

ANIMADVERSIONS

On the Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle

TO THE ROMANS, IN WHICH,

By comparing the SYRIAC, ARABIC, VULGATE, ERASMUS'

& BEZA'S versions, the more difficult passages,

and especially those passed over by others, are illustrated.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A Gleaning on the rest of the same Apostle's,

as well as the Catholic Epistles.

BY THE AUTHOR

LUDOVICUS DE DIEU.

NOT ALONE

LEIDEN.

From the Workshop of the Elzeviers.

A.D. 1646.

To the most Illustrious and Learned Men,

D. JOHANNES DERRAMOUTIUS, AND D. ABRAHAMUS HEYDANUS,

Most Vigilant Pastors of the Church of Leiden.

This posthumous offspring of an excellent parent we inscribe to your name, most Illustrious Men, which seemed not so much to go to you as to hasten of its own accord. For committed to your care and judgment, although imperfect and lacking the final polish, you nevertheless judged it worthy to see this public light. Wherefore it was right that it should now have as patrons those to whom it in a way owed its life; nor can you forsake it, when, by your authority, it is exposed to the judgments and censure of all.

Added to this is your inviolate and incomparable friendship with our author and parent, which after his death you testified with such piety, love, and services towards us, our most sweet mother and sisters, that we would be ungrateful if we did not publicly profess how much we owe you. Your other merits and virtues, your knowledge and science of divine matters, your singular pursuit of peace, your consummate eloquence, and other things which either the common people or the learned esteem or care for, we do not touch upon here. We know your modesty; and calumny has made it so that not even the most malicious can any longer doubt them. Brought into the greatest odium, you preferred to neglect your reputation for a time rather than your conscience or the peace and tranquility of the Church, safe in the patronage of truth alone against the rumors of the fickle and incautious populace.

An example worthy of imitation in this age, in which all things are full of controversies, and very many theologians, savagely pitted against each other, present a most pleasing spectacle to the enemies of the reformed religion. May God, the Best and Greatest, always preserve this mind in you, and preserve you for the Church and for us for as long as possible.

April 24, 1646.

Bound to you by every duty,

DANIEL AND LUDOVICUS DE DIEU.

THE PRINTERS TO THE READER.

We finally give to you, Reader, although somewhat later than we wished, the most learned commentary on the divine Epistle of Paul to the Romans by the man of blessed memory, D. Ludovicus de Dieu, a most eminent theologian: which he had completed in this form, as you see, a few days before his death, so that it might be a successor to his brilliant works on the Gospels and the Apostolic writings, and a pledge of the commentaries to follow on the remaining Epistles. In this work, we present for your eyes his singular precision (*ἀκριβειαν*) in uncovering the meaning of the Holy Spirit, by which he has happily elucidated and explained, beyond what can be said, the most difficult and most debated passages of that Epistle, and those untouched by most interpreters.

If we can judge anything, this labor is worthy to see the light after the animadversions of all, whoever have earned some name in this field of study, and to be read diligently. For whatever was passed over or neglected by others, our author has so taken up as to make it his own: whatever was accepted with little skill or soundness, he has so illustrated by introducing a new light, that he has not only alleviated the labor of investigation for others, but has also made it unnecessary in most cases. So that one must marvel that such a great treasure of all- Tÿ- p - A n i - kinds of erudition could be contained in such brief spaces. Add to these a perspicuity that rivals brevity, which so satisfies the reader's attention and desire that it never fails or sends him away empty. Many things were of assistance to this divine man here; an immense knowledge of the languages of the East, by which sacred erudition is acquired, and without which such things are not even to be attempted, a precise examination of the rites and customs of all nations, especially the Jewish, a constant and uninterrupted reading and comparison of the divine word, and what I consider chief, the daily exercise of piety and prayer.

By all these things he achieved that whatever in this field can be acquired by labor, study, industry, and even divine help, all that was generously granted to him by the divine Power. How excellently it would go with human affairs, and what a splendid addition would be made to our studies, if sacred interpreters would choose to follow this path, which is shown here, and would prefer to occupy themselves with unsaid things, rather than to offer their rhapsodies and ill-digested centos to the world! But this is the vice of our age, which, as everywhere, so also here, labors under its own weight. It is truly to be lamented that by the premature death of this distinguished man, the commentaries on the remaining Epistles have been cut off from us, which we would have had as plain twins to these, if this had not happened. However, lest you should be entirely without them, provision has been made by the Gleaning, which we subjoin to these. Farewell, candid Reader, and, if you prove to us that these things have not been unpleasing to you, expect shortly from our press Notes by the same hand on the more difficult passages of the Old Testament.

'κατα'πνεῦμα ἁγίωσύνης' are opposed as two natures in Christ, the Orthodox have preferred to render it "the Spirit of sanctification," and by it to understand the divine nature of Christ. That this is done correctly is taught quite clearly in the Myrothecium of Cameron. But grant to the adversary and enemy of Christ's divinity that the Holy Spirit is understood here, even so I affirm that the divine nature of Christ is asserted. For since the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, having his essence communicated from the Son, of the same essence in number with the Son, and, as is the 'περιχώρησις' of the divine persons in one another, always existing in him, it seems rightly said that Christ is the Son of God according to the Holy Spirit, that is, according to the divine essence, which the Holy Spirit has from the Son, and in the Son, and which therefore the Son has the same as he. For, as Damascenus speaks of the Trinity, 'ἀχώριστοι τοιγαροῦν αἰὺ ποσταί σεις, καὶ ἀνεκφοίτητοι ἄλλη ἄλων εἰσὶν, ἀσυγχύτως ἐχουσαι τὴν ἐν ἄλλῃ ἴλαις περιχώρησιν'. "The persons cannot be separated, nor depart from one another, since, though unconfusedly, they mutually permeate each other." As if they mutually enter into one another by way of a circuit, and contain each other. For that is the force of the word 'περιχωρήσεως'. Nor does it seem that it should be passed over, that among the arguments by which Christ the God-man (θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος) is proven to be true God, almost the most effective is that which is drawn from the relation between Christ and the Holy Spirit, which far exceeds the condition of any creature.

For hence that man is said to be anointed with the Holy Spirit above all his companions, because he is the same God, Ps. 45:8. The Spirit of God in the form of a dove sat upon him, because he is the same beloved son of God, Matt. 3. Hence Christ says, "The Father will send him in my name." John 14:26. "I will send him from the Father." John 15:26 & 16:7. "He will testify of me." John 15:26. "He will glorify me." John 16:14. "For he will take from what is mine." Ibid. "For all that the Father has is mine; therefore I said that he will take from what is mine." Ibid. v. 15. All of which are such that they cannot belong to a creature, since the Holy Spirit cannot depend on it in that way.

It follows in the same place, 'ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν'. Which the Syriac and Arabic have rightly interpreted not of the resurrection of other dead, but of Christ himself from the dead. See the notes of Beza, especially of Erasmus, which are most learned here. To which we add that 'ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν' and 'τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν' are commonly used in exactly the same sense. Compare I Cor. 15:12, 13, etc. with Luke 20:35 and Acts 4:2. And so according to that phrase, 'ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν', that is 'τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν', can also be attributed to one man. Hence it is that in Acts 17:32 it is said of the Athenians, 'ἀκούσαντες δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν', although Paul in verse 31 had spoken only of the resurrection of Christ. Thus Paul in Phil. 3:11 desires to 'καταντῆναι εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν'. Not indeed in the sense that he might attain to the resurrection of other dead, but that he himself might one day rise blessedly from the dead. But even if the resurrection of other dead were understood here, from that too the divinity of Christ is most validly proven, because it depends

on his power. For hence Christ in John 5:21 proves himself equal to the Father, because just as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will.

VERSE 5.

'Δι' οὐ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἑνὶ ἰστέω ζην πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὑπερ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ.
οὐ'. The Syriac rendered it as if one were to read, 'δι' οὐ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἑνὶ ἰστέω ζην τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ'.

And he took 'εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἑνὶ ἰστέω' for 'εἰς τοῦ ὑπακούειν τῆ ἰστέω'. But it is far better to keep the order of the words, and to translate everything literally, so that the Apostle's meaning is, that he received the grace of apostleship, to bring about faith in all nations, which is pure obedience. And that this grace was not given to him for his own name, or that of any other creature, but for the name of Christ alone, so that he would preach neither himself, nor others, but Christ. But why is obedience attributed to faith? Not only because by faith we obey all the precepts of God, but because faith itself consists in obedience. For faith does not rest on reasons, but on the truthfulness, authority, and command of God who speaks. Why do I believe that there are three persons in God, that Christ is the God-man (θεοῦ ἄνθρωπον), that his death is an expiation for sins? Because God, who cannot lie and is the Lord of all, testifies these things about himself and his Son, and commands us to believe. To subject our mind and reason to God here, is to obey.

VERSE 6. 'Ἐνοῖξέστε καὶ ὑμεῖς, κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ'. The Syriac, 'ܐܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܚܝܢܐ ܕܝܫܘܥܝܢܐ ܕܚܝܫܬܐ ܕܚܝܫܬܐ ܕܚܝܫܬܐ'. Lessius Tremellius: "Among whom you also were called in Jesus Christ." Translate, "among whom you also are, called in Jesus Christ." The first 'ܐܘܢܝܢܐ' is a pronoun equivalent to "are": the second, a substantive verb, to which a distinction is subjoined, just as in the Greek. Furthermore, 'κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ', the Syriac translates, "called in Jesus Christ." Beza better, "by Jesus Christ." I praise the Vulgate, however, which has literally, "called of Jesus Christ." 'ܕܝܫܘܥܝܢܐ ܕܚܝܫܬܐ ܕܚܝܫܬܐ'. For that construction has a remarkable emphasis. Just as when in Mark 13:27 Christ is said to be about to gather 'τοῦ ζελεκτου' ζαυτοῦ', I would not translate "the elect by him," but "his elect," i.e., those whom he has for his own by election. So also here, not only is the grace of Christ, by which he called them, designated, but also the dominion of Christ, by which he henceforth has them as his own by the power of his call. As in Isa. 48:12 'ܝܫܪܐܝܝܠ ܕܝܫܘܥܝܢܐ' "Israel, my called," that is, you who are not only called by me, but so called that you are mine. And this title, this right and dominion over the Church, the God of Israel alone claims for himself. From which it must be concluded that Christ is true God by this very name, because the faithful are called his called.

VERSE 9. 'ὃ λατρεύων ἐν πνεύματι μου'. The Greek manuscripts do not vary here, nor does the Vulgate from them. The Syriac simply 'ܕܢܝܫܘܥܝܢܐ' "in spirit," or "by the Spirit." Since this can be referred to the Holy Spirit, the Arabic has translated

'الذين يعرفون القسط ويرتكبون الاثم' "who know the truth, and commit injustice." That is, who, having known the truth, are nevertheless most wicked, and so they indeed hold the truth, but mixed with unrighteousness. It does not seem that he took 'κατεῖχεν' for "to hold back," i.e., "to suppress," but simply for "to hold," or "to contain," or "to possess." As also the Syriac, who translates 'ܕܠܝܫܕܝܒܝܢܝܢ' "they have, hold, possess." In which sense 'κατεῖχεν' is used in I Cor. 7:30 and 2 Cor. 6:10. Nor do I deny that it has a correct sense in this place. But it seems, however, that something greater and more effective is said here. Namely, that they "hold the truth in unrighteousness," that is, they guard it, they hold it firmly, so that it cannot be separated from it. In the same sense that the pious "hold 'τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ' in a good and honest heart," Luke 8:15. Or they hold it captive in unrighteousness, so that it is not its own master, but is bound to acknowledge the dominion of sin. In the same sense that someone is said 'κατεῖχεται νοσήματι' "to be held by a disease," John 5:4. And as before redemption we were said 'κατεῖχεται ἐν νόμῳ' "to be held in the law," Rom. 7:6, because 'ἐκυριεύετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος' "it had dominion over the man." v. 1. Or finally, "in unrighteousness," that is, "by unrighteousness" to retain, delay, impede, so that the truth cannot exert its force. In which way in 2 Thess. 2:6, 7, the Roman empire is said 'κατεῖχοντο ἡμεῖς τὸν υἱὸν τῆς ἀπωλείας', "to restrain the son of perdition," so that the mystery of iniquity would not immediately break forth into the open. Unrighteousness is indeed most opposed to truth, and destroys it, as darkness does light. Whence Ali rightly and most elegantly said 'ظلمة الجور تطفئ نور الإيمان' "the darkness of unrighteousness extinguishes the light of faith."

VERSE 19. 'Διοτι το γνωστον του θεου φανερον εστιν εν αυτοις'. Just as in Rom. 2:4, 'το χρηστον του θεου' is 'ἡ χρηστοτης', so here the Syriac and Arabic took 'το γνωστον του θεου' for 'ἡ γνωσισις του θεου', the knowledge of God, taken passively, that is, by which God is known by men. This knowledge is manifest in them, that is, 'ܘܫܡܝܗܘܢ ܕܒܘܢܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܗܘܢ' "for men have it by nature, that from creatures they know their creator," says the Syriac Scholiast.

VERSE 20. 'Τα γαρ ρα ορατα του αυτου απο κτισεως κοσμου, τοις ποιημασι νοου μενα καθαροται'. Here the Syriac is most worthy of careful consideration. It has it thus: 'ܘܫܡܝܗܘܢ ܕܒܘܢܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܗܘܢ' (Bod. in Paris.) "For the hidden things of God from the foundations of the world, are seen in his creatures through the intellect." Badly, "in his creatures." Worse in the Royal Bibles, "from his creation." Translate, "are seen by his creatures," in the Dative case. Or "from his creatures." For the Syrians often use the Dative for the Ablative with the preposition 'ܐܘܢܝܢ'. See Mat. 14:8. Luke 23:41. 1 Tim. 4:4. John 13:2. Such also is that in Matthew 5, 'ἔρρεθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις', "it was said to the ancients," for "by the ancients." So here the Syriac thought 'τοῖς ποιήμασι καθαροται' to be, "are seen by creatures," that is, by creatures endowed with reason. Just as very frequently among the Hebrews 'ברייה' "creature" signifies man absolutely. And 'κλίσις' in Mark 16:15. But especially to be noted is the distinction in the Syriac, by which he does not construe 'ἀπο κτισεως κοσμου', as many do, with the following 'καθοροται', as if

the meaning were, "The invisible things of God have been made visible in creatures ever since the creation of the world," but with the preceding 'ἀόρατα'. So that the sense is, "Although God is invisible, and all his things are invisible, namely his eternal power and divinity, and have not been seen by any eyes since the creation of the world, nor could they be seen, yet men have no reason to complain that the knowledge of God has not been revealed to them." For although those things of God are 'ἀόρατα', yet they are 'νοούμενα', and are seen by rational creatures through the intellect. The same sense remains, even if by 'τοῖς ποιήμασι' you understand not men, but other created things. Namely, "that the things of God which have been, and are, and will be always invisible since the creation of the world, are seen, being understood through the things that are made." The Arab in almost the same way as the Syriac: 'واسرار الله منذ وضع اساس العالم انما يستبين للخلافة بالفكر والتفهم'. "And the secrets of God since the laying of the foundations of the world, indeed appear to his creatures through thought and understanding."

VERSE 21. 'Οὐχ ὥς θεοῦ νέδο' ξασαν'. The Arab 'كما كان يجبله' "as was fitting for him, as was becoming to him."

VERSE 23. 'Καὶ ἠλλαξαν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ ἕνεκα τοῦ εἰκόνα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου'. The phrase is taken from Ps. 106:20. 'וימירו את כבודם בתבנית שור'. "And they changed their glory into the likeness of a calf." The LXX have it thus, except that for 'αὐτῶν' "their," they said 'αὐτοῦ' "his," as if they had read 'כבודו'. Furthermore, 'ἐνόμοιωμα εἰκόνα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου' Beza translates, "into the fashioned image of a man." I prefer the Arab, who said 'شبه صورة الانسان' "the likeness of the form of a man." For 'εἰκὼν' denotes not only the image or effigy of the form of a thing, which here is indicated by 'ὁμοίωμα', and it would be a tautology if 'εἰκὼν' here meant the same thing, but also the form itself, the figure, and as it were, the face of the thing. Hesychius: 'Εἰκὼν, χαρακτήρ, ὄψις', "effigy, face." And so 'εἰκὼν' is taken when man is said to be created 'κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ' "according to the image of God." For it is not understood to be a certain image expressed from God, according to which man was created. For so it would be the image of an image expressed from God. But that very thing which is in God, which comes under the name of form or species anthropopathically. Because just as a painter cannot express the very essence of a man, but only his external form or appearance, so a certain form and appearance, as it were, is attributed to God, to which as to an archetype ('ἀρχέτυπον') man, the copy ('ἔκτυπον'), was formed. So here 'εἰκὼν ἀνθρώπου' is the archetype, but the copy is 'τοῦ ὁμοίωμα' or the idol, representing the appearance of a man.

But it is useful to examine what is meant by 'ἠλλαξαν εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἕνεκα τοῦ εἰκόνα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου'. It is a certain change, by which a thing becomes other than it was. In this sense, in the resurrection 'πάντες ἀλλαγῆσομεθα', I Cor. 15:51. Paul wishes 'ἀλλαξαι τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ', Gal. 4:20. The heavens 'ἀλλαγῆσονται', Heb. 1:12. This cannot be attributed to the incorruptible

God, whose glory cannot become other. Nor to the truth, about which Paul says below in v. 25, 'μετη'λλαξαντη'νάλη'θειαντοῦθεοῦἐντῷψευ'δει'. For the truth of God cannot become other than it is. There is also another kind of change, which consists in exchange, by which one thing is exchanged for another. The Arab took this passage in this way, when he rendered 'واستبدلوا مجد الله الذي لا يفسد بشبه صورة الانسان الفاسد' "they exchanged in (that is, for) the glory of God, whom corruption does not touch, the likeness of the form of corruptible man." That is, just as money is exchanged for merchandise, so that money is received in place of merchandise, so they exchanged the effigy of man for the glory of God, so that this is received in its place. And observe, the verb 'استبدل', which means to exchange one thing for another, is constructed with "Beth" for the thing which is lost in the exchange, and with the Accusative for the thing which is acquired by the exchange. The Arabs observe the same construction when they express this exchange with the verb "to buy." Such are the examples in the Quran, Surah Baqarah, 'الذين اشتروا الضلالة بالهدى بما ربحوا تجارتهم' "who bought error with the right way (properly, in the right way) but their trade was not profitable." He taxes the infidels, who instituted an exchange between the right doctrine of truth and errors, leaving the former to seize the latter. Ibidem, 'لا تشتروا آياتي بثمن قليل' "do not buy with my verses (properly, in my verses) a cheap price," that is, do not exchange these my Quranic verses, which offer you eternal life, for the most vile things of this world, so that you lose them for the sake of these.

On the other hand, when they allude to this exchange with the verb "to sell," the verb is constructed with "Beth" for the thing which is acquired by the exchange, and with the Accusative for the thing which is lost. Such is the case in the sentences of Ali under the letter 'ب', 'بع الدنيا بالآخر فتربح' "sell the world for the future life, (properly, in the future life) you will make a profit." The sense is, exchange the world for the future life. And the Hebrew verbs 'המיר' and 'החליף', denoting such an exchange, have this same construction. As in Lev. 27:10, 'לא יקח לי פגון לא ימיר את טובו ברעו ערב טובו באדם מירב בהמה בהמה הקהה והוא ותויתו הקהה וש' Which literally in Hellenistic Greek sounds like, 'οὐκ ἄλλα' ξειαὐτο', και' οὐ μεταλλα' ξειαὐτο', καλο' νένπονηρῶ, οὐδε' πονηρο' νένκαλω. ἐὰν δε' ἄλλα' σσωνάλλα' ξηκτῆνοξένκτη' νει, ἔστιαὐτο' και' το' ἄλλαγμα αὐτοῦ ἄγιον'. The same construction is in Ps. 106:20. 'וימירו את רבובו בקרבנותיו' the sense is, "they exchanged their most glorious God for the image of an ox." So Jer. 2:11. 'עמי יהי רבוב דודו ופלוזיועיל' "my people have exchanged their glory for something useless." You see the thing that is lost in the exchange is in the Accusative, that which is acquired is constructed with "in". The Apostle has imitated this same construction, and in the same sense, here: 'ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν, &c. ἐν ὁμοιώματι'. And the sense here is indeed most manifest in v. 25, where it is explained how 'μετη'λλαξαντη'νάλη'θειαντοῦθεοῦἐντῷψευ'δει'. Namely, because 'ἐσεβα'σθησαν και' ἐλάτρευσαν τῆκτῖ'σειπαρὰ το' νκτῖ'σαντα'. The sense is, that they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, inasmuch as they exchanged God for creatures, worshipping these rather than him. In which worship it is most usual for Scripture to call images of creatures 'שקר, הבל, און' or nothing, vanity, a lie.

quotes, explaining this passage, called, if I am not mistaken, a "mutual reward," that is, a "talion," by which not just any compensation is returned, but the very same thing as the sin. What the Hebrews call 'מדה כנגד מדה'. The sense is: They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of corruptible things, and thus truly defiled the glory of God. God punished them with a precisely similar penalty, when he so handed them over to themselves, that women changing the natural use of men, and men the natural use of women into that which is against nature, they defiled their own bodies in themselves. Most inept therefore are the patrons of God's Holiness, and truly injurious to His Justice, who deny that God punishes sins with sins. Nothing is more usual for God than to compensate disobedience with disobedience in turn. To which pertains the saying of Ben Asai in Pirke Aboth ch. 4. 'הוֹרֵץ לְמִצְוֵה קְלָה כְּכַח מוֹרָה וְבוֹרוֹחַ מִן הָעֲבִירָה שֶׁמִּצְוֵה גּוֹרֵר מִצְוֵה עֲבִירָה גּוֹרֵר עֲבִירָה שֶׁשְׂכָר מִצְוֵה מִצְוֵה וְשִׂכְרָה עֲבִירָה עֲבִירָה'.

"Hasten to a light precept as to a grave one, and flee from transgression. For precept draws precept, and transgression draws transgression. Because the reward of a precept is a precept, and of a transgression, a transgression."

VERSE 28. "And as they did not think it worthwhile to have God in their knowledge." The Vulgate and Erasmus, "And as they did not approve." Beza, "it seemed good to them." The Syriac and Arabic, "they judged in themselves." Then they translate, "to know God." Erasmus, "to acknowledge." As if they are blamed because they indeed knew God, as was said before, but having known him, they did not acknowledge him. Beza, "to retain in knowledge." I praise the Vulgate, which rendered literally, "to have in knowledge." Where "in" for me is "through." "To have" is "to possess." "They approved" is "they approved, they judged it excellent and worthy." Many indeed know God, who yet do not have or possess him through knowledge. And they so disapprove of that possession, that it does not seem worthwhile to them to devote themselves to it. They know God, but they value him so little that to have him is not approved by them, since they prefer to have idols and other creatures in his place. 'Ἐπιγνώσις' is 'γνώσις', as in Col. 1:9, I Tim. 2:4, 2 Tim. 2:25, & 3:7, and often elsewhere. And 'ἐπιγινώσκειν' for 'γινώσκειν' in Mark 5:30, Acts 27:39, and elsewhere. Nor does the emphasis of the pronunciation fall on 'ἐνεπιγνώσει', but on the verb 'ἔχειν'.

It follows, "God gave them over to a debased mind." Beza, "to a mind devoid of all judgment." The Syriac seems to have meant the same thing, when he translated 'ܠܡܝܢ ܥܡܘܢܐ' "to an empty mind," that is, void of all sincere judgment, or "to a vain mind," 'εἰς νοῦν μάταιον'. Just as above in v. 21, for 'ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογοῖσι αὐτῶν' he said, 'ܠܘܫܐܒܘܬܐ ܕܡܝܢ ܕܡܝܢܐܘܬܐ'. I do not see why we should not translate with the Vulgate and Erasmus, "to a reprobate mind." For by that is not meant a mind placed by an eternal decree of reprobation beyond the hope of grace and conversion, in which sense the reprobate are opposed to the elect, but one which is like reprobate or debased money, which, having no value in itself, is useless for the purpose of trade and for acquiring merchandise for oneself. Thus a reprobate mind is one which has nothing excellent, nothing

worthy of God, nothing of value for piety, nothing for which it might be approved by God. And so it is disapproved by God, just as God was disapproved by them, when 'οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν αὐτὸ νῆχειν ἐν ἐπιγνωσίῃ', that is, they did not consider him of such value that they would approve the possession of knowing him, and diligently devote themselves to it. In 2 Tim. 3:8, men are mentioned who are 'κατεφθαρμένοι τοῦ νοῦν, ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν'. And Tit. 1:16. 'Προὶ πάντων ἔργων ἀγαθῶν ἀδόκιμοι'. That is, 'ἄχρηστοι', and therefore 'ἀποβλητοί'. So here an 'ἀδόκιμος νοῦς' is a mind useless for all piety and justice, and therefore to be rejected.

VERSE 29. 'Κακοῦθεις'. Erasmus, "endowed with evil habits." He followed the composition of the word. For 'κακοῦς' is "evil," 'ἦθος' is "custom." Thus Hesychius interprets 'κακοῦθεις' by 'κακοτρόπον', and 'κακοῦθεις' by 'κακοτροπίαις'. The Vulgate and Beza, "malignity." Beza cites Aristotle, who defines 'κακοῦθειαν' as 'τὸ ἐπὶ τὸ χειρὸν ὑπολαμβάνειν πάντα', "when we interpret everything for the worse with a perverse suspicion." Whence he says that old men are generally 'κακοῦθεις', "suspicious." The Syriac seems to have taken it thus, when he translated 'ܠܥܬܘܠܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐ' "and with evil thoughts," such as are those of suspicious men. So also the Arabic.

VERSE 30. "And haters of God." The Syriac 'ܠܥܬܘܠܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐ'. Tremellius: "and hating God." Bodleian: "and haters of God." The Syriac would say that as 'ܠܥܬܘܠܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐ' or 'ܠܥܬܘܠܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐܘܪܘܬܐ'. But what occurs in this place is passive. See Matthew 10:22 and 24:9; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; Titus 1:16. Therefore, it should be translated, "and hated by God." Thus the Arabic 'وهم مبغضون لله' "and they are hated by God." Erasmus and Beza translate 'θεοστυγεῖς' as "haters of God." The Vulgate better, "hateful to God." Hesychius: 'θεοστυγῆς μισοῦμενος ὑπὸ θεοῦ'. Glossary: 'θεοστυγῆς' "hated by God." Just as 'βροτοστυγῆς' is "hated by men" in Aeschylus. Neither the Greek manuscripts, nor the Vulgate, nor the Syriac or Arabic read 'θεοφιλεῖς'.

It follows, "inventors of evil things." For since the human soul is sagacious, when abandoned by God it becomes most sagacious in evil things. I am pleased also to learn an excellent sentence on this matter from the most impure impostor Muhammad, which is found in the Surah of Joseph: 'إِنَّ النَّفْسَ لَمَّارٌ قَبِيلُ السُّوءِ' "indeed the soul is a diligent promoter of evil." Properly, "busy in evil," as if you would say "most occupied in evils." But Solomon spoke more effectively in Prov. 16:27. 'אִישׁ בְּלִיעַלְכָּר הֵרָעָה' "a man of worthlessness digs up evil," i.e., he strives to find evil in no other way than miners do gold in mines. H. Stephanus: 'ἐφευρετής' "inventor, contriver." Hence you would rightly translate 'ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν' as "contrivers of evil things." Suidas rendered it, 'τὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς παλαιοῖς κακοῖς ἔτερα καινοτομοῦντας κακά', "those who devise new evils in addition to the old ones."

VERSE 31. 'Ἀσυνθεῖ τους'. Beza rightly, "covenant-breakers." And Erasmus, "not at all keepers of pacts." Hesychius translates it, 'μηῖ ἐμμένοντας ταῖς συνθηκαῖς', "not abiding by covenants." He adds 'μηῖ συνθεμίμενους', "not composed." Thus in this place the

Hence Erasmus: *and you approve excellent things*. As also the Vulgate at Philippians 1:10 translates *potiora* (better things). But in this place, it has *utilia* (useful things). For \διαφέρον is sometimes the same as \συμφέρον, *to be conducive, to be useful*. It also means *to relate, to matter, to pertain*. The Glossary has \διαφέρει *interest, refert* (it matters, it concerns). Thus they often say, οὐδέ'νσοιδιαφέρει, *it does not concern you at all, it is nothing to you*. \Διαφέρει σοι τοῦτο, *this is of interest to you*. Hence \τὸ διαφέρον, *what is of interest, what pertains to some matter*, is required for it, and is necessary for it. Thus Epictetus in the Enchiridion, paragraph 32, after having taught that those who invite to dinner do not do it for free, but sell the dinner for a price, since they wish to be praised and honored, adds, \δὸς οὖν τὸ διαφέρον, εἴ σοι λυσιτελεῖ, \ὄσου πωλεῖται, *give, therefore, what is of interest, or what is required, if it is useful to you, for which it is sold*. So here \τὰ διαφέροντα could be the necessary things, which are of interest and are required for salvation, and pertain to the glory of God.

VERS. 20. \Ἐχοντα τὴν μὀρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. The Vulgate and Erasmus have: *having the form of knowledge etc*. Correctly. But not in the sense in which Hypocrites are said to have \μὀρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, *a form*, i.e., an external appearance and semblance, of piety, 1 Timothy 3:5. For the construction is, \Πέποιθας σεαυτὸν εἶναι ἔχοντα τὴν μὀρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως. And they did not consider that they had nothing but a shadow and an appearance, even if in reality it was so: but they gloried in the most solid knowledge of the truth. Therefore, here \μὀρφωσις τῆς ἀληθείας is the same as \τύπος τῆς διδαχῆς, Romans 6:17. A *Form*, that is, taken both passively, by which they boasted themselves to be informed by the law, which you could call the *formation* of knowledge and truth; and actively, by which they gloried in being able to inform others in turn, which the distinguished Beza called *information*. The Syriac and Arabic translator rendered \ܡܘܨܘܫܐ *similitudinem* (a likeness), that is, an image which would represent the whole body and conformation of the truth as if in a picture and likeness, which the Apostle called \ὑποτύπωσιν ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων in 2 Timothy 1:13.

VERS. 25. \Ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ᾖς. The Syriac version literally says: *you pass by for yourself from the law*, which Tremellius renders: *if you recoil from the law*. I note this to observe what it properly means to transgress the law. For *trans* there does not mean *beyond*, as when someone is said to cross a river, that is, to go to its further bank, which is called \διαβαίνειν and \διέρχεσθαι by the Greeks, but *past, alongside*, as one is said to pass a house, who goes past it, and having left it to the side passes by, which the Greeks properly call \παραβαίνειν, and \παρέρχεσθαι. A \Παραβάτης of the law, therefore, is one who, knowing the law set for him, does not approach it, but passes it by, and passing it as if left to the side, departs from it.

VERS. 26. \Εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται. In Chrysostom, one reads \περιτραπήσεται. Then in the Commentary, he says it reads \μετατραπήσεται. Finally, he adds, \οὐκ εἶπε λογισθήσεται, ἀλλὰ τραπήσεται, ὃ ἐστὶ ἐμφατικώτερον. This is truly strange, since the

Greek manuscripts, along with the Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic, consistently read \λογισθήσεται.

VERS. 27. \Καὶ κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα etc. The Syriac, and from it the Arabic translator, rendered these things improperly, as if it had been read, \καὶ κρινεῖ ἀκροβυστία, ἡ ἐκ φύσεως τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα. They seem to have thought that the same people are described here as were mentioned above in verse 14, of whom it was said that \φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου πράσσουσι. But these passages are very different. For that the Gentiles by nature do what is of the law can happen by the force of the law of nature; but that they should so fulfill the law from nature that their foreskin is reckoned to them for Circumcision, this far surpasses the powers of nature and its law. For it includes the circumcision of the heart, which is the very promise of the covenant of grace, Deuteronomy 30:6. But that some wish to imply by \τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα a perfect performance, absolute in all its parts, is frivolous. For in Syriac, which was the vernacular for the Apostles at that time, \νόμον πράσσειν and \τελεῖν are the same. This can be clear even from verse 25, where for \ἐὰν νόμον πράσσης, the Syriac has the same word that it used here for \τελεῖν. And in chapter 5:3, for \θλίμης ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, *affliction works patience*, the Syriac has, it works in us. Such is that of James 2, verse 8. \Εἰ μέντοι νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικόν. *If therefore you fulfill the royal law*, that is, in such a way that you do not violate by partiality the charity commanded by the law. The Apostle James did not even dream of full perfection, who in chapter 3:1 says that we all stumble in many things. I add that of Galatians 5:16. *Walk by the Spirit, and you will not fulfill* (\μὴ τελέσητε) *the desire of the flesh*. So also here, *And that which is by nature the foreskin, fulfilling the law, will condemn*. It follows, \τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου. How indeed was the Jew a transgressor of the law through the letter and Circumcision? It is correct what the distinguished Beza says, that the Apostle implies that the Jews are not only not justified by external circumcision, when they were transgressors of the law, but also that they are made more guilty by that very circumcision, which they profaned. Just as the baptized, who pollute themselves more each day, are made more subject to the wrath of God by the very fact that they are baptized. We add that the hypocrites of the Jews, against whom the Apostle here argues, became more secure and bolder in sinning from the law itself, written by the divine fingers, and from Circumcision. For since the written law of God, and that famous sign of the covenant, Circumcision, were two most excellent testimonies of divine love, and the most illustrious privileges of the Jewish people, they thought they always had a reason to rest in the law, and to glory in God, the author of the law and of Circumcision, as the Apostle said above in v. 17, even if they indulged their sins more freely. And thus they truly became transgressors of the law through the letter of the law and Circumcision. What sanctity and glory, then, did those things bring, which they themselves even abused for sinning? And the Arabic translator seems to have seen this, when for \διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς, he said *from your writing and your circumcision*, as if to say, from the very fact that you have the written law, and that you are circumcised, you take the opportunity to transgress the law.

translated *the oracles of God were entrusted to them*. In which way אֱתֵּימָן is also used in the said place Galatians 2, v. 7, and 1 Timothy 1:11, Titus 1:3. In the Arabic, there is no ambiguity, which, choosing the first way, translates *first, this is the verification of the word of God*. The sense is that the privilege of circumcision, and therefore of the Jewish nation, is great, and this indeed is the chief one, that through it the truth and faith of the promises of God were asserted. Which opinion seems to agree very well with what follows. For the Apostle rightly infers from it that, even if some were unfaithful, their unbelief could not abrogate the faith of God. Because it was not due to the oracles of God that they were not received by faith, since their faith was confirmed by circumcision among them.

VERS. 3. \Εἰ γὰρ ἠπίστησάν τινες; Beza, *if some were unfaithful?* I would prefer, with the Vulgate, Erasmus, Syriac, and Arabic, *if some were unbelieving?* or *if they did not believe*. And \ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν *their unbelief*, rather than *unfaithfulness*. For I think they are accused because they did not have faith in the oracles of God, confirmed and established by Circumcision. And yet, Circumcision was not deprived of its usefulness on that account. For the faith of God, i.e., the truth of His promise, which He had sealed with Circumcision, could not be abolished by their unbelief. The Apostle said, \μη ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ καταργήσῃ; *Will their unbelief abolish the faith of God?* The Vulgate, *shall make void*. Where the distinguished Beza notes that Cyprian read *has made void*. I add, and the Syriac rendered it with the preterite. But the Arabic with the future. The sense comes to the same thing. For "will it make void?" is equivalent to "shall we say it has made void?" for the matter being discussed is not future, but past.

VERS. 4. \μη γένοιτο. The Syriac, about which we said something at Matthew 16:22. Here, however, something must be added, because it may rightly seem unusual to many that *absit* (far be it) is rendered by the preterite, which means *he has spared*. But we note that it is most common for Orientals to express their wishes in the preterite. Hence among the Rabbis נִטְרָה רְחֻמָּא וּפְרֻקָּה (which they usually write abbreviated) properly means *the merciful God has guarded him and delivered him*, for *may He guard and deliver him*. It is a euphemism for the living. So among the Arabs, a euphemism for Muhammad is \صلي الله عليه, *may God bless him*. For his first followers, such as Ali, Abu Bakr, and seven others, رضي الله عنهم, *may God be pleased with them*. For later followers, distinguished men, رحمهم الله, *may God have mercy on them*. All of which are preterites. So in the history of Timur or Tamerlane, chapter 10, ادام الله تعالي ايام حياته وامن الاسلام او لمسطين ميامن بركاته, *may God, the Best and Greatest, prolong the days of his life, and aid Islam and the Muslims through the protection of his prayers*, where \ادام and \امن are preterites.

It follows from Psalm 51:6. \ὄπως ἂν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου. The question is, how does \ὄπως *so that* cohere with the preceding, *Against you only have I sinned, and done evil in your sight, so that you may be justified*. Tremellius and Junius interpose, *I acknowledge*. Because David could not have perpetrated sin *so that* God might be

justified, but he acknowledges sin for that end. Pagninus includes the preceding words of the Psalm in Parenthesis, so that what was said in verse 4, *cleanse me from my sin*, is construed with *so that you may be justified*. But there will be no need for these if we say that ὅπως here has the force of a command. Budaeus offers many examples of this. The distinguished Joh. Cloppenburgius also suggested two others; one from Theocritus, Idyll 1, the other from Euripides' Cyclops, where Ulysses says to Silenus, ἄλλ' ὅπως ἀνὴρ ἔσῃ, *but be a man*. The synonymous particle ἵνα is sometimes used in the same way. As in Mark 5:23. ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς, *that you coming may lay on, for coming, lay on*. The Vulgate, Syriac and Arabic, *come, lay on*. and Ephesians 5:33. ἡ δὲ γυνή, ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα. The Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic, *let the wife fear her husband*. Where it will also be useful to note, that it is very common in the Arabic language, that و and فَ, which properly mean *and*, when joined with futures, form an Imperative. و indeed induces an Apocope on the future, but فَ also without an Apocope. As in Surah Baqarah, وَلِتُكْمَلُوا الْعِدَّةَ وَلِتُكَبِّرُوا اللَّهَ، *And complete the number, and magnify God for that He has directed you, and be grateful*. So here, ὅπως δικαιωθῆς, *Be justified in your words, and prevail when you judge*. I confess, however, that among the Septuagint interpreters, who said not simply ὅπως, but ὅπως ἄν, it should rather be translated with *quo* (whereby). In what sense, we will say later.

Furthermore, τὸ δικαιωθῆς corresponds to the Hebrew word דָּקָא, which among the Arabs means not only to be just, but far more frequently to be true, veracious. דָּקָא *true*, דָּקָא *truth*. And that the same holds in Hebraism is clear from the Septuagint interpreters, who everywhere say δικαιοσύνη for אֱמֶת *truth*, and ἄδικος for פְּסוּדָה *false*. Which we have demonstrated at sufficient length on Luke 16:9. Hence δίκαιος for ἀληθής, 1 John 1:9. The same, we believe, occurs here. For since the Apostle's aim is to prove that God is true, even if all men are liars, he proves this excellently from this passage of the Psalm, if you translate it, *that you may be acknowledged as true in your words*. What then? That truth is understood here is indicated clearly enough by ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου. For truth corresponds to words rather than justice. Nor do I think that of Matthew 11:19 should be taken otherwise, ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς, *wisdom was acknowledged as true by her children*, which is to say, *it was verified*. And here, *that you may be verified in your words*.

It is added, καὶ νικήσης ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε. In Hebrew it is, וְנִתְּנָה בְּשִׁפְטֶיךָ, which they translate, *and be pure when you judge*. But the Septuagint recognized that the verb נָתַן among the Hebrews also means what it does among the Syrians, *to conquer*. Just as also in this place the Syriac has וְנִתְּנָה and for וְנִתְּנָה, they judge you. Where he uses וְנִתְּנָה and for וְנִתְּנָה. In which meaning this verb is also most frequently used in the Talmud. Therefore I think the Septuagint interpreters are to be praised, and one should not depart from their version, which the Apostle also expressed. ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε, the Vulgate, Erasmus, Syriac, and Arabic took passively, *when you are judged*. Beza actively, *when you judge*. Because in Hebrew it is וְנִתְּנָה. But that gerund, *in your judging*, can be translated both as, *when they*

judge you, that is, *when you are judged*, and as *when you judge*. There are many such cases, which, although of the active conjugation, allow translation with the prefixes לָ, נָ, פָ in the infinitive. see Genesis 5, verse 25. Exodus 9:16. and elsewhere. The Prophet's meaning seems to be, on the occasion of his sin, to compare himself with God in such a way that God is exalted from his own debasement. I have sinned against you, he says, and have committed what displeased you, I whom it least befitted, and from whom something else entirely was to be expected. I am of such a deceitful and inconstant nature, worthy to succumb and offer no defense, when I am judged by you and by men. Although this was done very badly by me, it was nevertheless holily governed by your providence, so that it may be clear that all men, even the most holy, are liars: you alone are truthful and faithful, and therefore always the victor, in whatever judgments you are assailed. From which the Apostle rightly collects that, so far was the faith of God from being overcome by their unbelief, and its own truth from not consisting in His glorious promises sealed by Circumcision, that on the contrary, from their unbelief, who are indeed deceitful men, the infallible truth of God appears more clearly, just as David confesses, after he betrayed the deceitful and inconstant condition of his nature by his sins, that the praise of infallible faith and truth belonged all the more to God.

To what end is all this? To make the unbelieving Jews, who wanted to be justified by works, all the more guilty, and to take away every occasion for boasting: since indeed it was not God's fault that they did not have excellent matter for boasting: since He gave them His covenant, from which they are named Jews, and sealed the promises of that covenant with Circumcision. And this with such constant faith, that by no unbelief of men could it be brought about that He should not be found most true in His words. Great, therefore, if you look to God, was the grace, utility, and prerogative of that covenant and Circumcision among the Jews: and so much the greater the wickedness of that people, that from such great and useful gifts of God they profited nothing for salvation. But because from this some pretext seemed to be offered for their unbelief, since it not only did not detract from the faith of God, but even made it more illustrious, the Apostle resolves this in the following words.

VERS. 5. \Εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην συνίστησι. That by ἀδικίαν, \ψεῦσμα is understood, and by \δικαιοσύνην, \ἀλήθειαν, the Apostle himself indicates in verse 7. See again, I pray, what was brought forth by us on this matter at Luke 16:9. When the Arabic translator saw this, for ἀδικία ἡμῶν he said كذبتنا *our lie*. And for \δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ, \صدق قوله بر الله *the justice of God and the truth of his word*, the latter of course explaining the former. \Συνίστησι, the Vulgate, Erasmus, and Beza, *commends*. The Syriac literally \مקים *establishes*. The Arabic \يثبت *confirms*. In Hebrew, with the Syriac, it should be translated \מקים, which the LXX would render \βεβαιοῖ *confirms*. For so they translate it in Psalm 119:28. Or \κυροῖ *authorizes*, as in Genesis 23:20. Or \πιστοῖ *makes firm, worthy of belief*, as in 2 Samuel 7:25. Furthermore, concerning this objection, the Syriac scholiast notes: "This is

audacity, (namely to say, our injustice establishes the justice of God.) because if this, that we treat him with contempt, causes him to win, why does he judge us, who were the cause of his victory?"

It follows, \κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω. The Syriac: Tremellius, *as a son of man I speak*. Boderianus, *as a man I speak*. But indeed, it fully corresponds to the Hebrew אֲדַבֵּר, and therefore signifies not only *as, like*, but also *according to*. As above in chapter 1, verse 16. \κατὰ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιόν μου, אֲדַבֵּר אֶלְכֶם אֶלְעִי אֶלְעִי *according to my Gospel*. Therefore the Syriac here too should be translated *according to the Greek phrase, according to man I speak*. Which the Syriac Scholiast explains thus: אֲדַבֵּר אֶלְכֶם אֶלְעִי אֶלְעִי, *according to those who speak this audacity*. But in what did that audacity consist? In the antecedent of the preceding hypothetical syllogism, which the hypocrites, from a poorly understood doctrine of Paul, subsumed in the minor premise, whence the impious consequent was necessarily inferred in the Conclusion. The antecedent was, *if our injustice establishes the justice of God*. This could be understood in two ways, a divine way or a human way. Divinely, if we say that the injustice of men is so governed by divine wisdom, power, and providence, against their own intention, that God thereby establishes and commends His justice. In which way David had taken it in Psalm 51, and from him Paul in the preceding verse. In a human way, if we say that the injustice of men is the true and genuine cause of commending and establishing the justice of God. In that sense the hypocrites subsumed the minor premise. From which the conclusion truly followed, *God is unjust, who inflicts wrath*. Certainly, when the Antecedent was understood according to God, namely that our injustice is directed by God for the establishment of His justice, it by no means follows from this that God is unjust who inflicts punishments on the unjust. But if it is taken according to man, the consequent is necessary. The Apostle abhors both in verse 6, namely both that Antecedent, taken according to man, and the consequent that flowed from it. He gives the reason for his abomination, because otherwise He would not be the judge of the world. And he proves that consequence in verse 7. *For if the truth of God through my lie abounded to his glory, why am I still also judged as a sinner?* That is, if, as you interpret, my lie is the cause of the manifested truth of God, and of his increased glory, I confess that I can by no right be judged as a sinner, and therefore God cannot be the judge of the world. I do not think, as the distinguished Beza wished, that Paul is speaking there in another's person, so that to complete the sentence it would be necessary to add after *for if*, in parenthesis, *someone will say*. But that he is speaking from his own opinion, and from the truth of the matter itself. Namely, if the illustration of divine truth and glory is the effect of human lying, man can by no right be punished. And it follows excellently from this what is added in verse 8, that it is lawful *to do evil that good may come*. But that this is by no means his meaning, and that their condemnation is just, who attribute such an antecedent to God, from which such a consequent follows. For although he had brought forward the example of David, who is said to have sinned so that God might be justified in His words, from which it certainly followed that by our injustice the justice of

God is established, and the truth of God through our lie redounds to His glory, yet his meaning was not that from our injustice and lie it flows that the justice of God is established, and His truth redounds to His glory, but that God Himself makes use of our injustice, so that by His best and most powerful wisdom He may elicit good from that evil. Just as the skill of a physician redounds through the patient's illness to his own glory. This is not effected by the patient's illness, but by the physician's experience and learning, which is exercised concerning that illness.

\Τί ἔτι κἀγώ. The Syriac, Arabic, and Beza omit \κἀγώ. The Vulgate and Erasmus express it. Nor do we think it is superfluous. For since in v. 9 he is about to conclude that all are under sin, which is the whole purpose of this discussion, he also includes himself here, and confesses that he is to be held and judged as a sinner. Unjustly and undeservedly, however, if his sins have the power of promoting the glory of God.

VERS. 8. \Καὶ μὴ (καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα, καὶ καθὼς φασὶ τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν) ὅτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά, &c. Certain copies have this parenthesis, which seems to me to obscure the sense not a little. For I do not see how \ὅτι ποιήσωμεν rightly coheres with \μὴ. The distinguished Beza indeed thinks that \ὅτι here is redundant, as often elsewhere. I admit it, but after verbs of saying, writing, denouncing, narrating and the like, as also here after the verb \λέγειν it is very well and in the usual manner redundant, if it is construed with it, as narrating what they rashly said about Paul. I would therefore prefer to follow the copies which omit the parenthesis, of which I have as many as six of different editions, besides Chrysostom. For thus, if only a substantive verb is understood after \μὴ, all things cohere excellently, *And why is it not, as we are slandered, and as some say that we say, let us do evil?* etc. The Syriac took \μὴ not negatively for *not*, but interrogatively for *num? an?* (whether?), just as in 1 Corinthians 9, v. 8. The sense is suitable, *And is it as we are slandered?* etc.

VERS. 9. \Τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; The Greek exemplars have this punctuation. Also Chrysostom and the Vulgate. But the Syriac and Arabic read, \τί οὖν προεχόμεθα; *What then do we excel?* and what follows, \οὐ πάντως, they did not read. Furthermore, the Apostle had indeed said in verse 1 that the Jew excels the Gentile, and circumcision the foreskin: but he had indicated in v. 2 that this only profits the faithful, who embrace by faith the faith of God, that is, the promise of His grace, announced in the covenant and sealed by circumcision. But the unbelievers, such as were those who wished to be justified by works, though they do not abolish the truth of the divine promise and its excellence, yet they derive no more utility from it than that, being found liars and unjust, they have made the truth and glory of God more illustrious. Nor yet could that pretext be taken from this, as if they were immune from guilt. For although, if that saying is taken according to man and the depraved judgment of the human mind, it is true that God would not be the judge of the world, nor could anyone be judged as a sinner, and it would be lawful to do evil, so that good might come: yet if it is

VERS. 21. *Now, however, the righteousness of God has been revealed without the law.* The Syriac Scholiast: namely that God is not of the Jews only, but also of all nations. He seems to have understood by the Righteousness of God the covenant of grace entered into not with the Jews only, but also with the other nations in Christ. What we think should be understood by it, we will say below at vv. 24 and 26. The Scholiast seems to have had in view the verse which follows below, 29, where from the fact that He is also the God of the Gentiles, the Apostle concludes the righteousness of faith, by which man is justified without the law. For the law of Moses, being a dividing wall between Jews and Gentiles, was given to the Jews, not to the Gentiles; if therefore justification is from the law, God is not of the Gentiles, but only of the Jews. But He is also of the Gentiles. Therefore, justification is not from the law.

VERS. 22. \Δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ &c. The Vulgate, Erasmus, and Beza construe \δικαιοσύνη δὲ with the preceding verse by Epanalepsis, where the righteousness of God was said to have been manifested without the law. And they indeed explain \δὲ as *autem, vero* (but, indeed), but Beza as *inquam* (I say). The Syriac however construes it with a substantive verb understood, *But the righteousness of God is through faith in Jesus Christ.* The matter comes to the same thing. For it is explained what that righteousness is which he had said was of God, and which he had opposed to the righteousness of works, namely that which is through faith in Jesus Christ. The Arabic translator took \δὲ for *enim* (for). As if the reason is here given why the righteousness of God is manifested without the law, that is, without the help of the law, the law contributing nothing to that manifestation. *For the righteousness of God is through faith in Jesus Christ.* But the law is not of faith, Galatians 3:12. Since therefore the righteousness of God is manifested through faith, it is necessarily manifested without the law, which reveals no other righteousness than our own, to be performed by us. *For Moses writes of the righteousness which is from the law, that the man who does these things shall live in them.* \Δὲ is also used elsewhere for *enim*. As in Romans 8:11, 1 Corinthians 8, v. 7, and 10, verse 11, and often elsewhere.

It follows \εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. The Arabic does not read \καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας. The Vulgate and Syriac did read it. Nor is it superfluous. \εἰς πάντας seems to indicate the object for which the righteousness of God is destined, and to which it is directed. \ἐπὶ πάντας the subject, upon whom it is conferred and as it were imposed. For although this righteousness of God is announced through the preaching of the Gospel to all, even to those who do not believe and will not believe, it is nevertheless not destined nor directed except to believers, nor is it conferred on others. Therefore it is called \δικαιοσύνη πίστεως Romans 4:11, 13. \ἢ ἐκ πίστεως, Romans 10, verse 6. \διὰ πίστεως, and \ἢ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει, Philippians 3:9.

VERS. 24. \Δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι, διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρόσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. This \ἀπολύτρωσις is that righteousness of God, which was discussed above in vv. 21 and 22, and in chapter 1:17. For it should be noted that the righteousness of

God in Isaiah, from where the Apostle undoubtedly derived this notion, is used for that gracious liberation and redemption, which He promised to His people, typically from the Babylonian captivity through Cyrus, but truly and spiritually from the servitude and damnation of sin through Christ. See Isaiah 46:13 & 51:6,8 & 56:1. In which places it is joined with *הַצְּלָוָה* *salvation*, as a cause with its effect, because that redemption by which the most just God, having justly punished the sins of his sons, and all the enemies of their salvation, benignly delivered them, is the cause of salvation, if not salvation itself. Hence *עֲדָתְךָ קְדוֹת* *eternal righteousness*, Daniel 9:24, is the same as *λύτρωσις αἰώνιος* *eternal redemption*, Hebrews 9:12. Nor did David understand anything else by the righteousness of God in Psalm 69:28. *Add iniquity upon their iniquity, and let them not enter into your righteousness*, *לְרַחֵם*, that is, into the redemption by which you free them from sins. From which it is also clear at the same time that nothing more atheological, or more foreign to the phraseology of Scripture, can be said than that the righteousness by which we are justified before God is an inherent holiness in us; for it is called the righteousness of God, by which is designated not something inherent in us, but the very redemption of God, and such as was prefigured by the liberation from Babel.

VERS. 25. *ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον*. The Vulgate, Erasmus, and Beza translate *προέθετο* as *propounded*. There is ambiguity both in the Greek verb and in the Latin. For the sense can be that He has now openly and in the sight of the whole world propounded, that is, exhibited him as a propitiation through the preaching of the Gospel. In which way Nazianzen said *λεῖς τὰ μφανές προτιθέμενος*, *bringing forth into the open*. Or it can refer to the *πρόθεσιν τῆς εὐδοκίας* to the *purpose of his good pleasure*, *ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ* *which he purposed in himself*, as he says in Ephesians 1:9. So that the sense is, *whom in the purpose of his decree he had destined as a propitiation*. Or the preposition *προ* can be taken as above in verse 9 in *προητιασάμεθα*, *we have before accused*, and in chapter 11:35, *προέδωκεν*, *he gave before*, and in chapter 15:4, *προεγράφη*, *it was written before*. So here *ὃν προέθετο*, *whom He before* (namely in the Old Testament through the shadows of the law, and the prophecies of the prophets) *set forth as a propitiation*. The Syriac translator took it in one of the two latter ways, when he translated it, *whom God purposed*. To avoid ambiguity, I would prefer, *whom he had already before set forth*, or *whom he pre-established*, whether in His decree, or in the polity of the Old Testament. For the Syriac phrase cannot admit the meaning of public manifestation. Nor can the Arabic, which has *whom God anticipated and set forth*, that is, *whom he had already before set forth*. Furthermore, for *ἱλαστήριον* the Syriac translates, Tremellius and Boderianus: *propitiator*, rather translate, *propitiation*. For propitiator is *ܐܘܨܬܪܝܘܢ*.

To demonstrate His righteousness through the remission, &c. That in the expiation of sins, not only of mercy, but also of divine justice, there ought to be its own place, even the Jews acknowledged, when they said that the end of sacrifices is *to reconcile to us all the attributes*, namely *the attribute of justice and the attribute of*

mercy. Which they declare more fully in these words: "They obtain mercy, after justice has received its portion, and the expiation is perfected through justice and through mercy."

It is added *\διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων*. Beza, *\διὰ per* (through). We prefer with the Vulgate, Erasmus, Syriac and Arabic *propter* (on account of). Which we also thought of the same particle in John 6:57. But two reasons are given here why God saved us only through the propitiation in the blood of Christ. One concerns God himself, that He might demonstrate His justice, which, having been offended by sins, demanded to be repaired in this way. The other concerns men, that their sins might be remitted, which could not be remitted unless God were placated and expiated. But why does he only mention sins committed before the advent of Christ? The response which the distinguished Beza supplies can abundantly satisfy settled minds. We note, however, that all seems much clearer if, as we noted before, *\προέθετο* is not taken for the exhibition of Christ, but for its preceding revelation in the Old Testament. So that a reason is given why he did not defer the revelation of Christ until his advent, but already before set him forth as a propitiation. Namely, this was done so that not only the sins which would be committed after his advent could be remitted, but also those which had occurred before. Therefore also in verse 21 he said, that the righteousness of God which is through faith in Jesus Christ was testified to by the law and the Prophets. How was it testified? Because from the books of the law and the Prophets it is clear that even then, long before his advent, he was set forth as a propitiation, for the demonstration of the justice of God, on account of the remission of those sins which were committed before his advent, which indeed were remitted, *\ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ αὐτοῦ through his forbearance*, or long-suffering, by which he endured to await the advent of his son, and the placation to be actually performed by him at some time, even if it was long deferred. For I think *\ἀνοχῇ* refers not so much to the sins which occurred, as to the advent of the mediator, who in the Old Testament was indeed set forth as a propitiation, but his exhibition had to be patiently awaited. Nor could God have remitted the sins of the ancient fathers, unless in his patience he had looked forward to that future propitiation of his son. But lest anyone should think that that justice of God was demonstrated under the shadows of the Old Testament themselves, he repeats in the following verse in what sense he had said that Christ had been set forth before as a propitiation to demonstrate the justice of God, namely for the demonstration of it *\ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, at this time that now is*, at which, that is, Christ has been exhibited, and has performed the propitiation, for which he had been set forth before.

VERS. 26. *\Ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ*. The distinguished Beza in later editions separated these words from here and annexed them to the preceding verse, because he wanted them to be governed by *\τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων*. But nothing prevents us from retaining the distinction which the Greek codices have, and which the Vulgate and Syriac have followed. Especially if the opinion already

brought forth by us is approved, according to which it is rightly construed with the act of God by which He remitted the sins of the ancients. Or even with the act by which long before the exhibition of Christ He set him forth as a propitiation also for the sins of those ages, which was truly done ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ.

It follows, ἄπρος τὴν ἐνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον, καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ. Here it is helpful to weigh what has been noted by the most learned man Joh. Cameron on the preceding verse 21. The word *righteousness*, he says, always denotes the goodness, mercy, salvation, and redemption of God. It is never used, however, to signify what we commonly call Justice, namely that disposition by which God is inclined to avenge crimes and sins. The words *wrath* and *judgment* are rather used to signify this. And he cites the places Isaiah 56:1 and Daniel 9:24, compared with Hebrews 9:12. Concerning which matter our opinion seems necessary to state. We admit that the LXX interpreters for ἰσχυρὴ *kindness* sometimes say δίκαιοσύνη *righteousness*. And conversely, there are places where for ἰσχυρὴ *justice* they say ἔλεος *mercy*. And that there are very many places where that word may be conveniently so taken. As whenever David says he wishes to commemorate the righteousneses of the Lord, that is, His benefits and mercies. Yet it cannot be denied that very often and most properly justice is attributed to God as Judge, and signifies that virtue and disposition by which He desires to reward the faith and hope of His own, but to avenge the sins of His enemies, and does avenge them. Hence ὁ δίκαιος κριτὴς, 1 Timothy 4:8 is said. Hence that of Psalm 89:15: ἡ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἡ κρίσις, *righteousness and judgment are the foundation of your throne*. And to retributive justice indeed belong the following: τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ *the righteous judgment of God is, that those who do such things are worthy of death*, Romans 1:32. δίκαιον παρὰ τῷ θεῷ *it is just with God to repay* &c. 2 Thessalonians 1:6. τὰ δικαιώματά σου ἐφανερώθησαν, Apocalypse 15:4, that is τὰ κρίματά σου *your judgments*. For there are places where ἡ δικαιοσύνη *righteousness* is translated κρίμα, as Jeremiah 51:10, and κρίσις, Isaiah 5:7 and 11:4. Nor do I doubt that, where the righteousness of God is celebrated in Scripture, those judgments of God are understood, by which, justly punishing His enemies, He liberates and saves His Church. In which, since the goodness and mercy of God towards the Church shine forth as greatly as possible, and in them the salvation and redemption of the Church consist, it is not surprising if the righteousness of God sometimes stands for His beneficence and for salvation and redemption, even if it does not primarily signify that; certainly for the disposition to avenge it seems it must be taken absolutely in Isaiah 59:16. *And his righteousness sustained him*. For when God complained that there was no one who cared for the restoration of the Church, it is said that *his arm brought salvation to him, and his righteousness sustained him: he put on righteousness as a breastplate, and a helmet of salvation on his head*. And so that you may know what that righteousness was, and what was the way of salvation, it is added, *And he put on the garments of vengeance for clothing*. So also here, when it is said that Christ was set forth as a propitiation in his blood, for the demonstration

of the justice of God, I believe his vindicating justice is to be understood, by which, having vindicated and condemned the sins of his people in the flesh of Christ, and at the same time having destroyed Satan, death, and hell, the greatest enemies of the Church, he brought forth salvation and redemption for his own, and therefore that redemption itself is also called the justice of God. *ἄξις τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον, so that he might be, that is, that he might appear to be, just, who having exacted just penalties for sin and from Satan, saves His elect; And justifying him who is of the faith of Jesus, who indeed having embraced by faith that redemption in Christ, ought to be a partaker of the justice of God, and therefore to be justified, that is, to be declared free and immune from the condemnation of sin and Satan, on account of that redemption, and the very justice of God by which He crushed and destroyed those enemies of the faithful. To this pertains the paraphrastic version of the Arabic translator who has, that it may be known that He is just, and that he who has believed in our Lord Christ is justified by His justice.*

VERS. 28. *Ἀλογιζόμεθα οὖν &c.* The Vulgate translates *ἄξις* as *enim* (for). But the Syriac, Arabic, Beza, and Erasmus, *igitur* (therefore). *Ἀλογιζόμεθα.* Vulgate and Erasmus, *arbitramur* (we think). Beza, *colligimus* (we conclude). Correctly. For it is a metaphor taken from the art of calculation, where from many numbers a sum is collected, and a certain account is entered, by which something certain is fixed and established. So also it is used in Romans 6:11, as the distinguished Beza correctly observed. We add also the passage in Hebrews 11:19 where concerning Abraham, *Ἀλογισάμενος*, that is, *so considering the matter and defining and establishing with himself, that God is able to raise even from the dead.* The Syriac, *we think* or rather *we feel*, in the sense that Philippians 1:7 says, *it is just for me to feel (ἄφρονεῖν) this about you*, that is, to establish that opinion about you in my mind. Where the Syriac used the same word. The Arabic for *Ἀλογιζόμεθα* said *we know*. In which way also Romans 6:11, Hebrews 11:19, and Romans 8:18 could be translated. It is said of a thing which we know and hold after having well weighed and collected the reasons.

VERS. 31. *Ἄνομον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίσεως; μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ νόμον ἰστώμεν.* Excellent are the things which the distinguished Beza notes here. I would like to add, however, what the Syriac Scholiast observes in a few words: "namely, since the law could not justify man, faith did that, and established the law." I understand the author's meaning thus. The scope, function, and end of the Law, as of God Himself, is of itself to justify man. That it condemns is accidental, from the intervention of sin. Romans 7:10. Nor has any man (except him who is already justified by faith) ever striven to obey the law, or can strive, except with the intention of being justified by it. Since it could not do this, its authority lay spurned and prostrate, so that man took up hostilities against it, and did not desire to be subject to it. Romans 8:7. Faith succeeded the law, which, abundantly providing what the law could not, raised up what had fallen, and brought it about that it should find faith, love, and grace among men.

CHAPTER IV.

VERS. 1. \Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν εὐρηκέναι κατὰ σάρκα; The Syriac: Tremellius and Boderianus in the Parisian edition, *What then shall we say of Abraham the Patriarch, what he found in the flesh?* In the Regia, *that he obtained in the flesh?* They did not observe the distinctive point between \אצק and \אשרשך, which demands that it be translated, *What then shall we say of Abraham the Patriarch that he found? In the flesh?* The Arabic translator in the same sense, but with a slightly different construction, *What shall we say now of Abraham the Patriarch? Shall we say that he obtained this by the works of the flesh?* The sense will be the same, if you punctuate the Greek thus, *What then shall we say? That Abraham our father found according to the flesh?* That Abraham found righteousness with God was beyond controversy between Paul and the Jews. The Apostle asks whether it should be said that he found it *according to the flesh*, that is, through carnal circumcision, and the other works of the law that depended on it. That question includes a negation, which the Apostle proves in the following verse.

VERS. 2. *For if Abraham was justified by works, he has something to glory in, but not before God*, that is, he has only a carnal boasting, which has no value before God. This is the major premise. All the Jews supplied the minor premise in their minds, *But Abraham had something to glory in, even before God*, that is, with such a glorying that would be valid before God, and pleasing to Him. All the Jews boasted this, and the Apostle confesses it. Hence the conclusion, *Therefore he was not justified by works*, or what is the same, *therefore he did not find righteousness according to the flesh*. For the flesh has nothing to glory in before God. Faith has, since, having embraced the grace of God and the death of His Son, it rightly glories that it has found eternal redemption. Which glorying, since it is in the Lord, is by far most pleasing to the Lord. Hence the Apostle argues, *Either Abraham did not have glorying before God, or he had it through faith. But Abraham did have glorying before God*. We both admit that. *Therefore he had it through faith*. And he proceeds to prove this further from Scripture in verse 3. But what we have said about the glorying of Abraham agrees excellently with the passage of Paul in Ephesians 2, verse 9. *not by works, lest anyone should boast*. For the Apostle does not disapprove of any and every glorying, since he commands us to glory in God, and asserts that Christ was made for us righteousness from God, so that we might glory. 1 Corinthians 1:31. But carnal glorying, which rests on the excellence of man himself, such as is all that which flows from works, he denies can have a place before God, or be borne by him. And therefore we are saved by grace through faith, lest there be any place for such glorying. It is the same thing that the Apostle asserts here concerning Abraham, that if he was justified by works, all his glorying before God has now vanished. But this is by no means to be established. For whose faith is so greatly proclaimed, who was called the friend of God, who was constituted the father of many nations and the heir of the world, and in whose seed all the nations of the earth were to be blessed, he certainly had something to glory in in this grace before God. Therefore

something other than works must be looked for in Abraham. The Syriac scholiast elucidates those words \ἔχει καύχημα, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, thus: "he would boast in his works, and not in the gift of God which is obtained by faith." He also recognized that two kinds of glorying are presented here, opposed to each other: one which consists in works, and necessarily arises from justification by works, but has no place before God: the other which consists in the gift of God, that is, in the saving grace which is granted through faith, and has a place before God. This is to be attributed to Abraham, and therefore he was not justified by works. The Arabic is different. Thus: "If Abraham had been justified by works, he would have had manifest glory in them. But it is not so with God." In the same sense, that great light of the Church, J. Calvin, took this verse, who wants \ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς θεόν to be the minor proposition of the Syllogism. In this way, *If Abraham was justified by works, he can glory in his own merit. But he has nothing to glory in before God. Therefore he was not justified by works.* Let the judgment be with the learned.

VERS. 4. *Now to the one who works, the wages are not counted according to grace, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ ὀφείλημα.* Beza, *but is of debt.* He states that the sentence is elliptical, and that the verb \λογίζεται should not be applied to both members. The Vulgate, Erasmus, Syriac, and Arabic did not observe this. Nor is there any doubt that the Apostle here posits two imputations, opposed to each other. One of which has its foundation in the one to whom the imputation is made, the other in the will of the one imputing. If anyone performs those things which the law prescribes, the wage of righteousness is imputed to him according to debt: for it has its foundation in himself. But if anyone does not work, but having transgressed the law believes, the wage of righteousness is imputed to him according to grace: for it has its foundation outside himself in Christ. Which the Apostle proves in the following verse, because he believes in him who justifies the ungodly. For if the imputation here were to be made according to the foundation which is in himself, sin would have to be imputed for guilt. For he is ungodly. But now faith is imputed even to the ungodly for righteousness, therefore this imputation is far different from that former one, having its foundation in the grace of the one imputing. Which he then proceeds to confirm from Psalm 32, vv. 1-2, from which passage he collects the imputation of righteousness which is without works, and which has joined with it the non-imputation of sin. If it is without works, then it is without foundation in us: if with the non-imputation of sin, then with the contrary foundation in us. Where it is to be observed, that the word imputation is used, even in a matter which has its foundation in us, and is so used wherever there is mention of the imputation of sin. As in 2 Samuel 19, verse 19. 2 Timothy 4, v. 16. &c. If someone has transgressed the law, and God imputes sins to him, the imputation is made according to his debt which is in himself. Conversely, therefore, if someone does not transgress the law, but works according to it, righteousness is imputed to him according to his debt which is in himself. But such an imputation was not made to Abraham. For his faith was imputed to him for righteousness. Therefore he did not have the foundation of righteousness in himself, but in the grace of the one justifying, to which faith

looked: nor was he justified as a worker, but as a transgressor of the law, through the non-imputation of sin, and the imputation of righteousness which was according to grace. The Syriac interpreter has, *But to him who works, the wage is not imputed to him as by grace, but as to whom it is owed.* Which Tremellius and Boderianus in the Parisian edition have interpreted a little differently, and not sufficiently according to the Syriac idiom.

VERS. 5. \Τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι &c. The Syriac and Arabic translators turned these present tenses into past tenses. Then, they saw excellently that these are opposites, so that with works removed, faith alone is established, rendering, *But he who has not worked, but only believed.* \Ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιούντα τὸν ἄσεβῆ. The Syriac and Arabic have *sinner*s in the plural, for they took it collectively. \Λογίζεται, the Arabic says, *surely his faith and his verification is imputed to him for righteousness.* He explained the act of justifying faith, which is to verify, that is, to hold the promise of grace in Christ as true, ratified, and certain.

VERS. 9. \Ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος. Beza, *ista igitur beatitatis declaratio* (this declaration of blessedness, therefore). But the Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic, *Beatitudo ergo haec* (This blessedness, therefore). I praise it. For he used it so also above in verse 6, saying, \Δαβὶδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *David speaks the blessedness of the man*, which Beza rightly renders, *he declares that man blessed.* But the notion of declaration is not in the noun \μακαρισμὸν, but in the verb \λέγει. Nor do I take that noun differently in Galatians 4, verse 15, which see. The Glossary has \μακαρισμός, *beatitudo*.

VERS. 11. \Καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβε περιτομῆς. The Syriac: *for he received the sign, circumcision*, to indicate that here the sign is not one thing, and circumcision another. Just as when I say, ivy is a sign of wine for sale, the sign is one thing, the wine another. But as when I say, by the sign of ivy, wine for sale is indicated, the sign is the same, the ivy is the same. The construction \σημεῖον περιτομῆς is therefore like *the river Euphrates, the city of Jerusalem*, etc. The Syriac Scholiast cites the words of the interpreter thus, *for God received the sign, Circumcision*, as if \ἔλαβε refers to God, which seems more correctly referred to Abraham. If to God, the sense is, *God received for Abraham*, that is, *gave as received*. In which sense *he commanded* is often used among the Hebrews. The Scholiast adds, "namely, when faith is not present, the sign is vain." That is, unless faith had pre-existed in Abraham's foreskin, the sign of Circumcision would have been vain, and so from the very fact that the sign was given to him, it is gathered that he already had faith before.

VERS. 12. \Τοῖς στοιχοῦσι τοῖς ἴχνεσι &c. The Syriac: Tremellius, *of them who walk in the footsteps of faith.* Boderianus, *of them who perfectly follow the footsteps of faith.* The word for *to be perfected, to be completed* is common. But I do not think it is used for *to walk*, or *to perfectly follow*. It often signifies, however, *to agree, to come together by agreeing*, as they do who cultivate peace among themselves. Whence peace is

taken thus in Romans 7, verse 21; Luke 22:16, and elsewhere, and so in this place I would translate it, *to those who agree with the footsteps of the faith of Abraham, who agree with him in the same footsteps*. A parallel passage is Galatians 6:16, where Tremellius again, *who walk according to this path*, interpreting the sense rather than the words. Boderianus less well, *who perfect this path*. For it has this transitive meaning in *pael*, not in *peal*, where it signifies three things: 1. To be perfected, to be finished. 2. To expire. 3. To agree. In which last meaning I would translate it, *and who agree to this way*. The Syriac calls a way what the Apostle calls a *\κανών* (rule). To agree, however, what the Apostle calls *\στοιχεῖν*, *\ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχήσουσιν*. The word *\στοιχῶ* has some signification of order, agreement, and consent, which the Syriac expressed by a word. Hesychius, *\στοιχῶ*, *\συνήμι* I agree. The Arabic translates *who follow the footsteps*.

VERS. 13. *\Οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλὰ διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως*. It is asked, for what reason is Abraham said to have been made heir of the world through the promise. The distinguished Beza responds, that by the world is understood all nations, of which Abraham was constituted father through faith, and so it is to have the whole world for sons, and in this way, as it were, to possess the entire world. But this seems less fitting, because the same promise of the inheritance of the world is said to have also been made to his seed. And in the following verse, all the faithful are said to be heirs. For indeed, as Beza explains, only the mutual relation of Father and Son is indicated; which is, that when it is promised to Abraham that he will be made the Father of a multitude of nations, at the same time it is promised that a multitude of nations will have Abraham as their Father; and thus it seems not very likely that they are called heirs because they are reckoned in the inheritance of Abraham. For an heir is one who possesses: but he who is reckoned in an inheritance is possessed. Abraham can be called the heir of the Gentiles, inasmuch as their father possesses them. But the Gentiles, inasmuch as they are possessed by Abraham, are not heirs, but the inheritance itself. Nor, indeed, do we seem, in 8:17 below, to be called heirs of God correlatively, because we are God's inheritance with Christ, but because we possess all the goods of God as our father as an inheritance.

To explain this passage, therefore, I compare it with the parallel one, which is in Galatians 3. For just as he says here that the promise was made to Abraham and to his seed, so there in verse 16, "the promises were spoken to Abraham and to his seed." And just as he says here that the promise is of the inheritance, which would be void if the inheritance were from the law, so also there in verse 19, "If the inheritance is from the law, it is no longer from promise." From this I gather that what is here called the inheritance of the world is the same as what is there simply called the inheritance. And he says this arose from the promise, and was made to Abraham and his seed. Because it was not a single promise, he says promises were made to Abraham and his seed. But there were two most important ones. One was of the covenant itself in Gen. 17:7, "I will be your God,

and of your seed after you." The other was given after the covenant and was dependent on it, Gen. 22:18, "In your seed all the nations will be blessed." For what he had said to Abraham before the covenant in Gen. 12:3, "In you all the nations will be blessed," he assigned to the seed after the covenant, "In your seed they will be blessed."

From this now necessarily follows the inheritance of the world. For just as sin, by the very fact that it separated us from God and subjected us to His curse, made us exiles and disinherited, so that we would not have a spiritual right or dominion worthy of the sons of God over even the smallest creature; so on the contrary, by the very fact that God is our God, and we are His blessed ones, we are restored as sons to the right and dominion over all our father's goods, and since there is nothing besides God and the world, we become heirs of the world—earthly, heavenly, present, and future. Hence 1 Cor. 3:21, "all things are yours." And among all those things, he names in verse 22 the world, and whatever things are in it, present and future. This is why, when earthly benefits are promised to the faithful, they are said to be heirs of the earth, Ps. 25:13 & 37:9, Matth. 5:5. When, on the other hand, heavenly benefits are promised, they are heirs of the kingdom of heaven, Matth. 25:34, where first they are called βλογητοὶ πατρός, then they are ordered κληρονομεῖν. It is plain how the Apostle in Galatians 3 deduces τῷ κληρονομίαν from ἐκ τῆς ἐυλογίας Ἰαβραάμ. And indeed, the symbol, down payment, and pledge of this whole inheritance of the world was the inheritance of the land of Canaan. Add to this that the Hebrew עולם, "world," "age," is sometimes used specifically for the blessedness of the future world or age. Such is that Talmudic saying in Berachoth, chapter היה קורא, at the end of the Gemara: עולמך תראה בחיך "you will see your world in your life." That is, as Baal Aruch explains, מעין אותן טובות שעתיד הק-ה לשלם לך לעולם הבא תראה כשאתה בחיך "You will see, while you are still alive, a fountain of those good things which God is going to repay you in the world to come." And thus, the heir of the world would be the heir of eternal blessedness.

But a scruple here seems to need addressing, that in Galatians 3, verse 16, when the Apostle had said that the promises were made to Abraham and to his seed, he restricts that seed to Christ alone. Here in Romans, however, when he says that the promise of the inheritance of the world was given to Abraham and his seed, not through the law but through the righteousness of faith, Christ cannot be understood by "seed." For just as he was not justified by faith, so neither was he made heir through the righteousness of faith. We may perhaps remedy this difficulty if we say that in the covenant made with Abraham, both Abraham and his seed should be considered in a twofold manner. Abraham, on the one hand, is first like a certain fountain of blessing, who contained in himself the one from whom the blessing flowed to the rest, according to the saying, "In you they will be blessed." And he is like a certain leader of the covenant, to whom it was first said, "I will be your God," and then "and of your seed after you." (G3)

Secondly, the same Abraham, comprehended with the rest of the faithful seed in the same body, is considered insofar as he is a participant in the same covenant and blessing with them, since he is blessed with the others and the others with him, Gal. 3:9. Similarly, the seed of Abraham is either primary or secondary. The primary is the unique and singular one, which was established by God as the head of the covenant and fountain of blessing, when He said, "In your seed all the Nations will be blessed," from whose fullness both Abraham and all his sons, both circumcised and uncircumcised, draw their blessing, and whose day Abraham longed to see. The secondary is the remaining crowd of believers, which is admitted with Abraham into the same grace of the covenant and participation in the blessing. The Apostle considers Abraham and his seed in the former way in Gal. 3:16; in the latter way, both Abraham and his seed, in Rom. 4:13. For to be a confederate of God, and blessed by God, and thus heir of the world in Christ, are things common to Abraham and to the rest of his secondary seed, and they are not had otherwise than through the righteousness of faith. But to be the father of Christ, and therefore to have all nations blessed in himself; similarly, to be the primary seed of Abraham, in whom as in the primary heir of all, all nations are blessed, are particular prerogatives of Abraham and Christ, which were granted not through the righteousness of faith, which follows the giving of Christ, but through the economy of divine good pleasure, which precedes the giving of Christ, by which both Abraham and Christ were elected for this. This, however, not only does not overthrow the righteousness of faith, but also establishes it. For if not even to Abraham, nor to his primary seed, were those privileges given otherwise than through the gratuitous promise of divine good pleasure, it is necessary to embrace that grace by faith, so that the righteousness, blessing, and inheritance which are contained therein may be obtained.

Furthermore, ἡ ἐπαγγελία here is not the very act of God promising, as when in Gal. 3:19 it is said that the inheritance is from promise. But it is the very thing that was promised. Therefore it is not said ἡ ἐπαγγελία εἶναι, nor εἰς τὸ εἶναι "that it might be," but τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν κληρονόμον τῷ κόσμῳ, namely "to be the heir of the world." This promise, the Apostle says, was not through the law τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτό. The sentence is elliptical. Erasmus supplied "contigit" (it happened). Beza, "cessit" (it fell to). Others, "data est" (it was given). I simply understand the substantive verb isti (is), which, constructed with the nominative of the thing and the dative of the person, signifies "has," and I translate the whole verse thus: "for not through the law does Abraham or his seed have the promise, namely to be heir of the world, but through the righteousness of faith." And thus the particle ἢ is more correctly taken properly as a disjunctive, than, what the Syriac translator intended, and Beza praises from him, as a copulative "and." The sense will be: whether you look at Abraham or his seed, neither he nor they could enjoy the promise of the inheritance of the world otherwise than through the righteousness of faith.

VERS. 14. *Ei γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου* &c. This is a usual phrase for the Apostle. Thus above in chap. 2:8 he said *τοῖς ἐξ ἐπιθείας*, which seems to us the same as *υἰοῖς ἐπιθείας*. Just as, on the other hand, in Eph. 2:2, *υἰοῖς ἀπειθείας* seems to us the same as *οἱ ἐξ ἀπειθείας*. Those are indicated who are so imbued with the nature of those vices that they seem to be, as it were, their sons and born from them. So those who are "of the law" are sons of the law, who profess it as a mother, from which they are what they are. But they are of two kinds, namely either by birth or by study. By birth, all and only the Jews were "of the law," because by the special law of the covenant initiated with that people and confirmed by circumcision, they were born Jews and bound to the law. And although they were of this kind by birth, they could nevertheless be "of faith" by regeneration, about whom he deals below in verse 16. But by study, they were "of the law," whoever devoted themselves to the law in mind and studies, and so depended on it that their hope and confidence were born from it. This could also happen to those who by birth were not from the law, but were born of gentilism. And it is about these, whether they were Jews or Gentiles, that the Apostle is dealing here.

VERS. 15. *οὐ γὰρ σὸς ἔστι νόμος*. The Syriac has *חב דלית גיר נמוסא*. And Boderianus: "quum enim non est lex" (for when there is no law). Translate: "ubi enim" etc. (for where etc.). *οὐ* signifies "quum" (when). But that *οὐ* signifies "ubi" (where), see Acts 10:23, Rom. 5:20. In the Syriac it follows *אלי הרופתא*. The vowel that should be placed over the Ayin is to be read over the Beth; otherwise, it is "transgression"; it is "transgressor."

VERS. 16. "That the promise may be sure to all the seed, not only to that which is of the law, but also to that which is of the faith of Abraham." The faithful seed is undoubtedly understood, for in others the promise cannot be sure; indeed, it does not even pertain to them. He makes this seed twofold, one which is "of the law," another which is "of the faith of Abraham." The former kind contains the Jews, and indeed only them, yet not those who sought salvation from the law, in which sense this phrase was used above in verse 14, but those who by birth were sons of the law, and as if born from it. For nature produced them as men, but the law produced them as Jews, confederates and belonging to the people of God from their very birth. And although they now believed in Christ, that faith did not finally begin to beget them for the Church, but it perfected those who had been begotten through the law of the covenant and of circumcision. The situation of the Gentiles was different, who in Rom. 2:27 are called *ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία*, and are distinguished thereby from the Jews, who can be called *ἡ ἐκ φύσεως περιτομή*. For although these also were born uncircumcised, yet the law of circumcision along with the covenant pertained to them, so that from their very birth they were considered sons of the circumcision. The situation of the Gentiles was far different, whom nature begot both as men and as aliens from the covenant, and who, having no law, as he said above in chap. 2:14, were begotten for the Church from no other source than from faith, and from there they drew the first origin of their spiritual birth. Therefore, by a certain special

reasoning, they are here said to be "of the faith of Abraham," in opposition to the Jews, who nevertheless also walked in the footsteps of the faith of Abraham. This is because the Jews from birth were the people of God, φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, as Paul says, "Jews by nature," which by force of the law inserted them into the Church. But the Gentiles were strangers from birth, federated only by the faith of Abraham. To the Jews, Abraham was a father, first by natural right, as their carnal father; then by legal right, as the father of Circumcision. Thirdly, if they believed in Christ, by the right of faith, as the father of the faithful. But to the Gentiles, only by the right of faith, since that alone made them sons of Abraham, and as it were begot them, so that they seemed to be born of the faith of Abraham.

VERS. 17. "(As it is written, 'I have made you a father of many nations,') before him whom he believed, God, etc." The distinguished Beza notes that Ambrose, for ἐπίστευσε "he believed," incorrectly read ἐπίστευσας "you believed." I advise that the Syriac and Arabic translators also read it this way, and with that reading the parenthesis which is closed before κατέναντι is removed, and from there to the end of the verse God's speech to Abraham is continued. I think that this reading, or rather interpolation, arose from no other source than from certain people who, not thinking of the parenthesis, did not know with what to connect κατέναντι or what sense to give it. And so they changed ἐπίστευσε into ἐπίστευσας, so that it would cohere with the immediately preceding words, continuing God's speech to the Patriarch. But because the Hebrew text is completely ignorant of that continuation, and the Greek copies and the old Latin Interpreter read it in the past tense, the parenthesis is necessary, and the connection, which the distinguished Beza expressed well, is most fitting. (H) It follows, ζωοποιῦντος τοὺς νεκροὺς, καὶ καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. The Syriac has مهذا لانكم ولا دقرا لائلين دلا ايتهاون اي ايتهاون. Where Tremellius and Boderianus: "and calls those things which are not as though they were." This should have been said in the feminine gender with ايلين. Now translate: "those who are not, as if they were." It is a description of the raising of the dead, which the Syriac translator thought was being discussed here, as in the preceding words. Similarly the Arab, who has ويدعو الذين ليسوا موجودون و يدعو كانهم موجودون "and calls those who are not found, as if they were found." But it is better to take it more generally, so that it alludes to creation itself.

VERS. 18. Ὃς παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστυσεν. The Vulgate, "Who against hope believed in hope." Erasmus, "beyond hope under hope." Beza, "against hope under hope." The Syriac has ولا دبلا سبرا لسبرا הימן "without hope, in hope." But I am surprised at the Arab, who, taking this in the plural number, seems to have referred it to the Gentiles, of whom he speaks at the end of verse 16, for he translates صدق الذين لم يكن لهم رجاء وامنوا ورجوا ما وعدوا به ليكون ابا لهم "those for whom there was no hope used it, and they believed and hoped for what was promised to them, that he would be a father etc." Furthermore, ἐπίστυσεν, εἰς τὸ γλνέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα πολλῶν ἔθνῶν, is said in Hebrew האמין להיותו אב גוים רבים, just as האמנתי לראותו in Psalm 27:13. The Apostle here expressed this Hebraism verbatim. But ἐπίστυσεν here,

although it is an aorist, has the meaning of the future, as often elsewhere, especially in the Acts of the Apostles.

VERS. 20. Δουὶς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ. The Arab has واخلى التسبحة لله "and he kept (left safe and whole) the glory for God." That is, he acted in such a way as not to detract anything from the divine glory by unbelief, but left it inviolate and sound.

VERS. 25. Ὁς παρεδόθη "who was delivered." Thus the Hebrews say. שהיו מוסרין עצמן על קדושת השם "who delivered themselves for the sanctification of God's name," that is, they delivered themselves to death.

CHAPTER V.

VERS. 2. Δι' ὃ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν. The Vulgate, "By whom we have access." Beza more correctly, "by whom we have also been brought." Thus the Syriac has דבו איתקרבנו, for which Boderianus not well enough translated as "accessimus" (we have approached), nor Tremellius as "admissi sumus" (we have been admitted). Translate, "adducti sumus vel fuimus" (we have been or were brought). For קרב is "to approach," איתקרב "to be made to approach," اقرب "he brought near." متقرب "brought near, moved near." What follows, ἐστήκαμεν "in which we stand," the Arab correctly interprets as تابتون "remaining, firm, and constant we are."

VERS. 3. Οὐ μόνον δέ. Beza and Erasmus supply, "neque id solum" (and not that only). The Syriac and Arabs, "neque sic solum" (and not so only). Similarly below in verse 11. ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται. The Syriac and Arabs, "perfects," that is, promotes to perfection, increases more and more. The Syriac Scholiast adds דמסברתא מתבחי בר נשא "namely, it promises us that we will not fail in temptations."

VERS. 4. ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν. Beza, "Patientia autem experientiam" (But patience, experience). Vulgate, Erasmus, Syriac, and Arabs, "probationem" (proof). As the distinguished Beza also translates in 2 Cor. 2:9 & 8:2 & 9:13. It is understood as the proof of faith, hope, humility, contempt of earthly things, and of the other Christian virtues and gifts of the Holy Spirit, which prove themselves through patience and endurance. Therefore the Syriac Scholiast says דמסברתא מתבחי בר נשא "namely, through patience a man is proved." Nor does it contradict what is read in James 1:3 (H2) in the contrary order, that the proving of faith perfects patience. For just as faith begets hope, and this in turn supports and sustains that, so the proving of faith in afflictions produces patience, and this in turn renders faith proven.

Ἦ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα. For as the Syriac Scholiast here rightly and very elegantly says ולא דלא מסבר לא מסבר "he who does not hope, does not endure." From hope arises endurance, and in turn from endurance hope takes strength. For while constantly enduring afflictions, we take experience of our faith and of the help of the Holy Spirit, that proof gives an increase to faith.

VERS. 6. ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν, rightly Beza, "quum essemus viribus destituti" (when we were destitute of strength). I would dare to translate, "quum essemus mortui" (when we were dead). For often among the LXX, ἀσθενέω is used for לָפַח "to fall," "to stumble," even where it signifies being pierced with a sword and killed and falling to the ground. As in ἀσθενήσεσι καὶ ἀπολῶνται ἀπὸ προσώπου σου, Ps. 9:3. Καὶ ἀσθενήσει, καὶ πεσεῖται, καὶ ἐχ εὐρεθήσεται, Dan. 11:19. καὶ ἀσθενήσεις ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, *ibid.* 33. see also verse 41. Also Hos. 14:10. Zeph. 1:3. and elsewhere, where it is used for utterly falling and perishing.

Κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανε. The distinguished Beza excellently translates, "Tempore suo pro impiis mortuus est" (In his own time he died for the ungodly). It would be said in Hebrew, בְּעֵתוֹ מָת הַלֵּךְ רָשָׁעִים. Thus in Isaiah 60:22, אֲנִי יְהוָה בְּעֵתִי אַחְזֶקְהָ, "I the Lord in its time will hasten it." The LXX: Ἐγὼ Κύριος κατὰ καιρὸν συνάξω αὐτούς. Thus among the same Interpreters you may read Job 5:26, Ἐλεύσει δὲ ἐν τάφῳ ὡσπερ σῖτος ὄριμος κατὰ καιρὸν θεριζόμενος, καὶ ὡσπερ θυμωνιὰ ἄλωνος καθ' ὥραν συγκομισθεῖσα. Where κατὰ καιρὸν and καθ' ὥραν are synonyms, and they signify "at its opportune time." See also Job 39:21 & Num. 23:24. The Syriac and Arabs translate "in hoc tempore" (in this time), that is ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ.

VERS. 7. "For scarcely ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται," "for a just man will one die." The Syriac has הָלַךְ הַלֵּךְ רָשָׁעִים "pro improbis morietur" (he will die for the wicked). Junius says, "read pro justis sive legitimis (for the just or legitimate): for רָשָׁעִים sounds like רָשָׁעִים which it is." For no doubt the scribes were deceived by the affinity and proximity of the word רָשָׁעִים which immediately preceded. So he says. Which to me, indeed, do not seem probable. For רָשָׁעִים did not precede, but רָשָׁעִים, which is easy to distinguish from רָשָׁעִים. Secondly, I desire an author by whose authority רָשָׁעִים designates the just or legitimate. The verb for the Syrians is "he signed, designated, destined." From it comes רָשָׁעִים "a note, sign, seal," not only among the Syrians, but also everywhere in the Talmud where סִגְנָא means "seals." Therefore I do not doubt that the reading הָלַךְ הַלֵּךְ רָשָׁעִים "for the wicked" should be retained. For the Arab also has "in place of the evil," "for the evil." But from where that reading arose, when in the Apostle we find ὑπὲρ δικαίου, is for others to judge. Perhaps the Syriac translator thought, which I see is also very much approved by the distinguished Beza, that in this way all the members of this argument, taken from comparison, agree with each other as best as possible. Because it scarcely happens that anyone willingly exposes his life for some wicked person; indeed, it is even rare that anyone would wish to approach the peril of death for the cause of an upright man.

But the Apostle's argument argues far more effectively according to the received reading. For he does not mean that it scarcely happens that anyone dies for a wicked person, but that this absolutely does not happen. It scarcely happens that one dies for a just person. But because "scarcely" does not universally negate, he adds the reason why he used that little word; "for τὸ ἀγαθὸν," for the good man, who deserves love by his virtue, and thereby can be useful to others (for ἀγαθὸς

also means useful), perhaps someone would dare to die. He does not plainly deny it, but neither does he assert it. He leaves it in doubt as a most difficult thing, and one which would not proceed except from a daring soul. (H3) Therefore he uses the verb *τολμᾷ*. And what the Syriac Scholiast adds is very true, אמת על מותא קשיא לבר נשא דבסר "a man hardly despises death." Of how great love, therefore, is the testimony that Christ was willing to die for us, ungodly men! For *τάχα* the Syriac has ארימ, which seems to have arisen from the Greek, and is explained by the Scholiast as מכין "perhaps."

VERS. 10. Κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ "we were reconciled to God." The Syriac has נמנע יתיא אלה "God was reconciled with us." For he did not feel, as heretics do today, that reconciliation is understood by which we, by the power of regeneration, are made lovers of God, with the enmities removed by which, while sin was dominant, we were formerly borne against God; but by which God, previously angry with us for our sins, is now placated towards us.

VERS. 12. Διὰ τῦτο, ὡσπερ δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ ὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. The Syriac and Arab omitted Διὰ τῦτο. Furthermore, D. Beza says in his commentaries that this member is ἀνανταπόδοτον (unanswered). Nor do all interpreters translate it otherwise, because they want the particle καὶ which is before ὕτως to have the meaning of the copula "And." When, in the manner of the Hebrews, it can be said to be redundant, and to be simply a ποδόςις (apodosis), or to show that the following member corresponds to the preceding one, and has a connection with it. This is most usual for the Hebrews in the second members of verses. So I translate thus, "Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and through sin death; so death passed upon all men, because all sinned." I see that the Arab has also translated in this way. Nor do I think that the comparison between the first Adam and the second should be started here; but I connect these things with the preceding ones through διὰ τοῦτο, in the same sense as in chapter 11:32 it is said that God has concluded all under sin, that He might have mercy on all. For he had said in the preceding verse that we glory in God through Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received reconciliation. And that we might receive that reconciliation, "therefore," he says, "just as through one man sin and death entered into the world, so death passed upon all men, because all sinned," so that an occasion might be given to God for exhibiting reconciliation through Christ. And that all have indeed sinned, he proves in the following verse, because sin did not begin from when the law was given through Moses, but was already in the world from Adam until the law; and from that it follows that there was also some law then, because without law sin is not imputed, sin is not considered. But it was imputed, "For death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one to come." Here now begins the comparison between the two Adams. The first, he says, was a type of the second: But the χάρισμα is not like the παράπτωμα etc. An illustrious example of a

superfluous καὶ exists in James 4:15, ἐὰν ὁ Κύριος θελήσῃ καὶ ζήσωμεν, καὶ ποιήσομεν τοῦτο ἢ ἐκεῖνο. Where καὶ before ποιήσομεν is entirely a παρέλκυσις (superfluity), and only notes that that member is a response to the prior one, which among the Belgians the particle "soo" does, and among the Arabs ف. But if this interpretation does not please someone, let him see if to avoid a hiatus, after διὰ τοῦτο at the beginning of the verse, there could not be understood ἔχει, or ἐστὶν ὡσπερ etc. "it is" or "is like" etc. For that this is often to be understood before ὡσπερ, many places teach. As in Matthew 25, verse 14. ὡσπερ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἀποδημῶν ἐκάλεσε τοὺς ἰδίους δούλους. The sense is, "For my coming is like a man traveling to a far country, etc." The same expression is in Mark 13:34. See also Rom. 15:3. So also in this place, "Therefore the reconciliation is like, as through one man sin entered etc." Let us try another way. Διὰ τοῦτο can be taken, as in John 7:22, for "propterea quod" (because). That διὰ τοῦτο, "therefore," often means "because," we proved there. In this sense, it coheres very well with the preceding words, "We glory in Jesus Christ, through whom we have obtained reconciliation, because, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and through sin death, so death has pervaded all men, because all have sinned." A reason is given why we have material for glorying in the reconciliation of Christ: because through Adam both sin and death had pervaded all. But I would like to set forth how the Arab has rendered this verse: وكما ان بانسان واحد دخلت الخطية الى العالم ودخل بالخطية الموت فكذلك عمر الموت جميع الناس لانهم جميعا اخطوا الى ان فرضت سنة التوراة & sicut per hominem unum intravit peccatum in mundum, & intravit per peccatum mors, sic morti obnoxii sunt omnes homines, quia omnes peccarunt, usque dum sancita fuit lex." (and just as through one man sin entered into the world, and through sin death entered, so are all men subject to death, because all have sinned, until the law was established). He has evidently torn ἄχρι νόμου from the following verse, discarding the particle γάρ. This is contrary to the authority of the Greek copies, the Vulgate, and the Syriac.

VERS. 14. "But death reigned from Adam until Moses." Death from sin, says the Syriac Scholiast. He seems to mean spiritual death, which his following words also make plain. מן אדם גיר ועדמא למשה גליא הוה בעלמא שולטנא דסטנא. וחטיתא לא חשיבא הות חטיתא. "Ab Adamo enim usque ad Mosen aperta fuit in mundo potestas Satana. & peccatum non reputatum fuit peccatum, quia non erat lex. At à Mose usque ad Christum interdum aperta, interdum occulta fuit. à Christo autem usque ad finem, infar furis seducit." (For from Adam until Moses the power of Satan was manifest in the world. And sin was not accounted sin, because there was no law. But from Moses until Christ it was sometimes manifest, sometimes hidden. But from Christ until the end, it seduces like a thief.) To have presented these things is to have refuted them.

It follows, "Even over them that had not sinned in the similitude בדמות עברנותה דאדם." Boderianus: "transgressoris legis Odom ipsius" (of the transgressor of the law of Adam himself). And so you will find Tremellius's version interpolated (but badly) in the Cothen edition of the Syriac New Testament. A transgressor of

the law is called עבר נמוסא or עבר נמוסא, but עברנותא is a substantive and signifies transgression. עברנותא דנומוסא "transgression of the law." as above in chap. 4:15. Boderianus and Tremellius translated it correctly. Therefore, here too it must be translated, "In the similitude of the transgression of the law of Adam." Which Tremellius expounded periphrastically, "in the similitude in which Adam transgressed the law," correctly. Others (says Junius) "his law," placed there. For the mode of transgression is different in Adam, and different in his posterity. So he says. Doubtless because the Syriac said דנומוסא with an affix. But in truth that affix, in the manner of the Syrians, refers pleonastically to what follows, and can have no other sense than that which is in Paul's words, ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιωματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ. But indeed, "in the similitude in which Adam transgressed his law," should be said in Syriac as איכנא דעבר על נומוסיה אדם, which differs greatly from what occurs here. The Arab has, وايضا على الذين لم يخطوا كما حد في معصية ادم في ناموس موسي, "etiam super eos qui non peccarunt sicut definitum est de transgressione Adami in lege Mofis" (also over those who did not sin as it is defined concerning the transgression of Adam in the law of Moses). I do not quite grasp what he means, unless perhaps he meant that in the law of Moses there is ὁμοίωμα παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ, because there, as in a portrait, it is depicted how far Adam's sin extends, and by what bounds and limits it is contained, but that death reigned even over those who sinned in ignorance of these limits. (I) The distinguished Beza seems to have rightly expressed the mind of the Apostle.

"Who is a type of him that was to come." Beza, "ejus qui futurus erat" (of him who was to come). The Syriac in the same way. The Arab, "ejus qui venturus erat post ipsum" (of him who was to come after him). They rightly understood that a person is being described.

VERS. 15. Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτω καὶ τὸ χάρισμα. To this the Syriac Scholiast adds, לא דמיא חטייתה דאדם לטיבותיה דמשיחא. קדמיא למאחריא אזיקת. וטיבותיה דמשיחא לקדמיא ולבתריא אהנית. "Scilicet, quia peccatum Adami posteris nocuit, sed gratia Christi praecedentibus & posteris profuit." (Namely, because the sin of Adam harmed his posterity, but the grace of Christ benefited those who came before and those who came after). What he says is insignificant. Would that he who was to undertake the Scholia on this Epistle, and who said that Saint John (he means Chrysostom) explained it in thirty-two homilies, had either read Chrysostom here or had been willing to praise him. He would have given us golden things, not such leaden ones. For thus Chrysostom says, ὁ λέγει τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν, εἰ ἡ ἁμαρτία τοσοῦτον ἴσχυσε, καὶ ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτία ἐνός· ἡ χάρις, καὶ θεοῦ χάρις, καὶ οὐ πατρὸς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ υἱοῦ, πῶς οὐ περιέσται πλεονάζονως; πολλῶ γὰρ τοῦτο εὐλογώτερον. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἕτερον δι' ἕτερον κολάζεσθαι, οὐ σφόδρα δοκεῖ λόγον ἔχειν· τὸ δὲ ἕτερον δι' ἕτερον σώζεσθαι, καὶ πρεπωδέστερον μᾶλλον καὶ εὐλογώτερον, εἰ τοίνυν ἐκεῖνο γέγονε, πολλῶ μᾶλλον τοῦτο. By which words he compares grace with sin, the grace of God with the sin of man, the grace not only of one man Christ, but also of God the Father with the sin of one man: so that we may know that, as much as grace surpasses sin, God surpasses man, and God the Father and the man Christ together surpass one single, mere man, so much more can the grace

of God through Christ save than the fall of Adam could destroy. Then he also compares the effects of Adam's sin and Christ's grace: from the former, death, from the latter, salvation flowed to others, of which the latter is far more agreeable to reason. For one to be punished for another does not seem very much in accord with reason; but for one to be saved for another is more fitting and more reasonable. If, therefore, the former happened, how much more is the latter to be hoped for?

To which I add, thus far even death contracted from Adam is opposed by τὴν περισσεΐαν "the abundance" of grace, because that death could be overcome by grace and turned into life for the faithful, but this grace can never be overcome and turned back into death.

VERS. 16. Καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος, τὸ δῶρημα. The Syriac translates as if it read, καὶ οὐχ' ὡς ἑνὸς ἁμάρτημα, τὸ δῶρημα. But the Apostle said that very thing, although in slightly different words, in the preceding verse. The Syriac translator seems to have seen the ellipsis, but not how it should be supplied. Nor does the Arab help, who departs even further. The Vulgate supplies nothing, and so its meaning cannot be understood, unless you supply it. Erasmus supplied, "venerat mors" (death had come). Beza, "illud quod introiit" (that which entered). We simply supply the substantive verb est. "And the gift is not as it is through one who sinned." That is, the gift of Christ is not as the state of affairs is through the one who sinned. I explain below in v. 18 similarly.

Ibidem, τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα. Erasmus translates ἐξ ἑνὸς as "ex uno delicto" (from one offense), Beza, "ex uno lapsu" (from one fall). We, with the Syriac and Arab, translate it "ex uno," namely "homine" (from one man), of whom he spoke at the beginning of the verse, ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος. For since in the comparison instituted between the first Adam and the second, the word ἑνὸς occurs eleven times, I think it should everywhere be referred to the person of either Adam or Christ. And in this place, indeed, the matter itself seems to demand it. For since the proposition at the beginning of the verse is, "the gift is not as it is through one who sinned," the first member requires that it be shown how the matter stands through that one. It stands thus, he says, that the judgment from one is unto condemnation. It is consistent that here δι' ἑνὸς in the proposition, and ἐξ ἑνὸς in the proof, be taken in the same sense. (I2) But, say learned men, the logic of the opposition, and what is subjoined ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων "from many offenses," show that παραπτώματος should rather be understood. I confess, if those words are to be translated in the way I see they have consistently been translated by the Vulgate, Erasmus, Beza, and the Syriac (the Arab omitted πολλῶν). But I advise that it can also be translated, "from the offenses of many," and that this fits the place very well. The judgment, he says, comes from one, that is from the offense of one man, unto condemnation: but grace comes not from one, but from the offenses of many men unto justification. Great is the condemnation which the offense of one man

brought forth, but it was increased in infinite ways when the offenses of infinite men were added. Grace removes this whole heap of condemnation, infinitely greater than what had resulted from the offense of the first man. Therefore the gift is not as the state of affairs is through the one who had sinned. The object of this gift here is not this or that individual of the faithful, to whom many sins indeed, but nevertheless only his own, are forgiven: but the whole race of the Elect comprehended in Christ, just as the whole human race comprehended in Adam is the object of the judgment that came upon all to condemnation. Therefore, just as that condemnation, insofar as it flowed from the offense of one unto all, has a certain proportion to the merit of the offense of that one man, so the grace by which that condemnation is abolished has an equal proportion. Add now the condemnation which the whole race of the Elect and faithful contracted by so many and so great offenses, which the same grace universally abolishes, and there at last it appears how much more good the grace of one has given than the offense of one had given evil. I would also like to observe that in the first member where it deals with judgment, ἐξ ἑνός signifies a meritorious efficient cause: in the other where it deals with grace, ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων signifies a terminus from which. For grace, insofar as it is conferred upon the faithful taken collectively in one body, proceeds from the offenses of many as from a terminus from which, to justification as to a terminus to which.

VERS. 17. Εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνός παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε διὰ τῷ ἑνός. Beza published τῷ ἐνὶ παραπτώματι "per unum lapsus" (through one trespass). And he says he restored it thus from the Claromontanus Codex. I would not want so much faith to be given to one Codex against the faith and authority of all the rest, and against the reading which Chrysostom, the Latin Vulgate, the Syriac, and the Arab have consistently followed. Nor, if you read τῷ τοῦ ἑνός παραπτώματι, will the following διὰ τῷ ἑνός be entirely redundant for that reason, which, since the Syriac and Arab also thought so, they omitted. Rather, it contains a most useful doctrine, and proposes what was most to the point in this matter of Paul: namely, how it happened that by the offense of one, death reigned over all. This did not happen through the imitation of posterity, but through that same one who had offended, so that the guilt of Adam's offense was transfused and propagated through the same Adam into his posterity, to such an extent that through him death also reigned over the rest. If, he says, one man could do this by his one offense, through himself alone, how much more will the one Christ, through that abundant grace which in the preceding verse he had said proceeds from the offenses of many to justification, bring it about that those who receive it by faith will reign in life? The Apostle's words are, πολλῶ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες, &c. Chrysostom also reads it this way, but it is noted in the margin that some codices read δωρεᾶς δικαιοσύνης. The Vulgate, Syriac, and Arab have followed this reading.

VERS. 18. Ἄρα ὅν ὡς δι' ἑνός παραπτώματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα, οὕτω καὶ δι' ἑνός δικαίωματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς. Beza alone translated δι' ἑνός

παραπλώματος as "per unum lapsum" (through one trespass), and δι' ἐνὸς δικαιώματος as "per unam justificationem" (through one justification). (I3) The other Interpreters whom we often cite, translate "per unius lapsum" (through the trespass of one man), and "per unius justificationem" (through the justification of one man), or rather "justitiam" (righteousness). We praise this. Nor do we see why that interpretation should not correspond to the Greek, nor does it create a tautology in the following verse, especially if you conveniently supply the ellipsis of this verse. Erasmus, after παραπτώματος, supplies "propagatur malum" (evil is propagated); after δικαιώματος, "propagatur bonum" (good is propagated). Beza in the former place, "reatus venit" (guilt came); in the latter, "beneficium redundavit" (the benefit abounded). The Syriac and Arabs supply nothing, but change the construction, as if it read κατάκριμά ἐστιν εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, and again, δικαίωσις ζωῆς ἐστιν εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους. We think that, as above in verse 16, so also here it is sufficient that in each member ἔστιν or ἔχει is understood. In this way, "Therefore, just as through the offense of one man the matter stands with regard to all men unto condemnation, so through the righteousness of one man the matter stands with regard to all men unto the justification of life." The explanation of this is given in the following verse.

I would like, furthermore, for the sake of Syriac students, to observe that the Syriac at the beginning of the verse has $\sigma\iota\delta\omicron\delta\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \Delta\lambda\ \mu\beta\ \Delta\epsilon\gamma\sigma\iota\ \lambda\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\iota$ "sicut ergo propter peccatum unius &c." (just as therefore on account of the sin of one etc.). To which Tremellius in his notes says, "We have changed what was incorrectly written $\kappa\omicron\gamma\alpha$ (which means nothing) to $\kappa\omicron\gamma\alpha$, that is $\omega\varsigma$." An error was admitted, he says, by the change of Yod to Zain, and by transposition, although it is read the same way in the Manuscript. So he says. But he changed it incorrectly. It is read correctly. The word $\kappa\omicron\gamma\alpha$ is usual for the Syrians from $\kappa\omicron\gamma$ "modus, species" (manner, kind), with an euphonic Aleph prefixed with a Caph of similitude from Hebraism, as if to say "according to the manner," that is, "just as." Just as from $\pi\eta$ "one," in the same way $\kappa\eta\beta$ is formed "according to one," i.e. "together, at the same time." But $\kappa\omicron\gamma\alpha$ has γ after it, with which it literally denotes "according to the manner in which," that is, "just as." From this it is clear what the cause of often variant readings is: namely, a change which the ignorance of readers or interpreters has produced.

VERS. 19. Κατεστάθησαν. Thus the Syriac and Arab also, and likewise Chrysostom read. Erasmus, however, reads κατεστάθημεν.

VERS. 20. Νόμος δὲ παρεῖσηλθεν, ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπλωμα. The Syriac and Arabs simply, "Lex autem intravit" (But the law entered). For there are also other places where *παρὰ* and *εἰς* are so compounded with verbs that they signify nothing new, but only augment the meaning of the simple verbs. Thus *παρεῖσενεγκεῖν* is used in 2 Peter 1:5. Erasmus, "Lex obiter subiit" (The law entered by the way). Nor does he explain in his notes what he means by "obiter." Perhaps he meant the same as Chrysostom, who comments thus on this verse: Διατί δὲ οὐκ εἶπε, νόμος ἐδόθη, ἀλλὰ,

νόμος δὲ παρεισήλθε; πρόσκαιρον αὐτοῦ δεικνύς τὴν χρείαν οὕσαν, καὶ οὐ κυρίαν οὐδὲ προηγουμένην. "Why did he not say, 'the law was given,' but, 'the law, however, παρεισήλθε'? Because he wished to indicate that the use of the law was temporary, and not of ruling or primary power." Which he proceeds to prove from the passage in Gal. 3:23, where the law is said to have kept us confined until faith should be revealed. But apart from the fact that the use of the law is perpetual, to increase sin, unless one is regenerated by the Spirit of Christ, the force of the word *παρεισελθεῖν* does not seem to be to signify a temporary entrance. Beza, "*Lex vero praeterea introiit*" (But the law moreover entered), that is, he says, "it was added to that disease with which all men were laboring, contaminated by the sin of one." But neither does that seem to be the genuine meaning of the word. Suidas says that *παρεισελθεῖν* is τὸ μετ' ἄλλου πλαγιάσαντος συνεισελθεῖν, "to enter together with another who came in obliquely." But *εἰσελθεῖν*, he says, is τὸ γυμνῇ τῇ παρρησίᾳ χρῆσασθαι, "to use naked freedom of speech." And that the Apostle meant this when he said, *παρεισήλθεν ὁ νόμος*. He does not seem to have referred this to the public giving of the Mosaic law, which was done openly, and where ἡ γυμνῇ παρρησία "naked freedom of speech" thrives as much as possible: but to the general use of the law common to all ages, by which it urges, presses, accuses, and condemns the sinner. For thus far it is truly said that as soon as sin entered obliquely into the world, the right, authority, and dominion of the law crept in along with sin, and even with the law being silent and saying nothing openly, the sinner became a slave of the law, and that by the just judgment of God, sin was increased through the dominion of the law. Whatever the case, Suidas thought that word had the meaning of "creeping in," as did undoubtedly the Vulgate, who for that reason translated it "subintravit" (it entered secretly). Thus it is certainly to be taken in Gal. 2:4, οἵτινες παρεισήλθον "who crept in." He is speaking of false brothers, who in the same place are called *παρεῖσακτοι* "crept in." Nor do we find another meaning of this word among lexicographers, who interpret it by *παρασιέναι* and *παραδύναι*. Nor does it seem to me to be alien from this place. For although, as the distinguished Beza truly says, the law of Moses was publicly proposed and accepted with such great ceremonies, yet if you look at the pursuits of men, to whom such a bridle was least expected, but who were lasciviously running wild and fearlessly indulging their desires, the law was given suddenly, restraining, prohibiting, threatening, urging, compelling, condemning those thinking of far different things; it can with the greatest justice be said to have "entered secretly" into the world, and to have "stolen upon" men, and as it were surreptitiously to have entered into their sins. Add that there is a certain clandestine and surreptitious power of the law, so that, what seemed least to be expected from it, sin is thereby increased.

But it is helpful here to hear Chrysostom on that saying of the Apostle ἵνα πλεονάση, etc. Τὸ δὲ ἵνα, he says, ἐνταῦθα οὐκ αἰτιολογίας πάλιν, ἀλλ' ἐκβάσεως ἐστίν. οὐ γὰρ εἰς τοῦτο ἐδόθη, ἵνα πλεονάση, ἀλλ' ἐδόθη μὲν ὥστε μειῶσαι καὶ ἀνελῶν τὸ παράπτωμα. ἐξέβη δὲ τοῦναντίον, οὐ παρὰ τὴν τοῦ νόμου φύσιν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν τῶν δεξαμένων ραθυμίαν. That ἵνα that is "ut" (so that), here does not state a cause but an outcome. For it was not

given for this purpose, that sin might abound. But it was given so that it might diminish and take away the trespass: but the contrary came about, not from the nature of the law, but from the indolence of those who received it. The Syriac Scholiast has translated these same things into his own work. Where it is certainly to be praised, that he says it is attributed to the law by accident that evil is increased from it, and that this should be ascribed not to the nature of the law, but to the indolence of men. Yet it does not follow from this that the particle ἵνα here denotes nothing besides the outcome. For the law is to be considered not only as an instrument of a good God, prescribing a rule of justice, but also as an instrument of an angry judge avenging sins, in which respect it is said to work wrath, Rom. 4, verse 15. And in this same respect, the office of the law is to increase sin. And although this comes from the malice of men, yet the law is not idle there, but applies its force to the malice of men in such a way that both the law through malice, and malice through the law, increase sin, whence that saying of the Apostle in Rom. 7, "The passions of sins... were effective through the law," verse 5. "Sin... works all concupiscence through the law," verse 8. "through the law it deceived me," verse 11. "it became exceedingly sinful through the commandment," verse 13. Nor would I readily admit what he said, that the law was given to diminish and abolish sin. I confess it was given to prohibit all sin whatsoever, and not to allow any at all to be committed. But to diminish or abolish a committed sin, that indeed is beyond the powers of the law, and so it cannot have been given to a sinner for that end. "A law was not given which could give life," Gal. 3:21. That is entirely the work of grace. The law, I confess, diminishes sin in the faithful and regenerate, but it does not have this from itself, but from the accompanying Spirit of regeneration, to which the law is a handmaiden in this work, and is its instrument, which is elevated by that principal agent above its own inherent virtue. Without it, the law increases sin rather than diminishes it.

Οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις. The Scholiast notes: דהינו בעממא הנפא "scilicet apud Gentes profanas" (namely among the profane Gentiles). This is alien to the scope of the Apostle, who here does not intend to commend the grace of God towards the Gentiles, because among them sin abounded more than among the Jews, but to show in general how much the grace of Christ surpasses the sin of Adam and the law of Moses. (K) Adam's sin introduced death and condemnation. The Law increased sin and condemnation, yet grace abounded over all these things.

CHAPTER VI.

VERS. 4. Διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ Πατρὸς. Among the Interpreters whom we are accustomed to cite, only Beza translates it, "In gloriam Patris" (To the glory of the Father). For what Tremellius translated from this Syriac בכבודא דאבוהי as "in gloriam patris sui" (in the glory of his father), was done incorrectly. Translate, "per gloriam patris sui" (through the glory of his father). The other would be said

as לכבודא דאבוהי just as in Phil. 2, verse 11, לשובחא דאלהא אבא, εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς. But that כ is used for εἰς, we have not yet learned. But what is this, "through the glory of the Father"? It is, "through the power of the Father." The Apostle learned this from the LXX Interpreters, who for עז "strength" say δόξα, Ps. 68:35, Isa. 12:2 & 45:24. also τιμή, Ps. 29:2 & 96:7 & 99:3. again δόξα for און "strength" Isa. 40:26, for תועפות "strengths," Num. 23:22 & 24:8. just as on the other hand for גאון "excellency," which they not rarely translate with δόξαν, elsewhere they have said ισχυς "strength," as Isa. 2:10, 19, 21. And lest it seem strange to anyone that the meanings of strength and glory are confused, I advise that among the Arabs the verb عز, which is the Hebrew עז, denotes not only to be powerful and strong, but also to be endowed with dignity, preeminent, excellent, honored, and is opposed to ذل "abject, despised." as in Ali's letter, نَدِيلُ الْخَلْقِ عَزِيزٌ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ "He who is despised among men, is in honor before God." The meanings can therefore be joined, so that by δόξαν an excellent, preeminent, and glorious power is denoted.

VERS. S. "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα." Erasmus and Beza, "nimirum & resurrectionis erimus" (truly we shall be also of his resurrection). The Vulgate, "simul & resurrectionis erimus" (at the same time we shall be also of his resurrection), as if he had read ἅμα. This reading does not displease the distinguished Beza, so that ἀλλὰ is said to have crept in for ἅμα. I would not want to suspect that, since no codices argue for it, especially when it is established that ἀλλὰ is not always adversative, but also confirmative, for "utique, equidem" (surely, indeed). As in John 16:2, Ἀποσυναγωγούς ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα, ἵνα etc. "They will put you out of the synagogues; utique (surely) the hour is coming etc." So in this place too I translate, "utique (surely) we shall be also of his resurrection." It is known that the Hebrew particle כ, besides being properly causal, sometimes affirms, as "equidem" (indeed), and sometimes opposes, as "sed" (but). It is not surprising, therefore, if from Hebraism, ἀλλὰ also not only opposes, but also affirms. For which reason, for כ "utique" (surely), the LXX said ἀλλὰ, Job 32:8. The Syriac for ἀλλὰ here in Paul has כננה, as does the Arab كذلك "similiter" (similarly), that is οὕτως.

VERS. 7. δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. Beza, "liberatus est à peccato" (he has been freed from sin). Thus also the Syriac ܕܝܚܝܢܐ and the Arab برى. This is the same thing that Peter said in his 1st Epistle 4:1, ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκί, πέπαιται ἁμαρτίας. I confess, however, that the Vulgate, who translates it literally, "justificatus est à peccato" (he has been justified from sin), pleases me very much. And indeed I think the Apostle had in mind what the Syrians would say ܕܩܕܫܐ among the Hebrews is "to be clean, pure, innocent, just." Similarly among the Syrians, among whom it also means "to conquer," and properly of him who in a trial, being declared clean of the imputed crime and just, conquers his adversary. (K2) From there comes ܕܩܕܫܐ "justification," Rom. 5:18, and ܕܟܘܠܐ "victory," Luke 1:1. ܕܟܘܠܐ "innocent," Mark 27:4, and "victor," everywhere among the Syrians. In the Ethpaal Conjugation, it means ܕܟܘܠܐ "he cleaned, purified, justified, made to conquer." I think therefore the sense is, "He who has died, has been so declared

clean and just from sin by the judge God himself, that he has conquered sin." Far be it, therefore, that the same man should succumb to sin, as if guilty and conquered. He who still lives to sin can rightly be accused, that he himself is a slave of sin, and sin is his master. But he who is regenerated through the Holy Spirit and has died to sin in Christ, is justified from that accusation and is absolved, since he can prove that sin no longer rules him, but he rules sin. This is a different justification from that which consists in the remission of sins. He who wants more on this, let him see below on Rom. 8:4.

VERS. 12. Εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ. The Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabs do not seem to have read αὐτῇ ἐν.

VER. 17. "You have obeyed that form of doctrine, εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε" "into which you were delivered," which the Syriac said in the same sense דאחמסר לכון. The Arab in the same sense and with the same root as the Syriac has الذي اسلمتم اليه. Where, however, we advise that it can be translated simply, "to which you have believed." For aslama (اسلم), which is of the 4th conjugation, or hiphil, is properly "to deliver," as also among the Syrians. Then it is used particularly for "to deliver oneself to God," that is, "to believe." And because the Mohammedans think that they alone truly believe and are delivered to God, it is said specifically of him who has embraced the Mohammedan religion. Hence everywhere in the history of Elmacin, هُوَ اسْلَمَ "he delivered," that is, "he believed," he became a Mohammedan. مُسْلِمٌ "a Muslim," "one who delivers, believes," that is, a Mohammedan. اِسْلَامٌ "Islamism," "tradition, surrender, faith," the Mohammedan religion. That this plainly agrees with the apostolic phrase, no one fails to see.

VERS. 19. Ἀνθρώπινον λέγω. Beza, "humano more loquor" (I speak in a human manner), that is κατ' ἄνθρωπον λαλῶ. The Vulgate literally, "Humanum dico" (I say a human thing). Not unskillfully, if it is rightly understood, namely "that which is human," taken from the midst of men, and therefore not so very arduous, since it can be grasped by the human mind. Thus I take the Syriac, who said איך בר נשא אבא. Tremellius: "Tanquam inter filios hominis loquor" (As if I speak among the sons of man). I would prefer, "secundum quod inter homines est dico" (I speak according to what is among men); not, "I speak": for that the Syriac would have said ממלל אבא. The Arab explains the Syriac: واقول كما يقال بين الناس: "and I say as it is commonly said among men." But the Syriac and Arabs have referred these words to what follows, as has the distinguished Beza, who translated ὡσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε as, "nempe sicut exhibuistis" (namely as you presented). So I also translate the Syriac, איכנא דהכינו דהמיכון "Nempe sicut parastis membra vestra, &c." (Namely as you prepared your members, etc.). אף הכנא "ita nunc etiam parate" (so now also prepare). For which Tremellius has, "ut sicut accommodastis &c. ita nunc etiam accommodetis" (as just as you have adapted etc. so now also you should adapt). That construction would not have required ד, but כד. What is prefixed, ד, is not the conjunction "ut" (that), but, as is usual after words of saying,

it expresses that very thing which, on account of the infirmity of their flesh, he proceeds to say, taken from human usage. (K3)

VERS. 21. *Τίνα ὄν καρπὸν εἶχετε τότε ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε;* The Syriac distinguished differently. He placed the question mark after *τότε*. He took the rest for an answer, in this way, "And what fruit did you have then?" Then: the things that follow are, says the Syriac Scholiast, *היא תורצא דשאלא קדמיה* "the answer to the preceding question," "of which you are now ashamed." I advise this, because Tremellius translated it differently.

VERS. 23. *τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια τῆς ἀμαρτίας θάνατος.* Vulgate and Beza, "Stipendia enim peccati mors" (For the wages of sin is death). In this sense *ὀψώνια* is taken in Luke 3:14 & 1 Cor. 9:7, namely for the pay of soldiers. The Syriac translates *פריעותא*, for which Tremellius has "stipendium" (stipend). Boderianus in the Paris edition, "merces" (reward). I translate, "questus, sive lucrum" (gain, or profit), for that *פריעותא* means this we have taught in Luke 12:58. And the same for the Arabic *تجارة* which this Interpreter has used here. Hesychius: *ὀψώνιον, δαπάνη, κέρδος*, "expense, profit." Suidas, *ὀψώνια, κέρδη* "profits." It is usual for the Talmudists to use *אספניא*, sometimes with the letters transposed *אספניא*, for stipend. As when in tractate Sanhedrin, c. 2, he explains that precept given to the King in Deut. 17, verse 17: *אלא כדי ליתן לו כסף וזהב לא ירבה לו* "gold and silver he shall not multiply for himself," as *אלא כדי ליתן לו אספניא* "unless that he may have whence to give stipends."

CHAPTER VII.

VERS. 1. "The law hath dominion over a man *ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῆ*." Erasmus: "quoad ea vixerit" (as long as it shall have lived), namely the law. Correctly. Beza: "quoad ipse vixerit" (as long as he shall have lived), namely the man. But it can, he says, be understood, either of him who has dominion, so that he who is dead ceases to have dominion, or of him who is subject to the one having dominion, who himself also, being dead, ceases to be subject. But in truth, no mention is made of any dominant person in this verse, but only of the law. And so the syntax itself forces that "ipse" which he inserted to refer to no other than him who is subject to the dominant law. This, however, does not seem to agree with the mind of the Apostle. Which the following similitude (otherwise than the most learned man thinks) in my judgment entirely proves. The similitude of the Husband and wife is adduced, where it is not said that the wife is bound to the husband as long as she lives, nor that she is freed when dead, but that she is bound as long as the husband lives, and when he is dead, she is freed. And from what? From the law of her husband, v. 2 & 3. Therefore, whether you say the husband, or the law of the husband, you say the same thing in this argument. While the husband lives, his law over the wife lives. When he dies, that law dies, because she is not bound to the man except through the law, verse 2. For which reason, in place of the dominant person, he said the law itself in verse 1, which he wants to have dominion over a man as long as it lives, which is just as if he had said that he who is fortified by the law has dominion over his subjects as long as he lives. And

the apodosis confirms the same, in which the Apostle does not urge that we are free from the former husband because we are dead, but because he is dead, and so we were permitted to marry another without any suspicion of adultery, namely Christ: nor is there now besides this husband another, who can claim any right over us.

Nor is it an obstacle that in v. 4 he says, ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ. For if the sense were, "you are dead while the law survives," as if the wife were to die while the husband survives, the whole similitude would be rendered void. The meaning, therefore, is, "the law being dead, you also have been made dead to its power," that is, freed from it. In the same sense as in verse 6 he says, καταργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου "we have been abolished," or "made void from the law," namely with respect to the dominion which it formerly exercised over us, but which is now plainly abolished. So that this may be understood more correctly, it must be inquired which was our former husband, sin or the law. I answer, neither sin alone, nor the law alone, but sin with the law and through the law. For just as in carnal marriage the Apostle observed three things: 1. The Husband, 2. the wife, 3. the marital law, that is, the divine right by which authority was given to the husband over the wife: so in our former spiritual marriage three things must be established: 1. Sin, 2. the unregenerate man, 3. the law of God, both moral and ceremonial, and especially moral, from which sin has all its power over man. For just as he taught above in c. 5:13, ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐλλοχεῖσθαι, μὴ ὄντος νόμου, "sin is not imputed, where there is no law," so here in chap. 7 he says τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν "the affections of sins" are διὰ τοῦ νόμου "through the law," v. 5; sin is not known except through the law, v. 7; sin takes occasion from the commandment, v. 8; without the law sin is dead, v. 9; but through the law it kills, v. 11, and becomes exceedingly sinful through the commandment, v. 13. Therefore, just as the husband has no power over the wife except by the force of marital law, and for that reason, for the law to have dominion over a man is the same for the Apostle in v. 1 as for the woman to be subject to the man in v. 2, so sin has no power over the unregenerate man except by the force of the divine law, which is therefore called δύναμις τῆς ἀμαρτίας "the power of sin," 1 Cor. 15, v. 56, and the "law of sin," Rom. 8:2, cf. with 3. And it is the same whether you say sin or the law dominates the unregenerate.

And just as when the husband is dead, the marital law is also dead, and therefore the wife is free, so when sin is dead, the law of God is also dead, and therefore the man is freed, so that he is neither under sin any longer, nor under the law. But how, you ask, is the law of God dead, when we are still held by it? I answer, it is dead with respect to the dominion which sin previously exercised over us through it and it through sin. For now in our second spiritual marriage three things are present, plainly adverse to the former: 1. Christ. 2. the regenerate man. 3. the Spirit of regeneration, who is in place of the law, subjecting us to Christ. And hence that saying, "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has freed me from the law of sin and death," Rom. 8, verse 2. The law of the

Decalogue therefore continues to bind us, but with no marital authority, not as a Lord, but as a handmaiden of the Spirit, ministering to the Gospel, and subservient to the ministry of the Spirit. For wherever the law acts as lord and husband over the sinner, it works wrath, increases sin, condemns, kills. But where Christ rules through his Spirit, there the law is an easy yoke, Matth. 11, verse 30, its commandments are not grievous, 1 John 5:3, it gives testimony to the righteousness of God through the faith of Jesus Christ, Rom. 3:22. And to this pertain what the Apostle hands down in 1 Tim. 1:8,9,10,11, where against the teachers of the law, who urged the righteousness of the law among Christians, he says that the law is good, if a man uses it lawfully. But how will a Christian use it lawfully? εἰδὼς τοῦτο, ὅτι δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κεῖται, "knowing this, that the law is not laid for a righteous man," but for the lawless, the insubordinate, etc., and if there is anything else that is contrary to sound doctrine, according to the Gospel of the glory of the blessed God. That is, if any faithful man, just in Christ through faith, and also endowed with internal justice through the regeneration of the Spirit, wishes to use the law lawfully, since it is good for him, he ought to know this thoroughly and hold it precisely, that the law is not laid for him, that is, to command as a mistress and master, to bind as a slave, to condemn when he sins, to attribute righteousness to him when he obeys. This right and dominion it has over the wicked and unjust, who, since they are adverse to the sound doctrine of the Gospel, and therefore are not subject to the dominion of Christ, are still forced to acknowledge the dominion of the law. He therefore who obeys the sound doctrine of the Gospel, makes the law good and useful for himself, when he knows that the law of faith is laid for him, not the law of works; but he uses the law of works as now subject to faith. For as he had said in verse 5, "The end of the commandment is now charity from a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." Faith has sanctified the law for us and made it useful, so that when we now love God and our neighbor from a sincere faith, that charity is holy and approved by the law, which it would otherwise profane and condemn on account of its adherent defects. And this indeed is νομίμως νόμῳ χρῆσθαι "to use the law lawfully," which those frivolous νομοδιδάσκαλοι (teachers of the law) by no means understood.

VERS. 4. Ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ. The comparison of the members demanded that it should rather be said, ἐθανατώθη ὑμῖν ὁ νόμος ("the law was made dead to you"). Therefore, learned men think that the Apostle, by a deliberate small inversion, wished to deflect the odium of the harsher word, lest he should offend the Jews if he had said that the law was dead. But it seems to me that these two phrases mean precisely the same thing, just as, when we are often said to be dead to sin, it is the same as sin being dead to us. And the Apostle takes it for the same: "the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world," Gal. 6. verse 14. Thus, it is the same: "you have died to the law," and "the law has died to you." He who says that we have died to the law, to sin, and to the world, says that we have been freed from the dominion of those things. He who says that the law, sin, and the world have died to us, says that those things have lost their dominion over us. Hence,

that "to have died" is explained by "to have been freed," Rom. 6. verse 18. & 8. 2. "to have been rescued," Gal. 1. 4. "not to be under," Rom. 6. 14.

VERS. 6. Νυνὶ δὲ καταργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου. The Vulgate, "We are loosed from the law." Beza, "we are freed." Others, "we are made void." in the same way the Vulgate translated it in Gal. 5. verse 4. The Syriac is excellent, ܘܢܘܢܝ ܕܥܝܢܝܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܢ ܕܡܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܘܬܝܢ, which Tremellius less aptly translated as "we are loosed." Boderianus is better in his interlinear version, "we cease from the law." Properly, "we have been made idle," or "we have been made to cease, to abstain from the law." He has explained the proper meaning of the verb καταργεῖν, which when referring to a person denotes "to make someone ἀργόν, idle, ceasing and abstaining from labor." Thus the Hellenists in Ezra 4. 21. 23. & 5. 5. & 6. 8. where the enemies of the Jews are ordered to compel them to cease from building Jerusalem, they call that action καταργῆσαι τοὺς ἄνδρας, in Chaldaic ܢܘܕܪܝܢܝܢ ܢܘܕܪܝܢܝܢ. So in this place, καταργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, that is, "we have been brought into such a state that we are permitted to be at leisure from the law, since we have no further business with it." As if to say, ἡ χάρις τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατήργησεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, "the grace of Christ has made us to cease from the law, so that henceforth our business is with Christ, the new husband, not with the law." Just as, conversely, in Gal. 5. verse 4, "You who wish to be justified by the law, καταργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, you have been made to cease from Christ," so that you have nothing to do with him, since you subject yourselves to the law, the old husband, and wish to deal with it. Whoever deals with the law is at leisure from Christ; whoever deals with Christ is at leisure from the law. The Arab seems to have had this in mind, قد برينا من اعمال الناموس when he translated it "we have been made immune from the works of the law." The Syriac Scholiast, "from the old law, that is." "that we may henceforth serve in newness of Spirit," ܡܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܘܬܝܢ, that is "in the new and spiritual law." If by the old law he understands the old administration of the law, as it was before Christ, and by the new and spiritual, the same moral law, which, having lost its marital dominion, is a handmaid to the grace of the Spirit, his sentiment is not bad.

It follows in the same verse, ἀποθανόντος ἐν ᾧ κατεχόμεθα. Thus only Beza reads. Although we hold this man in the highest esteem for his distinguished erudition and piety, it is a matter of religious principle to praise or tolerate what he has committed here in the sacred texts. He admits that the Greek texts with the highest consensus read ἀποθανόντες. To which I add the Syriac and the Arab. But from Erasmus he cites that Chrysostom read ἀποθανόντος and that the interpretation itself proves it; although he acknowledges that the printed copies disagree. The Savilian edition certainly has ἀποθανόντες, with no variant reading noted. Nor is it necessarily gathered from Chrysostom's interpretation itself that he read otherwise. Let us hear him. Καὶ πῶς ἡμεῖς καταργήθημεν; τοῦ κατεχομένου ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀνθρώπου παλαιοῦ ἀποθανόντος καὶ ταφέντος· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐδήλωσεν εἰπὼν, Ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατείχόμεθα, ὡσανεὶ ἔλεγεν, ὁ δεσμὸς δι' οὗ κατείχόμεθα ἐνεκρώθη καὶ διερρήη, ὥστε τὸν κατέχοντα μηδὲν κατέχειν λοιπόν, τουτέστι, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. He reads ἀποθανόντες, but says this is the same as ἀποθανόντος παλαιοῦ ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπου, which is the true and

plain explanation. We have been freed from the law, being dead, that is, the old man being dead. But dead in respect to what? In respect to sin, by whose bond the old man was held bound. Whatever the case, Chrysostom's interpretation ought not to be of such weight to us that for its sake we should change anything in the divine words against the testimony of all the codices.

Therefore, one must read ἀποθανόντες. But what then is, ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατεχόμεθα? Interpreters have tormented themselves here because of the unusual phrasing. Which I acknowledge, if it is construed with κατεχόμεθα, but not if it is construed with ἀποθανόντες. As if it were written, ἀποθανόντες ἐν ἐκείνῳ ᾧ κατεχόμεθα, "having died in that by which we were held," that is "according to that, with respect to that." Just as ἐν σαρκὶ and κατὰ σάρκα περιπατεῖν are commonly taken by the Apostle for the same thing. And so ἐν denotes the subject of spiritual mortification, or that which is mortified through regeneration. which is the very law of the flesh and of sin. and ᾧ κατείχεται is a phrase, such as in John 5. 14. ᾧ δὴποτε κατείχεται νοσήματι. Nor would I hesitate to translate it literally into Dutch, *ghestorven in het ghene/ Daermede wy ghehouden waren*. Not dissimilar is the phrase in 1 Pet. 4. 1. ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκὶ, πέπαιται ἁμαρτίας. The sense is, "he who has suffered in the flesh, just as the flesh itself may have suffered." where if for ὁ παθὼν you substitute (which in the matter of regeneration is the same thing) ὁ ἀποθανών, "he who has died in the flesh, such that the flesh itself has died," you have the same sentiment as Paul: "Having died in that by which we were held, such that the very thing by which we were held has died." But if the preposition ἐν must absolutely be construed with κατεχόμεθα, rather than reading ἀποθανόντος, I would translate, "having died in whom we were contained," namely, in Christ. For since we were elected in him, and given to him by the Father before the foundations of the world were laid, we are rightly said to have been contained in him, even before regeneration: and because we were contained, we were crucified, died, buried and raised in him. But I prefer the former opinion. which the Syriac also followed, translating, "And we have died to him who was detaining us," namely, to sin. The Arab, "from him."

VERS. 8. Αφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς. The Syriac, Arab and Beza expressed the article τῆς, for ταύτης, so that it refers to that commandment, "You shall not covet." The Vulgate and Erasmus took it generally, and therefore did not express it. which I commend. For the following verse clearly teaches that νόμον and ἐντολή are taken for the same thing. Nor on that account will verse 12 contain a hateful tautology. For if the vice of tautology is to be attributed to Scripture wherever שונות במלות אחר דבר occurs, as R. D. Kimchi commonly speaks, that is, "the same thing in different words," there will be no authors more inept than the prophet David, and especially Isaiah. Add that there seems to be a great reason here why Paul used the word "law" now, and "commandment" then, namely because the law offers occasion to sin for sinning more, by the very fact that it commands and by commanding irritates sin. The commandment, in turn, has authority against the sinner, because it is the commandment of the law. so

that I do not doubt that "commandment" is to be taken collectively for all the commandments of the law.

VERS. 9. Χωρίς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά. We understand this matter thus. If the law, where Adam transgressed it, had been abolished, that first sin would not have ceased to be a sin, but it would have been a dead sin, which could not beget any new sin. For it would have had nothing to transgress. But with the law remaining, sin lived, and produced new sins. for it had something to transgress further. And since it could not not transgress (for it could produce nothing other than what was like itself), the more it was constrained by the bonds of justice by the law, the more ferocious and ebullient it became, and the more it exerted its life in man. However, because from Adam to Moses the law was only natural, and therefore weak, the life of sin was also weak, so that it could even then be considered dead, if compared to those remarkable powers and, so to speak, activity, which sin received from the most perfect law, written by the finger of God himself and given through Moses. Here it should be noted again, what we also advised above from 1 Cor. 15. verse 56, that the law is the δύναμις, power or strength of sin. For just as the authority of a husband is his strength and power, by which he holds his wife subject to himself; so also the law of God is the strength and power and, as it were, the life of sin, by which sin, that is, original corruption, holds man himself subject and enslaved to it. And just as a man has power over his wife, not because he is a man, but because he is equipped with marital law and authority: so also original corruption reigns in man, not because it is sin, but by the power of the divine law, which by the just judgment of God subjected man to the dominion of corruption. For there can be corruption that does not reign, as now in the faithful and regenerate. The fact that it reigns in the unregenerate, dominates, and commands like a master to a servant, a husband to a wife, it has from the law, which, executing the just judgment of God, enslaved man to that first sin and to the corruption that flowed from it. Hence the Apostle said above in chapter 6, verse 15, that sin dominates as long as man is under the law.

For the law, which before the transgression was an instrument of divine goodness, subjecting man by a certain marital right to his benign Creator as to a husband, after the transgression became an instrument of divine wrath and vengeance, which, while retaining the marital right but with a completely different exercise, subjected man, who had defected from God to sin, to sin as to a husband in place of God. From this it is clear that although sin does not have from the law that it is sin (for the law is holy), yet because it has from the law dominion over man, it also has from the law that it condemns man, that it lives in man, and that it impels and pushes him to new and more sins incessantly, just as a husband impels his wife to work. it has this, I say, from the law, which avenges its own violation and, as a punishment, authorizes the primal and hereditary sin, as it were, to execute its desires through man with masterly dominion. not otherwise than above in ch. 1. 24. they had it from the hand of

life and power from sin, it makes the law itself, even in him by whom it was violated, a minister of justice and life. The Syriac Scholiast interprets that "that it might be seen to be sin" thus, ܐܘܪܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, "lest it should any longer use the appearance of justice." But I think it is indicated here not so much what God intended by the law, namely to take away the appearance of justice from sin, as what sin itself intended, when it dared to abuse the law itself to bring about death, namely to manifest itself, and to boast of its kingdom. And to this also pertains what follows, ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἢ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς. The Syriac, ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, "that sin might be more (or abundantly) condemned by the commandment." he referred ἁμαρτωλὸς not to the guilt in sin, but to the state of being accused and the punishment. As if you were to translate the Greek literally, "that sin might be rendered exceedingly guilty by the commandment." He thought it disgraceful to the law, if through its commandment sin is said to be made supremely sinful. but glorious, on the other hand, if by the commandment sin is said to be held supremely guilty for its merits. But there is no danger, since the Apostle here intends not what the use of the law is in itself, but how sin abuses it. However, I do not know if the renowned Beza was right enough to place, "that is," before ἵνα γένηται, as if he were explaining here what he had just said. It seems rather to suggest what end sin intends, when it effects death through the law, to what purpose it uses the law itself for that. namely, that it might become supremely sinful through the commandment. for since sin has seized empire, it aspires, which is the nature of all princes, to the pinnacle of empire. Therefore, just as princes do this, that having brought the forces of their enemies under their own power, they use them for the promotion of their own kingdom, so that they may reign alone, freely, without obstacles, according to their will: so sin, since it had no other enemy besides the law of God, converted the power of the law itself to its own use. so that, the more men seek justice in the law, the greater sinners they become. sin increasing its powers through the law itself, so that it may rise to the highest liberty and audacity of sinning, restrained by no barriers. The Arab, to whom all these things seemed very harsh and to be entirely avoided, wonderfully interpolated everything, for he has it thus: ولكن الخطية حين عرفت انها خطية: "But sin, when it was known to be sin, made a multitude of death to dwell in me: and this was the dominion of sin by the commandment."

VERS. 14. πεπραμένου ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. The Syriac, "sold to sin," ܩܘܕܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ. so also the Arab, but he adds for the sake of exposition, "in the flesh." Beza, "sold to be subjected to sin." I would prefer literally with the Vulgate, "sold under sin." That is, constituted under the power of sin like a sold slave, who by the right of purchase, is under the power of the buyer. nothing is lacking, except that "sold" is put for "constituted through sale," the consequent being understood from the antecedent, a manner most familiar to the Hebrews. The Syriac Scholiast says quite dilutely that the reason for the statement is, ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ.

ܠܚܕܘܬܝܗܘܢ, "because I am a man subject to passions, prone to concupiscence." he did not express that enslavement sufficiently.

VERS. 18. "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) nothing good dwells. For to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not." If, as the patrons of free will try to infer from this passage, a carnal man can will the good, the Apostle wrongly denies that any good dwells in his flesh. For it is a good thing to will the good, and indeed, from the fact that he feels himself ready to will, but does not find the ability to perform, he concludes that nothing good naturally dwells in him. For he speaks as one who is regenerate. and since even after the regeneration of the will, by which he now felt the readiness to will was present to him, he still found such malice of the flesh that it delayed the performance of the good willed through the grace of the Holy Spirit, he correctly collects from this that the malice of the flesh is supreme, void of all good. But how, acknowledging a readiness to will, does he deny the ability to perform, when in Phil. 2. 13. he says that God works both? I answer: He works both in his own, but not to an equal degree or extent. He works more of willing than of performing. For the faithful vow, desire, and will far more obedience than they either perform or can perform. God brings it about that they will every good, so that by this sense of regeneration their faith may be supported. But he does not so repress the malice of the flesh that they perform every good, so that by this sense of their natural corruption they may be humbled and cast down.

However, it seems to contradict what was said in that place, that he simply denies that he finds τὸ κατεργάζεσθαι. I answer: The statement is not universal, but indefinite. Just as in the following verse he says indefinitely, that he does not do the good that he wills, but does the evil that he does not will. The sense is not that he does no good that he wills, and does all the evil that he does not will, but that it happens more often than is pleasing to his mind that he wills the good, yet does not perform it: he does not will the evil, yet does it. Add that in all, even their best works, the faithful acknowledge some imperfection, and so a defect of some good which they willed, but did not perform: and a stain of some evil, which they did not will, and yet committed. The Syriac Interpreter has ܠܚܕܘܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܚܕܘܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܚܕܘܬܝܗܘܢ, "for to will the good is easy for me. but to perform it, I do not find." There is nothing about ease in the text. For the Apostle indicates by the word παράκειται μοι that it is perpetually present to him to will the good, not always present to perform it. But the Scholiast here is plainly insipid, when he elucidates the mind of the Syriac Interpreter thus: ܠܚܕܘܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܚܕܘܬܝܗܘܢ ܠܚܕܘܬܝܗܘܢ, "that one should know virtue, is easier than to do it." To will is certainly far more than to know. Furthermore, concerning τὸ δὲ θέλειν παράκειται μοι, this is found in this place in Beza's notes. He alludes perhaps to that of Gen. 4. verf. 7. "Sin lies at the door." In which place, however, it is specifically about Cain's wicked thought, not about the very root of sins. This whole observation, out of

place here, should be relegated to verse 21, to those words ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται. where it is very fitting.

VERS. 21. Εὐρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται. "I find therefore this law for me who wills to do good, that evil is present with me." Thus approximately the renowned Beza. with a very good and plain sense indeed. However, I would also like to examine the opinion of the Syriac, which has it thus: ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ. Tremellius translated it, "I find therefore the law, which agrees with my mind, indeed for him who wishes to do good, to be repugnant to my flesh: because evil is near to me." He supplied many things. which, so that Junius might avoid them, he translated thus: "I find therefore the law which is perfect, in my mind itself willing to do good: because etc." I also do not approve of Tremellius's supplements. However, I approve that he translated ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ as "which agrees with my mind." for that is what it truly means. but by no means that of Junius, "which is perfect, in my mind." for a law which is perfect would be said ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ, not ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ. And "in my mind" not ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ but ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ. I therefore translate the Syriac thus, "I find therefore the law, that it agrees with my mind willing to do good. because evil is near to me." Thus also the Arab closely expressed the Syriac. The sense of the paraphrast is, as if the Apostle had said. "Since I do what I do not will, and what I will I do not do, from this I find, not only that I consent to the law that it is good, but also that the law consents with my regenerate mind, which wills to do good." And that that consent is necessary, because evil naturally adheres to me. This interpretation of the Syriac makes it seem worthwhile to examine the Latin Vulgate as well. It, departing in no way from the Greek, adding nothing, translates, "I find then a law to me willing to do good, because evil is at hand for me." Which can be taken in two ways, with almost the same sense, although with a different construction. First, "I find a law for me," that is "for my part, standing on my side, favoring me, willing to do good." Then, "I find the law to do good for me who is willing to do good." for τῷ θέλοντι supply τὸ ἀγαθόν. just as above in verse 18, for τὸ θέλειν supply τὸ ἀγαθόν. For the law which is adverse to the unregenerate, is for the regenerate, it favors them, aids their regeneration, praises their good efforts, and for those willing to do good it also does good, by advocating, consoling, and exciting to greater virtue. And this indeed because natural corruption still adheres to them, against which the law fortifies and encourages them. and in this both the sanctity of the law and the depravity of native corruption clearly shine forth. But I confess that Beza's meaning is simpler and plainer.

VERS. 23. "But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." I see that the more learned commentators distinguish here the law of the members from the law of sin. The law of sin, says the great Calvin, is iniquity having dominion both in the man not yet regenerated, and in the flesh of the regenerated man. The law of the members is the concupiscence situated in the

members, having symphony with iniquity. Similarly, Beza says the law of sin is corrupt nature: the law of the members, the desires born from it, which he called "affections of sins." But it does not seem that the Apostle distinguishes these two here. for what they call the Law of the members, the Apostle said is the law "in his members." similarly he said the law of sin is "in his members." I think therefore that it deals with the same law, and at the end the antecedent is repeated in place of the relative pronoun. in this way, "But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and making me captive to itself." but he preferred to repeat the noun itself, both because quite a few words had intervened between it and the relative pronoun, and especially to explain which other law he had spoken of, namely the law of sin. It is usual for the Hebrews to repeat the noun in place of a pronoun. as in Gen. 9. 16. "And the bow shall be in the cloud, and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God (for between me) and every living creature." so Ps. 50. last verse. I do not think, however, that a fourfold law is devised here by Paul. 1. The law of God. 2. The law of the mind. 3. The law of the members. 4. The law of sin. But only two are opposed, the law of the mind, and the law of sin in the members. For here there is a twofold opposition. the first of the Mind, and of the members. The other, of the law of the mind, and the law of sin in the members. The mind is that which is regenerate in man. The members, what is unregenerate, corrupt nature, the old man, consisting of many members. about which Col. 3. verse 5. "Mortify your earthly members," that is your old man. The law of the mind is the very law of God, which is called of the mind. 1. because it is inscribed on the mind by the Holy Spirit. 2. because the mind delights in it, as the Apostle spoke in the preceding verse, and from there derived that notion here. 3. because the mind commands the whole man by it. The law of sin in the members is the dominion of sin, having its seat in corrupt nature: just as the law of God is in the mind, or in the regenerate nature. And from there is to be explained what is said in the last verse, "With the mind indeed," that is the regenerate part, "I serve the law of God," as being the law of the mind. "but with the flesh," that is the unregenerate part, "the law of sin," that is the dominion of sin, which relates to the flesh, or the members (for these are taken for the same thing), just as the law of God relates to the mind. The Syriac Scholiast says that other law in the members is ܠܘܥܒܝܢܐ, "the corporeal faculties," by which if he understands the faculties of the sensitive soul, pertaining to food and sex, which utterly serve the body, he is nothing. for the dominion of sin is something far different and worse, whose throne is erected in all the members of the old man.

VERS. 24. Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος. The Syriac ܠܘܥܒܝܢܐ ܠܘܥܒܝܢܐ ܠܘܥܒܝܢܐ The Scholiast, quoting these words, writes ܠܘܥܒܝܢܐ with a point subscribed, which however is not extant in the Syriac edition. and explaining the place he says the sense is ܠܘܥܒܝܢܐ ܠܘܥܒܝܢܐ ܠܘܥܒܝܢܐ which how I should take, I do not sufficiently understand. for ܠܘܥܒܝܢܐ with a point subscribed, and the prior Aleph elided in pronunciation, always has the value of the substantive verb *sum*. but in that sense, as far as I know, it is never joined to a participle or noun of the Emphatic form, but of the simple and

absolute. and so it should have been said אֲנִי מֵיָסוּר, I am miserable, and not אֲנִי מֵיָסוּר. and אֲנִי מֵיָסוּר וְעַבְדוּ, "I am miserable and captive," not וְעַבְדוּ אֲנִי. and then the statement would be indicative, not exclamatory. Since therefore it has no point written in the text, and it is joined to a noun of the emphatic form, I think absolutely that the point should be written above the Nun, and the prior Aleph should be read with the second vowel; then it is a pronoun, and the same as what the Apostle said, "miserable I man" by way of a sigh and a complaining exclamation. And in the same way it should be written in the Paraphrast, "Miserable I and captive." It follows, "Who shall deliver me ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου?" Erasmus, Beza, the Syriac and the Arab construe τούτου with the more remote σώματος. The Vulgate with the nearer θανάτου. which greatly pleases me. for it does not seem to have a singular emphasis if it demonstrates the body: but a far greater one, if it demonstrates death. for it indicates that that death which he felt from the remnants of the power of sin in his body was most sad and most unhappy.

CHAPTER VIII.

VERS. 1. Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα. The renowned Beza rightly observed that the Syriac did not read ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα. I add, nor did the Vulgate. then that the Syriac did not read the distinction after Ἰησοῦ. The Vulgate read it. hence the version varies. The Arab plainly follows the Syriac. Nor did the Syriac wrongly join μὴ with περιπατοῦσιν. for he understood very well that if it were to be understood after τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, τοῖς would have had to be repeated, and one would have to say τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν. both the sense and the genius of Greek demanded that.

VERS. 2. Ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠλευθέρωσέ με ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου. Beza, "For the law of the Spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus, has freed me from the law of sin and of death." Thus his text is edited. but from the notes it is clear that for *qui* (which) one should read *qua*, supply *vita* (by which life). and by that life which is in Christ he wants to be understood the perfect sanctification which is in Christ, and which being imputed to us, perfectly frees us from the law of sin, when otherwise in ourselves we are only imperfectly freed in this life. I do not know if the Apostle had that in view. He seems simply to be following the tracks of the preceding. namely, that the state of our marriage has been changed. that the husband of the former marriage was sin. that we were then detained by its law and truly enslaved. that another husband has succeeded, Christ with his Spirit. that we are now held by his marital law. that this change of conjugal law is most happy, because the law of sin was also of death: but the law of the Spirit of Christ is of life. hence both depend, which he established in the previous verse. first, that there can be no condemnation for us, because we have been freed from the law, that is, the right, authority and dominion of sin, as from a deceased husband, and therefore from death, and have been transferred into his law and dominion, with whom is life.

The other, that sanctification cannot but be found in us, by which we walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit. because with the law of sin abolished, we have been transferred into the law of the Spirit. But you will say, how does Paul boast that he is freed from the law of sin, when in the preceding chapter he complained that he is still enslaved to the law of sin, and still serves the law of sin? He said that he serves it with the flesh, but with the mind the law of God. if only with the flesh, not with the mind, then he is truly freed. for a believer is to be judged by the mind, not by the flesh. No account is taken of the flesh in the judgment of God, where the mind is God's, and delights in God's law. Add that the Law of sin is not taken in precisely the same way here as in the preceding chapter, verses 23 and 25. Here it is taken generally and absolutely. there specially and with restriction, insofar as it is in the members. Here it signifies that full dominion of sin to which the whole natural man constituted outside of Christ is subject, in which the very law of God is also comprehended, without which sin has no right, no authority over man, as we have often said in the preceding chapter. But there, by the law of sin were understood certain remnants of that dominion, which sin exercises, not over the whole faithful man, but only over his members, or his flesh, that is, over his corrupt nature, and this according to the remnants of power which it has reserved from the old use of the law, and will retain, as long as any corruption remains, so that the vestiges of the former servitude may be seen, and the faithful may have some sense of it in this life. whereas otherwise, according to the new use, which the law of God, inscribed on the minds of the faithful, has from the grace of the Holy Spirit, it does not conspire at all with the law of sin in them. According to this latter signification, Paul was still serving the Law of sin, with respect to that part of him in which alone sin still retained some dominion, namely with respect to the flesh. but according to the former signification, Paul was freed from the Law of sin, loosed according to the mind and the regenerate part of himself from all dominion, not only of sin but also of the divine law, which by the just judgment of God conspiring with sin, had formerly exercised marital right with it, and with it had brought forth death. but which now, when Paul had passed to another husband, conspired with his mind, and opposed and condemned the law of sin, which continued to command his flesh; having become a patron of justice to him, which formerly had been the president of sin. Therefore I would not wish to be condemned, if here by the law of sin, from which Paul says he has been freed, I understand the very law of God. in the sense, namely, in which the same Apostle here calls it the power of sin, 1 Cor. 15. 56. For sin does not have a law from itself. the law made for it is the most holy law of God himself, through which, by his most severe but most just judgment, it dominates, kills, and becomes supremely sinful. as we saw in chapters 6 and 7. Nor is it unworthy of note, that we are taught by the Apostle, to what extent we are freed from the law. not indeed with respect to the obedience it prescribes, by which we are always bound; but insofar as it is the law of sin and of death, giving

power to sin, and inflicting death. And hence arose the impossibility for the law to help us, of which the Apostle treats in the following verse.

VERS. 3. Τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός. Among the various interpretations which the renowned Beza brings forward, this one pleases me most, "For since the impotence or rather impossibility of the law was destitute of strength through the flesh." It is said far more effectively that "The impotence of the law was without strength," than if "The Law itself were said to be without strength." for thus it is indicated that that impotence was incurable, since it was situated in a total lack of strength. understand, of salvific strength. But what was the impossibility of the law? Namely to do that which God then did in the flesh of his son, to condemn sin. which absolutely had to be done, that we might be freed from the law of sin and of death. Now condemnation is taken in two ways. a deed is condemned, when it is disapproved and blamed. a person is condemned, when a sentence of death is passed on him, and is ordered for execution. Where sin is considered in the manner of a deed, insofar as it is a transgression of the law, and a violation of divine holiness, the law, which is always the patron of divine holiness, cannot but condemn sin by disapproving and blaming it. But if it is considered under the manner of a person, as a certain prince, who armed by the justice of God exercises power, dominion, and tyranny over the sinner, the Law not only does not condemn, that is, adjudicate to death, sin, but also, as the avenger of God's justice adds life to sin, stabilizes and confirms its dominion, so that by the same means by which the Majesty of God was spurned by man, man is afflicted, tortured, and punished. The law, I say, does not pass a sentence of death on sin, but on the sinner. nor can sin die by the law, but it lives more by it, so that man may die more. as the Apostle taught in the previous chapter. But after the son of God was sent in the likeness of the flesh of sin, that is, clothed in holy flesh, but which would represent the appearance of sinful flesh, because our sins had been transferred to it, God who is bound by no law, by the same grace by which he transferred our sin to his son, condemned sin in the flesh of his son, that is, as a transgressor of the law, and a violator of God's holiness, and a plague of the human race, and a tyrant of the Elect themselves, and now even assailing his own Son, he adjudicated it to death and killed it, so that now the sinner might not die, but live. And since before it was impossible for the law to bring about that the justification of the law might be fulfilled in us, because the poison of sin, poured into the law, had rendered the power of the law poisonous, which poured back in turn into sin rendered it more sinful, the Son of God, having condemned and killed sin in his flesh, and thus having removed at the same time all poison from the law itself, through his Spirit poured out into us, brought it about that the justification of the law should be fulfilled in us.

But the annotation of the Syriac Scholiast on that phrase ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκός ἁμαρτίας is most inept and utterly ἀθεόλογος. ܕܢܘܨܚܘܢܐ ܕܢܘܨܚܘܢܐ ܕܢܘܨܚܘܢܐ ܕܢܘܨܚܘܢܐ ܕܢܘܨܚܘܢܐ. It indicates, "our Lord put on the flesh of Adam before he sinned." as if the

conception by the Holy Spirit was not sufficient for him to put on immaculate flesh and only similar to sinful flesh, even after the fall of Adam. But what is it that follows, *καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας*? The Syriac and Arab have translated it "because of sin." The Vulgate and Erasmus "of sin." Beza, "for sin." with whom further see how the Interpreters have tormented themselves here. We take it in the same meaning as the Apostle to the Hebrews 10. 6. 8. where from Ps. 40. 7. he cites the words of the LXX Interpreters, who for *תְּלַחֵץ לֹא הִצְטִיחַ הֵלֵעַ* said, *όλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ἤτησας*. Beza there rendered it, "and a sacrifice for sin." well. for that *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is a type of sacrifice, contrasted with burnt offerings, is clear from the entire book of Leviticus, where it is used many times, sometimes for *תִּצְטִיחַ*. Lev. 5. 7. where it deals with two turtledoves or young pigeons, to be offered by a poor person instead of a lamb, and it is commanded to offer *הֵלֵעַ לְדָבָר תִּצְטִיחַ לְדָבָר*, the LXX *ἓνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας, καὶ ἓνα εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμα*, "one as an offering for sin, the other as a burnt offering." so often elsewhere. Sometimes simply for *תִּצְטִיחַ* without *ל*. Ibid. v. 9. *תִּצְטִיחַ דָּמָא* "from the blood of the sacrifice for sin," LXX. *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*. and v. 11. *הִיא תִּצְטִיחַ כִּי* "for it is an offering for sin," *ὅτι περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἐστίν*. So in this place, "Having sent his son in the likeness of sinful flesh, *καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας*," *תִּצְטִיחַ* "and as an offering for sin." or simply *תִּצְטִיחַ* "an offering for sin." For that the renowned Beza denies that this is about the death of Christ, seems to be done less correctly. for it is, as we have said, to condemn sin, to adjudicate it to death so that it is deprived of life, which was done only in the death of Christ. indeed, we believe that the principal cause is situated in his death, why the likeness of sinful flesh was attributed to him by the Apostle. For although the infirmities and miseries of his whole life revealed this likeness to some extent, it appeared most of all in his death. and the ancient sacrifices foreshadowed this. For just as the flesh of the victims, innocent and harmless in themselves, after the sins of the people had been imposed on them by the laying on of hands, had a likeness of sinful flesh, and as if they themselves had sinned, were slaughtered for God: so also the flesh of Christ, having become a victim for us, and bearing our sins in his body on the tree, had the likeness of sinful flesh, and as if it itself had sinned, was slaughtered.

VERS. 4. *ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῆ ἔν ἡμῖν*. Beza, "that that right of the law might be fulfilled in us." The Vulgate and Erasmus, "the justification of the law." just as above ch. 5. v. 18. *δι' ἑνὸς δικαίωματος* Beza himself translated, "by one justification." and Apoc. 19. verse 8. *τὰ δικαίωματα τῶν ἁγίων* "the justifications of the saints." The Syriac, "the justice of the law:" which the Arab also follows. The matter comes to almost the same thing. The right, justice, justification of the law consists in this, that through complete conformity with the law we may be held just and blameless before God. This could not be obtained while sin lived and reigned through the law. but with sin condemned in the flesh of Christ, and the law itself approving this condemnation, through the full conformity of Christ our head with the law, we are held just and blameless in the same head, with the law confessing it. and not only this, but so that the members may be conformed to the head, from him flows into us the Spirit of regeneration, who also in us

ourselves perfects the justification of the law. He so regenerates us, that with our mind we delight in the law of God. and what sin remains in the flesh, he so gradually abolishes, that at length we are to be acknowledged by the law itself without any spot or blemish. This entire righteousness therefore, both imputed which we have by faith in Christ our head, and inherent which we have by regeneration in ourselves, is indeed the righteousness of the law, but neither is from the law, nor through the law: but both are from the blood and Spirit of Christ.

And the first is indeed that of which Rom. 4. verse 11. 2 Cor. 5. verse 21. Phil. 3. 9. by which God, although in ourselves we are still unconformed to the law, yet fully, by the testimony of the law itself, justifies us, and holds us as completely conformed to it in Christ our head. about which justification the Apostle has disputed at length above in ch. 3. & 4. & 5. The other is that of which Rom. 6. 13. Eph. 4. 24. 1 Joh. 3. 7. by which God, through regeneration, having conformed us in part to the law in ourselves, now justifies us in part, and day by day justifies us more and more, as regeneration increases, and will justify fully, when perfection comes. about which Justification it is treated in Jac. ch. 2. 21. 24. Apoc. 22. 11. Matth. 12. verse 37. 1 Kings 8. verse 32. The works of the Law enter into this Justification. indeed, they alone constitute it. just as faith alone constitutes the first, that is the righteousness of Christ imputed by faith, not works: so works, not faith, constitute the other. Yet it is not therefore from the law, but from grace. For the law does not admit it from the authority of its own power, which can praise nothing but what is perfectly holy, but from the authority of the grace of Christ, to which the law is now a handmaid, and by whose command it praises even the imperfect works of the faithful, approves them, and holds them as conformed to itself. which grace we indeed embrace by faith, and by that faith are made ready and eager to give diligence to the righteousness of the law, yet not properly faith, but works constitute that second righteousness.

There is therefore a twofold Justification. One by which we, sinners in ourselves, are justified before God outside of us. The other, by which, having been justified before God outside of us, we are justified before him in us. The first of these is the cause of the second. the second is the effect and demonstration of the first. the first is accomplished by faith, the other by works. both must concur, for the justification of the law to be completed in us. Will you not then say, is there not a certain justification from the law, if it is from the works of the law? There is not, I say. Because the works of which we speak, although they are of the law, with respect to the norm they follow, or that they are prescribed by the law, yet with respect to their origin and the virtue from which they proceed, they are not of the law, but of grace and of the Spirit. Most importantly, however, because those are said to be justified by the Law, who are justified by works, as from a fulfilled condition of the covenant. which happens only then, when the works correspond to the law with complete perfection. for then the Law justifies the man, just as a husband justifies a wife who has never violated her faith to him:

for as that justification of the wife proceeds from the conjugal right: so from a similar right, which in the covenant of works God established between his law and man, proceeds the justification of that man, who has kept his faith to the law inviolate. But he who was before a covenant-breaker towards the law, and then joined to a new husband, namely Christ, by conjugal right, now lives indeed according to the law, but yet with many defects; the Law admits his righteousness, not because it owes it from conjugal right, but from its ministerial office, by which, having been made a servant of our husband, it approves what proceeds from his Spirit, even if imperfect.

Let us treat more fully of this second species of Justification. It is that by which God, from the regeneration given to us, and the works of sincere faith which we have produced, absolves us from the crime of hypocrisy, profanity and impiety, and no longer holds us as dead in sins, servants of the Devil, and sons of the world, but as truly faithful, his sons, restored to his image, endowed with his life, and translated into his kingdom. which judgment of God the Law also approves. Not that it considers itself satisfied by our works, but because, deprived of its own dominion and subjected to Christ our lord, it cannot but praise the works which proceed from faith in Christ and from his Spirit, and, although imperfect, hold them for true righteousness, and those who perform them for truly just, and sons pleasing to God. Let it be inquired here, since Scripture frequently and openly attributes to us both kinds of righteousness of which we have spoken, and therefore for the reason of both we are to be considered just, not only before men, but also before God, whether not, in the sense that we are said to be justified by works in James 2 and to be justified by our words in Matthew 12, our works can be said to be imputed to us for righteousness. Not indeed as faith is imputed to us for righteousness. but as the deed of Phinehas is said to have been imputed to him for righteousness, Psalm 106. 31. For the imputation for righteousness, by which the obedience which Christ performed for us is held as ours, and thence we unjust and sinners are absolved from the vengeance of an angry God, is one thing. there faith alone embracing that obedience is imputed for righteousness. The imputation of righteousness, by which the works of piety which proceed from us, justified by faith and regenerated by the Holy Spirit, although imperfect and deserving of blame and rejection, are yet held by God through grace for Christ's sake, as good, holy and just, and thence we are absolved from the charge of wickedness and fraud, and compared with the impious and profane, are justified as upright, is another. Here works are also imputed for righteousness. just as the deed of Phinehas, which otherwise being done without a calling, and therefore seemed blameworthy and to be disapproved, is said to have been imputed to him for righteousness, because it was attributed to him as a good, holy, and praiseworthy work.

I am pleased to set these things forth in the very words of the great Calvin, Inst. book 3. chap. 17. Sect. 8. "It is one thing," he says, "to dispute what works are worth in themselves, another in what place they are to be held after the

righteousness of faith has been established. If a price is to be set for works according to their dignity, we say they are unworthy to come into the sight of God: therefore man has nothing of works by which to glory before God. thence, stripped of all aid of works, he is justified by faith alone. With the remission of sins presupposed, the good works which now follow have a different estimation than from their own merit: because whatever in them is imperfect, is covered by the perfection of Christ. Therefore, with the guilt of all transgressions, by which men are hindered from bringing forth anything pleasing to God, being obliterated, and the fault of imperfection, which is wont to defile even good works, being buried: the good works which are done by the faithful are judged just: or (which is the same thing) are imputed for righteousness." Thus far he. Hence, furthermore, these distinctions arise: That the imputation of faith is for perfect righteousness, such as is the obedience of Christ. The imputation of works, for imperfect righteousness, such as are the works themselves in this life. In the former, the rigor of the law is satisfied: in the latter, the Law, having become an instrument of grace, condescends, and accommodates itself to us. That imputation is the cause of the remission of sins, this is not so: since it would have no place unless sins were first remitted. In the former, the sinner is absolved from guilt, in the latter, the pious is distinguished from the impious. for although the object of both is one and the same man, there, however, he is considered as impious, to whom believing in Christ God remits sins, Rom. 4. verse 5. Here as pious, whom, living among the impious, and at some time to appear with them before the tribunal of God, he pronounces and will pronounce from works of piety an heir of his kingdom, Matth. 25. 34. 35. In the former, God passes judgment on the price of his son's blood, how much it is worth for us before him. In the latter, he passes judgment on the gift of regeneration conferred on us, of what sort, namely, he holds us on that account.

Furthermore, the Pontiffs also posit two Justifications, a First and a second. The first is that by which we first from unjust become inherently just in ourselves, and therefore dear to God. The second, by which, having been made just in this way, we are advanced more and more in that righteousness, and therefore in the love of God towards us. which both differ from ours by the whole heaven. Both of theirs rest on our merit. and the first indeed on congruent merit, the other on condign. Both of ours rest on the sole merit of Christ, and his grace. Both of theirs consist in inherent holiness. The first of ours, in the remission of sins through the imputed obedience of Christ. The other, in the judgment of God, by which, overlooking the defects of our works for Christ's sake, he holds them as just, and conformed to his law, and thence pronounces us piously just. according to the saying of 1 Joh. 3. 7. "He who does righteousness is righteous." The foundation of which second Justification is indeed the righteousness inherent in us, but not by virtue of its own dignity, or of a holiness proportionate to the just law of God, but by virtue of the imputed righteousness of Christ, from which it flows, and on whose grace it entirely rests. For being stained with not a few defects, it deprecates the judgment of an angry God. having been reconciled, it

does not flee him, who holding his faithful as just in Christ, because he has imputed the righteousness of Christ to them, also holds them and wishes them to be held as just in themselves, because he has regenerated them by his Spirit, by whose power they give diligence to righteousness.

The Apostle asserts in 1 Cor. 6. 9. 10. that neither the unjust, nor fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor the effeminate, nor those who lie with males, nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners will be heirs of the kingdom of God. from these crimes, therefore, Christians must be justified, that is, pronounced innocent, if they are to be saved. And the Apostle affirms that this has already been done. "You were," he says, "some of these things: but you have been washed," that is, cleansed from these filthinesses: "but you have been sanctified," that is, separated from such impurities: "but you have been justified," that is, you are held innocent, so that you can no longer be accused of these crimes. and this "in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." I understand this of the second Justification, by which, those who were previously held by these crimes, now being regenerated in the name of Christ and by the Spirit of God, could no longer be accused of them, but had to be absolved therefrom. This is the very thing the Apostle said above in Rom. 6. 7. "He who has died, *δεδικαίωται*, has been justified from sin," that is, so freed from it, that he can no longer be accused as a servant of sin, since he is to be held not as a friend but as a hater of sin. Where again it is to be noted, that the first Justification is from sins of which we are guilty: but the second from those of which we are not guilty. When someone has committed a sin, he is guilty, nor is he justified therefrom, that is, he is not absolved from its guilt, except through the remission of sins, which is from faith alone. But I give you a regenerate man, who though before regeneration was a drunkard, a fornicator, etc. from the time of regeneration has ceased from these sins. he, surely, by the very fact that he has ceased, cannot be accused of them as before, having been justified. therefore he is justified from them, that is, absolved from things not perpetrated. and this justification is truly from works. because he has lived soberly and chastely, he must absolutely be justified from drunkenness and fornication. But you will say, David after his regeneration committed adultery. I answer, the guilt of that sin was blotted out by the first Justification from faith alone, nor could he in any way have been justified from it by the second, because since he had perpetrated adultery God could not pronounce that he had not perpetrated it. but with repentance added, he was justified from hardness and servitude to sin by the second Justification from the work of repentance itself. For if you compare Saul with David, both sin: but Saul, being impenitent, is accused and condemned for hardness from the work of impenitence: David, being penitent, is absolved from that fault from the work of repentance, since he is not guilty of it.

To this second species of Justification belongs what is usually called in the Schools the "justification of the cause." As when David, from the accusations and criminations of his enemies, appeals to the tribunal of God, he there professes

his innocence, probity, the pursuit of faith and piety, and subjecting his heart to the examination of God himself, he asks that his cause be tried by God, and that he be rewarded according to his justice: not only his cause, of course, but also himself, falsely accused by the impious, he asks to be justified by God. Thus God justified Job, when vindicating him from the crimes unjustly imputed to him by his friends, he says that Job spoke more rightly of him than they, nor would he be placated with them except by his intercession, Job 42. 8. Especially indeed, when in ch. 1. 7. 9. 10. 11. the Devil had calumniated Job before God, as if he followed God only for the sake of gain, with a mercenary love, God justifies his servant against that calumny in ch. 2. 3. saying, "He still holds fast his integrity, although you moved me against him, to destroy him without cause." and there justification is sought for Job from works, because he is still blameless and upright, fearing God and turning away from evil. The matter still stands the same way with all the faithful. For since the Devil is said to be the accuser of the brethren, accusing them before God day and night, Apoc. 12. 10. and not only before God, but also often in our own consciences, which he not rarely undermines and shakes with the suspicion of hypocrisy, as if we professed faith and piety with a less than sincere, indeed a feigned mind, we surely have need to be absolved from this accusation, and to be justified from this false testimony before God. which is certainly something other than being absolved and justified from the guilt of all our sins, by which we are bound over to wrath and the just judgment of God. This belongs to the first justification, and is accomplished only by faith in Christ. the other belongs to the second, and seeks aid from works. Let the kind reader, I beseech him, compare this our opinion with that which is extant in the other Colloquy of Ratisbon: where that great light of the Church, Martin Bucer, speaks thus on the passage of James, page 302. "To be justified by faith, which is the first and vital Justification, James has interpreted as being called a friend of God, that is, with sins forgiven, to be reconciled with God, and to be received by him into grace and friendship, who before was an enemy of God and a son of wrath. But to be justified by works, he taught is the same as to receive from God on account of good works, which Abraham and Rahab received from him, that is, approbation, praise, and remuneration." He adds on page 308. "We had said, following the Apostle and all Scripture, that there is a twofold righteousness of the Saints by which they are just before God and men. One is Christ's, perfect, on which all their hope of God's grace and salvation, and eternal life entirely rests. The other is begun in them by the Spirit of Christ, in which they ought not to trust, because it is always imperfect, while they live here, and cannot be approved by God except out of his liberal and infinite mercy and the merit of Christ. By this righteousness no one is justified before God with the justification of life." Then on page 313. "We feel that this inchoate righteousness is indeed a true and living righteousness, a splendid and excellent gift of God, and that the new life in Christ consists in this righteousness, and that all saints are just by this very righteousness also, both before God and before men, and on account of it the saints are also justified by God with a justification

themselves understand the Angels. To be subject to vanity is to be addicted to the ministry of men. Likewise, to be freed from the bondage of corruption is to be freed from the ministry of men. This is dung, compared to the most excellent gold that Chrysostom, Calvin, Beza, and others supply here, whom let him see who so desires.

VERSE 21. Εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ. Syriac: ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܒܢܐ. Tremellius and Boderianus: *into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God*. But ܩܘܪܒܢܐ is *in liberty*, or rather *in liberties*, for it is plural. For *into liberty* they would say ܩܘܪܒܢܐ. For the interpreter did not think that the rest of creation was to be so freed from the bondage of corruption as to be transferred into the liberty of glory, that is, into the participation of the most free glory of the sons of God; but that they were to be freed from the bondage of their corruption, *in liberty*, that is, then when the sons of God will attain the liberty of their glory. So also the Arab: *in hope that it also might be redeemed from the bondage of corruption بحرية مجد ابناء الله*, *in the liberty of the glory of the sons of God*. He explains, therefore, that in the Apostle, εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης is put for ἐν τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, just as elsewhere εἰς is often used for ἐν. Matthew 2, verse 23: Κατόκησεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέθ. Mark 1:9: ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην. In my judgment, this is excellent. However, ܩܘܪܒܢܐ here is plural, if I am not mistaken; ܩܘܪܒܢܐ, liberty, otherwise signifies a hole. The Scholiast notes, however, that other copies, instead of ܩܘܪܒܢܐ, read ܩܘܪܒܢܐ, which commonly signifies liberty, and seems to be the true reading here.

Chrysostom renders εἰς with διὰ, *on account of*. Whether you understand the efficient cause, *because* the sons of God will have been introduced into the liberty of glory, just as the nurse of a king's son, when he has succeeded to his father's dignity, she also on his account becomes a partaker of the goods. Or the final cause, that the liberty of the glory of the sons of God may be augmented and made more illustrious, just as when the head of a household is about to bring his son forth splendidly into public, he also dresses all the slaves splendidly, εἰς τὴν τοῦ παιδὸς δόξαν, *for or on account of the son's glory*. For Chrysostom offers these two similes. Nor is it unusual for εἰς to mean *on account of*, as we have previously shown on Luke 16:16. You could also translate it, *at the liberty of the glory of the sons of God*, in the sense that Num. 16:34 says ܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܒܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܒܢܐ, *they fled at their voice*, that is, having heard their voice. So also creatures can be said to be freed from the bondage of corruption, *at the liberty*, that is, when the liberty of glory, or the glorious liberty of the sons of God, will be present.

VERSE 22. *For we know that the whole creation* συστενάξει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν. Vulgate: *groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now*, neglecting the preposition σύν in both cases; so also the Syriac. For what Tremellius translates as *congemiscunt* (groan together), should be translated simply *gemunt* (they groan). Beza refers the preposition to the consensus of all parts of the world. Erasmus and the Arab refer it (P3) to us: *they groan and travail together with us*. Which could broadly mean, *they grieve for our lot*, and as if with groans and anxiety, they

Ibid. τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξόμεθα καθὸ δεῖ, οὐκ οἶδαμεν. The Syriac Scholiast says the sense is ܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ. "We do not desire the good things promised to us, because they are not known to us." For there is no desire for the unknown. ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις. That is, he says, ܘܠܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ. "That grace of the Spirit which is given to us, knows (properly attains) them, and prays that we may acquire them." What he says is not entirely nothing. For in 1 Cor. 2:12, the Apostle also teaches that we have received the Spirit of God, so that we might know the things that are given to us by God. Therefore, without the Spirit of God, it cannot happen that anyone should pray well. For without him, man does not even know which of God's things pertain to him.

VERSE 27. Ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγίων. Syriac: ܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ, *according to the will of God*. I would prefer this over taking κατὰ with the Arab for πρὸς or παρά, for he says ܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ, *he intercedes with God*.

VERSE 28. Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεόν, πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. The Syriac and Arab took πάντα for πάντη, *in everything*, or ἐν πᾶσι, *in all things*. And they construe συνεργεῖ with God whom the pious love: *But we know that he helps those who love God in everything for good*, namely, God who is loved by his own. And the Arab explains that Syriac *in everything* by *in every matter of good works*. But most simply the Vulgate and others construe συνεργεῖ with πάντα.

Ibid. τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὓσι. The Syriac excellently understood that πρόθεσιν here is not of men but of God. Therefore he translated, ܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ, *whom he set beforehand, that they should be called*. So also the Arab.

VERSE 29. Ὅτι οὓς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνας, &c. The Syriac, omitting the particle ὅτι, refers this to those of whom it was treated in the preceding verse. Furthermore, συμμόρφους is put for εἰς τὸ εἶναι συμμόρφους, just as πεφωτισμένους for εἰς τὸ εἶναι πεφωτισμένους, Eph. 1:18, and πλουσίους for εἰς τὸ εἶναι πλουσίους, Jas. 2, ver. 5, and ἀρχηγόν for εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἀρχηγόν, Acts 5:31.

VERSE 30. Οὓς δὲ προώρισε, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσε. Syriac, ܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ. Tremellius and Boderianus: *And those whom he previously sealed*. Translate: *designated, determined, destined*. For that is what ܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ means, but *sealed* to the Syrians is ܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ. It is helpful here again to hear the theology of our Syriac Scholiast. *Whom he predestined, them he also called*, to his Gospel. *And whom he called, them he justified*, ܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ, that is, *through baptism*. *And whom he justified, them he glorified*, ܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ, namely, *through the mighty works which he performed by their hands*. Are there therefore no predestined, called, and justified, except those whom he made famous by miracles?

VERSE 33. Τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; That is, says the Syriac Scholiast, ܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܨܘܘܩܘܡܝܢܐ, "Who will say that they are unworthy of grace?"

state of the people as it was under the Tabernacle and the first temple. For under the second temple they lacked the ark, and for that reason the Hebrews themselves confess that from that time they were without the שְׁכִינָה, since it was the dwelling place of God above the ark between the Cherubim. I would prefer, therefore, to understand it generally, what the Hebrews call תְּפָאֶרֶת, כְּבוֹד, הַדָּר, and גְּאוּנָה, the dignity, pre-eminence, and excellence by which this people stood out above all others, and perhaps it refers especially to Circumcision, which always remained among this people, and which was truly their glory. They boast of it so much that in the Talmud, in the book Nedarim, R. Simeon says, גדולה מילה שהיא, "Great is Circumcision, for it can be equated with all the precepts." Elsewhere they say, גדולה מילה שאלמלא מילה לא נתקיימו שמיים וארץ, "Great is Circumcision. For if it had not been, heaven and earth would not have stood," which they strive to prove improperly from Jer. 33, ver. 25.

What follows in the Apostle is καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι, *and the covenants*. And Circumcision itself was called הַבְּרִית, the covenant, to them, according to that of Acts 7:8, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς Διαθήκην περιτομῆς, because it was אֹת הַבְּרִית, the sign of the covenant, and therefore a matter of great glory. For which reason perhaps the Apostle here joined δόξαν and Διαθήκας. It is asked, however, why the Apostle said Διαθήκας in the plural number (which Beza and the Syriac translated *covenants*, the Vulgate *testaments*)? Some answer that it refers to the covenant made with Abraham, then repeated with his posterity. The illustrious Beza preferred to refer it to the two tablets of the covenant. We prefer to seek the explanation from the Epistle to the Galatians 4:24, where the Apostle, instituting an allegory of Sarah and Hagar, says, αὗται εἰσιν αἱ δύο Διαθήκαι, "these are the two covenants," or testaments: namely, the Old (Q2) and the New, of Works and of Grace, of Bondage and of Liberty. And although in respect of its truth, firmness, and completion, the latter properly pertained to the times of Christ, yet in respect of its institution, both are to be referred to the times of the Fathers. For one was foreshadowed in Hagar, the other in Sarah; and even then Ishmael, born of the slave-woman, was under the covenant of bondage, while Isaac, born of the free-woman, was under the covenant of liberty. God deals with His people concerning these two covenants in Jer. 31, ver. 32, 33, where it is to be observed that new covenant is properly and primarily made בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, *with the house of Israel*, and only through the house of Israel with the Gentiles. Hence that saying of the Apostle in Acts 13, v. 46, "It was necessary that the word of God should first be announced to you" (understand the word of the Gospel and of grace, which is everywhere called absolutely and κατ' ἐξοχήν the word of God), because the covenant of grace pertained first to them, and from them it was to flow to the Gentiles; nor does it pertain to the Gentiles, except insofar as they are grafted into the olive tree of the Jews. For which reason the Apostle, from the covenant promised to the Jews in Jeremiah, infers the future restoration and conversion of the Jewish nation at some point, Rom. 11:27. Rightly, therefore, he says the covenants belong to the Israelites, because we have them only from them.

But with respect to the antitypical, the same sons of Isaac, to whom the typical promise was made, were also, while the type lasted, sons of the antitypical, again excluding the Ishmaelites, except for those who became true members of the Israelite Church. But with this distinction, that not all sons of the typical promise were also of the antitypical. For just as, for one to be a son of the typical promise, it was not sufficient to be a son of Abraham according to the flesh, but it was necessary to be born from him through the promise, and therefore not Ishmael, but Isaac was counted as the seed, or what is the same, not in Ishmael but in Isaac was the seed called: so, for one to be a son of the antitypical promise, it was not sufficient to be from Abraham according to the typical and carnal promise, but it was also necessary to be born of the Holy Spirit of promise, who is so called in Eph. 1:13. For just as Ishmael, born only according to the flesh, stands in relation to the external covenant, compared to Isaac born from the typical promise, so the carnal descendants of Isaac, born from him only according to the carnal or typical promise, stood in relation to those who were born of the Holy Spirit of promise.

Therefore, before the death of Christ and the revelation of the Gospel, while the type lasted, the descendants of Isaac had a prerogative over the Ishmaelites. For even those of them who were carnal, although they were not sons of the salvific promise, were nevertheless of the typical and carnal one, since they were born not simply according to the flesh, like the Ishmaelites, but from the promise of the typical covenant which God had given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But after the death of Christ and the revelation of the Gospel, with the type now abolished, they were born simply according to the flesh from Abraham, no differently than Ishmael, so that whoever from then on were unbelievers were sons of neither the typical nor the antitypical promise, and thus were truly cut off from every covenant.

To make this clearer, it should be known that the entire covenant of Abraham, both in respect of the type and the antitype, looked to Christ, that preeminent seed of Abraham, in whom all nations were to be blessed, as the Apostle Peter teaches in Acts 3:25: "You are the sons of the covenant that God made with your fathers, saying to Abraham, 'And in your seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.'" Therefore, according to the relation in which they pertained to Christ, they were considered the seed of Abraham. Ishmael and his posterity, because they were alien to that covenant, did not pertain to Christ at all, and thus were in no way considered seed, nor in any way sons of the promise. Isaac, and the rest of his posterity, who, being included in the typical covenant, looked to Christ by faith, pertained to him typically and antitypically, and in both ways were sons of the promise. The rest of his posterity, included in the typical covenant, but furthermore unfaithful and unbelieving, pertained to Christ typically, not antitypically. But after the death of Christ, with the type abolished, neither typically anymore, nor antitypically. Thus they were considered as if, like Ishmael, they had been born of Abraham simply according to the flesh.

And this, I believe, is what the Apostle meant when he says in the following verse, "The children of the flesh are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted as the seed." For he does not consider the Israelites of his time only in the place where Jeremiah in his time held them, when he said in chap. 5:10, "they are not the Lord's." For although they were not his true sons, they still belonged to him by the external covenant, and were his people. But now they were in a far worse place, a bill of divorce having been given to them, alienated even from the external covenant, and no longer the people of God. Hitherto they had been called sons of God, because although unfaithful, they were not entirely sons of the flesh, but also sons of the typical promise, and thus far in Isaac were called the seed of Abraham. But now they are simply sons of the flesh, in no way sons of God, in no way the seed of Abraham, in that sense, namely, in which it had hitherto been considered in Isaac as opposed to Ishmael. For henceforth no other seed of Abraham was counted than that in Christ, the true promised seed, to which count, the Israelites in general having been repudiated, the Gentiles were now referred. The Apostle says he grieves vehemently over this, but that one must acquiesce in the will of the Lord and his wise and free dispensation. For salvation proceeds not from the flesh, but from the gratuitous promise of God; the type of this matter is (R) in Ishmael and Isaac, both sons of Abraham, of whom the former with his posterity was rejected from the covenant, as if he were not the seed of Abraham, while the latter with his posterity, the Israelites, was received into the covenant, and alone counted as the seed, because not the former but the latter was born of the promise, which the Apostle brings forth in verse 9. What was done in the typical covenant is similar in the antitypical. Only those are sons of the spiritual and saving covenant who are born from the divine promise, which God made to the elect in Christ. The Israelites are now alien from this. Therefore, it is in vain to murmur against the will of God.

VERSE 8. Τουτ' ἔστιν, οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ· ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα. The Arab translates Τουτ' ἔστιν as معني هذا, *it signifies this*, because, of course, the type of Ishmael and Isaac, proposed in the preceding verse, is explained here. τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός are not here those who walk according to the flesh, but those who have no other birth than that which is of the flesh and from the flesh, to whom are opposed the children of the promise, by whom are not understood here those to whom the promise was made, or who are heirs of the promise because they are sons, but who are born from the promise, and therefore are sons because they were promised. The Apostle clearly indicates this in the following verse, where he indicates that Isaac was a son of the promise because he was promised to Abraham from Sarah. As also in Gal. 4:23 he is said to have been born of the free woman διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, *through the promise*. In contrast, Ishmael, from the handmaid, was κατὰ σάρκα, *according to the flesh*, because, being born of Abraham and Hagar who were still vigorous and fit for generation, he had nothing beyond a carnal origin. But Isaac, born of Abraham

and Sarah who were worn out and dead, by the power of the promise, drew his origin from the promise, and without it would never have been.

Applying this type in the same place, v. 28, the Apostle says we are, according to Isaac, children of the promise; that is, we are sons of God not by nature, nor by the powers of free will, or what is the same, from the works of the law, which the powers of free will cannot surpass, but from the promise of the Holy Spirit who regenerated us and made us sons of God. However, the same thing is not being dealt with here to the Romans as there to the Galatians. For although some things agree, the purpose is not the same. Here, the Apostle's purpose is to console himself over the rejection of the Jews. The argument for consolation is that they should be counted as sons of God and the true seed of Abraham not from consanguinity with Abraham, but from the gratuitous promise of God, which depends on election. He declares this by the type of Ishmael and Isaac, where it is asked, since both are the seed of Abraham, why the seed was called for Abraham in Isaac alone. The Apostle answers in two places, the first of which is Gen. 21:12, where God defined it so by a free oracle, when Abraham would have preferred otherwise. For if God's definition had not stood in the way, Ishmael, born of a handmaid, could no less have been counted the seed of Abraham than those born of the handmaids Zilpah and Bilhah were considered the seed of Jacob. The other is Gen. 18:10, where the promise exists, through which Isaac was born of Sarah. Without which promise, Isaac either would not have been born, or would have been born according to the flesh also, like Ishmael. And so the conclusion is that none can be the sons of God and the seed of Abraham except those who are born of the promise. Since God designates this by his free will to whom and where he wishes, one must not speak against God here.

But there, to the Galatians, the purpose is that man is not justified by the law, but by faith. The argument is taken from the effects of each, because the law bears slaves, faith bears free men. This is declared by the type of Ishmael and Isaac, who are considered there not as from one father, but as born of different mothers. One from Hagar the slave is a slave, who is the type of the Justiciaries, who are born from the legal covenant through works unto slavery. The other from Sarah the free woman is free, who is the type of the faithful, who are born from the heavenly Jerusalem, that is, the Church of the faithful, through faith unto liberty. Since, however, faith is not from man, (R2) but from the promise of the Holy Spirit, that other point is added to the type: that Ishmael was so born of a slave that he was born only according to the flesh, that is, by the power of the flesh. Isaac was so born of a free woman that he was born through the promise. Thus, the Justiciaries have nothing except what is from the flesh, or from the powers of free will. The faithful, however, have what the Holy Spirit works in them by the power of the promise, contained in the election. And this indeed which he teaches there about the promise is the same as what he puts forth here to the Romans, but it serves a different end. For here he refers that promise to

only that which was common to other peoples living under their own law, but also that which was proper to them by right of covenant, as the special possession of God, exempt from the law of all men, and claimed for God alone. They never lost this afterwards, but as long as they remained the people of God, they reserved it for themselves as their own. Hence that saying in John 8:33, "We are Abraham's seed and have never been enslaved to anyone." They correctly sensed that slavery is not fitting for the seed of Abraham, and that to be the seed of Abraham and to be always free are indivisible. As truly, therefore, as they were the seed of Abraham, sprung from him through Isaac and Jacob, and thus the seed of the covenant, the people of God, the sons of God, so truly could they boast that they were free and had never served anyone.

But just as the foundation of that boasting could be twofold, either the prerogative of the external and typical covenant and lineage, or the truth of the internal and spiritual covenant and lineage, so also that liberty had to be considered in a twofold way: either according to a certain external relation to God, or according to internal and spiritual truth. In the latter sense, Christ denies that they are either the seed of Abraham or the sons of God, because they were slaves to sin, and did not imitate the works of Abraham, nor obey the will of God. Externally, however, they were sons of God, and the seed of Abraham, and for the same reason, free, not slaves. From which it is now sufficiently clear that when God assigns Esau to servitude, he is excluded from the covenant, both external and internal. Jacob, included in both, was truly the master of Esau, as a participant in the dominion of God himself, into whose covenant he was admitted. And to this also pertains that other statement, "Jacob I have loved," by giving him the liberty of the covenant and spiritual dominion over his brother. "Esau I have hated," by excluding him from the covenant and subjecting him to his brother's dominion. When my covenant was owed to neither, when I could have excluded both from it, when I could have adopted both into it, when I could have excluded Jacob and adopted Esau (for neither had yet been born, neither had done anything good or evil), it pleased me to love Jacob, and therefore to grant him the liberty and dominion of my covenant; and on the other hand to hate Esau, and therefore to deprive him of the covenant of my grace, and to subject him to the servitude which is outside my covenant. And from this it came to pass that not Esau with his people, but Jacob with his posterity was the heir of the promise of the land of Canaan. For if you consider the covenant made with Isaac and Abraham, Esau was a servant rather than a son. Therefore, he had to be excluded from the possession of that land, which was given by promise only to those who were counted in the seed, and was dedicated to the liberty of the sons of God, a shadow and a sign of eternal liberty.

And from the same source flowed the fact that by the singular providence of God, the firstborn right was transferred from Esau and his posterity to Jacob and his seed. Whence God everywhere calls Israel his firstborn, so that we may know

And ἀνταπόκρισιν διδόναι is *to give a response* by which you refute and confute another's words, Job 13:22 and 34:36. This fits perfectly here. *Who are you, O man, who answers against God?* That is, who dares to contradict God with your reply, and wishes to confute and refute his words.

VERSE 21 (22). Ἦνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς. The Syriac interpreter explains what this is with these words: ܠܕܢܝܢ ܕܠܠ ܠܦܕܘܫܘܢܝܢ ܫܡܝܢܘܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܝܢ ܠܕܘܫܘܢܝܢ ܠܦܕܘܫܘܢܝܢ. *He brought in much longsuffering wrath upon the vessels of wrath.* For the sense is that God did not immediately pour out upon them the wrath they had deserved, but only after he had borne with them sinning with long patience.

VERSE 25. *I will call him who was not my people, my people; and her who was not beloved, beloved.* The passage is from Hosea 2:23. Where the Hebrew truth has, ܘܢܚܡܝ ܐܬ-ܠܐ ܪܚܡܝ, *And I will have mercy on her who had not obtained mercy.* But the Septuagint Interpreters have, ἀγαπήσω τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην. For they seem to have read ܘܢܚܡܝ ܐܬ-ܠܐ ܪܚܡܝ, *and I will love the unloved.* The Apostle followed this. Nor does it make a bit of difference whether you read and translate it this way or that. For the matter being discussed is such that whether you say love or mercy, in either case you speak of the grace of election, to express which the Apostle above in ver. 13 and 15 promiscuously used the words for loving and having mercy. These are so related that the Hebrews and Syrians expressed both with one word, ܪܚܡ, the former in Kal, the latter in Piel. And it properly signifies that visceral love of a mother by which she loves her offspring, and because she loves, she has mercy on it.

We must here examine the Syriac text, because it has a difficulty. ܠܕܢܝܢ ܕܠܠ ܠܦܕܘܫܘܢܝܢ ܐܘܪܝܢܝܢ. Tremellius: *I will call them who were not my people, my people, and the unloved, loved.* Boderianus however, both in the Parisian and in the Royal edition: *And her that had not obtained mercy, having obtained mercy.* The former wanted ܐܘܪܝܢܝܢ to be the Ethpeel conjugation, where it means *to be loved*, from ܦܘܕܝܢ, *he loved*. The latter, the Ethpaal conjugation, and there it means *to obtain mercy*, from ܦܘܕܝܢ, *he had mercy*. But since both ܐܘܪܝܢܝܢ and ܐܘܪܝܢܝܢ are first person, neither has rendered the words well. For in the Royal edition the former is written ܐܘܪܝܢܝܢ, with the second vowel mark of the first person expressed at the end. Which indeed is not present in the Viennese, but in its place a dot is placed above, an index of the same person. The latter in the Viennese and Cöthen editions is written ܐܘܪܝܢܝܢ, with the second vowel at the end, which indeed is not present in the Royal, yet it must be read so there too, because in the 3rd feminine it would be written ܐܘܪܝܢܝܢ with a dot to the left side of the letter thau, which is lacking here in both places. If therefore it is of the Ethpeel Conjugation, it must be translated, *and she for whom I was not loved, I was loved.* Which agrees neither with the Hebrew, nor with the Greek, nor with the mind of the Apostle. If of the Ethpaal Conjugation (for it can be of either), *And on whom I had not mercy, I had mercy.* Which agrees well with the Hebrew. And the Syriac is accustomed to render places cited in the New from the Old Testament

have the meaning of decreeing, establishing, concluding, such as are among the Hebrews דָּרַךְ and הִקָּדַם, from which is derived Isaiah 10:22, which words the Apostle quotes in our present passage, it would be for a decreed and established matter; the Syriac has interpreted this excellently with, by which word he also uses elsewhere frequently for *to decree* and *to establish*, as in 2 Cor. 1:9, John 9:9, etc. Therefore, I translate the Syriac thus, *He decreed the word and precisely established it.*

Let us now be permitted to compare the words of the Prophet with the words of the Apostle. The words of the Prophet are כִּי כָלָה וְתִרְבֶּה אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת עִיָּה כְּלִיּוֹן הַרְוִץ שֹׁטֵף צָדִיקָה בְּקִרְבּוֹ כֹּל הַאֲרָץ. The Apostle's words are, λόγον γὰρ στυτελῶν συτέμνων ἐν δικαιοστώῃ, ὅτι λόγον σωτελμημένον ποιήσε κύρι πάσης τῆς γῆς. They are taken from the Septuagint interpreters. To which the distinguished Beza, from the comparison itself, says, "no one can deny that the Greek interpreters have translated this passage very negligently, as far as the words themselves are concerned." This, I confess, I by no means see. For that the Greek interpreter used the participles στυτελῶν and συτέμνων for the present indicative is from Hebraism, just as the Prophet here said עִיָּה and שֹׁטֵף. He said λόγον for *a thing*. Hellenistically from Hebraism. λόγου σωτελμημέ is for תִּרְבֶּה, *a matter decided*. But it should be especially noted how the Septuagint understood these words of the Prophet: כְּלִיּוֹן הַרְוִץ שֹׁטֵף צָדִיקָה. For they did not think, as Beza and most of our interpreters have supposed, that כְּלִיּוֹן הַרְוִץ has the place of the subject, of which is predicated, but they referred שֹׁטֵף to God and took כְּלִיּוֹן הַרְוִץ as nouns after the verb, and I do not doubt that they were most correct; which Junius also observed, who translates שֹׁטֵף צָדִיקָה as *overflowing with justice*, namely God who overflows with justice. And because a verb was now lacking, he supplied the defect by inserting the verb *he will accomplish*. For he translates, *He will accomplish a determined consummation, overflowing with justice*. I do not approve, because without a supplement it is clearly translated, *He makes a determined consummation to overflow in justice*, or *He overflows with a determined consummation in justice*. The whole negligence now lies in this, that having neglected the meaning of overflowing, he simply said, *he consummates and decides the matter in justice*. He took צָדִיקָה for בְּצָדִיקָה, which is excellent. But what now is that στυτελῶν συτέμνων λόγον? This does not have its interpretation from Greekism, but from Hebraism. στυτελῶν λόγον is עִיָּה מְלִיּוֹן or כָּלָה עִיָּה. Beza says, is consumption, and suggests that God has decided to reduce the ungrateful people to an extreme fewness. With the leave of so great a man, I would take these words far differently, and I would refer them not to punishment, but to a benefit and consolation; and that they should be taken thus will be clear to anyone who looks at the Prophet and the Apostle. I think these things pertain to the execution of election, under which, however, I do not deny that reprobation is also contained, as it arises from the law of opposites. And by כְּלִיּוֹן or כָּלָה I understand not some consumption, nor by תִּרְבֶּה an abbreviation or cutting off, but by both a consummated counsel in the mind of God, and a decided decree.

Thus כָּלָה is often taken. For example, 1 Samuel 20:33, וַיֵּדַע יְהוֹנָתָן כִּי כָּלָה הָיָא מִעַם אָבִיו לְהַמִּית, אֶת דָּוִד, "And Jonathan knew that it was a consummation from his father to kill David," that is, that the plan to kill David was consummated and firmly decreed by Saul. Thus is taken for to define, and to decree in 1 Kings 20:40, where Ahab says to the Prophet, אַתָּה הָרַצְתָּ, "you yourself have defined it, you have already passed sentence, and have established what ought to be done." So in this place in Isaiah, the remnant of Israel will be saved, because the decree of election is firm. There is with God כְּלִיּוֹן הַרוּחַ, a decreed consummation, a most consummated decree: there is with him כָּלָה וְנִתְרַצָּה, a consummated and established counsel. With this counsel he now overflows, and executes it on the earth. Nor do I take those words of Daniel in the last verse any differently: וְעַי כָּלָה וְנִרְצָה תִּחַדַּךְ עַל שׁוֹטֵם, "until the consummated counsel and the defined decree is poured out upon the devastator." Therefore, I would not wish to blame the ancient Interpreter so much with Lord Beza, who translated into δικαιοσύνη, "in equity"; indeed, even if someone had translated that צְדָקָה in Isaiah as "mercy," I would not blame him either, since the work of divine mercy and equity is entirely described here: and that word is often taken for mercy as in Daniel 9:16, and among the Rabbis and Syrians it is also taken for almsgiving. Therefore, with the Apostle, God is said σὼτελεῖν λόγον, when he consummates the decree of election in himself. He is said σὼτέμνον λόγον, when he precisely defines and concludes it in himself. For it is a Hebrew expression, which the Syriac excellently stated as, and σιωτετημένον λόγον ποιεῖν ἐν τῇ γῆ is to execute that decree. These things I say, with due respect for the judgment of the more learned. The Arab has كلمة صرمت وقطعت وسيضيها الرب على الارض, "a word completed and decided, and the Lord will make it come to pass upon the earth."

VERSE 29. Εἰ μὴ κύριο Σαβαώθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῶν πέρμα, ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγλυθήημεν, ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν ὠμοιώθημεν. The passage is from Isaiah 1:9, where R. D. Kimchi notes the reason why God is expressly named in this place *the Lord of hosts*: על שם צבאות, "on account of the hosts above, and on account of the hosts below who are the Israelites, who are called hosts (he seems to refer to the passage in Deut. 20:9, where the leaders of the Israelite people are called שְׂרָי צְבָאוֹת, princes of the hosts); therefore He did not wish to consume us all, as we had deserved," lest, that is, God should cease to be the God of hosts on earth, if He had completely extinguished Israel. And although this may be rather subtle, it is not entirely inept. ἐγκατέλιπεν, in Hebrew is הוֹתִיר, regarding which word Rashi excellently notes that God did this מֵאֵלָיו וּבְרַחֲמָיו, "of himself and through his mercies, and not on account of our righteousness." The Apostle meant this very thing, who from this elicits the mercy of gratuitous election. But what he here calls ἀπέρμα, the Syriac calls "a residue," following, as often elsewhere, the Hebrew text where it is. The Apostle expressed the Septuagint, who for residue said seed, because, of course, in the seed of anything, things otherwise dead and extinct come back to life, as the distinguished Beza has excellently said. What if they wanted to interpret whom the Prophet understands by the remnant? Namely, certain pious men who

constitute the true seed of Abraham, about whom Isaiah 6, last verse, says, *גֵרֵעַ קִדְשׁ מֵעֵבֶרֶתָּהּ*, "a holy seed is the stability of the land." Namely, the sons of the promise who are counted as the seed, as our Apostle spoke above in verse 8. And this fits the scope of this passage vehemently. But what is it, "we would have been like Sodom?" That is, we would have been like them both in sins and in destruction, as Jonathan interprets. Kimchi says the sense is, "we would have perished completely," *שְׁלֵא הָיָה בָהֶם שְׂרִיד וּפְלִיט*, "because there was no survivor among them who escaped." But why does he say in the first person *כְּסֹדֹם הָיִינוּ*, "we would have been like Sodom?" Because the Prophet, says Kimchi, *עָם הַפּוֹשְׁעִים לְכַבּוֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל*, "included himself with the transgressors for the honor of Israel."

VERSE 30. *Κατέλαβε δικαιοσύνῳ*, "they apprehended justice," that is, they attained it. The same as *ἔφθασε εἰς δικαιοσύλῳ*, as he says of the Jews in the following verse. Whence also the Syriac interpreted both with the same word, to attain. The metaphor is from those who, pursuing someone, catch up to them. For that is *καταλαμβάνον* to the Greeks. The sense is, the Gentiles, though they did not pursue righteousness, attained it, as if they had pursued it. The Jews, pursuing it, did not attain it, as if they had not pursued it.

VERSE 32. *Διὰ τι; ὅτι σὸκ ἐκ πίσεως, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων νόμῃ*. The sense is, because they did not pursue righteousness from faith, but as if they could have it from the works of the law, when it cannot be had from there. Such here is the force of the particle *ὡς*. The Syriac and the Arab also read *νόμῃ*. Furthermore, it by no means follows from this verse that the scope of this chapter is to demonstrate justification and, as the Pelagians say, election by faith. He has thus far removed the scandal that could arise from the rejection of the Jews, by an argument taken from the free decree of predestination, by which He allows some to be born of the flesh, and causes others to be born of the promise, and counts these alone as the seed. He loves whom He will, He hates whom He will. He has mercy on whom He will, He hardens whom He will, etc., from verse 6 to 24, where he passes from Election to effectual calling, because this is the execution and manifestation of Election. For whom He chose, the same and no others He called, not only from the Jews, but also from the Gentiles, verse 24. And indeed the calling of the Gentiles is proved, verses 25, 26, to be plainly gratuitous, because He called them, when they were neither a people, nor beloved. And as for the Jews, He chose and so called very few of them. For God reserved for His Church only some remnant from the many who perished by their own malice, v. 27, 28, 29. As for the rest, the Apostle proceeds by a comparison of them with the Gentiles to teach what the efficacy of that gracious calling is.

The Gentiles, he says (namely those whom he said were called from the Gentiles in verse 24), although they did not pursue righteousness, yet they apprehended the true righteousness which is by faith. So great was the power of the calling grace in them. But the Jews (namely, the majority, who were not of that remnant or seed that God had reserved for himself) pursuing the law of righteousness,

did not attain to it. So little can the wisdom of the flesh do, even in those who are called the people of God in name only, if they are destitute of the grace of the Spirit of God, verses 30, 31. To make this more clear, he reveals the cause in verse 32 why all their attempts were in vain, namely because they pursued righteousness from the works of the law, not from faith. And he proves that this is so, because they stumbled on the stumbling stone, namely Christ. With him rejected, there was no other way left but to seek righteousness from the law. And lest this action of the Jews seem strange to anyone, he adds in verse 33 the passage from Isaiah 8:14, where this was foretold.

From this it is clear that the Apostle's scope is not to set forth the doctrine of justification, whether it be by faith or by works: but to teach that it is not to be expected that most of the Jews should be saved, because they have been rejected by God, and left to their own blindness. This is the consequence of reprobation, and this is the effect of natural blindness, that they stumble on the stumbling stone, and therefore seek righteousness not from faith but from the law. For this reason they do not, and cannot, attain to righteousness. On the contrary, it happened to the Gentiles, to whom God, called according to the purpose of His election, gave to believe in Christ, and thus to become partakers of the righteousness of faith. Nor do the things which are added in the following chapter look to any other end. For although he there deals more fully with the righteousness of the law and of faith, yet the Apostle's scope is to deplore more fully the blindness of his nation, left by God to themselves, by which they were prevented from being able to attain to the righteousness of faith. For when in verse 1 he had repeated his holy wish for the salvation of the Israelites, he says that they have a zeal for God, but without knowledge. They are ignorant of the righteousness of God, and cannot be subject to it, because they seek to establish their own. This blindness is inexcusable, both because they should have learned long ago from Moses what the difference is between the righteousness of the law and of faith, and because they had rejected the Gospel preached to them, from which faith ought to have been born. But this was done according to the prophecies of the prophets, who long ago had foretold both the faith of the gentiles and the unbelief and contumacy of the Jews; yet of no others than those rejected by God. For there are, as he proceeds to show in chapter 11, those who according to the purpose of the election of grace have obtained faith: the rest have been hardened. Whence it is sufficiently clear that he is not here formally dealing with justification by faith, and another, opposed to it, from works: but on the occasion of Election and Reprobation he wished to teach that from Election, and the promise depending on it, made to the elect in Christ, faith flows. And this faith, since it has nothing human, but is entirely from the promise of Election, can pursue no other righteousness than that which was promised to the Elect in Christ. Reprobation, on the contrary, leaves men and hardens them in their natural blindness, from which nothing else can follow than that, scorning the righteousness of God, which is from the promise of grace, they proudly seek to establish their own from the works of the law. The scope is that we may learn

to depend entirely on God and His grace, to which both Election and the faith that flows from it lead.

CHAPTER X.

VERSE 3. Αγνοῦντες γὰρ τὴν εἰς θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην ζητούντες ζῆσθαι, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ἕθεν υπετάγησαν. Our Apostle has it from Isaiah that he opposes the righteousness of men and of God to each other. Thus God says in Isaiah 46:12-13, אֲשׁוּעוּ אֵלַי אֲבִירֵי לֵב הַרְחוּקִים מִצְדָּקָה קָרְבָּתִי צְדָקָתִי לֹא תָרַחַק, "Hearken unto me, ye stouthearted, that are far from righteousness. I bring near my righteousness; it shall not be far off." For us to approach the righteousness of God, it is necessary that we acknowledge ourselves to be far from our own righteousness. Hence also in chapter 57:12, אֲנִי יִצְרֵר צְרָתְךָ וְאֵת־מַעֲשֶׂיךָ וְלֹא יִרְעֻלוּךָ, "I will declare thy righteousness, and thy works; for they shall not profit thee." As if God were to say, "Come, let us dispute among ourselves: I will bring forth all the works of your righteousness, if perhaps you can be helped by them." But they will be of no profit. But he who, he says in the following verse, "hopes in me, shall inherit the land, and shall possess my holy mountain." Therefore also in verse 15 he says that he dwells with a contrite heart, and revives the spirit of the humble, who, namely, despising the works of their own righteousness, flee to the righteousness of God.

VERSE 4. Τέλου νόμο Χριστός, εἰς δικαιοσύνην πάντι τῷ πιστοντι. That is, the end of the law is not that a sinner should seek righteousness from it, since being violated it can only condemn. But the whole of it looks to Christ, it is directed to him as to its end and scope, so that righteousness might be from him, not to everyone who works, but to everyone who believes. However, this does not belong to the law in itself, insofar as it is a precept, a president, and a mistress in the covenant of works. For there it rests solely in man, and from him it demands either perfect obedience or a curse, and has no relation or respect to Christ. But insofar as it is transferred into an aid of the covenant of grace, it serves the Gospel. For there it leads by the hand to Christ, and teaches to seek in him what cannot be found in itself. Or, the end of the law in itself is that men should be justified by its performance. Since this end could not be obtained in us on account of intervening sin, it was obtained in Christ, who fully satisfied the law, and through Christ it is also obtained in us, to whom that satisfaction of the law is imputed through faith. Therefore, Christ is to us who believe for righteousness, in such a way that we have the end of the law in it, and the law itself is forced to acknowledge that it has attained its end. Rightly therefore did the Apostle say in the preceding chapter, v. 31, that the Jews, seeking righteousness from the works of the law, did not attain to the law of righteousness, because by such efforts the law cannot but be deprived of its end.

VERSE 6. "But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, etc." The most learned commentators wish that the righteousness of faith here prohibits two doubts, which necessarily and always afflict the legalists, namely, "Who shall ascend into heaven," that is, to bring us there, and

then, "who shall descend into the deep," that is, to rescue us from there? The ascension of Christ remedies the former, his death and descent to hell the latter. This is a pious sentiment, but one which can be reconciled with the mind of Moses in Deut. 30:12, 13, 14, only with great difficulty. For Moses' proposition in verse 11 was, "This commandment which I command thee this day, it is not above thee" (לֹא נִפְרָאת הוּא), "it is not wonderful from thee" "neither is it far off from thee." He proves this in the three following verses, because it is neither in heaven, that one should have to ascend there, and bring it down from there; nor is it across the sea, that there should be need to descend there, and bring it up from there. "But it is near thee, etc." We do not think we should depart from this mind of Moses. Therefore, we understand the Apostle's meaning simply thus: The righteousness of faith does not permit you to say that the commandment of salvation is placed above you, and far removed from you. It is not in heaven, that you should say, "who will ascend there, to bring down to us that by which we may be saved?" This is to bring Christ down from on high, as if he had never been on earth, nor had divulged the doctrine of salvation there: but would still have to be called from heaven for that very purpose. Nor is it in the abyss of the sea, that you should say, "who will descend there, to bring it up to us from there, that we may be saved?" This is to bring Christ back from the dead, as if he were still in death, and had left the reason of salvation buried there: when he has long since been brought back from the dead, and has brought the doctrine of salvation to light. Excellently indeed does the Apostle confirm the purpose of Moses, namely, that the word of salvation is hidden neither up in heaven, nor down in the abyss, so that it can or should be hidden from us. Not in heaven, because Christ has long since descended from there to earth: not in the abyss, because Christ has long since ascended from there to earth, to open the way of salvation. Where then is the word of salvation? "It is near you, in your mouth, and in your heart." And these things, says the Apostle, are said by the righteousness of faith, not by the righteousness which is of the law. For the righteousness which is of the law says, "Do this and you will live." That is, it only commands, and promises life under the condition of obedience: it does not supply the strength to obey. So that many have and know the law in their possession, yet if you consider their aptitude for performing it, you would rightly say that it is far from both their mouth and their heart, and truly נִפְרָאת מֵהֶם, "above them and impossible for them." But the righteousness of faith applies the law of God to us in such a way that it fixes it both in the mouth and in the heart: in the mouth through sincere confession, in the heart through faith and love. Both belong to the covenant of grace. Concerning the word of God in our mouth, there is a notable passage in Isaiah 59:21; concerning the law inscribed on the heart, Jeremiah 31:33. Then the law of God is not נִפְרָאת מֵמֵנוּ, "above us," nor are the commandments of God grievous, 1 John 5:3. For the Spirit of God makes them easy, who inscribes them on the heart, and bends hearts to them.

But it is asked, on what grounds the Apostle here interprets that word, of which Moses speaks, by the word of faith, and refers the whole passage to the

righteousness of faith, when in Deut. 30:10, 11, Moses expressly says that he is dealing with the precepts written in the book of the law, with the precept, which, he says, "I command you today." Therefore he is dealing with the law. This so troubled the distinguished Beza that he said, "What Moses said about the law, Paul accommodates all this to the Gospel by way of allusion: so that through the Gospel he may finally teach us to truly possess what the law promises, and to be freed from what it threatens." But it seems rather that the Apostle wanted to convince the Jews from Moses himself that they should have been zealous for the righteousness of faith, not of the law: and so to bring forth from Moses what he established concerning each. Concerning the righteousness of the law he established what is read in Leviticus 18:5; concerning the righteousness of faith, what is read in Deuteronomy 30:12. The Apostle's words are clear, "The righteousness of faith speaks thus," namely in the word of God in Moses, Deuteronomy 30, from where he quotes the words, as if spoken by the righteousness of faith; if they were spoken by the righteousness of the law, the Apostle is playing games and subverting himself. Does he not say in verse 8, "this word which Moses said is near you, is this very word of faith which we preach"? We think, therefore, that it should be understood with that greatest of men, John Calvin, who teaches that by Moses is understood the whole doctrine of God, which comprehends not only the law but also the Gospel, and that the doctrine which is handed down there is truly Evangelical. Let all that has preceded in that chapter be seen, and it will appear to pertain to the times of the Gospel. For it deals with those times when the Israelites will be dispersed among all peoples; which happened especially after the ascension of Christ and the preaching of the Gospel, and still endures, and will endure until that most desired conversion of the Jews, of which the Apostle is about to treat in the next chapter. At that time the things which God promised through Moses will happen, that he would bring them back from all peoples into the land promised to their fathers, not indeed that typical land, but into the true land of promise, into the heavenly Jerusalem, which is the true Church of Christ; and that he would circumcise their heart, and the heart of their seed. And that was the very time when they would truly experience that the word of God was placed not far from them, but in their mouth and in their heart. And the true Jews, the sons of the promise, were already experiencing the truth of this matter in the time of Moses, who felt the word of God inscribed on their mouth and heart by the power of the covenant of grace. But you will say, grant that some grace of God is contained in those words, by which he inscribes the law on their hearts; yet that word, which Moses says is in the mouth and heart of the people, is the word of the law, not of faith. I answer again, it is the whole doctrine of salvation, whose chief argument is the Gospel concerning Christ; the law is a certain secondary doctrine, and subservient to Christ.

For Moses wrote of Christ, John 5:46, and the end of the law is Christ, above verse 4. So that it should seem strange to no one that the Apostle attributes that passage of Moses, where without doubt the law is also treated, to the

equivalent to a universal, just as the indefinite, "man is an animal," is equivalent to the universal, "every man is an animal."

VERSE 14. Πῶς δε πιστεύσωσιν οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; The Vulgate and Syriac: "how then shall they believe in him whom they have not heard?" Erasmus and Beza, "of whom they have not heard," i.e. περὶ οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν. You could also translate it in the neuter gender, "what they have not heard."

VERSE 16. Τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; That this is used for "preaching" from Hebraism is long known. But because the Syriac translates, "Who has believed," to the word, "the daughter of our voice," it seemed fitting to note in passing what "the daughter of the voice" is. Which the Syrians pronounce, with the Resh elided, Bathkol, בַּת קוֹל. A Syro-Arabic glossary renders it صدی الصوت من الالسان واللفظة, "the echo of a sound from tongues and speech." The meaning is that and differ, in that signifies any sound, even of an inarticulate voice, but to the Arabs الصوت. But means only an articulate voice, such as that of languages, which enunciates something certain and distinct, which the Arabs call الكُفْطَة. Among the Masters, קוֹל specifically designates מן השמים שירד, "the voice that descends from heaven." It was a special mode of revelation, by which God revealed his will not through dreams, or visions, or the inspirations of the Holy Spirit, as was customary in the Prophets, but by an articulate voice; such was that voice of God in John 12:28, when he said articulately from heaven, "I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again."

VERSE 17. Ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς· ἢ δὲ ἀκοῇ διὰ ῥήματος Θεοῦ. Here ἀκοῇ can be conveniently taken with the same meaning as in the preceding verse. Therefore, "faith is from preaching, and preaching is by the word of God." This also includes hearing, but I would prefer "from preaching" than "from hearing," because preaching is from God, hearing is from us. But faith proceeds rather from that which is from God than from that which is from us. "And preaching is by the word of God," because through it is supplied to the sacred heralds what they are to preach. The Syriac said, "And the hearing of the ear is from the word of God." The Vulgate, "but hearing is by the word of Christ." It said "of Christ" for "of God."

But what did the Arab see, that he translated وما سمعته الاذان من الايمان بالمسيح كلمة الله, "and what the ear has heard is from faith in Christ, the word of God." By "the word of God" he understands Christ himself. And what is heard through preaching he wishes to be "from faith in Christ," when on the contrary it was said that faith is from what is heard.

CHAPTER XI.

VERSE 2. οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; Beza translates ἐν Ἠλίᾳ as "concerning Elijah," from, he says, an idiom of the Hebrews, among whom כ sometimes stands for *super, de* (upon, concerning); rightly so. And because this is rather rare,

and κατανυσσόμενον as ἡσυχιάζον. Whoever wants more on that Arabic word, let him see our notes on Mark 3:21. The Apostle drew that phrase from Isaiah 29:10, where it is put for הַמְדַּרְתָּ הַיָּר, "a spirit of deep sleep." The Septuagint: πνεῦμα κατανύξεως. Theodotion: ἐκστάσεως. Aquila: καταφορᾶς. But elsewhere also the Septuagint translated it by ἔκστασις and θάμβος. And Daniel 10:9 is nothing other than that he fell to the ground, seized by a certain stupor of mind, and a cessation of the senses. The Septuagint: ἡμην κατανενυγμένος. Sometimes κατανύσσεσθαι itself is used for to be quiet, to cease, to be silent. As in Leviticus 10:3, Psalm 4:5, & 30:13, & 35:15. To become mute, Daniel 10:15. Therefore, πνεῦμα κατανύξεως is a spirit of stupor, where the force of the mind rests, ceases, and collapses.

It follows here in the Syriac, .ܡܡܬܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܘܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ. Tremellius: "and eyes with which they may not discern, and ears with which they may not hear." It should therefore have been said in the feminine, because is of the feminine gender, "the ear has not heard," 1 Cor. 2. Boderianus in the Royal edition: "that with their eyes they may not see, and with their ears they may not hear." He departed too much from the true construction. But most rightly in the Paris edition: "And eyes that they may not discern in them, and ears that they may not hear." ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ ὄτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, Paul said. This would hardly have been worth observing, if the distinguished Beza had not seized upon the incongruous version of the Syriac in Tremellius to praise it.

VERSE 10. Καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον. Syriac: ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ. Tremellius: "and let their thigh be bent at all times." Boderianus: "their back." I would prefer "and their loins." For it is commonly put for ὀσφύς, as in Hebrews 7:5, 10, and also in the plural, Matthew 3:4, and often elsewhere. It is the Hebrews' word, though cast out. But although it is here in the Apostle, καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον, yet in the Psalmist, Psalm 69:24, it is הַמְדַּרְתָּ הַיָּר, "and make their loins continually to shake." Nevertheless, the distinguished Sionita in the said Psalm also translates it as "their back," شرة. The back includes the loins. Aristotle in book 1 of the History of Animals makes three parts of the νῶτα: the shoulder blades, the spine, and the loins.

VERSE 11. "Salvation has come to the Gentiles." Tremellius and Boderianus: "to provoke them to emulation." Translate simply, "to their emulation." For it is a noun, "emulation"; the other would be said, which Paul said εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς. The Arab also, following the Syriac, said لغيرتهم, "to their emulation."

VERSE 17. . So it is read in the Vienna and Cöthen editions. But in the Royal and in correctly, except that it should be written with two points indicating the feminine plural, for it is from a feminine gender, as in Mark 4:32.

VERSE 21. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο. Syriac, ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ, to the word, "for if God did not spare the branches which are of

said, πόσω μὲν μᾶλλον οὗτοι ἂν ἐγκεντρισθῆσονται τῇ κατὰ φύσιν αὐτῶν ἐλαίᾳ; Indeed, also where the Greek ἂν has no place, they sometimes use pleonastically, as in John 7:49, ἀλλ' ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον, ἐπικατάρτοί εἰσι.

VERSE 26. Ἦξει ἐκ Σιών ὁ ρυόμενος, "the deliverer will come out of Zion." Thus the Greek copies, the Vulgate and the Syriac consistently read. The Arab however has في صهيون, "in Zion," as if he had read ἐν Σιών. In the prophet Isaiah 59:20 it certainly reads, "And the Redeemer shall come," "to Zion," or even "into Zion," or "in Zion," for thus is also sometimes used. Then is added,, "and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob," for The Septuagint however, whom the Apostle followed, translated, καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ. Jonathan,, "to convert the rebels of the house of Jacob to the law," as if he had read, "to convert the rebel" (collectively) "in Jacob." From which it is clear that those ancients, both the Septuagint elders and the Chaldean paraphrast, understood that passage of the spiritual conversion of the Israelites, with our Apostle; far more correctly, indeed, than D. Kimchi, who refers these things to those times when the Jews, having long since been restored by the Messiah and brought back to their own country, will be pressed by the war of Gog and Magog, and will again desire a deliverer.

VERSE 28. Κατὰ μὲν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον. The distinguished Beza in a certain edition restored from one MS. codex μὲν οὖν. Which particle the Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabs did not recognize. I would not wish to restore it from one copy. Nor is there much need for it, since without it the sentence is fully consistent. The Syriac and Arabs have it, as if τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον were read.

VERSES 30 & 31. "For as you in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief: Even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy." (οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι νῦν ἠπειθήσαν, τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθῶσι). Beza, if I am not mistaken, was the first, following the opinion of Theophylact, to publish the Greek text with such a punctuation that a comma is placed after ἠπειθήσαν, by which τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει is separated from it, and construed with ἐλεηθῶσι; with the Greek copies, the Vulgate, the Syriac, and the Arab consistently opposing, all of whom have a comma after ἐλέει, and construe it with ἠπειθήσαν. What prompted the learned man to embrace this punctuation can be seen from his notes. And also, why he rejected the opinion of Erasmus, who has many learned things here, as often in those notes. Nor among them should it be entirely rejected that he says the faith of the Gentiles was a stumbling block to the Jews, so that they were alienated from the Gospel. This is true. However, the Apostle does not seem to have primarily regarded this, since that would not have been a stumbling block to the Jews, if their minds had not first been preoccupied with unbelief. And so the alienation of the Jews was not born from it, but only confirmed. However, I feel

entirely with Erasmus, that the Greek discourse, taken most simply, expresses that sense which consists of contrary relations, namely, "Just as you have obtained mercy through their unbelief, so they have been unbelieving through your mercy." The latter of which the distinguished Calvin says is indeed harsher, but contains nothing absurd: because Paul does not assign the cause of the blinding, but only signifies that what God transferred to the Gentiles, was taken away from the Jews. Rightly so, and this is entirely sufficient to preserve this version. That this may be clear, and indeed that what the Apostle said is not even harsh, we compare the rejection of the Jews and the conversion of the Gentiles with physical corruption and generation. Just as the corruption of one is the generation of another, so above in verse 12 he said that the fall of the Jews is the riches of the world, and their loss the riches of the Gentiles. And in verse 15, their rejection is the reconciliation of the world. Again, just as the corruption of one is for the sake of that which is to be generated from it, so in verse 28 he said that they are enemies concerning the Gospel for our sakes. Where "for the sake of" denotes not the efficient but the final cause. And just as one is generated by the corruption of another, and in turn one is corrupted by the generation of another, so in this place he says that we have obtained mercy by their unbelief, and in turn, that they have been made unbelievers by our mercy.

And I am pleased to add the difference between creation and generation. For although both are a change of a thing from not being to being, the former is a change from nothing, the latter from a pre-supposed subject. When God newly transferred Abraham and his posterity into the public covenant of grace, it had the image of creation, not of generation. It could not be said that the Jews obtained that mercy from the unbelief of the Gentiles, nor in turn, that the Gentiles were made unbelievers by that mercy of the Jews. For before God entered into the covenant, they were equally idolaters. But after God entered into a covenant with Abraham, and with his twofold posterity, first that which is of the flesh, then that which in its time would be born of his faith, which also included the Gentiles, whence from the very beginning of the covenant he was called the Father of many nations, the conversion of the Gentiles reflects the image not so much of creation as of generation. For the Jewish Church was not born as the Gentile church was after Christ. This one acknowledges the Jewish Church as its mother, from which by the force of the covenant initiated with Abraham it had to be born, and not to be borne by any other root than by the same which had been fixed in Abraham. Although God could have done this while the Jewish Church remained intact, yet it seemed good to him that the Gentile church should be so born from the Jewish, that it should also be born into its place. For so said the Apostle above in verse 17, that the natural branches were broken off, but the wild olive was grafted in among them. Beza says for "among them," that is, "in the place of the broken-off branches." And verse 19, "You will say then, 'The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in.'" Rightly. Hence it happened that by the generation of this one, the corruption of

that one was made, or as the Apostle speaks here, by the mercy of the Gentiles, they were made unbelievers.

But when the Jews are restored to the faith of Christ, it will have the image neither of creation nor of generation, but of regermination or resprouting. For the Gentile church will not be born from the Jewish as it once was, and then the Jewish Church in turn be born from the Gentile. God does not reject that nation in its entirety, but as the Apostle spoke in verse 25, ἀπὸ μέρους, "in part." For according to the election they are still beloved for the sake of the fathers, verse 28. And with the branches cut off for a time, the root still remained, from which new branches will sprout again, from their own root, I say, not from a foreign one. Nor would I easily admit, what the version of the distinguished Beza nevertheless has, that the Jews will obtain mercy by the mercy of the Gentiles. For the Gentiles are to be esteemed no further than as grafted branches, borne by a foreign root, verses 17, 18. But the Jews when they are grafted in, will be grafted into their own olive tree, verse 24. Therefore, they will be converted not so much through the mercy conferred on the Gentiles, as through the holiness of their own root (verse 16), that is, the faithfulness of the holy covenant initiated with their own nation.

VERSE 32. Συνέκλεισε γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθειαν, ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ. The Syriac also and the Arab read τοὺς πάντας, not, as the Vulgate, τὰ πάντα. But the Apostle understands the Jews and the Gentiles, into which two bodies, as it were, God has distributed the entirety of humanity; which the Apostle is therefore accustomed to express by Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλληνας, but not the single individuals of these. The Apostle understands not the individuals of these bodies, but the bodies themselves in their kind. For the Apostle has collected this verse from the two preceding ones. Where, speaking of the ἀπειθεία of the Gentiles, he said, ὑμεῖς ποτὲ ἠπειθήσατε, namely, formerly when, being aliens from the covenant, they walked in their own ways. But of the ἀπειθεία of the Jews, οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι νῦν ἠπειθήσαν, now, that is, when, departing from the faith of Abraham, they had stumbled upon Christ. Therefore, neither should the Gentiles now believing in Christ be said to be concluded in unbelief, nor could the Jews formerly be said to be concluded, when they still persevered in the covenant and faith of Abraham. Yet I do not for that reason agree with the distinguished Beza, who translates τοὺς πάντας as "all those," and wishes it to be understood as the elect from both the Jews and the Gentiles. For although God did not conclude either the Jews or the Gentiles in unbelief at all times, but the Gentiles before Christ, the Jews after Christ, yet those concluded in unbelief extend far more widely than those who have obtained mercy. For when in verse 30 he said, "You were once unbelievers to God, but now you have obtained mercy," he does not mean only those persons whom he is addressing, but the body of the Gentiles in general, in whom their fathers for many generations back were included, who had hitherto been unbelievers, when these now by mercy had been brought to faith. Similarly, when in verse 31 he said of the Jews, "These have now become unbelievers, that

they should obey, and that they should not obey (i.e., by the condition of nature both are in their power). Therefore, he has mercy on the good, who have obeyed, out of justice: but on the evil, who have not obeyed, out of grace, when they convert." He directly opposes himself to the Apostle, who says that God has concluded all under sin, that he might have mercy on all. But this one imagines some who are good and obedient to God, on whom he has mercy by right.

VERSE 35. "Or who has first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?" (*καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ*);. The Syriac has, and Tremellius and Boderianus, "and so may receive from him." From Hebraism, of course, where means "so, thus." Whence they were also forced to translate "may receive," when only means "he received." But "he received back" is said, "he returned he received," i.e., he received again. To the Syrians "so" or "thus" is said. But, according to Ferrarius, is "then, thereafter." It fits excellently. "Who has first given to him and thereafter received from him?" So also the Arab, *ثم اخذ منه العوض*, "then received from him compensation?"

CHAPTER XII.

VERSE 1. *λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν*. The Syriac. Boderianus, "by a verbal ministry." Tremellius, "rational." Where it is to be noted that just as *λόγος* for the Greeks is "speech" and "reason," so it is familiar to the Orientals to understand "reason" by "speech," because speech is proper only to rational creatures. Thus for the Masters, *אדם חי המדבר*, "man is a speaking animal," is the same as "a rational animal." Hence in the Arab Genesis 2, verse 7, it is, "And man became *لنفس ناطقة*," "a speaking soul," that is, a rational one. Nor otherwise in this place the Arab, *وخدمتكم الناطقة*, "and your speaking ministry," that is, rational. Similarly 1 Peter 2:2, *λογικὸν γάλα*, *اللبن الناطق*, "speaking milk," for "rational," where the Syriac has, "spiritual milk." So also here is understood a spiritual worship. And the Apostle explains what he had said, *θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ*. For here *ἁγίαν* is the same as *θυσίαν*, in what way we have said it is also taken in John 16:2, and often among the Septuagint Interpreters, which will be found proven by us in that place by whoever wishes. But it is called a rational sacrifice, in which not a beast, or any other carnal thing, but our mind itself, our reason and will itself is presented to God. And that the Mosaic sacrifices themselves foreshadowed this, the Hebrews declare in these words: *יען כי בהקרבת הקרבן מתעלה רצון השפל ומתקרב ברצון העליון ורצון העליון בשפל*. לפיכך השפל צריך להקריב לו רצונו על הקרבן וקושר נפשו בנפש קרבנו' ואז מעלה עליו הכתוב כאלו הקריב נפשו. "Since in the offering of the sacrifice the will of the humble man is elevated and brought near to the will of the Most High, and similarly the will of the Most High to the humble, therefore it is necessary that the humble one offer his will to him through the sacrifice, and bind his soul to the soul of his sacrifice. Then the scripture counts it to him as if he had offered his own soul" (or himself).

VERSE 2. *Ἀλλὰ μεταμορφώσαθε*. Vulgate, "But be reformed." Erasmus, "be transformed." Syriac, "be changed." The Arab more fully, *غيروا شكلكم*, "change your

anticipate by your vengeance the space which God has fixed for showing His wrath and for inflicting just punishment, but give to divine vengeance its own space. But if it be referred to the wrath of the avenging man, the meaning will be, let not your wrath immediately erupt into vengeance, but give your wrath space. For wrath is a brief madness, which if space is given, it is calmed and does not rush into vengeance. Thus the Arab has understood it, who for that reason translated بل دافعوا بالغضم حتي يجوز عنك "But restrain your wrath until it passes from you."

Ibid. Γέγραπται γδ, ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγα κύριο. The Syriac, which the Arab follows, has, "For it is written, if you do not execute judgment for yourself. I will execute your judgment. says the Lord." Trem. translates differently, but poorly.

VERS. 20. "Therefore if your enemy is hungry, feed him: if he is thirsty, give him a drink." From Prov. 25. 22. are they taken, where for "ciba cum" (feed him) one reads, הַאֲכִילֵהוּ לֶחֶם "feed him with bread." & for "da ei potum" (give him a drink), הַשְּׁקֵהוּ מַיִם "give him water to drink." Which R. Salomo correctly notes should be taken כמשמש "as they sound according to the letter." However, it is pleasant to understand the allegorical exposition of the Rabbis, which he adds in these words, ורבותיני פירשוהו על יצר הרעי אם רעב הוא ואומר לך להשביע בעבירות משוך את עצמך לבית, and רבותיני פירשוהו על יצר הרעי אם רעב הוא ואומר לך להשביע בעבירות משוך את עצמך לבית, "The Rabbis have expounded this concerning the corrupt nature. if it is hungry, & commands you to satisfy it with transgressions, transfer yourself to the sacred school, & feed it with the bread of the law. similarly give it water to drink, namely the water of the law." which is indeed truly trifling.

Ibid. τῦτο γῶποιῶν, ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσης Τπὶ τυώαεφα λιὼ αὐτό. In Hebrew it is, כִּי נִחְלִים, "for you will take coals upon his head, and the Lord will repay you." "You will take," that is, you will carry and place them there, for פשע is used commonly so. Furthermore, by "coals" most Commentators understand the wrath of God and its punishments. Aben Ezra a little differently. For thus he says, "quin he will remember the food and drink which you gave him, you will burn him as if you had brought coals upon his head to burn him, and he will beware of doing you harm." Similarly R. Levi son of Gershon, "For this thing will trouble him, as if you had brought coals upon his head to burn him. because he will be greatly ashamed to have received a benefit from you, in place of the evil with which he afflicted you." Furthermore for σωρεύσης our Syriac has תכמר, which they correctly translate "coacervabis" (you will heap up), and it is brought forward by our Lexicographers with that meaning: but relying on this place alone, since elsewhere כמר is "sepelivit" (he buried), "tumulavit" (he entombed) for the Hebrews. Therefore, to vindicate the meaning of heaping up for this word, it seemed good to add the passage from Ps. 128. (which for us is 129) ver. 7. "The

reaper does not fill his hand with it, nor his bosom מפזי the collector, who gathers the ears or sheaves, מעמר." And perhaps this is the first meaning of that word. then "to bury" and "to entomb," which is to gather & heap up earth into a mound over a corpse.

However, the saying of Ali is akin to the Apostolic sentence: أَحْسِنُ إِلَى الْمُسِيئِ تَسُدُّ "do good to the evildoer, you will rule." He truly rules over an enemy, who has him so much in his power, that he can load his head with burning coals. Therefore the Apostle rightly adds, "Overcome evil with good." for he is a victor, who compensates evil with good.

CHAPTER XIII.

VERS. 4. Εκδικῶ εἰς ὀργιῶν. Vulg. "a revenger unto wrath." Erafm. & Beza, "an avenger for wrath," that is, he says here, through whom an angry God punishes the wicked. Syriac תבועא דרובא "avenger of wrath." as if εἰς has the force of the Genitive, as with the Heb. in מְזוֹר לְדוֹד so here גֹּקֵם לְחַמָּה. The magistrate is certainly the avenger of divine wrath, while by avenging crimes he executes the wrath of God. The Arab translates ومنتقم بالرحر "and avenging in wrath." εἰς for εἰν, as often.

VERS. 6. "For they are ministers of God," εἰς αὐτὸ τῷτο πρυσὸ καρτερένεις, Vulgate, "serving for this very thing." προσκαρτερέν- τις namely τῷ θεῷ, just as Acts 10.7. a pious soldier weεσκαρ τεράνων αὐτῷ "of those who served him," where the Vulgate said "parebant" (they were obeying). Beza, "attending to this very thing." which he illustrates with a most learned Commentary. which will have even more place, if we add, that προσκαρτερεῖν is sometimes taken absolutely by the LXX Interpreters for πηη "to strengthen oneself, to take heart" as Num. 13.21 וַהֲתַחַזְקוּם וְלִקְחֵם מִפְּרֵי הָאָרֶץ wαρτερήσαντες λήψεθε ἀπό καρπῶν γῆς.

VERS. 7. Τῷ Φόρον, Φόρον. On the construction, see Cl. Bezam. The Syriac translates Φόρον as כסף רישא "head-silver," a poll-tax. The Arab الجزية, which among the Arabs is a type of tribute, which is paid by pagans, Christians, Jews and other foreigners to the Emperor, to acknowledge his dominion. and it is usually the fiftieth part of all revenue. They are accustomed to call tithes, which are also usually paid by the Mohammedans but then are called الركة. There is also for them a tribute called الخراج, and it is a poll-tax, which each of the foreigners pays yearly per head for freedom of religion, and for the security of exiting and entering. It is about two and a half gold coins in Egypt. المكس are another thing, which are called customs duties. by which word the Arab here has expressed τὸ τέλος. they are also called جباية.

VERS. 8. Μηδενὶ μηδεν ὀφείλετε, εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους. The Arab took ὀφείλετε indicatively, when he translated ولا يكون لاحد قبلكم شي "and no one has anything before you," i.e. you owe no one anything, no one has what he may demand from you, except etc. For in the imperative it should have been said ولا يكن, and that sense is certainly not unsuitable. For inasmuch as through Christ we have been freed

from the world, we have been made sons of God, and all that is ours, we have been exempted from the law of all, nor are we subject to any men as to our mind and our spiritual condition. Except for charity alone, which always holds us liable. because it is the bond of our spiritual communion. which liberty, just as it does not remove corporal debts, e.g. of tributes, taxes, and similar things, so it is a most effective argument, that we should faithfully pay those debts. For if anyone refuses to pay them, he is guilty of sin, and having lost his spiritual liberty he has passed into the right of others, and has become, even as to his mind, subject to another. This does not befit you, says the Apostle, who are so free in Christ, that you owe nothing to anyone. wherefore you ought not to become debtors of men. in the same sense as 1 Cor. 7. 23. he said, "do not be slaves of men." This seems to flow better, than if you take it Imperatively. for when, "Owe no one anything," has this sense, keep no debt unpaid to anyone, what is added does not cohere sufficiently well, "except to love one another." for that, as it is a perpetual debt, so it ought to be perpetually paid. I rightly advise another, that he should know he always owes charity to his neighbor. but I do not so rightly command, that he should always owe it. he should rather be commanded, to always pay what is due. ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τέτερον, "for he who loves another." Heb. וְהַיְיָ אֱחָדָה which the LXX explain not only by πλησίον "neighbor" but also by ἕτερον "another." see Gen. 31.49. Isa. 13. 8. & 34. 14.16.

VERS. 9. μοιχούσης, Φονεύσης, κλέψης, ἐψω-δομαρτυρήσης, σόκ πιθυμήσης. The Syriac omitted ψαδομαρτυρήσης, the Arab μοιχεύσες, which the Syriac placed after Φονεύσης, preserving the order of the decalogue. Ibid. ἐν τέτῳ τῷ λόγῳ ἀνακεφαλαιῶται, Erafm. & Beza, "is summarily comprehended." The Syriac & Arab "is completed." Hezychius, Ἀνακεφαλαιῶται, συμπληρέται, ἐπαναλαμβάν (perhaps ἐπαναλαμβάνε) "is completed, is gathered into an epilogue." for ἐπαναλαμβάνον is to make an epilogue, to resume the sum of the whole matter in an epilogue. ἐπανάληψις, πύλογο. hence also ἐπανα λαμβάνον ἑαυτὸν to restore oneself & to make whole again. and hence perhaps the Vulgate here translated ἀνακεφαλαιέτη, which is the same as ἐπαναλαμβάνε), as "instauratur" (is restored).

VERS. 11. Καὶ τῷτο, εἰδότες τ καιρὸν &c. see the notes of Cl. Beza, which could satisfy any learned person. I add however, that τῷτο can be taken absolutely for "ideoque" (and therefore), "quocirca" (wherefore). in which sense the plural ταῦτα, ταῦτα τοι, ταῦτα διή, ταῦτα is often taken, as can be seen in Budæus. Then, the Nominative ἰδότες can also be construed with ποθῶμεθα of the following verse, in this way: "And therefore, knowing the opportunity of the time, that it is the hour for us now to have risen from sleep (for now salvation is nearer to us than when we believed. the night has passed, and the day has drawn near) Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness" &c. Ibid. ὅπ ὥρα ἡμας ἤδη ἐξ ὕπνε ἐγερθῶαι. I see all take ἐγερθῆναι for ἐγείρες "to rise" or "to awake." I would prefer, preserving the aorist, "to have risen," "to have been awakened." What he says, "salvation is now nearer to us than when we believed," should be understood, Just as a runner has come closer to the goal when he has run for a long time, than when he begins

the race. (Scholiastes) The Syriac a little differently ܕܢܘܨܢܐ ܕܥܡܘܨܐ ܕܥܡܘܨܐ ܕܥܡܘܨܐ "in the beginning we did not know the promised salvation for us as much as now."

VERS. 12. "The night has passed, and the day" ἤγγικεν. Beza & Erasmus "appropinquat" (is approaching). I would prefer with the Vulgate, Syriac & Arab, "appropinquavit" (has approached), that is, it is already here, it has already come. consult our notes on Matth. 24.32. for we are already ἡοι ἡμέρας, οὐ νυκτός, 1 Thess. 5.5. Ibid. καὶ ἐνδυσώμεθα τὰ ὄτολα φωτός. Beza, "and let us put on the attire which befits the light." I confess that the Hebrew יָבֵשׁ signifies instruments, although also furniture, and thus also clothing of a garment & arms. whether ὄλον also denotes simple attire, is not yet clear to us. Hezychius translates it ἐνδυμα πολεμικόν "warlike attire"? Therefore I prefer with the Vulg. Erafm. Syriac & Arab to render it literally "arma lucis" (the armor of light). or for that reason which, as the illustrious man adduces, is found in Homer. τὸ ὀπλίζεις is taken for εὐτρεπίζεις "to be equipped, to be adorned." Hence יָבֵשׁ, which for the Chaldeans & Syrians is "to arm," for the Arabs is "to adorn." therefore he who says "the armor of light," simultaneously also says "the ornaments."

VERS. 13. Μῆκώμοις. Vulg. Erafm. & Beza, "not in revellings." The Syriac ܕܘܡܪܐ "in song." so also Gal. 5.20. 1 Petr. 4. 3. he renders that word. Hezychius Κῶμοι, ἀσελγή ἄσμαζα πορνικά. συμπόσιας ὠδαί, "wanton & meretricious songs, convivial songs." Ibid. μὴ κοίτοις καὶ ἀσελγείαις. The Syriac & Arab have taken it for μὴ κοίτης ἀσελγέσι.

VERS. 14. Καὶ σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ὑπιθυμίας. Syriac, "And do not take care for your flesh unto concupiscences." Beza supplies, "to fulfill the concupiscences." Arabs, "And do not be occupied in the concupiscences of your bodies." A clear reason is brought forth by Hillel, ch. 2. Aboth, because מרבה בשר מרבה רמה "he who multiplies flesh, multiplies worms."

CHAPTER XIV.

VERS. I. "Him that is weak in the faith" weσλαμβάνεθε "receive." Syriac ܕܗܘܐ ܕܠܗܝܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ "give him a hand." what follows μὴ εἰς 2ψακρίσεις Δαλογισμῶν he translated, וְלֹא תִהְיוּן מִתְפַּלְגִּין בְּמַחְשַׁבְתְּכֶם " & be not hesitant in your thoughts." The Arab expressed the Syriac to the letter. which version deserves the same censure, which Cl. Beza gave to Castellio. The Vulgate, "not in disputes of thoughts." for which Erasmus preferred, "not for decisions of disputes." Beza, "not for contests of disputations." or, "not for ambiguities of disputations." I do not see, why I should disapprove of the Vulgate version. For 2 αλογισμοί for "thoughts" is frequent. as Matth.15.19. Luc. 2. 35. & 2 αλογίζεας for "to think," Luc.1.29. Joan.11.50. & elsewhere, as the same most learned Interpreters admit. Nor is the sense unsuitable: "Receive the weak in faith, not disputing," or "not arguing," or "not judging his thoughts." so εἰς will be put, as often elsewhere, for ἀνευ. or if we wish to take εἰς properly for "ad" you may translate, "not unto the judgments of thoughts." For hence came all the evil, that they acted as masters over the thoughts of the brethren. For when the

forced to eat meat on the day of Passover, only ate the vegetables cooked in it." The former is correct.

VERS. 5. Ος μὲν κρίνῃ ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν, ὃς δὲ κρίνῃ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν. The Syriac translated literally, on which the Scholiast comments ܠܡܗܘܐ ܘܘܐ ܡܗܡܐ ܠܡܗܘܐ ܘܘܐ ܡܗܡܐ ܠܡܗܘܐ ܘܘܐ ܡܗܡܐ ܠܡܗܘܐ ܘܘܐ ܡܗܡܐ ܠܡܗܘܐ. "There is one who judges a day before a day, that is, he separates a day & honors it with fasting. but another judges all days, that is in the same order." The Arab wonderfully: ومن الناس من لا يعبر: "some men do not distinguish the days, but observe a day for a day. others judge it fitting to observe all days." which either I do not understand, or it has this sense, Some without any distinction of days promiscuously use feast days for profane days. others judge it fitting that all days to be observed should be observed. which the Interpreter seems to have understood not of Jewish, but of Christian feasts, so that the former seems to be of impiety, if contempt is present, the latter of piety. of which kind of thing Erafm. produces from Thomas in his notes. See various other interpretations in Beza. We think the verb κρίναν here is of the Hebrews דן, which signifies not only to judge, but also to litigate, to dispute, to plead a case and a cause, and to defend it. whence Ps. 54. v. 3. וּבְנִבְרָתְךָ הָדִינֵנִי LXX. ἐν τῇ διωάμα σε κρίνῃς με "And in your power you will judge me," i.e. you will plead my cause, you will dispute my case & you will defend it against my adversaries. So also here "another pleads the cause of one day before another," מִיִּשְׁרֹן יוֹם מִיּוֹם וְיִשׁ מִיִּשְׁרֹן כָּל-יוֹם i.e. contends one day to be more excellent and more worthy than another: another pleads the cause of every day, i.e. contends all are equal, and thus advocates for all, lest one be despised before another.

Ibid. ἕκασ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοί πληροφορεῖθω. I think this is the very same thing, which is said below in ver. 22. μακάριο ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζῃ!. For what is said here ἐν τῷ νοί "in his mind," is said there ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζῃ, "in that which he approves," namely with his mind. and what here is πληροφορεῖθω, there is μὴ κρίνῃτω ἑαυτόν. the sense is, He who does not distinguish days & foods, let him do so because he is persuaded of Christian liberty in his mind. He who still distinguishes, let him do the same because he has persuaded in his mind that the precept given by God through Moses is still in force. And although the Apostle neither praises nor wishes to be fostered that weakness, proceeding from a defect of faith and knowledge, yet while they labor under it, he does not permit that they either violate the days which they think are holy, or eat the foods which they deem forbidden, with a reluctant conscience. for thus they would condemn themselves. But he wishes each one to do what he is persuaded pleases God. for a soul is grateful to God, which strives to please him. the weakness of error which accompanies that effort, is pardoned to the truly faithful through grace.

VERS. 6. φρονῶν τῇ ἡμέραν. Syriac ܕܕܐܝܢ ܕܝܘܡܐ Trem. "who thinks of the day." τ is not valid for "de." Boder. in Reg. "who chooses the day," more correctly in Parif. literally, "who thinks of the day." for τ is of the genitive. understood are the things

signifies that, we have often shown. the sense is, if anyone has determined with himself not to distinguish days and foods, let him beware of doing it with a resisting conscience. similarly he who has determined the contrary. Arabs ما اوتي معرفته "in that of which he has received knowledge." as if someone having obtained knowledge of Christian liberty, yet from a scruple of mind does not dare to eat, condemns himself. similarly he who not having obtained that knowledge, yet eats, for everyone ought to follow his own knowledge.

CHAPTER XV.

VERS. 2. Ἐκας δῆμῶν. The Vulgate omitted γάρ. Erasmus, "nam." Beza, "itaque." Syriac & Arabs "sed." who also read ἡμῶν. Vulgate ὑμῶν.

VERS. 3. "For Christ did not please himself," ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται. after ἀλλὰ I understand εἶναι or ἔχει, or "the matter stands as it is written" &c. see what we have observed on Rom. 5.12. & compare with the notes of Beza.

VERS. 5. Τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις. Erafm. & Beza, "among yourselves." Vulgat. took it for εἰς ἀλλήλους as he spoke above, ch. 12. 16. "among yourselves," "others toward others." Syriac & Arabs, "one of another."

VERS. 7. "Christ assumed," εἰς δόξαν θεῖ. either it signifies the end, to which Christ has brought us assumed, making us partakers of the glory of God: or the purpose of our assumption, which is the glory of God. in the latter sense the Arab لمجيد الله "to glorify God." Furthermore for "nos," Vulg. Syriac & Arabs have "vos." it comes to the same thing. For what Cl. Beza wants to be understood by "nos" the Jews, seems less suitable, nor correctly collected from the seq. ver. We think rather the Gentiles are to be understood, who ought to assume the weaker Jews, and to minister to their edification, just as Christ also assumes the Gentiles, when as a minister he subjected himself to circumcision, a Jew himself for the sake of the Gentiles, so that the promise to the fathers being confirmed, the Gentiles which were contained in that promise, might have whereby they might praise God.

VERS. 8. Λέγωσε Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν Διάκονον γεγλυμῆαθς τπειλο μῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεῖ. Syriac אמר אנה דן דישוע משחא שמש גזרתא חלפ שרריה דאלהא Tremellius & Boderianus in the Paris edit., "But I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God." but in the Regiis, "he ministered to the Circumcision." That is correct. for if he had wanted to express the words of the Apostle literally, he would have said הוא משמשנא דגזרתא but not rashly for the sake of explanation he changed the paradigm & said "he ministered" and indeed without the intervening preposition lamed, which is of the Dative case, & is accustomed to follow this verb, when the person to whom one ministers is indicated. he said שמש לגזרתא to which you have a parallel phrase, & which explains this one outstandingly Acts 13.36 דויד בגילה שמש which I, although barbarously, translate. "David in his generation ministered the will of God and fell asleep," that is, subject to the will of God as a

minister he fulfilled it, & fell asleep. So in this place, "Christ ministered circumcision for the truth of God," that is subject to circumcision he fulfilled it, so that its truth might stand for the promises of God. Christ was therefore *ἑτάκων περιτομῆς* when he was circumcised, just as David was *ὑπηρέτης τῆς θεῆς βελῆς*, when he fell asleep. The Arab however expressed the dative *خدم للختان* "he ministered to the circumcision." We cannot but mention, what we have read in the not yet published Syriac treatises of Ephrem, that *שמ* with the Accus. often signifies to perpetrate, to commit, to bring to effect, to give, to do, to happen. such there is *חטאה דלא שמשנן* "the sin which we did not commit." So there. Angels are said to be sent *למשמשו פוקדנא* "to perform the command." Is this not precisely what we brought from Acts 13.36, "David in his generation performed the will of God"? so in this place, "Christ performed circumcision," that is, in his own circumcision he gave effect to the legal circumcision, since he was made its minister, just as a minister performs the will of his master. for Christ was made under the law, Gal. 4.4. just as *עבד* for the Hebrews is to serve, to minister, to worship, for the Chald. & Syrians to work, to do: so *שמ* for the Syrians is both, to minister, & to do. nor is it absurd, if in the alleged places you take *ὑπηρετεῖν* & *Διά κανον εἶναι* in the same way.

Ibid. *εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσθαι*, Syriac *דישרר* "that he might confirm, might make true," in Hiphil. The Scholiast notes, that it should be read *דישרר* in Kal with the second vowel, so that it would be "that it might be confirmed," namely the promise. the printed exemplars, and the Greek text are against it.

VERS. 10. *Εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη με ξ λαῖ αὐτό.* This passage is taken from Deut. 32. 43. which Cl. Beza says is so corrupt in the Greek edition, which is read under the name of the LXX. that scarcely any trace of the Hebrew truth appears: Which indeed seems to me to be said quite rigidly, not to say immaturely. In the Hebrew it is *עמו מים עמו* which since it literally sounds, "Sing, O nations, his people," the LXX have translated as the Apostle cited, with the phrase changed indeed, but with the same sense. as if they had said, *ἄδετε ἔθνη τ λαὸν αὐτό*, for *μετά* there does not signify company. as if the meaning were, The people of God has reason to sing, you Gentiles join yourselves as companions, & sing together with it. but it signifies the argument & matter of the song, that very thing which ought to be celebrated in song. in which way also in Belgian we say, "Hp is blijde met fijn huwelick/" as if you were to say in Latin, "he rejoices with his marriage," i.e. the happiness of his marriage is the matter of his joy. so the LXX, Ps. 21.7. *εὐφρανεῖς αὐτὸν ἐν χαρῆ με προσώπε σς*, "you will exhilarate him in joy with your countenance." for also in the Hebrew it is *תִּשְׂמַח בְּקִנְיִן* the sense is, you will cause that from your countenance he may have an argument for joy. so Isai.24.14. for *יִרְנְנוּ יְהוָה בְּגִאֹן יְהוָה* "they will sing in the excellency of the Lord" (i.e. of the excellency, they will sing the excellency, or they will rejoice because of the excellency) the LXX. have, *αὐφρανθήσων ἅμα τῇ δόξῃ Κυρία*, "they will rejoice with the glory of the Lord," i.e. *εἰ τῇ δόξῃ οἱ* "the glory, of the glory" which is the same as "they will sing the glory of the Lord." The illustrious Junius also labored here, who to reconcile the

words of Moses with Paul, thought עמו was an ἀπόδε την of speech for עמו "Sing, O Gentiles & his people." because he thought it signified company. but it is as I said. The Apostle proves that the Gentiles were to be assumed into the communion of celestial grace, because it was foretold, that it would be that the Church of God would be an argument for the Gentiles of joy & song. which could not happen, unless being partakers of the same grace, they understood the excellence of the Church.

VERS. 12. Ἐστίη ἡ ρίζα ξηοται, καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἀρχὴν ἐθνῶν, ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιασιν. Interpreters labor over the construction. which would have been less difficult, if the Apostle had added what is in the LXX. after ἔσαι, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. From the Hebrew the construction will become plain. וְיָרִית בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא שְׂרָשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל עוֹמֵד לְנֶס עַמִּים אֲלָיו "it shall be in that day, (there is a distinguishing accent Zakef katon) the root of Jesse, which stands for a banner of the peoples, that the Gentiles will seek," that is in Latin, "the Gentiles will seek the root of Jesse which" &c. so therefore also in this place. ἔσαι is placed absolutely, not constructed with ἡρίζα, but signifying in the Hebrew manner what is to be. In Belgian it is valid, "het sal gheschieden" (it shall come to pass). Then ἡ ρίζα καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος are absolute nominatives, which then constructed, through a pronoun, are changed into another case. such as are, Apoc. 6. ver. 8. καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπάνω αὐτε, ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὁ θάνατος. see also Joan. 6. ver. 42. Act. 7. 40. & often elsewhere. therefore ὁ ἀνιστάμενος I do not translate, with Cl. Beza, "and who may arise." but the whole passage I render thus, "And it shall be, in the root of Jesse, and he who arises to rule the Gentiles, the Gentiles will hope." The vernacular tongue allows, that all may be rendered literally, "Het sal gheschieden, de wortel Isai/ ende die opstaet om over de Hepdenen te heerschen/ in hem sullen de Hepdenen hoopen." Furthermore that they did not translate עומד עשר-עמד as ὁ ἐσῶς "who stands," but ὁ ἀνιστάμενος "who arises," was rightly done. For elsewhere we have said, that words which in the Oriental languages signify to be, signify also to begin to be. therefore היה so also עמד signifies to stand, & to begin to stand, which is to rise, so it is taken Neh. 7. 65. Dan. 8. 22. 23. & elsewhere. nor is anything more usual in the mishnayoth. What follows, גוים ידרשו אליו literally, "To him the gentiles will inquire," they have correctly translated ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐλπιασιν. for hope is that very affection, by which the mind exerting itself toward a future good seeks it, so that having obtained it, it may rest in it.

VERS. 14. Μεσοί ἐσε ἀγαθωσινης, in Hebrew מְלֵאֵי טוֹב אֶתְּם. For טוֹב or אגאתסינה the LXX often use ἀγαθωσιῶη, and more often indeed they use it for the goodness which is in kindness and beneficence (whence also the Vulgate Interpreter seems to have understood it specifically here of love), yet there is a place where they use it generally for all goodness of virtue. as Ps.38.21 וְיָרִית בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא שְׂרָשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל עוֹמֵד לְנֶס עַמִּים אֲלָיו "because I followed what was good." so Ps. 25. 3. You could also understand it of the goods which are called of possession, namely of the gifts of grace which God had bestowed, such as are the gifts of faith, of regeneration of the Holy Spirit, of consolation &c. For the LXX do not hesitate to use it also of the goods of

fortune. as Eccles.5.16 רבו אֲרוֹכֵי רַבּוֹ הַחַיִּים "when goods are multiplied, those who eat them are multiplied," LXX ἐν πλῆθῶ ἀγαθωστῶς ἐπληθύντησαν οἱ ἐθίοντις αὐτιῶ. see also ch. 6.3. & 9.17.

Ibid. δινάμθοι ἀλλήλες νεθετεῖν. Cl. Beza notes, that in 4 codices he found written ἄλλες, "others." so also the Syriac & Arabs.

VERS. 16. Ἱερεργέντα τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ξ 08. The Vulgate, "Sanctifying." Erafm. "administering the Gospel of God." Beza, "working the Gospel of God." as the Syriac וְיִשְׁלַח בְּאֹרְחֵי הַבְּשָׂרָה "I will work in the Gospel." similarly the Arab. Hezychius, Γεραργᾶ, θύ ἱερά ἐργάζε), "he sacrifices, he performs sacred rites." hence I translate, "performing the sacred rites of the Gospel of God." for as the ceremonial law once was, so also the Gospel has its sacred rites, and he who serves men by the Gospel, presents living victims to God, of which the Apostle treated above ch.12. 1. whence also here it follows, "that the offering of the Gentiles may be made acceptable."

VERS. 17. "I have therefore that of which I may glory in Christ Jesus" τὸς θεόν The Vulgate, Syr. & Arabs "apud Deum" (with God). as if they had not read πρὸς. Erafm. & Beza, "in those things which pertain to God." the same expression occurs Heb.5.1. "Every High Priest is constituted for men" πρὸς θεόν, where the Vulgate has, "in those things which are to God." The Syriac, "over those things which are of God."

VERS. 22. "Wherefore also I have been hindered" πολλὰ. Vulg. "plurimum" (very much). Erafm. & Beza "saepe" (often). so the Syriac & Ar. "multis vicibus" (many times).

VERS. 24. Ἐλπίζω γὰρ Διαπορθόμενο θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς. Vulg. "I hope that passing by I may see you." Beza, "that passing by that way." Erafm. "making a journey that way." where does "that way" refer? to Spain, of which mention was made before? but he says in the seq. ver. that he is now setting out for Jerusalem, from where going to Italy or Rome he could not pass by Spain, but Italy had to be passed by to go to Spain. 2 αἰρόμεν to me here is the same as ἀπερῶν "crossing," or διερχόμεν "passing through," namely from the place where he would be, namely Jerusalem or another place of Asia, all the way to Rome. it indicates the crossing between Asia & Italy. where Spain was not to be passed by. therefore he adds, "And be brought on my way thither by you." for first he was going to Rome, then to Spain. to which pertains what is said below ver. 28. ἀπελεύσομαι δὲ ὑμῶν εἰς Σπανίαν "I will go by you into Spain." Beza, "that way." for, he says, this also is a manner of speaking, like many others, taken from the middle, to be estimated from the sense itself not from the words. therefore he seems to refer "that way" to the city of Rome. as if the Apostle's intention was not, to betake himself to Rome, and in the city itself to see them, then to pass through the city into Spain, but to pass by Rome, and making a journey that way to call them from the city to himself, that

he might see them. which seems to be beyond the intention. nor arisen from anywhere else, than that he thought $21g\sim\pi\rho K_{\{0\}\prime}$ should be translated "passing by." when it rarely signifies that, or perhaps never. for what Luc. 18. v.36. ἀκέσας ἢ ὄγλο Διαπορού's you may rightly translate, "but when he had heard the people passing by," is by accident. for even if no one had sat there, except the crowd had gone by, yet the crowd could rightly have been said ἀπορεύεσ, that is, not to stand still, but to pass from place to place. and that is the very thing he heard. which passage when he, sitting beside it, heard happening, was by accident with respect to him a passing by.

VERS. 28. Τότι ἂν ὀπιτελέσας, σφραγισάμμου αὐτοῖς καρτήν τῶτον. The version of Erasmus & Beza pleases me, and their most learned notes on the participle σφραγισάμμου. I only advise, that it can be taken in almost the same meaning with ππλέσας, from the use of the verb πππ, which both the Syriac & the Arab have used here, which signifies not only to seal, but also to finish, to complete. because finished letters are sealed. So Dan. 9. 24. נִיכְשָׁהּ הַחֶזְקָה עֲשֵׂה נְלִמָּךְ The Vulgate "that transgression may be finished & sin may receive an end." Pagninus, "to finish transgression, & to make an end of sin." LXX, σωτελεθῆναι ἁμαρ- Τίαν, ξσφραγίσει ἁμαρτίας, the same there σωτελέστηκε σφραγίστες. For σφραγίσει ἁμαρτίας there is not, what Job. 14.17. ἐσφράγισας με τὰς ἀνομίας ἐν βαλαντίῳ, where it signifies, to preserve sins so that they may be imputed & punished. here on the contrary it is, to put an end to sins so that they may neither be imputed anymore nor punished. so in the same verse, נִיבְנִי וְנִיבְנִי מִיִּשְׁרָאֵל, Vulgat. "& vision & Prophets may be fulfilled." Pagninus, "& to finish vision & prophet." LXX, ἀξσφραγίσει ὄρασιν κῆ προφητείαν. Add the place Ezech.28.12. where it is said to the King of Tyre, נִיבְנִי הַחֶזְקָה חֶזְקָה "You are the sum of the pattern." it follows, "you are full of wisdom, & perfect in beauty." i.e. you are so full of wisdom & beauty, that you seem to have as it were contracted & consummated in yourself the sum of all perfection. Among the Arabs also ختم signifies not only to seal, but simply πλεῖν to perfect. see Gal.3.3. & elsewhere. especially 2 Cor.8.6. where for ἵνα διτελέσει sis vuas in zaer it has ان يختم بكم ايضا هذه النعمة ايضا which is properly ἵνα σφραγίσει, &c. so 2 Reg. 22. 4. הַחֶזְקָה-תֵּן הַחֶזְקָה " & let him perfect the money," that is, let him take care that all of it be at hand, as much as has been offered by the people. Lxx σφράγιουν τὸ ργύριον. for what certain editions have χωνούσασε τὸ δργύριον, is incorrect.

CHAPTER XVI.

VERS. 2. Καὶδ αὐτὴ τοροστάτις πολλῶν ἐγνήθη, αὐτὸ ἐμαῖ. Vulg. "For she also has stood by many, and by me myself." Erafm. "she has been present to many." Beza, "she has offered hospitality." and he added a not unlearned commentary. to which we add Hezychius, in whom Προστάται, οἱ μετοίκων, οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἀπροστασία ἐδιώκοντο. then at the word Προστάτε he notes, ἔνεμον προστάτω οἱ μέτοικοι, καὶ οἱ μὴ ὀπογραφόμενοι τῷτον, ἀπροσασίς δίκιω ὄφφλον. From which it is clear, that πάτω was said of him, on whom the care & protection fell μετοίκων of resident aliens, who had migrated from elsewhere into some city; who were bound to give their name to be

inscribed in his register, and to support their Prostates, by paying the tax of resident aliens which was called μετοίκιον. which those who did not pay, ἀπροσασίας ἐκρίνοντο, that is, of unpaid tax, which was owed by the resident aliens to the prostates. In this way it seems this Phoebe was chosen by the Church of Cenchreae, to be a guardian & curator of the faithful resident aliens, who would transfer themselves from elsewhere into that city. The Glossary, πιστάτης, patronus, prapofitus. weesaria patrocinium.

VERS. 3. Ἀπάσαθε Πρίσκιλλαν. So the Syriac also & the Arab read, not as the Vulgate Πρίσκαν. It follows Ἀκύ- λαν. The husband is placed after the wife. which the Syriac Scholiast says was done אהלח אדמבבב לבבבא לבסזזזזב "because of a greater fervor in piety." the same was done Acts 18. 18. against Ibid. ver. 2. & 26. 1 Cor. 16. 19. therefore the reason is frivolous.

VERS. 5. Ὁς ἐν ἀπαρχῇ Ἀχαΐας εἰς Χρισόν. The Syriac Scholiast notes, that among the Corinthians Stephanas is held to be the firstfruits of Achaia, but Epenetus seems to have been the son of Stephanas, and to have believed first. of that Stephanas, and of his household baptized by him Paul speaks 1 Cor.1.16.

VERS. 6. "Who has labored much" εἰς ἡμας. Beza, "for us." The Vulgate "in nobis" (among us). The Syriac בכי "in vobis" (among you). The Arab معكم "vobiscum" (with you) just as also many Greek codices read is ὑμας.

VERS. 12. Τασκοπιώσας ἐν Κυρίῳ. Syriac במרן אעלל Trem & Boder. "who labor in our Lord." I translate, "who have labored." for it is preterite, from the theme אעל "he labored." about which see our Grammat. p. 313. but two points are missing, the note of the plur. num. fem. gen. 3. person. it should have been written אעלל although the Syriac Scholiast, citing this word, does not emend it. In the present participle it should have been said אעלל in the preterite participle אעלל.

Ibid. Ἀπάσαθε Περσίδα. The Syriac Scholiast notes, that she is said to have been the wife of Rufus. of whom since mention is made in the seq. ver. is she also placed before her husband, because she was of more fervent piety, as he thought before of Priscilla?

VERS. 16. Ἀπάζον) ὑμας αἱ ἐκκλησίας Χριστῶ. Vulg. Syr. & Arabs πᾶστη αἱ ἐκκλησίας Χριστῶ.

VERS. 17. "Now I beseech you, brethren," σκοπεῖν τὸς τὰς δὲν χροστασίας ποιένιας &c. Vulg. & Beza, "that you may observe." Erafm. "that you may consider." Syriac & Arabs, "that you may beware of those who," &c. they have taken σκοπεῖν, just as commonly βλέπων for "to beware." see Marc. 12 38.& 13.9. Phil. 3. v. 2. just as σκοπεῖν is also taken Luc.11.35.

Ibid. τὴν διδαχίῳ. The Vulgate "prater" (besides). Erafm. & Beza "contra" (against), as also the Arabs "contrary to the doctrine." Syriac "extra," or "besides the doctrine."

VERS. 27. ᾧ δόξα. The Vulgate, "to whom be glory." But because that "cui" (to whom) does not correspond to the preceding words, and holds the sense plainly in suspense, Cl. Beza was bold enough to expunge the particle ᾧ. for then the sense is plain. But Erasmus here more religious, because it was read in almost all codices, preferred to confess, that he found nothing here that he could devise. There is no difficulty, if we say ᾧ is put for τέτῳ or ἐκείνῳ, a relative pronoun for a demonstrative, just as ἐφ in ἐφ ᾧ πάρει; Matth. 26. 50. we determined the sense to be, ἐπὶ τέτῳ πάρει; see what we have observed on that place. The same therefore here will be ᾧ δόξα, which in Eph. 3.21. is αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα. And to this same blessed God be glory for ever. Amen.

A COLLECTION in the rest of the epistles of Saint Paul, and the Canonical EPISTLES.

TO THE BENEVOLENT READER.

From those things, which the most learned Man commented upon in the divine Epistle of the Apostle to the Romans, it is easy for anyone to judge what a great loss the absence of his Commentaries on the other Epistles is. For when he had in mind to proceed in the rest in the same manner as was done in this one, envious death laid its hand, lest he could bring to effect what he had begun. a bitter and mournful event for all, who love these studies. Lest, however, you should deservedly miss anything in these matters, it seemed for the public good (which his modesty had forbidden) to add some not-to-be-despised remnants, as if relics of an opulent banquet, to these: from which anyone might be able to determine, what might have been expected further from this divine genius, if indeed it had seemed good to God to extend his life further. So great and excellent endeavors are often interrupted by the will of God, different from ours; to murmur against which is a sin, to obey is pious. But, unless my mind deceives me, although these at first sight promise only a certain Collation of the Greek text with the Syriac & Arabic versions, yet a healing hand is here applied to so many and desperate places, & the mind of the Holy Spirit is so happily brought out in most, that no one who comes upon this, can rightly regret the reading. Farewell, Reader, as much as you feel yourself helped by these labors, so much do not be reluctant to give effort to the memory of the best and most learned man.

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

CHAPTER I. VERS. XIX.

Syriac אלוא. Tremellius, "I will make vain the understanding of the understanding ones." Boderianus, "And I will despise the understanding of the understanding ones." I would prefer to translate, "thought, reasoning, counsel." for thus לכו is commonly taken, as also the verb ככלא for "to think, to reason, to conclude by reasoning," as Rom. 3. 28. Syriac نحيل "we reason therefore," by reasoning we collect & conclude. which the Apostle said, λογίζομεθα ἐν ὅτι δικαίεται ἄνθρωπο, &c. So in this place the Syriac thought, that by σώσειν συνεζῶν their λογισμὸν is understood. excellently in my judgment. What the Syriac says אלוא, the Apostle said, καὶ ἀθετήσω. which the most learned Beza has well translated, "& I will remove from the midst, or I will take away, or I will abrogate, or I will abolish." in which sense also ch. 7. to the Hebr. ver. 18. he said, ἀθέτησις γίνε) τορραγέσις ἐντολῆς. for this the Syriac rightly used the verb אלו, which properly does not signify to make vain, much less to despise, but is almost the same as the Heb. ללש with transposed letters, namely to plunder, to snatch away, to despoil, to deprive, to take away by depriving. Whence Marc. 6. ver. 2. ὅκ ἠθέλησε ἀθελεῖν αὐτῷ, which the Syriac translated לא צבא דנסלנה Tremellius rightly translated, "he did not want to deprive her," namely of the promise made to her, to remove her from the promise, far better than Boderianus, who translated, "he did not want to deny her." The Syriac elsewhere uses this verb for Σποχερεῖν 1 Cor. 7. ver. 5. & for ἀδικῶν 1 Cor. 6. ver. 7, 8. that is, to deprive someone of his goods by force or fraud. But the place which we are treating is taken from Isa. 29. 14. where the words are, וביתנת גבוניו תסתהר "the prudence of his prudent ones will be hidden," that is it will be so taken away, that it may be utterly hidden. or it will be destroyed. for תהר for the Syrians is to destroy.

VERS. 20. אכנא דורשא דעלמא הנא Trem. & Boder. "where is the disputer of this world?" correctly. for that is the very thing, ὁ συζητητῆς τῷ αἰῶνι τότε. just as Marc. 9. 16. τί συζητεῖτε πρὸς αὐτὸς, the Syriac translated מנא דרשין אתון עמהון "what do you inquire, or dispute, or argue with them." for דרש is to inquire, but among the Rabbis it is particularly to inquire into the mystical, allegorical, tropological & anagogical sense of Scripture, and to dispute among themselves about it. Thence מדרש according to Elias is "every exposition which is not according to the simple and literal sense." The school or Synagogue where such expositions and inquiries were made, was called בית המדרש but the preachers & disputers דרשנים also בעלי הדרש. The illustrious Drufius thought these were the same as those who were called בעלי מחקר in lib. 4. Observ. CHAPTER 6. whom D. Beza seems to praise here. but rightly he rejects it, and refutes it with great arguments Nicol. Fullerus lib. 3. CHAPTER 7. Also in the appendix.

CHAPTER II.

VERS. 2. Οὐκ ἔκρινα τῷ εἰδέναι τι ἐν ὑμῶν. In Hebrew לא פללתי לדעת וכח דבר. The most learned Beza rightly observed, in this place, as & Acts 3. 12. & 27.1. where the same construction occurs, that there is a Hebraism, & the article τε with ἔνεκα understood corresponds to the Hebrew infinitives with ל prefixed. there is also another Hebraism in ἔκρινα, which like the Hebrew פלל, does not always mean to be judged, but also to think. Thus Jacob says to his son Joseph לא פללתי "to see your face I did not judge," that is, as Onkelos translates לא סבריה "I did not think." So also here, "I did not think to know anything among you," &c.

VERS. 13. "And we compare spiritual things with spiritual." In Greek πνῶμαζικοῖς πνῶμαλικά συγκρίνοντες. The Latin & Greek have an ambiguity. for πνῶμαθικοῖς can be referred either to things, so that spiritual words are compared with spiritual things: or to persons, so that spiritual things are compared with spiritual men. The Syriac took it in the latter way, who by distinguishing the genders removed the ambiguity. ורוחניתא לרוחניא משועין אנהנן. D. Beza took it in the former way, who to remedy the ambiguity, translated, "Comparing spiritual things with those things which are spiritual." for he says it is by no means suitable, to refer τοῖς πνῶμαθικοῖς to men. To me indeed it seems most suitable to think with the Syriac. for to those, who disdained the Gospel, which was not proposed with the embellished words of human wisdom, the Apostle opposes two things. First, that the words of the Gospel ought to be διδακτά πνεύμαιο ἁγίς. Second, that since those things are spiritual, they ought to be conferred, that is, adapted, accommodated, prepared for the use of spiritual men. but what have both the Holy Spirit & spiritual men to do with the proud words of human wisdom? And that this is the correct interpretation, the following seem altogether to prove. "for the natural man does not receive the things that are of the Spirit." as if to say, if I were to set out to preach the Gospel to natural & carnal men, I would use words accommodated to their nature & disposition. for the natural man does not receive the things which are of the Spirit of God. But the spiritual, he says, discerns all things. And so since my business is with spiritual men, I accommodate spiritual things to them, and for their sake I use words διδακτοῖς πνοῦμα. The Arab however translated in the same opinion as Clar. Beza وقد نفائس الروحانيات للروحانيات "and we measure spiritual things by spiritual things." I also note, that in my Cothenian edition, & in the Regia I read משועין which since it is of the singular form, & yet because of the double point above ought to be plural, is without doubt a mistake, and should be read משוינן.

VERS. 14. Ψυχικός ω-θρως Is the carnal man, opposed τῷ πδμαλχῷ just as also 1 Corinth. 15. 44. σῶμα ψυχικὸν is opposed τῷ πνῶμαζικῷ. as also ver. 46. it is known that among the Hebrews נפש "soul" also signifies body, even a corpse. In the Persian Gospel آرزوهای نفس are "desires of the flesh," which the Savior says suffocate the seed of the word.

CHAPTER IV.

VERS. 7. מנו בקרך Tremellius, "for who discerns you?" But בקר does not signify to discern, but to search, to inquire, to investigate. and it refers to the mind, according to Ferrari. Boderianus therefore better, "Who searches you?" both however have erred in this, that they translated the preterite by the present, for although the Apostle said, Τίς σε 214- κρίνει; yet the Syriac deliberately changed it into the preterite, to teach that it is not about some present distinction here, when they were already faithful & adorned with gifts of grace, but about a past grace, by which when they were like the rest, God as it were inquired and investigated them, whom he would instruct with the knowledge of himself, & with other spiritual gifts. The Syriac therefore altogether looked back to the beginning of that distinction, therefore he used the preterite. The Apostle however to its continuous action, therefore he aptly used the present, in which however the preterite, as the beginning of the continuous action, must necessarily be observed. The Arab followed the Syriac word for word من فتشك "who has searched you?"

VERS. 9. ܘܗܘ ܕܘܠܗܘܢ ܕܘܠܗܘܢ ܕܘܠܗܘܢ ܕܘܠܗܘܢ ܕܘܠܗܘܢ ܕܘܠܗܘܢ. Trem. & Boder. neglected the distinction which is after ܕܘܠܗܘܢ, and so translated it, that the sense is, "God has set forth us who are the last Apostles as for death." but observing that distinction, the Syriac's meaning is different, which should be translated thus, "but I think that us the Apostles, he has set forth last, God has set us forth as for death." he does not compare the former Apostles with the latter, but the Apostles simply with the rest of the faithful, among whom since they seemed to be held first, they were made last, that is vile & despised before the rest, as if appointed to death. In precisely the same way the Arab took it, وقد اظن انا نحن معشر الرسل, أنما جعلنا الله, "I also think that we, the company of the Apostles, God has indeed made us last for death." they seem to have read, δοκῶ γὰρ ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἡμᾶς τοὺς ὀπισθοτάτους, ἐχάτερος ἀπέδοξεν ὡς πιθανατίους. or at least they understood it no differently, than if that distinction had been used. excellently indeed. for it follows, ὅτι θεάτρον ἐγλυήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις. Where it should be observed, that Clar. John Seldenus, concerning this passage, relates in the preface to his golden little book *de Diis Syris*, that it refers here to a custom common in the spectacles, where, when either gladiators or beast-fighters were killed or defeated, others were substituted for them, whom the Latins called *subdititios* or *supposititios*, but the Greeks called ἐφεδρος or succedaneous successors, whereas the Apostle here names them ἐσχάτους.

Beza took away this meaning, when, by changing the order of the words, he translated, "For I think that God has set us, the last Apostles, forth to be looked at." Better is the Vulgate, leaving the order that was with the Apostle, "For I think that God hath set forth us Apostles, the last, as it were men appointed to death."

CHAPTER V.

VERS. 1. Ὡς γυναικα τινὰ τοῦ πατροῦς ἔχων. A stepmother is understood, who among the Hebrews is called אשת אב, "wife of a father." He who had intercourse with her was counted among the הנסקלין, those to be stoned, in the Mishnah Sanhedrin, chap. 7, sec. 4, where it is simultaneously added that he who, הבא על אשת אב חייב עליה, "has relations with his father's wife, is guilty against her, both because she is his father's wife, and because she is another man's wife." That is, he sins against her on a twofold account: first, because she belongs to another man; second, because she is his father's. Just as he who, הבא על האם חייב עליה משום אם, "has relations with his mother, sins against her, both because she is his mother, and because she is his father's wife."

VERS. 7. "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." Fathers were held to narrate three things to their children on the night of Passover: פסח מרור ומצה, the passing over, the bitterness, and the unleavened bread. And the narration of these was called הגרה. Maimonides gives the reasons why they were bound to narrate these things in his Mishneh Torah, in Hilchot Chametz u'Matzah chap. 7. The "passing over," because God had passed over the houses of the Israelites in Egypt. The "bitterness," because Pharaoh had afflicted the lives of the Israelites with bitterness. The "unleavened," על שם שנגאלו, "because they were redeemed." For just as unleavened bread is a certain new and sincere mass, so they, redeemed from Egyptian servitude, and separated from the idolatry and filth of the gentiles, were a certain new people, sacred to God alone. From this it is clear that the Apostle most rightly argues from the redemption obtained through the slaughter of Christ, as the true paschal Lamb, for the purging out of the old leaven. Because unleavened bread was used on account of the redemption, so that they who had been made a new people through redemption would know that they ought to be free from the old leaven.

CHAPTER VI.

VERS. 4. Βιωτικά μεν οὖν κριτήρια ἐὰν ἔχητε, τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τοὺς τοὺς καθιζέτε. For the celebrated Beza, Κριτήρια are courts, and tribunals, and ordinary judges. And he thinks that καθιζέτε should be taken not in the mode of commanding, but by way of sarcasm. I would prefer to understand by κριτήρια the cases and disputes themselves which came to be judged. Thus the Syriac has it: "a dispute over worldly matters." The Arab translates it as منازعة, "controversy, debate," for κριτήριον is not always δικαστήριον, a place of judgment. The Graeco-Latin Glossary rendered it, "judgment, examination." Hence I render it, "If therefore you have causes to be judged, concerning those things which pertain to the use of this life." The Hebrews call βιωτικά κριτήρια, דיני ממונות ודיני קנסות, "monetary disputes."

What follows, "Set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church," I take not sarcastically, but comparatively, just as that passage in Matthew 5, verse 39, "if any one strike you on your right cheek, turn to him the other also." That is,

rather than avenge yourself, turn the other also. So also here: if you are not willing to bear an injury but to have your case tried, rather than dispute with your brother before unbelievers, appoint the least esteemed in the Church as judges. The Apostle seems, however, to be referring to a common Hebrew custom, among whom monetary judgments of importance, for example, those concerning robbery and injury, were conducted in מבית דין של שלשה, a council of three, who were all מומחים δούκται, approved and fortified by public authority: the remaining monetary cases could be judged by three laymen also, who were called הדיוטות, in the Greek diction ἰδιῶται; he who wants more on this, let him see the commentary of the most learned man Joh. Cocceius on Sanhedrin, p. 4, 5. Nor would I call our Apostle's ταῖς ἐξουθενημέvous anything other than the Scripture's קלים, or in the speech of the masters, הדיוטות. For thus in 1 Sam. 18, verse 23, for וְאֶנְכִי אִישׁ רָשׁ וְנִקְלָה, "I am a poor and contemptible man," the Chaldean has ואנא גבר מסכן והדיוט. And 1 Sam. 24:14, אַחֲרַי פְּרַעַשׁ אֶחָד, "after a single flea," than which surely nothing is more contemptible, the Chaldean has בתר הדיוט. Indeed, the Apostle says that even one alone is sufficient for judging their disputes, provided he is σοφοῦς. For so the following verse has it.

VERS. 6. Ἀδελφοῦς μεταῖ ἀδελφοῦ κρίνεται. Among those things which the Jews ask from God in their book of prayers, is this: מלפניך די שתצילני מדין קשה ומבעל דין קשה בין שהוא ברית, "May it please You, O Lord, to deliver me from a difficult lawsuit, and from a difficult adversary (prop. man of the suit), whether he pertains to Your covenant, or does not pertain."

VERS. 9. Syrus, מחבלנא, the Apostle, ὅτι μαλακοί. Hence Tremellius translates, "nor the soft." Boderianus, "nor the Corruptors." I translate, "nor the Corrupted." So that it is not from the singular Benoni "corrupting," but from the singular Peil, מחבל "corrupted." For both in the emphatic form make מחבלא, "corrupting" and "corrupted," and in the plural מחבלין, "corrupting" and "corrupted." The distinction is sought only from the sense. Moreover, they are called the Corrupted, whom the Greeks call ἄσωτους, who, indulging in incontinence and lascivious lusts, are broken in mind and body, so that they can scarcely be sound and whole, and thus are truly μαλακοί. Ferrarius: מחבל, "corrupted, or corrupting," besides "masturbator, soft." 1 Cor. 6, verse 9. It does not seem that μαλακοί here specifically designate masturbators, because immediately after, the Apostle has ἀρσενικοῖται. The Arab took it actively, for he translated it المفسدون, "the corruptors." μαλακοί are the effeminate, with a lost and corrupt soul, catamites.

CHAPTER VII.

VERS. 5. וְשׁוּבוּ אֵלַי וְאֶתְּנוּ אֵלַי חֵן וְרַחֲמִים. Tremellius, "again return to the same will." Boderianus, "and again return to the consensus." חֵן וְרַחֲמִים, as far as I know, never signifies "consensus," nor "will," which for the Syrians is called רעותא. I admit indeed that it is derived from חָנַן, "he willed," but if you look at its usage, it signifies nothing but "thing, business." In which way also חפץ is used by Solomon everywhere in Ecclesiastes. Let us see some passages where it seems most to the

interpreters to be put for "will." John 3, verse 27, "A man can receive nothing," מן גַּבְהַת נַפְשָׁה, Boderianus "from the will of himself." I, literally, "from the thing of his soul," that is, from that which is in his soul, that is, from himself. Or "from the thing of himself," from that which is in himself. It follows, "unless it has been given him from heaven." Another passage, John 7, verse 18. דָּמֵן גַּבְהַת רַעִינָה מִמֶּלֶל, Tremellius and Boderianus, "He who speaks from the will of his mind." I would prefer, "who speaks from the thing of his mind," that is from that which is in his mind, that is, as Christ speaks, ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλεῖ, "speaks of himself, he seeks the glory of himself." We add a third passage from 1 Cor. 7, verse 37, "He that standeth stedfast in his heart," וְלֹא אֵנֶס לָהּ גַּבְהַת, Boderianus, in the Paris edition, "and choice does not compel him," in the Royal Polyglot, "and he has no forced choice." Tremellius better, "and no thing compels him." The word "any" is not in the Syriac; I would prefer simply, "and a thing does not compel him," μὴ ἔχῳν ἀναγκήν, says the Apostle. He means the thing or business of the daughter of whom he speaks. It follows immediately וְשֵׁלִיט עַל גַּבְהַת, "and has power over his own will." You see that "will" is called גַּבְהַת and is something other than גַּבְהַת. Therefore, to return to the passage proposed at the beginning, I translate it thus, "and again return to the same thing," that is, to the same, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, says the Apostle, namely to the same use of matrimony, from which you had desisted for a time for fasting. For he did not refer ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό to a place, which Beza did, translating "come together," but to the thing or business of marriage. As also the Vulgate, translating, "return unto the selfsame thing."

VERS. 14. Ἠγί'ασται γὰρ ὁ ἀνήρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἠγί'ασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀνδρί. It is handed down in the Mishnah, tractate Berachoth, chapter 6, this general rule: כָּל עֵקֶר וְעֵמוּ טְפֵלָה מְבָרַךְ עַל הָעֵקֶר וְפוֹטֵר אֶת הַטְּפֵלָה. "This is the rule for everything principal that has an accessory, that the principal is blessed, and the accessory is dismissed," that is, it is not specifically blessed, because it is understood to be blessed in its principal. For example, הַבֵּיאוּ לוֹ מַלִּיחַ וּפֶת עִמוּ מְבָרַךְ עַל הַמַּלִּיחַ וְפוֹטֵר אֶת הַפֶּת שֶׁהֵפֵת. "If salted fish is brought to the table and bread with it, the salted fish is blessed, and the bread is dismissed, because the bread is its accessory." For although bread in itself is the chief and most necessary of all foods, because here it is added to the salted fish as an accessory, it is blessed in its principal. So also the husband, although in himself with respect to marriage he is the chief and principal part, because with respect to the covenant, which the Apostle here considers, the believer obtains the primary and principal place, hence it is that the unbelieving husband in that respect is an accessory of the believing wife, and so she being sanctified, he also is sanctified in her. For it is most true what the Apostle says in 1 Cor. 3, verse 21, πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, "all things are yours," that is, you faithful have right, dominion, and power over all things, such as an heir has over an inheritance, and a master over a servant. Therefore also over an unbelieving husband, although civilly she is always subject to him, yet spiritually the believing wife has acquired right and dominion, and in Christ she far excels him, and truly includes him in herself as an accessory. Similarly the believing husband, who as husband already had civil dominion over his wife, as a believer

also obtains another dominion, namely a spiritual one, over his unbelieving wife, by which he, being sanctified, makes her, as his accessory, a partaker of his sanctification.

VERS. 18. "Is any man called being circumcised? μη' ἐπισπᾶσθω, let him not become uncircumcised." In Hebrew, אל ימשוך. Thus in Maimonides, tractate Milah, chap. 3, sect. 8, one reads, כל המפר בריתו של אברהם אבינו והניח ערלתו או משכה, אף על פי שיש בו תורה, "Whoever makes void the covenant of our father Abraham, and leaves his foreskin, or draws it over, even though he has the Law and good works, he can have no part in the world to come."

VERS. 21. אלא אף אם מצי את למתהוי בר חירא אלא ביה פלה. Syrus, עבדאית אתקרית לא יתבטל לך. Tremellius, "if you were called as a slave, let it not be a care to you: but even if you can become free, choose rather than to serve." So also Boderianus in the Paris edition, who, in order to be able to translate thus, used remarkable audacity. For at the end of the verse, before פלה, he placed the particle מן in the text, which exists neither in the Vienna nor in the Antwerp edition, nor did it exist in the copy of D. Tremellius. For he himself says in his notes, "In the Syriac text," he says, "the particle מן, or 'rather than,' is not read. But the context argues that it fell out from the corrector when he was rereading the copy. For no sense can be elicited unless it is restored." Thus he. Which is not probable, since all copies agree. And so in the Royal Polyglot Boderianus used another artifice. For he translates thus, "but also, if you can become free, choose for yourself, to use it." But first, it is unusual to translate the verb פלה by "to use." It signifies in general, "to do," or "to work," specifically "to do servile work, to serve." And more specifically of the earth, "to cultivate," of war, "to serve as a soldier." Then he stumbles upon the same rock as Tremellius, because he translated אף אם as "also, if," as if it were written with two words אף ואם, where the first particle is copulative, the other conditional. But all copies write it together, אפאן, in which way among the Syrians it makes one particle, and that an adversative one, as among the Latins *etiam si* (even if). But what need was there for ambiguities? When both the words and the meaning of the Syriac are perfectly clear. The passage should be translated thus: "If you were called as a slave, let it not be a care to you, but even if you could become free, choose for yourself to serve." How, you will say, could this be the meaning of the Syriac, when it is repugnant to nature itself, to prefer servitude to liberty? This scruple, of course, held these great men, and forced them to pervert the words. But there is no danger. For he did not mean this, that they should spurn manumission spontaneously offered by their masters, and choose servitude, but that not even with opportunities offered for escaping and vindicating themselves into liberty, should they embrace them, but rather prefer legitimate servitude to illegitimate liberty. "Even if you could become free," namely by your own arts and frauds, "choose rather to serve."

And the very words of the Apostle seem to be able to admit this interpretation. δοῦλος ἐκλήθης; μη' σοι μελεῖτω. ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ δύνασαι ἐλευθεροῦ γενέσθαι, μᾶλλον χρῆσαι.

"Were you called as a slave? Let it not be a care to you. But even if you can become free, use it rather," namely, your servile state. And thus the following consoling reason fits perfectly, "For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: and he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant." As if to say, let not your servitude be so grievous to you that, if you could, you would wish to assert yourselves into liberty by evil arts. Discharge your calling rather. For although you are slaves of men, yet you are free men of God: and although you were free, you would nevertheless be slaves of Christ. Thus what follows coheres perfectly. "Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men." That is, you faithful, who believe in Christ, although you serve men, are nevertheless truly free. For you are bought with a price: therefore guard this your liberty and dignity, and while you serve in body, have your minds most free, and never subject them either to your masters or to any men, but only to Christ by whom you were bought, whom when you serve, do not think that you are slaves of men, but know that you are slaves of Christ alone. Nor is the phrase, "to use servitude" (δουλεία χρῆσαι) for "to serve," unusual. For Theodoret speaks thus in homily 9 on providence: ὅτι δε' οὐ λωβᾶται ἡ δουλεία τοῖς χρωμένοις, ἀτίκα δειχθήσεται, "but that servitude does not harm those using it, will now be demonstrated." However, if one may separate the particles of which אַנְפֵּס is composed, you could translate thus, "but also, if you can be freed, choose for yourself to do it." That is, do this rather, strive for this rather. For thus פִּלַּח is often taken. As in Titus 3:8, טבא יפלחון עבדא טבא, "to do good works." 1 Peter 4, verse 3. דפלחון ביה, "in which you did the will of the gentiles." Thus the Arab in this place took it. For he translated وان دعيت يا هذا وانت عبد مملوك فلا تبالين بل ان كنت تقدر علي ان تعتق وتصير حرا أيضا فخير ان تصنع. "And if you were called, O you, when you are an acquired slave, do not be afflicted. But if you can be manumitted, and become free also, it is best that you do it." Thus also in Hesychius פִּלַּח is explained by πράττειν. Yet the former interpretation is more accommodated both to the words and to the mind of the Syriac. And it is the same as that of Chrysostom, who commenting on this passage, translates μάλλον χρῆσαι as μάλλον δουλεύει, "rather serve," and this, he says, so that the Apostle might show, ὅτι οὐδὲν βλάπτει ἡ δουλεία, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὠφελεῖ, "that servitude does not harm at all, but even helps." Similarly in the preface to the Epistle to Philemon, citing and explaining this passage, he says that μάλλον χρῆσαι is τῇ δουλεία παραμένειν, "to remain in servitude." And χρῆσαι could be deduced from χρῆζω, meaning "I need, I lack," so that the sense is, "Even if you could become free, rather do without." Or, if you wish it to be an infinitive, "to do without is better," namely without liberty, in the sense, of course, which we stated before.

CHAPTER VIII.

VERS. 6. אַנְפֵּס אֵלֵּהּ אֵלֵּהּ אֵלֵּהּ אֵלֵּהּ אֵלֵּהּ אֵלֵּהּ. Tremellius & Boderianus, "But to us our one is God the father." That "our" is not from Paul. Nor is it necessary here. For although elsewhere אֵלֵּהּ is "our," here אֵלֵּהּ has a very common Syriac pleonasm, so that I translate simply, "But to us one is God, the father." By no means,

CHAPTER IX.

VERS. 27. Ἀλλ' ὑπὸ πιαζῶ μου τοῦ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ. This is of the highest fortitude. To which that saying of Ben-Zoma in Pirke Avot chap. 4 refers. איזהו גבור הכובש את יצרו שנאמר טוב ארך אפים מגבור ומושל ברוחו מלכוד עיר "Who is strong? He who subdues his passion, as it is written, Prov. 16:32, 'He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city.'"

CHAPTER X.

VERS. 2. Καὶ πάντες εἰς τοῦ Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο. "And were all baptized through Moses." εἰς for δια', as in Acts 7, verse 53, the law is said to have been given εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, "by the disposition of Angels." And Acts 19, verse 3, εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε; "through what," that is, "through which baptism, were you therefore baptized?" They answer εἰς τοῦ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα, "through John's baptism." It is a Hebraism where כּ is often "through." Hos. 1:2. תְּחִלַּת דְּבַר יְהוָה בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ, "The beginning of the word of the LORD by Hosea."

CHAPTER XI.

VERS. 21. Δεῖν σὺν ἑαυτῷ δεῖν ἑαυτῷ. Tremellius & Boderianus, "But every one taketh before (or beforehand) his own supper for himself." They translated σὺν as referring to the person, when one reads, ל-קדם, and it refers to the supper pleonastically, except that the prefixed lamed indicates that the preceding should be explained by the accusative. Furthermore, "taketh beforehand" is ambiguous. For it could be understood that the Corinthians are being reprov'd because before they approached the Holy Communion, each had already taken supper at his own home. But that, unless I am mistaken, would be said in Paël, קדם. For thus in composition, when "before" or "beforehand" refers to time, they are accustomed to use it in Paël. As קדם הוא, "he foresaw." Heb. 11:40. קדם כרו, "he proclaimed beforehand." קדם קם, "he rose beforehand," he rose very early. Mark 1:35. קדם אמר, "he foretold," Rom. 9:29. קדם בחר לן, "he chose us beforehand," Eph. 1:4, where in Kal it would not be rightly used, unless I am mistaken. On the contrary, when "before" or "beforehand" refers to persons, whom we precede and go before, Kal is more correctly used there, unless I am mistaken, than Paël. As in Matth. 28:7, Marc. 14, v. 28, קדם הוא לכון לגלילא, "he goes before you into Galilee." Marc. 21, v. 31, קדם לך, "they go before you into the kingdom of heaven." I think Paël cannot be correctly used there. Since therefore in this our passage it is Kal, not Pael, I translate, "but each one's supper he eats preventingly," that is, he eats it preventingly, not waiting for the other, but so that one prevents and preoccupies the other. He expressed perfectly what the Apostle said, ἕκαστος τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν. The Arab says: فلكن كل امرئ منكم يبادر الي عشاه فيأكله, "but every man of you hastens to his supper and eats it."

CHAPTER XII.

VERS. 28. Κυβερνήσεις. This word occurs among the LXX interpreters, Prov. 11, verse 14, where for *בְּאִין תִּהְיֶה לְפָנֶיךָ*, "through lack of counsels (that is, counselors תִּהְיֶה לְפָנֶיךָ) the people fall," they have, οἷς μὴ ὑπάρχει κυβερνήσις, πίπτουσιν. Thus chap. 20, verse 18, *עִשָׂה מְלָחָמָה*, "with counsels make war," μεταῦ κυβερνήσεως γίνεται πόλεμος. See also chap. 24, verse 6. So also here in the Apostle, those seem to be understood who are present as counselors for the government of the Church.

CHAPTER XIII.

VER. 3. "If I have delivered my body, ἵνα καυθήσωμαι, that I may be burned." Jerome, citing this passage in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, chap. 5, for "that I may be burned," gives "that I may glory." And lest anyone be surprised, he adds, "I know that in the Latin codices, in that testimony which we have placed above, 'if I have delivered my body that I may glory,' 'be burned' is had for 'glory': but because of the similarity of the word, by which among the Greeks 'be burned' and 'glory,' that is, καυθήσωμαι and καυχῆσωμαι, are distinguished by a single letter part, an error has grown strong among our people, but also among the Greeks the copies are diverse." To which the celebrated Drusus, in book 4 of his Observations, chap. 7, annotates that just as those two words among the Greeks are distinguished by only one letter part, something not dissimilar to it is here among the Syrians. For, he says, *ܩܘܠܘܢܐ* which is read in their books (read *ܩܘܠܘܢܐ* or *ܩܘܠܘܢܐ*) "that I be burned" (translate "that it be burned"), changing the letter to *ܩܘܠܘܢܐ* it means (read also here *ܩܘܠܘܢܐ* or *ܩܘܠܘܢܐ*) "that I be honored" (translate "that it be honored"). The most learned man erred in the vowels and in the persons. For what the Apostle said in the first person, ἵνα καυθήσωμαι, the Syriac rendered in the third, *ܩܘܠܘܢܐ*, "that it may burn." But also the other word brought forth by him he translated incorrectly by "to be honored." For it is the future Kal of *ܩܘܠܘܢܐ*, which signifies nothing other than "to be" and "to become heavy." But in Pael it is "to honor." In Ethpaal *ܩܘܠܘܢܐ* "to be honored."

VERS. 4. Ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστεύεται. The Arab changed the abstract ἀγάπη into the concrete صاحب المحبة, "he who has charity." He expresses μακροθυμεῖ with two epithets, طويل الرونة, "long of forbearance, he is possessed of slowness." For χρηστεύεται, لطيف المعاشرة, "kind, or pleasant in conversation." Ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ περπερευεται. The Vulgate and Beza, "does not behave itself unseemly." Thus the Old Glossary, περπερευομαι, "I behave unseemly." And Hesychius, Περπερευεται, Κατεπαίρεται, "is lifted up against another." Πέρπερος, ὁ μεταῦ βλακειῶς ἐπαιρόμενος, "he who is elated with folly." Suidas, Περπερείᾳ, ἢ κολακειῶς, "flattery." Also, ὁ μὴ διαῦ χρείαν, ἀλλὰ διαῦ καλλωπισμοῦν παραλαμβάνεται, "that which is assumed not for necessity but for adornment or pretense." Also, ἢ βλακειῶς, καὶ ἢ προπέτεια, "that which is called folly and rashness." Πέρπερος itself for him is, ὁ μεταῦ βλακειῶς ἐπηρμένος, οἷον λαῖλος, προπετής, μηδὲν λογισμῶ ποιῶν, "he who is elated with folly, such as is talkative, rash, doing nothing with reason." He explains the Apostle's passage, οὐ προπετεύεται, "is

not rash." The Syriac has לא מתקנטרא, "is not disturbed, or tumultuous," that is, is of a tranquil and firm mind, which is not easily moved, and is not incited to tumults or seditions. The Arab لا يتعجم, "does not act barbarously." For عجم is a barbarian. It seems he deduced the signification from the affinity of pronunciation, which exists between περιπερευ'εται and "to be a barbarian."

VERS. 6. Οὐ χαίρει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, "rejoices not in iniquity," συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. The Syriac and Arab, neglecting the preposition, took συγχαίρει for the simple χαίρει, "but rejoices in the truth." Beza, "but congratulates the truth," that is, he says, "he congratulates the just on their justice." More correctly, in our judgment, the Vulgate and Erasmus literally, "but rejoices with the truth." We prefer, however, "but rejoices with truth," that is, to be conjoined with truth. But the celebrated Beza rightly took ἀλη'θειαν for δικαιοσυ'νην, from a Hebraism, where תאמ is taken in that sense. See our notes on John 3, verse 21. The Syriac said שררא, the Arab الحق, which word itself signifies truth and justice promiscuously, we have taught at Luke 12, verse 57.

CHAPTER XIV.

VERS. 7. "And even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction," בין קינתא לחברתה. Tremellius and Boderianus: "between the pipe and its companion." But since the name קינתא exists, as far as is established from the lexicons, only in this place, it is better to interpret it with that word to which it corresponds in the Apostle, namely φθο'γγος, which Masius also does in his Peculium Syrum. Nor do I doubt that this word arises from the Hebrew קין, "to lament." Hence the common Hebrew קינה, "lamentation." Hence more generally among the Syrians קינתא, emphatically קינתא, "a lamentable sound," any sound, especially of pipes and flutes, with which, as is clear from the Gospel, they are accustomed to make laments. I would therefore translate, "between a sound and its companion," that is, between one sound and another. This is far more convenient to the mind of the Apostle, and to his words. εἴτε αὐλοῦς, εἴτε κιθάρᾳ, ἐὰν διαστολὴν τοῖς φθο'γγοῖς μὴ δῶ, πῶς γνωσθη'σεται τὸ αὐλου'μενον ἢ τὸ κιθαριζο'μενον. Ferrarius: קינתא "song, melody." The word is therefore corrupted from Latin. And the sense is, "between song and song." The Syriac explains what it is, ἐὰν διαστολὴν τοῖς φθο'γγοῖς μὴ δῶ. "If they do not make," says the Syriac, "a distinction between sound and sound." Ferrarius: "song, melody."

VERS. 9. הו'יתון לכו'ן ג'הו'א דע'ם א'אר ממל'ין. Tremellius & Boderianus, "you will be as speaking with the air (or into the air)." Good in sense, but ambiguous. For the Latin words can be understood, "as those who speak with the air." And that Boderianus understood it thus is clear from his interlinear version, where he translated, הו'יתון לכו'ן ג'הו'א דע'ם א'ילין דע'ם א'אר ממל'ין הו', "you will be to you, as those, who with the air are speaking." Which interpretation cannot consist with the words of the Syriac. For neither is הו'א of the plural number, nor is ממל'ין of the third person. However, it seems to me that I have observed that ג'הו'א ד with a preceding substantive verb and a following participle has the force of a substantive verb,

the Syriac phrase does not bear that interpretation. For the Syriac has ܠܗܘܢ ܡܝܬܐ, which cannot be translated otherwise than "for the dead," or "in place of the dead," but by no means "over the dead." Nor indeed does the Greek ὕπερ with the genitive easily signify that. Tertullian relates that it was customary in the Church for the living to be baptized for the dead, that is, for the consolation of the dead, all of whose souls were believed to be kept in a repository under the earth until the day of resurrection. Theophylact and Epiphanius report that the Marcionites were accustomed, if ever anyone had died without baptism, to have some of the closest relatives under the bed, upon which the dead person lay, or within the sepulcher itself, over which the deceased had been laid, baptized, lest he perish, but having obtained remission, be saved. Both of these are utterly superstitious. Others therefore refer it to the catechumens, who, since their baptism was accustomed to be deferred for a long time, until they were thoroughly instructed, if ever they were overtaken by death, were accustomed to ask for and obtain baptism at the very point of death. They are said to be baptized for the dead for this reason, because being near death, they were to be counted among the dead rather than the living. This is weak, besides the fact that in Greek it should have been said πρὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, not ὕπερ τῶν νεκρῶν. For which reason also the opinion of those seems to be rejected, who want all who are baptized to be baptized for the dead, inasmuch as being immersed in water, they are considered as dead, as indeed partakers of the communion of the death of Christ. For although that opinion is pious, and the thing itself true, yet the article τῶν demands that some be those who are baptized, others the dead, for whom they are baptized. Nor is the opinion of the celebrated Heinsius satisfactory, who wants the living to be said to be baptized for the dead, when the names of the dead are imposed on them in baptism. In this most obscure matter, which has hitherto exercised the greatest minds, we shall not fear to state our own opinion, or conjecture. The Apostle in this whole chapter deals with the blessed resurrection of those who have fallen asleep in Christ. He therefore understands no others here as the dead, for whom he says the living are baptized in vain, if those dead are not to rise again. It is confessed among all that Baptism is a seal of the resurrection, both because, having been conferred on the body of the faithful, it notes that it too is a partaker of the death as well as the resurrection of Christ: and because it is a seal of the covenant, whose promise is, "I am your God." From which the Savior most powerfully infers the resurrection in Luke 20, verses 37, 38. But it must especially be held that Baptism, as the first seal of the covenant, publicly conferred in the Church, seals the promises of the covenant not only for those particular persons to whom it is conferred, but also for the universal Church, both militant and triumphant, both of the living and of the dead, who indeed, constituting one and the same Church with them, and, like them, having been saved as yet only in hope, continually expect the fulfillment of the promises of the covenant. Therefore, as many as are baptized in the Church, are baptized not only for themselves, but also for the faithful dead: not to help them, or to free them, or to relieve them, or in their place, but to

establish unceasingly the promises of the covenant, made to them and still to be fulfilled. So that, as long as and as often as baptism is administered in the Church, so long and so often is the promise made to the dead renewed, that God is their God. And because God is not the God of the dead but of the living, that they live unto God, by promise. Wherefore it is necessary that at some time they themselves live in actuality. Whence it is firmly concluded, that the living are baptized for the dead in vain, if they are not to be resurrected.

VERS. 32. κατ' ἄνθρωπον ἐθηριομαχῆσα ἐν Ἐφεσῶ. This same phrase is used in Rom 3, verse 5, and in Galatians 3, verse 15, where κατ' ἄνθρωπον λέγω should be translated, "speaking in a human way, I say." So also in this place: "if, speaking in a human way (that is, so that I may speak with a phrase taken from human contests) I fought with beasts at Ephesus."

VERS. 41. Ἐτέρᾳ μὲν οὐρανίων δόξα, ἑτέρᾳ δὲ ἐπιγείων. Concerning the glory of celestial things, according to the opinion of most Hebrews, Maimonides writes thus in the Mishneh Torah, tractate Yesodei HaTorah, chap. 3, sect. 9: כל הכוכבים והגלגלים כולן בעלי נפש ודעה והשכל הם והם חיים ועומדים ומכירין את מי שאמר והיה העולם כל אחד ואחד לפי גדלו ולפי מעלתו משבחים ומפארים ליוצאם כדרך שהמלאכים וכשם שמכירין את הקב"ה כך מכירין את עצמן ומכירין את המלאכים שלמעלה מהן ודעת הכוכבים והגלגלים מעוטה מדעת המלאכים וגדולה מדעת בני אדם. "All stars and Spheres are endowed with soul, knowledge, and intelligence, and also with life and consistency. They acknowledge him by whose command the world was made. Each one of them according to its greatness and dignity praises and glorifies its creator just as the Angels do. And just as they acknowledge God, the Holy One Blessed be He, so they also know themselves, and they know the angels who are above them. But the knowledge of the stars and the spheres is less than the knowledge of the Angels, and greater than the knowledge of the sons of men." Therefore, they want the glory of celestial things to be that of rational creatures, and greater than that of terrestrial men.

VERS. 53. עתיד הוא גיר הנא דמתחבל דנלבש לא מתחבלנותא. והכנא דמית דנלבש לא מיתותא. Tremellius, "For it is necessary that this which is subject to corruption, should put on incorruption: and similarly that the mortal should put on immortality." Boderianus, "for it is to be that this corruptible, etc. and so that which is mortal, etc." Among the Syrians, "this" is said as הנא, which is masculine here. I therefore translate, "for it is to be that this one who is corrupted will put on incorruptibility: and similarly he who dies will put on immortality." The same is to be established for the following verse. For what the Apostle said of the body, τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο, καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο, the Syriac referred to the person. For which reason he changed the gender. The Arab similarly: فهذا المتغير مزعم ان يلبس ما لا يتغير وهذا. المايث عتيد ان يلبس عدم الموت. "This one who is corrupted, is to be that he puts on that which is not corrupted: and this one who dies, is to be that he puts on the absence of death," i.e., immortality.

serving the regimen of the Genitive: in this sense, "so that the gift bestowed on us may be of many persons."

CHAPTER II.

VERS. 10. דלא נתעלב מן סטנא. "lest Satan should get an advantage of us." Boderianus, "lest Satan bring an accusation against us." Ferrarius: עלב, "defrauded, slandered, was angry, oppressed." עלבא, "fraud, seizure, fraudulence, oppression, anger." So also the Lexicon Syr. Arab. says that עלב signifies الظلم "injury or oppression," الغضب "anger," and الغدر "fraud." In the N.T. it is most frequently put for πλεονεκτεῖν, as is the noun for πλεονεξία. Sometimes for ἀδικεῖν, as in 1 Cor. 6, verses 7, 8. Sometimes also for συκοφαντεῖν, but in that sense in which Luke 19, verse 8 says, εἴ τινοῦς τι ἐσυκοφάντησα, where it signifies not so much slander as defrauding. I would therefore translate also in this place, "lest Satan defraud us." The Greek has ἵνα μη` πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπο` τοῦ Σατανᾶ. The Arab: لئلا يقهرنا الشيطان, "lest Satan overcome us." It seems he took the Syriac עלב in the same sense as the Arabic غلب with a dotted Ain, which signifies to overcome; or it seems he took the Apostolic πλεονεκτεῖν for "to hold the superior parts." Which indeed by force of its composition is the proper signification of that verb, and in this place it fits well. Thus Aristotle said πλεονεκτῶ τῆς τιμῆς, "I have more honor, I surpass in honor." Isocrates, οἱ δίκαιοι τῶν ἀδίκων πλεονεκτοῦσι, "the just surpass the unjust." Hence πλεονεκτεῖσθαι passively is "to have all the inferior parts." See Stephanus.

VERS. 14. دل الله لى كل زمان مظهرنا فى المسيح. Boderianus, "But thanks be to God, who in every time shows a specimen to us in Christ." Better Tremellius, "who at all times makes a triumph for us in Christ." I would prefer, however, to translate literally, "who at all times makes us a spectacle in Christ." For I think that لى in دل is of the accusative case, not the dative. The sense is, "who through the Gospel always exhibits us as superior, as if placed on a triumphal chariot, to be viewed by all." He well expressed that of the Apostle, τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ. The Arab: والانعام لله الذي يظفرنا في كل حين بالمسيح, "And thanksgiving to God, who makes us victorious at all times in Christ."

VERS. 16. The Apostle had said in verse 15, ὅτι Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμεῖν τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις. It follows in verse 16, Οἷς μεῖν, ὁσμη` θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δε` ὁσμη` ζωῆς εἰς ζωῆν. The Syriac seems to have distinguished these differently. He did not read a comma after μεῖν and δε`, but after θανάτου in the first member, and after ζωῆς in the second: in this way, Οἷς μεῖν ὁσμη` θανάτου, εἰς θάνατον· οἷς δε` ὁσμη` ζωῆς, εἰς ζωῆν. For he translated, دل الله لى كل زمان مظهرنا فى المسيح, that is, "to whom is the odor of death, unto death: and to whom is the odor of life, unto life." So that the sense is, "to whom is the odor of death," that is, who themselves have the odor of death in them, to them I am an aroma unto death. And those who have the odor of life in them, to them I am an aroma unto life. Since Tremellius and Boderianus did not notice this, they translated against the usage of the language, "To these the odor of death unto death, and to those the odor of life unto life." For دل الله لى with a

following pronoun never signifies "these" or "those," but "whom," אֲשֶׁר לוֹ, as can be clear from the preceding verse. And with the preposition lamed prefixed, לְאֵילֵין דְּ, it means "to whom." But what they translated, "To these the odor of death unto death, and to those the odor of life unto life," the Syriac, unless I am mistaken, would say, לְהַנוּן מַךְ זַחַסְל כְּמוֹתָא מְלוֹתָא סְלֵהֲנוּן זַחַסְל כְּמוֹתָא דְּחַיִּיא. The Arab certainly understood the Syriac as we have said. For he translated, فالذين يستوجبون عرف الموت للموت, والذين يستاهلون عرف الحياة للحياة, that is, "and those who deserve the odor of death, unto death: and those who deserve the odor of life, unto life."

CHAPTER III.

VERS. 10. (מַךְ הַהוּא גִיר דְּאִף לֹא לְאַבְכֵסֶהּ סֵד דְּלְאַבְכֵסֶהּ כְּפִסְמֵבְל) דְּהִנָּה שׁוֹבְחָא דִּיתִיר. Tremellius, "since indeed even that which was to be glorified was not, what was glorified, in comparison with this excellent glory." Boderianus in the Royal Polyglot, "Since indeed not even that which was glorified was glorified, which was glorified etc." But in the interlinear version, what the words mean can scarcely be grasped, "As that very thing for what also not glorified what was glorified." We have said at 1 Corinthians 14, verse 9, that מַךְ הַהוּא דְּ signifies "as if it were that," in Latin, "as if." If you now understand the substantive verb because of that הוּא, the sense is clear, in this manner: "For it is, as if even that which was glorified had not been glorified, in comparison with this excelling glory." See that phrase also in 2 Cor. 5, verse 20, where Tremellius also translated מַךְ הַהוּא דְּ as "as if." See also Gal. 3, verse 1, where in the same phrase the substantive verb is also understood.

The Syriac has explained excellently what the Apostle said, εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργούμενον, δια' δο'ξης, "for if that which is abolished, was through glory," δια' is put for ἐν, the Apostle himself explaining in the following member, πολλῶ μᾶλλον τὸ μένον, ἐν δο'ξη. Therefore δια' δο'ξης and ἐν δο'ξη are the same. Nor is it strange because both mean the same as the Hebrew, who would say here, אִם הַנִּמְלָא בְּכַבּוּד אֶף כִּי הָעוֹמֵד בְּכַבּוּד. You see it is a pure Hebraism in the Apostle's diction. Moreover, δια' δο'ξης is a periphrasis of an adjective, so that δια' δο'ξης and ἐν δο'ξη are nothing other than ἔνδοξον; elsewhere it may be translated adverbially ἐνδοξῶς. For thus the Hebrews are accustomed to express adverbs of quality by a preposition and a substantive noun. As when God is said to exercise his punishments בְּצַדִּיקָה, δια' δικαιοσύνης, ἐν δικαιοσύνη, that is δικαίως. And thus I take the apostolic phrase in 2 Peter 1, verse 3, "who has called us δια' δο'ξης καὶ ἀρετῆς." The most learned Beza, "to glory and virtue," I would prefer "gloriously and powerfully." For δια' here means nothing other than the Hebrew בְּ, and that ἀρετήν said of God signifies power and strength, the same as הַיָּל or גְּבוּרָה, the great Heinsius teaches most eruditely in his preface to Aristarchus S. The Arab, however, translated الي مجده ورضوانه, "to His glory and His good pleasure," where الي seems to signify, "according to," and the word ἀρετήν he seems to have taken for ἀρεσκεία, as if it were derived from ἀρέσκω, "I please." The Syriac is far better: כְּמַכְּ כְּמוֹתָא דְּחַיִּיא, "who called us in his own glory, and power."

VERS. 18. "We are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory," ܠܡܝܢ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ. Boderianus, "as from the Lord's Spirit." But such a regimen of the genitive is entirely unusual for the Syrians. For they would say that as ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ or ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ. When Tremellius noticed this, he translated "as from the dominating Spirit." It would be better, "as from the Lord Spirit." "Dominator" for the Syrians is called ܫܠܝܬܢܐ. But ܕܗܘܪܐ signifies "Lord." But this sort of apposition is harsh and also unusual for the Syrians. The position of the words does not seem to bear any other interpretation than this: "as from the Lord is the Spirit." As if he had not read, ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ, but ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ. The sense is fitting, "just as the Spirit is from the Lord, so we are transformed by that Spirit into the same image of the Lord." Or ܕܗܘܪܐ, as it properly sounds, can be translated here, "according to what the spirit is from the Lord," that is, "according to that measure of the Spirit which we receive from the Lord we are transformed into the same image." That was undoubtedly the mind of the Syriac. For the Arab also took it thus, ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ, "according to what (or as) the Spirit of the Lord is given to us."

CHAPTER IV.

VERS. 4. Ἐν οἷς (namely ἀπολλυμένοις) ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἀγαθὰ αὐτοῖς etc. The Syriac rightly observed that τῶν ἀπίστων is so construed with the preceding words that it contains in itself the reason why the perishing are justly blinded by the Devil, namely ܕܝܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ. Therefore he translated, ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ etc. That is, "whose god of this age has blinded the minds, because they do not believe, so that the light of the Gospel etc. might not shine for them." Tremellius, however, not correctly noticing either the Syriac phrase or its scope, translated, "whose god of this age has blinded the minds, because they do not believe, and the splendor might not shine for them," that is, for this purpose that they might not believe and that the splendor might not shine for them. And in this manner also Boderianus translated, "so that they may not believe, lest it shine etc." But that is neither in the Apostle nor does it agree with the words of the Syriac, who said ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ, which is not, "so that they do not believe," but "because they do not believe." Thus the Arab: ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ, "God has blinded the hearts in this world, because they do not believe, so that it may not appear to them etc." where, moreover, let it be observed in passing, it seems he read, Ἐν οἷς ὁ Θεὸς ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ. Or he certainly took the words of the Apostle thus.

CHAPTER V.

VERS. 3. ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ. Tremellius, "Unless also, after we have been clothed, we be found naked." In the same way Boderianus. But there is no doubt that there has been a departure both from the words and from the mind of the Syriac. For besides the fact that that sense can scarcely be reconciled with the preceding and following context, the Syriac did not say in the plural ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ, but ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ ܕܗܘܪܐ.

"naked" (nudi), but in the singular ערטלי, "naked" (nudus). For a better interpretation, therefore, two things must first be indicated. First, that מה ד not only signifies when or since, or after, but just as מה ד signifies "he who," so מה ד signifies "that which." This is common. The other, that לא משתכח is not only the first person plural future, but also the third singular. And so we translate, "but also, what we have put on (or that with which we are clothed) will be found by us to be naked." The Syriac meant this, that we are affected by a double benefit of death, because not only is this body of ours with which we are now clothed to be super-clothed with a heavenly dwelling, but that it itself also will be naked, naked namely of that burden of sin and mortality, of which he makes mention in the following verse, "For we," he says, "that are in this house do groan from its weight, and we do not wish to be unclothed of it, but to be clothed upon it, that its mortality may be swallowed up by life." As if to say, this body with which we are now clothed, is wrapped in a most grievous burden, under which we groan: nor can it be super-clothed with heavenly glory, unless it be stripped of that. This will happen through death, it will be found at that time to be naked. For we do not wish to be unclothed of it, but we wish it to be stripped so that immortality may be put on over it. The Syriac does not seem to have read, εἶγε καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι, οὐ γυμνοὶ εὐρεθησόμεθα, but without the negative particle, εἶγε καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι, γυμνοὶ εὐρεθησόμεθα, that is, "if indeed we who are already clothed shall be found naked," namely, so that we may be clothed with a better garment. I doubt, however, whether there is not an error in אֵל and it should be read simply יָל. In the Vienna edition, certainly, before מִשְׁתַּכַּח there is indeed a little line, but so curved, imperfect, and inelegant, that it does not represent an Olaph, but seems to have been born from some stick used in the printing work. If we say this, it will have to be translated, "not even what we have put on will be found by us to be naked." The Arab translated, فاذا ما لبسناه ليس نوجد عراة ايضا, "if indeed with that which we have put on we are not found naked also."

VERS. 6. Θαρροῦντες οὖν πάντοτε, καὶ εἰδοῦτες ὅτι ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι, ἐκδημοῦμεν ἄπο τοῦ Κυρίου. How this verse is connected in various ways according to various authors with the following ones, see in the notes of the celebrated Beza. Our opinion is that Erasmus correctly translated the participle θαρροῦντες by the present indicative. This is frequent for our Apostle, who in this same chapter below v. 12, wrote διδόντες for δίδομεν. But I do not praise that he also translated the participle εἰδοῦτες by the indicative. For they do not cohere well, "We are confident, and we know that we are absent from the Lord, for our absence from the Lord does not produce confidence, but opposes it". We translate, *Therefore we are always confident, even knowing that while we are at home in the body we are away from the Lord.* That is, the fact that we know we are now away from the Lord does not destroy our confidence, but even so we are always confident. Thus, there is no need to enclose either verse 7 in a parenthesis (as the Vulgate did, with the particle in verse 8 protesting), nor verses 7 and 8 together (as Beza did). The Syriac version also made the seventh verse parenthetical, but in order to connect

the sixth with the eighth correctly, it omitted from the sixth θαρρόυντες οὖν παύτοτε, and from the eighth it deleted δε. The Arab followed the Syriac to the letter.

CHAPTER VIII.

VERSE 4. τηῖν χάριν, *hanc gratiam* (this grace). Beza correctly, *hanc beneficentiam* (this beneficence). For הן to the Hebrews is grace, a gratuitous benefit. They also call גמילות חסדים the retribution or bestowal of graces, which they distinguish from צדקה, alms, in this way. בשלשה דברים גמילות חסדים יותר מן הצדקה צדקה בממתנו תמילות חסדים בין בגופו בין בממוטו: ציקה לחיים גמילות חסדים בין לחיים בין למיתים צדקה לעניים גמילות חסדים בין לעניין בין לעשירין. That is, in three things beneficence is more excellent than almsgiving. First, because alms are given only with money, whereas beneficence is practiced with both body and money. Second, because alms are only for the living, whereas beneficence is practiced for both the living and the dead. Third, because alms are only for the poor, whereas beneficence is practiced not only for the poor but also for the rich.

VERSE 20. The text is στελλομένοι τοῦτο, *vitantes hoc* (avoiding this). Hence Tremellius, following the Greek rather than the Syriac phrasing, translates, *Evitavimus enim hoc* (For we have avoided this). Boderianus in the Royal Polyglot, *caterum hoc devitamus* (moreover we avoid this). In the Paris Polyglot, *devitamus autem in hoc* (but we avoid in this). Translate, *timentes autem sumus in hoc, meticulosi* (but we are fearful in this, meticulous), solicitous, we are anxious with care, lest anyone should blame us in this matter; just as when sailors, fearing danger from a storm, draw in the sails, which στελλομένοι properly denotes. Thus the Arab, من ولحن وجلون في هذا الامر, *nos metuimus in hac re* (we are fearful in this matter). Therefore, either the most learned Beza used a different version than the one published by Erpenius, or he did not correctly understand the Arab, when he says that he read σκεπτομένοι *spectantes* (looking), which they say is ناظرون. Furthermore, φόβον signifies fear or what is a little more, anxiety, Acts 27:9, 33; 1 John 4:18. See what we note on those passages.

CHAPTER IX.

VERSE 5. "For this reason, I was careful to ask my brothers to come to you before me, and to prepare the blessing, λησθησθε ὅσα παλαιὰ ἔσθησθη." Tremellius: "of which you have already been admonished, that it should be ready." Boderianus: "which you have heard from the beginning, that it may be ready." Literally, "which from the beginning you have been heard of as being ready," that is, for which there has long been a report about you that it would be ready. He has correctly expressed the Apostle's words, τηῖν προκατηγγελημένην εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν, ταύτην ἐτοιμὴν εἶναι, "that your blessing, which was announced beforehand, might be ready," of which there was formerly a fame and rumor.

VERSES 12, 13, 14. The parenthesis which begins in verse 12 before δια τῆς δοκιμῆς, and ends in verse 13, should be removed. And the dative which follows in

verse 14, *καὶ αὐτῶν δεήσει*, does not belong to verse 12, as Beza wished—for there is nothing there for the dative to be governed by—but is governed by *δοξάζοντες* in verse 13. And a third reason is given why the saints of the Jews have cause to praise God, namely because they also pray for the Corinthians, because through the beneficence of the Corinthians they have been provoked to pray to God for them; for that reason they praise God. And *διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστιῶν* I do not translate "through many thanksgivings," but "through the thanksgivings of many." And to *πολλῶν* I refer, by an enallage of case, what follows in verse 13, *δοξάζοντες*, for *δοξαζόντων*. We have observed a similar enallage also in the preceding verse 11, and in 2 Cor. 1:7, Eph. 3:17, Rev. 1:4-5.

CHAPTER X.

VERSE 9. *אֲנִי אֶסְבֵּר בְּיָדֵי מִצְוֹתַי וְלֹא אֶפְחָד לְפָנֶיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ*. Tremellius, and Boderianus in his interlinear version: "But I doubt lest I should be esteemed as one who by terrifying would terrify you by my letters." But the word *אסבר*, which is found only in Aphel, does not mean to doubt, but to neglect, not to care, to omit. See Hebrews 12:5; Acts 18:17. Therefore, in the Royal Polyglot he translates, "Moreover, I do not care to be esteemed as one," etc., but this is not correct either. For first, he neglected the distinguishing point, which is after *לֹא*. Then, that negative, "I do not care," is contained in *אסבר*. Therefore, another negation should follow, "I do not care not to be esteemed." For what follows is *לֹא*. Thirdly, it is repugnant to the Apostle's meaning, who expressly says that he does care about this, that he should not seem to wish to terrify them by his letters. The sense is clear, and coheres very well with the preceding, if you translate it thus: "But I omit, so that I may not be esteemed as one who by terrifying would terrify you by my letters." He had said in the preceding verse, "Though I should boast somewhat more of our authority... I should not be ashamed." But, he says, "I omit this, lest I should be esteemed as acting to terrify you." Thus he has very well supplied the ellipsis of the Apostle, *ἵνα μὴ δόξω ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν ὑμᾶς διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν*. The Syriac Lexicon explains *אסבר* by the Arabic *توانا*, he hesitated, *ويقال غفل وعمل*, and it signifies neglect and rejection. The sense therefore will be: but I hesitate, or I cease, and I neglect or reject boasting further of my authority. I add Ferrari, who translates *אסבר* intransitively as "he turned away," and transitively as "he turned away, he withdrew." He says it generally refers to the eyes and sight, and he cites a place from Isaiah 1:15 where it is taken transitively for *אָפְלִים*, I will hide. So also in this place it may be translated, "but I hide," or "I withdraw and hold back," namely, the boasting which I had begun. Intransitively it is correctly taken for *אל תמאס* in Proverbs 3:11, "do not be averse to the chastening of the Lord." *μη ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου*. And in Acts 18:17, *ולא הוה מסבר לה לגיליון על הליון*. "And Gallio was averse to these things," that is, he withdrew himself and did not care. So also in this place it can be translated, "but I turn away," or "I withdraw myself," namely from the boasting I had begun, lest I should be thought to terrify, etc. The Arab has expressed the Syriac excellently: *غير اني اجمل ذلك*, "except that I reject this"

of that which had passed between the second and the writing of this epistle. The Arab translated differently, who rendered it من بعد, "after."

VERSE 8. $\text{וְהוּא הָיָה עִזְזָה בִּי אֲפֹרָא}$. Tremellius: "For he that wrought effectually in Kîphâ, was mighty in me also." Boderianus in the Paris Polyglot: "in Cephas, in me." In the Royal Polyglot: "In Kîphâ." I translate more properly, "For he who incited (or made zealous, studious, diligent) Cephas, also incited me." For עִזְזָה is zealous, studious. אֲפֹרָא is zeal, diligence. Thus the Arab: وان ذلك الذي اعطى الصفا الاجتهاد هكذا حضني, "for he who gave Peter effort (or zeal) likewise admonished me."

VERSES 15, 16. $\text{וְאִם אֲנִי מֵת לַחֹק הַתּוֹרָה אֲנִי חַיִּים לְיֵשׁוּעַ מְסֻלְּמָן}$. The proposition contained in these verses is conditional, and is translated by Tremellius and Boderianus with only the antecedent, without the consequent. Tremellius, however, in his notes, wants it to be understood: "How much more does it suit the Gentiles, who by nature are alien from God, to be justified by faith alone in Christ, and not by the works of the law, which cannot justify even us Jews."

However, the lack of a consequent can be supplied if you translate thus: "For if we who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, because we know that a man is not justified by the works of the law but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in the same Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law, that is, because by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified." The whole proposition, therefore, is: if even we Jews believe in Christ, that we may be justified by faith, it is not by works that this happens, because no flesh can be justified by works. Or if it should be said that the aforementioned verses contain a mere condition, it can be joined with the condition which is in the following verse, to which the apodosis is there subjoined. In this way: "If we Jews ourselves have believed in Christ that we might be justified by faith, not by works: and if, while seeking to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin?" As if to say: you, Peter, by your action constitute Christ as if a minister of sin. For if we Jews, who believe in Christ and seek righteousness through faith, not from the law, are nevertheless constituted sinners, that is, we are subjected to the law from which comes the knowledge of sin, as sinners, which you by your action seem to imply, is Christ therefore a minister of the law and thus of sin? God forbid, he says. For I through Christ am dead to the law. But if I build again the law which I destroyed, and subject myself to it again, I make myself a transgressor, who was otherwise righteous in Christ, and thus I make Christ a minister not of righteousness but of sin. I would rest in this opinion, for the Arab also begins verse 15 with a conditional particle, and subjoins no other apodosis than that which is at the end of verse 17.

CHAPTER III.

VERSE 1. ܘܘܫܘܒܘܢ ܕܡܢܘܢ ܘܘܫܘܒܘܢ. Tremellius: "who has bewitched you?" Boderianus: "who bewitches you?" But that the verb ܡܢܘܢ is taken for "to bewitch" is handed down by lexicographers only by conjecture from this one place. Otherwise, it always means to be envious, to envy, as does the noun ܠܡܢܘܢ, envy. Since therefore βασκαίνειν means not only to bewitch but also to envy, the Syriac took it in the latter way, when he translated the Apostle's words, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανε, as ܡܢܘܢ ܘܘܫܘܒܘܢ ܘܘܫܘܒܘܢ, that is, "who envies you?" And note, what follows in the Apostle, τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πειθεσθαι, does not follow in the Syriac. It seems he did not read those words, because he did not even touch upon them. But it immediately follows, "because behold, it is as if Jesus Christ crucified had been portrayed before your eyes." The meaning of the Syriac seems to have been this: you foolish Galatians, can you complain that any one of us envies you, because we have not revealed the full salvation to you? When, on the contrary, we have preached Christ to you so clearly, no differently than if he with his cross had been portrayed before your eyes. Or thus: Who is so wicked as to envy you this good, that behold, it is as if Christ crucified were portrayed, etc. I prefer this sense. The Arab followed him: من ذا الذي حسدكم وهويكم بالمسيح مصورا بين عيونكم مصلوبا.

VERSE 5. "He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, *does he it* ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; from the works of the law, or from the hearing of faith?" (supply: does he minister it?). This affirmative question is equivalent to an absolute negative, as is common elsewhere, and is as much as if he had said, "not from the works of the law, but from the hearing of faith he ministers it." With this, the sixth verse coheres without any ellipsis, "As Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." He proves, namely by the example of Abraham, that the Spirit was not ministered from works, but from faith. Whence the conclusion rightly follows in verse seven, "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." This connection establishes no ellipsis in verse five, much less a harsh one (as it seemed to the illustrious Beza). Nor does it leave any necessity to construct, with that most learned man, a relative proposition from verses six and seven, of which the Πρότασις is in verse six, the Ἀπόδοσις in verse seven, where to indicate the Ἀπόδοσις he added at the beginning of the verse, "so." But he translates ἄρα as "namely," not "therefore." The Vulgate interpreter and the Syriac follow our opinion.

VERSE 14. "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Christ Jesus." The blessing of Abraham was, "In thy seed shall all nations be blessed," etc. Peter, referring this also to Christ in Acts 3:25-26, says, "Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you." But here Paul rightly infers that blessing from the curse to which Christ was subject in our place on the cross, so that we may know that this blessing depends on the priesthood of Christ, inasmuch as he offered himself as a victim for us.

Therefore, the blessing had its fulfillment at that time, which the high priest is commanded to pronounce in Numbers 6, verse 24: "The LORD bless thee, and keep thee. The LORD make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee. The LORD lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." The Hebrews call this ברכת כהנים the blessing of the Law, and they establish these rules for it: that the priest should bless 1. בלשון הקדש, in the holy tongue. 2. בעמידה, standing. 3. בנשיאות כפיים, with uplifted hands. 4. בקול רם, with a loud voice. 5. פנים כנגד פנים, face to face. 6. בשם המפורש, by pronouncing the name Jehovah, which appears three times in this blessing, and outside of it, it was forbidden to pronounce. 7. במקדש, in the Sanctuary. These things were fulfilled in the true priest, Christ, who in the holy tongue, raised up on the cross, with uplifted hands, with a loud voice, his face turned to the face of the onlookers, being himself Jehovah, in the Sanctuary or temple of his body, cried out that all things were completed, which, namely, the typical priest used to pronounce for the blessing of the people. Therefore, God providentially brought it about that, with the sanctuary of the temple in Jerusalem destroyed shortly after, that blessing was never again uttered by any priest with the שם המפורש, since it had now found its fulfillment in our high priest, Christ. Nor do they dare to utter it, both because they are ignorant of the correct and ὀνομαστος αὐτοῦ ἑκφω'νησις pronunciation, and because it was considered unlawful to utter it outside the temple. For thus we read in the treatise Eruvin: "Since the temple was destroyed, it is sufficient for a man to use in his praises the name of two letters, יה." Gloss: because the שם המפורש is not given to every man, but only to the Priests. And these indeed, במקדש אומרים את השם, "in the sanctuary pronounce that name as it is written, but in the province by its epithets." To which must be added from the Tractate Tamid, that this blessing was pronounced with the שם המפורש only once a year, ביום הכפורים, on the Day of Atonement, so that we may know that it all depended on the priesthood of Christ, and on his body as the true temple, and on his expiation, and consisted solely in him, through whom the secret name of God, which had been unknown to all except the priest, was made to us מפורש, explained, as John testifies in chapter 1:18.

VERSE 15. (מֵרָא כְּבִיבֵי בְּלִי לְאִי לְקִדְּוֹ). Tremellius: "My brethren, as one who speaks among the sons of men (supply: they speak), I speak." Boderianus without supplement: "as among men I speak." I would prefer, "according to what is among men, I speak," that is, after the manner of men, according to that which is customary among men. كما يكون بين الناس, "as it is among men," says the Arab. Thus he correctly explained the Apostle's phrase, κατα' ἄνθρωπον λέγω. In the same way the Syriac explained it in 1 Cor. 15:32, εἰ κατα' ἄνθρωπον ἐθηριομα'χησα ἐν Ἐφε'σῳ: (מֵרָא כְּבִיבֵי בְּלִי לְאִי לְקִדְּוֹ), "if according to what is among the sons of men (supply: is or is done) I was thrown to the beasts," that is, in a human manner, as is wont to happen to men. Boderianus again translates, "as among men." Tremellius, "as among men."

VERSE 16. Καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός. The seventy interpreters correctly observed that σπέρμα is said not only of many, but also of one, in Gen. 3:15, where referring τὸ σπέρμα τῆς γυναικὸς to one person, namely the Messiah, they translated, αὐτός σου τηρήσει κεφαλὴν. The neuter gender being changed to masculine, so that we would know a specific person is understood by σπέρμα. So also in chapter 4, verse 25, concerning the person of Seth, whom God had given in place of Abel, Eve says, "God hath appointed me another seed." And in chapter 21:13, concerning Ishmael to Abraham, אֲנִי אֶפְרָיִם בִּי, "because he is thy seed."

CHAPTER IV.

VERSE 15. Τίς οὖν ἦν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν; Beza: "What then was the proclaiming of your blessedness?" I translate without difficulty, "What then was your blessedness?" so that the sense is: great, undoubtedly, is the blessedness of those who receive the servants of Christ as Christ himself. Thus you once received me. What and how great, therefore, was your blessedness at that time? Now, indeed, it is much diminished, after my doctrine has been spurned and you prefer pseudo-apostles to me. The Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic have understood it this way, except that they seem to have read, ποῦ οὖν ἐστὶν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν; "where then is your blessedness?" And the Arab adds الان, "now." Concerning the meaning of the word μακαρισμὸς, see what we have noted on Romans 4, verse 9.

VERSE 17. Ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, οὐ καλῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκκλεῖσαι ἡμᾶς θέλουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοῦς ζηλῶτε. D. Beza was the first to read ἡμᾶς, and he himself confesses that in all codices it is written ὑμᾶς. I would not dare to change anything here against the authority of all the codices, especially since the old Latin also has vos, and the Syriac likewise. I confess, however, that there seems to be some error here, since ἐκκλεῖσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν does not seem to admit a suitable sense here. But that great father of learning, Erasmus, says that in Greek it is ἐγκλεῖσαι, but that the codices vary, and in some it is ἐκκλεῖσαι. D. Beza rejects that ἐγκλεῖσαι. But there is no doubt that the Syriac read it so, for he translates ܘܫܝ ܘܫܝܘܬܝܗܘܢܐ, which Boderianus translates very badly as, "but they want to exclude you," but Tremellius excellently, "but they want to include you." For ܘܫܝ never means anything other than to include, to shut up, to restrain, just as a boy is included in swaddling clothes, or a captive in a prison. As in Gal. 3:22, συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφὴ τὰ πάντα ὑποῦν ἁμαρτίαν, the Syriac said ܘܫܝܘܬܝܗܘܢܐ. And verse 23, ἐφρουροῦμεθα συγκεκλεισμένοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν, he said ܘܫܝܘܬܝܗܘܢܐ, shut up, constrained, and so always elsewhere. It properly has the meaning of binding, tying, obliging. Whence also among the Hebrews, שָׁבַח is said of physicians binding wounds with plasters and bandages; likewise of travelers saddling horses or donkeys, and tightening their girths. From this a plain sense is elicited: "They are zealous for you, but not well; but they want to enclose you, that you also may be zealous for them." That is, they feign a great study of love towards you, but falsely. For this is what they are doing, that they may enclose you for themselves, that they may constrain you in themselves as if imprisoned, or bind and oblige you to themselves, so that you also may be studious and

undoubtedly better: "lest they should suffer the persecution of the cross of Christ." Literally, "lest they should suffer persecution by the cross of Christ." In which way the Syriac must absolutely be translated, ܕܠ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ, which Tremellius incorrectly translates, "Only that for the cross," etc. The true sense is, "lest they should suffer the cross of Christ." In Dutch, "op dat sy met Christi cruyce niet vervolgt en worden," that is, lest they be afflicted with the same cross with which Christ was afflicted, or, lest they be compelled to undergo the cross, which the doctrine of Christ brings. The Arab agrees completely with the Syriac, for he translates τῷ σταυρῷ with the preposition ὑ, which does not mean "for," but forms the ablative.

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

CHAPTER I. VERS. XVIII.

Πεφωτισμένους τουὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, etc. The Syriac translated as if he read καὶ πεφωτισμένους. Beza took the accusatives absolutely, "the eyes being enlightened," which the Greeks are accustomed to express with the genitive, but sometimes also with the accusative, as in Aristotle, ὥσπερ μὴ οὐκ αὐτῷ χώραν τινα οὔσαν, "as if there were no region for him," for χώρας τινὸς οὔσης. See what we have noted on Acts 26, verse 3. εἰς τοῦ εἶναι could also be understood, "so that the eyes may be enlightened." Just as in James 2, verse 5, "He chose the poor πλουσίους ἐν πίστει" for εἰς τοῦ εἶναι πλουσίους, "that they should be rich in faith." Acts 5, verse 31, τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα ὑψώσε, for εἰς τοῦ εἶναι ἀρχηγὸν, "this man God exalted to be a prince and a savior." Romans 8, verse 29, προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκότος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, "he predestined *them to be* conformed to the image of his son."

CHAPTER III.

VERSE 11. ܘܥܘܕܘܫܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܫܘܢ ܘܥܘܕܘܫܘܢ. Tremellius: "That which had been prepared from the ages, and he did it in Jeschua." Boderianus in the Royal Polyglot: "which indeed was to be from eternity, but was made in Jeschua." In the Paris Polyglot: "That which was to be from eternity, and he did it" etc. The most learned men seem to have established an error in ܘܥܘܕܘܫܘܢ and wished to read ܘܥܘܕܘܫܘܢ, which you will find substituted for it in the Paris edition, a most manifest error. Since the feminine ܘܥܘܕܘܫܘܢ precedes, one should have read ܘܥܘܕܘܫܘܢ, and instead of ܘܥܘܕܘܫܘܢ, the Syriac reading is excellent, and should be translated, "which he had prepared from the ages, and effected it in Jesus." In the same way the Arab, التي اعدھا منن اوائل الدهور واكملھا بيسوع, "which he prepared from the beginnings of the ages, and perfected it in Jesus."

VERSE 15. Ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατρια, etc. Vulgate: "of whom all paternity." Erasmus: "of whom every family named from a common father." Beza: "of whom the whole family," correctly. So also for the Arabs ابوة, paternity, is used for family, as in that passage of the chronicler Elmacin, ولم يل الخلافة من ابوة هاشميين غير علي ابن ابي طالب, "And no one ruled the Caliphate from the paternity (i.e., family) of the Hashemites except Ali son of Abi Talib."

CHAPTER IV.

(VERSE 16). Tremellius and Boderianus: "joints". We add only that, according to Ferrari, ܘܥܘܕܘܫܘܢ is properly the "joint of the members," namely from ܘܥܘܕܘܫܘܢ, "he loosed," because the individual joints are loosed from one another and are only united by a ligament.

"piously," because nothing is more splendid or more glorious than piety. The Arab translates, "see now how you walk بالطهیر والعفة," "with purity and chastity."

VERSE 16. Ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρὸν, ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραὶ εἰσι. He warns that the opportunity must be used, lest it slip away, according to that saying of Hillel in chapter 2 of Aboth: אל תאמר לכשאפנה אשנה שמא לא תפנה, "Do not say, when I have leisure I will study; perhaps you will not have leisure." The Apostle's phrase, however, seems to be taken from Daniel 2, verse 8, where Nebuchadnezzar says to the procrastinating Magi, "I know for certain דַּי עֲדָנָא אֲנִתּוֹן זְבָנִין," "that you would gain the time." where the LXX uses the same phrase as the Apostle, ἐπ' ἀληθείας οἶδα ἐγὼ ὅτι καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζετε ὑμεῖς. The sense in Daniel is, just as those who buy, do so with all diligence, and spend money on this, so that the goods they need may be given to them, so that they may get their use from them, as from their own: so you do this one thing, that time may be given to you, thinking that there is nothing now that you need more, and that could be more useful to you for escaping the evil imminent from my edict. So also the Apostle wishes that among all goods, the time of grace should be most precious to us, most useful and most salutary, which we would most want to be given to us, and being given, to be prolonged, and therefore not to be neglected, nor to be allowed to slip away from us without fruit.

VERSE 33. Ἡ δὲ γυνή, ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα. There is an ellipsis in that ἵνα, such as is in the Enchiridion of Epictetus, paragraph 23: ἂν πτωχοῦν ὑποκρίνησθαι σε θεῶν, ἵνα καὶ τοῦτον εὐφυῶς ὑποκρίνη, "If he (God) wants you to play the part of a beggar on the stage (of this life), see that you play that part also with skill."

CHAPTER VI.

VERSE 2. Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου. The Hebrews say that כבוד אב ואם, "honoring father and mother," is among those things שאדם אוכל מפירותיהם בעולם הזה והקרן ש'אדם אוכל מפירותיהם בעולם הבא, "of which a man eats the fruits in this world, but the principal remains for him in the world to come."

VERSE same. "And this is the first commandment ב'קדמ' ב'." Boderianus in the Royal Polyglot: "which is promised." That is ב'קדמ' ב'. In the Paris Polyglot, however, as also Tremellius: "which promises." I do not disapprove, for we have warned several times before that the form ב'קדמ' is sometimes taken passively, sometimes actively. Now, these words follow after τίμα τὸν πατέρα in the Apostle's text, but in the Syriac they precede it, and "honor thy father" follows as a citation of the words of the fifth commandment. So also in the Arab: وهذه الوصية والاولى, المأمور بها اكرم اباك وامك, "this is the first commandment, in which it is commanded, honor thy father and thy mother." They seem to have read, ἡτις ἐστὶ πρώτη ἐντολὴ ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου. And indeed the Arab did not take ἐπαγγελίᾳ for "promise," but for "proclamation" or "edict," for it also signifies that, as does ἐπαγγέλλω, "I proclaim, I declare."

VERSE 12. Πρὸς ταῖς ἀρχάς, πρὸς ταῖς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας, etc. It is the same as if he had said, "against the gods of this world." For so the Devil is called in 2 Cor. 4:4. The Hebrews call it רשות, as in Sanhedrin, chapter 4, paragraph 4, שלא יאמרו הרבה רשויות בשמים, "lest they say, there are many powers in heaven," i.e., many Gods.

VERSE 16. ܩܒܘܫܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ. Tremellius: "by which you may be found mighty (Boderianus in the Paris Polyglot: strong) to extinguish," etc. But ܩܘܪܝܢܐ is an abstract noun, not concrete; besides, "you may be found" would be said by the Syrians as ܩܘܪܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܝܢܐ. But the verb ܩܘܪܝܢܐ, as also in Kal ܩܘܪܝܢܐ, is nothing other than "he was able." Hence in the Syriac-Arabic Lexicon, ܩܘܪܝܢܐ is مستطيع ممكن, "able, possible"; ܩܘܪܝܢܐ is الاستطاعة, "power," الممكنه, "possibility." Better, therefore, in the Royal Polyglot: "so that (or rather, by which) you may be able by your strength to extinguish." The Syriac construction, however, is rather, "you may be able for the strength," or "you may be able for the power," that is simply, "you may be able." For in the Lexicon, Arabic يستطيع is simply translated as "he is able." And also in Kal in Ferrari, ܩܘܪܝܢܐ is "powerful." It is therefore the same as what the Apostle said, ἐν ᾧ δυνήσασθε. The Arab: الذي به تقووا علي اطفاء, "by which you may be able over the extinguishing," i.e., from the Arabic phrase, "you may be able to extinguish."

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

CHAPTER I. VERS. XXIII.

דג, דג, דג, דג, דג. Tremellius and Boderianus: "I desire to be freed." I would prefer, "I desire to depart, or to de cease." Ferrari: דג, דג, "he went away, he departed." Also, "he de ceased, he died." Thus in the Targum on Canticles 1:1, it is said of Moses, כד אתא זמניה למיפטר מן עלמא, "when his time came to depart from the world." The Rabbis also, as Elijah testifies in his *Thisbi*, call a dead person נפטר, "one who has departed." For also in Hebrew, 1 Sam. 19:10, וַיִּפָּטֵר מִפְּנֵי שָׂאִיל is translated, "and he slipped away from Saul's presence." The Apostle said, ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι. The Vulgate: "having a desire to be dissolved." Beza more correctly: "for the departure." For also in Luke 12:36, ἀναλύσει ἐκ τῶν γάμων is "he should return from the wedding." He who desires more on this meaning of the verb ἀναλύειν, let him see the *Exercitationes Evangelicas* of Scultetus, book 1, chapter 62, where I am surprised that the most illustrious Beza is criticized for having translated ἀναλῦσαι by *dimissionem* (dismissal), when he rather translated it by *remigrationem* (departure), and added a most learned commentary. The Arab translates: لاني اشتهي: ان ازول وافارق الدنيا, "because I desire to move away, and to depart from the world."

VERSE 27. דג, דג, דג, דג, דג. Boderianus: "whether I come and visit you, or being absent I hear of you." He seems to construct "visit" with "whether," as if דג, דג, דג should be constructed with דג. Tremellius also seems to have taken it thus, "so that whether I come, I may see you, and whether I am absent, I may hear of you," etc. I would prefer to construct that "so that" (דג) with "I may hear" (דג, דג), and to translate, "so that whether coming I see you, or being absent I hear of you," etc., so that it agrees with the words of the Apostle, ἵνα εἴτε ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ὑμᾶς, εἴτε ἀπὼν, ἀκούσω τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν. For it is customary for the Syrians that the governing verbs דג, דג and דג, דג have another verb in the same tense after them, without a conjunction, expressed by a participle, or certainly the conjunction is to be understood. As in Matthew 20:10, דג, דג, "they came, they received," that is, "and coming they received," or, "and they came and they received." Mark 6:33, דג, דג, דג, in the same sense as above. So also in this place, "that whether I may come I may see," i.e., "coming I may see," or "I may come and I may see." It follows in the same verse דג, דג, דג, דג, דג. Tremellius: "and you may strive together through faith." I would prefer with Boderianus: "And you may become superior together in faith," or, "and you may excel," or, "and you may triumph together in faith." For דג, דג means he was victorious, he triumphed. דג, דג, victor, excellent, splendid. Thus also the Arab: تتصفون اجمعون بايمان, "excelling or conducting yourselves conspicuously together in faith."

CHAPTER II.

VERSE 1. מְדַבֵּר בְּלִבּוֹ. Tremellius and Boderianus in the Paris Polyglot: "and if there is speech in the heart." In the Royal Polyglot better: "or a soothing of the heart." See what we have noted on John 11:19. Ferrari: מְדַבֵּר, "solace, consolation." The Arab: تسكين القلب, "mitigation of the heart." Add only that, also in Hebrew, מלא is found for "to console," as in Jeremiah 31:26, וְכִלֵּיתִי שֹׁדֵדִים מִלְּאֵתִי, "I have consoled every sorrowful soul," properly, "I have filled."

VERSE 12. τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν καταργάσετε. Beza: "work out your own salvation." Vulgate & Erasmus: "work." The Syriac: עֲבַד עֲבַד עֲבַד, "work the work of your salvation." We translate, "work concerning your salvation," κατα τὴν σωτηρίαν ὑμῶν ἐργάσετε. Indeed, even if he had said simply, without κατα, τὴν σωτηρίαν ὑμῶν ἐργάσετε, the sense would not be, "effect your salvation," but the same which we have now given. Just as in 1 Cor. 9:13, οἱ τὰ ἱερά ἐργάζομενοι are not those who effect sacred things, but those who work concerning them. And in Rev. 18:17, ὅσοι τὴν θάλασσαν ἐργάζονται are not those who make the sea, but those who are occupied concerning it. And John 6:27, ἐργάσετε τὴν βρωσιν τὴν μένουσαν, is not "make the food that abides," but "work concerning it." So also here, ἐργάσθαι or καταργάσθαι τὴν σωτηρίαν is not to effect salvation, but to work and labor concerning it, to handle those things which lead to salvation. Furthermore, if each one ought to work out his own salvation, the common people in the Papacy are wrongly taught to entrust the business of their salvation entirely to their pastors. Excellent is that saying of Hillel in chapter 1 of Aboth: אִם אֵין אֲנִי לִי מִי, "If I am not for myself, who will be for me?" But he prudently and piously adds, וְכִשְׁאֲנִי לְעַצְמִי מִה אֲנִי, "and when I am for myself, what am I?" So that we may know that it is indeed our business to care for our salvation diligently, and not to entrust it to others, but that we must always depend on God, without whom we are nothing. Which the Apostle also here in the following verse inculcates. And no less excellent is what R. Tarphon says in chapter 2 of Aboth: לֹא עֲלֶיךָ הַמְּלָאכָה לְגַמּוֹר, "It is not your duty to finish the work, but neither are you free to desist from it." As if to say, it is God's, not yours, to perfect the work of salvation; yet it does not follow from this that this whole thing should be so left to God that you cease in idleness.

CHAPTER IV.

VERSE 6. Μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει μετ' εὐχαριστίας τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμῶν γνωρίζεσθω πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. For since our anxiety profits nothing, which the Savior teaches with many arguments in Matthew 6:27, etc., groans and complaints to God can do very much. The Arabs rightly say, السلاح الضعفاء الشكاية, "The weapon of the weak is complaint."

VERSE 11. "I have learned, in whatever state I am, αὐτάρκης εἶναι, to be content." Therefore, he was never poor; for a poor man is one who desires many things. Whence the wisest Hebrews derived the word אביון from the desiderative verb אבה, so that you would not consider him poor who is destitute of many things, but him who craves for more; and him rich, who is content with his lot. Most

excellently, therefore, the Arabs used the same word غني for both πλούσιον and αὐτάρκη. And similarly, with one word غنى, both πλοῦτον and αὐτάρκειαν. Let us be allowed on this occasion to explain a certain more difficult passage of the Alcoran, which is in the chapter on fraud. Where, after the pseudo-prophet had complained that some were unfaithful and were tergiversating, he adds, *وَاسْتَعْنَى اللَّهُ* *وَاللَّهُ غَنِيٌّ حَمِيدٌ*. Erpenius: "And God seeks riches, and God is rich, praised." Translate: "But God seeks his own contentment (αὐτάρκειαν), for God is content (αὐτάρκης), to be praised." The sense is, God does not care about their tergiversations, for he does not need them, but rests in his own contentment (αὐταρκειά), since he is truly content (αὐτάρκης) in himself. We have brought this up the more gladly, so that we may know that he who is content with his lot is next to God.

VERS. 19. It is badly written thus in the Cothonensis edition. It is also bad in the Regia edition. In the Viennensis, it is written *حيثيا* for lorica (cuirass). Ferrarius adds that it also signifies artery. If this is correct, it should be translated *through the arteries*. Tremellius & Boderianus: *through the joints*. ἀφῶν is what the Apostle said. And in Eph. 4, vers. 16, διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς, the Syriac translates it as ܠܫܘܢܐܘܬܐܘܪܝܐܘܬܐ. Let the more learned therefore inquire whether *هرما* and *حيثيا* are the same, or whether, as Ferrarius wishes, the former signifies a joint of the limbs, and the latter an artery. The Arab there translates *πάσης ἀφῆς* as *بكل عرق*, *through every artery*; here, *بعروق*, *through arteries*.

CHAPTER IV.

VERS. 5. "Walk in wisdom toward outsiders." *جبه چانههم*. Tremellius & Boderianus: *And redeem your occasion, or your opportunity*. But the Syriac did not say so in Peal, where this verb means to buy, but in Pael, where it always means to sell. Therefore it must be translated, *and sell your opportunity*. It seems the Syriac translator thought that ἐξαγοραζόμενοι in the Apostle is taken passively, as if you were to translate *καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι* as *exempted by opportunity*. But he who possesses a thing and is exempted from it by money, sells it. And so, *exempted by opportunity*, or *exempting yourselves by opportunity*, would be *selling the opportunity*. Perhaps he meant this, that they should not have regard for their own, but for outsiders, and should not consider what was opportune for them, but what was for them. Unless we say there is an error in the Syriac pointing, even though the manuscripts agree. Certainly in Eph. 5, v. 16, he translates the same phrase of the Apostle in Peal, ܘܒܝܢܐܘܐ ܡܢܦܥܬܗܘܢ, *who redeem their opportunity*. Indeed, in this very place the Arab translates *وابتاعوا منفعتكم*, *buy your advantage*. Therefore, it seems to be a mistake, and one should read *وجيه*.

دَمَام is of the feminine gender, and has after it a Dative, Tremellius better understood the word "faith" and translates, *ne cui vestrum fides succidatur* (lest the faith of any of you be cut down). I would prefer, however, to take it impersonally, and to translate simply, *ne cui vestrum succidatur* (lest it be cut down for any of you). For *succiditur ei* (it is cut down for him) among the Syrians is "he loses heart, he despairs." As in Heb. 6, vers. 12, ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε, he said مولا يا محمد كحم, and let it not be cut down for you. And in Heb. 10, vers. 38, for καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται he said مل, it is cut down for him, that is, if he loses heart. For it is opposed to τῷ πιστεύοντι.

CHAPTER IV.

VERS. 6. Τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν, καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν τῷ πράγματι τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. The most learned interpreter Beza: "And that no one oppress and take advantage of his brother in business." He understands it of the negotiation of goods which occurs between men, in which God forbids oppressions and frauds, so that it may be a new and different admonition from the preceding ones. Therefore, he neglected the article τῷ, to which at other times he perhaps attributes a demonstrative force more than enough. And he translated τὸ ὑπερβαίνειν as "oppressed," which our countrymen say, *iemandt over het lijf gaen* (to walk over someone), an elegant metaphor. Although I doubt whether the passage he cites as parallel in his annotations from Deut. 28, vers. 44, pertains to this, where the words of the text have, הַגּוֹי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּקִרְבָּךְ יַעֲלֶה עָלֶיךָ מֵעַלְמָה מֵעַלְמָה וְאֶתְהַרְדַּד מִטָּה מִטָּה, where, "he shall ascend above you higher and higher," seems to denote not oppression, but excellent eminence, just as, "And you shall descend lower and lower," denotes a signal depression. The Septuagint: ἐκεῖνος ἀναβήσεται (not ὑπερβήσεται σε) ἐπὶ σε ἄνω ἄνω, σὺ δὲ καταβήσῃ κάτω κάτω. The Chaldean in the same sense. But let the learned inquire whether this verse of the Apostle does not pertain to the same thing as the preceding ones, namely to chastity: so that τῷ πράγματι signifies that business, that matter which was treated of in the preceding verses, and τὸ ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν refers to adultery, proceeding ἐκ πάθους ἐπιθυμίας, of which he had made mention. The following verse also proves this. For why is it not permitted ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν τὸν ἀδελφὸν? οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσία, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγιασμῷ. Therefore, those things pertain to ἀκαθαρσίαν.

And so St. Jerome explains it in his commentaries on Ephesians chap. 4, v. 19, where concerning those words of the Apostle, "they have given themselves over to licentiousness, for the working of all uncleanness in greediness (ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ)," he comments that they do not pertain to avarice, as it simply sounds, but to lust and luxury. And he adds, "We must prove this sense by the testimony of another place. In the first epistle to the Thessalonians it is written, 'this is the will of God, etc., that every one should know his vessel etc., that no one should go beyond and defraud his brother in a matter.'" Observe diligently: because, provoking us to chastity, and wanting us to be content only with our wives, he said: "Let no one go beyond and defraud his brother in a matter," that is, leaving his own wife,

let him not seek to pollute the wife of another. This from Jerome, where he not only connects those words in sense with the preceding ones, but also the conjunction "And," which is not found in the Greek before *ὑπερβαίνειν* but was added by the most learned interpreter, he himself omitted, because they flow from the preceding in one sense. But if anyone thinks that *τὸ πλεονεκτεῖν* is not correctly referred to impurity, let him seek an explanation from that place to the Ephesians, where he deals with those who *ἀπηλγηκότες ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ, εἰς ἔργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ.* (L12) Where Jerome rightly says, "When they have omitted nothing at all that is impure, they have done all this in avarice: while they are never satisfied by debauchery, nor does their pleasure have a limit. Or certainly, beyond the permitted union of a man to a woman, they ascend to greater things, males working shameful things upon males." This again from him, to which I add, Why is this not *ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν τὸν ἀδελφόν*? The Syriac translator took it in the same sense, who translated it as *ܕܥܘܕܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܕܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܕܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܕܘܢܐ*. Which Tremellius translates, "And that you dare not provoke and injure a man his brother in any business." I do not approve. For neither does *ܥܘܕܘܢܐ* signify ever to provoke, nor does *ܥܘܕܘܢܐ* signify anything. I think it should be translated, "And that you dare not transgress, and greedily defraud each his brother in this business," that is, in the business of impurity which was dealt with before: for he took *τῷ πράγματι* for *τούτῳ τῷ πράγματι*. Boderianus translated it correctly in the Paris edition, less well in the Regia. The Arab has *ولا يترون علي ان يتجاوزوا ذلك وعلي لن يتعصب الانسان اخا لهذا الامر*, "that they should not dare to transgress this, nor that any man should seize his brother for this matter." It is manifest that he refers *τὸ πλεονεκτεῖν* to the sin of Sodom, by which a man seizing and compelling a man to impurity, truly *πλεονεκτεῖ τὸν ἀδελφόν*. And so *ὑπερβαίνειν* is the very thing which is said in the same phrase in the Mishnah, Maccoth chap. 3, § 1. *ואלו הן הלוקין הבא על אחותו ועל אחות אביו*, that is, to the letter, *καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ μαστιγούμενοι. ὁ ὑπερβαίνων τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, &c.* which is the same as *המגלה ערות אחותו*, "who uncovers the nakedness of his sister," &c.

VERS. 15. "We who will be left at the coming of the Lord, and are alive," *ووجه*. Tremellius & Boderianus: *non præveniemus eos qui obdormierunt* (we shall not precede those who have fallen asleep), but *ܥܘܕܘܢܐ* nufquam alibi significat *prevenire*, sed *semper affequi*, attingere, apprehendere. I therefore translate, *non affequemur eos qui obdormierunt* (we shall not catch up to those who have fallen asleep), that is, they themselves will precede us. For he who does not catch up to another, nor can apprehend him, is preceded by him. *Φθάνειν* signifies not only to precede, to preoccupy, but also to catch up, *καταλαμβάνειν*. The Syriac translator took it in this latter meaning in the Apostle. And so the Arab *لا تلحق بالذين قدوا*, *non attingemus eos qui obdormierunt* (we will not reach those who have fallen asleep). Let it be considered whether this is not correct. For the Apostle says in the following verse that the dead will rise first. Therefore they will go before the living. Therefore the living will not catch up to them in the resurrection, but will be left after them, nor will they be transformed before the dead have risen, so that then they may be caught up together with them to meet the Lord.

Tremellius and Boderianus also incorrectly translated those words of the Syriac in the following chapter, verse 4, ܘܥܘܕܘܢܝܢ ܕܥܘܕܘܢܝܢ ܕܥܘܕܘܢܝܢ ܕܥܘܕܘܢܝܢ, "that that day should precede you as a thief." It should be translated, *should catch up to you*, or *apprehend you*. The Apostle said καταλάβη. Hence, it is better in the Regia editions, *deprehendat vos* (should surprise you).

CHAPTER V.

VERS. 6. ܕܥܘܕܘܢܝܢ ܕܥܘܕܘܢܝܢ. Tremellius & Boderianus: *sed simus vigilantes & sobrii* (but let us be watchful and sober). I would prefer, *vigilantes & mente præditi* (watchful and endowed with mind), so that ܕܥܘܕܘܢܝܢ is the participle Peil of the conjugation Pael, from the noun ܕܥܘܕܘܢܝܢ, mind, reason, νοῦς. νήφω (which word the Apostle used here) is not only opposed to μεθύειν, but is sometimes related to the mind and taken for φρονέω. And so the Syriac translator took it. Ferrarius: ܕܥܘܕܘܢܝܢ, *ingenium, indoles* (intellect, nature). (L13) But it is certain that ܕܥܘܕܘܢܝܢ is more generally taken for mind and reason from Mark 3, vers. 21, whence also in the Syro-Arabic Lexicon, ܕܥܘܕܘܢܝܢ is explained as عاقل, *intelligens, cordatus* (intelligent, prudent). Whence also the Arab translated this passage ولكن لنكن عقلا متيقظين, *sed fimus intelligentes, vigilantes* (but let us be intelligent, watchful).

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONICANS.

CHAPTER I. VERS. VII.

ⲅⲟⲥⲁⲟ. Tremellius & Boderianus: *Et vobis qui affligimini quietem nobiscum* (And to you who are afflicted, rest with us). They took ⲅⲟⲥ for rest, since this noun is from the Hebrew קר, Syriac ⲅⲟⲥ, to rest. But that verb is from conjugation Aphel of the verb ⲅⲟⲥ, from קר, to live, to be saved. It should therefore be translated, *Et vos qui affligimini servet nobiscum* (And may he save you who are afflicted, with us). For he explained what ἀνταποδοῦναι ἄνεσιν, to give rest, is in the Apostle, namely to save, to give salvation. The Arab, however, has ويبيحكم, & *quietem det vobis* (and may he give you rest), which in Syriac should be said للمس.

VERS. 8. ⲅⲟⲥⲁⲟ ⲅⲟⲥⲁⲟ ⲅⲟⲥ. Tremellius & Boderianus, in the interlinear edition: *Quum sumet ultionem in vehementia ignis* (When he shall take vengeance in the vehemence of fire). In the Regia editions, however, *igne depascente* (in a consuming fire). It must be translated, *in flamma ignis* (in a flame of fire), as the Apostle says, ἐν πυρὶ φλογός, which the Syriac translator correctly took by anastrophe for ἐν φλογὶ πυρός. That this is the use of the Syriac word is clear from Psalm 18, vers. 9, where Dr. Erpenius translated منها as, *Et ignis à facie ejus inflammatus est* (And a fire from his face was inflamed). Dr. Sionita Syrus: *Et ignis à facie ejus exarsit* (And a fire from his face blazed forth). And so Dr. Masius correctly teaches in his *Peculium Syrum* that this verb in Ethpaal signifies to burn, to be kindled, to be inflamed. Thus in Acts 5, vers. 33, مجه, which Tremellius translated, *dissecabantur ira* (they were cut with anger). Boderianus: *corripiebantur ira* (they were seized with anger). You would better translate, *inflammabantur ira* (they were inflamed with anger), which is an explanation of the Apostle's διεπρίοντο. Whence, by the way, we think the version of a certain passage in the rites of Severus, p. 25, should be emended. Severus had narrated that when Christ approached to be baptized in the Jordan, the waters of the river were heated without fire and without wood, and that Christ had said to John, "Come and baptize me." But John had replied, ⲅⲟⲥⲁⲟ ⲅⲟⲥⲁⲟ ⲅⲟⲥⲁⲟ. Boderianus translated it, *fieri non potest, ut assumam rapinam* (it cannot be, that I should take up plunder), from the Hebrew קר, to seize. I think it should be translated, *non possum tenere flammam* (I cannot hold the flame). As if to say, this water is hot like a flame, I cannot grasp it. To which Christ's instance immediately follows: "Only place your right hand on my head, and I am baptized." I add the Syro-Arabic Lexicon, where Vio is translated as لهيب النار والاشتعال تاجج, *flamma ignis & incendii, fervor* (the flame of fire and of a conflagration, fervor).

CHAPTER II.

VERS. 8. Καὶ τότε ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ἄνομος, ὃν ὁ Κύριος ἀναλώσει τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. It seems the Apostle altogether referred to the passage in Isa. 11, vers. 4,

וּבְכֹרֶתוֹ שִׁפְתָיו יָמִית רָשָׁע, "and with the Spirit of his lips he will slay the wicked." From this it is clear that Christ, of whom it manifestly treats in both places, is not a common Κύριος, Lord, but true God. For just as it could only be said of the true God in Psalm 33, vers. 6, "By the spirit of his mouth were all their hosts made," so it can only be said of the true God, "By the spirit of his mouth he will consume the wicked one."

CHAPTER III.

VERS. 5. קְטֹבֵי אֱלֹהִים. Tremellius & Boderianus: *Et ad expectationem Christi* (And to the expectation of Christ). The word קְטֹבֵי אֱלֹהִים elsewhere signifies Evangelization, preaching. Here it is put for ὑπομονή, which is usually expressed by אֱלֹהִים קְטֹבֵי. And I hardly doubt that it should be read so in this place as well, especially since in the Vienna manuscript some trace of the letter Yod may be observed between ו and י, which also in Acts 2, vers. 30, we have observed in אֱלֹהִים קְטֹבֵי, for which in the Regia and Cohen editions it is wrongly אֱלֹהִים קְטֹבֵי. According to this reading it must be translated, *Et ad tolerantiam Christi* (and to the endurance of Christ), that is, to patience in bearing the afflictions of Jesus Christ. I confess, however, that the verb קְטֹבֵי is used not only for to evangelize, but also for to hope. Whence perhaps אֱלֹהִים קְטֹבֵי may be derived, which would retain both meanings of its verb, although this is not proven to me.

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

CHAPTER I. VERS. IV.

γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις. Each tribe and each family of the Jews had its כתב היחס, book of lineage, as appears from Ezra. And because various questions and disputes arose concerning lineages, especially after the Babylonian captivity and dispersion, they had books of genealogical controversies, which Benjamin in his Itinerary calls משגרות השאלות, extracts of questions, and he joins it with כתב היחס, the book of lineage, in the Leiden edition, p. 83.

CHAPTER II.

VERS. 2. ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων, ἵνα ἡρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν. This is the very thing which R. Hanina prescribes in Aboth: הרי מתפלל: "Pray for the peace of the kingdom, for if it were not for the fear of it, men would swallow one another alive."

VERS. 6. Ὁ δούξ ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. In Hebrew, אשר נתן עצמו כפרה על כלם. The force and use of this word among the Hebrews can be learned from the Talmud, tractate Sanhedrin chap. 2, where the people console the high priest, mourning and burying his dead, with these words, אנו כפרתך, "we are your expiation," that is, may your evil be transferred to us, and may we, substituted in your place, be able to redeem your evil with our evil. (Mm)

VERS. 7. "Of which I have been appointed a preacher and an Apostle (I speak the truth and do not lie)." Tremellius & Boderianus: *quia fui, vel (factus sum) doctor gentium* (because I was, or (was made) a teacher of the Gentiles). I would prefer, *ut essem doctor gentium* (so that I might be a teacher of the Gentiles). For the Syriac ܡ also has the value of "so that," not only when joined to the future, but also to the Benoni participle, and sometimes even to the past tense, which is frequent in the verb ܠܘܫܐ, as can be seen even from the following verse. This seems to fit better with the Apostle's words, εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κήρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος, ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι, διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν. So that the sense is, "I was appointed a preacher and an Apostle, so that I might be a teacher of the Gentiles." Otherwise the sense will be, "I do not lie, because I was made a teacher of the Gentiles," and then the parenthesis in which we have enclosed, "I speak the truth and do not lie," must be removed. Thus the Arab, اني قد صرت معلما للشعوب, "because I was made a teacher of the Gentiles."

CHAPTER III.

VERS. 15. Ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, στῦλος καὶ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας. The Church is so called, insofar as by defending the truth from Scripture and through it against errors and heresies, it supports and establishes it in the hearts of men, lest it collapse. By which praise anyone can also be commended for his own

measure, who bravely defends the truth. Just as Theodoret says of Peter and John in homily 10 on Providence: Βλέπε τοῖνον τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην, τοὺς πύργους τῆς εὐσεβείας, τοὺς στύλους τῆς ἀληθείας, τοὺς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τὴν οἰκοδομὴν ὑπερείδοντας. Where he makes them pillars not only of the truth, but also of the Church, and that not only insofar as they supported both with their living voice while they lived, but also insofar as they are still τὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας οἰκοδομὴν ὑπερείδοντας, "supporting the structure of the Church," which they do only through their writings. And so Holy Scripture is that by which the Church supports the truth, and the truth the Church, and men taught by God support and establish both the Church and the truth.

CHAPTER IV.

VERS. 1. "Some will depart from the faith and will go after..." خلاف. Tremellius & Boderianus: *post spiritus deceptores, vel impostores* (after deceiving spirits, or impostors). I would prefer, *post Spiritus errantes* (after errant Spirits), προσέχοντες πνεύμασι πλάνης. For he would have said deceivers or impostors in Aphel, جَدَّه, for there it means to deceive, to trick. But in Kal, كَدَّ, it simply means to err, to be led astray. Thus the Arab ويتبعون الارواح الضلع, "and they will follow the errant spirits."

VERS. 3. Κωλύοντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων, &c. That the Apostle is here inveighing not against those who forbid, but who command abstinence from foods, is clearer than daylight from the arguments that follow in the text. Therefore, learned men want to understand κηρυττ ὄντων before ἀπέχεσθαι. The Syriac translator renders it: ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢ, "they prohibit from joining in marriage, and they turn away from foods," as if he had read, κωλύοντων γαμεῖν, καὶ ἀπεχόντων ἀπὸ βρωμάτων. For ἀπέχων is sometimes transitive, to make abstain, to turn away. The Arab translates, as if he had read, τῶν ἀπεχομένων βρωμάτων, واجتنبون الاطعمة, "they abstain from foods."

CHAPTER V.

VERS. 1. "Do not rebuke an older man." Tremellius & Boderianus: *sed exhortare eum* (but exhort him). Properly, *sed persuade ei ut patri* (but persuade him as a father). For that is the perpetual meaning of this verb. That is, do not use rebuking words towards him, but persuasive ones, (Mm 2) as Orators are accustomed to do who try to persuade with pleasing speeches. The Arab has بل اطلب اليه وعزه كسالاب, "but ask him, and console him as a father." Just as, ἀλλὰ παρακάλει ὡς πατέρα, the Vulgate translated, *sed obsecra ut patrem* (but beseech him as a father), excellently in my judgment.

VERS. 4. Ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς προγόνοις. To this pertains that saying of Caliph Ali, بِرُّ الْوَالِدَيْنِ سَلْفٌ, "doing good to parents is a debt from a price already paid." It is a type of purchase, in which the price is paid before the goods are received. You repay benefits to your parents, you give the merchandise, the price of which you have long since received.

VERS. 13. Ἄμα δὲ καὶ ἄργαὶ μανθάνουσι περιερχόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας· οὐ μόνον δὲ ἄργαί, ἀλλὰ καὶ φλύαροι καὶ περιέργοι, λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα. The Syriac translator renders it, "But they also learn laziness, going about among the houses; and not only laziness, but also to multiply speech, and to spread vain things, and to speak what is not fitting." It is apparent that the Syriac translator supplied an ellipsis of the verb εἶναι after ἄργαί, which then flows into φλύαροι and περιέργοι, which the distinguished Beza followed, translating, "At the same time they also learn to be idle, going about the houses: nay, not only idle, etc." Anyone, I believe, will confess that this ellipsis is harsh and unusual. I praise the Vulgate which translated, "At the same time they also learn to be idle, going about houses, etc." where the enallage of the participle περιερχόμεναι for the infinitive περιέρχεσθαι is not only not harsh, but also most common among the Greeks, for whom it is a trite saying, μέμνημαι ἰδὼν for ἰδεῖν, "I remember seeing." αἰεὶ διατελεῖ ἀγαπῶν, "continue to love." And παύσομαι φιλῶν, "I will not cease to love." And so the Apostle reprehends the younger widows, because when they ought to be οἰκουροί, keepers of the house, Titus 2:5, they accustom themselves to go about other people's houses, a vice which has four others joined to it: 1. idleness, 2. talkativeness, 3. curiosity, 4. speaking things that are not proper.

Φλύαροι, Beza correctly translated as *nugaces* (triflers), for that is what the word properly signifies. But because trifling women are almost always garrulous and futile, the Vulgate translated it as *verbosæ* (wordy). The Syriac has "to multiply speech." The Syriac translator rendered περιέργοι as ܡܦܕܝܒܝܢ, for which Tremellius has *sectentur vana* (let them pursue vain things). Boderianus in the interlinear version has *agitent vana* (let them agitate vain things). We, *spargant vel spargere vana* (let them spread or to spread vain things). For ܦܕܝܒܝܢ is to separate, to make distant, and thus to spread. For he who spreads, separates things that are joined. The Syriac translator understood not badly that περιέργοι is said as if περισοῦν ἔργαζομένους, according to Hesychius, that is, those who, neglecting their own affairs, which generally have substance, curiously inquire into the affairs of others, which are generally superfluous and vain, and so, running about everywhere, they spread their vanities. The Arab translates ويحكين الاباطيل, "and they narrate vain things."

VERS. 14. Μηδεμίαν ἀφορμὴν διδόναι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ λοιδορίας χάριν. The Vulgate: *Nullam occasionem dare adversario maledicti gratia* (To give no occasion to the adversary for the sake of slander). Beza: *Ad maledicendum* (For slandering). Others, "so that he may have a cause for slandering." Let it be inquired, whether χάριν is not more correctly referred to διδόναι, so that a reason may be given why he wants the younger widows to marry, namely, that they may give no occasion to the adversary for slander. The phrase διὰ χάριν is frequently used for ἕνεκα, postponed after a substantive or infinitive. The correct construction would be, μηδεμίαν ἀφορμὴν λοιδορίας τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ διδόναι χάριν.

VERS. 15. علا وه ملحه : أن دح مودل تدهفدك. Tremellius: "For now many have begun to turn away after Satan." It is ambiguous whether he refers to men or to women, about whom it was treated in the preceding verse. Boderianus removed the ambiguity in the Regia edition: "For now some women have begun to turn away after Satan." Just as also the ambiguous words of the Apostle, ἦδη γάρ τινες ἐξεστράπησαν ὀπίσω τοῦ Σατανᾶ. The Vulgate translated it in the feminine gender, "For now some women have turned back after Satan," as did Beza. But the words of the Syriac (Mm 3) do not allow this, for ܕܚܘܕܐܢ are masculine, and must be translated "some men have begun." But that they translated it only as "for now," this is not correct either. I translate, "because for now." He gives a reason why in the following verse he admonishes that if any man or woman has widows, they should support them and not burden the Church, "because for now some have begun to decline after Satan." And so also the Arab, مع انه الان بدا انسان بالميل الي الشيطان فان, "for because now some men have begun to decline to Satan, therefore if anyone has, etc."

VERS. 16. "If any faithful man or faithful woman has widows..." ܕܚܘܕܐܢ ܕܚܘܕܐܢ. Tremellius & Boderianus in the Paris edition: *nutriant eas, & non onerent Ecclesiam* (let them nourish them, and not burden the Church). It is ambiguous whether "they should not burden" refers to the widows, or to the same persons to whom it was said, "let them nourish them." To remove this ambiguity, in the Regia edition he translated, *alant eas, ne sint oneri Ecclesiae* (let them feed them, lest they be a burden to the Church), omitting the conjunction "and," as the Arab also did. So that this is not omitted, and there is no ambiguity, I translate, *nutriant eas, neque sint illae oneri Ecclesiae* (let them nourish them, and let not those women be a burden to the Church), for the gender changes in the Syriac.

VERS. 17. Διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν. Perhaps the Apostle refers to the law of the firstborn, by which in Deut. 21, v. 17, a double portion is ordered to be given to him, which is called פִּי-שְׁנַיִם by the Hebrews, διπλᾶ by the Greek interpreters, and by the Chaldean תרין חולקין, two parts. The firstborn was, namely, the more important, more excellent and more honored person of the whole family. Hence Elisha, as the principal and most outstanding of all the disciples of the prophet Elijah, says, "Give me," בִּי שְׁנַיִם, "a double portion of your Spirit," 2 Kings 2, vers. 9. Which R. Levi son of Gershom interprets with these words, כונתו במא שהאצלת מרוחך על, יהיה הנאצל לי מרוחך פי שנים על כל אחד מהם: "his meaning is, in that which you have reserved of your spirit for all the sons of the prophets, let that which is reserved for me of your spirit be a double portion above each one of them." He adds that this was taken from the law of the firstborn. R. David Kimchi testifies in his commentary on that passage that his father felt the same. In the same sense, the Apostle here seems to have judged those who preside well, as certain firstborn, and among the others distinguished and preeminent, to be worthy of a double portion of honor and reward.

VERS. 25. ܠܚܘܿܕܝܿܢܝܿܐ ܠܚܘܿܕܝܿܢܝܿܐ. "So also the good men." Thus have the Vienna, Regia, Paris, and Plantin in 16mo editions. But Tremellius and the manuscript of Raphelengius write ܠܚܘܿܕܝܿܢܝܿܐ, *opera* (works), as the Apostle said, ὡσαύτως καὶ τὰ καλὰ ἔργα πρόδηλά ἐστι. In the Cothonensis edition it is badly read as ܠܚܘܿܕܝܿܢܝܿܐ, for that signifies slaves. Thus the Arab, وكذلك الاعمال الصالحة, "and similarly the good works, etc."

CHAPTER VI.

VERS. 2. "But those who have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are their brethren: but rather let them serve them." ܠܚܘܿܕܝܿܢܝܿܐ ܠܚܘܿܕܝܿܢܝܿܐ. Boderianus in the Regia edition: "because those are faithful and beloved, in whose ministry they enjoy rest." He referred that "faithful and beloved" to the slaves, so that the sense is, these slaves are faithful and beloved, in whose ministry the masters find rest. Better in my judgment in the Paris edition, he referred it to the masters, and translated, "because they are faithful and beloved, who are content in their ministry," and so did Tremellius. To the letter I translate, "who rest, or are refreshed in their ministry." So also the Arab, وهؤلاء الذين يستريحون في خدمتهم لهم, "these are they who are refreshed in their service to them." The sense of the passage is, it is so far from the case that slaves should despise their masters because they are faithful and brethren, that they should so much the more serve them, because they are faithful and beloved, and such that, being glad that they are served by the faithful and by brethren in Christ, they also receive refreshment from their ministry. The most learned Beza does not praise this opinion; to me, however, it is very pleasing, and seems to fit excellently with the mind of the Apostle, who said, πιστοὶ εἰσι καὶ ἀγαπητοὶ, οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβάνομενοι, which I translate, "because they are faithful and beloved who perceive this beneficence with their mind." For ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι often signifies to apprehend, to feel, to perceive, whether with the sense of the body or of the mind. See the Thesaurus of Stephanus, to which I add a passage from Theodoret, oration 9 on Providence, where he says of a hunting dog, Τὰ ἰχνεσαι τῆς θήρας ὑπὸ τοῦ κυνηγέτου κελευόμενος, καὶ τῶν ὀσμῶν ἀντιλαμβάνεται, καὶ ταύταις οἷον ἰχνεσί τισι καὶ ἀκριβειαν ἐπόμενος, οὐ πρότερον ἀφίσταται, ἕως ἂν εὔρη τὸ θήραμα. "This one, ordered by the hunter to track the prey, also perceives the scents, and following these as if certain tracks with accuracy, does not desist before he has found the prey." The sense is, when faithful slaves faithfully serve faithful masters, this ministry is considered a beneficence by the masters, which they apprehend with their mind, feel, and perceive with delight and a certain refreshment of the mind.

VERS. 6. "Great gain is piety with contentment" (μετὰ ἀνταρκείας). One cause out of many can be sought from that saying of Ali: *إِسْتِرَاحَةُ النَّفْسِ مِنَ الْبَاسِ*, "The rest of the soul is from desiring nothing."

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

CHAPTER I. VERS. XIII.

لوقت قلال. Tremellius: "Let the form of sound words which you have heard from me be to you." The Syriac syntax does not admit that version. Boderianus in the Paris edition: *Sint tibi forma sermonum sanorum, &c.* (Let the form of sound words be to you, etc.), where he errs not only in Syriasm, but also in Latinism. Perhaps it should be read in the plural, *formæ*. Correctly, however, in the Regia edition: *Forma tibi sint sani sermones quos audivisti a me* (Let the sound words which you have heard from me be a form to you). I would prefer to translate ܘܢܘܩܘܠܐ as "exemplar." For it is that which is submitted to be looked at, so that another may be formed to it, from ܘܢܘܩܘܠܐ, from the quiescents with a middle vav, "he looked at." Ferrarius: ܘܢܘܩܘܠܐ, "vision, sight. A yearling lamb. An extinguished coal. An example, an exemplar. A poplar tree." The Syro-Arabic Lexicon: ܘܢܘܩܘܠܐ, النضر, "as if visions, gazes, looks." Again, ܘܢܘܩܘܠܐ, شجرة الحور, "the poplar tree." With the same name, that is, among the Arabs as among the Syrians.

CHAPTER II.

VERS. 15. ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας. Beza: *qui recte sermonem veritatis secet* (who rightly cuts the word of truth). The Arab: يقطع بكمة الحق باستقامة (Nn) "cutting in the word of truth rightly." The Vulgate took it more broadly, *recte tractantem verbum veritatis* (rightly handling the word of truth). And so the Syriac, ووصح, "preaching rightly the word of truth." Excellently indeed. For ὀρθῶς is used both in the Septuagint and among other approved authors for handling something correctly. Perhaps, however, the Apostle was referring to the fact that among the Hebrews the biblical verses are called פסוקים, τμήματα; and the biblical text is called מקרא, sectio, from the verses into which it is cut. And those who are engaged with this text are called פוסקים בתורה, "those who cut in the law," which phrase the Arab has expressed exactly here, when he said يقطع بكمة الحق, which is the same as הפוסק בדבר, "cutting in the word of truth," that is, being engaged with the פסוק, the biblical text, which is the word of truth. He who does this rightly is said to be ὀρθοτομῶν. On these matters, see the most learned commentary of Fuller, *Miscellanea Sacra*, lib. 3, CHAPTER 16.

VERS. 16. "Abstain from vain speeches, in which there is no utility: for they will add more..." ته هم حلاوة وحين حمى. Boderianus in the Regia edition: *addent ad impietatem eorum qui talia respondent* (they will add to the impiety of those who answer such things). Better in the Paris edition and Tremellius: *qui occupantur in eis* (who are occupied in them). But it is an error everywhere, that they translated ܘܢܘܩܘܠܐ as "their impiety." For if ܘܢܘܩܘܠܐ comes after a word with a full vowel, it makes a Genitive, it should have been said ܘܢܘܩܘܠܐ. Then, that they referred ܘܢܘܩܘܠܐ to ܘܢܘܩܘܠܐ, as if the sense were, "vain speeches will add to the impiety of

VERS. 13. Τὸν φελόνην &c. Jerome reads Φαλόνην in his Epistle to Damasus, question 2, where he says that Paul, according to some, so called a Hebrew volume of the Pentateuch.

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

CHAPTER I. VERS. VI.

طه چه قناصة تقيا كدل حء كدل كلسلسه كدل كامة. Tremellius: "And who has faithful children, who are not given to luxury." Boderianus: "who are not licentious." But كذع does not mean to be given to luxury, nor to be licentious, but to revile. And since كذعك can be either a Benoni or a Peil, I here take it as Peil, and translate, "And who has faithful children, who are not subject to revilings," which the Apostle said, τέκνα ἔχων πιστὰ, μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ. For what follows, ἀσωτίας, the Syriac translator did not join with the preceding μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ, but with what follows, as if he seemed to have read, μὴ ἀνυπότακτα δι' ἀσωτίας, "and are not rebellious through luxury."

VERS. 7. Μη ὀργίλον. "Not quick-tempered." For as Hillel rightly says in chapter 2 of Aboth, ולא הביישן למד ולא הקפדן מלמד, "neither does a shy person learn well, nor does a quick-tempered person teach well." Where, by the way, the noun הקפדן should be observed, which could be derived from the Latin *capitosus*, with which it agrees in meaning, from the root קפד, to cut short, to abbreviate, to deduce, so that it is the same as what in Holy Scripture is קצר רוח, "short of spirit," that is, quick-tempered. Thus קפדנות is quick-temperedness in Num. 25, vers. 8 in the Targum of Jerusalem, as if you would say brevity and precipitancy of spirit. Add that a quick-tempered person is accustomed to cut short and abbreviate his actions and words, and for this very reason he is inept at teaching, which the Hebrew interpreter of the said sentence of Hillel expresses in these words, הרב הרב, "A master who cuts short with his disciples (that is, out of anger responds too briefly and not fully) when they ask him, will not teach as he ought."

CHAPTER II.

VERS. 11. كذء كلسلسه كدل كلسلسه كذء كلسلسه كذء كلسلسه. Boderianus in the Regia edition: *Patefacta est enim gratia Dei tota salutifera omnibus hominibus* (For the grace of God, wholly salutary, has been revealed to all men). In the Paris edition: *vivificatrix tota* (wholly life-giving). Better Tremellius: *Apparuit enim benignitas Dei servatrix omnium* (For the kindness of God, the savior of all, has appeared), but "to all men," which he omitted, should be added. The Arab has وقد ظهرت نعمة الله محيينا, "the grace of God, our savior, has now appeared to all men."

VERS. 14. "And might purify for himself a people for his own..." لمقا. Tremellius: *qui studiosè bona opera sectaretur* (who would zealously pursue good works). Boderianus: *qui studiosus esset bonorum operum* (who would be zealous for good works). Properly, "who would be emulous in good works," that is, who would be carried to good works with such fervor that one would emulate another, and they would, as it were, piously envy one another. For كلسلسه is the same as ζηλόω, to

be zealous for, to emulate, to envy, in a good and in a bad sense. The Arab has *يتنافس في الاعمال الصالحة*, "who would emulate in good works."

CHAPTER III.

VERS. 2. Ἐνδεικνυμένους πραότητα πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους. For God is φιλόανθρωπος, and he who does not study to be gracious to men cannot please God, according to that saying of Rabbi Hanina son of Dosa in Aboth 3: כל שרוח הבריות נוחה הימנו רוח המקום נוחה הימנו, וכל שאין רוח הבריות נוחה הימנו אין רוח המקום נוחה הימנו, "From whomever the spirit of men is refreshed, from him also is the spirit of God refreshed. But from whomever the spirit of men is not refreshed, neither is the spirit of God from him." Where, by the way, observe that בריות, creatures, designates men.

VERS. 13. Ζηνᾶν τὸν νομικόν. "Zenas the lawyer." But the Syriac has ܙܢܐܘܫܐ, and the Arab الكاتب, "the Scribe." In which way also νομικός is translated by the Arab in Matt. 22:35, for he who is called νομικός there, the same in Mark 12:28 is said to have been εἷς τῶν Γραμματέων. Indeed, even an amanuensis is called νομικός by the Syrians. The Syriac commentator on those words of Rom. 16:22, ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ, annotates: ܩܘܡܐܘܫܐ ܕܩܘܡܐܘܫܐ ܕܩܘܡܐܘܫܐ, "For this man was the scribe (or amanuensis) of Paul."

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

CHAPTER I. VERS. II.

δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν. In Hebrew אשר בידו אף העולמים עשה, which you could also translate, "through whom he also made the worlds." For עולם among the Hebrews designates not only an age, but also the world. And among the Arabs عالم denotes the world rather than an age, which is called دهر by them. There is, however, a common phrase among them, which occurs at the beginning of the Quran: الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ, "Praise be to God, lord of the worlds," by which name not various worlds, but all created beings, existing both in the highest and in the lowest world, are comprehended. They want this to be so denominated from the verb علم, to know, because absolutely nothing is contained in the world from which God cannot be known, and which does not exhibit a sign, signification, character, and indication of divine power and goodness. Nor will it perhaps be useless to observe here that, to distinguish the orders of creatures, the Hebrew sages established three עולמים, worlds. (Oo) The first of which they called השפל, the humble world, namely the Earth. The second, עולם התיכון, the middle world, which is that of the spheres and stars, or the airy region. The third, עולם העליון, the supreme world, the dwelling place of God and the Angels. If, therefore, עולם denotes the world here, as it does elsewhere, the Apostle will be said to have referred to these distinct worlds when he said in the plural, τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν, as also in chap. 11, vers. 3, "by faith we believe that the worlds were framed" (κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας). It is very common among the Rabbis, and often occurs in the Mishneh Torah of Maimonides, that God is called רבוון העולמים, "lord of the worlds," that is, of creatures.

VERS. 3. Ὁς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης. The Syriac: ומחייبه. Boderianus: *qui est germen gloriae ejus* (who is the sprout of his glory), because for the Hebrews צמח is a sprout. But Tremellius is better: *qui est Splendor gloriae ejus* (who is the Splendor of his glory). Ferrarius: צמחה, splendor. צמח, splenduit, illuminavit. The Syro-Arabic Lexicon: צמח, id est الضياء من الضياء, "it illuminates with splendor." It is therefore the same, צמחה, as الضياء, splendor, light, radiance, and the same צמח as ضيى, he shone, he was splendid. Whence also in this place the Arab interpreter has وهو ضياء مجد, "he is the splendor of his glory." Is it from this that in Jer. 23:5, וְהָקְמַתִי לְדָוִד צִמְחָה צְדִיקָה, the LXX translated, ἀναστήσω τῷ Δαυιδ ἀνατολήν δικαίαν? ἀνατολή is certainly used for splendor in Isa. 60, vers. 19, where נֹגַהּ הַיָּרֵךְ, the splendor of the moon, is translated ἀνατολή τῆς σελήνης. It properly signifies the east or a rising. But it is also said of herbs growing from the earth, as in Ezech. 16, vers. 7, חֲמֹצֵה אֲנִי הָאֲרֶזֶת, ἀνατολή τοῦ ἄγρου. See also chap. 17, 10. Therefore I would not dare in the said place of Jer. to translate ἀνατολήν δικαίαν as "a just splendor or rising." I would prefer "a just sprout," so that it corresponds to the property of the Hebrew word. ἀνατολή there is βλάστημα, as Symmachus translates. For which reason it did not displease learned men, even in Luke 1, vers. 78, to translate ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους as "a sprout

from on high," as the distinguished Beza had translated in earlier editions. This is certainly more tolerable than that מז in Jeremiah be translated "Orient," which, however, the distinguished Scaliger vehemently contends in his *Elenchus Trihæresii*, p. 150. Although among the Syrians that word has the meaning of splendor, it does not follow that it has the same among the Hebrews, where מז is properly said of herbs from the earth, then of hair and feathers growing from the body of animals. Metaphorically, however, it is said of any new thing, first appearing like a sprouting herb. That it is said of the rising of the sun or of some star has not yet been established. For that which the incomparable Man asserts, that מז signifies a horoscope, that is, the place of the Orient in a genethliac theme for the Hebrews, I would have wished proven. And even if it were, it perhaps refers more to the infant himself who, with this or that star rising, sprouts forth from the mother's womb like a sprout from the earth, than to the star itself which rises. Just as Christ in Heb. 7, vers. 14, is said to have sprung (ἀναπέταλκεν) from the tribe of Judah, a metaphor undoubtedly taken from a sprout budding from elsewhere, rather than from a rising star, especially since we have also proven above that ἀνατολήν in the LXX is sometimes taken for a sprout of the earth. I would prefer, however, in Luke 1 to translate ἀνατολήν ἐξ ὕψους as "splendor from on high," because the following metaphor seems to prove it, $\text{ἐπεσκέψατο ἡμᾶς, ἐπιφᾶναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις}$, all of which must be referred to the metaphor of light. The most learned Scultetus indeed rejects this in his *Exercitationes Evangelicæ*, l. 1, CHAPTER 12, because ἀνατολή signifies only the rising of the sun, or the region from which it rises, but Christ is neither the thing that has risen, nor the region from which it rises, but the very thing which does rise. But we have proven above from Isa. 60, vers. 19, that ἀνατολή is also taken for splendor, which is the very thing that rises.

VERS. 4. Τοσοῦτον κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων. The Syriac: $\text{ܠܝܕܢܐ ܐܘܠܘܢܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܠܝܕܢܐ}$. Where Tremellius has, *Et tanto potior factus est Angelis* (And he was made so much better than the Angels), correctly. But what "so much" (tanto) is worth in the Syriac, perhaps not everyone perceives. Boderianus in the Regia edition: *Et ipse tanto præstantior fuit Angelis* (And he himself was so much more excellent than the Angels). I do not praise this either. I would prefer, *and in this whole respect* (or, *in this entire respect*), *he excels the Angels, according to how much more excellent is the name which &c.*

τόσοῦτον does not always refer to a person, but often to a thing. As in *propter hoc* [because of this], *propterea* [therefore]. Therefore, *in this whole respect*, is *by so much*. Compare with Hebrews 7, verse 22, where $\text{ܠܝܕܢܐ ܠܡܘܬܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܫܘܒܪܐܢܐ}$ Boderianus most poorly translates, *Hic totius excellentioris istius testamenti factus est sponsor Ieschua* [He was made the sponsor of this more excellent testament]. But Tremellius excellently, *hoc toto præstantius est foedus, in quo factus est sponsor Ieschua* [by this much more excellent is the covenant, in which Jeshua was made sponsor].

VERS. 9. Ράβδου εὐθύτητος. Thus in Psalm 45, v. 7, the LXX translated שִׁבְט מִיְשׁוֹר. The Chaldean, ܩܒܕܐ ܩܝܡܐ, a right rod. The Syriac ܩܒܕܐ ܩܝܡܐ, *sceptrum rectum* [a right scepter], as Dr. Erpenius interprets it, or *virga recta* [a right rod], as Tremellius in this place. Boderianus less well, *sceptrum erectum* [an erect scepter]. The Arabic القصب المستقيم, *virga recta* [a right rod]. The Syriac adjective elsewhere commonly corresponds to the Greek ἀπλοῦς, simple, as in Matthew 6:22, ὀφθαλμὸς ἀπλοῦς [a simple eye]. In which sense פשוט is most common among the Rabbis. פשוט in Syriac means *he extended, he expanded*. It is therefore properly said of a thing simply and extended in straight lines. To the Hebrews, יָשָׁר, whence מִישׁוֹר, a plain, a valley, having a simple extension, undisturbed by any mounds, hills, or mountains. You could also translate ܩܒܕܐ from the proper meaning of the verb as *sceptrum extensum* [an extended scepter]. The distinguished Sionita, *protensum* [outstretched]. And so ράβδος εὐθύτητος, will be *Sceptrum rectum* [a right scepter], extended straightly, and therefore benign. For among the Orientals, it was a sign of benignity and benevolence when Kings extended the scepter toward someone. Esther 5:2.

VERS. 12. And as a mantle ἐλίξεις (duplicate) you will roll them up. Because in the Syriac New Testament not all vowels are always written, I doubt whether this word is written fully, or if it should be read ܩܘܒܘܥ from the second defective form. For in the Thargum ܩܘܥ is *to duplicate*. Whence also to the Syrians מעופא *duplicated*. ܩܘܥ *he duplicated*, as Ferrari testifies. But in Kal he cites the same ܩܘܥ *he duplicated*. Also ܩܘܥ *it failed*, from the second quiescent form. He cites a place from Apocalypse 6, verse ܩܘܥ ܩܘܥ and *duplicate for him a duplum*. The point below O indicates a long u, and therefore from the second quiescent form. For if it were from the defective, the point should have been written above, to indicate a short u, the Kibbutz of the Hebrews. Perhaps here too both forms are confused, as we saw before in ܩܘܒܘܥ, *he had mercy*, which is the same as ܩܘܒܘܥ. below chap. 2, verse ܩܘܒܘܥ, *he was humbled*, which elsewhere is ܩܘܒܘܥ, whence is ܩܘܒܘܥ, *you humbled him*, Ibid. verse 7. It follows in the same verse: Tremellius, *tu autem sicut es, eris* [but you, as you are, will be]. He added *eris* [you will be], as if in the Syriac there was nothing other than, *tu autem sicut es* [but you, as you are]. In which Boderianus in the Paris edition also erred, when he translated, & *tu sicut existens es* [and you, as existing you are]. Translate, *Et tu sicut es, es* [And you, as you are, are], as the distinguished Sionita in the Psalter; which Boderianus correctly has in the Royal edition. As for the sense, *tu autem idem es* [but you are the same].

VERS. 14. Are they not all λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα ministering spirits? It is taken from Psalm 103, verse 21, where they are called מְשֻׁרְתֵי, LXX λειτουργοὶ αὐτοῦ, *Ministri ejus* [His ministers]. And in the סדר תפלות, that is, the book of prayers, יוצר משרתים, *creator ministrorum* [creator of ministers], means of the Angels. Hence among the Hebrews they are commonly called מַלְאָכֵי הַשָּׂרָה, angels of ministry. Just as the Apostle here makes them lesser than Christ, so also did the ancient doctors of the Hebrews, who interpret verse 13 of chapter 52 of Isaiah, וְיָרִים וְנִשְׂא וְנִבְּה מֵאֵד, as

follows: וירום מאברהם ונשא ממושה וגבה מאד ממלאכי השרת *exaltabitur prae Abrahamo, & elevabitur prae Mose, & sublimis erit prae angelis Ministerii* [he will be exalted above Abraham, and lifted up above Moses, and will be sublime above the angels of Ministry]. For this sublimity of Christ above the Angels, Abrabanel, on these words of Isaiah, brings forth two rather trifling reasons. The first, because the Angels receive the virtue by which they protect men from God through the mediations of stellar influences; but the Messiah will receive it immediately from God himself. The second, that the Messiah will conquer the Angels set over the nations, who will fight for them, and he will destroy the nations. These are the delusions of men with too much time on their hands.

CHAPTER II.

VERS. 6. Διαμαρτύρατο δέ πού τις, &c. The Apostle, to prove that God did not subject the world to come, that is, the Christian Church, to Angels, but to Christ, alleges here and in the two following verses what is read in Psalm 8, verses 5, 6, 7. Most learned men think that this was done by the Apostle only by way of allusion, not by way of proof. From whom we strongly dissent, as also from all who deny that the Prophet is speaking of Christ. What led them into error was that they believed the Psalm to speak of man in general and considered absolutely. This opinion is contradicted by the words of verse 7: כל שפה תחת רגליו, *omnia posuisti sub pedibus ejus* [you have put all things under his feet]. The Apostle especially regarded these words, as they served his purpose. Wherefore, explaining them in verse 8, he says they are to be taken so generally that nothing at all is excepted. His words are, ἐν τῷ γὰρ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον. It deals with such a subjection, by which not only sub-celestial things, but also heaven itself and the Angels are subjected to man. This, God teaches in Genesis 1:26, never belonged to man, not even before the fall, much less after: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth." You see that dominion is given to man, but confined within rather narrow limits, only over living creatures, and besides them only over the earth (since, to be cultivated by man, it was to produce herbs by that cultivation), not over the air, not over the sea, much less over the highest heaven and the Angels. Nor is that dominion, repeated after the flood, extended any further, Genesis 9, verses 1, 2, 3.

To Christ alone is it attributed that all things are subject under his feet, 1 Corinthians 15:27, Ephesians 1, verse 22; that all things have been given into his hand, John 3, verse 35; that all power has been given to him in heaven and on earth, Matthew 28:18; that he has been appointed heir of all things, Hebrews 1, verse 2. Then, through and for him, this also belongs to the faithful, 1 Cor. 3, verses 21, 22, as co-heirs with Christ, Romans 8, verse 17. Thus, I maintain, David, since he was a Prophet and knew that God had sworn to him with an oath that from the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh (that is, human nature), Christ

نري انه يسوع من اجل الم موته والمجد والشرف موضوعات علي راسه *verum qui humiliatus fuit paululum prae Angelis, jam videmus quod sit Iesus propter passionem mortis suae, & gloria & dignitas posita sunt super caput ejus* [But he who was humbled a little before the Angels, we now see that he is Jesus on account of the passion of his death, and glory and dignity are placed upon his head]. The sense is: Although we do not yet see all things subjected to him, yet this we see, that he who was humbled a little below the Angels, is Jesus. But why is he Jesus? On account of the passion of his death: for which reason he was also adorned with honor and glory. Let the learned examine whether the Syriac has poorly grasped the Apostle's meaning.

VERS. 16. Οὐ γὰρ δὴπου ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται. Beza: *non enim utique Angelos assumpsit* [for he did not indeed take on Angels]. He wanted ἐπιλαμβάνεται to be put for ἐπέλαβετο, by an enallage of tense. Then he took δὴπου for the simple δὴ. In my judgment, the Vulgate better retained the present tense, and took που for *usquam* [anywhere]. But it did not correctly omit the emphatic particle δὴ. For it translates, *Nusquam enim Angelos apprehendit* [For nowhere does he take hold of Angels]. I translate literally: *Non enim profecto usquam Angelos assumit* [For surely he nowhere takes on Angels]. *Usquam* [anywhere], that is, in any place of scripture. Nowhere in Holy Scripture is he said to take on angels, but everywhere the seed of Abraham. Thus που is taken above verse 6, διημαρτύρατο δέ που τις. And below in chapter 4, verse 4, εἶρηκε γάρ που, &c. The Syriac plainly omits δὴπου. Our Old Belgian version is, in our judgment, better here than the new one.

CHAPTER III.

VERS. 2. Πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτὸν, ὡς καὶ Μωσῆς ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ. Reference is made to the passage in Numbers 12, verse 7, where God, comparing Moses with the other Prophets, says that he appears to the others in a vision or a dream, but that with Moses it is otherwise: בְּכָל-בֵּיתִי נֶאֱמַן הוּא, *in tota domo mea fidelis est* [in all my house he is faithful]. To which place that most learned man and our intimate friend Johannes Cloppenburgius pointed out to me that God's intention is not to praise the virtue of Moses, by which he conducted himself faithfully in administering his office, but his dignity and authority, in which he excelled above the other Prophets; and the meaning is, *Tota mea domus ei concredita est* [My whole house has been entrusted to him]. To the other Prophets I now appear in a vision, now in a dream at certain times, so that they may announce my will when and to whom I command, but to Moses I have entrusted my whole house, so that he may constitute, order, and govern my entire Church, instruct it with laws both ecclesiastical and political, according to which my whole house is to be governed both now and henceforth.

I praise this opinion. And to confirm this use of the Hebrew phrase, I bring forth what is in the Talmud, in Sanhedrin chap. 3, where one of two litigants, seeking judges for their dispute, says: באמן עלי אבא נאמן עלי אביך נאמנים עלי שלוש רועי בקר, *fidelis apud me est pater meus, fidelis apud me est pater tuus, fideles apud me sunt tres bubulci* [my father is trustworthy to me, your father is trustworthy to me, three herdsmen

are trustworthy to me], that is, I will entrust my case to be decided either by my father, or yours, or even three herdsmen. Nor is Aben Ezra unworthy of being heard on the words of Moses. What is בככל ביתי נאמן הוא? He explains: טעמו כבן בית שיכנס בלא רשות ואם תצטרך יגיד צרכיו. ואתם כאשר אתודע לכם בחלום תרשו ואם לא אין לכם רשות לשאול *Sensus ejus est, sicut filius familias, qui libere intrat nulla accepta potestate: & si quibus eget, libere eloquitur. Vos autem, quando appareo vobis per somnium, tum scitis. Si non appareo, non est vobis potestas interrogandi* [The meaning of it is, like a son of the family, who enters freely without having received permission: and if he needs anything, he speaks freely. But you, when I appear to you in a dream, then you know. If I do not appear, you do not have the power to ask]. You see that it refers to the power and authority which Moses has over the whole house of God, not the other Prophets. And I think that this is the same intention of the Apostle here, with that most learned man; that is, that Christ is not compared with Moses in respect to faithfulness, but in the power and authority which he has obtained over the whole Church. With this distinction, that Moses had this power only as a servant, but Christ as a son ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, lord of his house, as he says in verse 5. And Moses indicated this in Deuteronomy 18, verse 15 and 18, "God will raise up for you a Prophet כְּמוֹנִי like me," and what follows, which the Apostle Peter correctly applies to our Savior in Acts 3, verses 22, 23. Not in that sense, certainly, in which the most learned interpreters, and among them the great Calvin, take these words, as if נביא [prophet] should be taken indefinitely for prophets in general in Moses, and God promises that the people will always have prophets who will teach them rightly, but that Christ is chiefly to be understood, as the prince of prophets, and to whom all the earlier prophecies were directed.

We think that Christ alone is to be understood, since he alone was a Prophet like Moses, placed over the entire house of God. To those two alone did this prerogative and dignity belong. The first of the prophets under the law was Moses, who ordered the entire Church of the Old Testament up to the times of the Gospel, and fixed the laws even for the prophets who would follow. The first of the prophets under the Gospel was Christ, who ordered the entire Church of the New Testament until the end of the world, and fixed the laws for all subsequent prophets or pastors. In Moses all the other prophets of the Old Testament who followed him are comprehended: just as in Christ are all the Apostles, doctors, and pastors who followed him.

VERS. 3. *For this one has been counted worthy of more glory than Moses.* The Apostle opposes this to the religion of the Jews, by which they excessively venerated Moses as the father and head of all prophets who ever had been or would be. Hence among the thirteen articles of the Judaic faith, which Rabbi Maimonides opposed to almost all of the Christian faith, the seventh reads thus: אני מאמין באמונה: אבי שלמה שנבואת משה רבינו עליו השלום היו אמתיות ושהוא היה אב לחכמים לקודמים לפניו ולבאים אחריו that is, "I believe with perfect faith that the prophecies of Moses our teacher, peace be upon him, were true, and that he was the father of the wise, both those who preceded and those who followed him." Yet it was common among the ancient

teachers of the Hebrews to interpret those words of Isaiah chapter 52, verse 13, וירום מאברהם ונשא ממושה וגבה מאד ממלאכי שרת, about the Messiah in this way: "And he will be exalted above Abraham, and will be lifted up above Moses, and will be very sublime above the angels of ministry." Although the doctors of a later age wrongly and in bad faith referred the Messiah's dignity above Moses solely to the redemption of the people from captivity by the Messiah, and not to the matter of prophecy, in which they wish Moses to excel the Messiah. Regarding this, Abrabanel can be consulted on those words of chapter 52 of Isaiah.

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE SABBATH

VERS. 3. The sanctification of the Sabbath day, by which God in the fourth commandment is said to have sanctified it, that is, to have established it as a holy sign of his grace, is:

I. With respect to the circumstance of time itself. For that God destined that day for rest, on which he himself rested from the work of creation, was a type of a more excellent and more salvific rest, by which God and our Savior Christ, from the far more sublime and difficult work of Redemption (after his soul had labored grievously, about which see Isaiah 53), rested in the tomb on that very seventh day of the week.

II. With respect to the rest commanded to the people on that day, which was itself a sign of our spiritual rest to be obtained in Christ.

The Apostle teaches both in Hebrews 4, verses 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. For the understanding of this passage, four things are to be observed, which are like foundations for the Apostle's reasoning:

I. The rest of God, into which the faithful must enter, is not that by which we rest from our works, but that by which God rests from his; verses 3 and 4.

II. That rest of God is the source and origin of our own. Hence in the fourth commandment, *You shall rest on that day, because I first rested on the same*. And here, verse 10: "He who has entered into his rest, has himself also rested from his works, just as God did from his." Therefore, our resting from our works follows our entry into the rest of God.

III. There were two typical rests of God in the Old Testament, of which the people were also partakers. 1. That by which he rested on the seventh day, and the people in imitation of him. 2. That by which, having entered with his ark into the land of Canaan, and there having fixed his firm seat first in Shiloh, then in Jerusalem, he rested from wandering through the desert, and the people with him.

IV. True and saving rest is not external, whether from the works of the world, or from uncertain wandering through the earth, but spiritual in Christ, v. 10; into which no unbeliever enters, verse 6, and of which not even those who were led into the land of Canaan by Joshua were made partakers, namely those who were unbelievers. For although they entered into the external rest of the land of Canaan, they did not enter into that which was represented, any more than the unbelievers in the desert, to whom it was not even granted to enter into the typical one. Whence also in verse 8, the Apostle denies that Joshua led them into rest.

From these foundations, the Apostle infers that neither that rest of God, in which he rested on the seventh day from the works of creation, nor that other one, is that true rest into which we must enter, and from which our true rest can proceed. Because, although that rest was established from the very beginning of the world, the Israelites were not free from unbelief, impiety, and rebellion, and so God denies that they will enter into his rest, and establishes another day than the seventh in Psalm 95, verse 7. And although Joshua led the others into the land of Canaan, where they also with the ark of God, that is, God himself, rested from their wandering, yet he did not κατέπαυσεν αὐτοὺς, give them rest, because otherwise David would not have made mention of another day long after. Hebrews 4, v. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

Hence, he says it follows that another rest of God remains for the people of God, verse 9, into which entry is given to the faithful alone, verse 3, which is of such efficacy that whoever enters into it, they also rest from their works, just as God did from his, verse 10.

That rest is none other than the rest of Jesus Christ, by which, having completed the most grievous labors for our sins up to the entrance of the Sabbath day, he rested on the very Sabbath day with all our sins in the tomb. Whoever embraces this rest of Christ in the tomb by faith, they enter into that rest, and through it, the old man being buried with Christ, they themselves also rest from their works. Whence it is clear that the rest of the seventh day was a type of the future grace in Christ.

CHAPTER V.

VERS. 11. *But concerning that Melchizedek, we have much to say.* ἡ ἀποστολικὴ λέξις. Tremellius & Boderianus in the Paris edition: *Et occupatio ad exponendum illud* [And a business to explain it]. These most learned men have followed a Hebraism, where קטע as a substantive means business, occupation. But in Syriac אקטע is an adjective, and means difficult, harsh; sometimes, wicked, perverse. It should therefore be translated, & *difficilis ad explicandum eum* [and difficult to explain it]. What he said in the Royal edition is, *quaeque (sc. verba) difficiles explicatus habeant* [and which (words, that is) may have difficult explanations]. The substantive is לקטע, difficulty.

which the Syriac interpreted concerning baptism above. And hence that homily is inscribed, ἡ πρὸς τοὺς μέλλοντας φωτίζεσθαι κατήχησις, *catechesis ad illuminandos, i.e. ad baptizandos* [catechesis for those about to be enlightened, i.e., for those about to be baptized]. And perhaps we would not speak absurdly if we were to state that this word alludes to the Hebrew נהר, which, when it is a noun, denotes a river, but when a verb, to be enlightened, to shine, and this not only for the Hebrews, but also for the Chaldeans and Syrians, and is explained by φωτίζειν in Psalm 34, verse 5. For he who approaches the river of Christ's baptism is enlightened, and finds a river not only of elemental water, but also of living water flowing from the belly, about which Christ speaks in John 7, and it is nothing other than the gift of illumination. Furthermore, ἀνακαινίζειν, Beza has it actively, *renovare* [to renew]. The Vulgate, Erasmus, the Syriac and the Arab have it passively, *renovari* [to be renewed]. Which I praise, yet I do not think, with Erasmus in his notes, that ἐαυτούς is to be understood, as if the sense were, "It is impossible that they should renew themselves," but that anyone should renew them, that is, absolutely, that they should be renewed. For thus among the Hebrews the active infinitive is frequently taken passively, as in Psalm 51:4, בְּשִׁפְטֶךָ, *cum quis judicat te* [when one judges you], that is, when you are judged.

VERS. 8. כַּדְבָּל וְסִמְדָּבַל thistles and tribulations. Boderianus: *Carduos & spinas* [Thistles and thorns]. Correctly. For Ferrari teaches that כַּדְבָּל is a tree similar to a willow, but thorny, but סִמְדָּבַל, citing this very passage, is a thorn. The order of the words seems to be changed. For in the Greek it is ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους. τρίβολος means tribulus, as in Matthew 7:16, therefore סִמְדָּבַל denotes ἀκάνθας. The Syriac-Arabic Lexicon: כַּדְבָּל *id est, arbor quae dicitur* כַּדְבָּל וְיִקָּאֵל הַגִּנְיָ. *estque* inquit شجرة [and it is, he says, a tree].

Ibid. ἥς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν. Vulgate: *cujus consummatio in combustionem* [whose end is for burning]. Erasmus: *cujus exitus huc tendit, ut exuratur* [whose outcome tends to this, that it be burned up]. Beza, *cujus exitus tendit ad exustionem* [whose outcome tends to burning]. Syriac: *sed finis ejus est combustio* [but its end is combustion]. So also the Arab. We advise that it is a Hebraic phrase, the sense of which is, *quae tandem comburetur* [which will finally be burned]. Thus in the Mishnah, Sanhedrin chap. 4, § 5, the judges, about to warn the witnesses to guard themselves against false testimony, say to them: שמא אי אתם יודעים שסופנו לבדוק אתכם בדרישה ובחקירה, *fortasse vos ignoratis, finem nostrum fore ad examinandum vos (i.e. nos tandem examinatuos vos) accuratissima inquisitione* [Perhaps you do not know that our end will be to examine you (i.e., we will finally examine you) with a most thorough inquiry]. Thus in Mishnah Makkot chap. 3: הלא בין היום ובין למחר סופו ליתן: 3: כתובתה, *an non sive hodie sive cras finis ejus est ad dandum (i.e. tandem dabit) ei promissam dotem suam?* [Is it not so, whether today or tomorrow, his end is to give (i.e., he will finally give) her her promised dowry?]. We add a third place from Pirke Avot chap. 4, where R. Jonathan says thus: כל המקיים את התורה מעוני סופו לקיימה מעושר, וכל המבטל את התורה מעושר סופו לבטלה מעוני, *quicunque praestat legem pauper, finis ejus est ad praestandum eam (i.e. tandem praestabit eam) dives, & quicunque irritam facit legem*

dives, finis ejus est ad irritam faciendam eam (i.e. tandem irritam faciet eam) pauper [Whoever fulfills the law while poor, his end is to fulfill it (i.e., he will finally fulfill it) while rich, and whoever makes the law void while rich, his end is to make it void (i.e., he will finally make it void) while poor].

VERS. 9. ܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ. Tremellius & Boderianus: *Persuasi autem sumus de vobis fratres, ea quae sunt bona* [But we are persuaded concerning you, brothers, of those things which are good]. In the Royal edition: *persuasa habemus* [we hold as persuaded]. The Apostle: *πεπεισμεθα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀγαπητοί, τὰ κρείσσονα*. In Syriac this would be said ܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ. And perhaps it should be read thus. For ܡܫܝܚܝܢ is *persuademus* [we persuade]. If this is the correct reading, the sense will be: "Although we speak to you thus, yet to others we speak better things concerning you, which pertain to salvation." The Arab: *وانا لنعرف منكم يا اخوة خصالا جميلة*. This is ambiguous. If you take *نعرف* in the first conjugation, it must be translated, *nos autem scimus de vobis ô fratres res pulchras* [but we know concerning you, O brothers, beautiful things]. But if in the fourth, *nos autem docemus de vobis ô fratres res pulchras* [but we teach concerning you, O brothers, beautiful things]. And so it will agree with the Syriac.

VERS. 10. Οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεός, ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν. That is what R. Eliezer in Pirke Avot excellently advises: *דע לפני מי אתה עמל ונאמן הוא בעל מלאכתך שישלם לך שכר פעולתך*, *scito coram quo opereris. nam fidelis est Dominus operis tui, ut reddat tibi mercedem laboris tui* [Know before whom you labor, for the Lord of your work is faithful to pay you the reward of your labor].

CHAPTER VII.

VERS. 8. *And here indeed men who die receive tithes, ἐκεῖ δὲ μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῆ, but there one who has testimony that he lives*. The Syriac: ܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܝܢ, *de quo testata est Scriptura quod vivat* [of whom the Scripture has testified that he lives]. So also the Arab. This indeed must necessarily be understood not of Christ here, but of Melchizedek, yet as a type of Christ, as can be gathered from what precedes and follows. For the Apostle's scope is to show that Melchizedek was greater than the Levites. He proves this, 1. Because the Levites receive tithes from their brothers, but Melchizedek from the Patriarch Abraham himself, verses 4, 5, 6, 7. 2. Because the Levites are men who die, but Melchizedek has testimony that he lives, verse 8. 3. Because Levi himself was tithed in Abraham, verse 9, by the one, indeed, by whom Abraham was tithed, namely Melchizedek. Therefore he adds verse 10: "For he was still in the loins of his father when Melchizedek met Abraham," and therefore also when he received tithes from him.

But it raises a scruple that there is no testimony of Scripture concerning Melchizedek, that he lives. But in fact, no more is said here of Melchizedek than was said above in verse 3, that he had no end of life. If Paul said this truly from Scripture there, because no mention of his death exists in it, he also rightly says

here that Scripture testifies that he lives. But there is also the testimony of Psalm 110, verse 4, which place the Fathers correctly applied here. For although I confess it speaks not of the priesthood in the abstract, but of the Priest there, yet I deny that it speaks only of Christ there, since it also speaks of Melchizedek there.

VERS. 12. Μετατιθεμένης γὰρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης, ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ νόμου μετάθεσις γίνεται. How much this is repugnant to the opinion and faith of the Jews is clear from the thirteen articles of the Judaic faith, collected by Maimonides and received by all, where the ninth reads thus: *אני מאמין באמונה שלימה שזאת התורה לא תהא מוחלפת ולא תהא תורה אחרת*: מאת הבורא יתברך שמו, that is, "I believe with perfect faith that this law (namely, that given to Moses) will not be changed, nor will another law ever proceed from the blessed Creator."

CHAPTER VIII.

VERS. 11. Καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, &c. From this passage the use of the sacred Ministry is wrongly abolished. 1. Because those who are said to have no need to be taught by their neighbor are not unbelievers and ignorant of divine things, who certainly have need to be taught from the word of God what they do not know: but those in whose minds God has put his law, which God has accomplished both through the external ministry of the word and through the internal efficacy of the Holy Spirit. They have no need for anyone to say to them, "Know the Lord," as if they did not know him, because, God says, "all shall know me, from the least to the greatest." Thus 1 John 2:20, "You have an anointing from the Holy One, and you know all things." Again, verse 27, "The anointing which you have received from him abides in you." Hence he infers, "And you have no need that anyone should teach you," but that anointing, which you have of course received through the preaching of the Gospel from the Holy Spirit, teaches you about all things. Therefore it is not necessary for anyone to teach you anew, as if you were ignorant. Hence verse 21, "I have not written to you because you do not know the truth, but because you know it." They knew it, however, not only from the illumination of the Holy Spirit, but also from the instruction of the word, which is everywhere presupposed here.

2. Although the faithful in the New Testament are denied to have need to be taught anew by anyone through the ministry of the word, yet they are not denied to have need to be confirmed in the doctrine they have received through the ministry of the same word. Therefore John did not cease writing to them because they knew the truth: but because they knew it, he continues to write, lest they be led astray from it. Whence in verse 26 he says, "I have written this to you about those who are leading you astray." This was not to teach them to know the Lord, but to strengthen them in the Lord whom they knew.
3. So that the difference here between the old and new Testament may be clear, it must be held that few in the Old Testament truly knew the Lord.

And those who did know him were nevertheless always such novices in that knowledge that they had need to be told anew, "Know the Lord." For since the Lord Jesus, the savior of the world, was only promised, not exhibited, veiled in shadows, and therefore seen only with a covered face and greeted from afar, many things were still lacking which were required for a full and clear knowledge of that Lord, because of the obscurity of the doctrine and the scant grace of the Holy Spirit. But now that the Lord has been exhibited, the shadows turned into truth, and the Holy Spirit poured out in full measure, it has been given to us to behold the glory of the Lord with unveiled face; having been so taught, we have no need for anyone to teach us anew and say, "Know the Lord." For it is one thing to teach anew so that you may know the Lord, which the faithful of the New Testament do not need, because they know the Lord clearly, perspicuously, and with the full persuasion of the Holy Spirit; it is another thing to teach so that you may advance and be confirmed in the knowledge of the Lord. This we always need.

CHAPTER IX.

VERS. 3, 4. This passage has greatly exercised learned men, its words being: μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεῦτερον καταπέτασμα, σκηνὴ ἢ λεγομένη ἄγια ἁγίων, verse 4, χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον, καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης περικεκαλυμμένην πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ, ἐν ἧ ἰστάμιος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα, καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἢ βλαστήσασα, καὶ αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης. How are the urn of manna and the rod of Aaron said to have been in the ark, besides the tablets of the covenant, when in 1 Kings 8, verse 9, and 2 Chronicles 5, verse 10, it is affirmed that only the tablets of the covenant were in it? The most learned Junius in his parallels, whom many other doctors also follow, reconciles it thus, that the relative pronoun ἐν ἧ should not be referred to the nearer κιβωτόν, but to the more remote σκηνή, so that all those things are understood to have been in the tabernacle, not in the ark. But besides this being rather harsh, to what, I ask, will the pronoun of the following verse be referred? ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς χερουβὶμ δόξης, κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλαστήριον. Where the pronoun can by no means be referred to the tabernacle, but must be referred to the ark, because the wings of the Cherubim covered not that but this. Since, therefore, after ἐν ἧ no mention is again made of the ark, to which ὑπεράνω αὐτῆς could be referred, it follows that the disposition and sense of the words absolutely demand that both ἐν ἧ and ὑπεράνω αὐτῆς be referred to the same thing, namely to the ark.

The Syriac understood it no differently; for σκηνή he uses the masculine noun ܠܚܘܒܐ, but for κιβωτός the feminine ܠܘܚܒܐ. And for what follows, ἐν ἧ, he translates ܫܘܒܐ, with a point above the i, a note of the feminine gender, which Tremellius correctly translated, *erat in ea scilicet arca* [was in it, that is, the ark]. But Junius incorrectly notes that it can also be translated, & *erat in eo, scilicet tabernaculo* [and was in it, that is, the tabernacle]. For the affix of the feminine gender cannot be referred to ܠܚܘܒܐ, which is masculine. The Arab also took it thus. Since القبة,

tabernacle, is feminine, but تابوت, ark, is masculine, he subjoined the masculine affix: وكان فيه, & *fuit in ea, nempe arca* [and was in it, namely, the ark]. But how will this be consistent with the truth of the history, if it is stated that besides the tablets of the covenant, also the urn and the rod were in the ark?

Response: In the Old Testament and in the New Testament, ἐν does not always denote something that is inside another, but also what is annexed to and adheres to another. As in Genesis 1, verse 22, "Let fowl multiply *רָאָץ* in the earth," not inside, but upon. Colossians 3, verse 1, Christ is said to sit ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, that is, at the right hand of God, which in Mark 16 is called ἐκ δεξιῶν. In which way *in* is also used among the Latins, when someone is said to hang *in ligno* [on the wood], who hangs appended to the wood. So in this place. I say the three things which the Apostle mentions were *in arca* [in the ark], but in different ways. The tablets of the covenant alone were *in*, that is, inside the ark. But the urn of manna and the rod of Aaron were *in*, that is, *ad arcam* [at the ark], adhering to the ark, and annexed to it. Nor does Moses contradict this in Exodus 16:34, when he says that the *יָרֵךְ* [jar], the urn in which was an omer of manna, was placed *לפני הַעֲדוּת*, "before the testimony," that is, the ark of the testimony. Understand, it was placed at the front part of the ark, so that it was both before the ark, and yet as it were adhered to it.

Furthermore, as for the τὸ θυμιατήριον, which the Apostle places within the veil of the second tabernacle, Dr. Junius seems to err again, who thinks the altar of incense is understood by it, about which Exodus 30 speaks. For that was not inside but *לפני הַפְּרָכֶיךָ*, ἀπέναντι τοῦ καταπετάσματος, as the LXX translated, Exodus 30, verse 6, and it was not in the second, but in the first tabernacle, ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, where priests often burned incense. Nor indeed was that altar called θυμιατήριον by the ancients, but *θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος*, as in Hebrew *מִזְבֵּחַ קְטֹרֶת*, Chaldean *מִדְבַּח מְדֻבָּר*. But they used *θυμιατήριον* for the Hebrew *מִקְטָרֶת* in 2 Chronicles 26, verse 19 and Ezekiel 8:11, and it is said not of the altar, but of the instrument of incense which was held in the hands, in Latin *thuribulum* [censer], which is otherwise called *מִקְתָּה* by the Hebrews. In which way also in Ezekiel 8, verse 11, it was translated by the Chaldean as *מִקְטָרֶת*. The Syriac understood it thus, who translated τὸ θυμιατήριον as *ܘܘܫܘܬܐ ܕܘܫܘܬܐ* (Boderianus: *domus aromatum* [house of spices], Tremellius: *thuribulum* [censer]), and no differently the Arab *اناء الطيب*, *vas aromatis* [vessel of spice]. For *מִקְתָּה* they usually say *πυρεῖον*. Which in Apocalypse 8:3, 5 is called *λιβανωτός*, in Syriac *ܘܘܫܘܬܐ*, perhaps from the Greek *πυρεῖον*. But Moses makes no mention of such a censer being kept in the holy of holies. I confess. But yet in Leviticus 16:12, mention is made of a censer, with which Aaron, when he entered the holy of holies once a year, would make a solemn incense offering. The Apostle teaches in this place that this was a special censer, as it was golden, and kept in the holy of holies for that purpose.

VERS. 8. Τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν, ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνης ἐχούσης στάσιν. This verse is usually connected with the

preceding one, as if it contained the antitype of the former type, and thus by τῶν ἁγίων heaven would be understood, and by τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς the whole old Tabernacle. Perhaps it better still pertains to the type, so that the Apostle indicates that the Holy Spirit wished to indicate by the structure of the ancient sanctuary that the way τῶν ἁγίων to the holy places (namely, the holy of holies, just as ἅγια is taken below in verse 12) had not been revealed, that is, it had to remain closed, as long as the first tabernacle (in the sense in which it is taken in verse 2, and opposed to the second tabernacle in verse 3) persisted.

VERS. 16. ܫܒܚܒܒ ܫܘܫܘܦ ܫܘܫܘܦ ܫܘܫܘܦ ܫܘܫܘܦ ܫܘܫܘܦ. Boderianus: *Ubi enim est testamentum, mors ostenditur ejus qui condidit illud* [For where there is a testament, the death of him who made it is shown]. He intended ܫܘܫܘܦ to be Peal masculine gender, emphatic form, related to ܫܘܫܘܦ. But Syriac grammar demanded that it be said in the simple form ܫܘܫܘܦ. I do not doubt that it is a Benoni of the feminine gender, simple form, to be referred to ܫܘܫܘܦ. Therefore it was correctly translated by Tremellius, *Ubi enim est Testamentum, mortem ostendit ejus qui facit illud* [For where there is a Testament, it shows the death of him who makes it], or *fecit illud* [made it]. That is, where there is a Testament, there the Testament itself shows the death of him who made it. Thus the Arab: وحيث ما كانت وصية فهي تدل علي موت الذي أوصي بها, *Et ubi est Testamentum, illud ostendit de morte ejus qui testatus est illud* [And where there is a Testament, it shows concerning the death of him who testified it]. We declare not so much the thing, as the Syriac grammar, to which we think it also better suits, if it is read ܫܒܚܒܒ, than as it is written here ܫܘܫܘܦ. For ܫܘܫܘܦ is pleonastic, not demonstrative, just as in the following verse it is read ܫܘܫܘܦ ܫܘܫܘܦ.

VERS. 17. Ἐπεὶ μήποτε ἰσχύει, ὅτε ζῆ ὁ διαθέμενος. Greek copies do not have a question mark. Neither the Syriac nor the Arab observed it. They took μήποτε for a simple *non* [not]. The Vulgate, Erasmus, and Beza for *nondum* [not yet], which the Greeks say οὐπω or μηδέπω. It is not yet established whether μήποτε ever occurs with either meaning. It commonly means *ne, neforte* [lest, lest perhaps], which does not fit here. But sometimes it also interrogates, as in John 7, verse 26, μήποτε ἀληθῶς ἔγνωσαν οἱ ἄρχοντες, *an revera cognoverunt principes, hunc verè esse Christum?* [Have the rulers indeed truly recognized that this is the Christ?]. So also it could be translated here, *Quoniam an valet, quando vivit testator?* [Since does it have force when the testator is alive?], which question is equivalent to a negation, *non valet* [it does not have force].

CHAPTER X.

VERS. 5. *Sacrifice and offering you did not desire, but a body you prepared for me.* But in Psalm 40:7 it is אָזְנַיִם כָּרַיתָ לִי, *auris perfodisti mihi* [ears you have dug for me]. The sense fits perfectly. And truly there the Holy Spirit searched the depths of God. You, said David, did not want sacrifices of beasts, but you wanted me myself consecrated to you, as a better victim. Therefore *you pierced my ears*, that is, you made me your servant, just as formerly servants, by the piercing of their ears,

VERS. 26. Ἐκουσίως γὰρ ἀμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν, &c. *For if we sin voluntarily.* They sin ἔκουσίως who sin in the manner of the impious and unregenerate. For the regenerate man, although with respect to the flesh, by which he still serves the law of sin, also sins ἔκουσίως, yet with respect to his renewed mind, from which as from the better part he is named, he sins ἀκουσίως [unwillingly]. For he is able, with the Apostle in Romans 7, to say, "What I do, I do not know" (that is, I do not approve; in which sense God is said not to know the wicked, Matthew 7). "For I do not do what I want, but I do what I hate." "So now it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells within me. For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do." It is plainly otherwise with those who sin ἔκουσίως. The evil they perpetrate, they know, that is, they approve. For they do what they want, and they do what they do not hate. Therefore both they themselves, and the sin that is in them, perpetrate it. For they neither want nor do good; they both want and do evil. The Apostle says we must diligently beware lest this happen to us. For if we, we I say who are truly faithful, who have received the knowledge of the truth, by which we were sanctified and renewed, relapse to the point that in the manner of the unregenerate we neither do nor want good, but both want and do evil, and thus truly ἔκουσίως with full will we sin, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins. For the sacrifice of Christ, by which we were once renewed and regenerated, having been enervated and rendered void, either the same sacrifice would have to be repeated, or another one found, both of which are ἀδύνατον [impossible]. We have accepted the Apostle's meaning with the same opinion above in chap. 6, verse 4, which see. Wherefore we do not praise the Syriac, nor the Arab who follows him, who for *if we sin voluntarily*, have, *if anyone sins by his own will*. For it can happen that someone who has obtained the knowledge of the truth, yet not yet regenerated in will and affection, sins ἔκουσίως in the manner of the unregenerate, for whom, however, the sacrifice of Christ may afterwards at some time be profitable for the renewal of the will also, and for eternal salvation. The matter was different for the Apostle, and the others to whom he writes, whom he considered truly faithful and regenerated with himself, the Hebrews, whom he includes in the first person plural, saying, "If we sin voluntarily." All Greek codices without exception approve this reading. The sense is, if I, and you faithful Hebrews, fall away from our regeneration, and again enslaved to sin, we sin voluntarily and with a willing mind, every sacrifice of reconciliation is henceforth taken from us. Which sentence we believe to be most true.

VERS. 34. τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν &c. For they saw that they would make more profit than loss, when they lost everything for Christ's sake. On the contrary, they would incur more loss than profit, if they kept their goods but lost Christ. Rightly R. Judah HaNasi in Pirke Avot chap. 2: הפסד כנגד שכר עבירה כנגד הפסד הוא, *confer damnum praecepti divini cum emolumento ejus, & emolumentum transgressionis cum damno ejus* [compare the loss of a divine precept with its reward, and the reward of a transgression with its loss].

collectively. All exemplars agree on the plural reading, as well as on δι' αὐτῆς, which refers to faith, and not, as the Syriac wished, to the gift or sacrifice.

But how is he, though dead, still said to speak? First, by the example of his life, by which in Holy Scripture he perpetually teaches and admonishes the Church to imitate the constancy of his faith even unto death. Then, and especially, by his blood, whose voice not only cried to God from the earth while Cain was still alive, and was heard by him, Genesis 4, verse 10, but it also continues to cry even now. For which reason the Apostle does not say, *defunctus loquebatur* [the deceased was speaking], but *adhuc loquitur* [he still speaks]: so that the perpetual action of his blood, as if addressing God and demanding vengeance, may be indicated. For that murder has not yet been fully avenged. Whence Christ in Matthew 23:35 teaches that all the righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, would come upon the Jews themselves. This is because, imitating the example of Cain, they would slay the just servants of God with the same cruelty as he did Abel, and for the same reason: and thus, by approving Cain's deed, they would make themselves guilty of the blood of Abel, and for that reason make themselves partakers of the punishment still to be exacted for that blood. But why is it attributed to faith, that through it the deceased still speaks? This can be understood if we consider first that the faithful, since through faith they obtained to be just and dear to God, and to have God as their God, through the same they obtained to still live after death. For God is not the God of the dead but of the living. For which reason Christ testifies concerning Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all who died in faith, that all live to God, Luke 20, v. 37, 38. Therefore, just as Abel through faith still lives to God, so through faith he still speaks to God as his patron, guardian, and avenger, and he must be counted among the number of those souls of the slain for the word of God, who in Apocalypse 6:9-10 are said to cry from under the altar and demand vengeance for their blood.

Nor should anyone wonder that faith has its force and use even after death. For just as it is necessary for the heavens to receive Christ ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων, Acts 3:21, so the faith and hope of the deceased themselves await those times, nor until then were they saved otherwise than by hope. Whence that passage in 1 Peter 1, verse 13, τελείως ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. For faith and hope remain until τὸ τέλειον has come, 1 Corinthians 13, verses 10, 13, which is not present immediately after death, but will finally appear at the appearing of Christ. It must not be concealed, however, that when we translate ἔτι λαλεῖται as *adhuc loquitur* [he still speaks], it is taken as a middle verb, and put for λαλῶ. Which, however, we confess to be unusual, and not used in any other place of the N. Testament, nor perhaps by any approved author. For it is used passively everywhere; as λαληθεῖς for *dici, praedicari* [to be said, to be preached], Hebrews 2, verse 3. τὸ λαλούμενον *id quod dicitur & praedicatur* [that which is said and preached], Mark 5, verse 36; Luke 2:33; Acts 16, verse 14. And 17, verse 19; 1 Corinthians 14, verse 9. If it is taken in this sense here also, the

meaning will be, *per quam defunctus adhuc praedicatur* [through which the deceased is still preached]. Nor does it fit badly. Just as in Matthew 26, verse 13, it is said of that holy woman, "wherever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, λαληθήσεται καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν αὕτη [what this woman has done will also be told]": so the faith of Abel ἔτι λαλεῖται *adhuc dicitur* [is still spoken of]. Yet the Vulgate, Erasmus, Beza, the Syriac, and the Arab have followed the active meaning.

VERS. 7. Πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων, εὐλαβηθεὶς κατεσκεύασε κιβωτόν, &c. καὶ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος. If anyone should ask what those things are which Noah apprehended by faith in the construction of the ark, whence he also became an heir of the righteousness of faith, the Apostle Peter teaches this in 1 Epistle 3:20-21, where the Ark, which saved eight souls through water, is said to have signified Christ, who saves us through Baptism, by the power of his resurrection. It is pleasant here to relate how the Kabbalists themselves derive Jesus from the dimensions of the Ark. Noah's Ark is said to have been 300 cubits long, 50 cubits wide, and 30 cubits high, Genesis 6, verse 15. Here the Kabbalist first divides the length by the height, and they get ten, which correspond to the letter Jod. Then he adds to it the length itself, to which the letter Schin corresponds. Finally, he divides it by the width, and six emerges, which is noted by the letter Vau. Thus is elicited the name of the savior, Jesus. Schickard says these things in *Bechinath Happeruschim* p. 65.

VERS. 17. Καὶ τὸ μονογλῶττι σέφερεν. The Syriac, *مجمس حسا*, which Tremellius translates: *And his only-begotten he offered upon the altar*. The Syriac phrasing does not support this. Boderianus therefore has, *he exalted to the altar*. This is the same phrase as in Matthew 17, verse 1: *اهم انم حلم*, *he made them ascend the mountain*. So in this place, *And his only-begotten he made ascend the altar*, that is, *he placed upon the altar*. The Syriac wanted to explain what *μονογλή τοροσέφερειν* means here: not that he actually slew him, but that he placed him upon the altar as a victim. Thus also the Arabic: *واصعد الي المذبح*, *he made ascend the altar*.

VERS. 24. *By faith Moses, when he was grown up, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter.* &c. It is helpful here to refer to what Josephus recounts in *Antiquities*, book 2, chapter 5: *ὄντα δι' αὐτὸν τοιαῦτον, ἡ θερμεθις που δοποιεῖται, γονῆς γνησίας μεμοιραμένη. και πολε κομίσασα τ μωυσή πρὸς τὸ πατέρα, ἐπεδείκνυε τι τῶτον, καὶ ὡς Φροντίστε Διαδοχῆς, εἰ βελήσι θεῷ μὴ τύχοι παιδὸς γνησίως. πρὸς αὐτὸν τε ἔλεγχμ. αναθρε ψαμένη παῖδα μορφῇ τε θεῖον φρονήματι χωναῖον, θαυμασίως διε αὐτὸν και παρ' αὐτῆς ὁ λαβέσα χάριου, εμαυτῆς μεν ἡγησά μίω παῖδα ποιήσαοθζ, τῆς διε σῆς βασιλείας Διάδοχον. ταῦτα λέγε σα ταῖς τὸ πατρὸς χερσὶν ἀντίθησι τὸ βρέφθ. ὁ δὲ λαβὼν προσερνισάμμου, κ Φιλοφρόνησιν χάριν τῆς θυγατρος πιτίθηση αντιὸ τὸ Δλάδημα. καταφέρα δι' ὁ μωυσῆς εἰς τὴν γιῶ, τοιελό- μα αὐτὸ κ νηπιότητα δῆθεν, ἐπέβαινέ τε αὐτῷ τοῖς ποσί. ἐτῶν ἔδοξεν οἰωνὸν ἐπὶ τῇ βασιλεία Φέρον.* That is, according to the interpreter Gelenius, "since he was such, Thermuthis adopted this one as her son, since she otherwise lacked legitimate children. And having brought him to her father, she showed him, saying that she was thinking of a successor, even if God would not grant her to bear a legitimate son. This boy, she said, I have

raised, excellent not less in divine disposition than in beauty, whom the Nile itself can be seen to have delivered into my bosom. I have decided to adopt him as my son, and as a successor to you in the principate and empire. And with this said, she placed the infant into her father's hands. But he, after he had received him and pressed him to his chest, in order to gratify his daughter, gently placed his own diadem on his head. But Moses, having childishly pulled it from his head, allowed it to fall to the ground, and even trampled it with his feet, which was soon seen as an ominous sign, portending no good for the kingdom."

VERS. 24. *Refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter.* Not inept is that Talmudic saying: *הוי תנב לאריות ואל תהי ראש לשועלים*, "be the tail of lions rather than the head of foxes." As much as a lion, a generous and noble animal, differs from a fox, a vile and most abject animal, so much and more did the people of God (whom David calls magnificent, Psalm 16:3) differ from the Egyptians, who, like all wicked people, were *הלוות לְבַנֵי אֲדָמָה*, the vilest of men, Psalm 12, last verse. Rightly therefore did Moses prefer to be the tail of the Israelites, than the head of the Egyptians.

VERS. 25. *H* > *πρόσκαιρον ἔχῃν ἁμαρτίας Σπόλαυσιν.* Erasmus: *than to enjoy the temporary advantages of sin.* Beza: *than to retain the temporary fruition of sin.* That is, he says correctly in his Notes, pleasure. Wherefore the Vulgate laudably has, *than to have the temporary enjoyment of sin.* It seems he read *χαίρει*, which we have as *πρόσκαιρον*. Correctly, however, he rendered *Σπόλαυσιν* as enjoyment, for thus also Aristotle in book 1 of the *Ethics*, chapter 5, calls *Σπολαυσικέες* those who, devoted to pleasure, place their happiness in it. He distinguishes them from those who strive for riches, whom he calls *χρηματισίτες*. Hesychius: *δπολαύφ, του, he delights.* Wherefore the Syriac here: *هلا i asl=3 به حسينة*, *and not that for a little while he might delight himself in sin.* The Arabic: *ولا يتنعم زمنا يثيرا بما يوئمة*, *and not delight himself for a short time in that by which he would sin.*

VERS. 26. *Μείζονα πλετον ἡγησάμι ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ θη σαυρῶν τόνφδοισμὸν τε Χριτδ.* A great man understands by *όνδοισμὸν* an exprobration, and indeed that by which the gentiles reproached the Jews for the tardiness and delay of the Messiah's coming. This certainly cannot be taken in that sense below in chapter 13, verse 13: *Therefore let us go forth to him outside the camp, τόνφδοισμὸν αὐτὸ Φέροντις, bearing his reproach:* not, of course, the reproach of the delay of Christ's coming (for he had already come by then), but the reproach of the cross and sufferings of Christ. So I would also like it to be understood here. The Syriac *وبهيم ومحفل*, *the riches of the reproach of Christ.* The Arabic *واضمران الاستغناء بمثل العار الذي احتمله المسيح افضل من احتوا كنوز مصر*, *And he considered that to acquiesce in the likeness of the reproach which Christ suffered is better than to possess the treasures of Egypt.* *όνδοισμὸς* is the Hebrew *הַלְמָה* and *הַלְמָה*, which are thus translated by the Septuagint. For the Syrians, not only is it said, but also, which in the Targum is sometimes used for the Hebrew, more often for *עצב*, sorrow. Among the Rabbis and Talmudists, however, it is always used for sorrow. Therefore, the sorrows and sufferings of Christ, joined with reproach, are

signified. Since he already saw him bearing these in his federated people, he supported himself by faith, ἀπέβλεπε, as follows, εἰς τὴν μιθαρδοσίαν. For כל המצער עצמו עם הזכר, as is wont to be said by the Masters, *whoever afflicts himself with the Church is worthy also to see the consolation of the Church.*

CHAPTER XII.

VERS. 1. *Ογκαν Σποθέμμοι πάντα.* The Vulgate and Beza have translated *ὄγκον* as weight. Erasmus, burden. The Syriac, pondera. The Arabic, pondus, or onus. Suidas: $\tilde{\theta} = \rho\prime\beta\alpha\alpha\prime$ (**I'm aware this shit doesn't make sense, but I won't fix it**). Nor does it fit badly with the following metaphor, *ὑπομο νῆς τρέχωμω τ προκείμμον ἡμῶν ἀγῶνα.* For nothing obstructs a runner more than weight. I confess, however, that it more properly signifies a tumor, and here it is rightly taken for pride of spirit, as it is commonly among good authors. By this I do not understand that persuasion by which someone rashly believes he has already reached the goal, but that by which someone, attributing too much to himself, deems afflictions unworthy of himself. For nothing is so adverse *τῆ ὑπομονῆ* as pride. The Apostle in chapter 10, from verse 32 to the end, had exhorted them to endure afflictions bravely from then on, as they had begun, and to take care that they be not of *σολῆς, ἀλλὰ πίσεως.* To this end, he had brought forth a cloud of witnesses from the Old Testament throughout the eleventh chapter, who, pressed by great afflictions, had overcome them by faith. From which he gathered at the beginning of this chapter, that if anyone thinks so much of himself that he is unwilling to suffer with them and by their example, and *δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχον τ προκείμμον ἀγῶ να,* he truly reveals his own *ὄγκον,* his pride, which must be laid aside, so that the course may be rightly completed. It follows, *των υπεί- σατον ἀμαρτίαν.* Beza, *And the sin which is prone to encompass us.* Erasmus, *tenaciously inherent.* The Vulgate, *surrounding.* The Syriac, whom the Arabic follows, *س,* *the sin which at all times is ready for us.* This agrees with Hesychius, who translates *Λωεία- τον* as *κολον;* $\alpha_{\chi\epsilon\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\tilde{\epsilon}}$, easy, ready. This pleases me. For *πέιστασις* is circumstance, as of place, time, persons. Hence *πέισα τον,* easily surrounding. This is certainly preferable to that of Suidas, *σπείσατον, μωρον, ταχέως πειτρεπόμον,* foolish, which is quickly turned about.

CHAPTER XIII.

VERS. 1. *Τῆς Φιλοξενίας μὴ λανθάνεθε.* In the Jewish prayer book, *הכנסת אורחים,* to receive travelers into one's house, is listed among those things *פארם אוכל מפירותיהם בעולם הזה* *והקרן קיימת לו: לשלם הבא*, "of which a man eats the fruits in this world, but the principal remains for him in the world to come." And indeed, the traveler who was received with hospitality was bound to add to the fourth or last prayer, which the Jews are commanded to say while taking food, a vow of this sort for his host: *יהי רצון שלא יבוש בעל הבית בעולם הזה ולא נכלם לעולם הבא*, "May it be God's will that this householder not be ashamed in this world, nor be disgraced in the world to come." Maimonides in the tract, chapter 2.

VERS. 5. *Be δρέμμοι τοῖς παρᾶσιν,* content with present things. It seemed fitting to adorn this excellent admonition of the Apostle with the distinguished saying of the Emperor Ali: *إظهار العنّي من الشكر*, "the manifestation of *αὐταρκείας* is a species of thanksgiving." That is, he who is content with those things which God bestows,

and declares in words that he acquiesces in them, by that very act gives thanks to God.

VERS. 7. ὧν αναθεωρένεις τὴν ἔκβασιν ανατροφῆς. *Whose end of conversation you behold. By end you could understand manner. As we have more fully proposed in Psalm 68:21, where תִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ we translate, "to Jehovah the Lord belong the ways of death."*

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE CATHOLIC EPISTLE OF JAMES

CHAPTER I.

VERS. 5. *Who gives to all simply.* The Apostle said ἀπλῶς. Which Erasmus translates as *simply*. Beza, *benignly*. The Vulgate, most excellently, *abundantly*. It is known to the Syrians, as also to the Arabs, with changed to as is their custom, بسط means *he extended, he expanded*. Hence M=M=9, Arabic بسط, extended, expanded, as we have said on Hebrews 1:8. Then, because things that were wrapped up, if they are extended and expanded, become simple, it also signifies simple. Thus *A* فيلم is properly *extensively*; then, *simply. extensio, simplicitas*. The same is ἀπλότης in the Apostle, 2 Corinthians 8:2, where the churches of Macedonia are said in their poverty to have abounded εἰς τολῶτον τῆς ἀπλότης αὐτῶν. The Greek scholia rightly interpreted ἀπλότητα as δαψίλαν. The Arabic في غنا انبساطهم, in the riches of their extension, which in the same sense signifies that simple and outstretched extension of the soul, which is in the beneficent and liberal, from which also arises the extension and bestowal of wealth. As, on the contrary, in the avaricious man all things are contracted and confined. Wherefore the avaricious man is said ἐλπιεῖ, to hide himself from his own flesh. Isaiah 58, verse 7. κλείν τὴν καρδίαν John 3, verse 17. ἀπλότης is therefore that, so to speak, unfolding of the soul, by which we give not only our possessions but also our soul to our neighbor.

And I do not doubt that this is what is meant in Matthew 6, verse 22 by ὀφθαλμὸς ἀπλῆς, namely a benign and beneficent mind. As on the contrary, ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς is an avaricious and envious mind. This is clearly established from the preceding verses of the same passage, where the Savior attacked avarice. The Hebrews call a beneficent mind יָד, a good eye; but an avaricious one, an evil eye. Therefore, ἀπλῆς is not only simple, but also beneficent, who extends his soul in beneficence. Pollux was not ignorant of this, who in book 5, chapter 21, says, *exposed in the middle*, καζάτκά, most ready, ἐλύθερο, free, noble, liberal. And in chapter 50, he takes ἀτολῶσαι τὸ σῶμα, ἐκλείναι τὸ σῶμα, τοειλεῖναι τὰ χῶλα for the same things. The old Greek Lexicon: ἀπλέμαι, I am spread out. ἀπλῶ, I make simple, I spread out. ἀπλωσον, expand. I add Chrysostom, homily 6 to the people of Antioch, where he says that mothers τὸς κόλπος ἀπλώστη to their weeping children. Therefore, this word among the Greeks is precisely the same as among the Hebrews. Wherefore the Vulgate also rightly translates ἀπλῶς as *abundantly*, properly *expansively*. The

Arabic also excellently: من سعة, from amplitude, or from dilatation, that is, most amply. He could have translated it بسطة, *extensively*, as in the Alcoran, Surah Baqarah: وَتَرَادَ بِسَطَةٍ فِي الْعِلْمِ وَالْجِسْمِ, "God increased (Saul) extensively in knowledge and body." Otherwise, بسطة is *simply*.

It follows in the same verse, *καμὴ ἀναδίζονα*, and who does not reproach. The Apostle shows the difference between God giving, and man. This the Hebrews also express excellently, when in the book מעשרות, in the prayer of the sixth day, they pray thus: ואל תצריכני לירי מתנת בשר ודם מפני שמתנתם מעוטה וחרפתם מרובה אלא לידך המלאה והרחבה, "and make me not to need the gifts of flesh and blood, whose gifts are few, but their reproach is manifold: but to your hand that is full and broad." From which it is also clear, when God is said to give to all ἀπλως, that in Hebrew this is said רחבה, with a broad hand, that is, not contracted, but dilated and expanded.

VERS. 14, 15. *But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away by his own lust, ἐξελκόμῃθ και δελεαζόμῃθ, and enticed.* The metaphor is taken from a harlot, who draws away an imprudent youth from his parents or from the right path, and allures him to herself as with bait. Then from her congress she conceives and gives birth. The harlot is concupiscence, which draws man, truly foolish and stupid, away from God and his holy law, and sweetly entices him to herself. This happens with the first stimulation to sin; then follows the consent of the will, which, since it is like a certain congress of the will with concupiscence, concupiscence is there impregnated, and the conception of sin takes place. Lastly is the birth of the same, when it is brought forth into act and, as it were, into the light. Then, however, sin is completed: so that to me, ἁμαρτία Σποτελεθεισα here is the same as τεχθεισα. Therefore, three stages of actual sin are described, flowing from concupiscence or original sin: the enticement to congress, from congress the conception, after conception the birth. Death proceeds by equal stages. But the Apostle expressed only the third, because there at last death appears evident and, as it were, sensible. By no means, therefore, should it be denied that death also pertains to the first two stages of sin. On the contrary, if the third stage, namely sin brought to birth, brings forth and gives birth to death from the womb, it is necessary that it was conceived in the second stage, and enticed in the first. From which it follows that concupiscence, which is the root of actual sin, is also the root of death.

VERS. 18. *That we should be a kind of firstfruits αὐτῷ κλισμά- των of his creatures.* That creatures, by a very common usage of the Hebrews, denote men specifically, learned men have long since proved with many examples. And the same usage obtains among the Arabs, for whom *creature* collectively means men, as in the Saracen history: وقتل منهم خلف كثير, *and a great creature was slain from among them*, that is, many men were slain. And in the sentences of Ali, the letter دليرُ الخلقِ عزيزٌ عندَ الله, *Contempt of the creature* (i.e., he who is despised among men) *is in honor with God.*

VERS. 19. *Βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλήσῃ.* Shammai rightly says in chapter 1 of Aboth: אמור מעט, "say little, do much." For as Rabbi Akiba says in chapter 3, סית לחכמה שתיקה, "a fence for wisdom is silence." *Βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν.* It is the admonition of Rabbi Eliezer in chapter 2 of Aboth, אל תהי נוה לבעוס, "be not easy to anger." Observe the Hebraism.

VERS. 23. *Οπεῖτις ἀκροατῆς λόγkεί, και ποιητῆς* Ⲭc. Simeon the son of Gamaliel in chapter 1 of Aboth rightly says, לא המורש: הוא העקר אל א המעשה, "study (or inquiry) is not the principal thing, but the work."

VERS. 25. *πρακύμας εἰς νόμον τέλφον τῆς ἐλάθε ρίας, και τοδαμείνας.* This seems to be what Shammai meant in chapter 1 of Aboth when he said עשה תורתך קבע, "make your law a fixed thing." That is, after you have taken hold of the law of God as your own, take care not to waver in it, but make your mind fixed in it. Furthermore, it is called the law of liberty, *δελάθερίας*, because only then is a man free, when he undertakes the yoke of the divine law. And he willingly obeys God who commands in the law. For although the principal efficient cause of our liberty is the Son, John 8, verse 36, and the Spirit of Christ, 2 Corinthians 3:17, yet because liberty consists in this, that being freed from the yoke of men and of sin, we serve God according to the law, which Paul urges with many arguments in Romans 6, the law is rightly called the law of liberty. To this pertain what Rabbi Nehunia says in book 3 of Aboth: כל המקבל שום תורה עליו מעבירין ממנו עול מלמת ושל ודרך ארץ וכל, "Whoever takes upon himself the yoke of the law, from him is removed the yoke of the kingdom (that is, tyranny has no power over him) and the yoke of the way of the earth (that is, sins and earthly desires no longer rule him). On the contrary, whoever breaks from himself the yoke of the law, upon him are both those yokes imposed." For what the Scholiast understands by the yoke of the kingdom, *מסין ואתתיות*, tributes and taxes, and by the yoke of the way of the earth, *עמל הפרנסה*, the labor and trouble of acquiring a living, is to me too diluted.

CHAPTER II.

VERS. 4. *Και ἐγένεσθε κριταὶ Δαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν.* The Syriac, ܟܪܝܬܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܠܘܬܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܠܘܬܐܝܢ. Tremellius & Boderianus: *and you have become interpreters of evil thoughts.* Among the Hebrews, *הַמְפָרֵשׁ* is to interpret; *מְפָרֵשׁ*, interpretation; *הַמְפָרֵשׁ*, interpreter. I strongly doubt whether it is the same among the Syrians. Among them, it is called. But is to separate, to discern, to distinguish, to judge. Hence 1 Corinthians 12, verse 10, *Διακρίσης πνδουμάτων* is *قزرة مة*, but *ἐρωμαεία γλωσσῶν* is *ܝܟܬܐ*. Thus Acts 17, verse 11, *ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφὰς, εἰ ἔχῃ ταῦτα ὕτως*, the Syriac translates *ܟܪܝܬܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܠܘܬܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܠܘܬܐܝܢ*, "when they discerned, or distinguished from the Scriptures, whether these things were so." So also in this place I translate, *and you have become distinguishers of evil thoughts.* For the issue here is not about interpreting evil thoughts in this or that way, but about the distinction which they made with evil thoughts between the rich and the poor. The Apostle said, *ἐγλύεθε χεῖπ4 Δαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν*, where the genitive *Δαλογισμῶν* does not denote the object around which the *κρίσις* is

concerned, but designates an attribute of the *κριτῶν*, namely that they discern and judge between the rich and the poor with evil thoughts. This the Arabic has rightly expressed: *judicialis* و قضيتم بالنيات الحنيئة, "and you have judged by evil opinions," namely by honoring the more wicked, and contemning those better and more excellent before God. Rabbi Joshua son of Perachiah rightly admonishes in chapter 1: וידן את האדם לכף זכות, "judge every man with the balance of justice," that is, according to the merits of each, not according to external appearance.

VERS. 5. *Οὐχ ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο τὸς πλωχὸς κόσμος τότε, πλεσίας ἐν πίσ, κή κληρονόμος βασιλείας* Ὡc. There is only an ellipsis of the substantive verb, for *ἐξελέξατο εἶναι πλεσίες*. In which manner the Apostle said in Ephesians 1, verse 4: *καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους*. Such phrases are: John 12, verse 46, *Εγὼ φῶς (for εἶναι φῶς) ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον*. 2 Corinthians 3:6, *Ὁς κλικάϊωσεν ἡμᾶς Διακόνες τῆς Διαθήκης, for εἶναι 2 ἀνόνες*.

VERS. 8. *Νόμον βασιλικόν*. The royal law. Some wish it to be so called by a certain proverbial locution, as we speak of a royal road, which has no detours: because the law is open to all without any acceptance of persons, nor does it flatter anyone. Others wish it to be for *νόμον βασιλέως*, the law of the king, namely of God. Hence the Syriac simply translates it as, the law of God. Nor is this to be entirely spurned. For God is often called *βασιλῶς* absolutely. See Isaiah 6:5; Jeremiah 51:46. And it is the same as בגדלך, ὀμέγας βασιλῶς, Psalm 48:3; Matthew 5:35. Nor is that notion inept in this place. For by it he urges them, not to compel the law to serve their own affections through *ωσωποληψίαν*, and so be *κριταὶ τῶ νόμῳ* rather than *ποιητας*, a crime of which he will accuse them below in chapter 4, verse 11. But they should know that the law is the law of the great king, which acknowledges no masters besides that King. I would prefer, however, that the Law be so called because it contains something regal in itself, and prescribes and commands with royal authority, which men are bound to obey, not command.

Thus the Hebrews speak of the Law, to which they attribute a crown. For so it is in Pirke Aboth chapter 4: שלושה כתרין הם כתר תורה וכתר כהונה וכתר מלכות: "Three Simeon says are the crowns: of the Law, of the Priesthood, and of the Kingdom." Indeed, they also say that when the Law was being given on Mount Sinai or Horeb, a crown was placed on the heads of all the Israelites. And from this it is that in Exodus 32, verse 25, where, after the golden calf was made, it is said that Moses saw the people כי פָּרַע הוּא גַי פְּרִשָׁה אֶתְרוֹן, "that they were naked, for Aaron had made them naked," Jonathan interprets this as, "They were stripped of the holy crown, which they had worn on their heads, and on which the great and glorious name was sculpted and expressed," and indeed from Mount Horeb, as the Targum of Jerusalem says, with which Jonathan on Exodus 33:4 agrees.

VERS. 10. *Ὅς ἐν ἐνὶ πλαίσι, πάντων ἔνοχο ἐσί.* Not much different from this is that saying of Ali: *ذَنْبٌ وَاحِدٌ كَثِيرٌ وَيَكْفُرُ وَأَلْفٌ طَاعَةٌ قَلِيلٌ*, "a single transgression is much, but a thousand acts of obedience in the worship of God is little."

VERS. 22. *Βλέπὸς ὅτι ἡ πίστις συνήργα τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτό;* *You see that faith was working with his works?* From this the Pontificians infer, if the faith of Abraham worked with his works, it also justified with his works. But we deny the consequence. First, because not every operation of faith is Justification. For in Acts 15:9, the operation of faith is also said to be the purification of the heart, which is sanctification, not justification. Secondly, when the faith of Abraham is said to have co-operated with his works, the sense is not that the faith of Abraham was aided by his works to justify him. For the Apostle deduces this thesis from what he had said in the preceding verse, that Abraham offered his son upon the altar. His faith co-operated with this work. Was it so that through that work itself he might be justified from the guilt of his sins?

But in the following verse, the Apostle brings forth from Genesis 15, verse 6, that "Abraham believed God and it was imputed to him for righteousness." Since this imputation for righteousness was made more than twenty years before Isaac was offered, indeed long before he was born, the faith of Abraham could not have been aided there by that work, which followed long after. Add to this that from that very same passage Paul draws the argument that Abraham was justified by faith without works. When, therefore, in verse 21, James asserts that Abraham was justified by works when he offered Isaac, he is not dealing with the same justification about which he speaks later in verse 23, since the latter preceded the former by many years. Therefore, the Apostle distinguishes them in this way, that by the fact that Abraham was justified by the works of the offering of Isaac, it was fulfilled, he says, that is, it was then clearly established that he had truly been justified by faith beforehand. Why so? Because when Abraham in Genesis 22, out of filial fear of God and ready obedience, offered his only-begotten son, that faith by which he had believed the divine promise, that in his seed all the nations would be blessed, and which had been imputed to him for righteousness, co-operated with that work, or with those works, namely the offering of his son, and the fear of God and obedience, from which the offering flowed. For since he had believed with certain faith that a seed was to be given to him, and indeed one who would be his heir, Genesis 15, verse 4, and in whom all nations were to be blessed, Genesis 12, verse 3, that faith produced a filial fear, by which he was afraid to refuse the command of God to slay Isaac, and it incited him to prompt obedience, rendering him certainly persuaded that God would not, however, fail in His promise, because He was able to raise him even from the dead, Hebrews 11, verse 19. Therefore, it should be observed that James does not say that the works of Abraham co-operated with his faith, but that faith co-operated with his works. For the works had their existence from his faith, and their action, and their justification. Namely, that faith, by which alone without works he was justified from the guilt of his sins, so that as a sinner in himself he

was not considered a sinner, sanctified his heart for good works, and caused him to be justified by them from the false accusation of hypocrisy and of a mercenary disposition. We have dealt more fully with these types of justification in our notes on Romans 8, verse 4.

VERS. 22. *Καλέξ ἔργων ἢ πίσις ἐτελφώθη, And by works faith was made perfect.* Therefore, the Pontificians exclaim, Faith has its perfection from works, and charity, which holds the first place among good works, is the form of faith, giving it its perfection. This is just as if one were to infer thus: Aristotle, in Nicomachean Ethics, book 10, chapter 4, says, *πλοῖ (observe the same word the Apostle used here) τῶ ἐνέργῳ ἢ ἡδονῇ*, "pleasure perfects the act"; Therefore, the act holds its formal perfection from pleasure. Aristotle denies the consequence, because a thing is said to perfect another in various ways. For he adds, *ἐτ αὐτὸν διε τρόπον ἢτε ἡδονῇ τελοῖ καὶ τὸ αἰθητέν τε αἰθησις, πεδαῖα ὄντα*, "pleasure does not perfect in the same way as the object of sense and sense itself do, when they are good." Then, *τελοῖ τῶ ἐνέργῳ ἢ ἡδονῇ, ἐχ' ὡς ἔξις ἐνυπάρχεσα, ἀλλ' ὡς ὑπιγινώ μμόν τι τέλοθ, οἶον τοῖς ἀκμαίοις ἢ ὄρα*. "Pleasure perfects the act, not as an inherent habit, but as a certain end which supervenes: just as beauty does for those who are in the bloom of age." Beauty certainly perfects the bloom of age, but not as the internal vigor of the body, which perfects it efficiently and formally, but as a concomitant accident, arising from the bloom of age itself, and adorning it. Thus, in the act of sensation, the object which moves the sense, and the sense or the faculty and habit of sensing which effects the sensation, bestow formal perfection on that act. But the concomitant pleasure is an appendix of perfection, increasing and terminating the perfection of the act by its accession. In nearly the same way, in the act of faith, the righteousness of Christ, which, offered in the Gospel, moves and elicits faith as its object, and then the habit of faith itself, engendered in the heart by the Holy Spirit, formally perfect the act. Good works perfect the same act, *ὡς τέλοθ πιγινόμμον*, as concomitant appendices and ornaments of faith. And just as pleasure perfects action in such a way that it presupposes the internal perfection of the action and follows it, so also do good works perfect faith in such a way that they presuppose its internal perfection and follow it. Insofar, therefore, as good works manifest the life of faith, and its strength, efficacy, and sincerity, and thus illustrate and adorn it, they are rightly called the perfection of faith.

VERS. 23. *Καὶ φίλο θεῖ ἐκλήθη.* This cognomen of Abraham does not appear in Moses. But it does appear in Isaiah 41:8, where Israel is called by God, *מִן־בְּרִיתִי עַד־יְהוָה*, "the seed of Abraham my friend." There is no doubt, however, that the Apostle expressed this cognomen especially because Abraham was very well known by it throughout the entire Orient. For even today among the Mahometans, he is named by a certain special privilege *الله*, "the friend of God." And when they say absolutely, "The friend of God did this," no other is understood than Abraham, and simply *الخليل* with the name of God omitted.

VERS. 24. *You see therefore, that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only?* This passage is easily reconciled with those things which Paul seems to argue to the contrary everywhere, if we establish, which is most true, that the Apostle James is not dealing here with one single justification, which is accomplished partly by faith, partly by works, but with two distinct ones, of which the former is from faith, and from faith only, the latter is from works. For since a twofold accusation is brought against the faithful, one from God, the law, and conscience, by which they are held guilty of many sins; the other from the Devil and the wicked, by whom they are falsely accused of hypocrisy, a mercenary spirit, impiety, and heinous crimes, a twofold justification is required: one by which, though truly sinners in themselves, they are absolved freely for Christ's sake from the guilt of their sins, which justification is by faith alone without works. The other, by which, as truly sanctified and regenerated, they are absolved from those false accusations of the Devil and the wicked, which justification is sought from works. James urges that both must be joined, and therefore that man is not justified by faith only, but also by works. That is, it is not sufficient that he be justified by faith from the sins he has committed, but it is further required that he be justified also by works from the sins of which he is falsely accused, and from which he is immune through regeneration.

CHAPTER III.

VERS. 1. *Μη πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεθε.* To this pertains that saying of R. Shemaiah in Aboth chapter 1: אהוב את המלאכה ושנא את הרבנות, "Love work, but hate the mastership." Nor perhaps is that saying of Joshua son of Perachiah in the same place foreign to it: עשה לך רב וקנה חברו, "make for yourself a master, and acquire for yourself a companion." That is, do not make yourself a master, but have a master, and rather have companions who are your equals, than disciples over whom you preside.

VERS. 13. *Τις σοφος επισήμων ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται.* Here the saying of R. Hanina son of Dosa is to be praised: כל שיראת חטאו קודמת לחכמתו מתקיימת וכל שחכמתו קודמת ליראת חטאו אין חכמתו: מתקיימת, "Whosoever's piety precedes his wisdom, his wisdom is stable. But whosoever's wisdom precedes his piety, his wisdom is not stable." Nor is what he adds inept: כל שמעשיו מרובין מחכמתו חכמתו מחכמתו וכל שחכמתו מרובה ממעשיו אין: חכמתו מתקיימת, "whosoever's works are more numerous than his wisdom, his wisdom is stable; but whosoever's wisdom is more copious than his works, his wisdom is not stable." But especially excellent is what is said there by R. Eleazar: כל שחכמתו מרובה ממעשיו למה הוא רומח לאילן שענפיו מרובים ושרשיו מועטים והרוח באה ושוקרתו והופכתו על פניו שנאמר והיה כערער מערבה ולא יראה כי יבוא טוב ושכן חררים במדבר ארץ מלחה ולא תשב אבל כל שמעשיו מרובין מחכמתו למה הוא דומה לאילן שענפיו מועטין ושרשיו מרובין שאפילו כל הרוחות שבעולם באות ונושבות בו אין מזיזות אותו ממקומו שנאמר והיה כעץ שתול על מים ועל ווגל ישלח שרשיו ולא יראה: "He who has more wisdom than works, to what is he like? To a tree having many branches, but few roots, which a rushing wind easily uproots and overturns. According to the saying, Jeremiah 17:6, 'He will be like a tamarisk in the desert, and will not

see when good comes, and will inhabit dry places in the wilderness, a salt and uninhabitable land.' But he who has more works than wisdom, to what is he like? To a tree having few branches, but very many roots, which all the winds of the world with their blowing cannot move from its place. According to the saying, Jeremiah 17:7, 'He will be like a tree, etc.'"

CHAPTER IV.

VERS. 6. *Ο'θεός ὑπερηφανοὺς ἀντιοσε), ταπνοῦς διε δε δώσει χάριν.* The passage is from Proverbs 3, verse 34, from the version of the Septuagint interpreters. In the Hebrew it is: אַמ־לְלִצִּים הוּא לִי וְלִצְנָוִים קָרַן מִן, where the first member properly sounds, "Surely he scorns the scorners." But the sense is, those proud scorners, who not only do not subject themselves to God, but also insolently spurn his admonitions and judgments, are in turn scorned by God. If you wish to express this metaphor with a proper word, you could not use a more fitting one than that God resists them. Therefore, the Interpreters have expressed the sense well. And that the scorners here are noted especially on account of their pride, they have seen very well, because they are opposed to לעניי, which according to the Masoretes should be read as *humilibus*.

VERS. 14. *What is your life? Is it not a vapor that appears for a little while.* Boderianus translates as *and is cast down*. Better is Tremellius: *and vanishes*. See the notes on 2 Corinthians 1, verse 8. Tremellius translates as, *and is drawn apart*. Boderianus, not badly, *and vanishes*. For it is the same as the former, as the Syriac-Arabic Lexicon attests, where it is explained by "it failed" and "it vanished." In Arabic by فني نفد وانقرض, "it failed, it was consumed, and it was cut off." Ferrarius similarly, "it failed, it vanished, it was consumed, it was destroyed, it perished."

CHAPTER V.

VERS 3. אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ לְהַחֲרִיב אֶת-כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב. Tremellius: *and your gold and your silver is corrupted, and the corruption of them is for a Testimony against you*. They have followed a Hebraism, where תִּשָּׁחַד is "he has corrupted." But by A. Ferrarius it is translated *aruginavit*, has rusted. *arugo, rubigo, rust*. Thus the Syriac-Arabic Lexicon explains it by مدي من الصدا, has rusted, from rust. Therefore it should be translated, *And your gold and your silver has contracted rust for itself, and the rust of them etc.*, just as the Apostle said *καλίσταται, κι ὁ ἴδς αὐτιῶν* &c. The Arabic صريا وصداها are the same things which we have produced from the Syriac-Arabic Lexicon.

VERS. 5. *For you have indulged in delicacies upon the earth.* الخضم Tremellius & Boderianus in the Paris edition: *and you have mocked*. In the Royal edition: *and you have made mocking gestures*. They have followed a Hebraism, where it is to mock. So also Ferrarius, *he mocked, he despised, he derided*. I doubt if this is correct. He cites two places, the first of which is Isaiah 57, verse 4: where however it signifies not so much to mock, as to delight oneself and take pleasure. For it is put for the Hebrew. The other is this passage of James, where it is put for *ἐπαπαλήσατε*, you

Mishnah: "המתפלל ושעה סימן רע לו אם שליח צבור הוא סימן רע לשולחויו מפני ששלוחו: של אדם כמות", "If someone prays forgetfully, this is a bad omen for him. But if he is the legate of the Church, it is a bad omen for those by whom he was sent. For he who is sent by someone is like the sender himself."

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER

CHAPTER I. VERS. XIV.

And do not associate yourselves again with the former lusts, which you lusted after ^{مولا ٢٥} Tremellius & Boderianus: *without knowledge*. They have neglected the preposition. For *without knowledge* would be said. I would therefore prefer to translate: *when you were not in knowledge*, that is, when you were in ignorance. Or, *because you were not in knowledge*, understand, *eratis*. The Apostle said, *μη συσχηματιζόμενοι πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὅμῶν ὀπιθυμίας*. The Arabic: *and do not lust, as you lusted first in ignorance*.

VERS: 23. *حميها سها ولما*. Tremellius: *By the living word of God, which remains forever*. Boderianus: *which stands forever*. That word can be either masculine in the Emphatic form, or Feminine in the simple form. In the former way it refers to, in the latter to N^{>∞}. Those great men took it in the former way, but, I think, wrongly. For it is an adjective including the substantive verb *is*, of which kind are never expressed among the Syrians in the Emphatic form, but in the simple. Therefore it should be translated, *by the living word of God, which is stable forever*. For of God it should have been said, as of the word it was necessary to say *ܕܘܡܢܐ* not, *ܕܘܡܢܐ*, and *ܕܘܡܢܐ* not, *ܕܘܡܢܐ*, as is most manifest from the following verse.

CHAPTER II.

VERS. 8. *They stumble at it, because they do not obey the word*. Tremellius: *because for this they were appointed*. Boderianus in the interlinear version: *who for this were appointed*. In the Royal editions, *to which (namely the word) they were appointed*. You could simply translate, *to which they were appointed*, as the Apostle said, *εἰς δετίθησαν*. *is* indeed simply *this*. But with preceding it is *that, to which*. Just as *o* is said for *who* and *و* for *which*.

VERS. 9. *Λαὸς εἰς πειποίησιν*. It is a Hebraism, *עם לקיגלה*, where *ל* has the force of the Genitive, as in *קנימור לקיגלה*, a Psalm of David. So in this place, *a people of acquisition*, as the Vulgate rightly translated, that is from the Hebraism, *acquired*. The Syriac well: *catus redemptus*, a redeemed people. As also the Arabic *شعب مقتني*, an acquired people. *ὅπως τὰς Ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε*, *that you may announce the virtues*. The Syriac: *his praises*, correctly. For so also the LXX in Isaiah 42, verse 12 for *וְהִתְהַלְלוּ בְּאֵימֵי יְיָ*, *they will announce his praise among the nations*, have, *τὰς δρετὰς αὐτὸ ἐν νήσοις ἀπαγγε λέσι*. So

chapter 43, verse 21 for *תְּהִי וְסַפְרוּ* is *τὰς δρετάς με δι γήσονται*; chapter 63:7, *תְּהִי וְתִלְוִת* is *τὰς δρετάς Κυρία*.

CHAPTER III.

VERS. 1. *You wives, likewise, be submissive to your husbands, so that those who do not obey the word, you may, through your good behavior, without labor* جتته انه, which Tremellius & Boderianus in the Royal editions simply translated *you may acquire*, neglecting the pronoun. But in the interlinear version, he changed it into the masculine, against the authority of the Syriac codices, and translated *you may acquire them*. I translate, *you may acquire it*. That is, since they are unwilling to obey the word of God preached by men, take pains that you yourselves by your behavior may acquire them. I add that it is not correctly read in the Vienna & Cöthen editions, but correctly in the Royal & Plantin editions. For the affix refers to the women.

VERS. 3. المحامى *Do not adorn yourselves*. I warn in my Grammar, p. 231, that there is an error here, and one should read either in the future or in the Imperative, which occurs in the following verse. The illustrious Edward Pococke informed me by letter that in the manuscript of the Bodleian Library it is read اولم, and that where in the printed editions of Acts 9, verse 39 it reads, in the manuscript it is read without a vowel. Concerning which, see Grammar p. 201. And that where in Acts 22, verse 11 it is *المصحة*, in the manuscript it is read, about which see Grammar p. 369. It follows in this verse of Peter: Boderianus, *or by additions of gold*. Tremellius, *or by contrivance of gold*. I do not deny that the verb signifies to contrive and to plot, but for evil, as in Psalm 83, verse 3: *in their cunning they have devised a secret*. See also Psalm 41, verse 7, which place Ferrarius cites to prove this meaning. But he adds that it also signifies, *he encrusted with gold, or silver, he cast*: plural NSm, goldsmithing, an ornament cast from gold or silver, a golden or silver incrustation. سعة, a goldsmith, a silversmith. Thus the Syriac-Arabic Lexicon says that it signifies, that is properly *he melts gold or silver, he casts*. (for so he writes what is read here *بيفكة*) he translates الحلي, ornament, المصاع, what is cast from gold or silver. صياغة في النفس, a casting proper. Therefore I translate Peter's words, *or of incrustations of gold, or of ornaments encrusted with gold or cast from gold*. And *καὶ πειθέσεως χρυσίων* said Peter.

VERS. 7. Ως ἀθηνεσέρω σκύλ τῶ γυναικίω Σπονέμοντες τιμώ. It is from a customary Hebrew formula, that he wants honor to be given by husbands to their wives. For so it is read in the Talmud, Bava Metzia fol. 59.1. לעולם יהא אדם זוהר בכבוד אשתו שאין ברכה מצויה בתוך ביתו של אדם אלא בשביל אשתו שנאמר ולאברהם היטיב בעבורה והיינו דאמר להו רבא לבני מחווא אוקירו "Let a man always be careful about the honor of his wife. For blessing is not found in a man's house, except on account of his wife. For it is said (Genesis 12, verse 16), 'And he did well to Abraham on her account.' This is what Rabba said to the men of his city, 'Honor your wives, so that you may become rich.'" Thus in the marriage contract, the groom is accustomed to insert these words: "הוא לי לאנתו ואנא אפליה ואוקיר ואוון ואפתנס יתוכי: "Be my wife, and I will cherish,

and honor, and feed, and govern you." *I will honor you*, that is, I will care for you solicitously, I will love you, I will defend your honor, etc.

VERS. 17. *If that is the will of God*. I think one should read, with a point written below, not *oi*, for that does not usually change the preceding vowel into, but *o* does when it is a substantive verb, or when it is pleonastic. In the Royal edition it is written, which can be read. And it will be a demonstrative pronoun, in this manner: *if that will of God is so, est* is understood. Let it also be observed, for *videlicet*, or *modò*, which otherwise is wont to mean *ergo, igitur*.

VERS. 21. ܘܘܫܘܚܘܢܐ ܘܘܨܘܒܘܢܐ ܘܘܨܘܒܘܢܐ ܘܘܨܘܒܘܢܐ. Boderianus: *But giving thanks to God with a pure conscience*. A distinction must be made between followed by, and the same followed by S. Followed by it signifies to profess or confess a thing or person, that is, to make a profession or confession of it. As in Mark 1, verse 5, *confessing their sins*. But followed by it is to give thanks, as in Luke 17, verse 16: *He fell on his face at the feet of Jesus, giving him thanks*. Hellenism elsewhere imitates this Syriacism. For *ὁμολογῶ ἐν σοι* is one thing, and *ὁμολογῶ σοι* is another. The former is *I confess you*, the latter *I give thanks to you*. As in Matthew 10, verse 32, there is one phrase, *πᾶς ὅτις ὁμολογήσῃ ἐνέμοι, ὁμολογήσω κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ*. In Syriac, *حلف حافظا*. Another is in Matthew 11, verse 25, *ὁμολογῶ σοι πάτερ* *مها اب*. Better therefore Tremellius, *but confessing God in a pure conscience*. The Arabic, *لكننا نستعمل النية الصالحة والاعتراف بالله*, *but we exhibit a good conscience and a confession of God*. See, however, concerning this Syriac interpretation, the notes of Beza, where he rightly praises it.

CHAPTER IV.

ܘܘܨܘܒܘܢܐ ܘܘܨܘܒܘܢܐ ܘܘܨܘܒܘܢܐ ܘܘܨܘܒܘܢܐ. Tremellius & Boderianus: *Each one of you, the gift which he has received from God, let him minister to his neighbors, or let him minister to his fellows*. They have not observed the Syriac phrase, nor the which is in *ܘܘܨܘܒܘܢܐ*. If you translate word for word: *and each of you, the gift which he has received from God, let him minister with it to his neighbors. Let him minister the gift with it*, that is, *let him minister with the gift*. A phrase most used by the Hebrews and Syrians: *לֵאמֹן אֲנִי* for *אֲנִי*.

VERS. 19. *Therefore let those who suffer according to the will of God, ὡς πιστῷ κλίση ωραϊθέτωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς ἑαυτῶν*. The Vulgate, *commend their souls to a faithful creator*. It has neglected *ὡς*, serving the Imperative. Which our Old Belgic version has also followed, as has the Arabic Interpreter, and a certain learned man proved in his letters to me. I would approve it too, if a subjunctive followed, just as *ἵνα* sometimes has the force of commanding; for example, Ephesians 5:33, *ἵνα φοβῆται ἁλδεα*, "but let the wife fear her husband." See also Mark 5, verse 23. So also *ὅπως* in the *Cyclops* of Euripides, where Ulysses says to Silenus, *ἀλλ' ὅπως ἀνὴς ἔσμι*, "but be a man." See also Theocritus, Idyll 1. In which expressions *ἵνα* and *ὅπως* joined with subjunctives properly mean *that*, but they have the force of commanding, due to the ellipsis of another Imperative: for the sense is, *but let the woman see that she fears her husband, but see that you are a man*; that is simply, *let her*

fear her husband, be a man. So in this place, *Let those who suffer according to the will of God, see that they commend their souls to a faithful creator*, that is simply, *let them commend.* But, as I said, *ὡς* ought then to be constructed with a subjunctive, but *ῥωδαλιθέτωσαν* is an Imperative. Therefore I praise Beza who translated, *as to a faithful creator let them commend.* But because this has a certain harshness and obscurity, the Syriac Interpreter brought a remedy by the supplement of the pronoun *ei*: *To Him as to a faithful creator let them commend their souls.* Which the Genevans have also followed. The full construction would be, *οἱ πάχοντες κῆ τὸ θέλημα ζῆτες, τις ὡς πιστῶ κλίση θέτωσαν* &c. A similar ellipsis of the pronoun *αὐτὸς* is in Hebrews 9:19, *λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς νόμον ὑπὸ Μωϋσέως παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα ἐρρόντισε.* The full sense is, if you read, *αὐ τὸς λαβὼν*, that Moses himself, by whom the law had been spoken to the whole people, sprinkled. However, that supplement in Peter can also be omitted, if the construction is taken as if the order of the words were, *κλίση ὡς πιστῶ πλατιθέτωσαν*, *to the creator as being faithful let them commend their souls.*

CHAPTER V.

حلمه بغرامة مجمعة. Tremellius & Boderianus in the Paris edition: *And clothe yourselves inwardly with humility of mind.* I do not know why they translated it *inwardly.* Certainly they do not have it from Hebraism, where it means *outside, exterior.* Therefore in the Royal editions, *And be ye clothed about with meekness of spirit.* The Syriac looked to *cinxit, accinxit* whence also *sin don*, a linen cloth with which something is girded and wrapped. But we do not think the meaning of this adverb should be sought from there, but from the adjective, which Ferrarius translates, *Strictus, coarctatus, inculcatus, infartus*: also *charus, amplexu astrictus.* From this is conveniently derived *stricte, estricte, arcte.* Thus he not badly expressed what Peter said, *τιῶ ταπόνοφροσιώζω ἐγκομβώσαθε*, *tightly and as if stuffed, put on humility of mind.* In the Syriac-Arabic Lexicon, it is translated الحصيف, compressed, المرز, compact, and والمبرم, twisted, and *con* من والمشدت, firm, and وشديد, hard, and وصفيق, strict, and والسريع, hasty, unless perhaps this last one signifies something else akin to the preceding ones.

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

CHAPTER I. VERS. IV.

Εἰας φύσεως κοινωνοί. *Partakers of the divine nature*, that is, having communion with God. *θεῖα φύσις* is God, just as *φύσις ἀνθρωπίνη* is man in James 3, verse 7. And *φύσις θηρίων*, beast, *ibid.* See Johan. Cloppenburgium in his treatise *de Fædere.*

CHAPTER II.

VERS. 7. Lot is here described by the Apostle as an example of true piety, who could not bear even in his mind the wicked crimes of the Sodomites. Therefore,

that is a wicked saying which R. Sal. on Genesis 13, verse 10, brings forth from a Talmudic Tractate as a reproach against so great a man: על שטופי זימה בחר לו לוט בשכונתם, "because they (the Sodomites) were lost in wickedness, Lot chose their dwelling for himself." No less impious is the opinion of R. Solomon himself on verse 14, where, giving a reason why God spoke to Abraham only after Lot was separated from him, he says it was done because ככל זמן שהרשע עמו היה הדבור פורש ממנו, "as long as that wicked man was with him, the speech departed from him." Suffer that calumny, most just man, until כָּל־לְשׁוֹן תִּקְוֶה אֶתְּךָ לְמִשְׁפַּטַּי תִּשֵּׁי, "you will condemn every tongue that rises against you in judgment," Isaiah 54, verse 17.

CHAPTER III.

VERS. 7. *Oi ναῦ ἐρανοὶ κὶ ἡ γῆ τῶ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθσαυρισμένοι εἰσι, πυρὶ τηρέμβυοι.* As this Apostle teaches that the first world perished by water, but this one is reserved for fire, so, according to Josephus, *Antiquities* book 1, chapter 3, Adam had predicted that ἀφανισμόν τῶλων ἔσεαζ, *μεν κατ ἰσὺ'πυρος,τ'επρουγῆΤβιαυ×γσλη-θGiδalG*, that is, "all things would someday perish, once by the force of fire, and once by the force and multitude of water."

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN

CHAPTER I. VERS. IX.

God is faithful δίκαιο & just. I would dare to translate, *and true.* Such is what occurs in the *Seder Tefillot*, that is, in the book of Jewish prayers: ותקם את דברך כי צדיק את, "And you have performed your words, because you are just (that is, true)." See more on this matter observed by us on Luke 12, verse 57, and 16:9. Nor would you err, if you take *δίκαι* for merciful, which property of God is especially opposed to sins, and consoles the one who confesses and repents. In this sense *צדקה*, justice, is taken in Daniel 9, verse 16, where, after a confession of sins is made, the Prophet adds, *אֲדַבֵּר בְּכָל־יְהוָה וְיִשְׁבַּח נָא אֱלֹהֵיךָ.* The LXX: *Κύριε, ἐν πάσῃ ἐλεημοσίῳ σε Σποσραφήτω ὁ θυμός σε.* Hence, commonly in the book of prayers: *כי אין בנו מעשים צדקה עשה*, "because there are no works in us, do justice with us," where surely they do not implore the justice of God properly so called, which repays the due penalty for sins, but grace and mercy, which are opposed to the merits of sinners. Indeed, even more broadly, *צדקה, δικαιοσύνη*, denotes alms which are given to the poor among the Hebrews, which is known to all.

CHAPTER II.

VERS. 2. *οὐ πει τ ἡμετέρων δε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πει ὄλεξ χάσμα.* The Syriac, *ܟܗ ܣܦܩܝ ܘܥ ܠܐ ܠܗ ܘܥ ܟܗ ܣܦܩܝܢܐ.* Trem. & Bod & not for ours only, but also for the whole world's. This interpretation is by no means supported by the phrase, for it should have been said, *مگه سخف, I translate وفيه نحقا, وليس بدلنا نحن فقد لكن بدل العلم كله*, "not for ours only, but also for the whole world. So also the Arab, not for ours only, but for the whole world."

Furthermore, it is customary for the Hebrews to say "the whole world" for a certain universality of some people, who are being discussed in the subject matter. In Horajoth chap. 3, it is read in the Gemara עלמא הווי קיימי כולי עלמא מי הווי עייל רשב"ג הווי קיימי כולי עלמא "When R. Simeon son of Gamaliel (whom I have previously said was the Leader and head of the Sanhedrin) would enter (namely into the Synagogue) the whole world would rise before him," that is, as many as were in the Synagogue. So in this place, where it deals with the faithful (for a faithful one speaks to the faithful), by the sins of the whole world are understood the sins of all who are faithful.

VERS. 17. Ὁ κόσμος παράγεται, the world passes away. A great argument for the contempt of the world. Which the Arabs also, having noted, elegantly said, كَفَاكَ مِنْ عَفَاكَ مِنَ الْعُيُوبِ الدُّنْيَا أَنْ لَا تَبْقَى "it is enough for you of the world's faults, that it does not remain." That is, even if the world labored under no other fault than that it is transitory, it would be enough for you to hate it.

VERS. 27. Ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ αὐτὸ χρίσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων, καὶ ἀληθὲς ἐστὶ, I translate, "But as that same anointing teaches you about all things, so it is true, and is not a lie." Here, the first ὡς is not connective for me, but apodotical. As also elsewhere, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, "as in heaven, so on earth." Matth. 6. And above verse 18. καθὼς ἠκούσατε ὅτι ὁ Ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν. "As you have heard that the Antichrist is coming, so now many antichrists have come." The sense is, there is no need for anyone to teach you, but the anointing which you have received is sufficient for you. For this, as it teaches you about all things, so it is the very truth itself. Therefore, as it has taught you, remain in it. However, these words, "There is no need for anyone to teach you," do not abolish the use of the sacred Ministry, as we explained at Hebr. 8. verse 11.

CHAP. III.

VERS. 16. "We also ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." That saying of Maimonides in יסודי התורה chap. 5 is well-known. הרגת נפש מישראל לרפאת נפש אחרת ואין מאבדים נפש מפני נפש. That is, "The killing of an Israelite soul is for the healing of another soul, and a soul is not lost for the sake of a soul." That is, when an Israelite is handed over to death for the worship of God, while he loses his own soul, he provides for another's soul. And so he does not even lose his soul, when he gains a soul.

VERS. 18. "Let us not love in word and tongue, but in deed and in truth." The Arab correctly observed, that it is not simply forbidden here to testify to our love in word and tongue, but that we should not stop there, therefore he translated كلاما باللسان فقط "in word by tongue only." Moreover, in this place "truth" signifies real beneficence, by which charity is tested in reality. In the same way the LXX seniors translated אמנה by ἐλεημοσύνη in Isa. 38. 18. and no wonder: since the Rabbinic word, which for them signifies beneficence and almsgiving, is of

the same root as the Arabic صدق which for them denotes truth. whose root صدق in the first conjugation means "to be truthful." in the second, "to give alms, to be beneficent." So great is the affinity of beneficence with truth. And that charity without work is void, is also taught by that saying of Ali, أَخُوكَ مَنْ وَاسَاكَ فِي الشَّدَّةِ "your brother is he who helps you in danger." وسي properly is to shave the head with a موسى, a razor. but because the poor in the East assist each other by shaving their heads, it is also taken for "to help".

CHAP. V.

VERS. 9. "If we receive the testimony of men, how much more the testimony of God which is greater?" Thus Tremellius & Boderianus translated the Syriac. In the Syriac, however, it is not ܘܢܝܢܘܢ ܡܫܬܒܝܢܢܝܢ we receive, but ܡܫܬܒܝܢܢܝܢ simply, with neither a preceding nor a following pronoun of the first person. which by the law of Syriasm, can be translated in no other way than by the third person, "they receive." It seems he did not read, εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνομεν, but λαμβάνουσι. Or he wanted to indicate that the Apostle here speaks not in the person of the faithful, but of men. If men are accustomed to receive the testimony of men, and we do the same with the rest of men, how much more was the testimony of God to be admitted by all?

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

VERS. VI.

εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας. is the same as εἰς ἡμέραν μεγάλης κρίσεως, as the Chaldean Paraphrast speaks in Ps. 50. vers. 6. where those words which are in the Prophet יְבֹא אֱלֹהֵינוּ "our God will come," he says are to be pronounced by the just בְּיוֹם דִּינָא רַבָּא "in the day of great judgment."

Δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν. These words take away all hope of salvation from the devils. which is also noted in the Thargum Jerosolymitano, Gen. 3. vers. 15. on those words, "It shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel," with these words, בְּרֵם יְהוּי אִסוּ לְבַנְהָא דְאִיתְתָּא וְלֶךְ חוּיָא לֹא יְהוּי אִסוּ "but there will be a cure for the sons of the woman, but for you, serpent, there will be no cure."

VERS. 16. θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα are בְּשֵׁי פְנִים, θαυμαστοπρόσωποι. For thus the Greeks interpret that Hebrew phrase in Deuter. 10. vers. 17. Prov. 18. vers. 5. Job. 22. vers. 8.

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN.

CHAP. II. VERS. XI.

Ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος. thus in Isa. 65. for "I will repay into their bosom," Jonathan has וְאִמְסֹר לְמוֹתָא תְּגִינְאִית גּוּיְתְּהוֹן, "I will deliver their bodies to the second death." In the

same chap. vers. 15. for יהמיתך "he will kill you," וימיתכון מותא תנינא "he will kill you with a second death."

CHAP. III.

VERS. 4. Περιπατήσουσι μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς. This perhaps refers to the sacerdotal custom of the Jews, about which we read in Maimonides in the Mishnah, tractate ביאת המקדש, c. 11. that the great Sanhedrin had its assembly in the temple, where יושבין שם הכהנים הגדולים ובודקין הכהנים בייחוסין ובמומין. כל כהן שנמצא פסול בייחוסו לובש שחורים ומתעטף שחורים ויוצא מן העזרה וכל מי שנמצא שלם וכשר לובש לבנים ומשמש עם אחיו הכהנים: "where they judge concerning sacerdotal matters, and inquire into the genealogies and imperfections of the Priests. Any Priest who is found rejected regarding his genealogy, is clothed and veiled in black garments, and exits from the court. But whoever is found whole and upright, is clothed in white, and ministers with his brother priests."

VERS. 14. Ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ. This seems to be taken from Prov. 8. vers. 22. where the eternal Wisdom of God says, יהוה קנני ראשית דרכו קדם מפעליו מאז "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, the first of his works of old." not the first creature, but the effective beginning of all creatures is understood, through which the Father created all things. Hebr. 1. v. 2. And Christ is the eternal wisdom of God. Whence also the Thargum Hierosolymitanum translated those words of Moses Gen. 1. vers. 1. בְּרֵאשִׁית בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים in the beginning God created, as "in wisdom God created," that is, in his eternal wisdom, which is the beginning and cause of all things.

VERS. 21. "He who overcomes, I will give to him to sit with me on my throne, as I also overcame and sit with my Father on his throne." For the throne of a king among the Orientals is ample and wide, like a bed, raised a little above the ground by supports, and adorned with carpets. so that besides the seat proper to the King, others also whom the King wishes to honor can have seats on the same throne. The Arabs call it سرير. But كرسى is the seat of Judges and Patriarchs, suitable for only one man. although taken more generally it is also attributed to kings, like the Hebrew כסא from which it is derived. Whence in this place for ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ μου the Arab has علي كرسى and for ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ علي كرسى, which is when the King is considered as a judge. but when his royal Majesty is to be expressed, they say عرش.

CHAP. V.

VERS. 8. Γεμούσας θυμιαμάτων. this refers to the incense of the Old Testament, about which Josephus Antiq. l. 3. c. 9. says δις τῆς ἡμέρας πρὶν τε ἀνασχεῖν τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ πρὸς δυσμαῖς θυμιᾶν ἐγρηῖν. "twice daily, before the sun rose and around sunset, it was necessary to burn incense."

CHAP. X.

VERS. 6. "And he swore ἐν τῷ ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων." "by him who lives for ever and ever." This is an epithet of the true God, who in Dan. 4. vers. 31. is called אלהים חי "the living one of the age," that is, for all eternity. I would like here to examine in passing, what Anchialus means in Martial in that distich l. 9. Epigr. 95. "Ecce negas jurasque mihi per Templa Tonantis; Non credo, jura verpe per Anchialum." The distinguished Johan. Selden examines this word in his Prolegomena de Successionibus, where he rejects the opinion of Joseph Scaliger, who asserts that the Hebrew formula of an oath אלהים חי "ala," that is, "God lives," deceived Martial, so that he thought they swore by Anchialam: likewise that of Thomas Farnabius, who wanted it derived from אלהים חי אמ "im chi ala," that is, "if God lives": he brings forth his own opinion, namely that the complete formula is אלהים חי יפרע "may he who lives forever avenge," which can be correctly read *iperan chi olam*. whence Martial corruptly "per Anchialum." But I have no doubt that "per" in the Poet is of the Latin language, as in "per templa Tonantis," and that the Hebrew formula for swearing is contained in the single word Anchialum, which I resolve into אלהים חי ענה "Ane chi alam," that is, "be a witness, you who live forever." for the word ענה to hear thus means to bear witness everywhere. Although I confess I would hardly prefer my opinion to Farnabius's, provided that for the Hebrew אמ is substituted the Syriac or Rabbinic אן. for then it sounds אן חי אלה "en chi ala," "if God lives." which with a Latin ending is Anchialus, and in the Accusative Anchialum. nor does it matter that the Syrians read אן with a *tseri*, not with a *pathach*. For it is known that the masters call פתח קטן *camets parvum*, and therefore it has a pronunciation akin to it. whence also the Greek *ai* derives its origin.

CHAP. XIII.

VERS. 18. Ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ χξς 666. Irenaeus adapted the word Λατεῖνος to this, which would signify the Roman Church, from which the Antichrist is to come forth, because in numbers λ 30. α 1. τ 300. ε 5. ι 10. υ 50. ο 70. ς 200. are valid, and all joined together they make up the aforesaid sum. Others derive the same number from μίσσα ἢ παπική, which first began to be sung around the year of Christ 666. Some recur to the Hebrew appellation רומיה. Schickardus in Bechinath Happer. p. 63.

CHAP. XIV.

VERS. 8. Ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς πεπότικε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. I translate, "Because from the poisoned wine of her fornication she has made all nations drink," οἴνος θυμοῦ, in this place indeed, where a meretricious matter is being discussed, is a philter, or a poisoned potion adapted with some drug, so that others may be drawn into love by it. θυμός from the usage of the Hellenists, signifies not only wrath, but also poison; and it corresponds to the חמה of the Hebrews, which similarly signifies both. Indeed, they also translated רֵאשׁ, gall, hemlock, poison, by θυμόν. as Deut. 32. v. 33. חמת תנינם יינם וראש פתנים אקר. θυμός

δράκοντων ὁ οἶνος αὐτῶν, καὶ θυμὸς ἀσπίδων ἀνίατος. See also vers. 24. likewise in Psalm according to the Greeks 57. according to the Hebrews 58. 4. Job. 20. 16. & elsewhere חמק occurs for poison.

CHAP. XVI.

VERS. 19. "To give her the cup τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ." In Hebrew I translate, חמק שׂרר יין ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ. For שׂרר, gall, bitterness, is translated as θυμὸς by the LXX. Deut. 32. 33. Job. 20. vers. 16. Amos 6. 12. elsewhere it is translated as πικρόν, as in Jer. 23. vers. 15. שׂרר מִי מִי קִיִּיתִי, ποτιῶ αὐτοὺς ὕδωρ πικρόν. elsewhere it is translated as χολή, bile. so that θυμὸς, πικρόν, χολή are synonyms for them. just as therefore above in chap. 14. 8. where a meretricious matter was discussed, θυμὸς signified φαρμακεία, or some poisoned drug, which was used in philters, so here, where punishment is discussed, it signifies bitterness, which mixed with wine, by the custom of the Hebrews is accustomed to be offered to those being punished. just as in Matth. 27. 34. they are said to have given to our Savior οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον. which from Hellenism could also have been said θυμοῦ μεμιγμένον.

CHAP. XVIII.

VERS. 17. ὅσοι τὴν θάλασσαν ἐργάζονται. Beza, "as many as make a living from the sea." I would prefer with the Vulgate, "who work in the sea." or, "who cultivate or handle the sea." In Hebrew אֲשֶׁר יַעֲבֹדוּ אֶת הַיָּם. Just as in Gen. 2. vers. 15. Adam is said to have been placed in the garden לְעֹבְדָהּ "to cultivate it," LXX, ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτόν. And 2 Sam. 9. vers. 10. אֲשֶׁר לֹא יַעֲבֹדָהּ לְךָ "you shall cultivate the land for him," LXX, καὶ ἐργᾶ αὐτῷ τὴν γῆν.

CHAP. XX.

VERS. 6. & 14. Ὁ θάνατος ὁ δεύτερος. Thus eternal death was called by the Hebrews, as is clear from Jonathan on Isa. 65. v. 6. where for וְשִׁלַּמְתִּי עַל חַיָּקָם "I will repay into their bosom," he has וְאִמְסֹר לְמוֹתָא תַנְיִנָּא יַת גּוּיְתָהוֹן "I will deliver their bodies to the second death." And v. 15. for וְהִמְיִתְךָ "he will slay you" וּמִיִּתְכֹן מוֹתָא תַנְיִנָּא "and he will make you die the second death."

END.

LATIN INDEX OF THINGS AND WORDS.

A.

- **Abba**, what this Chaldaic word denotes. 112. why the Greek ὁ πατήρ is joined with it. *ibid.*
- **Abel**, how, according to the Apostle, though dead, he still speaks. 319
- **Abel's sacrifice**, what commended it to God. 318

- **Abraham**, in what way he is said to have been made heir of the world through promise. 51
- **Abraham's boasting**, what it was. 46, 47
- **Abraham and his seed**, a twofold consideration with respect to the covenant initiated with him. 53
- **Abraham**, in what sense James says he was justified by works. 334
- **Accusation**, to man's twofold accusation, a twofold justification is opposed. 336
- **Adam's prediction** of the world's destruction, from Josephus. 350
- **Adverbs of quality** are expressed by the preposition τ and a noun. 228
- **Altar of incense**, $\thetaυσιαστήριον \thetaυμιάματος$, where it stood in the temple. 312
- **Amen**, the force of this little word. 218
- **Anathema**, what it is. 122
- **Anchialus**, by whom Martial jests that the Jews swear, what it is. 358
- **Ark of the covenant**, what things it contained deposited within it. 311
- **Ark of Noah**, a type of Christ. 321
- **Ears**, how the Father pierced Christ's, and what this expression means. 315

B.

- **Baal** and other gods of the Gentiles were of indeterminate sex. 157
- **Baptism**, why used for illumination. 305
- **Baptized for the dead**, in what sense the Apostle says this. 219 & seq.
- **Blessing of the law** by שם המפורש , when the priest ceased to pronounce it. 245.
- **Blessing of the law**, what the Hebrews call it, and what laws they establish for it. 244
- **Beneficence**, how it differs from Alms. 232

C.

- **Cabalists**, how they derive Jesus from the dimensions of Noah's Ark. 321
- **Causes** among the Hebrews, two kinds were adjudicated by two kinds of Judges. 204
- **Charity**, should it therefore be called the form of faith, because faith is perfected by works? 335
- **Christ** $\acute{\omicron}\rho\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma \upsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, in what sense. 3. not an ordinary $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, but true God. 272. why a propitiation already placed even in the Old Testament. 41
- **Christ's comparison** with Moses in terms of authority. 297 & seq.
- **Circumcision**, how much it was esteemed by the Jews. 123
- **Minister of circumcision**, how Christ was. 187
- **Cleomenes's head**, suspended on a cross, was wrapped by a serpent, from what physical cause. 236
- **Knowledge of the Lord** in the New Testament is far greater than it was in the Old Testament. 276

- **Concubines**, if they were freeborn and Israelite, their sons also inherited. 248
- **Concupiscence**, the root of both sin and death. 329
- **Conscience**, its power. 20
- **Corrupt**, who are. 204
- **Original corruption**, how it comes to reign in man. 86
- **Creature** or creatures, in very common Hebrew and Arabic usage, denotes men. 10, 288, 329

D.

- **Dative** among Syrians is often used for the ablative with the preposition *a*. 10
- **God** is asserted to punish sins with sins. 15
- **Devils**, no hope of salvation remains for them. 355
- **Rich**, who is. 259
- **Lord of the worlds**, i.e., of creatures, is very commonly said by the Rabbis for God. 290

E.

- **Church**, why it is called *καὶ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας*. 274
- **Ellipsis** of a verb, used by Paul. 132
- **Enallage** of the participle for the infinitive is very common for the Greeks. 203
- **Epistles to the Romans and Hebrews** were written by Paul in another language than Greek, is not conceded by the Syriac Scholiast. 1
- **Esau**, how God excluded him from the covenant. 135, 136
- **From faith to faith**, what this means. 8

F.

- **Ferment**, to purge out the old, the Apostle exhorts. 205
- **Faith**, when it is said to cooperate with its works, is it correctly inferred that it also justifies with works? 333
- **Faith's obedience**, why so called? 6
- **Faith of the saints**, for what reason it has its power even after their death. 320
- **Covenant** made with Abraham, its typical and antitypical promise is explained. 126
- **Covenants** of the Israelites, two: the old and the new. That one of works, this one of grace. 123

G.

- **Genealogy** and books of genealogical controversies of the Jews. 273

- **Gentiles**, how they, by nature, did what was of the law. 20
- **Glory of the incorruptible God**, how the Gentiles exchanged it for the likeness of the image of man. 11
- **Gloriation**, what is approved or disapproved. 46, 47

H.

- **Heirs of the world**, how we become so with Abraham. 51, 52
- **Inheritance of the land of Canaan**, a symbol of what thing. 53

I.

- **Imputation**, twofold, and the foundation of each. 46
- **Infinitive active** among the Hebrews is frequently taken passively. 306
- **An angry man** is unfit for teaching, why. 287
- **Descendants of Isaac**, what great and long-lasting prerogative they had over the Ishmaelites. 128
- **Ishmael**, although circumcised, was not a son of the promise and of the covenant initiated with Abraham. 127
- **Ishmael**, why he was excluded from the inheritance. 248
- **Israel**, whence and why Jacob was called so. 126
- **Jews**, when were all those who were previously called Israelites, so named. 21
- **Believing Jews** are sons of Abraham by a triple right. 57. by what right they boast of eternal liberty. 135. how through the letter of the law and Circumcision they were made transgressors of the law? 25
- **Jews' manner and mode of praying** in cases of litigation. 204
- **System of judgments** among the Hebrews, what it was. 204
- **Justice of God**, what it is. 38, 39. how it appears in the work of redemption. 43
- **The term justice**, whether it always denotes God's goodness, mercy, salvation, and redemption. 42
- **Man is justified by works**, and not by faith alone, in what sense James says this. 336
- **Justification**, twofold in the orthodox sense, what and of what kind each is. 102 & seq. according to the Papists, also twofold, but both are most false. 105, 106
- **Justification**, what is its cause. 107

L.

- **Law and Grace**, how much they differ. 88
- **Law**, why it is called by the Apostle James the law of liberty. 137, 330. why royal or kingly. *ibid.* & 332. it condemns not from its purpose, but accidentally. 25. how long it dominates man. 78. how it is said to increase sin. 72, 73, 86

- **Law of the members**, whether it differs from the law of sin. 93
- **Law of the mind**, what it is and why it is so called by the Apostle. 94
- **Law of sin** opposed to the law of the mind, what it is. 94. taken generally, what it is. 97
- **Law's comparison with a husband**. 78, 85
- **End of the law**, Christ, how. 149
- **Lawful use of the law** for the faithful, what it is. 81
- **Change of the Mosaic law** is incredible to the Jews. 309
- **Book** for the Pentateuch of Moses. 315
- **Books of lineage and genealogical controversies** were held by each family of the Jews. 273
- **Patrons of free will** are refuted. 90
- **Lot's probity** is vindicated from the reproach of the Rabbis. 350

M.

- **Marcionites'** custom of baptizing for the dead, what it was. 219
- **Melchizedek** is greater than the Levites, for what reasons. 308
- **Mind** as opposed to members, what it means. 94
- **Second death**, what it is to the Hebrews. 360
- **Moses**, in what sense he is said to have been faithful in the whole house of God. 297
- **Moses'** history, adopted by Pharaoh's daughter, from Josephus. 322
- **Moses**, how much the Jews esteem him. 299
- **World** (עולם) is sometimes used by the Hebrews specifically for the blessedness of the future world. 53
- **Whole world** for a certain universality of some, about whom the subject matter deals, from Hebraism. 352
- **Three worlds**, the wise men of the Hebrews constituted, which and why. 289
- **Change**, of different kinds. 11

N.

- **Nature**, the Hebrews derive knowledge from ceremonies. 262
- **His own name**, why Paul prefixed it to the titles of his Epistles, a futile reason. 1
- **The ineffable name's** correct pronunciation is unknown to the Jews today. 245
- **The Apocalyptic number** χξς, what authors think it designates. 358

O.

- **Good works**, how they perfect faith? 335. to what extent they are also imputed to the regenerate for justice. 104
- **Works and Faith** are opposed to each other. 49

- **Oriental**s, it is most common for them to express their wishes in the past tense. 28

P.

- **On the night of Passover**, fathers were obliged to narrate three things to their children, and what they were. 202
- **Paul**, when he was called so from Saul. 1. how a Servant of J. Christ, *ibid.* how he boasts of being freed from the law of sin, who a little before complained that he was still enslaved to the law of sin. 97
- **Poor**, who is. 259
- **Poor**, whence the Hebrews say it. 259
- **Actual sin**, three degrees, which are they. 329
- **Promptitude and alacrity of prayer** is a good sign, and why. 341
- **Prerogative of the firstborn**. 278
- **Promises** to Abraham and his seed, two were made, which ones. 52
- **Pronoun**, to repeat the noun in place of it is common for the Hebrews. 343
- **Prophets**, how the spirits of the prophets are subject to them. 218
- **His neighbor**, in what sense it is said that no one will teach him. 309

Q.

- **God's rest**, indicated in the fourth commandment, what and how manifold it is. 300
- **Rest of the seventh day** was a type of the future grace in Christ. 302
- **Our true rest**, what it is. 301-302

R.

- **Reprobate mind**, what it is. 16

S.

- **Sanctification of the Sabbath**, what it is and to what it looks. 300
- **Testing or rejection of priests** among the Jews, how and by whom it was done. 356
- **End of sacrifices**, even according to the testimony of the Jews, what it was. 40
- **Care for one's own salvation** is incumbent on each individual, it is not to be entrusted to pastors alone. 258
- **Saints**, how and why they cannot sin. 304
- **Sanctity** inherent in us is not the justice by which we are justified before God. 39
- **Royal scepter**, if kings extend it towards someone, what they mean. 292

- **Syriac scholiast's** absurd opinion about the flesh of the still innocent Adam being put on by the son of God, is noted. 100
- **Seed of Abraham**, twofold. 56
- **Serpents**, how antiquity believed them to be born from human bodies. 236
- **Servants**, of how many kinds. 1
- **Servitude** does not apply to the seed of Abraham, but liberty. 135
- **Sign of circumcision**, what kind of construction. 50
- **Stars and Spheres** are animate, is the common opinion of the Hebrews. 221
- **Incense** in the O.T., when and how often per day it was made. 357
- **Great Sanhedrin's** session and judgment concerning the Priests, where. 356
- **Syriasm** was once vernacular to the Apostles. 24

T.

- **Tabernacle** and the ceremonies pertaining to it, the Hebrews referred to Philosophy and natural matters. 262
- **Royal throne** among the Orientals, its description and use. 357
- **Golden censer**, its use and keeping. 313
- **To transgress the law**, what it signifies. 23

V.

- **Variant readings**, what is often the cause of them. 70
- **To will and to perfect**, God does not operate in his own at the same level nor to the same extent. 90
- **To hold the truth in unrighteousness**, what it means. 8
- **Traveler's prayer** for his host, what was the customary one among the Jews. 326
- **Vices of younger widows** are reprehended, which ones. 276
- **Called of J. Christ**, an emphatic construction, signifying the dominion of Christ. 6
- **Volume of the book** for the Pentateuch. 315
- **Urns of Manna and Aaron's rod**, whether they were also in the ark next to the tables of the covenant. 311
- **Father's wife** for stepmother, from Hebrew. 202
- **The customary formula of the Hebrews for honoring wives**, which one. 345

GREEK INDEX

A.

- Αιτιᾶσθαι, what it means. 36
- Ἀγιωσύνη, what it means. 4
- Ἀδικία for falsehood. 32
- Ἀγίασμα, i.e., God. 349
- Αἰῶνες, why the Apostle used the plural number. 290
- Ἀκοή for preaching, from Hebraism. 154, 155
- Ἀθετεῖν, what it means. 197
- Ἀλήθεια for δικαιοσύνη. 216
- Ἀλλά, sometimes confirmative, for "indeed, certainly". 75
- Ἀνακαινίζειν, passively, to be renewed. 306
- Ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, what it means. 177
- Ἀναλῦσαι, what it means. 256, 285
- Ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν, i.e., ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν. 5
- Ἀνατολή for splendor, also for shoot. 290
- Ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι, what it means. 138
- Ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι, what it means. 280
- Ἀντιμισθία, what it means. 15
- Ἀπέχειν, sometimes it is transitive, for to make abstain. 275
- Ἀπλοῦς, what it means. 328
- Ἀποκαραδοκία, what it means. 115
- Ἀπόλαυσις, what it means. 323
- Ἀσθενής & ἀσθενεῖν, what they mean. 60
- Ἄσπονδοι, who they are. 18
- Ἀσύνθετοι, who they are. 18
- Αὐτά, what it means. 263
- Ἀφορισμένος ὁ Παῦλος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, what. 2
- Αὐτάρκης, truly rich. 259
- Αὐταρκείας, its fruit. 280

B.

- Βασκαίνειν and Βασκάνειν signify both to bewitch and to envy. 243

Γ.

- Γενέσθω, aorist, having the signification of the future. 58

Δ.

- Δε, enim. 110
- Διὰ, on account of. 40
- Διὰ, for ἐν, from Hebraism. 228
- Διὰ τοῦτο, for "because". 65
- Διαλογισμοί, what they are. 179
- Διαπορεῖν, to cross over. 191
- Διαφέρειν, τὰ διαφέροντα, & Διάφορον, what they mean. 22

- Δίκαιος for ἀληθής. ἄδικος for ψευδής. 30, 32
- Δίκαιος for merciful. 350
- Δικαιοσύνη for παν, truth, everywhere in the LXX interpreters. 30, 32
- Διότι & διὸ differ in signification. 37
- Δόξα for ἰσχύς. 74

E.

- Εἰκὼν, what it is. 11
- Εἰς for ἐν. 213
- Εἰς for περὶ. 117, 175
- Εἰς is often used for ἐν. 179, also for "on account of". 117
- Ἐκουσίως peccare, what it is. 316
- Ἐλαττοῦν, what it means. 295
- Ἐν for εἰς, in the manner of the Hebrews. 13
- Ἐν & εἰς do not always denote a thing which is inside another, but also what is annexed and adheres to another. 312
- Ἐν for περὶ, from a Hebrew idiom. 156
- Ἐν δυνάμει is not correctly translated as "powerfully". 3
- Ἐντολή for νόμος, taken collectively. 84
- Ἐξω, often has the force of coupling. 38
- Ἐξαγοράζειν τὸν καιρὸν, from where this phrase is taken. 253, 263
- Ἐπανάληψις & ἐπαναλαμβάνειν, what they mean. 177
- Ἐπίγνωσις & ἐπιγινώσκειν, the same as γνῶσις & γινώσκειν. 16
- Ἐπιστομύειν with the accusative. 27
- Ἐργάζεσθαι τι, to work around something. 258, 360
- Ἔσται absolutely placed for "it shall be". 44
- Εὐπερίστατος, what it is. 325
- Ἐφευρεται κακῶν, inventors of evil things. 18

Θ.

- Θεία φύσις, i.e., God. 349
- Θεοστυγεῖς, what it means. 17
- Θυματήριον, what it was and where it was kept. 312
- Θυμός, what it means. 359

I.

- Ἱεραρχῶν, what it means. 190
- Ἰλαστήριον Χριστὸν προέθετο ὁ Θεός, i.e., God put him forth already before, namely in the O. T. 40. why? 41
- Ἴνα, and also ὅπως, sometimes has the force of commanding. 29, 347

K.

- Καὶ preceded by ὡς, apodotical. 352
- Καὶ before οὕτως, apodotical, redundant in the manner of the Hebrews. 62, 63
- Καὶ τοῦτο, and therefore. 177
- Κατὰ καιρὸν, what it means. 60
- Κατάνυξις & καταλύσσειν, what they mean. 157
- Καταργεῖν, what it means. 82
- Κατεργάζεσθαι σωτηρίαν for ἐργάζεσθαι κατὰ τὴν σωτηρίαν, to work towards salvation. 258
- Κατέχειν. 8
- Κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, whether it is an ἀσύνδετον phrase. 2
- Κριτήρια for causes and lawsuits to be judged. 203
- Κυβερνήσεις, what they are. 214
- Κῶμα, what it is. 173

Λ.

- Λαλεῖν, in the middle conjugation for λαλεῖσθαι. 321
- Λατρεία λογική, what it is. 169
- Λογίζεσθε, what it means. 189
- Λόγος. 49

Μ.

- Μακαρισμός, Beatitude. 246
- Μάταιοι, who they are. 205
- Μετά, preposition, signifying not society but argument and matter. 188
- Μεταλλάσσειν τι ἐν τινι, a Hellenistic phrase. 13
- Μήποτε, sometimes interrogative. 314. for "whether perhaps". 283
- Μόρφωσις τῆς εὐσεβείας, in what sense. 23

Ν.

- Νοεῖν for φρονεῖν. 269
- Νομικός, lawyer and amanuensis. 288
- Νοῦς ἀδόκιμος, what it is. 17
- Νῶτα for ὀσφύς, what it means: loin. 159

Ο.

- Ὀγκος for tumor and pride. 325
- Οἱ ἐκ νόμου for υἱοὶ νόμου. 55
- Οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας, what it means. 19
- Οἶνος θυμοῦ, what it means. 359
- Ὅμοιομα, how it differs from εἰκόν. 11
- Ὅμολογῶ ἐν σοὶ & ὁμολογῶ σε, how they differ. 346

- Ὀνειδισμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, what it is. 324
- Ὅπως sometimes has the force of commanding. 29, 347
- Ὁρθοτομεῖν, what it means. 232
- Ὅς for ὁ. 3
- Ὅς for αὐτὸς or ἐκεῖνος, relative for demonstrative. 195
- Ὁ μὲν, used distributively for ὁ μὲν... ὁ δὲ. 180
- Οὐ when it is redundant. 35
- Ὀψώνια, what it means. 78

Π.

- Παραβάτης νόμου, who is. 23
- Παραδιδόναι is constructed indifferently with εἰς and ἐν. 14
- Παρέρχεσθαι, what it means. 71
- Πατρία for familia. 251
- Περί ἀμαρτίας, what it means. 100
- Περιέργα, what it means. 277
- Περπερεύομαι, πέρπερος, περπερεία, what they mean. 215
- Πιστεύειν εἰς & πιστεύειν τινί, how they differ. 284
- Πλεονεκτεῖν. πλεονεκτεῖν ἀπό τινος, what it means. 225
- Πλεονεξία. & πλεονεκτεῖν τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐν τῷ πράγματι is understood by Jerome of adultery. 267
- Πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης for the divine nature of Christ. 4
- Πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, what it is. 157
- Προαιτιᾶσθαι, what it means. 36
- Προσκαρτερεῖν, what it means. 175
- Προστάτις, what it means. 193
- Πρόσωπον, the ambiguous signification of this word. 39
- Πράοτης, what it means. 292

Ρ.

- Ῥῆμα & ῥήματα, what they mean. 282

Σ.

- Σπέρμα, not only said of many, but also can be said of one. 246
- Σπλάγχνα, what it means. 233
- Στοιχεῖν, what it means. 50
- Συναπάγεσθαι, what it means. 171
- Συζητητής, disputer. 198
- Συντελεῖν καὶ συντέμνειν λόγον, what it means. 144
- Σύστημα, what it means. 36
- Σφραγίζειν, the use of this verb. 192

Τ.

- Τελεῖν νόμον, the same as πράσσειν τὸν νόμον. 24
- Τοῦ, article prefixed to infinitives with ἔνεκα understood, from Hebraism, where ל does the same. 199

Υ.

- Ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν τὸν ἀδελφόν, what it means. 269

Φ.

- Φόρος, what it means. 175
- Φρόνιμος, what it means. 172
- Φωτίζειν, what it means to the Hellenists. 305
- Φωτίζεσθαι & baptizari, why they are the same for the Syrian. 305
- Φῶτισμα, baptism was formerly called, why. 305

Χ.

- Χάριν for ἔνεκα, is postponed to a substantive or infinitive. 277
- Χρᾶσθαι δουλεία for servire. 209
- Χρεῶσται, what it means. 170

HEBREW INDEX

- אמן, its usefulness. 218
- אמר with ב, how constructed. 13
- אשתכר, stipend. 115
- ב, preposition for ἐν. 156
- ב with a substantive for an adverb of quality. 228
- בריות, creatures. 288
- ברית, how many kinds. 123
- ברכת התורה, 244
- בת קול, what it means to the Rabbis. 155
- במילות חסדים differs from צדקה in three ways. 232
- דיני ממונות, 204
- דרך ארץ, 331
- דרוש, with derivatives. 198
- ה, the use of this particle. 162
- הדיוטות, 204
- החליף with ב, what it means. 13
- הן, how it is constructed. 13
- הן, what it is expl. 9. 16. 138
- הן, Syrians, what it means. 178
- הן, what. 30
- הן for כי, but one. 4

- הן, they give birth. 115
- חבל, 154
- חמה, 359
- חן, 296
- חסד, 205
- חפץ, three meanings. 122
- חרון אף, whence. 144
- חשך, 174
- חתם, to finish. 192
- טוב, for in the presence of. 312
- יד, indeed, but. 75
- כל, 352
- כליון & כלה, seq. 143
- כלי, 178
- ל for an infinitive and participles, is explained in many places. 180
- ל is said of God. 3
- מדה, 315
- מדת הדין, 40
- מומחים, 204
- מצוה, 123
- נאמן, 298
- נהר, 306
- נרדם, 158
- סמאל, 235
- עבד, 187
- עברה, twofold. 61
- עולם, is taken in two ways. 154
- עולם, which is taken. 289
- עז, two meanings, strength and glory. 74
- פנים, in two ways. 224
- פסק, 282
- צבאות, who they are. 7.
- צדקה, 354, 353
- צור, two meanings. 324
- קנא with derivatives. 287
- ראש, 359
- רחם, what. 139
- רשויות, 255
- שבועה, what, Exod. 48. 12. 32
- שלום, who. 53
- שכינה, defined. 123
- תרדמה, 158

- ܠܐܘܢ, perhaps. 62
- ܠܐܘܢ, its use. 25
- 288 & 243 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐ
- ܠܐܘܢ, with preceding ܠ and following ܐܘܢ 346
- ܠܐܘܢ, is explained in several places. 117
- 235 ,ܠܐܘܢܐ
- ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐܐܘܢܐ, phrase is explained. 119
- 283 ,ܠܐܘܢܐ
- 159 ,ܠܐܘܢܐ
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, with its conjugates. 348
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, with its derivatives. 345
- ܠܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ, what and whence. 208
- 169 ,ܠܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ
- 225 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ
- 258 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ
- 262 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ
- 256 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐ
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, with conjugates. 255
- ܠܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ, what. 19
- ܠܐܘܢܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ, what. 36
- 292 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐ
- 288 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ
- 238 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐ
- 277 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ
- 268 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐ
- 7 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐ
- 257 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ
- ܐܠܐܘܢܐ, what 2 Cor. 7. 270
- ܐܠܐܘܢܐ, with derivatives. 252
- 285 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐ
- 263 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐ
- 20 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐ
- 251 ,ܐܠܐܘܢܐܘܢܐ
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, how to write it. 160
- 293 ,ܠܐܘܢܐ
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, when. 56
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, for the Syrians it is also ܐܘܢܐ, from. 10
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, is different from the Hebrew. 8
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, transgression. 65
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, with. 346
- 286 ,ܠܐܘܢܐ
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, two meanings. 339
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, what it is. 32
- ܠܐܘܢܐ, with an infinitive, what it is. 113

- ד, with following 226 ד
- 346 ,ד
- ד, for 4 ,עו
- ד, it brought. 3
- 233 ,ד
- 197 ,ד
- 174 ,ד
- 217 ,ד
- ,ד what. 14
- 40 ,ד
- 331 ,ד
- 327 ,ד
- 292 ,ד
- 187 ,ד
- ,ד with derivatives. 290
- 2 ,ד
- ,ד profit. 78
- 40 ,ד
- ,ד three meanings. 187
- ,ד for 252 ,ד
- 218 ,213 ,ד

ARABIC INDEX

- 277 ,ابطيل
- 264 ,ابتاع
- 241 ,اجتهاد
- 32 ,احري
- 58 ,اخلص
- 12 ,استبدل
- 279 ,استراح
- 260 ,استغني
- 82 ,استاهل
- 76 ,اسلم
- 76 ,اسلام
- 12 ,اشترى
- 160 ,اصار
- 47 ,44 ,اعمال
- 230 ,امي
- 20 ,انت
- 226 ,انعام
- 237 ,انتقان
- ب
- 157 ,باعل

- بالي, 210
- بدل, 352
- بسطة, 326
- بت,
- تاييد الروح, 7
- تبرر, 326
- تجارة, 78
- تصريف, 75
- تطهير, 253
- تعصب, 268
- تقدم, 40
- ثقل, 325
- ج,
- جياية, 176
- جزم, 45
- جزية, 176
- جس, 28
- حرم, 122
- خ,
- ختم, 192
- خراج, 175
- خلف, 329
- د,
- دافع, 173
- دهر, 289
- ذلل, 74
- راجع علم, 44
- رحم, 28
- رضوان, 14
- ز,
- زكاة, 175
- س,
- سخت, 328
- سلف, 276
- سنة, 64
- منها, 27, 49
- ش,
- شبه, 11
- شب, 89
- شتم, 252
- شرف, 296
- شره, 340
- ص,
- صالحة, 279

- صبة, 314
- صدق, 353
- صبرم, 29
- صلي, 29
- صهيون, 162
- ض,
- ضمائر, 20
- ع,
- عالم, 289
- عجم, 216
- عرش, 357
- عرف, 227
- عزز, 74
- عشور, 176
- عفة, 253
- علام, 289
- علي, 168
- عوض, 282
- غ,
- غني, 326
- غنى, 259
- غيرة, 19
- ف,
- فارق, 256
- فقتش, 201
- فرضت, 64
- قضاء, 341
- قطع, 144
- كتاب ايليا, 156
- كرسي, 357
- ل,
- لفظة, 155
- لم, 186
- مجد, 122
- محروم, 140
- مرحومة, 76
- مسلم, 201
- معشر, 130
- معني, 205
- مقسى, 343
- مقتني, 239
- موجودة, 138
- نازع, 169
- قاطعة, 65

- ناموس, 212
- نفاق, 18
- فية, 235
- و,
- وفاء, 235

INDEX OF PLACES IN HOLY SCRIPTURE,

which are explained here in passing.

- Gen. 1. v. 26. (295)
- Exod. 32. v. 25. (333)
- Levit. 16. v. 12. (313)
- Deut. 18. v. 15, 18. (298)
 - 2. v. 17. (278)
 - 3. v. 12-14. (250)
- 1 Reg. 8. v. 9. (311)
- 2 Reg. 2. v. 9. (278)
 - 2. v. 4. (192)
- 2 Paral. 5. v. 10. (311)
- Psal. 8. v. 5-8. (294)
 - 2. v. 8.
 - 3. v. 6. (19, 30)
 - 4. v. 28. (39)
 - 5. v. 31. (104)
 - 6. v. 4. (308)
- Prov. 16. v. 27. (18)
- Isa. 52. v. 13. (299)
 - 2. v. 12. (149)
 - 3. v. 16. (43)
- Ezech. 28. v. 12. (192)
- Matth. 5. v. 39. (203)
 - 2. v. 22. (328)
 - 3. v. 19. (30)
 - 4. v. 35. (320)
- Luc. 1. v. 78. (190, 291)
 - 2. v. 37, 38. (310)
- Joh. 3. v. 27. (305)
 - 2. v. 18. (205)
 - 3. v. 33. (135)
 - 4. v. 16. (5)
 - 5. v. 26. (5)
 - 6. v. 14. (5)
- 1 Cor. 3. v. 21. (52)

- 2. v. 9. (106)
- Gal. 3. v. 16. (52, 53)
 - 2. v. 23. seqq. (131)
- v. (83)
- Phil. 2. v. 13. (90)
 - 2. v. 11. (5)
- 1 Tim. 1. v. 8-11. (80)
- Jacob. 1. v. 3. (59)
 - 2. v. 8. (34, 137)
- 1 Pet. 1. v. 13. (321)
- 2 Pet. 1. v. 3. (218)
- Apoc. 6. v. 8. (189)

ADDENDA

to the Latin Index.

- Syriac pleonastic affix. (65)
- Punctuation mark of distinction in Syriac. (45)
- Words that mean "to be" also mean "to begin to be" to the Orientals. (184)
- Participles for the present of the indicative. (143) for the future.
- Words for cutting and incising also mean to decree and conclude in the Orient. (142)
- The past tense for Orientals expresses a wish. (28)
- Syriac verbs for a participle. (316)
- Throne. (357)

END.