

HORÆ  
HEBRAICÆ ET TALMUDICÆ:  
HEBREW AND TALMUDICAL EXERCITATIONS  
UPON  
THE GOSPELS, THE ACTS,  
SOME CHAPTERS OF  
ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS,  
AND  
THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

BY  
JOHN LIGHTFOOT, D. D.,  
MASTER OF CATHARINE HALL, CAMBRIDGE.

A NEW EDITION,  
BY  
THE REV. ROBERT GANDELL, M. A.,  
ASSISTANT TUTOR OF MAGDALEN HALL,  
LATE MICHEL FELLOW OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.  
VOL. IV.

OXFORD:  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.  
M.DCCC.LIX.

177660

SEP 20 1913

CBR  
·LG2  
4

## CONTENTS

OF THE

### ADDENDA TO 1 COR. XIV.

---

#### CHAP. I.

Concerning the Hebrews and Hellenists .....Page 286

#### CHAP. II.

Of the Hebrews in Babylon, and the adjacent countries..... 287

#### CHAP. III.

In the same regions were the seats of the ten tribes ..... 291

#### CHAP. IV.

Peter preaching the gospel in Babylon ..... 294

#### CHAP. V.

The Hebrew Bible read in the synagogues of the Hebrews..... 295

#### CHAP. VI.

What the Jews think of the versions ..... 297

#### CHAP. VII.

A comparison of the history of the LXX as it is in Josephus  
and as it is in the Talmudists ..... 299

#### CHAP. VIII.

Of the thirteen places that were changed ..... 302

#### CHAP. IX.

In what value 'the Version of the Seventy,' as it is commonly  
called, seems to have been among the Jews..... 303

#### CHAP. X.

What things are objected for the affirmative ..... 308

#### CHAP. XI.

By what authors and counsels it might probably be that that  
Greek version came forth, which obtains under the name  
of 'The Seventy.' ..... 309

**HORÆ**  
**HEBRAICÆ ET TALMUDICÆ;**  
**OR,**  
**HEBREW AND TALMUDICAL**  
**EXERCITATIONS**  
**UPON THE**  
**ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.**

LIGHTFOOT, VOL. IV.

B

## LECTOREM PRÆFATIO.

SACRAM Scripturam (Amice Lector) præ aliis omnibus, quæ hactenus apud homines literis mandata habentur, facile principem esse nemini dubium erit, qui, ne quid de summa ejus antiquitate dicam, Autorem illius atque institutum paulo attentius considerarit. Nam cum primum Divini Spiritus afflatu fuerit consignata, deque rebus summi momenti agat, tum etiam ad præstantissimum scopum collimare certum est, ut genus nempe humanum ad æternam felicitatem perducatur; inde merito censere debemus eam ita fuisse Dei consilio conscriptam, ut huic fini quam optime inserviret; adeoque pios homines, qui simplici corde ac præjudiciis exuto ad ipsam accesserint, fructum plane eximium ex ejus lectione percepturos.

Quanquam vero hæc ita sint, tamen aliqua in sacris hisce paginis *δυσνόητα* esse negari minime potest; ac facile evenire hinc posse, ut homines, *ἀμαθείς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι*, ea prave distorqueant, ac, ut cum S. Petro loqui pergam, *πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν* pervertant. Neque arduum certe foret plurima istius modi loca adducere: sed cum hæc jam abunde ab aliis fuerint tractata, nec res id a me jam exigat, operæ pretium non sum ratus de iis hic fusius disquirere.

At enimvero quo plures majoresque in sacro hoc codice difficultates occurrunt, et quo gravius ejus sensum corrumpendi periculum nobis impendet, eo alacrius instare debemus, ut illa omnia a nobis diligenter ac studiose adhibeantur, quæ tum ad sensum ejus recte assequendum, tum ad periculi hujus magnitudinem evitandam, conducant. Non enim idcirco, ut aliqui improbe opinantur, quod nonnulla in eo difficiliora sint, abjici continuo debet; sed eo majōri cura ac modestia est evolvendus; atque omnino arbitrari æquum est id potius tum humanæ rationis debilitati, tum voluntatis et affectuum pravitati, (quæ menti caliginem offundit) tribuendum, quod in harum rerum cognitione majorem profectum non fecerimus.

Nec sane mirum alicui videri debet, in libro vetustissimo ante tot sæcula scripto, eaque in gente cujus ritus ac consuetudines maximam fere partem ignoramus, tot inveniri obscura et intellectu difficilia. Quare ea aut perperam rejicere, aut, quod nonnulli faciunt, sibique inde ac aliis urbani videri volunt, risu ac sannis excipere, iniquissi-

<sup>a</sup> Not in the English folio edition. Ed.

## AD LECTOREM PRÆFATIO.

mum est. Liquido enim constat plurima in ea, vel ipsis fatentibus, præclara et eximia contineri; ut non aliter nobis de eo censendum sit, quam fecit olim Socrates de quodam Heracliti scripto, de quo sententiam rogatus ita respondit, Ἄ μὲν συνῆκα γενναῖα. οἶμαι δὲ καὶ ἄ μὴ συνῆκα, i. e. *Ea quidem quæ assecutus sum, pulchra sunt; puto item et quæ non sum assecutus.* Præterea videmus nostris hisce temporibus illustria quædam ingenia extitisse, quæ summas ejus difficultates egregie enodârunt; unde non sit desperandum quin pari successu, et ea quæ etiamnum restant, explicentur. Quinimo iis, quæ jam præstita ab ipsis sunt, multo majora et præstantiora fieri possent, et in posterum fient, si Principes ac Magistratus tum impensam ad hæc necessariam, tum alia quæ in eorum potestate sunt subsidia, conferre velint. Ejusmodi enim sunt hæc studia, ut, ad ea perfecte absolvenda, cum populis Orientalibus commercia colere, eorum scripta penitus cognoscere, regionesque iis habitatas invisere ac perlustrare necessum sit.

Inter alios autem Viros præstantissimos, populares nostros, qui insignem in veteribus sacræ Scripturæ ritibus explicandis operam navârunt, merito primum locum occupat (ut ego arbitror) Johannes Lightfoot, S. T. D., Aulæque S. Catharinæ in Academia Cantabrigiensi non ita pridem præfectus. Majori industria an modestia fuerit, dicere nequeo; erat ille quidem in omni literatura, Hebraica vero inprimis, peritissimus; in Sacris Scripturis diligentissime atque accuratissime versatus. Ad hæc, Verbi Divini præco assiduus; summa præterea morum simplicitate conspicuus; ab omni animi fastu ac φιλαυτία maxime alienus. Neminem aut læsit aut contempsit; verbo dicam; qualis revera vir fuerit, plurima ab ipso edito, tum Latino tum vernaculo nostro sermone, præclare testantur. Quæque ille ad extricandas hasce sacrarum literarum difficultates eruditissime omnino ac felicissime præstitit, satis fidem faciunt, quanta demum præstari possent, si ea (de quibus jam ante dixi) accederent, quibusque eximius hic vir plane erat destitutus.

Quod ad sequentia attinet *σχεδιάσματα*, ex proprio Autoris MSto desumpta, typis jam excuduntur; nec præconio sane ullo ad aucupandam Lectoris benevolentiam egent; satis ipsi constabit cujus sint, nomineque, quod in fronte ostentant, optimi hujus viri, haud esse indigna. Equidem decreveram de vitæ, studiorumque Reverendi doctissimique Autoris ratione breviter sermonem instituisse, sed unici ejus fratris morte præventus sum; unde iis omnibus, quæ ad hanc rem opus erant, penitus excidi: quamobrem in præsentiarum tantum esto.

R. KIDDER.

# HEBREW AND TALMUDICAL

## EXERCITATIONS<sup>a</sup>

UPON

### THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

---

#### CHAP. I.

VER. 1 : Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιήσαμην, &c. *The former treatise have I made, &c.*] We may reduce to this place (for even thus far it may be extended) what our historian had said in the very entrance of his Gospel, ἔδοξε καμοὶ καθεξῆς σοὶ γράψαι, *it seemed good to me also to write unto thee in order*: where καθεξῆς, *in order*, seems to promise, not only an orderly series of the history of the actions of our Saviour, but successively, even of the apostles too. For what passages we have related to us in this book may very well be reckoned amongst the πράγματα πεπληροφορημένα, *those things which are most surely believed among us*. Indeed, by the very style in this place he shews that he had a design of writing these stories jointly; that is to say, first to give us a narration of the actions and doctrine of Christ, and then, in their due place and order, to commit to writing the acts and sayings of the apostles.

As to most of the things contained in this book, St. Luke was both αὐτόπτης, *an eyewitness*, yea, and a part also: but how far he was spectator of those acts of our Saviour which he relates in his other book, none can say. What he speaks in the preface of that work is ambiguous, ἔδοξε κάμοι πᾶσιν ἄνωθεν παρηκολουθηκότι, and leaves the reader to inquire whether he means, he *had a perfect understanding of all things from the very first*, by the same only way which those had that undertook to compile the evangelical histories from the mouth αὐτοπτῶν

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 633. *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 685.

καὶ ὑπηρετῶν τοῦ λόγου, of those that were *eyewitnesses*, and *ministers of the word*; or whether he came to this understanding of things from the first, he himself having been from the beginning an *eyewitness* and a *minister*; or, lastly, whether he does not by the word ἀνωθεν declare that he understood all these things *from heaven*, and *from above*. We have taken it in this last sense in our notes upon that place, as being beyond all controversy that he was divinely inspired, and the Spirit *from above* governed his pen while he was writing those things. But whether it might not mean, according to the second sense (for the first we wholly disallow), viz. that St. Luke was amongst those who adhered to our Saviour Christ from his very first preaching of the gospel, I leave it to the inquiry of the reader to determine.

Ὡν ἤρξατο Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν, &c. Of<sup>b</sup> all that Jesus began both to do, &c.] I am sensible that in the common dialect, to begin to do, and to do, is one and the same thing. But I suppose the phrase in this place is to be taken relatively; q. d. "In the former treatise I discoursed of all those things which Jesus himself began to do and to teach: in this I am to give a relation of those things which were continued by his apostles after him."

Ver. 2: Διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου Through the Holy Ghost.] Expositors place these words differently. The Syriac, one of the Arabic copies, Beza, and the Italian, place them next after οὗς ἐξελέξατο, whom he had chosen: that the sense according to them is, "after that he had given commandments to the apostles whom he had chosen through the Holy Ghost." But the other Arabic, as also the Vulgar, the French and English translations, retain the same order of the words as we find them in the Greek text: most rightly rendering it, "after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments." Which also of old had been done by God to the prophets, dictating to them by the inspiration<sup>c</sup> of his Holy Spirit what they should teach and preach.

The apostles had indeed cast out devils and healed diseases through the Spirit; but it is a question, whether they had as yet taught any thing but what they had heard verbatim from the mouth of their great Master. He had given them a pro-

<sup>b</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 634.

<sup>c</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 686.

mise, that they should bind and loose the law of Moses : he had told them, that there were several things yet behind that must be revealed to them, which as yet they could not bear, concerning which they should be further instructed by the inspiration of the Spirit. When therefore he had risen and breathed in their face, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" from that time they were endued with the Spirit as the prophets of old, who dictated to them what they should preach, what they should require, and what they should ordain. And now nothing was wanting but the gift of tongues; that what was dictated to them they might declare and make known to all men in their own languages.

Ver. 3 : Δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ὄπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς. *Being seen of them forty days.*] "It<sup>d</sup> is a tradition. On the evening of the Passover they hanged Jesus. And a crier went before him for *forty days*, saying, 'Behold the man condemned to be stoned, because by the help of magic he hath deceived and drawn away Israel into an apostasy. Whoever hath any thing to allege in testimony of his innocence, let him come forth and bear witness.' But they found none that would be a witness in his behalf." But he himself (O thou tongue, fit to be cut out) gives a sufficient testimony of his own innocence; having for the space of *forty days* conversed amongst men after his resurrection from death, under the power of which he could not be kept by reason of his innocence.

"It<sup>e</sup> is a tradition. R. Eliezer saith, 'The days of the Messiah are *forty years*,' according as it is said, 'Forty years בְּדוֹר אֶקְרֵט shall I be grieved with this generation.' The Gloss is, "Because it is אֶקְרֵט (in the future tense) it is a sign the prophecy is concerning the time to come." It is ingenuously done, however, of these Jews, that they parallel that faithless generation that was in the days of the Messiah with that perverse and rebellious generation that had been in the wilderness: for they will, both of them, prove a loathing and offence to God for the space of *forty years*. And as those *forty years* in the wilderness were numbered according to the *forty days* in which the land had been searching<sup>f</sup>; so also may those *forty years* of the Messiah be numbered according

<sup>d</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 43. 1.<sup>e</sup> Ibid. fol. 99. 1.<sup>f</sup> Num. xiv. 34.



to the *forty days* wherein he was conversant amongst mankind after his resurrection from the dead. But you must compute warily, lest you stumble at the threshold about the year of Tiberius wherein Christ rose again; or at the close about the year of Vespasian wherein Jerusalem was taken. 'Εδάω μὲν (saith Josephus) Ἱεροσόλυμα ἔτει δευτέρῳ τοῦ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ ἡγεμονίας, *Jerusalem was taken in the second year of Vespasian's reign*: When indeed, according to the 'Fasti Consulares,' it was taken in his first year; but his second year from the time wherein he had been declared emperor by the army. He is saluted emperor by the army in Egypt at the very calends of July, and the fifth of the ides of July in Judea. So that his first year from the time of his being declared emperor was complete on the calends of July the year following; but indeed, it was but half his first year according to the computation of the 'Fasti.' Now Jerusalem was sacked on the eighth of September following.

Ver. 4<sup>b</sup>: Καὶ συναλιζόμενος μετ' αὐτῶν παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς. *And, being assembled together with them, commanded them, &c.*] We will make some inquiry, both as to the place and time wherein these things were spoken and done.

I. We derive the word συναλιζόμενος not from ἀλς, *salt*, but from ἀλία, *an assembly or congregation*. So the Lexicons: ἀλία, *a congregation*; ἐκκλησία, ἄθροισμα, *an assembly*. Προείπας<sup>i</sup> ἀλίσειω Πέρσας στρατὸν, *When thou shalt give notice to the Persians to gather their forces together*. Τά τε αἰπόλια καὶ τὰς πόλμνας καὶ τὰ βουκόλια ὁ Κῦρος πάντα τοῦ πατρὸς συναλίσας ἐς τῶντὸ ἔθνε· *Cyrus, having gathered together his father's flocks and herds of goats, and sheep, and oxen, sacrificed them<sup>k</sup>, &c.*

II. Our Saviour, after his resurrection, never appeared amongst his disciples but by surprise and unexpectedly, excepting that one time in the mountain of Galilee, where he had appointed to meet with them, Matt. xxviii. 16. So that I would refer these words therefore to that passage in St. Matthew; so that συναλιζόμενος μετ' αὐτῶν may signify his meeting with them in the mountain of Galilee, according to the appointment he had made. Nor do those words hinder

<sup>s</sup> De Bell. lib. vi. cap. 47. [Hudson, p. 1292.] [vi. 10. 1.]

<sup>h</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 635.

<sup>i</sup> Herodot. Polymn. [vii.] cap. 12.

<sup>k</sup> Id. Clio [i.], cap. 126.

that it is said, "he commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem," &c.; as if it should necessarily be supposed that they were now at Jerusalem: that passage ver. 6, οἱ οὖν συνελθόντες, *when they were come together*, may signify their assembling in that place; and the words παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς, *he commanded them*, &c., may very well be construed, that *he commanded them* to repair straightway to Jerusalem, and not to depart thence.

III. I conceive, therefore, that these things were spoken and done in the mountain of Galilee (where probably the five hundred at once were together to see him, 1 Cor. xv. 6), and that when the time of his ascension drew near. For reason would persuade us that they would not delay their return into the city when he had commanded them thither; nor that he commanded them thither but when the time drew near wherein he was to meet them there.

And whereas he adds in the very same place and discourse, ver. 5, Οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας, *not many days hence*; it is necessary that the word *ταύτας* should have its due force, having not been added here in vain; but seems to respect the days that were yet to come between that and Pentecost.

We have frequent mention amongst the Rabbins concerning פֶּרַס הַפֶּסַח, *the 'Paras' of the Passover*, and פֶּרַס עֵצֶרֶת *the 'Paras' of Pentecost*, and פֶּרַס הַחֹג *the 'Paras' of the feast of Tabernacles*. Now the פֶּרַס *Paras* (themselves being the interpreters) was that space of fifteen days immediately before any of these feasts. So that five-and-thirty days after the second of the Passover, began the פֶּרַס הָעֵצֶרֶת *the 'Paras' of the feast of Tabernacles*: and the second day of those fifteen was (this year) the Lord's day, on which I almost think they had that assembly on the mountain of Galilee, and that the disciples, being remanded from thence to Jerusalem, got thither within three days. But lest we should straiten the matter within too narrow a compass of time, and seem too nice and curious about the very day, I should judge we can hardly more properly apply these words συναλιζόμενος μετ' αὐτῶν, *being assembled together with them*, than to that meeting on the mountain of Galilee which Christ himself had made the appointment of. From thence it was that Christ com-

<sup>1</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 687.

manded them to Jerusalem, a place which, having tainted itself with the blood of their Lord, they might probably have very little mind to return to again, had it not been by some special command: and do we think they would have gone thither to have celebrated the feast of Pentecost, or indeed have been present all at it in that place; had not their Master directed them so to do?

Ver. 6: *Εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραήλ; Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?* It is very apparent, that the apostles had the same fanciful conceptions about the earthly reign of Christ with the rest of that nation: but yet they seem here a little to doubt and hesitate, either as to the thing itself, or at least as to the time; and that not without cause, considering some things which had so lately fallen out. ‘Lord, wilt thou restore the kingdom to those that have dealt so basely and perfidiously with thee? What, to this generation, that lies under the actual guilt of thy bloodshed? Or indeed to<sup>m</sup> this nation at all, which, by the perpetration of the late wickedness, had made itself unworthy of so great a kindness?’ Now what our Saviour returns for answer, viz. “that it is not for them to know the times or the seasons,” does not in the least hint any such kingdom ever to be; but he openly rebukes their curiosity in inquiring into the times, and in some measure the opinion itself, when he tells them, that “they should receive power from heaven, and should be his witnesses,” &c.

What that nation apprehended concerning the temporal reign of the Messiah, as to many things they speak plainly and openly enough; but in other things a man may inquire, but can hardly satisfy himself what they mean or intend. To omit others, they are in three things somewhat obscure:

I. Whether the ten tribes be to be admitted to the felicities of this reign? For as to this matter it is disputed by the Rabbins. “The ten tribes are not to return<sup>n</sup>.” But in the Jerusalem Talmudists it is expressed thus: “The ten tribes have not a part in the world to come, *ואינן רואין לעתיד לבוא* neither shall they see the future age.” Which is discoursed in the Babylonian writers, viz. whether this be not to be understood of those individual persons only that were car-

<sup>m</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 636.

<sup>n</sup> Sanhedr. cap. Chelek, halak. 7.

ried away by the king of Assyria; that they indeed shall not partake of the blessings of the Messias, though their posterity should. So that there may lie hid something of ambiguity in the word *Israel* in this passage we are now examining; that is, whether, in the conception of those that speak it, the ten tribes are included, yea or no. For commonly the name *Israel* amongst the Jews was wont to be taken for the Jews only; so that they called themselves *Israel*, and the ten tribes, by way of distinction, *the ten tribes*. In which sense, and according to which distinction, that of the apostle<sup>o</sup> seems to be said, "Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I."

II. What opinion was to be had of the two Messiahs, Messiah Ben David, and Messiah Ben Joseph, or Ben Ephraim, as he is called by the paraphrast, Cant. iv. 5? Whether they were to reign at the same time, the one over the ten tribes, the other over the two? or whether in succession to one another, both of them over the whole nation? Messiah Ben Joseph was to be cut off<sup>p</sup>. And then what must become of his subjects, whether they were of the ten tribes, or of the two, or of all?

III. It is further obscure in their writings, whether they had an apprehension that the Messiah should reign alone; or whether he should substitute any king or kings under him, or after him. It seems probable to them that the Messiah should reign his thousand years alone: but then as to that age which they called עתיד לבא (if *eternity* be not meant by it), what did they conceive must be done in it? Whether kings should be substituted in it of the race of David? They can dream of nothing but mere earthly things: and if from such kind of dreams we might conjecture what kind of future state that עתיד לבא should be, we may guess what should then be done. But to what purpose is it to trace error, where, as we cannot so much as fix a foot, so the further we proceed the more we slip?

What kind of *kingdom* the apostles had framed in their imaginations is not easy to conceive. There was something that might seem to cherish that opinion about a temporal reign, wherewith they had been leavened from their very

<sup>o</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 22.

<sup>p</sup> Succah, fol. 52. 1.

childhood ; and that was, that not only Christ, but several of the saints, had risen from the dead ; and that *the kingdom* of the Messiah should commence from some resurrection, they had already learnt from some of their own traditions. But in what manner should Christ now reign ? His body was made a spiritual body. Now he appears ; anon he vanisheth, and disappears again : and how will this agree with mortals ? The traditions, indeed, suppose the Messiah would be perhaps מן דמכיא *one of the dead* : but when he should revive, he was to have the same kind of body with other men. This was apprehended by some<sup>q</sup>, that those dead, mentioned Ezek. xxxvii, did revive, returned into the land of Israel, married wives and begat children : “ ‘ I myself,’ saith R. Judah Ben Betirah, ‘ am one of their offspring ; and these very phylacteries’, which my grandfather bequeathed to me, belonged to them.” Now, who is it can so much as imagine what opinion the apostles conceived concerning the bodily presence of Christ in this *kingdom* of his of which they had been dreaming ?

Ver. 12 : Σαββάρον ἔχον ὁδόν. *A sabbath day's journey.*] I have already said something in Luke xxiv concerning *a sabbath day's journey*. I will add a few things in this place<sup>s</sup>. “ Whosoever goeth beyond the bounds of the city on the sabbath day, let him be scourged : because it is said, ‘ Let no one go out from his place on the seventh day :’ this place is the bounds of the city. The law doth not determine the compass<sup>t</sup> of these bounds. But the wise men define these bounds from without to be about twelve miles, according to the Israelites’ camp : for Moses our master said unto them, ‘ Ye shall not go out of your camp.’ However, it is ordained by the words of the scribes, ‘ Let no one go out of the city beyond two thousand cubits. For two thousand cubits are the suburbs of the city. From whence we may learn that it is lawful to walk clear through the city on the sabbath day, be it as spacious as Nineveh, and whether it be walled or no. He may also expatiate beyond the city to the length of two thousand cubits from every side of it. But if a man go beyond these two thousand cubits, they scourge him מכת מדרות

<sup>q</sup> In Sanhedr. fol. 92. 2.

<sup>r</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 688.

<sup>s</sup> Maimonid. Schabb. cap. 27.

<sup>t</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 637.

with the scourge of rebellion ; that is, if he go so far as twelve miles : but if he go out of the city beyond twelve miles, though it be but the space of one cubit, he is scourged according to the law." Let us comment a little.

I. It was commonly believed, that the Israelites' encamping in the wilderness was about twelve miles square : "The<sup>u</sup> length of the Israelites' camp was twelve miles, and the breadth twelve miles."

"The breadth of the waters" (that is, those that were divided in Jordan) "was twelve miles, answerable to the camp of Israel, according as our Rabbins expound it<sup>x</sup>. The waters which came down from above stood and rose up upon a heāp, Josh. iii. 16. And what was the height of these waters? It was twelve miles' height upon twelve miles' breadth, according to the camp of Israel." Where the Gloss is, "The camp of the Israelites was twelve miles upon twelve miles" (that is, twelve miles square) : "and they passed over Jordan according to their encampings ; viz. the whole breadth of their camp passed over together for the space of twelve miles<sup>y</sup>." Hence that in *Hieros. Sotah*<sup>z</sup>, "Adam and Zarethan" (i. e. the place from whence and the place to which the waters were divided) "were distant from one another twelve miles."

Whether they took the number of twelve miles precisely, from allusion to the twelve tribes, or from any other reason retained that exact number and space, is not easy to determine : yet this is certain, that the Israelites' camp was very spacious, and had a very large compass, especially granting a mile's distance between the first tents and the tabernacle. And indeed, as to this commonly received opinion of the camp's being twelve miles square on every side, we shall hardly believe it exceeds the just proportion, if we consider the vast numbers of that people : nay, it might rather seem a wonder, that the encamping of so many myriads, or rather so many hundred thousands, should not exceed that proportion. Place the tabernacle in the midst ; allow the space of one mile from each side of it (in which space were the tents of the Levites), before you come to the first tents of the Israelites ; and then guess what length and breadth and thickness all the other tents would take up.

<sup>u</sup> Targ. Jonath. in Numb. ii.

<sup>y</sup> Sotah, fol. 34. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Kimch. in Josh. iii. 16.

<sup>z</sup> Fol. 21. 4.

II. It is supposed lawful for any one to have walked upon the sabbath day, not only from the outmost border of the camp to the tabernacle, but also through the whole camp from one end of it to the other; because the whole encamping was of one and the same, and not a diverse jurisdiction. According to that known canon concerning עירוב הצרות *commixion* or *communion of courts*. And hence it is that Maimonides makes such mention of twelve miles, and the lawfulness of walking on the sabbath day through any city, be it as spacious as Nineveh itself.

III. But when the people were disposed of, and placed in their several cities and towns in the land of Canaan, and the face of things quite changed from what it had been in the wilderness, it seemed good to the wise men to circumscribe the space of a *sabbath day's journey* within the bounds of two thousand cubits. And that partly because the inmost borders of the Israelites' tents were so much distant from the tabernacle, as may be gathered from Josh. iii. 4: and partly because it is said, Num. xxxv. 4, 5, "From the wall of the city ye shall measure a thousand cubits; and from without the city ye shall measure two thousand cubits." Now<sup>a</sup>, "a thousand cubits are the suburbs of the city, and two thousand cubits are the bounds of the sabbath."

IV. As to these words therefore of the evangelist now before us, we must suppose they do not define the exact distance of the mount of Olives from Jerusalem, which indeed was but five furlongs<sup>b</sup>; nor do they take in the town of Bethany within the bounds of the sabbath, which was distant fifteen furlongs, John xi. 18: but they point out that place of the mount where our Saviour ascended into heaven, viz. that place where that tract of the mount of Olives ceased to be called *Bethphage*, and began to be called *Bethany*. Concerning which we have discoursed more largely in another place.

-Ver. 13: 'Ανέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὑπερφῶν They<sup>c</sup> went up into an upper room.] לעלייהו to an upper room, in Talmudic language.

I. It was very familiar with that nation, that when they were to concern themselves with the law, or any parts of reli-

<sup>a</sup> Sotah, fol. 27.

<sup>b</sup> Joseph. Antiq. lib. xx. cap. 6.

<sup>c</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 638. *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 689.

gion, out of the synagogue, they went up לעלייה into an upper room, some uppermost part of the house. "Abniah<sup>d</sup>, a very rich man, invited Rabban Johanan Ben Zacchai, and his disciples, and Nicodemus, &c. to a feast, which he made at the circumcision of his son. When the feast was done, Rabban Johanan and his disciples went up לעלייה into an upper room, and read, and expounded, till the fire shone round about them as when the law was given at mount Sinai. Abniah was amazed at the honour that was given to the law, and so devoted his son to the law." Take notice that עלייה an upper room is distinct from a dining room, where they dined and supped; and there it was they handled the law and divine things: to which if that ἀνώγειον, large upper room, mentioned Mark xiv. 15, and Luke xxii. 12, where our Saviour celebrated the Passover, had any affinity, it seems to have been something different from a common dining room.

II. Such a kind of ὑπερφῶν, or upper room, I presume, was the Beth-Midrass of this or that Rabbin. R. Simeon<sup>e</sup> saith, "I saw בני עלייה the sons of the upper room, that they were few in number;" that is (if I take the word עלייה aright), the sons or disciples of Beth-Midrass: but I will not contend in this matter.

"Those<sup>f</sup> are the traditions which they delivered בעלייה in the upper room of Hananiah, Ben Hezekiah, Ben Garon:" and many instances of that kind. Of this kind seems that upper chamber at Troas, mentioned Acts xx. 8. And so, where we meet with the church in such or such a one's house, it seems to look this way: viz. some upper part of the house, sequestered on purpose for the assembling of the church, in the same manner that the Beth-Midrass was set apart for the meeting of the disciples of this or that Rabbin. And as the Beth-Midrass was always in the house of some Rabbin, so probably, for the most part, were these churches in the house of some minister or doctor of the church. Was not Aquila such a one, in whose house we find a church mentioned, Rom. xvi. 5, compared with Acts xviii. 26? Was not Philemon such a one, Phil. ver. 2?

Ver. 15: "Ὡς ἑκατὸν ἑκοστὶ About an hundred and twenty.]

<sup>d</sup> Juchasin, fol. 23. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Juchasin, fol. 45. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Hieros. Schab. fol. 3. 3.



The same number was Ezra's great synagogue. "Ezra<sup>‡</sup> was the head of all: he was the twenty-second receiver of traditions, וקנים "בית דינו היו קד" and his whole Sanhedrim consisted of a hundred and twenty elders." There was no stated council in any city under this number. "How<sup>h</sup> many men are requisite in a city that it might be capable of having a council settled in it? A hundred and twenty. What is their office? Three-and-twenty are to make up the number of the lesser Sanhedrim. And there are three classes of twenty-three: behold, there are ninety-two. There are ten במלין *to be at leisure* for the synagogue: behold, there are a hundred and two. Two בעל דינין (*the plaintiff and the defendant*) who have business before the Sanhedrim: שני זוממין *two crafty witnesses*" (those who by their counter evidence might implead the witnesses, if possible, of a lie): "שני זוממין שני זוממין *two counter-witnesses against those counter-witnesses*. Two scribes. Two *chazanim*, two collectors of the alms, and a third to distribute. רופא *a physician* (the Gloss hath it, *one to circumcise infants*). אומן *an artificer, chirurgion* (the Gloss is, *one to let blood*). לבלר *a libellary*, i. e. one that was to write bills of espousals, divorces, contracts, &c. and a schoolmaster; behold, a hundred and twenty." If you will pick any thing out of this parity of number, you may. However, certainly, the number of those we have now before us ought always to occur to mind when we read such passages as these: "They were all with one accord in one place," Acts ii. 1: "They were all scattered abroad excepting the apostles," chap. viii. 1. So chap. xi. 19, &c.

Besides the twelve apostles and seventy-two disciples, who can tell us who those other thirty-six were that were to fill up the number? what kind of men, of what degree and quality, who, though they were neither of the number of the twelve apostles, nor the seventy disciples, yet were admitted members of that great and holy consistory? Reason itself seems against it, that any women should be accounted of that number. As also it is plain, that though there were more in the city that believed, yet these were, for some special

<sup>‡</sup> Juchasin, fol. 13. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 17. 2. Maimon. Sanhedr. cap. 1.

2

cause and reason, ascribed into this peculiar fellowship and number. As to the twelve and the seventy we need not inquire: as to the rest, let<sup>i</sup> us see whether it may not be intimated to us, ver. 21, that they had been the followers of Christ, in company with the others, from the very first of his publishing the gospel.

That Peter should be always at the head of them, and have the chief parts in the whole history, as their prolocutor and chief actor, must be attributed,

1. To his seniority, he being older than any of the other twelve. And whereas, under this notion of his age, he had been their chief speaker all the while that our Saviour conversed amongst them, it was but just and reasonable he should hold the same place and quality now that their Lord was gone.

2. To his repentance. And what was but necessary, that he who had so scandalously fallen might, by his future zeal and religion, as much as possible give some considerable testimonies both of his repentance and recovery.

3. He was designed to the apostleship of circumcision as the chief minister: it was fit therefore<sup>k</sup> that he should be chief amongst those of the circumcision. But when we style him the chief minister of the circumcision, we do not dream of any primacy he had over the other ministers of the circumcision; only that the greatest work and the widest space of that ministry fell to his lot, viz. Mesopotamia, or the Babylonish and Assyrian captivity, namely, the Jews in Babylon, and the ten tribes mixed with them. And when we speak of him as acting the chief and principal parts, we do not believe the rest of the apostles idle; we know they were endowed with equal authority, an equal gift of miracles, equal number of tongues, equal wisdom, and an equal power of preaching the gospel; but that he, for the reasons above mentioned, had shown his zeal, industry, and activity, in some ways and measures very extraordinary.

Ver. 18: Καὶ πρηνῆς γενόμενος ἐλάκησε μέσος· *Falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst.*] The Vulgate and Erasmus have it, *Suspensus crepuit medius: Being hanged, he cracked asunder in the midst.* So the Italian translation: *Appicato*

<sup>i</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 639.

<sup>k</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 690.

*crepo pel mezzo*; rendering St. Matthew rather than St. Luke; and I question, indeed, whether they do rightly take the mind of St. Matthew, while they so strictly confine the word ἀπήγαρο to *being hanged*. I have produced my conjecture concerning this business at Matt. xxvii; viz. that the devil, immediately after Judas had cast back his money into the temple, caught him up into the air, strangled him, threw him headlong, and dashed him in pieces upon the ground. For,

I. It is questionable enough, whether the word ἀπήγαρο do necessarily and singly denote *he hanged himself*; and not as well, *he was hanged or choked*; and, indeed, whether the word always supposes the halter: how the learned Heinsius hath defended the negative, we may consult him upon this place, and upon Matt. xxvii.

II. If Judas *hanged* himself, as is commonly believed, and commonly so painted, how could it be said of him that ἐγένετο πρηνής, *he fell headlong*? Grant that, upon the breaking of the halter, he might fall upon the ground; yet what matter is it whether he fell on his face, or that he fell backward? But if πρηνής be derived ἀπὸ τοῦ προνεύειν, as the grammarians would have it, it may be *headlong* as well as *upon the face*; that is, as *upon the face* is opposed τῷ ὑπέρῳ, to *supine* or *backward*.

III. Histories tell us of persons strangled by the devil. That is a known passage in Tob. iii. 8: "Asmodeus אַסְמוּדֵיט (so it is in the Heb. of P. Fagius) *strangled* Sarah's seven husbands," &c.; and it may be the less wonder, if the devil, being corporally seated in this wretch, should at last strangle him.

IV. There are also histories of the devil snatching up some into the air, and carrying them away with him. Now, of all mortals, no wretch did ever more deserve so direful a fate than this traitor; nor did any other death become the most impious of all mankind than the dreadfulest the devil (to whom he was entirely given up) could inflict; as what might be of most horror to himself and terror to others.

V. The words immediately following, "That this was known to all the dwellers at Jerusalem," ver. 19, argue it was a thing of no common and ordinary event, and must be something more than hanging himself; which was an accident not so very unusual in that nation.

Καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ. *And all his bowels gushed out.*] “A<sup>1</sup> certain Syrian saw a man, who fell from the roof of his house upon the ground; פקעיה נרסיה ונפיק; פקעיה כמעיה *his belly burst, and his bowels gushed out.* The Syrian brought the son of him that had thus fallen, and slew him before him, באחיזת עיניים. But at length it seemed so.” [*At deinceps visum.*] The Gloss<sup>m</sup> telleth us, he did not strike or hurt the boy; but made as if he would have killed him: because he, loath to meddle with the man’s bowels himself, for fear lest he should any way displace them, seemed as if he had killed the boy; that so the father, upon the sight of it, groaning and fetching strong and deep sighs, might draw in his bowels into their proper place again.

The devil had dwelt in this wretch for three days, or thereabout, from the time that he had entered him upon his receiving the sop, John xiii; and now, by a horrid eruption tearing out his bowels, he goes out again.

Ver. 19: Ἀκελδαμά: *Aceldama.*] חקל דמא *A field of blood:* so called, both as it had been purchased with the price of *blood*, and as it had been watered with the *blood* of this traitor; for hither I presume the devil had thrown him headlong: and upon this event it was that the priests were moved to purchase this very field; and so, in a twofold sense, it might be said of this traitor, that ἐκρήσατο τὸ χωρίον, *he purchased a field*, both as it was bought with his money and sealed with his blood. If *Aceldama* was in that quarter of the city that it is now shown in to strangers, that is, between the east and the south, as Borchard tells us, then it was in the valley of Hinnom, or thereabout.

Ver. 25: Πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον. *That he might go to his own place.*] Balaam<sup>n</sup> “went to his own place, that is, into hell.” “It<sup>o</sup> is not said of the friends of Job, that they, each of them, came from his own house, or his own city, or his own country, but from his own place, or שנתבצר, במקום שנתבצר, *that is, from a place cut out for him in hell.*” The Gloss is, “from his own place, that is, from hell, appointed for idolaters.” “Whosoever betrays<sup>p</sup> an Israelite into the

<sup>1</sup> Cholin, fol. 56. 2.

<sup>m</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 640.

<sup>n</sup> Baal Turim, in Num. xxiv. 25.

<sup>o</sup> Midras Coheleth, fol. 100. 4.

<sup>p</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 691.

hands of the Gentiles, hath no part in the world to come<sup>q</sup>." If so, then where must he have his place that betrayed the very Messiah of Israel?

Ver. 23: 'Ἰωσήφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαβᾶν *Joseph called Barsabas.*] I. Amongst the Jews, יוסי *Joss*, and יוסף *Joseph*, are one and the same name. "אמר ר' יוסי בבבל לשון ארמי *R. Jose saith, 'In Babylon, the Syrian tongue,'*" &c.; which being recited in *Sotah*<sup>s</sup> is thus expressed, "אמר ר' יוסף לשון ארמי *R. Joseph said, 'In Babylon,'*" &c. So יוסי *R. Jose*, in *Hieros. Jom Tobh*<sup>t</sup>, is יוסף *R. Joseph* in *Bab. Berac.*<sup>u</sup> יוסי בן יוחנן *Jose Ben Johanan* in *Avoth*<sup>x</sup>, is *Joseph Ben Johanan* in Maimonides's preface to *Misnah*. And so 'Ἰωσῆς in Matt. xxvii. 56, and Mark vi. 3, is rendered in the Vulgate, *Joseph*. See Beza upon the place now before us.

II. I would therefore suspect that this Joseph, who is called *Barsabas*, might be Joses the son of Alpheus, the brother of James the Less, who, as James also, was called the Just: nor could we suppose any a more likely candidate for the apostleship than he who was brother to so many of the apostles, and had been so oftentimes named with James. What the word *Barsabas* might signify, it is not so easy to determine; because *Sabas* may agree with so many Hebrew words; the nomenclators render it, *the son of 'conversion,' son of 'quiet,' son of an 'oath.'* (But, by the way, who can tell what etymology the Arabic interpreter in Bib. Polygl. referred to when he rendered it ברצאפאן *Barzaphan*?) I would write it בר סבא *Bar Saba* (which also the Erpenian Arab. does) i. e. *a wise son*: unless you had rather *son of an old man*. There is also another *Barsabas*, chap. xv. 22; "Judas surnamed *Barsabas*:" by whom if Judas the apostle be to be understood, let Joses and he (both *Barsabas*) be brothers, both of them בר סבא *Bar Saba*, *the sons of old Alpheus*.

<sup>q</sup> Maimon. in Covell *umazzi*.  
cap. 8.

<sup>r</sup> Bava Kama, fol. 83. 1.

<sup>s</sup> Fol. 49. 2.

<sup>u</sup> Fol. 19. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Cap. 1. hal. 4.

<sup>t</sup> Fol. 61. 3.

CHAP. II. <sup>γ</sup>

VER. 1: Καὶ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς. *And when the day of Pentecost was fully come.*]

I. This word *Pentecost* seems to be taken into use by the Hellenist Jews to signify this feast; which also almost all the versions retain, the Western especially, and, amongst the Eastern, the Syriac and Ethiopic. The Hebraizing Jews commonly call this feast by the name of עֲצֵרֶת; from which one of the Arabic translations differs very little, when it renders it in this place יום אל עֲצֵרֶת אֱלֹהִים; where the letter נ is only inserted; the other omits the word wholly, and only hath יום אֱלֹהִים, *the day of the fifty*.

II. It is well enough known that עֲצֵרֶת, in the holy Scriptures, was a *holiday*, Levit. xxiii. 36; Deut. xvi. 8; 2 Kings x. 20: and the reason why the Jews so peculiarly appropriate it to the feast of *Pentecost* seems to be this; because this feast consisted in one solemn day, whereas the feast of Passover and of Tabernacles had more days. "As <sup>z</sup> the days of the feast are seven. R. Chaija saith, 'Because the *Pentecost* is but for one day, is the morning so too?' They say unto him, 'Thou arguest from a far-fetched tradition.'" Where the Gloss hath it, "That this fast is but for one day, we learn from the very word עֲצֵרֶת." "The <sup>a</sup> men of the town Mahæsia are strong of heart, for they see the glory of the law twice in the year." The Gloss is, "Thither all Israel is gathered together in the month Adar, that they may hear the traditions concerning that passover in the school of Rabh Asai; and in the month Elul, that they may hear the traditions concerning the feast of Tabernacles. But they were not so gathered together יום אחד בעֲצֵרֶת שאִינוֹ אֱלֹהִים *at the feast of Pentecost, because that is not above one day.*"

Hence that Baithusean may be the better believed in his dispute with Rabban Johanan <sup>b</sup>, "Moses our master (saith he) will love Israel; ויודע שעֲצֵרֶת יום אחד היא *and he knows that the feast of Pentecost is but for one day.*"

III. And yet there is mention <sup>c</sup> of a second holiday in

<sup>γ</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 641.

<sup>z</sup> Beresh. Rabba, fol. 114, 3.

<sup>a</sup> Beracoth, fol. 17. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Menacoth, fol. 65. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Sanhed. fol. 26. 2.

*Pentecost*, הנהו קבוראי דקבור נפשא ביום טוב ראשון של עצרת שמתינהו רב פפא *Rabh Papa hath shammatized those bearers that bury the dead on the first feast-day of Pentecost, &c.*; where the mention of the 'first feast-day' hints to us that there is a second, which we find elsewhere asserted in express terms. "R. Simeon<sup>d</sup> Ben Jozadek saith, 'In eighteen days any single person repeats the Hallel over;' that is to say, in the seven days of the feast of tabernacles, in the eight days of the feast of dedication, the first day of the passover, and the first *day of Pentecost*. But in the captivity they did it in one-and-twenty days. In the nine days of the feast of tabernacles, in the eight days of the feast of dedication, in the two feast-days of the passover, עצרת של שני ימים טובים של *and the two feast-days of Pentecost.*"

Whereas it is said בגולה in the captivity, the difficulty is answered; for although in the land of Israel there was but one solemn day in the feast of *Pentecost*, yet amongst the Jews in foreign countries there were two; which also happened in other solemnities. For instance, within Palestine they kept but one day holy in the beginning of the year<sup>e</sup>, viz. the first day of the month Tisri; but in Babylon and other foreign countries they observed both the first and the second day. And the reason was, because at so great a distance from the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, they could not be exactly certain of the precise day, as it had been stated by the Sanhedrim; they observed, therefore, two days, that by the one or the other they might be sure to hit upon the right.

IV. God himself did indeed institute but one holiday in the feast of *Pentecost*, Levit. xxiii: and therefore is it more peculiarly called *עֲצֵרֶת* a solemn day, because it had but one feast-day. And yet that feast hath the name of *חג* and *רגל*, the same titles that the feast of tabernacles and the passover had, Exod. xxiii. 14, &c.: and all the males appeared in this feast as well as in the others; nor was this feast without its *Chagigah* any more than the rest. So that however the first *day of Pentecost* only was the holy and solemn day, yet the feast itself was continued for seven days. So the doctors in

<sup>d</sup> Erachin, fol. 10. 1.

<sup>e</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 692.

*Rosh Hashanah*<sup>f</sup>; “R. Oshaiah saith, ‘Whence comes it that *עצרת* the *Pentecost* hath *תְּשׁוּמִין* compensations for all the seven days?’ Because the Scripture saith, *בַּחֲגַת הַמִּצֵּוֹת* *In the feast of unleavened bread, ובַּחֲגַת הַשְּׁבִיעוֹת* and in the feast of weeks, *ובַּחֲגַת הַסֻּכּוֹת* and in the feast of tabernacles. He compares the feast of weeks (i. e. *Pentecost*) with the feast of unleavened bread. That hath compensations for all the seven days, אָפָה חֲגַת הַשְּׁבִיעוֹת יֵשׁ לָהּ תְּשׁוּמִין כָּל ז’ so the feast of weeks (i. e. *Pentecost*) hath compensations for all the seven days.” They called that *תְּשׁוּמִין* compensations, when any one not having made his just offerings in the beginning of the feast, repaired and compensated this negligence or defect of his by offering in any other of the seven<sup>g</sup> days. And thus much may suffice as to this whole feast in general. Now as to the very day of *Pentecost* itself, it may not be amiss to add something.

I. It is well known that the account of weeks and days from the Passover to *Pentecost* took its beginning from, and depended upon, the day of offering the sheaf of the first-fruits, Levit. xxiii. 15. But through the ambiguity of the phrase *מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת* the *morrow of the sabbath*, there hath arisen a controversy betwixt the scribes and Baithuseans, whether by the *sabbath* ought to be understood the weekly *sabbath* (or, as the scribes commonly called it, *שַׁבַּת בְּרֵאשִׁית*, the *sabbath of the creation*), or whether it should be understood of the *sabbatical day*, i. e. the first day of the seven days of passover, which was the solemn day, Exod. xii. 16. The Baithuseans contend vehemently for the former, and will not have the sheaf offered but after the weekly sabbath. As suppose the first day of the passover should fall out upon the first day of the week, they would stay till the whole week with the sabbath day was run out; and then, on the morrow of that sabbath, i. e. the first day of the following week, they offered the sheaf. But the scribes, very differently, keep strictly to the sixteenth day of the month Nisan for offering the firstfruits without any dispensation, after the sabbatical day or the first day of the feast is over. And amongst other arguments by which they strengthen their opinion, those two

<sup>f</sup> Fol. 4. 2.<sup>g</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 642.



different places of Scripture, Exod. xii. 15, "Seven days ye shall eat unleavened bread," and Deut. xvi. 8, "Six days thou shalt eat unleavened bread," they, according to the sense they have, do thus reconcile, 'seven days, indeed, you shall eat unleavened bread;' that is, unleavened bread of the old wheat, on the first day of the feast, the sheaf being not yet offered; and unleavened bread of the new wheat, the remaining six days, after you have offered the firstfruits<sup>h</sup>.

II. If the day of the firstfruits be to be taken into the number of the fifty days, which the authors now quoted do clearly enough affirm out of those words, Deut. xvi. 9, "Number the seven weeks to thyself **מִהַחֵל הָרִמֶשׁ בְּקַמּוֹ**, when thou beginnest to put the sickle into the corn;" then it will appear plain enough to any one that upon whatsoever day of the week the sheaf-offering should fall, on that day of the week *the day of Pentecost* would fall too. And hence the Baithuseans contended so earnestly that the **מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת** *the morrow after the sabbath* (on which it is commanded that the sheaf of the firstfruits should be offered) should be understood of the first day of the week, that so *the day of Pentecost* might fall out to be the first day of the week too: not so much in honour of that day (which is indeed our "Lord's day"), but that the *Pentecost* might have the more feast-days; **כִּי שִׂיחוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּתְעַנְגִּין שְׁנֵי יָמִים** *that the Israelites might delight themselves for two days together*, as one of them speaks out their meaning<sup>i</sup>.

III. As to the year, therefore, we are now upon, wherein Christ ascended, and the Holy Ghost came down; the sheaf-offering was on the sabbath day. For the paschal lamb was eaten on Thursday; so that Friday (on which day our Saviour was crucified) was the first day of the feast, the sabbatical, or holiday. And the following day, which was their sabbath, was the *δευτέρα*, *the second*, on which the sheaf was offered whilst Christ lay in the grave. And for this very reason was it said to be *ἡμέρα μεγάλη τοῦ σαββάτου*, *a high day of the sabbath*, John xix. 31.

IV. Let us inquire, therefore, whether *the day of Pentecost* fell out on their sabbath day. I know, indeed, that the

<sup>h</sup> Siphra, fol. 51. 1. Pesikta, fol. 20. 1. Menac. fol. 66. 1.

<sup>i</sup> Menac. fol. 65. 1.

fifty days are reckoned by some from the resurrection of our Lord; and then *Pentecost*, or *the fiftieth day*, must fall on the first day of the week, that is, our Lord's day: but if we number the days from the common epocha, that is, from the time of offering the sheaf of firstfruits (which account doubtless St. Luke doth follow), then *the day of Pentecost* fell out upon the Jewish sabbath. And here, by the good leave of some learned men, it may be questioned, 'Whether the Holy Ghost was poured out upon the disciples on the very *day of Pentecost*, or no.' The reasons of this question may be these:

I. The ambiguity of the words themselves, ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι<sup>k</sup> τὴν ἡμέραν, which may be either rendered, as we have done in English, *when the day of Pentecost was fully come*; or as they in the Italian, E nel finire del giorno della Pentecoste, q. d. *when it was fully gone*. So that the phrase leaves it undetermined, whether *the day of Pentecost was fully come* or *fully gone*: and what is there could be alleged against it, should we render it in the latter sense?

II. It is worthy our observation, that Christ the antitype, in answering some types that represented him, did not tie himself up to the very day of the type itself for the fulfilling of it, but put it off to the day following. So it was not upon the very day of the Passover, but the day following, that ἐθύθη αὐτὸς Πάσχα ἡμῶν, *Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us*<sup>l</sup>: it was not on the very day that the sheaf of the firstfruits was offered, but the day following, that Christ became ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, *the firstfruits of them that slept*<sup>m</sup>. So also did he institute the Christian sabbath not the same day with the Jewish sabbath wherein God had finished the work of his creation, but<sup>n</sup> the day following, wherein Christ had finished the work of his redemption. And so it was agreeable to reason, and to the order wherein he disposed of things already mentioned, that he should indulge that mysterious gift of the Holy Ghost, not upon the day of the Jewish sabbath, but the day following, the day of his own resurrection from the grave; that the Spirit should not be poured out upon the same day wherein the giving of the law was

<sup>k</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 693.

<sup>l</sup> 1 Cor. v. 7.

<sup>m</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 20.

<sup>n</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 643.

commemorated, but upon a day that might keep up the commemoration of himself for ever.

III. We can hardly invent a more fit and proper reason why upon this day they should be *ἅπαντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*, *all with one accord in one place*, than that they were so gathered together for the celebration of "the Lord's day." So that although we have adventured to call it into question, whether the Holy Ghost was poured out upon the very day of the Jewish *Pentecost*, yet have we not done it with any love to contradiction, but as having considerable reason so to do, and with design of asserting to "the Lord's day" its just honour and esteem: for on that day, beyond all controversy, the Holy Ghost did come down amongst them.

*Ἦσαν ἅπαντες ὁμοθυμαδόν, &c. They were all with one accord, &c.*] Who were these *ἅπαντες*, these *all* here mentioned? probably the "hundred and twenty" spoken of chap. i. 15: and the connexion falls in well enough with the foregoing story. Those *all* were together, when the election of the twelfth apostle was propounded, and when the choice was made too: and therefore, why the *all* in this place ought not to have reference to this very number also, who can allege any reason? Perhaps you will say, This reason may be given why it should not; namely, that 'all those that were here assembled were endued with the gift of tongues; and who will say that all the hundred and twenty were so gifted? I do myself believe it, and that for these reasons:

I. All the rest were likely to publish the gospel in foreign countries as well as the apostles; and therefore was it necessary that they also should be endowed with foreign tongues.

II. The apostles themselves imparted the same gift by the imposition of hands to those whom they ordained the ministers of particular churches. It would seem unreasonable therefore that those extraordinary persons that had been all along in company with Christ and his apostles, and were to be the great preachers of the gospel in several parts of the world, should not be enriched with the same gift.

III. It is said of the seven deacons, that they were *πλήρεις Πνεύματος ἁγίου*, *full of the Holy Ghost*, even before they were chosen to that office: which doth so very well agree with what is said in this part of the story, ver. 4, *ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαν-*

τες Πνεύματος ἁγίου, they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, that we can hardly find out a more likely time or place wherein these deacons had been thus replenished, than when the apostles themselves were so; that is, upon the coming down of the Holy Ghost.

IV. The dignity and prerogative of the apostles above the rest of the disciples did not so much consist in this gift of tongues being appropriated to themselves; but in this, amongst other things, that they were capable of conferring this gift upon others, which the rest could not do. Philip the deacon doubtless did himself speak with tongues; but he could not confer this gift to the Samaritans, that they also should speak with tongues as he did: this was reserved to Peter and to John the apostles.

V. The Holy Ghost, as to the gift of tongues, fell upon all that heard Peter's discourse in the house of Cornelius, chap. x. 44: it may seem the less strange, therefore, if it should fall on these also, at this time and in this place.

Ver. 2: Ἦχος ὡσερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας. *A sound as of a rushing mighty wind.*] The sound of a mighty wind, but without wind; so also tongues like as of fire, but without fire. Φερομένης is fitly and emphatically enough added here; but I question whether ἐπεφέρετο was so properly put by the Greek interpreters in Gen. i. 2; Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος, the Spirit of God was carried upon the face of the waters. And yet the paraphrast and Samaritan copy is much wider still from the meaning and intention of Moses, when they render it by נשׁנשׁ he breathed upon the waters. I conceive they might in those words, "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," have an eye to those waters that covered the earth; whereas Moses plainly distinguisheth between the abyss, that is, the waters that covered the earth, upon the face of which deep the darkness was, and those waters which the Spirit of God moved upon, that is, the waters which were above the firmament, ver. 6, 7. And by the moving or incubation of<sup>o</sup> the Spirit upon these waters, I would rather understand the motion of the heavens, the Spirit of God turning them about, and by that motion cherishing the things below as the bird doth by sitting upon its young,

<sup>o</sup> English folio edition, vol. ii. p. 644.

than of any blowing or breathing of the Spirit or the wind upon them; or that the Spirit was carried upon the waters as a wind is upon the sea or upon the land.

Ver. 3<sup>p</sup>: Διαμερίζομαι γλώσσαί ὡσεὶ πυρός. *Cloven tongues like as of fire.*] The confusion of languages was the casting off of the Gentiles and the confusion of religion: for after once all other nations excepting that of the Jewish came to be deprived of the use and knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, in which language alone the things of true religion and all divine truth were known, taught, and delivered, it was unavoidable but that they must needs be deprived of the knowledge of God and religion. Hence that very darkness that fell upon the Gentile world by that confusion of tongues continued upon them to this very time. But now behold the remedy; and that wound that had been inflicted by the confusion is now healed by the gift of tongues; that veil that was spread over all nations at Babel was taken away at mount Zion, Isa. xxv. 7. We meet with a form of prayer in the Jewish writings which was used on the solemn fast of the ninth month Ab, of which this is one clause<sup>q</sup>: “Have mercy, O God, upon the city that mourneth, that is trodden down and desolate; כי באשׁ החרבתה ובאשׁ אתה עתיד לבנותה *because thou didst lay it waste by fire, and by fire wilt build it up again.*” If the Jews expect and desire their Jerusalem should be rebuilt by fire, let them direct their eyes towards these *fiery tongues*; and acknowledge both that the building commenced from that time, and the manner also, how only it is to be restored.

Ver. 13: Γλεύκους μεμεστωμένοι. *These men are full of new wine.*] “Rabba saith, בפורי׳א, בפורי׳א, בפורי׳א *A man is bound to make himself so mellow on the feast of Purim, that he shall not be able to distinguish between, Cursed be Haman and, Blessed be Mordecai.*” “Rabbah and R. Zeira feasted together on the feast of Purim and איבסמו *they were sweetened, or made very mellow.*” The Gloss is, ואיבסמו נשתכרו *and they were sweetened, i. e. they were drunk.* So that the γλεύκους μεμεστωμένοι εἰσὶ is nothing but what they were wont to express in their common dialect, איבסמו *they are sweetened, that is, are drunk.*

<sup>p</sup> Leusden's edition, vol. ii. p. 694.      <sup>q</sup> Hieros. Taanith, fol. 65. 3.

<sup>r</sup> [Megillah, fol. 7. 2.]

But may we not rather judge those drunk who, by saying the apostles were *full of new wine*, imputed that sudden skill of theirs in so many languages to wine and intemperance? The Rabbins, indeed, mention a demon קרדיקוס *Cordicus*, who possesseth those that are *drunk with new wine*<sup>r</sup>. But is he so great a master of art and wit that he can furnish them with tongues too? These scoffers seem to be of the very dregs and scum of the people; who, knowing no other language but their own mother tongue, and not understanding what the apostles said while they were speaking in foreign languages, thought they said nothing but mere babble and gibberish.

Ver. 15: \*Ἔστι γὰρ ὥρα τρίτη τῆς ἡμέρας. *It is but the third hour of the day.*] That is, with us, nine o'clock in the morning; before which time, especially on the sabbath and other feast-days, the Jews were not wont so much as to taste any thing of meat or drink, nor, indeed, hardly of other days. "This<sup>s</sup> was the custom of the religious of old, first to say over his morning prayers on the sabbath day, with those additional ones in the synagogue, and then go home and take his second repast:" for he had taken his first repast on the evening before, at the entrance of the sabbath. Nothing might be tasted before the prayers in the synagogue were finished, which sometimes lasted even to noon-day; for so the Gloss upon the place, "When they continue in the synagogue beyond the sixth hour and a half, which is the time of the great *Minchah*, (for on a feast-day they delayed their coming out of the synagogue), then let a man pray his prayer of the *Minchah* before he eat, and so let him eat." And in those days it was that that commonly obtained, which Targ. in *Kohheleth* [Eccles.] noteth<sup>t</sup>; בתר דמקרבין תמידא אכלין; להמא בזמן ד' שעין *After they had offered the daily sacrifice they eat bread in the time of the four hours*, i. e. in the fourth hour. In *Bava Mezia*<sup>u</sup> a certain officer of the king's teacheth R. Eleazar the son of R. Simeon how he should<sup>x</sup> distinguish betwixt thieves and honest men; על ארבע שעו לחנות "Go (saith he) into the tabernacle on the fourth hour, and

<sup>r</sup> Gittin, cap. 7.<sup>s</sup> Maimon. Schab. cap. 30.<sup>t</sup> Cap. 10. 16.<sup>u</sup> Fol. 83. 2.<sup>x</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 645.

if thou seest any person drinking wine, and nodding while he holds his cup in his hand," &c. Where the Gloss hath it, "The fourth hour was the hour of eating, when every one went into the tabernæ, and there ate." So that these whom ye deride, O ye false mockers, are not *drunk*, for it is but the *third hour of the day*; that is, it is not yet the time to eat and drink in.

Ver. 17: 'Εν ταῖς ἑσχαταῖς ἡμέραις. *In the last days.*] The prophet Joel hath it אַחֲרֵי־כֵן, *after these things*; Greek, μετὰ ταῦτα, *after these things*. Where Kimchi upon the place hath this note, והיה אחרי כן כמו יהיה באחרית הימים *And it shall come to pass "after these things,"* is the same with καὶ ἔσται ἐν ἑσχαταῖς ἡμέραις, *it shall come to pass "in the last days."* We have elsewhere observed that by the *last days* is to be understood the last days of Jerusalem and the Jewish economy, viz. when the τέλος τοῦ αἰῶνος Ἰουδαϊκοῦ, *the end of the Jewish world*, drew near. And there would be the less doubt as to this matter if we would frame a right notion of "that great and terrible day of the Lord;" that is, the day of his vengeance upon that place and nation. Which terror the Jews, according to their custom and fashion, put far off from themselves, and devolve it upon Gog and Magog, who were to be cut off and destroyed.

Ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα. *I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh.*] The Jews cautiously enough here, though not so honestly, apply this prophecy and promise to Israel solely; as having this for a maxim amongst them, "That the Holy Ghost is never imparted to any Gentile." Hence those of the circumcision that believed were so astonished when they saw that "on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost," chap. x. 45. But, with the Jews' good leave, whether they will or no, the Gentiles are beyond all question included within such-like promises as these: "All flesh shall see the salvation of God<sup>z</sup>;" and, "All flesh shall come and worship before the Lord<sup>a</sup>;" &c.

Ver. 19: Καὶ ἀρμυδα καπνοῦ. *And vapour of smoke.*] The prophet hath it in the Hebrew עֲשָׂן וְתַמְרֵיהֶם *and pillars of smoke*. St. Luke follows the Greek; who, as it should seem,

<sup>y</sup> Vide Matt. xxiv. 3, and 1 Cor. x. 11.

<sup>z</sup> Isa. xl. 5. [Luke iii. 6.]

<sup>a</sup> Isa. lxvi. 23.

are not very solicitous about that nice distinction between *מְתַמֵּר עֵשֶׁן* *pillaring smoke, or smoke ascending like a staff*, and *מִפְצִיעַ לְכָאן וּלְכָאן* *smoke dispersing itself here and there*: a distinction we meet with in *Joma*<sup>b</sup>; where we have a ridiculous story concerning the curiosity of the wise men about the ascending up of the smoke of incense.

As to these prodigies in blood, fire, and smoke, I would understand it of the slaughter and conflagrations that should be committed in that nation to a wonder by seditious and intestine broils there. They were monsters rather than instances; than which there could never have been a more prodigious presage of the ruin of that nation than that they grew so cruel within themselves, breathing nothing but mutual slaughters and desolations.

Ver. 23: *Τούτου τῆ ὀρισμένη βουλῆ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκδοτον λαβόντες, &c.* *Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, &c.*] We may best fetch the reason why St. Peter adds this clause, from the conceptions of the Jews. Can he be the Messiah, think they, that hath suffered such things? What! the Messiah crucified and slain? Alas! how different are these things from the character of the Messiah! *לו יתרון ומעלה וכבוד על כל המלכים* “*To him belong honour, and glory, and pre-eminence above all kings that have ever been in the world*; according as all the prophets, from Moses our master (to whom be peace!) to Malachi (to whom be peace!) have prophesied concerning him.” Is he then the Messiah that was spit upon, scourged, thrust through with a spear, and crucified? “Yes (saith St. Peter); these things he suffered *τῆ δ ὀρισμένη βουλῆ καὶ προγνώσει Θεοῦ, by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.*” And these things had been foretold concerning him from Moses to Malachi; so that he was nevertheless their Messiah, though he suffered these things; nor did he, indeed, suffer these things by chance, but by the determinate counsel of God. What the learned have argued from this place concerning God’s decrees I leave to the schools.

Ver. 24: *Λύσας τὰς ᾠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου.* *Having loosed the*

<sup>b</sup> Fol. 38. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Rambam in Artic. fid. Jud. Sanhedr. fol. 121. 1.

<sup>d</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 646.



*pains of death.*] Let these ὠδῖνας θανάτου be either the 'pains' of death, or the 'bands' of death, yet it is doubtful whether St. Peter might speak only of the death of Christ, or of death in general: so that the sense may be that God raised him up, and, by his resurrection, hath loosed the bands of death with respect to others also. But supposing the expression ought to be appropriated to Christ only, (whom, indeed, they do chiefly respect), then by ὠδῖνας θανάτου we are not to understand so much the torments and pangs in the last moments of death as those bands which followed; viz. the continued separation of soul and body, the putrefaction and corruption of the body in the grave; which two things are those which St. Peter acquits our Saviour from in the following words. For however it be a great truth that death is the wages of sin, yet is it not to be understood so much of those very pangs whereby the soul and body are disjoined, as the continuation of the divorce betwixt soul and body in the grave.

Ver. 27: Οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ᾗδου. *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell.*] It is well known what the word ᾗδης signifies in Greek authors; viz. the state of the dead, be they just or unjust. And their eternal state is distinguished not so much by the word itself as by the qualities of the persons. All the just, the heroes, the followers of religion and virtue, according to those authors, are in ᾗδης, *hades*; but it is in Elysium, in joy and felicity. All the evil, the wicked, the unjust, they are in *hades* too; but then, that is in hell, in torture and punishment. So that the word *hades* is not used in opposition to heaven, or the state of the blessed; but to this world only, or this present state of life: which might be made out by numberless instances in those authors. The soul of our Saviour, therefore, κατήλθεν εἰς ᾗδου, *descended into hell*; i. e. he passed into the state of the dead; viz. into that place in *hades* where the souls of good men went. But even there did not God suffer his soul to abide separate from his body, nor his body to putrefy in the grave; because it was impossible for Christ to be holden of those bands of death, seeing his death was not some punishment of sin, but the utmost pitch of obedience; he himself being not only without sin, but incapable of committing any.

Ver. 29: Ἐξὸν εἰπεῖν μετὰ παρηγορίας, &c. *Let me freely*

speak, &c.] It is doubted whether ἐξὸν should be rendered *I may*, or *let me*: if that which<sup>e</sup> R. Isaac saith obtained at that time, viz. “Those words, ‘my flesh shall rest in hope,’ teach us רמה ותולעא שלא שלט בו רמה ורמה that neither worm nor insect had any power over David<sup>f</sup>; then was it agreeable enough that St. Peter should by way of preface crave the leave of his auditory in speaking of David’s being putrified in the grave, and so the word ἐξὸν is well rendered, *let me*. But *I may* pleaseth me best, and by this paraphrase the words may be illustrated; “That this passage, ‘Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell,’ &c. is not to be applied to David himself, appears in that *I may* confidently aver concerning him, that he was dead and buried, and never rose again, but his soul was left εἰς ἄδου, in the state of the dead, and he saw corruption: for his sepulchre is with us unto this day, under that very notion, that it is the sepulchre of David, who died, and was there buried; nor is there one syllable any where mentioned of the resurrection of his body, or the return of his soul ἐξ ἄδου, from the state of the dead.”

I cannot slip over that passage, “R. Jose Ben R. Ben saith David died at Pentecost; and all Israel bewailed him, and offered their sacrifices the day following.”

Ver. 34<sup>h</sup>: Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου, &c.] *The Lord said unto my Lord, &c.*] Seeing St. Peter doth with so much assurance and without scruple apply these words to the Messiah, it is some sign that that comment wherewith the later Jews have glossed over this place was not thought of or invented at that time; glossing on the words thus: “The Lord said unto Abraham, ‘Sit thou on my right hand.’” “Sem<sup>i</sup> the Great said unto Eleazar, ‘When the kings of the east and of the west came against you, how did you do?’ He said unto him, לאברהם ואותביה מימיניה *God took up Abraham, and made him sit at his right hand*: he threw dust upon them, and that dust was turned into swords; stubble, and that stubble was turned into darts: so it is said in David’s psalm, ‘The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand.’” Where the Gloss very cautiously notes

<sup>e</sup> Leusden’s edit., vol. ii. p. 696.

<sup>f</sup> Midr. Till. fol. 13. 4.

<sup>g</sup> Hieros. Chagig. fol. 78. 1.

<sup>h</sup> English folio edition, vol. ii. p.

647.

<sup>i</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 108. 2.

that these words, "The Lord said unto my Lord," are the words of Eleazar, whose lord of right Abraham might be called.

"R. Zachariah<sup>k</sup>, in the name of R. Ismael, saith: God had a purpose to have drawn the priesthood from Sem, according as it is said, 'He was the priest of the Most High God.' But when he pronounced his blessing of Abraham, before his blessing of God, God derived the priesthood from Abraham. For it is said, 'And he blessed him, saying, Blessed be Abraham of the Most High God, possessor of heaven and earth: and blessed be the Most High God.' Abraham saith unto him, 'Doth any one put the blessing of the servant before the blessing of his lord?' Immediately the priesthood was given to Abraham; as it is said, 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand.' It is written afterward, 'Thou art a priest for ever,' על דברתי על דברתי על דברתי [after the order of Melchizedek], על דברתי על דברתי על דברתי [for the words of Melchizedek] [who had not placed his blessings in due order]. "And forasmuch as it is written, 'And he was a priest of the Most High God;' it intimates to us that he was a priest, but his seed was not." Can we think that this gloss was framed at that time, when St. Peter so confidently, as though none would oppose him in it, applied this passage to the Messiah? which also our Saviour himself did before him to the great doctors of that nation, and there was not one that opened his mouth against it<sup>l</sup>.

Ver. 38: Βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: *Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ.*] Beza tells us that "this doth not declare the form of baptism, but the scope and end of it. Yet this clause is wanting in the Syriac interpreter." Wherever he might have got a copy wherein this was wanting, yet is it not so in other copies. But to let that pass: what he sayeth, that "this doth not declare the form of baptism," is, I fear, a mistake: for at that time they baptized amongst the Jews in the name of 'Jesus' (although among the Gentiles they baptized 'in the name of the Father, and the Son, and Holy Ghost'), that Jesus might be acknowledged for the Messiah by them that were baptized; than which nothing was more

<sup>k</sup> Nedarim, fol. 32. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Matt. xxii. 44.

tenaciously and obstinately denied and contradicted by the Jews. Let the Jew, therefore, in his baptism own Jesus for the true Messiah; and let the Gentile in his confess the true God, three in one.

Ver. 41: Προσετέθησαν ψυχαι ὡσεὶ τρισχίλιαι. *There were added about three thousand souls:* and chap. iv. 4, ὡσεὶ χιλιάδες πέντε· *about five thousand.*] To which I would refer that passage in Psalm cx. 3, עֲמֹה נְדָבוֹת בְּיוֹם חֵילֶךָ *Thy people shall be a willing people in the day of thy power.* The day of Christ's power was the day of his resurrection, when he had subdued death and hell; and the day of his ascension, when he was set at the right hand of God, above all principality and power; concerning which the first verse of that psalm speaks. The story in this place, therefore, is the fulfilling of the prophecy, ver. 3; and it shows how willing his people were in that day of his power.

Ver. 42<sup>m</sup>: Καὶ τῆ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου *And in breaking of bread.*] *Breaking of bread* was a phrase much in use amongst the Jews, arising from a custom as much in use among them. For their dinner began with blessing and *breaking of bread*. "R. Zeira" was sick. R. Abhu came to him, and bound himself, saying, 'If R. Zeira recover I will make a festival-day for the Rabbins.' He did recover, and he made a feast for all the Rabbins. *כי מטא למשרי* *When they were going to dinner*, R. Abhu said to R. Zeira, *לישרי לן מר*, 'Master, begin for us.' To whom he answered, *לא סבר לה מר להא*, 'Doth not the master remember, or call to mind, that of R. Johanan, who saith, *בעל חבית ברצע* *The master of the house breaketh bread?*' Where the Gloss upon these words *כי מטא למשרי* is this: "It signifies a feast; as if he should have said, 'Break bread to us with the blessing, *המוציא* *He that bringeth forth* food out of the earth,'" &c. The Gemara goes on: "When they came to give the blessing, R. Abhu said to R. Zeira, 'Let the master give the blessing for us:' to whom he answered, 'Doth not the master call to mind that of R. Hounah of Babylon, who saith, *ברצע מברך* *He that breaketh bread giveth the blessing?*'" And a little after; "He that breaketh bread doth not break it before the *Amen*

<sup>m</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 648.

<sup>n</sup> Beracoth, fol. 46. 1.

of all that sit down at meat be pronounced; and that they all answer *Amen* to him when he giveth the blessing." Again in the same place; "No one of the guests must taste any thing till he who breaketh bread hath first tasted."

"R. Abba<sup>o</sup> saith, בשבת חייב אדם לבציע על שתי ככרות, *A man is bound on the sabbath day to break upon two loaves, because it is written לחם משנה double bread,*" Exod. xvi. 22. "Rabh Issai saith: 'I saw Rabh Calina, that he took two loaves, ובצע אחד and brake but one.'" Instances of this kind, as to the use of this phrase, are endless.

But now the question is, whether *κλάσις ἄρτου, breaking of bread*, in this place, be to be taken in this sense: that is, for *common bread*, or not rather for *bread of the holy eucharist*; which question also returns, ver. 46, "breaking bread from house to house." Now, I ask whether בציעה, *breaking of bread*, amongst the Jews, was ever used to denote the whole dinner, or the whole supper? It signifies, indeed, that particular action by which they began the meal; but I do not remember that I have any where in the Talmudists observed the phrase applied to the whole meal of dinner or supper. סעודה was the word by which they commonly expressed the whole repast: but בציעה *breaking bread*, never; if I am not much deceived. And I doubt that of Beza is but "*gratis dictum*," rather than proved, when he tells us, "It came to pass that eating together, and so all the feasts they were wont to make amongst one another, went under the name of *breaking of bread*." Which if true, I ingenuously confess my ignorance: but if false, then *κλάσις ἄρτου, or breaking of bread*, in these places we are now upon, must not be understood of their ordinary eating together, but of the Eucharist; which the Syriac interpreter does render so in express terms: a parallel to which we have in 1 Cor. x. 16; Acts xx. 7.

Ver. 44: Εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινά: *They had all things common.*] To repeat here what is disputed concerning the Essenes and Therapeutæ, is to say the same thing over and over again: but what is said of the Jerusalem writers, and is not so obvious, I cannot omit; viz. that they did not hire either houses or beds in Jerusalem; those things were not mercenary, but

<sup>o</sup> Schabb. fol. 117. 2.

lent gratis by the owners to all who came up to the feast<sup>p</sup>. The same may be well supposed of their ovens, caldrons, tables, spits, and other utensils. Also provisions of water were made for them at the public care and charge<sup>q</sup>.

CHAP. III.<sup>r</sup>

VER. 1 : 'Επὶ τὴν ὥραν τῆς προσευχῆς τὴν ἕννάτην *At the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour.*] Whether it was the ninth hour of the same day, wherein about the third the Holy Ghost had been poured out, must be left to conjecture. This is certain, that the ninth hour of the day (which with us is three o'clock in the afternoon) was the ordinary hour as for sacrifice, so also for prayer too. As to the hours of sacrifice, Josephus gives us this account<sup>s</sup>: Δὶς τῆς ἡμέρας πρῶτ τε καὶ περὶ ἕννάτην ὥραν, ἱερουργούντων ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ *Twice a day (viz. in the morning and at the ninth hour) they offer sacrifices on the altar.* And concerning the hours of prayer the Talmudists thus<sup>t</sup>; “R. Jose Ben R. Chaninah saith, The patriarchs appointed the prayers. R. Joshua Ben Levi saith, They appointed them according to the daily sacrifices. Morning prayer is till the fourth hour. The prayer of the *Minchah* or evening is till the evening. Which is the great *Minchah*? That from the sixth hour and a half. Which is the less *Minchah*? From the ninth hour and a half,” &c.

They distinguish betwixt the afternoon prayers and the evening prayers; although part of them, if not all, were one and the same. For whereas the precise time for recital of the phylacteries and the prayers annexed for the evening, was not but at the entering in of night, yet they recited them in their prayers at the *Minchah*. Hence that dispensation in the Gloss in *Beracoth*<sup>u</sup>; “The recital of the *Shema* in bed is the foundation; that is, after that the stars have begun to appear: and so it is in the Jerusalem Talmud. If any one recite them before that time, he doth<sup>x</sup> not do his duty. If it be thus, then why do we say our phylactery prayers in the

<sup>p</sup> Joma, fol. 12. 1. Megill. fol. 26. 1. son, p. 614. l. 16.] [xiv. 4. 3.]

<sup>t</sup> Beracoth, fol. 26. 1. 2.

<sup>q</sup> Shekalim, cap. 5.

<sup>u</sup> Fol. 2. 1.

<sup>r</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 649.

<sup>x</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 698.

<sup>s</sup> *Antiq. lib. xiv. cap. 7.* [Hud-

synagogue. It is that we may continue in prayer because of the words of the law.”

Ver. 2 : Πρὸς τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὴν λεγομένην Ὠραίαν [At the gate of the temple which is called Beautiful.] Here I am at a stand as to the determination of this gate, according to the uncertain signification of the word Ὠραίαν. If in the etymology of it, it hath any relation with ὦρα, *time*, (which any one would imagine,) then we might suppose it the gate called חולדה *Huldah*; perhaps so called from חלד *Heledh*, *time*, or *age*. There were two gates of this name on the south side of the court of the Gentiles, under that noble porch called the βασιλική, or *royal porch*; through which the way led from Jerusalem itself, or Acra, into the Temple. But if by Ὠραίαν be meant strictly *beautiful*, as it is commonly rendered, then we might suppose it the east gate of the Women's Court: which although it was but a brazen gate, yet for splendour and glittering it exceeded the other gates of silver or gold. “There were nine of the gates indeed that were overlaid with silver and gold. But one without the temple made of Corinthian brass, which far exceeded those of gold or silver<sup>z</sup>.”

Let the reader judge, whether that which is added ver. 11 increase or explain the difficulty: “As the lame man which was healed held Peter and John, all the people ran together unto them in the porch which is called ‘Solomon’s.’” From whence this difficulty ariseth: Whether Peter and John and the lame man had hitherto gone no further than the Court of the Gentiles; or whether they had come back thither from the Women's Court. If the former, then the lame man lay at some gate of the court of the Gentiles that was called Ὠραία, which we may suppose was the gate called *Huldah*: if the latter, then he lay at that Corinthian gate.

Ver. 4 : Βλέπον ἡμᾶς *Look on us*<sup>a</sup>. Ver. 5 : Ὁ δὲ ἐπέειχεν αὐτοῖς *He gave heed unto them*.] In the Jerusalem language perhaps it might be said לֹן חַמִּי לֹן חַמִּי *Look on us*; and he looked on them. “On<sup>b</sup> a certain day Elias came to R. Judah while a fit of toothache was upon him, and he said

<sup>y</sup> Middoth, cap. i. hal. 3.

<sup>z</sup> Joseph. de Bell. Jud. lib. v. 650. cap. 14. [v. 5. 3.]

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p.

<sup>b</sup> Hieros. Chetub. fol. 35. 1.

unto him, *לי חמי ליה* *Look on me.* *והמי ליה* *And he looked on him,* and he touched his teeth, and cured him."

Ver. 6 : *Ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον οὐχ ὑπάρχει μοι* *Silver and gold have I none.*] "It is a tradition<sup>c</sup>: Let no one enter into the mountain of the Temple *בסדינו לו בצרורים* *with money bound up in his linen*; *ובפונרתו מושפלת אחריו* *nor with his purse hanging behind him.*" Where, by the way, we may observe the Gloss of Rambam upon the word *פונרתו*; "It is a garment (saith he), which a man puts on next his skin, in which he sweats, that he may not spoil better clothes: nor is it the custom for any one to go abroad with that garment alone, having no other clothes on." We leave the reader to spell out his meaning; but with this remark, that he is not followed in the explication of this word by his countrymen.

But though it was not lawful for any to carry a purse into the Temple with them, yet was it very seldom that any did go into the Temple without money, either in his hand, or carried about them some other way, and that with an intent either to bestow in alms, or to make a voluntary offering in the treasury: this is evident from those two mites of the poor widow. Might not Peter have something of this nature to bestow to a beggar, though he had neither silver nor gold? Doubtless he had no such equivocation; but meant it sincerely, that he had no money at all.

Ver. 11 : *Ἐπὶ τῇ στοᾷ τῇ καλουμένῃ Σολομώντος* *In the porch that is called Solomon's.*] If we will distinguish betwixt porch and porch, then *Solomon's porch* was on the east, and the *royal porch* on the south, &c. But if we would have the whole Court of the Gentiles to be comprehended under the name of *Solomon's porch*, though it may seem something obscure why it should be called a *porch*, and why *Solomon's porch*, yet it may not be unfitly admitted here. But whether it took its name from *Solomon's porch*, strictly so called, as being the most noble porch, and anciently that of *Solomon*; or because *Solomon* consecrated that court in his Temple by sacrifices<sup>d</sup>; or whether because *Solomon* *μεγάλας ἐγχώσας φάραγγας*, (as Josephus<sup>e</sup> tells us,) *filled the deep trenches with earth*, that by

<sup>c</sup> Beracoth, fol. 62. 2.    <sup>d</sup> 1 Kings viii. 64.    <sup>e</sup> [Antiq. viii. 3. 9.]



levelling the place he might have room enough to make this court: whatever it was, I deny not but the whole court might go under that name; although, as I have elsewhere shown, the very *Solomon's porch*, strictly taken as a *porch*, was only the eastern part and porch of that court. And let me only repeat what I have quoted in that place: שַׁעַר הַכֹּהֵן וְשַׁעַר לְעוֹדִים הוּלְדָה לֹא חָרְבוּ “*The priest's gate, and the gate Huldah, were not to be destroyed at all, till God should renew them.*” Which increaseth our suspicion that the name הוּלְדָה *Huldah* is derived from הֶלֶד *Heled*, which signifies *time* and *age*, from the lastingness they had fancied of this gate; and that the word Ὀρᾶ in this place might have some such signification, as one would say, *the gate of time*. And perhaps the little priest's gate was the other gate of *Huldah*, from the same duration they conceived in that gate also; for there were two gates of that name on the south side of the court, as we have noted before.

Ver. 19: Ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσι καιροὶ ἀνανήψεως. *When the times of refreshing shall come.* I may perhaps betray my ignorance in the Greek tongue, if I should confess that I cannot see by what authority of that language the most learned interpreters have rendered ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσιν, &c., *that when the times of refreshing shall come*; as the Vulgar, Erasmus, and the Interlinear: or *when they shall come*; also the English, French, and Italian<sup>b</sup>: or *after they shall come*, as Beza. I am not ashamed to confess I do not understand by what reason they thus render it, when it so well agrees with the idiom of that language to translate it, *that the times of refreshing may come.* Psalm ix. 14, ὅπως ἂν ἐξαγγελῶ. Hebrew, הֲסַפְּרָה לְמַעַן אֲשַׁמְּרָה that *I may show forth*, &c. Psalm xcii. 8, ὅπως ἂν ἐξολοθρευθῶσι. Hebrew, לְהַשְׁמֹדִים that *they may be destroyed for ever.* Psalm cxix. 101, ὅπως ἂν φυλάξω. Hebrew, אֲשַׁמְּרָה לְמַעַן אֲשַׁמְּרָה that *I might keep.* Acts xv. 17, ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσι. *that they might seek*, &c. And so in this place; “Repent, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσι, *that the times of refreshing may come*, and God may send Jesus Christ to you.” These last words, “may send Jesus Christ,” I suppose have

<sup>f</sup> Midr. Schir. fol. 16. 4.

<sup>g</sup> Leusden's edition, vol. ii. p. 699.

<sup>h</sup> English folio edit., vol. ii. p. 651.

begot the difficulty in this place, and occasioned the variety of versions we meet with: and how the Chiliasts apply these things is well known. But if our interpretation be admitted, what could be more fully and plainly said to answer the conceptions of the auditors, who might be ready to object against what St. Peter had said, "Is it so indeed? Was that Jesus, whom we have crucified, the true Christ? Then is all our hope of refreshment by the Messiah vanished, because he himself is vanished and gone. Then our expectation as to the consolation of Israel is at an end; because he who should be our consolation is perished." "Not so, (saith St. Peter;) but the Messiah, and the refreshing by him, shall be restored to you if you will repent: yet so that he himself shall continue still in heaven. He shall be sent to you in his refreshing and consolatory word, and in his benefits, if you repent," &c. We have something parallel to this in Acts xiii. 47: "We turn unto the Gentiles; for so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles." Set *thee*? Whom? What, Paul and Barnabas? No, but Thee, Christ, sent, and shining forth by the ministry of those two apostles.

And hence it is that I the less doubt of the reading of the word *προκεκηρυγμένον*, *preached before unto you* (whereas some would rather have it *προκεχειρισμένον*, *made ready*); for St. Peter's design and discourse is about *preaching*. He shall send Christ to you by way of preaching, "as he was before preached of." We may observe, that the apostle in this discourse of his instances in a threefold time: 1. The time before his coming, wherein he was *προκεκηρυγμένος*, *preached before* by Moses and all the prophets from Samuel, and so on. 2. This time when he came, and God exhibited him to the world (*ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν*, *having raised him up*, ver. 26): raising him up for a Saviour, he sent him to you first, that by his doctrine he might turn every one of you from his iniquities. And, 3. Now that he is gone up into heaven, and is there to abide, yet God will send him to you that repent in the preaching of his word, as he was before preached."

Ver. 24: Καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ, &c. *And all the prophets from Samuel, &c.*] We have Moses and Samuel mentioned together in this place, as also Psalm xcix. 6; be-

cause there are few or no prophets between these two, 1 Sam. iii. 1, and the apparitions of angels having been more frequent. And, after the decease of Phinehas, it is a question whether there was any oracle by Urim and Thummin, through the defect of prophecy in the high priests, till the times of Samuel: but then it revived in Abimelech, Abiathar, &c. שמואל רבן של נביאים *Samuel was the master of the prophets*<sup>i</sup>.

#### CHAP. IV.

VER. 1: Καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ. *And the captain of the Temple.*] We have spoken already of this *captain of the temple* in notes upon Luke xxii. 4; and told you, that he was the captain of all those priestly and Levitical guards and watches that were kept in the temple. He is termed in the Talmudists איש הר הבית *the man of the mountain of the house*; or, the ruler of the mountain of the temple.

Ver. 5<sup>k</sup>: Συναχθῆναι ἄρχοντας καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ γραμματεῖς εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. *Their rulers, and elders, and scribes, were gathered together at Jerusalem.*] *At Jerusalem*, admits of a double construction; either as the city may be set in opposition to the country: or the town itself to the temple.

I. If we admit the former, and that these had gathered themselves from the adjacent towns to meet *at Jerusalem*; then we may suppose them assembled rather upon the account of some solemnity of the day, than merely to take cognizance of the cause of Peter and John. It is a question, whether they all knew of their imprisonment, which was done the evening before; and probably while they were absent their commitment was made, and that act done by some chief of the priests, the captain of the watches, and by the Sadducees, not by a just Sanhedrim.

If we will grant, therefore, that the lame man was healed that day in the afternoon on which the Holy Ghost had been poured out upon the disciples in the forenoon<sup>l</sup>, then, on this very day, it behoved every male to appear before the Lord in the temple with some oblation or other. For whereas the day of Pentecost fell then on the Jewish sabbath, and this

<sup>i</sup> Hieros. Chagigah, fol. 77. 1. <sup>k</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 652.  
<sup>l</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 700.

day (that being supposed) was the second day after that, it was the day of הֵרָאָה appearing in the temple; which probably might occasion these rulers and elders meeting together in the city at this time.

II. But if we take *Jerusalem* in this place in opposition to the temple, it remembers us of the tradition concerning the Sanhedrim's removal from the temple to the city, which Jewish authors tell us of. "The<sup>m</sup> Sanhedrim removed from the room *Gazith* to the *Tabernæ*, and from the *Tabernæ* into Jerusalem," &c. Where we may observe the same contradistinction between the city and the temple: for in the temple was both *Gazith* and the *Tabernæ* or *shops*. This removal happened forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem. "Forty<sup>n</sup> years before the destruction of the city the Sanhedrim removed. For when they observed the strange increase of murderers amongst them, that they grew too many to be called in question, they said, מוטב בגלי ממקום למקום *It is best for us to remove from place to place.*" Upon which very words, *It is best for us to remove*, I cannot but remember that passage in Josephus; "On<sup>o</sup> the feast which is called Pentecost, the priests, according to custom, entering into the inner temple by night, to perform the service, perceived first, as they said, a certain motion and crack, and then a sudden voice, Μεταβαλῶμεν ἐντεῦθεν, *Let us remove from hence.*" Which words whether they agree amongst themselves, and fall in with the time now before us, let the reader himself consider and judge. That passage in chap. v. 25 gives some hint that the Sanhedrim at this time sat in the city, and not in the temple; which the reader may also consider.

III. I hardly believe any one will doubt but that by ἄρχοντας, πρεσβυτέρους, and γραμματεῖς, *rulers, elders, and scribes*, must be understood the *great council*: but to distinguish these particularly, I can hardly say whether it be more nice or more difficult. We might say that by ἄρχοντας, *rulers*, might be meant Gamaliel the president, and Simeon his son, the vice-president: by the *elders*, the rest of the body of the Sanhedrim: by the *scribes*, either the two registrars, or

<sup>m</sup> Rosh hashanah, fol. 31. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Avodah Zarah, fol. 8. 2.

<sup>o</sup> De Bell. Jud. lib. vi. cap. 31.  
[Hudson, p. 1282. l. 18.] [vi. 5, 3.]

those wise men לפני חכמים *who judged before the Sanhedrim*, or both: but I waive being too curious.

Ver. 6: 'Ιωάννην *John*.] If we may render εκ γένους ἀρχιερατικού with the Vulgar, *ex genere sacerdotali*, and especially with the Syriac and Arabic, *of the stock of the priests*, I would, without any stickling, conceive this *John* here mentioned to be no other than Rabban Jochanan Ben Zaccai; because at that time there was not any one more famous throughout the whole nation; and he was of the stock of the priests.

“Rabban<sup>p</sup> Jochanan Ben Zaccai the priest lived a hundred and twenty years, &c. He found favour in the eyes of Cæsar: from whom he obtained Jafneh, and his wise men, and physicians that cured R. Zadok. משמת במלכה זיו החכמה *From the time that he died, the glory of wisdom ceased.*” About that very time which we now have under consideration, we have this passage related concerning him: “Forty<sup>q</sup> years before the destruction of the city, when the gates of the temple flew open of their own accord, Rabban Jochanan Ben Zaccai said, ‘O temple, temple, why dost thou disturb thyself? I know thy end, that thou shalt be destroyed; for so the prophet Zachary hath spoken concerning thee, Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars.’”

He<sup>r</sup> saw the flames of the city and of the temple: and having obtained from the emperor Titus that the Sanhedrim might be settled at Jabneh, he presided there two or five years; for the certain number is not agreed upon.

All that can be objected against this Jochanan Ben Zaccai being the *John* mentioned in this place seems to be this, that if this was an assembly of priests, leavened with the leaven of the Sadducees, (as may be conjectured out of chap. v. 17,) then this Jochanan Ben Zaccai ought not to be reckoned amongst them; for he both lived and died a Pharisee, at least not a Sadducee: but if the whole Sanhedrim is to be understood here, wherein the priests, as much as they were capable, would strengthen their own party, then would I look for no other *John* than this son of Zaccai.

Ver. 11: Οὐτός ἐστιν ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐξουθενηθεὶς, &c. *This is the*

<sup>p</sup> Juchasin, fol. 60. 7.

<sup>q</sup> Joma, fol. 39. 2.

<sup>r</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 653.

stone which was set at nought, &c.] The words are taken out of Psalm cxviii. 22; **אֲבָן מִצֵּיטוֹן הַבּוֹנִים** *The stone which the builders rejected, &c.* And are these things said of the Messiah? Surely the Jew will hardly believe his pompous Messiah should be rejected, and set at nought by his own countrymen. And therefore doth St. Peter the more vehemently inculcate it; *This is the stone.* Our Saviour had said before, Matt. xxi, “Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected,” &c. Yes, they had read and read it again, and oftentimes recited it in their Great *Hallel*; but you shall never persuade them that these things were spoken of their Messiah, but rather of Jacob, as some<sup>s</sup>; or of David, as others<sup>t</sup>; or of the congregation of Israel, as Aben Ezra, &c.; but by no means of their Messiah: for they dreamed of such a Messiah that should come so according to their heart’s desire, that it was incredible any Jew should ever reject or despise him.

Ver. 13<sup>u</sup>: **Ἀγράμματοι εἰσι καὶ ἰδιῶται** *Unlearned and ignorant men.*] “Illiterate and vulgar persons also.” For it is supposed in *Joma*<sup>x</sup>, that even the high priest himself may be **ἀγράμματος**, *unlearned*, when yet he was by no means a vulgar person, no **ἰδιώτης**, *plebeian*. “They say unto him, ‘Lord high priest, do thou read thyself out of thine own mouth: perhaps thou hast forgotten; or perhaps thou didst never learn.’” And so *vice versa*. There<sup>y</sup> are some called **הַדְּיוֹטִיּוֹת** *ἰδιῶται*, who were not so *unlearned*. There are three kings that have no part in the world to come, viz. Jeroboam, Ahab, and Manasseh; **וְאַרְבַּעַת הַדְּיוֹטוֹת** *and four common persons*, Balaam, Doeg, Ahithopel, and Gehazi.”

But these apostles were *unlearned*, and *ἰδιῶται*, *men of no degree or quality*, but vulgar persons, and of the common people. So 1 Sam. xviii. 23, **אִישׁ רָשׁ וְנִקְלָה** *a poor and vile man*. The Targumist reads **גַּבַר מִסְכֵּן וְהַדְּיוֹט** *A poor man and ἰδιώτης*, or *vulgar person*. And chap. xxiv. 14, “After a dead dog, after a flea?” Targumist, **בְּתַר חֵלֶשׁ חַד בְּתַר הַדְּיוֹט חַד** *After one feeble wretch, after one ἰδιώτης, common person.*

<sup>s</sup> Midr. Tillin.

<sup>t</sup> Pesachin, fol. 119. 1.

<sup>u</sup> Leusden’s edit., vol. ii. p. 701.

<sup>x</sup> Cap. 1. hal. 3.

<sup>y</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 90. 1.

Ver. 17: 'Απειλή ἀπειλησώμεθα αὐτοῖς, &c. *Let us straitly threaten them, &c.*] I. This incessant and implacable enmity and stubbornness the Sanhedrim had against the doctrine and miracles of the apostles in the name of Jesus, (of which this was the first specimen,) did betray a most particular spite and ill will they had towards Jesus above all other men. Let us only compare the case of Jesus with that of John Baptist. "All men esteemed John a prophet<sup>z</sup>;" nor did they so much oppugn his preaching. And why should they so unanimously set themselves against the preaching of Jesus, which was signalized with so many and so great miracles beyond that of John the Baptist?

II. We conceive in our notes upon John xi. 48, that the fathers of the Sanhedrim had either a downright knowledge, or at least a suspicion, that Jesus was indeed the Messiah; and hence arose their hatred against his person and doctrine. It is much disputed and questioned concerning the testimony which Josephus gives concerning Jesus, whether it was Josephus's own, or whether it had not been foisted and thrust in by some Christian. And yet in it (excepting the last clause) you will hardly find any thing but what the very rulers of the Jews either owned, or at least suspected, if they would speak out. Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρὴ ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής<sup>a</sup>. *About this time, there was one Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him<sup>b</sup> a man: for he wrought strange works.* I suspect that Josephus in those words, *if it be lawful to call him a man*, did not set the word ἄνδρα, *man*, in opposition to *God*, but in opposition to *prophet*, in some such sense as this; "If it be lawful to call him merely σοφὸν ἄνδρα, *a wise man* [Heb. כּוּמָן], and not to call him a prophet; for he did great miracles." He goes on: 'Ο Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν *This was the Christ*, Matt. xxi. 38: "When the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him." Now if the rest of that parable agree with the actions of the rulers of that nation, in persecuting the prophets, and even Christ himself, which any one may discern; then why may not this clause be accounted to agree so far with them

<sup>z</sup> Matt. xxi. 26.

<sup>a</sup> Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. 4. [Hud-

son, p. 798. l. 26.] [xviii. 3. 3.]

<sup>b</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 654.

too, as that when it shows that "they said among themselves, This is the heir," &c., it may intimate, that the chief of the Jews, who condemned and crucified the Lord Jesus, knew him to have been the Messiah?

To proceed in the historian, Ἐφάνη αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν. *He appeared to them (his disciples), having revived the third day.* Let us but consult Matt. xxviii. 13—15, and see if there can be any doubt whether the priests and fathers of the Sanhedrim were not convinced and persuaded that Jesus had indeed arose from the dead, when they did, so knowingly and industriously, devise a tale to elude his resurrection. Thus far, therefore, Josephus (if it was he indeed that was the author of that passage) hath uttered nothing but what the rulers themselves were conscious of, if they would have spoken out: but what is added in him, τῶν θειῶν προφητῶν ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλα μύρια θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων. *the divine prophets having said these, and a thousand other wonderful things of him,* this, I confess, is so noble and ingenuous an acknowledgment of Jesus, that I would hardly expect it from Josephus, and much less from any of his countrymen. But, however, be this passage Josephus's own or not, yet,

III. That which we assert seems confirmed by that of John xi. 47, 48; The chief priests and Pharisees said, "What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation." Who does not here see that they that speak this had their eye upon that of Daniel ix. 26, 27; where the prophet discourseth about the Messiah, "that he shall be cut off; that he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease; that *the people of the prince that shall come* [i. e. the Romans] shall destroy the city and sanctuary?" Whence it may very probably be argued, that they, both from the agreement of times and from the miracles and doctrine of Jesus, did more than suspect that this was the Messiah of whom the prophet had there discoursed, and that they were in great doubt what to do with him. "This man doth many miracles, and demonstrates himself to be the Messiah; and what shall we do? To cut off the Messiah would be a horrid thing: and yet, on the other hand, if we should suffer him, he



would make the sacrifice and oblation to cease; he would put an end to the service in the temple; our religion would fall: and then what remains, but that the people of the prince that shall come, the Romans, will come and take away both our place and nation?"

*Object.* But do we not meet with such passages as these? "And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers," Acts<sup>c</sup> iii. 17. "For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets," &c.; chap. xiii. 27.

*Ans.* They knew not, indeed, the person and office of the Messiah: they were ignorant of his Godhead; and as to his office, dreamed of nothing but earthly and temporal things; but then this doth not hinder but that they might know Jesus to be the true Messiah: whom when they found falling short of the expectations and conceits they had framed of the Messiah, and that his doctrine tended to the subversion of Judaism, they had rather have no Messiah than such a one; and let himself and his gospel perish with him, rather than their Judaism.

Ver. 27: Συνήχθησαν ἐπ' ἀληθείας. *Of a truth they were gathered together.*] And then follows in some Bibles, ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, *in this city*: so Beza, the Vulgar, the Syriac, and the Alexandrian MS., ἐν τῇ πόλει σου ταύτῃ, *in this city of thine*. Which might be, therefore, the rather allowed of, because the Jews do remove the insurrection that should be made against the Lord and his Christ so far from their own city. It is a thing they will not believe, that in Jerusalem, or amongst the Jews, any rebellion against the Messiah should ever be moved or fomented: these things, they say, were spoken concerning Gog and Magog, that rose up against Israel<sup>d</sup>; or concerning some other (heathen) country rebelling against the Messiah<sup>e</sup>.

Ver. 36<sup>f</sup>: Ἰωσῆς ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρνάβας, &c. *Joseph, surnamed Barnabas, &c.*] Whereas there were two very noted Josephs, for distinction's sake, as it should seem, the one was Joseph *Barnabas*, the other Joseph *Barsabas*. The apostles

<sup>c</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 702.

<sup>d</sup> *Avodah Zarab*, fol. 3. 2.

<sup>e</sup> *Midr. Till.* fol. 4. 2.

<sup>f</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 655.

gave the name of *Barnabas*; it may be questioned whether they did the name of *Barsabas* or no: because there is a Judas Barsabas also, in Acts xv. 22.

It is uncertain whence the name *Barnabas* is derived; and so much the more, because it is uncertain what the word παράκλησις should signify in this place. It is generally interpreted, *the son of consolation*. In the Syriac, בְּרָא דְבוּיָאָא; whence by a long deduction they would make נָבָא *naba*. I contend not; but when παράκλησις equally signifies *exhortation* as well as *consolation*; and the apostle expressly distinguisheth it from παραμυθία, *consolation*, 1 Cor. xiv. 3; it seems more probable to take its original from נָבָא to *prophecy*: under which word every one knows *exhortation* is comprehended in the first place; and according to this signification of the word παράκλησις we find him behaving himself, chap. xi. 23, παρεκάλει πάντας, &c. “*He exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord.*”

Κύπριος τῷ γένει: *Of the country of Cyprus.*] So the two apostles of the Gentiles have Gentile countries for their native soil. Paul in Cilicia, Barnabas in Cyprus: where he also sold his land; for it is a question whether he could have sold it in the land of Israel; as also whether he, being a Levite, was capable of possessing any land that had not belonged to the cities of Levi, which could not be sold in the same manner that other lands were. Nay, “*It was not lawful for an Israelite to part with the land of his inheritance, unless constrained to it by his poverty: according as it is said, If thy brother should become poor, and sell his possessions,*” &c. Here lands are sold, not so much upon account of their own poverty, as the poverty of others.

#### CHAP. V.

VER. 2: Ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, &c. *Kept back part of the price, &c.*] Didst thou not remember, O Ananias, what things had been prophesied concerning the Spirit of the Messiah? רוחו של מלך משיח *The Spirit of the King Messiah*, viz. a spirit of wisdom and understanding, &c. Isaiah xi. 2: “*He shall make him quick of scent in the fear of the Lord.*” “*Rabba<sup>h</sup> saith, רמורח ודאין He smelleth and judgeth: not*

<sup>g</sup> Maimon. Shemittah Vejobel, cap. 11.

<sup>h</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 93. 2.

after the sight of his eyes doth he judge. Bar-Cozbi reigned two years and a half; and said to the Rabbins, 'I am the Messiah.' They reply upon him, 'It is written of the Messiah, That he smelleth and judgeth: let us see if thou canst do so also,' &c. The Gloss is, "He smells out a man, whether he be guilty or innocent."

By what apprehension of things Ananias was so deceived, as to think to have deceived the Holy Ghost, is not easy to conceive or guess. He might understand by the instance of Gehazi how quick and sagacious the spirit of a prophet is in detecting all cheats and tricks; and did he not suppose the apostles endowed with a spirit as capable as the prophet's was? Whatever it was that had blinded him to that madness, or hardened him to that daringness in sin, he abides as a dreadful monument throughout all ages of the indignation of God upon all those that shall contemn and vilify his Holy Spirit: whom if he did not blaspheme within his heart, how near was he to that sin! Such mischiefs can hypocrisy and covetousness bring about.

It is not to be searched out, of what degree or quality this Ananias was. There is some probability he was not of the mere vulgar sort, but of some higher rank; because the mention of him falls in with that of Barnabas; and there are more things that do in some measure persuade us. For what hinders why he should not be supposed to have been one of that number upon whom<sup>i</sup> the Holy Ghost had been shed? What Judas was amongst<sup>k</sup> the twelve, that might he be amongst the hundred and twenty; endowed with the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and yet a devil. For *ψεύσαθαί σε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον* may have something more in it than *lying to the Holy Ghost*. Perhaps it may be the same with *לזייף* *falsifying* the Holy Ghost, and making him a liar.

Ver. 3: *Εἶπε δὲ Πέτρος, &c. But Peter said, &c.*] Whether St. Peter derived the authority of sentencing this man to an immediate death from those words of our Lord, "Whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained<sup>l</sup>;" or whether from some immediate revelation, or both; he gives a notable instance of his own repentance and recovery, after his fall,

<sup>i</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 703.    <sup>k</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 656.

<sup>l</sup> John xx. [23.]

whilst he who by a lie, yea, even perjury itself, had denied his Master, doth such severe execution upon another for a lie he was guilty of.

Ver. 6 : *Συνέστειλαν αὐτὸν, &c. Wound him up, &c.]* They having no *תכריכין* *burying cloths* at hand do bind up the dead man in what fashion they can ; and, carrying him out of that place, commit him to the earth.

Ver. 7 : *Ὡς ὥρων τριῶν διάστημα· About the space of three hours.]* So long a space of time being spent for interring the deceased, doth seem to hint something as to the distance of the buryingplace ; which in the cities of the Levites we have thus described : “The suburbical lands for the Levitical cities are defined in the law to be three thousand cubits from the wall of each side outward. According as it is said, ‘From the wall of the city and outward, a thousand cubits.’ And it is elsewhere said, ‘Ye shall measure from without the city, on the east side, two thousand cubits.’ The thousand cubits are the suburbs of the city ; and those two thousand which they measure beyond those are for fields and vineyards. Now they assign the buryingplace for each city beyond all these bounds ; because they do not bury their dead within the limits of the city<sup>m</sup>.” The buryingplace from a Levitical city was above a mile and a half distant. Was it so in other cities, that belonged not to the Levites ? doubtless buryingplaces were at some distance from all cities ; but whether so far, may be inquired, but must not be the matter of our present search.

*Μὴ εἰδῦια τὸ γεγονός· Not knowing what was done.]* Hence, probably, we may gather the reason why the word *συνέστειλαν, they wound him up*, is added. Had the deceased been carried to his own house or lodgings by them who brought him out of the chamber, where he fell down dead, to fetch buryingcloths, his wife could not have been ignorant of what had fallen out : but *συνέστειλαν αὐτὸν, they wound him up*, as well as they could in his own clothes, and so carried him out and buried him.

Ver. 13 : *Τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς· And of the rest durst no man join himself to them.]* Who should these *λοιποὶ, rest*, be ? Those certainly that were of the

<sup>m</sup> Maimon. Shemittah Vejobel, cap. 13.

number of the hundred and twenty, excepting the twelve apostles. Of this number I presume Ananias might be one: and the rest, being terrified by the fate of one of their own order, conceived so great a dread and reverence for the apostles, that they durst not join with them as their equals.

Ver. 15<sup>n</sup>: *ἵνα ἐρχομένου Πέτρου κἀν ἡ σκιὰ ἐπισκιάσῃ τινας αὐτῶν* *That at the least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them.*] And why *the shadow of Peter* more than the rest of the apostles, who shared an equal authority and power of miracles with himself, ver. 12? 1. It must be supposed that the sick were not brought out in their beds into the streets, unless they had first seen Peter, or were assured that he must pass by. 2. It is a question whether they that brought out their sick knew any other of the apostles besides Peter. They had heard him speaking, they had seen him doing, while the rest were silent and sat still. And that which these believers here do doth not so much argue his preeminence beyond the rest of the apostles, as that he was more known and noted than the others were.

Ver. 20: *Τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης* *The words of this life.*] There is no necessity that these words should beget any difficulty, if we will observe that ver. 17 there is mention of the ‘sect of the Sadducees.’ So that “the words of this life” are words that assert and prove this life, that is, the resurrection; which the Sadducees deny. For the controversy was about Jesus’s resurrection.

Ver. 34: *Γαμαλιήλ, νομοδιδάσκαλος* *Gamaliel, a doctor of the law.*] This was Rabban Gamaliel the First; commonly, and by way of distinction, called *רבן גמליאל הזקן* *Rabban Gamaliel the Old*. He was president of the council after his own father Rabban Simeon, who was the son of Hillel. He was St. Paul’s master, and five and thirtieth receiver of the traditions; and upon this account might not improperly be termed *νομοδιδάσκαλος, a doctor of the law*, because he was one that kept and handed down the *Cabbala* received from mount Sinai; only that the Rabbins of an inferior degree enjoyed also the same title. He died eighteen years before the destruction of Jerusalem, his son Simeon succeeding him in the chair, who perished in the ruins of the city. Whereas he doth in some

<sup>n</sup> *English folio edition, vol. ii. p. 657.*

measure apologize for the apostles, one might believe he did favour Christianity. But he died<sup>o</sup> a Pharisee; and if he was not the author, yet did he approve and recommend that prayer entitled ברכת מינים *a prayer against the heretics*, Samuel the Little being the author: and who they meant by *heretics* is easy enough to apprehend. The counsel, therefore, that he giveth here seems to be of that nature that had all along been practised between the Sadducees and the Pharisees, one sect always wishing and looking for the destruction of the other.

Ver. 36: Πρὸ γὰρ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνέστη Θεῦδας. *Before these days rose up Theudas.*] Josephus makes mention of one *Theudas*, an impostor<sup>p</sup>, whose character indeed agrees well enough with this of ours; but they seem to disagree in time. For Josephus brings in his *Theudas* Φάδου τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπιτροπέουτος, when *Fadus* was governor of *Judea*, about the fifth or sixth year of *Claudius*: and *Gamaliel* brings in his before the times of 'Judas the Galilean.'

Those that are advocates for Josephus do imagine there might be another *Theudas* besides him that he mentions: and they do but imagine it, for they name none. I could instance, indeed, in two more of that name; neither of which agrees with this of *Gamaliel*, or will afford any light to the chronology of Josephus.

I. We meet with one *Theudas* a physician in *Bab. Sanhedrim*<sup>q</sup>, where there is a dispute upon no mean question; Where *Daniel* was at that time that *Nebuchadnezzar's* image was set up and worshipped, that he should all that while come under no examination, nor have any the least harm fall to him: and it being answered, amongst other things, that he was then sent into *Egypt* to fetch some swine thence, it is objected איני התניא "Is it so indeed? but this is the tradition: תודוס הרופא אמר *Theudas the physician saith*, 'That neither cow nor sow come from *Alexandria of Egypt*.'" <sup>r</sup>

II. There<sup>r</sup> is mention of one *Theudas*, a Jew, living at *Rome*<sup>s</sup>. "The traditions of *R. Jose* saith, איש רומי

<sup>o</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 704.

<sup>p</sup> *Antiq.* l. xx. cap. 2. [xx. 5. 1.]

<sup>q</sup> *Fol.* 93. 1.

<sup>r</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 658.

<sup>s</sup> *Hieros. Jom Tobh*, fol. 61. 3; *Moed Katon*, fol. 81. 4; *Bab. Bera-coth*, fol. 19. 1.

רומי היהו אוכלין גדיים מקולסין בלילי *Theudas, a man at Rome, taught men* (i. e. Jews) *at Rome, that, on the Passover-nights they should eat whole kids roasted*: the Gloss is, "the trotters, legs," &c. The wise men sent to him, threatening excommunication, because he taught Israel *לאכול קדושים בחוץ* *to eat holy things without*, i. e. the Passover, at Rome; which it was not lawful to eat but at Jerusalem: for, as the Gloss hath it, "Whosoever should see kids so roasted would conceive they were consecrated for paschal lambs." I am very apt to believe that the procœnium, or meal before the Lord's supper, 1 Cor. xi. 21, might be some such thing as this.

Can we suppose now that Gamaliel could have either of these *Theudas* in his eye? Indeed, neither the one nor the other has any agreeableness with that character that is given of this *Theudas* about whom we are inquiring. That in Josephus is much more adapted; and grant only that the historian might slip in his chronology, and there is no other difficulty in it. Nor do I indeed see, why we should give so much deference to Josephus in this matter, as to take such pains in vindicating his care or skill in it. We must (forsooth) find out some other *Theudas*, or change the stops in the verses, or invent some other plaster for the sore, rather than Josephus should be charged with the least mistake; to whom yet, both in history and chronology, it is no unusual thing to trip or go out of the road of truth. I would therefore think that the *Theudas* in Josephus is this same in Gamaliel; only that the historian mistook in his accounts of time, and so defaced a true story by false chronology.

Ver. 37: *Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος* *Judas of Galilee*.] In Josephus it is *Ἰούδας Γαυλανίτης*, *Judas the Gaulanite*<sup>t</sup>; and yet, in the title and inscription of that chapter it is *περὶ Ἰούδα τοῦ Γαλιλαίου*, *concerning Judas of Galilee*; which hath elsewhere occasioned a question, Whether some part of the country beyond Jordan went not also under the name of *Galilee*? But I shall not repeat it here.

<sup>t</sup> Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. 1. [xviii. 1. 1.]

## CHAP. VI.

VER. 1: Γογγυσμὸς τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους. *A murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews.*] First, let us consider who these *Hebrews* were.

I. The word עֵבְרִי *a Hebrew*, admitted another kind of signification under the second temple than it had before and under the first: because, in the Old Testament it had reference to the original and language of that nation; in the New Testament, to their travels and their language. Abraham is first called עֵבְרִי Gen. xiv. 13, *a Hebrew*. So Symmachus, the Vulgar, and others: but the Greek interpreters render it περάτης, *passer-over*<sup>u</sup> [transitor]. But this version need not concern us much; when it is plain the interpreters have rendered the word עֵבְרִי according to the common use under the second temple, and not according to the primitive and original use of it. For the same reason the Rabbins incline the same way.

“ R. Nehemiah<sup>x</sup> saith, ‘ Abraham is called עֵבְרִי *a Hebrew*, because he was of the posterity of *Heber* [עֵבֶר]; but the Rabbins say, he is so called because he came from *beyond* [עֵבֶר] the river.’” And they add withal (which deserves some inquiry) עֵבְרִי וְשָׂוִי מִשִּׁיחַ בְּלָשׁוֹן עֵבְרִי *Andy for that he used the language beyond the river*. I would rather have said, he might fitly be called עֵבְרִי *a Hebrew*, because, even in Mesopotamia and Chaldea, he retained the *Hebrew* language in the proper sense. For, if he brought over the transfluvian or Chaldean language into Canaan, as his own and family’s mother-tongue, it is hardly imaginable by what means the Hebrew tongue, strictly so called, should become the native and proper language of his posterity. I have elsewhere offered another reason why he should be termed *a Hebrew* in that place in Genesis; which I still adhere to.

II. After<sup>z</sup> the Babylonish captivity, there was such an alteration of things, that לָשׁוֹן עֵבְרִי *the Hebrew tongue* became *the language beyond the river*, or *the Chaldee tongue*. This is plain from those several words, *Bethesda*, *Golgotha*, *Akeldama*,

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Nobil. in loc.

<sup>x</sup> Beresh. Rábba, fol. 47. 1.

<sup>y</sup> Leusden’s edit., vol. ii. p. 705.

<sup>z</sup> English folio edit., vol. ii. p. 659.



&c. which are said Ἐβραϊστί λέγεσθαι to be so called in the Hebrew tongue; and yet every one knows the words to be mere Chaldee. The old and pure Hebrew language at that time was called לשון אשורי the Assyrian tongue: and the Syriac and Chaldee לשון עברי the Hebrew tongue, or (as themselves interpret it) the language beyond the river. עברית לשון דעבר In the Hebrew language, i. e. in the language beyond the river<sup>a</sup>. לשון אשורית In the Assyrian tongue, i. e. in the holy language<sup>b</sup>.

We cannot but observe by the way, that the doctors distinguish betwixt עברי the Hebrew tongue, and סורסי the Syriac; in the mean time distinguishing both from אשורי the Assyrian or holy language. “סורסי לאיליאיא the Syriac tongue is fit for lamentation; עברי לדיבור the Hebrew tongue for speech: ויש אומרים אף אשורי לכתב and there are that say, the Assyrian tongue is good for writing<sup>c</sup>.” This distinction between the Hebrew tongue, or that beyond the river, and the Syriac, which really are the same language, is much such another distinction as between סורסי the Syriac, and ארמי the Aramean. “Rabbi<sup>d</sup> saith, למה למה Why the Syriac tongue in the land of Israel, אלא או לשון אלא או לשון יונית קדש או לשון יונית בבבל לשון ארמי when either the holy language or the Greek should rather be used? R. Jose saith, למה למה Why the Aramean tongue in Babylon, אלא או לשון אלא או לשון פרסי when rather, either the holy language or the Persian should be used?” The Gloss is, “Because the Greek is more elegant than the Syriac, and the Persian than the Aramean.”

We see first how they distinguish here betwixt the Syriac tongue and the Aramean; and the Gloss upon the place tells us upon what account they do it, in these words: “Behold, whereas he takes notice that the Syriac is used in the land of Israel, and the Aramean in Babylon, therefore he doth it, as saith R. Tam, because there is some variation and difference between them: as it happens in any common language which

<sup>a</sup> Aruch in עבר.

<sup>b</sup> Gloss. in Megil. fol. 8. 2.

<sup>c</sup> Hieros. Sotah, fol. 21. 3.

<sup>d</sup> Bava Kama, fol. 83. 1. Sotah, fol. 49. 2.

they speak much finer in one country than in another. For as to those words Gen. xxxi. 52, עַר הַגֵּל הָזֶה *This heap be witness*, Onkelos renders them סְהִיד דְּגוּרָא הַדִּין when Laban saith יָגַר שְׁהָדוּתָא. But now we must say that Laban spoke לשון סורסי *in the Syriac tongue*, which is so called from Syria. Now Syria was Aram Naharaim, and Aram Zobah, which David subdued. And because that is nearer to the land of Israel, the *Aramean* language of it is not so pure." Gloss in *Sotah*<sup>e</sup>: "The *Syriac* tongue is near akin to the *Aramean*. And I say that that is the language of the Jerusalem Talmud."

We see, secondly, that the *Syriac* was the mother tongue of the land of Israel, and the *Aramean*, which is almost the same, was that of Babylon rather than the Greek or Persic, which were more elegant; nay, rather than the holy language, which was the noblest of all: and that (as to the holy language) for a reason very obvious, viz. that it was everywhere lost as to common use, and was generally unknown. As to the two other languages, why they were not in use, the Gloss gives the reason; which we have also given us elsewhere: "אל יהי לשון סורסי קל בעיניך" *Lest the Syriac tongue should be vile in thine eyes.*" [*Bereshith Rabba*, by a mistake of the printer, hath פרכי *the Persic*, instead of סורסי *the Syriac*.] "For, behold, God doth give it honour in the Law, in the Prophets, and in the Hagiographa. In the Law, for it is said, יָגַר שְׁהָדוּתָא *The heap of witness*, Gen. xxxi. 47: in the Prophets, for it is said, בְּדַבְרֵי תְאֵמִירוֹן לְהוֹם *Thus shall ye say unto them*, Jer. x. 11: and in the Hagiographa, for it is said, וַיְדַבְּרוּ הַכַּשְׂדִּים לְמֶלֶךְ אַרְמִית *And the Chaldeans spake to the king in Syriac*, Dan. ii. 4."

The *Syriac*, therefore, or the *Aramean* tongue under the second temple, was that which went under the name of the *Hebrew* tongue, that is, the language *beyond the river*: whence they were at that time called *Hebrews*, upon the account of the common use of that tongue. But whether all to whom that was their mother-tongue were called *Hebrews* may be a little questioned: and for what reasons it may be so, I shall show after I have said something concerning the *Hellenists*.

<sup>e</sup> Fol. 49. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Hieros. Sotah, fol. 21. 3. Beresh. Rabba, fol. 83. 4.

I. It is not denied by any but that the *Hebrews* were Jews in their original: whether the *Hellenists* were Jews too is called in question by some. Beza upon the place denies it: “Ἑλληνιστὰς, the *Hellenists* St. Luke means in this place are those who were of a profane stock, but adopted into the nation of the Jews by circumcision, called therefore *proselytes*. For they are mistaken who think those Jews that were dispersed amongst other nations were called Ἑλληνισταί, *Hellenists*.” He thinks this opinion of his is countenanced by that of Acts xi. 19, 20: “Preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only. And some<sup>s</sup> of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the *Hellenists*.” From whence Beza infers, “Whereas the Ἑλληνισταί, or *Hellenists*, seem to be opposed to the Jews in this place, it is plain that by the name of *Hellenists*, not only the provincial or proselyte Jews are to be understood, that is, such as were<sup>h</sup> here and there dispersed, but even those also of the Gentiles who are elsewhere by St. Luke termed σεβόμενοι, or *devout men*,” &c.

Let it be granted that the σεβόμενοι, or *devout men*, should be promiscuously understood with the *proselytes*, though there is some difference betwixt them, and that very conspicuous; yet I see not by what law or authority he should confound the *Hellenists* with the *proselytes*. And if those are mistaken who suppose the Jews that were dispersed amongst other nations to be called Ἑλληνισταί, *Hellenists*, I confess myself willingly to be in that error too. Nor yet would I put all these Jews that were dispersed among the Gentiles under the name of *Hellenists*; not those that were scattered amongst the Medes, Parthians, Persians, Arabians, and those eastern countries. Nor do I suppose that he would call the proselytes of those nations *Hellenists*, because the very etymology of the word implies *Grecism*.

1. Chap. ii. 10, we meet with Jews and proselytes; and in this chapter we meet with *Hebrews* and *Hellenists*. We may most truly say, that the proselytes there are distinguished from the Jews: we cannot at the same time say, that the word *Hellenists* in this place distinguisheth them

<sup>s</sup> Leusden's edit., vol. ii. p. 706.    <sup>h</sup> English folio edit., vol. ii. p. 660.

from the Jews, when we see it only distinguisheth from the *Hebrews*.

2. St. Luke calls Nicolas 'a proselyte of Antioch,' ver. 5. Would we therefore call him 'Ἑλληνιστῆν Ἀντιοχεία, a *Hellenist of Antioch*? we would rather term him, Ἕλληνα, a *Greek*, because his very name shows him to have been originally a Greek.

3. As to that distinction in chap. xi. 19, 20, (for I would rather term it a distinction than an antithesis,) it doth not conclude the Hellenists not to have been Jews, but intimates the difference only between Jews of a more pure and worthy rank, and Jews not so pure and worthy.

II. There are those that think, and that truly, that the *Hellenists* were 'Jews dispersed amongst the Gentiles;' but that they were called *Hellenists* for this reason especially, viz. because they used the Greek Bible in their synagogues: which whether it be true or not I question, but will not dispute it at this present; only thus far I will observe:

1. That the Greek tongue was in mean esteem amongst the Jews; indeed they hated it rather than took any pleasure in it, or had any value for it. When<sup>i</sup> Aristobulus the Asmonean besieged his brother Hyrcanus, and some things had fallen out amiss with them, through the counsel of a certain old man skilled in the Greek learning, "they said 'at that time, 'Cursed be the man that cherisheth swine,' and, 'Cursed the man that teacheth his son the wisdom of the Greeks.' שלם בפולמוס של שיטוס In<sup>k</sup> the war of Titus they decreed שלם ללמד אדם את בנו יונית that no man should teach his son Greek." The Gloss upon this place confounds the stories; and would have the war of Titus the same with that of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus; but the Gloss upon the former place rightly distinguisheth, and grants there was such a decree made in the days of the Asmoneans, but having been neglected, in process of time was revived and renewed in the war with Titus. Let it be one or the other, we may abundantly see what kind of respect the Greek learning or language had amongst them. For this passage follows in both: "Samuel saith in the name of Rabban Simeon Ben Gama-liel: There were a thousand boys בבית אבא in my father's

<sup>i</sup> Bava Kama, fol. 82. 2.

<sup>k</sup> Sotah, fol. 40. 1.

*school*, of whom five hundred learned the law, and five hundred the wisdom of the Greeks, and there is not one (of all that last number) now alive, excepting myself here, and my uncle's son in Asia."

I rendered אבנא בבית אבא *in my father's school or family*, because of what follows in both places; "They allowed the family of Rabban Gamaliel the Greek learning, because they were allied to the royal blood," i. e. they sprung of the stock and lineage of David. They permitted that that family should be brought up in that learning, because it became them for their honour and nobility to want no kind of learning. But this they did not freely allow others, and if they did not permit the wisdom of the Greeks, we can hardly suppose they excepted the Greek tongue; especially when we find it in the very terms of the decree, "Let no man teach his son יונית *Greek*." Upon what I have already said, I cannot but make these following remarks:

I. What an effectual bar they laid in their own way against the reading of the New Testament, when they so renounced the Greek tongue: which God had now honoured beyond their Syriac, though they will have that so much graced both in the law, prophets, and holy writings.

II. That even those who understood little else but Greek would very hardly admit the reading of the law and the prophets in their synagogues in the Greek tongue; in that it was so very grateful to their countrymen, and the decrees and canons of the elders did either require, or at least permit, an interpreter in the reading of the Bible in their synagogues.

III. How<sup>1</sup> probable a thing is it, that those Jews, who having lived amongst the Gentiles understood no other language but the Greek; for that very thing grew the less valuable with their own nation that had retained the common use of the Hebrew tongue, and were had in some lower esteem than others.

2. If therefore they stood so affected towards the Greek learning, what value must they have for the Greek tongue? Grant that it were in some esteem amongst them, because, indeed, most of the learned Rabbins did understand it; yet

<sup>1</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 661.

what account must they make of those Jews that knew no other language but<sup>m</sup> the Greek? Surely they must be looked upon as in the lower, yea the lowest degree of Jews, who were such strangers to the language so peculiar to that nation, that is, the Hebrew. Such are those whom we find mentioned in Hieros. Sotah<sup>n</sup>: “R. Levi Ben Chajathah, going down to Cæsarea, heard them קריין שמע אלניסתין *reciting their phylacteries in Greek*, and would have forbidden them: which when R. Jose heard, he was very angry, and said, If a man doth not know how to recite אשורית *in the holy tongue*, must he not recite them at all? let him perform his duty in what language he can.”

Cæsarea Philippi is the scene of this story, a city that the Rabbins make very frequent and honourable mention of in both the Talmuds. This being one of the cities in Decapolis, which were all under the Gentile or Greek jurisdiction, it seems there might be some Jews there that understood Greek, but not Hebrew. Otherwise they would, doubtless, have said over their phylacteries in the Hebrew, though they could not do it in the holy tongue.

3. There were many Jews in several countries, and those very probably to whom both the languages of Hebrew and Greek were their mother-tongues. The Hebrew in their own country, and the Greek among the Grecians; the Hebrew in the families and synagogues of the Jews; the Greek amongst their fellow-citizens the Gentiles. Such was Paul of Tarsus, a Greek city; and yet was he a “Hebrew of the Hebrews,” Phil. iii. 5. And such those of Cyprus and Cyrene seem to be, who are mentioned chap. xi. 19, 20; who in Cyprus, Phœnice, and Antioch itself, preached the word of God amongst the Hebraizing Jews (though perhaps they might also speak the Greek tongue), and at length to the *Hellenists* in Antioch, i. e. ‘the Jews who understood nothing but Greek,’ to whom the Hebrew tongue was perfectly unknown. For so I would distinguish the *Hellenists* from the Jews in that place; and not oppose them to the Jews, as if they were not Jews themselves. And let me crave the reader’s leave to give my judgment of these Hebrews and *Hellenists* in these following particulars:

<sup>m</sup> *Leusden’s edition*, vol. ii. p. 707.

<sup>n</sup> Fol. 21. 2.

I. That the *Hellenists* were Jews, dwelling among the Gentiles, and not at all skilled in the Hebrew tongue. The apostle in that division of his, which he so oftentimes useth, of Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ Ἕλληνας, *Jews and Greeks*, meaning by *Greeks* all other nations excepting the Jewish only, speaks chiefly to the capacity of the vulgar, to whom, by reason of the late circumjacent empires of the Greeks, that way of expressing the Gentiles was most known and familiar; nor perhaps was it so very safe at that time to have brought in the Romans in that antithesis.

But may the word *Hellenist* be taken with that latitude on the other side, that the phrase may be applied not to the Jews only who understood nothing but Greek, but to all the Jews also that did not understand Hebrew? Perhaps the strict etymology of the word may make something against it; but should it be granted, it would not be of so absurd a consequence if we do but except the Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and the rest of those eastern countries who were not of the Greek or Macedonian, but the Persian and Babylonish captivity or transmigration. For the very word *Hellenist*, especially as it is opposed to *Hebrew*, seems to intend some such thing; viz. that those who are called *Hebrews* should be those who were of the captivity and dispersion *beyond the river*; and those that go under the denomination of *Hellenists* are those who after their return from this captivity have suffered some other removal or scattering among the Greek or western countries, and understood no other language but of those countries only, having lost the use of what was originally their native tongue, viz. the Hebrew or Chaldee.

II. As to the *Hebrews*, I suppose there are hardly any will deny but that all in general might be so called that used the Hebrew as their own mother-tongue. Nor can I imagine for what other reason Paul of Tarsus should go under the denomination of a *Hebrew*, but because the Hebrew tongue in his father's family was his mother-tongue, and the Greek was the mother-tongue of the place where he was born. But that we may inquire a little more strictly into the peculiar propriety of this title and denomination, let us propound this question,—viz. to whom that Epistle of St. Paul to the *Hebrews* was particularly written?

I would say, to those of Palestine: for to them it is that the name of *Hebrew* doth of greatest right belong; which these two particulars (if I mistake not) will make very plain<sup>o</sup>. 1. That it seems most proper that they should be termed *Hebrews* who use the Hebrew tongue and none else as their natural language, rather than they who use the Greek and Hebrew tongue indifferently. 2. Indeed the Mesopotamians used the Hebrew only as their mother-tongue, and ought in reason to be accounted amongst the *Hebrews* in general; but they went commonly under the denomination of גללה *the captivity*, because they dwelt still in the place whither they had been led captive, and had not returned into their own land. But those of Palestine who had returned thither were the most properly called *Hebrews*, because they had *passed over from beyond the river*, and had brought the *transfluvian* tongue along with them.

And as to what concerns this present matter, viz. the murmuring of the *Hellenists* against the *Hebrews* about an equal distribution of the common charity, it may be made a question, whether any other besides those of Palestine had as yet sold their lands and patrimonies. For omitting that, by reason of the distance of place, they could hardly yet be capable of doing it; that concerning Barnabas's selling his land in Cyprus seems to hint some such thing, and that it was a thing very extraordinary, and that had not been done elsewhere. But our inquiry is chiefly about the *Hellenists*, not the *Hebrews*: and what we have said concerning both is ingenuously submitted to the candour of the judicious reader.

Ver. 3<sup>p</sup>: Ἀνδρας ἐξ ἑμῶν μαρτυρουμένους ἔπραξ, &c. *Seven men of honest report, &c.*] I. This office of the deacon (to whom the charge and care of the poor was intrusted) was translated from the Jewish to the Christian church. For there belonged to every synagogue ג' פּרנסיים *three deacons*, with whom that care was deposited<sup>q</sup>.

II. As to the number *seven*, I would not be curious. The multitude of the poor and the increase of the church made it necessary that the number of the deacons should exceed the number that were allotted for every single synagogue; why

<sup>o</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 662.      <sup>p</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 708.

<sup>q</sup> See Hor. in Matt. iv. 23, and elsewhere.



they should be just seven, let him that hath confidence enough pretend to assign a particular reason. Only from the number and character of the men, I cannot but call to mind the שבועה דעיר טרבי *seven good men of the city* frequently mentioned by the Rabbins: and I would suppose them chosen both out of the number of the hundred and twenty mentioned chap. i. 15, and also by them only, and not the whole church in general.

Ver. 5: Καὶ Νικόλαον προσήλυτον Ἀντιοχέα. *And Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch.*] I. Whereas this *Nicolas* only is termed a *proselyte*, it makes it evident that all the rest, excepting himself, were Jews, however they might be known by Greek names. Nor yet would I call them *Hellenists*, but *Hebrews* rather; who understood Greek indeed (and for that reason the care of the *Hellenists* was committed to them), but yet the Hebrew was their own mother-tongue. For it is hardly supposable that Stephen, when he pleaded his cause before the Sanhedrim and the whole multitude, would plead it in Greek, though he understood it well.

II. It is so constant an opinion of the ancients that the most impure sect of the *Nicolaitans* derived their name and filthy doctrines from this *Nicolas*<sup>r</sup>, that so much to distrust the thing would look like contradicting antiquity. But if it were lawful in this matter freely to speak one's thoughts, I should conjecture (for the honour of our *Nicolas*), that the name might take its derivation from נִכּוֹלֵא *Necola*, *Let us eat together*; those brutes animating one another to eat things offered to idols. Like those in Isa. xxii. 13, נִכּוֹלֵא בֶשֶׂר וְנִשְׁתֵּי חֹמֶר *Let us eat flesh and drink wine*.

Ver. 6: Ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας. *They laid their hands on them.*] We read of this or that Rabbin constituting *deacons*<sup>s</sup> in this or that synagogue, but not a word about laying on of hands in that action<sup>t</sup>: and no wonder, when even in the promotion of their elders they commonly used only some form of words, and not this rite or ceremony; which we observe in notes upon chap. xiii. The apostles in this place and elsewhere retain the ancient usage ἐπιθέσεως χειρῶν, *of imposition of hands*. At other times frequently that they might, in ordaining any to the ministry<sup>u</sup>, impart to them the gift of the

<sup>r</sup> Iren. lib. i. cap. 27. Epiphan.

<sup>t</sup> Hieros. Peah, fol. 21. 1.

lib. i. hæres. 5, &c.

<sup>u</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii.

<sup>s</sup> פּרנסיין.

p. 663.

Holy Ghost; here, that they might ordain persons to the office of deacons without the gift of the Holy Ghost: for these seven had been so endowed already, ver. 3.

Ver. 9: 'Εκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης Λιβερίνων' *Certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines.*] *Libertines*, i. e. *servants that had received their freedom*, called in the Jewish writings מְשֻׁחָרְרִים, which,

I. Must be understood of servants that were of the Jewish nation: for this was a rule amongst them<sup>x</sup>, אסור לאדם לשחרר עבד כנעני "It is not lawful to make a Canaanite (or Gentile) servant free: and if any one doth make such a one free, he transgresseth the law, לְעוֹלָם בָּהֶם תַּעֲבֹדוּ they shall be your bondmen for ever, Levit. xxv. 46: but if any one do make him free, he is made free." There is a dispute about this matter in *Sotah*<sup>y</sup>: "R. Ishmael saith, 'There is only רשות a license'" granted (if you have a mind) of keeping a Canaanite a bondman for ever. "But R. Akibah saith, 'It is חובת a binding command,'" that every one who hath a Canaanite servant is bound to keep him in his service, and never to make him free. If it should be granted what R. Ishmael would have, that a man might, if he please, make a Gentile servant free, yet it is not likely there could be a whole synagogue of such so made free.

II. Those, therefore, מְשֻׁחָרְרִים *servants that had their freedom*, whom the Talmudic writers so frequently speak of, they were certain Jews, who had either been sold into bondage by the Sanhedrim for theft, or who had sold themselves for mere poverty, and had now regained their freedom anew. Exod. xxi. 2: כִּי תִקְנֶה עֶבֶד עִבְרִי *If thou buy a Hebrew servant.* "If thou<sup>z</sup> buy him from the hand of the Sanhedrim who sell him for his thieving; or if he have sold himself through mere necessity."

In the servitude of these there were these differences. "It<sup>a</sup> is a tradition: He that selleth himself is sold for six years, or for more than six: he that is sold by the Sanhedrim is sold but for six years only. He that selleth himself is not bored through the ear with an awl: he<sup>b</sup> that is sold by the Sanhe-

<sup>x</sup> Maimon. Avadim, cap. 2.

<sup>y</sup> Fol. 3. 1.

<sup>z</sup> R. Solomon upon the place.

<sup>a</sup> Kiddushin, fol. 14. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Exod. xxi. 6.

drim is bored through. He that selleth himself, they provide no viaticum for him: he that is sold by the Sanhedrim, they do provide for him. A man that selleth himself, his master cannot give him a Canaanitish handmaid to wife: to him that is sold by the Sanhedrim, he may.”

III. In what manner these are made free, either by paying a price, or by the year of jubilee, or by the seventh year, or upon any other occasions, having a writing of their freedom given them, Maimonides treats largely in<sup>c</sup> *Avadim*; and the Talmudic writers in the place already quoted, and elsewhere.

I question not but the *Λιβερτίνοι*, the *Libertines*, in this place were such; and that our historian doth by this phrase render the word *משוחררים*, than which nothing was more commonly known in that nation, or more commonly mentioned in Jewish writers. And if so, then may we see what dregs of people, what a lousy tribe (if I may so speak), rose up against our most blessed martyr; such as had been formerly either beggars or thieves, afterward slaves; and were now little else but a pack of knaves.

*Κυρηναίων*. *Cyrenians*.] What *Cyrene* that was from whence these *Cyrenians* are so called, St. Luke points to us, Acts ii, by its neighbourhood to Libya: which whether the interpreters rightly understand when they render *Kir* by *Cyrene*, let us consult themselves and see. So the Vulgar, and the Alexandrian MS. in 2 Kings xvi. 9; the Vulgar and Targum in Amos i. 5.

Whether these *Cyrenians*, mentioned by St. Luke here and elsewhere, took their denomination from the city *Cyrene* or the country of *Cyrene* is hardly worth our inquiring. Strabo describes the city<sup>d</sup>, and Pliny the country<sup>e</sup>; but neither of them says any thing of the Jews dwelling there. However, Dion Cassius in the Life of Trajan<sup>f</sup> speaks it out; *Ἐν τοῖς περὶ τὴν Κυρήνην Ἰουδαίοις, &c.* “In the mean time, the Jews who dwelt about Cyrene, under the conduct of one Andrew, fall upon both Romans and Greeks, tear their flesh, devour their entrails, besmear themselves with their blood, and cover themselves with their skins. They sawed many of them asunder

<sup>c</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 709.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. xvii. 3.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. v. cap. 5.

<sup>f</sup> [Hist. Rom. lxxviii. 32.]

from the crown of the head; they threw many to the beasts, and forced several of them to fight one with another: so that they destroyed at least two hundred thousand men." It must surely be an infinite number of Jews that could commit so great a slaughter (the like the Jews did in Egypt and Cyprus). It might be a wonder how so vast a multitude of Jews could be got together in those countries: but this is not our present inquiry.

That<sup>s</sup> which is rather to be discussed is, what language the Cyrenian Jews used. I would say Greek; for that was the language of Cyrene, the city having been built by the Grecians, and the whole country under the government of the Ptolemies, as Strabo tells us in the place before quoted. I would reckon them, therefore, among the *Hellenists*, to whom the Hebrew tongue was strange and foreign; unless that this synagogue, having been conversant at Jerusalem, might perhaps have learned the language there.

[Ἀλεξανδρέων *Alexandrians*.] We met with a synagogue of *Alexandrians* in Jerusalem, mentioned in the Jewish writers. "There is a story of R. Eliezer Ben Zadoc, that he took אלכסנדריים של בית הכנסת של *the synagogue of the Alexandrians* that was in Jerusalem, ועשה בה צרכיו *and turned it to his own use*:" word for word, *did in it all his business*<sup>h</sup>: כל חפצו *all his pleasure*.

There is a dispute in the place newly quoted, whether it be lawful to alienate a synagogue from its sacred to a common use: and it is distinguished betwixt בית הכנסת של יחיד *the synagogue of one man*, and בית הכנסת של רבים *a public synagogue*. And upon permitting that the former may be alienated, but the latter not, there is this story, which I have newly quoted objected to the contrary; and this passage further added, אלכסנדריים עשו אותה משל עצמן *The Alexandrians build that synagogue at their own charge*; which doth both attest to what our sacred historian mentions of a *synagogue of Alexandrians* at Jerusalem; and argues that they were divers synagogues here spoken of, one of the *Liber-tines*, another of the *Cyrenians*, and so of the rest: which may be so much the more credible, if that be true which is related

<sup>s</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 664.

<sup>h</sup> Hieros. Megil. fol. 73. 4. Juchas. fol. 26. 4.

in the same place, viz. that there were four hundred and eighty synagogues in Jerusalem.

Καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας· *And of them of Cilicia.*] St. Paul seems to have been of this synagogue, but of the school of Gamaliel: for the Jewish youth, sent out of far countries to Jerusalem for education, being allotted to this or that synagogue, chose this or that master for themselves according to their own pleasure. St. Paul had been brought up in a Greek academy from his very childhood, viz. that of Tarsus: I call Tarsus both an *academy*, and a *Greek* one too, upon the credit of Strabo, who speaks thus concerning it<sup>i</sup>; *Ταρσὸς κτίσμα ἐστὶ τῶν μετὰ Τριπτολέμου πλανηθέντων Ἀργείων κατὰ ζήτησιν Ἰοῦς· Tarsus was built by the Argives that wandered with Triptolemus in the search of Io.* And a little after; *Τοσαύτη δὲ τοῖς ἐνθάδε σπουδῇ πρὸς τε φιλοσοφίαν, &c.* “They of Tarsus had so great a love to philosophy and all liberal sciences, that they excelled Athens, Alexandria, and if there were any other place worth naming, where the schools and disputes of philosophy and all human arts were maintained.” Hence is it so much the less strange that St. Paul should be so well stocked with the Greek learning, and should quote in his discourses the poets of that nation, having been educated in so famous a university from his very youth.

Ver. 15: Ὡσεὶ πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου· *As it had been the face of an angel.*] God himself by a miracle bears witness to the innocence of this holy man, and shows he had done no wrong to Moses, when he makes his face shine as Moses’s had formerly done, and gave him an angelical<sup>k</sup> countenance like that of Gabriel: for if he had said that “Jesus should destroy that place,” &c. he had but said what Gabriel had said before him.

## CHAP. VII.<sup>1</sup>

VER. 2: Τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὄντι ἐν Μεσοποταμίᾳ· *Unto Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia.*] “Abraham<sup>m</sup> is like the friend of a king, who, when he saw the king walking in darksome galleries, gave light to him by a window: which when the king saw, he said unto him, ‘Because thou hast given me

<sup>i</sup> Geogr. lib. xiv. [5.]

<sup>k</sup> *Leusden’s edition*, vol. ii. p. 710.

<sup>1</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 665.

<sup>m</sup> *Beresh. Rabba*, fol. 32. 3.

light through a window, come and give me light before my face.' So did the holy blessed God say to Abraham, 'Because thou hast given light to me, ומחברותיה שלי וממספוטמיה out of my Mesopotamia, and its companions, come and give light to me in the land of Israel.'" Whether or no it be worth the while to inquire why God should term it *my Mesopotamia*, as also what should be the meaning of חברותיה her consorts or companions; yet can I not but take notice that this adjunct doth once and again occur in the writings of the Jews. "O seed<sup>n</sup> of Abraham my friend, I took thee from the ends of the earth; וממספוטמיה ומחברותיה, viz. from Mesopotamia and her companions. Who<sup>o</sup> is he among you that feareth the Lord? This is Abraham: who walketh in darkness: who came ומחברותיה וממספוטמיה out of Mesopotamia and her consorts, and knew not whither; like the man that dwelleth in darkness." It is written indeed מאספמיה, as if it should be out of Spain; but I correct it by the authority of the Aruch; and, indeed, the very sense itself corrects it. The Gloss hath nothing but this trifling passage in it; "I have found the interpretation of Mesopotamia, viz. that it is the name of a city in Aram Naharaim."

The geographers do indeed distinguish between Mesopotamia and Babylon, or Chaldea; so in Ptolemy's fourth table of Asia, to omit other authors, Ἡ Βαβυλωνία περιορίζεται, ἀπὸ μὲν ἄρκτων Μεσοποταμίας, &c.: "The country of Babylon is bounded on the south by Mesopotamia," &c. And yet Babylon may in some measure be said to be in Mesopotamia; partly because it lay between the two rivers Euphrates and Tigris, but especially according to the propriety of Scripture language, because it was "beyond the river." Which we may take notice was observed by the Vulgar interpreter in Josh. xxiv. 3, where what in the Hebrew is, "I took your father Abraham מֵעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן from the other side of the flood," he hath rendered it, "I took your father Abraham de Mesopotamiæ finibus, from the borders of Mesopotamia."

Josephus, speaking of Abraham and his removing from his country, hath this passage<sup>p</sup>, Δι' ἄπερ Χαλδαίων τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Μεσοποταμιτῶν στασιασάντων πρὸς αὐτὸν, μετοικεῖν δοκι-

<sup>n</sup> Beresh. Rabba, fol. 48. 1.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid. fol. 66. 1.

<sup>p</sup> Antiq. lib. i. cap. 8. [Hudson, p. 22.] [i. 7. 1.]

μάσας, &c.: *Wherefore the Chaldeans and other Mesopotamians moving tumults against him, he thought fit to remove his seat, &c.* Where we see the Chaldeans, amongst others, are called *those of Mesopotamia*; nor indeed without cause, when, as Eratosthenes in Strabo tells us<sup>p</sup>, that “*Mesopotamia, with the country of Babylon, is contained in that great compass from Euphrates and Tigris.*”

And so perhaps the Rabbin newly quoted distinguisheth; that that *Mesopotamia*, which he makes to be called by God שלי *my Mesopotamia*, is Charran; where the worship of God had been kept up in the family of Nahor, and which had been the native country and breeder up of eleven patriarchs. And so let חברותיה *her consorts* be Babylon and Chaldea; for in what other signification חברותיה here can be taken, I cannot well tell.

In that Stephen speaks of God appearing to Abraham while he was yet in Chaldea, before he removed to Charran, when Moses rather ascribes that passage to Terah his father, Gen. xi, he speaks with the Vulgar, according to the commonly received opinion of his countrymen; who not only taught that Abraham acknowledged and worshipped the true God, even while his father Terah worshipped idols; but further, that Terah was so zealous an idolater, that he delivered his son Abraham to Nimrod, to be cast into a fiery furnace. We have the tale in *Bereshith Rabba*<sup>q</sup>, ridiculous enough. [Fregerat Abrahamus idola Terachi, et dixit, ea mutuis ictibus se confregisse, litigantia de farinæ eis oblatæ comestione. Suspiciens Terachus se illum נסביה ומסריה להמרוד *prehendit Abrahamum, et tradidit eum Nimrodo: qui projecit eum in fornacem ignis. Ast Abrahamus exiit e fornace salvus*<sup>r</sup> etc.]

Ver. 3: “Ἐξελεθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου” *Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred.*] I would not confound this passage with that in Gen. xii. 1; for Stephen, and indeed the thing itself, assures us that this was spoken to Abraham in Chaldea, but that in Charran. Here is no mention of his going “from his father’s house,” as there

<sup>p</sup> Lib. ii. 1.

<sup>q</sup> Fol. 42. 2.

Talmudicarum loca,” the eighth

<sup>r</sup> From “*Pauca interserenda in quædam Horarum Hebraicarum et*

tract, in Leusden’s edition, vol. iii. p. 102.—ED.

is there. Nor did<sup>s</sup> he indeed depart “from his father’s house” when he removed from Ur of the Chaldeans, for he took his father and whole family along with him. But he departed when he removed from Charran, leaving his father buried behind him, and Nahor his brother with his family.

Ver. 4: *Μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, &c.* *When his father was dead, &c.*] Here ariseth a difficulty, and upon that a controversy, which we may take in in the words of R. Solomon upon Gen. xi: “And Terah died in Charran, that is, more than threescore years after Abraham had left Charran and had settled in the land of Canaan. For it is written, ‘Abraham was seventy-five years of age when he went out of Charran, and Terah was seventy years old when Abraham was born.’ Behold, Terah was one hundred and forty-five<sup>t</sup> years of age when Abraham left Charran, and he had a great many years yet behind.” There remained, indeed, according to this calculation, sixty years.

I. In that whole chapter there is no mention of the death of any person there named, before or beside that of Terah. Where, by the way, we may take notice of the boldness of the Greek interpreters, who to every one of those persons have annexed *καὶ ἀπέθανε, and he died*, directly against the purpose of Moses and the mind of the apostle, Heb. vii. 3. Now, therefore, why, when Moses had passed over the death of all the rest that had been reckoned up before in that catalogue, should it be put in concerning Terah only that “he died in Charran,” were it not to shew that Abraham did not remove from thence till after his father’s decease there? This R. Solomon, even while he is defending the contrary, seems something apprehensive of; for thus he expresseth himself: “Why doth the Scripture tell of the death of Terah before it mentions Abraham’s removal? viz. lest the matter should be made public, and men should say, ‘Abraham did not give that honour to his father that he ought to have done, relinquishing him now in his old age, and going away from him.’ The Scripture therefore speaks of him as now dead, because the wicked, even while they are alive, are accounted for dead.”

How is this Rabbin mistaken! For Terah now is no

<sup>s</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 666.

<sup>t</sup> *Leusden’s edit.*, vol. ii. p. 711.



wicked man, nor an idolater, but converted; and therefore Moses makes him chief in that removal out of Chaldea that his conversion might be known, although the command concerning the departure from that country came first to Abraham. And if it was not lawful for Abraham to have forsaken his father, being yet an idolater, much less was it so when he was now become a worshipper of the true God.

II. It is indeed said, that "Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abraham, Nahor, and Haran:" but as it is against reason to suppose they were all begot in one year, so there is no necessity to think they were begot in the order they are placed in in the story. Here that common maxim in the Rabbins takes place; אין מוקדם ומאוחר במקרא *There is no first and last in the holy Scripture*, i. e. the order of the story does not necessarily determine the time of it. And the Gemarists themselves, however they suppose that Abraham might be older than Nahor one year, and Nahor than Haran one year; yet do they at length conclude, דלמא רחמיהו אברהם זוטא רחמיהו *perhaps Abraham was the youngest of his brethren*<sup>u</sup>: which they also confirm out of the order observed in numbering the sons of Noah, where Sem is first in the catalogue, though he was younger than Japhet.

It is commonly received amongst the Jews that Sarah, Abraham's wife, was the daughter of his brother Haran; and that not without reason. יסכה זו שרה *Iscah (say they) is the same with Sarah*. And Josephus speaks it out, as a thing of ancient tradition; Ἀράνης μὲν, καταλιπὼν υἱὸν Λῶτον, καὶ Σάρραν καὶ Μελχὰν θυγατέρας, ἐν Χαλδαίῳ ἀπέθανεν *Haran, leaving one son, Lot, and Sarah and Melcha, two daughters, died in Chaldea*<sup>x</sup>. If therefore Sarah, who was but ten years younger than Abraham, was Haran's daughter, which seems to be in some measure confirmed, Gen. xx. 12, we can by no means suppose Abraham to have been the firstborn amongst the sons of Terah, but Haran rather; unless we will trifle with some of the Rabbins, and say that Haran begat Melcha when he was but six or eight years old. But they conclude at length a little more rationally, if I understand what they mean; קא חשיב להו דרך חכמתן *they reckon them up according to their wisdom*.

<sup>u</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 69. 2.

<sup>x</sup> Antiq. lib. i. cap. 7. [Hudson, p. 21.] [i. 6. 3.]

Conceive therefore Abraham born, not in the seventieth, but in the hundred and thirtieth year of Terah; and that these words here recited by Stephen were spoken to him in “Ur of the Chaldeans;” but those mentioned Gen. xii. 1 spoken in Charran, and<sup>y</sup> thus join the story: “Terah died in Charran: then said God unto Abraham,” &c.

Ver. 14: Ἐν ψυχαῖς ἑβδομηκονταπέντε *Threescore and fifteen souls.*] The Hebrew copies have it everywhere but “threescore and ten.” So also Josephus<sup>z</sup>; εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον, &c. “He came to Egypt with his sons, and all their sons; ἦσαν δὲ οἱ πάντες ἑβδομήκοντα, *they were in all threescore and ten.*” Again<sup>a</sup> elsewhere, οὗ μετὰ ἑβδομήκοντα τῶν πάντων, &c. “*who with threescore and ten, all that were with him, going down into Egypt,*” &c.

So Ezekiel, Tragœd. in Euseb. de Præpar. Evangel. <sup>b</sup>:

Ἄφ' οὗ Ἰακώβ γῆν λιπῶν Χανααῖαν  
Κατῆλθ' εἰς Αἴγυπτον, ἔχων ἐπτάκις δέκα  
Ψυχὰς σὺν αὐτῷ·

*From the time that Jacob, having left the land of Canaan, came down into Egypt, having seven times ten souls with him.* So the very Greek version itself in Deut. x. 22; ἐν ἑβδομήκοντα ψυχαῖς, &c. “Thy fathers went down into Egypt *with threescore and ten persons;*” which is strange, when they have it in another place<sup>c</sup>, ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε, *threescore and fifteen.* We may easily discern that St. Luke here follows that version that adds five grandchildren to Joseph, Gen. xlv. 20, Machir and Gilead, because of those words, Gen. l. 22, “the sons of Machir, the son of Manasseh, brought up upon Joseph’s knees:” and Sutelah, and Tahan, and Eden, because it is said, “Joseph saw Ephraim’s children unto the third generation.” Where, by the way, I cannot but think it strange why the Greek interpreters should select these their additional persons out of the sons of Joseph, rather than any other of the patriarchs: and further take notice, how, though they reckon up nine children of Joseph—“Now the sons of Joseph which were born to him in the land of Egypt were nine souls,” ver. 27—yet they name but seven. Josephus the

<sup>y</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 667.

<sup>z</sup> *Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 4.* [ii. 7. 4.]

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid. cap. 5.* [ii. 9. 3.]

<sup>b</sup> *Lib. ix. cap. 28.*

<sup>c</sup> *Vid. Gen. xlv. 27. and Exod.*

i. 5.

historian speaking of those threescore and ten persons that went down into Egypt, "I will reckon them up (saith he), that I may satisfy those who would pretend we took not our original from Mesopotamia, but from Egypt." It is strange therefore that the interpreters would add those that were actually born in Egypt. But it seems that, when they would confound the true number, they chose those upon the account of those words in Gen. 1. which we mentioned.

As<sup>d</sup> to these children of Ephraim and others, whose story is mentioned 1 Chron. vii. 20, the masters of traditions tell some ridiculous tales of them; viz. that having not counted right as to the years of their bondage in Egypt, they went to invade the land of Palestine before the appointed time, and fell by the sword of the Gittites<sup>e</sup>: but that they came to life again with those whom Ezekiel raised from the dead, chap. xxxvii.<sup>f</sup>

I have, in my notes upon Luke iii, offered my conjecture why the interpreter should confound the number, and put *threescore and fifteen* instead of *threescore and ten*: as also why the evangelist should follow that version and that number: and am of the same mind still. In the meantime, wondering at their retaining the true number, Deut. x. 22, where Nobilius in his Scholia tells us, "Josephus in his second book of Antiquities, writing of Jacob, hath set the number." (I have quoted the passage already.) "And St. Jerome in his questions upon Genesis, witnesseth that the Septuagint so writ it. Other copies have ἐν ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ πέντε ψυχαῖς, *threescore and fifteen souls*."

If the Septuagint wrote so in this place, when elsewhere they have *threescore and fifteen*, I know no other reason can be rendered of it but that Moses is here introduced speaking to the people of Israel, who very well knew the certain and true number; but elsewhere, where it is rendered by them *threescore and fifteen*, he is writing a history for the whole world, to whom the precise number was not so well known. But one may suspect the same pen did not translate the Book of Deuteronomy that had translated the Books of Genesis and Exodus. So *Capthorim* in Gen. x. 14, by the interpreter

<sup>d</sup> Leusden's edition, vol. ii. p. 712.

<sup>e</sup> Targ. in Cant. ii. 7.

<sup>f</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 92. 2.

of that Book is rendered Γαφθορείμ, *Gaphthoreim*; or as it is in MS. Alex. Καφθορείμ, *Caphthorim*; but in the Book of Deuteronomy, chap. ii. 23, it is Καππάδοκες, *Cappadocians*.

Ver. 16 ε: Μερετέθησαν εἰς Συχέμ: *Were carried over into Sychem.*] לעולם ישנה אדם לתלמידו דרך קצרה *Ever let a man teach his disciple concisely<sup>h</sup>, or briefly.* So that a short way of speaking, especially in a thing plain, was not strange amongst the Jews: which rule if Stephen followed in this place, he might do it more safely and unblamably in a story so well known.

I. It was very commonly, and without any kind of doubt, received amongst them, that the bones of the twelve patriarchs, as well as those of Jacob, were carried out of Egypt into Canaan. "It<sup>i</sup> is written, I will go down with thee into Egypt, וְאֲנִי אֵעָלֶה גַם-עִלָּה *and even in going up I will make thee to go up*, Gen. xlv. 4. מִה תֵּל גַּם עִלָּה *What are we taught by גַּם-עִלָּה even in going up?* He saith, I will make thee to go up, and I will make all the other tribes to go up too: teaching thereby שבט ושבת העלה עצמות ראש שכל שבט *that every tribe should carry up the bones of the patriarch of his tribe with it.*" Take notice by the way that the Seventy render גַּם-עִלָּה *eis τέλος, unto the end.*

"The<sup>k</sup> bones of all the patriarchs were carried out of Egypt, and buried in the land of Canaan: as it is written, And ye shall carry up my bones with you," Gen. i. 25<sup>l</sup>.

II. Thus far therefore Stephen speaks with the consent of that nation, viz. That the bones of the patriarchs were conveyed out of Egypt into Canaan. But what can we say as to their being buried in *Sychem*? Doubtless he spake according to the common received opinion amongst them in this thing also; though I cannot but say that all Jewish writers, as far as I have met with, are wholly silent in it. Nay, Josephus himself will have them buried in Hebron, and that before the Israelites came out of Egypt<sup>m</sup>.

The Talmudists speak very much of Joseph's being buried in *Sychem*, and amongst other things say this, "That they

<sup>ε</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 668.

<sup>h</sup> Gloss. in Zevachim, fol. 2. 1.

<sup>i</sup> Hierosol. Sotah, fol. 17. 3.

<sup>k</sup> Gloss in Bava Kama, fol. 92. 1.

<sup>l</sup> See also Beresh. Rabba, fol. 115. 3. Gloss. in Maccoth. 11. 2.

R. Sol. in Exod. xiii. 19.

<sup>m</sup> Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 4. [ii. 8. 2.]

stole him from *Sychem*, and restored him to *Sychem* again<sup>n</sup>." But as to the burying of the other patriarchs there, they have not one word. Benjamin also in his Itinerary, speaking of *Sychem*, mentions the sepulchre of Joseph, and none but that. And so do the *Cippi Hebraici*<sup>o</sup>, as the learned Hottinger translates them; "From *Sychem* at the distance of a sabbath day's journey lies a village called בֵּלַטָּה *Belata*, where Joseph the Just, of blessed memory, lies buried."

I conceive the reason why the Jews are so silent in this matter may be, because they fear it would be a reproach to themselves, and too great an honour for the Samaritans, that the patriarch's bones should lie amongst them. As to Joseph's being buried there, there could be no denial of that, because the Scripture speaks it in express terms that he was buried in *Sychem*: but it is very grievous for them to acknowledge that all the other heads of the nation and tribes should lie there, where the apostasy of the ten tribes first began, and after their expulsion the odious nation of the Samaritans were seated: and for this very reason one might argue that Stephen would never have mentioned such a thing, if it could have been contradicted by them. The masters of the traditions indeed do tacitly yield that the eleven patriarchs were not buried in Hebron, when they admitted but four couples there, viz. Adam and Eve, Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Leah<sup>p</sup>. And if so, where were they buried? If we do but consider how the great charge and care of public affairs was committed to Joshua, who was of the stock and lineage of Joseph, and from that very relation had a particular concern with *Sychem*, probability itself would argue (were there no other proof for it), that he would have as strict a care of the patriarchs now dead, as his progenitor Joseph had had of them while they were yet alive.

Whence<sup>q</sup> I cannot but wonder that the Samaritans dwelling in *Sychem*, having in their letters, sent lately into England, made mention of the sepulchres of Joseph, Eleazar, Phinehas, the seventy elders, Eldad and Medad, that are with them to this day, should say nothing of the sepulchres of the eleven patriarchs. But so long as all the other tribes

<sup>n</sup> Sotah, fol. 13. 2.

<sup>o</sup> [p. 52.]

<sup>p</sup> Sotah, fol. 13. 1.

<sup>q</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 713.

are in mean esteem amongst them, and the tribe of Ephraim, i. e. (if I may so speak) the Samaritan tribe, being of greatest account, it is the less wonder if they are not so very solicitous, at least do not boast so much of the heads of the other tribes.

Καὶ ἐρέθησαν ἐν τῷ μνήματι ὃ ὠνήσατο Ἀβραὰμ τιμῆς ἀργυρίου, παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ τοῦ Συχέμ. *And laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor the father of Sychem.*] This passage is not a little obscure: not very unlike that in Gen. l. 5; Joseph saith, “My father made me swear, saying, ‘Lo, I die.’ In my grave אֲשֶׁר כָּרִיתִי לִי which I have digged for me, or which I have purchased for myself, there shalt thou bury me.” I will not contend about the word כָּרִיתִי, whether it should be rendered, *I have digged*, as the Greek, Jonathan’s Targum<sup>r</sup>, &c. have rendered it; or whether it should be, *I have bought*, as Onkelos, the Syriac, and the Talmudists. Be it the one or the other, seeing the discourse is plainly about the cave of Machpelah, how can we say either this or that is true? I little question the former sense: for when Abraham had bought the cave, and digged a sepulchre in it for himself and Sarah, reason will tell us that Isaac did the same for himself and Rebekah, and Jacob for himself and Leah; for they both dwelt in Hebron as well as Abraham. But if we will admit of the latter sense, which the Rabbins tenaciously adhere to, there is no less a difficulty occurs than what is now before us. They indeed remove it by this blessed comment, viz. that when Jacob purchased the birthright from Esau, he did, by a peculiar writing and deed of contract, include this cave within the bargain, as his own propriety. We may read the whole figment in *Sotah* and the Targum of Jonathan in the places above quoted.

But to take this matter in hand a little more seriously.

I. It had been enough for Stephen to have made mention of the burial of Jacob and the patriarchs, without any addition about the purchase of the burying-place, if he had not a design to hint something peculiar in the mention he makes of it. Nor did it make for his cause at all, to tell over a bare story, which they all knew, if there were not something included in it that made for his defence. He had said before,

<sup>r</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 669.

ver. 5, concerning Abraham, that God had not given him any "inheritance in the promised land, no, not so much as to set his foot on:" and here he tells them, that even Jacob and the patriarchs had no place where they should be buried, but what they themselves bought for a sum of money: "And will you, O ye persecutors, upon the mere promise of the land made to your fathers, be so confident as to persuade yourselves it will be your abiding place for ever? and that, howsoever you behave yourselves towards God, you cannot be removed from it?"

II. Ὁ ἀνήγατο Ἀβραὰμ τιμῆς ἀργυρίων *That Abraham bought for a sum of money.* Thus far is no difficulty, when the discourse is of the burial of Jacob in the cave of Machpelah; but the knot is in the following words, παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ τοῦ Συχέμ, *of the sons of Emmor the father of Sychem.* That the text is not interpolated (as Beza and Heinsius would have it) appears from the universal consent both of the copies and the translations. For those that would have it interpolated cannot show one copy reading it otherwise; and all the versions follow this reading in the very words wherein the difficulty most lieth. The Syriac, indeed, refers the words to Jacob only, rendering it in the singular number וְאֶתְנִי וְאֶתְחַסֵּי *And he was carried and laid, &c.*; but yet owns the following words, "in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor," where all the difficulty lies. So also, as to that clause, other versions have it.

Now, as to what is objected, let us take it in the words of *Bereshith Rabba*<sup>s</sup>: "R. Juda Bar Simon saith, 'This is one of the three places' (viz. the cave Jacob bought, Gen. xxxiii. 19) 'concerning which the nations of the world cannot reproach Israel, saying that they took it by force and rapine.' The places are these, the cave of Machpelah, the house of the sanctuary, and the sepulchre of Joseph. The cave of Machpelah, as it is written, 'And Abraham hearkened to Ephron, and weighed to Ephron,' &c. Gen. xxiii. 16. The house of the sanctuary, according as it is said, 'So David gave to Ornan for the place,' &c. 1 Chron. xxi. 25. And the sepulchre of Joseph, as it is said, 'He (Jacob) bought a parcel of a

<sup>s</sup> Fol. 89. 1.

field,' &c. Gen. xxxiii. 19. יַעֲקֹב קָנָה שָׁכֶם *Jacob bought Shechem,*" or that parcel of it: therefore, Abraham did not. But,

I. Let us take a little view of that passage, Gen. xii. 6: "Abraham passed through the land unto the place of Sychem, מוֹרֵה עַד אֵלֶּן מוֹרֵה Gr. ἐπὶ τῆν δρυὸν τῆν ὑψηλῆν, *to the high oak*: [Targ.] מוֹרֵה עַד מִישׁוֹר מוֹרֵה *to the plain of Moreh.*" Vulg. Usque ad convallem illustrem, *to the famous valley.* Targ. Hieros. et Samarit., *to the vale of vision,* &c. But our inquiry is for the place rather than the etymology. Deut. xi. 29, 30; "Thou shalt put the blessing upon mount Gerizim, and the curse upon mount Ebal. Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites, who dwell in the champaign overagainst Gilgal אֶצֶל אֵלֶּוֹנֵי מוֹרֵה *besides the plains of Moreh?*"

Let us take the Talmudic comments upon this place: "When<sup>t</sup> the Israelites had passed over Jordan, they came to mount Gerizim and mount Ebal, which are in the country of Samaria, near Sychem, which is besides the plain of Moreh, according as it is said, 'Are they not on the other side Jordan,' &c.? And it is said elsewhere, 'Abraham passed through the land unto the place of Sychem to the plain of Moreh.' What is<sup>u</sup> the plain of Moreh there, Gen. xii. 6? It is Sychem. And so the plain of Moreh is Sychem here also, Deut. xi. 30." "R. Eliezer<sup>x</sup> Ben Jose saith, 'In this thing have I accused the Samaritan books of falsifying;' and I said unto them, 'Ye have falsified your law, and gained nothing by it; for you say אֵלֶּוֹנֵי מוֹרֵה שָׁכֶם *the plain of Moreh which is Sychem*: for we confess that the plain of Moreh is Sychem.'" The Samaritan text in Deut. xi. 30 hath מוֹרֵה מוֹל שָׁכֶם *the plain of Moreh near Sychem*; but no such thing in Gen. xii. 6 is added.

If<sup>y</sup> the word *μνήματι*, *in the sepulchre*, did not lay some obstacle in the way, I should easily conceive that Stephen had his eye as intent (if not more) upon this place as upon the cave of Machpelah. It is not said, that Abraham bought this place, much less that he bought it for a burying-place: but

<sup>t</sup> Sotah, fol. 31. 1.    <sup>u</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 714.    <sup>x</sup> Sotah, fol. 33. 2.  
<sup>y</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 670.



however, that he did buy it (though not under that notion of a burying-place) seems probable, because this was the first place in which he pitched his tent and built an altar: all which he would hardly have done upon another man's ground. It is said of Jacob, that he bought a parcel of ground where he had spread his tent, Gen. xxxiii. 19. And why should we not think that Abraham did the same? only it is not expressly said so of him, as it is of Jacob.

It might be no improper question here, upon what conditions Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob fed their cattle and maintained their families in the land of Canaan? Whether the places and fields they occupied were common, and had no proper owner? Whether Abraham, not far from Sychem, in the plain of Moreh, in the disposal of himself and his flocks, intruded upon another's possession, or whether it was all champaign, without any lord? It is probable it was neither one nor the other: and therefore some third thing must be found out, viz. that either they might purchase those lands, or take them of the owners upon an agreed rent. It is said of Abraham, that "he planted a grove in Beersheba," Gen. xxi. 33. How came he to any right in that piece of land? Had that place no lord, no prince, no owner, till he came? If it had any lord or owner (which is most probable), then it is easy apprehending how Abraham might come by the possession of it, viz. by some sum of money, though there is no mention made of it.

However, whether Abraham bought *the plain of Moreh* or not, it is very evident, from the words of the protomartyr, that the patriarchs were buried in that place, where he in his very first entry upon that land had made his abode, where he had received the first promise of the land by vision, and where he erected his first altar. And I cannot believe but that either St. Stephen or St. Luke would, in this their short way of speaking, revive the memory of some such thing; viz. that the patriarchs were buried in that very same place where Abraham had made his first abode, where he had received the first promise of the land; yet that they did not possess that land any otherwise than in their graves.

Ver. 23: 'Ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦτο αὐτῷ τεσσαρακονταετῆς χρόνος, &c. *When he was full forty years old.*] The martyr speaks agree-

ably with the whole nation; "Moses<sup>z</sup> was forty years in Pharaoh's court, and forty years in Midian, and forty years he served Israel. Rabban Jochanan Ben Zaccai exercised merchandise forty years, was learning the law forty years, and forty years he ministered to Israel. R. Akibah was בור an illiterate person forty years; he bent himself to study forty years, and forty years he ministered to Israel<sup>a</sup>."

Ver. 25: Ἐνόμιζε δὲ συνίεναι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ, &c. *For he supposed his brethren would have understood, &c.*] Moses was endowed with a spirit of prophecy even in Pharaoh's court, (to which that passage may refer, that "he was mighty in words and in deeds,") and knew himself designed to redeem Israel out of Egypt; and so he thought that people conceived of him too. For they could not but know the story of his miraculous preservation in his infancy; his providential education in a prince's court; and especially the apparent signs of a prophetic spirit in him. Which though Moses himself speaks nothing of, yet doth Stephen relate it, not without good authority and the consent of his countrymen: who all suppose Moses miraculously born, and as wonderfully saved in the ark of bulrushes; namely, that he was conceived when his mother was a hundred and thirty years of age, brought forth without any of the pangs of child-birth, and born טוב דווא good, that is, לנביאות apt for prophesying<sup>b</sup>. Note by the way how that fiction of Josephus<sup>c</sup> concerning Pharaoh's putting his crown upon the head of the child Moses, and his throwing it to the ground, is told also by the Jewish Rabbins<sup>d</sup>, only with this variation; that Moses himself took the crown from Pharaoh's head and put it upon his own.

Ver. 42<sup>e</sup>: Μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατέ μοι, &c. *Have ye offered to me slain beasts and sacrifices, &c.*] Kimchi upon this place of Amos speaks out what the Jewish schools think in this matter by a passage taken out of *Chagigah*<sup>f</sup>: "There is a tradition concerning the daily sacrifice made in mount Sinai. R. Eliezer saith, that there were rules indeed given

<sup>z</sup> Beresh. Rabba, fol. 115. 3.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. et Shemoth Rabba, fol. 118. 3.

<sup>b</sup> Sotah, fol. 12. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Antiq. lib. ii. cap. 5. [ii. 9. 7.]

<sup>d</sup> Shemoth Rabb. fol. 118. 3.

<sup>e</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 671.

<sup>f</sup> Babyl. fol. 6. 2.

concerning it on mount Sinai, but the sacrifice itself was not offered. R. Akibah saith, It was offered, and from that time hath not ceased. But what do I prove" (in these words), "Have ye offered to me slain beasts and sacrifices by the space of forty years in the wilderness, O ye house of Israel? viz. the tribe of Levi, that had not committed idolatry, they offered; but Israel did not offer. And in those words, 'the children of Israel kept the Passover in its time,' seems to be some reproach reflected upon Israel; as hinting that they had observed no Passover in the wilderness but that."

It is most certain that sacrifices were offered in the striking of the covenant, Exod. xxiv.; in the consecration of the altar and the tabernacle; and in the celebration of that Passover: and this was all done in Sinai before the fatal decree passed of their not entering the land. But it may not without reason be suspected that the daily sacrifices were continued after that time; for we find live coals upon the altar, Numb. xvi. 46, and it is not to be thought that fire would be perpetually burning on the altar to no purpose; but God's complaint seems to be about the free-will offerings that *they* ceased; and that none made oblations of their own good will. Nor let any think it strange that the prophet, and after him the protomartyr, counts up the time in that round sum of forty years, when it was indeed but eight-and-thirty and a half; for so doth God himself, Numb. xiv. 34.

Ver. 43: Καὶ ἀνελάβετε, &c. *Yea, ye took up, &c.*] The word in Amos is אָנֹכִי, which if we might render with R. Solomon in the future tense, "And ye *shall* bear your idols with you into captivity, as burdens laid upon your shoulders," it would take off a little of the difficulty that otherwise seems to lie in this passage; for it might be very reasonably questioned whether the Israelites ever did this in the wilderness: but then this is directly contrary both to the Greek version in that prophet, and now to the Holy Ghost in this place, and to the very scope of the protomartyr in quoting it. For he speaketh of God as giving up the people to worship the host of heaven; and straightways suggests that they first desisted from serving God, and then addicted themselves to

• *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 715.

the worshipping of idols. But the question is, whether the discourse in this place is concerned in the idolatry they committed in the wilderness, or that in aftertimes. That it doth not point at the idolatry in the wilderness these following arguments seem to confirm :

I. Because there is no mention of any idolatry committed in the wilderness after the golden calf besides that with Baal-peor. And it is hardly imaginable that Moloch and Baal-peor were the same, and that Moloch and Remphan were not two different idols. Nor is it probable at all that the sacred historian would have passed over such a piece of wickedness, without taking any notice either of the fault or punishment ; especially when as everywhere else the history of their idolatry is related so very accurately. But not to multiply arguments,

II. If Stephen refer this idolatry of the Israelites to the times after those in the wilderness, and in that sense interprets the prophet, he speaks the same thing that was commonly known and received amongst the Jews ; viz. that the punishment of that sin of the golden calf descended and was derived to following generations. “ R. Oshaiah<sup>b</sup> saith, that to the times of Jeroboam the children of Israel sucked of one calf,” (the Gloss is, Viz. that calf they made in the wilderness ; ) “ but from that time forward they sucked of two, and of a third too,” (the Gloss is, Those two of Jeroboam’s, and the third of the wilderness.) “ R. Isaac saith, There is not any instance of vengeance that comes upon the world wherein there is not a twenty-fourth part of a pound of the first calf. According as it is said, ‘ In the day that I visit, I will visit their sin upon them,’ Exod. xxxii. R. Chaninah saith, After twenty-four generations” (the Gloss hath it, In the reign of king Zedekiah), “ this verse was accomplished, as it is said ; ‘ He cried in mine ears with a loud voice, The visitations of the city draw near, every man having his destroying weapon in his hand,’ Ezek. ix. 1.”

Τὴν σκητὴν τοῦ Μολόχ. *The tabernacle of Moloch*<sup>i</sup>.] The prophet Amos hath it כָּסוּת מִלְכָּם וְנִשְׂחָתָם אֵת סִכּוֹתָם מִלְכָּם; Lat. Interlin., Et portastis Siccuth regem vestrum, i. e. *Ye carried Siccuth your king.* So R. Solomon and Kimchi, “ Siccuth is

<sup>b</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 102. 1.

<sup>i</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 672.

the name of an idol." For my part I am at a stand in this matter; as also in what words the Chaldee paraphrast hath rendered this clause. For in the books published amongst us it is פתכומרון ית סנות; when as the *Aruch*, citing the Targumist in this place, saith, סנות מלכנם תרגום סנות פתכריכון 'Siccuth malchechem,' with the Targumist is 'Succuth pethacrecon.' Observe *petkacrecon*, not *pathcumarcon*: and that it was so originally written in the Targumist I do very much suspect, however Kimchi owns only the other reading. For,

I. It is not easy, I may say not possible, to give פתכומרון that propriety in this place that it bears in Ezek. xiii. 18 and xvi. 16.

II. Whereas the same paraphrast renders מלכו in Isa. viii. 21 by פתכריה, and מלכם in Zeph. i. 5 by פתכריהון, it is the more probable that he may render מלככם in this place by פתכריכון; which word, it should seem, he useth for some *idol*, or *heathen god*; because when he would express a *king*, taken in its proper sense, he always retains the usual word מלכה. If, therefore, according to the copy quoted by the *Aruch* it should be read פתכריכון, then the Chaldee version falls in with the Greek, and shews that מלככם should be rendered *your Moloch*: so that *Moloch* signifies an *idol*; and *Siccuth* not an *idol*, but σκηνη τοῦ Μολοχ, *the tabernacle of Moloch*: which seems the more likely from the agreement of the two clauses σκηνη τοῦ Μολοχ and ἄστρον τοῦ Περμφαν, *the tabernacle of Moloch and star of Remphan*.

But who or what kind of god this *Moloch* should be, I will not spend much time to find out<sup>k</sup>, this having been the business of so many pens already; only this I cannot but observe, that both *Moloch* and *Remphan* were certain figures that represented some of the celestial luminaries, because he saith he "gave them up to worship the host of heaven," &c.; and that it is generally supposed that by *Moloch* was represented the sun; partly because of the kingly name, and partly upon the account of the fiery form and shape of the idol and the fiery rites of its worship. It is also called *Baal*, Jer. xxxii. 35; "They built the high places of Baal, to offer their sons

<sup>k</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 716.

to Moloch :” which whether it be the same idol that Ahab brought in upon Israel might not be unworthy our considering. There may be some colour and hint of that bloody worship in what the priests of Baal did to themselves ; “ They cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them<sup>1</sup>.”

*Moloch* (as the Jews describe him) was an image of brass, having the face of a calf, his hands open like one ready to receive something brought him from another. And so Diodorus Siculus describes Saturn of Carthage : Ἦν δὲ παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἀνδριὰς Κρόνου χαλκοῦς ἐκτετακὼς τὰς χεῖρας ὑπίαις, ἐκτεταμέναις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὥστε τὸν συντιθέντα τῶν παίδων ἀποκυλίεσθαι, καὶ πίπτειν εἰς τὸ χάσμα πλῆρες πυρός. *They had an image of Saturn made of brass, stretching out his hands, extended towards the earth ; so that a child being put into them, was thrown and rolled into a great gulf of fire<sup>m</sup>.* There we have also this passage out of Philo<sup>n</sup> concerning the history of the Phœnicians : Κρόνος τοίνυν, ὃν οἱ Φοίνικες Ἰσραὴλ προσαγορεύουσι, &c. “ Saturn, therefore, whom the Phœnicians call *Israel*, having governed that country after his death, was made the star called *Saturn*. Of his wife Anobret he had one only-begotten son, whom therefore they call *Jeoud* ; that being the term for an only-begotten son amongst the Phœnicians to this day. Upon the breaking in of a very destructive war upon the country, he takes his son, and having decently adorned him, and prepared an altar for him, sacrificed him on it.” This *Israel* by name was Abraham by the character, from whom whether they derived by direful imitation this horrid usage of sacrificing to Moloch, is no place at present to dispute ; the question rather might be, whether the Israelites did act any such thing themselves in the wilderness ; whether with the tabernacle of the Lord they also erected a tabernacle to Moloch too ; whether, having slighted the way of sacrificing beasts, they instituted the offering up of their own children. Which how unlikely it was that Moses should either suffer it to be done, or having been done should pass it by in silence, and make no mention at all of it, any one may judge. I shall conclude with that passage in Por-

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings xviii. 28. <sup>m</sup> Apud Euseb. Præpar. Evang. lib. iv. cap. 16.

<sup>n</sup> [Ibid.]

phyrus quoted by the same Eusebius, worth our taking notice of: Καταλυθῆναι δὲ τὰς ἀνθρωποθυσίας, &c. "That these sacrifices of men were abolished almost everywhere Pallas tells us, who wrote excellently well concerning the mysteries of Mithra under Adrian the emperor."

Καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ῥεμφάν. *And the star of your god Remphan.*] In Amos it is כִּיּוֹן, *Chijun*; in the Seventy Ῥαιφάν, *Rephan*. I would not in this place heap up what learned men have said in this matter: upon these two hinges the whole difficulty turns; first, to reconcile the Septuagint with the prophet Amos; and then to reconcile St. Stephen, or St. Luke, with the Septuagint.

I. Forasmuch as the Heb. כִּיּוֹן *Chijun* is Ῥαιφάν, *Rephan*, in the Septuagint, I would not look for any thing *gigantic* in the word Ῥαιφάν, *Rephan*, but something rather *weak* and *infirm*. Any one knows that רַפָּה and רַפְיוֹן signify *weak* and *weakness*; and from thence perhaps the word Ῥαιφάν, *Rephan*, may take its original, and not from רַפָּא, *a giant*. And so the same thing might be done by the interpreters in this name that had been done by the Jews in the name of Beelzebub, viz. invented the name for mere contempt and reproach. The naked and native signification of כִּיּוֹן *Chijun* is *firm, upright, stable*; and therefore is rendered by some in that place *basis, or foundation*: a name, indeed, most unfit for an idol, which is a lie, vanity, nothing. This the Septuagint being apprehensive of might translate it by a word perfectly contrary, but more agreeable to the thing itself; viz. Ῥαιφάν, *Rephan*, that is, in Hebrew, רַפְיוֹן *weakness, infirmity*: if Ῥαιφάν, *Rephan*, does not denote 'Saturn' in the Coptic language, as Kircher tells us.

II. But how Ῥαιφάν, *Rephan*, should be changed into Ῥεμφάν, there have been various, and those not impertinent, conjectures. The Syriac and Arabic retain רַפָּא and רַפְיוֹן; which, as to the sense we have mentioned, sound properly enough to eastern ears. And what if St. Luke or our martyr, that they also (as much as might be) might sound the same thing in the ears of the Greeks, should pronounce it by Ῥεμφάν, *Remphan*; where the sound of the word ῥεμβός, which signifies *wandering* or *tottering*, might be included.

Be it therefore that *Moloch* is the sun, and *Remphan* or

*Chijun* should be Saturn; we read of the introduction of Moloch into the land of Israel, but of *Chijun* not at all, only in the prophet Amos, and here in the mention of *Remphan*.

When I read that in 1 Kings xii. 30, "That all the people went to worship the calf in Dan," and observe further that Dan was called Pania, I begin to think that Φὰν, *Phan*, in 'Ραιφὰν, *Rephan*, and 'Ρεμφὰν, *Remphan*, may have some relation with that name; and that Dan is mentioned rather than Bethel, because° the idolatry or calf of that place continued longer than that of Bethel.

Μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος. *I will carry you away beyond Babylon.*] But the Hebrew words of Amos are מִדְּמָשֶׁק לְדַמָּשֶׁק *beyond Damascus*: so the Greek, ἐπέκεινα Δαμασκού, *beyond Damascus*.

I. Nothing was more usual in the schools and pulpits of the Jews than for the reader or preacher to vary and invert the text of the Scripture, to adapt and accommodate it to his own sense. Hundreds of times we meet with this phrase אַל תִּקְרָא in the Talmudic writers and the Jewish expositors, *Do not read this or that word so, but so, or so*: where forsaking the proper and genuine reading they put another in the stead, that may better fall in with the matter they are upon. Not that they reject or vilify the original text, but to bring what they allege more ingeniously to their own purpose. I have known this done in some words wherein they keep indeed to the same letters, but make the variation by the change of vowels. Which shews, in the mean time, that this was neither any strange thing amongst them, nor accounted any crime; but received rather with applause, to alienate the words of the Hebrew text from their native and original reading, to deduce something either true in itself, or at least smooth and ingenious. And if Stephen here, after the usage of the schools, quoting this passage of the prophet Amos מִדְּמָשֶׁק לְדַמָּשֶׁק *beyond Damascus*, had magisterially said, as they were wont to do, אַל תִּקְרָא *Do not read it מִדְּמָשֶׁק beyond Damascus*, but לְבָבֶל *beyond Babylon*, it would have gone down well enough with his auditory, both by reason of the usual custom of the nation, and principally because what he said was true. For,

° *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 717.



II. Let us consult another place in the same prophet, Amos iv. 3: "And ye shall go out at the breaches one against another, וְהִשְׁלַכְתֶּנּוּ הַחֲרוֹמוֹנָה and ye shall cast them into the palace." Where the Targum and Syriac, "They shall carry them beyond the mountains of Armenia:" and the Greek, εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Ῥομμάν, unto the mount Romman. R. Solomon upon the place tells us that Jonathan paraphraseth חֲרוֹמוֹנֵי הַר הַשֶּׁחַד beyond the mountains of Horman, they are the mountains of darkness. "Alexander P, king of Macedon, קָצָא מַלְכָא קַזְיָא לְאַחֲרֵי הַר הַשֶּׁחַד went to the king of Cazia behind the mountains of darkness." Let me add one passage more: "Israel<sup>q</sup> went into three captivities; לְפָנִים מִנְהַר סַנְבַטְיוֹן one was within the river Sanbaton, וְאַחַד לְדַפְנֵי שַׁל אַנְטוֹכְיָא and the other was to Daphne of Antioch; the other, where the clouds did descend upon them and covered them<sup>r</sup>."

Ver. 51: Σκληροτράχηλοι. *Stiffnecked*<sup>s</sup>.] We have a like phrase, and a story not much unlike, in *Shemoth Rabba*<sup>t</sup>: When the people, in the absence of Moses, were urgent with Aaron to make them gods that should go before them, "Hur resisted them, and said to them, קִצְעֵי צִוְאֵרִיא Ye short-necked, do you not remember what wonderful things God hath done for you? Immediately they rose up against him, and slew him."

Ver. 53: Εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων. *By the disposition of angels.*] I. I would not render this word ἀγγέλων by the Hebrew word מַלְאָכִים *angels*, as the Syriac and Arabic interpreters have done, but by שְׁלִיחֵי צְבֹר is ἀγγελος *ἐκκλησίας*, the *angel* or *messenger of the church*. The Jews have a trifling fiction, that those Israelites that were present at mount Sinai, and heard the law pronounced thence by God himself, should have been like the angels, that they should never have begot children, nor died, but for the time to come should have been like to angels, had it not been for that fatal and unfortunate crime of theirs in the matter of the golden calf<sup>u</sup>.

If εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων might admit of this passive con-

<sup>p</sup> Beresh. Rab. fol. 35. 4.

<sup>q</sup> Hieros. Sanhed. fol. 29. 3.

<sup>r</sup> Bemid. Rabba, fol. 268. 1.

<sup>s</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 674.

<sup>t</sup> Fol. 156. 2.

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Avod. Zarah, fol. 5. 1.  
Hor. Heb. in John x, 35.

struction, "that men might be disposed into the same predicament or state with the angels;" then I should think our blessed martyr might in this passage remember them of their own opinion, and the more smartly convince them of their *ἀνομία*, *transgression of the law*, even from what they themselves granted; as though he had said, "Ye have received a law which you yourselves confess would have put men into an angelical state, and yet you have not observed it."

II. But if this clause will not bear that interpretation, it is doubtful in what sense the word ἀγγέλων must be taken; and whether *εἰς διαταγὰς*, *unto the dispositions*, be the same *διὰ διαταγῶν*, or *διὰ διαταγῆς*, *by the dispositions* or *disposition*. That expression in Gal. iii. 19 agrees with this, *διαταγὰς δι' ἀγγέλων*, *ordained by angels*; and in both these places it would be something harsh to understand by *angels* those heavenly spirits strictly and properly so taken: for what had they to do in the disposition of the law? They were present indeed at mount Sinai when the law was given, as many places of the holy Scriptures do witness; but then they were but present there: for we do not find that any thing further was done or performed by them. So that the thing itself makes it necessary that both in this and in that place we should understand by *angels* the *messengers* of God's word, his prophets and ministers. And the particle *εἰς* may retain its own proper force and virtue, that the sense may come to thus much; viz. "Ye have received the law *unto the disposition of messengers*, i. e. that it should be propounded and published by<sup>x</sup> ministers, prophets, and others; and that according to your own desire and wish, Exod. xx. 19, Deut. v. 25, and xviii. 15, 16; and yet ye have not kept the law. Ye desired prophets, and ye had them: and yet which of those prophets have not you persecuted?"

Ver. 56: Τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν ἐστῶτα τοῦ Θεοῦ· *The Son of man standing on the right hand of God.*] Christ frequently calls himself *the Son of man*, but it is rarely that we find him so called by others. But St. Stephen in this expression recites that of Dan. vii. 13: "I saw one like *the Son of man* coming with the clouds of heaven, and coming to

<sup>x</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 718.

the Ancient of days, and they brought him before him." I would hardly have expected from a Jew what R. Saadiah saith upon this place, 'like to the Son of man?' "זרו משיח צדקינו" *This is the Messiah our righteousness*; but is it not written of the Messiah, Poor and riding upon an ass? For he shall come in humility. 'And they brought him before the Ancient of days:' this is that that is written, 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand.'"

They doctors in *Sanhedrim*<sup>2</sup> talk much more out of the way; "זכרו עם ענני שמיא" *If they are worthy* (i. e. the Israelites), *then he shall come with the clouds of heaven*; but if they are not worthy, then he will come poor, and riding upon an ass." The protomartyr declares he saw that of Daniel fulfilled now in Jesus; to which that in Isa. vi. 1 is something parallel.

Ver. 58: Καὶ ἐκβαλόντες ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, ἐλιθοβόλουν. *And cast him out of the city, and stoned him.*] בית הסקילה "The place of stoning was without the Sanhedrim; according as it is said, 'Bring forth him that hath cursed without the camp,' Lev. xxiv. 14." "It is a tradition: The place of stoning was without three camps." The Gloss tells us that the court was the camp of the divine presence; the mountain of the temple, the camp of the Levites; and Jerusalem, the camp of Israel. Now in every Sanhedrim, in whatever city, the place of stoning was without the city, as it was at Jerusalem.

We are told the reason by the Gemarists why the place of stoning was *without the Sanhedrim*; and again, *without three camps*: viz. "מחנות לג" *If the Sanhedrim go forth, and sit without the three camps, they make the place for stoning also distant from the Sanhedrim*: partly lest the Sanhedrim should seem to kill the man; partly, that by the distance of the place there might be a little stop and space of time before the criminal come to the place of execution, if, peradventure, any one might offer some testimony that might make for him. For, in the expectation of some such thing,

II. אחד עומד צל פתח בד" והסדרון בידו " *There stood*

<sup>1</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 675.

<sup>2</sup> Fol. 98. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Hieros. Sanhedr. fol. 23. 1.  
Bab. Sanhed. fol. 42. 2.

one at the door of the Sanhedrim having a handkerchief in his hand, ויכוס רחוק ממנו כרי שיהא רואהו and a horse at such a distance as it was only within sight. If any one, therefore, say, 'I have something to offer in behalf of the condemned person,' he waves the handkerchief, and the horseman rides and calls the people back. Nay, if the man himself say, 'I have something to offer in my own defence,' they bring him back four or five times, one after another, if it be any thing of moment that he hath to say." I doubt they hardly dealt so gently with the innocent Stephen.

III. If no testimony arise that makes any thing for him, then they go on to stoning him: "The crier proclaiming before him, *N*, the son of *N*, comes forth to be stoned for such or such a crime; *N* and *N* are the witnesses against him: if any one hath any thing to testify on his behalf, let him come forth and give his evidence."

IV. "When they come within ten cubits of the place where he must be stoned they exhort him to confess; for so it is the custom for the malefactor to confess; because every one that confesseth hath his part in the world to come, as we find in the instance of Achan," &c.

V. "When they come within four cubits of the place they pluck off his clothes, and make him naked."

VI. "The place of execution was twice a man's height. One of the witnesses throws him down upon his loins; if he roll upon his breast, they turn him upon his loins again. If he die so, well; if not, then the other witness takes up a stone, and lays it upon his heart. If he die so, well; but if not, then he is stoned by all Israel."

VII. "All that are stoned are hanged also," &c. These things I thought fit to transcribe the more largely, that the reader may compare this present action with this rule and common usage of doing it.

1. It may first be questioned for what crime this person was condemned to die. You will say, For blasphemy: "For we have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God." But no one is condemned as a *blasphemer* (מגדף), unless for abusing the sacred name with four letters, &c. Hence is it, that although they oftentimes accused our Saviour as a blasphemer, yet he was not condemned for this,

but because **לְיִשְׂרָאֵל** *he used witchcraft, and deceived Israel, and seduced them into apostasy*<sup>b</sup>. And these are reckoned amongst persons that are to be stoned, **הַמְסִית הַמְדִידָה הַמְנַשֵּׂה** *he that evilly persuades, and he that draws into apostasy*<sup>c</sup>, and a conjurer<sup>d</sup>.

2. It may further be questioned whether our blessed martyr was condemned by any formal sentence of the Sanhedrim, or hurried in a tumultuary manner by the people, and so murdered : it seems to be the latter.

Παρά τοὺς πόδας νεανίου. *At* a young man's feet. Philem. ver. 9 : Τοιοῦτος ὢν ὡς Παῦλος πρεσβύτης. *Being such an one as Paul the aged.*] By which we may compute whether *νεανίας* here denotes *mere youth*, and not rather *strength and stoutness* ; 2 Sam. vi. 1, **כָּל־בְּחֹר בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל** *every chosen man of Israel* : where the Greek hath it πάντα νεανίαν ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, *every young man of Israel*.

Ver. 60 : Ἐκοιμήθη. *Fell asleep.*] **דָּמָה** or **דָּמִיד** *he slept* ; than which nothing is more common in the Talmudists.

#### CHAP. VIII.

VER. 2 : Συνεκόμισαν τὸν Στέφανον. *Carried Stephen to his burial.*] “They<sup>f</sup> do not bury (any one condemned by the Sanhedrim) in the sepulchres of their fathers. But there are two places of burial belonging to the Sanhedrim ; one, for those that are beheaded and strangled ; the other, for those that are stoned and burnt.” The reason why such are not to be buried with their fathers is this, **שְׂאִין קוֹבְרִין רֹשֶׁע עִם צְרִיק** *because they do not bury the guilty with the innocent* ; which they deduce from the story of an ordinary person cast into Elisha's grave, who continued not there, but rose again.

“The<sup>g</sup> stone wherewith any one is stoned, the wood on which he is hanged, the sword by which he is beheaded, and the halter wherewith he is strangled, is still buried in the same place with him,” or at least very near him. That it was otherwise with Stephen, the words now before us do evince ; but whether this was from the indulgence of the Sanhedrim towards the condemned person, or because he was not condemned by the Sanhedrim, let others judge.

<sup>b</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 43. 1.

<sup>c</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 719.

<sup>d</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 53. 1.

<sup>e</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 676.

<sup>f</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 46. 1.

<sup>g</sup> *Ibid.* fol. 45. 2.

Καὶ ἐποιήσαντο κοπετὸν μέγαν ἐπ' αὐτῷ· *And made great lamentation over him.*] The Rabbins go on : לֹא הָיוּ כִּתְּנֵי בְּלִיָּהּ לֹא הָיוּ אֲוֵנִים לֹא הָיוּ אֲוֵנִים *They do not make a lamentation (over one condemned by the Sanhedrim), only bemoan him ; i. e. inwardly, and in their heart only :* שֵׂאִין אֲנִינֹת לֹא בְּלֵב *for this grief is not but in the heart.* And it was a vulgar conceit amongst the Jews, that by how much the more sordidly the criminal was handled by the Sanhedrim, and how much the less bemoaned after execution, by so much the more it tended towards the remission of his sins. Whence the Gloss upon the place, "They do not bewail him, that so that disgrace of his might turn to his atonement."

This generous and true Christian courage of these good men burying St. Stephen is deservedly applauded by all ; and those that did thus bury him did thereby publicly explode that ridiculous conceit of expiation by undergoing the greatest disgrace here ; for they knew well enough that the remission of this martyr's sins flowed from a more noble source.

Ver. 5 : *Εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας· To the city of Samaria.*] Having done with the story of Stephen, who was the first named amongst the seven deacons, the evangelist passeth on to the affairs of Philip, who was the second. Whether he betook himself to Sebaste, or to Sychem, or to some other third city of Samaria, might be a reasonable question ; because it is said, ver. 14, that "the apostles heard that Samaria had received the word of God ;" which seems more agreeably to be understood of some city in Samaria rather than the whole Samaritan country. Now what city should that be, which as the metropolis of that country is by way of emphasis called Samaria ? It is certain that Sebaste is that very city which anciently was Samaria.

הָיָה שׁוֹמְרוֹן<sup>h</sup> שְׁבַסְתִּי<sup>i</sup> "Sebaste is the same which was Samaria, where to this day the palace of Ahab is shown." *Ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ Σαμαρείδι, &c.* "In Samaria (Herod) fortified a city with a noble wall of twenty furlongs, and carrying thither a colony of six thousand men, and distributing good land amongst them, in the midst of the city erected a goodly

<sup>h</sup> *English folio edition, vol. ii. p. 677.*

<sup>i</sup> Benjam. [Tud.] in Itinerar. [p. 38. Ed. L'Empereur.]

temple to Cæsar; and leaving a grove about it of about three half furlongs, τὸ ἄστυ Σεβαστῆν ἐκάλεσεν, *he called the city Sebaste*<sup>k</sup>."

Was this therefore *the city of Samaria* where Philip now was, because that was once the city Samaria? If we observe how the city of Sychem was the very heart and seat of the Samaritan religion, and the mount Gerizim was, as it were, the cathedral church of that sect; perhaps to this one might more fitly have respect when mention is made of 'the city of Samaria,' than any other place.

Ver. 9: Σίμων, προῦπήρχεν ἐν τῇ πόλει μαγεύων *Simon, which beforetime in the same city used sorcery.*] If this was in Sychem, you will say, what became then of the Sychemites' faith, which Christ himself had already planted amongst them!<sup>l</sup> It may be answered, (though in so very obscure a thing I would not be positive,) That it was some years since the time when Christ had conversed in that city, and when as he had done nothing that was miraculous there, Simon by his magics might obtain the easier reception amongst them. But, however, grant it was Sebaste, or any other city of Samaria, that was the scene of this story, yet who<sup>m</sup> did this Simon give out himself to be, when he said μέγαν εἶναι τινα, *that he himself was some great one?* and what sort of persons did the Samaritans account him, when they said of him, Οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ μεγάλη, *This man is the great power of God.*

I. Did they take him for the Messiah? It is commonly presumed that Simon was a Samaritan by birth; but should Messiah spring out of the Samaritans? It is no impertinent question, whether the Samaritans, when they looked for the Messiah<sup>n</sup>, yet could expect he should be one of the Samaritan stock, when they admitted of no article of faith that had not its foundation in the books of Moses? Could they not gather this from thence, that "the Messiah should come of the tribe of Judah?" A Samaritan perhaps will deny this, and elude that passage in Gen. xlix. 10, by some such way as this; "It is true, 'the sceptre shall not depart from

<sup>k</sup> Joseph. de Bell. Jud. l. i. c. 16.  
[Hudson, p. 1007.] [i. 21. 2.]

<sup>l</sup> John iv.

<sup>m</sup> Leusden's edition, vol. ii. p. 720.

<sup>n</sup> John iv. 25.

Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come;’ but then this does not argue that Shiloh must derive his original from the tribe of Judah; only that some dominion should continue in Judah till Shiloh should appear.” Where, by the way, it is worth our observing, that the Samaritan text, and interpreter in that place, instead of שִׁלֹה reads שְׁלָה without the *jod*, and instead of מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו reads מִבֵּין סִדְרָיו *from between his ‘feet,’* that text reads מִבֵּין דַּגְלָיו *from between his ‘banners;’* and the interpreter hath it מִבֵּין סִדְרָיו *from between his ‘ranks,’* or *companies.*

That figment concerning Messiah Ben Joseph, or Messiah Ben Ephraim, (for he goes by both those names,) whether it was first invented by the Jews or by the Samaritans, is not easily determined. The Jewish writers make very frequent mention of him: but the thing itself makes so much for the Samaritans, that one might believe it was first hatched amongst themselves; only that the story tells us that Messiah was at length slain; which the Samaritans would hardly ever have invented concerning him. And the Jews perhaps might be the authors of it, that so they might the better evade those passages that speak of the death of the true Messiah.

II. However, it was impiety enough in Simon, if he gave out himself for a prophet, when he knew so well what himself was; and if you expound his “giving out himself to be some great one,” no higher than this, yet does it argue arrogance enough in the knave. I would not depress the sense of those words concerning John Baptist, Luke i. 15, *ἔσται μέγας ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου, he shall be great in the sight of the Lord;* but if we take it in the highest degree, “he shall be a prophet before the Lord Christ,” it carries both an excellent truth along with it, and also a most plain agreeableness with the office of John. And when Stephen expresseth Moses to have been a prophet in these terms, *Ἦν δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἐν ἔργοις, He was mighty in words and deeds,* perhaps it bears the same sense with what the Samaritans said and conceited concerning this Simon, that he was *ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη, the great power of God.*

Ver. 13°: *Ὁ δὲ Σίμων καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίστευσε. Then Simon him-*

◦ *English folio edition, vol. ii. p. 678.*



self believed also.] That is, he believed that 'Jesus of Nazareth was the true Messiah,' and so was made capable of baptism, as in ver. 37; and was indeed baptized in the name of Jesus, ver. 16. And now, O Simon, what thinkest thou of thyself, if hitherto thou hadst exhibited thyself as the Messiah? Darest thou after this pretend to be the Son of God? That which is commonly told of him, and which Epiphanius<sup>p</sup> reports, without alleging any others, Τὸν Πατέρα ἔλεγεν ἑαυτὸν τοῖς Σαμαρείταις, 'Ιουδαίοις δὲ ἔλεγεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι τὸν Υἱόν· To the Samaritans he gave out himself to be the Father; to the Jews, to be the Son; betrays not only the blasphemy, but the madness of the man; that amongst the Jews he should pretend himself to be 'the Son of God,' when they would acknowledge no Son of God at all.

Ver. 14: 'Ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, &c. They sent unto them Peter and John.] Epiphanius<sup>q</sup> here very appositely tells us, *Philip, being but a deacon, had not the power of imposition of hands, so as by that to confer the gift of the Holy Ghost.* It was the apostles' peculiar province and prerogative, by laying on of their hands, to communicate the Holy Ghost, that is, in his extraordinary gifts of tongues and prophecy; for as to the spirit of sanctification, they never dispensed that.

Peter and John, besides the eminent station they held amongst the apostles, were also to be the apostles of the circumcision in foreign countries. James the brother of John was now alive, who with those two made up that noble triumvirate that had a more intimate familiarity with Christ. And one would believe he ought also to have been sent along with them, but that they were sufficient; and that this was only as a prologue to their future charge and office of dealing with the circumcision in foreign countries.

They lay their hands upon some whom the Holy Ghost had pointed out to be ordained ministers; and by so doing they did communicate the gifts of tongues and prophecy so very visibly and conspicuously, that it is said, that "Simon saw how through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given." Amongst the Jews, persons were ordained elders by three men; but here this duumvirate was

<sup>p</sup> [Hær. xxi.]

<sup>q</sup> Ibid.

abundantly more valuable, when they could not only promote to the ministry, but further confer upon those that were so promoted a fitness and ability for the performance of their office.

Ver. 19: Δότε κἀμοὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην, &c. *Give me also this power, &c.*] How infinitely mistaken is this wretch, if he think that the gifts of the Holy Ghost could be bought and procured by silver or gold! and how much more mistaken still, if he think that the power of conferring these gifts to others could be thus attained! The apostles had a power of imparting these gifts, but even they had not a power of enabling another to impart them. Paul by laying hands on Timothy could endow him with the gifts of tongues<sup>r</sup> and prophecy, but he could not so endow him that he should be capable of conveying those gifts to another. This was purely apostolical to dispense these gifts; and when they died, this power and privilege died with them.

It is easy apprehending what this wily wretch had in his thought and design, viz. an affectation both of lucre and vainglory; otherwise it might have been abundantly enough for him to have requested, ‘Give me also the gift of tongues and prophecy, as ye have given to these.’

Ver. 24<sup>s</sup>: Δεήθητε ὑμεῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, &c. *Pray ye to the Lord for me, &c.*] If he begged this in earnest and from his heart, it is a wonder he should afterward break out into so much blasphemy and wickedness that church history reports concerning him, if that say true. “And<sup>t</sup> when he did still more and more disbelieve God, and set himself more greedily in an opposition against the apostles,” &c. Σίμωνα μέγαν μεγάλων ἀντίπαλον τῶν θεσπεσίων ἀποστόλων, &c. *Simon, the great adversary of the great and holy apostles, &c.*<sup>u</sup> For him to beseech the apostles earnestly to pray for him, and yet from thenceforth to oppose them to the utmost of his power, —this certainly is the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity.

We have (if we believe the story) St. Peter and this Simon meeting with one another again at Rome; where the apostle by his prayers tumbles this magician headlong to the ground,

<sup>r</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 721.

<sup>t</sup> *Iren. lib. i. cap. 20.*

<sup>s</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 679.

<sup>u</sup> *Euseb. lib. ii. cap. 14.*

while he was flying in the air, and so Simon Magus breathes his last. If it had been taken notice of, that (if Philostratus may be believed) it is probable St. Peter and Apollonius Tyanæus were at one and the same time together in Babylon, doubtless there would have been some such tale as this framed about St. Peter's triumphing over him also.

That in Justin Martyr<sup>x</sup> concerning a statue erected at Rome to Simon Magus, with this inscription, *Simoni sancto Deo*, 'To Simon the holy God,' is shewn by learned men to have been so called by mistake, when it was rather a statue erected *Semoni Sanco Deo*. I fear there is some such mistake concerning St. Peter's chair erected in Rome as there was concerning the statue of Simon erected at Rome<sup>y</sup>.

Ver. 26 : Εἰς Γάζαν, αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ἔρημος. *To Gaza, which is desert.*] Who is it speaks this clause, *which is desert*, the angel or the historian? Strabo indeed tells us<sup>z</sup> that "Gaza anciently was a noble city, destroyed by Alexander, καὶ μένουσα ἔρημος, and continues desert:" but why is this added in this place, and by whom is it so? I would suppose it is added by the angel, and that for this reason; because there was another Gaza not very far from that place, where Philip now was, viz. in the tribe of Ephraim, 1 Chron. vii. 28 : שָׁכֶם וּבְנֵי תַיִדָּה עַד-עֵינָה וּבְנֵי תַיִדָּה *Sychem with the towns thereof, to Gaza with the towns thereof*: this was the dwelling of the children of Ephraim. Here is Gaza of Ephraim, but Philip must go to Gaza of the Philistines.

Ver. 27 : Δυνάστης Κανδάκης τῆς βασιλείουσις Αἰθιοπίων. *Of great authority under Candace queen of the Ethiopians.*] In a French treatise lately published, that bears the title of 'Histoire de la Haute Ethiopie,' p. 15, all the Ethiopian kings are named and reckoned up, and Candace not mentioned. But at the end there is this animadversion upon it: "Dans cette chronologie il n'est point parlé ni de la reine Candace, ni de l'imperatrice Helene," &c. *In this chronology there is no mention of the queen Candace, nor of the empress Helen*: the Abyssins, no more than the Jews, use not to name the women in their genealogies; a thing very common with all the eastern nations."

<sup>x</sup> [Apol. c. 56.]    <sup>y</sup> [See art. *Simon* in Dict. of Gk. and Rom. Biogr.]

<sup>z</sup> [Lib. xvi. c. 2.]

However, that there was a certain *Candace* queen of the Ethiopians, nay, that there were several queens of that name, is so very plain both from Pliny and Strabo, that it would be an impertinent thing to seek for this *Candace* of ours any where else. "The head of the kingdom (saith Strabo) was Meroe, a city of the same name with the island itself." Now the country Meroe was made an island by the river Nile westward, and the river Astabora eastward<sup>a</sup>.

If our eunuch here came indeed from Meroe, then may we call to mind that passage in Zeph. iii. 10, "From beyond the rivers of Ethiopia my suppliants," &c. But from what part soever of *Candace's* empire he might come, and what way soever he went, that might be true of him, and a very long journey he must needs take before he could arrive at Jerusalem. But the Ethiopic version cuts the journey much shorter when it makes him travelling to the city Gaza; so rendering that passage, *ὅς ἦν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γᾶς αὐτῆς*, not who had the charge of all her 'treasure,' but who was over all 'Gaza.'

I<sup>b</sup> am apt to imagine this devotionist might come to Jerusalem upon the same errand that had brought the Jews from all countries, Acts ii; viz. led hither by the prophecy of Daniel, which had foretold the appearance of the Messiah about this time. And one would wonder that whilst he was at Jerusalem he should have heard nothing concerning Jesus. Or perhaps what he heard of him was the occasion of his studying at this time that passage in Isaiah's prophecy. Where now were the apostles and the rest of that holy college and company, that so great a person, and one of such devotion, should be let go untaught and unsatisfied concerning the Lord Jesus? Is it possible that he could be ignorant of the talk of his death and resurrection, abiding in the city, although as yet he might not believe it? but his instruction and conversion is reserved to a more peculiar miracle, that should render it the more famous and better known.

Ver. 32: *Ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγῆν ἤχθη*. *He was led as a sheep to the slaughter.*] The text in Isaiah is indeed expressed here according to the Greek version; but whether the eunuch

<sup>a</sup> Ptol. tab. 4. Africa.

<sup>b</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 680.

used that version or no, is no unjust question. As<sup>b</sup> also, whether he were a Jew or a proselyte; whether a proselyte made, or a mere Gentile; whether a eunuch in the strict or in the larger sense: which things are not to be inquired into, because we can nowhere be resolved about them. The perverseness of the Jews is more obvious, who, to elude these express and plain things about the sufferings of the Messiah, do divert the whole sense of this chapter to another thing. It goes current amongst them that the afflicted people of Israel are the subject of this prophecy; although there are those who would apply part of it to Jeremiah; others, part of it to 'R. Judah the Holy;' nay, some there are that will allow some part of it to the Messiah himself, in the mean time providing that they admit not of his death. It would be very tedious to set down particularly their triflings and illusions in this matter: I rather inquire who it is that the Greek interpreters apply this passage to? Whether they plainly and sincerely understood them of the sufferings and death of the Messiah? Let those answer for them who would have them inspired by the Holy Ghost. If they were thus inspired, they could not but attain the true sense and scope of the Scripture, as well as the grammatical signification of the words, and could not but discern here that the prophet treats of an afflicted, suffering, dying, buried Messias, &c.

And if so, how strange a thing is it that the whole nation should be carried away with so cursed, perverse, and obstinate a denial of the Messiah's death! What! for seventy-two doctors and guides of the people, and those divinely inspired too, so plainly to foresee the sufferings and death of the Messiah foretold in this chapter, and yet not to take care to disperse this doctrine amongst the people, nor deliver and hand it down to posterity? But if they did do it, how came so horrid an averseness to this doctrine to seize the whole nation? If they did not, what execrable pastors of the people were they, to conceal so noble and so necessary an article of their faith, and not impart it!

In like manner do the Jews commonly apply that famed prophecy of Christ, Isa. ix. 6, to king Hezekiah. I doubt

<sup>b</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 722.

also the Greek interpreters lean that way; that clause, "Ἀφ' ὑγείαιαυ αὐτῷ, *I will restore health, or soundness, to him,* gives a suspicion of it.

Ver. 33: 'Εν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ ἡ κρισις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη. *In his humiliation his judgment was taken away.*] The Hebrew text is, לָקַח מֵעֵצֶר וּמִמִּשְׁפָּט לָקַח. *He was taken from prison and from judgment:* which the Seventy read thus, בַּעֲצֹר מוֹשַׁפְּטוֹ לָקַח. If you render the word עֵצֶר in the same sense with יְהוּדָה לְפָנַי יְהוּדָה I Sam. xxi. 8, *Doeg (for devotion, saith Kimchi) was detained before the Lord;* then is shown so much the greater wrong done to Christ. He was snatched from the place of his devotion, and from his work; and he was snatched from the place of judgment, that he could neither be safe in that, nor have just judgment in the other. Any one knows what עֲצָרָת signifies, namely, *being detained upon a religious account:* and what affinity the word עֵצֶר to *shut up,* may have with it, every one may also see.

Τῆν δὲ γενεάν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγῆσεται; *Who shall declare his generation?*] That is, "Who shall declare the wickedness of that age or *generation* wherein he lived, and by whom he suffered such things?" This and such like passages are very usual amongst the<sup>c</sup> Jews. "In<sup>d</sup> the *generation* in which the Son of David shall come, the synagogue shall be a common stews; Galilee shall be destroyed and Gablan shall be laid waste; the wisdom of the Scribes shall putrefy; good and merciful men shall fail; yea, and truth itself shall fail; and the faces of that generation shall be as the faces of dogs. R. Levi saith, The Son of David shall not come but in a *generation* wherein men's faces shall be impudent, and which will deserve to be cut off. R. Jannai saith, When thou seest the *generation* after the slandering and blaspheming *generation,* then expect the feet of King Messias," that is, his coming. While I read the Chaldee paraphrast in Isa. liii, methinks I see a forehead not unlike the faces before mentioned: for he wrests the prophet's words with that impudence and perverseness from their own proper sense, that it is a wonder if his own conscience, while he was writing it, did not check and admonish him.

<sup>c</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 681.

<sup>d</sup> Midr. Schir. fol. 17. 3.

Ver. 40: Φίλιππος δὲ εὑρέθη εἰς Ἀζωτον. *But Philip was found at Azotus.*] If this was done at Gaza or near it, it was from thence to *Azotus* about two hundred and seventy furlongs<sup>e</sup>; or thirty-four miles, or thereabout. And *Azotus* was, as it seems, two miles from Jamnia, according to the computation of Antoninus's Itinerarium. From Gaza to Askalon sixteen miles; from Askalon to Jamnia twenty. We have the mention of one רבי פליפא *Rabba Philippi*, as it should seem, in the Jerusalem Talmud<sup>f</sup>.

### CHAP. IX.

Ver. 2: 'Ἡτήσατο παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολὰς εἰς Δαμασκόν. *He desired of him [the high priest] letters to Damascus.*] These letters were written from the whole Sanhedrim<sup>g</sup>, the head of which was Gamaliel, Paul's master; yet they are attributed to the high priest, he being of a more worthy degree and order than the president of the council. That in Acts xxiii. 4 hath a peculiar emphasis, τὸν ἀρχιερέα τοῦ Θεοῦ, *God's high priest*; and hints to us the opinion that nation had of the high priest, namely, that he was 'God's officer': whereas the president of the council was only an officer of the people, and chosen by men. The charge of the high priest was to take care about holy things: the charge of the president was to take care about the traditions: for he was the מקבל, *the keeper and repository of traditions*.

But<sup>h</sup> the words we are upon do occasion a more knotty and difficult question, viz. whether the decrees of the Sanhedrim were of authority amongst the Jews in countries abroad? As to Damascus, there is the less scruple; because Syria in very many things was looked upon to be of the same rank and condition with the land of Israel. But what shall we think of more remote countries? For instance, Egypt or Babylon, where the greatest number of Jews above all other countries in the world did reside.

I. There was no Sanhedrim of seventy men, either in Egypt or Babylon, or indeed anywhere else but that at Jerusalem. There were very famous academies in Babylon, viz. that of Nehardea, that of Sorah, and that of Pumbeditha;

<sup>e</sup> Diod. Sicul. lib. xix. [84.]

<sup>f</sup> Megill. fol. 70. 2.

<sup>g</sup> Vid. Acts xxii. 5.

<sup>h</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 723.

but a Sanhedrim nowhere. There was a very famous cathedral church at Alexandria, wherein were seventy pompous stalls; but it was but a church, not a Sanhedrim<sup>i</sup>.

II. In what veneration the Jerusalem Sanhedrim was held everywhere amongst all sorts of Jews may be collected from this: that the rule and determination concerning intercalating the year, concerning the beginning of the year, and the appointed time of the feasts, &c. came from it; as also that was esteemed the keeper and repository of the oral law.

III. The judgment of life and death, in the matter of heresy and heterodoxy, belonged only to the Jerusalem Sanhedrim: and it is some such thing that is now before us. The Christians were to be sent from the synagogues bound to Jerusalem, that if they would not deny their faith they might be condemned to die. The synagogues by their three men<sup>k</sup> might scourge them, but they could not pass sentence of death: and these goodly men conceived there was no other way to extirpate Christianity but by the death of Christians.

IV. Whether therefore these were mandatory letters, or only exhortatory, which St. Paul desired, the fathers of the Sanhedrim knew the synagogues were heated with so great an indignation against Christianity, that they would most readily undertake what was desired. Where by the way we may make this observation, That the power of life and death was not yet taken out of the hands of the Sanhedrim. I have elsewhere given you a copy of a letter from the Sanhedrim to those of Babylon, and also to those of Alexandria<sup>l</sup>.

Ver. 5: Σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. *It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.*] In Syriac, קשא דו לך למבעטו לעוקסא. It is well known that בעט signifies to *kick*, from Deut. xxxii. 15, and 1 Sam. ii. 29; nor is it less known what this word *kicking* in these places means. “R. Bibai sat and taught—R. Isaac Ben Cahna ביה בעט kicked against him<sup>m</sup>.”

Ver. 7: Ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς, &c. *Hearing a voice, &c.*] But it is said, chap. xxii. 9, “They heard not the voice of him that spake unto me.” They heard קול the *voice* or *sound*; but they did not hear דבר the *words*. So we find the

<sup>i</sup> Hieros. Succah, fol. 55. 1.

<sup>k</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 682.

<sup>l</sup> Vid. Hor. Heb. ad Matt. ii. 14.

<sup>m</sup> Hieros. Schab. fol. 11. 1.



Jewish writers distinguishing: "There I will speak with thee. The word shall be with thee, but not with them all. יהוה שומעין את הדבר לא היו שומעין את הקול *Perhaps they did not hear the words, אבל היו שומעין את הקול but they heard the voice*."

Μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες. *But seeing no man.*] But did Paul himself see him? See ver. 17: "Jesus that appeared to thee in the way:" and ver. 27, "He saw the Lord in the way." 1 Cor. ix. 1; "Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" And chap. xv. 8, "He was seen of me also," &c.; but did he see his person, or his glory only? I would say he saw both; and so had obtained a more illustrious vision of him than any of the rest, having seen him since he was glorified, which they did not. But whether he saw with his bodily eyes, or as Isaiah, chap. vi. 1, by vision only, let those dispute it that think fit.

Concerning Damascus, the scene of this history, we may call to mind that of Zech. ix. 1; "The burden of the word of the Lord in the land of Hadrach, and Damascus the rest thereof," &c.: where the Targum; "Damascus shall be converted, so that it shall be of the land of the house of his majesty." Kimchi hath it, "Damascus shall be his rest:" that is, "the habitation of his glory and of his prophet," &c.; which things whether they have any relation to this place, let the reader judge. Only I must not let it pass unobserved, that Paul, the converter of the Gentiles, was called to his apostleship, and saw Christ in a country, and almost in a city of the Gentiles.

St. Paul himself tells us, that this voice which came from heaven spake to him Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ, *in the Hebrew tongue*, chap. xxvi. 14: which our historian doth not mention; nor indeed those passages, ver. 16, 17, 18, which St. Paul there relates.

Ver. 12: Ἐπιθέντα αὐτῷ χεῖρα, ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃ. *Putting his hand on him, that he might receive his sight.*] Ananias himself adds, ver. 17, "that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." Could Ananias therefore confer the Holy Ghost? This seemed the peculiar prerogative of the apostles; could therefore a private disciple do this to an

<sup>n</sup> Bemidb. Rab. fol. 163. 1.

apostle? By the imposition of his hands could he impart the gift of tongues and prophecy? Will not this degrade our apostle even below the ordinary ministers who received these gifts by the imposition of the apostle's hands? and shall he that is an apostle take his commission from the hands of one that is not so himself? It was not ordinary for an apostle to be baptized by one that was not an apostle; and it would be strange if such a one should add over and above greater things to an apostle.

It<sup>o</sup> may be no needless question, who it was that baptized the rest of the apostles, when "Jesus himself baptized not," John iv. 2? who, therefore, baptized those that did baptize? Let the Romanists say who baptized Peter: I would say John the Baptist did. But do you think Peter was rebaptized? if so, by whom, when Jesus himself did not baptize?

## CHAP. XII.

VER. 2: 'Ανεῖλε δὲ Ἰάκωβον μαχαίρα· *He killed James with the sword.*] This kind of death is called הרג *killing*. "Four kinds of death are delivered into the hands of the Sanhedrim: סקילה *stoning*; שריפה *burning*; הרג *killing* (with the sword); חנק *strangling*." "The precept בהרגין *concerning those that are to be killed* is this, ראשו בסיף *They beheaded him with the sword*, as the (Roman) kingdom does. R. Judah saith, 'This is a vile disgrace to him.' But they lay his head upon a block, and chop it off with an axe. Others reply, 'There can be no death more disgraceful than that<sup>q</sup>.' You will say, Herod (Agrippa) imitated the Roman customs, as having no small relation to Rome. But beheading by the sword was a death used amongst the Jews themselves, and they particularly fell under that sentence that drew away the people to the worship of other gods. "If they be but a few that seduce the people to strange worship, they are stoned, and their goods are not confiscated; but if their numbers be great, they die by the sword, and their goods are confiscated<sup>r</sup>."

St. James, indeed, was but a single person; but Herod

<sup>o</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 683.  
*Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 724.

<sup>p</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 49. 2.

<sup>q</sup> *Ibid.* fol. 52. 2.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid.* fol. 111. 2.

knew that there was Peter also, and several others, who, according to his judgment, *מדיוחין* drew away the people to an irreligious worship; and deals with James as he intended to do with the rest. So he falls, and his goods are confiscated; and so that begins to be accomplished which our Saviour had formerly told the sons of Zebedee, "Ye shall drink of my cup," &c. "The Rabbins say, killing [by the sword] is a heavier punishment than strangling\*."

Ver. 7: Αἱ ἀλύσεις ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν *His chains from his hands.*] I am mistaken if the Jerusalem Talmudists do not express ἀλύσεις τῶν χειρῶν by כִּירו מְנִיקָא, 'chiromanica,' *hand-manacles*. "It is written, 'The Lord spake to Manasseh, and to his people, but they hearkened not; wherefore the Lord brought upon them the captains of that host of the king of Assyria, which took Manasseh בְּחֻזִים. What signifies בְּחֻזִים? that is, בכירו מְנִיקָא in manacles?'" The Targum on 2 Chron. xxiii thus renders it ואחורו ית מנשה בכירו מְנִיקָא; where I am apt to suspect the word כירו is ill writ instead of כירו; but I stand corrected very willingly if I guess amiss.

In those words of our Saviour, "Bind the unprofitable servant hand and foot," &c. it is plain to see how he alluded to manacles and fetters.

Ver. 15: Ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ ἔστιν, &c. *It is his angel.*] That is, an *angel* in his shape: for it was familiarly received amongst them that the *angels* did sometimes put on the shape of this or of that person. "It is written, 'He hath delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh. Bar Kaphra saith, מלאך ירד הבריחו בדמות משה הבריהו, *An angel descended in the shape of Moses, and made him flee.* והיו סוברין במלאך שמשה הוא *And they that came to lay hold on Moses thought the angel to be Moses*.'" The Gloss is, "The *angel* quickened Moses in his flight; so that those that sought for Moses were very little solicitous about him, because they thought the *angel* was Moses." "The holy blessed God saith, 'I have said to Mirth, What doth it? What doth that crown in thine hand? Descend from my throne.' In the same hour an *angel* de-

\* Hieros. Sanhedr. fol. 29. 4.

† Ibid. fol. 28. 3.

‡ Debarim Rabba, fol. 290. 4.

scended שלמה של בדמותו *in the shape of Solomon*, and sat upon his throne<sup>x</sup>.”

It is well known that the Jewish writers do take Elias for “the angel of the covenant,” Mal. iii. 1; and how often have we Elias appearing in the shape of this or of that man! “Elias<sup>y</sup> came מניוהו להו כחד מיניוהו *and seemed unto them as one of themselves*.” “עאל אליהו לגביה בדמות ר' חייה” “On a certain day *Elias came to R. Judah the Holy in the shape of R. Chaiah Rubbah, &c.*: having touched his teeth he took away their pain. The next day R. Chaiah Rubbah came to him and said, ‘How doth Rabbi, how do his teeth?’ To whom he replied, ‘From the time that thou touchedst my teeth with thy fingers they were healed<sup>a</sup>.’”

Ver. 20: Διὰ τὸ τρέφεσθαι αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς. *Because their country was nourished by the king's country.*] Here we may call to mind that of Ezek. xxvii. 17: “Judah and the land of Israel [O Tyre] were thy merchants; they traded in thy market wheat of Minnith and Pannag, and honey, and oil, and balm.” So the Latin, the Interlinear, our English, and the Italian versions. But others make Minnith and Pannag not places but merchandise ware; namely, the Syriac, Arabic, Greek, and the Chaldee especially, who hath rendered the words so that R. Solomon and R. Kimchi confess they know not well what he means. As for *Minnith*, we have it mentioned in Judges xi. 33: for which<sup>b</sup> the Syriac hath *Makir*, for a reason not known; and the Greek *Arnon*, for no reason at all. As for *Pannag*, we meet with it nowhere else. Whatever it be, the words of the prophet hint to us the same thing that the evangelist doth here; which is strengthened also from that in 1 Kings v. 11: “And Solomon gave Hiram twenty thousand measures of wheat for food to his household, and twenty measures of pure oil; thus gave Solomon to Hiram year by year.”

Ver. 23: Γενόμενος σκοληκόβρωτος ἐξέψυξεν. *And he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost.*] Josephus<sup>c</sup> speaks more sparingly in this matter, “Ἀθροὺν δὲ αὐτῷ τῆς κοιλίας προσέφυσεν ἄλγημα. *The pains of his belly came thick upon him; speaking only of*

<sup>x</sup> Midr. Coheleth, fol. 87. 4.

<sup>y</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 684.

<sup>z</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 109. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Hieros. Kilaim, fol. 32. 2.

<sup>b</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 725.

<sup>c</sup> [Antiq. xix. 8. 2.]

the torments of the belly, and suppressing the cause: and that (as it should seem) not only to conceal the king's reproach, but to add something of honour to him. For lay that passage in the Talmud to this, רובן של צדיקים מתים בחולי, *Many just persons have died of the pain in the bowels*<sup>d</sup>. On the contrary, to be devoured by worms was reckoned an accursed thing, and what befell none but men of greatest impiety. Those<sup>e</sup> that went to spy out the land of promise, and raised an evil report upon it, "they had their tongues hanging out, and falling upon their navels; *היו תולעות מלשונם ויצאתו מלשונם* and worms issued out of their tongues and crept into their navels, and issued out of their navels again, and crept into their tongues." "A certain priest" (a Baithusean as it should seem) "made incense without, and brought it within. There are who say, *יצא חוטשו מונוק תולעים* that his nose hung down, issuing out with worms; and that something like a calf's hoof grew in his forehead<sup>f</sup>."

### CHAP. XIII.

VER. 1: Ἦσαν δέ τινες ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατὰ τὴν οὔσαν ἐκκλησίαν *There were some in the church that was at Antioch.*] Compare that passage, chap. xi. 27, with this place; and neither the word *τινες*, *some*, will seem redundant, nor the phrase *κατὰ τὴν οὔσαν ἐκκλησίαν* so harsh. "There came some prophets from Jerusalem to Antioch," when yet there were in the church of Antioch some prophets of their own already. And it seems to hint that the separation of Paul and Barnabas to the ministry was done by the stated ministers of that church, and not by others that came thither.

Προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι *Prophets and teachers* ε.] These offices, indeed, are distinguished 1 Cor. xii. 28 and Eph. iv. 11: but here they seem as if they were not so to be. For the church of Antioch was not yet arrived at that maturity that it should produce teachers that were not endowed with the Holy Ghost and the gift of prophecy, and the phrase *κατὰ τὴν οὔσαν ἐκκλησίαν* seems to intimate some such thing; viz. that *according to the state of the church then being* in that place, there were, nay it was necessary there should be, pro-

<sup>d</sup> Schabb. fol. 118. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Sotah, fol. 35. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Hieros. Joma, fol. 39. 1.

<sup>ε</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 685.

phetic teachers, because there was not any who by the study of the Scriptures was become fit for that office. But why then is it not rather said διδάσκαλοι προφητικοί, *prophetic teachers*, than προφήται καὶ διδάσκαλοι, *prophets and teachers*? Namely, because there were *prophets* who were not ordinary *teachers*, but acted in their prophetic office occasionally only: and they were such as rather foretold things to come than ordinarily preached, or taught catechistically. But these were both *prophets* and constant preachers too.

Μαναήν τε Ἡρώδου τοῦ τετράρχου σύντροφος. *And Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch.*] So Menahem is writ in the Alexandrian copy, at 2 Kings xv. [14.] Μαναήν, *Manaen*: but the Roman hath Μαναήμ, *Manaem*. This our Manaen's education with Herod the tetrarch brings to mind what is related in *Juchasin*<sup>b</sup>: "Hillel and Shammai received their traditions from them" (that is, from Shamaiah and Abtalion). "But first were Hillel and Menahem. Menahem went off into the king's family and service, עם שמנים וזהב לברשים *with fourscore men clothed in gold*. Menahem was grave and wise, like a prophet, and uttered many prophecies. He foretold Herod, when he was yet very young, that he should come to reign: and when he did reign, he sent for him, who foretold him also that he should reign above thirty years. And he did reign seven-and-thirty." Josephus (who is quoted also by this our author) speaks much the same as to part of the story: "There was amongst the Essenes one named Menaem; who, besides that he was famous for the holiness of his life, had obtained of God a foreknowledge of future things. He called Herod, while he was yet a child, king of the Jews;" &c.

I do not think this our Manaen was the same person; nor do I say that he was his son; for had the Essenes children? But whereas this person was so accepted in the court of Herod the Great, and our Manaen brought up with Herod his son, I cannot but suspect there might be something of kindred betwixt them. But that matter is not *tantis*: it is only worthy our considering, whether this Manaen might not lay the foundations of his Christianity while he was in Herod the tetrarch's court, where John the Baptist preached, and

<sup>b</sup> Fol. 19. 1.<sup>1</sup> Antiq. lib. xv. cap. 13. [Hudson, p. 699.] [xv. 10. 5.]

that with some kind of approbation and applause even from Herod himself, Mark vi. 20.

As to the remaining part of the story, the Talmudists<sup>k</sup> add this passage; “ יצא מנחם ויכנס שמאי *Menahem went out, and Shammai entered.* But whither went Menahem? Abai saith, יצא לתרבות רעה *He lashed out into all abundance of wickedness.* Aba saith, ‘He went into the service<sup>l</sup> of the king, and with him went fourscore pair of disciples, all glad in silk.’” I dare not say this Menahem was the same with our Manaen, unless he were a hundred years of age, or thereabout; and yet, when I observe the familiarity that was between that Menahem and Herod the father, and how ours was brought up with Herod the son (which certainly was not put in by our historian for no reason), it cannot but give me some apprehension that either he might be the person himself, or rather his son (if at least that Essenes had children); or, in a word, some very near relation. Be it one or other, it is worthy inquiry, whether this our Manaen might not lay the foundation of his evangelical religion in the court of Herod the tetrarch, when John Baptist preached there.

Ver. 2 : Λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ νηστεύοντων. *As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted.*] I. The more religious amongst the Jews fasted and met in their synagogues to the public prayers and service on the second and fifth days of the week: so that on those days it might be properly said of them, ἐλειτουργοῦν καὶ ἐνήστευον, that *they ministered and fasted.* On their sabbath, indeed, ἐλειτουργοῦν, *they ministered,* but they did not ἐνήστευον, *fast;* but on these days in the week, the second and the fifth, they did both.

II. Perhaps it might be somewhat bold to say, that the church at Antioch did according to the Jewish custom observe the weekly fasts; and yet more bold to say that church chose those days for fasting which the Jews had done, viz. the second and fifth days of the week: but it would be most audacious to conjecture that they observed the Jewish sabbath<sup>m</sup> in some measure with the Lord's day, and that with fasting, when as the Jews would by no means endure a fast upon that day. But whatever the day of this fasting was, or what occa-

<sup>k</sup> Chagigah, fol. 16. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Leusden's edition, vol. ii. p. 726.

<sup>m</sup> English folio edition, vol. ii. p. 686.

sion soever there was of it, from that ordinary custom of the Jews, it is easy to judge of that phrase, *λειτουργούντων*, *ministering*, viz. that a public fast was celebrated with the public assembly of the church and administration of holy things: which whether it was so done, ver. 3, where it is said, *τότε νηστεύσαντες καὶ προσευξάμενοι*, *then they fasted and prayed*, may be some question: that is, whether at that time there was a public fast of the whole church, or a more private one amongst the elders only.

Ver. 3: *Ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς, &c.* *Laid their hands on them, &c.*] *סמיכת וקנים ועריפת עגלה בשלשה* *The ordaining of the elders and beheading the heifer is by the three*<sup>n</sup>. In this thing, therefore, this present action agreeth with the common usage of the synagogue, that three persons, Simeon, Lucius, and Manaen, lay their hands on two that were to be sent out, viz. Paul and Barnabas. But in that they lay on their hands, they do also recede from the usual custom. "After what manner is the ordaining of elders for ever? Not that they should lay their hands upon the head of an elder, but only should call him 'Rabbi,' and say to him, 'Behold, thou art ordained, and thou hast power of judging,' &c. Anciently, every one that had been promoted to be an elder promoted his disciples also: but this honour the wise men indulged to old Hillel; namely, decreeing that no person should be ordained to an elder but with the licence of the president. But neither is the president to ordain any person unless the vice-president assist him; nor the vice-president, unless the president assist him. But as to what belongs to the other societies, it is lawful for one man to ordain with the allowance of the president: but let him have two more with him; for it is not an ordination unless by three; nor do they ordain elders out of the land<sup>o</sup>."

It might not be unworthy our inquiry, if there were place for it here, both why they have abolished the ceremony of imposition of hands, as also why they should restrain the ordaining of elders to the land of Israel only. We see the church at Antioch doth otherwise; and by the same rule the Christian church. But perhaps some will ask, upon what

<sup>n</sup> Sanhedr. cap. i. hal. 3.

<sup>o</sup> Maimon. Sanhedr. cap. 4.



reason? when laying on of hands in the ordination of elders was hardly used at all, either under the first temple, or before or under the second temple. It was not under the second temple, if we may believe the Rabbin newly quoted; or, at least, if it was used, it was abolished at last. And before the second temple where is there any sign or footstep of such a thing?

Ver. 4: Κατήλθον εἰς τὴν Σελεύκειαν. *Departed unto Seleucia.*] This doubtless is Seleucia of Pieria; concerning which Strabo<sup>p</sup> tells us, Μετὰ δὲ τὴν Κιλικίαν πρώτη πόλις ἐστὶ τῶν Σύρων Σελεύκεια, ἣ ἐν Πιερῆα, καὶ πλησίον Ὀρόντης ἐκδίδωσι ποταμός. *Beyond Cilicia, the first city in Syria is Seleucia, which is said to be in Pieria.* So Xylander translates it, leaving out the version of the last clause wholly; intimating, that ‘the river Orontes pours itself into the sea not far from this place.’ And to this the situation and distances in Ptolemy do agree.

Seleucia of Pieria, 68. 36. 35. 26.

The mouth of the river Orontes, 68. 30. 35. 30.

Pliny<sup>q</sup> also affirms that Seleucia in Pieria is the very first coast of Syria from Cilicia: “Latitudo (*Syriæ*) a Seleucia Pieriæ, ad oppidum in Euphrate Zeugma, DXXV. M.P.” “The latitude (*of Syria*) from Seleucia of Pieria to Zeugma, a town upon Euphrates, is 525 miles.”

Ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν Κύπρον. *From thence they sailed to Cyprus.*] How great a multitude of Jews there were in *Cyprus* may be somewhat conjectured from the times of Trajan backward from this story<sup>r</sup>: Ἐν τούτῳ οἱ κατὰ Κυρήνην Ἰουδαῖοι, &c. “In the mean time, the Jews who dwelt<sup>s</sup> about Cyrene, under the conduct of one Andrew, fall both upon the Romans and the Greeks, feed on their flesh, eat their bowels, besmear themselves with their blood, and cover themselves with their skins: many of them they sawed asunder from the crown of the head down the middle; many of them they threw to the wild beasts; many of them they forced to fight amongst themselves, till they had destroyed above two hundred and twenty thousand men. In Egypt and Cyprus they committed

<sup>p</sup> Lib. xiv. [c. 5.]

<sup>r</sup> Dion. Cass. in Vit. Trajani. [lxviii. 32.]

<sup>q</sup> Nat. Hist. lib. v. cap. 12.

<sup>s</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 727.

the same kind of outrages, the † leader (*of the Cypriots*) being Artemion; where two hundred and forty thousand men were lost: whence it came to pass that a Jew might not come into Cyprus. But if by chance and stress of weather he put in upon the island, he was killed. But the Jews, as by others, so especially by Lucius, whom Trajanus sent upon that expedition, were all subdued.”

Ver. 6: \*Ὀμι ὄνομα Βαριήσοῦς· *Whose name was Bar-jesus.*  
 Ver. 8: \*Ἐλύμας ὁ μάγος· οὕτω γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ· *Elymas the sorcerer (for so is his name by interpretation).]* I. It may be inquired whether Ἰησοῦς, *Jesus*, in Βαριήσοῦς, *Bar-jesus*, be a proper name or an appellative. In the Arabic in the Polyglot Bible it is writ as a proper name ישוע *Jesu*; but in the Arabic of the Erpenian edition it is writ as an appellative יאסוס *Jesus*: and under the same notion, the Syriac, taking the word for *Bar-jesus*, hath בר שומא *Bar-Shumah*, the *son of a name*, as Beza would have it: but trulier, the *son of a swelling*, or a *wound*: for שומא and סומא is a *tumor* or *pustule*, in the Targumists of Jonathan and of Jerusalem, upon Levit. xiii. 2; and in the Syriac, it is שומתא. So also חֲבִירָה a *wound* is by that translated שומתא, Isa. i. 6. liii. 5. And indeed *Elymas* can no way be the interpretation of *Bar-jesus*, if *Jesus* here be a proper name, and especially if it must be writ ישוע.

II. I would therefore write *Bar-Jesus* in Hebrew letters thus, בר יעשרש a word derived from עשרש which signifies to *waste away*, or *be corroded and worn by a disease*. So Psal. vi. 8. xxi. 10. עֵשְׂתָה מִבְּעַם עֵינַי *mine eye is consumed*, or, as the Interlinear, *corroded, because of grief*. And that the Syriac had reference to this radix when he renders it by בר שומא *the son of a wound*, or a *swelling*, proceeding from a disease, is little to be doubted; and with this etymology the word *Elymas* agrees excellently well.

III. There are those that would have it to be the interpretation of the word μάγος; that is, that the Arabic word עלימה [*Alima*], and so *Elymas*, is the same with μάγος, a *sorcerer*; which does not seem very distant from truth. Once indeed such a conceit pleased me well enough; but since, these two things, well considered, have led me another way:—

† *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 687.

1. Because it may reasonably be doubted whether St. Luke would explain μάγος, a well-known word, by a word far more unknown. Besides, why should this sorcerer only be called *Elymas*, whenas, according to that etymology, all persons of the same art might have the same name?

2. Because the Syriac and Arabic do not begin the word *Elymas* with the letter  $\gamma$  but  $\aleph$ . I little doubt, therefore, but this name *Elymas* takes its original from the Arabic word אלימה *Alima* or *Elima*, which signifies *to grieve* or *be tormented*. And how this sense agrees with the word ששש any one may see: for what can be nearer akin than *to consume away*, and *to grieve*; and *to waste away by a distemper*, and *be under torment*? So that I suppose this sorcerer was called in his own Hebrew name בר יעשש *Barjesus*, and went by that name among the Hebraizing Jews: but amongst those that spake Arabic, *Elymas*: which in the Arabic tongue signifies the same thing. I confess it is a somewhat unusual thing for St. Luke to render a Hebrew name by Arabic, and not by Greek; which the evangelists commonly do. But it seems that this magician was born and bred in some place or country where the Arabic was the mother-tongue, inhabited by Jews also that used their own language; and from thence he came to be known by this twofold name. I am mistaken if Jabneh itself, a known academy of the Jews, and sometimes the seat of the Sanhedrim, was not in such a country. For it may be made out elsewhere that it is very probable the whole Philistine country, at least the greatest part of it, did use the Arabic as their mother-tongue.

Ver. 9: Σαῦλος δὲ, ὁ καὶ Παῦλος. *Then Saul, who also is called Paul.*] Here is both his Hebrew and Roman name too, upon the account of that relation he had to both nations. He was by his parentage a Jew, and so called *Saul*; but withal he was a free denizen of Rome, and thence had the name of *Paul*. Under the same notion *Silas* is called *Silvanus*: for he also was a citizen of Rome, as may be collected out of Acts xvi. 37. The apostle, having hitherto conversed chiefly amongst the Jews, retains his Jewish name; but being now declared the apostle of the Gentiles, and travelling amongst the Gentiles, St. Luke gives him his Gentile name only.

Ver. 10: *Υἱὲ διαβόλου* *Thou child of the devil.*] Is not this much of the same import with that in the Old Testament, בֶּן־בְּלִיַעַל *son of Belial*? בכור שטן at first hearing seems to sound very harshly; and indeed, at first sight, might appear as if it signified the *firstborn of Satan*: but it is given to a certain Rabbin to his praise, and as a title of honour<sup>x</sup>, in a far different signification, the word שטן taking its derivation from שטן *to decline from*.

Ver. 12: *Ἀνθύπατος* *The deputy.*] This is a word much in use amongst the Talmudists, with a little variation only in the reading. “R. Chanina and R. Joshua Ben Levi passed before the ἀνθύπατος, or deputy of *Cæsarea*. He seeing<sup>y</sup> them rose up to them. His own people say unto him, ‘Dost thou rise up to these Jews?’ He answered them and said, ‘I saw their faces as the faces of angels<sup>z</sup>.’” See the *Aruch* upon the word.

Ver. 13: *Ἦλθον εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας* *They came to Perga in Pamphylia.*] From Paphos in Cyprus, whether old or new (both being maritime places situated on the western shore of the island), they seemed to sail into the mouth of the river Cestrus; concerning which Strabo hath this passage<sup>a</sup>: *Ἐἶθ' ὁ Κέστρος ποταμὸς, &c.* “Then there is the river Cestrus, which when one hath sailed sixty furlongs, he comes to the city Perga, near which is the temple of Diana of Perga, in a high place, where every year there is a solemn convention.” Ptolemy also speaks of the river Cestrus, and of the cataract, concerning which Strabo hath some mention.

But Mela<sup>b</sup> hath this passage: “Thence there are two strong rivers, Oestros and Cataractes: Oestros is easily navigable; but Cataractes hath its name from the violence of its running: amongst these is the city Perga,” &c. One may justly suspect an error in the writer here, writing Oestros for Cestros; and it is something strange that Olivarius hath taken no notice of it.

We may conjecture there was no synagogue of Jews in

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 688.

<sup>x</sup> Hieros. Jevamoth, fol. 3. 1. Bab. Jevamoth, fol. 16. 1.

<sup>y</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 728.

<sup>z</sup> Hieros. Beracoth, fol. 9. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Geograph. lib. xiv. [4.]

<sup>b</sup> Mela, lib. i. cap. 14.

Perga; because there is no mention of it, nor any memorable thing recorded as done by the apostles here; only that John, whose surname was Mark, did in this place depart from them: for what reason is not known.

Ver. 14: Παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίας. *They came to Antioch in Pisidia.*] Strabo reckons up thirteen cities in Pisidia<sup>c</sup> from Artemidorus, amongst which he makes no mention of Antioch. But Pliny<sup>d</sup> tells us, “Insident vertici Pisidiæ quondam Solymi appellati, &c. *There are that inhabit the top of Pisidia, who were once called Solymites; their colony is Cæsarea, the same is Antioch.*” And Ptolemy, Πόλεις δὲ εἰσιν ἐν Παμφυλίᾳ μεσόγειοι, Φρυγίας μὲν Σελεύκεια, Πισιδίας δὲ Ἀντιόχεια. *The inland cities in Pamphylia are Seleucia of Phrygia and Antioch of Pisidia.* Where the interpreter most confusedly, “Civitates sunt in provincia mediterranea, Phrygia quidem Pisidiæ, Seleucia Pisidiæ, Antiochia:” that is, *there are cities in the midland country, Phrygia of Pisidia, Seleucia of Pisidia, Antioch;* and in the margin he sets Cæsarea.

Ἐκάθισαν. *They sat down.*] So it is expressed commonly of any one that teaches; יָרַב, *he sat down.* And if the rulers of the synagogue had no other knowledge of Barnabas and Saul, they might gather they were preachers from this, that when they entered the synagogue *they sat down*, according to the custom of those that taught or preached.

Ver. 15: Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. *After the reading of the law and the prophets.*] But in what language were *the law and the prophets* read in this synagogue? It is generally supposed, that in the synagogues of the Hellenists the Greek Bible was read. But was that tongue understood amongst the Pisidians? Strabo, at the end of his thirteenth book, tells us, “The Cibyratian prefecture was reckoned amongst the greatest of Asia: Τέταρσι δὲ γλώτταις ἐχρῶντο οἱ Κιβυράται, τῇ Πισιδικῇ, τῇ Σολύμων, τῇ Ἑλληνίδι, τῇ Λύδων. *The Cibyrates used four languages, the Pisidian, the Solyman, the Greek, and Lydian.* Where we see the Pisidian tongue is expressly distinguished from the Greek. If Moses and the prophets, therefore, were read here

<sup>c</sup> Strabo, lib. xii. [7.]

<sup>d</sup> Plin. lib. v. cap. 27.

in the Greek tongue, were they understood by those in Pisidia? Yes, you will say; for the very name of the city Antioch speaks it to have been a Greek colony. Grant this: but then suppose a Jewish synagogue in some city of Pisidia that was purely Pisidian, such as Selge, Sagalessus, Pernelissus, &c., or in some city of the Solymites or of the Lydians, in what language was the law read there? Doubtless in the same tongue<sup>e</sup> and the same manner that it was read in the synagogue of the Hebrews, i. e. in the original Hebrew, some interpreter assisting, and rendering it to them in their mother-tongue.

Ver. 16: Οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν. *And ye that fear God.*] That is, *proselytes*. “ ‘Blessed is every one that feareth the Lord, that walketh in his ways,’ Psalm cxxviii. 1. He doth not say, Blessed is Israel, or Blessed are the priests, or Blessed the Levites; but Blessed is every one that feareth the Lord, אֵילֵר גְּרִים שְׂהֵם יִרְאֵי ה' *These are the proselytes*, the φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν, *they that fear the Lord*. According as it is said of Israel, ‘Blessed art thou, O Israel,’ so is it said of these, ‘Blessed is every one that feareth the Lord.’ Now of what proselyte is it said that he is blessed? It is said of the proselyte of justice. Not as those Cuthites, of whom it is said, that ‘they feared the Lord, and yet worshipped their own gods<sup>f</sup>.’ ”

Ver. 18: Ἐτροποφόρησεν αὐτούς. *He suffered their manners.*] The participle ὡς seems to exclude the reading of ἐτροποφόρησεν, which word we meet with in the Seventy, Deut. i. 31; ἐτροποφόρησε, God did indeed bear with them full forty years: and so you will say, ἐτροποφόρησεν αὐτούς is not wide from the truth. But the apostle adding the participle ὡς, *about the time of forty years*, seems chiefly to respect that time which went between the fatal decree that they should not enter the land, and the going in.

Ver. 19: Ἐθνη ἑπτὰ. *Seven nations.*] The Rabbins very frequently, when they mention the Canaanitish people, give them this very term of the *seven nations*, שבועה אומות.

Ver. 20<sup>g</sup>: Ὡς ἔρεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πενήκοντα. *About the space of four hundred and fifty years.*] Amongst the many

<sup>e</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 689.    <sup>f</sup> *Bened. rab. fol.* 227. 2.

<sup>g</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 729.

things that are offered upon this difficulty I would choose this ; that in this number are reckoned the years of the judges, and the years of those tyrants that oppressed Israel, computing them disjunctly and singly : which at first sight any one would think ought to be so reckoned, but that 1 Kings vi. 1 gives a check to a too large computation.

I. The years of the judges and tyrants, thus distinguished, answer the sum exactly :—

<i>The Judges.</i>		<i>The Tyrants.</i>	
Othniel	40	Chusham	8
Ehud	80	Eglon	18
Deborah	40	Sisera	20
Gideon	40	Midian	7
Abimelech	3	Ammon	18
Tola	23	The Philistines	40
Jair	22		
Jephthah	6	In all	111
Ibsan	7		
Elon	10		
Abdon	8		
Samson	20		
Eli	40		
	In all		339

So that reckoning three hundred and thirty-nine, and one hundred and eleven together, the sum amounts exactly to four hundred and fifty.

II. Josephus<sup>b</sup> seems expressly to follow this computation<sup>i</sup> : “ Solomon began to build his temple in the fourth year of his reign, and in the second month, which the Macedonians term *Artemision*, the Hebrews *Ijar*. Μετὰ ἔτη πεντακόσια καὶ ἑννεήκοντα καὶ δύο τῆς ἀπ’ Αἰγύπτου Ἰσραηλιτῶν ἐξόδου. *After five hundred and ninety and two years from the Israelites’ going out of Egypt.*

In 1 Kings vi. 1 there are reckoned four hundred and four-score years : Josephus, five hundred and ninety-two, exceeding that number by a hundred and twelve years : so as the

<sup>b</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 690.

<sup>i</sup> *Antiq. lib. viii. cap. 2.* [Hudson, p. 341.] [viii. 3. 1.]

three years of the tyrants make the number to exceed in this place.

III. In the particular summing up of these years, I cannot omit what is said concerning Samson in the Jewish writers<sup>k</sup>: “Samson saith, ‘O Lord eternal, give me a recompense for one of mine eyes in this world, and for the other in the world to come.’ One place saith, אֶרְבַּעִים אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְשָׁנָה *And he judged Israel forty years.* Another place saith, חֲמֵשִׁים אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה *And he judged Israel twenty years.* R. Acha saith, ‘By this it is hinted, that the Philistines were afraid of him twenty years after his death, as they had stood in fear of him twenty years while he was alive.’”

From these words we might imagine that it was written concerning Samson, that he judged Israel forty years; which yet is nowhere found: only it is said in two places, Judg. xv. 20, xvi. 31, that “he judged twenty years:” whence the Jewish writers draw that conclusion as was said before, viz. that the Philistines were under the terror of him for the space of twenty years after he had been dead. Indeed, it is said of Eli, that “he judged Israel *forty years*,” 1 Sam. iv. 18: which when I observe the LXX rendering by *ἑκκοσι ἔτη*, ‘*twenty years*,’ I cannot but suspect they might somewhat favour the received opinion amongst the Jews.

Ver. 33: *Ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ.* *In the second psalm.* “Why<sup>l</sup> are the daily prayers to the number of eighteen? R. Joshua Ben Levi saith, ‘It is according to the eighteen psalms, from the beginning of the psalms to *The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble* [Psalm xx. 1.]. But if any one say to thee, ‘They are nineteen,’ אמור לו למה רגשו לית הוא מינון *say thou to him, ‘Why do the heathen rage? [i. e. the second psalm] is not one of them.’* Hence they say, ‘He that prays and is not heard, it is necessary for him to fast too.’”

I. Judge hence whether this *second psalm* were joined or confounded with the first, when it seems in some measure sequestered from the whole number. And do you observe the Rabbins’ way of arguing? Being to prove that the number of the daily prayers being eighteen was adapted to the

<sup>k</sup> Hieros. Sotah, fol. 17. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Hieros. Taanith, fol. 65. 3.



number of the eighteen psalms, from the beginning of the book to that place, *The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble*, &c. Psalm xx, he takes refuge in a common axiom of theirs, "He that prayeth and is not heard must fast also." As if that maxim was founded upon the equality of numbers, and the authors of that maxim did so design it: q. d. He that pours out eighteen prayers, according to the number of those eighteen psalms, and is not heard, let him fast, and he shall be heard, according to the tenor of the psalm immediately following, *The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble*, i. e. in the day when thou troublest and afflictest thyself with fasting.

II. I will not make any nice inquiry for what reason they should exclude the *second psalm* out of the number. We find in it, however shut out of the number, a considerable testimony to the resurrection of the Messiah: and perhaps to this the apostle may have some respect in these words. But if not, by this his noting the number and order of the psalm we may guess he spake to this sense, viz. Ye have a testimony of the resurrection of Christ in the very entrance of the Book of Psalms, so near the beginning of it, that we meet with it even in the *second psalm*.

Τίός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.*] R. Solomon confesseth that the Rabbins do interpret this psalm of the Messiah; but he had rather it should be applied to David. For the Jews take special care that the Messiah should not be acknowledged as the genuine Son of God. Hence<sup>m</sup> *Midras Tillim*<sup>n</sup>, "*Thou art my Son*: hence we may answer the heretics, who say 'He is Son to God.' Do thou answer, בן לי אתה אינך אומר *He doth not say, 'Thou art Son to me,'* אלה בני אתה *but, 'Thou art my Son.'* [A very learned distinction indeed!] As the master speaking kindly to his servant may say to him, 'I love thee like my own son.'" So the Targumist<sup>o</sup>; "The Lord said לִי אֵנֶת לְאָבִיא כְּבֵן לְאָבִיא *'Thou art beloved to me as a son is to his father.'*"

They do indeed acknowledge that the Messiah is concerned in this Psalm<sup>p</sup>; but then if you will be a true Jew indeed,

<sup>m</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 730.

<sup>n</sup> *In loc.*

<sup>o</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>p</sup> *Succah*, fol. 52. 1.

you must have a care how you acknowledge him the begotten<sup>a</sup> Son of God. It would be a vain and impertinent thing to collect all their little artifices by which they endeavour to evade the force of this place. It were much more proper for us to observe the way of the apostle's arguing, and by what means he makes it out that these words of the Psalmist point at the resurrection of the Messiah. Take this passage by the way<sup>r</sup>: "R. Houna saith, נחלקו היסורין ג' חלקים *There are three portions of chastisements divided.* The fathers of the world and all generations received one part; the generation of persecution another; and the generation of the Messias another. And when his time cometh, then will the Holy Blessed say, עלי לבראתו ברייה חדשה *It lies upon me to make him a new creature.* And so he saith, היום ילדתיך *To-day have I begotten thee.*"

When the Jews ask a sign of our Saviour, he constantly gives them the sign of Jonas the prophet; that is, that his resurrection, which should come to pass, should be a most undoubted proof for him that he is the Son of God, the true Messias. So Rom. i. 4, "He was declared to be the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead:" for so was he indeed distinguished from all mortals and sons of men. And God saith he had then begotten him, when he had given a token that he was not a mere man by his divine power whereby he had raised him from the dead. And according to the tenor of the whole psalm, God is said to have begotten him then when he was ordained king in Sion, and all nations subdued under him. Upon which words that passage of our Saviour, uttered immediately after he had arisen from the dead, is a good commentary: "All power is given unto me," &c. Matt. xxviii. 18.

What do those words mean, Matt. xxvi. 29, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom?" They seem to look this way, viz. "I will drink no more of it before my resurrection." For in truth his resurrection was the beginning of his kingdom, when he had overcome those enemies of his, Satan, hell, and death: from that time was he

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 691.

<sup>r</sup> Midr. Tillim, ubi supr.

begotten and established king in Zion. I am mistaken if that of Psalm cx. 3 doth not in some measure fall in here also; which give me leave to render by way of paraphrase into such a sense as this: "Thy people shall be a willing people in the day of thy power: it shall be a willing people in the beauties of holiness; it shall be a willing people from the womb of the morning: thine is the dew of thy youth." Now the dew of Christ is that quickening power of his by which he can bring the dead to life again, Isa. xxvi. 19, "And the dew of thy youth, O Christ, is thine:" that is, "It is thine own power and virtue that raiseth thee again." I would therefore apply those words *from the womb of the morning* to his resurrection; because the resurrection of Jesus was the dawn of the new world, the morning of the new creation.

Ver. 34: Τὰ ὄσια Δαβὶδ τὰ πιστὰ. *The sure mercies of David.*] It hath been generally observed that this phrase, τὰ ὄσια, is taken from the Greek version in Isa. lv. 3. But it is not so generally remarked, that by *David* was understood the Messiah; which yet the Rabbins themselves, Kimchi and Ab. Ezra, have well observed, the following verse expressly confirming it. The resurrection of our Saviour therefore, by the interpretation of the apostle, is said to be τὰ ὄσια τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὰ πιστὰ, *the sure mercies of Christ*: And God by his prophet (from whence this clause is taken) doth promise the raising again of the Messiah, and all the benefits of that resurrection. He had foretold and promised his death, chap. liii. But what mercies could have been hoped for by a dead Messiah, had he been always to have continued dead? They had been weak and unstable kindnesses, had they terminated in death: he promises mercies therefore, firm and stable, that were never to have end; because they should be always flowing and issuing out of this resurrection.

Whereas these things are quoted out of the prophet in the words of the LXX, varying a little from the prophet's words; and those much more, Ἴδετε οἱ καταφρονῆται, *Behold, ye despisers*, and wonder, &c. ver. 41, it might be inquired in what language the apostle preached; as also in what language Moses and the prophets were read in that synagogue, ver. 15. If we say, in the Greek, it is a question whether the

Pisidians could understand it. If we say in the Pisidian language, it is hardly to be believed the Bible was then rendered into that language. It is remarkable what was quoted above out of Strabo, where he mentions four tongues, amongst them the Greek and the Pisidian distinct from one another. But this I have already discussed in the notes upon ver. 15 of this chapter.

Ver. 41<sup>a</sup>: Ἰδετε οἱ καταφρονηταί, &c. *Behold, ye despisers, &c.*] Dr. Pocock<sup>t</sup> here, as always, very learnedly and accurately examines what the Greek interpreters, Hab. i, read; saving in the mean time the reading which the Hebrew Bibles exhibit; for it is one thing how the Greek read it, and another thing how it should be truly read.

Ver. 42: Παρεκάλουν τὰ ἔθνη, &c. *The Gentiles besought, &c.*] It is all one as to the force of the words, as far as I see, whether you render them *they besought the Gentiles* or *the Gentiles besought them*. The latter version hath chiefly obtained: but what absurdity is it, if we should admit the former? and doth not the very order of the words seem to favour it? If it had been τὰ ἔθνη παρεκάλουν, one might have inclined to the latter without controversy; but being it is παρεκάλουν τὰ ἔθνη, there is place for doubting. And if it were so, that the Jews resented the apostles' doctrine so ill, that they went out of the synagogue disturbed and offended, as some conjecture, and that not improbably, we may the easier imagine that the apostles besought the Gentiles that tarried behind that they would patiently hear these things again.

Εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σάββατον *The next sabbath.*] I. The word μεταξὺ, as the lexicons tell us, amongst other things denotes *henceforward* or *hereafter*. Now this must be noted, that this discourse was held in the forenoon; for it was that time of the day only that they assembled in the synagogue; in the afternoon they met in *Beth Midras*. Let us consider, therefore, whether this phrase will not bear this sense, 'They besought that *afterward*, upon that sabbath, viz. in the afternoon, they would hear again such a sermon.' And then, whether *the Gentiles besought the apostles* or *the apostles the Gentiles* it doth not alter the case.

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 692.

<sup>t</sup> Poc. Miscell. 3.

II. Let us inquire whether the apostles and the Christian church did not now observe and celebrate the Lord's day. It can hardly be denied; and if so, then judge whether the apostles might not invite the Gentiles that they would assemble again the next day, that is, upon the Christian sabbath, and hear these things again. If we yield that the Lord's day is to be called the sabbath, then we shall easily yield that it might be rightly called *μεταξὺ σάββατον*, *the sabbath after*. And indeed, when the speech was amongst the Jews or Judaizing proselytes, it is no wonder if it were called the sabbath. As if the apostles had said, 'To-morrow we celebrate our sabbath; and will you on that day *λαληθῆναι τὰ ρήματα, have these words preached to you?*'

III. Or let *τὸ μεταξὺ σάββατον* be *the week betwixt the two sabbaths*; as that expression must be rendered *νηστεύω δις τοῦ σαββάτου*, *I fast twice in the week*, then, as the sense is easy, that they besought them the same things might be repeated on the following week, so the respect might have more particularly been had to the second and fifth days in the week, when they usually met together in the synagogue.

#### CHAP. XIV.

VER. 6: *Εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας, Λύστραν καὶ Δέρβην· To Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia.*] Strabo tells us expressly that Iconium also was within Lycaonia<sup>u</sup>; "Thence are the Lycaonian hills plain, cold, naked, and pastures for wild asses, &c. There are also the lakes, the greater called Coralis, the less called Trogitis. *Ἐνταῦθα δὲ πον καὶ τὸ Ἰκόνιον ἔστιν* About those places stands Iconium, a town built in a better soil than what I mentioned as the pasture of wild asses." Ptolemy also places Iconium in Lycaonia<sup>x</sup>. How comes it to pass then that St. Luke doth not call *Iconium* a city of Lycaonia, as well as *Derbe*<sup>y</sup> and *Lystra*? Because Iconium was of something a distinct jurisdiction. "Datur et tetrarchia ex Lycaonia<sup>z</sup>," &c. "There is also granted a tetrarchy out of Lycaonia, on that side that bounds upon Galatia, consisting of fourteen cities, the most famous of which is Iconium."

<sup>u</sup> Strab. Geogr. lib. xii. [6.]

<sup>x</sup> Ptol. Tab. Asiæ 1. cap. 6.

<sup>y</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 693.

<sup>z</sup> Plin. Nat. Hist. l. v. c. 27.

Ver. 11 : Λυκαονιστί: *In the speech of Lycaonia.*] It is hard to say what the Lycaonian tongue was ; nor is it easy to say why this was added, when it might have sufficed to have said, *They lift up their voices, saying, The gods, &c.*

I. I should hardly be persuaded the Lycaonian language was any Greek dialect, when it sufficiently appears by what I lately quoted out of Strabo that there were peculiar mother-tongues in these countries distinct from the Greek. And he himself remarketh<sup>y</sup> that the Carians, who are situated something nearer Greece than the Lycaonians, were called by Homer βαρβαρόφωνοι, *people of a barbarous language.* So the Phrygians also were *barbari, barbarous*<sup>z</sup>.

Let us hear once again what Strabo saith<sup>a</sup>: “The Cappadocians, who use the same language, are those chiefly who are bounded southward with that part of Cilicia that is called Taurus, eastward by Armenia and Colchis; καὶ τοῖς μεταξὺ ἐπερογλώττοις ἔθνεσι, *and other interjacent countries that use a different language.*” What amongst these *other languages* should be the Lycaonian, let him find out that hath leisure and capacity to do it; as for my part, I neither can nor dare attempt it.

#### CHAP. XV.<sup>b</sup>

Ver. 2 : Γενομένης οὖν στάσεως καὶ σιζητήσεως, &c. *Dissension and disputation, &c.*] Were I to render these words into the Talmudic language (which was the school-language) I would render στάσεως by מַלְחָמָה, and σιζητήσεως by בְּיַעֲרִיב, terms very well known in the schools; according to which idiom if they were expounded there would be no difficulty in them.

Ἔταξαν ἀναβαλεῖν Παῦλον, &c. *They determined that Paul should go up, &c.*] Of this journey Paul himself makes some mention, Gal. ii. 1; where he intimates *that he went up by revelation*: that is, given to the ministers of Antioch; for it would not have been said ἔταξαν, *they determined*, if the revelation had been made to Paul himself. Amongst others that accompanied him in his journey, Titus was one; but where he adopted him to himself, in those his journeys described chap. xiii and xiv, let him guess that can.

<sup>y</sup> Lib. xiv. [2.]

<sup>z</sup> Pausan. lib. i.

<sup>a</sup> Strab. lib. xii. [1.]

<sup>b</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 732.

Ver. 7: 'Ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων *A good while ago, &c.*] I do not question but St. Peter in these words had an eye to that saying of our Saviour, *I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven*, viz. that 'thou mayest first open the door of the gospel to the Gentiles.' Then it was that the Lord chose him, *that, by his mouth first, the Gentiles might hear the word of the gospel, and might believe.* This, he saith, was done ἐν ἡμέραις ἀρχαίαις, *in former days*; that is, as he speaks elsewhere, *in the time when Jesus went in and out amongst them*, Acts i. 21: which time is expressed by our evangelists by ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, *from the beginning*, Luke i. 2.

Ver. 16<sup>c</sup>: 'Ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαβὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν' *I will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down.*] "Rab. Nachman said to R. Isaac, מִי שְׁמִיעַ לְךָ אֵימַת אֲתִי בֵּר נַפְלִי *Whence art thou taught when Bar Naphli will come?* He saith unto him, בֵּר נַפְלִי מִאֵן *Who is this Bar Naphli?* The other replied, 'It is the Messiah.' 'Dost thou then call the Messiah Bar Naphli?' 'Yes,' saith he, 'for it is written, In that day I will build again the tabernacle of David הַנּוֹפֶלֶת *hannopheleth, falling down*.'"<sup>d</sup>

Ver. 17: "Ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, &c. *That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, &c.*] I. I think it will hardly be denied by any but that St. James spake now in Hebrew, i. e. in the Syriac tongue. For reason will tell us that the council at Jerusalem would be managed best in the language of Jerusalem; and indeed the word Συμεὼν, *Symeon*, with which he begins his discourse, argues that he spoke Hebrew amongst Hebrews; not so much in that he saith *Simeon* and not *Simon* as in that he saith Συμεὼν, with the letter *v*, and not Συμεὼν, *Simeon*; the Syriac tongue affecting the letter *u* in the first syllable, as in בּוֹרְחָא, דּוֹכְתָא, גּוֹשְׁמָא, and many such words. So also in proper names, בֵּן סוּטְדָא *Ben Sutda*, in Jerusalem language, for *Ben Satda*, and מוֹגְדָלָא *Mugdala*, for *Magdala*.

II. Neither, I presume, will it be denied that the apostle, quoting this passage of the prophet, recites the very words as they are in the Hebrew; which was always done in their schools and sermons: when they recited any place or testimony of the Scripture they did it always in the very original

<sup>c</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 694.

<sup>d</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 69. 2.

words. But do you think that the Hebrew words of Amos in the mouth of James were למען ידרשו שארית אדם *that the residue of men might seek*, in which sense the Greek words speak? The Hebrew text in Amos ix. 12 is thus, למען ידרשו את שארית אדם *that they may possess the remnant of Edom*. But the Greek interpreters have it, *ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν, &c., that the residue of men might seek after the Lord*; where they add Κύριον, *the Lord*, of their own, and is not the prophet's: nor indeed is it in the Roman copy, but in the Alexandrian MS. it is.

It is hardly worth our inquiry whether through carelessness or set design they have gone thus wide from the words of the prophet; for indeed nothing is more common with those interpreters than to depart after that manner from the Hebrew text. One may suspect that they did it on purpose here, partly as envying so comfortable a promise made to *Edom*, and partly because in the prophecy next following it is said, *There shall be no remnant of the house of Esau*, Obad., ver. 18: where they distinguish that also by rendering שריר by πυροφόρος, *one that carrieth fire*.

III. The Hebrew words of Amos quoted by James do suit very well with his design and purpose, when to prove 'that God visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name,' he cites this, *I will build again the tabernacle of David, that they may possess the remnant of Edom*: τὸ λείμμα τοῦ Ἐδῶμ, *the remnant of Edom*, in the same sense with the τὸ λείμμα τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, *the remnant of Israel*, mentioned Rom. xi. 5. And by naming *Edom*, one of the bitterest enemies that Israel had, from whom a remnant should be taken out and reserved, the thing propounded is the more clearly made out; viz. *that God had visited the Gentiles, &c.* The words also in the Greek version, which St. Luke follows, do prove the thing too; mention being made of "all nations seeking after the Lord:" and therefore he doth the more safely follow that version here, which indeed he doth almost every where; and for what reasons he so doth I have observed in another place.

IV. I know that the Talmudic and other Jewish writers understand by the *Edomites* commonly the *Romans*; but why



they do so does not so well appear. But their impudence sufficiently appears when they<sup>e</sup> introduce the Romans<sup>f</sup> owning themselves for the children of Esau, or Edom, and making their boasts of it. “ At Rome once within seventy years, מביאין אדם שלם, *they bring forth a sound man* [one that represents Esau], ומרכיבין אותו על אדם חיגר, *and make him ride upon a lame man* [that represents Jacob, and by that they shew how Esau now ruleth over Jacob]; ומלבישין *and they clothe him with the garments of Adam* [those were בגדי חמדה *the garments of desire* that Esau had]; and they put upon his head קקיפלו של רבי ישמעאל, *the skin of the head of Rabbi Ishmael* [he was the high priest that had been killed by the kingdom of the Romans<sup>h</sup>, but had so comely a face, that Cæsar’s daughter caused the skin of it to be taken off and preserved in balsam]: ותלו לו מתקל זווא דפינא, *And they hang upon him a pearl of the weight of a zuzee*, and proclaim before him, סך קירי פלסטר אחוה דמרנא זייפנא, *The computation of the lord* [of Jacob, as one Gloss; or of Isaac, as another] *is falsehood* [that is, his prophecy, by which he promised redemption to his children, is a lie]: *the brother of our lord* [i. e. of Esau] *is a deceiver*. מאי דחמי חמי ורלא חמי לא חמי, *Whosoever sees* [this sight at present], *let him see it; and whosoever doth not see it, shall not see it* [that is, till the seventieth year again]. What did thy deceiver get by his deceit, and what did that falsifier get by his falsehood? And so at length conclude, ווי לרין כד יקום דין, *Woe to this man when he shall arise*, [Woe to Esau when Jacob shall arise.]”

I thought fit to transcribe these things only to give you a specimen with what confidence the Jewish writers esteem the Romans for Edomites; of whom they hardly ever speak without spleen and hatred, curse and abhorrency. The words shut within the parentheses are not mine, but those of the Gloss.

V. I do not believe that the Romans were thus taken for Edomites by the Jews when the Græek version was wrote: but yet I do believe that at that time the Edomites were as odious to the Jews: so that it is no wonder if those inter-

<sup>e</sup> Avodah Zarah, fol. 11. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Leusden’s edit., vol. ii. p. 733.

<sup>g</sup> Gen. xxvii. 15.

<sup>h</sup> English folio edit., vol. ii. p. 695.

preters from that hatred, should envy them those things which Amos had foretold should happen to them "that remained of Edom," and diverted his words another way: "This<sup>i</sup> is the offering thou shalt receive from them, gold, silver, and brass, Exod. xxv. 3. The gold is Babel: the silver is Media: the brass is Greece, Dan. ii: but there is no mention of iron: why so? Because wicked Edom, that wasted the sanctuary, is likened to that; to teach us that God in time to come will accept an offering from every kingdom except Edom."

Ver. 20: Ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλισγημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων καὶ τῆς πορνείας. *That they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication.*] I. It may with good reason be asked whether these four things were forbidden under one and the same notion, namely this, that the converted Gentiles might not give offence to the Jews if they should not abstain from all these things: or whether there might not be something else interwoven, viz. that those converted Gentiles might not relapse into something of their former heathenism: the *abstaining from pollutions of idols, and from fornication* seems to respect this latter, as that of *abstaining from things strangled and from blood*, the former.

In the mean time one might wonder at the heart and forehead of the Nicolaitans, who not only practised but taught diametrically contrary to this decree of the apostles, Rev. ii. 14, 20. Those Balaamites and Jezebelites, with what paint could they beautify that horrid and accursed doctrine and practice of theirs? was it the liberty of the gospel they pretended? or rather, did they not abuse that love and charity commanded in the gospel? namely, making a show of some more transcendent friendship amongst themselves, they would eat any thing with any man, and lie carnally with any woman.

I have oftentimes thought of those words of the apostle, 1 Tim. iv. 3, "forbidding to marry." Who were these that forbade to marry? but especially upon what account did they forbid it? We know, indeed, upon what unreasonable reason marriage is forbidden to some in the Romish communion in these latter ages of the world: but to whom and upon what

<sup>i</sup> Shemoth Rabba, fol. 152. 3.

occasion it was forbidden in those last days of the Jewish economy, to which times the apostle refers in this place, is not easily determined.

As to the clause that follows immediately in the apostle, "commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received," &c.; that passage<sup>k</sup> comes into my mind, "When the temple was destroyed the second time, the Pharisees" [i. e. *the separatists*] "were greatly multiplied in Israel, who taught that it was not lawful to eat flesh nor to drink wine. R. Joshua applied himself to them and said, 'My sons, why do you not eat flesh, nor drink any wine?' They say unto him, 'Shall we eat flesh, that were wont to offer it upon the altar, and that altar is now broken down? shall we drink wine, that were wont to pour it out upon the altar, which altar is now gone? 'If it be so,' saith he, 'then we should not eat bread, because the offerings of bread-corn are ceased; we should not eat any fruits, because the offering of first-fruits is at an end; we should not drink water, because the drink-offering is ceased,'" &c. And a little after; "Since the kingdom of iniquity" [the Roman empire] "hath decreed sharp things against us—it is but just that we should ordain amongst ourselves לישא אשה *not to marry wives*, nor beget children, &c.; and so it would come to pass, that the seed of Abraham would decay and fail of itself. But let Israel rather be שגגין *mistaken* than כוזרין *presumptuous*."

How<sup>l</sup> great a difference is there between these men and the Nicolaitans! And yet these as foolishly and superstitiously erred in one extreme, as those did impiously and filthily in the other. As to the Nicolaitans, we may wonder at their ignorance, if they knew nothing of this decree of the apostles; and their impudence in so bold a contradiction, if they did.

Ἐκ τῶν ἀλισγημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων *From pollutions of idols.* In the epistle of the council it is ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, *from meats offered to idols*. The Rabbins distinguish the matter (when they discourse of what is forbidden concerning idolatry) into אכילת אסורי הנאה *things prohibited to eat*, and אסורי הנאה *things prohibited to use*. The εἰδωλόθυρα, or *things offered to*

<sup>k</sup> Bava Bathra, fol. 60. 2.

<sup>l</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 696. *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 734.

*idols*, were prohibited to eat; and all the utensils about any idolatrous sacrifice were prohibited to use. Ἀλισθήματα τῶν εἰδώλων doubtless comprehended *all things offered to idols*, and perhaps all the utensils too: and it is no impertinent question, whether that in the epistle commanding them ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων, to abstain from things offered to idols, did not restrain them from the use of all such utensils, as well as from the eating of things offered.

Καὶ τῆς πορνείας. *And from fornication.*] Any one may discern how obvious this twofold inquiry is; namely, of what *fornication* the discourse here is? and for what reason *fornication*, whatsoever it is, should be reckoned here amongst the ἀδιάφορα, or *indifferent* things?

I. When I recollect what we frequently meet with amongst the Rabbins, that some things are permitted מפני דרכי שלום for *peace*' sake; and some things forbidden מפני דרכי אִמֹרִיִּים by reason of the customs of the Amorites, or the Gentiles; I am apt to suspect in these decrees of the apostles there is some relation to both; that it was permitted to the converted Gentiles to judaize in some things for *peace*' sake; but to abstain in other, not that they might not judaize, but that they might not do as the heathen.

II. Particularly in this prohibition of *fornication*, we must consider that it is not so proper to think there needed any peculiar command or prescript of the apostles to those that had embraced Christianity against *fornication*, in the common notion and acceptation of the word, whereas the whole tenor of the gospel prescribed against it. And for that very reason I cannot persuade myself that by *blood* forbidden in this place we are to understand *murder*.

III. There was a certain *fornication* amongst the Jews that seemed to them lawful, and had some colour of legitimation: this was polygamy, Hos. iv. 10; הִזְנוּ וְלֹא יִפְרְצוּ They shall commit whoredom, and shall not increase: so the Chaldee and Syriac and our own translation render it well. But now *fornication*, as it denotes whoredom, doth not wish or expect any offspring, but the contrary rather: but the words relate to bigamy or polygamy. For in case of the wife's barrenness, it was a common thing for them to take to them another

woman, or more, for propagation's sake: and this it is that God brands with the reproachful name of *fornication*; "they commit *fornication*, but do not multiply." Whatever else is understood by this word, I would certainly understand this; namely, that the apostles prescribed against polygamy, a thing esteemed indifferent amongst the Jews (as *fornication* was amongst the Gentiles), and therefore not unfitly mentioned here amongst things indifferent.

Tell me in what place in the New Testament bigamy or polygamy is forbidden, if not in this. Perhaps you will say, in that of our Saviour, Matt. xix. 4, 5; where indeed provision is made against putting away of a man's wife, but hardly against polygamy, especially comparing the apostle's words, 1 Cor. vi. 16. Provision is made that bishops and deacons shall not have two wives, 1 Tim. iii. 2: and I should not believe but that the same provision is made against the bigamy of the laity. But where is that done if not in this place?

IV. There was another *fornication* ordinarily so reckoned also in the opinion of the Jews themselves (for they did not account the having many wives to be *fornication*); and that was, besides what they call simple *fornication*, their marrying within the prohibited degrees, that which they commonly called עריות *nakedness*. These marriages they were so averse to, that to some of them they allotted 'death,' to all of them לכרת or *cutting off*: concerning which Maimonides speaks largely<sup>m</sup>. In the mean time they allowed the Gentile that became a proselyte to the Jewish religion to marry with his kindred, though never so near in blood, with his sister if he pleased, or with his mother<sup>n</sup>, &c. Hence perhaps arose that incestuous marriage mentioned 1 Cor. v. 1. They did well, therefore, to provide by this apostolical decree against such kind of marriages as these, being so odious to the Jews.

Καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος. *And<sup>o</sup> from things strangled, and from blood.*] These I suppose were forbidden the Gentile converts for the sake of the Jews, and by way of condescen-

<sup>m</sup> Maimon. Issur. biah, cap. i. et per tot. tract.    <sup>n</sup> Idem, ibid. cap. 14.

<sup>o</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 697.

sion, that they might not take offence. By *blood*, therefore, I can by no means understand *murder*: *πικρὸν*, *strangled*, shall be considered by and by.

I. For wherefore should any mention of *murder* come into this present controversy? Were the Gentile converts to be brought over to Moses, when the moral precepts of Moses scarcely came in their minds as being the precepts even of nature itself? But the question is<sup>p</sup> about ceremonials; and what hath *murder* to do in that? and, as I have already said, what need could there be of such peculiar caution against *murder* to those who had embraced the gospel of love and peace?

II. By the prohibition of *blood*, therefore, I make no question but that caution is given against eating of *blood*; which is more than once prohibited in the law<sup>q</sup>: and there could hardly any thing except an idol be named that the Jew had a greater abhorrence for than the eating of *blood*.

III. The Jews distinguish between *אבר מן החי* *the member of a living beast*, and *דם מן החי* *the blood of a living beast*<sup>r</sup>. The former is forbidden by that, "Flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall you not eat." The latter also is forbidden, "Thou shalt not eat blood let out by the cutting of a vein, or any other way, from any beast," saith R. Chaninah in the place above quoted. See also *Pesikta* and R. Solomon<sup>s</sup>; and, instead of more, that passage<sup>t</sup>: "Wherefore is blood forbidden five times in Scripture? [Gen. ix. 4, Lev. iii. 17, vii. 26, xvii. 10, Deut. xii. 16.] That the blood of animals that are holy might be included, and the blood of animals not holy, and the blood that was to be covered in the dust, and the blood *אבר מן החי* *of the member of a living beast*, and *דם התמצית* *and the blood that is let out*," by the cutting of a vein or otherwise. God himself adjudgeth him that eats blood to be cut off, Lev. vii. 27, &c. But as to this matter there are wondrous nice and subtle questions and distinctions laid down in Maimonides<sup>u</sup>; I will only transcribe this one: "As to the blood that is let out, and the blood of the members, viz. of the spleen, the kidneys, the testicles, and the

<sup>p</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 735.

<sup>q</sup> Gen. ix. 4. Deut. xii. 16, &c.

<sup>r</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 59. 1.

<sup>s</sup> *Pesikta* in Deut. xii. R. Sol.

in Gen. ix.

<sup>t</sup> Cherithuth, fol. 76. 2.

<sup>u</sup> Maimon. *Maacaloth Asuroth*;

cap. 6.

blood gathered about the heart in the time of slaying, and the blood found about the liver, they are not guilty of cutting off: but whoever eateth of any of that blood, let him be scourged: because it is said, Thou shalt eat no blood. But concerning being guilty to cutting off it is said, Because the life of the flesh is in the blood. A man therefore is not guilty of cutting off, unless he eats of that blood with which the life goes out."

IV. I know what the *κρεῖττα πνικτὰ*, *strangled flesh*, in Athenæus<sup>x</sup> means; but that hath no place here, nor is there any reason why such meats as he there sets on the table should be forbidden even to the Jew. Nor would I by *πνικτὸν*, *strangled*, understand *מֵן הַחַי אֲבֵר* *the member of a living beast*, partly because I suppose that included in the word *αἷμαρος*, *blood*; and partly because it is thus determined by the Rabbins<sup>y</sup> concerning it: "They learn by tradition, that that which is said in the law, 'Thou shalt not eat the life with the flesh,' forbids the eating of a member torn from a living animal: and concerning *מֵן הַחַי אֲבֵר* *the member cut off from a living beast*, God saith to Noah, 'But flesh with the life, which is the blood thereof, shalt thou not eat.'" So that to eat a member so cut off is to eat blood: and under that clause *καὶ τοῦ αἷμαρος*, *and from blood*, is contained the prohibition of eating both *מֵן הַחַי דָּם* *the blood of a living beast*, and also *מֵן הַחַי אֲבֵר* *the member of a living beast*. And under that clause *καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ*, *and of things strangled*, is the prohibition of eating flesh of a beast not well killed, so as the blood issueth not out as it ought to do. Concerning which there is a large discourse in the tract *Cholin*, obscure and tedious enough; however, I cannot but note one passage<sup>z</sup> out of it: "If any one desire to eat of a beast before the life of it be gone, let him cut off a piece of flesh from the killing place to the quantity of an olive, and salt it very well, and wash it very well, and stay till the life of the beast be gone out of him, and then he may eat it: this is equally lawful both to the stranger and to the Israelite." When we speak of not eating of flesh which the blood is not duly got out of, it is not necessary we should include within this rank *נבלה*

<sup>x</sup> Lib. ix. [53.]

<sup>y</sup> Maim. Maacaloth Asuroth, cap. 5.

<sup>z</sup> Cholin, fol. 33. 1.

that which dies of itself, and טרפה that which is torn of wild beasts.

### CHAP. XXIII.<sup>a</sup>

VER. 2 : 'Ο δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀνανίας. *The high priest Ananias.*] It is a question among some expositors whether this *Ananias* be the same *Ananias* that Josephus mentions that was high priest; and I ask again, whether ἀρχιερεὺς in this place be to be necessarily rendered *high priest*.

I. That *Ananias*, the high priest whom Josephus mentions<sup>b</sup>, was sent bound to Rome by Quadratus the governor of Syria, to render an account of his actions to Claudius Cæsar, and that before Felix entered upon the procuratorship of Judea; but whether he ever returned to Jerusalem again is uncertain; still more uncertain whether ever restored to his place of high priest: and most uncertain of all whether he filled the chair at that time when Paul pleaded his cause, which was some years after Felix had been settled in the government, Acts xxiv. 10.

II. About this time there was one *Ananias*, a man very much celebrated indeed, but not the *high priest*, only the *sagan of the priests*, concerning whom the Talmudic writers record these passages: "There were thirteen corban chests, thirteen tables, thirteen adorations in the temple: but to them that were of the house of Rabban Gamaliel חנניה ר' ושל בית ר' and to those that were of the house of R. Ananias, sagan of the priests, there were fourteen<sup>c</sup>," &c. "*R. Ananias*, sagan of the priests, saith<sup>d</sup>," &c. "*Ananias*, sagan of the priests, was slain<sup>e</sup> in the time of the destruction (of Jerusalem), with Rabban Simeon the son of Gamaliel<sup>f</sup>." "*R. Ananias* the sagan is said to be slain on the five-and-twentieth day of the month Sivan, together with Rabban Simeon Ben Gamaliel and R. Ismael<sup>g</sup>."

If we cannot reconcile the *Ananias* in Josephus with this in St. Luke, let *Ananias* the *sagan* be the *Ananias* mentioned in this place, who may very well be called ἀρχιερεὺς, or *high*

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 698.

<sup>b</sup> *Antiq. lib. xx. cap. 5.* [xx. v. 2.]  
et *De Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. 21.* [ii. 17. 9.]

<sup>c</sup> *Shekalim*, cap. vi. hal. 1.

<sup>d</sup> *Pesachin*, c. i. hal. 6. et *Misn. Hieros.*

<sup>e</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 736.

<sup>f</sup> *Tsemach David*.

<sup>g</sup> *Juchasin*, fol. 57. 1.



*priest*, as may be evident from those titles given to Annas and Caiaphas, Luke iii. 2. Nor doth any thing hinder but that we may easily suppose that *Ananias* the sagan was in the possession of his saganiship at this very time.

Ver. 5: Οὐκ ᾔδειν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεὺς. *I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest.*] I. Suppose he might not know that man to have been *high priest*, or *the sagan*, (which is hardly probable,) yet he could not be ignorant, from the rank he held and the seat he possessed, that he must be at least one of the fathers of the Sanhedrim and rulers of the people; and so in reviling him he transgressed that precept, "Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people," as well as if he had reviled the high priest.

II. It is very little to the credit of the apostle to think, that when he said, "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall," &c. that he uttered it rashly and unadvisedly, or carried away in a heat of passion and indignation, or that he did not know whom he thus threatened, or what degree and office he held. But he spoke it soberly, and as became an apostle, by the authority and guidance of the Holy Ghost. Nor did he nor had he any need to retract those words, or make apology for his rashness; but they are of the very same tenor with the rest that he uttered.

III. If this *Ananias* was that *sagan of the priest* that perished in the destruction of Jerusalem, as hath been already said, I would conceive his death was foretold prophetically by the apostle, rather than that he rashly poured out words that he afterward retracted. Let me, therefore, paraphrase upon the words before us: "I know it is not lawful to speak evil of the ruler of the people; nor would I have said these things to him which I have, if I had owned such a one; but I did not own him so, for he is not worthy the name of a high priest."

IV. The president of the Sanhedrim at this time was Rabban Simeon Ben Gamaliel: his father Gamaliel having been dead about two or three years before. Paul knew Simeon, and Simeon very well knew him, having been fellow-disciples, and both sat together at the feet of Gamaliel. Nor indeed could he be ignorant of any of the rulers of the people, if they were of any age, because he had been so long educated

and conversed in Jerusalem<sup>b</sup>. So that it is very improbable he should not know either *Ananias the high priest*, if he were now present, or *Ananias the sagan*, or indeed any of the fathers of the Sanhedrim, if they had any years upon their backs.

Indeed, not a few years had passed since he had left Jerusalem : but seeing formerly he had spent so many years there, and had been of that degree and order that he was an officer of the Sanhedrim, and had a patent from them, he could not have so slippery and treacherous a memory but that upon his return he could readily know and distinguish their faces and persons. And whereas it is said in the verse immediately following, that " Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees," &c. if it should be asked, whence he came to distinguish so well concerning their persons ; it may be answered, that (if he had no other ways to know them) he might understand that by his former knowledge of them : he had known them from the time that he himself had been a Pharisee, and conversed among them. See chap. xxii. 5.

V. Forasmuch therefore as he saith, *οὐκ ᾔδειν, I wist not*, I do not see how it can argue so much an ignorance of his person (with whom he might have had some former transactions in obtaining that accursed commission against the followers of Christ), but that it must relate to his affection rather than his understanding. So that the sense is, " I knew not that there was any high priest at all ;" or, " I do not acknowledge this person for such a one." It was safer to inveigh against the person than the office : but if he had said concerning the very office, " I do not know that there is any high priest at all," I question not but he had uttered his mind ; being well assured that that high priesthood was now antiquated by the death of our great High Priest Jesus.

For let us lay down this problem : Although the apostle, as to other things, had owned the service of the temple (for he was purified in it), yet as to the high priesthood he did not own the peculiar ministry of that ; doth it not carry truth with it, seeing God by an irrefragable token, viz. the rending of the veil of the temple from the top to the bottom, had shewn the end and abolishing of that office ?

But suppose the words of the apostle relate to the person

<sup>b</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 699.

and not the office, and that they were spoken in reference to the man himself; "I do not own him ἀρχιερεύς, *high priest*; he is not worthy of that title:" perhaps St. Paul knew of old how wicked a person he had been; or from his present injustice or rash severity had reason enough to make such a reply. To *know* instead of to *own* and *acknowledge* is not unusual in Scripture style. That is a sad and dreadful instance enough, "I know you not; depart from me, ye workers of iniquity!" And in the Jewish writings, when R. Judah being angry with Bar Kaphrah only said to him, "I know thee not," he went away as נִוּיָהּ *one rebuked*, and took נִיפָהּ *the rebuke* to himself. The story is this<sup>1</sup>: "When Bar Kaphrah came to visit him, he said unto him, בַּר קַפְרָה אֵינִי מְכִירָךְ מֵעוֹלָם, 'O Bar Kaphrah, I never knew thee.' He understood what he meant: therefore he took the rebuke unto himself for the space of thirty days."

Ver. 8<sup>k</sup>: Σαδδουκαῖοι μὲν γὰρ λέγουσι μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν. *The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection.*] What therefore is the religion of a *Sadducee*? He prays; he fasts; he offers sacrifice; he observes the law; and yet doth not expect a *resurrection* or life eternal. To what end is this religion? It is that he may obtain temporal good things, observing only the promise of them made in the law, and he seeks for nothing beyond the mere letter. That the *Sadducees* took their denomination from one *Sadoc*, a disciple of Antigonus Socheus, is commonly received, and that not without reason. In the mean time it may not be amiss to inquire whether *Sadoc* did himself deny the *resurrection*; and whether he rejected all the books of the Holy Scripture excepting the five books of Moses, which the *Sadducees* in some measure did.

I. The Jewish writers do relate his story with so much variety, that, as some represent him, we might think he denied the *resurrection* and future rewards; but, as others, that he did not. For so say some<sup>1</sup>: "Sadoc and Baithus were the heads of the heretics; for they erred concerning the words of their master," &c. "Sadoc<sup>m</sup> and Baithus hearing this passage from their master, 'Be ye not as servants that serve their master for hire and reward's sake;' &c. they said among them-

<sup>1</sup> Moed Katon, fol. 16. 1.

<sup>k</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 737.

<sup>1</sup> Juchasin, fol. 15. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Rabbam in Avoth, cap. 1.

selves, 'Our master teaches us that there is neither reward nor punishment,' &c. Therefore they departed from the rule and forsook the law," &c.

Others<sup>n</sup> say otherwise; "Antigonus Socheus had two disciples, who delivered his doctrine to their disciples, and their disciples again to their disciples; they stood forth and taught after them and said, 'What did our fathers see that they should say, It is possible for a labourer to perform all his work for the whole day, and yet not receive his wages in the evening? Surely if our fathers had thought there was another world, and *the resurrection* of the dead, they would not have said thus," &c. "Antigonus Socheus<sup>o</sup> had two disciples; their names<sup>p</sup> Sadoc and Baithus: he taught them, saying, 'Be ye not as hirelings, that serve their masters only that they may receive their pay,' &c. They went and taught this to their disciples, and to the disciples of their disciples; **לֹא אָמְרוּ פִירוּשׁוֹ** *but they did not expound his sense.*" [Mark that.] "There arose up after them that said, 'If our fathers had known that there were *a resurrection*, and a recompense for the just in the world to come, they had not said this.' So they arose up and separated from the law, &c. And from thence sprung those two evil sects, the Sadducees and Baithuseans." Let us but add that of Rambam, mentioned before; **לֹא הִבִּינוּ כוֹנֵנוֹ** "Sadoc and Baithus *did not understand the sense of their master* in those words, 'Be ye not as servants who serve their master for the reward's sake,'" &c.

From all which compared together, as we find the Jewish writers varying from one another somewhat in relating this story, so from the latter passages compared one would believe that Sadoc was not a *Sadducee*, nor Baithus a Baithusean; that is, that neither of them was leavened with that heresy that denied *the resurrection*, &c. There was an occasion taken from the words of Antigonus, misunderstood and depraved, to raise such a heresy; but it was not by Sadoc or Baithus; for they "did not understand the sense of them," saith Rambam: and, as it appears out of the *Aruch*, they propounded the naked words to their disciples without any

<sup>n</sup> Avoth R. Nathan, cap. 5.

<sup>o</sup> Aruch in ביתוסין.

<sup>p</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 700.

gloss at all upon them, and their disciples again to the disciples that followed them; so that the name, sect, and heresy of the *Sadducees* do not seem to have sprung up till the second or third generation after Sadoc himself: which, if I mistake not, is not unworthy our remark as to the story and chronology. There was a time when I believed, (and who believes it not?) being led to it by the author of *Juchasin* and Maimonides, that Sadoc himself was the first author of the sect and heterodoxy of the *Sadducees*; but weighing a little more strictly this matter from the allegations I have newly made out of R. Nathan and *Aruch*, it seems to me more probable that that sect did not spring up till many years after the death of Sadoc. Let us compare the times.

The Talmudists themselves own that story that Josephus tells us of Jaddua, whom Alexander the Great met and worshipped: but they alter the name, and say it was Simeon the Just. Let those endeavour to reconcile Josephus with the Talmudists about the person and the name, who believe any thing of the story and thing itself; but let Simeon the Just and Jaddua be one and the same person, as some would have it<sup>9</sup>. So then the times of Simeon the Just and Alexander the Great are coincident. Let Antigonus Socheus, who took the chair after him, be contemporary with Ptolemeus Lagus. Let Sadoc and Baithus, both his disciples, be of the same age with Ptolemeus Philadelphus. And so the times of at least one generation (if not a second) of the disciples of Sadoc may have run out before the name of *Sadducees* took place.

If there be any truth or probability in these things, we shall do well to consider them when we come to inquire upon what reasons the *Sadducees* received not the rest of the books of the sacred volume with the same authority they did those of the five books of Moses. I ask therefore, first, whether this was done before the Greek version was writ? You will hardly say Antigonus, or indeed Sadoc his disciple, was touched with this error. He would have been a monster of a president of the Sanhedrim that should not acknowledge that distinction<sup>r</sup> of the law, "the prophets and holy writings." And it would be strange if Sadoc should from his master renounce all the other books excepting the Pentateuch.

<sup>9</sup> Vide *Juchas.* fol. 14. 1.

<sup>r</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 738.

The *Sadducees* might learn indeed from the scribes and Pharisees themselves to give a greater share of honour to the Pentateuch than the other books, for even they did so; but that they should reject them, so at least as not to read them in their synagogues, there was some other thing that must have moved them to it.

When I take notice of this passage<sup>s</sup>, that “five of the elders translated the law into Greek for Ptolemy;” and that in Josephus<sup>t</sup>, that “the law only was translated;” and both these before so much as the name or sect of the *Sadducees* was known in the world, I begin to suspect the *Sadducees*, especially the Samaritans, might have drawn something from this example: at least, if that be true that is related by Aristeas; that he was under an anathema that should add any thing to or alter any thing in that version. When the *Sadducees* therefore would be separating into a sect, having imbibed that heresy, *that there is no resurrection*, and wrested the words of Antigonus into such a sense, it is less wonder if they would admit of none but the books of Moses only; because there was nothing plainly occurred in them that contradicted their error: and further, because those ancients of great name having rendered those five books only into Greek, seem to have consigned no other for books of a divine stamp. I do not at all think that all the *Sadducees* did follow that version, but I suspect that the Samaritans took something from thence into their own text. It is said by some, in defence of the Greek version, that in many things it agrees with the Hebrew text of the Samaritans<sup>u</sup>, as if that text were purer than our Hebrew, and that the Greek interpreters followed that text. They do indeed agree often; but if I should say that the Samaritan text in those places, or in some of them, hath followed the Greek version, and not the Greek version the Samaritan text, I presume I should not be easily confuted.

Shall I give you one or two agreements in the very beginning of the Pentateuch? In Gen. ii. 2 the Hebrew text is, וַיִּכַּל אֱלֹהִים בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי *For God ended his work on the ‘seventh’ day*: but the Greek hath it, Καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ Θεὸς

<sup>s</sup> Massech. Soph. cap. 1.

<sup>t</sup> Antiq. lib. i. cap. 1. [Procem. 3.]

<sup>u</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 701.

ἐν ἡ ἡμέρᾳ ἕκτῃ, *God finished his work on the 'sixth' day.* The Samaritan text agrees with this, ויכל אלהים ביום הששי *He finished his work on the 'sixth' day, &c.* You will say, 'The Greek version translated according to the Samaritan text.' I say, 'The Samaritan text was framed according to this Greek version.' Who shall determine this matter between us? That which goes current amongst the Jews makes for me; viz. that "this alteration was made by the LXXII<sup>x</sup>." But be it all one which followeth the other in this agreement, we next produce, in the same chapter, Gen. ii. 19: ויצר יהוה אלהים מן האדמה *The Lord God had formed out of the ground.* The Greek words are, Καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ Θεὸς ἔτι ἐκ τῆς γῆς, *The Lord God formed as yet out of the ground.* The Samaritan text agrees, ויצר יהוה אלהים עוד מן האדמה. We will not inquire here which follows which, but we rather complain of the boldness of both; the one to add the word ἔτι, and the other עוד, *as yet*; which seems to persuade us that God, after he had created Adam and Eve, did over and above create something anew; which to me is a thing as yet unheard of: and to whom is it not?

Μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν *That there is no resurrection.*] In my notes upon Matth. iii. 9 I take notice of the Gloss upon *Beracoth*<sup>y</sup> (if he be of any credit), that there were heretics even in the days of Ezra, who said that "there is no world but this:" which indeed falls in with Sadduceism, though the name of *Sadducee* was not known then, nor a long time after. But as to their heresy when they first sprung up, they seem principally, and in the first place, to have denied the immortality of the soul; and so, by consequence, the resurrection of the body.

I know that תחיית המתים in the Jewish writers is taken infinite times for *the resurrection of the dead*, but it is very often taken also for *the life of the dead*; so as the one denotes *the resurrection of the body*, the other *the immortality of the soul*.

In the beginning of the Talmudic chapter *Helec*, where there is a discourse on purpose concerning the life of the world to come, they collect several arguments to prove תחיית התורה *the life of the dead out of the law*; for so

<sup>x</sup> Megill. fol. 9. 1. Massech. Sopher. cap. 1.

<sup>y</sup> Babyl. fol. 54. 1.

let me render it here rather than *the resurrection of the dead*. And the reason of it we may judge from that one argument which they bring<sup>z</sup>, instead of many others; viz. "Some do say that it is proved out of this Scripture. He saith unto them, 'But ye that did cleave unto the Lord your God הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה כָּלְכֶם הַיּוֹם *are alive every one of you this day,*' Deut. iv. 4. פְּשִׁיטָא דְהַיּוֹם כֹּלְכֶם הַיּוֹם *It is plain that you are now alive,* when Moses speaks these things; but he means this, that in the day wherein all the world is dead ye shall live:" that is, "Ye also, though dead, shall live;" which rather speaks out the immortality of the soul after death than the resurrection of the body. So our Saviour's answer to the *Sadducees*, Matt. xxii. 31, 32, from those words, "I am<sup>a</sup> the God of Abraham," &c. is fitted directly to confute their opinion against the immortality of the soul; but it little, either plainly or directly, so proves the resurrection of the body, but that the *Sadducees* might cavil at that way of proof.

And in that saying of the *Sadducees* themselves, concerning the labourer working all the day and not receiving his wages at night, there is a plain intimation that they especially considered of the state of the soul after death, and the non-resurrection of the body by consequence. Let the words therefore be taken in this sense; "The *Sadducees* say, 'Souls are not immortal, and that there are neither angels nor spirits;'" and then the twofold branch which our sacred historian speaks of will the more clearly appear when he saith, "But the Pharisees confess both."

It is doubtful from the words of Josephus<sup>b</sup> whether the *Essenes* acknowledge *the resurrection* of the body, when in the mean time they did most heartily own the immortality of the soul: Καὶ γὰρ ἔρρωται παρ' αὐτοῖς ἥδε ἡ δόξα, φθαρτὰ μὲν εἶναι τὰ σώματα, καὶ τὴν ἕλην οὐ μόνιμον αὐτοῖς, τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς ἀθανάτους ἀεὶ διαμένειν *This opinion prevails amongst them, that the body indeed is corruptible, and the matter of it doth not endure; but souls endure for ever immortal.* So that the question chiefly is concerned about the soul's immortality.

Μηδὲ ἄγγελου μήτε πνεῦμα· *Neither angel, nor spirit*<sup>c</sup>.] They deny that the soul is immortal, and they deny any spirits, (in

<sup>z</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 90. 2.

<sup>a</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p.

<sup>b</sup> Bell Jud. lib. ii. c. 12. [Hudson, p. 1064.] [ii. 8. II.]

<sup>c</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 702.



the mean time, perhaps, not denying God to be a spirit, and that there is a Spirit of God mentioned Gen. i. 2.) And it is a question whether they took not the occasion of their opinion from that deep silence they observe in Moses concerning the creation of angels or spirits, or from something else.

There is frequent mention in him of the apparitions of angels: and what can the Sadducee say to this? Think you the Samaritans were *Sadducees*? If so, it is very observable that the Samaritan interpreter doth once and again render the word אֱלֹהִים *God*, by מלאכיה *angels*. So Gen. iii. 5; "Ye shall be as *Elohim*;" Samar. תהונו כמלאכיה *Ye shall be as 'angels.'* Chap. v. 1; "In the similitude of *God*:" Samar. בצורת מלאכיה *In the similitude of 'angels.'* So also chap. ix. 6: בצורת מלאכיה *In the similitude of 'angels.'* And wherever there is mention of angels in the Hebrew text, the Samaritan text retains the word *angels* too.

Did not the *Sadducees* believe there were *angels* once, but their very being was for ever vanished? that they vanished with Moses, and were no more? Did they believe that the soul of Moses was mortal, and perished with his body? and that the *angels* died with him? Otherwise, I know not by what art or wit they could evade what they meet with in the books of Moses concerning *angels*; that especially in Gen. xxxii. 1.

You will say perhaps that by *angels* might be meant 'good motions and affections of the mind.' The Pharisees themselves do sometimes call 'evil affections' by the name of 'devils:' צר הרע שטן *an evil affection is Satan*. But they do not call 'good affections' *angels*, nor can ye yourselves apply that passage so; "The angels of God met him, and he called the name of that place *Mahanaim*;" i. e. *two camps*, or *two hosts*. One of those camps consisted of the multitude of his own family: and will you have the other to consist of 'good affections?'"

If the *Sadducees* should grant that *angels* were ever created (Moses not mentioning their creation in his history), I should think they acknowledged the being of *angels* in the same sense that we do in the whole story of the Pentateuch; but that they conceived that after the history of the Pentateuch was completed those *angels* were annihilated, and that after Moses there was neither *angel*, nor *spirit*, nor prophecy.

I have in another place taken notice that the Jews com-

monly distinguished between 'angels and spirits' and 'devils. Where by *spirits* they understood either the ghosts of dead persons or spirits in human shape, but not so dreadful and terrible as the angels. And what need is there any more (will the Sadducee say) either of *angel* or *spirit*, when God before Moses died had made known his will by his writings, had given his eternal law, completely constituted his church?

It is an innocent and blameless ignorance not to understand τὰ βάθη τοῦ Σατανᾶ, *the depths of Satan*, and the secrets of heretics; and if in learning their doctrines we mistake, and perhaps not a little, the shame is not much. It is venial to err *concerning* them; to err *with* them is mortal. Let the reader therefore pardon my ignorance, if I confess I am wholly ignorant where lay the difference between the Sadducee and Baithusean; whether they agreed in one, or whether they disagreed in some things. The Holy Scriptures make no mention of the Baithuseans; the Jewish writings talk much of them, and in some things they seem to be distinguished from the Sadducees; but in what it is somewhat obscure.

We have the Sadducees disputing with the Pharisees<sup>d</sup>; and we have the Baithuseans disputing with a Pharisee<sup>e</sup>; and a Baithusean interrogating something of R. Joshua<sup>f</sup>; and frequent mention of them up and down in the Jewish writings. But particularly I cannot let pass one thing I have met with, "Of old they received<sup>h</sup> a testimony of the new moon from any person whatsoever, משקלקלו הַיּוֹנִים *but after that the 'heretics' began to deal deceitfully,*" &c.; so the Jerusalem Misna reads it. But the Babylonian, משקלקלו הביתוסין *After that the 'Baithuseans' began to deal deceitfully, or lightly.* And the *Misna*, published by itself at Amsterdam, hath it, משקלקלו האפיקורוסים *When the 'Epicureans' dealt lightly,* &c. Where both the *Gemaras* tell us, "The Baithuseans endeavoured to lead the wise men into an error, and hired, for the sum of four hundred zuzees, one of our own and one of theirs, to give in a false testimony as to the new moons," &c. The Glosses give this reason of it: "The thirtieth day of the

<sup>d</sup> Jadaim, cap. 4.

<sup>e</sup> Menacoth, fol. 65. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Schabb. fol. 108. 1.

<sup>g</sup> Rosh hashanah, cap. 2. hal. 1.

<sup>h</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 740.

month Adar fell upon a sabbath; and the new moon did not appear in its time. And the Baithuseans were desirous that the first day of the Passover should fall upon the sabbath, that the sheaf-offering might fall upon the first day of the week; and so the day of Pentecost upon the first day of the week also."

Who now should these Baithuseans be, Sadducees, or Samaritans, or Christians, or some fourth sect? The Christians, indeed, would have the day of Pentecost on the first day of the week; but whether they mean them in this particular let others judge. In other things otherwise. "Wherefore<sup>i</sup> do they adjure the high priest?" [viz. that he rightly perform the service<sup>k</sup> of the day of expiation:] "Because of the Baithuseans, who say, 'Let him burn incense without, and bring it within.' There is a story of a certain person that burnt incense without and brought it within . . . Concerning whom one said, I should wonder if he should live very long. They say that he died in a very little time after." You would believe this was a high priest and a Baithusean.

Ver. 9: *Γραμματεῖς τοῦ μέρους τῶν Φαρισαίων*. *The scribes that were of the Pharisees' part.*] For there were also "scribes of the Sadducees' part:" and on both parts the *γραμματεῖς*, *scribes*, must not be distinguished either from the Pharisees or from the Sadducees that were now present in the Sanhedrim: but the meaning is, the scribes that were of the sect or profession of the Sadducees, or of the Pharisees; and by this twofold division the whole Sanhedrim is to be understood. But if we would take the thing more strictly, there were in the Sanhedrim some scribes who took the part of the Pharisees against the Sadducees who yet were not of the sect of the Pharisees. I should believe the Shammeans and Hillelites were all against the Sadducees; and yet I should hardly believe all of them of the sect of the Pharisees. We find them frequently disputing and quarrelling one against the other in the Talmudic writings; and yet I do not think that either the one or the other favoured the Sadducee, nor that all of them bore good-will to Pharisaism. There is a bloody fight between them mentioned<sup>l</sup>; "The Shammeans" (who at that time were

<sup>i</sup> Hieros. Joma, fol. 39. 1.      <sup>k</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 703.

<sup>l</sup> Hieros. Schabb. fol. 3. 3.

the greatest number) “stood below, and killed some of the Hillelites.” This was done in the house of Hananiah Ben Hezekiah Ben Garon, whom they came to visit, being sick. A friendly visit this indeed!

Ver. 11: Οὕτω σε δεῖ καὶ εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρῆσαι. *So must thou bear witness also at Rome.*] Hence the warrant and intimation given to St. Paul of appealing to Cæsar. It was a rare thing for a Jew to appeal to any heathenish tribunal; and it savoured of venomous malice the Sanhedrim had against Jesus, that they delivered him over to a heathen judge. St. Paul, therefore, when he found no place or manner of escaping otherwise, was directed by this vision what to do.

Ver. 12: Μῆτε φαγεῖν μῆτε πιεῖν, &c. *Neither eat nor drink, &c.*] What will become of these anathematized persons if their curse should be upon them, and they cannot reach to murder Paul? (as indeed it happened they could not:) must not these wretches helplessly die with hunger? Alas! they need not be very solicitous about that matter; they have their casuist-Rabbins that can easily release them of that vow<sup>m</sup>: לא אחר שנדר מן הכנר ווי דייכל ווי דלא ייכול “*He that hath made a vow not to eat any thing, woe to him if he eat; and woe to him if he do not eat.* If he eat, he sinneth against his vow; if he do not eat, he sinneth against his life. What must such a man do in this sense? ילך אצל חכמים ויתירו לו את נדרו *Let him go to the wise men, and they will loose his vow;* according as it is written, ‘The tongue of the wise is health,’” Prov. xii. 18. It is no wonder if they were prodigal and monstrous in their vows, when they could be so easily absolved.

## CHAP. XXVIII.<sup>n</sup>

Ver. 1: Μελίτη *Melita.*] Pliny tells us<sup>o</sup>, that in the Sicilian sea “*Insulæ sunt in Africam versæ, Gauros, Melita,*” &c.; ‘there are islands towards Africa, Gauros, *Melita*, from Camerina eighty-four miles, from Lilybæum a hundred and thirteen.’ Ptolemy reckons it amongst the maritime islands of Africa: for thus he distinguisheth; Νῆσοι τῇ Ἀφρικῇ παρακείμεναι πλησίον τῆς γῆς, *islands adjacent to Afric, near the land.*

<sup>m</sup> Hieros. Avodah Zarah, fol. 40. 1.    <sup>n</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 704.

<sup>o</sup> Nat. Hist. lib. iii. cap. 8.

And νῆσοι πελάγαι τῆς Ἀφρικῆς, *the maritime islands of Afric.* Amongst these latter we find the island *Melita*, in which was the city:—

Melita	38. 45.	34. 40.
Chersonesus	38. 40.	34. 45.
Juno's Temple	39.	34. 40.
Hercules' Temple	38. 45.	36. 6.

Πρόκειται δὲ τοῦ Παχύνου Μελίτη<sup>p</sup>, &c. “*Before Pachynus lieth Melita<sup>q</sup>, and Gaudus*” (Pliny calleth it *Gauros*) “*eighty-three miles from both*” (i. e. Sicily and Pachynus), “*both being distant eighty-eight miles:*” where the Latin interpreter saith *furlongs*, making a very vast defect in the measure. Whereas, therefore, according to the same Strabo<sup>r</sup>, the distance between Carthage and Lilybæum of Sicily was *χιλίων καὶ πεντακοσίων σταδίων*, *one thousand five hundred furlongs*, or near two hundred miles, and *Melita* from Lilybæum one hundred and thirteen miles, it is evident that island was situated almost in the middle between the Sicilian and the African shore, anciently under the jurisdiction of Carthage: and from them perhaps took the name of *Melita*, which in their language signifies *evasion* or *escape* from מִלֵּט, to *escape*, from the mariners that sail out of Africa, *escaping* the danger of the Syrtes. It was certainly an *escape* to Paul and the rest that were shipwrecked with him in this place.

Ver. 2: Οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι, &c. *And the barbarous people, &c.* Col. iii. 11: Ἕλληνας, Βάρβαρος, Σκύθης. *Greek, Barbarian, Scythian.*] I. The Gentiles were called by the Jews יוֹנִים Ἕλληνας, *Greeks*; partly because the Greeks excelled all other nations in language and learning; partly because the Jews had so long lain under the empire of the *Greeks*, the Ptolemies on one side, and the Seleucidæ on the other. From whence, I. חִכְמַת יוֹנִית *the wisdom of the Greeks* is commonly taken by the Rabbins for all kind of Gentile learning, wherein the Grecians peculiarly excelled. Hence that passage<sup>s</sup>; שֶׁם יִפְתָּח בְּאֹהֲלֵי שָׁם יִפְתָּח יִפְתּוֹת שֶׁל יִפְתָּח יִפְתּוֹת שֶׁל יִפְתָּח *The beauty of Japheth shall be in the tabernacles of Sem.* The Gloss is, “*This is the Greek tongue, which is more elegant than any language of the chil-*

<sup>p</sup> Strab. vi. [2.]

<sup>q</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 741.

<sup>r</sup> xvii. [3.]

<sup>s</sup> Megillah, fol. 9. 2.

dren of Japheth." And *Aruch* in יון; מובחרת; יון כתיבת יון מובחרת. *The Greek way of writing is most elegant.* And hence is it, 2. That the Jews, even while they were under the Roman yoke, counted their years by the epocha or era of the *Greeks*, that is, the *Seleucidæ*. Whence that cavil of the Sadducee; "A certain Sadducee said, 'I rebuke you, O ye Pharisees, because you write the emperor with Moses<sup>t</sup>.'" The Gloss is, "In writings of contracts, they write the years of the kings, and this also, יהוה נרת משה וישראל, *and this also is according to the law of Moses and Israel;*" viz. that they might reckon according to the years of the *Seleucidæ*. See Josephus and the book of Maccabees.

II. After the same manner that the Jews called all Gentiles *Greeks*, so the *Greeks* called all other nations but their own *barbarians*. Strabo<sup>u</sup> largely discusseth the reason of that name, and him the reader may consult. Perhaps the etymology of the word may have some relation with בר *bar*, a Chaldee word, which signifies *without*. Whence בר a *stranger*, or one of another country, in the Samaritan version is בראי a *foreigner*; so that בר בראי the word being doubled denotes a *great foreigner*<sup>x</sup>. But to let etymologies pass, I take notice that the Syriac in that place of the Colossians before quoted, instead of Ἑλλην, *Greek*, hath ארמייא; for βαρβάρους, *barbarian*, hath יוניא *Greek*, (which is chiefly to be taken notice of,) and for Σκύθης, *Scythian*, ברברייא. Whence these  $\gamma$  inhabitants of *Melita* should be termed *βάρβαροι*, *barbarous people*, is something obscure; when doubtless the island itself was under the Roman jurisdiction, which the very name *Publius*, who was the chief of this island, does make out. However, the inhabitants seem to be Africans, brought over thither by the Carthaginians when they had possession of that island. For I hardly think St. Luke would call the Romans *barbarians* when they were so very cultivated a nation, and all people were ambitious of the name of a *Roman*, St. Paul himself having obtained it. The people of *Melita*, perhaps, were transplanted out of *Barbary* itself, as that part of Africa at length was called.

"The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God. אילר

<sup>t</sup> Jadaim, c. 4. hal. 8.

<sup>u</sup> xiv. [2.]

<sup>x</sup> [valde extraneus.]

<sup>y</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 705.

מַרְשָׁנַי אֲנָשֵׁי בַרְבַּרְיָא וְאֲנָשֵׁי מַוְרִיטַנְיָא *These are the men of Barbary, and the men of Mauritania*, that walk naked in the streets. Nor is there any thing more loathsome and execrable before God than he that goes naked in the streets.<sup>γ</sup>”

Ver. 4: Ἡ δίκη ζῆν οὐκ εἶσεν *Vengeance suffereth not to live.*] That of the Jewish writers is not much unlike this<sup>z</sup>: “Although the Sanhedrim is ceased, yet are not the four deaths ceased. For he that deserves stoning either falls from his house, or a wild beast tears and devours him. He that deserves burning either falls into the fire or a serpent bites him. He that deserves cutting off with the sword is either betrayed into the power of a heathen kingdom or the robbers break in upon him. He that deserves strangling is either suffocated in the waters or dies by a squinancy.”

Ver. 5: Ἀποτινάξας τὸ θηρίον εἰς τὸ πῦρ, &c. *He shook off the beast into the fire.*] The first miraculous sign recorded in the Holy Scriptures is about a serpent, Exod. iv: and so is this last, for they may both be reckoned amongst mere signs.

Ver. 10: Οἱ καὶ πολλαῖς τιμαῖς ἐτίμησαν ἡμᾶς. *Who also honoured us with many honours.*] That is, ‘bestowed many gifts upon us:’ “Manoah<sup>a</sup> said to the angel of the Lord, What is thy name, that when thy words shall come to pass וְכִבְדְנָהּ *we may do thee honour?* that is, לך דורון *we may give thee a gift:* nor is וְכִבְדְנָהּ any other than, *We may do thee honour with some gift.* According as it is said, כִּבְדֵּן אֶתְּכֶם בְּכִבְדֵּן *In honouring I will honour thee,*” Num. xxii. 16. So 1 Tim. v. 3, “Honour widows that are widows indeed.”

Ver. 11<sup>b</sup>: Παρασήμῳ Διοσκούροισ· *Whose sign was Castor and Pollux.*] Gemini in the zodiac, commonly pictured sitting upon horses. And so they appeared (if we will believe the historian) in that fight at the lake Regillus, leading on the Roman horse, and so pressing upon the enemy, that under their conduct the victory was obtained<sup>c</sup>. But another time the pseudo-Castores, false Castor and Pollux, appeared not so fortunately<sup>d</sup>: Λακεδαιμονίων ἐπὶ στρατοπέδου Διοσκούροισ ἐορτήν ἀγόντων, &c. “While the Lacedæmonians were celebrating

<sup>γ</sup> Jevamoth, fol. 63. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 37. 2. Bemid. Rab. fol. 250. 2.

<sup>a</sup> Bemidh. Rab. fol. 239. 3.

<sup>b</sup> Leusden's edition, vol. ii. p. 742.

<sup>c</sup> Dionys. vi. [47.]

<sup>d</sup> Pausanias in Messeniæcis, iv.

[27.]

the feast of *Castor and Pollux* within their camp, and had given themselves to sports and drinking, after dinner Gonippus and Panormus" [two Messenian young men that were wont to waste the Lacedæmonians] "of a sudden appear amongst these Lacedæmonians, clothed in white tunics and purple cloaks, mounted on beautiful horses. The Lacedæmonians beholding them, and supposing them no other than *Castor and Pollux*, and that they were come to their own festivals, worship them, and make their prayers to them. But the young men, as soon as they found themselves received in the midst of them, break through them making slaughter everywhere with their lances; and so a great number being slain they return safe to Audania, casting a reproach upon the feast of *Castor and Pollux*."

\* From the habit of these pseudo-Castores, false *Castor and Pollux*, it is easy conjecturing in what form they were wont to be pictured, who in the judgment of the deceived people were the true ones. Comely young men, in comely apparel, and riding on horseback; and yet they are sometimes drawn on foot, as in that obscure passage in the same Pausanias<sup>e</sup>, Τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν τῶν Διοσκούρων ἐστὶν ἀρχαῖον, αὐτοὶ τε ἐστῶτες, καὶ οἱ παῖδες καθήμενοι σφίσιω ἐφ' ἵππων; where the Latin interpreter renders it, "The temple of *Castor and Pollux* is very ancient<sup>f</sup>, where young men are beheld sitting on horseback." But the words of the author are plainly to this purpose, that "*Castor and Pollux* are drawn standing, and their boys on horseback." There is something parallel in another place of this author that gives some light in this matters: Μερὰ δὲ ταῦτα Διοσκούρων ναός. Ἄγαλμα δὲ αὐτοὶ τε καὶ οἱ παῖδες εἰσι, Ἄναξις καὶ Μνασίνουσ, σὺν τε σφίσιω αἱ μητέρες Ἰλάρεια καὶ Φοίβη, etc. After this is the temple of *Castor and Pollux*. They are pictured themselves, and their two sons, *Anaxis and Mnasinous*, and together with them their mothers, *Hilaria and Phœbe*, done by the skill of *Dipœnus and Scyllis* in ebony wood: the greater part even of the horses being made of ebony; the rest, though very little, of ivory.

It was believed they were propitious deities to mariners; and therefore does the centurion, having been so lately ship-

<sup>e</sup> Pausan. in Atticis, [xviii. 18.] <sup>f</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 706.

<sup>g</sup> In Corinthiacis, ii. [22.]



wrecked, so much the rather commit himself to a ship that carried that sign. And what doth St. Paul say to such a superstition? He knew he had the convoy and protection of a better Deity, nor is it improbable but that the centurion had imbibed something of Christianity himself; and it would be strange if some of the soldiers by so long society with St. Paul had not also. But it seems there was no other ship ready, at least no other that was bound for Italy.

Ver. 13: ἤλθομεν εἰς Ποιόλους. *We came to Puteoli.*] Πόλις ἐμπορείου γεγένηται μέγιστον, χειροποιήτους ἔχουσα ὄρμους.<sup>h</sup> *It is a city, a very great mart town, where there are havens for ships made by art and labour.* Whence it is less wonder if now there were Christians there, either such as were merchants themselves, or such as were instructed in Christianity by merchants trading there.

The Jewish writers make some mention of this place with this story<sup>i</sup>: “Rabban Gamaliel, and R. Eliezer Ben Azariah, and R. Joshua, and R. Akiba, לרומי נכנסין ἤλθον εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην, *went to Rome*, [i. e. made a voyage to Rome, as in this chap. ver. 14, ἤλθομεν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην, *we went towards Rome*:] “מפוטליולוס קול המונה של רומי *and they heard the sound of the multitude at Rome*, being distant a hundred and twenty miles. Therefore they began to weep, but R. Akiba laughed. They say unto him, O Akiba, why shouldst thou laugh while we weep? He saith unto them, And why should you weep? They make answer, Have we not cause to weep, when these Gentile idolaters worship their idols, and yet remain prosperous and quiet, whiles in the mean time the temple, the footstool of our God, is become a flame, and a habitation for wild beasts? Have we not cause to weep? To whom he answereth, For this very cause do I laugh; for if it be so prosperous with those that provoke God to anger, how much more shall it be so to those that do his will!”

This story is repeated elsewhere<sup>k</sup>; and there, instead of פוטליולוס *Puteolus*, it is set פרטיה; and yet the Gloss upon the place, quoted out of *Echah Rabbathi*, tells us, that “in the third chapter of the treatise *Maccoth*, it is written פטולוס.”

<sup>h</sup> Strabo, v. [4.]

<sup>i</sup> Echah Rabbath. fol. 81. 2.

<sup>k</sup> Maccoth, fol. 24. 1.

St. Paul and the rest abide at *Puteoli* seven days at the entreaty of the Christians of that place: which redounded to the credit of the centurion, whose leave must be obtained in that case: so that his yielding so far may somewhat argue that he favoured Christianity.

Ver. 15: 'Εξήλθον εἰς ἀπάντησιν ἡμῶν ἕχρισ 'Αππίου Φόρου καὶ Τριῶν Ταβερνῶν *They came to meet us as far as Appii forum and The three taverns.*] 'Via Appia' and *Appii forum* are much spoke of in authors; but the mention of *The three taverns* is not so frequent. There is mention in Zosimus<sup>1</sup> of *Τρία καπηλεῖα*, i. e. *The three victualling-houses*; where Severus the emperor was strangled by the treason of Maximianus Herculius and Maxentius his son.

<sup>1</sup> Zosim, lib. ii.



HEBREW AND TALMUDICAL  
EXERCITATIONS  
UPON  
SOME FEW CHAPTERS  
OF THE  
EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

---

CHAP. III.<sup>a</sup>

VER. 12: Πάντες ἐξέκλιαν, &c. *They are all gone out of the way, &c.*] I. This with the following part of the quotation is taken out of the fourteenth Psalm, according to the Greek version; being indeed added to the Hebrew context: which is in truth a thing not unusual either to those interpreters or the ordinary interpreters in the synagogues. We have already observed elsewhere, that there stood by the reader of the Law and the Prophets in the synagogues an interpreter, that was wont to render what was read to the people in the Hebrew into their own language, and that it was a very usual thing for those interpreters to expatiate, and, by way of comment, to preach upon the words that had been read. Concerning which I have given some instances; a thing also observable enough in the Chaldee paraphrasts.

II. That the Greek interpreters did the same thing upon this Psalm I do not question; indeed the thing speaks itself; especially if we take notice of the subject which is discoursed of there. But let this be taken notice of by the way, that wherever any thing occurs in the Holy Scripture that is either terrifying or disgraceful or threatening the Jews commonly

<sup>a</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 875.—*English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 707.

apply it to the Gentiles, as by numberless instances might be confirmed. These interpreters, therefore, having gotten such a subject in this Psalm, and according to the custom of the nation applying it to the Gentiles; they heap together passages from other places of the Scripture, which they either believe or would have to look the same way, loading and stigmatizing the poor heathen with odious characters enough; for to them the Jews make no doubt, but assuredly believe, all those things do appertain.

III. Our apostle follows their quotations exactly, transcribes their words, approves the truth of the thing, but disproves the falsehood of the application, ver. 19: q. d. "You Jews expound these things of the Gentiles only, as if they did not in the least belong to yourselves. And with the same design likewise have your interpreters multiplied this heap of quotations, having their eye on them: but ye must know that whatever things the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law."

#### CHAP. VIII.

VER. 19: Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως *For the earnest expectation of the creature, &c.*] There is a twofold key hanging at this place that may unlock the whole, and make the sense plain and easy.

I. The first is this phrase *πάντα κτίσις*, which we render *the whole creation*, ver. 22; and we meet with it twice elsewhere in the New Testament, Mark xvi. 15, *Κηρύξατε<sup>b</sup> τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει: Preach the gospel to every creature.* Col. i. 23, *Εὐαγγελίου τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει: The gospel which was preached to every creature.* Now it is apparent enough what is meant by *πάντα κτίσις* in both these places, viz. all nations, or the heathen world. For that which in St. Mark is *κηρύξατε εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει, preach the gospel to every creature,* in St. Matthew is *μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, go and teach all nations.* The very phrase in this place lays claim to that very interpretation. I have also observed upon that place of St. Mark, that that phrase *כל הבריות* which signifies the same with *πάντα κτίσις, every creature*, is applied by the Jews to the Gentiles, and that by way of opposition to Israel.

<sup>b</sup> *English folio edition, vol. ii. p. 708.*

2. The second is, that word *ματαιότητι*, ver. 20, which indeed is not unfitly rendered *vanity*: but then this *vanity* is improperly applied to this vanishing, changeable, dying state of the creation<sup>c</sup>. For *ματαιότης*, *vanity*, doth not so much denote the vanishing condition of the outward state, as it doth the inward *vanity* and emptiness of the mind. So the apostle, speaking of the Gentiles, (concerning whom he speaks here,) tells us, *ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν* *They became vain in their imaginations*<sup>d</sup>. And again, *ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν* *The Gentiles walk in the vanity of their mind*<sup>e</sup>. So also, “The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, *ὅτι εἰσὶ μάταιοι*, *that they are vain*.” To all which let me add this observation further, that throughout this whole place the apostle seemeth to allude to the Israelites’ bondage in Egypt, and their deliverance out of it, with a comparison made betwixt the Jewish and the Gentile church. When God would deliver Israel from his bondage, he challengeth him for his son and his firstborn, *Exod. iv. 22*. And in like manner the people of the Gentiles do earnestly expect and wait for such a kind of manifestation of the sons of God within and among themselves. The Romans, to whom this apostle writes, knew well enough how many and how great predictions and promises it had pleased God to publish by his prophets, concerning gathering together and adopting sons to himself among the Gentiles: the manifestation and production of which sons, the whole Gentile world doth now wait for, as it were, with an outstretched neck.

Ver. 20: *Τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἣ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, &c.* *For the creature was made subject to vanity.*] The Gentile world were *subject to vanity* of mind; but how? *οὐχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα*, *not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same*. May we not say, *ἐματαιώθη ἐκούσα*, *it became vain willingly*, but *ὑπετάγη ματαιότητι οὐχ ἐκούσα*, *it was made subject to vanity not willingly*? For let us recur to the very first original of Gentilism, that is, to the first confusion of languages, by reason of the attempt to build the tower at Babel. I confess there are some passages in the Gloss of the Targumists upon this matter, (*Gen. xi.*) that might move

<sup>c</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 876.

<sup>d</sup> *Rom. i. 21.*

<sup>e</sup> *Ephes. iv. 17.*

<sup>f</sup> *1 Cor. iii. 20.*

laughter ; but as to the sum and scope of the thing, they are worth weighing :

“ They said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, and let its head reach unto the top of heaven, ונעביר לו, בגויה בית סגרו בראשיה, and let us make us a house of worship in the top of it, and let us put a sword into his hand, that he may wage war for us against our enemies, before we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.” We may smile, indeed, at that figment about the idol and the sword, &c. But certainly they do not altogether miss the mark, when they hint to us that this tower was built upon an idolatrous account. So the Talmudists<sup>h</sup> ; “ It is a tradition. R. Nathan saith, כולם לשם ע”ז נתכוונו, *They were all intent upon idolatry.*” And hence it is that they commonly say that “ that generation hath no part in the world to come.” Nor indeed does the severity of the punishment, (viz. the confusion of languages, by which true religion was lost in the world,) argue any less but that they sinned against God in the highest degree in that wicked enterprise. They were inclinable to idolatry willingly and of their own accord ; but that they were subjected to that vanity proceeded from the just indignation and vengeance of God. The whole world lay under heathenism from the first confusion of languages to the bringing in of the gospel among all nations, two thousand years and upwards : and in this its most miserable condition who could not but observe that God was angry ?

Ver. 21 : Ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς. *Shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption* ] The word φθορὰ, sometimes, yea very frequently in the Holy Scriptures, denotes *sinful corruption* ; so 2 Pet. i. 4, φθορὰ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ, *corruption through lust* : 2 Cor. xi. 3<sup>i</sup>, φθαρῆ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν, *your minds should be corrupted* : 1 Cor. xv. 33, φθέρουσιν ἡθῆ χρηστὸ ἁμλίαι κακά, *evil communications corrupt good manners*, &c. So that the sense of the apostle in this place seemeth to be this : “ The Gentile world shall in time *be delivered from the bondage of their sinful corruption*, that is, the *bondage* of their lusts and vile affections, (under which it hath lain for so long a time,) into a noble liberty, such as the sons of God enjoy.”

<sup>g</sup> Targ. Hieros. et Jonath.

<sup>h</sup> Sandhedr. fol. 109. 1.

<sup>i</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 709.

Ver. 22 : Πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις στυγεύζει, &c. *The whole creation groaneth together, &c.*] If it be inquired how the Gentile world groaned and travailed in pain, let them who expound this of the fabric of the material world tell us how *that* groaneth and travaileth. They must needs own it to be a borrowed and allusive phrase. But in the sense which we have pitched upon, the very literal construction may be admitted.

## CHAP. XI.

BEFORE we apply ourselves to the exposition of this chapter, let me make these few inquiries :

I. Whether the Jewish nation, as to the more general and greater part of it, had not been rejected and blinded before such time as our Saviour manifested himself in the flesh? I know well enough that the casting off of that nation is commonly assigned to that horrid wickedness of theirs in murdering the Lord Christ, and persecuting the gospel and his apostles; a wickedness abundantly deserving their rejection indeed: but were they not blinded and cast off before? They were γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, *a generation of vipers*, at the time that the Baptist first appeared amongst them; and this bears the same signification as 'the seed of the serpent.'

Our Saviour preacheth to them in parables, "that they might neither see, nor hear, nor be converted, nor their sins be forgiven them," Mark iv. 11, 12: which may give ground of suspicion that that people were cast off, to whom Christ preaches in such a form and manner of oratory on purpose that "they should not be converted."

If<sup>k</sup> they were Jews to whom St. Peter directs his First Epistle, (as who indeed doth deny it?) then there is some weight in those words, chap. ii. 10, "Ye were in times past not a people."

II. Is it not very agreeable to reason and Scripture to suppose that nation cast off for the entertainment they had given to their fond and impious traditions? A reprobate people certainly they were, whose religion had made void the commandments of God: a reprobate nation, who in vain worshipped God after the commandments of men, Matt. xv; and by such commandments of men which had leavened, yea, poi-

<sup>k</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 877.



soned their minds with blasphemy and hatred against the true Messiah and the pure truth of God, Isa. xxix. 13: "Because the fear of this people towards me is taught by the precept of men, therefore the wisdom of their wise men shall perish," &c. May we not from this original derive the first original of the rejection of this people? And by how much the more they are bewitched with the love of their traditions, by so much the more we may suppose them separated from God, hardened, and cast off: so that the apostle seems to look back to times before the murdering of our Lord, when he is discoursing about the casting off of that nation.

III. Was not the gospel brought unto and published amongst the ten tribes as well as amongst the Jews when the apostle wrote this Epistle? The determination of this matter seems to conduce something towards the explaining of this chapter, seeing throughout the whole chapter there is no mention of the Jews singly, but of Israel.

The gospel was to be preached to the whole world before the destruction of Jerusalem, Matt. xxiv. 14: and was it not to the ten tribes as well as other nations? It makes for the affirmative, that St. James directs his Epistle *ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς*, to those ten tribes, as well as the other two. But the apostles wrote to none but to whom the gospel was now come.

Ver. 1<sup>1</sup>: *Μὴ ἀπόσωτο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; Hath God cast away his people?*] We may observe what it is the apostle propounds to discourse, viz. not of the universal calling in of the nation, but of the *non-rejection* of the whole nation: hath God so rejected his people that he hath cast them away universally? *μὴ γένοιτο, God forbid.* For I myself am an Israelite, and he hath not cast me away.

*Ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμίν* Of the tribe of Benjamin.] So Phil. iii. 5: the jasper stone, upon which was inscribed the name of Benjamin in the breastplate, was the first foundation in the new Jerusalem, Rev. xxi. 19: in memory (as it should seem) of this Benjamite, the chief founder of the Gentile church. "The<sup>m</sup> jasper of Benjamin fell one day out of the breastplate and was lost. Dama Ben Nethinah having one like it, they bargained with him to buy it for a hundred pence," &c.

<sup>1</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 710.

<sup>m</sup> Hieros. Peah, fol. 15. 3. et Kiddush. fol. 60. 2.

Ver. 2: 'Ως ἐντυγχάνει· *How he maketh intercession, &c.*] Elijah<sup>n</sup> begs of God that he would take vengeance on the Israelites for the wickednesses they had committed.

Ver. 3: Τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν· *They have digged down thine altars.*] *Thine altars?* What altars of God should they be that the Israelites had thrown down in Samaria? The altar in the Temple was whole at that time; and what altar had God besides? R. Solomon upon 1 Kings xix. tells us, "These altars were private altars raised to the name of God." Such a one was that that "Elijah repaired, being broken down," 1 Kings xviii. 30.

There were indeed *תְּרִמָּה* *high places* built up to idols, but there were some also built up to God. And that (as the Jews grant) lawfully enough, before the Temple was built; which were used afterward: but the use of them became faulty, because they were bound to go only to that altar that was in the Temple. These *altars* were unlawfully built amongst the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, because the way lay open for them to the altar at Jerusalem; but it was not so unlawful for the ten tribes within the kingdom of Samaria, because they could have no such access. It is questionable therefore, whether Elijah would call *the high places* or *altars* in Judea, though dedicated to the true God, *the altars of God*: which being so dedicated in Samaria, he calls by the name of *thine altars*.

Ver. 4: Τῇ Βάαλ· *To [the image of] Baal.*] Those who would have the Hebrew Bibles corrected by the Greek version, and contend that those interpreters were inspired with a prophetic spirit, let them tell us here who it was that mistook? these interpreters, or St. Paul? For so they in 1 Kings xix. 18; καὶ καταλείψεις ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ἑπτὰ χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν, πάντα γόνατα ἃ οὐκ ἔκλασαν γόνυ τῷ Βάαλ· *And thou shalt leave in Israel seven thousand men, all the knees which have not bowed the knee τῷ Βάαλ, to Baal.* So the Roman and Alexandrian edition. But the apostle, κατέλιπον ἐμαντῷ ἑπτακισχιλίου ἀνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ· *I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, all that have not bowed the knee τῇ Βάαλ, to Baal.* To pass by the difference between *καταλείψεις, thou shalt leave*, and *κατέλιπον, I have left*, or *reserved*, which is no

<sup>n</sup> Lev. Ger. in 1 Kings xix.

little one, we will only examine the difference between the two articles  $\tau\acute{\omega}$  and  $\tau\grave{\eta}$ .

Ahab had introduced Baal, the idol of the Tyrians, amongst the Israelites, 1 Kings xvi. 31. And were there but seven thousand amongst the whole ten tribes of Israel that did not worship this Baal? Perhaps there were seventy thousand: nay, perhaps seven times seventy thousand. For consider the story in 2 Kings x. 21; and it will appear that the worshippers of this Baal were not so numerous that they could amount to many thousands, perhaps not many hundreds.

But<sup>o</sup> what did it avail them not to have worshipped Ahab's Baal, if in the mean time they worshipped Jeroboam's<sup>p</sup> calves? Jehu himself, that rooted Baal and his worshippers out of Israel, yet did not he depart from the sin of Jeroboam, namely, the golden calves. And what great matter was there in this *divine answer* (*χρηματισμὸς*) to Elijah, if it had said, "I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not worshipped τὸν Βάαλ, *Baal*," the god of the Tyrians, if in the mean time they worshipped the calves in common with the rest of that nation? Elijah himself had slain these worshippers of Baal before he had this answer from God; and therein indeed had done a great act. But it was a small matter if all Israel, excepting seven thousand only, should still worship this Baal.

By  $\tau\grave{\eta}$  Βάαλ therefore, with the feminine article, the apostle teacheth us that it must be understood not  $\tau\grave{\eta}$  εἰκόνι Βάαλ, of 'the image' of Baal, but  $\tau\grave{\eta}$  δαμάλει Βάαλ, of 'the calf' of Baal. For all will confess that Baal was a common name for all idols. And that which follows 1 Kings xix. 18, "every mouth which hath not kissed him," takes light from that in Hos. xiii. 2, "Let them kiss the calves."

Now Jeroboam's calves are called δαμάλεις in the feminine gender; 1 Kings xii. 28, ἐποίησε δύο δαμάλεις χρυσᾶς, *he made two calves of gold*. So Josephus, Δύρ<sup>q</sup> ποιήσας δαμάλεις χρυσᾶς, τίθησι τὰς δαμάλεις, &c.; *Jeroboam making two golden calves, places them, &c.* And instead of more, the Book of Tobit comments sufficiently upon  $\tau\grave{\eta}$  Βάαλ, Tob. i. 5; καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ συναποστᾶσαι ἔθνον  $\tau\grave{\eta}$  Βάαλ  $\tau\grave{\eta}$  δαμάλει, *and all the tribes*

<sup>o</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 711.

<sup>q</sup> *Antiq. lib. viii. cap. 8.* [Hudson,

<sup>p</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 878. p. 364. l. 45.] [viii. 8. 4.]

that revolted together sacrificed to the calf Baal. To this sense, therefore, the words of God to Elijah come: "I have left, or I have reserved, to myself, seven thousand men that have kept themselves untouched with the common idolatry of the nation in the adoration τῆς Βάαλ, [of Baal, or] of Jeroboam's calf."

Ver. 5: Οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ λείμμα, &c. *Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant, &c.*] However we suppose the Jewish nation, as to the more general mass of it, was cast off before the times of Christ; yet no question there was in all ages λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος, a remnant according to the election of grace, and in that age more especially wherein Christ and his gospel began to shine out. And that he meant the calling of this remnant in that age and time wherein the apostle wrote, and not any call of the whole nation to be hereafter, what can be more plainly said than what is said in these words, ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, at this present time?

Let us take a view of the apostle's reasoning: "'Hath God cast away his people?' No; for I also am an Israelite, and he hath not cast me off. And as in the days of Elijah there was a remnant, even so it is ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, at this very present time." How unfitly would this argue that the calling of the nation was to be after a great many ages? But if we will suppose that the Jews had, for the greatest part of them, been cast off, blinded, and hardened, before the times of Christ and the apostle, then this reasoning will run easily and smoothly: "Let it be granted that the nation, as to the main body of it, was cast away for some ages past; yet is it so cast away that there is no hope for any Jew? By no means. For ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, at this present time, there is a remnant, as it was in the days of Elijah: I myself am one of that remnant."

Ver. 8: Ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, &c. *God hath given them the spirit of slumber, &c.*] So the Greek interpreters in Isa. xxix. 10; πεπότικεν ὑμᾶς Κύριος πνεύματι κατανύξεως. *The Lord hath made you drink in a spirit κατανύξεως, of compunction.* The difficulty lies in the word κατανύξεως, which properly denotes remorse or compunction, very wide from the meaning both of the prophet and apostle.

I. The Greek interpreters, what Jews soever they were, do sometimes frame a sense of their own, and that not seldom,

very foreign from the Hebrew truth: and very often use Greek words in a sense very different from the common idiom of the Greeks. There might be instances given abundantly both for the one and the other if this were a place for it.

II. This very word we have in hand they frame to their own sense, different from the common acceptation of it. And whether they take it from *κατανύττω*, to *prick*, or from *καταυγέω*, to *grieve*, or have any eye to the word *νύξ*, *night*, they attribute such a sense and signification to it as denotes 'silence, astonishment, horror,' &c. Gen. xxvii. 38, *καταυχθέντος* δὲ Ἰσαὰκ, (a clause of their own inserting;) we may equally render it, *Isaac being amazed and astonished, or grieved and pricked with sorrow*. Psalm lx. 3; ἐπότισας ἡμᾶς οἶνον *καταύξεως*. *Thou hast made us to drink of the wine of compunction*. The Hebrew is, יַיִן תְּרַעְלָהּ the wine of horror. So that the meaning of the word *καταύξεως* in them must be fetched from themselves; and in this place, from the Hebrew word תְּרַעְלָהּ in the prophet, rather than from any Greek lexicon.

Ver. 10: Τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διαπαντὸς σύγκαμψον. *Bow down their back alway.*] The apostle follows the Greek interpreters, and they their own paraphrastic and allusive way. The Hebrew hath it, מְתַנִּיחֵם תָּמִיד הַמַּעַד *make their loins to quake continually*. And so the Chaldee paraphrast renders it too; but these, 'Bow down their back;' to which the Syriac and Arabic incline. It is very true that they whose loins are weak and feeble do go bowing and trembling; but perhaps the interpreters might allude to that in Deut. xxv. 2, 3, where the malefactor, condemned to be beaten with stripes, must be bowed down. To which that passage in the Psalmist seems to allude, Psalm i, "The wicked shall not rise up, or stand in judgment." The Greek interpreters do frequently allude to the customs, yea, not seldom to the traditions of their own country; whence one might the rather suspect an allusion in this place also. Such a kind of version is that, (seeing we are discoursing about scourging,) Prov. xxvii. 22; ἐὰν μαστιγοῖς ἄφρονα ἐν μέσῳ σινεδρίῳ *if thou shouldst beat a fool with stripes in the midst of the Sanhedrim*; instead of, "Though thou shouldst bray a fool in a mortar."

† *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 712.

**HORÆ**  
**HEBRAICÆ ET TALMUDICÆ;**  
**-OR,**  
**HEBREW AND TALMUDICAL**  
**EXERCITATIONS**  
**UPON**  
**THE FIRST EPISTLE**  
**OF**  
**ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.**  
**TO WHICH IS ADDED,**  
**A DISCOURSE**  
**CONCERNING WHAT BIBLES WERE USED TO BE READ IN THE**  
**RELIGIOUS ASSEMBLIES OF THE JEWS.**



TO THE  
RIGHT HONOURABLE AND LEARNED  
SIR WILLIAM MORICE, KNT.  
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY OF STATE,  
AND  
ONE OF HIS MAJESTY'S MOST HONOURABLE PRIVY COUNCIL<sup>a</sup>.

---

RIGHT HONOURABLE,

ALL that I have done in this work may well seem a continued solecism : when I have with so unskilful a hand attempted to explain so abstruse an epistle, and handled things so difficult in so brief a manner ; and, lastly, in daring to dedicate these so unpolished papers to a person of such judgment and learning. And what account shall I give of these things ?

I know indeed that among those *δυσνόητά τινα*, *passages hard to be understood*, which are in St. Paul's Epistles, [2 Pet. iii. 16,] this First to the Corinthians claims no small share ; an Epistle behind none for the variety of the things handled, and for the difficulty of the style wherewith they are handled above all. Things these are to be trembled at, but alluring withal, and provoking a mind greedy of the knowledge of Holy Scriptures so much the more to the study of them, by how much they are the more difficult. So that it was neither arrogance nor rashness that I employed myself in these obscurities ; but a studious mind, breathing after the knowledge of the Scriptures, and something restless, when in difficult places it knew not where to fix. What fruit I have reaped, I say not any thing of but this, that I repent not of my pains : for I have in some measure satisfied myself ; but whether I shall do others, is not in my power

<sup>a</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 88o. *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 735.



to judge. I hope it will not give offence upon this account, that if I mistake I mistake only in historical matters, (as most of those things are that here create difficulty,) where there is no fear of dashing upon the analogy of faith or the doctrine of the church.

That<sup>b</sup> I presume, Right Honourable, to lay these my rude thoughts before your learned eyes, is not boldness, but duty, gratitude, and obligation. I know well enough such is my meanness, that I am not able to invent or frame any thing that may be worthy of that great learning wherewith you are so signally endowed. But it is your goodness, with which you are as much endowed, that I and these my papers have to do with. They approach to pay their respects to it, and to render you all the thanks that possibly I can for that favour, assistance, and patronage that your Honour vouchsafed to aid and comfort me with when I and my affairs lay under adversity and hazard. You, great sir, came in to my succour; and when I was wholly a stranger to you, and you to me, yet you generously afforded me your helping hand; and that of your own accord, unasked, and with an earnest diligence, care, and affection. O, how much am I indebted to that kindness of yours, and wherewith shall I requite it? Let this issue of my studies, whatever it be, serve as a monument of my vows; and having your great name inscribed upon it, let it live and glory, and testify to all the world the obedience, duty, and gratitude of,

Right Honourable,

Your most humble and most obliged servant,

JOHN LIGHTFOOT.

From Catharine Hall, Cambridge,  
Commencement eve,  
July 4, 1664.

<sup>b</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 736.

## OF CORINTH ITSELF.

CORINTH<sup>a</sup> was seated in an isthmus, by the space of five miles parting the Ægean sea from the Ionian ; joining Greece to Peloponnesus by a strait passage<sup>b</sup>.

In<sup>c</sup> the isthmus was the temple of Neptune ; and the Isthmian games every five years, for this cause instituted, as is said, because the coasts of Peloponnesus are washed with five bays. These plays, broke off by Cypselus the tyrant, the Corinthians restored again to their ancient solemnity in the forty-ninth Olympiad.

The<sup>d</sup> bounds of the straits of the isthmus on this side are Lechæum, and Cenchreæ on the other. The haven of Cenchreæ serves for the traffic of Asia, that of Lechæum for the traffic of Italy. The haven of Cenchreæ was distant from the city seventy furlongs. The Lechæan port lay under the city.

King Demetrius, the Dictator Cæsar, Caius the prince [Caligula], and Domitius Nero, endeavoured to cut through the straits with a navigable canal, but unsuccessfully<sup>e</sup>. Corinth, from that high tower, which they call Acrocorinthus, beholds both seas. That<sup>f</sup> city, heretofore called Ephyra, was built by Sisyphus, in that time when Othniel was captain and judge of the Hebrews. Hence<sup>g</sup> the tower Sisyphium at Corinth, from the name of the founder. From<sup>h</sup> the coming down of the Heraclidæ into Peloponnesus, the city was under kings for a long series: then under yearly princes<sup>i</sup>; afterward under Cypselus, usurping the government; and after him under Periander his son; and after a long space of time<sup>k</sup> under Philip. Whose endeavours the Corinthians aided, and so despised the Romans for him, that some presumed to cast dirt upon their ambassadors as they passed by their houses. For which crime and other wicked deeds an army was sent thither by the Romans, and Corinth overthrown by L. Mummius.

When<sup>l</sup> it had a long time lain forsaken, it was rebuilt by Julius Cæsar; who built Carthage also at the same time; and into both, anciently splendid and famous cities, he brought down colonies of the

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 737.

<sup>b</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 881.

<sup>c</sup> *Pomp. Mela*, lib. ii. cap. 3.

<sup>d</sup> *Solin.* cap. 13.

<sup>e</sup> *Plin.* lib. iv. cap. 4. *Strab.* lib. viii. [6.]

<sup>f</sup> *Mela*, in the place before.

<sup>g</sup> *Euseb.* in Chron.

<sup>h</sup> *Diod. Sicul.* lib. xix.

<sup>i</sup> *Euseb.* in the place before.

<sup>j</sup> *Herodot.* lib. v. cap. 92.

<sup>k</sup> *Strab.* in the place before.

<sup>l</sup> *Dion Cass.* lib. xliii.

Romans, especially of such as were Libertines [*freedmen*]. They<sup>m</sup>, when they had begun to remove the rubbish, and had withal digged up graves, found very many works made of baked earth, and not a few of brass; the workmanship of which they so admired, that there was no sepulchre which they digged not up; and having got great plenty of such things, they sold them at a great price, and filled Rome 'Necrocorinthiis,' *with the spoils of the Corinthian dead*; for so they called those works which were taken from the sepulchres, especially such as were made of earth. And when Mummius laid the city waste, there were pictures found of admirable workmanship which were brought to Rome. For the arts of painting and counterfeiting, and other arts of that kind, were very much improved in Corinth and Sicyon.

The<sup>n</sup> situation of the city, now rebuilt, was of this nature. There was a high mountain, whose perpendicular was three furlongs and a half; the ascent thirty furlongs, and it ended in a sharp top. The mountain's name was Acrocorinthus. At the very foot of Acrocorinthus stood the city. The compass of the city made full forty furlongs: it was strengthened with a wall, as much of it as the mountain had laid bare<sup>o</sup>: Acrocorinthus also was walled as far as it could be fortified with walling<sup>p</sup>. "And as we went up (they<sup>q</sup> are the words of Strabo) the ruins of the old city appeared; so that the whole compass was eighty-five furlongs."

The mountain on the top of it had the temple of Venus; a temple so wealthy, ὥστε πλείους ἢ χιλίας ἱεροδούλους ἐκέκτητο ἑταίρας, *that it had more than a thousand whore-priests [famulas meretrices]*, whom men and women had dedicated to the goddess. In<sup>r</sup> the old city heretofore stood the temple of Juno; where all the Corinthian women being gathered together, Periander the tyrant, by his officers, stripped them stark naked, without any difference; and having carried their clothes into a certain pit, he burnt them to Melissa his deceased wife; with whom he lay after she was dead.

The history of the first founding a gospel-church in this city, Acts xviii, makes it plain that there were very many Jews there, and one synagogue of them at least, if not more.

<sup>m</sup> Strab. in the place before.

<sup>n</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 882.

<sup>o</sup> [Quantum ejus mons denudaverat.]

<sup>p</sup> Quâ muro muniri poterat.

<sup>q</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 738.

<sup>r</sup> Herodot. lib. v. cap. 92.

HEBREW AND TALMUDICAL  
EXERCITATIONS  
UPON THE  
FIRST EPISTLE  
OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

---

CHAP. I.<sup>a</sup>

VER. 1: Παῦλος. *Paul.*] Who was also called 'Saul.' He had a double name, according to his double relation: the Hebrew name שָׁאוּל *Saul*, as he was a Hebrew; the Roman name *Paul*, as a Roman.

It was common in the Jewish nation, that among the Jews they went by a Jewish name; but among heathens by another. That is, either by the same name turned into the heathen language; as *Tabitha* to the Jews was *Dorcas* to them that spake Greek; and *Thomas* to the Hebrews was *Didymus* to the Greeks; and perhaps *Silas* to the Jews was *Tertius* to the Romans, Rom. xvi. 22, from שְׁלוֹשׁ *Shalosh*, *three*; and *Jason* was *Secundus*: compare Rom. xvi. 21 with Acts xx. 4. Or they went by some different name; as *Herod* in Luke, Acts xii. 1, is *Agrippa* in Josephus; and *John* is also *Mark*, Acts xii. 12.

Hence the Gloss upon Maimonides; "Perhaps<sup>b</sup> he hath two names, viz. a Jewish, and that whereby רְלוּעֵיוֹת *those that are not Jews* do call him." And that passage, "The<sup>c</sup> Israelites without the land of Israel have names like the names of the Gentiles." Yea, hearken to what they say in

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 739.  
—*Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 883.

<sup>b</sup> Gerushin, cap. 3.  
<sup>c</sup> Hieros. Gittin, fol. 43. 2.

the same tract<sup>d</sup> concerning Jews dwelling even in the land of Israel<sup>e</sup>: "Perhaps he hath two wives, one in Judea another in Galilee. And perhaps he hath two names, one in Judea another in Galilee. If he subscribes his name whereby he goes in Judea, to put away her who is in Galilee, or the name whereby he goes in Galilee, to put away her who is in Judea, it is not a divorce."

It is no wonder therefore if *Saul*, who was born out of the land of Israel, and free of the city of Rome, had a Roman name joined with his Jewish. And it deserves observation, that he, being now made the apostle of the Gentiles, always calls himself by his Gentile name, by his Jewish never: and that Luke, prosecuting his Acts, calleth his name *Saul* while the scene of the story is among the Jews, but *Paul* while it is among the heathen.

Ver. 2: Ἁγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ *Sanctified in Christ Jesus.*] It seems to be opposed to τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις ἐν νόμῳ, *those that are sanctified in the law*, or to respect that law, Deut. xxiii. 1, 2, &c., concerning the excluding very many out of the church of God: which is not so done under Christ.

Κλητοῖς ἁγίοις *Called saints.*] שְׁרָקָה אֱלֹהִים *a holy convocation*, is so rendered in the language of the LXX interpreters, Lev. xxiii. 2: αἱ ἑορταὶ Κυρίου, ἃς καλέσετε αὐτὰς κλητὰς ἁγίας *The feasts of the Lord which ye shall call, called Holy.* Ver. 3; σαββάτα ἀνάπαυσις, κλητὴ ἁγία τῷ Κυρίῳ *The sabbath a rest, called holy to the Lord.* See also, ver. 4, 7, 8, &c.

*Sanctified in Christ* is a general word, which is subdivided into κλητοὺς ἁγίους, *truly saints*, and ἐπικαλουμένους τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου, *those that call on the name of the Lord*, saints by profession.

Ver. 5: Ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ, καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει *In all utterance, and in all knowledge.*] That is, 'in the gift of tongues, and prophesying.' These he calls in the verse following μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *the testimony of Christ*; that is, *the testimony* whereby Jesus is proved to be the true Messiah, seeing he bestowed<sup>f</sup> such gifts. So Rev. xix. 10, "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy;" not only the doctrine which the prophet uttered, but the very gift of prophesying. And

<sup>d</sup> Fol. 45. 3.

<sup>e</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 740.

<sup>f</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 884.

1 John v. 8, "The spirit, and the water, and the blood," yield a testimony of Christ on earth. 'The spirit,' or the gift of prophecy; 'the water,' or baptism; and 'the blood,' or martyrdom. For seeing the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit did so abound, and such infinite multitudes flocked to baptism in the name of Jesus, and very many for that name endured martyrdom, it was an undoubted testimony that he was the true Messias.

Ver. 12: Ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμι Παύλου, &c. *I am of Paul, &c.*] To trace the original of this schism, we may have recourse to the twofold division of this church into converted Jews and Gentiles; which appears from their story, Acts xviii. The Gentile part perhaps boasted the name of Paul and Apollos; the Jewish, that of Cephas and Christ. But each of them again was divided into two. Some of the Gentile part revered Paul—either alone, or certainly above all others, as their father, their apostle, and the first that brought in the gospel among them; however, he preached plainly, in a low style, and not according to human wisdom and art. But some preferred Apollos before him, as a more profound, more elegant, and more quaint doctor: see Acts xviii. 24. Hence that large discourse of the apostle of this very manner of preaching, from chap. i. 17 to chap. iv. 6; where he saith, that he transferred those things in a certain figure to himself and Apollos.

Ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ. *And I of Cephas.*] We will not here dispute whether Peter were ever at Corinth. For even they themselves who assert that he was sometime there yet deny him ever to have been there before the breaking out of this schism. Whence therefore came there to be a sect of his name? You will scarce be able to produce a more probable reason, than that those of the circumcision embraced him who was the minister of circumcision, rather than the minister of uncircumcision. Let us take an example from Mark himself, the son or disciple of Peter, 1 Pet. v. 13. He being chosen by Paul and Barnabas for their companion in their travel among the Gentiles, on a sudden departed from them and returned to Jerusalem, Acts xiii. 13. And why so? I should bring this reason of it, which you may correct if it displease, namely,

ε *English folio edition, vol. ii. p. 741.*

that he, cleaving to Peter before, who was the minister of the circumcision, liked not what these ministers of the uncircumcision did among the Gentiles ; but being better informed afterward, returned again to Paul. So also these Corinthians, and indeed all the Jews everywhere that were converted, too much Judaizing as yet, how much more readily would they give up their names to that famous minister of circumcision, than to the minister or ministers of uncircumcision ? But why not to James or to John, who were as much ministers of circumcision ?

I. Peter was the minister of circumcision *without* the land of Israel, but James *within* ; and it seemed more agreeable to these Corinthian Jews that were seated without the land of Israel, to choose to themselves the chief apostle without the land, than him who was within it. But you will say, John also was an apostle of circumcision without that land as well as Peter ; and he was nearer Corinth, dwelling in Asia, than Peter who was in Chaldea. True indeed ; but,

II. Peter was the minister among the circumcision of the purest name, namely, the Hebrews, when John was among the Hellenists : yea, among the Hebrews of the purest blood, viz. the Babylonians : yea, among the circumcision taken in the largest sense, viz. among the ten tribes, as well as among the Jews. To which add,

III. That Peter in this outshone the two other apostles of circumcision, that to him alone were committed ‘the keys of the kingdom of heaven ;’ that is, that he should first open the door, and bring in the gospel among the Gentiles. Taking all these observations together, it is no wonder if these Corinthian Jews, Judaizing in very many other things, as appears from this Epistle, when they were minded to enrol themselves under some apostle, it is no wonder, I say, if they would enrol themselves under Peter, the apostle of circumcision, rather than under Paul, the minister of the Gentiles ; under Peter, an apostle out of the land, rather than under James, who was not ; under Peter, the apostle of the purest Hebrews, and of circumcision in the fullest name, than under John the apostle of the Hellenists.

Yea, it is no wonder if the Christian Gentiles, whether Corinthians or believers of some other places, when they

would enrol themselves under some peculiar apostle, it is no wonder, I say, if they had regard to Peter, who first brought in the gospel among the Gentiles, rather than any other who brought in the gospel into this or that peculiar place. So that opinion of the primacy of Peter seems to have arisen among the Jewish Christians, for their particular difference of his ministry among the circumcision; and among the Gentile Christians, for his bringing in of the gospel among the Gentiles.

'Εγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ. *And I of Christ.*] If there were any among the Corinthians who had been baptized by the baptism of John only, as there were among the Ephesians, Acts xix. 4, no wonder if they said, 'Εγὼ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *I am of the Messias*, not knowing as yet Jesus of Nazareth to be him. But be it granted that all were better taught by Paul or Apollos, when yet very many still inclined to Judaism, one may suspect that they said, *I am of Christ*, or *Messias*, in that sense as we formerly<sup>h</sup> were instructed of the Messias; namely, that every one should be enrolled and subjected under him only as our Captain, not under any deputed by him, or supplying his place.

Ver. 14: Κρίσπου. *Crispus.*] The name *Crispus* is also in use among the Talmudists. "R. Aibulari saith, נגרי קריספי *Nigri Crispi.*" אמר ר' קריספי *R. Crispus*<sup>k</sup> saith.

Γάϊου. *Gaius.*] If that *Gaius* or *Caius*, to which the Third Epistle of John is writ, were the Corinthian *Gaius*, which is very probable, comparing Rom. xvi. 23 with the seventh verse of that Epistle; then John seems to have written his First Epistle to the Corinthians. "I write (saith he) to the church:" to what church? Certainly to some particular church, and where *Gaius* himself resided. But what Epistle is that which he writ? Who would not more fitly say, that it was the first of his Epistles, than that that which he writ was lost? And if these things are true, you may look for Diotrophes in the church of Corinth, the ringleader in the schism. But these things under correction.

Ver. 17: Οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλέ με Χριστὸς βαπτίζειν. *For Christ sent me not to baptize.*] Paul was not appointed a baptist among the Gentiles, as John was a baptist among the Jews; nor

<sup>h</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 885.

<sup>i</sup> Hieros. Jevamoth, fol. 2. 3.

<sup>k</sup> *Ib.* fol. 12. 2.

<sup>l</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 742.



was the office of the one and the other alike. The Jews, even from their cradles, were instructed in the doctrine of the Messiah, and in the articles of religion, so that John had no need to spend much pains to prepare them for baptism in the name of the Messiah now to come, and for the reception of the faith of the gospel. But how much pains must Paul take among the Gentiles, who had not so much as ever heard either of Christ or of the true God? He preached therefore daily, and, as it were, drop by drop instils into them the doctrine of religion; and it was no small labour leisurely to lead them to a *baptizable* measure of knowledge, if I may have leave so to express it. He baptized Gaius, Crispus, Stephanas, that were Jews, who were presently and with little labour instructed in the doctrine of the gospel; but others, who did ripen more slowly to the knowledge of it, he committed to other ministers, to be baptized when they should find them fitted for it.

Ver. 20: Πού σοφός; πού γραμματεὺς; πού συζητητής; *Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer?* "God<sup>m</sup> showed to Adam,

דור דור ודורשיו: *Every generation καὶ συζητητὰς αὐτῆς, and the disputers of it.*

דור דור וחכמיו: *Every generation καὶ σοφὸς αὐτῆς, and the wise men of it.*

דור דור וסופריו: *Every generation καὶ γραμματεῖς αὐτῆς, and the scribes of it.*

דור דור ומנהיגיו: *Every generation καὶ ἡγουμένους αὐτῆς and the governors of it.*" These words are recited with some variation elsewhere<sup>n</sup>.

Σοφός, חכם, *a wise man*, who taught others. Γραμματεὺς, סופר, *a scribe*, any *learned man*, as distinguished from the common people, and especially any Father of the Traditions. Συζητητής, דרש or דרשן, *a disputer*, or propounder of questions; he that preached and interpreted the Law more profoundly.

Ver. 21: Ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν Θεόν. *In the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God.*] That is, *the world in its divinity could not by its wisdom know God.*

<sup>m</sup> Beresh. Rabb. sect. 24.

<sup>n</sup> Avodah Zarah, fol. 5. 1.

Σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the wisdom of God*, is not to be understood that wisdom which had God for its author, but that had God for its object: and is to be rendered *wisdom about God*. There was among the heathen σοφία τῆς φύσεως, *wisdom about natural things*, and σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ, *wisdom about God*, that is, *divinity*. “But the world in its divinity could not by wisdom know God.”

CHAP. II.<sup>o</sup>

VER. 6: Σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. *Yet the wisdom not of this world.*] The apostle mentions a fourfold *wisdom*:

I. Heathen *wisdom*, or that of the philosophers, chap. i. 22: which was commonly called among the Jews חכמה יוניית *Grecian wisdom*. Which was so undervalued by them, that they joined these two under the same curse: “Cursed is he that breeds hogs; and cursed is he who teacheth his son *Grecian wisdom*.”

II. Jewish *wisdom*: that of the scribes and Pharisees who crucified Christ, ver. 8.

III. The *wisdom* of the gospel, ver. 7.

IV. The *wisdom* τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, *of this world*: distinguished as it seems from the rest, where *this world* is to be taken in that sense, as העולם הזה is, as it is opposed to העולם הבא *the world to come*. And he speaks of the last and highest *wisdom*, which who is there that could obtain ἐν αἰῶνι τούτῳ, *in this world*, before the revelation of the gospel in the coming of Christ, which was αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων, *the world to come*? And this is that the apostle does, namely, to show that the highest, yea, the soundest *wisdom* of the ages before-going, was not in any manner to be compared with the brightness of the evangelic *wisdom*.

Ver. 9<sup>a</sup>: Ἄ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε, &c. *Eye hath not seen, &c.*] “R. Chaia Bar Abba saith<sup>r</sup>, ‘R. Joohanah saith, All the prophets prophesied not but of the days of the Messiah: אבל לעולם הבא עין לא ראתה, *but as to the world to come, eye hath not seen, O God, besides thee,*” [Is. lxiv. 4,] &c. These words are repeated elsewhere<sup>s</sup> upon another occasion. Where

<sup>o</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 743.

<sup>p</sup> Bava Kama, fol. 82. 2.

<sup>q</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 886.

<sup>r</sup> Bab. Sanhedr. fol. 99. 1.

<sup>s</sup> Schabb. fol. 63. 1.

the Gloss: "The eyes of the prophets could not see these things."

You see here the Rabbin distinguishes between *the days of Messiah* and *the world to come*; which is sometimes done by others; but they are very commonly confounded. And you see upon what reason, yea upon what necessity he was driven to this distinction, namely, that he supposed some things laid up for those that waited for God, which the eyes of the prophets never saw. "But (saith he) the prophets saw the good things of the days of the Messiah; therefore they are laid up for the world to come, after the days of the Messiah." Rabbin, learn from Paul, that the revelation under the gospel is far more bright than the prophets ever attained to.

### CHAP. III.

VER. 1: 'Ως νηπίους *As unto babes.*] The Hebrews would say תינוקות *little children*, (from a word that signifies to *give suck*.) Hence that saying is very common, של תינוקות רבן בית רבן *children in school*. "Rabh<sup>t</sup> said to Rabh Samuel Bar Shillah [the schoolmaster], Take a child of six years of age, and give him food as you would do an ox." The Gloss is, "Feed him with the law, as you feed an ox which you fatten." יהא אדם מתגלגל עם בנו עד יב שנה *Let a man deal gently with his son to his twelfth year*. The Gloss there; "If he refuse to learn, let him deal gently with him and with fair words," &c.

Ver. 12<sup>u</sup>: Ξύλα, χόρτον, καλάμην *Wood, hay, stubble.*] That the apostle is speaking of *doctrines*, is plain by the context:

I. He supposeth these builders, although they built not so well, yet to have set themselves upon that work with no ill mind; ver. 15, "He himself shall be saved."

II. By the several kinds of these things, "gold, silver, wood, hay, stubble," we may understand not only the different manner of teaching, but even the different kinds of doctrines taught. For if they had all propounded the same truth and doctrine, it had been no great matter if they had not all declared it in the same manner. But while some produce "gold, silver, wood," precious, pure, sound doctrine, others bring "hay, stubble," doctrine that is vile, trifling, and

<sup>t</sup> Chetub. fol. 50. 1.

<sup>u</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 744.

of no value or solidity: the very doctrines were different: and some were such as could endure the trial of the fire, and others which could not.

III. There were some who scattered grains of Judaism among the people: but this they did not as professedly opposing the gospel, but out of ignorance, and because they did not as yet sufficiently understand the simplicity of the gospel. Paul calls these and such like doctrines "hay and stubble," to be consumed by fire: yet while they in the mean time who had taught such things might escape, because they opposed not the truth out of malice, but out of ignorance had broached falsehood.

Ver. 13: Ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλώσει ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται. *For the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire.*] Two things shall discover every man's work, *the day* and *the fire*. Both which you may not understand amiss of the word of God manifesting and proving all things. For the light of the gospel is very frequently called the *day*, and the law of God called *fire*, Deut. xxxiii. 2.

But I had rather in this place understand by the *day*, the day of the Lord that was shortly coming, and by *fire*, the fire of divine indignation to be poured out upon the Jewish nation. And I am the more inclined to this interpretation, because there is so frequent remembrance of that *day* and *fire* in the Holy Scriptures.

When therefore there were some who built Judaism upon the gospel foundation, and that out of unskilfulness and ignorance of the simplicity of the gospel, (for of such the apostle here speaks,) he foretells and threatens that the day and fire of the Lord is coming upon the Jews: by which the folly and inconsistency of that superstructure would not only be revealed, but that very superstructure itself should perish.

This place being taken in this sense, all the things the apostle speaks in this passage become plain: that *fire* shall prove doctrines, whether they are evangelical or no. If any one's work or doctrine will endure the trial of that *fire*, he shall receive the reward of sound doctrine: if the doctrine of any will not endure it, but be consumed, he shall receive the damage of his pains and labour lost, but he himself shall be saved; but this, as he is proved *by fire*.

Would you have a parallel of a doctrine and building of straw concerning which Paul speaks? "The<sup>x</sup> Rabbins deliver, לא יסוד אדם את ביתו בסיד *Let no man plaster his house with lime*; ואם ערב בו חול או תבן מותר *but if he mix sand and straw with lime, it is allowed.*" The tradition respects the times after the destruction of the Temple, when, by reason of the mourning for that fatal overthrow<sup>y</sup>, it was not permitted them to whiten their walls, but to let them be overrun with blackness, as a colour fit for mourners. Therefore it was not permitted to whiten the walls with lime only, lest they should look too bright: but if they were mixed with sand and straw, whereby the whiteness of the lime might be darkened, then it was permitted. A doctrine of straw truly, from a superstruction of straw; and that yields a very fit image of those Jewish doctrines of which the apostle speaks, clouding the brightness of the gospel.

#### CHAP. IV.<sup>z</sup>

VER. 6 : Μετεσχημάτισα εἰς ἑμαυτὸν καὶ Ἀπολλώ. *I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos.*] And why not to himself and Cephas? From this very place, if it may not elsewhere be proved, it appears Peter taught not at Corinth. The apostle treats purposely of their principal ministers; and it is past belief that he would pass by Peter, if Peter had preached among them.

When he saith that 'he transferred these things in a figure to himself and Apollos,' he understands not the changing of names and persons; nor doth he transfer the names of others into his person and Apollos's, that he might not reprove any by name, (which sense is commonly fixed to this place;) but the figure which he useth is this; namely, while he speaks of that preaching of the gospel which was plain, and rude, and very distant from human wisdom; and on the contrary, of that preaching which was elegant, well studied, and more profound; these things, saith he, I have transferred in this scheme to myself and Apollos, the former way of preaching to myself, the latter to Apollos.

Ver. 8 : Ἡδὴ κεκορεσμένοι ἐστὲ, &c. *Now ye are full, &c.*]

<sup>x</sup> Bab. Bathr. fol. 60. 2.      <sup>y</sup> Leusden's edition, vol. ii. p. 887.

<sup>z</sup> English folio edition, vol. ii. p. 745.

A bitter taunt! chastising the boasting of the Corinthians, who had forgot from whom they had first received those evangelical privileges concerning which they now prided themselves. They were enriched with spiritual gifts; they reigned, themselves being judges, in the very top of the dignity and happiness of the gospel; and that “*without us*, saith the apostle, as though ye owed nothing to us for those privileges:” and “O, would to God ye did reign;” and that it went so happily and well with you indeed, that we also might reign with you, and that we might partake of some happiness in this your promotion, and might be of some account among you!

## CHAP. V.

VER. 1: “Ὡστε γυναῖκά τινα τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχειν” *That one should have his father's wife.*] Not his own mother, but the wife of his father who was still alive, as it seems from the Second Epistle to these Corinthians, chap. vii. 12: “I wrote to you, not in respect of him that had done the wrong, nor in respect of him that suffered the wrong.” He that had done the wrong was plainly this incestuous person: for it will scarcely be denied but that the apostle there speaks of that business. And who is he that suffered the wrong? The father, without doubt; now certainly alive, and not deceased; for it would scarcely have been said of him if dead, that he suffered wrong by this wicked action.

Ver. 2: Καὶ ὑμεῖς πεφυσωμένοι ἐστέ” *And ye are puffed up.*] It is a wonder indeed that they mourned not; but it is more wonderful that they should be *puffed up* and glory in such a wickedness as is shown at ver. 6. But whence proceeded so foolish and wicked a boasting?

I. Perhaps from the affectation of a party, and the bitterness of their contentions, the adverse party triumphing against that party in which happened so grievous a fall.

II. Perhaps<sup>a</sup>, by an ill conceit of the liberty of the gospel, they triumphed in this thing, as though the gospel had brought in such a liberty against the law.

III. Or it may seem that the father of the incestuous person was not a Christian, but either a heathen or an un-

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 746.

believing Jew; but the mother converted to Christianity, and so the son also. And hence might happen the departing of the wife from the unbelieving husband, and her marrying with the believing son. Thence might the glorying of the Corinthians proceed, not from this merely, that the son had married his mother-in-law, (for to think that would be ridiculous,) but that the gospel had so prevailed as to separate even a wife from an unbelieving husband.

Καὶ οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἐπενθήσατε, ἵνα ἐξαρθῆ· *And have not rather mourned that he might be taken away.*] “It was your duty, O ye Corinthians, to have besought God with prayers and fastings to take away from among you so wicked a man, if so be he repented not: ‘but you are puffed up,’” &c. Πενθεῖν, to *mourn*, in this place seems to extend to the sense of תענית *fasting*, among the Hebrews.

“These<sup>b</sup> are to be stoned; הבא על האם ועל אשת האב *He that lies with his mother, or with the wife of his father.* He that lies with his mother is (doubly) guilty, both because she is his mother, and because she is his father’s wife. He that lies with the wife of his father is (doubly) guilty, both because she is the wife of his father, and because she is the wife of another: whether his father be living<sup>c</sup> or dead, and whether she be the wife of his father by espousal or marriage.” See also Maimonides<sup>d</sup>. And elsewhere this very sin is adjudged to cutting off: כריתות בתורה לו<sup>e</sup> *there are thirty-six cuttings off in the law*, or thirty-six who are to be cut off, הבא על אשת אב ועל האם *he that lies with his mother, or with the wife of his father, &c.*

It may indeed seem a wonder that one and the same crime should be adjudged to ‘stoning,’ which was inflicted by the Sanhedrim, and to ‘cutting off,’ which was by the hand of God. But hear the Glosser; “All those cuttings off, saith he, are concerning things done presumptuously, בלא התראה *where there was no previous admonition or protestation*: but if there were previous admonition, some of them are adjudged to strangling, and some to stoning. But if these things are done out of ignorance, a sacrifice for sin is required.”

כרת *Cutting off* was by the immediate hand of God, which

<sup>b</sup> Sanhedr. cap. 7. hal. 4.

<sup>c</sup> *Leusden’s edit.*, vol. ii. p. 888.

<sup>d</sup> In *Issure Biah*, cap. i. 2.

<sup>e</sup> *Cherithuth*, cap. i. hal. i.

this impious person had deserved in the highest degree: for that this wicked act was done by him out of ignorance, it would be ridiculous to imagine.

Ver. 5: Παράδοῦναι τῷ Σατανῇ: *To deliver unto Satan.*]

*A few things concerning excommunication among the Jews. Whether 'to excommunicate' and 'to deliver to Satan' among them were the same.*

Being to speak of *excommunication* among the Jews, we must first speak a little concerning *נויפה* *reproof*, which with the Babylonian writers was the same with *excommunication*. אין נויים פחות מז' ימים " *Reproof*<sup>f</sup> or *admonition* is not less than for seven days: as it is said, If her father spit in her face, shall she not be ashamed seven days? (Numb. xii. 12.) Rabbi Chasda saith, נדרי שלנו כנויפה שלהן *Our excommunication* (in Babylon) *is like their reproof*" (in the land of Israel).

These examples are there produced: "R. Simeon the son of Rabbi (Judah) and Bar Kaphra sat reading; and when the place which they read was too hard, R. Simeon said to Bar Kaphra, We have need of Rabbi for an interpreter here. To whom Bar Kaphra, And what can Rabbi say in this matter? R. Simeon went away and told this to his father, who thereupon was angry. Bar Kaphra came to visit him. He said to him, O Bar Kaphra, I knew you not. He knew what he meant: נהג נויפורה therefore he underwent *reproof* thirty days." And again; "Rabbi sometime commanded that the masters teach not their scholars in the streets; applying those words mystically hither, 'The compass of thy thighs are like jewels,' (Cant. vii. 1.) As the thighs are in secret, so the words of the law are in secret. R. Chaija (ר' חייא) came forth, and taught the two sons of his brother in the street; that is, Rabb, and Bar Bar Channah. Rabbi heard this and was angry. R. Chaija came to visit him. He saith to him, עייה O Aija, who shall read to thee in the street?" (The Gloss there: "He called him עייה *Aija* in contempt: Who shall read to thee in the street, is as much as if he had said, Begone hence.") "He knew why he uttered such words against him; therefore he took נויפה *the reproof* for thirty days."

<sup>f</sup> Bab. Moed Katon, fol. 16. 1.



R. Asher<sup>d</sup> sticks in this business why Bar Kaphra and R. Chaija submitted themselves thirty days to that 'reproof,' when it extended not itself beyond seven days: concerning which let the reader see, if he be at leisure, what he discourseth.

The difference between *נויפה* *reproof*, and *נידוי* *excommunication*, was this:

I. That *reproof*, or correction, had not need of absolution; *excommunication* had.

II. Although he who was struck with such reproof kept himself within doors, and went not abroad as a man ashamed, yet others abstained not from his company. Before him who had struck him with that thunder he appeared not, nor conversed in public; yet any one might resort to him at home. So R. Chaija is said to have taught Rabh at home those thirty days.

"*Reproof* *נויפה* (say the masters) is, when some eminent man chides another, saying, How impudent is N., or something of that nature. Now the condition of a man thus chidden, or reprov'd, is this: he hides himself, and keeps himself at home as one ashamed, that he may not see his face who shamed him; nor does he stand before him with his head uncovered. He abates also of his laughter, and of his words, and of his business, and makes himself sad before those that see him. But there is no need for him to withdraw himself from men, but he may eat and drink with them, and salute them. Nor needs he to please him that reprov'd him, nor needs he absolution: but when he hath taken the reproof upon him, and the time is expired, he is free." Compare the words of the apostle, 1 Tim. v. 1, *πρεσβυτέρφ μὴ ἐπιπλήξῃς, &c. rebuke not an elder, &c.* with this *נויפה*.

And now to pass to *excommunication* itself.

I. *Excommunication* was devised and found out by the Jews, if my eyes see anything, to be a punishment of those faults for which there was no other punishment decreed, either in the Holy Scriptures, or in the traditions. I believe he scarcely was excommunicated among the Jews, for whose offence the punishment either of cutting off, or of death, or of whipping, or of restitution of double or fourfold, &c., was openly ap-

<sup>d</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 747.

pointed either by the law or by the fathers of the traditions. But in those things concerning which there was no such appointment or punishment, what was to be done? There were faults worthy of punishment, but neither law nor scribes assign<sup>e</sup> them any of all those punishments which were named: but certainly provision ought to be made, that such things be not done without punishment. Hence *excommunication* was invented as the general punishment of such faults. The thing itself, if I mistake not, speaks this, if we well weigh those things for which *excommunication* was inflicted.

II. The causes or reasons of *excommunication* were generally two: namely, לַמְּוֹנָה *for money*; and לְאַפִּיקוֹרְתָא *for epicurism*. This distinction we meet with in a place in<sup>f</sup> their Talmud, where they treat at large of *excommunication*, and whence we have many things concerning this subject.

*Excommunication for money* was not when one owing another *money* did not pay it; for an action at law laid against him: but when he was summoned into court and adjudged by the bench to pay it, and yet paid it not.

What *אפיקורס* *Epicurism* means we may learn from the definition of Epicurus. "Epicurus is he that despiseth the words of God. Epicurus is he that despiseth the scholars of the wise men." The *Aruch* saith thus; "אִפְקָר is he that speaks with an ill tongue; he is Epicurus." Among the Talmudists אִפְקָר denotes one that is *presumptuous, dissolute, a man governed by no rule*. Thence אִפְקוֹרוֹס *Epicurus, lawless, dissolute, not circumscribed within the laws of the scribes*. פְּקָרוּ מִיָּנִים is rendered by the Gloss פְּנִיחָם הֵעִיזוּ *the<sup>h</sup> heretics have hardened their faces*. בְּתַפְקָר בְּשִׁלְיַחַת רַבִּי דִּינָא, The Gloss renders it, *He<sup>i</sup> reproacheth the messenger of the Sanhedrim*.

More particularly. "Rambam<sup>k</sup> of blessed memory saith, For twenty-four causes they excommunicate either man or woman; and these are they that are to be excommunicated."

1. "He that vilifies a wise man, yea, after his death."
2. "He that vilifies the messenger of the Sanhedrim."
3. "He who calls his companion servant."

<sup>e</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 889.

<sup>f</sup> Bab. Moed<sup>k</sup> Katon, fol. 16. 1.

<sup>g</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 99. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Megill. fol. 25. 2.

<sup>i</sup> Moed Katon, fol. 16. 1.

<sup>k</sup> Orach Chaim, cap. 359.

4. "He that sets at nought one word of the *scribes*; there is no need to say he that sets at nought the *law*."

5. "Who appears not at the day set him by the bench."

6. "Who submits not to the judgment of the bench, they excommunicate him till he do submit."

7. "Who keeps any hurtful thing; for example, a fierce dog or a broken ladder; they excommunicate him till he put it away."

8. "Who sells his farm to a heathen, they excommunicate him until he take upon himself all the wrong which may thence come to an Israelite his neighbour."

9. "Who gives evidence against an Israelite before a heathen tribunal; and by that evidence extorts money from him: they excommunicate him until he pay it back again."

10. "A<sup>k</sup> butcher priest, who divides not a portion to the other priest, they excommunicate him until he gives it."

11. "Who profaneth the second feast day of the captivity although it be according to custom." Of this day see Maimonides<sup>1</sup>.

12. "Who doth any servile work on the Passover-eve afternoon."

13. "Who mentioneth the name of God in vain, either in an oath or in words."

14. "Who compels the people to eat the holy things out of the bounds."

15. "Who compels the people to profane the name of God."

16. "Who intercalates the year or months without the land of Israel."

17. "Who lays a stumblingblock before the blind."

18. "Who hinders the people from performing the precept."

19. "The butcher who offers a torn beast."

20. "The butcher who showeth not his knife to a wise man to be approved of."

21. "Who hardens himself against knowledge."

22. "Who hath put away his wife, and yet hath partnership and dealing with her."

23. "A wise man that lies under an ill fame."

<sup>k</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 748.

<sup>1</sup> In Kiddush. Hodesh, cap. 5.

24. "Who excommunicates him that deserves not excommunication."

These you have likewise in the learned Buxtorf's Talmudic Lexicon, in the word מִנְדוּי<sup>m</sup>.

By how much the more carefully I look upon the causes and reasons of *excommunication*, so much the more I persist in my opinion, that *excommunication* was invented as a punishment for those faults for which no kind of punishment was decreed, either by the law, or by any traditional canons. Consider them singly, and perhaps you will be of my opinion.

III. He against whom they were to proceed by *excommunication* was first cited, and a day set him wherein to appear, by a messenger sent him by the bench, which certified him of the day, and of the persons before whom he was to appear. מתרין ביה שני וחמישי ושני *They<sup>n</sup> appoint him the second day of the week*, (on which day they sit in the court, and assemble in the synagogue,) *and the fifth day of the week*, (on which day also there is an assembly and a session,) *and the second of the week following*. If he appeared not on the day first appointed, they look for him unto the day that was secondly appointed and thirdly appointed. And this was when the case was about money: אבל לאפיקרותא לאלתר *but if it were for Epicurism* (if he made not his appearance on the first day appointed), *they excommunicate him without delay*.

IV. They<sup>o</sup> first struck him with simple *excommunication*, which they call נידוי *niddui*, in which there was not absolute cursing. אין בו קללה *In<sup>p</sup> 'niddui' was not absolute cursing*. For they said only יהא נידוי *Let N. be under excommunication*.

V. This *excommunication* was for thirty days. אין נידוי משלשים *Excommunication<sup>q</sup> (niddui) was not less than for thirty days*: as it is said, "Until a month, until the flesh come out of your nostrils," Numb. xi. 20. But if the excommunicated person appeased those that excommunicated him within that time, they absolve him forthwith.

VI. But if he persisted in his perverseness, the thirty days being ended, they *excommunicate him again*, מנדין ומקללין

<sup>m</sup> [Col. 1303 foll.]

<sup>n</sup> Moed Katon, fol. 16. 1.

<sup>o</sup> Leusden's edition, vol. ii. p. 890.

<sup>p</sup> Piske הראש in Moed Katon, art. 55.

<sup>q</sup> Hieros. Moed Katon, fol. 81. 3.

אותו *adding also a curse*. And this second *excommunication* they call שמתא *shammatha*. מנין דמשמתין “Whence<sup>r</sup> is it that we ‘shammathize?’ In that it is written, Curse ye Meroz,” Judges v. 23. Rabbenu Asher upon the place: “Barak<sup>s</sup> *shammathized* Meroz; as it is written, Curse ye Meroz: which is both נידוי *excommunication*, and קללה *cursing*: for in the word ארור is both *excommunication* and *cursing*.”

VII. They published his offence in the synagogue. פרשין חטאיה בציבורא *We<sup>t</sup> particularly publish his crime in the synagogue*. The Gloss is: “They said to his fellow citizens, For this and this cause we *shammathize* him.”

VIII. If he persist still for these thirty days in his perverseness, מנדין אותו *they anathematized him*. מנדין 'מחר ל' ומחרים ל' *They excommunicate him; and after thirty days they again excommunicate (shammathize) him; and after sixty they anathematize*. Rabbenu Asher saith<sup>u</sup>, “They anathematize, saying, Let him be under anathema. And this is much more heavy than either *niddui*, or *shammatha*. For in this is both *excommunication* and *cursing*, and the forbidding the use of any men, unless in those things only which belong to the sustaining of life. And they anathematize not but when a man hath hardened himself against the bench once and again.”

IX. They give the reason of these proceedings in *Moed Katon*<sup>x</sup> in these words:

“Whence is it that they send a messenger to him from the court (‘מבד<sup>r</sup> from the house of judgment?’) Because it is written, ‘And Moses sent to Dathan and Abiram.’”

“Whence is it that they summon him to judgment? Because it is written, ‘And Moses said to Korah, Be thou and all thy company present.’”

“Whence<sup>y</sup> is it that they cite him before some great and eminent man? Because it is written, ‘Before the Lord.’”

“Whence is it that it is before N., or such a man? Because it is written, ‘Thou, and they, and Aaron.’”

“Whence is it that they appoint them a set time of appearance? Because it is written, ‘Be ye present to morrow.’”

<sup>r</sup> Bab Moed Katon, in the place before.

<sup>s</sup> Fol. 34. 2.

<sup>t</sup> Moed Katon in the place before.

<sup>u</sup> In the place above.

<sup>x</sup> In the place alleged.

<sup>y</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 749.

“ Whence is it that it is from time to time? Because it is written, ‘ They did cry there, Pharaoh king of Egypt is but a noise; he hath passed the time appointed.’ ” Jer. xlvi. 17.

“ Whence is it that they shammatize? Because it is written, ‘ Curse ye Meroz.’ ”

“ Whence is it that they anathematize? Because it is written, ‘ Curse ye.’ ”

“ Whence is it that he is cursed that eats and drinks with him, and stands within four cubits of him? Because it is written *וְשֹׁבְרֵיהָ*, as one would say, *sedentes ejus*, or *those that sit with her*,” Judges v. 23.

“ Whence is it that they publish his crimes in the synagogue? Because it is written, ‘ Because they came not to the help of the Lord.’ ”

“ Whence is it that they confiscate his goods? Because it is written, ‘ Whosoever comes not within three days, according to the counsel of the princes and elders, all his substance shall be forfeited,’ ” Ezra x. 8.

“ Whence is it that we contend with him, and curse him, and strike him, and pull off his hair, and abjure him? Because it is written, ‘ And I contended with him, and cursed them, and struck some of them, and pulled off their hair,’ ” Neh. xiii. 25.

“ Whence is it that we tie and bind them?” (The Gloss is, His hands and feet, and to a pillar, to be whipped.) “ Because it is written, ‘ Either to death or banishment, or confiscation of goods, or imprisonment,’ ” Ezra vii. 26.

You see *excommunication* among the Jews drawn out by their own pencil from head to foot. And now whether this, themselves being judges, were *delivering into the hands of Satan*, is matter of further inquiry, and more obscure inquiry too. Any such saying of *excommunication* does not at all occur in terms; and whether it occur in sense, let the reader judge from those things that are spoken of the condition of the person excommunicate.

I. *זה דין המנודה* “ *This<sup>z</sup> is the condition of a person excommunicate.* They eat not nor drink with him, nor sit within four cubits of him,” (his wife, and children, and servants being excepted, to whom it was permitted to sit by him.)

<sup>z</sup> Piske הראש in Moed Katon, cap. 3.

“When they give thanks” (at meat), “they join him<sup>a</sup> not in the thanks, nor admit him to any thing which wants the ten men. But any may talk with him, and he hires workmen, and he is hired himself for a workman.”

II. As to those things which respect religion,

First, Persons excommunicate went to the Temple as well as others. “All<sup>b</sup> that go into the Temple, according to the custom, go in the right-hand way, and go about and go out the left-hand way, except him to whom any thing happens, who walked about to the left hand.”

“Being asked what is the matter with you, that you go about to the left, he answered, *Because I am excommunicate*, (שאני מנודה.) To whom the other replied, He that dwells in this house put it into thy heart to hearken to the words of thy companions.”

Secondly, “It<sup>c</sup> is a tradition. מנודה שונה ושנין לו *He that is excommunicate expounds the traditions, and they expound to him.* He that is anathematized expounds not to others, nor do they expound to him; but he expounds by himself, that he forget not his learning.” And again, It<sup>d</sup> is permitted the excommunicate person to deal in the law: but to the person anathematized it is forbidden. But he expounds by himself.”

Thirdly, He that turns over the Talmudical authors shall very often observe that a person ‘excommunicate,’ and he that ‘mourns for the dead,’ are subject to the same conditions in very many things: yea the ‘mourner’ to worse conditions.

“The<sup>e</sup> mourner and the person excommunicate are forbidden to have their hair cut. The mourner is bound to veil his head; the excommunicate not. The mourner on the first day is deprived of his phylacteries; the excommunicate not. The mourner is forbidden salutation; to the excommunicate it is permitted: much more is it lawful to talk with him. The mourner is forbid to employ himself in the law; to the excommunicate it is permitted. But the person anathematized may not converse in the law; but he expounds it to

<sup>a</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 891.

<sup>b</sup> *Middoth*, cap. ii. hal. 2.

<sup>c</sup> *Orach Chajim*, in the place before.

<sup>d</sup> Piske הרי"ש in the place above, art. 51.

<sup>e</sup> Piske Harosh in the place above, art. 51.

himself, and he makes himself a little tent for his food. The mourner is bound to the rending of his garment; the excommunicate not. The mourner is forbid to do any work; to the excommunicate it is allowed. The mourner is forbid to wash himself; to the excommunicate it is allowed. The mourner putteth not on sandals; the excommunicate puts them on. The mourner lies not with his wife; the excommunicate lies with his," &c.

From what hath been said, it seems that it may be concluded on one part that *excommunication* among the Jews scarcely sounded the same with *delivering to Satan*: and there are some reasons also by which it seems it may be concluded in like manner, that *delivering to Satan* here in the apostle doth not sound the same with *excommunication*. Be<sup>f</sup> it granted that he is excommunicated and cast out of the church, is rejected also by God, and is indeed delivered into the hands of Satan; this is not that which is our task at present to consider; but whether Paul by his *let him be delivered to Satan*, or the Corinthians by that expression, understood *excommunication*. We embrace the negative for these reasons:—

I. Because no reason can be rendered why the apostle, rejecting the vulgar and most known word *excommunication*, should fly to another that was very unknown, very obscure.

II. The act of this wicked wretch was above *excommunication*. 'And it was a small matter for such an impious man to be excommunicated. He deserved death, as we have observed, two or three times over. And it was more agreeable to that extraordinary wickedness, that it should have some more extraordinary punishment inflicted on it than that very common one of excommunication.

III. Why should the apostle use such earnest counsel and exhortation to excite the church to excommunicate one that so deserved *excommunication*? Was *excommunication* a thing so difficult to be obtained among them? What need was there of the presence of St. Paul's spirit in a thing any ministers of the church were empowered to do? What need was there of such solemn determination (*ἡδὴ κέκρικα, I have determined*

<sup>f</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 750.



already), in a thing concerning which every one would confess that he deserved *excommunication*?

IV. *To deliver to Satan* was *eis ðλεθρον σαρκὸς*, for *destruction of the flesh*. But what could *excommunication* avail to that in a man sworn upon his lusts? You will say, Perhaps it might come to pass that it might have such an effect. But I reply, when the apostle saith, *to the destruction of the flesh*, he speaks not of a fortuitous effect, but of a certain or undoubted one.

These are the reasons, to omit others, whereby we are led to be of their opinion who interpret the place of a miraculous action, namely, of the real delivery of this person into the hands and power of Satan, to be scourged by him, and tormented by him with diseases, tortures, and affrightments. And the phrases used by the apostle about this matter, and the circumstances of the thing itself, do very well accord hereunto.

Ἦδη κέκρικα ὡς παρών. *I have judged already, as though I were present.*] I. *To deliver to Satan* is never mentioned in Scripture but when there was an apostolic power, as here, and 1 Tim. i. 20. And that apostolic power of striking obstinate persons miraculously, or wicked sinners with any punishment, was not usually put forth by them, unless in the presence of the parties, as by Peter against Ananias and Sapphira, and by Paul against Elymas; and likewise, as it is very probable, against Hymeneus and Alexander; yet he being now a great way distant and remote, “‘I have judged’ (saith he) ‘and decreed’ to exercise at a distance this my power against this wicked man, as though I were present and before his face;” which indeed was not ordinarily done, but this was not an ordinary wickedness.

II. To this sense is that clause to be rendered, καὶ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, *and my spirit*; that is, my ‘apostolical spirit,’ or the gift of the Spirit conferred upon me. So “the spirit<sup>h</sup> of Elias dwelt upon Elisha,” 2 Kings ii. 15; that is, the prophetic spirit of Elias.

III. And compare that clause, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ*, with

<sup>g</sup> “Hominem in libidines suas juratum.”

<sup>h</sup> *Leusden’s edition*, vol. ii. p. 892.

the same manner of speech, Acts iii. 6, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk;" namely, when a miracle was to be done: and also,

IV. The word *δύναμις*, *power*, is very usually in the gospel referred to miracles: it is very rarely, if at all, used for the power of discipline.

Let us conclude our discourse of *excommunication* among the Jews with a tradition received among them; which see if you please: אסותא ליה דלית ליה מדקיה דרבנן חיויא "If the Rabbins' serpent bite any one, there is no cure for him. Bar Kasha in Pumbeditha was bitten by the Rabbins' serpent, and there was no cure for him." The Gloss is; "Because he had transgressed against the excommunication of the wise men: therefore when he was bitten by a serpent there was no healing for him.

Ver. 9<sup>k</sup>: Ἐγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ: *I wrote unto you in an epistle.*] In an *epistle*? What?

I. The Aorist *ἔγραψα* may be rendered *I had written*, without any wrong to grammar. "'*I had written* in this Epistle, Company not,' &c. before the report of this wickedness came to me: but now hearing it I sharpen my pen the more, and I bind you with a straiter prohibition, namely, 'That ye do not eat with such.'"

II. The apostle had sent Timothy to the Corinthians before he wrote this Epistle, chap. iv. 17: and it is very likely that he sent some epistle by him in which he had so written. But Stephanus, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, coming to the apostle, and laying open the whole state of the church of Corinth to him, and bringing him letters and questions from the church, when as yet, as they knew, Timothy was not arrived at Corinth; he suppresses that epistle, and comprises it in this. And if you say, That is lost, you will say true in some respect, because the exact copy of that epistle came not unto us: and you will not say true in another respect, because in this Epistle we have all things comprised in that, and much more besides.

Μὴ συναναμίγυσθαι. *Not to company.*] I. It is plain the apostle riseth higher here, and obligeth them with a straiter admonition than he had done before. He had written to them

<sup>i</sup> Schab. fol. 110. 1.

<sup>k</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 751.

before μή συναμύγνυσθαι, *not to company with them*: now he writes μή συvesθίειν, *not to eat with them*.

II. It is plain also that he aims his words at profane Christians, not at heathens, both now and when he writ before. For there were among the Christians converted from heathenism some, without doubt, whose parents, or children, or kinsmen, not yet converted, wallowed in idolatry, covetousness, and whoredoms. But now a Christian was not to forget all these alliances; nor was all familiarity and respect towards them to be cast away.

III. "The word συναμύγνυσθαι denotes, saith Camerarius, *necessitudinem aliquam interiorem, some more intimate friendship, or alliances*: which indeed in some respect is true, if that *more inward friendship* be distinguished into that which is more close and less close. Συναμύγνυσις is to be reckoned that *conversation and friendship* which a Jew might enter into with a Jew, and not with a heathen: according to the rule of which, as being very well known, it scarcely can be doubted but the apostle speaks.

I. A Jew might deal and traffick with a heathen nevertheless, under this and some other cautions of that nature: למים לפני אידיהן של ענ' ג' ימים "Three' days before the festivals of the heathens, it is forbidden to give and receive with them, to lend to or to borrow of them, to restore or to fetch back any thing," &c. I scarcely believe this falls under the signification of the word συναμύγνυσθαι, *companying*.

II. To eat together and at one table was συναμύγνυσθαι, *to company*, which certainly appears enough from the strait prohibition of such eating with a heathen. A Pharisee, in markets and fairs, would have dealing with a common person; but he would not eat with him. So a common person would trade with a heathen; but he would not eat with him. The apostle therefore does not oppose συναμύγνυσθαι, *companying*, and συvesθίειν, *eating together*, one against another, but propounds *eating together* as a certain degree συναμύγνυσις, of *companying* or *mixing together*. For,

III. There was, which by common experience may be observed, a much more inward friendship than such a bare eating, namely, that which is called by the Jews' lawyers

<sup>1</sup> Avodah Zarah, cap. i.

שותפות *copartnership* in merchandise and traffick; and that which is called by us 'deputation:' both forbidden a Jew with a Gentile. אסור לאדם שיעשה שותפות עם הגוי, "It<sup>m</sup> is forbidden a man to enter into copartnership with a heathen; lest haply he must sometime swear, and is compelled to swear by his idol." And Maimonides<sup>n</sup>: אין הגוי נעשה שליח "A heathen is not made a messenger [or a deputy] for any thing, nor is an Israelite made a deputy for a heathen."

IV. Friendship was yet more close by contract of marriage and affinity: this the LXX call *συγκατάμυξις*, Josh. xxiii. 12.

And now it is not very hard to fathom the sense of the apostle, which take in this paraphrase: "I wrote you in an epistle that ye mingle not with fornicators in any more inward familiarity or friendship: which I understood not so much of heathen fornicators, as of those who are called brethren or Christians. But now I write the same<sup>o</sup> thing, that ye mingle not in any such familiarity with them, or others of that stamp<sup>p</sup>, as covetous, or idolaters: no, not in that familiarity that is most remote, namely, eating with such a man at the same table."

Ver. 12: Τι γάρ μοι καὶ τοὺς ἔξω κρίνειν; *What have I to do to judge them also that are without?* Here, perhaps, one may stick at the version and sense commonly received. Beza reads, Quid meâ interest? *What doth it concern me?* The French, Qu'ai-je à faire de juger? *What have I to do to judge?* The Italian, Che appartiene a me giudicare? *What doth it belong to me to judge?* I know well enough the phrase τί μοι very frequently occurs in this sense: but here we may upon good ground inquire, If it concerns thee not, O blessed apostle, to judge them that are without, why didst thou judge Elymas with blindness? why Hymeneus and Alexander, by delivering them into the hands of Satan, when they were now apostates, and no other than such as were without?

What therefore if the words be rendered to this sense; "For why is power granted me to judge concerning them also that are without? that is, by my apostolic authority to strike even a heathen with some divine plague, if he be incu-

<sup>m</sup> Bab. Sanhedr. fol. 63. 2.

<sup>n</sup> Schilluchin, &c. cap. 2.

<sup>o</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 893.

<sup>p</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 752.

rably an enemy, and blasphemer of the gospel; which I did to Elymas, &c. Why is this granted me, but to cut off such as are past cure? And do not you also, within your sphere, judge those who are within? But now those that are without which I thus judge and smite, God judgeth and smites, and by his vengeance gives his suffrage to my censure. Καὶ ἐξαρῆτε, *therefore put away*: in like manner you also, doing what lies in you, may *take away* this man, and other such wicked persons, by that hand of God." It cannot be passed over without observing that ἐξαρῆτε is the future tense, and it is not rashly to be rendered by another tense. We explain therefore the whole place by this paraphrase: "It is given me by God to judge those also that are without; and do not ye judge them that are within? But those that are without, whom I judge, God himself judgeth; and you also by the like judgment, may take away this wicked person out of the midst of you." The LXX, in Deut. xvii. 7, ἐξαρεῖς τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, *Thou shalt take away the wicked person from among you*; and elsewhere very frequently.

#### CHAP. VI.

VER. 1: Κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων *Go to law before the unjust.*] We cannot here but first of all produce the words of Titus the emperor, thus discoursing to the seditious that were besieged in Jerusalem: Πρῶτον μὲν ὑμῖν τὴν τε χώραν ἔδομεν νέμεσθαι, καὶ βασιλεῖς ὁμοφύλους ἐπεστήσαμεν, ἔπειτα τοὺς πατρῷους νόμους ἐτηρήσαμεν, καὶ ζῆν οὐ μόνον καθ' ἑαυτοὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπετρέψαμεν, ὡς ἐβούλεσθε. *First<sup>a</sup>, we have granted you to dwell in your own country, and have set over you kings of the same tribes with yourselves. Then we have preserved your country's laws, and have permitted you not only to live by yourselves, but others also, according to your will.*

That the Jews had now lived by their own laws under the Roman empire, is clearer than to need demonstration. And, the Gemarists<sup>r</sup> being witnesses, judgment in money matters, or in things pertaining to this life, was not taken from them before the times of Simeon Ben Jochai. Now I would have you tell me, whether the same things were not allowed the

<sup>a</sup> Joseph. de Bell. lib. vi. cap. 34. [Hudson, p. 1284. l. 44.] [vi. 6. 2.]

<sup>r</sup> Hieros. Sanhedr. fol. 24. 2.

Jews converted to Christianity? Let us take an example in this Corinthian church: it consisted of Jews and Gentiles now converted. The Jews, while they believed not, had in their synagogues *בֵּן שְׁלֹשׁ* *the bench of three*, who judged *περὶ τῶν βιωτικῶν*, *concerning things pertaining to this life*; and that by the permission of the Roman empire. Now they were translated into a Christian synagogue, or congregation, and, with them, Gentiles who believed. Was that denied them by the Romans in a Christian congregation which was granted them in a synagogue?

First<sup>s</sup>, There was no persecution at all as yet raised against the Christians by the Romans when the apostle wrote these things: for not a few years passed before Nero brake forth into that wickedness.

Secondly, The Romans little cared to distinguish between a Judaizing synagogue of the Jews, and a Christianizing synagogue of the Jews. And that of Gallio was as the business was indeed, "Look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters," Acts xviii. 15. It was free for them to judge of 'names and matters of their law.'

Therefore these Corinthians were worthy of reproof, in whose power it was freely to exercise such judgments among themselves; yet, to the scandal of the gospel and the Christian name, betook themselves to heathen courts of justice.

Ver. 2: *Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινουσι; Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world?*] This place is wrested to a twofold opinion. By the Fifth Monarchists [*Chiliastis*] into I know not what sense; which I would rather you should ask them than expect from me. By others into this opinion, that "*the saints* in the last judgment shall sit together with Christ, and shall approve his judgment." And to this they bring those words of our Saviour, Matt. xix. 28, Luke xxii. 30, "When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones," &c.

I wonder the verses of so illustrious and notable a subject as that is which we now handle, and that which is now quoted, are so much strained from their proper and genuine sense: let me speak it by the leave of the learned. Let us first weigh the words of our Saviour.

<sup>s</sup> \* *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 753.

I. There is but small logical arguing in this manner, (if those words were to be taken in that sense which they would have,) “‘Ye shall sit upon twelve thrones<sup>t</sup>, judging the twelve tribes of Israel;’ therefore all *the saints* shall judge the world, as assessors with Christ in the last judgment.” Which harshness they thus smooth over; “That<sup>u</sup> which he said to them, he said to all those that should imitate them.” “Here<sup>x</sup> shall be some eminency of the apostles above the rest of *the saints*.” And so very many others.

II. But Judas was present when these words were uttered by our Saviour; and was not he to be concluded within that number of twelve? But omitting this, there were more also present when he said these words, who had ‘followed him in the regeneration:’ and if all they, and all *the saints* that should be in the whole world, were to be concluded within that privilege of sitting with Christ upon the bench, why is the number restrained only to twelve? “You twelve,” that is, all *saints*, “shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel,” that is, ‘the whole world,’ is so thorny a gloss, that my fingers can by no means touch it.

III. We gave the sense of the words in their place. Namely, by ‘Christ’s sitting in the throne of his glory,’ is not to be understood his tribunal in the last judgment; but when he should come in the glory of his vengeance against the Jewish nation, then not the *persons*, but the *doctrine* of the twelve apostles, should judge and condemn that most wicked nation.

And as to the opinion itself concerning *the saints*’ sitting with Christ,

I. Nothing is plainer in the Scripture than that all shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ, 2 Cor. v. 10, as well the sheep as the goats, Matt. xxv. 32, &c. Mention indeed is made of *reigning* with Christ, but nowhere of *judging* with Christ in the day of judgment.

II. How little or nothing doth that sound, “*The saints* shall approve the judgment of Christ!” Are thrones for this to be set up, that those that sit upon them should approve the judgment? The very devils and damned themselves shall not otherwise choose but acknowledge his justice.

<sup>t</sup> *Leusden’s edition*, vol. ii. p. 894.

<sup>u</sup> Primasius.

<sup>x</sup> Beza.

III. And what, I pray, is this manner of arguing? ‘*Saints*, in the last day, shall approve the judgment and sentence of Christ: therefore ye are able to judge concerning those things which pertain to this life?’

We therefore make no doubt that the sense of these words, *Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world?* most plainly is this; ‘Know ye not that Christians shall be magistrates, and judges in the world?’ Which most clearly appears by these observations:

I. The word *ἅγιοι*, *saints*, in the verse before, denotes all Christians, as opposed to infidels not professing Christianity. But that all these shall judge the world with Christ, the espousers of that opinion will not acknowledge: and then let a reason be given why the word in this verse is to be taken in a different and stricter sense than the same word is in the verse foregoing.

II. The apostle speaks as of a thing known and confessed; *Ὀὐκ οἶδατε*, *Know ye not?* But whence was this known, or to be known, that Christians should be magistrates, and judges of the world? Most easily and most plainly out of Dan. vii. 18, 27: where when the four heathen monarchies which had so long ruled the world under their tyranny fell, at length the rule, and dominion, and empire under the whole heaven, was to be translated to the people of *the saints* of the Most High. In what sense and in what latitude the word *saints* is to be taken, one may learn from a very plain antithesis in that chapter. The rule, and the dominion, and empire under the whole heaven was before belonging to heathens: but under the reign of Christ it was the *saints*’, that is, the *Christians*’.

III. This sense agrees very well with the apostle’s argument: “Think it not unlawful to decide among yourselves such differences as arise among yourselves; and by flying to heathen tribunals, do not bring a reproach upon the gospel: for consider what is foretold by Daniel, which ye know well enough, namely, that the *saints*, that is, the *Christians*, shall hereafter possess the dominion and government of the whole world, as now a long while the heathens have possessed and do possess it. If they shall one day be endued with a right

† *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 754.



of governing, certainly you yourselves may determine of contentions now.

IV. That which is said by the Apocalyptic, chap. xx. 4, agrees with the sense of this place: that when Christ had bound Satan, he should no more deceive the Gentiles as he had done before, by idols, oracles, &c. Thrones are set up, and judgment is given unto them who sit upon them, that is, a power and authority of judging, and ruling, and exercising magistracy.

Ver. 3: Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἀγγέλους κρινοῦμεν; *Know ye not that we shall judge angels?*] He saith not, as he did before, The *saints* shall judge *angels*, but *we* shall judge them. By *angels*, all confess *devils* to be understood. But certainly *all saints*, (according to the latitude of that word in the verse foregoing,) that is, all that profess Christianity, shall not judge devils. Nor is this *judging of angels* to be understood in the last day. But the apostle speaks of the ministers of the gospel, himself, and others, who by the preaching of the gospel and the name of Christ should spoil the devils of their oracles and idols, should deprive them of their worships, should drive them out of their seats, and strip them of their dominion. Thus would God subdue the whole world under Christian power; that Christian magistrates should judge men, and ministers of the gospel, devils: and do not you now judge among yourselves of some trivial differences?

Ver. 4<sup>z</sup>: Βιωτικά μὲν οὖν κριτήρια: *Judgments of things pertaining to this life.*] How judgments among the Jews were distinguished into ממונות דיני *pecuniary judgments*, and נפשות דיני *capital judgments*, every one knows. Whether κριτήρια βιωτικά, *judgments of things pertaining to this life*, and דיני ממונות *pecuniary judgments*, are the same, we do not dispute: certainly under *pecuniary judgments*, as they are opposed to *capital judgments*, are comprised all judgments below capital. Hence is that which we observe elsewhere; “*Capital judgments* were taken away from Israel forty years before the destruction of the Temple<sup>a</sup>.” And “*pecuniary judgments* were taken away from Israel in the days of Simeon Ben Jochai<sup>b</sup>.”

Τὸς ἐφουβηνημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ: *Who are least esteemed in*

<sup>z</sup> Leusden's edition, vol. ii. p. 895.

<sup>a</sup> Hieros. Sanhedr. fol. 24. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. col. 1.

*the church.*] I. To interpret this word here for those that are *most vile*, or *most contemptible*, which some versions do, is certainly somewhat hard and improper. What! needy persons, and such as seek their living by alms or hard labour, to make *them* judges! Whence should such have skill to judge, or be at leisure for it? How apt might they be to consult rather their own gain than just judgment? And who would not despise such judges? The word therefore, *ἐξουθενημένους*, *least esteemed*, is not to be referred to the lowest of the common people, but to the lowest of the order of judges.

II. That order had these degrees in the Jewish benches; according to the custom and disposition of which it is very likely the apostle speaks :

1. There was the great Sanhedrim, consisting of seventy-one elders.

2. There was the Sanhedrim of three-and-twenty, in cities of more note.

3. There was *בד' של ג'* *the bench of three*, in every synagogue.

4. There was *בד' של מומחין* *the authorized* (or *authentic*) *bench*.

5. There was *בד' שאינן מומחין* *the bench not authorized*; *ἐξουθενημένους*, *not authentic*.

III. We distinguish, first, between *בד' של שלשה* *the bench of three*, appointed in every synagogue, and *בד' מומחין* *the authorized bench*, however consisting also of three men. For *the bench of three* in every synagogue consisted of three elders, duly and by imposition of hands preferred to eldership. But that bench which we style *authorized* consisted not always of men promoted by ordination to eldership, but often of men receiving authority to judge in such or such matters by some special patent granted them by the Sanhedrim. It consisted for the most part of *חבירי חכמים* *fellows of the wise men*; men learned indeed, and scholars, but such as were not yet elected into the order and rank of elders.

And the duties of the *מומחין* *mumchin*, *the authorized bench*, was different from the duties and offices of the *Triumviral bench*. This bench was to judge of money matters, of wrongs, &c. That, namely the *mumchin*, was to judge of the firstborn

<sup>c</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 755.

of cattle to be offered to the Lord, whether they were without spot or no: of<sup>d</sup> women's charms to be worn or not on the sabbath: of<sup>e</sup> the knives of the butcher priests, whether lawful or not: and of divers things of that nature.

IV. When we rendered those words ב'ד' שאינן מומחין *the bench not authentic*, we meant it so called, not that the judgments and determinations of that bench were of no value, but that that bench received not its authority from the Sanhedrim, but was chosen by them between whom the controversy depended.

“Rabh Nachman<sup>f</sup> saith, A widow,” (if she would sell somewhat of her dowry,) “hath no need ב'ד' של מומחין *of the bench of the authorized*; but hath need ב'ד' של הדיוטות *of the bench of idiots*,” or *private men*. Maimonides citing these words writes thus; “A widow, whether she became a widow after marriage, or after espousal, is bound by oath, and sells a piece of land of her husband's” (for her maintenance), “either in the court of the *mumchin*, the authorized, or in שאינן מומחין *the court of those that are not authorized*; now that court or bench is, when three men are present that are honest and skilful in valuing a piece of land.”

To this very ordinary bench among the Jews, the apostle seems to have respect in this place, and to prescribe it to the Corinthians for a means of ending their differences which was easy, common, and void of cost and charges.

The bench of the *mumchin* one may not unfitly call τὸς ἀθετημένους, *such as were deputed by authority*: this bench consisting of שאינן מומחין *those that were not mumchin*, he calls ξθουθετημένους, not *vile* or *contemptible*, but such as were *not authorized*.

He exhorteth, therefore, that if at any time suits arise among them concerning pecuniary, or other matters, they by no means run to heathen courts, but rather choose some private men among themselves as judges and arbitrators in such matters.

: בשלשה הדיוטות *pecuniary<sup>h</sup> judgments may be by three private men*, ב'ג' מומחין *judg-*

<sup>d</sup> See Beracoth, fol. 48. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Schab. fol. 57, &c.

<sup>f</sup> Bava Mezia, fol. 32. 1.

<sup>g</sup> In מישות cap. 17.

<sup>h</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 3. 1.

ments of things taken away and damages by the three authorized. "The<sup>i</sup> precept of pulling off the shoe of the husband's brother requires three judges אפילו שלשתן הדיוטות, *although those three be private men.*" And Rambam upon the place, אינן חכמים הדיוטות *private<sup>k</sup> men, that is, not they that are the wise men.* And Rabbi Solomon; Such who were not of the bench of the elders in their city;" and yet in that case they might be judges.

They who were to judge in that affair were called זקנים *elders* by God, Deut. xxv. 9: "Then shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of *the elders,*" &c. And by the Talmudists they are called דינים *judges*; and yet might be private men.

The same Fathers of the Traditions speak many things of the plaintiff and defendant choosing themselves judges or umpires to decide their differences; and that both parties be bound to submit themselves to their sentence, although it be a form of judging not altogether according to the form of the statute. For example's sake, three judges were required to determine concerning pecuniary suits, and they by canon and statute, such as were made elders or presbyters by lawful ordination. But the contending parties might, if they would, choose themselves only one such arbitrator or judge; or three private men, and not elders. "The<sup>l</sup> Rabbins deliver; pecuniary judgments are by three. ואם היה מומחה לרבים דן אפילו יודי *But if he be authorized, he may judge alone.* Rabh Nachman saith, As I judge alone of pecuniary matters. And so saith R. Chaija, As I judge alone of pecuniary matters." Yea, if he be chosen by the contending persons he may judge alone: for this hath obtained, אם קיבלו עליהו *If they take upon themselves*, or undertook to submit themselves to the judgment of that one<sup>m</sup> elder, or those three private persons, they must submit, and the judgment was good.

Of this matter both Talmuds treat largely enough in the tract Sanhedrim<sup>n</sup>.

Out of the Babylonian take these passages in the place now alleged: "Rabh Nachman judged, and erred in his judgment.

<sup>i</sup> Jevamoth, fol. 101. 1.

<sup>k</sup> Leusden's edit., vol. ii. p. 896.

<sup>l</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 5. 1.

<sup>m</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 756.

<sup>n</sup> Cap. 1.

He came therefore to Rabh Joseph, of whom he heard these words: *אם קיבלך עלייהו לא תשלם* *If they have taken upon them (or undertaken) to stand to thy judgment, thou art not obliged to the payment of the damage,* &c. And a little after; “Rabban Simeon Ben Gamaliel saith, *הדין בשלשה ופשרה בשנים* *Judgment is by three, and arbitration, or reconciliation, by two.* And better is the force of reconciliation than the force of judgment: for when two judge, the parties contending may depart from their sentence: but when two arbitrators compose the difference, the contenders cannot depart from their sentence.” The reason of each is, because two judges were not a just bench. If therefore they would judge according to their office, their judgment was of no avail; but if they were particularly chosen by the contending parties for arbitrators, it stood. For as the Gloss, “The contending parties cannot depart from the sentence of two who compose the difference, for they choose them.”

Out of the Jerusalem Talmud<sup>o</sup> this passage: “R. Abhu sat judging alone at Cæsarea. His scholars said to him, Did not Rabbi teach us this, That none should judge alone? He answered them, When ye shall see me sitting alone, and yet shall come to me, ye are like them who take a judge to themselves.”

Ver. 12: *Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν, &c. All things are lawful for me, &c.*] The apostle now passeth to another subject, and treats underhand [*tacitè*] against that plague that got too much ground in the church, even the wicked heresy of the Nicolaitans, which persuaded the eating of things offered to idols and fornication.

I. He that should deny the sect of the Nicolaitans to have taken its name from *Nicolas*, one of the seven deacons, would seem certainly to go against all antiquity: and yet the ancients themselves do not sufficiently agree about the matter. Go to the authors, and you will find them differing whether the heresy sprang from an *action* of *Nicolas*, or from some *saying* of his. What if it came from neither? But that the name of the sect comes from the word *ניכוליה Nicolah*, which signifies *Let us eat*. For who knows not that the Hebrew word *נאכל* might pass into *ניכול* among the Chaldees? And when

<sup>o</sup> Fol. 18. 1.

nothing was more ancient among those very wicked men than mutually to exhort one another to eat things offered to idols, saying to each other, and to others also, as we may guess, נִיכּוֹלֵיהָ *Let us eat*, how very fitly might they be called hence *Nicolaitans* by the orthodox! נִיכּוֹל אִמְרִין *saying*<sup>p</sup>, *Let us eat flesh*.

II. Whencesoever the name of the sect comes, one can scarce say whether the sect itself were more to be abominated or more to be wondered at. For when the synod of Jerusalem had very lately decreed against eating things offered to idols and fornication, (Acts xv.) it is a matter of astonishment that presently a sort of men should spring up, and they such as professed the gospel, who should oppose them with all boldness, and excite others with all industry and endeavour to eat things offered to idols, and to commit fornication.

III. Besides that those naughty wretches used and abused the pretence of Christian liberty in the doing of these most wicked actions, they invented arguments fitted to conceal their wickedness and to defend their boldness; which the apostle reflects on in order.

The first is that πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν *all things are lawful for me*. Which although Paul might very well say concerning himself, "All things are lawful for *me*," as he doth, chap. x. 23; yet he seems secretly to whisper their very words and argumentation: to which he also answereth, "But all things are not expedient: but I will not be brought under the power of any."

The second is, "The belly is appointed for meats." Things offered to idols are meats; ergo, he answereth, "God shall destroy both it<sup>q</sup> and them." Therefore care is especially to be taken of the soul, not of those things which shall perish. And be it granted that the belly is for meats, but yet "the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord."

Ver. 16<sup>r</sup>: Ἔσονται γὰρ, φησὶν, οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν *For two, saith he, shall be one flesh*.] "And<sup>s</sup> they two shall be one flesh; מִקּוֹם שְׁנַיִם בָּשָׂר אֶחָד *namely, in that place where they make only one flesh*." Which is an apter gloss than you would take it to be at first sight; and to which the apostle

<sup>p</sup> Targ. in Isa. xxii. 13.

<sup>q</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 897.

<sup>r</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 757.

<sup>s</sup> Bereshith Rabb. sect. 18.

most plainly hath respect in this place. Those words in Moses regard a just marriage, but the apostle bends it to carnal copulation with a harlot. Whence it is necessary to take the words of Moses in this sense: “‘Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they two (*only*) shall be one flesh:’ that is, they between themselves only shall be carnally coupled, and not with any other man or any other woman.” •

## CHAP. VII.

VER. 3: Τὴν ὀφειλομένην εὐνοίαν *Due benevolence.*] What is wont to be understood here is known well enough. For although the word εὐνοία includes all mutual offices of living together, you see to what the apostle applies it, ver. 5; and that not without reason, when the Jewish masters seriously prescribed many ridiculous things of this matter; sometimes defining the appointed times of lying with the wife, sometimes allowing the vow of abstinence. Modesty forbids to relate their trifles; I had rather the reader should go to them himself than defile our paper with them. Only these few things we cannot but produce, that a reason may in some measure appear why the apostle treats of this matter:

“Lying<sup>t</sup> with the wife, concerning which mention is made in the law, is this: gentlemen, who neither exercise merchandise, nor any other work, every day; workmen, twice a week; scholars of the wise men, every sabbath-eve.”

Ver. 5: Μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους, &c. *Defraud ye not one the other, &c.*] “He<sup>u</sup> that by a vow constrains his wife from his bed, according to the school of Shammai, let him do it for two weeks; according to the school of Hillel, for one only.” Rambam upon the place writes thus: “Let him keep this his vow for one week only. But if he will keep it longer, let him put her away and give her dowry. But they say, Let the scholars go forth to learn the law, even without the permission of their wives, for thirty days. These, indeed, are the words of R. Eliezer. But according to the wise men, it is lawful for two or three years: and the tradition is according to the wise men.”

<sup>t</sup> Chetubb. cap. 5. hal. 6.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid.

You have examples of some that far exceeded these bounds, in the Gemara at the place alleged; which see.

Rambam concludes (concerning the common people), “ Know thou that it is in the power of the wife to retain her husband from going to sea, or into the army, unless it be near at hand; lest she might be defrauded of her due bed. She may also restrain him from passing from one work to another, lest her bed be thereby diminished; the study of the law only excepted.”

Ver. 6: Οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγήν. *Not by commandment.*] Συγγνώμη, *permission*, and ἐπιταγή, *command*, do something answer to those words, very usual among the Fathers of the Traditions, רשות and חובה. But now they would have marriage enjoined under a very severe command.

“ The<sup>x</sup> man it commanded concerning begetting and multiplying, but not the woman. And when doth the man come under this command? From the age of sixteen or seventeen years. But if he exceeds twenty years without marrying, behold he violates and renders an affirmative<sup>y</sup> precept vain. But if he be studious in the law, and conversant in it, and if he fears marriage, lest the care of providing for his wife hinder his study in the law, he may still tarry; because he that is employed in the precepts is free from that precept: much more he that converseth in the study of the law. He whose mind is always taken up in the study of the law, as Ben Azzai, and he that is intent upon it all his days, if he marrieth not a wife, in his hand is no iniquity. But if affection prevail upon him, let him marry a wife, although he have no children, lest he fall into evil thoughts.” “ Let<sup>z</sup> not a man refrain himself from generation and multiplying, unless he hath children already.” The Gemara upon this place thus, “ If he have children, let him refrain himself from generation and multiplying; but from marrying a wife let him not refrain himself. It is forbid him to be without a wife, because it is said, It is not good for man to be alone.” And “ Whosoever<sup>a</sup> gives not himself to generation and multiplying is all one with a murderer. He is as though he diminished from the image of God,” &c.

The apostle, therefore determines against the Jewish

<sup>x</sup> Maimon. in אישות cap. 15.

<sup>z</sup> Jevamoth, cap. 6. hal. 6.

<sup>y</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 758.

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.* fol. 63. 2.



schools, that a man is not bound by the law to marriage, but that he is in his own power in this affair, to contract himself or not, as he finds himself continent or not. *They* said, It is<sup>b</sup> a command that every one marry a wife; but *he* saith, "I have not a command."

Ver. 9: *Κρείσσον γάρ ἐστι γαμῆσαι ἢ πυροῦσθαι*: *It is better to marry than to burn.*] That you may apprehend the sense of the word *πυροῦσθαι*, *to burn*, hear a story; "Some<sup>c</sup> captive women were brought to Nehardea, and disposed in the house, and in *the upper room* (*ὑπερώω*) of Rabh Amram. אשקולו דרגא מקמיידהו *They took away the ladder,*" or *the stairs* (that the women might not go down, for they were shut up there until they should be ransomed). "As one of them passed by the window, the light of her great beauty shined into the house. Amram" (taken with the woman's beauty) "set up the stairs again, which ten men scarcely could do," (that he might go up to the woman). כי משא לפלגא ניהו דרגא איפשא *When he was now got to the middle of the stairs they broke<sup>d</sup>*, (he stopped, struggling with that evil affection to overcome it; רמא קלא נורא בי עמרם *and with a loud voice cried out, 'Fire, fire, in the house of Amram.'* (The Gloss saith, This he did, that the neighbours flocking thither, he might desist from his purpose and from that affection out of shame.) "The Rabbins run to him, and" (seeing nothing of fire or flame) "say, 'Thou hast disgraced us.' To whom he replied, 'It is better that ye be disgraced in the house of Amram in this world, than that ye be disgraced by me in the world to come.' He adjured that evil affection to go out of him, and from thence it went out as a pillar of fire. To which he said, 'Thou art fire, and I am flesh; yet for all that I have prevailed against thee.'"

Ver. 10: *Οὐκ ἐγὼ, ἀλλ' ὁ Κύριος*: *Not I, but the Lord.*] And on the contrary, ver. 12, *ἐγὼ λέγω, οὐχ ὁ Κύριος*: *I speak, not the Lord.*

I. Weigh first that distinction very usual in the schools, between קרא *a text of Scripture*, and סברה *an opinion*. "Death<sup>e</sup> by the sword is worse than death by the plague.

<sup>b</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 898.

<sup>c</sup> *Kiddushin*, fol. 81. 1.

<sup>d</sup> [This is Buxtorf's rendering—*diffRACTA fuit (scala)* in *Lex. T. et*

R. sub v. פשוט col. 1860. Light-foot has *dilatavit pedes.*]

<sup>e</sup> *Bava Bathra*, fol. 8. 2.

: איבער אימא קרא איבער אימא קרא *If you will, I will produce a text of Scripture*” (to prove this). “*If you will, I will produce reason, or my opinion.* If you will, I will produce an opinion. That renders one abominable, but not this. If you will, I will produce Scripture; ‘Precious in the eyes of the Lord is the death (the plague) of his saints.’ Famine is worse than the sword, אי בער אימא סברא *If you will, I will produce an opinion*; Famine afflicts a long while, the sword not. אי בער קרא *If you will, I will produce Scripture*; ‘It is better for them that die by the sword, than that die by famine.’” And<sup>e</sup> “a burnt-offering that is killed not under its proper notion, the blood of it is not to be sprinkled under a notion that is not proper. אי בער אימא קרא *If you will, I will produce my opinion or reason.* *If you will, I will produce a text of Scripture.*” And very many instances of that nature.

II. And now compare the words of the apostle: “These things I say not, but the Lord:” that is, this is not my bare opinion, but so saith the Scripture. And on the contrary, “These things I say, not the Lord:” that is, This is my opinion, although there be not some text of Scripture which saith so in plain words. Thus he explains himself, chap. ix. 8, “Say I these things, and not the law?”

Γυναῖκα<sup>f</sup> ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ χωρισθῆναι *Let not the wife depart from her husband.*] Nor without weighty reason doth he admonish concerning this thing also; since both among Jews and Gentiles the opinion was too loose concerning the firmness of the marriage bond: and more loose among the Jews than among the Gentiles.

I. Think, first of the toleration of מייאורין<sup>g</sup> among them; which take in their words: “If<sup>h</sup> any marry a young maid, and she afterward will not have him for her husband, she may put him away and depart from him; and there is no need of a bill of divorce.” Hence this is the form מייאורן גט *of a bill of this kind of putting away* (when the wife put away her husband) if it were demanded:

<sup>e</sup> Zevachin, fol. 2. 1.

<sup>f</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 759.

<sup>g</sup> [מייאורין] *Denegatio*, from דנאן, *denegare*. *Dicitur apud Talm. in specie, de ea quæ in annis minore-*

*nitatis suæ alicui desponsata, postea, cum ad annos maturitatis venit, renuit ipsi nubere.* Buxtorf Lex. T. et R. sub. voc.]

<sup>h</sup> Maimon. Gerush. cap. 11.

“In the day *N.*, of the week *N.*, of the month *N.*, of the year *N.* *N.*, the daughter of *N.*, put away before us and said: ‘My mother or my brethren deceived me, and wedded me, or betrothed me, when I was a young maid to *N.*, the son of *N.* But I now reveal my mind before you that I will not have him,’ &c.

II. Among them also there was departing from each other by mutual consent: “A<sup>i</sup> good man had a good wife; but because they had not children *זה את זה גרשו זה* *they mutually put away one another*. That good man married a bad wife, and she made him bad. That good woman married a bad husband, and she made him good.”

They allow also the same license to the heathen. “R. Jochanan<sup>k</sup> saith, The sons of Noah have not divorce, but *גרשו זה את זה* *they put away one another*.

III. To omit the departure of the wife from the husband for the causes of lust, as Herodias departed from Philip to be married to Herod, and Drusilla from Aziz, and married Felix<sup>l</sup>, a perverse wife might compel her husband to put her away. “A<sup>m</sup> wife which refuseth to lie with her husband is called *מורדת* *rebellious*; and they demand of her, Why she is so rebellious<sup>n</sup>. If she answers, ‘I despise him, and cannot endure his bed:’ they compel him to put her away for a time.” Yea, R. Jochanan<sup>o</sup> saith, “A wife may put away her husband.”

Those departures, therefore, the apostle altogether forbids. And when, ver. 11, he saith, *ἐὰν δὲ χωρισθῆ*, *but and if she depart*, he doth not so much tolerate them, as supposes them to happen, and provides against them all, as much as may be, by the following rules: “Let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband.”

Ver. 11: *Τῷ ἀνδρὶ καταλλαγῆτω* *Be reconciled to her husband.*] Compare Deut. xxiv. 4, “Her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife.” For the bond which was there made is not dissolved here. *בטלו מבוטל* “*Her makes it void: It is made void:* they are the words of

<sup>i</sup> Beresh. Rabb. sect. 17.

<sup>k</sup> Id. sect. 18.

<sup>l</sup> Joseph. Antiq. lib. xx. c. 5. [xx. 7. 2.]

<sup>m</sup> Maimon. in *אשורת* cap. 14.

<sup>n</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 899.

<sup>o</sup> Beresh. Rabb. in the place last

quoted.

<sup>p</sup> Jevamoth, fol. 90. 2.

Rabbi." (The Gloss is; "The husband sends a bill of divorce to the wife: if either he himself afterward goes to his wife, or sends a messenger to her, saying, 'The bill of divorce, which I sent to thee, let it stand for nothing, it is nothing.'") "A tradition. In former times he compelled the bench in another place, who would make void the bill, and made not the thing known to his wife. Gamaliel the elder appointed that they should not do this; because sometimes the wife, not knowing of the withdrawing of the bill, marrieth another, and so hath bastard children."

Behold *καταλλαγῆ*, a *reconciliation*, even after a divorce (but the apostle speaks not in this place of divorce): and yet the Jews by their practice showed that they thought the bond of marriage was loosed by any divorce; for they admitted second marriages.

Ver. 14: Τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν νῦν ἅγια ἐστίν· *Now are your children holy.*] Ἀκάθαρτα, *unclean*, and ἅγια, *holy*, denote not children unlawfully begotten and lawfully begotten, but heathenism and Christianity. There is indeed this tradition among the Jews: "A<sup>q</sup> son by unlawful wedlock" [that is, unlawful by consanguinity] "is a son of the man in all regards, and is to be reputed for an Israelite, although he be misbegotten. *רבן מן הגויה אינו בנו* *But a son begotten of a heathen woman is not his son.*" Where the Gloss, "He is not called the son of the man, but the son of the woman."

But the present discourse of the apostle turns not upon this hinge, namely, whether a son, sprung from parents, whereof one was a Christian, the other a heathen, be a legitimate issue; but whether it be a Christian issue. For it is sufficiently known that the word קרושים ἅγιοι, *holy*, is very frequently taken for those that profess Christianity: and so the word קרושה *holiness*, in the Talmudists, is taken in a like sense.

"A<sup>r</sup> husband<sup>s</sup> and wife, being made proselytes, are separated from each other ninety days, that distinction may be made בין זרע שנורע בקרושה לזרע שלא נזרע בקרושה *between an issue born in holiness and an issue born out of holiness.*" "The<sup>t</sup> daughter of a proselytess made a proselytess with her mother, if she play the whore (after espousal) is to

<sup>q</sup> Maimon. Issure Biah, c. 12.

<sup>r</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 760.

<sup>s</sup> Jevamoth, fol. 42. 1.

<sup>t</sup> Chetubb. fol. 44. 1.

be strangled. היתה הורתה שלא בקדושה ולידתה בקדושה. *But if she conceive without holiness, and bring forth in holiness, then she is to be stoned.*" Again<sup>u</sup>; "A proselytess which was married to a proselyte, and they beget a son, אפילו הורתה בקדושה ולידתה בקדושה *although both his conception and his birth be in holiness, yet it is permitted him to marry a bastard woman.*"

+ You see at first sight what that expression *in holiness* means. An offspring born out of *holiness* was an offspring born while the parents were yet heathens; *within holiness*, when they were now made proselytes. In the same sense the apostle; "Your children are born *in holiness*, that is, within Christianity, if either father or mother be Christian: and the children themselves are *holy*, that is, Christians."

The heathens were reckoned by the Jews for unclean; and so unclean indeed, that they could not contract uncleanness, no, not from the most unclean thing, a sepulchre<sup>x</sup>. Hence heathen children were to them ἀκάθαρα, *unclean*, and the children of Jews ἅγια, *holy*. To which sense, very well known to the nation, the apostle alludes in these words.

Ver. 18: Μὴ ἐπισπάσθω. *Let him not become uncircumcised.*] In Talmudic language, אל ימשך ערלתו, *let him not draw his foreskin.* "Let<sup>y</sup> circumcision be four or five times repeated, if any one be so often מושך ἐπισπασθεις, *drawn, uncircumcised.*" Again, "There<sup>z</sup> were many in the days of Ben Cozba, שמשכו ערלתם *who had drawn over the foreskin, that were again circumcised.*" And<sup>a</sup>, תניא מושך צריך למול "A tradition. *He whose foreskin is drawn over is to be circumcised again.* The interpretation of the word מושך (ἐπισπασθεις, *drawn*) is this; If, after he had been circumcised, the foreskin is *drawn over*, either by men, or by some sickness. There were many in the days of Ben Cozba who had been circumcised, באונס שמשכים *whose foreskin they drew over by force* in the city Betar. But Ben Cozba prevailed, and reigned two years and a half. And they were circumcised again in his days."

Ver. 19: Ἡ περιτομή οὐδέν ἐστι. *Circumcision is nothing.*]

<sup>u</sup> Maimon. Issure Biah, cap. 15.

<sup>x</sup> Hieros. Pesach. fol. 36. 2.

<sup>y</sup> Beresh. Rabb. fol. 46.

<sup>z</sup> Hieros. Jevamoth, fol. 9. 1.

<sup>a</sup> R. Nissim in Jevamoth, fol. 428. 2.

Among many things which may here be spoken, we will observe only<sup>b</sup> two; one, from the very practice of the Jews, the other, from the chief end of *circumcision*.

I. You will wonder perhaps, reader, when you hear that some Jews always went uncircumcised; yea, that some priests not circumcised ministered at the altar, and that without the complaint of any, and indeed without any fault. But the Fathers of the Traditions themselves do confess this. Very frequent mention is made in the Talmudists of *עֵרֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל* *an uncircumcised Israelite*, and *עֵרֵל כַּהֵן* *an uncircumcised priest*.

“ R. Jochanan<sup>c</sup> in the name of R. Benaiah saith, ‘ They sprinkle *עֵרֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל* upon an uncircumcised Israelite.’ ”  
 “ All<sup>d</sup> the sacrifices, whose blood is received by an alien, *עֵרֵל* the uncircumcised priest lamenting, &c. are not approved. R. Simeon saith, ‘ They are approved.’ ” And, “ R. Lazar<sup>e</sup> in the name of R. Haninah saith, ‘ There is a story *בְּכֹהֵן עֵרֵל* of an uncircumcised priest, who sprinkled blood at the altar; and his sprinklings were approved.’ ” “ An<sup>f</sup> uncircumcised priest is a priest whose brethren died by circumcision: ” and g, “ an uncircumcised Israelite is, whose brethren died of circumcision: and yet he is an Israelite, *although uncircumcised*. For the Israelites are not bound to perform the precepts where death will certainly follow: for it is said, ‘ Laws, which if a man shall observe them he shall *live* in them,’ not that he *die* in them.”

Hence if the first, second, third son should die by circumcision, those that were born after were not circumcised, but were always uncircumcised, and yet Israelites in all respects, priests in all respects. “ R. Nathan<sup>h</sup> saith, ‘ I travelled to Cæsarea of Cappadocia; and there was a woman there who had brought forth male children which had died of circumcision, the first, the second, the third: they brought the fourth to me, and I looked upon him, and saw not in him the blood of the covenant. He advised them to permit him a little while, though not circumcised; and they permitted him, ’ &c.

<sup>b</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 900.

<sup>c</sup> Hieros. Pesach. fol. 36. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Zevachin, cap. 2. hal. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Hieros. in the place before.

<sup>f</sup> Gloss in Zevachin.

<sup>g</sup> Aruch ex Cholin.

<sup>h</sup> Hieros. Jevamoth, fol. 7. 4.

Now<sup>i</sup>, Jew, tell me, whether *circumcision* is any thing, especially whether it be of so much account, either to justification or to sanctification, as you esteem it, when an Israelite might be a true Israelite, and a priest a true priest, without *circumcision*.

II. *Circumcision is nothing* in respect of the time; for now it is vanished, the end of it, for which it had been instituted, being accomplished. That end the apostle shows in those words, Rom. iv. 11, σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πλστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυσσίᾳ: *a seal of the righteousness of the faith in uncircumcision*. But I fear the words are not sufficiently fitted by most versions to the end of *circumcision*, and the scope of the apostle; while they insert something of their own. The French translation thus; "Sceau de la justice de foi, laquelle il avoit durant le prépuce:" *A seal of righteousness of faith which he had during uncircumcision*. The Italian thus; "Segno della giustitia della fede, laquale fu nella incirconcisione:" *A seal of the righteousness of the faith, which was without circumcision*. The Syriac reads, חתמת דכאנותא דהימנותא, *And a seal of the righteousness of his faith*. The Arabic, "Of the righteousness of faith, **אלרי כאן** which was in uncircumcision." Others to the same sense; 'as though *circumcision* were given to Abraham for a sign of that righteousness which he had while as yet he was uncircumcised;' which we deny not in some sense to be true; but we believe *circumcision* especially looks far another way.

Give me leave to render the words thus; "And he received the sign of *circumcision*, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which should hereafter be in uncircumcision:" I say, 'Which *should be*,' not 'which *had been*;' not which had been to Abraham as yet uncircumcised, but which should be to his seed uncircumcised, that is, to the Gentiles that should hereafter imitate the faith of Abraham.

For mark well upon what occasion *circumcision* was appointed to Abraham, laying before your eyes the history of it, Gen. xvii.

First, This promise was made to him, "Thou shalt be the father of many nations," [in what sense, the apostle explains in that chapter;] and then a double seal is subjoined to esta-

<sup>i</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 761.

blish the thing, viz. the changing of the name 'Abram' into 'Abraham;' and the institution of *circumcision*, ver. 4, "Behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations." Why is his name called 'Abraham?' For the sealing of his promise, 'Thou shalt be a father of many nations.' And why was this *circumcision* appointed him? For sealing the same promise, 'Thou shalt be a father of many nations.' So that this may be the sense of the apostle, very agreeable to the institution of *circumcision*; "He received the sign of *circumcision*, a seal of the righteousness of faith, which hereafter the uncircumcision (or the Gentiles) was to have and obtain."

Abraham had a double seed; a *natural* seed, that of the Jews; and a *faithful* seed, that of the believing Gentiles. The natural seed is signed with the sign of *circumcision*, first indeed for the distinguishing itself from all other nations, while they were not as yet the seed of Abraham; but especially in memory of the justification of the Gentiles by faith, when at last they were his seed. Therefore upon good reason, *circumcision* was to cease when the Gentiles should be brought in to the faith, because then it had attained to its last and chief end; and from thenceforth ἡ περιτομή οὐδέν, *circumcision is nothing*.

Ver. 23<sup>k</sup>: Μὴ γίνεσθε δοῦλοι ἀνθρώπων. *Be ye not the servants of men.*] I ask whether the apostle speaks these words directly, and as his own sense? or by way of objection, to which he answereth in the verse following? The Jews were wont thus to object concerning themselves, by reason of their liberty obtained by the redemption out of Egypt; so that they would not endure by any means to be called 'not free,' John viii. 33. "Rabban<sup>l</sup> Jochanan Ben Zaccai said, The blessed Lord saith, The ear which heard my voice upon mount Sinai, at what time I said, For the children of Israel are my servants, and not the servants of servants, but it goes and obtains to itself the lord, let that ear be bored."

Perhaps these new Christians that were of a servile condition laboured under this pride, not as yet instructed concerning the true sense of evangelical liberty. Or this scruple stuck with them, Whether it were lawful for a Christian to

<sup>k</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 901.

<sup>l</sup> *Kiddush*. fol. 22. 2.



serve a heathen, an atheist, an idolater, &c. Such questions are moved by the masters, "Whether an Israelite is to be sold for a servant to a heathen? Whether an Israelite that is a servant is to be pressed with the same service as a Canaanite?"

If the apostle speaks directly, he does not discourse concerning servants particularly, but of all Christians in general. And it is far from his intention to take away the relation that is between masters and servants; but he admonisheth all Christians that they serve not the evil lusts and wills of men, but him that redeemed them with a price.

Ver. 26<sup>m</sup>: *Διὰ τὴν ἐνεστώσαν ἀνάγκην* For the present necessity.] And by and by, ver. 29, *ὁ καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος, τὸ λοιπὸν ἐστὶ, the time is short, it remaineth.* The Corinthians inquired of the apostle by a letter in the case of marriage, as it seems by his answer :

I. Concerning marriages between a believer and an unbeliever, whether they were to be continued or not continued.

II. Concerning the marriages of virgins or single persons. But now, how a scruple should arise to them in this latter, is somewhat obscure. Among the Jewish Christians a scruple might arise whether it were lawful for a single man to abstain from marriage; because in that nation, as we have observed, they commanded matrimony by law. But if the question were, whether it was lawful for a virgin or a single man to contract matrimony, (for the apostle answereth *οὐχ ἥμαρτες, thou hast not sinned*, as though it were asked rather, whether it were lawful to marry, than whether it were lawful not to marry,) then you will scarcely conjecture whence it should arise but *ἐξ ἐνεστώσης ἀνάγκης, from the present necessity.*

Our apostle teacheth, that some forbade marriage, 1 Tim. iv. 3. But under what pretence? Either under this, that they babbled that marriage opposed the purity of the gospel, as Saturninus in Irenæus<sup>n</sup>; or that they avoided marriages for those calamities that hung over them. "They forbid marriage (saith the apostle), and command to abstain from meats." Hear the Gemarists a little.

"From<sup>o</sup> the time that the second temple was destroyed,

<sup>m</sup> English folio edition, vol. ii. p. 762.

<sup>n</sup> Lib. i. c. 22.

<sup>o</sup> Bava Bathra, fol. 60. 7.

Pharisees (*separatists*) were multiplied in Israel, who ate not flesh nor drank wine. To whom R. Josua, Why, O my sons, do ye not eat flesh nor drink wine? And they answered, Should we eat flesh of which we were wont to offer on the altar, and now it is perished? And shall we drink wine of which we were wont to pour out upon the altar, and now it is ceased? When a wicked empire ruled over Israel, and decreed rough things against them, and made the law and the precept cease from them, and permitted them not to circumcise their children, they said to R. Josua, It is fit that we resolve among ourselves not to contract marriage, nor beget sons," &c.

Behold men prepared and sworn almost to perpetual abstinence from marriage by reason of calamities. From the like cause, also, I suspect some Christians might be in doubt in the times of the apostles. Our Saviour had foretold that those times should be very rough that went before the destruction of Jerusalem, Matt. xxiv: and that not within the bounds of Judea only, but that "judgment should begin from the Temple of God," everywhere, 1 Pet. iv. 17; and "a day of temptation should come upon the whole world," Rev. iii. 20. So that that prediction being known to the churches, and the times now inclining towards those calamities, it is no wonder if concern and care about those straits invaded the Christians, and deterred very many single persons from marriage.

#### CHAP. VIII.

VER. 1: Οἶδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γνῶσιν ἔχομεν *We know that we all have knowledge.*] Γνῶσις, *knowledge*, of which the apostle here speaks, is the *knowledge* of the liberty of the gospel; but these words are spoken ironically: as if he had said, "It is concluded by all, that they know sufficiently that evangelic liberty; and thereupon some run out into things which are not convenient. That 'knowledge puffeth up,' renders men bold, neglects the consciences of others; and he that in this sense seems to know something, as yet knows nothing as he ought to know."

VER. 4P: Οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ. *An idol is nothing in the world.*] I render it, "We know that there is no idol in the world:" that is, a representation of God. Εἶδωλον, *an idol*,

P *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 763.

as the lexicographers teach, is ὁμοίωμα, a likeness, εἰκὼν, an image, σημεῖον, a sign, χαρακτήριον<sup>q</sup>, a character, σκιοειδὲς, a shadow. Idols indeed are in the world made of wood, stone, gold, silver, &c. ; but οὐδὲν εἰδωλον, there is no idol ; there is no representation or figure of God, and none can be. The apostle hitherto, as I indeed think, puts on the person of those who made no scruple in eating things offered to idols ; as though he had said, “ You say, ‘ We know that there is no representation of God in the world, and there is only one God,’ &c. Therefore those graven images and those various idols are mere figments of human mistake ; and to offer sacrifices to them is a mere invention of men. There is nothing sacred, nothing of religion in them, because there is no representation of God in them. Shall we therefore, who are under the liberty of the gospel, abstain from eating that flesh which the foolishness of men only hath separated from common use, and offered to stocks and stones which have nothing of God in them, but are created only by the same human sottishness ? Ye say truth indeed, but illy applied, and ‘ all have not this knowledge.’ ” Or if you render it, *an idol is nothing in the world*, it comes to the same sense.

Ver. 10 : 'Εν εἰδωλείῳ κατακείμενον' *Sitting at meat in the idol's temple.*] Compare those passages of the Talmudists :— מאהבה ומיראה "העובד עו" He<sup>r</sup> that adores an idol out of love or fear, Rabba saith, He is free : Abai saith, He is guilty. Abai saith, He is guilty because he worships it. Rabba saith, He is free : אי קבליה עליה באלוה אין if he take it for God, he is so, he is guilty ; לא לא ואי לא לא but if he doth not, he is not." And a little after ; “ If he supposeth the idol-temple to be the synagogue, and adore an idol, חרי לבו לשמים אלן דהוא behold, his heart is towards God. אנדרטא But if he see a statue and adore it, if he take it for God he is guilty, מוזר as doing presumptuously. But if he takes it not for God, לא כלום הוא it is nothing at all.” The Gloss there is, “ Behold, his heart is towards God ; although he know that that house is an idol-temple, and he adores God in it, it is no crime, &c. If he see a statue such as they are wont to set up for the picture of the king, and

<sup>q</sup> Leusden's edition, vol. ii. p. 902.

<sup>r</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 61. 2.

adore it, not under the notion of an idol, but in honour of the king, it is nothing.”

Hieronymus à Sancta Fide cites<sup>s</sup> this Talmudic passage in these words: “They say in the book Sanhedrim, If any worship an idol out of love or fear, he is free: and R. Solomon glosseth thus; By *love* is understood that if any master should ask his servant that out of love to him he would adore him: by *fear*, that if any master should threaten him unless he would. Nevertheless, R. Moses of Egypt glosseth otherwise, saying, That by *love* is understood, if he be in love with the beauty of the image of that idol; by *fear*, that if he fear the idol should hurt him, as the worshippers of it think that it can profit or hurt; and that if he adore it in such a case, he is free.”

An excellent school, and excellent doctrine indeed! To omit other things, mark that which prevailed also with these Corinthians: אִם לֹא קַבְּלִיהָ עֲלֶיהָ בְּאֵלֹהִים “*If he acknowledge not the idol under the notion of God, it is nothing.*” And these men said also, “‘An idol is nothing:’ therefore to be in an idol-temple, to eat things offered to idols, is nothing; for I own nothing of the Deity in the idol, I know it is wood or stone,” &c. But saith the apostle,

First, “However the idol itself be wood or stone, yet those things which are offered to it are offered to devils,” chap. x. 20. And,

Secondly, “However you think yourself so wise as to judge of an idol as a matter of nothing, yet all have not so accurate a judgment: and you, by your example, encourage others to eat things offered to idols, even under the notion of things offered to idols.”

Ver. 11: Δὲ ὅν Χριστὸς ἀπέθαιεν *For whom Christ died.*] He useth the very same argument and reason, Rom. xiv. 15. And his words respect the quality of the person rather than the person himself, barely considered. As though he had said, “For tender consciences, and trembling at the word of God, for those that are burdened and groan under the yoke and weight of the law, for such as sweat and pant in the ways of the Lord, to keep faith and a good conscience; for such

<sup>s</sup> Lib. ii. contr. Judæos, cap. 2. [Max. Bibl. Vet. Patr. De la Bigne, Tom. xxvi. p. 547 A.]

Christ died; and will you destroy such a one by your meat? He died to loosen those yokes, and to lighten consciences pressed under those weights; and will you destroy such with your meat?"

#### CHAP. IX.†

VER. 1: Οὐκ εἰμι ἐλεύθερος; *Am I not free?*] Here some interpreters in their versions vary the order of the clauses, and read, *Am I not free?* and then after that, "Am I not an apostle?" moved to it hence undoubtedly, because it is greater to be an *apostle* than to be *free*: and they supposed they should keep true order if they proceeded from a lower degree to a higher. But they should have considered that Paul did not barely treat of Christian liberty, but of apostolic liberty: which appears also sufficiently, ver. 5. Nor could he use a more accurate method in his business, than by first proving himself an apostle, and then proving his apostolic liberty.

He is about to treat of his liberty, or how lawful it is for him to require maintenance for himself, his wife and family, if he had them, for his ministry in the gospel among the heathen, which Peter and the rest of the apostles did among the Jews. It was formerly appointed<sup>u</sup> by Jewish lawyers, that tithes were not to be required and taken of the Gentiles; maintenance was not to be asked from heathens; and that a Jew should not make himself any ways beholden to a heathen. Which so much the more also prevailed among them, because there was not any permission in the law concerning these things, or at least that there was deep silence in the law concerning them. These matters could not but raise a contest against him concerning his maintenance among the heathen, while he preached the gospel to them.

Our apostle, therefore, the minister of the uncircumcision, flies to that, namely, to defend himself by his apostolical power among them who had raised a difference against him about this business, ver. 3: "Be it granted that it was appointed by the traditional laws concerning taking no maintenance from heathens; yea, though it were granted that it were so decreed by the law of Moses; but 'I am an apostle,' I am free from such laws; yea it is in my power to institute

† *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 764.

<sup>u</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 903.

this for a law to the converted heathen, that those that preach the gospel should be sustained by the gospel.”

Οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐώρακα ; *Have I not seen Jesus Christ ?*] Paul saw the Lord twice. First, in his journey to Damascus, when he was marked out for an apostle; secondly, in his trance at Jerusalem, when he was marked out for the apostle of the Gentiles, Acts xxii. 21. He alone among the apostles saw the Lord after his ascension.

Ver. 3: Ἡ ἐμὴ ἀπολογία. *My apology, &c.*] The *apology* itself follows, “Have we not power,” &c. unto ver. 15. The necessity of his *apology* was, that he was accused by some of receiving maintenance from heathen churches for his preaching the gospel; or it was observed with a stern countenance by some cavillers, whether he would receive it or not. Hence it was that he applied<sup>x</sup> himself to mechanic labour, whereby he might sustain himself and get his living: not that it was unlawful for him to demand a livelihood of the Gentiles, but because he would not, to stop the mouths of the Jews that barked against him. Hence are those words, ver. 19, 20, “I am free from all men, and yet I am become the servant of all: to the Jews I became as a Jew,” &c. Compare 3 John, ver. 7, “They took nothing of the Gentiles.”

Ver. 13: Οἱ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσεδρεύοντες. *They which wait at the altar.*] He distinguisheth between ἱερὰ ἐργαζομένους, *labouring about holy things*, and προσεδρεύοντας τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, *waiting at the altar*. For there were some who wrought in the holy things, besides those who served at the altar: concerning whom see the tract *Shekalim* γ. Among the rest were they העצים את המתלעים *who picked the worms out of the wood* which was to be laid upon the altar: who being touched and infected with some spot were not fit to minister at the altar; but they were deputed to this office, and nourished out of the consecrated things.

Προσεδρεύοντες τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, *assidentes altari, sitting at the altar*, not in the proper and strictest sense; for it was lawful for none to sit within the court but for the king alone. But<sup>a</sup> rather *obsidentes; besieging* the altar, and spread everywhere about it in the service of it: some taking away the

<sup>x</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 765.

<sup>y</sup> Cap. 5.

<sup>z</sup> Middoth, cap. 2. hal. 5.

<sup>a</sup> Joma, fol. 69. 2.

ashes; some killing the sacrifice; others sprinkling the blood; others laying the pieces of the sacrifice upon the altar, &c. Concerning which see the tract *Tamid*<sup>b</sup>.

*Προεδρεύω* signifies also to lay snares, which may also be applied to that emulous diligence, wherewith they did, as it were, lay snares for the altar; contending in former times who should first go up thither to take away the ashes, and to make the fire, &c.; concerning which these things are related: "In<sup>c</sup> former times whosoever would clear the altar of its ashes did it (in the morning): but when many strove together about that business, and ran and went up by *כַּבַּשׁ* the ascent of the altar, &c. There was a time when two strove together, and ran with equal speed, and went up by the ascent of the altar; and one thrust the other, so that he fell and his leg was broke," &c.

Ver. 21: *Τοῖς ἀνόμοις ὡς ἀνομοί*. To them that are without law, as without law.] He distinguished, as it seems by the verse before, between the 'Jews,' and those that are 'under the law:' which may be understood of the Jews in general, and of the Pharisees in particular; because the Pharisees seemed more to subject themselves to the law than the rest of the nation. But by *ἀνόμοις*, such as are without law, whether he means the Sadducees, who altogether opposed the laws of Pharisees, or whether the heathen, inquire. How he could yield himself conformable to the heathen, it is not easy to judge. To the Jews, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, he might conform himself in some things without scruple, that he might gain them: this only being understood of the Sadducees, that his conformity is to be understood in rites, not in the heresy about the resurrection.

Ver. 27: *Μήπως ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι*. Lest I should be a cast-away.] 'Αδόκιμος may well render the word *פְּסוּל*, a word very usual among the masters; especially as it is opposed to the word *כֶּשֶׁר*: for *כֶּשֶׁר* denotes *δόκιμος*, that is, approved, fit, either thing or person: *פְּסוּל*, on the contrary, denotes *ἀδόκιμος*, not approved, not fit.

<sup>b</sup> Cap. 3. hal. 1, &c.

<sup>c</sup> Joma, fol. 22. 1.

CHAP. X.<sup>d</sup>

VER. 2: Καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωσῆν ἐβαπτίζοντο. *And were all baptized unto Moses.*] They had been newly circumcised before their going out of Egypt. For when God accuseth them by the prophet, that they complied with the customs of the Egyptians, and worshipped their idols, Ezek. xx. 7, 8, it is more than probable that they neglected circumcision, as also other of God's appointments, and yielded themselves conformable to the Egyptians in all their irreligious rites. Whence, by a peculiar precept, God provided, when he instituted the Passover, that, before the eating of it, every one should be circumcised, Exod. xii. 48: which that it was done also is clear out of Josh. v. 5, "All going out of Egypt were circumcised."

To circumcision is added baptism in the cloud and in the sea; and the latter seal took not away the first, but superinduced a new obligation. They were not circumcised into Moses, but they were baptized into Moses. The Jews themselves confess that they were baptized at mount Sinai from those words, Exod. xix. 10. But the apostle fetcheth the thing higher, that he may show that the types of the gospel-sacraments were both divine and also miraculous.

Ver. 4: Ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας. *Of that spiritual Rock that followed them.*] Not that the very rock in Horeb followed them, but that streams of water, flowing from that rock, followed them, and were gathered together into pools wheresoever they encamped. Hence that rhetorical figure very usual in the prophets, "I will give in the wilderness pools of water," when discourse is of the watering of the Gentiles by the gospel and the Spirit. "During<sup>e</sup> all the forty years they had a well." And the Targum of Jonathan concerning another well<sup>f</sup>; "From the time that the well in Mattanah was given them, it was made again to them brooks that were overflowing and violent; and again it went up unto the tops of the mountains, and went down with them into the valleys," &c.

<sup>d</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 766.—*Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 904.

<sup>e</sup> R. Sol. in Num. xx. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Num. xxi. 19.



Ver. 8: *Εικοσιτρεῖς χιλιάδες* *Three-and-twenty thousand.*] But in Numb. xxv. it is, "Four-and-twenty thousand." And in the Talmuds; "Those<sup>§</sup> four-and-twenty thousand that perished by reason of Baal-Peor," &c. And "Balaam<sup>h</sup> came to receive his reward for the four-and-twenty thousand that had perished." Whence therefore is it in Paul, "*Three-and-twenty thousand*" only?

To omit that which is not unusual in the Holy Scriptures, when the same story is recited in two places, to bring in somewhat different in the reckoning, either of the things or the men or the years; and that not without the highest reason; as, compare 2 Kings viii. 26 with 2 Chron. xxii. 2; and 2 Kings xxiv. 8 with 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9; and very many of that nature; let us see what the Talmudists say of this story.

They discourse of it in divers places of the tract *Sanhedrim*<sup>i</sup> to this sense. Upon those words of God to Moses, קָח אֶת־כָּל־רִאשֵׁי הָעָם "Take all the heads of the people, and hang them up before the sun," they thus comment: "Take all the princes of the people, and make them judges; that they may slay all those that transgressed with Baal-Peor. If the people sinned, what did the heads of the people sin? Saith Rabh Judah, Rabh saith, God said to Moses, 'Divide to them judgment-seats.' Wherefore? Because they judge not two in one day." Now, Jew, find fault with Paul if you list; and he hath wherewithal to answer you, even from your own writers:

I. He saith not that *three-and-twenty thousand* were all that fell in the case of Baal-Peor; but he saith that *three-and-twenty thousand* fell in one day.

II. It is manifest enough that God made use of a double vengeance against the sinners, namely, by judges, and by a pestilence.

III. But<sup>k</sup> now their own countrymen say, "It is not lawful for one bench to judge two in one day." Or be it granted (which is granted also by their countrymen) that it is lawful to judge and slay too, so it be by the same kind of death, how

<sup>§</sup> Hieros. Sotah, fol. 21. 4.

and elsewhere.

<sup>h</sup> Bab. Sanhedr. fol. 106. 1.

<sup>k</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p.

<sup>i</sup> Fol. 33. 1; 64. 1; 82. 2; 106. 1; 767.

many benches, I pray, were set up? or how many days were spent in putting to death a thousand men under that provision, "Let one bench put to death only one man, or at most two, in one day?"

Our apostle, therefore, speaks with the Vulgar: and saith not definitely *three-and-twenty thousand* perished just to a man, but *three-and-twenty thousand* at least; when, according to that vulgar canon, it is scarce credible that a thousand men were put to death by those benches; when one bench put to death only one, or two at most, in the space of one day.

The Levites, being numbered presently after the plague of Baal-peor, were just so many as the apostle here numbers, Numb. xxvi. 62. So a number, equal to the whole tribe of Levi, perished in one day.

Ver. 10: Ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀλοθρευτοῦ. *Of the destroyer.*] The Jews call evil angels מלאכי הבלה *angels ὀλοθρευτὰς, destroyers*: and good angels מלאכי שרת *angels λειτουργικοὺς, ministering*. But I inquire, Whether the apostle speaks to this sense in this place. For<sup>1</sup> where can we find the people destroyed and slain by an evil *angel*? They perished indeed by the pestilence, and by the plague for Baal-peor, concerning which the apostle spake before: but here he distinguisheth the destroying of them *by the destroyer* from that kind of death. Therefore the apostle seems to me to allude to the notion very usual among the Jews concerning the *angel of death*, the great *destroyer*, called by them *Samael*, concerning whom, among very many things which are related, let us produce this only:

A<sup>m</sup> question is propounded of a cow delivered to a keeper, hired with a price, carefully and faithfully to keep her. She strays in a fen, and there dies בררכה *in the common manner*; that is, by no violent death: it is demanded, how far the keeper is guilty? and it is determined that if she had perished being devoured by wolves, or driven away by thieves and slain, then the keeper were guilty by reason of negligence. But this, they say, was the work מלאך המות *of the angel of death*. For they say, שבקה מלאך המות בבית דגנבא הרה, קיימא *If the angel of death had suffered her, she had lived in a*

<sup>1</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 905.

<sup>m</sup> *Bava Mezia*, fol. 36. 1.

*thief's house.* And the Gloss, מלאך המות נמי בבית השוכר לה קטיל לה *The angel of death might kill her even in the house of him who hired the keeper.*

You see how they ascribe it to *the angel of death*, when any violent, known, and ordinary cause and evident kind of death doth not appear. So the apostle in this place mentioneth the known and evident ways of death; serpents, pestilence, ver. 8,9; and now he speaks of the common kind of death (and not of some evident plague), whereby the whole multitude of those that murmured perished, Numb. xiv., within forty years. He saith they perished ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀλοθρευτοῦ, *by that great destroyer, the angel of death.*

Ver. 11: Εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων, &c. *Upon whom the ends of the world, &c.*] He saith, τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων, *the ends of the ages*; not τὰ τέλη τοῦ κόσμου, *the ends of the world.* Αἰών, *age*, in the Scripture, very ordinarily is *the Jewish age.* In which sense circumcision, the Passover, and other Mosaic rites, are said to be לעולם *eis aîwva, for an age.* So the disciples, Matt. xxiv. 3, inquire of Christ περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, *concerning the end of the age*; and he answereth concerning the destruction of Jerusalem. In the same should I render the words of the apostle, Tit. i. 2; "To the hope of eternal life, which God hath promised πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων *before the times of the [Jewish] ages:*" that is, God promised eternal life before the Mosaic economy: that life therefore is not to be expected by the works of the law of Moses.

Thus, therefore, the apostle speaks in this place: "These things which were transacted in the beginning of the Jewish ages are written for an example to you, upon whom the ends of those ages are come. And the beginning is like to the end, and the end to the beginning. Both was forty years, both consisted of temptation and unbelief, and both ending in the destruction of unbelievers: *that* in the destruction of those that perished in the wilderness; *this* in the destruction of those that believed not in the destruction of the city and nation."

Ver. 16<sup>n</sup>: Τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας *The cup of blessing.*] כוס הברכה *The cup of blessing.* So was that *cup* in the

<sup>n</sup> *English folio edition, vol. ii. p. 768.*

Passover called, over which thanks were given after meat; and in which our Saviour instituted *the cup* of the eucharist; of which we have spoken largely at Matt. xxvi. 27. When therefore the apostle marks out *the cup* of the Lord's supper with the same name as the Jews did their *cup*, he hath recourse to the first institution of it, and implies that giving of thanks was continued over it by Christians, although now under another notion.

Thus his reasoning proceeds: "As we in the eating of bread, and drinking of the eucharistical *cup*, partake of the body and blood of Christ; so in eating things offered to idols, men partake of and with an idol. You partake of the blood of Christ, therefore fly from idolatry. I speak to wise men; do you judge of the argument. For the very participation of the eucharist seals you up against idolatry, and things offered to idols."

Ver. 17 : Οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. *For we all are partakers of that one bread.*] The manner of reasoning, "We all are one body, because we partake of one bread," recalls that to mind which among the Jews was called *עירוב* *mixing*, or *κοινωνία*, *communion*. The manner and sense of which learn out of Maimonides<sup>o</sup>; "By the words of the scribes (saith he) it is forbid neighbours to go [on the sabbath day] *ברשות היחיד* in a place appropriated to one, where there is a division into divers habitations, unless all the neighbours on the sabbath eve *יערבו* enter into communion. Therefore Solomon [for they make him the author of this tradition and custom] appointed, that each place be appropriated to one man, there where there is a division into divers habitations, and each of the inhabitants receive there a place proper to himself; and some place also is left there common to all, so that all have an equal right in it, as a court belonging to many houses, which is reckoned a place by right common to all. And every place which each hath proper to himself is reckoned *רשות היחיד* a proper place. And it is forbid that a man carry any thing from a place proper to himself into the place common to all, [that is, on the sabbath;] but let every one use the place appropriate to himself alone, *עד שיערבו כולן*, until all enter into communion."

<sup>o</sup> In *עירובין* cap. 1.

: ומה הוא העירוב: "But how is that communion made? יתערבו במאכל אחד They associate<sup>p</sup> together in one food, which they prepare on the eve of the sabbath: as though they would say, לכולנו אחד ואוכל אחד לכולנו, We all associate together, and we have all one food: nor does any of us separate a propriety from our neighbour; but as we all have an equal right in this place which is left common to us, so we have all an equal right in the place which every one takes to himself for his own."

"And עירוב the *consorting together*, which those that dwell among themselves in the same court make, is called עירובי הצרות the *communions*, κοινωλιαi, of courts. And that *consorting together*, which they make that dwell among themselves in the same walk or entry, or which citizens of the same city make among themselves, is called שירתה, *participating together*."

"They do not consort together in courts, בפת אלא שלימה בלבד, but with a whole loaf. Although the bread of the batch be a whole *seah*, if it be not a whole loaf, they do not enter into consortship with it. But if it be whole, if it be no more than an *assarius* only, they enter into *consortship* with it."

"How do they enter into κοινωλια, *communion*, in the courts? They demand of every house which is in the court one whole cake or loaf, which they lay up in one vessel, and in some house which is in the court, although it be a barn, or a stable," &c. And one of the company blesseth, and so all eat together, &c.

Compare these things with the words of the apostle, and they do not only illustrate his argumentation, but confirm it also. If it were customary among the Israelites to join together in one political or economical body by the eating of many loaves collected from this, and that, and the other man; we are much more associated together into one body by eating one and the same bread appointed by one Saviour.

Ver. 19<sup>q</sup>: Τι σὺ φημι; [What say I then?]: ומה אני: But what say I? A phrase very usual in the schools, that is, 'This I will,' or 'This I conclude.' "Be an idol

<sup>p</sup> Leusden's edit., vol. ii. p. 906. <sup>q</sup> English folio edit., vol. ii. p. 769.

something or not ; or be a thing offered to an idol something or not ; yet certainly those things which the Gentiles offer to idols, they offer to devils."

Ver. 21 : Τράπεζα Κυρίου *The Lord's table.*] שולחן : גבוה *The table of the Most High*, a phrase not unusual in the Talmudists for *the altar*. x

Ver. 25 : 'Εν μακέλλῳ *In the shambles.*] The Gemarists<sup>r</sup> treat of a question not differing much from this which the apostle here treats of ; namely, how far it is lawful to buy flesh in the shambles, and that from a heathen, where there may be a suspicion concerning טריפה *its being torn* : and a story is brought in of one buying such torn flesh of a heathen : upon which case saith Rabbi, שוטה זה הבשיל " *For this fool, who did that which was not decent, כל מקולין נאסר כל שוטה זה הבשיל שוטה זה הבשיל שוטה זה הבשיל shall we forbid all shambles ?*" See the place if you list, and be at leisure to read it.

Μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες, διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν *Asking no question for conscience sake.*] The Jews were vexed with innumerable scruples in their feasts as to the eating of the thing, as also to the company with which they ate, and of the manner of eating. Of fruits and herbs set on the table, they were to inquire whether they were tithed according to custom, whether they were consecrated by the *Truma*, or some other way, or whether they were profane ; whether they were clean, or touched with some pollution or uncleanness, &c. And concerning flesh that was set on the table, whether it was of that which had been offered to idols, whether it were of that which was torn, or of that which was strangled, or not killed according to the canonical rule, &c. All which doubts the liberty of the gospel abolished as to one's own conscience, with this proviso, that no scandal or offence be cast before another man's weak and staggering conscience. Q  
i  
2nd ed.

## CHAP. XI.

VER. 4 : Προσευχόμενος ἢ προφητεύων κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων *Praying or prophesying, having his head covered.*] It was the custom of the Jews that they prayed not, unless first their head were veiled, and that for this reason ; that by this rite

<sup>r</sup> In Cholin, fol. 95. 1.

they might show themselves reverent, and ashamed before God, and unworthy with an open face to behold him.

“Let<sup>s</sup> not the wise men, nor the scholars of the wise men pray, unless they be covered.” And the Gloss upon *Schabbath*<sup>t</sup>, מתעטף מאימת שכינה *Let him veil himself out of reverence towards God.* כהנים המתעטפים כשעולים לדרון, *The<sup>a</sup> priests veil themselves when they go up into the pulpit.*

“Nicodemus<sup>x</sup> went into the school, והתעטף והתפלל *and veiled himself, and prayed.* אן קטון היודע להתעטף *A child when he knows how to veil himself, בציצית הייב is bound to fringes upon the borders of his garment.*” “Moses<sup>z</sup> in mount Sinai saw God עטוף כשץ *as an angel of the church veiled.*”

You may fetch a double reason of this veiling out of these words of the Rabbins: “When<sup>a</sup> one goes in to visit a sick person, let him not sit upon the bed, nor in a chair; אלא מתעטף *but let him veil himself,* and sit before him; for God is upon the pillow of the sick person.” Where<sup>b</sup> the Gloss is, מתעטף מאימת שכינה *“He veils himself by reason of the terror of God [or reverence towards God], like a man that sits אין פונה לצדדין in fear, and looks not on this or that side of him.”* And<sup>c</sup> “The scholars of the wise men” (in solemn fasts) “veil themselves, and sit as mourners and persons excommunicate, כבני אדם הנופין למקום *as those that are reprov'd by God;*” namely, as being ashamed by reason of that reproof. So נווה, ‘*He that was reprov'd by some great Rabbin*’ “kept himself at home as one that was ashamed; nor did he stand before him who made him ashamed with his head uncovered.”

We may observe Onkelos renders ביד רמה *with a high hand,* by בריש גלי *with an uncovered head:* as in Exod. xiv. 8; The Israelites went out of Egypt *with an uncovered head;* that is, *confidently, not fearfully,* or as men ashamed; and Numb. xv. 30; “The soul which committeth any sin בריש גלי *with an uncovered head;*” that is, *boldly and impudently.*

<sup>s</sup> Maimon. in Tephil. cap. 5.

<sup>t</sup> Fol. 12. 2.

<sup>u</sup> Piske Tosaph. in Menacoth, numb. 150.

<sup>x</sup> Avoth R. Nathan, cap. 6.

<sup>y</sup> Erachin, fol. 2. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Maimon. in Jesudei Torah, cap. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Schabb. fol. 1. 1.

<sup>b</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 770.  
—*Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 907.

<sup>c</sup> Taanith, fol. 14. 2.

So Jonathan also in Judges v. 1 ; The wise men returned to sit in the synagogues בריש גלי *with an uncovered head* ; that is, not fearing their enemies, nor shamed by them.

Men therefore veiled themselves when they prayed, partly, for a sign of reverence towards God, partly, to show themselves ashamed before God, and unworthy to look upon him. In which thing that these Corinthians did yet Judaize, although now converted to Christianity, appears sufficiently from the correction of the apostle.

Of the manner of veiling, see the treatise *Moed Katon* <sup>d</sup> ; and the *Aruch* <sup>e</sup>.

Ver. 5 : Πᾶσα δὲ γυνή. *But every woman.*] I. It was the custom of the women, and that prescribed them under severe canons, that they should not go abroad but with their face veiled.

“ If a woman do these things, she transgresseth the Jewish law ; if she go out into the street, or into an open porch, ואין עליה רדיד *and there be not a veil upon her* as upon all women, although her hair be rolled up under a hood.” אי זו היא רת יהודית “ *What is the Jewish law?* Let not a woman go with her head uncovered. This is founded in the Law, for it is said [of the suspected wife], ‘The priest shall uncover her head,’ Numb. v. 18. And the tradition of the school of Ismael is, That the daughters of Israel are admonished hence not to go forth with their heads not veiled.” And <sup>h</sup>, “Modest women colour one eye with paint.” The Gloss there is ; “Modest women went veiled, and uncovered but one eye that they might see, and that eye they coloured.” “One <sup>i</sup> made bare a woman’s head in the street : she came to complain before R. Akiba, and he fined the man four hundred *zuzees*.”

II. But however women were veiled in the streets, yet when they resorted unto holy service they took off their veils, and exposed their naked faces ; and that not out of lightness, but out of religion. סקבא דשתא רגלא, *The<sup>k</sup> three feasts are the scabs of the year.* The Gloss is ; “The three feasts

<sup>d</sup> Fol. 15. 1. and 24. 1.

<sup>h</sup> Schab. fol. 80. 1.

<sup>e</sup> In עטף et ב.

<sup>i</sup> Bava Kama, fol. 90. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Maimon. in משורת cap. 24.

<sup>k</sup> Kiddush. fol. 81. 1.

<sup>g</sup> Chetubb. fol. 72. 1.



[Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles,] are the breakings out of the year, by the reason of the association of men and women, and because of transgressions. Because in the days of those feasts men and women assembled together to hear sermons, and cast their eyes upon one another. And some say that for this cause they were wont to fast after Passover and Pentecost.”

From whence it may readily be gathered that men and women should not so promiscuously and confusedly meet and sit together, nor that they should so look upon one another as in the courts of the Temple, and at Jerusalem, when such innumerable multitudes flocked to the feasts: but that women should sit by themselves, divided from the men, where they might hear and see what is done in the synagogue, yet they themselves remain out of sight. Which custom Baronius proves at large, and not amiss, that those first churches of the Christians retained.

When the women therefore did thus meet apart, it is no wonder if they took off the veils from their faces, when they were now out of the sight of men, and the cause of their veiling being removed, which indeed was that they might not be seen by men. The apostle, therefore, does not at all chide this making bare the face absolutely considered, but there lies something else within. For,

III. This warning of the apostle respects not only public religious meetings, but belongs to those things which were done by men and women in their houses and inner chambers; for there also they used these rites when they prayed and handled holy things privately, as well as in the public assemblies. “Rabban<sup>1</sup> Gamaliel journeying, and being asked by one that met him concerning a certain vow, he lighted off his horse ונתעטף *and veiled himself*, and sat down and loosed the vow.” So R. Judah Bar Allai, on the sabbath eve, when he composed himself in his house to meet and receive the sabbath, “they brought him warm water, and he washed his face and hands, and feet, ודחתעטף בשדין מצוין *and veiling himself with his linen cloth of divers colours*, he sat down, and was like the angel<sup>m</sup> of the Lord of hosts.” So in the example

<sup>1</sup> Hieros. Avodah Zarah, fol. 40. 1. <sup>m</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 771.

of Nicodemus lately produced; He went<sup>n</sup> into his school alone privately, and “veiled himself and prayed.” So did men privately, and women also, on the contrary, baring their faces privately. A reason is given of the former, namely, that the men were veiled for reverence towards God, and as being ashamed before God; but why the women were not veiled also, the reason is more obscure.

A more general one may easily be rendered, viz. שאישה פטורה ממצודה *that a woman was loosed, or free from the precept*, that is, from very many rites to which men were subject; as from the carrying of fringes and phylacteries, from these or the other forms and occasions of prayers, and from very many ceremonies and laws to which men were bound. “R. Meir saith<sup>o</sup>, Every man is bound to these three benedictions every day: Blessed be God that he hath not made me a heathen; that he hath not made me a woman; that he hath not made me בור *stupid,*” or *unlearned*. But Rabh Acha Bar Jacob, when he heard his son say, “Blessed be God that he hath not made me בור *unlearned,*” stuck at it; and upon this reason as the Gloss interprets, לא בני מצודה *Because a heathen and a woman are not capable of the precept*: but בור *a rude or unlearned man* is capable. Deservedly, therefore, God is blessed, that God made him not a heathen or a woman.”

By this canon, *that a woman was loosed from the precept*, they were exempted from covering the face during religious worship, when that precept respected men, and not women. But if you require a more particular reason of this exemption, what reason will you find for it? It is almost an even lay, whether the canonists exempted women from veiling because they valued them much, or because they valued them little. In some things they place women below the dignity, and without the necessity of observing those or the other rites: and whether in this thing they were of the same opinion, or that, on the contrary, they attributed more to the beauty of the faces of women than of men, is a just question. But whether the thing bend this way or the other, the correction and warning of the apostle doth excellently suit to this or to that, as it will appear in what follows.

<sup>n</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 908.

<sup>o</sup> In Menacoth, fol. 43. 2.

Καταισχύνει τὴν κεφαλὴν *Dishonoureth her head.*] “Dis-  
honoureth her *head*?” What *head*? That which she carries  
upon her shoulders? or that to which she is subjected? as  
the man to Christ, the woman to the man. That the apostle  
is to be understood especially of the latter appears from the  
verse before, and indeed from the whole context. For to  
what end are those words produced, ver. 3, “I would have  
you know that the *head* of the woman is the man,” &c. un-  
less that they be applied, and make to the apostle’s business,  
in the verses following?

Nor yet is the subjection of the woman and the supe-  
riority of the man all that by and because of which the apo-  
stle concludes that a woman must not pray but veiled, and a  
man the contrary. For if it were so argued by him, Let not  
a woman pray but with her head covered, because she is sub-  
ject to her husband; it might be argued in like manner, Let  
not a man pray but with his head covered, because he is sub-  
ject to Christ.

I fear lest that interpretation which supposeth the veiling  
of women in this place as a sign of the woman’s subjection to  
her husband should more obscure the sense of this place,  
obscure enough indeed of itself. So one writes<sup>p</sup>, “A woman  
ought to have a covering, that she may show herself humble,  
and to be subject to her husband.” And another<sup>q</sup>, “Now  
the reason of the veiling of women is because they are subject  
to men,” &c. “A veil<sup>r</sup>, by which is signified that the wife is  
in the power of the husband.” And lastly, “A<sup>s</sup> veil, whereby  
is signified that she is subject to the power of another.” And  
very many to the same sense. But let me ask,

I. Where, I beseech you, is a veil propounded as a sign of  
such subjection? It is put indeed as a sign of true modesty,  
Gen. xxiv. 65, and of dissembled modesty, Gen. xxxviii. 14:  
but where is it used as a sign of subjection?

II. Hair was given to our grandmother Eve for a covering,  
(as the apostle clearly asserts in this place,) from the first  
moment of her creation, before she was subjected to a hus-  
band, and heard that “He shall rule over thee;” yea, before  
she was married to Adam.

<sup>p</sup> Primasius, [ad loc.]

<sup>q</sup> [Dionys.] Carthusian. [ad loc.]

<sup>r</sup> Beza, [ad loc.]

<sup>s</sup> Camerarius, [ad loc.]

III. The apostle treats not of wives alone, but of women in general, whether they were wives, virgins, or widows.

IV. The obligation of subjection towards the husband follows the woman ever and everywhere; ought she ever and everywhere to carry a veil with her, as a sign of that subjection? Must she necessarily be veiled while she is about the affairs of her family? Must she be veiled in the garden, in the fields, walking alone or with her family? It is clear enough the apostle speaks of veiling only when they were employed in religious worship; and that regard is had to something that belongs to the woman in respect of God<sup>t</sup>, rather than in respect of her husband. And although we should not deny that the veiling of the woman was some sign of her subjection towards her husband, yet we do deny that the veiling, concerning which the apostle here speaks, hath any regard to it.

V. The Jews assign *shame* as the reason of the woman's veiling: "Why<sup>u</sup> does a man go abroad with his head not covered, but women with their heads covered? R. Josua saith, It is as when one transgresseth and is made ashamed; she therefore goes with her head veiled." Behold a veil, a sign indeed of shame, but not of subjection. And they fetch the shame of the woman thence, that she first brought sin into the world.

Therefore the apostle requires<sup>x</sup> the veiling of the woman in religious worship, by the same notion and reason as men veiled themselves, namely, for reverence towards God. But certainly it may be inquired whether he so much urgeth the veiling of women as reproveth the veiling of men. However, by this most fit argument he well chastiseth that contrary custom and foolishness of man: as though he had said, "Do ye not consider that the man is *δόξα Θεοῦ*, *the glory of God*? but the woman is only *δόξα ἀνδρός*, *the glory of the man*? that woman was made for man? that man is the head of the woman? and then how ridiculous is it that man should use a veil when they pray, out of reverence and shame before God, and woman not use it, whose glory is less! *γυνὴ δόξα ἀνδρός, the woman is the glory of the man.*" So R. Solomon *כתפארת*,

<sup>t</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 772.

<sup>u</sup> Bereshith Rab. sect. 17.

<sup>x</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 909.

<sup>y</sup> In Isa. xlv. 13.

אדם *like the glory of the man*, that is, saith he, like the woman, who is the glory of the husband." See also the Targum.

Κατασχώνει τὴν κεφαλὴν. *Dishonoureth her head.* קלות שרא *the lightness of the head*, among the Talmudists, is *levity* or *irreverence*: and if you should render the Greek expression in the same sense, as though it were ראשו בקיל *he vilifies his head*, or מקילה ראשה *she vilifies her head*, one should not much stray either from grammar or from truth. But the sense ariseth higher; a man praying covered, as ashamed of his face before God, disgraceth his head, Christ, who himself carried the like face of a man: especially he disgraceth the office of Christ, by whom we have access to God with confidence. And a woman praying not veiled, as if she were not ashamed of her face, disgraceth *man*, her head, while she would seem so beautiful beyond him, when she is only the glory of the man; but the man is the glory of God.

Ver. 6: Καὶ κειράσθω. *Let her also be shorn.*] "If she be not veiled, *let her be shorn.*" Yea, rather you will say, let her go with her hair loose, for it was given her for a covering by nature. Will the apostle suffer this, or any civilized nation? By no means. He saith, The hair of women was given them for a covering, and yet requires another covering; calling to mind the primitive reason why the covering of hair is given by nature to a woman, viz. to be a sign of her reverence, humiliation, and shame before God. The apostle permits women to gather and bind up their hair into knots by hair-laces; a thing done in all nations that were not fierce and wild, yea, he would scarce suffer the contrary. But if any woman was so unmindful or forgetful why the veil of her hair was granted her by nature, and so much assured of her beauty and her face, as when she prays to take off her veil, the sign of her reverence towards God; let her take off also, saith he, that natural sign of reverence, the veil of her hair.

Ver. 10: Διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, &c. *For this cause ought the woman to have power, &c.*] That which commonly here obtains is that by ἐξουσίαν, *power*, is understood *a veil, a sign of power* above her, or of her subjection. But it is to be inquired whether ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, *to have power*, does not properly, yea, always denote to have *power in one's*

own hand, not a *power above* one: as Matt. vii. 29; John xix. 10; 1 Cor. vii. 37; ix. 4; and elsewhere a thousand times.

Διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους. *Because of the angels.*] *Because of the angels?* Whom? Whether because of *good angels?* or because of *bad?* or because of *the ministers?* The reader knows what is said for this sense and for that and for the other, which we will not repeat.

I. Truly<sup>z</sup>, if I would understand a *veil* by ἐξουσίαν, *power*, by *angels* I would understand *devils*, which are called *angels* in this very Epistle, chap. vi. 3. And if I were of opinion that the apostle treated here of public assemblies only, I would render his words to this sense: "A woman in the public assembly of the church ought to have her face veiled, *because of the devils*: namely, that they ensnare not men by the appearance of the beauty of women's faces, and provoke them to gaze upon their faces, and to behold them with lascivious eyes, while they ought rather to look up to heaven, and to be intent upon divine things." ✓

II. Or if by *angels* are to be understood *ministers*, our interpretation doth suit very well, which makes a veil a sign of shame and reverence before God, not of subjection towards the husband. For certainly this sounds more logically: women are to be veiled in religious worship, as being ashamed before God; therefore let them be veiled before those who are the ministers of God: than that women are to be veiled in religious worship, because they are subject to their husbands; therefore they are to be veiled before ministers. ✓

III. If we take *angels* in the most proper sense, that is, for *good angels*, and attribute its most proper sense to the expression, ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, *to have power*, that is, *to have power in one's own hand*, then we might interpret the place after this manner: A woman hath not the power of her own head in her own hand, διὰ τὸν Θεὸν, *in respect of God*, but is to be veiled in reverence towards God: but she hath the power of her head in her own hand, of not veiling herself διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, *in respect of the angels*; for she oweth not such a religious reverence to them.

IV. But I suppose the apostle looks another way; and,

<sup>z</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 773.

I. That he does not here speak in his own sense, but cites something usual among the Jews; not so much to dictate some rule for Christian women, as to produce a Jewish custom in confirmation<sup>a</sup> of those things which he had said immediately before.

II. He had said, That 'the woman is the glory of the man,' that 'she was of the man,' that 'she was made for the man,' &c. "And this may testify that which is said among the Jews, The woman ought to have in her own hand power of her head, because of the angels."

III. But now there was among them שילוחי קדושים *angels, or messengers of espousals*; who were deputed by this or that man to espouse a wife for him that deputed him. Concerning which angels the masters here and there discourse largely; but especially see *Kiddushin*<sup>b</sup>: where it begins thus; אויש מקדש בו ובשילוחו *A man espouseth a wife to himself, either by himself, or by his angel, or deputy.*

IV. But now, although the canons of the masters required, and the custom of the nation approved, the veiling of women's faces in the streets; yet it was permitted women to bare their faces, to adorn them, to beautify them, in order to honest marriage: which reason itself and the custom of the nation confirm, and the Rabbins teach.

V. Hither the reasoning of the apostle in this place seems to refer, "Woman was created for man," ver. 9. Which is proved, O ye Jews, by your own consent; when ye decree that a woman hath power, and ought to have it in her own hand, over her own head, because of the *angels of espousals*. Let her bare her face if she will, that she may appear beautiful; let her veil it if she will, that she may appear modest. She hath free power in her own hands to promote her own espousal and marriage, that she may be for a man, since she was created for man.

VI. It is true, indeed, that especially obtained which immediately almost followeth after the words newly alleged, מצוה בו יותר מבשילוחו *It is commanded that a man espouse a woman by himself, rather than by his deputy*: and that which presently follows, "Let no man espouse a woman

<sup>a</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 910.

<sup>b</sup> Cap. 2.

before he see her c.” But it was very frequently done, that after one had seen a woman, he betrothed her to himself by his *angels* or *deputies*, either out of his own modesty, or some necessity compelling him.

VII. Hence the apostle seems to make mention of those *angels*, rather than of the men that deputed them to that business; and that the more strongly to confirm and prove the thing which he treats of. As if he should say, “The woman hath not only power of her head to bare her face before him who is to be her husband, but before them who are sent and deputed by him to betroth her: and from this very thing (saith he) it is clear that the woman was created for the man: seeing she, that she might be for the man, hath such a power of uncovering her face before those *angels* who come to espouse her, when otherwise by the custom of the nation it were not lawful.” The apostle conceals the word קורשים *espousals*; and saith only, *because of the angels*; not *because of the angels of espousals*: for by the very scope of his discourse that is easily understood, when in the words immediately going before he saith, “The woman is created for the man.” So also the Talmudists very frequently use the single word שילוחים *angels*, when once it is known that they are speaking of espousals.

Ver. 14<sup>d</sup>: Ἄνθρωπος ἐὰν κομᾷ, &c. *That if a man have long hair, &c.*] Whether the apostle reproves men’s long hair by occasion offered from his discourse of women’s long hair; or (which is not improbable) that these Judaizing Corinthians as yet retained Nazariteship, and for that cause let their hair grow; that which he saith, that “nature itself teacheth that it is a disgrace for a man to have long hair,” is sufficiently confirmed from hence, that it is womanish. There were indeed divers nations which wore long hair, as καρρηκομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ, *the long-haired Achæans* in Homer; ‘Gallia Comata,’ *Gaul whose inhabitants wore long hair*, in the historians, &c.; but whether in this they followed the light of nature, or rather did it out of their barbarous breeding, or that they might appear more terrible to their enemies, is upon good reason inquired.

You will say then, Whence comes it to pass that the Na-

<sup>c</sup> Kiddush. fol. 41. 9.

<sup>d</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 774.



zarites let their hair grow, and that by divine command? I answer, It was a sign of humiliation and self-denial, as abstaining from wine and grapes also was. It made a show of a certain religious slovenliness, and contempt of a man's self.

They are therefore very much deceived who think that Absalom let his hair grow out of pride, when he did so, indeed, by reason of a vow (at least a feigned vow) of Nazarite-ship. The Jerusalem Talmudists say very truly; אבשלום נזיר עולם היה *Absalom (say they<sup>e</sup>) was a perpetual Nazarite.* Very truly, I say, in this, that they assert he was a Nazarite: but of the perpetuity of his vow we will not here dispute. See 2 Sam. xv. 7, 8.

There is in Tacitus a wicked votary not unlike him, Civilis by name, of whom thus he speaks; "Civilis<sup>f</sup>, barbaro voto, post cœpta adversus Romanos arma, propexum rutilatumque crinem, patratâ demum cœde legionum deposuit." *Civilis, by a barbarous vow, after arms taken up against the Romans, laid down his long red hair, the slaughter of the legions being at last executed.*

The Jews, if they were not bound by the vow of a Nazarite, cut their hair very often; and however they did it at other times, certainly always before a feast, and that in honour of the feast that was approaching. Whence a greater suspicion may here arise, that these Corinthians, by their long hair, professed themselves Nazarites.

"These<sup>g</sup> cut their hair in the feast<sup>h</sup> itself: he that comes from a heathen place, and he that comes out of prison, and the excommunicate person who is loosed from his excommunication." The sense of the tradition is this; "Those who were detained by some necessity before the feast, that they could not cut their hair, might cut it in the feast itself: but if no such necessity hindered, they cut their hair before the feast, and commonly on the very eves of the feast. "When<sup>i</sup> any man cuts not his hair on the eves of the festival day, but three days before, it appears that he cut not his hair in honour of the feast."

We cannot here omit this story: "A<sup>k</sup> certain traveller,

<sup>e</sup> Nazir, fol. 51. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Hist. lib. iv. cap. 61.

<sup>g</sup> Moed Katon, cap. 3. hal. 1.

<sup>h</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 911.

<sup>i</sup> Piske Tosaph. ad Moed Katon, art. 78.

<sup>k</sup> Hieros. Avodah Zarah, fol. 41. 1.

who was a barber and an astrologer, saw by his astrology that the Jews would shed his blood," (which was to be understood of his proselytism, namely, when they circumcised him.) "When a certain Jew therefore came to him to have his hair cut, he cut his throat. And how many throats did he cut? R. Lazar Ben Jose saith, Eighty. R. Jose Ben R. Bon saith, Three hundred."

Ver. 15: 'Η κόμη ἀντὶ περιβολαίου δέδοται. *Her hair is given her for a covering.*] The daughter of Nicodemus being reduced to miserable poverty, going to Rabban Jochanan to speak to him, נִתְעַטְפָה בְּשַׁעֲרָה "veiled<sup>1</sup> herself with her hair, and stood before him." The poor woman had no other veil, therefore she used that which was given her by nature: and she used it (shall I say as a sign? or) as an instrument and mark of modesty and shamefacedness.

Ver. 21: "Ἐκαστος τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει: *Every one taketh before other his own supper.*] I. I wonder the *Agapæ*, the love feasts, of which St. Jude speaks, ver. 12, should among interpreters receive their exposition hence. "In those feasts (saith Beza) which they call *Agapæ*, that they used to take the holy supper of the Lord, appears from 1 Cor. xi: of which thing discourse is had in Tertullian's Apologetic, chap. xxxix, and in other writings of the ancients." So he also speaks at Acts ii. 42. And upon this place, "The<sup>m</sup> apostle (saith he) passeth to another head of this discourse, namely, the administration of the Lord's supper, to which the love feasts were joined," &c. And upon the following verse; "The love feasts, although they had been used a long while in the church and commendably too, the apostles themselves being the authors of them, yet the apostle judgeth them to be taken away because of their abuse."

So also Baronius; "The use of a most commendable thing continued as yet in the church, that as Christ had done at his last supper, and had admonished his disciples to do in remembrance of him, Christians meeting in the church should sup together, and withal should receive the most holy eucharist: which nevertheless when the Corinthians fulfilled not as they ought, Paul doth deservedly reprove."

<sup>1</sup> Bab. Chetubb. fol. 66. 2.      <sup>m</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 775.

He that should deny such charitable feasts to have been used in the church together with the eucharist, certainly would contradict all antiquity: but whether those feasts were these *Agapæ* of which the apostle Jude speaks, whether those feasts had Christ or his apostles for their authors, and whether these Corinthian feasts were such, if any doubt, he doth it not without cause, nor doth he without probability believe the contrary. Of these Corinthian feasts, hear what Sedulius saith: "Among the Corinthians (saith he) heretofore, as some assert prevailed an ill custom, to dishonour the churches everywhere by feasts, which they ate before the Lord's oblation. Which supper they began a-nights, and when the rich came drunk to the eucharist, the poor were vexed with hunger. But that custom, as they report, came from the Gentile superstition as yet among them." Mark that; I should say, 'From the Jewish superstition.' The very same is in Primasius.

II. If I may with the good leave of antiquity speak freely that which I think concerning the *Agapæ*, of which the apostle Jude speaks, take it in a few words:

Those *Agapæ*, we suppose, were when strangers were hospitably entertained in each church, and that at the cost of the church. And we are of opinion that this laudable custom was derived from the synagogues of the Jews. "In<sup>n</sup> the synagogues they neither eat nor drink, &c. But there was a place near the synagogue in which travellers were wont to sleep and eat." Hence that in *Pesachin*<sup>o</sup>, where it is asked, Why they consecrate the day (which was usual over a cup of wine) in the synagogue? And it is answered, לאפקי אורחים לנישת ידי חובתן דאכלו ושתו וגנו בני נישת *That travellers also may do their duty, who eat, and drink, and feast in the synagogue.* Here the Glosser inquires, Whether it were lawful to eat and drink in the synagogues, when it is forbidden by an open canon<sup>p</sup>. And at length among other things he answereth thus; חררים סמוכים לבית הכנסת קרי בי נישתא "The chambers which joined to the synagogue are called synagogues also, and from thence travellers heard the consecration." There was, therefore, a certain hospital either near or joining

<sup>n</sup> Gloss. in Bava Bathra, f. 3. 2.    <sup>o</sup> Fol. 101. 1.    <sup>p</sup> Megil. f. 28. 1.

to the synagogue, wherein travellers and pilgrims were received, and entertained at the common cost of the synagogue. Compare Acts xviii. 7. x

But now that a custom of so great charity was translated into the Christian church, there are many things which persuade: as also that these entertainments of strangers were those *Agapæ* concerning which St. Jude speaks in terms; and Peter in the same sense, though not in terms, 2 Pet. ii.

I. Since<sup>a</sup> the apostolic churches imitated the laudable customs of the synagogues in all things almost, which might more largely be demonstrated if this were a place for it; it is by no means to be thought that this so pious, so Christian, so necessary a custom, should be passed over by them. I say it again, *so necessary*. For,

II. When the apostles and disciples travelled up and down, preaching the gospel, poor enough both by the iniquity of the times, and by the very command of our Saviour; and when at that time not a few were banished from their own dwellings for the profession of the gospel; the honour of the gospel, the necessity of the thing, and Christian piety and charity required, that they should be sustained by some such relief. x

III. When Gaius is said to be 'the host of the whole church,' Rom. xvi. 23, you can scarce take this in another sense than that he was deputed by the church over the public hospital [*xenodocheum*:] where he discharged his office so laudably, that he carried away a testimony of praise (if he be the same Gaius which it is probable he was) from St. John in his third Epistle, ver. 5. x

IV. When mention is made of 'widows washing strangers' feet,' 1 Tim. v. 10; and when Phoebe is said to be *διάκονος τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κερχραῖς*, a *servant of the church at Cenchrea*, Rom. xvi. 1; to omit other women who are said 'to labour much in the Lord;' you will scarcely fix a better sense upon these characters, than that they ministered in that public hospital of which we are speaking. x

V. And this sense agrees excellently well above all others with the place of Jude alleged, as also with that of Peter, who treats of the same thing. For Jude speaks of apostate here-

<sup>a</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 912.

tics, seducers, the most wicked of all mortal men; who, he saith, were *σπιλάδας*<sup>r</sup> ἐν ἀγάπαις, *spots in their agapæ*. And do you think these were of the same church where they so fasted? Were these admitted without any scruple to the *Agapæ*, if they were appendages to the Lord's Supper? For Jude saith, ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες, *feeding themselves without fear*. How much more probable is it to think that these strangers were unknown persons, under the form of believers, wandering up and down, and received in the common hospital of the church, and there scattering their errors; and that so much the more boldly, as they were themselves the more unknown! We are far from denying that some *agapæ*, *love feasts*, were used as appendages of the Lord's supper in more ancient ages of the church: but whether in the times of the apostles we ask, and whether Jude means such, we very much doubt; and that such are here pointed out by the apostle we do not at all believe. Those banquetings of the Corinthians before the Eucharist, unless we are very much mistaken, look far another way; and I fear lest while some pursue this place concerning the Lord's supper with such commentaries of dread and terror that some, being moved and terrified thereby, do altogether avoid this sacrament as some deadly thing, and not to be meddled with; I fear, I say, that they do [not] hit<sup>s</sup> upon the fault and error of the Corinthians in this business, and that they do not reduce that ἀναψίως, *unworthily*, to their proper crime.

We believe the Jewish part of this church, although converted to the gospel, yet retained somewhat of their old leaven; and as they Judaized in other things, so in this about the Eucharist; so grievously erring concerning the proper end of it, that they thought it only an appendage of the Passover, or some new or superadded form of the commemoration of the going out of Egypt. Into which error they might be the more apt to fall, they especially who were so inclinable to Judaism, both because it was instituted in bread and wine which were in the Passover, and because they had drunk in this from their very cradles, "That the Messiah, when he should come, would banish or change nothing of the rites of

<sup>r</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 764. errorem Corinthiorum hac in re non

<sup>s</sup> [Vereor, inquam, ne culpam et acu tangant. Orig. Lat.]

Moses, but would promote and raise all unto a more splendid form and pomp." That this was the error of the Corinthians about the Eucharist, these observations make evident which the apostle hints, both in this verse and those that follow : of which in their order as we meet with them. And first, let us weigh this that is under our hands :

I. It is clearer than the sun, that the apostle sharply reproves the Corinthians for these very suppers : I say, *for the very suppers*, and not only for an abuse happening in the suppers. For *ἰδίου δείπνον*, *his own supper*, he calls that which was to be eaten at home, if any were so hungry before the Eucharist, that he could not abstain : he dishonoureth the church with the supper which was brought into it. Weigh these things and think whether these *Agapæ* were those that are supposed.

II. The Corinthians placed somewhat of religion in these suppers when they brought them into the church. But what was that ? Thus doing they retained the shadow and memory of keeping the Passover, and very willingly they imitated the example of Christ in the ante-supper, that they might the more freely serve their Judaism in so doing : yea, they dreamed that the Eucharist was instituted for the same commemoration with the Passover. It was epidemical among the Jews converted to the gospel, that they embraced Christianity, but did not forego Judaism : yea, that they brought over the things of the gospel as much as could be to the doctrines and practices of the Jews.

<sup>α</sup>Ὅς δὲ μεθύει. *Another is drunken.*] There is none that we know that applies not *ὅς μὲν πεινᾷ*, *one is hungry*, to the poor, and *ὅς δὲ μεθύει*, *another is drunken*, to the rich ; which we also once believed : but they seem rather to be applied to the different nations. *Drunken*, to the Jews, celebrating the Passover in their ante-suppers before the Eucharist ; and *hungry*, to the Gentiles, not being hungry so much out of poverty or necessity<sup>t</sup>, as that they would not embrace such an ante-supper as savouring of Judaism.

We may interpret the word *μεθύει*, *another is drunk*, more favourably than to extend it to extreme drunkenness. For

<sup>t</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 913.

all know what יצבר means in Gen. xliii. ult. *they drank largely with him*; and Cant. v. 1, "*Drink abundantly, O beloved.*" Where the LXX read, ἐμεθύθησαν μετ' αὐτοῦ, *they were drunk with him*; and μεθύθητε, ἀδελφοί, *be ye drunk, brethren.* But if you will attribute an ignominious sense to it, it does not much differ from that liberal pouring in of wine which was allowed, and used by some in their celebrating the Passovers. But the apostle seems to inveigh against the very use of the thing, namely, against the suppers themselves, rather than against the abuse of them. For if the excess of those suppers had been that, which is especially accused, he had bent the force of his reproof more directly against it; but of that there is not one syllable besides this word.

We<sup>u</sup> therefore believe these two contrary expressions, *one is hungry* and *another is drunken*, are thus to be understood: the Jewish part of the church would by no means come to the Eucharist without a paschal ante-supper and banquet, where they were treated deliciously and plentifully, ate and drank, καὶ ἐμέθουν, *and drank freely*, and were filled, and raised to a pitch of cheerfulness; when the Gentile party, on the contrary, abhorring this Judaizing, and avoiding such ante-suppers, πεινῶ, *as yet were hungry*, and approached to the sacrament fasting, that is, not having supped. And this we suppose to be the true cause of that enormity which the apostle corrects, ver. 33, namely, that they would not "tarry one for another:" the Gentile party would not tarry till the Jewish party had despatched their own time, how much soever it were, in eating their suppers.

Ver. 23: Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου. *For I have received of the Lord.*] What need had the apostle to recur to this? Did the Corinthians doubt of the institution of the Eucharist? or of the authority of the apostle who delivered unto them that institution? It was neither one nor the other: for they came to the Eucharist, and that because it was delivered them by the apostle. But he calls them back hither for this reason, that from the words of Christ who had instituted his own supper, and from his words wherein he had

<sup>u</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 777.

<sup>v</sup> [Ubi laute et affluenter excipiebantur.]

delivered to them that institution, they might observe, that the scope and end of that institution was the commemoration of the death of Christ, not any paschal commemoration.

I. Namely, that Christ had said, "This is my body, This is my blood;" to teach that the bread and wine now looked another way than they had looked when they were used in the Passover. In *that* the unleavened bread showed their hasty deliverance out of Egypt, and the wine their joy for that deliverance: but in the *Eucharist*, the bread points out the body of our Lord broken, and the wine, his blood poured out.

II. That he said also of the wine, that it is the "new testament in his blood;" and what had it therefore to do with the Passover of the "old testament?"

III. That he said, lastly, upon both, "Do this in commemoration of me:" in commemoration of *me*, not in commemoration of the *Passover*, or any thing else.

Ver. 25: Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον *This cup.*] That our Saviour speaks here figuratively hath been sufficiently proved formerly by very many. But let us observe this moreover. That *cup* which Christ used was mixed with water, if so be he retained the ordinary custom of the nation in this matter; which is not in the least to be doubted. Of the custom of the nation we have spoke at Matt. xxvi. 27; now repeating this only thence: "The<sup>x</sup> wise men gave their votes for R. Eleazar, that none must bless over the cup of blessing until water be mingled with it." This we note, that the harmony between the sacramental blood, as we may so call it, of the old testament, and this sacramental blood of the new, may be demonstrated; and in like manner between this sacramental blood of the new testament and the very blood of Christ.

I. In the striking of the old covenant, Exod. xxiv, there was blood mixed with water, Heb. ix. 19: and in this sanction of the new, there was wine also mixed with water.

II. Out of Christ's side, with blood flowed water, John xix. 34; unusual, beside the course of nature, and that it might answer the type.

Matthew and Mark exhibit the words of Christ thus, Τοῦτό

<sup>x</sup> Bab. Beracoth, fol. 50. 2.



ἔστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, *This is my blood of the new testament*: Paul, and Paul's companion Luke, thus, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι; *This cup is the new covenant in my blood*, to the same sense with the former, but more explained. And here again let us compare the sanction of the old covenant, Exod. xxiv.

I. A figurative expression is used in that history, when it is said, that Moses sprinkled the blood "upon all the people;" that is, upon the twelve pillars erected by him to represent the twelve tribes, ver. 4. So also in this place, "This is my blood," that is, 'the representation of my blood.'

II. Of the blood then sprinkled it might be said, This is the blood of Christ, of the old or first testament. The very blood then and from thence represented the blood of Christ; because, under the old testament, there was from time to time to be shedding of blood. But now, wine is a representation of the blood of Christ; because thenceforward the shedding of such kind of blood was to cease.

III. The<sup>z</sup> old covenant was not established in the blood of that paschal lamb in Egypt, but in the blood of bulls and goats in the wilderness. And the reason was, because when the Passover was instituted, the laws and articles concerning which the covenant was entered into had not been promulgated: but when they were published and written, then the covenant was established. In like manner Christ, in the institution of baptism, established not the new covenant: baptism was 'the beginning of the gospel,' Mark i. 1: but when he had delivered the doctrine and articles of the gospel, then he established the 'new testament.'

‘*Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη*’ *The new testament*.] אֵי זוּ הִיא מַתְנָה  
 “*What<sup>a</sup> is giving?* Behold, all my goods are given to N. from this time. הִיא זוּ הִיא דִּייתִיקִי *What is διαθήκη, a covenant?* תְּהֵא לִי לְהִיּוֹת וְלֵעֲמֹד וְאִם מְתִי יִתְנֶנּוּ נִנְסִי לְפָלוּנִי. *Let mine be my own and remain so; but when I die let N. have them.*” So the apostle, Heb ix. 16, ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη, &c. *Where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of the testator,*” &c.

I. This cup is not only a sign of the blood of Christ, nor

<sup>y</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 778. <sup>z</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 914.

<sup>a</sup> Hieros. Peah, fol. 17. 2.

only a seal as a sacrament, but the very sanction of the new testament; that is, of the whole evangelic administration, not only the sanction of a covenant, but the sanction of the covenant under the evangelic administration. From thenceforth was the cessation of Judaism. So that blood, Exod. xxiv, was not only the sanction of the covenant of grace, and the sanction of the covenant of the peculiarity of the people of Israel, but the sanction of these things under such an economy.

II. While therefore we receive this sacrament, we profess and protest against all other dispensations and religions besides that of the gospel. Hence in the times immediately following the ascension of Christ, the communication of the Eucharist was so frequent; viz. that they who had been now newly converted from Judaism by the use of this sacrament, might show that they renounced their Judaism, and professed the faith and economy of the gospel.

III. Our communion therefore in this sacrament is not so much spiritual as external, and declarative of our common and joint profession of the Christian faith. We are far from denying that the saints have a spiritual communion with God, and among themselves in the use of the Eucharist; yea, we assert there is a most close communion between true believers and God. But what is that spiritual communion of saints among themselves? Mutual love, one heart, prayers for one another, &c. But they may exercise the same communion, and do exercise it, when they meet together to any other part of divine worship. They may and do act the same thing, when they are distant from one another. Therefore their communion in this sacrament, which is distinctly called the 'communion of the Eucharist,' is, that they meet together, and, by this outward sign, openly and with joint minds profess that they are united in one sacred knot and bond of Christian religion, renouncing all other religions.

IV. When therefore we approach to the Eucharist in any church, we do not only communicate with that congregation with which we associate at that time, but with the whole catholic church in the profession of the true evangelic religion.

Ver. 26 : Τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε. Ye do show

*the Lord's death.*] It is known what the *הגדרה* in the Passover supper was, namely, a *declaration* of the great works of God in the deliverance of the people out of Egypt. The same, as it seems, would these Judaizing Corinthians retain in the Lord's supper; as if the Eucharist were instituted and superadded only for that commemoration. The word *καταγγέλλετε*, does very well answer to the word *הגדרה* *the declaration*: and while the apostle admonisheth them that the death of Christ is that which is to be *declared*, it may be gathered that they erred in this very thing, and looked some other way.

Ver. 27<sup>b</sup>: *Ἀναξίως* *Unworthily.*] The apostle explains himself, ver. 29; where we also will speak of this verse.

Ver. 28: *Δοκιμάζτω δὲ ἑαυτοῦς, &c.* *Let a man examine himself, &c.*] He had said before, ver. 19, *ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται*, *that they which are approved may be made manifest*. And in the same sense he saith, *δοκιμάζτω*, *let a man approve himself* in this place. Not so much, *let him try or examine himself*, as, *let him approve himself*; that is, *let him show himself approved by the Christian faith and doctrine*. So chap. xvi. 3, *οὓς ἐὰν δοκιμάσητε*, *whomsoever ye shall approve*. We meet with the word in the same sense very often.

Ver. 29: *Μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου* *Not discerning the Lord's body.*] This is to be meant of the proper act of the understanding: viz. of the true judgment concerning the nature and signification of the sacrament. If it were said indeed, *μὴ διακρίνων τὸν Κύριον*, *not discerning the Lord*, it might be rendered in the same sense as "he knew not the Lord;" that is, "he loves him not, he fears him not, he worships him not." But when it is said, *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα*, *not discerning the body*, it plainly speaks of the act of the understanding: "He does not *rightly distinguish* of the body of the Lord." And this was a grievous error of these Judaizing Corinthians, who would see nothing of the body of Christ in the Eucharist, or of his death; their eyes being too intent upon the commemoration of the Passover<sup>c</sup>. They retained the old leaven of Judaism in this new Passover of the Eucharist. And this was their partaking of the sacra-

<sup>b</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 779.    <sup>c</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 915.

ment ἀναξίως, *unworthily*, as assigning it a scope and end much too unworthy, much too mean.

There are, alas! among Christians, some who come to this sacrament ἀναξίως, *unworthily*; but whether this *unworthily* of the Corinthians be fitly applied to them, I much doubt. How mean soever I am, let me speak this freely, with the leave of good and pious men, that I fear that this discourse of the apostle, which especially chastised Judaizers, is too severely applied to Christians, that Judaize not at all; at least that it is not by very many interpreters applied to the proper and intended scope of it.

Of these Corinthians receiving the Eucharist *unworthily*, in the sense of which we spake, the apostle speaks two dreadful things:—

I. That they became ἐνοχοὶ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου, *guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*, ver. 27. With this I compare that of the apostle, Heb. x. 29, “He hath trampled under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant by which he (the Son of God) was sanctified, a common thing.” And Heb. vi. 6, “They crucify again to themselves the Son of God, καὶ παραδειγματίζουσι, *and put him to an open shame.*” Of whom is the discourse? Not of all Christians that walked not exactly according to the gospel rule, (although they indeed esteem and treat Christ too ignominiously;) but of those that relapse and apostatize from the gospel to Judaism, whither these Corinthians too much inclined, and are admonished seasonably to take care of the same guilt. For when any professing the gospel so declined to Judaism, that he put the blood of Christ in subordination to the Passover, and acknowledged nothing more in it than was acknowledged in the blood of a lamb and other sacrifices, namely, that they were a mere commemoration and nothing else, oh, how did he vilify that blood of the eternal covenant! He is *guilty of the blood of the Lord*, who assents to the shedding of his blood, and gives his vote to his death as inflicted for a ‘mere shadow,’ and nothing else; which they did.

II. That they ate and drank κρίμα ἑαυτοῖς, *judgment to themselves*. But what that *judgment* is, is declared ver. 30; “Many are sick,” &c. It is too sharp when some turn κρίμα

by *damnation*, when the apostle saith most evidently, ver. 32, that *κρινόμενοι παιδευόμεθα, ἵνα μὴ κατακριθῶμεν*, *When we are judged we are chastened, that we should not be condemned.*

Thus<sup>d</sup>, as in the beginning of the Mosaical dispensation, God vindicated the honour of the sabbath by the death of him that gathered sticks; and the honour of the worship in the tabernacle by the death of Nadab and Abihu; and the honour of his name by the stoning of the blasphemer: so he set up like monuments of his vengeance in the beginning of the gospel dispensation, in the dreadful destruction of Ananias and Sapphira for the wrong and reproach offered to the Holy Ghost; in the delivery of some into the hands of Satan, for contempt of and enmity against the gospel; in this judgment for the abuse of the Eucharist; in the destruction of some by the plague for Nicolaitism, Rev. ii. 23, &c.

Ver. 33: *Ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε*. *Tarry one for another.*] Not that he allowed those ante-suppers of the Judaizers, and commands the Gentile party of the church to wait till the Jewish part ate those suppers; but having before wholly condemned those paschal ante-suppers, he would take away all dividing into parties, and that all might resort to the Eucharist together with one accord, not separately, and in parts and contentions.

## CHAP. XII.

VER. 3: *Λέγει ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦν*. *Calleth Jesus accursed.*] Very many Jews that were magicians, exorcists, conjurors, wandered up and down, who boasted that they were endued with the Holy Ghost, taught much and did miracles; and yet called our Lord Jesus *anathema*. "But be ye certain (saith the apostle) that these men neither speak, nor act, nor are acted by the Spirit of God: 'For no man, speaking by the Spirit of God, calleth Jesus *accursed*.'" On the other part also, the whole Jewish nation indeed denied that the Holy Ghost was given to the Gentiles. "The Holy Ghost (say they) dwells not upon any without the land of Israel." Hence is that, Acts x. 45, "The believers that were of the circumcision were astonished that, even upon the Gentiles, had been poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost."

"But (saith the apostle) when the Gentiles confess Jesus

<sup>d</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 780.

<sup>e</sup> See R. Sol. in Jon. i.

is the Lord, they do not this but by the Holy Ghost." And so he instructs Christians, that they be not deceived by the crafty and magical spirits of the Jews; and in like manner he stops the mouth of the Jews, that they should not deny the Holy Spirit to be bestowed upon the Gentile Christians.

Ver. 8: *Λόγος σοφίας, &c. The word of wisdom, &c.*] When the apostle, in this very chapter, numbers up thrice the gifts of the Spirit, perhaps it will not be in vain to make them stand parallel in that very order wherein he recites and ranks them:—

Ver. 8f.	Ver. 28.	Ver. 29.
Δίδοται, is given.	Ὅς μὲν ἔθετο, God hath set some.	Μὴ πάντες, are all.
Λόγος σοφίας, the word of wisdom.	Πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, first apostles.	Ἀπόστολοι, apostles.
Λόγος γνώσεως, the word of knowledge.	Δεύτερον προφήτας, secondly, prophets.	Προφήται, prophets.
Ver. 9f.	Τρίτον διδασκάλους, thirdly, teachers.	Διδάσκαλοι, teachers.
Πίστις, faith.	Ἔπειτα δυνάμεις, after that miracles.	Δυνάμεις, miracles.
Χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, gifts of healing.	Ver. 30.	Ver. 30.
Ver. 10.	Ἐτα χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, then gifts of healing.	Χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, gifts of healings.
Ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων, working of miracles.	Ἀντιλήψεις, helps.	
Προφητεία, prophecy.	Κυβερνήσεις, governments.	
Διάκρισις πνευμάτων, discerning of spirits.	Γένη γλωσσῶν, divers kinds of tongues.	Γλώσσαις λαλοῦσι, speak with tongues.
Γένη γλωσσῶν, divers kinds of tongues.		Διερμηνεύουσι, interpret.
Ἐρμηνεῖα γλωσσῶν, interpretation of tongues.		

We will not be so curious as to conclude that all the words that are placed in parallel denote the same things, when Paul himself inverts his own order concerning the 'gifts of healings,' and of 'miracles,' or 'powers,' ver. 9, 28, 30: yet we cannot be so negligent but to observe a little his order, that we might fetch something out of it:

*Λόγον σοφίας, the word of wisdom,* therefore, we attribute to the apostles, because they unfolded, in a divine clearness, the whole mystery of the most deep wisdom of God concerning Christ, and the salvation of man. Concerning which our apostle very frequently.

<sup>f</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 916.    <sup>g</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 781.

Λόγον γνώσεως, *the word of knowledge*, we attribute to the prophets, that is, *the knowledge* of things to come.

But how do we apply πίστιν, *faith*, to teachers? That by *faith* in this place is not to be understood *justifying faith*, is granted, as I think, by all: and that upon good reason; when the apostle treats here only of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. Nor can I, indeed, understand it of the *faith of miracles*; not of *the faith of doing miracles*, because δυνάμεις, *miracles*, and χαρίσματα λαμάτων, *gifts of healings*, are particularly and distinctly reckoned up: nor of *the faith of believing miracles*, because the discourse here is of the ways and persons that actively propagated the gospel, not passively that received it. By *faith*, therefore, I would understand *fiducia*, that is, *a holy boldness, confidence, and magnanimity*, wherewith those most holy preachers of the gospel were armed, so that they could not be terrified by any thing nor by any person. See Acts iv. 13; but especially ver. 29, 31. And in this sense *faith* may very well be attributed to 'teachers.'

Δυνάμεις, *miracles*, and χαρίσματα λαμάτων, *the gifts of healings*, are very easily both distinguished and understood. You have them again so distinguished, Mark vi. 5, and xvi. 17, 18.

Ἀντιλήψεις, *helps*, were they probably who accompanied the apostles, and baptized those that were converted by them, and were sent here and there by them to such places, to which they being employed in other things could not come; as Mark, Timothy, Titus, &c. The Talmudists sometimes call the Levites לכהנין ססעדי *ἀντιλήψεις ἱερέων*, *helps of the priests*.

Προφητεία, *prophecy*, and ἀντιλήψεις, *helps*, are placed in parallel according to the order of the apostle; and do agree indeed excellently well together, if you take *prophecy* for *preaching*: which is done very frequently.

Κυβερνήσεις, *governments*, also, and διακρίσεις πνευμάτων, *discerning of spirits*, stand parallel; and that they denote one and the same thing I scarcely make a doubt. But *κυβερνήσεις* in this place to me sounds not *governments*, or a *power of ruling*, but it speaks a *deep and profound reach*, [*solertiam*]: in which sense it occurs in the Seventy interpreters more than once, and answers to the Hebrew word רַבְרַבִּיּוֹת *prudent*.

*counsels.* Prov. i. 5, יִקְנֶה נְבוֹן תְּחִבּוּלוֹת 'Ο νοήμων κυβέρνησιω κήσεται. The Interlinear version reads, 'Intelligens consilia solertia possidebit;' *The understanding man shall possess wise counsels.* Aben Ezra saith, תְּחִבּוּלוֹת עֵנִין עֵצָה וּמַחְשָׁבָה, 'Tahbuloth' denotes *counsel and thinking.* See also Kimchi and R. Solomon upon the place. And the same Seventy, chap. xi. 14, בְּאֵין תְּחִבּוּלוֹת יִפְּלֵעַם reads, οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπάρχει κυβέρνησιω πίπτουσι, *they who have not κυβέρνησιω fall.* What the word means you may easily gather from the antithesis in the following words, רַב יוֹעֵץ בְּרַב יוֹעֵץ σωτηρία δὲ ὑπάρχει ἐν πολλῇ βουλή· *but safety is in much counsel.* And again, chap. xxiv. 6<sup>h</sup>: בְּתִחְבּוּלוֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה לָּהּ מְלַחְמָה, the Seventy read, μετὰ κυβερνήσεως γίνεται πόλεμος, *war is made with κυβερνήσιω.* The Vulgar reads, 'Cum dispositione initur bellum,' *with disposing, or setting things in order.*

Διάκρισις πνευμάτων, *discerning of spirits*, was the judging between magical and diabolical *spirits*, and their operations, and between the operations and speech of the Holy Ghost. For many false prophets had at that time gone out into the world, 1 John iv. 1; and that κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει, καὶ σημείοις, καὶ τέρασι ψεύδους: *according to the working of Satan in all power, and signs, and lying wonders:* so that it was not *easy*, I had almost said it was *impossible*, to distinguish between their wonders and the true miracles of the Holy Ghost. But the most merciful God taking pity upon his people, among other gifts of the Holy Ghost shed abroad for the edification of the church, granted this also to some, that they might distinguish of prophetic *spirits*, whether they were true and divine, or false and diabolical. That this deep reach is pointed out under this word κυβερνήσιω, the apostle's order, the signification of the word, and the thing itself, do not a little persuade. For when, among all the gifts of the Spirit, there was scarce any either more useful or more necessary than this *judging of spirits*; I think he would hardly omit it in his second enumeration. But where will you find the mention of it if not in that word?

## CHAP. XIII.

VER. 1: Γλώσσαις τῶν ἀγγέλων. *With the tongues of angels.]*

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 782. <sup>1</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 917.



“Rabban<sup>k</sup> Jochanan Ben Zaccai omitted not שיחת שדים ושיחת דקלים ושיחת מלאכי השרת *the speech, or the talk, of devils, of palms, and of angels;*” but had learned it. The Gloss is, “The speech of devils to exorcise them, and of angels to adjure them.” The apostle speaks according to the conception of the nation.

Κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον. *A tinkling cymbal.*] Κύμβαλον, a cymbal, in the Talmudists is צלצל. Of which thus they write, ואסף במצלתיים להשמיע *And<sup>1</sup> Asaph with loud cymbals,* 1 Chron. xxv. מצלתיים תרי הוו *The little bells [or cymbals] were two* [as appears from the dual number. כיון דחדא עבידתא עבדי חוד גברא עבדי בהו קרי להו חד *But when they performed one work, and one man performed it, they are called one.* The *Aruch* saith, “They were two balls of brass, and they struck one against another.”

But now κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον, a *tinkling cymbal*, was when these two balls were struck one against another without any either measure or tone of music, but with a rude, inartificial, and howling sound, Mark v. 38; κλαύοντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας, *weeping and howling.*

We may observe in these instances, which are compared with charity, and are as good as nothing if charity be absent, that the apostle mentions them which were of the noblest esteem in the Jewish nation; as also the most precious things which could be named by them, were compared with this more precious, and were of no account in comparison of it.

I. λαλεῖν γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *to speak with the tongues of men*, with those interpreters is, “to speak the tongues of the *seventy* nations,” or at least to speak the tongues of *many* nations. So they relate it to the praise of Mordecai, that he perfectly understood the language of the *seventy* nations; and they require of the Fathers of the Sanhedrim that they be skilled in many languages, that “the Sanhedrim hear nothing by an interpreter<sup>m</sup>.”

II. λαλεῖν γλώσσαις τῶν ἀγγέλων. *To speak with the tongues of angels.* For this singular praise they extol Jochanan Ben Zaccai in the example alleged.

<sup>k</sup> Bava Bathra, fol. 134. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Erachin, fol. 13. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Maimon. in Sanhedr. cap. 2.

III. Εἶδεν μυστήρια πάντα, &c. *To know all mysteries, &c.* So they from the same place cited above; "Hillel the Elder had eighty disciples: thirty who were worthy to have the Holy Spirit dwell upon them, as it did upon Moses. Thirty worthy for whom the sun shall stop his course, as it did for Joshua. Twenty were between both. The greatest of all was Jonathan Ben Uzziel, the least was Jochanan Ben Zaccái. He omitted not," (but perfectly understood,) "the Scripture, the Misna, the Gemara, the idiotisms of the law, and the scribes, traditions, illustrations, comparisons, equalities, gematries, parables," &c.

IV. Ὅρη<sup>n</sup> μεθιστάνει· *To remove mountains.*] By this expression they denoted, 'doing things in a manner impossible,' as we have observed at Matt. xxi. 21. עקר שורי *he rooted up mountains*<sup>o</sup>.

#### CHAP. XIV.

VER. 2: Ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσση· *He that speaketh in a tongue.*] *Speaking in a tongue?* In what *tongue?* You will find this to be no idle question when you have well weighed these things:

I. There is none with reason will deny that this whole church of Corinth understood one and the same Corinthian or Greek language: as also, that the apostle here speaks of the ministers of that church, and not of strangers. But now it seems a thing not to be believed, that any minister of that church would use Arabic, Egyptian, Armenian, or any other unknown language publicly in the church; from whence not the least benefit could accrue to the church, or to the minister himself. For although these ministers had their faults, and those no light ones neither, yet we would not willingly accuse them of mere foolishness as speaking an unknown language for no reason; nor of ostentation as speaking only for vainglory. And although we deny not that it was necessary that those wonderful gifts of the Holy Ghost should be manifested before all the people, for the honour of him that gave them; yet we hardly believe that they were to be shown vainly and for no benefit.

II. The apostle saith, ver. 4, ὁ λαλῶν γλώσση, ἑαυτὸν οἰκοδομεῖ, *he that speaketh in a tongue edifieth himself*: which how

<sup>n</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 783.

<sup>o</sup> Bava Bathra, fol. 3. 2.

could he do from those *tongues*, when he could have uttered those very things in his mother-tongue, and have reaped the same fruit of edification ?

III. The apostle tolerates an unknown *tongue* if an interpreter were present. But I scarce believe he would tolerate that one should prate in Scythian, Parthian, or Arabic, &c., when he could utter the same things in the Corinthian language, and without the trouble of the church and an interpreter.

We are of opinion, therefore, nor without reason, that that<sup>p</sup> unknown language which they used, or abused rather, in the church, was the Hebrew ; which now of a long time past was not the common and mother tongue, but was gone into disuse ; but now by the gift of the Holy Ghost it was restored to the ministers of the church, and that necessarily and for the profit of the church. We inquire not in how many unknown languages they could speak, but how many they spake in the church ; and we believe that they spake *Hebrew* only.

How necessary that language was to ministers there is none that doubts. And hence it is that the apostle permits to speak in this (as we suppose) unknown language, if an interpreter were present, because it wanted not its usefulness. The usefulness appeared thence as well to the speaker, while he now skilled [*calluit*] and more deeply understood the original language ; as also to the hearers while those things were rendered truly, which that mystical and sacred language contained in it.

The foundations of churches were now laying, and the foundations of religion in those churches ; and it was not the least part of the ministerial task at that time, to prove the doctrine of the gospel, and the person, and the actions, and the sufferings of Christ out of the Old Testament. Now the original text was unknown to the common people ; the version of the Seventy interpreters was faulty in infinite places ; the Targum upon the prophets was inconstant and Judaized ; the Targum upon the law was as yet none at all : so that it was impossible to discover the mind of God in the holy text without the immediate gift of the Spirit, imparting perfect and

<sup>p</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 918.

full skill both of the language and of the sense; that so the foundations of faith might be laid from the Scriptures, and the true sense of the Scriptures might be propagated without either error or the comments of men.

The apostle saith, "Let him pray that he may interpret," ver. 13. And 'interpretation' is numbered among the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. Now let it be supposed that he spake Latin, Arabic, Persian: either he understood what he spake, or he did not: if he did not, then how far was he from edifying himself! And yet the apostle saith, *he that speaks in a tongue edifies himself*. If he understood what he spake, how easy was it for him to render it in the Corinthian language! There are many now learned by study who are able to translate those tongues into the Corinthian or the Greek, without that extraordinary gift of interpretation immediately poured out by the Holy Ghost. But let it be supposed, which we do suppose, that he spake in the Hebrew tongue, that he either read or quoted the holy text in the original language; and that he either preached or prayed in the phrases of the prophets; it sufficed not to the interpretation to render the bare words into bare words, but to understand the sense and marrow of the prophet's language, and plainly and fully to unfold their mysteries in apt and lively and choice words, according to the mind of God: which the evangelists and apostles by a divine skill do in their writings.

Hear the judgment of the Jews concerning a just interpretation of the holy text. They<sup>r</sup> are treating of the manner of espousing a woman. Among other things these passages occur; תר" על מנת שאני קריינא " *The Rabbins deliver*. *If he saith, 'Be thou my espouser if I read:'* if he read three verses in the synagogue, behold she is espoused. R. Judah saith, 'Not until he read and interpret.' יתרגם מדעתיה *May he interpret according to his own sense?* But the tradition is this: R. Judah saith, כצורתו פסוק המתרגם *He that interprets a verse according to his own form*, behold he is a liar. If he add any thing to it, behold he is a reproacher and blasphemer. What therefore is the Targum? [Or what interpretation is to be used?] Our Targum."

The Gloss there writes thus: "He that interprets a verse

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 784.

<sup>r</sup> Bab. Kiddush. fol. 49. 1.

according to his own form, that is, according to the literal sound: for example, לֹא־תִעַן עַל רִיב Exod. xxiii. 2; he that interprets that thus, לֹא תִסְהִיד עַל דִּינָה *Thou shalt not testify against judgment*, is a liar: for he commands that judgment be brought forth into light. But let him so interpret it, Thou shalt not restrain thyself from teaching any that inquire of thee in judgment. So Onkelos renders it."

"If he add any thing to it:]—If he say, 'Because liberty is given to add somewhat, I will add wheresoever it lists me;' he sets God at nought and changeth his words. For wheresoever Onkelos added, he added not of his own sense. For the Targum was given in mount Sinai, and when they forgot it, he came and restored it. And Rab. Chananeel explains those words, 'He that interprets a verse according to his own form,' by this example, וַיִּרְאוּ אֶת־אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל Exod. xxiv. 10. He that shall render it thus, וַדְּחוּ ית אֱלֹהָּ, וַדְּחוּ ית אֱלֹהָּ *and they saw the God of Israel*, is a liar; for no man hath seen God and shall live: and he will add to it who should render it, וַדְּחוּ ית מַלְאַכָּא דֵאֱלֹהָּ *and they saw the angel of God*. For he attributes the glory of God to an angel. But let him interpret it thus, וַדְּחוּ ית יְקָרָא דֵאֱלֹהָּ *and they saw the glory of the God of Israel*. So Onkelos again."

So great a work do they reckon it to interpret the sacred text. And these things which have been said perhaps will afford some light about the gift of interpretation.

But although the use of the Hebrew tongue among these ministers was so profitable and necessary, yet there was some abuse which the apostle chastiseth; namely, that they used it not to edification and without an interpreter. And further, while I behold the thing more closely, I suspect them to Judaize in this matter, which we have before observed them to have done in other things; and that they retained the use of the Hebrew language in the church, although unknown to the common people, and followed the custom of the synagogue. Where,

I. The<sup>s</sup> Scripture is not read but in the Hebrew text; yea, as we believe, in the synagogues even of the Hellenists: as we dispute elsewhere of that matter.

<sup>s</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 919.

II. Public prayers in the synagogue were also made in Hebrew, one or two excepted, which were in Chaldee. "They<sup>t</sup> were wont to repeat the prayer whose beginning is קריש, after sermon. For the common people were there present who understood not the holy language. Therefore this prayer they composed in the Chaldee tongue, that all might understand:" the rest they understood not.

III. He that taught, or preached out of the chair, spokē Hebrew, and by an interpreter. "The<sup>u</sup> interpreter stood before the doctor who preached: חכם לחש לו לשון עברית, and the doctor whispered him in the ear in Hebrew, and he rendered it to the people in the mother tongue." And there in the Gemara a story is related of Rabh, who was present as interpreter to R. Shillah: and when R. Shillah said קרא גבר the cock crows, Rabh rendered it קרא גברא, when he should have rendered it קרא תרנגולא. Hence there is very frequent mention in the books of the Talmudists of מתרגמניה של פלוני אמוריה the interpreter of this and that doctor.

While I consider these things used in the synagogues of the Jews, and remember that a great part of the church of Corinth consisted of Jews; I cannot but suspect that their ministers also used the same tongue according to the old custom; namely, that one read the Scripture out of the Hebrew text, another prayed or preached in the Hebrew language<sup>x</sup>, according to the custom used in the synagogues. Which thing, indeed, the apostle allowed, so there were an interpreter, as was done in the synagogues: because that language, full of mysteries, being rendered by a fit interpreter, might very much conduce to the edification of the church.

I suspect also that they Judaized in the confused mixture of their voices; which seems to be done by them because the apostle admonisheth them to speak *by turns*, ver. 27, and not together. Now from whence they might fetch that confusedness, judge from these passages: "The<sup>y</sup> Rabbins deliver. In the law one reads, and one interprets; and let not one read and two interpret. But in the prophets one reads, and two interpret. But let not two read and two interpret.

<sup>t</sup> Gloss. in Beracoth, fol. 3. 1.

<sup>u</sup> Gloss. in Joma, fol. 20. 2.

<sup>x</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 785.

<sup>y</sup> *Megil.* fol. 21. 2.

And in the *Hallel*, and in the Book of Esther, ten may read, and ten interpret."

The Gloss is thus: " 'Let not one read in the law, and two interpret.' Much less let two read. And the reason is, because two voices together are not heard. 'But in the prophets let one read, and two interpret,' because the interpretation was for the sake of women and the common people, who understood not the holy language. And it was necessary they should hear the interpretation of the law, that they might understand the precepts: but of the interpretation of the prophets they were not so accurate."

Ver. 3: 'Ο δὲ προφητεύων *He that prophesieth.*] The word προφητεύειν, to *prophesy*, comprehends three things, 'singing psalms,' 'doctrine,' and 'revelation:' as ver. 26.

I. To *prophesy* is taken for 'singing psalms,' or celebrating the praises of God, 1 Sam. x. 5, "Thou shalt meet a company of prophets,...with a psaltery, and a tabret, a pipe, and a harp, מִתְנַבְּאִים וְהִמָּה וְהֵמָּה *and they shall prophesy:*" where the Chaldee, וְאִינוּן מְשַׁבְּחִין *and they shall sing or praise.* And chap. xix. 24, 25, וְאוּל מְיֹול וּמְשַׁבַּח *And he went forward singing.* And he put off his (royal) garment וְשַׁבַּח *and sang.*

From this signification of the word *prophesying*, you may understand in what sense a woman is said to *prophesy*, chap. xi. 5; that is, to 'sing psalms.' For what is there said by the apostle, "A man praying or *prophesying*," and "a woman praying or *prophesying*," is explained in this chapter, when it is said, "I will pray," and "I will sing."

II. To *prophesy* is to 'preach,' or to 'have a doctrine,' as ver. 26. Hence the Chaldee almost always renders נְבִיא *a prophet*, by סַפְרָא *a scribe*, or *learned*, or *one that teacheth*. When it is very ordinarily said of those that were endued with extraordinary gifts, that "they spake with tongues and prophesied." Acts x. 46, it is said, that "they spake with tongues, and magnified God." For *they prophesied*, is said, 'they magnified God:' and that these two ways, either by praising God, or by preaching and declaring the wonderful things of God, Acts ii. 11.

III. To *prophesy* is to foretell and teach something from divine revelation; which is expressed, ver. 26, by "hath a

revelation." In those times there were some who, being inspired with a spirit of revelation, either foretold things to come, as Agabus did a famine, Acts xi. 28, and Paul's bonds, Acts xxi. 10: or revealed the mind of God to the church, concerning the doing or the not doing this or that thing; as Acts xiii. 2, by the prophets of Antioch they separate Paul and Barnabas, &c.

Ver. 5: *Θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις.* *I would that ye all spake with tongues.*] The words do not so much speak wishing, as directing; as though he had said, "I restrain you not to prophesying alone, however I speak those things which are ver. 1-3: but I will exhort that ye speak with tongues when it is convenient, but rather that ye prophesy." He had said *tongue*, in the singular number, ver. 2, 4, because he spake of a single<sup>z</sup> man; now he saith *tongues*, in the plural number, in the very same sense, but that he speaks of many speaking.

Would the apostle therefore have this, or doth he persuade it? or doth he wish it, if so be it be a wish? "I would have you all speak in the church in the Punic, Egyptian, Ethiopic, Scythian, and other unknown tongues?" Think seriously to what end this could be. But if you understand it of the *Hebrew*, the end is plain.

Ver. 15<sup>a</sup>: *Τί οὖν ἐστὶ.* *What is it then?*] The apostle renders in Greek the phrase מָדוּ most common in the schools. "Rabba<sup>b</sup> asked Abai, בָּא עָלֶיהָ וּנְתָאֲרָסָהּ מָדוּ, *A man goes in to the woman when she is espoused; what then?*" Or what is to be resolved in that case? Again; "The<sup>c</sup> wife saith, I will suckle the infant: but the husband saith, Thou shalt not suckle him. The women hearken. But the husband saith, That she should suckle it; the wife saith, not. מָדוּ *What is then to be done?*" "One<sup>d</sup> goes in the street and finds a purse: מָדוּ *What is to be done with it? behold, it becomes his.* But an Israelite comes and gives some signs of it: מָדוּ, רִי עֲסִי; *What is then to be resolved on?*" "Let<sup>e</sup> our Master teach us, כְּהֵן בְּעַל מוֹם מָדוּ שִׁישָׁא אֵת כַּפּוּי, *A priest that hath a blemish, רִי עֲסִי; What is it that he lift up his*

<sup>z</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 920.

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 786.

<sup>b</sup> Bab. Chetubb. fol. 39. 1.

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* fol. 61. 1.

<sup>d</sup> Bava Mezia, fol. 24. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Jevamoth, fol. 25. 1.



*hands*" to bless the people? that is, what is to be resolved concerning him? whether he should lift up his hands or no? And the determination of the question follows everywhere.

To the same sense the apostle in this place, *τί οὖν ἐστὶ*; *what therefore is to be done* in this case, about the use of an unknown tongue? He determines, "I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding."

So ver. 26: *Τί ἐστὶν, ἀδελφοί*; *What is it, brethren?* that is, 'What is to be done in this case, when every one hath a psalm, hath a doctrine,' &c. He determines, "Let all things be done to edification."

*Προσεύξομαι τῷ πνεύματι, &c.* *I will pray with the Spirit, &c.*] That is, in the demonstration of the gifts of the Spirit; and, 'I will pray with the understanding,' that is, that I be understood by others.

Ver. 16: *Ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου*. *He that occupieth the room of the unlearned.*] *הידיוט* *hidiot*, a word very usual among the Rabbins. *ר' מ' היה דורש לשון הידיוט* "R. Meir<sup>f</sup> explained [or determined] in the private tongue. So also R. Judah. And Hillel the old. And R. Jochanan Ben Korchah," &c. The Gloss is; "Private men were wont to write otherwise than according to the rule of the wise men." There *חכם* and *הידיוט* *a wise man*, and *ἰδιώτης*, are opposed. So *כהנים הידיוטות* *private priests*, are opposed to priests of a worthier order: and which we have observed before, *הידיוטות* *ἰδιῶται*, *private men*, are opposed to *דיינים* *judges*.

In 1 Sam. xviii. 23, *איש רש ונקלה*, *a poor and contemptible man*, in the Targumist is *גבר מסכן והידיוט* *a poor and private (hidiot) man*.

According to this acceptance of the word *ἰδιώτης* among the Jews, the apostle seems in this place to distinguish the members of the church from the ministers,—*private persons* from public. So in those various companies celebrating the paschal service there was one that blessed, recited, distributed, and was as it were the public minister for that time and occasion, and all the rest were *ἰδιῶται*, *private persons*. So also in the synagogues, 'the angel of the church' performed the public ministry, and the rest were as *private men*. There

<sup>f</sup> Bab. Mezia, fol. 104. 1.

were indeed persons among them who were not in truth *private men*, but judges and magistrates, and learned men; but as to that present action, ἀνεπήρουν τὸν τόπον (which you must not understand of sitting in lower seats, but of their present capacity), *they supply the place, or sustain the condition of private persons*, as to the present action, as men contradistinct from the public minister. Ἰδιώτης indeed occurs for a *common or unlearned man* ver. 23, which yet hinders not at all but that in this place it may be taken in the sense mentioned.

Πῶς ἐπεῖ τὸ ἀμήν, &c. *How shall he say, Amen, &c.*] It was the part of one to pray, or give thanks,—of all to answer, *Amen*. “They<sup>s</sup> answer *Amen* after an Israelite blessing, not after a Cuthite,” &c. But “they<sup>b</sup> answered not אמן יתומה *the orphan Amen* ולא אמן חטופה *nor the snatched Amen*,” &c.

The *orphan Amen* was when *Amen* was said, and he that spake weighed not, or knew not why or to what he so answered. To the same sense is מזמורא יתומה, an<sup>i</sup> *orphan psalm*; that is, a psalm to which neither the name of the author is inscribed, nor the occasion of the composure. יתומא among the Talmudists is sometimes a *fool*, or *unlearned*<sup>k</sup>. Let it be so, if you please, in this phrase. Such is the *Amen* concerning which the apostle in this place; when any one answers *Amen* foolishly to a thing not understood.

Ver. 21: Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται: *In the law it is written.*] *In the law*, that is, in the Scripture: in opposition to דברייהם, *the words of the scribes*. For that distinction was very usual in the schools. וזה מתורה *this we learn out of the law*, וזה מדברייהם, *and this from the words of the scribes*. דברי תורה אין צריכין חיזוק <sup>1</sup>*The<sup>m</sup> words of the law*, [that is, *of the Scripture*] *have no need of confirmation*. דברי סופרים חיזוק צריכין *but the words of the scribes have need of confirmation*.

The<sup>n</sup> *Former Prophets*, and the *Latter*, and the *Hagio-*

<sup>s</sup> Beracoth, cap. 8. hal. 8.

<sup>b</sup> Hieros. Berac. fol. 12. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Bab. Avod. Zarah, fol. 24. 2.

<sup>k</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 787.

<sup>1</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 921.

<sup>m</sup> Tosapht. in Jevamoth, cap. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Bab. Sanhedr. fol. 91. 2.

*grapha* are each styled by the name of *the law*; so that there is no need of further illustration. "Whence is the resurrection of the dead proved out of *the law*? From those words, בָּנָה לֹא נֹאֵר, Josh. viii. 30. *It is not said, Then he 'built'* [in the preterperfect tense], but יִבְנֶה *he shall build* [in the future tense], מִכָּאן לְתַחִיית הַמֵּתִים מִן הַתּוֹרָה *Hence the resurrection of the dead is proved out of the law.*"

"Whence is the resurrection of the dead proved out of *the law*? From thence that it is said, 'Blessed are they that dwell in thine house; עוֹד יִדְבְּרוּ לְךָ *they shall always praise thee,*' Psalm lxxiv. 4. *It is not said, They do praise thee,* but יִדְבְּרוּ לְךָ *They shall praise thee.* Hence the resurrection of the dead is proved out of the law."

"Whence is the resurrection of the dead proved out of *the law*? From thence that it is said, 'Thy watchmen shall lift up their voice. קוֹל יִחַדְדוּ יַרְנְנוּ *They shall sing with their voice together,*' Isa. lii. 8. *It is not said, They sing,* but יִרְנְנוּ *They shall sing.* Hence the resurrection of the dead is proved out of *the law.*"

Behold the *Former Prophets* called by the name of the *Law*: among which is the book of Joshua; and the *Latter Prophets*, among which is the book of Isaiah; and the *Hagiographa*, among which is the book of Psalms.

Ver. 26: "Ἐκαστος ὑμῶν ψαλμὸν ἔχει: *Every one of you hath a psalm.*] That is, "When ye come together into one place, one is for having the time and worship spent chiefly in singing psalms, another in preaching, &c. One prefers singing of psalms, another a tongue, another preaching," &c.

Ver. 27: Κατὰ δύο ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τρεῖς: *By two, or at the most by three.*] The apostle permits the use of an unknown tongue, as you see; and I ask again, of what tongue? Let that be observed which he saith, ver. 22; "Tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not." And unless you prove there were in the church such as believed not, which it implies, I would scarcely believe he permitted the use of unknown tongues under any such notion; especially when he had said immediately before, "Let all

things be done to edification." But suppose that which we suppose of the Hebrew language, and the thing will suit well.

This our most holy apostle saith of himself, chap. ix. 20, "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews;" which seems here to be done by him: but neither here nor any where else unless for edification, and that he might gain them. They would not be weaned from the old custom of the synagogue as to the use of the Hebrew tongue in their worship, and for the present he indulges them their fancy; and this not vainly, since by the use of that tongue the hearers might be edified, a faithful interpreter standing by; which in other languages could not be done any thing more than if all were uttered in the Corinthian language.

"If any speak in a tongue, let it be by two," &c. Let one read the Scripture in the Hebrew language, let another pray, let a third preach. For according to these kinds of divine worship you will best divide the persons, that all may not do the same thing.

Ver. 29°: Προφήται δὲ δύο ἢ τρεῖς λαλείωσαν. *Let the prophets speak two or three.*] Let one sing, who 'hath a psalm;' let another teach, who 'hath a doctrine;' and if a third hath 'exhortation or comfort,' as ver. 3, let him also utter it.

Ver. 30: Ἐὰν δὲ ἄλλῃ ἀποκαλυφθῆ καθήμενος. *If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by.*] That is very frequently said of the Jewish doctors, בשרי ירדתי *He sat*: which means not so much this barely, *he was sitting*, as *he taught out of the seat of the teacher*, or *he sat teaching*, or *ready to teach*. So that indeed *he sat* and *he taught* are all one. Examples among the Talmudists are infinite. In the same sense the apostle: "If something be revealed to some minister who hath a seat among those that teach, &c., not revealed in that very instant; but if he saith, that he hath received some revelation from God, then ὁ πρῶτος σιγάτω, *let the first be silent*; let him be silent that 'hath a psalm,' and give way to him."

Ver. 35: Ἀλοχρὸν γὰρ ἐστὶ γυναῖξιν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ λαλεῖν. *For it is a shame for women to speak in the church.*] Compare that P: "The Rabbins deliver, הכל עולין למניין שבעה

° *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 788.

P *Megill. fol. 23. 1.*

*Every one is reckoned within the number of seven*" [of those that read the law in the synagogues on the sabbath day], וְאִפִּילֵר וְאִשָּׁה קָטָן וְאִפִּילֵר וְאִשָּׁה "even a child, even a woman. But the wise men say, 'Let not a woman read in the law, מִפְּנֵי כְבוֹד צִיבּוֹר for the honour of the synagogue.'" Note that: it was a disgrace to the church if a woman should read in it; which was allowed even to a child, even to a servant: much more if she usurped any part of the ministerial office. It was also usual for one or the other sitting by to ask the teacher of this or that point: but this also the apostle forbids women; and that for this reason, "Because it was not allowed women to speak, but let them be subject to their husbands," ver. 34. It was allowed them to answer *Amen* with others, and to sing with the church; but to speak any thing by themselves, it was forbidden them.

## CHAP. XV.

VER. 5: Καὶ ὄρι ὤφθη Κηφᾶ· *And that he was seen of Cephas.*] Namely, going to Emmaus. See what we have said at Mark xvi.

VER. 6: Ἐπειτα ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ· *After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once.*] "In a mountain of Galilee," Matth. xxviii. 16; where it is added by the evangelist, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν, *but some doubted*, which is to be warily understood; not that some of the eleven now still doubted of his resurrection, for Thomas himself had believed before; but that some of that multitude, assembled there with the eleven, doubted. Therefore it is not only congruous but necessary to render that verse thus; "And they (the eleven disciples) seeing him, worshipped him; but others doubted." Not *some* of the eleven, but *others* of the company.

VER. 7<sup>r</sup>: Ἐπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ· *After that, he was seen of James.*] What *James*? the son of Zebedee, or of Alphaeus? It is more probable to understand it of *James* the son of Alphaeus; and that he was alive when Paul wrote this; and that the apostle seems on purpose to treat of the appearance of Christ to Peter; and *James*, the minister of the circumcision; and to himself, the minister of the uncircumcision.

<sup>q</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 922.

<sup>r</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 789.

See the story of one *James*, a disciple, as he is styled, of Jesus<sup>e</sup>.

Ver. 8: 'Ὡσπερὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι, &c. *As of one born out of due time, &c.*] נִפְּלָא *an untimely birth*, Job iii. 16, to the LXX interpreters is ἐκτρώμα: and, which is to be marked, they render נִפְּלָא טְמוּן *a hidden untimely birth*, ἐκτρώμα ἐκπορεύομενον ἐκ μήτρας μητρὸς, *an untimely birth, proceeding out of his mother's womb*; when the word טְמוּן *hidden* seems rather to denote the contrary; namely, that it never went out of its mother's womb, but was always hidden there. So the Chaldee נִפְּלָא במעינא *an untimely birth, hidden in the womb*.

Hence the word מַפְלֵת, very usual among the Talmudists for a woman bringing forth an abortion. המפלת כמין בהמה חיה ועוף *A woman that comes before her time, and brings forth, in the figure of a beast, or a bird.* המפלת סנדל או שפיר מרוקם *Coming before her time, and bringing forth a sandal, secundine, or a figured lump, &c.* Numb. xii. 12; 'Ὡσεὶ ἐκτρώμα ἐκπορεύομενον ἐκ μήτρας μητρὸς, καὶ κατασθίει τὸ ἥμισυ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτῆς: *As an untimely birth coming out of the mother's womb, and devoureth the half of her flesh.*

As though the apostle should say, "How far am I from an apostle! As much as some misshapen and deformed lump brought forth by an abortive birth differs from the shape of a man." You may render the words in English more apt and clear, unless I am mistaken in my conjecture, after this manner: *as to a thing born out of due form*, than as they are rendered, *as to one born out of due time.* Παιδλον μὴ ἐξεικονισμένον, *a child not shaped*; so the LXX in Exod. xxi. 22.

Ver. 20: 'Ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων' *The firstfruits of them that slept.*] Although the resurrection of Christ, compared with some *firstfruits*, hath very good harmony with them, yet especially it agrees with the offering of the *sheaf*, commonly called עֹמֶר<sup>u</sup>, not only as to the thing itself, but as to the circumstance of time. For, first, there was the Passover, and the day following was a sabbatic day; and on the day following that were the *firstfruits* offered. So "Christ our passover was sacrificed." The day following his crucifixion was the sabbath, and the day following that, He, the *firstfruits of them that slept*, rose again.

<sup>e</sup> Avodah Zarah, fol. 16. 2. and 27. 2.      <sup>t</sup> Cherithuth, cap. i. hal. 3.

<sup>u</sup> [Lev. xxiii. 10-13.]

Ver. 29 : Οἱ βαπτίζομενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν *They which are baptized for the dead.*] I. In this sense you may best understand these words : “ Otherwise what shall they do who undergo martyrdom, and are *baptized* in that sense, as baptism denotes death by martyrdom, if the dead are not at all raised ?” For,

I. That baptism is taken for martyrdom appears enough, Matth. xx. 22, 23.

II. See how very well the connection of the following verse agrees to this sense : “ What shall they do who have undergone, and do undergo martyrdom, if there be not a resurrection ? τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κωδυνέομεν ; ‘ *and why do we also every day and every moment go in danger of martyrdom ?*”

III. He argues from them that die in Christ, that is, *in* the faith of Christ, ver. 18. And do you believe he would omit an argument from those that die *for* the faith of Christ ?

IV. He saith, τί ποιήσουσιν ; *what shall they do ?* Not ποιούσιν ; *what do they ?* Not what they mean, or denote, or signify by this that they are *baptized*, &c. but *what shall they do ?* or what shall become of them ? They have delivered their bodies to martyrdom, and what shall become of them if their bodies rise not again ? So Jer. v. ult. לְאַחֲרֵי־הַיָּמִים לְמַדְּתֵנוּ, *What will ye do in the end thereof ?* that is, what will become of you ?

There <sup>u</sup> lies no sense in the words as to this sense which we propound, but in the phrase ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, *for the dead* : which let us illustrate by a like phrase. The Jews baptized a proselyte לְשֵׁם גֵר, *under the notion or in the name of a proselyte* ; and a servant to be set free לְשֵׁם מְשׁוּחָר, *under the notion or in the name of a libertine*. But now when it was said, ‘ *N. is baptized לגר for a proselyte ; N. is baptized לְמְשׁוּחָר for a libertine* <sup>x</sup> ; are not these words uttered well in Greek, ‘Ο δέινα βαπτίζεται ὑπὲρ προσηλύτου, ὑπὲρ ἐλευθέρου, *such a one is baptized for a proselyte, for a free man.*

II. If the rendering the word ὑπὲρ in this sense seem somewhat uncouth, let it be supposed that the apostle speaks of washing and purification appointed to the Jews after the touching a dead body, and the rendering will be nearer.

<sup>u</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 790.

<sup>x</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 923.

Upon that law thus R. Bechai; "He that toucheth a dead body is to be purified with the water of purification with ashes; namely, those of the red cow, which purifies him that is defiled by the dead. Whence arose among us the custom of washing hands when we come from a dead person; רמז והוא גם, לְמִי פָדָה, *which intimates the water of the red cow*, כֵּן רִמְזוּ לְתַחִיית הַמֵּתִים *of the dead.*" But after what manner doth it do that? Hear *Zohar*<sup>y</sup> upon that matter: "The spirit of uncleanness dwells upon men by reason of the dead. **וְאֵל עִפְרָם יָשׁוּבוּן** *But what remedy have they?* That which is written, **וְאֵל עִפְרָם יָשׁוּבוּן**, *And they shall return to their dust*; that is, to the dust of the burnt red cow, whereby they are purified. And the spirit of uncleanness departs, and another holy spirit is shed abroad. God gave Israel counsel, that they should use all manner of remedies whereby they might obtain the life of the world to come; namely, that they be found pure in this world and holy in the world to come. Concerning whom it is written, 'I will sprinkle upon you pure water, and ye shall be purified,' Ezek. xxxvi.

We cannot omit that<sup>z</sup>: "Anciently it was a custom to baptize vessels over women dying in their monthly courses, **מִשְׁבִּילֵן אֶת הַכִּלִּים עַל גְּבֵי נִידוֹת**, at which thing the menstruous women that were alive blushed. Therefore they appointed to baptize over all women, for the honour of menstruous women that were alive. Anciently they baptized over profluvius men departed; for which the profluvius men that were living were ashamed. They appointed therefore that they should baptize over all men, in honour of the profluvius men that were alive."

Ver. 31: *Nḡ τῆν ὑμετέραν καύχησην, ἣν ἔχω, &c.* *I protest by your rejoicing which I have, &c.*] That which the apostle asserts is this, that he died daily; that is, was trod upon, suffered contempt, underwent danger, expected death. And that this is so I appeal, saith he, *to your boasting*, O ye Corinthians. But in what sense is that *boasting* to be understood? Not the apostle's *boasting* of them; for then it would more properly have been said, *ἡμετέραν καύχησην, our*

<sup>y</sup> Fol. 86. 4.

<sup>z</sup> Babyl. Moed Katon, fol. 27. 2.



boasting, than *ὑμετέραν, your*. Nor was there indeed any reason, as things then stood, why the apostle should *boast* of them. Nor is their *boasting* in the apostle to be understood: for alas! how did they too much undervalue him! The *boasting*, therefore, that he hints was their *boasting against* him; and this is it that he calls upon and appeals to. "Every day (saith he) I die, I am despised, trod upon, am in hazard; and for witness of this I call and appeal to your very *boasting against* me: which indeed I reckon for my *boasting* in Jesus Christ. It became not you to glory against me; but since ye do it, I glory in this very contempt and reproach."

Ver. 32: *Εἰ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ἐθηριώμαχισα*. *If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts.*] This is that great danger concerning which he speaks, 2 Cor. i. 8, 9; which is not at all to be understood of the tumult raised among the Ephesians by Demetrius, for this Epistle was written before that tumult; but according to the letter, that the apostle was really cast to wild beasts in the theatre. Nor does it obstruct this opinion that Luke, relating the acts of Paul, omitted this so notable a history, since he hath omitted very many other; nor that those that *fought with beasts* were different from those that were cast to beasts, since the latter must fight with them or perish without any hope. But, on the contrary, there are these two things make for it:

I. That in Demetrius's insurrection *the chief of Asia* (Asiarchæ) afforded themselves Paul's friends, Acts xix. 31: that is, those priests among the heathen whose office it was to publish those plays of the theatre for the honour of the gods. Ἡρώτων τὸν Ἀσιάρχην Φίλιππον, ἵνα ἐπαφή τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ λεόντα. Ὁ δὲ ἔφη μὴ εἶναι ἕξον αὐτῷ, ἐπειδὴ πεπληρώκει τὰ κυνηγέσια: *They<sup>a</sup> asked Philip the Asiarch [the interpreter renders it munerarius<sup>b</sup>, the setter-forth of the games] to let loose a lion upon Polycarp; but he answered, he might not, because now the fighting with wild beasts [those games] was over.* The same were the 'Phoeniciarchæ' and the 'Syriarchæ':

But now whence came it to pass that these *Asiarchs* were

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. iv. c. 15.    <sup>b</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 791.

<sup>c</sup> Novell. 89. at the end, &c.

friends to Paul? Was it as being persons that embraced the gospel? Why therefore were they still *Asiarchs*? But it seems rather that Paul, being set to combat with beasts, was preserved by some wonderful and stupendous manner; so that the *Asiarchs* themselves, seeing the miracle, were carried away with admiration of the thing, and the good will towards him.

II. What else doth *κατὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐθρησιμάχησα* mean, than *I have fought with beasts in the manner that men fight with beasts?* or, *I have fought with beasts in this very human body.* And that which he adds, *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, in *Ephesus*, renders the sense more clear, and restrains it much more to the letter. For if it were so to be understood, 'I fought at Ephesus with Demetrius and his fellows, as if it had been with beasts,' it had been much more suitable to have brought an example of his stoning in Lystra, Acts xiv. 19; of his whipping at Philippi<sup>d</sup>, Acts xvi. 22, 23, &c. For in Demetrius's uproar at Ephesus you find him to have borne or undergone, no not one blow, I had almost said nor any danger. Gaius and Aristarchus indeed, being drawn into the theatre, endured some violence, being perhaps presently to be cast to the beasts: but read and read again the whole story, Acts xix, and there is not a syllable of any wrong that Paul at that time endured in his person.

Ver. 36: "Ἀφρον' Fool.] שׁוֹטֵה, would the Talmudists say, *sot, madman.* " Rabban<sup>e</sup> Jochanan Ben Zaccai answered the Baithuseans [denying also the resurrection of the dead] and said, שׁוֹטֵים מִנִּיּוֹן לָכֵם "Ἀφρονες, *Fools, whence did this happen to you, &c.*

Ver. 45: Οὕτω καὶ γέγραπται. *And so it is written, &c.*] Of the former no doubt is made; for it is written Gen. xi. 7. But where is the latter? Throughout the whole sacred book: thence the Jews speak so many things and so great of the 'Spirit of Messias,' and of 'Messias quickening.'

Ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. *The last Adam was made a quickening spirit.*] Job xix. 25, אֲנִי יִדְעֵתִי בְּאַחֲרֵי יָמַי, *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth.* Job

<sup>d</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 924.

<sup>e</sup> Gloss. in *Taanith*, fol. 17. 1.

seems to me in this place, in the words אַחֲרוֹן עַל-עֵפֶר יִקָּוֵם, to speak in the same sense with ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ, *the last Adam*. Of the former Adam it was said, עֵפֶר אַתָּה וְאֶל-עֵפֶר תָּשׁוּב *Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return*. I know (saith Job) that my Redeemer liveth, and he shall arise from the dust another or a latter [posterior]; and I shall see the Lord made of the same flesh that I am of, &c. : intimating the incarnation of the Messiah.

Εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν *A quickening spirit.*] “The Spirit of the Lord moved upon the face of the waters,” Gen. i. 2. וְהָיָה רִחוּוֹ שֶׁל מַלְאָךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ *This is the Spirit of King Messiah*. So the Jews speak very frequently. And also מְשִׁיחַ עָתִיד *Messiah shall quicken those that dwell in the dust*.

It cannot be passed over without observation, by what authority Paul applies those words of Psalm cii, “Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast founded the earth,” &c., to the Messiah, Heb. i. 10, to prove his Deity and dignity. “But thou art deceived, O Paul, (would a Hebrew say;) these words are to be applied to God the Father, not to the Messiah.” The apostle hath what to reply from the very confession of the Jewish nation; “You acknowledge that Spirit which was present at and president over the creation was ‘the Spirit of the Messiah.’”

It ought not also be passed by without observation, that Adam, receiving from him the promise of Christ, and believing it, named his wife *Chava*, [חַוָּה] that is, *Life*. So the Seventy, Καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδὰμ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γυναίκος αὐτοῦ ζωὴ *And Adam called his wife's name ‘Life,’* Gen. iii. 20. What! is she called *Life* that brought in *death*? But Adam perceived τὸν ἔσχατον Ἀδὰμ, *the last Adam*, exhibited to him in the promise to be πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν, *a quickening spirit*; and had brought in a better *life* of the soul, and at length should bring in a better of the body. Hence is that, John i. 4. Ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, *In him was life*.

Ver. 47<sup>f</sup>: Ὁ δεῦτερος ἄνθρωπος, ὁ Κύριος *The second man is the Lord.*] Gen. iv. 1; “Eve conceived and brought forth Cain, and said, קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֶת-יְהוָה *I have possessed,*” or

<sup>f</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 792.

obtained, τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν Κύριον, a man, the Lord; that is, “that the Lord himself should become man.” For let me so turn it, depending upon these reasons:

I. That this interpretation is without any manner of wresting the participle אָת; yea, it is according to its most proper signification and use.

II. That, without doubt, Eve had respect to the promise of Christ when she named her son; as Adam had respect to the promise in the denomination of Eve.

Ver. 55: Ποῦ σου θάνατε, &c. *O death, where is thy, &c.*] Hos. xiii. 14, אָהִי דְבָרֶיךָ מוֹת, the Seventy read it, Ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου, θάνατε; *Where is thy revenge, O death?* And thus speaks Aben Ezra; יש אומרים הפך כמו איה “*There are some which invert the word, אָהִי I will be, as though it were איה where: והנכון נאמרו אָהִי מַלְכָּה איפוא הוא And very truly; as it is said, אָהִי מַלְכָּה ver. 10, Where is thy king?*” Where the Chaldee, אַן מַלְכָּךְ, not *I will be thy king*, but *Where is thy king?* So that the Greek interpreters, and the apostle after them, translated אָהִי ποῦ, *where*, properly and truly.

The word דְבָרֶיךָ in the prophet is rendered by the Targumist and the Rabbins to signify a word: but some, as Kimchi acknowledges, understand it to signify the plague; and that upon good ground, because the word קָטַב destruction is joined with it; as קָטַב destruction, and דְבָרֶיךָ the plague, are joined together, Psalm xci. [6.] Where see the Targum and R. Solomon, and compare the Greek interpreters with them.

## CHAP. XVI.

VER. 1: Περὶ δὲ τῆς λογίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους. *Now concerning the collection for the saints.*] Unless I am much deceived מגבת חכמים in the Jerusalem writers denotes, in the like sense, τῆν λογίαν εἰς τοὺς σοφοὺς, *the collection for the wise men.*

They have this story; “R. Eliezer, R. Joshua, and R. Akiba went up to Cholah of Antioch, מגבת חכמים על עסק *employed in the collection for the wise men.* One Abba Judah was there, who performed the law with a good eye. Being now reduced to poverty, when<sup>h</sup> he saw the Rabbins he was

<sup>ε</sup> Horaioth, fol. 48. 1.

<sup>h</sup> Leusden's edition, vol. ii. p. 925.

dejected. He went home with a sad countenance. His wife said to him, 'Why doth thy countenance languish?' He answered, 'The Rabbins are come, and I know not what to do.' She said to him, 'You have one field left; go and sell half of it, and give to them.' Which he did. And when they were departed he went to plough in the half of his field, and found a great treasure," &c. I produce this the more willingly, that it may be observed that *collections* were made among the Jews in foreign nations for the poor Rabbins dwelling in Judea, in the same manner as they were made among Christians in foreign nations for the poor Jews converted to Christianity in Judea.

Ver. 2<sup>1</sup>: *Karà μλαν σαββάτων* *On the first day of the week.*] *בחד בשבת* *In the first of the sabbath* would the Talmudists say.

I. That day was everywhere celebrated for the Christian sabbath: and, which is not to be passed over without observing, as far as appears from Scripture, there is nowhere any dispute of that matter. There was controversy concerning circumcision, and other points of the Jewish religion, whether they were to be retained or not retained; but nowhere, as we read, concerning the changing of the sabbath. There were, indeed, some Jews converted to the gospel; who as in some other things they retained a smatch of their old Judaism, so they did in the observation of days, Rom. xiv. 5, Gal. iv. 10; but yet not rejecting or neglecting the Lord's day. They celebrated it, and made no manner of scruple, as appears, concerning it; but they would have their old festival days retained too: and they disputed not at all whether the Lord's day were to be celebrated, but whether the Jewish sabbath were not to be celebrated also. So they admitted baptism, but it went against them not to admit circumcision also. And so also in some other articles of Judaism, not rejecting the gospel, but superinducing something of Judaism. "As I have ordained in the churches of Galatia, (saith the apostle,) so do ye also: on every *first day of the week*," &c. And yet the same apostle saith of the same Galatians, "Ye observe days, and months;" not that they refused the Christian sabbath, but that they retained the Jewish sabbaths.

<sup>1</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 781.

II. The 'Lord's day' sufficiently commended itself by its own authority; nor could the institution of it at all be doubted by the converted Gentiles, as never knowing, or at least owning, any other sabbath: nor by the converted Jews if they acknowledged Jesus for the true Messias; because they had learned in their schools that Messias should make a new law, as Moses had made the old. And that also which they had drunk in from their cradles, that Messias should not abolish the institutions of Moses, but raise them higher, and make them more splendid, although it might be more a scruple among them of the abolishing the Jewish sabbath, yet it could make none of superinducing the Christian sabbath.

III. In that controversy of the change of the sabbath from the Jewish to the Christian, which some prosecute too much without any cause, they reckon the Scriptures' silence concerning the institution of the 'Lord's day' for a denial of the thing: as if it were by no means to be believed because it is not expressed in plain words.

Among many things said in that case, let us put in these few:

I. The holy text, indeed, is silent of this matter while the scene of Christian affairs is lying in Judea, mention being only made by the evangelists of the appearances of Christ on 'the first day of the week;' namely, on that day wherein he arose from the dead, and 'the first day of the week' following, John xx. 26. But when the scene is transferred to the Gentiles, then there is very open mention of it; namely, in this place, and Acts xx. 7, and Rev. i. 10.

II. For the chief care concerning mentioning the sabbath was this, that mention might be made of that sabbath which was to be among the Gentile churches, and was to endure for ever. And of that, mention is most evidently made in the history of those churches.

III. Therefore the former silence does by no means argue that the apostles and disciples in Judea, converted to the faith, did not celebrate 'the Lord's day,' or that they observed it not by divine institution; but by good right and reason the mention of it is reserved to its most proper place, that is, in the story of the Gentile churches.

Θησαυρίζων *Laying up.*] “For these (saith Beza) are true riches laid up in heaven,” &c. By occasion of whose words let us add these few passages of the same subject :

“A<sup>k</sup> certain woman came to Rabban Jochanan Ben Zaccai, and said, ‘Sir, vouchsafe me sustenance.’ To whom he answered, ‘And who art thou, my daughter?’ ‘I,’ saith she, ‘am the daughter of Nicodemus Ben Gorion.’ ‘And,’ replied he, ‘O daughter, what is become of the riches of the family of thy father?’ She answered, ר' לא כרין מתלין מתלא, בירוש' מלה ממון חסר ואמרי לה *O Rabbi, do not they use this proverb at Jerusalem, The salt of riches is the want of them?* ר' חסד But those that stood by said to her, ‘But mercy or alms is their salt.’” Where the Gloss is : “Whosoever will season his riches, that is, make them not to putrefy, let him bestow them in alms ; and the want of riches arising from such a cause is the seasoning of them.”

Ver. 5<sup>1</sup>: Μακεδονίαν γὰρ διέρχομαι. *For I do pass through Macedonia.*] There is a division about the sense and translation of these words ; and here, indeed, the whole hinge of the controversy turns upon the place whence this Epistle was writ.

There are some that render it to this sense ; “I am now passing through Macedonia ;” which without doubt he did, whosoever he were who first joined those words to the end of the Epistle, Πρὸς Κορινθίους πρώτη ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Φιλίππων. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians<sup>m</sup> was written from Philippi* : and they must do the same who think it sent from thence.

But the Vulgar and Interlineary interpreter, “For I *shall* pass through Macedonia,” in the future tense, is more true, and best of all ; for that this Epistle was sent from Ephesus these and other things make plain :

I. That the apostle salutes the Corinthians in the name of ‘the churches of Asia :’ which it is probable he would not at all have done if he now were in Macedonia. But be it granted that he, very lately coming out of Asia, carried the salutations of those churches along with him, it is as improbable

<sup>k</sup> Babyl. Chetubb. fol. 66. 2.

<sup>1</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 926.

<sup>m</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p. 794.

that he would not also salute them in the name of the churches of Macedonia.

II. It appears that he wrote this Epistle before he came into Macedonia, from what he saith in the Second Epistle, chap. ii. 12, 13, and vii. 5-7. For when he met not Titus at Troas, whom together with Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, he had sent to Corinth with this Epistle, nor as yet could know what fruit it had gained among the Corinthians, he hastened a journey into Macedonia. And when he came thither and found not Titus there, he stayed for some time with an unquiet mind, until Titus at last came, the messenger of good news.

III. He saith, ver. 8, ἐπιμενω δὲ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. *I shall tarry in Ephesus*: as if he would say, "Here at Ephesus, where now I am, I shall remain until Pentecost."

Ver. 8: Ἐπιμενω δὲ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. *But I will tarry at Ephesus.*] Whether he tarried at Ephesus until the time determined by him, [that is, Pentecost,] or the uproar of Demetrius drove him away thence sooner, is uncertain. Being driven thence, Macedonia received him, as is related, Acts xx: where although among his travels there is no mention of his journey to Corinth, yet thither he travelled, while his companions went before to Troas, and expected him there.

Ver. 9: Θύρα γάρ μοι ἀνέσχε, &c. *For a door is opened to me, &c.*] See Acts xix. 17-20.

Ver. 10: Ἐὰν δὲ ἔλθῃ Τιμόθεος. *But if Timothy come.*] This place deceived him again who added the ὑπογραφὴ, *the underwriting*, to this Epistle: in whose fancy Timothy was sent with Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, to bring the Epistle to the Corinthians: by no light mistake; for Timothy indeed was sent, but from Ephesus into Macedonia with Erastus, Acts xix. 22, to see the Corinthians in his return, but not at all sent thither out of Macedonia by the order of the apostle, which he dreams of.

Ver. 19: Σὺν τῇ κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίᾳ. *With the church that is in their house.*] So also it is said of them when they were come back from Rome, that they had a church in their house, Rom. xvi. 5. And the same is said of Philemon, Philem. ver. 2, and see Col. iv. 15. But in what sense to understand this is somewhat obscure.



I. Perhaps there were in Aquila's house some which travelled with him from Rome, being driven thence by the edict of Cæsar, and boarded with him in the same house while they were in their banishment. But what then shall we say of them when they went back to Rome to their own dwelling? and also what shall we say of *the church* in the house of Philemon?

II. Or perhaps Aquila was *the church's* host, as Gaius was at Corinth; in whose house were other men and women appointed to that office with him. And, it may be, he performed the same office at Rome when he went back. And, it may be, Philemon did the same at Colosse: and thence that of the apostle to him, "Prepare me a lodging," ver. 22. But all these things are somewhat uncertain; nor can one see where to fix his foot. Let me, therefore, add another conjecture also.

III. It<sup>o</sup> is well enough known what *בית מדרש* *beth midrash*, *the divinity school*, or *the chapel*, was among the Jews; and what the difference was between it and *בית הכנסת* *the synagogue*. Now *beth midrash* was called also *בי רבנן*, *be rabbanan*, *the school of the Rabbins*. And it is inquired<sup>p</sup>, *מאי בי רבנן ביתא דרבנן* *What is the school of the Rabbins? It is the house of the Rabbins*. Where the Gloss: "Why do they call *בתי מדרשות* *the divinity schools*, 'be rabbanan?' namely, Because it is their house for any use." In that place the Gemarists treat of synagogues set apart for holy use; and how far it was lawful to put them to common uses, either when they now flourished, or were fallen to decay, and antiquated as to sacred uses. And concerning the *beth midrash*, which was very near of kin to the synagogue, it is concluded, as you see, that it is as the very house of the Rabbin, teaching in it<sup>q</sup>, and to be used by him for any use.

Mention of the *בי רבנן* *be rabbanan*, or *beth midrash*, and the very thing concerning which we now are speaking, bring to remembrance the *בי אבידן* *be abidan*, of which the Talmudists write; but in a double and various sense. The mention of it occurs in *Babyl. Avodah Zarah*<sup>r</sup>, where it denotes a heathen temple. R. Eliezer Ben Parta is examined by a

<sup>o</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 795.  
<sup>p</sup> Megill. fol. 28. 2.

<sup>q</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 927.  
<sup>r</sup> Fol. 17. 2.

Roman magistrate, and, among other things, this is demanded of him; "Why did you not go to *בי אבירן* *be abidan*, the Temple? He answered, 'I am an old man, and I was afraid lest you should tread me under foot.' To whom the other replied, 'Was ever any old man trod under foot?' A miracle happened; for that very day was an old man trodden upon." Where the Gloss, *בי אבירן* "*Be Abidan* is a house or temple where they eat and drink in honour of an idol, *ומזבלין זיבול*, *לע"ז* and void dung (that is, sacrifice) to an idol," &c.

But elsewhere\* it occurs in another sense: *ספרי דבי אבירן* "The books of the '*be abidan*,' do they snatch them out of the fire, or do they not snatch them? *אין ולא* Yes, and no:" that is, sometimes they do, and sometimes they do not. But what the books of the *be abidan* were, the Gloss teacheth in these words; *ספרים נתבו להם מינים להתויכח עם ישראל* "*The heretics wrote books of disputations to themselves against the Jews: ומקום שמתוכחים שם קרי ליה בי אבירן* and the place where the dispute is, is called '*be abidan*.'" By heretics, no doubt is to be made but that Christians are understood; and that *be abidan* in this place is not to be taken for a heathen temple is clear enough from what follows: "Rabh (say they) went not into *be abidan*, much less *לבי נצרפי* into a heathen temple<sup>t</sup>. Samuel went into a heathen temple, but went not into *be abidan*. They said to Rabba, *לא אתית* מ'ט' *לבי אבירן* Why went you not to '*be abidan*?' he answered, 'There is a certain palm in the way, and hindereth me.' 'We will stock it up,' say they. 'The place of it,' saith he, 'is difficult to me.'" The Gloss writes: "Rabh and Rabba feared to go into *beth abidan*, lest in the dispute they might rise up against them and kill them."

And now let us return to our own business. What hinders but that we may be of opinion that the house of Aquila at Ephesus and Rome, and of Philemon at Colosse, might serve for such a purpose? namely, sometimes for holy lectures, and disputes either with Jews or among Christians. Not that the public assembly in the church should be neglected, but that some number out of the church—perhaps the whole company

\* Schabb. fol. 116. 1.

et T. sub v. צרף col. 1944. See

<sup>t</sup> [*Domus conflatorium, scil. imaginum, idolorum.*—Buxtorf Lex. R.also sub v. *אבירן* col. 8.]

of ministers and teachers—*assembled here, and others who breathed more after gospel mysteries [ad mysteria evangelica magis adhelarent]*; where the more obscure articles and points of faith were handled, and disputes were held, if the thing required it, either among themselves or against the Jews.

Ver. 22: Εἰ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα, μαρναθά. *If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maran-atha.*] The word *anathema* sounds indeed all one with חֶרֶם *cherem* among the Hebrews; as we may see abundantly (to omit all other examples) in the Seventy interpreters, in the last chapter of Leviticus compared with the Hebrew.

And the word is taken in a threefold sense, especially in the holy Scripture; which the author of *Aruch* notes in the word חֶרֶם *cherem*, and that from the author of *Tosaphoth*.

I. חֶרֶם כְּהֹנִים *The anathema, or somewhat devoted to the priests*, that is, something which, being consecrated to God, necessarily falls to the priests. חֶרֶם כְּהֹנִים אֵין לָהֶם פְּדוּיוֹן “*The<sup>u</sup> anathemas of the priests do not admit redemption, but they are to be given to the priests for Trumah,*” or an *oblation*.

II. חֶרֶם גְּבוּהָ *An anathema, or that which is devoted to the Most High*. Examples of which you have, Lev. xxvii. 27, 28, &c. Where the Seventy thus, Πᾶν ἀνάθεμα ἁγίου<sup>x</sup> ἁγίῳ ἐστὶν τῷ Κυρίῳ. *Every anathema shall be holy to the Lord.*” In *Babyl. Nedarim* it is called חֶרֶם אֵל שָׁמַיִם *that which is devoted to heaven*.

III. חֶרֶם אֲשֶׁר יֵהָרֵם מִן הָאָדָם *An anathema which is devoted of men*. Of this, Lev. xxvii. 29: where again the Seventy thus, Πᾶν δὲ ἐὰν ἀνατεθῆ ἄπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὐ λυτρωθήσεται, ἀλλὰ θανάτῳ θανατωθήσεται: *Every anathema, or devoted of men, shall not be redeemed, but shall die the death*. But what is the *anathema of men*? The author of *Tosaphoth* answered, ‘אֱלֹהֵי חַיִּיבֵי מִיתוֹת בַּד *He that is condemned to death by the Sanhedrim*. R. Solomon saith, “When an Israelite devoted his manservant or his maidservant, that were Canaanites, to death.” R. Menahem saith, “When the Israelites in war

<sup>t</sup> Ad Erachin, cap. 4.

<sup>u</sup> Bab. Erachin, fol. 28. 2.

<sup>x</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 796.

<sup>y</sup> Fol. 28. 2.

devoted their enemies to destruction if they overcame them, as was done by them," Numb. xxi. "Whence<sup>z</sup> is it that when any, condemned to die by the Sanhedrim, is led forth to suffer death, another goes forth interceding and saying, 'I will pay for his redemption;' whence is it, I say, that he saith this to no purpose? Namely thence, because it is said, 'Every *anathema* of men shall not be redeemed, but shall be punished with death.'

If therefore we inquire into the original and proper nature of this *anathema*, it was certainly the destining of some malefactor to most certain death and destruction. Hence is that in the Chaldee Paraphrast in Isa. xliii. ult.; where, for **לְהָרִים אֶת־יַעֲקֹב יְעֻבָּה** *I will deliver Jacob<sup>a</sup> to anathema*, he renders it, **אֶמְסֵר לְקָטֵלָה** *I will deliver him to be slain*.

And now, in reference to the words *Maran-atha*, very many commentators agree that this phrase is a certain form of excommunication, and that it is the highest and heaviest. "Thus (say they) is the extremest kind of *anathema* marked; as though he would say, 'Cursed be he *to the coming*, and *in the coming*, of the Lord.'"

They assert this to be the third kind of excommunication among the Jews, and think that it sounds the same with **שְׁמַתָּה** *schammatha*, and interpret **שָׁמ שְׁתָּה** *God cometh* to the same sense<sup>b</sup>.

But let me, with the leave of so great men, speak freely what I think in this business.

I. I have not found in my reading in any places, although I have sought diligently, in any Jewish writers that I have perused, where *Maran-atha* occurs once for a form of excommunication. Nor have I found in any Christian writer the least sign whereby might be shown in what place or in what Hebrew author that phrase is found in such a sense. Yea, to speak out plainer, as the thing is, I do not remember that I have found this phrase, *Maran-atha*, in any sense at all, in any Rabbinical or Talmudic writer, at any time, in any place.

II. But those commentators mentioned do silently confess that *Maran-atha*, indeed, in so many syllables, does not occur

<sup>z</sup> Bab. Chetubb. fol. 37. 2.

<sup>b</sup> [See more in Buxtorf Lex. T.

<sup>a</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 928. et R. sub v. col. 2466.]

in the Hebrew writers; but שְׁמַתָּה *schammatha*, which speaks the same thing, occurs very frequently: and so they interpret שֵׁם אֲתָנָה *God cometh*.

But passing over this, that this interpretation seems to betray an ignorance of the word שְׁמַתָּה, from whence *schammatha* is derived, the Talmudists, to whom that word is sufficiently common and well known, produce another etymology of the word שְׁמַתָּה *schammatha*. מַאי שְׁמַתָּה *What<sup>b</sup> signifies 'schammatha'?* Rabba answered, שֵׁם מִיתָה *scham metha, There is death*. Samuel answered, שֵׁם תְּהֵא or תִּיתֵי, *Let death be there, or come thither*: as it is written, "The curse shall come into the house of the thief, and shall lay it waste," Zech. v. They have these and the like sayings, but no mention in them of שֵׁם אֲתָנָה *God cometh*.

What the apostle means by *Maran-atha* we shall more easily trace when we shall have observed this first, that the apostle chiefly directs the dint and stroke of this *anathema* and *curse* against the unbelieving Jews, who were most bitter enemies against the Lord Jesus and his gospel: which I cannot but think, being induced thereunto by these four reasons:

I. Because the Jews, above all other of the human race, *loved not the Lord Jesus*, neither yet do *love* him. The holy Scripture teaches this abundantly; unhappy experience teaches it. The pagans, indeed, *love not Christ*, because they know him not: but, because they know him not, neither do they hate him. The Turks, indeed, *love not Jesus* in that manner as the Christians do, but they do not hate him in that manner as do the Jews.

II. Because he speaks here in the language and dialect of the Jews, namely, in that Syriac phrase, *Maran-atha*. He had spoken Greek through the whole Epistle; he speaks Greek in all his Epistles: but when he speaks here in the Jewish language, the thing itself speaks it, without all controversy, that he speaks concerning the Jews.

III. The Jews only of all mortals called Jesus *accursed* (see chap. xii. 1.): therefore the apostle deservedly strikes them, above all other mortals, with a *curse*, rendering like for like.

<sup>b</sup> Bab. Moed Katon, fol. 16.

IV. Hither<sup>c</sup> I, or rather doth the apostle, bring those words of Isaiah, chap. lxv. 15, "Ye shall leave your name for a *curse* unto my chosen." Hither also may be brought that of Malachi, chap. iv., wherewith the Old Testament is concluded, פֶּן־אָבוֹא יְהוָה וְהִכִּיתִי אֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַזֶּה *Lest I come and smite the land with (anathema) a curse. Lest I come: this is the same with that which the apostle saith, Maran-atha, the Lord cometh. And I will smite with anathema, the same with that in this verse, Let him be anathema. Against whom is the threatening in the prophet? Against the unbelieving Jews. Against the same is both the threatening and curse of the apostle, taken (methinks) out of the very words of the prophet.*

And now you may easily fetch out the sense of the word *Maran-atha*. The holy Scripture speaks great and terrible things concerning the *coming* of Christ to punish the nation of the Jews, for their *not loving*, yea, hating Christ, and treading the gospel under foot. It is called his '*coming* in his kingdom, in the clouds, in glory:' which we observe elsewhere. So that I should much more readily interpret this expression *Maran-atha*, that is, *our Lord cometh*, in this sense, from this common manner of speech, and which is so very usual to the Scripture, than to run to I know not what Jewish form; which yet is not at all to be met with among the Jews<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>c</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 797. foot. It is in vol. v. p. 417 fol. of

<sup>d</sup> [There is a *Concio ad Clerum*, Pitman's Ed.]  
de *Maranatha*, on this text by Light-

ADDENDA TO CHAP. XIV.<sup>d</sup>

That some light may be added to what we spake at chap. xiv. about the use of an *unknown tongue*, we thought it not amiss to make a brief discourse for the discussing that question, *What Bibles were commonly used in the religious meetings of the Jews?* which discourse we have laid here, that the continuation of the commentary might not be broken.

## CHAP. I.

*Concerning the Hebrews and Hellenists.*

WHEN the *Hellenists* and *Hebrews* are distinguished, Acts vi. 1, it seems to be less obscure than when distinction is made between the *Hellenists* and the *Jews*, Acts xi. 20: for that the *Hellenists* were *Jews* almost all agree.

The reason of the distinction may be fetched either from their dispersion or from their language. Διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, *the dispersion of the Greeks*, John vii. 35, may be plainly distinguished ἀπὸ τῆς διασπορᾶς τῶν Βαβυλωνίων, *from the dispersion of the Babylonians*. The Jews dispersed by the victories and colonies of the Greeks, from the Jews dispersed by the Babylonian captivity and the Persian dominion.

But the difference is rather fetched from their language; they being called *Hebrews* to whom the *Hebrew* was the mother-tongue, that is, the Syriac or Chaldee; they *Hellenists* to whom the *Greek* language was so.

Under the name of *Hebrews*, there is none but would place the *Palestinæans*, the *Babylonians*, the *Assyrians*, the *Syrians*, if they knew what was the common mother-tongue of all these countries; especially if they that knew all these countries were placed by the Talmudists themselves, in effect, under the same rank and alliance of customs and privileges, as well as under the same language. Hence are these and such like expressions to be met with in them:

“Whosoever<sup>e</sup> dwells in Babylon is as though he dwelt in the land of Israel.” “All<sup>f</sup> foreign land is called מדינת דים *heathen*, except Babylon.” Where by בבל *Babylon* they understand all those countries unto which the Babylonian captivity was carried and led away.

<sup>d</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 798.  
—*Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 929.

<sup>e</sup> Bab. Chetub. fol. 31.  
<sup>f</sup> R. Sol. in Git. cap. 1.

And these passages they have of Syria. "In<sup>ε</sup> three respects Syria was like to the land of Israel. It was bound to tithes, and the seventh year; you might go thither in purity: and he that bought a farm in Syria was as though he bought one in the suburbs of Jerusalem." And again<sup>h</sup>, "Syria as to some judgments is as the land of Israel." And again<sup>i</sup>, "They bring out [the fruits of the seventh year] into Syria, but not without the land." Note, that Syria was not reputed 'without the land,' but in divers things to be united with Palestine. And many passages of that nature may be produced both of Syria and of Babylon.

Now then when our discourse is of the *Hellenists*, the Jews of these countries and of this language are to be distinguished from those; not denying nevertheless, that even among these, here and there, were also *Hellenists*; as the synagogue of Alexandria at Jerusalem; they of Cæsarea, who "recited<sup>k</sup> their phylacteries in the language of the *Hellenists*;" and they of Antioch, of whom mention is made in that place of the Acts alleged.

Nobody doubts that the Syriac was the mother-tongue of all Syria; and yet who will doubt who hath read the history of the Syro-Grecians, that there were very many in Syria whose mother-tongue was Greek? And hence that knot is very easily untied, Acts xi. 20: the dispersed disciples that preached the gospel found in Antioch some *Hellenists*, that is, whose mother-tongue was Greek, among the Jews, whose mother-tongue was Syriac.

## CHAP. II.<sup>1</sup>

### *Of the Hebrews in Babylon and the adjacent countries.*

THE people that returned from Babylon are numbered, Ezra ii: and the sum total is computed to be "forty-two thousand three hundred and threescore," ver. 64. And yet the number of the families there particularly reckoned, amounts not to more than thirty thousand. So that those twelve thousand which are comprised within the sum total, and yet are not numbered by their families, were either ple-

<sup>ε</sup> Gittin, fol. 8. 1.

<sup>h</sup> Rambam in Demai, cap. 6.

<sup>i</sup> Sheviith cap. 6. hal. 6.

<sup>k</sup> Hieros. Sotah, cap. 7.

<sup>1</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p.



beians, and persons of no name, or such who could not derive their genealogy, as ver. 62, or perhaps not a few of them were of the ten tribes.

But<sup>m</sup> how great a multitude of Jews yet remained in Babylon, when that number went back to their ancient country, you may conjecture by these two things, to omit others :

I. That of the four-and-twenty courses of the priests there returned only four, as the Jerusalem Talmudists<sup>n</sup> observe, and that well, out of Ezra ii. 36. And although you may conceive a less proportion by far in the rest of the people, yet the number of those that tarried behind did far exceed the number of those that returned.

II. The people had taken root in Babylon, and the seventy years of the captivity had, in a manner, made them forget their own country. They had been commanded of God to build themselves houses, to plant gardens, and to compose themselves for a long continuance in that place ; Jer. xxix. 5, 6 : and at length necessity passed into pleasure, and having obtained quiet, commodious, and gainful seats, they judged it better to be there than to return into an unmanured [*incultam*] country, full of danger and want.

Hence the masters dispute, Whether that whole company that went up with Ezra went not up by compulsion : and מר סבר אפרושי אפרושיהו ומנפשייהו סליקו " *one ° master thinks, that in separating they separated themselves, and voluntarily went up.* Another master, בעל כרחיהו אסקיניהו " *that they were carried away by compulsion.*" For as the Gloss speaks, " They that remained at Babylon enjoyed their quiet ; but those that went up to Jerusalem were pressed with poverty, and with all kind of labour and fear, by reason of those that dwelt about them."

Concerning those that tarried behind, the Jews themselves have these words :

I. That a purer blood of Jews remained in Babylon than was of those that went up<sup>p</sup>. Because that " Ezra carried away with him the dregs of the people, and left Babylon like pure flour : " that is, as the Gloss writes, " All that were of impure blood he carried away thence with him." Hence is

<sup>m</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 930.

<sup>n</sup> *Taanith*, fol. 68. 1.

<sup>o</sup> *Bab. Kiddush*. fol. 69. 2.

<sup>p</sup> *Ib.* fol. 27. 1.

that כל הארצות עיסה לאי ואי "עיסה לבבל" *All lands are as a mixed (or impure) lump, compared with the land of Israel: and the land of Israel is a mixed lump compared with Babylon; viz. as to purity of blood.*

II. That the blood of the stock of David remained more noble in Babylon than that which ascended in the family of Hillel: because that was of the male seed, this, of the female<sup>q</sup>.

III. Yea, this prevailed with them in the Talmudic times: "It is forbidden to go out of Babylon into another land, even from Pumbeditha to Be Cubi; and Rabh Joseph excommunicated one who went from Pumbeditha to Be Cubi."

And if we would propound some specimen of the numerousness of the Jews inhabiting that land, we might take a view of their three universities under those times, viz. at Naardea, Sora, and Pumbeditha; as also divers other places famous for Rabbins, such as,

Bethdoli, where R. Nehemiah was<sup>r</sup>. Which is also called Bedeli<sup>s</sup>.

The river Pekod, where R. Jacob was<sup>t</sup>.

Bagdat, where R. Channah was<sup>u</sup>.

Corconia, where R. Chaijah<sup>x</sup>.

The town Mahaziah, where were doctors equal with those of Pumbeditha<sup>y</sup>. But let us offer some kind of geographical table of the countries in Babylon, where the Jews dwelt, as it is represented by the Talmudists.

"Rabh<sup>z</sup> Papa the aged, in the name of Rabh, saith; בבל בריאה, *Babylon is in health*: מישון מתה, *Meson is dead*: מרי חולה, *Media is sick*: עילם נוססים, *Persia is expiring*." That is, the Glosser being interpreter, "In Babylon the Jews are of pure blood: in Meson, all are illegitimate: in Media, many are of pure blood and many not: in Persia, there are very many not of pure blood, and a few that are pure."

They<sup>a</sup> go on: עד היכן היא בבל "How far is Babylon extended?" Rabh saith, עד נהר עזק *Unto the river Azek*. Samuel saith, עד נהר יואנו *Unto the river Juani*. And how

<sup>q</sup> Juchas. f. 89. 1. Bab. Chetub. f. 3. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Jevam. f. 122. 1.

<sup>s</sup> Ib. fol. 115. 1.

<sup>t</sup> Zevach. f. 6. 1. <sup>u</sup> Ib. f. 9. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Jevam. fol. 67. 1.

<sup>y</sup> Chetub. fol. 4. 1. and fol. 55. 1.

<sup>z</sup> Kiddush. fol. 71. 2.

<sup>a</sup> *English folio edition*, vol. ii. p.

800.

far above, near Diglath? Rabh saith, עד בגדא ואוונה *Unto Bagdaah and Avana*. Samuel saith, עד מושכני *Unto Muscani*. But Muscani itself is not within the border. But R. Chaija Bār Abba saith, that Samuel saith, that Muscani is as the captivity, [that is, Pumbeditha,] as to genealogies. To Muscani, therefore, is so to be understood as that Muscani is within the border. Within, near Diglath, how far? To lower Apamia. For there were two Apamias, one the upper, and another the lower. In one were Jews of pure blood, in the other not. And between them was the space of four thousand paces."

"Above, towards Euphrates, how far? Rabh saith, עד רתולבנקני אקרא *Unto Acra Tulbankana*. Samuel saith, Unto the bridge of Euphrates. R. Jochanan saith, Unto the passage דגיומא *of Gizma*."

[From the river Azek.] Thence, perhaps, the town *Azochis*, of which Pliny<sup>a</sup>.

: נהר יואני *The river Juani, or Joani*,] is perhaps the same with *Oena* in Marcellinus<sup>b</sup>.

דגלת *Diglath*.] "Tigris where it was slower than Diglith, whence it riseth, from its swiftness began to be called Tigris<sup>c</sup>."

[Of *Apamia*] Ptolemy and Pliny both speak.

תולבנקני *Tulbankana*<sup>d</sup>.] Among the cities near a part of Euphrates, according to Ptolemy, is *Θελβενκάνη, Thelbenkane*, in degree 38. 30. 35. 30.

To all this that hath been spoken may also be added, that, in the *Notitia Imperii*, under the disposition of the honourable person the duke of Osrhoena, were 'Equites promoti indigenæ Syriæ Judæorum:' *Promoted horse, inhabitants of Syria of the Jews*: and that in Pliny there was a country called Palestine in these regions, concerning which we are now speaking; which whether they do not savour of Jewish inhabitants we leave to conjecture.

Let that also of Marcellinus be added<sup>e</sup>: "Near the place where the greater part of Euphrates is divided into many

<sup>a</sup> Lib. vi. c. 27.

<sup>d</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 931.

<sup>b</sup> [Intra Onam et Tigridem sita fluvios. Amm. Marcell. xxiii. 6. 20.] [4. 1.]

<sup>e</sup> Ammian. Marcellin. lib. xxiv.

<sup>c</sup> Plin. lib. vi. cap. 27.

rivers, in this tract a city being deserted by the Jews that were inhabitants in it, because of its low walls, was fired by a band of enraged soldiers."

### CHAP. III.

*In the same regions were the seats of the ten tribes.*

TRACING the seat of the ten tribes by the light of the Scriptures and the Talmudists, we find they were placed in Assyria, and Babylon, and the bordering countries; disposed under their captivity in those very lands wherein the divine counsel had decreed the two tribes also should be disposed, when they should undergo the same lot: that those tribes which had bordered upon each other in their own land, should border also upon each other in a strange land: and that they, whom God had united in the promise of their future call, should be also united in the same habitations, that they might be called together.

Those that were carried away from their own land, "the king of Assyria placed in Halach and Chabor, near the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes," 2 Kings xvii. 6, and xviii. 11.

The Talmudists do thus comment upon the places named:

"R. Abba<sup>f</sup> Bar Chana saith,

: הלח זה חלוואות *Halac is Halvaoth.*

: חבור זה הדייב *Habor is Adiabens.*

: נהר גזן זה גינזק *The river Gozan is Ginzak.* "R. Akiba<sup>s</sup> preacheth in Ginzak in Media."

: ערי מדי זו חמדון וחברותיה *"The cities of the Medes are Chemdon and its fellows.* But there are some who say, ניהר חברותיה *Nihar and its fellows.* What are those fellows? Samuel saith, מושכי *Muschi*, הידקי *Hidki*, דומקי *Domki.*"

These things are repeated elsewhere, and that with this variation of the names.

: חלון זה חלון *Chalah<sup>h</sup> is Chalzon.*

: ערי מדי זו תמדון *"The cities of the Medes are Tamdan and its fellows.* But there are some that say, נהוונר *Nehvanad*, and its fellows. What are these fellows? Samuel

<sup>f</sup> Bab. Jevam. fol. 16. 2.

<sup>s</sup> Beresh. Rabba, §. 33.

<sup>h</sup> Kiddush. fol. 72. 1.

saith, The towns מושכי *Muschi*, חושקי *Chushki*, and רומקי *Romki*."

Of the rendering הלח *Chalah*, although the Gemarists do not exactly agree among themselves, one while interpreting it by הלואות *Halvaoth*, another while by חלזון *Chalzon*; yet<sup>1</sup> they disagree not about the situation of the place, when in both places they join it to Adiabene. And in the place last cited they so apply those words of Daniel, וְתָלַת עֲלֵעִין, וּבְפִמּוֹה בֵּין שְׁנֵיהֶּ And *three ribs within his mouth*, Dan. vii. 5. R. Jochanan interpreting, "are חלזון *Chalzon*, והדייב *and Adiabene*, ונציבין *and Nesibis*."

I ask whether חלזון *Chalzon* be not illy written for חלוון *Chalvaon*, (by the likeness of the letters ו (Vau) and ז (Zain)) which comes nearer to הלואות *Halvaoth*, and both agree with Ἀλουανίς, *Alvanis*, which was a city in Mesopotamia, in Ptolemy, in degree 74. 15. 35. 20. In the same author<sup>k</sup>, the river Χαβώρας *Chaboras* bears the memory of *Chabor*, and Χαλκίτις, *Chalcitis*, bears that of *Chalach*, and Γαυζανίτις, *Gauzanitis*, that of *Gozan*. הדייב *The river Adiab*, whence the country of *Adiabene*, of most noted fame. See Ammianus Marcellinus<sup>l</sup>.

These things the Jews speak of the first seats of the ten tribes: and that they also remained there in afterages, they are so assured, that in the Talmudists חוששין לקדושין שמא הוא השבטים מ' *provision<sup>m</sup> is made concerning espousals, that they contract not with any of the ten tribes*. And the Gloss there is, בדיכתייהו הוו רובא מ' שבטים *In those places were very many of the ten tribes*.

And while the masters strictly provide that the stocks of pure blood be preserved, and name very many places in Babylon, and the countries adjacent, where families of pure blood were, and where they were not; they point with the finger, as to others, so also to the ten tribes residing there, as people of impure blood, and with whom they were not to mingle.

But now if the seats, cities, countries of the ten tribes in the times of the Talmudists were so well known, much more

<sup>1</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 801.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. xxiii. [6. 20.]

<sup>k</sup> Ptol. Tab. 4. Asiæ de situ Mesopot. <sup>m</sup> Jevamoth, in the place above.

were they so in the times of the apostles ; which were not so far removed from their first captivity. That people, therefore, in that time skulked [*latuit*] not in I know not what unknown land, [a thing now conceived of them,] but that the preaching of the apostles came also to them, as well as to other nations. One may say this with the greatest assurance upon the credit of St. James, who writes his Epistle to the whole twelve tribes, and also upon the credit of the author of the Apocalypse, in whom the twelve tribes are sealed, chap. vii. And the words of our Saviour argue the same thing respecting the twelve<sup>n</sup> apostles, that were to judge the twelve tribes, implying that they all twelve heard of the sound of the gospel, concerning the reception or rejection of which that judgment was to be.

Under this notion, unless I am much mistaken, is the apostle to be understood treating of the calling of Israel, Rom. xi ; not of the Jews only, but of *the whole twelve tribes* of Israel, δωδεκαφύλου. And this is that mystery concerning which he speaks at ver. 25, namely, that hardness, or “ blindness happened to Israel ἀπὸ μέρους *by parts, or separately ;*” first, the ten tribes were blinded, and some hundreds of years after, the two tribes : and both the one and the other remained under that state until the fulness of the Gentiles came in, when the gospel entered ; and ‘so all Israel,’ δωδεκάφυλος, *the whole twelve tribes*, namely, they who were λείμμα, *the remnant*, κατ’ ἐκλογὴν χάριτος, *according to the election of grace*, ver. 5, were saved. For those words ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ, *until the fulness of the Gentiles come in*, are not so to be understood, as if the gathering of the last handful of the harvest of the Gentiles were to be expected before that calling of all Israel : but they are opposed to that seldom coming in of heathens to true religion before the preaching of the gospel. For at that time they were added to the church by drops only, and very rarely : but when the gospel entered, they flowed in as in a full stream, καὶ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πληρώματι τῶν ἐθνῶν, *and in the whole fulness of the Gentiles*. And so (which is a great mystery) first the Gentiles were blinded, and after them the ten tribes were blinded, and after them the two tribes were blinded ; all lying under that miserable

<sup>n</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 899.

condition, until all at last were enlightened by the gospel, and closed together into one body. And that the apostle spake of his own times, when the gospel was now newly brought to the Gentiles, he himself sufficiently ratifies and makes known by those words, ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, *at this present time*, ver. 5.

#### CHAP. IV.°

##### *Peter preaching the gospel in Babylon.*

THE whole world, therefore, being thus divided into Israelites and Gentiles; and the Israelites again into the ten tribes and the Jews; and the Jews again into Hebrews and Hellenists; and the Hebrews into those who dwelt within the land of Israel, and those that dwelt without it; hence something may be observed which concerns the evangelical and apostolic history.

I. And this first, as to the four evangelists, namely, that Matthew writ for the Hebrews *within* the land of Israel and Syria: Mark, for the Hebrews, *without* the land in Babylon and Assyria; where also were the ten tribes: John for the Hellenists: Luke for the Gentiles.

II. Then when James, Peter, and John are celebrated for the three apostles of the circumcision, Gal. ii. 9, hence one may fitly distinguish each apostle's diocess: viz. Palestine, and which borders upon and is reckoned with it, Syria, to James; Babylon and Assyria to Peter; and the Hellenists, especially of Asia, and such as were further off, to John.

Babylon, I say, and Assyria to Peter: which he himself confirms when he dates his First Epistle from Babylon; and in his Second, סִיחְתוֹ כַּבְּבַל *heP useth the Babylonian idiom*. You would believe the word 'Bosor' to be pronounced for 'Beor,' chap. ii. 15; or it was a solecism of Peter, or an error of the transcribers: but it savours of the Chaldee dialect, and plainly teaches what that Babylon was where Peter then was.

It was ordinary with the Chaldeans to change ש (Schin) into ע (Ain); and on the contrary ע (Ain) into ש (Schin): ש into ע, as שפם *Shepham*, into עפמית *Apamia*, Num. xxxiv. 11, 12: where see the Targums, Samaritan, and Jerusalem, and Jonathan. שטר *a bill of contracts*, into עיטור, in the

<sup>c</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 766.

<sup>d</sup> See Kiddush. fol. 71. 2.

Talmudists; and divers others of that nature. And  $\epsilon$  into  $\psi$  or  $\sigma$ , as in  $\epsilon\delta$  a *witness*,  $\psi\delta\delta$ , the letter  $\eta$  (He) only put in; and  $\epsilon\delta$  *until*, in the Samaritan dialect, is changed into  $\sigma\epsilon\delta$ , with a letter in like manner put in. So  $\epsilon\gamma\kappa$  to *divide*, is also  $\sigma\gamma\kappa$ , and  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\eta$  a *cheek*, is also  $\lambda\iota\sigma\eta$ ; and very many of the like variation; which, being observed, do openly testify that Peter was in Babylon of Chaldea, and spoke Chaldee when he said  $\beta\sigma\sigma\epsilon\gamma$  *Bosor* for  $\beta\epsilon\sigma\gamma\epsilon\gamma$  *Beor*.

Nor was there in all the world any country in which that great apostle of circumcision could preach more agreeably and suitably to his office, than in Babylon and the adjacent places; where were Hebrews of the purest blood, and where the ten tribes were 'the circumcision' in its full name.

Hitherto we have traced the Hebrews, or those Jews whose mother-tongue was Syriac or Chaldee, namely, the Palestinians, Syrians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Mesopotamians, and an infinite number of Israelites of the ten tribes sprinkled among them, using also the same language. Now let us see briefly what Bibles were used in their synagogues.

## CHAP. V.

### *The Hebrew Bible read in the synagogues of the Hebrews.*

THE Jerusalem Talmudists<sup>q</sup> say, "There were five things wanting under the second Temple which were under the first; the fire from heaven, the ark, Urim and Thummim, the oil of anointing, and the Holy Spirit," or the Spirit of prophecy<sup>r</sup>: let the Hebrew tongue, the prophetic language, be added also.

Of the Spirit of prophecy the Babylonian Talmudists<sup>s</sup> have these words also: "From the death of the latter prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, the Holy Spirit ceased from Israel." In the first generation, indeed, after the return out of Babylon, that the gift of prophecy flourished, those prophets, and indeed very many others do witness, if we believe the Masters of the Traditions. For thus they speak<sup>t</sup>: "Among the eighty elders who opposed the statute of Esther and Mordecai, concerning the feast of Purim, as if it were an innovation in the law, more than thirty were prophets." But

<sup>q</sup> Taanith, fol. 56. 1.

<sup>r</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 932.

<sup>s</sup> Sotah, fol. 24. 2.

<sup>t</sup> Hieros. Megil. fol. 70. 4.



that generation being<sup>u</sup> extinct, the gift of prophecy vanished also, and appeared no more before the morning of the gospel. To this that of St. John hath respect, chap. vii. 38, *οὐπω ἦν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, the Holy Ghost was not yet*; and Acts xix. 2, *ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιόν ἐστιν ἠκούσαμεν, we have not heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.*

Whether the use of the mother Hebrew tongue was continued in that first generation, as the gift of prophecy was continued, we shall not dispute: this certainly we cannot pass by, that those books of the sacred canon which were writ in that generation, viz. Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, (only a little in the Book of Ezra excepted,) all were written in the Hebrew language.

Whether the Hebrew language were at that time the vulgar speech or not, without all doubt, in the ages following, the Syriac or Chaldee was the mother-tongue both in Babylon and Palestine: and yet the Hebrew Bible was read in their synagogues, not understood by the common people, but rendered into Chaldee, their vulgar tongue, by an interpreter.

The Gemarists assert that it was so done in that first generation, while they thus explain those words of Nehemiah, chap. viii. 8: "They<sup>x</sup> read in the law of God, במקרא, *in the Hebrew text, מפורש זה תרגום, explaining it, that is, with the Targum.*"

In all the following ages these things obtained: "If<sup>y</sup> any write the holy books in any language, or in any character, yet he shall not read in them [publicly in the synagogue], עד אשורית כתובי אשורית, *unless they be written in Hebrew.*" "R. Samuel<sup>z</sup> Bar Rabh Isaac went into the synagogue, and saw a minister there interpreting, and not any standing by him for an interpreter. He saith to him, This is forbidden you: for as the law was given by a mediator, so it is to be handled with a mediator." Hence were there so many and so accurate canons concerning an interpreter in the synagogues." He<sup>a</sup> that reads in the law, let him not read to the interpreter more at one time than one verse." The Gloss

<sup>u</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 803.

<sup>x</sup> Megil. fol. 3. 1. Nedarim, fol.

37. 2.

<sup>y</sup> Massech. Sopher. cap. 1. hal. 6.

<sup>z</sup> Hieros. Megil. fol. 74. 4.

<sup>a</sup> Bab. Megill. fol. 23. 2.

saith, "Lest the interpreter mistake." And, "The<sup>b</sup> deed of Reuben is read, but it is not interpreted. The deed of Thamar is read, but it is not interpreted. The first history of the golden calf is read and interpreted: the second is read, but is not interpreted." Where the Gloss is, 'That history which Aaron himself relates of the calf, is called the second history of the calf. In it are these words, וַיֵּצֵא הָעֵגֶל הַזֶּה, *And there came out this calf.* Therefore that story is not interpreted, lest the common people err and say, That there was something that came forth from itself. But they understood not the Hebrew text itself." Let that be marked. The Gemarists go on: "R. Chaninah Ben Gamaliel went to Chabul, and hearing there a minister of the synagogue reading those words, וַיְהִי בְשָׁכֵן יִשְׂרָאֵל *And it came to pass when Israel dwelt,* he said to the interpreter, Be silent, and interpret not; and the wise men commended him."

Very many passages of that nature might be produced, whereby it appears plain that the Hebrew text was read in the synagogue of the Hebrews, that is, of those of Babylon and Palestine, and whose soever mother-tongue was Syriac or Chaldee. But whether it were read in the synagogues of the Hellenists, further inquiry must be made.

## CHAP. VI.

### *What the Jews think of the versions.*

THOSE canons which we have cited concerning reading and interpretation, do they bind the Jews, Palestinians, and Babylonians only? or other Jews and the whole nation wheresoever dispersed? Those canons are in both Talmuds, and as all other traditions comprised in that book do bind the whole nation, unless where the reason of times and the difference of places dispense, so why should not these bind concerning reading the Law and the Prophets in the synagogues out of the Hebrew text?

The whole Jewish nation were carried away with the highest zeal and veneration towards the Hebrew text, which to neglect in the synagogues was accounted among them for a high impiety. It was read in the synagogues of the Hebrews, and rendered very frequently in the very words of Onkelos and

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. fol. 25. 1.

Jonathan. And why were not the Targumists themselves read rather, and the business done by fewer? Because the original text is by no means to be neglected. And why the Hellenists should be cooler in this business than the Hebrews, who can give a reason?

Therefore, how much the more zeal and honour they had for the Hebrew text, so much the less grateful to them was the version of it into another tongue. For they thought so much of honour, virtue, and worth departed from the holy text, as that language or those very letters were departed from.

I. In<sup>c</sup> that canon כתבי הקודש מטמאים את הידים *the holy books pollute the hands*; whereby, as they say, the worth of those books is proved, if there be made any change of the language or characters, so much they believe the nobility of them is diminished<sup>d</sup>. For “the Targum, if it be written in Hebrew, and the Hebrew Bible, if it be written in the language of the Targum, and the writing changed, [*scriptura trans-ammana*,] they defile not the hands; and indeed those books do not defile the hands, unless they be written in Hebrew.”

II. It is disputed<sup>e</sup>, “Whether it be lawful to snatch the holy books out of the fire on the sabbath-day,” when that cannot be done without some labour. And it is concluded without all scruple, that if they are wrote in Hebrew, they ought to be snatched out; but if in another language, or in other characters, then it is doubted. Yea, R. Jose saith, “They are not to be snatched out.”

III. It is disputed further, אם מותר לאבדן ביד ‘If the holy books so written shall come to your hands,’ *whether you may destroy them with your own hand*, either by cutting or tearing them, or throwing them into the fire; and it is concluded, indeed, in the negative: which yet is to the same effect as though it were determined in the affirmative. “Let them be laid up (say they) in some foul place, where they may be consumed by themselves.”

And it is related of Rabban Gamaliel first, that when ספר איוב תרגום *the Book of Job, made into a Targum*, was brought to him, he commanded that it should be buried

<sup>c</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 804.  
—*Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 934.

<sup>d</sup> *Jadaim*, cap. 4. hal. 5.

<sup>e</sup> *Schabb.* fol. 115. 1.

under a heap of stones. Which example also a certain Rabbīn afterward urgeth to his great grandson Gamaliel, that he also should bury under ground *the Book of Job Targumized*, which he had in his hand, to be consumed.

*The Book of Job Targumized* was that book translated into the Chaldee language, the mother-tongue of the nation, the tongue into which the Law and the Prophets were rendered in the synagogues; and yet by no means did they tolerate the version of that book, (which, indeed, was not read in the synagogues,) though rendered in that language; much less would they tolerate the version of the Law and the Prophets into a more remote and more heathen language.

These things well considered, one may with good reason suspect that the Jews thought not so honourably of any version, as to cast away the Hebrew Bible, and to espouse that in the room of it. And what they might or did think concerning the Greek version of the LXX, as it is called, let us, as much as we can, briefly search.

#### CHAP. VII.

*A comparison of the history of the LXX, as it is in Josephus, and as it is in the Talmudists.*

THE story as it is in Josephus and Aristēas hath no need to be repeated, being so well known to all. From which how vastly different is it from the story as it is related in the Talmudists! which we transcribe verbatim from *Massecheth Sopherim* thus<sup>f</sup>:

מעשה בחמשה זקנים שכתבו לתלמי המלך את התורה  
 יונית: והיה היום קשה לישראל כיום שנעשה העגל: שלא  
 היתה תורה יכולה להתרגם כל צרכה: שוב מעשה בתלמי  
 המלך שכנס שבעים ושנים זקנים: הושיבם בשבעים ושנים  
 בתים: ולא גלה להם על מה כנסם: נכנס לכל אחד ואחד  
 מהם אמר להם כתבו לי תורת משה רבכם: נתן המקום  
 עצה בלב כל אחד ואחד והסכימו דעתן לדעת אחת: וכתבו  
 לו תורה בפני עצמה: ושלושה עשר דבר שינו בה:

*There is a story of five elders who transcribed the law for Ptolemy the king in Greek. And that day was bitter to Israel*

<sup>f</sup> Cap. i.

as the day wherein the golden calf was made; because the law could not be turned according to all things requisite to it. And again there is a story of king Ptolemy, that he assembled seventy-two elders together, and disposed them into seventy-two cells, [domunculis;] but he revealed not to them why he had assembled them. But coming in to every one of them, he said to them, 'Write me out the law of Moses your master.' God put counsel into each of their hearts, that their minds agreed in one. And they wrote out for him the law by itself; but they changed thirteen places in it.

The Babylonian Talmud<sup>f</sup> relates the story in the like manner, this only excepted, that there is no mention of the five elders; as also that this clause is wanting, "They wrote out the law for him by itself."

I. § Josephus<sup>h</sup> speaks glorious things of letters sent from the king to the high priest sending for interpreters, of presents sent to Eliezer, and other things consecrated to the Temple, of many talents spent by Ptolemy for the redemption of the Jews, of honourable rewards conferred upon the interpreters: all which, according to the account of Josephus and Aristæus, amounted to such a sum, that one might with reason believe the whole Alexandrian library was not worth so much; yea, a whole year's tax of Egypt would scarcely have been of that value.

But of all this there is deep silence in the Talmudists; and yet usually they want not either for will or elocution when something is to be declared for the glory of their own nation. They are not silent of the gifts of Monobazus and Helenai, Nicanor, Ben Cattin, &c.; of the gifts of princes either given or lent to their Rabbins; but of these vast expenses of Ptolemy there is not one syllable.

II. In Josephus the interpreters are sent for by letters, and that under that notion that they should interpret. But in the Talmudists they are convened, being altogether ignorant what they must do.

III. In Josephus they turn (the law at least) into Greek: in the Talmudists it is obscure whether they translated any thing at all. Of the five elders, indeed, it is said in terms

<sup>f</sup> In Megill.

<sup>g</sup> [Antiq. xii. 2.]

<sup>h</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 805.

<sup>i</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 935.

that כתבו יונית *they transcribed in Greek*, that is, they turned, as the word which followeth להתרגם *to interpret*, sufficiently explains. But of the Seventy there is no such thing: but only this, שכתבו תורה בפני עצמה “*that they transcribed the law by itself*, and changed thirteen places in it.”

There is a passage indeed where the Babylonian Talmudists are brought in with their relation, whereby one might think that they intimated that the Seventy translated into Greek. “Our masters (say they<sup>k</sup>) permitted not that the Holy Books should be transcribed but into Greek. And it is a tradition. R. Judah saith, When they permitted to transcribe in Greek, they permitted it of the Book of the Law only; ומשום דתלמי המלך מעשה דתלמי המלך *and that because of that which happened to king Ptolemy:*” or let it be as it is rendered by some, *Whence the work was begun with Ptolemy the king.*

But if any should say that they *transcribed*, indeed, in Greek, that is, the Hebrew text in Greek letters, and *translated* not, you would scarcely refute him out of the Talmudists; especially when elsewhere they distinguish between writing out לשון בכל *in any language*<sup>l</sup>, that is, in the characters of any language; and writing out לשון בכל *תרגום by a version into any language*: and when there was a publication and edition of a double Hebrew text in Origen’s Hexapla and Octapla<sup>m</sup>, δι’ Ἑβραϊκῶν καὶ Ἑλληνικῶν στοιχείων, *in Hebrew and Greek characters*, he seems not to have been without his copy, in which the Hebrew text itself was written out in Greek letters.

What at length does that mean, *They wrote out the law by itself*? Certainly either this, They transcribed the law only, and not the other books; or rather, They transcribed the Hebrew law itself in Hebrew, and turned it not.

“They wrote out (say they) the law by itself, and changed thirteen places in it.” The examination of the latter clause will yield light to the former, and will give its vote to him that says, That it does not appear in the Talmudists that the LXX translated at all, but that they only transcribed the Hebrew books in Hebrew.

<sup>k</sup> Megil. fol. 9. 1.

<sup>l</sup> Schabb. fol. 115. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Epiphan. Hæres. 63.

## CHAP. VIII.

*Of the thirteen places that were changed.*

BOTH Talmuds, as also other Rabbins who relate the story of the seventy elders, add always this, that "they changed thirteen places in the law:" which they also reckon up. But now, when those different readings are not found in the Greek version, that story is exploded by the most as a mere fiction; when indeed the change was not in the version, but in the Hebrew transcription. Let the thing speak itself:

They wrote, say they, בְּרֵאשִׁית בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים "God created in the beginning, Gen. i. 1, not בְּרֵאשִׁית בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים *In the beginning God created*; lest the king should say, *Beresith* is God, and there were two powers, and the first created the latter<sup>m</sup>." But now, in the Greek version, it was impossible that such a scruple should arise; it could arise only from the Hebrew<sup>n</sup> text: and it must necessarily be that this change, intended for an amendment, should be reckoned to be in the Hebrew words themselves.

They write וַתִּשְׁחַק שָׂרָה בְּקִרְבָּיהָ *And Sarah laughed among her neighbours*, Gen. xviii. 12, for בְּקִרְבָּהָ *within herself*.

They wrote לֹא חָמַד אֶחָד מֵהֶם נִשְׂאָתִי *Whatsoever was desirable I took not from them*, Numb. xvi. 15, for חֶמְרֵי אֶחָד *one ass*. Now who will doubt but that the change was made in the Hebrew words themselves? In the former from the affinity of the words; in the latter from the similitude of the letters.

But instead of more, let this one example serve. They wrote וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת זִמְרֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל *And he sent worthy men of the children of Israel*, Exod. xxiv. 5, for אֶת-בְּעָרֵי *young men*. Now if it be asked whether they wrote the very word זִמְרֵי, or the sense of it in the Greek language, the Jerusalem Gemarists witness, that that very same word was written by them in this story: "Three books (say they) were found in the court of the Temple. In one of them was written מֵעוֹן קָרַם, Deut. xxxiii. 27. In two was written מֵעוֹנָה. They received those two, and they rejected the third. In one was written וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת זִמְרֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל *He sent worthy*

<sup>m</sup> See the Gloss in Megill. and fol. 9. 1.

<sup>n</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 806.

<sup>o</sup> [Quid si veritas *minores, plebeios* ex significatione וַיִּשְׁלַח בִּי. Buxtorf L.

T. et R. sub v. וַיִּשְׁלַח col. 682.]

*men of the children of Israel.* In two was written, וישלה את נערי בני ישראל *He sent young men of the children of Israel*: they received those two, and rejected the third. In one was written תשע היא *nine*. In two was written אחד עשרה היא *eleven*. They received those two, and rejected the third."

Now it may be asked, What, I pray, were those two copies in which it was written מעונה, and נערי, and אחד עשרה? They were Hebrew copies, without<sup>p</sup> all controversy: and so was that without all doubt in which it was written מעון and תשע and זאמוטי.

There is no reason, therefore, why that tradition of the thirteen places changed should bear so ill a report, and be accounted for a fiction, because those thirteen alterations are not met with in the Greek version: for the Talmudists plainly treat of the Seventy-two, not translating out of Hebrew, but transcribing the Hebrew books themselves.

Let us also add the introduction that the Jerusalem writers make to this history<sup>q</sup>: "The Jerusalem Talmudists (say they) wrote ירושלם ירושלימה צפון צפונה תימן תימנה *Jerusalem, Jerushlema, Tzaphon, Tzephona, Teman, Temna*:" that is, they changed the writing of these Hebrew words: and immediately they add, יג' דברו' שינו חכמים לתלמי המלך *The wise men altered thirteen places for Ptolemy the king*. Which is also to be understood of the Hebrew words themselves: otherwise this does not suit with what goes before.

## CHAP. IX.

*In what value 'the version of the Seventy,' as it is commonly called, seems to have been among the Jews.*

Thus it remains doubtful whether the Talmudists acknowledge any version of the Seventy-two elders or no. Let it be granted, therefore, that they attributed θεοπνευστων, *divine inspiration*, to them from hence, that being put asunder, yet they all conspired in one mind and sense; nevertheless, it will not at all follow thence that any honour was given by them to this version, which is carried about under that name.

One may much more readily perceive in it the breath of Jewish traditions than any inspiration of the Holy Ghost. And although their own traditions were of account certainly

<sup>p</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 936.

<sup>q</sup> Megill. fol. 71. 4.



to the nation, and, for the patronising them, many things seem to be put into the version which favour them, yet this did by no means so much obtain with them as that they valued the version above the Hebrew original, and that they, casting away that, made choice of this to themselves; but they always reserved to the Hebrew text its due honour.

I. What the learned among them might judge of the Greek version, one may somewhat guess from hence, that even a Christian himself, seriously reading and viewing it, may observe many things in it whereby he may discover by what counsels, cautions, and craftiness, that version was published: especially if, together with it, he hath in his eye the manners, traditions, ordinances, and state of the Jewish nation; to which allusion is very frequently made, and respect had by those interpreters. The matter may be illustrated by one or two examples as to their traditions.

Gen. xx. 18: "Οτι συγκλείων συνέκλεισε Κύριος ξέωθεν πάσαν μήτραν" *Because the Lord in shutting up every womb without.* Whence comes the putting in of the word ξέωθεν, *without*? It agrees with the tradition, that the wombs were barred up against copulation<sup>r</sup>.

Exod.<sup>s</sup> xxiv. 10: Εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἰστήκει ὁ Θεός. *They saw the place where God had stood,* instead of εἶδον τὸν Θεὸν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, *they saw the God of Israel.* Compare the tract *Kiddushin*<sup>t</sup> with this; where the Gloss is this, "R. Hananael saith, He that renders אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל *they saw the God of Israel,* is a liar," &c. See the notes before at chap. xiv. ver. 2.

Deut. xxx. 6: Καὶ περικαθαριεῖ Κύριος τὴν καρδίαν σου, *And the Lord shall purify thy heart.* And Josh. v. 4, "Ὁν δὲ τρόπον περιεκάθαρεν Ἰησοῦς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ. *After which manner Joshua purified the children of Israel,* for περιέτεμεν, *he circumcised;* in a sense too much inclining to the trifling praises of circumcision among the masters.

Whence are those words taken? Josh. xxi. 42, and xxiv. 30: Ἐκεῖ ἔθηκαν μετ' αὐτοῦ (Ἰησοῦ) εἰς τὸ μνήμα, εἰς ὃ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ τὰς μαχαίρας τὰς πετρίνας, &c. *There they laid with him (Joshua) into the sepulchre, in which they buried him; I say, there they laid the stone knives,"* &c. And 2 Sam. xxi. 11;

<sup>r</sup> Bava Kama, fol. 92. 1.

<sup>s</sup> English folio edit., vol. ii. p. 807.

<sup>t</sup> Fol. 49. 1.

Καὶ ἐξελεύθησαν, καὶ κατέλαβεν αὐτοὺς Δὰν υἱὸς Ἰωᾶ ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γιγάντων· *And they died, and Dan the son of Joa, of the sons of the giants, took them.*

1 Sam. i. 21, this clause is added, καὶ πάσας τὰς δεκάτας τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ· *and all the tithes of his land*; according to the canons of the nation concerning offering *tithes* at the feast.

2 Kings ii. 1, "When God would take up Elias in a whirlwind, ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, *as into heaven*;" so ver. 11, agreeing with the opinion of the nation concerning the ascension of Elias very near to heaven, but not into heaven itself<sup>u</sup>.

1 Chron. ix. 31, Τοῦ τηγάνου τοῦ μεγάλου ἱερέως· *the pan of the high priest*: from the noted fame חֲבִירֵי כֶהֵן הגָּדוֹל of *the high priest's pan*. See *Menacoth*<sup>v</sup>, and in other places very frequently.

Psalms ii. 12, Δράσασθε παιδείας· *take hold of instruction*; instead of בָּרַךְ יִשְׁקֶרְבֶּר *kiss the Son*. "Bar<sup>x</sup> signifies nothing else but *the law*; as it is said, בָּרַךְ יִשְׁקֶרְבֶּר *kiss the Son*."

We omit more passages of the same observation and suspicion; and they are not a few.

II. We may observe in the Jerusalem Talmudists, that the Greek version of Aquila is sometimes quoted, but that of the Seventy never.

: בְּתֵי נֶפֶשׁ) תְּרַגְּמֵם אַקְוִילָא תְּרַגְּמֵם אַסְמוּכוּרִיָּא· *Aquila renders* (בְּתֵי נֶפֶשׁ) *tablets*<sup>z</sup>, Isa. iii. 20,) στομοκήρια, *stomachers*.

: אַקְוִילָא תְּרַגְּמֵם אַקְוִילָא לְקַבֵּל נְבִרְשָׁתָא לְקַבֵּל לְמַפְרָם· *Aquila renders* אַקְוִילָא תְּרַגְּמֵם אַקְוִילָא לְקַבֵּל נְבִרְשָׁתָא *over against the candlestick*, Dan. v. 5, *over against the lamps*.

: הוּא יְנַהַגְנוּ עַל מוֹת· *He<sup>b</sup> shall be our guide unto death*, (Psalm xlviii. 14.) אַתְּמַנְסִיָּא תְּרַגְּמֵם אַקְוִילָא *Aquila renders* ἀθανασία, *immortality*.

: פְּרִי עֵץ הָדָר· *"Fruit<sup>c</sup> of goodly trees*, (Lev. xxiii. 40.) R. Tanchuma saith, תְּרַגְּמֵם אַקְוִילָא עֵץ הָדָר *Aquila renders* עֵץ *Etz, ὕδωρ, water*;" if his conjecture fail not in the interpretation. See<sup>d</sup> also *Beresith Rabba*<sup>e</sup>.

<sup>u</sup> Succah, fol. 5. 1.

<sup>v</sup> Cap. 11. hal. 3.

<sup>x</sup> Sanhed. fol. 92. 1.

<sup>y</sup> Schabb. fol. 8. 2.

<sup>z</sup> [A. V. In the margin—*houses of the soul*.]

<sup>a</sup> Joma, fol. 41. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Megill. fol. 73. 2.

<sup>c</sup> Succah, fol. 54. 4.

<sup>d</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 937.

<sup>e</sup> Fol. 14. 2. et fol. 19. 1, &c.

But I do not remember that I have found one clause alleged out of the version of the Seventy in the whole Talmud, either one or other.

Let it also be added, that<sup>f</sup> 'the book of Ben Syra' is a prohibited book; and yet you may find it cited in both Talmuds: in that of Jerusalem, in the tract *Beracoth*<sup>g</sup>; where it seems to be the book of Syracides: but otherwise in divers other places<sup>h</sup>. But I do not, I say, remember that I have found the version of the Seventy alleged in any place; and I scarce think that such an allegation could pass me unobserved. Which thing more increaseth my suspicion that those Jews owned not such a version, and that they understood the transcription of the Seventy not to be the version of, but the copying out, the very Hebrew text itself. And as to the version itself, whereof we are speaking, how they stood affected towards it, one may in some measure learn from this, that when another version is alleged by them they cite not this at all.

III. The Jews knew well enough that the Greek version was not published for Jews, but for heathen; and was done by their labour who came unwillingly to that work, nor would have suffered any such thing, if it had laid in their power to have hindered it. But now, with what faithfulness such a thing was done, the thing itself speaks, and the Jews knew it well enough; who knew also well enough with what small affection the whole Jewish nation stood towards the heathen.

By no argument, therefore, shall any persuade me that that version was a pure and accurate version, exactly according to the Hebrew truth which the interpreters had in their hands; and that the differences which we now perceive in our Bibles were risen thence, that the Jews depraved the Hebrew text according to their pleasure. For I shall never believe that any masters of the Jews would exhibit a pure, uncorrupted, and exact Bible to the heathen, in the Greek version; and obtrude an interpolated, depraved, corrupt one upon themselves. And let us call themselves in for judges in this case:—

<sup>f</sup> Sanhedr. fol. 100. 2.

<sup>g</sup> Fol. 11. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Bab. Chetub. fol. 110. 2. Cha-

gig. fol. 13. 1. Bathra, fol. 98. 2.

especially Sanhedr. in the place before.

I. In<sup>1</sup> Gen. ii. 2, the Greek words are, Συνετέλεσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ. *And God finished on the sixth day.* Was it to that very sense in the copy which the interpreters used? “They changed, and wrote, say the Gemarists, ויכל ביום הששי *He finished in the sixth day.*” The Gloss writes, “That it might not be said that God did any thing on the sabbath.” In their Hebrew copy it was as it is in ours, ויכל ביום השביעי, “*And God ended his work on the seventh day.*” but they changed it in the Hebrew transcript whereof we spake, and so did the interpreters in the Greek version.

II. In Exod. xii. 40, the Greek words are, Ἡ δὲ κατοίκησις τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, ἣν κατέκτισαν ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ ἐν γῆ Χαναάν, &c. *Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, which they sojourned in the land of Egypt, and in Canaan, &c.* Did the interpreters read so in their Hebrew copy? No. “They changed (say the Talmudists), and writ, בארץ מצרים ובארץ כנען *In the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan.*” In the copy which was in their hands, those words ובארץ כנען *in the land of Canaan,* were absent: but they added it of their own. The Gloss saith, “Lest it should be said, A lie is written in your law: for behold, Kohath was among those that went down into Egypt. And if you reckon all the years of Kohath, Amram, and Moses, they amount not to four hundred.”

III. In Numb. xvi. 15, the Greek words are, Οὐκ ἐπιθύμημα οὐδενὸς αὐτῶν εἶληφα. *I have not taken the desire of any of them.* Was חמד *desire,* written in the copy used of the Seventy? No. It is an alteration, say the masters; for it was written חמר *an ass,* and they transferred it into חמד *desire.* The Gloss writes, “That it might not be said, Perhaps he took not an *ass,* but he took away some other *desirable thing.*” And you may know the lion by his paw.

Let these things be spoken to prove that it is not so heterodox to suppose that the Greek version was not read in the synagogues of the Hellenists; but the Hebrew text, so as it was in the synagogues of the Hebrews. And now let us briefly weigh what things are said on the contrary side.

<sup>1</sup> *English folio edition,* vol. ii. p. 808.

## CHAP. X.

*What things are objected for the affirmative.*

I. FIRST, That passage<sup>k</sup> is objected, "R. Levi went to Cæsarea, and hearing them read the lesson שמע *Schema*, (Deut. vi,) in Greek, would hinder them. R. Jose observing it was angry, saying, He that cannot read in Hebrew, shall he not read at all? Yea, let a man read in any tongue which he understands and knows, and so satisfy his duty." So the words are rendered by a very learned man.

But the Gemara treats not of *reading* the law in the synagogues, but concerning the *repeating* of the passages of the phylacteries, among which the first was שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל *Hear, O Israel*, Deut. vi. [4.] Therefore the word קורין is not to be rendered *reading*, but *repeating*. In which sense the word קרא occurs very frequently in the masters. As קראה על פה "She recites<sup>l</sup> the Book of Esther by her mouth;" that is, without book. And, "Heretofore<sup>m</sup> every one that could לקרות *recite*," (that passage used in offering the firstfruits, Deut. xxvi,) "קרא *recited*. And he that could not *recite*, מקרין אותו *they taught him to recite*:" or they recited for him.

II. That example and story are urged concerning reading the Law and the Prophets in the synagogue<sup>n</sup> of Antioch of Pisidia, Acts xiii. 15. To which there is no need to answer any thing else but that it begs the question.

III. That also of Tertullian is added, Sed<sup>o</sup> et Judæi palam lectitant, vectigalis libertas vulgo auditur (or *aditur*) singulis sabbatis: *But the Jews also read openly, the liberty of the tax is heard (or gone unto) every sabbath day.*

I answer, Be it granted that Tertullian speaks of the Greek version, which is not so very evident; that which was done under Severus doth not conclude the same thing done in the times of the apostles: but especially when Severus was, according to the sense of his name, very severe towards the Jews, as Baronius teacheth, and Spartianus long before him. Under whom sabbaths could not be kept by the Jews, but under a tax. And be it granted that the Greek version was

<sup>k</sup> Hieros. Sotah, cap. 7.

<sup>l</sup> Bab. Megill. fol. 17. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Bicurim, fol. 86. 1.

<sup>n</sup> *Leusden's edition*, vol. ii. p. 938.

<sup>o</sup> *Apologet.* cap. 18.

read then by them at Rome, (as the Glosser upon Tertullian describes the scene of the affair,) that was also under a tax ; not by the choice of the people, but by pure compulsion.

IV. That of Justin Martyr is produced ; *Εἰ δέ τις φάσκει μὴ ἡμῖν τὰς βιβλους ταύτας, ἀλλὰ Ἰουδαίοις προσήκειν, διὰ τὸ ἔτι καὶ νῦν-ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν σώζεσθαι.* *But<sup>p</sup> if any say that these books belong not to us, but the Jews, and therefore they are to this day preserved in their synagogues<sup>q</sup>.* And, *Ἐμεινῶν αἱ βιβλοὶ καὶ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, &c.* *The<sup>r</sup> books remained even among the Egyptians hitherto, and are everywhere among all the Jews, who, reading them, understood them not.*

V. But that is instead of all, that Philo and Josephus follow the Greek version ; and that (which is still greater) the holy penmen do follow it in the New Testament, in their allegations taken out of the Old. Therefore, without doubt, say they, that version was frequent and common in the synagogues, and in the hands of men ; and without doubt, of the highest authority among the Jews ; yea, as it seemeth, of divine. These are the arguments which are of the greatest weight on that side.

That I may, therefore, answer together to all, let us expatiate a little in this inquiry.

## CHAP. XI.

*By what authors and counsels it might probably be that that Greek version came forth which obtains under the name of 'The Seventy.'*

I. It was made and published, without doubt, not for the sake of the Jews, but of the heathen. We have Josephus a witness here in his story of the Seventy : granting him to be true in that relation, what moved Ptolemy so greedily to desire the version, to purchase so small a volume at such vast expenses ? Was it religion ? or a desire of adorning his library ? By that paint does Josephus colour the business : but reason will dictate a third cause, and that far more likely. For both the Jewish and heathen writers teach, that Egypt at that time was filled with an infinite multitude of

<sup>p</sup> Orat. Parænet. ad Græcos.      <sup>q</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 799.

<sup>r</sup> Apolog. 2.

Jews ; and what could a prudent king, and that took care of himself and his kingdom, do else than look into the manners and institutions of that nation, whether they consisted with the peace and security of his kingdom ; since that people was contrary to the manners and laws of all other nations.

When, therefore, he could neither examine nor understand their law, which comprised their whole religion, polity and economy, being written in Hebrew ; it was necessary for him to provide to have it translated into their vulgar tongue. Hence arose the version of the ' five elders,' as we may well suppose ; and lest some fraud or collusion might creep in, the assembling of the ' Seventy-two elders' was occasioned hence also. And does it not savour of some suspicion, that he assembled them, being altogether ignorant what they were to do ? For let reason tell us why we should not rather give credit to the Talmudists writing for their own countrymen, than to Josephus writing for the heathen : and if there be any truth in that relation, that when he had gathered them together he shut them up by themselves in so many chambers, that still increaseth the same suspicion.

II. Let it be yielded that they turned it into Greek ; which, as we have seen, is doubtful ; yet the speech in the Gemarists is only concerning the Books of Moses, and concerning the law only in Josephus. Who, therefore, translated the rest of the books of the holy volume ? It is without an author perhaps should we say, the Jerusalem Sanhedrim, but not without reason. For,

III. The Jews, wheresoever dispersed throughout the world, and they in very many regions infinite in their numbers, made it their earnest request that they might live and be governed by their own laws ; and indeed they would live by none but their own. But what prince would grant this, being altogether ignorant what those laws were ? They saw their manners and rites were contrary to all other nations ; it was needful also to see whether they were not contrary to the peace of their kingdoms. That very jealousy could not but require the version of those laws into the common language, and to force it also from them, how unwilling soever they might be. The great Sanhedrim, therefore, could not consult better and more wisely for the safety and security

and religion of the whole nation, than by turning their holy books into the Greek language, that all might know what it was that they professed. They could not but see but those books would at last, though they were never so unwilling, come forth in the vulgar language; nor could they hinder but they would everywhere happen into the hands of the heathen. Therefore, that it would be far better that a version should come forth by their care and authority<sup>s</sup>, which might be according to their pleasures, than that some should come forth in one place, and some in another, which perhaps might turn to the disgrace of the holy text, or to the danger and reproach of the nation, or might too much lay open the holy mysteries among the heathen.

By<sup>t</sup> these authors, and by these reasons, I confess ingenuously it is my opinion that that version was made which goes about under the name of 'the Seventy.' Nor are there some things wanting in the version itself which hint some such counsel in the publishing of it. For,

IV. Even a blear eye may see clearly enough that it was hammered out, and dressed with more caution than conscience, more craft than sincerity: 1. That, as much as might be, the holy books might remain free from any reproach or cavilling of the heathen: 2. That they might soften some things which might be injurious to the Jewish nation, either as to their peace or reputation, or which might create offence to the Gentiles: 3. That the mysteries and the bare truth of the holy books might be revealed as little as possibly could be to the heathen. All which might be demonstrated by such numberless examples as to leave no occasion to doubt of that matter behind it.

By these and the like cautions and subtleties was that version made; wherein the translators had less care that the interpretation should come out sincere and true; but provision was chiefly made that any thing should be thrust upon the Gentiles, so it were without danger, and that the glory and safety of the Jewish nation might be maintained. And may it be allowed me to speak out what I think? Among the various copies and editions of this version which go about, I

<sup>s</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 939. <sup>t</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 810.



do not esteem that copy for the most genuine which comes nearest to the Hebrew text, but that which comes nearest to the mind of the translators in such like cautions.

It is said, as we saw before, that when the five elders had turned the law, "that day was bitter to Israel, as the day wherein the golden calf was made." And why? "Because the law could not be turned according to all things convenient to it." Did their grief arise hence, because it was not turned, nor could not be, clearly, exactly, and evidently enough, that the heathen might see the full and open light of it? Who will believe that this ever was the Jews' desire or wish? But their trouble proceeded rather from hence, that those five had not translated it cunningly, warily, and craftily enough, as the Gentiles were to be dealt withal.

Of this matter there was care enough taken in this version; the authors setting all their strength and wits on work, that, according to their own pleasures, it might come forth such as they would have it, and might serve their purpose both as to themselves and as to the Gentiles. This they established and strengthened by their own authority, not as a pure version, and such as was to be recommended to their countrymen, but as fit enough to stop the mouths and satisfy the curiosity of the heathen, and lest any among them might attempt another, in which those cautions and provisions might not be sufficiently observed.

This they laid up in their Sanhedrims and synagogues, that it might be ready, and shown to the heathen as a symbol and token of the Jewish law, faith, and religion, if at any time the matter and necessity called for some such thing.

We grant, therefore, to Justin Martyr, that that version was in the synagogues and hands of the Jews; but one would not conclude from that, that it was read in the synagogue instead of the Hebrew text. And we will yield also to Tertullian, that that version was read at Rome in his age, in the synagogues of the Jews; but being compelled so to do by that suspicion whereof we spake, namely, that it might be known to all what the law and religion of the Jews was, whether it consisted with the Roman government. Our question is, Whether the Hellenists chose to themselves the reading of the Greek version, and neglected the Hebrew text; and

seeing for the most part they lived by their own laws and ordinances, you will hardly any where show me, especially in the times of the apostles, concerning which we speak, or in the times before them, that they were compelled to reject the one and to read the other.

And as to that which is objected concerning Philo and Josephus, it is no wonder if they, writing for the heathen, followed that version which was designedly made for the heathen.

But that is of the greatest weight of all, which is objected concerning the evangelists and apostles who embraced that version in their quotations out of the Old Testament. To which the answer is very easy; namely, those holy writers had to do with two sorts of men, Jews and Gentiles: the volume of the New Testament was in the hands of both. A Gentile desires to examine the quotations which are brought out of the Old Testament; but not understanding the Hebrew, whither should he go but to the Greek version which he understands? So that it was not only *ἐκ στυκαταβάσεως*, out of condescension, that those holy writers followed the Greek version, but out of pure necessity: for otherwise it was impossible that their allegations out of the Law and the Prophets could be examined by the Gentiles. And if a Jew, having the New Testament in his hand, should complain and quarrel that in their quotations they departed from the Hebrew text, they had an answer ready, viz. this very version which<sup>u</sup> is cited is that very same which ye have written, published, and propounded to the world, as the symbol and token of your law<sup>x</sup> and religion, and as your own very Bible.

If we would designedly attempt a full disquisition concerning that version, we might, it may be, more at large demonstrate all these things which have been spoken, by various instances, reasons, and methods. But let this suffice at present. This discourse was raised by occasion of the mention of the 'unknown tongue,' chap. xiv, which we suppose was Hebrew, formerly used in the Hellenistical synagogue of the Corinthians, and which they would retain, being now converted to the gospel; too much wresting to Judaism the gift of tongues, in the same manner as they did the other privi-

<sup>u</sup> *English folio edit.*, vol. ii. p. 811.    <sup>x</sup> *Leusden's edit.*, vol. ii. p. 940.

leges and ordinances of the gospel; and using an unknown language so much the rather, because the gift of tongues was granted from Heaven, using it to an end plainly contrary to the gift itself; unhappily perverting it, and not requiring, not admitting now an interpreter, [which before was done by them,] as if they thought God had given unknown tongues to be unknown to all besides those to whom they were given.

In what I have said of the Greek version, and of the not reading it among the Hellenists, I know I have very learned men differing in their opinions from me; and heretofore I myself was of a contrary judgment. Whence, I hope, the reader will be the more easily persuaded that I do not speak these things from a desire of contention, but from a serious inquiry, as far as I am able, into the thing, from often repeated thoughts, and a most hearty desire of searching after truth.