jewish Commonwealth, nor any benefit by their Destruction; I do not see why they should be commanded to wait for this with patience. And therefore I rather think what the Apostle here says is to be understood of the last Judgment, which he speaks of as near at hand, because it was unknown when it was to be, and therefore every Age ought to look upon it as nigh. And it's certain as to particular Persons, Christ may truly be said to come, when he calls them by Death to Judgment.

Ver. 9. Note c. Seeing St. James does not speak here to the Jews who had embraced the Christian Faith in Palestine, but those who were in the Diaspora scattered abroad; I am apt to think he does not so much respect here the Vices of the Jewish Zealots, as of those Jews who lived in other places; which yet I do not deny to have followed the Example of the Zealots in Palestine.

Ver. 13. Note e. It is much better to understand here after ἀεινόντας ἀνέπηρ, his Sins by the Lord; that the Phrase may be entire thus: ἀνέπηρ ἐμφανει χριστιάνου ἀνέπηρ ἐν Κρίσις; if he has committed Sins, his Sins shall be forgiven him by the Lord: There is no mention here of Ecclesiastical Punishments, but only of the miraculous curing of a Disease, and obtaining pardon from God, not from the Priest. So that what our Author here says about the Absolution of the Church, is foreign to this place. Whoever seriously endeavours to reform his past Life, and to make continual progress in Holiness, does not need the forgiveness of a Priest; on which Christ has no where
where taught that the Hope or Salvation of a Christian depends. Chapter V.
And whoever does not amend his sinful practices, would in vain receive all the Absolutions and Benedictions of all the Priests in the World.

Ver. 15. Note h. Notwithstanding what our Author says, the word ἄνωνίωσις shews the Discourse to be about a mutual confession of Faults between equals, or those who are reckon'd equals. That is the perpetual use of the Greek Language without any exception, as to the word ἄνωνίωσις; nor does the place alleged out of 1 Pet. v. 5. prove the contrary, as I shall there shew. It is ridiculous to say that the Prayers of an Elder praying ex officio, are more effectual, than the Prayers of any good Man whatsoever that fears God; as if God granted the thing requested of him, for a Mans Office, and not for his Piety. And there is the same absurdity in saying that a Priest particularly laying open the Sins of his Brother to God, is the more likely by that means to prevail with him; as if God did not know what a Sinner stands in need of, or had promised more to such Prayers than to general ones. And little better is that which is added about direction, as if it were certain that Elders use to give better or more faithful advice in this matter, than any other pious and learned Men; when experience teaches us that they have no more discretion than others, and often use Religion only as a means to enrich themselves, or encrease their Authority.
Chapter I

ANNOTATIONS

On the first Epistle General

Of St. Peter the Apostle.

At the end of the Premon. I. I will not deny that St. Peter wrote this his first Epistle in that year which Baronius affirms, for there is nothing said in it from which any certain judgment can be made of the time wherein it was written. But that St. Peter was then at Rome, is a mere invention of those who thought the falsehoods of the Clementine Homilies to be a true History. He seems not to have gone thither before the reign of Nero, as Dr. Pearson acknowledges in chap. viii. Diss. 1. concerning the Succession of the Roman Bishops. We may consult also about this matter Lud. Cappellus in Append. Historiae Apostolicae, and Ant. Pagus in Baron. Episc. on the years of Christ xliii. num. 2 & 3. and liv. num. 3. Yet I had rather say that this Epistle was written later, after St. Paul had preached the Gospel round about Asia; for before that time there do not seem to have been so many Christian Churches, to which St. Peter might write.

II. That by the name of Babylon we are not to understand Rome, but a City properly called by that name, is granted by Dr. Pearson, who also shews that the Chaldean Babylon was at that time desolate, and so that it is the Egyptian Babylon that is here meant. Those who desire to be fully satisfied in this matter, may consult Dr. Pearson himself.

C H A P. I.

Vers. 2. Eἰς ἀπάρνησιν ἔν συνελεγμένοις. Seeing there is a change here made in the form of the expression, and after these words Ἕν ἀναγέμ. ὑπάτος by sanctification of the Spirit, the Apostle immediately subjoins Ἐἰς ἀπάρνησιν unto obedience, I am apt to think the difference of these Propositions must be observed, so as that this should be the sense; elect by Sanctification of the Spirit, that they
might perform obedience, and that they might be sprinkled with the Chapter Blood of Christ. They are said here to be elected, who are separated from the rest of Mankind, not by some unknown Decree, but by the Spirit of Sanctification, whereby their Lives are amended, that they may become the People of God.

In the mean time I wonder here at Dr. Hammond, who compares ἴππαλον and προκαλομεν with one another, as if they were both joined with αἰματος Ἰωνας Χεστι, and were taken in a Passive sense. For ἴππαλον, when the Discourse is about one that obeys, is always taken Actively, and cannot here be taken otherwise. Besides, ἴππαλον is not joined with αἰματος, but stands alone; but καταστασις is connected with αἰματος, and is taken in a Passive sense, for we do not sprinkle the Blood of Christ, but are our selves sprinkled with it. The thing is clear, and no one here could have stumbled, but our Author; who in these Annotations on the General Epistles, has surpassed himself in barbarousness of style.

Verf. 4. Ἐἰς ὑμᾶς.] In this place I shall remark what is elsewhere often observable in these Writings, viz. that the Apostles frequently begin a sense without continuing it, and no otherwise connect their Discourse than with the last words of the former Period, and the beginning of the next; so as on occasion of the last word to begin a new sense. For the better understanding of which, I have subjoined some of St. Peter's words, in which those are printed in Capital Letters, which connect the Discourse.

Verf. 4. To an Inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in Heaven for YOU; 5. WHO are kept by the power of God through Faith unto Salvation, ready to be revealed in the last TIME: 6. WHEREIN ye greatly rejoice, tho now for a season (if need be) ye are in heaviness through manifold TEMPTATIONS: 7. That the TRIAL of your Faith being much more precious than of Gold that perisheth, tho it be tried with Fire, might be found unto Praise, and Honour, and Glory, at the appearing of JESUS CHRIST; 8. WHOM having not seen, ye love; 9. Receiving the end of your Faith, even the SALVATION OF YOUR SOULS; 10. Of WHICH SALVATION the Prophets have enquired and searched diligently.

Verf. 5. Σωτηρια ἐπίσημα ἰδορευματικόν εἰς καλχὸ τίτῳ.] Here St. Peter speaks only of eternal Salvation, as the foregoing words manifestly shew: See ver. 4. Nor was there any Salvation revealed to the Christian Jews, scatter'd through Asia Minor, by the destruction of Jerusalem. Our Author speaks every where as if Proconsuls and Pretors had been sent from Jerusalem, not from Rome, into the Provinces of the Ffff
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Roman Empire, who had persecuted the Christians. But certainly the Christians had reason to fear only the Heathen Magistrates, not a few contemptible Jews, to whom no part of the Administration of the Provinces belonged.

Ver. 10. Σωμητα.] That is, of the Salvation of Souls, of which he spake in the Verse before; or of eternal Happiness, which will then only be conferred, when Christ returns from Heaven. Of this Salvation the Prophets enquired; not of a deliverance of the Christians from the fear of the Jews, whom they had no reason to be much afraid of, unless perhaps in Judea. Yet some may object in favour of Dr. Hammond, the following Verse, in which the Discourse is principally about things that happen'd in the time of the Apostles, whence he inferred that σωμητα signified a Deliverance which happened in the same Age. But the learned Doctor did not observe, that the Prophets, who desired to know the time of the last Judgment, did at once covet to know when were to be the sufferings for the sake of Christ, because after them, and not before, Christ was to come to Judgment. And hence St. Peter calls all those things which had already followed, and were afterwards to follow, τὰς μετὰ τὰ ἄτοκα ἔκεις, that is, the glorious things that after them should come to pass; not immediately and all together, but at several intervals, which not only the Apostles, but also the Angels themselves were ignorant of.

Ver. 11. Τὰ ἐις Χριστὸν παθήματα.] This Beza renders, eventuras Chriſti perpessiones, The future Sufferings of Christ, which Grotius follows, and says that διὰ τῆς θανατοῦ is understood, and so εἰς θανᾶς is taken in the foregoing Verse. But εἰς θανᾶς does not signify your, but to you: who profecied of the Grace εἰς θανᾶς to you, that is, to be conferred on you; or which God was about to bestow on you. So also in ver. 4. Salvation reserved in Heaven εἰς θανᾶς, is either until you, or for your sakes. And agreeably, τὰ ἐις Χριστὸν παθήματα must signify the sufferings of good Men for the sake of Christ; which the Prophets obscurely foresaw, and the Glory of Believers that should follow; but of which they knew not the times, only it was revealed to them that they were not to come to pass in their Age. This excellently agrees with the series of St. Peter's Discourse, who speaks of the Afflictions which Christians endured for Religion fake.

Ver. 12. Εἰς ἑτέρους Αγίους συγγενής.] This I understand of the time of the last Judgment, which the Angels do not know. Otherwise, if St. Peter had spoken of a thing already past, he would have said ἐρεβύμεν, desired.
I. Peter.

Ver. 20. Περιεχομένων.] That is, whom God had purposed in him, to send at this time. The Apostle does not say προσήχθης, prefigured, which makes me wonder why Dr. Hammond here speaks of Types and Images. At this rate, the Apostles may be made to say any thing.

CHAP. II.

Ver. 1. Πολλαρι, &c.] Grotius rightly observes that St. Peter here means those Vices which had been very common among the Jews, and with which those to whom he writes had been infected. But our Author, without reason, would have the Vices of the Gnosticks to be intended; which yet at that time, wherein he supposes this Epistle was written, could hardly have infected so many. Besides, the Verb venience to lay aside, shews that the Discourse here is about Vices, with which those to whom St. Peter writes, had been corrupted, in Judaism itself; and not about unknown Vices, against which they were only to fortify themselves.

Ver. 4. Αἴθων ζῷα.] By a Metaphor taken from Plants, which stick yet fast to their Roots, and are nourished by juice ascending from them, Stones which remain still in the Quarry are said to be living. By which Epithet here, I suppose, is meant the firmness of that thing which is signified by the name of a Stone; because nothing is firmer than Stones, still growing in a Quarry, or cleaving fast to a Rock by their Roots. For which reason a steady and inflexible purpose of Mind is compared by Ovid to such a Stone, in Metam. xiv. where he speaks of Anaxaretas:

Durior & ferro, quod Noricus excoguit ignis,
Et saxo quod aedebus VIVUM radice tenetur.

Hermas in his Vision of the Tower, thus describes Christ, Lib. iii. Sim. 9. § 2. In medio campo candidam & ingentem nimi petram ostendit, qua de ipso campo surrexerat; In the midst of the Field, he shewed me a white and huge Rock, which had risen out of the Field itself.

Ver. 12. Note I. In St. Peter's words there is an Ellipsis, common in all the best Greek Writers, who expressing only the Relative Pronoun, leave the Demonstrative to be understood. Thus therefore we must Grammatically explain this Phrase, where the Pronoun to be supplied is expressed in great Letters: "Ινα ὂν καθαράλειτον ὑμῶν, ὡς κακωνίων, ΤΟΤΟ ἐκ ὧν καρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐποτισθήνετε, ἐξέλειστοι ὡς Θεον:  
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that whereupon they speak against you, as evil doers, understanding this more throughly, by your good Works, they may glorify God. In the same manner we must resolve the Phrase, occurring about the same matter in Chap. iii. 16. Εἴνα ἡμεῖς καταλαμβάνων τὸν ὄμην, λέγοντες ΕΝ ΤΟΤΕ, καταλαμβάνων ὑπερβολής: that whereupon they speak evil of you, as of evil doers, IN THIS they may be ashamed, that falsely accuse your good Conversation in Christ.

II. It is true that ἐπέχειν signifies more than δέχεσθαι to see, for it is properly to look into, or understand throughly; for this Verb is immediately derived from ἐπέχω, which signifies a Judge or Witness of the more secret Rites used in Holy Mysteries; the sight of which not only the profane Multitude, but also the Mystae themselves were debarred; which we may learn as from others, so especially from J. Meurfius in his Eleusinia Sacra. I shall produce but one Testimony out of Suidas: Ἰπείνας, ο Ραφερεῖ Παραγγελισμόν: λέγεται κατὰ διέξοδον τινα ὑπερβολής, ὑπερβολής: we are those who took part of the Mysteries; they were called at first Mystae, and the next Year Epoetes and Ephori. Afterwards it follows: Ἐπέχειν, ἰδιώτα πάντες καὶ ἰδιώτα, in which words he seems to intimate that there is the same difference between ἐπέχειν and to know, viz. superficially or externally, as between an Epoetes and Mysta. The same Author hath: ἐπέχειν, ἐπεχομένου, consideration. Therefore I believe we ought to correct the Old Glosses, in which ἐπέχειν is rendered prorspicio, to look forward, whereas it signifies rather perspicio, to look through, as I suppose it should be read. This signification being supposed, there results an excellent sense; for by the words of the Christians, denying that they were ὑπερβολής, the truth could not be understood, which false pretenders to Vertue carefully conceal by deceitful words; but by their good Works, whereby the thing itself is throughly discerned. For it could not but be a good Doctrin which made such good Men, Christ shewing his Disciples how they might distinguish Hypocrites from good Men, faith, beware of false Prophets which will come unto you in sheep's Clothing, but inwardly they are ravenous Wolves: Ye shall know them by their Fruits, Mat. vii. 15. For tho they cunningly dissemble their Wickedness, it is not long before it discovereth itself. But on the other hand, when we see any Man live well, and that for many Years, we easily perceive that Man cannot profess a Doctrin which favours Wickedness.

III. Our Author therefore, without necessity, recurs to Hesychius, and suspects there is a mistake here committed by some Scribe, or that ἐπέχειν is the same with ἐπονεῖν, contrary to all Copies, and the Analogy of the Greek Language. But it is the greatest Absurdity imaginable,
I. PETER.

imaginable, what he says about the Verb ἰματηθή, which never signified su- Chapter
spicere, but only suspicari, to suspect, for which signification there is here
no place. Besides, the Latin suspicere is not to look upon the ground, but
as it were from some low place to look upon another as above us, or
reverence him. Our Author was scarce awake when he wrote this,
and it does not seem to have been written by the same hand with the
rest of his Annotations.

Ibid. Note g. I. No Body will doubt but ὑπῆρπεν πρώκουδα, ἱστούρα, visitation, signifies very often Revenge; but it is as well known that
this word ἰματηθή is ambiguous, and signifies also God's Benefits. So
that we may as fitly understand the day of Visitation, of the time in
which God favourably visits the Heathens, when he converts them to
the Christian Religion; and so the meaning of St. Peter will be: By
your Conversation, so reconcile the Minds of the Heathens to the
Christian Religion, as that they may at last acknowledg its truth,
when God shall more fully set it before their Eyes. The day of Visi-
tation signifies ἐκ ἐκλογὴ the time when the Gospel is more fully and
clearly revealed, as manifestly appears from Luke xix. 44, where Christ,
speaking to Jerusalem, foretells all those evils which afterwards came
upon her; because thou knewest not, faith he, the time of thy Visitation,
ὑπῆρπεν ἱστούρα, that is, wouldst not understand that God called thee, by
my Ministry, to Salvation.

II. The fame of the Christians flight out of Jerusalem, does not
seem to have so much as reached the Ears of the Heathens who lived
in Asia Minor, or the Roman Magistrates, and those that attended
them through the Asiatick Provinces; much less to have been taken
notice of by them as a remarkable Deliverance. For a great while
after the most learned Men among the Romans, did not distinguish
Christians from Jews; as sufficiently appears by Tacitus and Suetonius.
The Halcyonian days, which our Author tells us the Christians enjoy-
ed throughout the whole Roman Empire, after the destruction of
Jerusalem, are mere Dreams.

Verf. 20. Ποῦν βὰ ἐκέντροντος ἔστω; Aeschylus, in his
Seven Captains that went against Thebes, says something very much
like this:

Εἰσὶν ἤκακὴν ἔφη βίδο
καὶ ἐξάκις ἐτέρνης.
εἰσὶν μόνον ἐκ κράζει ἐκ τεκμήρου.
Καὶ ἤκακὴν ἐν Ἰταλίαις ἔστη.

If any one suffer evil, without inmany, well and good; for this is only gain:
among the dead. But for wicked and vile Men [to suffer] cannot be:
Chapter III.

Ver. 24. Note h. If the Apostles words had been, ὅσιον ἔχω τὰ κακά ἡμῶν, who being upon the Tree bare our Sins, there would have been some place for Dr. Hammond's Interpretation. But when St. Peter says, ἀνιπολύω, ἐν τῇ σαφείᾳ αὐτῶ, συν τῷ ἐλαφῷ, he took them up with his Body upon the Tree, it is clearly not so much the expiation of Sins, as the Mortification of them, as the Apostles speak; that is here signified. For St. Peter's meaning is, that our Sins were as it were fastened to the Cross, that is, mortified, when Christ was lifted up upon it: See Rom. vi. 6. ἐν τῇ σαφείᾳ αὐτῶ I render with his Body, because as ἐν and ἐν in Hebrew is frequently so taken, so the Phrase it self will not bear to be otherwise rendered.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 4. Our subtle Author sees here two Hebraisms, where others cannot see so much as one. Το αὐτὸν ἐν κραξίνια, may be said as well in Greek as in Hebrew; and ἐν Σώματον is so true a Greek Phrase, that it was used by Plato, as Henr. Stephanus in Scholia Smatibus has long ago observed.

Ibid. Note b. I. If St. Peter had made mention of αὐτῶν, perhaps there would have been some place for what our Author here says, of the corruption of compounded things; but because he mentions no simpericity, it is nothing to the purpose. Instead of ἑκάστων, he should have written οὔρας, the word used by Homer Iliad. 1. ver. 50. on which Verse the Scholiast makes that remark which Dr. Hammond sets down.

II. The incorruptibleness of a meek and quiet Spirit, wherewith St. Peter would have Women to be adorned, seems to be opposed to two things which are easily corrupted; viz. to the comeliness of the Body, whereof a part is the Hair, which the Apostle had mention'd in the foregoing Verse; and to Apparel, which is a thing much more liable to corruption than Gold, and which he likewise makes mention of. It's plain this Verse is oppos'd to all the foregoing.

Ver. 7. Note c. I. If the alluded place of Scripture were said to signify any thing ἔστιν γυναι, I should not doubt but that γυναι was taken for some secret Sense, which the Jewish Allegorists sought for in the Scripture. But it being said that Husbands ought συναφεῖν ἔστιν γυναι, to dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the Wise as the weaker Vessel; ἔστιν γυναι is to manage the dispositions of Women skilfully and prudently.
II. The examples, which our Author produces, are nothing to the purpose; for they do not contain any mystical interpretation of the places in Genesis, but confectaries deduced from the nature of Matrimony it self, and the plain words of Moses. The place in Ephes. v. 31. 32. I have interpreted, contrary to Dr. Hammond, and I shall not repeat what I have there said.

III. Συναυθίνω properly signifies to dwell together, or to live in the same House, whence it was applied to all the Duties belonging to married Persons; whether the Discourse be about Procreation, or any other conjugal Office. So that the place in Moses concerning multiplying, is no more to the purpose, than Plato’s Fable about the Antient Hermaphrodites. Other things here might be corrected, which I pass by, but shall afterwards touch upon.

Ibid. Note d. Ἀναφημεν τιμίω γυναικι, where the Discourse is about the Duty of a Husband towards his Wife, never signified, to afford her Maintenance; and the τιμίω sometimes comprehends rewarding, it does not signify that alone. It may much more naturally and truly be interpreted to honour her, as who, being the weaker Vessel, is extremly offended even with the bare appearance of Neglect.

Ibid. Note e. There is no doubt but καθισ signifies a Benifit, but some of the places alluded by our Author might a little otherwise be explained, as of John i. 14. I have shewed in a particular Dissertation, [inserted in this Volume.] In this place also καθισ λαις, is vivifying Grace, or the Gospel, of which the Wife is said to have been made partaker no less than the Man, as Grotius has observed. But I had rather read with the Vulgar Interpreter συγκαταγαγματις λαις, for here the Apostle extols not the Man, but the Woman, which in this respect is made equal to the Man. This the series of the Discourse seems to require.

Verf. 15. Ἀναφημεν τιμίω γυναικι. That is, know that God is Holy, or a lover of Sanctity. For this is often the signification of the Hebrew Conjugation Hiphil שֵׁרֵה bikkisch, which is ordinarily rendered διδόν. See my Notes on Gen. ii. 3. This sanctifying God in the Heart is the cause of our Sanctification before Men, spoken of in the following Verse, whereby we openly shew how Holy we esteem God. See Levit. x. 3. and Num. xx. 12. and my Notes on those places.

Verf. 19. Note f. I. On this place, our learned Author has collected a great many things, all which I have neither leisure to examin, nor is it worth my while, especially having interpreted the place here explained, in my Commentary on Genesis. And therefore in a few words I shall say, that the Apostle does not seem here to have
Chapter a respect to the place in Genesis, cited by our Author. It is truly indeed rendered *my Spirit shall not abide in man*, and the thing is to be understood of the Soul of Man, as I have shewn on Genesis. But the Souls of those that lived before the Flood cannot therefore be called *Spirits in prison*, nor can יד jadon or יד jadin, in Hiphil, be by any means deduced from יד neden, which signifies a sheath. It should be read jidon, to be deduced from the Root יד, which Dr. Hammond does not seem to have observed.

II. The νεώμα, by which Christ was raised, is truly understood of the Divinity which was afterwards in him, and was with God before Abraham was, and so in the beginning of all things, as St. John teaches us in the beginning of his Gospel. But νεώμα in φυλάκι flicks *Spirits keeping guard*, that is Angels who φυλάζω keep men, as we are told in Psal. xci. 11. The same are called דיהם birim, watchers, in Dan. iv. 13, which may properly be rendered of in φυλάκι, for watchers and keepers are all one. So that the Divinity is said to have called the Men that lived before the Flood to Repentance, together with the Angels, who admonished Noah to exhort them to a better Life. I should render this place thus: *and being quickned by the Spirit*, *by which he went with the Spirits that watch*, and preached to the unbelieving, &c. When God is about to do any thing among men, he is represented as coming down from Heaven attended with a guard of Angels, of which I have spoken on Gen. i. 27. and xi. 7. and Exod. xx. 1. For this reason coming down with the Angels, to admonish Noah and command him to call men to repentance, he is said to have gone with the *Spirits that watch*: and besides, to have done that which Noah did in his name and by his command. The Example out of St. Paul in Eph. ii. 17. clearly shews, that St. Peter might speak in this manner.

Ver. 20. Note g. I. All that is here said by our Author are vain Conjectures, which have no foundation either in things themselves, or in the use of Scripture; tho’ he often repeats them, and that as very probable. (1) The Verb יסדה signifies, not to believe, not to obey; which is a heinous sin, where the thing to be believed or done is of great importance; and a small one where it is a matter of little moment. Here it signifies a great sin, because the men of the old world would not obey God, calling them by the Ministry of Noah to a better life. (2) Tho’ we can say nothing particularly of the sins of the men who lived before the Flood; yet we may deny that it can be gather’d from the words of Moses that they were corrupted with the sin of ἁδειγμα Sodomy, and other such like. Tho’ they are joined with the Sodomites for their wickedness and πνεόμαι, it does not
not therefore follow that they were both guilty of the same kind of Chapter Impieties, different sorts of wicked men being often joined together, and the same punishments suffered for divers crimes. (3) The Hebrew הָרָה, rapha, and the Greek πωμεία, signify any sort of vice, and therefore it might be put by St. Luke for ἀνεγρία, intemperance, because it is a more general name which comprehends under it the particular, not that those words are ordinarily confounded. (4) It is true that ἀνεγρία and πωμεία sometimes have those significations, which Dr. Hammond attributes to them, as also the Hebrew חָשִׁיב, hashib, used by Moses; but they likewise signify in general any kind of deprivation, or change for the worse, in which sense I shall take the word in Moses, till it be evidently proved that a general signification, in him, can have no place. (5) The word ὅνεν no more signifies Violence than any other sort of Injustice, as I have shewn on Gen. vi. 13. So that what our Author builds upon that signification is vain, as all the rest of his Conjectures which rely upon this foundation. Our learned Author often forges an Interpretation, by heaping together a parcel of very slight Conjectures; afterwards he raises what Superstructure he pleases upon that interpretation; and then lastly speaks of the Conjectures he thence deduces as so many certain Truths. But we ought not only to set bounds to our Conjectures, but especially to the Consequences we deduce from them, if we would not be in perpetual danger of erring. That danger no body here will be in, who shall suppose that the men of the old World were very wicked men; there being in that no conjecture, because it is affirmed by Moses in plain words: but whoever shall attempt particularly to explain what Moses has said in general, and give way in this matter to Conjectures, will find himself in the dark. And this may suffice to have been said briefly against a way of interpreting Dr. Hammond too often takes.

II. It had been better to observe, that from the very Expression of St. Peter it may be gather’d that πολλαὶ ἐν φυλάξι is not to be joined with ἀπεικονίζων; for thus he speaks: ἤς (to wit. πολλαὶ) ἔτι πᾶσ ἐν φυλάξι πολλαὶ, where after ἀς we must repeat ἤς, by which, and by the spirits that watch be preached; to whom? Namely, καταπληκτίως, to them who were sometime disobedient, &c.

Vers. 21. Note h. I. I think ἤς is the true reading, not ἤς; and it might easily be, that some Transcribers not having another Copy to write after, but setting down the words from the mouth of a Prompter might confound ἤς with ἤς. Ἀντίτυπως εἰς τιμιάμα is used just in the same sense as if it were said somewhat like, as the Word is manifestly taken in
Chapter Heb. ix. 24. on which place see my Note. A pattern is called διανομή, from the similitude which it has with the πληροë or κοιμεῖται; whence the vulgar Interpreter translates it similia forma. The other interpretations Dr. Hammond gives of this place are forced.

II. He says indeed truly, that διανομή sometimes signifies contrary, which might be proved from several places in Xenophon, but not that which he alleges out of Hiero; where διανομή is not simply contrary, but dura, hard, severe, that is, severe, as it is rightly rendered by F. Leunclavius.

CHAP. IV.

Verf. 1. Our Author here says that Saint Peter’s phrase in Note a. of this Chapter is hard, and I do not deny it; but I say also that he is a hard Interpreter, if ever any one deserved that name. For here, as one said, lapides loquitur, he speaks stones, not words to mollify hard phrases. The whole sense of this verse depends upon a particular Elegancy arising from the ambiguity of the phrase κατὰ σαρκί, to suffer in the flesh, or to the flesh; which being used of Christ, signifies that he suffered and died in his humane nature, or for the sake of our humane nature, i.e. of men. But when we are said to die or suffer to the flesh, we are understood to be no longer devoted to the flesh, or to the vices of the flesh: and accordingly St. Peter’s meaning is this; seeing I say that Christ has suffered to the flesh, ye also who ought to imitate him as far as ye are able, know that you must suffer to the flesh, in a sense which is agreeable to you, to wit, wholly renounce it: for he that has suffered to the flesh, has ceased from sin. Just such another sort of reasoning we have in Rom. vi. 10, 11, in the place parallel to this. For in that he died (instead of which St. Peter here says suffered) he DIED UNTO SIN once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also your selves to be DEAD indeed UNTO SIN, but alive unto God. Instead of to die unto sin, here is to suffer to the flesh; but both these phrasal have the same ambiguity in them. These places should have been compared, not verse 6. with this, which have no affinity with one another.

Verf. 3. [Alibi post alibi] Grotius on this place says it is idololatriæ quaedam species adesse sodalitiorum sancti, de quibus profecta falsis Diis dantur, & in hae maxime re credibile est Judeos antequam Christiani essent, accommodasse se Gentium moribus: a sort of Idolatry to be present at such common feasts where part of the meat is offered in sacrifice to false Gods; and in this particular especially, it is probable the Jews, before they were Christians, conformed themselves to the manners of the Heathens. And
And I do not deny but this might be done by them, but there having been among the Jews every where a great number of Proselytes, of which many embraced the Christian Religion, I rather think St. Peter has a respect here to these, who had formerly been Idolaters.

Ver. 6. [I.e. κεκυρων μιχείν αθοντος σαρκος, ζῶοι μιχείν αθον πνεύματος.] None but Dr. Hammond could have thought that κεκυρων σαρκος was the same as to die to the flesh, who could digest any impropriety, tho' never so great, in his own stile. But it is much more natural to interpret it; so that they were condemned indeed in the flesh, according to men, that is, put to death by the judgment of men, as to the body; but live according to God in the Spirit, that is, their Souls were made partakers of eternal life by God. This is the usual signification of the words, which ought not to be changed without reason.

Ver. 14. Note f. This is all forced, the meaning is evidently this: If ye are reproached for the name of Christ (that is, because ye will be called Christians) happy are ye; because the Spirit of glory and of God rests with you; that is, those reproaches are so far from being a sign that the Spirit hitherto bestowed upon you by God, and which has brought so much glory to the Gospel, departs from you, that on the contrary it so much the more rests, or will more constantly abide with you, as long as ye stedfastly profess the Christian Religion. The Spirit of glory and, as it is in the Alexandrian Manuscript, of power, εἰ θαυμάζων, is the Spirit of Miracles, which was conferred upon Christians. θαυμάζων often signifies Miracles, and θαύμα the same. See my Notes on Exod. xvi. 7. and John i. 14.

Ver. 15. Note g. As I do not scruple disagreeing with our Author, when the matter seems to require it, so I am ready to commend his inventions when they are such as this interpretation. Ἀλλοτελεωσισκοτος is in all probability the same with ἄλλωτελεωσισκοτος, that is, who does or takes care of other men's business; by which word the Greeks signify those who usurp other men's offices in a Commonwealth. Plato lib. iv. de Repub. where he at large proves that all Orders of men in a Political Society have a certain and determinate business, which they ought to take care of, and that therein consists the justice and peace of a Commonwealth, towards the end says, that the contrary is injustice.
Chapter V.

Ver. 1. Σταμπεστύτες.] Thus St. Peter calls himself, out of modesty, not because he executed any where the Office of a Bishop, who was invested with a much higher, viz. that of an Apostle. Bishops or Elders, properly so called, had the oversight but of one Church, from which they were not to depart; but the Apostles were Bishops and Elders of all the Churches in the World, and could not be confined to one particular place. Besides, he did not write this Epistle from Rome, but from Babylon a City of Egypt, as learned men have shewn, and I have observed at the end of the Premonition to this Epistle.

Ver. 3. Note b. I. The Verb πουμαίνω to feed, is indeed truly here used to signify the Office of a Bishop, and ποιμίνιον flock, to signify the Church; but it does not therefore follow that the rest of the words here used are taken from Shepherds. No body ever said that Shepherds, properly so called, are ποιμενι of the Sheep, when he going before, they follow him, except Dr. Hammond. No body would say that ινναξις and ομοιοί are applicable to Sheep, properly so called, which belong to reasonable Creatures; not at all to Sheep, which are forced to follow with blows, unless they go along with the rest by natural instinct.

II. It is true indeed that, whilst the Roman Commonwealth stood, the Roman Magistrates chose their Provinces by lot, which therefore might...
might be called their lots, to whom they fell by lot. But I can't tell Chapter
whether, among Latin Writers, or those Grecians that have written about the Roman Affairs, for s or ἔνωσις, are ever used for a Province; at least as I never read any such thing, so I could not find any example of it in the Writings of Learned men, who do not use to omit such things. I dare also affirm, that no Greek Writer ever said ἔνωσις in Κλίσεις, for that which is, to vex Provinces by Tribute or Extortion.

III. Our Author seems to have believed a Fable, which some Writers of no repute formerly divulged, about the division that was made of the World by Lots among the Apostles; which even Baronius himself did not absolutely give credit to. Κλίσεις Ἀποστόλων, in Acts i. 25. is part of the Apostleship, not a Province which Matthias obtained by Lot. See Dr. Hammond himself on that place. He had much better here have followed Grotius, whom the Reader may consult.

Ver. 5. Ἀλλὰς ἵππος ἑαυτὸν καταλαμβάνω.] Ye younger, faith he, be subject to the elder; and all be subject one to another: that is, let the younger give way to the elder, and comply with their Admonitions; and the elder, on the other hand, shew themselves courteous to the younger, not scrupling to yield to them; and comply with them, when there is a just occasion. Here the discourse is about an ἐνεπιπληθωμένον which is a consequent of Meekness and Courteousness, and whereby we easily yield and comply with one another; not about that Obedience which is due to Church-Governors, from those who bear no Office in the Church. Therefore the Apostle says, A L L be subject one to another; which shews him to speak of a thing that belongs to every one; and which is a mutual duty. See my Note on Jam. v. 16, and Eph.

Ver. 13. Note d. See what I have said about this matter on the Premonition.

ANNO.
ANNOTATIONS
ON THE
Second Epistle General of St. Peter.

At the end of the Premom.] For my part, as I profess myself to be of Dr. Hammond's Opinion as to the Apostle Peter's being the Writer of this Epistle; so I cannot forbear saying that our learned and pious Author deals a little unfairly with Hugo Grotius. I. He suspects here and elsewhere, without reason, that the Posthumous Annotations of Grotius had not past his review before they were published, as also that there were some things mixed with them by another hand, contrary to his real sentiments. But it appears both by Grotius his Epistles, lately published, and others, that the learned J. Mercer, a man of unquestionable integrity, received all these things from Grotius himself, and his Widow, to be set forth, and published them as he had received them. But Grotius is here and elsewhere mistaken. As if that Learned man had been exempted from all danger of error! It's plain all these things have one and the same style, and are written in the same strain; and I do not think it would have been an easy matter in France, or elsewhere, to find a man that could have obtruded his own works instead of Grotius's upon the more judicious sort of Readers. II. Besides, why did Dr. Hammond not take notice that there are other reasons, for which both antient and later Writers have suspected this Epistle, drawn from the stile, which is not like that of the former Epistle? Did not he know that Jof. Scaliger also, who was afterwards followed by Cl. Salmasius, thought this Epistle to be supposititious? Methinks all this may much extenuate Grotius his error, who only studied for new arguments to confirm the opinion of those great men. III. What our Author allidges out of Chap. iii. 1. to prove that this is a second Epistle of St. Peter, is of no force, if that Chapter it self be a second Epistle of Simeon, as Grotius conjectures, whom he ought to have consulted. IV. The comparing of Grotius his Annotations on Mat. xvii. with those he has on Chap. i. 17. of this Epistle, does not prove that
II. PETER.

that these were written by another hand; because Grotius might Chapter have changed his Opinion, as he plainly here acknowledges. If Dr. Hammond had lived longer, and carefully reviewed his own Annotations, I doubt not but he would have alter’d a great many things which I have corrected in him. V. They that have rejected this Epistle as falsely attributed to St. Peter, have not stuck to say that the Person of that Apostle is here ill represented, Scaliger having ventured to affirm that it is commentum veteris Christiani orio suo abutentis. The invention of some antient Christian who did not know how to employ his time. VI. Grotius did not infer from Simeon Bishop of Jerusalem’s writing this Epistle, as he supposed, that it was written after the destruction of Jerusalem; but on the contrary, from its being written after the destruction of that City, that we must find out some Writer who survived it, to whom this Epistle might be attributed, and whom he thought to be this Simeon, because of the likeness of the name. VII. It cannot be denied that the Christians, who had read Mat. xxiv. did not expect the consummation of all things before the destruction of Jerusalem; but it did not therefore follow that the last Day of all the World was immediately to follow that Destruction. So that tho the Christians were here commanded to wait patiently for the last Judgment, it would not follow that this Epistle was written after the demolishing of Jerusalem. This I had rather say, than deny there is any mention here made of the last Judgment, as Dr. Hammond does with the greatest confidence, in opposition to most other Interpreters. VIII. Our Author followed, as he ordinarily does, Cæs. Baronius, as to the year of Christ in which St. Peter suffer’d Martyrdom. But Ant. Pagi contends that it happen’d in the year of Christ LXV, and Dr. Pearson in LXVIII, whom I choose to follow. But if we suppose St. Peter died at Rome, in the Year which Dr. Hammond thinks, and that he wrote this Epistle a little before his Death, it cannot be said that the Jewish War was then approaching, which began in the xiith of Nero, and in the iid of Cestius Florens President of Judea, and of Christ LXVI, and in the Month of May. See Dr. Pearson’s Annales Paulina.

CHAP. I.

Ver. 3. Instead of ἄρα δεινν ἐκ ἀποστόλου, the Alexandrian Copy and others read ἢ ἀν δεινν ἐκ ἀποστόλου, by his own Glory and Virtue, propria gloria & virtute, as the Vulgar Latin also hath it. Which way soever of these we read it, the sense will be the same. Christ, namely, hath called us ἔλεγξα, καὶ ἐλεγγα, by the extraordinary...
Chapter 1.

nary Miracles which he wrought, as Dr. Hammond well observes; and by his Virtue, that is, by his most holy Example, whereby we are as much affected, as by his preaching; nay without which all his preaching would be vain and insignificant. They are mistaken who by καλοπαρά here understand God the Father, because it is to be understood of Christ, who himself called the Apostles and first Disciples, whom he won to himself not only by the excellency of his Doctrine, but by the Miracles he wrought, and the Sanctity of his Life. Besides, οὐδὲν no where signifies ὄνειρος, power.

Ver. 4. Αἰσθήσει.] By the Miracles and Virtue of Christ are said to be given unto us great and precious Promises; because they accompanied the Word he preached, and added weight to it; without which it would have had no greater influence upon Men than the Doctrines of Philosophers, which did not work upon many, because there were no Miracles wrought in confirmation of them, and they themselves often contradicted them in their Lives.

Ibid. Note b. I. No one will doubt but that ἀθύπηλη often signifies a desire of unlawful fleshly Pleasures, and, if the Discourse be about that, of those which are contrary to nature; but that it may be thought to have those extraordinary significations, the circumstances of the place must require it. Otherwise it may be reasonably thought that word is taken in general for any Desire or Lust whatsoever. The same may be said of the word ὕβδεις, which signifying any corruption of Manners, does sometimes peculiarly denote what our Author here supposes to be refer'd to. But I see in this place no circumstance which should oblige us to take those words in any other than a general sense. For the Apostle speaks of that amendment of Life to which Christ called all Men; and therefore it is probable that the Corruption through Lust, which is in the World, signifies any sort of Vice which Christ would have us renounce.

II. To corrupt a Youth, where the Discourse is about a Man, and unnatural Lust, signifies what our Author says; but when young Men are said to corrupt a Maid, all we can think is meant by it, is the deflowering her, as in the Passage cited out of Palladius. The corruption which Socrates was accused of, was nothing but a depravation of Manners and Temper, not that peculiar Wickedness which our Author speaks of. This appears from the Apology of Socrates, written by Plato. And in the same sense we must understand the words of the counterfeit Epistle of Heraclitus to Hermodorus, as appears only by the Passive voice used by the false Heraclitus; for such an abuse could not be put upon Heraclitus, who was then well stept in Years. In the places
ces of the New Testament, there is no reason why we should depart from the general signification of Corruption. So that it would have been better if Dr. Hammond had here followed Grotius.

Verf. 3. *The aether*.] Our Author, after Grotius and others, seems to have rightly interpreted *aether* here by *aerpeia* in his Note on vers. 3. But he did not carefully enough read the place of Euripides in Stobæus his Florileg. Tit. vii. for the first Verse is produced out of his Bellerophon, the last out of Euripides his *Ægeus*, and should be divided into two Dimensions, as it is in Grotius his Edition.

Ibid. *Note c.* Because our learned Author often speaks of this *γνώσεως*, and the *Gnosticks*, to whom I have shewn that he refers a great many things without necessity, and in this place, lets himself more particularly to explain the original of their Name; it will not be amiss, if I also treat here of that matter in a few words.

I. I cannot deny but *γνώσεως*, which is a general name for any sort of Knowledge or Learning, is sometimes taken properly for Christian Knowledge, and where the Discourse is about the Mystical sense of Scripture, for the understanding of Mysteries. It is used several times in this sense in the Epistle of Barnabas, as I have thereon observed. But I should not compare the Gift of the Holy Ghost, by which the Minds of the Evangelical Prophets were fitted to understand obscure places of Scripture, with the Jewish *Cabbala*. For this without any regard had to the literal sense, taken from the proper or metaphorical signification of words, and the series and occasion of the Discourse, deduces *any thing out of any place of Scripture*, and relies either upon trivial reaonings to prove what it asserts, or very uncertain Tradition; so that if any deny it, there is no means left to convince them, and those that believe it do so upon insufficient grounds, and may be made to believe anything, tho' never so unreasonable. But the Christian Prophets, who received their Knowledge from the *Spirit of Truth*, alluded nothing out of Scripture that was not in it, and could not be deduced out of it by Grammatical Reasons. Otherwise Prophecies must have been explained by Prophecies, and the new Prophets attested to by Miracles, to make it believed, that such a thing was contained in the Old Prophets, because they affirmed it to be so, which otherwise no Man could have seen in them; which method of acting does not seem worthy of the Spirit of God; as I have shewn out of a learned Man on Matt. i. 22. I acknowledge that in the Writings of the Apostles, there are several interpretations of places of Scripture more like Cabbalistical than Grammatical ones; but wherever we find them, they are used only as Arguments to con-
vance the Jews, and in compliance with their Opinions and Practices, not as demonstrations to Perils of different Sentiments.

II. It is very true that the word γνῶσις sometimes signifies a profound knowledge of the Christian Religion, and so is taken in a good sense, as manifestly appears from Clemens Alexandrinus, who often so uses that word, both elsewhere, and in Strom. Lib. vi. out of which I shall produce a few words, so much the rather, because from them we may gather the reason why the Apostle here joins Knowledge with Faith and Virtue. Now he in pag. 648, speaks thus: Ταξιωμα γίνεται (συνώνυμον τοις γνωστοις) πάντων ἡτίδηπον οἷς καὶ πάντων ἀληθινῶς βεβαια καταλήψει καρπωμένων, καὶ οὗτος οἷς ἡμών ἀνέφερα, ἐν ὑποτάξει γνωσιν, ἵνα ἰδώμεθα Ἰδακύς, Πέτρος, Ἰωάννης, Παῦλος, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Απόστολοι: we dare say (far here is the Faith enlightened with Knowledge) that a true Gnostick knows all things, and understands all things, having a firm comprehension, even of those things whereof we doubt; such as were James, Peter, John, Paul; and the rest of the Apostles. Then he adds, γνῶσις τὸ πλήρη ἐκ σωφροσύνης, ἐν ἐδίκησιν κυρίας, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων σαρκικώς ἡμῶν; καὶ ἐν τῷ γνώσιν ἐνδοιασμον ἐνεργεῖν ἐν καθεστάσεις, ἐν ὑποτάξει γνωσιν, ἵνα ὑπερήφανος εἰς ἀναφανσίαν ἔχησθε; for Prophecy is full of knowledge, as having been given by the Lord, and by the Lord again manifested to the Apostles. And is not Knowledge a property of a reasonable Soul, trained up to this, that by Knowledge it may be entitled to Immortality? Afterwards he shews that Action must be preceded by Knowledge; and contends that nothing is ἀνατάλλωσιν incomprehensible; which is true, if we speak of things necessary. For whatever it is necessary for us to understand, to attain Salvation, we can undoubtedly understand. At length he thus describes a Gnostick: ὁ γνωσίσις τοῦ ἐκείνος, ἔστιν λόγος, τὸ ὄνομα ἐκτάλλωσιν διαίρεσιν τῶν ἀλλων αὐτῶν καταλαμβάνει προστάτες ἐν ἐν ἐκτάλλωσιν τῆς ὑποτάξει τῆς Θεοῦ, οὗτος ἐν ἐκτάλλωσιν—Εἰ δὲ καὶ πεποίηται τοιαύτης τῆς ὑποτάξεως εἰς ἐκτάλλωσιν εἰς εἰς ἐκτάλλωσιν εἰς ἐκτάλλωσιν εἰς ἐκτάλλωσιν εἰς ἐκτάλλωσιν χρόνων ἐν τῇ σφαίρᾳ μαθητῶν: And the Gnostick, of whom I speak, comprehends those things which seem to others to be incomprehensible, believing there is nothing incomprehensible to the Son of God, and therefore nothing which cannot be taught——If any desire the knowledge of many things, he knows what past of old, and conjectures what will be hereafter. A Disciple of Wisdom can discover the deceitfulness of words, and unfold Riddles; he foreknows also Signs and Wonders, and the events of Times and Seasons. So that γνῶσις is taken for a more exquisite degree of Knowledge, and γνωσικός, a Person profoundly knowing. Hence St. Peter exhorts Christians to join to their Faith γνῶσιν, that is, the highest degree of Knowledge possible.

III. It appears indeed, from the Writings of the Apostles, that
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gages signifies such a Knowledge; but I don’t know whether it hence follows that the Disciples of Simon were by an Antonomasia, called even at that time Gnosticks, or assumed to themselves that name. There is no place alluded from whence this can be concluded. Besides, I don’t know whether all that Epiphanius says of the later Gnosticks be true, much less do I believe him in everything concerning the Antient. Epiphanius is not a Person whose affirmation should easily be credited, where he accuses and inveighs against the antient Hereticks. Yet I do not take upon me to defend the cause of these Men, of whom there are no Records come to our hands: But I leave the matter undecided.

IV. It is true indeed that in the Epistle of Barnabas many places of the Old Testament are explained Allegorically, and several Mysteries unfolded, which otherwise no one would have discerned in them. But they are interpretations much more like the Jewish Cabbala, and the greatest part of them undoubtedly vain, if not also false; but yet fit for the Jews of that Age, according to whose Opinions rather than to Truth, Barnabas reasons. So that I should not account this γέγονε of his, the same with that Christian Knowledge which is so highly extolled by Clemens. I would allady some examples out of him, but that the Epistle of Barnabas was this last Year M.DC.XCVII, published at Amsterdam, with all the Annotations of all Interpreters upon it.

V. In many places indeed St. Peter opposes the Errors, which in his time were spread among Christians, and the evil Practices of some Men; but whether those Errors sprang from Simon Magus, and were defended by some particular Sect, who were notorious for their Wickeddness, is to me uncertain.

Ver. 16. Note e. I. The first circumstance, from which our Author gathers that the Transfiguration shadowed out the coming of Christ to punish the Jews, and deliver the Christians who dwelt in Palestine, is altogether vain; because there were at least six days interval between the Discourses he mentions, and the Transfiguration, as will appear by St. Mark Chap. ix. 2. if we compare his words with Luke ix. 28. It is not likely that Christ spent so many days silently, without teaching his Apostles any thing all that while, or inculcating upon them what he had already said; which if he did, there will be no force in Dr. Hammond’s reasoning, which is grounded only upon this, that the forementioned discourses were made by Christ, immediately before his Transfiguration.

II. Secondly, what he here says about the θεος of Christ, and his com-
Chapter paring it with the *Exodus* of Moses, are mere niceties, as easily rejected as they were invented. I have shewn on Luke ix. 31, that ἔξοδος there signifies a warlike expedition against the obstinate Jews.

Ver. 17. Note f. Our learned Author trifles, when he subtilly distinguishes the μεγαλειόν, Majesty or Greatness of Christ, from the Voice that was heard. For that Voice was no small part of the μεγαλειόν of Christ, because thereby he was pronounced the Son of God, and commanded to be heard. This is clear from the very order of the Discourse: we were witnesses of his Majesty. λέγω Γιὰ, FOR be received from God the Father, Honor and Glory, such a Voice coming to him. By this very Voice, Majesty, Honour and Glory were conferred on Christ. St. Peter says they were ἑκατέρα and διόνυσα, because in the Transfiguration they had seen some things, and heard others. I had rather with Grosius, after λέγω understand ἦν ἦν, than look here for a Hebraism, were it only for the Particle ἦ, which in such an order of words cannot be joined with an absolute Case.

Ver. 19. φανοντι εκ ἀνχυμευσι τοιον.] In the first place, I would have φανοντι here to be understood in the Preterimperfect Tense; as if St. Peter had said ἀληγοὶ ἀνεία, a Candle which shined, that he may be thought to speak of the Time which preceded the Coming of Christ. Secondly, I should render ἀνχυμευσι τοιον, with the Vulgar and Beza, caliginosum, a dark, or obscureum locum, an obscure place, not that ἀνχυμευσι properly signifies obscure, which primarily signifies dry and nasty; but because Dungeons which are nasty, are also dark, therefore ἀνχυμευσι here is not nasty, but dark. And the time which preceded the Coming of Christ is fitly called dark, compared with that which succeeded it; as the Knowledge which Men had of Religion under the Old Testament, is aptly resembled to the light of a Candle, in comparison of the Sun of Righteousness Christ Jesus, which being then actually risen, I should render the words of St. Peter thus: *Until the Day dawned, and the morning Star arose in your Hearts.* St. Peter here tells the Christians, they did well that they read the Prophets; not as the only Rule of Faith, and a perfect and full Revelation of the Will of God; but as Books which they formerly, when they had nothing more clear and full, made use of with great Advantage, till Christ came and taught them all things. Our Author strains this place in his Paraphrase, whilst he applies it to the destruction of Jerusalem.

Ibid. Note g. 1. It is true that ἡγεῖλα signifies the Mind in Scripture, but it is not opposed here to Heaven, than which nothing could have been said more flat; when the thing it self shews, to any one of common sense, that the morning Star is to be understood in a metaphorical
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cal sense. The morning Star, and the Day here signifie, the Doctrine of the Gospel, compared with the Old Testament; which is said to be risen in our Hearts, when it is not only heard, but sinks down into our Minds, so that we heartily believe it.

II. To encourage the Christians to bear patiently the Persecutions which they suffer'd in Judae, in expectation that their Persecutors should be destroyed, it had been improper to propose to them the Prophecies of the Old Testament about that matter, which were very obscure; when they had clear ones deliver'd by Christ, recorded in Mat. xxiv. and the parallel places of the other Evangelists.

III. Tho I will not deny but the Day of Christ, and the Day, are used for a time of Vengeance; yet wherever these Phrases occur, we ought not presently to apply them to that time, as our Author too often does. Because he had interpreted some places of the New Testament not unhappily, about some vile Men whom he calls Gnosticks, there is scarce ever anything said about Impostors, or wicked Men, where he does not think the same Persons to be spoken of. The like fault he commits almost wherever the Discourse is about the Day, or about the coming of Christ, which he strains to the Vengeance taken upon the Jews, overlooking all Circumstances. For tho in his Paraphrase the series of the Discourse seems to have a respect thereto, that is of no moment, because he adds to the words of the Apostles what he pleases. In this place the morning Star and the dawning Day, are the Gospel, until which the Law and the Prophets continued in force, which were like a Candle in the greatest darkness wherein Mankind lay. Afterwards as the light of a Candle is quite obscured by the light of the Sun, they were not of so great use, but yet not to be despised. The Gospel is often compared to Light, as in Mat. iv. 16. and John i. 5. & seq. The condition also of the Jews before the Gospel, is compared to darkness in the same places. All which clearly enough shew that the Interpretation commonly received, is better than Dr. Hammond's.

Ver. 20. Note h. Ασέβεια signifies the place from whence the Racers started, not ἐσβέεια, the Apostle should have said ἐπίθεων sending but, and not ἔθεσιν sending in, if he had had a respect to that Agonistical Exercise. I had rather interpret ἔθεσιν as it were a loosing of the Tongue or Mouth; for as they are said to have their Tongues tied who cannot speak, so the Mouth or Tongue of those that speak are said to be loosed, εἰκονέω. Rob. and Henr. Stephani will supply us with examples to this purpose in their Thesauri. So that the meaning of St. Peter will be this, that the Prophets did not open their Mouths, or a resolvere, or som ἀνθουσα, of their own accord, but by the Will of God.

*
Vers. 1. "Εστε τα ἐνυπεδικάγλαί."

If the Gnosticks had been already everywhere spread, as our Author both in his Paraphrase and his Annotations often inculcates; St. Peter would never have used the future Tense, there shall be, shall bring in, &c. I wonder Dr. Hammond did not observe this.

Vers. 3. "Ἐν προεξάγεια."

The following Verb, ἐνπροεξάγεια, they shall make Merchandise of you, clearly shews that προεξάγεια here signifies Covetousness, tho our Author, carried away by prejudice, interprets it Filthiness. But I have already confuted him on Rom. i. 29.

Vers. 5. Note a. This observation our Author owed to Sam. Bochart, who treats of the same things more fully in his Phaleg. Lib. i. c. 3.

Vers. 10. "Τὸς ὑπὸ σαρκοῦς."

This Verse is thought by Dr. Hammond to belong to the Gnosticks, whom he supposes to have been by birth Heathens; but it as fitly agrees to those wicked Jews, who took the ready way to destroy themselves, and their Nation by their Seditions, whom Josephus exactly describes in many places of his History of the Jewish War. From this Writer, who was an Eyewitness of what he relates, it certainly appears that there were such Men as those; but it does not appear from any credible Author, that there were in Judæa at that time Dr. Hammond’s Gnosticks.

Vers. 12. Note b. Our Author is mistaken when he interprets the words ἄλωσις and προεξάγεια actively, as appears by the very last word of the Verse. But these as living Creatures, void of Reason, made by nature as ἄλωσις γραμμών to be taken and destroyed, speaking evil of the things which they understand not, shall perish καταφθανόντας in their destruction. For therefore it is said of them that καταφθανόντας, they should be corrupted, not that they should corrupt, because they were like living Creatures, designed by nature to be taken by men and killed. See Grotius on this place.

Vers. 13. Note c. Seeing our Author had begun to borrow from Grotius what he here says, he ought with him to have added that it was read so by the Vulgar Latin Interpreter.

Vers. 14. Note d. Our Author should not have cited, Plutarch de Verecundia, for there is no Book of Plutarch’s which has that Title; but de Vitioso Pudore, ἄνωτη τις. That Rhetorician or Orator was called Amphicrates, as we are told by Longinus de Sublim. cap. iv. on which see Interpreters.
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Ver. 15. Note e. i. Our Author does not speak accurately, when he says that the Chaldeans pronounced $Ain$ γ like $S$, for that is not true, and whenever they wrote that Letter, they pronounced it like the Jews. But his meaning was that γ $Tsade$ is changed into the Guttural $Ain$, and therefore it was possible the former might be sometimes written for the latter; whence it came to pass that לְבָנָא, which is expressed in Greek by λευρός, was written for לְבָנָא befor.

II. If St. Peter here has a reference to the Gnosticks, as our Author thinks, and the Gnosticks had already crept into most Christian Churches, as the Doctor contends; I don’t understand why St. Peter, in the beginning of the Chapter, should use the Future Tense. But if we understand him to speak of the wicked Jews, who had not yet joined themselves to the Christian Assemblies, but yet would join themselves to them after the destruction of Jerusalem, there will be no such difficulty.

Ver. 19. Η ἐνεπάθων τὸν ἐπηλθάντα.] The Apostle here has a respect to the original of Bondage, which was the effect of Victory, and is thus expressed by Justinian in Instit. Lib. 1. Tit. 3. de Jure Personarum; Servi ex eo appellati sunt, quod Imperatores captivos vendere, ac per hoc servare, nec occidere solent. Qui etiam mancipia dicti sunt, eo quod ab hostibus manu capiuntur. Servi — sunt, aut jure gentium, id est, ex captivitate; aut jure civili, cum liber homo, major viginti annis, ad pretium participandum sese venum dari passus est. Servants were so called, because it was the Custom of Commanders to sell their Captives, and to that end servare to keep them, and not kill them. Which were called so Mancipia Slaves, because manu capiuntur, they were taken captive by the Enemy. Men became Servants, either by the Law of Nations, that is by Captivity; or by the Civil Law, when a Free-man above twenty years of Age, to enjoy part of the price, suffers himself to be sold.

Ver. 22. Note g. This Etymology is given by Sam. Bochart in Hieroz. Part 1. Lib. ii. c. 57. but he adds others altogether as likely.

C. H. A. P. III.

Ver. 1. Αὐτῷ ἡμῖν, ἂγιοντι, ἄντειν ὑμῖν γεφων ἐκσολεί. Grotius, left these words should be thought to shew that St. Peter wrote two Epistles, of which this was the second, contends that this is the beginning of a new Epistle of the same Simeon, and that the former was comprehended in two Chapters. But it was never the Custom to send Epistles without any Inscription, tho they were written to those to whom others had been sent before. This appears from the second Epistle.
Chapter [ref. to the Corinthians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, &c. So that there is no sufficient reason why we should think this to be the beginning of a new Epistle.

Vers. 2. Τάν εἰρήμενον ἀκήρατον.] That is, of the Doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, which our Author without reason interprets only of the destruction of Jerusalem; who on this Chapter has outdone himself in straining the Scripture, to prevent our thinking that the Apostle here speaks of the end of all things. But a faithful Interpreter ought not to apply general words to a peculiar sense, unless the thing itself, or the series of the Discourse, requires it; which cannot in this place be pretended.

Vers. 3. Εἰς ἄγαν τῇ θησαυρῷ.] That is, as Grotius well observes, hereafter, which I have already elsewhere suggested: see my Note on Gen. xlvi. 1. But our Author interprets it of the last Age of the Jewish Commonwealth, which was present at that time wherein he supposes this Epistle to have been written. So that, according to Dr. Hammond's Hypothesis, St. Peter ought not to have said, ἤδεικνυται, but ἠδοχεῖν came; for those wicked Men which the DoBor thinks are here meant, must have already come, or they never would come. Besides, who can bear that δυσμυθησαν Scoffers, should be said to signify a mighty defection from the Christian Religion? And what defection happened between the XIIth year of Nero, in which the Jewish War began, and Jerusalem was first besieged by Cestius Gallus, and the second and last Siege of that City? When the Jews were reduced to great straits by the Romans, and there were evident Tokens of their approaching Destruction, there was no reason why any should revolt to them; nor do we read that the Romans at that time in Judæa compelled the Jews, or the Christians, to renounce their Religion, and worship the Roman Gods. Nay when the Christians had seen the Prophecy of Christ fulfilled, concerning the first Siege of Jerusalem, and after that was raised, had retired to Pella; there was no reason left to doubt concerning that Coming of Christ which our Author here speaks of. And this happen'd in the XIIth year of Nero, from which time the Jews suffer'd innumerable Calamities; for in the beginning of the next Year Vespasian came with an Army. Our Author had not well consider'd this, when he thought there might be Scoffers in the XIIth year of Nero, when the Jews were to be destroyed, and all the signs of their Destruction were then present. Nay the most discerning part also of the Jews themselves had a great while before begun to think that their Affairs were in a bad Condition, as we are told by Josephus in Lib. vii. of the Jewish War, cap. 12. and elsewhere.

Ibid.
Ibid. Note a. I. I shall say nothing about the signification of the Chapter word ὅτι λέγειν in the Old Testament, but whether St. Peter has a respect to that I do not know. Yet however that be, the Scoffers mentioned by St. Paul were no better than those of old. I am apt to think they were some of the Sect of the Sadducees, or such a sort of men, who denied the resurrection of the dead, and the future judgment; and de- rided those that believed them. That which follows will shew the Apostle had some such thing in his thoughts.

II. Such men must necessarily, unless they disagreed with themselves, walk after their own lusts. For those that expect nothing after death ought in reason to indulge themselves in any sort of pleasure, at least as far as it can do them no hurt in this life.

III. The Apostacy spoken of by St. Paul in 2 Thess. ii. 3. may more fitly be understood of the defection of the Jews from the Romans, against whom they took up arms; than of the Apostacy of the Christians to any other Opinions, as I have shewn on that place. The passage also in 1 Tim. iv. 1. is not necessarily to be understood of those times, because it may very fitly be interpreted of any time after that of the Apostles; for ὃσιος χρόνος signifies any after times. Tho there is some similitude between the deception of these, and those spoken of by Christ in Mat. xxiv. it does not follow they were the same. Nor are there wanting Hereticks, to whom what St. Paul says may very properly be applied.

IV. I will not deny that St. Peter here speaks of the Gnosticks, provided we understand him of those that were after the destruction of Jerusalem, whom the Antients describe. Πρώτον here signifies not first in time, but especially, as Grotius well observes.

Ver. 4. Πρώτον εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν τοῦ παροικίας Αἰγύπτου. That in this place the Apostle has a respect not to the coming of Christ to punish only the Jews, but to judg all mankind, appears by the following words, where these Scoffers say that all things continue as they were from the beginning of the Creation; which does not belong to the Jews, but to all Mankind, whose several Ages had succeeded one another from the beginning of the World. I know our Author thinks there are two objections in this verse, but doubtless he is mistaken; for it is but one, conceived in these words, Where is the promise of his coming? which is confirmed by the following: ἀπὸ τοῦ γαλάξιον, FOR since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the Creation. Which words do not contain a new objection, but an enforcement of the former; for because no change had happened among mankind, generally considered, tho the Prophets were thought to have often foretold the last Judgment,
Chapter therefore the Scoffers said, *Where is the promise of his coming?* The Apostles had spoken much more clearly of that coming, and oftener inculcated it than the Prophets; whereby it came to pass, that the objection was with greater show of strength renewed against them. For which reason St. Peter here gives a particular and full solution to it.

Ibid. *Note b.* I. Our Author ought in the first place, to have produced an example, by which it appeared that ἀφ' ἕξ signifies, except *that*, or something like it; for no body will believe him barely affirming what no one perhaps before ever observed.

II. Secondly, those wicked men derided the promises of the divine Judgment, and so of the Resurrection; because since those Fathers, to whom that promise was made, whoever they were supposed to be, not excepting Adam, were dead, there had been always the same succession of men dying and being born, and no Generation hitherto, from the beginning of the World, had been ever raised from the dead, and called to Judgment. That perpetual succession for so many ages had persuaded them, as they said, that it would always be so, and that the coming of Christ to judge Mankind was promised in vain. To that objection St. Peter first answers, that as the Earth had been of old created, with the water, which was mixed with it, and whereby wicked men had been punished in the time of Noah: so it would once be that the Earth being dissolved by means of Fire, which is in nature, had men should be punished thereby. Which is just as if he had said, that the change which will hereafter be made with fire, ought as easily to be believed, as that which had been of old made with water. This is clearly the sense of this place, which shews the discourse to be about the end of the whole World, not of the Jewish Commonwealth only.

III. If the Unbelievers, St. Peter opposes, had rejected only that which was said concerning the ruin of the Jewish State, they would not have used such an argument as this, that there had no change happened since the beginning of the World; because no one was so sensible as to deny that both many other Commonwealths had been destroyed, and the Jewish State had been overthrown in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, to omit other calamities that befell it. All, except a few furious Jews, were afraid of the destruction of that Commonwealth by the Roman Power, which at that time not only lay heavy upon its neck, but was also an enemy to it. St. Peter likewise would not have recourse to the Deluge to prove that the Jewish Commonwealth was to be destroyed, but to the History of that Commonwealth, and to the power of the Roman Empire, and the actions of the Romans. I need say no more in so clear a case.
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Verst. 5. Note e. I had rather, with Grotius and others, interpret Chapter 1-2 of wilful ignorance; for they who objected such things against the Apostles, were not unacquainted with the story of the Flood, because that story was known by the Heathens themselves. Nor could our Author think it was unknown to the Jews or Gnostics, to whom he attributes the foregoing objection. And therefore he interprets the word in his Paraphrase, not of ignorance but of carelessness, or want of consideration. But I prefer the former interpretation, for the forementioned reason.

Verst. 7. Note e. I. It is true that the whole is sometimes expressed by all or some of its parts, by which no more is signified, than by the single name of the whole. But I don’t think that the heavens and the earth any where signifies either the earth alone, or this sublunary region. At least no place ever occurred to me in which these words were so taken. See also my Note on Col. i. 20.

II. Our Author in his Annotation says, that the words, heaven and earth, signify Jerusalem, but in his Paraphrase he makes no mention of their having any such signification. Which yet he ought to have done, if that were true which he had observed on the foregoing verses concerning the objection of the Scoffers. For if St. Peter here speaks of the conclusion of the whole World, he spake before of the same. But if he spake before of the destruction of Jerusalem, he discourses of the same also here. So that the 7th verse, as it is explained in the Doctor’s Paraphrase, has no connexion with the foregoing.

Verst. 8. Mia ἡ δεδομένη καὶ οὐκ ἡ ἰδιαίτερη.] If our Author’s mind had not been prejudiced and taken up with a false interpretation, he would easily have seen that St. Peter in these words had a respect to the delaying of the last judgment. For that which he aims at in them is, that a delay perhaps of many ages might not seem long, and that no one might therefore cry out, Where is the promise of his coming? No such thing could be said about the destruction of Jerusalem, which St. Peter certainly knew would shortly happen, because of Christ’s prediction, and which, when the Jewish War began, discerning Perils might almost foresee. It is absurd to speak of a thing that is to come to pass in a short time, as if it were at the distance of several thousand years, as St. Peter here would speak, according to Dr. Hammond’s opinion. If he had thought of the extinction of the Jews, he would have said undoubtedly that the thing would come to pass in a little time, and that there was no need of any long patience.
Chapter III. Note f. This interpretation of our Author is false in all respects. ἠφίκον is properly ἱβίλο, στίρεο, to hiss, to gnash or rattle; and ἠφίκατο is not simply with a noise, but with a rattle. This is the proper signification of it, which ought not, without reason, to have been forsaken. Besides, ἀφίκατο is not swiftly, but vehemently, in Phavorinus. The reason also, taken from the comparison of a Thief in the night, is of no force: for it is not said that the day of the Lord will come ἠφίκατο, as a thief in the night; but that the Heavens will pass away with a rattling noise, when that sudden and unexpected day comes as a Thief. The coming of the Lord is compared to the coming of a Thief, because both are sudden, not because the Lord will punish the Wicked without noise.

II. It is utterly false, that the Destruction of the Jews was so sudden and unexpected: for certainly after Vespasian had entered into Judea, it was not difficult to conjecture that there was an end of the Jewish Commonwealth, to those who were able to compare the strength of the Jews with that of the Romans. Even before, under the Government of Gessius Florus, and when Cestius Gallus came into Judea, the Anger of the Romans was loudly enough proclaimed against the Jews.

Ibid. in Note g. Col. 2. Lin. 2. after the words, testified by Predictions. By the way here I shall advertise the Reader, that the Chapters of Josephus are to be understood according to the Latin Division, and that there is a fault in the citation of the Passage where Josephus speaks of the burning of the Temple, which is said to be in lib. 3. c. 9. when it is in lib. 7. which seems to be a mistake in the Print. Besides, what Dr. Hammond here says about the fatal day, as out of Josephus, is grounded only upon the Latin Translation of Sig. Gelenius, which runs thus: Evolutisque temporibus, aderat fatalis dies, qui erat decimus mensis Augusti. But in the Greek the thing is otherwise worded; to wit, μεθύομαι εἰς εἰσαγωγόν, χρησμὸν ἀλλάξων, εἰς εἰσαγωγοὺς ἔλεγεν. And their fate came, in the revolution of times, in the tenth day of the month Lous. Which shews that Dr. Hammond's observation is vain. But let us hear him straining the words of St. Peter to the Destruction of Jerusalem.

Ibid. At the end of that Note. I. When our Author refers us to his Premonition, for proof that St. Peter here speaks of the excision of the Jews, and not of the end of the World, he makes a mere circle; for what he says there is grounded upon these violent interpretations, which if false, what he affirms in his Premonition must of necessity be false also. It is true indeed, that the Prophets,
when they describe a great change in the Affairs of an Empire or Chapter
Commonwealth, make, if I may so speak, Heaven and Earth meet together (cœlum terra miscet) and use such like Phrases. But here
the circumstances of the place shew that the Discourse is about the end of all things. See my Notes on Ver. 7. and 8.

II. I acknowledg the word σωφρία frequently signifies the Planets,
and the signs of the Zodiack, as is at large shewn by Aeg. Menagius on Lib. vi. S. 102. of Diogenes Laertius. But it being added here to the
Heavens, there can be no doubt but we are to understand the Starry
Heaven, in which those elements are. The word σωφρία, when it is
alone, is ambiguous, and may be understood as well of the lower regi-
ons as of the upper: but when it is joined with the Planets, or the
Stars, it ceases to be ambiguous, and signifies the Starry Heaven; as on
the contrary, when it is said the birds of heaven, the word Birds shews
it to signify the air. But it is the greatest absurdity imaginable, be-
cause the σωφρία are in the Starry heaven, to say that that word sig-
ifies what is in the Air, the Clouds, Birds, &c. Which can neither be
made out by reasoning, nor confirmed by any use of the Greek Lan-
guage, or of the sacred Writers.

III. Nor is there any better ground for what our Author says about
the distinct signification of the heavens and the earth; for the style of the
Prophets in this matter is such, as he himself observes on ver. 7. that
every word has not a particular signification, but the whole discourse
one general meaning: But Dr. Hammond when he has any thing to
prove, often takes up every thing that lies in his way, not excepting
those things which elsewhere he himself has confuted.

Ver. 16. Note h. I agree with Dr. Hammond in keeping here to
the ordinary reading. But the rest of what he says is so forced, that
I wonder so learned a man could satisfy himself in that wherein he will
satisfy no one else. It is a mistake that St. Paul in most of his Epistles
speaks of the destruction of the Jews, as I have shewn against our Au-
thor in several places; on the contrary, nothing is more true than that
he ordinarily speaks of the last judgment. It is false that in the destruc-
tion of Jerusalem there was any thing Νωσίντοι, for what was there in it
hard to be understood? Was it strange that a sinful nation should be pu-
nished by God, or that Jerusalem should be demolished, which had for-
merly suffered the like under Nebuchadnezzar? Was it difficult at that
time to understand that the Jews were oppressed by the Romans, whose
subjects they then were? To none certainly but Fools or Madmen.
It is needless to confute what our Author here says, about the fœsis of
St. Paul's discourse from ver. 3. which I have already shewn that he
misinterprets.
II. As it is improbable, considering the thing itself, that Christ did not know the point of time in which Jerusalem was to be destroyed; so it is yet more improbable, that that Destruction was so very unexpected at the time when this Epistle was written, and the whole Jewish Nation had broke out into Rebellion, and divided themselves into several Parties. Whoever reads Josephus of the Jewish War, will easily see that Dr. Hammond invented what he thought would serve to confirm his Hypothesis, and did not take it out of History. Of the place in Acts i. 7. consult H. Grotius.

III. Our Author perpetually speaks of the Destruction of the Gnosticks, as a concomitant of the destruction of the Jews; which would be tolerable, if the discourse were only of those that were in Judea, and feigned themselves to be Jews: But what was this to the Gnosticks that dwelt in other Provinces of the Roman Empire? What did the Calamities which befell Judea concern also the Christians that lived elsewhere, except that they saw the Prophecies of Christ accomplished in them? There was no need likewise of their being carefully admonished, that the particular point of time was unknown wherein Jerusalem was to be burnt, because from the disturbances that were in Judea, they might easily conclude that it was near at hand. The only thing the Apostles could then do in this matter, was to admonish the Jews that had embraced the Christian Religion, and lived elsewhere, that they should not go into Judea, nor enter into Jerusalem, unless they would incur the same danger as threatened Palestine and that City.

IV. Many might abuse those Passages of S. Paul, in which he describes the last Judgment, as if it were near at hand, because the time of it was uncertain. See 1 Thess. c. iv. and v. 1 Cor. xv. and 2 Cor. v. It was now ten years, or more, since he had wrote in that manner to the Thessalonians; from whence some might conclude that he was deceived, and so revolt from the Faith they had received from him. But this was not properly Novuslov, but other circumstances of the Judgment, of which the greatest part are Novusilla to those who judge of them by humane experience. Such things might more easily so speculatively be wrested, than those which Dr. Hammond speaks of; tho' it's true what might not be wrested by ignorant and wicked men; when our learned and pious Author, serving an Hypothesis, has so strangely wrested both this Chapter and many other places of the New Testament, contrary to all the Rules of Grammar, and Accounts of History.
Annotations


At the end of the Premon.] Of the Gnosticks and the last Hour I shall speak on the places where Dr. Hammond treats of them.

CHAP. I.

Ver. 1. "Οὕτως ἀνέπρεπεν." That which had been said and done by Christ from the beginning of the Gospel, is here opposed to the new Doctrines of false Prophets. Besides this, we have an indirect intimation here of the Writer of this Epistle, who was from the beginning with Christ, which was necessary to make an Apostle. See Acts i. 21, 22.

Ver. 5. Note a. I will not affirm, with our Author, that the Apostle here has a respect to the Gnosticks, the disciples of Simon; who did not, as those to whom St John speaks, hope to attain Salvation by Christ, seeing, if what the Antients say be true, Simon opposed his Apostles, and said that he himself was Christ, as we are told by Irenaeus lib. i. c. xx. who also says that Simon affirmed in so many words secundum ipsius gratiam salvati homines, that men were saved by his grace. If St. John had been to oppose Simon, he would in the first place have shewn, that he lied in calling himself Christ. But they seem to be bad Christians, who abused the Gospel which the Apostles preached; which they pretended to have embraced, and whose errors the Apostle here confutes. Light, in the style of the New Testament; signifies holiness; and darkness wickedness. See the Epistle of Barnabas towards the end, where he discourses of the way of light, and the way of darkness.

Ver. 16. Note b. That the Gnosticks, that is the followers of Simon Magus, who did not believe in Christ but Simon, are here referred to;
Chapter I do not think: for these refused to be accounted the disciples of the Apostles, nor did the Apostles join themselves to them; and therefore St. John would not have confuted them, as he here does, for it is sufficiently manifest, that he confutes men that lived among the Christians. I rather think he has a respect to some Jews, who were not thoroughly sensible of the sins they had committed whilst they were Jews, and in which they still lived after their conversion to the Christian Religion. These ought to acknowledge that they had sin, that is, as St. John afterwards speaks, that they had sinned, and so had deserved punishment for their past sins; which unless they did, they made Christ a liar, because they denied they stood in need of his Redemption, when he had taught that he came to redeem all the World; for he that has not sinned, is liable to no punishment for sin, and needs not a Redeemer. Besides, upon that confession of their sins, it was consequent that they should renounce them, if they would have fellowship with Christ, as he speaks in verse 7. that is, be his true disciples, whom he would make partakers with himself of eternal happiness. By this we may understand why St. John says he writes these things to Christians, that they sin not. But tho' he uses this phrase ἔχοντες ἔργα τοῦ Κυρίου, to know Christ, it does not presently follow he alludes to the Gnostics, because all who professed to embrace the Gospel, said that they therefore embraced it, because they knew that Jesus came from God. Such allusions must not be recurred to, but when the thing cannot well be understood without an allusion. Otherwise whenever the Apostles use the Verb ἔχειν, where the discourse is about the knowledge of the Christian Religion, or those things which concern it, we must always recur to the Gnostics, who it is not certain in the Apostles age were so called. Besides, to find out Dr. Hammond's conceptions in St. John, innumerable things must be supplied, and added; than which way of interpreting, nothing can be imagined more uncertain.

CHAP. II.

Ver. 1. Προφητείας τοῦ Κυρίου τοῖς ἁγίοις τῇ καταφρέν. What our Author says in his Paraphrase about the Prayers of the Church, is indeed true, but does not belong to this place, in which St. John does not speak the least word about the Church. And therefore I had rather he had omitted it, and reserved it for a fitter place; for it is a deceitful Paraphrase, which assumes things that are neither expressly contained in the words of the Apostle, nor necessarily deduced from them. Our Author every now and then imposes his own conceptions upon the Reader.
Reader instead of St. John's. This by the way, lest I should seem to Chapter approve of Dr. Hammond's insertions, if I had taken no notice of them.

Ver 18. Note b. I. I had rather our Author had contented himself with a more general Assertion, and said that St. John here had a respect to divers false Christians, which at that time had revolted from the Christian Church, and the Doctrin of the Apostles, whether they were Simon's Disciples, or others. For this only being affirmed, there would have been no need of interpreting several words of this Chapter, not so much as they truly signify, as according to the signification which he would have to belong to them, that he might find in them his own Opinion. Read what he says of the five things foretold by Christ, which he supposes to be spoken of in this Chapter as fulfilled; and compare it with St. John's own words, and it will appear that a great many things must be supplied in them, to make out Dr. Hammond's interpretation.

II. Polycarpus is said by Irenæus Lib. iii. c. 3. to have saluted Marcion when he met him once at Rome, primogenitum Satanæ, The first-born of Satan. And to him, or rather to any Hereticks who did as he says, he seems to have had a respect, not to the Gnosticks only.

Ibid. Note e. I. I will not exclude indeed Simon and his followers out of the number of these Antichrists; but that name signifying, as is well observed by our Author after Grotius, both those that oppose Christ directly, whilst they deny that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, or was a true Man; and those who take upon themselves to be Christ, or put themselves in the place of Christ, I don't see why we should think the Apostle here to have a respect to the Gnosticks, more than to any others, who did either of those things. It's true, those Antichrists are said to have gone out of the Christian Assemblies; but who knows whether others, besides the Gnosticks, that were half Jews, did not depart from the Christian Churches? There being no historical Records of the Christians of those times, we cannot certainly determine any thing about this matter.

II. Our Author thought that Δρυμολόγητος signified that which is called in English to counterfeit, in French contrefaire; but his Memory failed him, for Δρυμολόγητος signifies only contra facio, adversarius sum, altercor, par pari reddo, aggredi, vindico, repondo; To counterwork, to resist, to contend: to return like for like, to set upon, to revenge, to repay. Yet it is true that the Preposition Δι', as when alone, so in Composition signifies that which Dr. Hammond affirms; for it signifies loco, in the place of, and pro, for as well as contra, against; so that the name Δρυμολόγητος may...
Chapter may truly be applied not only to him who directly opposes Christ, but also who puts himself in the place of Christ, tho’ he denies nothing concerning Jesus. So ἄραντιος is to exchange, that is, to give and receive one thing for another; ἄραντις is one that comes in the place of another Man; ἄραντιος is to substitute; ἄραντιος is to compensate; ἄραντις, a Proconsul, &c.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 19. Of this word Dr. Hammond has treated on Gal. i. 10, Note e. and interpreted it in the same sense as he does here; but I have shewn on that place that he is mistaken. Here also the expression is Elliptical, for ἀρνέως τοῦ ἄραντιον, we shall persuade our Hearts, is a doubtful Phrase, for the understanding of which, we must repeat out of the foregoing words, ἄραντις ἄραντιος is, that is, we shall be conscious to our selves, before God, that we are truly Christians. St. John teaches us that he is a true Christian, who helps his Neighbour not in Words, but in Deeds; and from that true Beneficence only can conclude himself to be a good Man, and rest thoroughly persuaded of it in his own Mind. But he that assisteth his Neighbour only in words, when he is able indeed to relieve him, if he deceives others, yet he cannot deceive himself, but is conscious to himself before God of Uncharitableness. And St. John adds ὄρεισθαι ἄραντι, before him, to wit, God, because God only is witness of the Judgment which secretly pass upon our selves. Hence that noted expression in Scripture, to be just before God, to signify a true and sincere Vertue, because God alone is the true and infallible judg of it. See Luke i. 6. and Interpreters on that place.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 2. The words ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐνεργεῖ must be rendered, as Dr. Hammond well observes in the Margin of the English Translation, not that [Jesus Christ] is come in the Flesh, but which is come in the Flesh. But besides, this whole Period is to be understood thus: every Spirit that confesses Jesus, who is come in the Flesh, to be the Christ, is of God. Such another Expression there is in St. John’s Gospel chap. xvii. 3. where see my Note. So also St. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 3.
I. JOHN.

Verse 11. That is, it appears by the love which we have for one another, that our love to God is most perfect, which otherwise is not, but when we have some degree of piety towards God, but do not heartily enough love our neighbour. Such were the Jews, who professed to love none but those of their own religion, and were not sincere even in that: see Cap. ii. 5. Our Author in his Paraphrase of this and the following Verses, is very severe, and scarce knows how to speak his own Thoughts, so far is he from happily expressing the mind of the Apostle.

CHAP. V.

Verse 6. If I should undertake to examine particularly all the foregoing medly, I should be obliged, instead of short Additions, to write a long Dissertation. And therefore I shall touch only upon the chief things. I do not disagree with our Author about the interpretation of the 6th verse, but I wonder he spends so many words in endeavouring to make out the Connection of verses 7. with that, and the meaning of the words are one, or are to one, before he had shewn, or endeavoured to shew that this Verse and those words are genuine. Of such an order in discoursing it may be said, ἐν πολλῷ ὑπεράνθετε. But to pass by this, Dr. Hammond does but wrangle with all the most learned Interpreters, who interpret are one of consent. And the reason why they understand those words of consent, is, first, because they are so taken in John x. 30, & xvii. 21. Secondly, because here the Discourse is about a unity of Testimony, and not about a unity of Nature. But why is this consent other-
Chapter wise expressed in the following verse? I answer, for variety sake, or also by mere accident; for in this simple stile words must not be so subtilly scanned or watched. All our Author here alledges besides, is foreign to the purpose, and the scope of the Apostle.

II. As for his saying that tho the Alexandrian, and many other antient Manuscript Copies, omit the 7th verse, yet it is read in many other Manuscripts, and all the printed Copies except one; that, to say no worse of it, is not accurately said. For in the old Greek Copies, that is, which were written seven or eight Ages ago and older, it is nowhere read, and seldom in those that are later. In the most antient Latin Copies likewise it is not read, tho frequently in the New Beza alledges a Britifh Greek Copy, mention’d by Erasmus, and a Spanish Complutenian Edition, and several Copies of R. Stephanus, which have this place. But besides that these do not sufficiently agree with one another, they are by no means to be equal’d with the most antient Copies, which with great consent reject this verse, and are confirmed by the Authority of all the Greek and Latin Fathers until St. Austin, who never used this place against the Arians, or other antient Antitrinitarians; tho they often make mention of the three Witsneses on Earth, as learned Men have long since observed. For as for our Author’s objecting St. Cyprian, Jerom, and Ambrosius, that is to no purpose, as we shall presently see. There are more printed Copies than one, which omit this place; but tho they all had it, their Authority would signify nothing against the Manuscript Copies, and the consent of Antiquity.

III. The conjecture about the omission of some Scribe, because of the repetition of the like words, as it takes place elsewhere, so it cannot here be allowed; first, because it must be supported by another Conjecture; and secondly, because it opposes all Antiquity. For who will believe that such an omission was admitted in all the Copies, which the Christians used privately and publicly, for several Ages; and afterwards was discovered by I know not whom, without the help of any antient Copy? Who but those who have no regard to truth, and think that Truth may be defended by the help of Falshood? Our Author’s reasonings against the suspicion of this place being supposititious, are insignificant, because they cannot be opposed to the joint Authority of the antient Copies, Fathers, and Interpreters. Besides, who does not know, that tho Truth may be well defended, and relies upon solid grounds, yet the Orthodox, as well as others, invented innumerable falshoods to support it? Whence came so many supposititious Books in antient times, but from this perverse practice? But here it
I. J O H N.

is to be observed, that it might easily be that these words were inserted into the Context, not out of any design to deceive; but some Body having in the Margin of his Copy, over against the 8th Verse, noted that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was signified in this place, others afterwards put that into the Text; as is conjectured by Ric. Simon, who has set this matter in a clear light, in his Critical History of the New Testament P. 1. c. 18. and his Dissert. concerning the Manuscript Copies of the New Testament added to the 3d Part, to whom I refer the Reader. The places our Author here alludes to prove the Doctrin of the Trinity, might have been found in any Theological System, and in greater number: nor do they make any thing to confirm the ordinary reading, for every thing which is agreeable to the Christian Faith, is not presently the true Reading. Whereas he adds, that if this place had been corrupted by the Orthodox, the Arians would have taken notice of it; tho that should be admitted as a forcible Argument, it would signify nothing to this place; which seems to have been inserted very lately, seeing none of the antient Fathers, Greek or Latin, till the time of St. Austin, ever allledged it against the Arians. Consult the foremention'd Monfieur Simon.

IV. The passage cited out of St. Cyprian, does not prove that he read this place, as we read it in the printed Copies, but only that he understood the words of the 8th Verse, of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; which is so clearly demonstrated by Mr. Simon, that a Man must be very obstinate, after reading his reasons, to assert the contrary. Our Author produces a place out of Tertullian in Lib. Contra Praxeam, without adding the Chapter or Page; which is a very bad Custom, in a thing especially of such great Moment. So that I was forced to read the greatest part of that Book, to find out the place, which is in Cap. xxv. p. 315. of the Paris Ed. An. 1675. But Tertullian has not a respect to this place in the 1st Epistle of St. John, but to John x. 30. For these are his words: Connexus Patris in Filio, & Filii in Paraclete, tres efficic coherententes, alterum ex altero: qui tres unum sunt, non unus, quomodo dixit summum: ego & pater unum sumus; ad substantiam unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem. The conjunction of the Father with the Son, and of the Son with the Comforter, makes three cleaving together one upon another; which three are (unum) one thing, not (unus) one as it is said; I and my Father are (unum) one thing; as to unity of Substance, not as to singularity of number. He no where allidges this place in John, which yet in that disputation he ought to have allledged, if it had been read at that time, as it is now; seeing he often allidges the place in John x. which is not so expres. to his purpose. Praxeas was
ANNOTATIONS on

Chapter V.

It was of the opinion of Sabellius or Photinus, who thought that there was but one Person in the Godhead; so that perhaps he might have abused this place in St. John, and so have alleged it; or if this place had been thought to be contrary to him, it would have been alleged against him. St. Jerom's name is prefixed indeed to the Preface to the Cathlick Epistles; but that it is not his Preface has been shown by Mr. Simon in the 2d Part of his Critical History of the New Testament, c. ix. and the Benedictine Monks, who have lately begun to set forth the Works of St. Jerom at Paris, tho' very great Adversaries to Father Simon, have confirmed his Arguments, so that they seem to have stopped the Mouth of Obstinacy itself; which Dr. Hammond also would have acknowledged.

Si foret hoc nostrum fato dilatus in ævum,

If he had lived to this day. As for St. Ambrose, it is not without intolerable Negligence that his words are not set down; because Dr. Hammond knew that he would not be believed in this matter. But really there is no where any such thing in the true St. Ambrose. And if such a fault had been committed by P. Socinus, our Author would not have spared him so easily, as he forgave himself.

V. He would have done much better, towards the confirmation of the Truth, to adhere only to the Scripture, and not to recur to the Fathers, whose opinion was quite different from that which is now received; as who, properly speaking, affirmed that there were three consubstantial Gods, as has been shewn by Dyon. Petavius, Steph. Curcellæus, Dr. Cudworth, and others. Our Author had read the Fathers upon this Head with a mind full of Prejudice, as it is very common for Persons to do; and with little care, as appears by the choice of places which he produces. I should not think it safe to cite Clemens upon the Authority of St. Basil, because he might have taken the alleged words out of an Apocryphal and supposititious writing of Clemens, of which kind there were a great many of old, and are some still at this day. For it is notorious that the Antients, neglecting all the rules of Criticks, often confounded supposititious Writings with genuine. And our Author imitates them, whilst he alleges Passages out of the manifestly spurious Writings of Justin Martyr, as his, or at least as if they were of some moment; for why otherwise did he produce them? Of the rest, I have nothing to say, but that Dr. Hammond could not stand by the Faith of the Fathers which he cites; who, to speak the truth, were Tritheists rather than assertors of the present
present Opinion. For they believed the unity of Substance, not the singularity of number, as Tertullian speaks, that is, that the substance of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost was specifically one, but numerically three; as the learned Men, I before mention'd, have clearly shewn, and might much more largely be demonstrated. Those that do not think fit to anathematize the Fathers, ought also to be charitable to other erroneous persons, for a great many reasons, to every one obvious. Besides, whoever considers these things seriously, will not be so apt to boast of the consent of Antiquity, or complain so loudly of Hereticks as Dr. Hammond here does; who, I believe, acted therein sincerely, but without due consideration, and not very much like a Christian, which I do not speak out of a censorious Humour, but only by way of Admonition.

Verf. 16. Note c. I rather think that ἐπί η διαθήκης is a Metaphor taken from Diacleses, which are said to be ης διαθήκης, when they are mortal; as appears from John xi. 4. I wonder Dr. Hammond sets down St. John's words, as if he had said έπί διαθήκης, when all Copies have ης. Did not that false reading induce him to seek here for Excommunication?

II. I don't know why our Author makes mention here of the Prayers of the Church, when the Apostle speaks of this matter so, as to mention nothing about the Church or its Governors. The Power of the Keys, which was too much in the Doctor's thoughts, made him look for those things which belong to it, even where there is no footstep of them.

Verf. 21. And ἦ διάθηκης.] Our Author in the Margin of the English Translation, remarks that the Alexandrian Copy adds έπί, which the Vulgar Interpreter also read. And indeed if it be omitted, it must be understood. See Grotius on this place.

Verf. 21. Note d. But I don't know why the Idols of the Heathens themselves may not here be understood, whose Worship the Christians were no less obliged to beware of, than the Idolatry of the Simonians. Nay, there was a much greater care necessary to be taken, in order to keep themselves from the worship of the Heathens, because Heathens had the government of the World, and compelled the Christians by Torments to join with them in their Idolatry; whereas the followers of Simon had no Authority either in the Roman Empire, or elsewhere.
ANNOTATION
ON THE
Second Epistle of St. John.

Ver. 1. I With our Author had given us better reasons for think-
ing that some of the Primitive Christian Churches had
a twofold Bishop, one a Jew, and the other a Gentile.
For I can see a great many Objections, to which that
supposition is liable, and which I do not understand how he could have
satisfactorily answered. There might that also be said against the No-
tion he affixes to οἱελθ, which would be sufficient to overthrow it, but
which for brevity sake I pass by. I rather think the Apostle here ad-
dressed himself to some Christian Matron, whose name, for the reason
mention'd by Dr. Hammond, he concealed. It's known that the word
Eleth is often used to signify all Christians, as Grotius and Dr. Hammond
have several times proved.

ANNOTATIONS
ON THE
Epistle of St. Jude.

Ver. 4. I Had rather understand αὐτοποιηθεν according to the
common use of the Preposition αὐτο in Composition,
for before; for αὐτοποιηθεν also does not seem so much
to signify, if we urge the proper Notion of the word,
that which is set forth, as that which was before written, but with a
design that afterwards it may be publickly set forth to be read. For an
Edict, or an Advertisement, was first written on Paper or a Board, be-
fore it was exposed to be read publiquely, and to that end fixed up in some
open
open place. So likewise in Gal. iii. 1. I chuse to render ἀναγεννησθαι, hath been before delineated, rather than set forth. St. Jude here alludes to Laws, which ἀναγεννησθαι punishments to Malefactors, as a means to deter Men from transgressing. His meaning is that such Men as he speaks of, were already expressly condemned by the divine Laws, because Punishments were clearly prescribed to their Crimes. So that I do not think there is a respect here had to any prediction of Christ.

II. I don't see the necessity of interpreting what St. Jude here says of none but the Followers of Simon, when we may very well understand him of any wicked Men whatsoever, who had joined themselves to the Christians, both Jews and others, such as afterwards was that Peregrinus, spoken of by Lucian. For the great Charity of the Christians, who suffer'd none that joined with them in their Worship, to want necessaries; and their frequent ἀγάπαι Love-feasts drew to them not only those that were good, but also many wicked Men. If Dr. Hammond will call these Gnosticks, I shall not be against it, because I won't contend about a name; but wonder from what credible Author he came to understand, that all the bad Christians of those times espoused the opinions of Simon Magus.

III. He thinks that χρισμα here signifies the destruction of Jerusalem, which that it may be true, he must suppose that this Epistle of St. Jude was directed only to the Christians of Judæa; for these alone were destroyed with the Jews, who had joined themselves with them in taking up Arms against the Romans. But I see no sign in this Epistle, by which it may appear that it was written to the Christians of Judæa, rather than to others. And then if it be not evident that in this Verse Condemnation signifies the destruction of the Jews, it will not be certain that the common Salvation, spoken of in the Verse before, is the deliverance of the Christians out of the hands of the Jews, by whom they were persecuted. I had rather understand, both Salvation, of eternal Happiness, and Condemnation, of everlasting Punishment, which God was about to inflict upon them. And so Men prescribed to this Judgment, are Men condemned by the divine Laws to suffer perpetual Misery, for the Sins which St. Jude enumerates.

Ibid. Note b. I don't believe the Apostle here speaks of a positive and open denying of the points of Faith mention'd; for how would the Christians have endured in their Agape, Men who had denied God the Father, or Jesus to be the Christ? He could not be accounted a Christian, that denied those Doctrins. But he means a denying of them before the Heathens, in case they were vehemently urged to it; so that it was only to avoid Perfection that they denied themselves to be Christians.
Christians; which they thought they might very lawfully do: They no more believed Simon, or the Priests of the Heathens, than they did Christ, nor opposed him any more than others; but, according to the time and place they were in, feigned themselves to believe what it was their Interest to appear to believe.

Vers. 7. Note c. But there is another more proper, if, namely, we understand these Punishments of that Fire, with which, in St. Jude's time, all the Coast of Sodom did still burn; for which reason it is called eternal, because it continued burning for so many Ages. Upon this account the Sodomites will be said σείωνα καίγονα, that is, before set to be an example, and still so to be. See what I have said about this matter in a Dissert. de subversione Sodomeæ.

Vers. 8. Note d. Tho I prefer the Apostles before all the lesser or greater Powers of the Roman Empire, yet I do not think they are here respected, who are no where else called by that name; for as for their being said to be filled the glory of Christ in 2 Cor. viii. 23. that is foreign to this place, because it is a quite different thing. Besides, ὑδάτω being very frequently used among Greek Writers, to signify Honours and Empires, or Magistrates, it is better to follow here that notion. And so I am apt to think the Apostle has a respect not so much to the Gnosticks, as to the Jews, who bore the Yoke of the Roman Magistrates very impatiently, and said that it was unlawful for a Jew to serve any but God, whom they called the only Lord and Ruler. This was the Opinion of the fourth Sect of the Jews, founded by Judas Gaulonita, of whose followers Josephus speaks thus, Lib. 18. cap. 2. Antiq. Jud. Τα ταύτα δεινονε και τα Ρωμαίων ὑμιλούσαι, ἀποφέροντες οὕτως ἐν θειλέραις ἀφ' ευτοῖς, μόνον ἵματος καὶ ἀποτύπωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναλαύοντες. Ἡταν δὲ ἡ ταύτα Παγγαίου ἐνσυναγωγήν εἰς ὅλης περατος, καὶ συγκεκριμένη, καὶ πασαὶ ἥπατο ἡ μεν Αρχαῖων ἁγιορειτών αἰσχρότων: in all other things they agree with the Pharisees, but they have an unmoveable love for Liberty, thinking that God alone is their Lord and Ruler, and reposing it a small matter to suffer various kinds of Death, and the Punishments of their Kindred and Friends, for refusing to call any man Lord. This Doctrine was by many greedily embraced, as we are told by Josephus, in the beginning of the same Book; and indeed if not openly, at least in their Thoughts it was favoured by most of the Jews; and that some such Men as these had joined themselves to the Assemblies of the Christians, is not at all strange.

Vers. 9. Note e. 1. The words here attributed to Michael, being the very same that are found in Zachar. iii. 2. it is with reason thought by Dr. Hammond in concurrence with other Interpreters, that St. Jude alludes to that Vision. And because the Angel there is represented as
disputing with the Adversary, about the restoring of the Jewish Commonwealth, it is consequent that the same is here signified by άνθρωπος, the body of Moses, in St. Jude; which Phrase St. Jude took from the use of the Apostles, who ordinarily call Christians the body of Christ.

II. But what Dr. Hammond says afterwards of the Magistracy of the Devil, whose Dignity the good Angel reverenced, even in an evil Spirit, tho Grotius and others say the same, that I confess I cannot digest. For it's true, among Men, not only Subjects honourably bespeak their Rulers, but Princes also themselves show a mutual respect to each other; the Law of Nations requiring it should be so, for many weighty reasons between Nations enjoying an equal Power, lest they should be at perpetual variance among themselves, constituted, like the Civil Law among Citizens. But there seems to be no such Law between good and bad Angels, who are irreconcilable Enemies; the bad having rebelled against their common Lord, by whom being put in Chains they are reserved unto the Judgment of the great Day. So that the διαβόλος, which the Angel would not rail at, are some others; nor does Satan signify the Prince of the Devils. If we consult the History of the times, to which the Vision seen by Zachariah refers, we shall find that the Governors of Persia, who had the oversight of the Provinces situated on the West of Euphrates, vehemently opposed the design of Joshua about restoring the Temple. And of these the chief were the Thathbenai and Sebcharbozoznai, whose Enterprises and Calumnies are recorded in Esdr. Chap. v. Now these things were represented to Zachary the Prophet in a Vision, by which he understood that the Jews had indeed powerful Enemies with the King of Persia, but that God by the Ministry of his Angels rendered their Calumnies and Attempts ineffectual. So that Satan are the Thathbenai and Sebcharbozoznai, and other Adversaries of the Jews, that were represented to the Prophet under the person of one Accuser. So in Psalm cix. 5. Satan standing at his right hand is manifestly an Accuser, and that word often signifies any Adversary who endeavours to frustrate any one's designs. The same is meant by the word διαβόλος, which is used by the Septuagint; for διαβολής is as well to resist (adversarii) as to calumniate. And the same Persons that are called Satan in the Prophet Zachary, and here the Devil, were διαβόλος, or Magistrates sent from Persia, to rule over Syria, and other Countries on the West side of Euphrates, subject to the King of Persia; for which reason the same that are signified in this Verse by the word διαβόλος, are in the foregoing and St. Peter, stiled διαβόλος. And in the disputation of the Angel with those Men, mention'd
tion’d in Zechariah, the Angel being represented as modestly rebuking the enemies of the Jews, the Persian Rulers, because of their Dignity; hence St. Peter and St. Jude with great reason infer that the Jews did very ill in reviling the Roman Governors, who stood at that time in the same relation to the Jews, as formerly the Persians. This interpretation seems to me much more natural and agreeable to History and things themselves, than any other; and I doubt not but the Jews in the Apostles times did so interpret the place in Zachariah.

Vers. 10. "Occa úx ić ëxpet.] I do by no means think that the Apostle here has a respect to Angels, but to general Notions, concerning the necessity of the distinction of Men into Magistrates and Subjects, and about the necessity of obeying those whom the divine Providence has set over us, tho’ they do not always behave themselves as they ought; lest Wars should ensue, which are much more pernicious than that obedience.

Ibid. ðëxhës.] That it without a Master. See my Note on 1 Cor. xi. 14.

Vers. 11. Note f. I should render the words; effusì sunt errore Balaami, mercedis causa, Were poured out in the error of Balaam, for Reward; which perfectly agrees with the place in St. Peter, which is undoubtedly parallel to this, not Rom. i. 27. but in the harsh Conjecture of Dr. Hammond. 'Eξεχθήσαν εἰ πάλιν is exactly the same with εὐπλανίσκον; for εὐχθίναι, where the Discourse is about Men, signifies to be spread abroad, or wander, by a Metaphor taken from Liquor poured out. So Judith Chap. xv. 2. about the flight of the Assyrians, which the Jews pursued, some running one way, and some another: and there was not a Man which stayed before the face of his Neighbour, but εὐχθίναι being poured out, they fled every way —— and then the Children of Israel, every warslike Man among them, εὐχθίσκον were poured out upon them. This is what was meant by Hesychius and Phavorinus, when they interpreted this word by εὐπλανίσκον, because they that thus fly away, run out of others sight; nor must any thing be alter’d in Phavorinus, of whom we have no Manuscript Copies, because he himself first printed his own Lexicon in the time of Leo X. Our Author seems to have thought that he wrote before Printing was found out: But in Hesychius we must read εὐπλανίσκον.

Vers. 12. Note g. I prefer the latter interpretation, so as to think, it is not a Tempet, called εὕμωνειρ, but the signification of the word that is here referred to, which comes from εὕμων τῷ οίδειρ, to corrupt Fruit, as it is in the Etymologicum Magnum; because tho’, towards the end of the φύσωτερ Trees are destitute of Leaves and Fruits, yet principally
principally during that Season, the fruit of Trees ripen and are gather'd.

Verf. 16. Note i. I acknowledge that the Phrase here used by St. Jude, is taken from Daniel, but it does not therefore follow it must be understood in the same sense; for what is more common either among Jewish or Christian Writers, than to take Phrases out of the Scripture, tho' not to be understood just in the same sense? It is sufficient if they can but with some fitness be applied to those things which are spoken of. Besides, when the whole place is not alluded, no body will say that the whole place is referred to, unless the thing require it.

II. Therefore by great swelling words, I am apt to think is meant the boastings of the wicked Jews, who pretended to defend the Cause of God, against the Tyranny of the Romans; and promised their Associates Victory, and declared that they could not be subject to any. To these Men, and not to the Gnosticks, St. Paul seems to have had a respect in 2 Thess. ii. as I have shewn at large, against Dr. Hammond, on that place. I have shewn also on Rom. viii. 20. that παρασιν does not signify Idolatry.

Verf. 22. Note m. Διακοινωνεῖν is a Participle of the Passive, and not of the Middle Voice, and must be rendred making a difference; namely according to mens Dispositions and Offences. For some must be dealt with more tenderly, and others more severely, as Dr. Hammond observes: See what Priscus has collected on this place, and my Note on James ii. 4.
ANNOTATIONS
ON THE
Revelation of St. John the Divine.

At the end of the Premon.] Tho I think Dr. Hammond's Interpretation of the Apocalypse, may as easily be defended as any other; yet some things he says here which seem to need correction, and which I shall briefly take notice of.

I. He represents to us the Christians of Asia Minor, as being as much afraid of the Jews and Gnosticks, as if they had sent Proconsuls into Asia; or at least the Roman Magistrates were so entirely in their Interest, that the least complaint they made of them would be pernicious to the Christians. For unless this be true, the Christians would have had no reason to be so much afraid of the Jews, or to think they were delivered from Persecution by the Calamities of that People. But that the Jews had so much Power, or were in so great favour with the Roman Magistrates, that at their instigation they dealt cruelly with the Christians, does not appear by any History. We find indeed in the Acts that the Jews exasperated the Heathens as much as they could, and raised Seditions, and went to the Magistrates to accuse the Christians; but we find also that they were but derided by them: see Acts xviii. 12. & seqq. The Christians that lived in Asia Minor had most reason to fear the Statuaries, Painters, Priests, and other Men who made a gain of Idolatry, and any superstitious Persons whatsoever; but not the Jews, who were as much hated by them as the Christians: see the Story of the Tumult at Ephesus, which is in Acts xix. So that what is foretold of the destruction of the Jews, belongs primarily to them that lived in Judea and the neighbouring Countries, who were really to be delivered from the Persecutions of the Jews; and secondarily also to others, especially those which had gone over from Judaism to the Christian Religion, and who would be glad to see the Prophecies of Christ and the Apostles fulfilled, and be confirmed in their Faith by that means.
II. I don't know why our Author thought the Edict of Claudius, about expelling the Christians or Jews out of Rome, reached as far as Ephesus. For they that were only expelled out of Rome, were not forced to go out of other Cities of the Roman Empire, unless it was so order'd in the Edict. By the word Rome, no body ever understood the rest of the Cities of the Roman Empire: see Interpreters on the place in Suetonius, and on Acts xviii. 2. If therefore St. John was banished at that time, and transported from Ephesus to Patmos, it was not because of the Edict of Claudius, but for some other reason. But the Chronology of those times, the accounts of which are not taken out of the Writings of the Apostles, is very uncertain.

III. Our Author does not speak accurately, where he says that Domitian was Governor of Rome, whilst Vespasian was in Judæa; he should have added, either in Egypt, or whilst he was upon his Journey; for Vespasian did not stay long in Judæa, after he was saluted Emperor.

IV. There being nothing not only more uncertain, but even more false, than the Menology of the Greeks, and the Martyrology of the Romans, as those learned Men who have touched upon them have shewn: I don't see what made Dr. Hammond scruple to disparage their Authority. This I am sure would have been much better than to wrest every thing, that he might not seem to contradict them, as to the time when Antipas suffer'd Martyrdom. But I shall say something of that on Chap. ii. 12.

V. What he says here of the sudden destruction of the Gnosticks, is false, as I have shewn on 2 Thess. ii. 8.
Chapter... apt to perswade the unwary, that not only these Names, but also the Power that was joined with them in the following Ages, were known in the Apostles times. I had rather our Author, in his Paraphrase of the New Testament, had abstained from them.

II. Dr. Hammond had not look’d into the Digg. Lib. i. Tit. xvi. Leg. 4. S. 5. where Ulpian does not speak himself, but alledges the words of Antoninus, and somewhat also otherwise: Our Emperor Antoninus Augustus, at the desire of the Asians, wrote back, that a Proconsul was obliged to go by Sea to Asia, ἕως τοῦ γεγονότος Ἐφέσου, that is, and among the mother Cities to touch first at Ephesus. The place also in Pliny is false quoted out of Lib. vi. instead of Lib. v.

Verf. 6. Noted. I. With Dr. Hammond had allledged some Edict of the Roman Emperors or Magistrates obtained by the Jews, whereby the Christians were forbidden to meet together, before the destruction of Jerusalem; for I do not remember that I ever read any in Ecclesiastical Writers, or others: which yet if it be uncertain, or false, as I verily think, some of those things which he lays in the foregoing Annotation must needs be false, or at least uncertain. And from the destruction of Jerusalem, to the reign of Adrian, the Jews were too odious upon the account of their Seditions, to prevail with the Roman Emperors or Magistrates to persecute the Christians, as our Author well proves in what follows.

II. That Dr. Hammond might shew that the Christians reigned, as he speaks, after all the hopes and power of the Jews were taken away, he is forced to extenuate those ten noted Persecutions; which it’s certain some of the Antients too much aggravated, as has been solidity proved by Mr. Dodwell in his Dissert. de Paucaitate Martyrum. But tho I do not deny but that in the fourth and following Ages, the number of Martyrs was very much increased; yet I do not see how the condition of the Christian Church, in the second and third Centuries, could be represented under the similitude of a Kingdom, unless that Kingdom be very faintly understood. I had rather this had been referred to later times.

Verf. 10. 'Εν τῇ Κυρίειν ἡμέρᾳ.] This day, which in the words of Andreas Casarianus, allledged by our Author in the Margin of his Paraphrase, is ἔν ἑάυστροις Χριστεί ὑπημένου φήμου, Barnabas in Ep. Cathol. cap. xv. calls the eighth. For after he had said, that the six days of the Week signify six thousand Years, during which the World was to continue, and the seventh the last thousand, in which God would put an end to it, he speaks thus: Ὁ γὰρ ποιεῖ κλίσιν ἐπὶ τῶν σαββατών ἰμαία διηκότω, ἀλλ' ἐκ πνευματός τοῦ πάντα ἐξχρημάτων ὑπέκχουν, ὅτι τὴν ἀλλ' ἡχώματι ἐξχρημάς.
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δεξιω: mind how he speaks: The present Sabbaths are not acceptable to me, when putting an end to all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is, another World. Did ἥξις τῶν ἡμερῶν τῶν ὑμῶν, εἰς ὄροις ὁμοιούς ἐάν τούτοις, καὶ εἰς τὰς ἔρεντας: Wherefore also we spend the eighth day in expressions of joy, in which Jesus both arose from the Dead, and having shown himself ascended into Heaven.

Ver. 11. Ὅ νῦν ἐκεῖνος ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν. That is, before whom no Man ever was that which I am, nor ever shall be; who neither had any Predecessor, nor shall have any to succeed me. This is a Phrase taken out of Isa. xli. 4, where it is used of God the Father. It is explained in the same Prophet, Chap. xliii. 10, in these words: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me; and Chap. xlv. 6. I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God. God seems to have had a respect to the Opinion of the Heathens, who feigned Successions of Gods, of which some came and dethroned others, and reigned in their stead, and which seems to have prevailed among the Eastern Nations, as it did among the Greeks, whose sentiments are thus expressed by Promethus, in Aiobulus:

Διός τούτους ἐκποιήσες νῦν ἡμῖν,
Τετικ πάντα τὸν πρωτότοκον ἔσωσα
Δίκτυα ἦν τάξις.

Which Grotius thus interprets:

— Annon hos duos
Ego ipsa confessi evoluit arcibus?
Brevi videbo tertium, et fade quidem,
Et dereumte.

Ver. 20. Note h. It were to be wished that our Author had reconcile what he says here of single Bishops, in the Churches of Asia, with that which he elsewhere says of a twofold Bishop; of which one was set over the Jewish, and another the Gentile Christians: see his Premonition to the 2d Epistle of St. John. Did he think that these Epistles were written only to the Assemblies of the Circumcised?
Chapter II.

Ver. 2. It is not necessary we should know who these Impostors were of which St. John speaks, there being so many other things in antient Ecclesiastical History of much greater moment as the Travels and Martyrdoms of most of the Apostles, altogether unknown to us; either because none committed them to writing, or because the Records of them are lost. And therefore I had rather confess my ignorance in this matter, than violently bring in here the Gnosticks. I might with more probability say that the Apostle has a respect to some Jewish Deceivers, who boasted that they had been familiar with Christ, and therefore said that they were Apostles. It is not certain that Cerinthus called himself an Apostle, or pretended to have received what he asserted from a great Apostle. It is said indeed by Gaius in Eusebii Lib. iii. cap. 28. that Cerinthus proposed his Doctrins to Jacquæ-Jesu, et &c. Αποκάλυφθη γεγονός εἰς ἐπιστολῶν, &c. that he was only the Judgment of Gaius, and not Cerinthus his own words.

Ver. 4. Note b. I. What our Author here says about Elxai, out of Eusebii, shews that some of the Jews (for Elxai was a Jew) were possessed with an Opinion, before the Apostles time, that it was lawful to dissemble their Religion, yea to renounce it, to avoid Persecution. So that whenever that Doctrine is opposed by the Apostles, we need not presently think they have a respect to the Gnosticks, the Followers of Simon Magus, as our Author often inculcates, not without tiring his Reader.

II. Our Author seems to have thought that Elxai was a Christian Heretick, but he was rather an Essene, which was the name of a Jewish Sect, as we are told by Epiphanius, and took a great many more things from Judaism than from Christianity. Dr. Hammond, whilst he makes him to be a Christian, changes the words of Epiphanius; for instead of that which he calls, to worship Idols, εἰσαγωγὴς, he writes in English to abjure the faith; and adds, as out of the same Author: From these came the Helkephaite, &c. Which I could not in find him, nor do I believe they are Epiphanius his words.

Verf. 13. Note i. I do not commend Mr. Brightman, but I wonder Dr. Hammond should so easily assent to the Menology, which Grotius has shewn to be unfit to be here credited.

Verf. 26. Note o. I. I have shewn on 2 Thess. ii. 3., that it is erroneously thought that Simon was look'd upon as a God by the Romans. I have alleged
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alleged also on the same place, a passage out of Eusebius, in which he Chapter
affirms that the followers of Simon were alive in his time. And that III.
we ought to believe him rather than any other, the thing it self shews,
feeling the Valentinians, and other Gnosticks flourished under the Anto-
nini and afterward, as we are told by the same Eusebius out of Irenæus,

II. It is not necessary that the name Jezabel should be thought to
signify any Sect, whereas it might be the name of some Woman that
took upon her the title of a Prophetess at Thyatira. Considering the
great scarcity of Records of that Age, is is no wonder there are many
things which we cannot understand in such kind of allusions.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 14. IS there then any difference between ἐνεαγὼνδὲνεγκαὶ ὁ
Note a, c. μᾶς ἔνεγκα; none certainly. But these are the false and
very subtleties of I know not whom, which our Author
collected on this Chapter that he might not seem too short. See the
verses about Antipas alleged by him on chap. ii. 13. in which a Bishop
is called καλυκάνες.

Ver. 15. Note d. I. Tho the Gnosticks might justly be charged with
lukewarmness and pride, if they were such as the Antients describe
them; yet we must not therefore think that all the primitive Christians
that were guilty of those vices were the Disciples of the Gnosticks. I
am sorry our Author should recur to those Heretics without any cer-
tain marks of their being here referred to.

II. Lukewarmness here is not the opposite to gold tried in the fire,
or a white garment, but to poverty which the Laodicæans are upbraided
with in the verse immediately foregoing. But our Author, who never
took any care to speak properly, confounds every thing.

Ver. 20. ἐκατῆσα μηρ' ἑλε. That is, as he entertains me at his house
and table when I knock at his door, so I will receive him when he
comes to me. Otherwife it would be an idle tautology, if these words
were understood of the same Supper; for if we sup with any one, he
cannot but sup with us. But he is said to sup with us, whom we en-
tertain; and we to sup with him that entertains us. The meaning
of this figurative Expression is, that if any one in this life, with that
sincerity which he ought, embraces the Christian Religion, he shall
be received by Christ into the Mansions of eternal Happiness. Our
Author did not understand this place.
Verf. 2. "I Δι φυγα, 8σα.] This vision, as almost all the rest, has many things in it resembling the Visions of the Prophets of the Old Testament; and the Apostle often uses Words and Phrases borrowed from them: for the manner of God’s revealing himself to men, was, to use Phrases to which they were accustomed, rather than any other. And so because the Christians were used to the reading of the Old Testament, God describes future things under the New by the same Images and Expressions by which he had represented them to the antient Prophets. This every one must have in his eye that undertakes to explain these Prophecies, that by the accomplishment of the antient Predictions he may judge of the New; which if he does not, he will be apt to fall into very great mistakes. For instance, we read this Prophecy in Joel ii. 30, 31. I will shew wonders in the heavens above, and wonders in the earth beneath, blood and fire, and vapour of smoke. The Sun shall be turned into darkness, and the Moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come. Whoever should understand these words properly, and according to the present way of speaking, would be mightily deceived, and ready to think that they were yet to be fulfilled. But St. Peter, in Acts ii. has told us, that they are to be understood figuratively, of a spiritual change which the Gospel was to make in the earth. And so when we read the like in this Book, we must have a care of thinking that the changes which are described as future, both in Heaven and Earth, before some things here foretold came to pass, were really and literally to be accomplished.

Ibid. Note b. If it were certain that the privileges of Metropolitans were known in that age, that the Apostles sat in a lower place than the Bishop of Jerusalem, and the Christians at that time were as observant of that external order, as they were afterwards; Dr. Hammond’s conjecture might be born. But now to speak in the softest terms, all those things being uncertain, it will not easily be believed by judicious persons, that St. John here alludes to the Church of Jerusalem, rather than any other Assembly.

Verf. 4. Note c. The Sanhedrin of the Jews sat in the form of a half circle, as is largely shewn by Mr. Selden de Synedrion, lib. ii. c. 6. and the Head of the Council in the middle seat. And hence I rather think that the form of the heavenly Council represented to St. John was taken, both because the Sanhedrin was an Assembly of Judges, and
and because it is not certain that in the Apostles times Christians meeting together secretly and in a private house, did so carefully observe that order in sitting. Our Author often takes it for undoubted that the customs of the second or third Century, or also later Ages were Apostolical, which he ought not to have done: Of the Episcopal seat in Churches, see Beveridge his Notes on Can. xi. of the first Nicene Council.

Ibid. Note d. I. Our Author before [ in Note on v. 2. ] rejected their opinion, who thought this Image of a Court presented to St. John, was taken from the Great Sanhedrim, because the number was not in both the same, and it is strange he was not afraid lest it should be objected to him, that it was altogether as unallowable to feign a certain number of Bishops, without the authority of ancient Records. But tho this Image be said to be taken from the Great Sanhedrim, it is not necessary there should be a perfect similitude between them. But, you will say, why are there only four and twenty, and not lxxii here represented as sitting in Council? If I should say I don’t know, Dr. Hammond’s conjecture will not be therefore at all more probable. But it may be said, that to describe this Court, four and twenty Heads of the priestly Order were chosen out of the Sanhedrim, because they were in a special manner consecrated to God; besides that the Priests only were of divine institution, not the rest of the members of the Sanhedrim.

II. The High Priests of the Jews cannot be said to have worn Mitres, because they were made of linen, and had no gold belonging to them, but only a thin plate hanging over the Forehead. See my Note on Exod. xxviii. 4. Much less do I think there is any respect here had to the Mitres of Bishops, which I no more imagin to have been in that age than the rest of the ornaments at this day used by them. They had the thing then without the Ornaments; and now we have the Ornaments without the thing.

Ver. 5. Note e. I see here nothing that looks like a respect to the Deacons of the Church of Jerusalem, unless it be the number of seven; which seems rather to be taken from the number of Lamps used in the Sanctuary, and that was otherwise common in holy Solemnities among the Jews and other Nations. See my Notes on Exod. xxix. 29. and Levit. xiv. 7.

Ver. 6. Note f. I. It is a mistake that αὐτοὶ signifies in the former part, because where the discourse is about men, to be in the midst of them, is all one as to be before them. The places in the Acts are in vain alleged, for in them it is not properly the middle part or centre that
Chapter is signified by the words \( \mu \rho \omega \nu \), nor properly the former or hinder part; but \( \mu \rho \omega \nu \) is simply before the rest, or among the rest, in Acts i. 15. and iv. 7., for in the other places those words are not found. So that \( \mu \rho \omega \nu \) here will not signify behind.

II. The Interpreter our Author confutes is H. Grotius, who interprets \( \mu \rho \omega \nu \) properly over against the midst of the Throne, placing one living Creature upon the steps before the Throne, and another behind; which is much more probable, because he takes \( \pi \lambda \nu \rho \alpha \) here, as \( \pi \lambda \nu \rho \alpha \nu \) is taken in vers. 4. according to Dr. Hammond’s own Opinion. Yet I had rather place two living Creatures before the Throne, not on the Steps, but even with the ground, over against the middle of the Throne, and two on the sides; for this reason, because afterwards, in Chap. v. 6. it is said, that a Lamb stood in the midst of the throne, and of the four living Creatures, and in the midst of the Elders; by which it appears that there was some space between the Throne and the living Creatures. From this place our Author disputes indeed against Grotius, but so, as it appears that he did not know what himself meant.

Ibid. Note g. I. He that sits upon the Throne is represented as much greater than the four living Creatures, as being God himself, whom the living Creatures praise and worship, which are undoubtedly the Angels. I am apt to think, if it were to be enquired, who resembled them in the Sanhedrim; the only persons that can be likened to them are the Officers that waited upon the Sanhedrim. But between these Ministers of God and the Ministers of the Sanhedrim, there was almost as much difference as between God and the Prince of the Sanhedrim, and therefore there is no similitude to be sought for between them, but in this, that they might both be called Ministers.

II. This is much more likely than what is said by our Author, who, to find out his own meaning, makes Apostles inferior to a Bishop, which is utterly false: for the Apostles having received their Commission from Christ himself, had an equal Authority over all Nations, and in all Cities; and therefore wherever they were, had the privilege of the first Seats, if any order was to be observed in sitting. And they ought not to yield to the Bishop of Jerusalem, whom they themselves had ordained. What Clemens Alexandrinus says of the Bishoprick of Jerusalem, just as if the Apostles out of modesty had not aspired to it, is, with that learned Writer’s leave, not agreeable to things themselves. It was not lawful for the Apostles to take upon them the Bishoprick of any one City, because
they were to spread the Gospel through the whole World, according to the Command of Christ; nor could they, without disparaging themselves, seek a Dignity less than their own. Yet our Author several times alledges these inconsiderate words of Clemens, as if they were of some moment. But you will say, St. James having heard the rest, at length in Acts xv, sums up the Judgment of the Council, after all were agreed, which is the Office of a President. But it does not therefore follow that he did that as President, and so as a thing which of right belonged to him; but rather by the impulse of the Holy Spirit, who might have pronounced that Decree by the mouth of any that were there present. Those holy men were not ambitious of the οἰκονομίαν or ιεραπεσίαν like the Pharisees; and therefore among Friends, and those acted by the same Spirit, every thing doubtless was done without standing upon Order or Ceremonies, the effects of mens Pride and Contention. Nor do I any more think that St. James here acted as a President, than that he sat on a high Throne, with some four Apostles attending on him as Metropolitan and Archbishop, as our Author calls him, and the Bishops of Judea sitting round about: which yet must have been done, if this representation of the heavenly Court was taken from thence; otherwise it has no more resemblance with the Council of Jerusalem than with any other Consistory of Judges.

III. The Objection our Author proposes to himself is of no moment, and might have been solved in one word, from what he says towards the end of his second Answer: for it is visible, that the Antiochians sent to enquire at Jerusalem, because there were there a great many Apostles, and other Disciples, who had conversed with Christ on earth, and had received spiritual gifts from him from Heaven; who if they had been in the most obscure Village in all Judea, would nevertheless have been there consulted. They had no respect therefore to the Metropolitan Dignity of the City, which our Author here, without reason, makes a shew of, and which was a piece of Grandure not known in those times. Of after Ages I say nothing, in which it was lawful for Bishops to enter, as it were, into Covenant with one another, and attribute a greater dignity to some seats than to others; which Constitution seemed useful, and ought not to be changed where it has obtain'd, because it may be beneficial to the ordinary sort of Christians.

Ver. 7. Note h. I. These things are not only Conjectures, but most extravagant Fancies, in which I wonder our learned Author could acquiesce. There is not here so much as the least indication of:
Chapter of the Standards or Standard-bearers of Israel; nor any ground to imagin them alluded to, besides that which is said by the Rabbins, who are less acquainted with what was done of old than we, and whose inventions are justly said by our Author to be absurd. But why then did he believe them? I confess I don't understand.

II. On the contrary, here is a manifest allusion to the Cherubims, who are the Ministers of God, not God himself. And so it is they which are describ'd, and not God; of whom see what I have said on Exod. xxv. 18. They are the Officers and Ministers of God in executing his judgments, which best of all agree to this place; and not Apostles, whose Office was not to punish obdurate Offenders. What our Author here says out of Eusebius, and about some particular Apostles, is as absurd as the fictions of the Rabbins.

Verf. 8. Note i. But if we understand the Attendants of God to be signified by those living Creatures, which seems to be more probable; those Eyes will denote the watchfulness of the Angels, in guarding those whom God commits to their care. Such another Image presented itself to the fancies of the Poets, when they described Argus, as set by Juno to watch her Rival:

Centum luminibus centum caput Argus babebat, &c.

which may be read in Ovid. Metam. Lib. 1.

C H A P. V.

Verf. i. Scriptus & in tergo, makes nothing to the length of the Note b. Roll, which tho short, might be written on the backside; but to the abundance of matter contained in it, which was so much that it could not be all written on the foreside of the Parchment; as the Orestes of a certain unknown Poet, mentioned by Juvenal, Sat. 1. 5.

——— Summi plena jam margine libri, Scriptus & in tergo, nec dum finitus Orestes.

Verf. 8. Note c. It is indeed the Office of Bishops to offer Prayers and Praises to God, in the name of the Churches over which they are set; but this Assembly held as in Heaven, is not a representation of things done on Earth; but as a Celestial Court, to set out which there are some colours taken from earthly things. So that the four and twenty Elders are rather Angels of the highest Dignity, which are as it were God's
the REVELATION.

God's assistants in this Council; which Angels having the Patronage of the Christian Religion assigned them, it is no wonder if they are said to present the Prayers of Christians to God, and to speak in the name of Christians. An Angel is in like manner represented as performing this Office, afterwards in Chap. viii. 3, 4.

CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 2. Kαι εξελθὼν κατακεραυνη, ἔφες εἰς πάθον.] That is (the words being inverted) he went out to conquer, and did in effect conquer from his very going out. That which is meant is, that the Coming of Christ, whether to reform Men, or to punish them if they were obstinate, was neither vain, nor casual.

Ver. 4. Note a. I. It was worth observing that Eusebius makes mention of two Famines, under the reign of Claudius, one foretold by Agabus, and to be referred to the second year of Claudius, the he mentions it on his fourth; another in Greece and at Rome, which he refers to the ninth and tenth Years of that Emperor. I know that Joseph Scaliger thinks that the latter was foretold by Agabus, and refers it to the fifth Year of Claudius; but he gives no reason for his Affirmation; expecting, as is common with him, to be believed without proof.

II. Suetonius does not expressly say what our Author attributes to him, but only: Judaos, impulsore Christo, assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit. The unbelieving Jews endeavoured to raise a Tumult against the Christians, upon the account of Religion, for which reason both the Jews and Christians were expelled out of Rome. Suetonius says that Christ was impulsor, the cause or mover of those Tumults, out of Ignorance, when he should only have said that he was the occasion of them.

III. Whereas our Author affirms, that those who were by the Emperor's Edict expelled out of Rome, were expelled also out of the rest of the Cities of the Roman Empire, he ought to have proved it, and not have supposed it as certain. But it is false, as every one knows that has read any thing of the Roman History. Of this I have spoken already on the Premonition prefixed to this Book.

Ver. 6. Note b. The learned Dr. Bernard thinks that the Syrian Chœnix, when full of Wheat, weighed something above four English Pounds, and that one of Tiberius his denarii, current in the time of John, was worth a little more than seven English Farthings. By which calculation it appears that Wheat was dear, when four Pounds cost seven Farthings; but that our Author is mistaken, who supposes that
Annotations on

Chapter VI.

Verse 8. Note d. I. ὑπεύθυνος cannot signify Cattel, but only wild Beasts, except improperly: and therefore I prefer the ordinary reading before that of the Alexandrian Copy.

II. There are two faults here in the Citations of Josephus; one in the Margin, where Lib. vi. c. 8. Bell. Jud. is set instead of Lib. vi. c. 28. and the other, where Josephus de Captiv. L. vi. c. 44. is cited instead of the same Book de Bell. Jud. Lib. vi. c. 45.

Verse 9. Note e. I. Our learned Author thought St. John here alludes to the fourth, as it is called, Book of Esdras, extant only in Latin. But his Publishers, knowing this Book to be Apocryphal, cited the second of Esdras, in which there is no such passage. [This must be in a different Edition from that which I use, where Esdras 4 is referred to.] In the Epistle of Barnabas Chap. xii. there is a place produced out of the same Book. But this might also be added in Barnabas his Epistle; and he that wrote the 4th Book of Esdras, who seems to have been some Christian, imitated this place in the Revelation.

II. Ψυχήν ἔραται, the Souls of them that were slain, may, according to the use of the Hebrew Language, which these Writers often follow, signify their dead Bodies; for Ψυχή Soul is frequently taken for a dead Body. But tho' the Soul is taken for the Life, and the Life be in the Blood, it does not therefore follow that in the use of Scripture the Blood is ordinarily called the Soul. The use of words must be shewn by examples, and not by reasonings. He might have produced that Passage in Virgil Aeneid. ix. v. 349.

Purpuream vomit ille ANIMAM, & cum sanguine mista Vina refert moriens.

But it is better to understand by Ψυχή here the Souls of Martyrs, which being admitted into the heavenly Sanctuary, did by their Presence put God in mind of taking Vengeance upon the Jews. For the loud Voice here does not signify praying, or desiring Revenge, but the greatness of the Crime, which is said to cry unto God, because the thing itself does as much implore the divine Justice, as if the injured Person called upon him with a loud Voice. This appears by the example of the Blood of Abel, and the Story of the Sodomites, in Gen. xviii. 20.

Verse 12. Note g. I. There is no doubt but great numbers of dead Bodies send forth exhalations into the Air; but that Clouds have been made.
made by them, and visible Meteors, whereby the Sun has been made Chapter black, and the Moon bloody, was never, I believe, by any one observed: And therefore the prophetical Expressions, in which great Calamities are represented under such Images, are not taken from what really is, but are rather a Prosopopeia, whereby the Sun is said to refuse to behold the impieties of Men, and the Moon upon that account to blush and become red with shame, when they are very great. There are a great many such figurative Expressions in the Poets, as in Ovid, Metam. v. where speaking of the prodigies that preceded the death of Julius Caesar, he says,

___Phœbi quoque tristis imago
Lurida follicitis præbebat lumina terris.
___Sparsi Luneares sanguine currus.

II. I do not think we ought, in the representation of those Miseries that befell Judea, under the Similitude of the Sun becoming black, and the Moon red, and the Stars falling, to consider the several parts distinctly, but all these things together; which without doubt signify very great Calamities, but must not be examined particularly as if they had each a special signification, which can be proved by no place of Scripture: see on the contrary Isa. xiii. 10. where all these things signify one thing conjunctly, and nothing at all separately. Add also the place in the same Prophet, alluded by our Author.

Ver. 15. Note i. 1. The word Δισεία in Josephus should not have been rendered the promiscuous Noise or Voice; for what is a promiscuous Noise, but the sudden Voice, as it is translated by Sigism. Gelenius? The Passage which the Doctor afterwards cites as out of Josephus, without naming him, in these words, the seditious go to the Palace where many had laid up their Wealth, drive out the Romans thence, kill eight thousand of them, four thousand Jews that had gotten thither for Shelter, plunder the place, is not exactly translated from the Greek, which is thus, Lib. vii. cap. 37. according to the Greek division: Οι σαταναί δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν ὑγιές άνευ, εἰς δὲ ὑπόκειται πολλοί ταῖς κυνικὰς ἐπιθέσεις, τῶν τε Ῥωμαίων εἰς αὐτὰς τρίχοντας, καὶ τὸ συνέδριον αὐτὸς ἡ δήμῳ τῶν φονεύσαντος, ὡς εἰς ἐκταχμένος καὶ τετευχομένος τὰ κρατικὰ διάφυγον: that is, the Seditious went into the Palace, in which, because it was a safe place, many had laid up their Possessions, and put the Romans to flight; and killing all the Inhabitants that were there gather'd together, to the number of eight thousand and four hundred, plunder'd their Riches. Some difficulty there is in the words, Ῥωμαίων εἰς αὐτὰς τρίχοντας, which seem to be corrupted.
Chapter VII. I don't know why our Author should recur to the Walls of the Temple, to explain πρεσβεία τὸ ἐσορν, when, besides the Mountain of the Temple, there were two other Mountains contained within the Walls of the City, under which there had been Vaults made, where the Jews hid themselves, as he himself relates out of Josephus. When there is a natural and literal interpretation ready at hand, what need is there of recurring to a violent one? However he interprets here πρεσβεία in Mat. xxvii. 51. Walls better than by Sepulchres. See my Note on that place.

CHAP. VII.

Vers. 4. It is not to be thought that the Priests of the Jews were so Religious, as in a matter which made for the Glory and Safety of the Jewish Nation, not to exceed at all in their account of the number of the Paschal Sacrifices. And therefore I should not suppose it as certain which Josephus says about this matter, who is otherwise very profuse in magnifying every thing which belonged to his own Nation. Nor indeed could Palestine contain so great a Multitude, in which besides Jews, there were a great many Syrians, as Josephus in several places affirms.

II. The Paschal Feast was eaten by all the Jews which at that time were in Jerusalem, and not only by the Inhabitants of Palestine. For there is no doubt but many that were scattered abroad into other Countries, went thither about that time; tho' all the Males went not, nor any one perhaps every Year, besides those that were near. So that if we compare the Chrisians of Judæa with the unbelieving Inhabitants of the same Tracts, they will be more than our Author thought. The calculation which he speaks of is made by Josephus, de Bell. Jud. Lib. vii. c. 41.

CHAP. VIII.

Chapter VIII. Will not deny but the figures here used in the description of that which St. John saw done in Heaven, are taken from the Temple of Jerusalem: but I do not think that the things done in that Temple are by way of Vision here described, as Dr. Hammond says; who yet undoubtedly meant that St. John saw something, I know not what, done in Heaven, like those things which were done in the Temple; for he never so much as dreamt that the Priest who went into the Sanctuary, offer'd up the prayers of the Christians. But a habit of speaking improperly made him express himself
himself very awkwardly; and I doubt not but his Conceptions themselves were a little dark and perplexed, for otherwise he would never have spoken so harshly. But by this means, instead of giving light to the Writer we attempt to explain, we render him more obscure. Our Author here several times mentions the High Priest, whom he describes as offering up the daily Incense; which it's true he might sometimes do, but he did not do it daily. For that Office was for the most part executed by the ordinary Priests. See Luke i. 9.

Ver. 12. Note g. Many things might have been said against the former Interpretation, which is certainly very violent, unless our Author had preferred the latter; and therefore I shall speak only to that, which to me does not seem at all more probable. For that prophetic words may be said to signify anything particularly, it must either plainly appear by the event, or be shewn it is the Custom of the Prophets. But Dr. Hammond here does neither. And therefore I had rather say, that as the darkning of the Sun, Moon and Stars, in the Prophets signifies very great Calamities, even such as end in utter Destruction; so proportionably the darkning of a third part of them signifies lighter distresses. This is the only probable interpretation of this place, all others being made up of pure Fancy and Conjecture.


c h a p.  i x.

Ver. 11. W H A T is this to the Jews, who did not worship Apollo? Or why should the Devil be called Apollo rather than Jupiter? I rather think this Title is to be applied to John the Captain of the Sicarii, who is called here himself the Angel of the bottomless pit, as his Soldiers, like so many Locusts, are said to have come out of its smoke, in verfe 2. the meaning of which expressions is, that this John and his Soldiers were stirred up and assisted by the Devil in contriving those Villanies which they executed with so much fury: see what Dr. Hammond himself says on verf. 1, out of Josephus, or rather Josephus himself in Lib. iii. de Bell. Jud. Cap. x. & seqq. in the Greek.

Ver. 17. Note g. I choose to interpret what is here said simply, and in gross, omitting all niceties which are very uncertain, about an exceeding formidable Army, which should bring very great Calamities, among which the principal are burnings and slaughters, upon Judea. This is what is meant by the colour of the Armour, and the Fire proceeding out of the Mouth of the Horses. This only seems to be certain, every thing else is but conjectural. Of the Discipline of
Chapter of the Roman Armies it may be worth our while to read what is said by Josephus in Lib. iii. de Bell. Jud. Cap. 5. in the Greek.

CHAP. X.

Vers. 9. Thv κολίαν.] The Alexandrian Copy reads καταστήσας, but it is a manifest Error. Κολία here, as ἢκότε αἱ άποθέν, in Ezekiel, is not taken for the Belly, but for the Stomach: For the Meat descends out of the Mouth immediately into the Stomach, and those things which remain still in the Stomach may cause a bitterness in the Mouth, but not those which have passed into the Bowels. If any should doubt whether κολία signifies the Stomach, he might be referred not only to the Greek Physicians, but also to Αelian Variar. Hist. Lib. i. c. 1.

CHAP. XI.

Chapter Vers. 3. If these Witnesses are to be sought in Judea, I had rather say that two of the famous Churches of Judea, in two distinct Cities, as Jerusalem and Caesarea, are signified by that name, than go to explain the uncertain meaning of an obscure place, by a very uncertain Conjecture. Our Author builds conjectures upon conjectures, and is not afraid lest a structure that leans upon such weak props, should fall to the ground. But it is the part of a careful Interpreter to be very sparing in Conjectures, and in doubtful matters to abstain from Conjectures; for the more uncertainties are heap'd together, the more that which is said appears to be false, or at least the Conjecturers are in greater danger of erring. But I confess ingenuously I do not understand these Prophecies; and tho' I easily see what there is wanting in the conjectures of learned Men, to make them seem probable; I can my self propose nothing better. For which reason I have in many places forborn to confute Dr. Hammond's interpretations, because I did not think it worth my while to shew that others were unfortunate in their conjectures, when I my self could produce nothing more certain. But here I thought fit to say something about the Conjecture of Dr. Hammond concerning two sorts of Bishops in the Apostles time, in single Cities; because that may make for the illustration of Ecclesiastical History.

II. It appears indeed by Acts xv. and other places, that there was some disagreement between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, and that these latter had a Letter sent them, which is there set down. But that there were two distinct Churches, and two sorts of Bishops, can be
be gather'd from no sign. Nor is it at all probable, that after this Chapter Apostolical Decree, the Jewish Christians refused to unite with the Gentiles; especially Jerusalem being destroyed, and St. Paul having written so many Epistles about the unprofitableness of the Mosaical Rites. There are no credible Records by which it may appear that Evodius and Ignatius were together Bishops of the Antiochian Churches. In the Apostolical Constitutions Lib. vii. c. 46. it is said indeed that Evodius was ordained by St. Peter (not by St. John, as it is said by the Doctor) and Ignatius by St. Paul. But not to say that we cannot easily believe that Writer, as being a notorious Impostor; he does not say that they were made Bishops at the same time, and of several Congregations, as is well observed on that place by J. Bapt. Cotelerius, who has also other things worth reading about this matter.

III. What is said here about St. John's ruling the Jewish Churches in Asia, while St. Paul, and after him Timothy ruled the Gentiles, is a mere invention of our Author. There is no footstep of a twofold Episcopacy in those places; and that Timothy was first Bishop of Ephesus is also very uncertain, because he might be left there by St. Paul as an Evangelist, not as a Bishop: for the late Catalogues are not worthy our regard, which reckon up the Bishops of antient times, according to the opinion of the Age in which they were written, and not according to any certain knowledge. They tell us indeed that the Apostles themselves were Bishops, which is absurd, tho' Dr. Hammond also speaks in the same manner. But granting him that Timothy was Bishop of Ephesus, still there are two things that remain doubtful: One is, that John was at Ephesus, or somewhere near it, when Timothy was left there by St. Paul. And secondly, that both of them performed the Office of Bishop in different Congregations; and that St. John did not come thither after Timothy's Ordination, and exercise only the Office of an Apostle, not of a Bishop. It's plain the Writer of the Apostolical Constitutions, whose Authority the Doctor elsewhere makes use of, says that Timothy was constituted Bishop of that City by St. Paul, and John by St. John.

IV. What is said here of the Church of Rome was, I believe, invented by Dr. Hammond, to reconcile the Antients that disagreed among themselves about the first Bishop of Rome after the Apostles; but he never found in any credible History, that two Apostles were Bishops of the Roman Church, and had each their Deacon, whom they left in their place. The Apostles could not be Bishops of any particular Church, and they are mere Dreams which are related concerning the Deaconship of Linus and Clemens. Whoever desires to be informed about...
Chapter about those beginnings of the Church of Rome, may consult Dr. Pearson, and Mr. Dodwell's Dissert. about the first Bishops of that City. I wonder our Author, who had such sharp adversaries to deal with, ventured to propose such things without proof. The conjunction of two Churches at Rome under Clemens, is also another Fiction, of which there is nothing at all said by any of the Antients. The Author of the Apostol. Constit. affirms, that Linus was ordained by St. Paul, and Clemens μετὰ τὴν Διαθήκην, after the death of Linus. On which place see Cotelerius.

V. That after the restoring of Jerusalem by Adrian, or a little before, there were two Bishops of Jerusalem, none of the Antients ever said, Eusebius, in Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. c. 5. where he sets down the succession of the Bishops of Jerusalem, tells us, that the time during which they were Bishops was unknown, but that fifteen fat till the Siege of Adrian, which were all Jews by descent. Then he adds, συνωτοι τινας αυτοις των πυεαν Εκκλησιας της Εκκλησιας πενυν και και των Αποστολων κα των των διηρεκοδων πολομεων; that all the Church under them was made up of believing Jews, who had continued from the Apostles to the Siege which then happen'd. By this it appears, that there were not two Congregations at that time in Jerusalem; nor indeed does Eusebius mention those fifteen Bishops, as if some of them had been Bishops together, but all one after another. That there were many Bishops within a short compass of time, may as well be attributed either to their being of a great age when they were elected, or the sudden death whereof some of them were overtaken, as to a multiplicity of Bishops in one City. The same Historian, in the next Chapter, after he had spoken of the Calamities which befel the Jews under Adrian, and related how Jerusalem was restored, and called Αἰλία, in honour of Αἰλίος Adrian, subjoins; και οὐδε τινας ἐκκλησιας ἐν ἑαυτην ουσκειοθεσιως, ἀντιθητης των των ἐκχειαν ἐκκλησιας ἐκκλησιας της Αἰλίας, των τω υπερ οἰκουμενικην ἐκκλησιας ἀντιθητης της Αἰλίας. And the Church of the same place being composed of Gentiles, Marcus first, after the Bishops of the Circumcision, undertook the Priesthood over them that were there. He does not say ουσκειοθεσιως ἐκκλησιας ἐν ἑαυτην τινας ἐκκλησιας, the Church being composed of Jews and Gentiles, as he ought to have said according to Dr. Hammond's Opinion.

VI. Diversity of languages could be no reason for the Jewish and Gentile Christians keeping up distinct assemblies, because the Jews of old, as also now, understood the languages of the places in which they lived; or at least the Greek, which obtained in all Asia as well as in Greece: and for that reason there were so many Greek Translations made of the Old Testament for the sake of the Jews, that of the Septuagint,
Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, &c. And whatever were the Customs Chapter of the Jews, there are extant no Records whereby it appears, that after the Apostles times they refused to meet in the same Assemblies with the Gentiles; nor can any such thing be gather'd from the writings of the Apostles, as that they were forced in every particular Town or City to constitute two Bishops and two Churches: For all Differences are not open Schisms. So that there is no reason why we should assent to Dr. Hammond, obtruding upon us a raw Conjecture, almost for a certain Truth. It would be easy to find any thing in ancient History, if we might be allowed to reason after the same rate, and interpret the Antients by supplying what is wanting in them with Conjecture, as if they said in so many words what we infer only by guessing from doubtful signs.

CHAP. XII.

Ver. 6. Our Author owes what he says here to Cæsar Baronius, Note c. as many other things, which he took and set down out of him without examination, which made him judge amidst of the place in Tacitus; for Tacitus does not give the least intimation of his thinking that the Christians were guilty of firing the City. For after he had said, in Annales lib. xv. c. 44. that the scandal of the City's being burn'd by the Emperor's order, could not be wipe'd off by any humane endeavours, nor by the Princes gifts, nor by imploring the Gods, he subjoyns: Ergo abolendo rumoris Nero subsidit res, where the Verb subdere is all one as loco veri auctoris alium supponere, to substitute another in the place of the true Author; and res does not signify one convinced of any crime, but only one that is accused, as all know that understand Latin. Afterwards he describes the rise and progress of Christianity from Judæa as far as Rome, and at length relates the Torments endured by the Christians, in these words: Igitur primo correpti qui fatebantur, first those were taken up who confessed, namely, that they were Christians, not those that set the City on fire, as Baronius misinterprets it, and after him Dr. Hammond, which the following words clearly shew: Deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens, HAUD PER-INDE in crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis convicti sunt: then by their discovery a great multitude was convicted of the crime of having set on fire the City, as of hatred to mankind. If they had confessed it, they would have been found guilty, by their very own confession. I do not vindicate Tacitus for his hatred against the Christians, and his shameful ignorance in the business of Religion; but only from the Lye which he is falsely charged with.
Chapter XIII.

Ver. 7. *Kai ἐξεξάλειψεν πόλεμός &c.* Here our Author, in his Paraphrase, after Grotius, entertains us with a nauseous Fable about the contention of Simon with St. Peter; which I have confuted on 2 Thess. ii. They that believe such Stories, either have not examin’d them, or believe what they please, not what they are sure is true.

Ver. 10. *Κατηρίθην ἀπὸ Καυμής.* Of the casting down the Devil from Heaven, see my Note on Luk. x. 18. As this casting down from Heaven is to be understood metaphorically, of loss of power; so also the War which went before it, of the attempts of the Jews and superstitious Heathens against the Preachers of the Gospel, which Attempts it is prophesied should be vain; not of the fabulous Conflict of Simon Peter with Simon Magus.

CHAP. XIII.

Ver. 1. I T was not worth the while to cite Ausonius, a Christian Poet, when there were Heathen Poets ready at hand. And besides, the last Verse is not rightly quoted, which is;

*Hæc erit ætérna série ab origine Romæ,*

not mundi. See the four Epigrams, which are at the end of the Epigr. of Ausonius. There are a great many Medals in which Rome is stiled ETERNAL. See Numism. Imp. Praetant. collected by J. Valentius.


*Terrarum DEA, gentiumque Roma,*
*Cui par est nihil, & nihil secundum.*

Car. Patinus in the beginning of his Collection Numism. Aer. Imp. mentions 4 pieces of Coin, in which over the figure of a Womans head, with a Tower or Helmet upon it, there is this inscription, *ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ.* And those pieces were coined by the Symadenses, Temenoburitæ, Amoriani, and Anicrani. He also speaks of other pieces of Coin inscribed thus, *ΘΕΑ ΣΤΡΑΓΩΝΟΣ,* and *ΘΕΡΩΣ ΔΗΜΟΣ,* which are all names of Blasphemy attributed to Rome and the Romans.

Ver. 3. Note b. I shall add some things here at the end of this Note, which will partly confirm, and partly confute what Dr. Hammond says.
the REVELATION.

I. It's true that one may by a Hebraism signify that which is first in order, or number; but as the Hebrew word רְכַבָּד, which is rendered as, never signifies first in dignity, so neither can signify the chief of the heads. Nor is it necessary that this Phrase should be so understood, that Grotius and Dr. Hammond's interpretation may stand. It is sufficient if do but signify one. So that Dr. Hammond had no reason to enlarge Grotius his Note with this false Interpretation.

II. It is true indeed that Livy affirms, caput humanum aperientibus fundamenta Templi apparuisse: that a man's head was found by those who dug up the foundations of the Temple, but is false that the Oracle was consulted. They consulted an Hetrurian Prophet, as we are told by Dionysius Halicarnasseus lib. iv. Ed. Wechel, pag. 257. and he answered: ἐν καρδίᾳ κοβακόνοιμον ἰταλίας, καὶ τὸν τότον ἐν καρδίᾳ ἐγκριν: that the Fates had determined, that that place, in which they had found the Head, should be the Head of all Italy. Which is expressed in this manner by Livy lib. i. c. 51. Qua visa species hacte per ambages, arcem eam Imperii, caputque rerum fore portendebat; idque ita cecinere vates, quique in urbe erant, quosque ad eam rem consultandum ex Etruria accicerant. Which fight clearly portended that that place should be the chief strength of the Empire, and the Head of the World; and so it was interpreted by the Prophets, both those that were in the City, and those that were sent for out of Etruria to be consulted about that matter.

III. That the deadly wound here given to the Beast may be rightly understood of the burning of the Capitol, appears, not only by what is said by Grotius and Dr. Hammond, but also by the opinion which the Records of the Heathens shew them to have had about such an Event. For here we are not to consider the thing itself, but the mens opinion, from which the Christians might rightly argue against the Heathens. It was ordinarily therefore look'd upon as a Prodigy, if a Temple was touched from Heaven; and that Prodigy was so much the greater, by how much more magnificent or venerable the Temple was thought to be. Livy will supply us with a great many such Examples, but see particularly lib. xxvii. c. 4. where among other Prodigies it is related, jovis ædis culmen fulmine ictum, ac prope omni tepeto nudatum: that the top of Jupiter's Temple was struck with a thunderbolt, and almost stript of all its covering. So also Cicero in the second Book about his Consulship, among the Prodigies portending Catilina's Conspiracy, made mention of this, as appears from lib. 1. de Divin. c. 12.
ANNOTATIONS on

Nunc ea Torquato qua quondam & Consule Cotta,
Lydius ediderat Tyrrenae Gentis aruspex,
Omnia fixa tuus glomerans determinat annus.
Nam pater altitumans, stellanti nixus Olympo,
Ipse suos quondam tumulos ac Templam petivit,
Et Capitolinis inject sedibus ignes.

All these things which were heretofore under the Consulship of Torquatus and Cotta, foretold by Lydus the Etrurian Prophet, are now ratified, and accomplished; for Jupiter has sometime since smitten his own Hills and Temples, and thrown fire into the Capitol. And therefore the burning of the Capitol under Vespasian was counted a very great calamity, as we may see by these tragical words of Tacitus in Hist. lib. iii. c. 72. Id facinus post conditam urbem, lucentissimum, faedissimumque populo Romano accidit; nullo externo hoste, propitiis, si per mores nostros liceret, Deis; sedem Jovis Opt. Max. auspiscato à majoribus pignus imperii conditam, quam non Porsena dedita urbe, neque Galli capta, ternerare potuissent, furore principum exscindi. Arserat & ante Capitolium civili bello, sed fraude privata; nunc palam obsessum, palam incensum. Quibus armorum causis, quo tantae cladi pretio pro patria bellavimus? &c. This Action, since the first building of the City, was the most dismal and shameful that ever happened to the People of Rome; that when we had no foreign enemy at our gates, and the Gods, for any thing we had done to provoke them, were propitious to us, the seat of the great and excellent Jupiter, ominously ered as a pledge of Dominion, which neither Porsena, when the City was delivered to him, nor the Gauls, who took it by Assault, had been able to break into, should be destroyed by the fury of our own Princes. Once also before, the Capitol was burnt, during a Civil War, but it was then by secret fraud; now it was openly bestr, and openly set on fire. Was it for this, and that so great a Calamity might befall us, that we have been engaged in so many Wars, and fought so long for our Country? How great the fame of this Accident was among neighbouring Nations, and how they interpreted it as a Prodigy, the fame Writer tells us in Hist. l. 4. c. 54. where having made mention of the Commotions—that were in Gaul and Germany, he faith, Nibil æque quam incendium Capitolii, ut finem Imperii adesse crederent, impulerat. Captam olim à Gallis urbem; sed integra Jovis fede, manuisse Imperium. Fatali nunc igne, signum coelestis iræ datum, & posse ensenem rerum humanarum Transalpinis gentibus portendi superstitione vana Drudee censebant. Nothing had so much inclined them to think that the end of the (Roman) Empire was come, as the burning of the Capitol. That the City had been formerly
formerly taken by the Gauls, but Jupiter's Seat standing safe, the Empire had continued. Now that by this fatal fire it appeared the Gods were incensed against the Romans, and designed to confer the government of the World upon the Nations beyond the Alps, was the superstitious tone of the Druids. So that these Comotions being appeased, and the Capitol rebuilt, it might be said that the deadly wound was healed.

Verf. 8. Note e. It should have been added, with Grotius, that the word ἔργον is understood, in the book of life of the Lamb slain, written from the beginning of the world; that is, in which God from the beginning of the World, until this time, began to write the names of the Confessors and Martyrs for the Truth, whom wicked men had persecuted or killed for its sake: for of a man that is alive it cannot be said, his name was not written from the beginning of the world, instead of never; for it could not be written before he was born, supposing the Discourse to be about a Catalogue only of those who have begun to live, as it is here, which Dr. Hammond acknowledges.

Verf. 10. Note f. I do by no means think, that S. John here has a respect to Passive Obedience, as our Author's Counrymen speak, but to the Persecutors themselves; to whom it is foretold, by this Proverb, that it should be their lot to suffer the same things they inflicted upon others. See Grotius on this place. To this purpose is the Subject of Lactantius his Book de mortibus Persecutorum. So that in this place their Opinion is neither approved nor condemned, who think it lawful to oppose force by force, provided there be a prospect of doing it successfully, and without too much bloodshed. Nor is there any thing said about this matter in the places which the Doctor cites; and it is a thing which it's probable he would not here have thought of, unless he had lived in the days of Cromwel. But those things which please us, we bring to mind upon the least occasion.

Verf. 15. Note m. Excepting the place in the Maccabees, all our Author here says is taken out of Hugo Grotius, who treats of the same matter more largely and accurately. I have allledged a more antient example to this purpose on Numb. xxxv. 6. than any allledged by either of them. See also what Spencer has collected about this Subject, de Rit. Mof. Legg. l. 2. c. 14.

Verf. 17. Note n. What our Author here says, of the several ways whereby sacred marks were received, and what follows as far as the citation of Martianus Capella, he took for the most part out of Grotius; but excepting these words: Of these Servius and Virgil makes frequent mention, [perhaps it may be so printed in that Edition of Dr. Hammond which Mr. Le Clerc used; but in the second Edition of it, it is,
Chapter XIII. Which if Mr. Le Clerc had known would not have made this remark. Which are a manifest corruption of these words of Grotius: *Talia mystica nomina etiam alius Deisuisse ex Servio discimus: that other Gods also had such mystical names we may learn from Servius.* Virgil himself nowhere makes mention of such names, much less does he frequently mention them, and perhaps it is but in one place they are mentioned by Servius.

II. They that had received the mark of Bacchus, were not for that reason called *vaglinophagi*, but because when they danced at Bacchus his Feasts, they really carried in their hands a bunch of Ivy, or a *vaglin.*

III. I wonder that our learned Author, who interprets the first Beast of the Idolatry of Rome, and especially of the Capitol, did not seek for the number of the Beast in the names of the Gods of the Capitol. My self, supposing what is said by Grotius and Dr. Hammond to be true, and conjecturing that the mark of the name, or of the number of the Beast, must contain the number made by the letters of the names of Jupiter and Juno, who were chiefly worshipped in the Capitol, and signify that he who bore that mark, was a worshipper of those Gods, found the number of the Beast, *χξς*, in these words:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\Delta & \text{4} \\
\text{I} & \text{10} \\
\text{O} & \text{70} \\
\Sigma & \text{200} \\
\text{E} & \text{5} \\
\text{I} & \text{10} \\
\text{M} & \text{40} \\
\text{I} & \text{10} \\
\text{H} & \text{8} \\
\text{H} & \text{8} \\
\text{P} & \text{100} \\
\text{A} & \text{1} \\
\Sigma & \text{200} \\
\hline
\text{666}
\end{array}
\]
the REVELATION.

So that he who had those Letters written on his wrist, which Chapter made 666, it was the same as if he had had written upon him Διός εἰμι XIII. Ἡγεμ., I am of Jupiter or of Juno; whereby they professed themselves to be worshippers of the Gods of the Capitol. This or some such thing seems to be signified, not that it was always done, or that the Christians were forced to receive such marks upon them, for fear of being barred all commerce with the rest of mankind; but that which is signified is the publick profession of Idolatry, of which the bearing such marks was a notable token. This Conjecture I do not propose as certain, for I confess there are few things in these Prophecies which I clearly understand, but as better agreeing with the rest of the interpretations of Learned men, than that which is said by Grotius, who fought for the number of the Beast in the name ΟΤΑΠΙΟΣ, which was that of Trajan. For the name of the Beast cannot be the name of a Prince, unless that Prince be counted a Beast; which Grotius did not think, who interprets the beast Ἰδολολατριαμ ferino more fævientem, Idolatry raging like a wild Beast, on verse 1. in his Explic. of this Chapter, first printed with the Gospels, as also in his last Works, afterward published with his Annotations on the Epistles.

Ver. 18. Note o. I. As I was rendering the foregoing Annotation into Latin, I thought of a reason of the obscurity that is in these Prophecies; which upon thorough consideration I looked upon to be very probable, and therefore I shall here propose it, which is, that a great part of these Predictions being about things that were shortly to be fulfilled by the Romans, and St. John speaking of these as the enemies of God, by whom they were also suddenly to be destroyed, it was not safe either for himself, or for others to whom he communicated these Prophecies, that the matter of them should be more clearly represented; lest the Book falling into the hands of the Romans, should be a means to enrage them. But how could they be understood, you will say? and of what use were they, if they were not understood? To this I answer, I doubt not but St. John himself very well knew what every thing in them meant, and explained the contents of them to the Bishops of Asia, and the wisest part of ordinary Christians, so far as it was necessary for them to understand the accomplishment of these Predictions. But their meaning not being thought fit to be indifferently communicated to all, lest the imprudence of some persons should bring the Apostle and the Churches into danger; the memory of their secret signification, especially upon the intervening of Persecution, was in a little time lost, and it is no wonder that it did not descend to Irenaus.
II. The distance of so many Ages is no hindrance at all to our understanding these Prophecies, considered in itself; but the want of Historical Records, that were perhaps heretofore written both by Christians and Heathens, out of which, if they were extant, we might undoubtedly come to know many of the circumstances which are here referred to. We should make out the sense better than the Antients themselves, who did nothing by rule and method; for which reason most of their Interpretations of Scripture are impertinent, and do not fute with their great reputation. I wonder that our learned Author rejects the judgment of Irenæus, about the way of explaining this place, for such silly reasons; but perhaps after he had searched a great while and could find nothing himself, he had a mind to deter others from an enquiry, which he thought would be to no purpose. It is a mistake that the custom of expressing a name by numbers was not known to the Greeks of that age, for what else can be meant by the number of the name? Does not Irenæus, who lived almost in the time of St. John, as he himself speaks, mention it as a thing which was known? in lib. v. c. 3. Is there not some such thing in the Books of the Sibyls, as Dr. Hammond himself has before observed, which most Learned men suppose to have been counterfeited in the second age? Does not also Irenæus in lib. 2. c. 40, and 42. expressly affirm that the Valentinians used the art of numbering the letters of names, for their numeral signification? But granting St. John to have taken what he says from the custom of the Jews, yet why might not he apply to the Greek letters what was usual in the Hebrew, seeing he wrote in Greek? For to suppose a man writing in Greek, and that to men who understand only that language, to think of the Hebrew names of the Idolatry of the Romans, is, in earnest, too much to indulge Conjectures, and to consider only what is possible, and not what is probable. So, 'tis certain, Barnabas searched for an Arithmetical mystery in the Greek letters, in cap. ix. of his Epistle. What our Author says about two ways of expressing numbers among the Greeks (to grant now that the thing is well expressed by him) is nothing to the purpose. For however numbers are expressed, it is all one, if that number be but found in the name which is written with its letters. We may express DC. LXVI. in Greek thus, χεξη, or by two Π, of which the first shall be within a great Π, which signifies the, a Δ inclosed in the like figure, and another Δ alone, and then last of all the letters Π. But neither way are the letters of the name expressed otherwise than by their numeral signification. Dr. Hammond does not seem to have well understood what he meant, when he argued from a twofold way of expressing numbers against Irenæus.
III. As he rashly affirmed that the Greeks, in that Age, were not acquainted with this way of expressing a name, by the number of the letters; so without reason he attributes the invention of it to the Rabbins, who perhaps borrowed it themselves from the Greeks. Doubtless Gematria is a mere corruption of the Greek word γεματρία; and it is probable that that custom would not have had a Greek name, if it had not been derived from the Greeks. I acknowledge indeed that the Rabbins did more frequently use this way of signifying names than the Greeks. [It should seem by this that Mr. Le Clerc misunderstood Dr. Hammond, for the Doctor does not say, as he represents him, that the custom of expressing names by numbers was not known at that time by the Greeks, but that it was not ordinary among them, and that it was very usual among the Rabbins of that age, unless not ordinary, inusitatum, as he translates him, and not known, ignotum, be the same.] But this was owing to the vain fancies of the Jews, who made too much use of it. So that our Author had no reason to slight the forementioned way of finding out the name of the Beast, if he had not taken some pains himself about this matter to no purpose.

Ibid. Ανθρωπος εκ άνθρωπος ἐτέρων.] Grotius interprets this in his first Explanation of this Chapter, nomen viri principis ex quo post exutam libertate Rempublicam, tempora maxime cognoscebantur: the name of a Prince, by which, after the Commonwealth was deprived of its liberty, the times were especially known; and the same he expresses in other words in his last Explanation of it. But first, the question here is, what is the number of the name of the Beast, not of a Man, as I have already said. Secondly, St. John would rather have said α' της Θεοτοκος than α' της Θεοτοκος. Lastly, it is nothing to this place, that the times were signified by the names of Emperors; for St. John does not speak about the time when the Beast was to shew itself, but about his name expressed in numbers. What is then the number of a man? I answer, a small number, or one not so great that a man cannot count it. So άπειρον α' της Θεοτοκος is used afterwards in Chap. xxi. 17. where see my Note.

CHAP. XIV.

Ver. 2. Άπειρον α' της Θεοτοκος.] This is rightly understood by Grotius and Dr. Hammond, of multitudes of converted Gentiles. Ovid twice uses the same comparison, speaking of a tumult of people, Metam. lib. v. Fab. i.
You may compare them to the Sea, which the fierce rage of the Winds make rough with Waves. And Metam. xv. Fab. 49.

Qualia fuit
Æquorei faciunt sique procul audiat illos,
Tale sonat populus.

Such a noise as the waves of the Sea make, when they are heard afar off, was made by the people.

Ver. 10. Note d. I have already on Matt. xxvii. 34. rejected Dr. Hammond's interpretation of this place, because SUB is no where used to signify the bitterness, or poison of God, which is an absurd phrase. We must render this place thus: of the Wine of the wrath of God, which is without mixture poured into the cup of his indignation, for which frequently signifies to pour in, as Mr. Gataker had shown at large in Advers. cap. v. where he has collected a great many things about this, and the like phrases.

Ver. 13. Τὸ Νησίαν ἀντέχειν ἀνάκτοις τῷ ἀντών. It is said that riches do not follow rich men, because it is of no advantage after death, to have been rich in this world: but on the contrary, here it is said of good men, that their works follow them, because they receive the reward promised to them, from God. To this purpose are the verses of Euripides in Temenos.

Ἀργείος ὁ κράτος τῆς ἐκ ἀλλήλων
Ζηλὸς ὁ κρατίστος αἰματός, ἡμίστιον ἄρσ
Ἀναστά σφιδα συναντών ζωός ξοδέκα.

Virtue when any one dies, is not destroyed,
But lives even after the dissolution of the body; but when a bad man Dies, all he possesseth perishes, and descends with him under the earth.

Which are in Florileg. Stobaei Tit. 1. So the Rabbins in Pirke Aboth cap. penult. In the hour wherein a man departs out of this life, neither Silver, nor Gold, nor precious Stones, nor Pearls stick by a man, but only the Law and good Works.

Ver. 20. Note h. Our Author did not well understand Grotius, who does not say these slaughters happen'd in Judea, but interprets the words γελοῖον ἡλεκτριν, extra Judeae terminos, without the limits of Judea.
the Revelation.

Chapter XV.

Verse 3. Αwaters of an name.] That is, just and righteous (ἀκεύς) are thy ways; for among the Greeks ἀνήσι, and words properly signifying the same thing, are often taken for ἀκεύς, righteous. So ἁρυμῳ, in Homer and Hesiod, is frequently used for righteous: whence Hesychius hath, ἀνήσι, δαναζ έ δανής, just. It is a noted Verse of Horace, which is the last of Epist. vii. lib. i.

Metiri se quemque suo modulo ac pede verum est.

That is, say the old Scholia, ἀκεύμ est, ac decet, it is just and fit. To the same purpose is the Observation of Priscian, in lib. xviii. fol. 115. Ed. Badiana: "Sophocles in his Ajax says, διιαθο, περι for verus, "true. And our Latins also often put verus for justus, and justus for "verus. As Virgil, Æneid. xii.

Quæcunque est fortuna, mea est, me verius unum
Pro vobis suedes lucere & decernere ferro.

"By verius he means justius.

Chapter XVI.

Verse 12. I. W hat Dr. Hammond says about the treacherous Chapter Note e. Bridg of Maxentius, is false, and grounded indeed that Maxentius had made that Bridg ὑμανανο ὑλίθης καθ' ευτίκεις, for an engine of his own destruction. But that came to pass accidentally, not that the Bridg was so contrived as to fall in pieces of its own accord; for Maxentius would not have been such a Fool, as to make use of that Bridg himself.

II. It is false that Eusebius says these things happen'd to Constantine according to the prediction of the divine Oracles, or thought that
Chapter S. John had a respect to them in this Vision. He only compares this XVII. Event with the antient Miracles, and applies some places of Scripture to it.

Ver. 17. Note i. St. John indeed seems to have taken this Phrase from the Stile of the Greeks and Latins; but that it is usual in Prophecies to express sad events covertly, as by an Euphemismus, I leave them to believe who never read them, or have forgotten them.

C H A P. XVII.

Ver. 3. Dr. Hammond sometimes allidges the words of Writers Note b. so carelessly, that he does not so much as set down a perfect sense, as here in the words of Tertullian, which are in cap. 7. Ed. Rigaltianæ. In quæm enim alium universæ Gentes crediderunt, nisi in Chriftum qui jam venit? Cui enim et alie Gentes crediderunt, Partbi, Medi — tunc et in Jerusalem Judei, et cætera Gentes, ut jam Getulorum variætates, et Maurorum multis fines; Hispanicum omnes terminis Galliarum diversæ nationes, & Britannorum inaccessa, &c. For in whom else have all Nations believed, but in the Christ who is now come? For whom have other Nations also believed, the Parthians, Medes — then also the Jews in Jerusalem, and the rest of the World, as now the several Nations of the Getuli, and many Countries of the Moors; all the People of Spain, and divers Nations of France, and the places, &c. But who will believe that Tertullian, according to the custom of zealous Declamers, did not make the thing more than it really was? It's certain there were but few Christians, if any, among those Nations, when they invaded the Roman Empire, and they did not receive the Christian Religion till they had fixed themselves in it. I shall say nothing about the counterfeit Lucius in England.

Ver. 5. Note c. The word κυρίας considered in itself, signifies nothing shameful, nor could it be used by Achilles Tatius in the sense our Author here mentions, but improperly. I do not deny but in the Eleusinia sacra there were some indecent Rites used; but I do not think they were so very unclean and abominable as the Doctor supposes, nor will any one else think so that has read Meursius his Eleusinia, or otherwise at all versed in Greek Writers. They concealed rather some Secrecies about the Gods, than any Lusts which they there indulged. And that the religious Solemnities of the Romans were commonly joined with Fornication or other such unclean Actions, nobody will believe who is not a stranger to their History. There is no doubt indeed, but the strange Rites which were brought to Rome were for
that reason sometimes forbidden, as the *Orgia of Bacchus*, in *Livy*, lib. Chapter xxxix. and the Rites of the *Egyptians* in *Tacitus*, *Annal. lib. ii. cap. 85.* XVII. But this very thing shows that the Roman Worship was not generally accompanied with Uncleanliness, as our Author frequently affirms. It is fallly also said by him, more than once, that Idolatry was propagated in other Countries from the City of Rome, when the Idolatry of the Egyptians, Syrians, and Grecians, was much more antient than the Roman. But Rome may be said to have made the Kings of the earth drunk with the wine of her Fornication, because she resolutely adhered to Idolatry, and confirmed it by her example, tho' the Jews and Christians had for some time upbraided her with it; and because also she went before many others in the Worship of the City of Rome, as a Goddess, and her Emperors.

Vers. 8. Note d. Our learned Author does not seem to have well understood what it was in the time of *Vespasian, Cæsarensis Salutari*; for he thinks it was just the same as to be called *Augustus* and Emperor, which it is not; for at that time the Sons of the Emperors were called *Caesars* almost as soon as ever their Fathers came to the Throne, but they were not therefore *Augusti*. *Domitian*, in his Father's absence, was indeed, at least in show, invested with the Government, because the state of Affairs required it, no other daring to take upon him to be Emperor whilst the Prince his son was present; but he was not therefore accounted *Augustus* [his Majesty:] or made Partaker of the supreme Power. So that no one could wonder if that unsettled Authority of *Domitian* ceased at his Father's Return, who had not intrusted him with the Empire. Yet that which our Author meant, might be said, but in the words of *Grotius*, which he corrupted.

Vers. 14. Note e. I. Our Author sets down somewhat largely this Story, but without necessity, because *Orosius*, who lived in those times, often affirms that the *Goths* were at that time Christians, in *lib. 7*. The latter place cited out of him by our Author, I was a great while before I could find, for it is not in *lib. 11. c. 10.* as it is absurdly set in the Margin, when *Orosius* wrote only seven Books in all; but I met with it at last accidentally in *lib. 2. c. 3.* *Et Christiani fuerent qui parcerent, & Christiani quibus parcerent, & Christiani propter quorum memoriam, & in quorum memoriam parcerent.* The same Author has also the Story related by *Rubeus*, in *lib. 7. c. 37*.

II. But it is true that the neighbouring barbarous Kings often fought against the Lamb. *Austin de Civ. Dei lib. 18. c. 52.* where he confutes those who thought that after the Accomplishment of the ten Persecutions which had already been, there was none to come but
Chapter XVII.

the eleventh, which was to happen in the very time of Antichrist, among other things says this; *Nisi forte non est persequutio computanda, quando Rex Gotthorum, in ipsa Gothia, persequitus est Christianos persequutione mirabili, cum ibr non essent Catholici, quorum plurimi martyrio coronati sunt; sicut a quibusdam fratibus, quis tunc illic pueri fuerant, & se ista vidisse incunctanter recordabantur, audivimus.* Unless perhaps it is not to be reckoned a Persecution when the King of the Goths strangely persecuted the Christians in Gothia itself, because there were not then any Catholics, of whom a great many were crowned with martyrdom; as we have heard from certain Brethren that were there when Children, and well remembered that they saw those things. See also Orosius in lib. 7. c. 32. Then of the Conversion of those Northern People, after their Entrance into the Roman Empire, and there settling themselves, Orosius speaks thus in lib. 7. c. 41. *Quanquam si ob hoc solum barbari Romanis finibus inmissi forent, quod vulgo per Orientem & Occidentem Ecclesia Christi, Hunnis, Suevis, Vandalis, & Burgundionibus, diversis & innumeris credentium populis replentur, laudanda & attollenda Dei misericordia videretur; quandoquidem, nisi cum labefaciatione nostris, tantae gentes agnationem veritatis acciperent, quam invenire utique, nisi hoc occasione, non possent. Tho if it were only for this, that the Barbarians should have been sent into the Roman Borders, that generally the Eastern and Western Churches are filled with Huns, Suevians, Vandals, Burgundians, and a multitude of other different sorts of people, who have embraced the Christian faith, yet we ought to praise and extol the mercy of God; considering that, tho' with the weakening of the Empire, so great Nations receive the knowledge of the Truth, which they would never have attained if they had not had this opportunity.*

Ver. 16. Note f. There are some faults in this Annotation, which I must correct. I. It is absurdly said by Dr. Hammond of Genesericus, that he robb'd the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus OR Olympus. For no body ever called Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome Olympus, nor is there any such thing in Procopius. The Temple of Jupiter Olympus was at Olympia, not at Rome. I might perhaps also say that this is a Fable, and that it is not likely that the Capitolian Temple had stood untouch'd, under so many Christian Emperors. But I leave the matter undecided. II. Our learned Author, having reckon'd Illyricum among the provinces which the Barbarians possessed, mentions also Dalmatia, which should have been left out; because every one knows that Dalmatia is the same Country, which was before called Illyricum. III. After he had spoken of Totilas, and referred us for what he had said about him, as one would think, to Sozomen, lib. ix. c. 6. where that Author speaks of Alaricus, he immediately adds: *This being done in the time of Honorius, making, as the Reader*
der might suppose, Bellisarius contemporary with Honorius, which he Chapter knew to be false, but designed by the word THIS, tho no body would XVIII. think so, to refer to what he had said before the mention of Totila and Bellisarius; for the burning of part of Rome by Totila, was after the time of Honorius and Innocentius. IV. A little after he says, that Innocentius was not at Rome (after the first taking of it before the second) but he would have said Siege of it, for he knew that Alaric twice besieged Rome, and took it but once. V. I have set down the place cited out of Orosius Lib. vii. c. 38. more at large in my Latin Transl. than it is in the English; because the words which Dr. Hammond omits make more to his purpose, than those which he alludes. [And they are these:] Rhadagaiso Romanis arcibus imminente, fit omnium Paganorum in urbem concursus, hostem esse cum utique virium copia, tum maxime praefidio Deorum potens; urbem autem ideo desitutam & maturè perituram, quia Deos & sacra perdiderit. Magnis querelis ubique agitur, & continuo de repentina sacrilaria celebrandisque tractatur; fervent tota urbe blasphemiae, vulgo nomen Christi, tanquam lues aliqua, praesensium temporum probris ingravatur. When Rhadagasius drew near the Roman Towers, all the Pagans ran together into the City (crying out) that an Enemy was come against them, who besides a powerful Army, had also the Gods to assist him; and that the City was destitute of all hope, and would soon be destroyed, because they had lost the Gods, and forborne to do sacrifice to them. There were heavy Complaints made in all places, and presently they entered—offering them; all the City was filled with loud Blasphemies, and the name of Christ was reviled and inveighed against as some present Plague.

CHAPEL. XVIII.

Verf. 2. It is much more natural to think that the Jews groaning under the Roman Tyranny, and believing they should be deliver'd from all manner of Evils by the Messias, did upon that ground conclude that the Romans should be destroyed by him, that being agreeable to their most noted sentiments; than to suppose, against all probability, that they learned it from the Revelation. For nothing is more certain than that the Christians and their Writings were detested by the Jews. So that what is here said of the persuasion of that People, being nothing at all to St. John, might have been omitted without any loss to the Reader.

Verf. 8. Note b. If the desolations that were brought upon Rome by Alaricus Gensericus and Totila be all put together, without doubt the misery of that City will be the greater; but all these are not comprehended
Chapter headed in the Testimony of Palladius, who speaks only of the taking XVIII. of Rome by Alaric, which happen'd An. Chr. CCCXX. when Genesius took it in An. Chr. CCCCLV. and Totila An. Chr. DXLVI. Which times our Author should have distinguished, and not spoken of them confusedly.

II. It is true what he says about the sense of prophetic Expressions, of which see the Examples I have alluded on Rev. iv. 2. and elsewhere. But he ought not to have said, that after the Prophecies of Jeremiah, the Dominion of Babylon was translated to the Medes, but to the Persians, as every one knows: but the confused Memory of the four pretended Monarchies put him out.

Verf. 13. Our Author took almost all this out of H. Grotius, as many other things; without ever looking into Julius Pollux; by whom he would have seen that Grotius his Animadversion was false. Pollux in Lib. iii. c. 8. S. 2. where he reckons up the names of Slaves, says that those were called ἵλα ωματα which were φις δείσιον ἀθάνατώσκειν, changed for Money; and a little after he says: ὁματα ἐὰν ἑπίδει εἰς ἐν ἑτερ; ἀλα ἵλα ωματα: we must not say Bodies simply, but Servile Bodies. In which he corrects the common, but barbarous Custom of those who called a Slave ωμα; but he does not say that ωμα signifies Freemens which hire themselves for Money. It is true indeed that ωμα is used of any Man, whether a Freeman or a Slave, as Lexicographers will shew. But when the Discourse is about Wealth, or buying or selling Slaves, then ωμα signifies a Slave, not from the proper Notion of the word, but because of the Circumstances. Examples are allledged by If. Cusaboyn on Athenæus Lib. V. c. 10. A hireling was never called ωμα, and therefore the reason of that Appellation, invented by Grotius, is groundless. But Slaves are stiled Bodies, when in reckoning up Possessions men are opposed to other things, which do not use to be called by that name. They are stiled also Souls by the Jews, and by the Greeks, because as many Slaves as there are, so many Souls there are, or, as the Lawyers speak, Persons. Nor is it any thing against this signification of the word ωμα, that there are Souls of Men afterwards mention'd, which are Slaves; for such repetitions are not avoided by these Writers.

Verf. 23. Note d. As our Author before rashly followed Grotius, whom he transcribed without examination, so here he rashly forsakes him. For it is the wealth of the Romans, and not that of Strangers, which is extolled in this place. Grotius had produced a Passage out of Isa. xxiii. 8. where there is the like Phrafe, whom the Reader may consult.
the REVELATION.

CHAP. XIX.

Verf. 8. It is a mistake that ἰδιωματα is used in these Books for the Ordinances of the Mosaical Law, as I have shewn on Rom. viii. 4. In this place ἰδιωματα δέον are the Saints righteous Affions, or κατοθριματα, which are aptly described by a white Garment, whiteness being a Symbol of Innocence. Nothing could be devised more violent than Dr. Hammond's interpretation.

Verf. 20. Εἰς τὸν άμυνο τινες τὴν καυσίμην ἐν τῷ Σθίῳ. I have said in my Dissertation about the destruction of Sodom, that these Phrases are taken from the Lake Asphaltites, which is a Lake burning with Fire and Brimstone. Which seems to have been observed also by Dr. Hammond, as may be gather'd from his Paraphrase. So it is usual with the Rab-bins to banish any thing that is abominable, and the use of which they think to be profane, to the salt Sea, ים הים, as is observed by Mr. Lightfoot Cent. Chorog. on Mat. Cap. v.

CHAP. XX.

Verf. 5. I confess indeed ingeniously I do not understand the sense of this Prophecy, concerning the Persons here mention'd, reigning a thousand Years: But notwithstanding that I could, if I pleased, confute what is here said by Dr. Hammond. He will never persuade any one who believes that Christ and his Apostles were the only arbitrary (ἀρbitrary) founders and interpreters of the Christian Religion, that for a thousand Years after Constant in the Church was purer than it was before; or that there were fewer false Doctrins by publick Authority, establish'd in many Churches. In that interval of time there were not only many Herefies, which created almost perpetual differences; but very great Errors crept in among Christians, which were openly approved by the Governors of Churches; so that the Church-Discipline which our Author so much boasts of, was used only to confirm those Errors, and with the consent of Princes, to kill, or at least abuse those who dared to oppose them. So that if this Kingdom be to be extended to the thousand following Years, it must not be thought consist in sanctity of Life, and purity of Doctrin; but only in the Liberty which the Christians should enjoy, in the greatest part of the Roman Empire, so that they might be good and pious Men, without being envied or persecuted by the Heathens.
Chapter XX. 

Ver. 7. Note e. I. I wonder our learned Author here took so much pains to confute very weak Objections, and yet took no notice of the Heresies which disturbed the Eastern and Western Churches at the time when he supposes the Christians reigned; as I have before observed.

II. He takes it for certain that not only Alaricus spared the Christians, and destroyed none but Heathens, but also that Genfericus and Attila did the same, which he does not prove. This should have been shewn, and not that which he proves of Julian in so many words, when no one can deny it, who has read any thing of the History of those times.

III. I confess I don't approve of the opinion of the Millenarians, but I wonder Dr. Hammond here objects against them the condemnation of the Church, and gives them the odious name of Hereticks. For as that is but a small Error, if the rest of the Doctrins of Christiannity be retain'd, as they were by Irenaeus; so the Church had not received any Revelation about that matter from the times of the Apostles.

Ver. 8. Note f. I. That Gog and Magog signify the People who dwelt about the Mountain Caucasus, has been so clearly shewn by Sam. Bocchart Geogr. Sacr. Lib. iii. c. 12. that it is impossible to doubt of it. And the Turks having invaded Asia from those places, our Author might hence have confirmed his Interpretation; which I wonder he did not, seeing he allegeds that Writer elsewhere. For what is said here by Grotius, cannot in the least be compared with what we may learn from Bocchart, as to this matter.

II. It is true indeed that Gyges was sometime Ruler of Lydia; but the Kings which succeeded him were not therefore, as I remember, called Gyge; tho' it be affirmed by Grotius, and after him by Dr. Hammond, who absurdly deduces it from this place, whereas Gyges and his Posterity were in part antiquiter than Ezekiel, and partly his Contemporaries; and therefore sure that name could not be taken from the Revelation.

III. If the Empire of the Turks be here referred to, I had rather interpret the beloved City, and the Camp of the Saints, of all the Eastern Church, than Constantinople alone. But ver. 9. seems to oppose it, in which a sudden Victory over Gog and Magog seems rather to be promised, than the taking of that City by those People threatened. Yet this, and all other things of that kind, I leave undetermin'd.
the REVELATION.

G H A P. XXI.

Vers. 4. Cicero Tuscul. Quest. Lib. ii. c. 15. having defined labor and dolor, Labour and Sorrow, adds: hae duo, Græci illi, quoram copiosis est lingua quam nostra, uno nomine appellant; These two things, the Grecians, whose Language is more copious than ours, call by one name. He means the word πόνος, as what he says afterwards, as well as the thing it self shews. So in Epidemus Enchir. Cap. xiv. Ἐὰν πόνος οὐκ ἀκούσται, τίς νοστίμη αὐτὸν: If Sorrow present it self, you will find patience. In this place also Sorrow seems to be intended.

Vers. 12. Απολλ. Συναγ. These words seem also to signify the Apostles, as may be gather'd both from the number here specified, and from this, that by them all Nations enter'd into the Church. If this and the like things be to be applied to the Church in later times, as Dr. Hammond thinks, it must be remember'd that the praises here given to it, must be understood comparatively, so as for that Church to be opposed to the Jews and Heathens, in comparison of which it is not unworthy of these Commendations. But we must not measure its Doctrins or Practices by the perfect Rule of the Gospel, from which Dr. Hammond himself did not think but it had departed, tho' he would not acknowledg it.

Vers. 16. Ey Ταύτης.] To wit, from the bottom of the Mountain on which the City stood, to the top of its Walls; for the Walls themselves were not so very high. It is somewhat uncertain whether all the sides of this Square were twelve thousand Furlongs in length, so as that the whole Circuit was forty eight thousand Furlongs; as also the height of the Mountain joined with the height of the Walls; or whether a fourth part only of that number is to be assigned to each of the sides, that is, three thousand Furlongs. The former is most likely, so as that an exceeding great City should be described, nothing but what is great and spacious being here to be thought on.

Vers. 17. Note f. By a man's Cubit here, I rather understand an ordinary Cubit, as in Deut. iii. 11. where without doubt Moses speaks of a Cubit of six handbreadths. In Ezekiel also the Discourse is not about a Cubit of a Foot, but of six handbreadths, as is evident from vers. 5. Chap. xl. where the Angel is saith to have had in his hand a measuring Reed of six Cubits, by the Cubit, and an handbreadth, that is, six Jewish, not Babylonian Cubits. See Dr. Cumberland of the Jewish Measures.
IT was sufficient to say, that by the Authority of the Lamb sitting upon his Throne, Baptism was instituted; which is very true, and is here signified, granting that the Water in Baptism is meant by the Water proceeding out of the Throne. The rest Dr. Hammond adds of his own Invention, to find out here the power of the Keys, as he does in other places, where no one else would think them referred to. The same he does afterwards, but being in haste to make an end of this tedious work, I shall not particularly examine what he says, nor would it be worth while. For who but he could here mistake? He describes to us, for instance, the happy Condition of the Christians from Constantine, to the Year MCCCL, living under the Discipline of Church-Governors, and a most pure Church during that interval, and most worthy of Christ. Which that we might believe, either the New Testament must have been many Ages ago lost, or no footsteps at all of the History of those times remained. Our Learned Author was taken up about something else when he wrote this, and whilst he served an Hypothesis, committed to writing what was inconsistent with his stated Sentiments.

Verf. 3. Note e. If allegorical Divinity were argumentative, as the Schoolmen speak, possibly some or other might be deceived by these allegorical Interpretations, and think that Christ approved of all the Excommunications that were denounced by Church-Governors, from the time of Constantine, for ten Ages; but that Axiom of the Schoolmen being very well known, I shall not spend time in confuting our Author's Fictions, which the thing itself also abundantly confutes.

FINIS.
An INDEX

Of the Greek Words and Phrases, newly or more largely explained in the Supplement to Dr. Hammond's Annotations.

A.

Aραβος, bountiful, Rom. vi. 7.

Διδος. Αγγελις, perhaps for Δις Αγγελις, 1 Cor. xi. 10.

Δυνατος, whether it signifies the state of the Dead, or rather a place? Mat. xi. 23.

Διδος, whether one that doth not doubt, or one that makes no difference, Jam. iii. 17.

Δολυς, in an Active sense for one that cannot try things, 2 Cor. iii. 5.

Δολυς, for that which is very difficult, Heb. vi. 6.

Δολυς, νυμιν, to reject the Law, Heb. x. 28.

Αμαλκος, for a sandy, or gravelly Shore, Acts xvii. 39.

Αλεπος, properly, who? Tit. iii. 10.

Αλεπος, who? Ibid. 11.

Αλεπος, δευτεραμενος, a Phrase borrowed from the Stoics, Heb. v. 14.

Αλεπος of the Gnastics, whence so called, 1 Tim. i. 15.

Αλεπος, for eternal, and for ancient, Tit. i. 2.

Αλεπος, αυτοκρατορια, the different senses of which that Phrase is capable, Mat. xxiv. 3.

Αλεπος, as applied to the Heathens, signifies, their being out of God's Covenant, 1 Cor. vii. 14.

Αλεπος, whether one that does no hurt, or that is sincere, Mat. 10. 16.

Αλεπος, & Αλεπος, one that has no command over himself, 1 Cor. vii. 5.

Αλεπος, among the uncircumcised Gentiles, Rom. ii. 27. and iv. 11.

Αλεπος, the first fruits taken off the tops of spoils, or any other things heaped to-gether, Heb. vii. 4.


Αλεπος, not to be cold, but to grieve, 2 Cor. iv. 8. Eph. iv. 19.

Αλεπος, to be salted, and to be consumed, in Mat. ix. 49.

Αλεπος, for a seditious Person, 1 Pet. iv. 15.

Αλεπος, for what cannot always be enjoyed, or belongs not to the Mind, in a Philosophical sense, Luke xvi. 12.

Αλεπος, whether to be taken actively, or passively, 2 Pet. ii. 12.

Αλεπος, being a coiner of words, what? 1 Job. v. 16.

Αλεπος, to compel, by example or entreaty, Gal. ii. 14.

Αλεπος, of the Athlete, what? 1 Cor. ix. 25.

Αλεπος, to renew, not to dedicate, Heb. vi. 6.

Αλεπος, the measure of Faith, Rom. xii. 6.

Αλεπος, to return, Phil. i. 23. ἀπαλλαγον, a method so called, which, Ibid.

Αλεπος, whether it ever signifies in Scripture, simply a second state, or only the resurrection of the Dead, Mat. xxii. 31. Luke xx. 27.


Αριστος, signifies a Substitution, where the Discourse is about the Death of Christ, Mat. xx. 28.

Αριστος, to resist, not to imitate, 1 John ii. 18.

An Index of

Ἄρτιχος, what it signifies, 1 John ii. 18.
Ἄρτιμίας, whether it signifies a suffocation arising from Melancholy, or only violent strangling. Mat. xxvii. 5.
Ἄρτουρος & Ἀριστζώνας, the brightness of the glory of God, how Christ is said to be so, Heb. i. 3.
Ἄρτιφλεν, to disobey, applied either to small or heinous Sins, 1 Pet. iii. 20.
Ἄρτιυμα, liberality why so called, Rom. xii. 8.
Ἄρτικλος, liberal, applied to the Eye, Mat. vi. 22.
Ἄρτιτοπερα, who, Rom. i. 29. Eph. iv. 19.
Ἄρτικλος, to be understood, Gal. i. 1.
Ἄρτιντορ καθ' ἑαυτὸν, from the Creation of the World, Rom. i. 20.
Ἄρτιννας, to approve, 1 Tim. i. 15.
Ἄρτιννας, approbation, Ibid.
Ἄρτιννας, the expeliation of the Gentiles, of what kind, Rom. viii. 19.
Ἄρτιννας, ἐνδυναμία, the restitution of all things. Acts iii. 19.
Ἄρτιννας, a departure, a revolt, signifies the rebellion of the Jews against the Romans, 2 Thess. ii. 3.
Ἄρτιννας, to defraud, Mar. x. 19.
Ἄρτιννας, whether the name imports any Authority or Dignity, Luke vi. 13. who were so called, Prem. to James.
Ἄρτιννας, cast out of the Congregation, John ix. 22.
Ἄρτιννας, a word either reproachful, or which tends to corrupt the Manners of Men, Mat. xii. 36.
Ἄρτιννας, Idle, not Unclean, Tit. i. 12.
Ἄρτιννας, that which please, John viii. 29.
Ἄρτιννας, whence so called, Acts xvii. 19.
Ἄρτιννας, to espouse, 2 Cor. xi. 2.
Ἄρτιννας, who, 1 Cor. v. 10.
Ἄρτιννας, what, Phil. ii. 6.
Ἄρτιννας & ἀρτιννας, what, 2 Cor. xiii. 11.
Τίῳ ἄγων, the meaning of that Phraze, John viii. 25.
Ἄρτιννας, who, Mar. v. 22.
Ἄρτιννας, of Tiberius, how much, Mat. x. 29.
Ἄρτιννας & Ἀρτιννας, to signify a Disease of the Mind, 1 Cor. viii. 7.
Ἄρτιννας, ἐφεύγων, what, 2 Thess. iii. 6.
Ἄρτιννας, wicked, 2 Thess. iii. 2.
Ἄρτιννας, whether it signifies except that, 2 Pet. iii. 4.
Ἁρτιννας, what, Mat. vi. 16.
Ἄρτιννας, to be joined with οὐρανός, Luke i. 73.
Ἄρτιννας, not boasting, but imprudence, Mat. vii. 22. several significations of that word, Ibid.
Ἁρτιννας, nor the straw of Corn, but the Husk, Mat. iii. 12.

B.
Ἐρ. Εἰρ. ἤρ, whether it signifies, to be severe, 1 Thess. ii. 6.
Εἰρ. Εἰρ. & ἡρ, why God is so called, 1 Tim. i. 17.
Βλανγομα, an abominable thing, 1 Cor. v. 10.
Περ. περ., whether it signify a little while, in Heb. ii. 7.

Γ.
Γασεωμαχία, intemperance in eating, its derivation, Tit. i. 12.
Γραννας, applied to a Law, signifies its continuing in force, Mat. v. 18.
Γραννας, the origin of a thing, not taken for any event, Mat. i. 1.
Γραννας, for strange Languages, 1 Cor. xii. 28.
Γραννας, for a profound sort of Knowledge, and in a good sense, 2 Pet. i. 5.
Γραννας, έκπαιδευμα, whether it has any reference to the Gnosticks, 1 Tim. vi. 20.
Κατά Γραννας, prudently, or skilfully, 1 Pet. iii. 7.
Γραννας, for the literal sense of the Law. Mat. v. 17.

Δ.
Δαμαίνα, not always evil Spirits, 1 Cor. x. 20.
Δαμαίνα, for ṽ, Jam. i. 9.
Δαμαίνα, to assent to, 1 Cor. ii. 14.
Δαμαίνα, for in, 1 Tim. ii. 15.
Δαμαίνα, ἐν Χριστῷ, as a Disciple of Christ, Rom. i. 8.
Δαμαίνα, an Adversary or Hater, Mat. iv. 1.
the Greek Words and Phrases.

Διάβαλε, an ambiguous word. Anno. on the Tit. of the New Testament, and Heb. ix. 16. where there is an Argument grounded on the ambiguity of it.


Διάκονος, spoken of a Woman. what. Rom. xvi. 1.

Διακονεύον σώμα Κυρίων, what. 1 Cor. xi. 29.

Διακρίνω, to distinguish, James ii. 4.

Διακριτικοῦ, Thoughts and Counsels, Mat. xv. 19. Opinions in Rom. xiv. 1.

Διαστήνω, to finish a Voyage, Acts xxi. 7.

Διαστίζω, to gnash with the Teeth, Acts v. 33.

Διαύλω, to doubt: and διάλογος ψιθυρίας, a Man that doubteth, James i. 6. 8.

Διασπαρασθομα, under the New Testament, who, and how they differ'd from Prophets, 1 Cor. xii. 28.

Διαφωμα, St. Paul's sense of it, Rom. iii. 4.

Διαφωμα, any divine Precept, Rom. ii. 26. and viii. 4.

Διαφωματα, ἅλων, what, Rev. xix. 8.

Δίκη, the fame with Nemesis, Acts xxviii. 4.

Διακαθαρίζω, to examin and approve, Rom. ii. 18.

Δεξία, for Miracles, John i. 14. and the Power of working them, Ib. xvii. 22. whether taken for a Beam in 1 Cor. xi. 7.


Δίλοι, for Servants of a free Condition, in opposition to Slaves, Mat. xviii. 23.

Διευνέῃς Θεού, to prevail with God. Luke xviii. 5.

Ε.

Εὐσεβίωμα, what Woman, Acts xvi. 16.


Εὐχέρεια, a power over a Man's self:

εὐχέρεια, one that is master of his Passions: εὐχέρειασα, to be Temperate, 1 Cor. ix. 25. p. 319.

Εὐθεία, used in a bad sense by St. Paul, Col. ii. 15.

Εὐθύς, for the Inhabitants of several Territories in the same Country, Mat. xxiv. 7.

Εὐθυς, the Gods of the Heathens, whence so called. 1 Cor. viii. 4.

Εὐχαίρετον ἄρμα, whether it signifies to excommunicate, Luke vi. 22.

Εὐκλησία, the use of the word in the Primitive Times. 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

Εὐξεία, whether taken for a Church, 2 John i.


Εὐχέλλω, εὐχέλλω, by or from many, 2 Cor. i. 11.

Εὐχέλλω, εὐχέλλω, εὐχέλλω, what, Jud. xi.

Εὐχερχος, whether a Persuasion, or an Argument, Heb. xi. 1.

Εὐχερχος, a burnt Sacrifice, Mark ix. 49.

Εὐφανεία, to accuse, Acts xxiv. 1.

Εὐφυς, λόγος, a word which sinks down into the minds of its Hearers, 1 Sam. i. 21.

Εὐγενεία, taken both Actively and Passively, Gal. v. 6. where the Doctor's Opinion about the use of it in the New Testament is examin'd.

Εὐξοφιοῦς, to despair utterly, 2 Cor. iv. 7.

Εὐχή, to signify the Coming of Christ to take Vengeance upon the Jews, Luke ix. 31.


Εὐκαταλάλω, for a Veil, 1 Cor. xi. 10.

Εὐκατάλησις, whether to be rendred, sending out, or loos'd, 2 Pet. i. 20.

Εὐκάθιστος, any Lust whatsoever, 2 Pet. i. 4.

Εὐκαθίστω, that which is necessary for the future, Mat. vi. 11.

Εὐκαθίστω, visitation, either in Mercy or in Vengeance, 1 Pet. ii. 12. p. 589.

Εὐκαθίστω, to look into, or understand throughly, 1 Pet. ii. 12.

Εὐκαθίστω, to get his Living by Labour, John vi. 27.

Εὐκαταλάλω, the same as hereafter, 2 Pet. iii. 3.

Εὐκαθίστω, what, 2 Cor. vi. 14.

Εὐκαθίστω, to receive a gracious Promife, Heb. iv. 2.

Εὐκενεία, what disposition of Mind, Acts xvii. 11.

Εὐκενεία, that is easily circumvented, not joined with Temptations, Heb. xii. 1.

Εὐκενεία, happened, Mat. i. 18.


Εὐκενεία, a cleanly word for obscene Discourse, Eph. v. 4.
An Index of

Ἐκκλήσια ἡ θεοῦ, not the Devils but a Man, in Mat. xiii. 28.
*Eos, used as an Adverbial, Mat. v. 18.

Z.
Ζηνομένα, with an Accusative case, no Elliptical Phrase, Mat. xvi. 26.
Ζῶν γεγονότα εἰς ἀλοιφὴν Ἡ φωνήν, what, 1 Cor. v. 10.

H.
Ἡ, when a Negation goes before Ἡ, the same as ἢ or ἢ, Eph. v. 3.

Θ.
Θέλω, for I would. Rom. vii. 15. for I had rather, 1 Cor. vii. 6.
Θεμιστὸς, the same as Κείσκλης, and perhaps to be so read, 1 Tim. vi. 19.
Θεοφιλάκτος, preserved by God, nor, one that defends God, 1 Tim. ii. 1.

I.
Ἰδοὺς ἔλαθον, how St. Paul confides himself to be so, 2 Cor. xii. 6.
Ἰδανίδια, what, Rom. iii. 25.
Ἰδανίς σι, the meaning of that Phrase, Mat. xvi. 22.
Ἰδιάς, a Cloak, Mat. v. 40.
Ἰσα Θεός ἐνας to be made equal with God, Phil. ii. 6.

K.
Καθιερός, alone, not properly Excommunication but degrading from Office, καθιερός ὡσματικός, the destroying a Fence, not the excommunicating an obdurate Sinner, 2 Cor. x. 4.
Καθεστός σικών, what, Mat. xi. 13.
Καθέκασις ἀπολογίαν, a Proverb, Mat. vi. 41.
Καμιλος, a Cable, Mat. xix. 24.
Καμεῖν, properly to be tired, metaphorically, to faint or fail, Heb. xii. 3.
Κατὰς, whether it ever signifies a Burntoffering: κατὰς χειλῶν, whether applicable to the Oblations of Christians at the Eucharist, Heb. xiii. 2.
Κατὰ παρὰ, whether by Works, or in the judgment of Man, Rom. iv. 1.

Κατακλίζεται, to be deceived, Col. ii. 18.
Καταλυτός, whether it ever signifies to discover, Gal. ii. 11.
Καταλυτικός, whether an Agonistical term, Phil. iii. 12.
Καταλυτος, to hate or judge, Luke ix. 12.
Κατανική, to be burdened, 1 Cor. xi. 9.
Κατάνοια, compassion, and tending, Rom. xi. 8.
Καταγχές, to excite, to stir up, to make Sins arising from the Body, Rom. vi. 6.
Καταφίλως, how variously taken in the New Testament, 2 Cor. xiii. 11.
Καταμορφώ, to mould or form, and καταμορφοσις, forming, 2 Cor. xiii. 11.
Κατανωμα, whether the Rank of such as are ordained Ministers, or rather a dress of any sort, Tit. ii. 3.
Καταπαθως, applied by way of contempt to those who boasted of, Cyprianism, deus omnis, Phil. iii. 2.

Κατερών, to overcome by force. Mat. xvi. 18.
Κατός, whether it signifies false, 1 Thes. ii. 11.
Καταρακτίων, for to pluck in. Rev. xiv. 10.
Καταρακτίων, whether full of Grace, or singularly favoured by God, Luke i. 28.
Καταφόρω, whether to cry out, Mat. viii. 12.
Κατάρας, the Doctor's Opinion, the use of that word in Scripture examined, Mat. xx. 16. πολλοὶ ἐστὶν κατάρα, spoken of whom, and what it signifies, B. xvii. 14.
Κατάκλυσις, for the Stomach, Rev. x. 9.
Κατασκόν, Unclean, Mark vii. 2.
Κατασκονία συμβατικός, what. 2 Cor. xiii. 14.
Κατασκόνα, for earthly, Heb. ix. 1.
Καταφόρος & συμφίλος, words signifying the same thing, Mat. xvi. 10.

Κατέστρεπται [ἐκατέρω] to hang upon a thing, spoken of the Law, the ground of the expression, Mat. xxii. 40.
Καταστρέπται, what, Jas. iii. 1.
Ο Καταστρέπται, on that judgment of Good and Evil, Rom. ii. 1.
Κατάστρεπται, for a Judgment, 1 Cor. vi. 2.
Καταστρέπται πάντα, how they are said to have been so by Christ, Col. i. 16.
Κατάστρεπται, Divination by Lots, Eph. iv. 14.
the Greek Words and Phrases.

A.

Ἀλλαὶ ἔστι, what, Judg. 16.

Ἀλλο, let simply where ἄλλο is understood, Eph. v. 14.

Ἀλλαὶ, Oracles, whence so called, Rom. iii.

2. ἄλλα ἡμῖν, what, Ibid.

ᾄρα, the Divine Reason, prem. to John i.

for Knowledge, 1 Cor. i. 5. for Report,

1 Thess. ii. 5. for the Gospel, Luke i. 2.

joined with θεός, for God himself in Heb.

iv. 12.

Ἄσέβείας, whether it signifies Useful, 1

Cor. v. 11.

Ἄφθαρτος, to be grieved, so as to become
disaffected to Christianity, Rom. xiv. 15.

whether it ever signifies Excommunication,

2 Cor. vii. 8. 9.

M.

Ἄρματος, whether it signifies Idolatry or

Vanity, Rom. viii. 20.

Ἄλλα, to mind, or take care of, 1 Tim.

iv. 10.

Ἐκ Μάκι ἐκτικὸς, what, Col. ii. 16.

Ἐξελέφθη, to disafflict, 1 Cor. vii. 34.

Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἁγιῷ, for, over against the midst

of the Throne, Rev. iv. 6.

Ἄνασται δὲν διότι, for to use a Blessing,

Heb. vi. 7.

Ἄνασται, whether ever taken in the New

Testament for Church Penalties, Heb. vi. 6.

Ἄρνησις, whether it signifies Dumb,

Mar. vi. 32.

Ἄρνησις, and ἄργαλες, what, Phil.

ii. 6. 7.

Municipium & Municipatus in Lat. what,

Phil. iii. 20.

Marcus, who, 1 Tim. ii. 1.

Mucilegov, whether it signify any thing indecent, Rev. xvii. 5.

Μακαρισμὸς, his Office among the Jews,

Heb. iv. 13.

Μαρακλονία, for obscene Discourse, Eph. v. 4.

N.

Ναζωδο μεθή, Nard faithfully prepared,

Mar. xiv. 3.

Ναζωδίας, a common title of the Cities in

Asia, Acts xix. 35.

Ναζωῆς, whether applied to Christians that have no Office in the Church,


Εἰς Νιν, in victory, not for ever, 1 Cor.

xv. 54.

Ναυτία, a profusion of words, 2 Tim.

ii. 16.

Νῖς, for the meaning or sense of words, 1

Cor. xiv. 14. for quickness of Wit, or Un-

derstanding, Phil. iv. 7.

O.

Οἰκία ἡ ἐκκλησίας, a House in the likeness of a

Tabernacle easily dissolved, 2 Cor. v. 1.

Κατ᾽ ὁλοκλήρον, from house to house, Acts ii. 46.

Οἰκονόμος, who man grieved to do any thing,

Phil. iii. 1.

Οἶκος, an Adverb of affirming, or in few

words, 1 Cor. v. 1.

Ἐν οἴκους ἐν οἴκους γυναῖκας, to carry

himself like a common Man, Phil. ii. 7.

Οἰκουμένη, for a Person, Acts i. 15.

Ὀρθοδοξία ἐτὸς Θεοῦ, how Christ is said to

have been so, Rom. i. 4.

Ὀρθωρχοῦσα ὁμοίως, earthen Vessels, 2 Cor. iv. 7.

Ὀρθώτευσις, whether an Expletive, Mat. vii. 23.

for how, Mar. vi. 2.

Ὀρθωτευσία, the beginning of an Apologies, Jam. iii. 5.

Ὀρθολογία, for Ὀρθολογία, Gal. v. 12.

II.

Παραγεγραμμένος, what sort of Exercise, 1 Cor.

ix. 26.

Παιδίον, for a Servant, Luke xi. 7.

Παραγιμενά, a Philosophical word, signifying the restorations of all things, Mat.

xix. 28.

Παρασκευή, heavy Armour, Eph. vi. 11. 15.

Παρασκευάζω, to punish, among the antient Greeks, to traduce, among the later, Mat. i. 19.

Παρασκευός, whether it signifies to ex-

communicate, Tit. iii. 10.

Παράφιλής, in what sentence used by Christ,

John xiv. 16.

Παρασκευή, Friday, Mar. xv. 42.


Παρασκευή, Remission, Rom. iii. 25.

Παράστασις, an ambiguous expression,

1 Pet. iv. 1.

Παρθενος, whether it ever signifies to pacify,

2 Cor. v. 11. and Gal. i. 10. ἄλλο

καὶ παρθένος ἤ λαμυ, an Elliptical Phrase, 1

John iii. 19.

Παρθενος, to avoid, 2 Tim. ii. 16.

R G R T E R.
An Index of the

Pneudhaqua, the offscouring, a contemptible Person, 1 Cor. iv. 12.

Psecw, a period, Acts viii. 32.

Peri-Si, i. 9. pneudhaqua, q. v.

Peres & Peres, the same, Mat. x. 2.

Peris, Faith, several Notions of it, Mat. viii. 10. for a certain knowledge, Rom. xiv. 23. and i Thess. iii. 10.

Pisces eis to oikou, what, John ii. 23.

Plasonela, whether it signifies unnatural Lifs, Rom. i. 29. Eph. v. 3.

Play. perist, several senses of it, Luke, 12.

Pleneu, a multitude, Rom. xi. 12.

Plu, for the design of the Lawgiver in opposition to the Letter of the Law, Mat. v. 17. Rom. ii. 29. and v. 5. 2 Cor. iii. 6. for the miraculous Gifts of the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. ii. 4. for the mind of Man distinct from the Body, 1 Cor. xiv. 14. pnuuma pneuma, what, Rom. viii. 15. pneuma pneuma, what, 1 Cor. xiv. 2. p. 356. pneuma pneuma, what, the Spirits that watch, 1 Pet. iii. 19.

Pnuematikos, for supernatural, 1 Cor. x. 3.

Pnuym, to drag along by head and shoulders, Mat. xviii. 28.

Poiou, a work, Rom. i. 20.

Poluteia, the privilege of Citizen, Phil. iii. 20.

Politexa, a City, Ibid.

PnuG, Grief, Rev. xxii. 4.

Pneumew, what, Phil. i. 13.

Pneustikos & pneuvstikos, used promiscuously, to signify either Dignity or Age, Tit. ii. 2.

Peri&livein, to push forward, or lead to Judgment, Acts xix. 33.

Pneusas, who, Jud. 4.

Pneusmu & pneuvstikos, what, Jud. 4.

Pneus, a purpose of Mind; ἐὰν σεβαστόν, agreeably to such a purpose, Rom. viii. 28.

Pneumasth tōn, what, 1 Cor. xiv. 4.

Pneumatikos signifies both divine and civil Worship, Mat. ii. 9.

Pneuma & Suvia, whether they differ, Eph. v. 2.

Pneuma, for that which may be converted into Food, John xxi. 5.

Pneumasthos yeuvstos, the natural Countenance, James i. 23.

Pneuma, a Cause true or pretended, 1 Thess. ii. 5.

Pneumatikon, Dr. Hammond's opinion about the various senses of that word examined, Luke i. 67.

PnuG, superior, John i. 15.

Pnuematikos pneumatos, what, Col. i. 15.

Pnuematikos, how the Law of Moses is to be called, Gal. iv. 9.

Pnuvneuma, among the Jews, what, Mat. vii. 2.

Pnuveuma, what, Mat. xvi. 18.

Pnuvneuma, what, Acts xvi. 16.

Pnuvneuma, a very fit word to express the Hebrew Elohim, 2 Thess. ii. 3.

Sauow, a concurrence in the Air, Mat. xxvii. 2.

Sneus, whether it signifies to be made by Excommunication, 2 Thess. iii. 14.

Sxwia, a rough Figure, Heb. viii. 5.

Sxwia, τῇ σεκερί, what, 2 Cor. xi. 7.


Sxwia, to be slain; applied to a Sacrifice, 2 Tim. iv. 6.

Sxwia, whether to excommunicate, or only to withdraw himself, 2 Thess. iii. 6.

Sxwia, for a Shadow, Col. ii. 9.


Sxwia, whether it be to serve, Luke xxiii. 11.


Sxwia, why St. Peter calls himself, 1 Pet. v. 1.

Sxwia, what, 1 Cor. viii. 7.

Sxwia, sometimes signifies all conjugal Offices, 1 Pet. iii. 7.

Sxwia, to prefer, Mar. vi. 20.

Sxwia, σουζο, to break a Vessel, not to shake it, Mar. xiv. 3.

Sxwia, a sign, Rom. iv. 11.

Sxwia, an outward appearance, Phil. ii. 8.

Sxwia, taken for several things, Luke xiii. 23.

Sxwia is, whether it signifies my self, Rom. vi. 6. 1 Cor. ix. 27.
Greek Words and Phrases.

Σῶμα ἄμαρθα, whether Sin, or a Body obnoxious to Sin, Rom. vi. 6.
Σώματα, for Slaves, not Hirelings, Rev. xviii. 13.
Σωτηρία, for eternal Salvation, not a temporal Deliverance from Persecutions, Heb. ii. 3.

Τ. 
Ταυτεία, Secret Chambers, Mat. xxiv. 26.
Συν Ταυτοπίας αὐτίνα, what, 1 Tim. ii. 15.
Τελείωσις, for a sort of Perfection, which is only ornamental, Heb. vi. 1.
Τελείωσις, to consecrate, not to make perfect, Heb. ii. 10.
Τελείωσις, whether an Agonistical term, Phil. iii. 12.
Τελείωσις, to enjoy perfect Happiness, Heb. xi. 40.
Τελειωσις, the Consecration of any one that offer'd Sacrifice, Heb. vii. 11.
Τελειωσις of two sorts, Mat. xi. 19.
Τεταγμική-ος, one of just Stature, Mat. vi. 27.
Τιμή, Honour and Reward, 1 Tim. v. 17.
Τιμὴ οὐδεμιός, what, Col. ii. 19.
Τεχνος τεχνος, the wheel of Generation, what, James iii. 6. p. 580.
Τεχνώμεθα, what sort of Torment, Heb. xi. 35.
Τεχνώμεθα, whether a Wheel, or a Club, Ibid.
Τέχνη, several significations of that word, 1 Cor. x. 7.

Υ. 
Τεχνικής, to hearken if any body knocks or calls, Acts xii. 13.
Τεχνική εἰς θεοῦ, superabundantly, 1 Thess. iii. 10.
Τεχνικής ἐν τοιχίνῃ, in the room or stead of those that are dead, 1 Cor. xv. 29.
Τεχνομαχία, whether it signify unnatural Filthiness, 1 Thess. iv. 6.
Τεχνομαχία, whether it signify the supreme Power, Rom. xiii. 1.

Τομήν, in which the Apostles met together, whether in the Temple, Acts i. 13.
Τομήν ήμας, an imitation, Heb. viii. 5.
Τομήν ήμας, our xixv., what, Mark xii. 44.

Φαλήρα, no Greek word, 2 Tim. iv. 13.
Φθορωτική Νοός, whence so called, Jud. 12.
Φθορά, signifies sometimes Filthiness, sometimes any Corruption, 2 Pet. i. 4.
Φθαρίζειν ἐν ὑπέρθεν, what, 1 Cor. iv. 6.
Φθορᾶς, the mind of the Just, Luke i. 27.
Φθορα, for natural Light, in opposition to Instruction, 1 Cor. xi. 14.
Φθορίζειν, for οἰκοποιεῖσθαι, to speak to, John ii. 9.

Χαρὰ, joy for a Feast, Mat. xxv. 21. and xxvi. 7. for a Christian Virtue, Rom. xiv. 17.

χαρά, for the Gospel, in opposition to the Law, John i. 14. p. 183.
Χαρὰ, whether it be the Charity of Christ, 2 Cor. xiii. 14.
Χαράν εἰς χάριν, what, John i. 16.
Χαραποσιβή, what properly, what metaphorically, Acts xiv. 23.
Χαρία, a Coat, Mat. v. 40.
Χάρι, whether good Dispositions or good Manners, 1 Cor. xv. 33.
Χάρι, of a person, bountiful ; of a thing, profitable, Mat. xi. 30.

Ψ. 
Ψηφίζεις το ἀριθμὸν προσφημα, what, Acts v. 3.
Ψηφίζεις εἰσπραγμένον, may be the dead bodies of the Slain, Rev. vi. 9.
Ψηφίς εἰσπραγμένον, a brutish sensual Man, 1 Cor. ii. 14.
An Index of the

Cubit of a Man, for an ordinary Cubit, Rev. xxi. 17.

Curse, in what sense Christ is said to have been made a Curse, Gal. iii. 13.

Cymbals, their form, use, and matter, 1 Cor. xiii. 1.

D.

Day of Christ, not always to be understood of the Destitution of the Jews, 2 Pet. i. 19.

Daily Bread, what, Mat. vi. 11.

Darts fiery, what, and why so called, Eph. vi. 16.

Deacons in the Church, whence so called, Luke viii. 3.

Delivering to Satan, not to be confounded with the ordinary Centuries of the Church, 1 Cor. v. 5, 2 Cor. vii. 8, and x. 4, 5. whether so has any reference to Satan's desiring to have Men deliver'd to him, 1 Cor. v. 5.

To Deny himself, what, Mat. xvi. 24.

Devil, whether any reverence be due to him as a Prince, Jude 9.

To Die unto Sin, an ambiguous expression, 1 Pet. iv. 1.

Diogenes Cynicus his Character, Luke i. 67.

To be Drawn of God, what, John vi. 44.

Drowning, not us'd as a Punishment among the Jews, Mat. xviii. 6.

E.

Earnest of the Spirit, what, 2 Cor. i. 22. and of the Inheritance, Eph. i. 14.

Ebonites, what Heretics, and whence so called, Gal. iii. 1.

Ellipses many in the Apostles' file, Heb. iv. 8. how they are to be supplied, Ibid. examples of Elliptical expressions, Gal. i. 10.

Elxai, a Jew, his History, Rev. ii. 4.


Epistles of Recommendation, from one Bishop to another, their original, 2 Cor. iii. 1.

Epistle to the Hebrews, why rejected for some time, but afterwards admitted, Heb. v. 6. p. 548. whether written by St. Paul, or another, Ibid. ii. 2. and x. 34. and xi. 21.

Eternal, why the Gospel so called, Luke i. 70.

Evangelists relate the same thing variously,
Memorable things.

they were all suddenly destroyed with the rebellious Jews, 2 Thess. ii. 8. whether they abstained from Wine, or forbade others the use of it, 1 Tim. v. 22. or attempted to draw away Servants from their Masters, 2 Cor. vi. 2. whether there was any one Seat in the Apostles times peculiarly so called, Ibid. 20.

Gog and Magog signify the Turks, Rev. xxi. 8.

Grace for Grace, what, John i. 16.

Great God, whether he be so called, with a respect to the Cabiri, or great Gods of the Heathens, Tit. ii. 13.

Grotius, his Posthumous Annotations without reason suspected by Dr. Hammond, Rom. xiv. 23. and Prem. to 2 Pet.

Guardian Angels, see Angels.

Gyge, whether the Kings of Lydia that succeeded Gyges, were so called, Rev. xx. 8.

H.

Happiness of Heaven, why represented under the similitude of a Feast, Mat. viii. 11.

Head, the Custom of Mens having it bare, when they appeared in publick, and Women, veiled, 1 Cor. xi. 4. head of the Feast, which had received a deadly wound, to be understood of the burning of the Roman-Capitol, Rev. xiii. 3.

Heart, how the Law is said to be written in it, Rom. ii. 15.

Heaven, whether it can be taken for a name of God, Mat. xxii. 25. how it is said to have opened, Mat. iii. 16. to fall from it, what, Luke x. 18. Rev. xii. 10. the Phrase Heaven and Earth, whether it signifies only this Earth, or sublunar Region, 2 Pet. iii. 7. all things in Heaven and Earth, whether they signify Men, Col. i. 20.

Hellenists, who, Acts vi. 1.

Heretic, properly who, Tit. iii. 10. of what sort to be avoided, Ibid. how said to be condemned of biniel, Tit. iii. 11.

Herodes Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee, not the Procurator of Judea, Mat. xxii. 16.


Holy, why the Infants of Christians are so respected, 1 Cor. vii. 14.

Hours, how counted by the Jews and the Romans, John xix. 14.

Humanely, to speak so, what, Rom. vi. 15.

Husband of one Wife, in what sense it is said a Bishop ought so to be, 1 Tim. iii. 2.

I.


Idiotic or rude smile, what, 2 Cor. xi. 6.

Idle word, which, Mat. xii. 36.

Idolatry, whether always joined with unnatural Lusts, 1 Cor. v. 10. 2 Cor. xii. 21.

Jerusalem, when taken, Mat. xxiv. 17. whether the Destruction of it was so very sudden and unexpected, as is supposed by Dr. Hammond, 2 Pet. iii. 16.

Jeroboam, whether it need be understood of any Seat of Heretics, Rev. ii. 2.

Jews, their zeal to make Proselytes became a Proverb, Mat. xxiii. 15. acknowledged their Destruction to be from God, Mat. xxiv. 3. the Vengeance taken on them by Christ represented by his going out to battle against them, Luke ix. 31. how they hoped for Justification by the Law, Gal. iii. 10. whether they were in so great favour with the Roman Magistrates, as to be able to put them upon persecuting the Christians, 2 Thess. i. 5. and Prem. to Rev. whether they were so numerous as Josephus affirms, Rev. vii. 4.

Image of the invisible God, how Christ is said to be, Col. i. 15. and the express Image of his Person, Heb. i. 3.

Immortality of the Soul believed by the Platonists, 1 Cor. xv. 29.

Impostors, how they were to be known in St. John's time, 1 John iv. 2.

Impossible, for what is very difficult, Heb. vi. 6.

Interrogation, equivalent to a Negation, Mat. iii. 7.

Joseph of Arimathaea, one of the Sanhedrim, Mar. xv. 43.

Joy for a Feast, Mat. xxv. 21.

Judas his indignation against the Woman that anointed Christ, what pretence for it, besides his Covetousness, Mat. xxvi. 7. the manner of his Death, Mat. xxvii. 46. 19. 92.

Judges,
An Index of the

Judges, among the Jews, whence they took their name, Mat. iii. 2.
To justify, what in St. Paul's dispute with the Jews, Rom. iii. 4.
Justin Martyr, his Authority not much to be regarded, 2 Thess. ii. 4.

K.
Kaballistical interpretations of Scripture, of what kind, 2 Pet. i. 5.
Key of David, what, Mat. xvi. 9.
Kingdom, whether the condition of the Christian Church could be called such, after the destruction of Jerusalem, Rev. i. 6.
Kingdom, which a Nobleman went into a far Country to receive, how to be understood, Luke xix. 12.
Kings Manuscript, whether properly a different Copy, or rather a Paraphrase of the New Testament, Mat. xx. 29. Acts x. 25.
Kiss Holy, with which the Christians saluted one another, Rom. xvi. 16.

L.
Labour of Love, what, 1 Thess. i. 2.
Lake burning with Fire and Brimstone, where the Phraze is taken, Rev. xix. 20.
Lodiceans, whether St. Paul wrote to them, Col. iv. 16.
Last days, which, Acts ii. 17.
Law, taken in a larger or stricter Notion, John x. 35. Law of Sin, and the Spirit, what, Rom. viii. 2. Law of Moses, in what sense possible or impossible to be kept, Gal. iii. 10, 11. the Jews only freed from the Curse of it, not the Heathens, Ib. v. 13. how it was a Pedagogue to bring us to Christ, Gal. iii. 24. why called Elements of the World, and weak and beggarly Elements, Heb. iv. 3.
Levi the Publican, whether the same with St. Matthew, Luke v. 27.
Light, in a metaphorical sense, what, Job i. 5.
To Live with Christ, whether it signifies to be in Prosperity, 1 Thess. v. 10.
Lord of Hosts, why God is often so styled, 1 Tim. i. 15.

M.
Malchus, a Syrian name, John xviii. 10.
Martyrs, their several denominations for distinction sake, trifling, Rev. iii. 14.
Man of Sin, whether the Gnosticks, or the rebellious Jews, 2 Thess. ii. 3.
Melchisedek, how said to have been without Father or Mother, and to have represented Christ, Heb. vii. 4.
Messenger of Satan, what, 2 Cor. xii. 7.
Metropoles, their Privileges as to Civil Government, Rev. i. 4.
Metropolitans, whether any in the Apostles times, Phil. i. 1. 1 Tim. iii. 15. Rev. iv. 4, 6.
Morning Star, for the Dooer of the Gospel, 2 Pet. i. 19.
Mystery of Iniquity, whether the secrets of the Gnostick Sect, or the hidden Counsels of the seditious Jews, 2 Thess. ii. 7.

N.
Nard, an Herb or Ointment, and why of great Price, Mark xiv. 3.
Name above every Name, what, Phil. ii. 9. to ask in the name of Christ, what, John xiv. 14.
Nature, for that which is opposed to instruction, 1 Cor. xi. 14. by nature Children of Wrath, as of the Jews, what, Eph. ii. 3.
Neapolis in Palestine, confounded by Dr. Hammond with that in Macedonia, Acts xvi. 13.
Number and name of the Beast, what, Rev. xiii. 18. number of a Man, what, Ibid.

O.
Oaths, why said to be paid to the Lord, tho made to others, Mat. v. 33.
Offering might be said to be sanctified two ways, Rom. xv. 16.
To Open the Eyes or Understanding, what, Luke xxiv. 16, 45.
Oracles, whence so called, Rom. iii. 2. signifying, what: Ibid. counterfeit Oracles cited by Dr. Hammond, Heb. vi. 9.
Outward darkness, what, Mat. viii. 12. and xxv. 30.
Memorable Things.

P.
Palestine, whether subject to Syria, in Herod the Great's time, Luke ii. 1.

Pasts, of Christ, whether before vulgarly used by the Jews, Mat. xxii. 15, do not always allude to a Custom, Chap. xxiii. 2, nor observe a perfect decorum, Chap. xxv. 24, every thing in them not allegorical, Luke xvii. 22.

Parents, whether Magistrates are included in that word, Eph. vi. 4.

Passions evil, hinder Men from acknowledging Truth, John iii. 19.

Passive Verbs, often used in an Active Sense, James ii. 4, 5.

St. Paul, how a Roman Citizen, Acts xxii. 25, whether a single Man, 1 Cor. ix. 5, some of his Writings may be lost, 1 Cor. v. 9, whether conversant in Heathen Writers, 1 Cor. xi. 6, whether eloquent, Gal. ii. 6, disputes with the Jews upon their own principles, Gal. iii. 10, 16, 24, Chap. iv. 3, 12.

St. Peter, how it is said the Gates of Hell and Death should not prevail against him, Mat. xxvi. 18, whether he prophesied of the destruction of Jerusalem, 2 Pet. iii. 6, the time of his Death, 1 Pet. xii. 11, Prem. to 2 Pet.

Phenice, a part of Syria, whose Inhabitants were therefore called Syro-Phenicians, Mat. iv. 22.

Philippi, a Roman Colony, and Metropolis of Macedonia, Phil. i. 1.

Pilate could have put Christ to Death without the consent of the Jews, Mat. xxvii. 15.

Plutarch thought the Devils roved about Men's sepulchres, Mat. ix. 28, believed the Immortality of the Soul, 1 Cor. xv. 29.

Plural number, put for the Singular, Mat. xxvii. 7, and xxviii. 44.

To Pray any one's name, what, John xiv. 14.

Preexistence of Souls, believed by the Jews, John ii. 2.

High Priesthood, when joined with the Dignity of Emperor, Heb. vi. 9.

Prisoners, the Custom of releasing them on Festival days, Mat. xxvii. 15.

Prophecies of two kinds, Mat. ii. 15.

of the Revelations, like the Ancient, Rev. iv. 2, why so obscure, Rev. xiii. 18.

To Prophecy of any one, for saying what may be fitly applied to him, Mat. xv. 7.

Prophecy, cited instead of an allegorical Interpretation of some Passages in them, Mat. ii. 23, whether they commonly express dismal things covertly, Rev. xvi. 17, among the Heathens, whether they taught the People Virtue, Luke i. 67, many false Prophets during the Siege of Jerusalem, 2 Thess. ii. 9.

Prophetical expressions, not always to be understood in a proper sense; nor every particular Phrase to have a special meaning assigned it, Rev. iv. 2, and ix. 17.

Propositions universal, for particular, 1 Cor. xii. 28.

Publicans, of two sorts, Mat. xi. 19.

Purifying, by Fire and Water, common among the Heathens, to signify the cleansing of the mind, Mat. iii. 11.


R.

Redeeming of time, for delaying, Rev. v. 16.

Regeneration, the Stoics notion of it, Mat. xix. 28.

To Remit and retain Sins, spoken of the Apostles, what, John xx. 23.

Repetitions for emphasis sake, 2 Cor. xi. 22.

Resurrection of the dead, whether it ever signifies no more than a second State or Subsistence, Mat. xxii. 31.

Rest of God, under the Law, the Land of Canaan, under the Gospel, Heaven, Heb. iii. 11.


Riches whether promised under the Gospel, 2 Cor. ix. 8, 9.

Righteous for Merciful, Mat. i. 19.

Right hand of God, where mention is made of sitting on it, what, Mark xvi. 19.

Rock that followed the Israelites, how it is said to have done so, why called Spiritual, and how said to have been Christ, 1 Cor. x. 4.

Rome, fulfilled a Goddess, Rev. xiii. 1.

Rude in Speech, how St. Paul so calls himself, 2 Cor. xi. 6.
An Index of the

Sacrifices under the Law, whether acknowledg'd by the Jews to be Types of Christ, Heb. xiii. 11.

Saints, why Christians are so called, 1 Cor. vii. 14. by the Jews, Eph. ii. 19.

Salt, for wood Asher, Luke xiv. 34.

Salutation, see Kifs.

Sanctuary of the Jews, sat in the form of a Semicircle, Rev. iv. 4. from the form of the Heavenly Council represented to St. John in a Vision, seems to be taken, Ibid. and verf. 6.

Satan, for a Man, 2 Cor. ii. 11.

To Save, taken for to heal, Mar. v. 34. to prefer, Luke xiii. 23.

Saved so as by Fire, what, 1 Cor. vii. 9.

Saviour of all Men, but especially of them that believe, in what Sense God is said to be, 1 Tim. v. 16.

Scourging, a servil Punishment among the Romans, not among the Jews, Acts v. 41.

Sealed, how Christians are said to be so by God, 2 Cor.i.28. Eph. iv. 30. how Christ, Eph. iv. 30.

To See God; what, Mat. v. 8. John i. 19.

Sepulchres, whitened among the Jews, Mat. xxviii. 27. adorning them charged on 'em as a Crime, Luke xvi. 47.

Simon Magus, his fabulous contest with St. Peter, Rom. i. 23. Prem. to 1 Thess. 2 Tim. iii. Rev. xii. 7, 9. whether defrayed by the Romans, 2 Thess. ii. 3.

Sin unto Death, what, John xi. 4.

Sins of the Men that lived before the Flood, 1 Pet. iii. 20.

Solaces, many in St. Paul's Epistle, Gal. ii. 6.

Son of Man, who, Mat. xii. 8. of Perdition, for the wicked Jews, 2 Thess. ii. 3.

To Speak as a Man, what, Rom. vi. 19.

Spirit, for the design of God in the Law, Mat. v. 17. Rom. ii. 29. 2 Cor. iii. 6, 17. for a disposition of Mind, Rom. viii. 15.


Spiritual, who so called by St. Paul, Gal. vi. 1. Spiritual Meat, what, 1 Cor. x. 3.

Stone, living, whence so called, v. 4.

Strong Meat, how some Doctrins are so called, Heb. v. 14.

To Suffer to the Flesh, an ambiguous Expression, 1 Pet. iv. 1.


To Sup with Christ, and be with us, what, Rev. iii. 19.

Swearing by the Head, Mat. v. 30, and by the Throne of God; both Hebrew Customs, Mat. xxiv. 36.

Synecdoche, a Platonist, 1 Cor. xv. 29.

Syrian, a name of Reproach, John viii. 48.

Tacitus vindicated from the charge of imputing the burning of Rome to the Christians, Rev. xii. 6.

Temple, not profaned with Sepulchres, Mat. xxvii. 51. two Garisons placed in it, Luke xxii. 52.

Thief on the Cross, whether converted in an Instant by an extraordinary efficacy of God's Power, Mat. xxviii. 44.


Tongues, the Gift of them and in use, 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 5, 10, 13, 14.

Transfers of the New Testament have sometimes substituted more familiar words in the room of others let known, Mat. xiii. 35. 1 Cor. xi. 10.

True for righteousness, Rev. xv. 3. the true Bread, Meat and Light, why Christ is so called, John vi. 55.

Truth, to do it, what, John iii. 2.

Types and typical significations, ch common Doctrin concerning them goundless and vain, 1 Cor. x. 6.

V.

Vanity to which the Gentiles were made subject, what, Rom. viii. 10.

Vesalcan, ill compared by Dr. Hammond with Christ, Mat. xxiv. 3.

Unclean, why the Children of Heathens are to be accounted, 1 Cor. vii. 14.

Upper room, in which the Aposles met together and prayed, whether the Temple, Acts i. 13.
Memorable things.

W.

Worship, in a metaphorical sense, for the sacred Functions of the Levites, about the Temple, Luke xxii. 52.

Washing the Hands, among the Jews, the occasion of it, Mark vii. 2.

Waters, many compared to a multitude of People, Rev. xiv. 2.

Wear and Heavy Laden, spoken only of the Jews, and in what sense, Mat. xi. 28.

To Will, set after doing, signifies to do a thing heartily or willingly, a Cor. viii. 2.

Willingly understood in a bad sense by St. Paul, but if taken for a lawful course of Piety not commanded, when acceptable to God, Col. ii. 23.

Wine of the Wrath of God, what, Rev. xiv. 10.

Wise Men, how they knew the Birth and Dignity of Christ, Matt. ii. 3, did not understand that he was the Son of God, and therefore gave him only civil Worship, Ibid. p. 9, 19.

Wisdom of the World, and the Princes of this World, what, 1 Cor. ii. 6.

The Word of God, for God himself, Heb. iv. 12.

Works of supererogation may be done, but are not meritorious, 1 Cor. ix. 17.

Work of Faith, for a Work of which Faith is the cause, 1 Thess. i. 2.

Z.

Zacharias lain between the Temple and the Altar, which, according to Mr. Le Clerc, Mat. xxiii. 35.

FINIS.
Books printed for Sam. Buckley, at the Dolphin in Fleetstreet.

An Inquiry concerning Virtue, in two Discourses. I. Of Virtue, and the belief of a Deity. II. Of the Obligations to Virtue. 8°.


Voyages and Discoveries in South-America. The first up the River of Amazonas (which runs a Course of above 1200 Leagues thro the finest Country in the World, not yet planted by the Europeans) to Quito in Peru, and back again to Brazil, performed at the Command of the King of Spain, by Christopher D'Acugna. The second up the River of Plate, and thence by Land to the Mines of Potosi; by Monsieur Acavete. The third from Cayenne into Guiana, in search of the Lake of Parima, reputed the richest place in the World. By M. Grillet and Bechamel. Done into English from the Originals, being the only Accounts of those parts hitherto extant. The whole Illustrated with Notes and Maps. 8°.


Monsieur De Pointi's Expedition to Cartagena: Being a particular Relation, I. Of the Taking and Plundering of that City by the French, in the Year 1697. II. Of their Meeting with Admiral Nevil in their Return, and the Course they steer'd to get clear of him. III. Of their passing by Commodore Norris at Newfoundland. IV. Of their Encounter with Capt. Harlow, at then going into Brest. English'd from the Original publish'd at Paris, by Monsieur De Pointi himself. And Illustrated with a large Draught of the City of Cartagena, its Harbour and Forts.

The French Perfumer; teaching the several ways of Extracting the Odours of Drugs and Flowers, and making all the Compositions of Perfumes for Powder, Washballs, Efficaces, Oils, Wax, Pomatum, Paste, Queen of Hungary's Water, Roja Solis, and other Sweet Waters. The manner of preparing sweet Toilets, Boxes, &c. with the Preparations and Use of Perfumes of all kinds whatsoever. Also how to Colour and Scent Gloves and Fans. Together with the Secret of cleansing Tobacco, and Perfuming it for all sorts of Snuff, Spanish, Roman, &c. Done from the Original Printed at Paris. The Second Edition, wherein all the Faults that happened in the first are Corrected.

The History of Don Quixote, newly Translated out of Spanish by several Hands, with Sculptures, in Folio, is in the Press, and will be publish'd with convenient Speed.